

**INTERIM ACADEMIC SENATE (IAS)
Minutes of the February 24, 2009 Special Meeting**

Welcome

Shelley Broderick, Dean of the David A. Clarke School of Law and Interim Chair of the Interim Academic Senate opened the meeting requesting all Interim Senators and Observers to introduce themselves.

The following Interim Senators were **PRESENT**:

| | |
|--|--|
| Abellera, Ben C. (Philosophy) | Jackson, Terri (OGC) |
| Broderick, Shelley (Law) | King Berry, Arlene (Education) |
| Barnett, David (Computer Science) | Mahmoud, Wagdy (Engineering) |
| Baxter, Grae (Provost) | Musgrove, Derek (History) |
| Cousin, Carolyn (Bio-Sciences) | Pearson, Clarence (Eng/Archt/Aero) |
| Ezeani, Eboh C. (Accounting) | Petti, Matthew (English) |
| Farmer, Shurron (Math) | Petty, Rachel (CAS) |
| Glanville, Cheryl (Student Rep.) | Rode, Meredith (Mass Media & Perf Arts) |
| Hanff, William (Mass Media & Perf Arts) | Seyoum, Hailemichael (Chem/Phys) |
| Harrison, Elgloria (Nursing/Allied Health) | Tannen, Michael (Mgmt/Hosp & Grad) |
| Inmon, Katie (LRD) | White, William B. (Marketing & Legal Info) |

Observers:

| | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| <i>Al-kawasz,</i> | <i>Kinzie, Susan</i> | <i>Richards, Delia</i> |
| <i>Bolig, Rosemary</i> | <i>Korey, Judith</i> | <i>Richards, Leslie</i> |
| <i>Charles, C.</i> | <i>Krauthorn, Helene</i> | <i>Riley, John T.</i> |
| <i>Fox, James A.</i> | <i>Lyons, Dale</i> | <i>Smith Lonnie</i> |
| <i>Green-Ridley, Gloria</i> | <i>Mills, Stacie Y.L.</i> | <i>Scott, Merwyn L.</i> |
| <i>Hamilton, Marylin</i> | <i>Minus, Bertha</i> | <i>Slack, John</i> |
| <i>Harvey, Barbara S.</i> | <i>Peters, Doris</i> | <i>Walton, Lena</i> |
| <i>Howard, Virginia</i> | <i>Racine, Marie M.B.</i> | |

Minutes

S. Broderick sought and received approval of the January 13, 2009 Meeting Minutes as corrected/revised.

Order of Business

Interim Chair Broderick called the body to order and then proceeded with the Order of Business as reflected in the Meeting Agenda. A. King-Berry offered a motion from the floor proposing to move the discussion on the education department, an agenda item under New Business, to the first Order of Business. S. Broderick reminded the body that the meeting was a Special Meeting called primarily to address unfinished business and that the Interim Senate did not have any proposals concerning the education

department before it. A King-Berry's Motion was not seconded and the Interim Chair proceeded with the Order of Business.

Discussion

Committee Reports

- **By-laws and Charter Committee**

S. Broderick reminded the senators that the body was governed by the Interim Bylaws and encouraged others senators to join the committee by contacting any of the members (A. King-Berry, S. Broderick, D. Musgrove, M. Rode).

- **Admission and Retention Committee**

The Committee, chaired by E. Harrison, moved that the proposed admissions standards be approved by the IAS.

- Discussion

A. King-Berry provided a point of clarification that the proposal concerned admission and not retention standards.

W. Mahmoud advised that the proposal lacked statements concerning the: (i) TOEFL standard; (ii) ACCUPLACER; and (iii) definition of "college-ready." He moved to amend the proposal to include the appropriate language as researched by the committee.

G. Baxter explained that "a rigid definition of 'college-ready' did not exist;" that the President's proposal contemplated a "welcoming and flexible standard" that would ultimately be decided by a University Admissions Committee.

S. Broderick added that best practices from law schools across the country also included a look at "a cumulation of factors" when making admissions decisions.

The Motion to approve the President's proposed admissions standards including statements on TOEFL and ACCUPLACER was approved without opposition.

S. Broderick thanked W. Mahmoud for his insightful comments and thanked the Admission and Retention Committee for their hard work, thoughtful process and proposal.

- **Academic Standards, Programs and Policies Committee**

The committee, chaired by M. Petti, offered proposed guidelines for: (1) new programs and program changes and (2) course offerings.

- Discussion

M. Petti stated that the goal of the committee was to create a streamlined approach; encourage ownership amongst the programs, departments and the deans for their courses/programs; and allow for more accountability.

G. Baxter agreed that departments should be responsible for generating courses and that Deans were the proper parties providing oversight in the diversity of course offerings and budgetary concerns.

S. Broderick added that there was not a lot of “value added” at the IAS level.

W. Mahmoud voiced his displeasure in being left out of the call for committee meetings.

M. Petti apologized “sincerely;” promised to correct all future notices going forward; and promised to find a convenient time for interested senators to meet.

W. Mahmoud pointed out that the proposals lacked concrete timetables. Senators: W. Hanff, E. Ezeani, G. Baxter, A. King-Berry, D. Musgrove, C. Cousin, E. Harrison, T. Jackson all agreed that the proposals needed to include timetables expressed in concrete language that took into consideration such factors as: (i) the real time needed for submission and review; (ii) registration and publishing deadlines; and (iii) needs of special programs.

J. Slack (Observer) commented that it was “time to do work and that what is needed is better planning and organization.” J. Slack advised the committee to consider the demands on the Deans’ time.

S. Broderick requested that the Committee revise the proposals to include concrete timetables and to properly reflect the new name of the Committee.

Election

S. Broderick reported that the Interim Charter allows for the election of a Interim Chairperson and an Interim Vice Chairperson, however, she had not received any nominations via email. Receiving none from the floor, the issue was tabled until the next meeting.

Schedule for Spring 2009

IAS has moved to a bi-weekly schedule to complete the business of the University. Next meeting would be convened on Tuesday, March 3, 2009 in the Board Room at 2:00 p.m. In consideration of the conflicting Spring Break schedules for the Undergraduate and the Law Schools, the following meeting would take place on March 17, 2009; notice would confirm place and time.

New Business

D. Musgrove agreed to allow A. King-Berry to lead the discussion on the concerns of the faculty in the education department before his discussion on the tuition increase.

A. King-Berry introduced R. Bolig (Education) to present on behalf of the department. R. Bolig thanked the Chair and the Senate for the opportunity to speak on the “abolishment of the undergraduate degree programs in the University’s education unit” and to provide a response to the President’s plan for the Center of Urban Education.

- Remarks:

R. Bolig requested that all plans to close out the department's programs cease and that the faculty be given the opportunity for shared governance for the following reasons:

- i. The goal of expanding the department to a School of Education had not been realized.
- ii. Eliminating undergraduate programs would abolish the legacy of Myrtilla Miner and the University's land-grant status.
- iii. The plan anticipates a fifth year requirement for students to achieve the Master's teaching degrees.
- iv. Implementation would have a negative impact on early childhood and special education programs.

- Discussion

A. King-Berry added that the University had made plans to "close out the department and that students were not being admitted to the department's programs."

D. Musgrove raised the concern that the President "did not offer plans or reports, only PowerPoint presentations" and that the Interim Academic Senate needed to ask questions and receive information.

D. Peters stated that students were not permitted to declare an education major.

G. Baxter stated that "the Board of Trustees has only approved a conceptual framework" and that University is "ethically obligated" to advise students about potential changes if they inquired about education majors.

R. Petty stated that faculty had been informed about the proposed Center for Urban Education; that the department has over 300 majors and yet only 10 students are in the baccalaureate program; the program is unfortunately not a financially feasible program. The President's proposal is to delete low-performing programs to enhance the resources needed by other high-performing programs.

V. Howard stated that the programs were viable, but they needed support from the University to help students pass the PRAXIS exam.

E. Williams suggested that the University should support the department because African Americans need strong teachers: "let's not throw the baby out with the bathwater."

M. Hamilton stated that the department offers programs that prepare teachers in the public schools and talked about the accomplishments of the Early Childhood Leadership Institute (ECLI).

L. Richards stated that racism inhibited the accomplishments of the department, the faculty and the students; described the PRAXIS as biased against minority students; and reminded the body that George Mason University started its education program at about the same time as UDC and now receives more federal dollars and support.

L. Walton stated that if programs were removed from the traditional educational field then UDC will be providing a disservice to potential teachers: “We’re good at early childhood education.”

G. Baxter reported that “OSSE is enthusiastic about the President’s proposal to move education to a Center for Urban Education;” reminded the body that the proposal includes adding at least one and perhaps two charter schools, which would provide additional teaching opportunities; and stated that “we all want UDC to produce the best teachers –the question is how we get there.”

M. Cooper remarked that if UDC wanted to continue producing good teachers “then it should not cut the four year program.” For those students seeking music education degrees their opportunities will be limited because of the “delay” in the completion of their programs.

G. Harrison stated that “since the District has committed to early and special education, the District’s flagship needs to meet those requirements and also be committed.”

D. Musgrove reiterated that the issues before the IAS were whether the decision to eliminate a program had already been made; and whether students were being advised that they could not major in the program.

G. Baxter stated that no decision had been made; the University had taken the position that students needed to be advised responsibly.

M. Alkawasiz stated that “the problem at UDC these days was that the cart is always before the horse;” and questioned “if the Board approved a ‘concept’ then how did orders go out?” Alkawasiz suggested that the Center of Urban Studies could “be part of a School of Education and that if the President wanted faculty cooperation then faculty should be involved in the planning.”

M. Rode told the Senate that it needed “tangible information to form the basis for tangible action.” IAS should communicate to Dr. Sessoms the need for information; request a status update on the vision/plan; and then be prepared to react to it and react with it.”

S. Broderick requested a timeline from R. Petty (CAS-Dean) and G. Baxter (Provost).

R. Petty provided a point of clarification: “no one has been given a directive to pull back on accreditation activities.” Stated that there was no timeline, but that she had requested and was still waiting for information from all programs to determine how best to proceed.

G. Baxter stated that she had requested all Deans to provide strategic plans and was waiting for that information.

S. Farmer stated that he was “dumbfounded at the prospect of programs being eliminated” and requested advice from the education department faculty as to next steps.

P. Meyers called for a process.

L. Walton explained that the Provost (G. Baxter) had told graduate students that their programs would be “abolished and asked faculty for proposals on how to teach out those programs.”

C. Charles has advised students to talk with their professors about concerns that programs would be “abolished.”

S. Broderick reminded the faculty that they were “the ambassadors who needed to dispel rumors and give students the facts: they will be taught out.”

C. Glanville offered a “logical solution” would be to identify a liaison who would work with the President and the Chairs so that all interests were represented in the decision-making process.

M. Petti stated that the IAS needed to look at the process since the Board approved the plan. IAS needed to determine whether a program could be cut without IAS approval.

S. Broderick noted the time and the need to respect Senator’s time and desire to participate.

D. Musgrove’s motion to reconvene the meeting to conclude the discussion of the education department was moved and passed unanimously.

J. Slack commented that there was a need for shared governance and that the President was acting without faculty.”

S. Broderick clarified the role of the Interim Academic Senate “was not just to address the concerns of the faculty, but the entire University.”

Adjournment

The February 24, 2009 Special Meeting of the IAS was adjourned upon motion made, seconded, and approved at 4:09 pm.

Meeting Materials

- Meeting Notice
- Agenda
- Minutes of the February 11, 2009 Meeting
- Elements to be Included in Resolution to Support Revised Academic Standards
- Curriculum Proposal Guidelines: New Programs/Program Changes (Draft)
- Curriculum Proposal Guidelines: Course Offerings (Draft)
- Statement of Rosemary Bolig, Professor-Education Department