

College of Education Executive Committee Meeting
Monday, November 10, 2008

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

Absent: Fassinger, Mayer

Guests: Lee, Salisbury

Meeting was called to order by Costa at 1:32 pm

1. Approval of the Agenda
M/S Young, Davis, approved.
2. Review of the Minutes of October 27, 2008
M/S Young, Davis, approved.
3. Priority Business

3.1 Report on Goals 1, 3, 6, 9: Outcomes, Activities, Timelines, Effectiveness Measures

3.1.1 Goal 1: Accreditation (Myhre)

Myhre passed out a timeline for accreditation. He now has a good grasp of what is required for accreditation. He believes we have most of what we need for CCTC; programs are doing what needs to be done in terms of collecting data. A budget has been proposed for coordinator time as well as for the actual visit; it is currently with Fassinger for consideration. Myhre is meeting with all programs and departments trying to find out what data are available. For CCTC we need only 1 year of data, but NCATE requires 3 years of data. We may not have that degree of data across departments and the unit. There were assessment plans developed for our last accreditation visit, but they were never fully implemented, partly due to the shifts in leadership at the Dean level. The preparation for the accreditation review is an opportunity to create habits for the long term, especially with regard to assessment. We hope to work on the mission and vision through fall and use the February date productively as a college. Myhre is setting up the documents room and is hoping to make many documents available electronically. The TPAs will help toward accomplishing this task.

3.1.2 Goal 3: Develop MAT (Salisbury)

A handout was distributed detailing outcomes, activities, and timelines for development of the MAT program. The existing 4000-level courses will be reconfigured into 5000-level courses, addressing the content and graduate criteria. The program can retain up to 9 units of 4000-level courses; special ed, health, and technology may fit into this should coordinators opt to do so. The program will prepare candidates to do action research. A person can complete the credential

part of the program in 12 months and then there are 2 extra semesters of graduate work required for the master's portion. Initial thought regarding the current graduate core is that concepts covered in EDGS 5500 will be addressed in MSCP and SSCP foundations courses, so EDGS 5500 would not be part of the program. EDGS 5510 would be required. A new course, Intro to Action Research, would need to be created. If a student wanted to complete a more traditional thesis, then they would have the option of taking EDGS 5600 or 5610. The model being carried out for this MAT is very similar to Chapman's and National's model.

The goal is to begin the program in summer or fall of 2010. COE committee review (Graduate Committee and the Curriculum Committee) must be complete prior to the end of spring 2009 to be on track for that to happen. Although the program is on the Chancellor's Office new programs calendar, a fall 2011 start may be more realistic. A needs assessment survey is being developed through the Institutional Research office.

The MAT is going to be offered through the regular schedule and not UEE. It is likely that the current credential program will be phased out eventually—possibly ten years—and be replaced by the new program. The new MAT program will create changes to enhance the current MA program, another program likely to be phased out gradually. It was suggested that concentrations (such as in Physical Education) might be considered during the development stages of the program. To appeal to already-credentialed people, there is a need to look at hybrid and online courses for the master's portion of the program.

3.1.3 Goal 6: Develop Doctoral Culture (Lee)

The document, *Developing a Doctoral Culture*, was distributed. This was one of the documents prepared for the fall WASC visit. An outline of activities and projects was developed to address the 4 strands from the WASC document. Academic Colloquia are planned for spring; they will be incorporated into two spring courses. Faculty development, especially preparation for advising dissertations, will be a key to the success of the program. Information is being collected for the e-newsletter. Faculty mentorship and student mentorship are also sub-goals. A document was distributed regarding measuring outcomes; this document will be shared with core doctoral faculty next week. Some of the materials listed in the outcomes document are not yet developed.

3.1.4 Goal 9: Assigned/Release Time (Myhre)

Some corrections were made to the current document. On page 2, #2 under Reassigned/Release time for Program Coordinators, the "in addition to the baseline WTUs" should be dropped from the first sentence. On page 4, #6 "for Research and Scholarly activities" should be added to the sentence.

The committee recognizes it is up to the Dean to hand out assigned time; however, the Dean will likely use this document for guidance. Based on this document, some program coordinators who have had reassigned time may lose

units while others may gain units. The document was created in an effort to address fairness across the College of Education. The second handout, Issues Related to Reassigned/Release Time Guidelines, documents things the committee struggled with. The biggest challenge was the definition of programs. There is no consistency across departments of what constitutes a “program.” There is no clear job description for program coordinators; Department Chair responsibilities are defined in the Faculty Handbook. It might be a good idea for someone—possibly the Executive Committee—to actually define what a coordinator does. WTUs should be allocated to programs, not individuals, so the units can be distributed as appropriate.

In creating the guidelines, the Curriculum Committee started with those receiving the fewest units and made sure they didn’t get more in an effort to be mindful of the budget. Chairs get 6 or 12 units of assigned time; these units have been pretty static. The chair assigned time is likely to stay where it is unless there is growth in a department. The bigger issue seems to be with coordinator assigned time.

Some accountability has been built into the document to account for non-permanent increases in units. In tight budget times, some of the extras are not available. However, this required justification might create a situation in which people don’t want to be chair or coordinator. The plan builds in baseline units for coordinators, but not for chairs. There was a suggestion that a formula similar to that used for programs be developed for chairs. The baseline used for coordinators may not account for all activities assumed by coordinators, especially those in departments without multiple coordinators.

There was discussion about the 2 unit baseline for coordinators not fitting well into workload. However, the units that construct a workload vary across programs and can be achieved lots of ways that are not in 3-unit increments (thesis/project advising, fieldwork supervision, etc).

Myhre suggested sending the document out for review and comment by COE faculty before Exec acts on the guidelines. The call for comments should come from Executive Committee via an email from Costa. Costa will channel feedback to the Curriculum Committee, which will discuss and then bring information back to the Executive Committee, hopefully at the December 5 meeting.

Oddmund and members of the Curriculum Committee were commended for their efforts in creating guidelines that could be put into place.

3.2 Provost’s RSCA Support Program: Report on Selection of Recipients

The Dean has not yet acted on the committee’s recommendations, so no further information was shared. Executive Committee members indicated that there has been some discussion in other university-wide committees about whether the RSCA support funds will be available for their intended purpose or if they might be diverted to funding other critical needs during the budget crisis.

3.3 Online Programs Policies

During discussion it became clear that the issue was not really the development of policy, but professional development related to online courses that was the impetus for this agenda item. Several suggestions were made regarding how this could be addressed, including weaving it into the doctoral culture and getting the university-wide Faculty Development Committee involved. Deaner is on the FDC and will share the suggestion with the committee. Departments may choose to have committees related to online policies.

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

Because we have had to defer committee reports at each Executive Committee meeting this year, Young suggested having committee chairs distribute their reports electronically prior to meetings. Committee members could then review prior to the meetings and have a chance to ask questions when we meet. The suggestion was accepted by consensus.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 pm.

M/S Fletcher/Flores.