

**College of Education Executive Committee Meeting**  
**Monday, December 8, 2008**  
**Minutes**

Present: Elmano Costa, Cathlin Davis, Heather Deaner, Ruth Fassinger, J. Sue Fletcher, Juan Flores, Mira Mayer, Oddmund Myhre, Dawn Poole (recorder), Kathy Shipley, Nancy Jean Smith, Shawna Young

Meeting was called to order by Costa at 1:32 p.m.

1. Approval of the Agenda

M/S Smith/Mayer, approved with the addition of items 3.5 and 3.6.

2. Review of the Minutes of November 24, 2008

M/S Young/Deaner, approved.

3. Priority Business

3.1 Budget Update (Fassinger)

We are likely to be facing yet another round of cuts somewhere around \$1-2 million for our campus, which will impact planning for 2009-2010. We are still trying to get solid enrollment numbers for fall and hope to have the information to chairs by the end of the week. We will likely have to cut back on enrollment numbers for next year. The COE did a great job dealing with the budget; as a result, the monies passed down by the president to colleges can be used for other critical things such as NCATE and TPAs. Fassinger feels more positive about going into next AY than she did a few weeks ago. There was a question about how summer will be impacted by budget cuts. Fassinger said that there are contractual issues with regard to summer. We are likely to be asked to convert some courses to UEE, but there is recognition that we will not be able to cut a lot of actual course offerings. She encouraged us to take our ideas to UBAC; there is an open forum on 12/10.

3.2 Report on Goals

3.2.1 Goal 1: Accreditation Core Committee Report (Myhre)

Myhre continues to meet with department and program faculty and has set some solid deadlines. Institutional Research can help us with storage and gathering of assessment data at the program, department, and college level. They will store the materials for several years. They will even analyze the data if we would like for them to do that.

3.2.2 Goal 5: Develop Instructional Materials Center (Fassinger)

Fassinger met with Bengston this fall to discuss designating a place in the library in which minimal renovations could result in an area suitable to serve as a repository for materials. Since Bengston is retiring, Fassinger may need to start talks with Whitman, who will assume some of the Bengston's duties until a

permanent replacement can be found. She will share specific plans with Exec for approval before anything actually transpires. There is money in the Ed.D. budget for doctoral-level materials, but there needs to be a space to house them; that is why money could potentially be transferred from the Ed.D to facilitate this activity.

3.2.3 Goal 7: Emphasize Regional Special Needs (Fassinger)

Fassinger is focusing specifically on math and science, though she believes conversations regarding special education need to occur as well. A core planning group across campus is being formed related to math and science, and a meeting is scheduled with that group in the next week. The group will figure out who else needs to be involved, and that larger group will move forward with generating a Math/Science Center. Fassinger will bring back progress and plans to the Executive Committee for approval. Partnerships with the community are also in the mix to try to take advantage of grant opportunities tied to math and science. We need to be looking at UEE programs, especially as related to Math and Science. Stockton is part of all of this planning. There are some early discussions for making Stockton a center for science and health-related things; this center would form a bridge across all colleges.

3.2.4 Goal 8: Develop and Implement P-16 Partnerships (Fassinger)

Fassinger has been out meeting people in the community to solidify and foster partnerships. She is creating a glossy multi-page marketing document that will twice yearly go out to alumni, school superintendents, community partners, and others we might hope to tap into. This process will begin in spring, with intensive work over the summer. We need to activate an alumni network; Fassinger is trying to get lists from Development. She would like to have some type of spring event for this group. She would like to figure out a way to get some grants and gifts.

3.2.5 Goal 9: Develop Marketing Plan for Offsite Programs (Fassinger)

Fassinger indicated we probably need to use partnerships to build Stockton. She has not moved forward on this goal completely yet because there are some things the central administration is discussing surrounding Stockton. It seems that the initial support that the President pledged may no longer be as strong as was pledged in fall. Fassinger believes there may need to be two plans for Stockton, one that is based on full university support and one based on support for our programs without broader university support. Merced so far doesn't fit prominently into the offsite program marketing plans simply because Fassinger hasn't yet had a chance to fully explore and learn about it. Young indicated that the WASC recommendations for Stockton are being discussed at the campus level, which may influence the COE's position and actions. Services in Stockton are only defined by programs according to Shipley, based on discussions in the WASC self-study groups. Stockton is not an independent center; it is officially a satellite campus. Students need to be told exactly what services to expect.

### 3.3 Next Steps in Completing Goals (Young)

Young distributed a hard copy of the planning document that she had previously distributed electronically. She said filling in the boxes is now important to help us figure out what role this document might play in NCATE, aside from giving the Executive Committee instructions about what to do and to begin making progress. Myhre said that the goals will certainly be part of the NCATE report, although NCATE is focused mostly on the 6 Standards which relate to competence of students and how good are we at delivering our programs. The COE goals will fit into that piece of it, though Myhre is not completely sure where it will fit; the document will at least facilitate a discussion about what we want to do and accomplish as a college. The bigger problem for NCATE is that we haven't implemented a systematic assessment plan at any level and linked those data to goals. Young proposed dedicating a winter meeting to filling in the boxes and then share with general faculty for review. Young is willing to plug in information based on conversations in Exec to date. Conversations about the goals still need to occur; for example, Goal 2 could be changed to developing a graduate culture, with a doctoral culture being one of the sub-goals within that. Costa suggested discussing taking a portion of the goals at each of the next meetings to identify goals, benchmarks, and achievements; this was agreed upon by consensus. Young will send out an electronic copy of the existing document prior to next meeting.

### 3.4 EDGS Core Commitment (Young)

Young shared a "sense of the COE Graduate Committee" regarding the EDGS core. The Ed.D program and EDGS courses compete for the same instructors, who also teach in program areas. The current budget situation has impacted priorities within departments in terms of faculty assignments. The COE Graduate Committee recommends that once faculty recommendations have been made and finalized by chairs, that departments strive to honor those commitments. The core is fundamental to all of the graduate programs since students are learning research skills, which are so fundamental to their learning in all of our MA programs; we need skilled, knowledgeable instructors in those courses so students come to thesis advisors knowing what to do. Fletcher suggested thinking "outside the box" to accommodate needs, such as looking across the college at ways of alternating admissions schedules in small programs that may free up faculty in alternate years while maximizing enrollments in programs. Smith said that reimbursement for part-timers who are hired to replace faculty teaching in the EDGS courses needs to be guaranteed so that the part-time funding budget is not negatively impacted when faculty teach in the core. Shipley cautioned that the impact of the tight budget should not result in the creation of a policy putting one program ahead of others. Young specified that this is not a policy but just a sense of the Graduate Committee to try to articulate an issue which will be exacerbated in another year when the EdD program is fully implemented. Mayer thought the EdD program was supposed to stand alone and wanted to know why the doctoral program is drawing from other resources. Poole explained that the program is fully self-funded through student tuition, and that funds to reimburse departments when faculty teach in the program are transferred back to departments. Costa cautioned that while the EdD program doesn't draw money resources from department budgets, it does draw people resources; he wants to be sure that the reimbursement money goes back specifically to the department part-time pool. Smith said Teacher Ed will do its best to

provide faculty for the EDGS and EdD programs. Young indicated that we are only asking chairs to do their best, certainly not mandate and be aware of the major issues. Young distributed a hard copy of the Committee's recommendation.

### 3.5 Scheduling of Winter/Spring 2009 Executive Committee Meetings

Winter and Spring 2009 meetings are scheduled from 1:30-3pm on the following Mondays in DBH 346: 1/26, 2/23, 3/23, 4/20, and 5/4.

### 3.6 Assigned Time

The Curriculum Committee received feedback from COE members regarding the AT/RT Guidelines. Feedback related primarily to department chairs. Some people suggested that chairs should have more assigned time, while other people suggested there should be a formula for chair assigned time that is similar to that for program coordinators. The Curriculum Committee tried but could not come up with a formula that seemed to make sense for department chairs because of the uniqueness of each department. To avoid AT inflation, the committee set the base as what is currently allocated to department chairs, 6 WTUs per year to Advanced Studies and 12 WTUs per year to the others. There is no rationale except that this is the current practice. The committee recommended that these values should be revised by the Executive Committee if there are changes to programs or personnel that warrant a revision. There is a section in the guidelines that indicates an additional 12 WTUs can be requested per year for department chairs. Myhre indicated that the Curriculum Committee has completed its charge, and that the Executive Committee can take action as it sees fit.

Smith suggested that the chair of Teacher Education has historically been released from one additional class per semester to deal with chair activities. Flores said that he had to request extra time from the Dean, which included creating projects that were defined in consultation. He suggested that the dialog occurring between the chair and Dean about these projects was fruitful and seemed reasonable in terms of the request for additional assigned time. Smith questioned why the chair should have to request extra assigned time when it is clear that the base is not sufficient. Costa suggested leaving the AT for chairs out of the guidelines since the guidelines do not change existing practices for this group. Others questioned why we would not address the issue at this point to make the guidelines inclusive of all. Smith suggested Teacher Education needs 9 units per semester as a base for its chair. Shipley said the baseline doesn't serve LIBS well, either, but she believes the guidelines afford chairs the opportunity to discuss with the Dean, which she sees as a positive thing. Flores suggested that there should be some way of accounting for complexity that varies from year to year.

Discussion will continue at the next meeting.

## 4. Reports

### 4.1 Graduate Committee Young Deferred.

4.2 Curriculum Committee Myhre  
Deferred.

4.3 Senate Mayer, Davis, Deaner/Hall, Flores  
Deferred.

4.4 Departments Fletcher, Poole, Smith, Shipley  
Deferred.

4.5 Dean  
Deferred

5. Other

The meeting was adjourned at 3:12 p.m.  
M/S Davis/Flores, approved.