

## ADDENDUM TO COE REORGANIZATION PROPOSAL

This email includes additional information for the University Senate's consideration of the Proposal to Reorganize the College of Education. The following items are attached:

1. College of Education Senate Action-March 4, 2011: A memorandum regarding actions taken by the College of Education Senate in response to the University Senate postponement of consideration of the College's reorganization proposal.
2. A matrix that provides the College's rebuttal to concerns raised about the reorganization at the March University Senate meeting.

Additionally, at the suggestion of the University Senate, a vote of the College of Education was taken to indicate its support in moving forward with reorganization. Faculty, staff, and student representatives were asked to vote to confirm or reject acceptance of the College Senate's resolutions.

David Imig, Chair of the College of Education Senate, transmitted the results of the voting on the reorganization of the College of Education to me on March 31, 2011. Because the College of Education has been as inclusive as possible of all constituencies in our deliberation and as inclusive as on-line voting permitted of this reorganization, the following results reflect the raw vote counts by each constituency in the college:

- 151/225 or 67% eligible voters voted
- 75% of Tenure Track Faculty voted
- 75% of all voters, voted favorably
- 69% of Tenure Track Faculty voted favorably

The table below breaks out the results by categories:

<b>Unit</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>SubCategory</b>	<b>Vote Count</b>	<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>	<b>Eligible</b>
Combined	Faculty	TTTK	75	52	23	101
Combined	Faculty	Non-Tenured	28	21	7	52
Combined	Staff	Combined	41	35	6	59
Combined	Student	UGRep	4	4	0	6
Combined	Student	GradRep	3	2	1	7
Totals			151	114	37	225

However, in accordance with our valid Plan of Organization, our College Assembly is to be comprised of:

101 T/TK faculty

13 students (6 UG; 7 Grad)

1:10 ratio of staff to T/TK faculty in the college equating to a maximum number of 10 staff/non-TK faculty votes. ( Weighting factor= 10/52+59)

TOTAL votes eligible= 124

Therefore, according to the Plan of Organization the following represent the votes of our College Assembly.

88 voted (71%) (denominator=124)

Votes for: 63 (72%) (denominator=88)

Votes against: 25 (28%) (denominator= 88)

## **MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** College of Education Assembly

**FROM:** David Imig

**SUBJECT:** Actions Taken by the College of Education Senate

As part of a regularly scheduled monthly meeting of the College of Education Senate, with 19 members present and participating, the Senate took up the matter of the one month postponement, by the University Senate, of the College's reorganization proposal. The College Senate reviewed the events that transpired last Wednesday at the University Senate meeting, identified issues and concerns to be addressed, and engaged in a discussion with Dean Wiseman of ways to respond to queries of University Senators. Copies of Greg Hancock's presentation to the University Senate had been distributed prior to the meeting and he was afforded the opportunity to speak to the points made in that document.

After nearly 90 minutes of discussion, during which all Senators had the opportunity to speak (and did) , the Senate voted to adopt two resolutions. The first had to do with the Senate's prerogative to take action on behalf of the College Assembly. By a vote of 14 to 3 (with one abstention), the College Senate voted to move forward without a vote of the Assembly to endorse a recommendation for action.

A second vote then followed with the Senate calling upon the Dean of the College to respond to the issues and concerns raised at the meeting of the University Senate, highlighting the processes and procedures followed in arriving at the proposal for reorganization. That resolution also called for the College to move forward with reorganization. That resolution received a vote of 15 to 1 (with 3 abstentions).

The results of the vote were reported to the Office of the Provost, at their request.

On a personal note, I want all members of the Assembly to know how engaged the Senators were in this matter. Principles of faculty governance were articulated and strategic concerns were voiced. It invited some very helpful dialogue on the role of faculty, staff and students in the reorganization process and their responsibilities to both the College and the University. It also elicited and some memorable rhetoric.

**Proposal to Reorganize the Departments of the College of Education  
Rebuttal to Claims Made by Dr. Gregory Hancock at March Meeting of University Senate**

Several senators at the March meeting of the University Senate requested a point-by-point rebuttal to the claims made by Dr. Gregory Hancock. The College would like to offer the following in response to this request. Below are the specific concerns that Dr. Hancock highlighted in his remarks, as well as a narrative response and specific page numbers of the proposal that address these concerns.

Concern about Reorganization	College's Response	Evidence in Proposal
<p><i>Why reorganize?</i></p>	<p>Five forces converged to create the impetus to begin reorganization discussions for the College, listed below. It should be noted that even in the years prior to the development of the Strategic Plan and under the leadership of former deans, conversations about reorganization took place within the Council of Chairs group.</p> <p><i>1) Advancing the goals of the College's Strategic plan:</i> In 2008, the College released an ambitious, action-oriented strategic plan, in line with the University's strategic plan. The College recognized that it needed to shift resources to a powerful, reduced set of programs and activities that were most closely aligned with the priorities of the strategic plan and maximize operational efficiency at all levels to become an agile and responsive organization. To achieve these objectives, specific recommendations were made including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Redistributing faculty and other resources to redress current imbalances;</li> <li>- Examining opportunities and implementing programs to decrease operational costs and increase efficiencies through economies of scale;</li> <li>- Reorganizing in such a way to optimally support scholarship, teaching responsibilities and support of student learning.</li> </ul> <p><i>2) Addressing External Reviewers Criticism of Departmental Silos:</i> Reviews at the department level revealed academic silos that hindered the advancement of true interdisciplinary scholarship. Reviewers noted: <i>"There is something of a 'silo' effect at work here...The programs currently have far more independence (and fewer economies of scale and scope) than one would expect. This may be a propitious time...to reconsider and reevaluate the current structure and arrangement of its programs."</i> The perceived isolation of the departments was also felt by students, as commented in exit feedback.</p> <p><i>3) Eliminating Redundancies and Inefficiencies in a Climate of Fiscal Austerity:</i> With past and most-likely continued budget cuts, colleges at the University are obligated to act fiscally responsible and to employ fiscal management measures that promote accountability and</p>	<p>Page 1-2, Strategic Plan page 41</p> <p>Pages 1, 14 Pages 1-2, 15</p> <p>Pages 1-3, 5-8</p> <p>Page 5</p>

Concern about Reorganization	College's Response	Evidence in Proposal
<p><i>Why reorganize? (con't)</i></p>	<p>cost-containment. Inefficiencies such as redundancy in course offerings were discovered through internal and external reviews. Courses that may have natural overlap are offered through more than one department or program within the College creating low-level enrollment. Lack of economies of scale and small, financially unviable departments and programs have created a need to examine the existing configuration of academic units within the larger organizational structure of the College.</p> <p><i>4) Responding to the Recommendations of Higher Administration</i>  The Dean received a direct recommendation from the Provost to consider reorganization, a message that was also shared with the College community. In February 2009, in response to questions from a College faculty committee on reorganization, the Provost urged a reorganization that would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• position the college for an accelerated ascent in rank of the best Education Colleges in the next ten years</li> <li>• promote interaction among faculty</li> <li>• avoid small and inefficient units and programs, and</li> <li>• be meaningful and attractive to potential outstanding faculty and students</li> </ul> <p><i>5) Responding to the Changing Demands of Colleges of Education</i>  To meet the challenges that are facing all education colleges, it is imperative that the College of Education at the University of Maryland reorganize to provide the structure that will enable the interdisciplinary practitioner education and research that are called for by today's educational context. The reorganization of schools and colleges of education is on the agenda of many of our peer institutions and there was a pervasive sense that this College should follow suit. Indeed, "right-sizing" education schools and reorganizing them into larger campus units, was much on the mind of many provosts; Nebraska, Iowa State, Tennessee, Minnesota, Arizona, and Michigan were just a few among the many places undergoing change.</p>	<p>Pages 1-2, 5, 14-15</p> <p>Pages 4-5</p>

Concern about Reorganization	College's Response	Evidence in Proposal
<p><b>Votes were constrained to be between competing severe reorganization structures</b>  --the final 89% vote was actually between two three-department models  -- this is like voting between a poke in the eye and a sock in the jaw</p>	<p>The College Senate, the representative body of the College, developed a democratic and inclusive process to develop a suitable model of reorganization. It is true that the 89% approval may not indicate wholesale approval of the college reorganization, however it was not a choice between a “poke in the eye and a sock in the jaw.” This implies that faculty and staff were force-marched to make the choice between two undesirable outcomes. This is just not the case. At every point during this process there existed opportunity to voice concern and to take an active role in the shaping of the College’s future. Indeed, a straight up-or-down vote did occur in the early stages of the reorganization where the College Assembly was asked to vote Yes or No on 6 possible models of reorganization. The instructions on the ballot asked for a “FOR or AGAINST vote for ALL of the six model variations.” The ballot included the following language: “In addition, please do <i>not</i> just vote for the one model that you like the most. Rather, consider which models could offer a reasonable (if not perfect) fit for you and your program area. We would like to identify more than one viable model for the second stage of voting.” Everyone who voted had an opportunity to vote against all models if they so wished – and had a majority of the Assembly done so, the process would have been halted to better address the concerns.</p> <p>After two rounds of on-line anonymous voting, first among 6 models, then between 2 models, the results indicated that 59% of the voters supported a move from the College’s existing seven-department arrangement to a three-department model. As the College began consideration of governance and financial issues, questions and concerns regarding the proposed model emerged. The process was then halted to convene the Summer Reorganization Oversight Committee (SROC) which worked over Summer 2010 to address these concerns. The SROC recommended specific changes to the three-department model that had emerged from the previous round of voting. It was on this model that 89% approval was received.</p>	<p>Pages 8-10</p>
<p><b>Enable more cross-disciplinary work:</b>  Instead of reorganizing you can pull together:  --special interest communities regarding topical issues;  --establish interdisciplinary centers; and  --incentives for cross-departmental</p>	<p>Numerous internal and external reviews all citing the same criticism that the departments in the College operated in silos, there was still nothing done to change the status quo. Perhaps the current departmental structure has been inhibiting the very ideas that Dr. Hancock suggests. Perhaps faculty in the smaller departments, with service commitments, participation in governance, advising students, dissertation committees lacked the free time to develop such tools of cross-departmental collaboration. Perhaps there was not adequate staffing support to assist with staffing special interest communities or submitting cross-departmental grants.</p>	<p>Pages 1, 3, 5, 8, 11, 13</p>

Concern about Reorganization	College's Response	Evidence in Proposal
collaboration.	Whatever the reason, while collaboration across existing COE departments are possible and are occurring in some instances, there is widespread agreement among our College faculty that reorganization has the potential to enhance significantly opportunities for new research collaborations and provide opportunities for development of innovative new education programs. Indeed, in anticipation of the proposed reorganization, faculty have already become galvanized and work has begun on creating interdisciplinary and innovative programs in higher education and educational leadership.	
<p><b>Become a well-respected leader on pressing educational issues:</b></p> <p>--How does moving from seven departments down to three accomplish this?</p> <p>--Where is the chain of evidence?</p>	It is true that just changing of administrative structures will not enhance the College of Education's reputation as a leader in education. However, the proposed departmental structure will create an environment where collaboration and innovation are fostered, rewarded and will synergistically grow. The College will continue its quest to achieve Top 10 status and recognizes the need to constantly push forward to better position itself to compete in a rapidly changing environment in which our programs and scholarship reflect innovation and embrace the 21 <sup>st</sup> century milieu. The development of innovative and interdisciplinary programs is one of the principle benefits of the reorganization, and once the College is totally reorganized, program changes that reflect changes in the profession, as well as new relationships among faculty, including new hires, will be expected and encouraged. It is important to note, that any future changes to academic programs will be made by the faculty, as this is under the defined purview of faculty in a shared governance structure. Cost savings from the reorganization can potentially be reallocated to support innovative programs, seed grants, incentive structures and other tools to encourage cutting-edge, interdisciplinary scholarship.	Pages 5, 11
<p><b>Become competitive in a modern, technologically enhanced teaching and learning environment:</b></p> <p>--There is no explanation about how the reorganization utilizes new technology in a concrete way.</p>	As one of the priorities outlined in the College's Strategic Plan, increasing the technological infrastructure of the College is paramount. Teaching in the 21st century has to require an emphasis on understanding how to use information technologies. Teachers need to instruct students on use of a variety of technologies, legitimate methods of Internet research, and how to identify useful information. Teachers in the 21st century also must have access to a host of cutting edge research about how students learn. They should know and be able to apply that research in their classroom. As the College streamlines its operations, right sizes its programs and creates other areas of efficiency, resources will be allocated towards technology in order to improve education delivery to our students.	Page 4, Strategic Plan pages 31-33

Concern about Reorganization	College's Response	Evidence in Proposal
<p><b>Streamline administrative structures to support a more nimble decision-making environment:</b></p> <p>--Why would we think a larger department could be more nimble?  --Larger departments lead to levels of sub-governance to make sure all stakeholders are represented</p>	<p>The reorganization into three moderate-sized departments around faculty with common or complementary interests will streamline the College and departmental administrative structures, not only providing a cost savings, but also supporting a leaner, more nimble decision-making environment. The potential for more equitable shared participation in department-based committees and student support roles (e.g., admissions, advising, comprehensives, committees, etc.) will be facilitated through the proposed reorganization. For many faculty, required participation in governance and service, especially for roles outside of the department should be less burdensome and more equitable, especially for faculty from what had been the small departments. Finally, as programs with similar or complementary orientations are in one governance unit, there will be less competition for resources and greater likelihood that redundancy in courses as well as programs will diminish.</p>	<p>Page 1, 15</p>
<p><b>Provide Cost Savings:</b></p> <p>--What about the cost of reorganization?  --What about the potential changes in enrollment resulting from this reorganization?  --What about paying for the extra layers of interdepartmental support?  --What about the money we will spend on infrastructure (new offices, etc.)</p>	<p>The cost of the reorganization is difficult to quantify, as to this point the only investment made was the time of the College's faculty, staff and students. However, the implementation of the reorganization surely will have associated upfront costs that will level out over time. There will be resources spent on physical facilities; however, the Benjamin Building needs renovation regardless of the College's departmental structure.</p> <p>The proposed reorganization will save the College a conservative estimate of \$500,000 per annum in administrative salary costs. Three well-staffed business offices will provide administrative support to each of the new units. Administrative and clerical staff will be distributed equitably across the new units and the College to assure that all three departments are staffed to provide seamless services and support. This will be accomplished without the investment of additional funds, but through the fair distribution of responsibilities and increased efficiency.</p> <p>Because this proposal is a change in the administrative structure of the College, and not a change to any of its programs or degrees, there should be no substantial impact to student enrollment. Programs will only change at the request of faculty within the particular discipline.</p>	<p>Pages 14-15</p>