



# College of Education Interim Strategic Plan

2012-2015



I.	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
II.	<b>Our Strategic Planning Process.....</b>	<b>4</b>
	<b>History/Background .....</b>	<b>4</b>
	<b>Planning Process &amp; Timeframe .....</b>	<b>4</b>
	<b>Planning Team Members .....</b>	<b>6</b>
	<b>Assumptions .....</b>	<b>7</b>
	<b>Add any additional categories appropriate for this     strategic plan. ....</b>	<b>7</b>
III.	<b>Mission, Vision, &amp; Values.....</b>	<b>8</b>
IV.	<b>GRU Strategic Priorities &amp; Organizational Goals .....</b>	<b>11</b>
	<b>Strategic Priority 1 CONSOLIDATION.....</b>	<b>11</b>
	<b>Strategic Priority 2 EDUCATION.....</b>	<b>11</b>
	<b>Strategic Priority 3 RESEARCH .....</b>	<b>11</b>
	<b>Strategic Priority 4 SERVICE .....</b>	<b>12</b>
	<b>Strategic Priority 5 EFFICIENCY.....</b>	<b>12</b>
	<b>Strategic Priority 6 DIVERSITY .....</b>	<b>12</b>
V.	<b>College of Education Strategic Focus Areas &amp; Goals .....</b>	<b>14</b>
	<b>Strategic Focus Area 1: CONSOLIDATION .....</b>	<b>14</b>
	<b>Strategic Focus Area 2: EDUCATION.....</b>	<b>14</b>
	<b>Strategic Focus Area 3: RESEARCH.....</b>	<b>14</b>
	<b>Strategic Focus Area 4: SERVICE .....</b>	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
VI.	<b>Appendix A: Alignment of Plans.....</b>	<b>15</b>
	<b>Alignment of College Plans with Stratigic Plan.....</b>	<b>15</b>
	<b>Alignment of College/Division Plans with Mission     Plans .....</b>	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
VII.	<b>Appendix B: Strategic Planning Components and Taxonomy .....</b>	<b>16</b>
VIII.	<b>Appendix C: Results from SWOT Analysis.....</b>	<b>18</b>
IX.	<b>Appendix D: Any additional documentation pertinent to the plan.....</b>	<b>19</b>

*Office Location:*

Summerville Campus  
University Hall 345

[lhchance@gru.edu](mailto:lhchance@gru.edu)

706 737-1499



COLLEGE of  
EDUCATION

*Mailing:*

1120 15<sup>th</sup> Street  
Augusta, GA 30912

**To:** Gretchen Caughman, Executive Vice President and Provost

**From:** Cindi Chance, Dean

**Re:** Strategic Planning Process and Documents

**Date:** November 3, 2014

During the consolidation process, GRU developed *Transition Forward* strategic plan. In March 2013, this plan was adopted. To continue the planning process, many colleges and divisions developed plans to align with the strategic priorities and organizational goals in *Transition Forward* without the benefit of mission-based strategic plans. Therefore, the strategic planning cycle is out of sequence. Between now and January 2017, when we begin reviewing and revising the GRU strategic plan (which will align with the USG strategic plan), the academic, research, and clinical plans will be developed and refined. From these mission plans, colleges and divisions will conduct a rapid cycle alignment with these plans.

Please find included the strategic planning process and documents completed during the consolidation years for the College of Education. In preparation for the consolidation, the College of Education sought a veteran dean to lead the work through a 3-year cycle. Initial steps led by the College Leadership Team included an administrative review of the existing programs, college structure, staffing and role expectations, enrollments, as well as readiness for the changing roles that would result from the consolidation. Based on the gaps identified in this review a College Review and Recommendations Committee was formed to drill down into the gaps, recommend possible changes, and to provide input to the College Leadership Team.

On December 3, 2012, Dean Chance met with the members of the COE Review and Recommendation committee to present the goals of the committee. This is the final report after several months of review of the key areas in the initial charge. This document contains summaries of the findings. The full report is in excess of 150 pages with detailed strengths, weakness, and recommendations. The process The Strategic Planning process will be repeated beginning with a new SWOT analysis effective summer/fall of 2015, assigned to the new College Dean. The process that is reflected here is the process following by the College beginning 2012-13 and effective through 2014-15.

## History/Background

The principles of equality and opportunity are at the root of Georgia Regents University's historic mission. Chartered as the Academy of Richmond County in 1783, the Academy offered secondary diplomas and post-secondary instruction that prepared students for their junior year at major American universities. In 1925, post-secondary instruction was assigned to the newly formed Junior College of Augusta, the first public junior college in the state of Georgia. The institution changed its name to Augusta College in 1958 when it became a part of the University System of Georgia. Augusta College continued to grow in size and programs: the first four-year degrees were awarded in 1967 and graduate degrees in 1973. Now, more than 50 associate, bachelor, masters, and specialist degree programs are offered. On June 12, 1996, the college became Augusta State University. As a member of the University System of Georgia, Augusta State University (GRU) is the primary public institution of higher learning in the state's second largest city. In 2013 Augusta State University merged with Georgia Health Sciences University to become Georgia Regents University. The university is well known for its dedication to expanding educational opportunities for people of all ages and backgrounds, with a special emphasis on service to the Central Savannah River Area (CSRA).

Georgia Regents University is committed to the advancement of knowledge and the enrichment of its community in a climate that fosters a love of learning. The university is committed to the value of a liberal arts education and strives to be open to the voices of all its members, to be responsive to the needs of its community, and to appraise its success through the achievement of its students, faculty, and staff. To accomplish its mission, the university offers a broad array of programs that range from learning assistance to advanced degrees. All programs and student experiences in and outside the boundaries of the traditional classroom are designed to foster the intellectual growth of students and cultivate faculty members who are excellent in teaching, active in scholarship, and generous in service.

Preparation of quality professional educators has been a part of the mission of GRU since its founding in 1783. As the role of the professional educator has changed, so have the educational programs offered at GRU. The professional education unit at GRU is comprised of all academic programs that prepare educators in 13 initial teacher preparation programs (undergraduate and MAT); in three advanced teacher education programs (M.Ed. in Special Education, M.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction and Ed.S. in Curriculum and Instruction); and in three other school professional programs (M.Ed. in School Counseling, M.Ed and Ed.S in Educational Leadership). This includes programs in all three departments in the GRU College of Education, as well as seven departments in the Pamplin College of Arts and Sciences, and the College of Mathematics and Science. The Dean of the College of Education serves as the head of the unit and as Chair of the Teacher Education Council (TEC). Membership in the TEC represents administrators, faculty, staff, candidates, and stakeholders involved in educator preparation. The TEC has three purposes: (1) to provide a structure for the consideration of all issues affecting the preparation of teachers and other school professionals in the undergraduate and graduate programs; (2) to promote cooperation and collaboration among the various academic colleges, P-12 public school practitioners, and students in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of programs to prepare teachers and other school personnel; and (3) to make recommendations to the Director of Teacher Education on issues related to the preparation of teachers and other school personnel.

## Planning Process & Timeframe

In preparation for the consolidation, the College of Education sought a veteran dean to lead the work. Initial steps led by the College Leadership Team included an administrative review of the existing programs, college structure, staffing and role expectations, enrollments, as well as readiness for the changing roles that would result from the consolidation. Based on the gaps identified in this review a College Review and Recommendations Committee was formed to drill down into the gaps, recommend

possible changes, and to provide input to the College Leadership Team. The full report is in excess of 150 pages with detailed strengths, weakness, and recommendations.

On December 3, 2012, Dean Chance met with the members of the COE Review and Recommendation committee to present the goals of the committee. This document contains summaries of the findings. The full report is in excess of 150 pages with detailed strengths, weakness, and recommendations. The Committee was charged as follows:

### **College of Education Review and Recommendations Committee**

What should the College of Education look like in 5 years as we grow toward becoming a research on university?

How do we reallocate resources, or position ourselves for new resources, in this time of financial downturn?

How do we develop a culture of entrepreneurial activities and develop a culture of seeking external grants and contracts?

How do we efficiently use our assigned space and other resources while growing numbers, new faculty, and staff positions?

This work is about the *future of the College*. Everything is on the table—programs, departmental structure, space reallocations, etc.

#### **The committee will be charged to make recommendations based on the following:**

- **Creating a research one culture, including programs, research/scholarship, grantsmanship, etc.**
  - Collaboration among/between colleges in degrees, services, etc.
  - Rewards for research (funding for original research papers vs ‘workshopy’ or practices type of presentations, etc.)
  - Reassigned time (how assigned, assessed, etc.)
  - Valid / reliable assessment for teaching (especially important for those choosing largest percent of time in teaching)
- **Effective and efficient management of all resources**
  - Budgeting based on enrollments, meeting outcomes, etc.
- **Effectiveness, currency, and continued need for programs/degrees**
  - CORE curriculum
  - Integration of mobile technology in classrooms
  - Online learning
  - Dual certifications (meeting new school demands including, special education, ELL, online teaching, etc.)
- **Cutting edge/national leadership of programs/degrees**
  - Futuristic – Needs 5 years from now, 10 years out, etc. (online teaching skills/endorsement for teacher candidates)
- **Creating an entrepreneurial culture**
  - Positioning ourselves for ability to earn funds for COE

#### **The committee will review and make recommendation relative to:**

- Viability of programs (including enrollments, student/faculty ratios, national recognition or potential for, potential for growth, potential for online options), etc.
- Department structure/College of Education organizational changes, such as:
  - Department/degree/program reassignments
  - Budgeting based on productivity, (enrollments, scholarship, etc.)

- Ensuring faculty input on prioritizing technology needs in the college—not just the loudest squeaky wheel).
- Potential for Centers / Institutes
- Potential for Certificate programs, new degrees, etc.
- Others as may arise

The committee will report their findings and recommendations to the COE Leadership Team:

**Budget Items (with rationale/data)      February 1, 2013\***  
**Restructuring, Program Recs, etc.      April 15, 2013**

The Leadership Team will receive, review and respond with final plans for the College no later than May 1, 2013.

Those who accept this role, and serve in an active role, will have earned a \$300 extra travel or materials stipend to support his/her scholarship efforts. This can be used FY13 or FY14. All COE GAs and staff will be expected to help gather info and support the work.

\* Need to have these data to introduce for the FY 14 budgeting process.

Be thorough *and* realistic in projections and need. I do not believe in the game of asking \$10k if you need \$5k. Realistic requests based on data will be better received by me, and other GRU administrators. *Know* that there will be little to no, new funds for FY14. Reallocation of internal funds and funding models is our first order of business. Once the most effective and efficient measures are in place, then we can begin to seek additional funds to support growth and quality needs.

**College of Education Review and Recommend Committee Members (elected by your peers):**

- Wayne Lord, COE Leadership Team
- Karen Wish and Graeme Connolly, Kinesiology and Health Sciences
- Drs. Olajide Agunloye, and Paulette Harris, Educational Leadership, Counseling and Special Education
- Drs. Susan Edwards, and Steven Page, Teacher Education
- Mr. Bill Gray, Staff member

Thanks for taking time to serve on this very important committee. As Dept/Staff representatives, please be sure that you keep your colleagues in the communications loop. I will assume that the recommendations represent all faculty and staff.

**Planning Team Members**

The following are members who were involved in the review and recommendations process. The COE Leadership Team conducted an initial assessment of gaps that resulted from the proposed consolidation and changing role of the College, and the faculty/staff team conducted the needs assessment from faculty/staff and developed the Review and Recommendations report. This report serves as the SWOT for the College and the guide for changes for the active consolidation years—2012-2015.

The following served as members of the College of Education Leadership Team

- Dr. Cindi Chance, Dean
- Dr. Paula Dohoney, Associate Dean
- Dr. Karen Wise, Chair Kinesiology and Health Science
- Dr. Wayne Lord, Chair Leadership, Counseling and Special Education

Dr. Judi Wilson, Chair Teacher Education

Following is a list of the members of the faculty/staff committee:

Dr. Olajide Agunloye - ELCSE

Dr. Graeme Connolly - KHS

Dr. Susan Edwards - TED

Mr. Bill Gray – Staff, Dean’s Office

Dr. Paulette Harris - ELCSE

Dr. Wayne Lord – COE Leadership Team (On initial committee, moved to the PhD committee)

Dr. Steven Page - TED

Dr. Judi Wilson – COE Leadership Team (Joined the committee when Dr. Lord departed)

Dr. Karen Wish – COE Leadership Team and KHS (Committee Chair)

## **Assumptions**

Following are assumptions used during the 2012 strategic planning process:

- As a result of the consolidation, the College of Education will change. The committee will create a vision for the new College as it moves toward becoming a research one university.
- Resource reallocations will be impacted by the consolidation’s new vision, by this time of financial downturn, and mandates emanating from the State and Federal levels for educator preparation programs.
- The new consolidated College will need an increased culture of entrepreneurial activities and external grants and contracts.
- The College’s resources—assigned space, budget for salaries and start-up packages, and other resources such as centers—will require changes as we support the changes, and grow in student enrollment.
- Everything is on the table—programs, departmental structure, space reallocations, etc.

## **Add any additional categories appropriate for this strategic plan.**

The report and recommendations was created by a faculty/staff committee, reviewed by and shared with all faculty and staff. The decision was reached to use this report during the tenure of the Dean from 2012-2015. During FY16 a second review will be conducted. This review will more likely follow the traditional SWOT analysis and development of another Strategic Plan.

## Mission, Vision, & Values

Include an introduction paragraph if needed. Click on the section and begin typing.

### GRU Mission

Our mission is to provide leadership and excellence in teaching, discovery, clinical care, and service as a student-centered comprehensive research university and academic health center with a wide range of programs from learning assistance through postdoctoral studies.

### College of Education Mission

#### **Academic Vision Statement**

The College of Education will be recognized as a national / international center for scholarly research, informed and creative teaching, developing human potential, and creation of new knowledge through scholarship, and upholding the highest standards of professional service to the community and society.

### GRU Vision

Our vision is to be a top-tier university that is a destination of choice for education, health care, discovery, creativity, and innovation.

### College of Education Vision

#### **Academic Mission**

The mission of the College of Education is to educate and prepare prospective professionals to be knowledgeable, highly effective, and ethical practitioners who transform learners into thinking, productive citizens.

In support of the GRU Vision, the College of Education as created a model and criteria to define programs of distinction. It has been adopted as one of its core values for the college.

**COE Core Value:** Engagement between a great research University and strong local, state, national, and international partners will be the lens through which programs will be viewed to determine distinctiveness. Professional Distinction is achieved when outstanding learning and leadership are seen in these three area: Programs, Students, and Faculty. The outcomes of this work will be: prepared, able and responsive professionals;

interdependent professional communities of learners focused on transformation and reform; and sustainable partnerships that cross over perceived boundaries to address educational and community challenges.

#### GRU Values

**Collegiality** – reflected in collaboration, partnership, sense of community, and teamwork.

**Compassion** – reflected in caring, empathy, and social responsibility.

**Excellence** – reflected in distinction, effectiveness, efficiency, enthusiasm, passion, and quality.

**Inclusivity** – reflected in diversity, equality, fairness, impartiality, and respect.

**Integrity** – reflected in accountability, ethical behavior, honesty, and reliability.

**Leadership** – reflected in courage, honor, professionalism, transparency, and vision.

#### College of Education Values

The College of Education supports the GRU Values. These values are reflected in the Programs of Distinction model as well as the Review and Recommendations Report:

**Distinction Areas** (examples of characteristics—not an exhaustive list, will vary by department/degree):

##### 1. Programs of Distinction

- Ensure both quality and quantity of their students
- Meet clearly identified needs of the CSRA
- Have excellent retention and completion rates
- Document excellent employment and retention rates
- Prepare students to be agents for transformation and reform
- Receive state, national, international recognitions
- Maintain accreditation and specialized program approvals
- Collaborate across disciplines and colleges

##### 2. Students and Graduates of Distinction

- Demonstrate the ability to respond to needs present in the changing demographics of the CSRA and beyond
- Demonstrate the ability to work effectively in high need areas
- Receive honors and recognitions in the public and private sectors

- Assume roles of leadership in their respective disciplines at the local, state, national, and international levels

### **3. Faculty of Distinction**

- Are engaged in collaborative relationships with local, state, national, and international partners
- Exhibit leadership that has a positive impact at local, state, national, and international levels
- Provide leadership in state, national, international professional organizations
- Demonstrate excellent teaching based upon best practice and research
- Are active in discipline specific scholarship and research

## GRU Strategic Priorities & Organizational Goals

---

### Strategic Priority 1 CONSOLIDATION

BE A NATIONAL MODEL for the successful consolidation of two higher-education institutions into one fully integrated and aligned research university.

- SP1. Organizational Goal 1** Deliver excellent education and training throughout our expanding footprint.
- SP1. Organizational Goal 2** Cultivate a collaborative, enriching work environment that generates open, honest, and constructive communication.
- SP1. Organizational Goal 3** Ensure that facilities and infrastructure fulfill the needs of our academic, athletic, clinical, military outreach and research programs.
- SP1. Organizational Goal 4** Promote access to higher education, in the context of a research university, and respond to the needs of our communities.
- SP1. Organizational Goal 5** Attain national and international recognition as an integrated and innovative university and academic health system.

### Strategic Priority 2 EDUCATION

BE A COMPREHENSIVE RESEARCH UNIVERSITY that leverages its history of excellence in health science and medical education with a strong foundation in liberal arts education and professional degrees.

- SP2. Organizational Goal 1** Deliver excellent education and training throughout our expanding footprint.
- SP2. Organizational Goal 2** Create, enhance, and sustain programs that prepare graduates for success in a rapidly changing global workplace and society.
- SP2. Organizational Goal 3** Provide an environment that promotes innovative education.
- SP2. Organizational Goal 4** Increase student retention, progression, and graduation.
- SP2. Organizational Goal 5** Develop an undergraduate curriculum with a distinctive profile that embraces the principles of liberal arts education as fundamental to all disciplines and that recognizes the value of a culture of intellectual inquiry, creativity, and undergraduate research.

### Strategic Priority 3 RESEARCH

BE A NATIONALLY & INTERNATIONALLY RECOGNIZED LEADER in research, discovery, and scholarship.

- SP3. Organizational Goal 1** Support a culture of collaboration and interdisciplinary research, discovery, and scholarship.
- SP3. Organizational** Foster novel research and creative activities that lead to discoveries with

**Goal 2** significant academic, therapeutic and economic impact.

**SP3. Organizational Goal 3** Lead in training, attracting, and retaining highly qualified researchers and scholars from diverse backgrounds

**SP3. Organizational Goal 4** Promote a culture of undergraduate and graduate student research.

**SP3. Organizational Goal 5** Practice distinction in biomedical research and health science education.

### Strategic Priority 4 SERVICE

PROVIDE SERVICE to the local, state, national, and global communities.

**SP4. Organizational Goal 1** Partner with our constituent communities and regional health care assets to leverage coordinated Inter-professional care and empirically-based expertise

**SP4. Organizational Goal 2** Provide scholarly service and leadership in local, state, national, and international venues.

**SP4. Organizational Goal 3** Engage in service that demonstrates a sustained commitment to diversity and inclusion.

**SP4. Organizational Goal 4** Demonstrate excellence in patient care by developing high-quality, culturally appropriate, cost-effective patient- and family-centered health care.

### Strategic Priority 5 EFFICIENCY

OPTIMIZE OUR POTENTIAL as a whole through greater efficiency, effectiveness and productivity supporting strategic growth and development.

**SP5. Organizational Goal 1** Optimize leadership, faculty, and staff recruitment, retention, productivity, and engagement.

**SP5. Organizational Goal 2** Develop innovative employee-sensitive policies, practices, and programs that establish GRU as an employer of choice

**SP5. Organizational Goal 3** Enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of the enterprise's administrative, academic, student services, and clinical infrastructure, systems, and processes to maximize the stewardship of all resources.

**SP5. Organizational Goal 4** Efficiently use existing resources and identify new resources to meet our current and future needs.

**SP5. Organizational Goal 5** Advance a coordinated philanthropic strategy to increase and enhance fundraising activities supporting all aspects of the enterprise.

### Strategic Priority 6 DIVERSITY

Provide sustained commitment to DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION across all missions.

**SP6. Organizational** Develop practices and policies of inclusivity that are implemented and

**Goal 1** embraced across the enterprise.

**SP6. Organizational Goal 2** Facilitate ongoing cultural competency development.

**SP6. Organizational Goal 3** Enhance efforts to reduce population disparities.

## College of Education Strategic Focus Areas & Goals

---

### **Strategic Focus Area 1: Consolidation**

Create a College that is enriched by the expanding footprint, diversity of programs, and that fulfills the needs of the area schools and agencies that we serve.

**Goal 1.1:**

Enhance the College's identity as an effective and efficient unit with a focus on diversity, positive impact, service, quality teaching and applied/action research.

**Goal 1.2:**

Establish mutually beneficial partnerships with citizens, schools, and community agencies to advance the development of human potential.

### **Strategic Focus Area 2: Education**

Increase the number of competitive, rigorous, research based, student-centered academic programs.

**Goal 2.1:**

All programs migrate to performance based assessment measures (i.e. content performance assessments; measure of exceptional teaching; program reviews for viability/productivity, and quality), while simultaneously increasing enrollments and support of RPG.

**Goal 2.2:**

To provide an array of delivery choices, support services, and programs in response to changing local, national and international job markets and social demands.

### **Strategic Focus Area 3: Research**

Develop a nationally recognized College in research, discovery and scholarship.

**Goal 3.1:**

Increase research and scholarship that addresses national and global problems through research/service centers, and an infrastructure that supports for faculty research.

**Goal 3.2:**

Develop an interdisciplinary culture of, and support for, collaborative, cross-disciplinary research and scholarship.

### **Strategic Focus Area 4: Service**

Develop a nationally recognized unit that integrates teaching, multi-disciplinary research and service, to address challenges facing area schools/systems and health care/kinesiology agencies.

**Goal 4.1:**

Develop models that promote social responsibility, cultural awareness, and global competence through scholarly services to our community constituents.

**Goal 4.2:**

Develop models that focus on positive impacts and ones that support and reward faculty service.

Appendix A: Alignment of Plans

**Alignment of College Plans with University Strategic Plan**

Mission Focus Areas		<u>GRU Strategic Priority 1: Consolidation</u>				<u>GRU Strategic Priority 2: Education</u>				<u>GRU Strategic Priority 3: Research</u>			
		OG1	OG2	OG3	OG4	OG1	OG2	OG3	OG3	OG1	OG2	OG3	OG5
Academic	Students	√			√				√				
	Programs	√			√	√			√				
	Pedagogy					√			√				
	Content				√								
	Clinical / Field Experience	√				√							
Research	Culture	√		√		√		√		√			
	Scholarship									√	√		
	Faculty Support /Diversity		√		√								
	Engagement/Community			√			√						
Service	State/National Leadership				√		√						
	Engagement/Community			√			√			√	√		
	Growth								√				
	Culture								√				

Mission Focus Areas		<u>GRU Strategic Priority 4: Service</u>				<u>GRU Strategic Priority 5: Efficiency</u>				<u>GRU Strategic Priority 6: Diversity</u>			
		OG1	OG2	OG3	OG4	OG1	OG2	OG3	OG5	OG1	OG2	OG3	OG5
Academic	Students												
	Programs						√						
	Pedagogy									√			
	Content		√										
	Clinical / Field Experience												
Research	Culture						√	√		√			
	Scholarship							√					
	Faculty Support /Diversity		√			√	√	√		√	√		
	Engagement/Community		√										
Service	State/National Leadership		√										
	Engagement/Community												
	Growth					√	√	√					
	Culture						√			√			

## Appendix B: Strategic Planning Components and Taxonomy



<b><i>USG Strategic Imperative</i></b>	An identified focus area within the framework of the 2013 – 2018 University System of Georgia strategic plan that is critical to the success of creating a more educated Georgia.
<b><i>GRU Strategic Plan</i></b>	The highest level GRU plan that supports the USG strategic imperatives and includes strategic priorities and organizational goals designed to meet the mission, vision, and values of GRU. The GRU strategic plan is accomplished through the mission-based strategic plans, college strategic plans, division plans, and unit plans.
<b><i>GRU Strategic Priority</i></b>	An aspirational and visionary statement that encapsulates a clear priority to enable GRU to meet its mission and achieve its vision. Supported by the GRU organizational goals.
<b><i>GRU Organizational Goal</i></b>	A clear statement that describes the means by which the GRU strategic priorities will be met.

<p><b><i>Mission-based Strategic Plan</i></b></p> <p><b>Academic   Research   Clinical</b></p>	<p>A mission-focused plan that supports the GRU Strategic Plan and focuses on the relevant GRU mission. Includes mission strategic focus areas and mission goals.</p>
<p><b><i>Mission Strategic Focus Area</i></b></p>	<p>An identified focus area within the relevant mission that is supported by mission goals.</p>
<p><b><i>Mission Goal</i></b></p>	<p>A clear statement of intention within the relevant mission supported by descriptions and specific intentions and/or opportunities.</p>

<p><b><i>College or Division Strategic Plan</i></b></p>	<p>A college-focused plan that supports the GRU Strategic Plan and focuses on the relevant GRU mission(s). Includes college/division-specific strategic focus areas and goals.</p>
<p><b><i>College or Division Strategic Focus Area</i></b></p>	<p>An identified strategic focus area within the college/division that is supported by college/division goals.</p>
<p><b><i>College or Division Goal</i></b></p>	<p>A clear statement of intention within the college/division plan supported by descriptions and specific intentions and/or opportunities.</p>

<p><b><i>Support Services Plan or Unit Plan</i></b></p>	<p>A division or unit plan that supports the college/division strategic plan(s), the mission-based plans, and the GRU strategic plan. Includes goals that can span multiple years and annual tactics and meGRUres.</p>
<p><b><i>Goal</i></b></p>	<p>A clear statement of intention around a specific area that could span multiple years. These goals directly support the college, division, and mission-focused plans.</p>
<p><b><i>Tactic</i></b></p>	<p>Specific activities or tasks to accomplish a goal – describes how the goal will be met.</p>
<p><b><i>MeGRUre – Expected Results</i></b></p>	<p>A statement of expected results for a specific tactic – describes what results are expected and how to meGRUre the achievement of the tactic.</p>

## Appendix C: Results from SWOT Analysis

---

The process used that resulted in this document was a bit unusual. In preparation for the consolidation, the College of Education sought a veteran dean to lead the work. Initial steps led by the College Leadership Team included an administrative review of the existing programs, college structure, staffing and role expectations, enrollments, as well as readiness for the changing roles that would result from the consolidation. Based on the gaps identified in this review a College Review and Recommendations Committee was formed to drill down into the gaps, recommend possible changes, and to provide input to the College Leadership Team.

On December 3, 2012, Dean Chance met with the members of the COE Review and Recommendation committee to present the goals of the committee. The results of this two-level review, a 3-year plan was developed to be implemented during the consolidation years (2012-13—2014-15) and until a new dean was appointed—summer 2015.

<b><i>Strengths</i></b>	<b><i>Weaknesses</i></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty</li> <li>• College / University as a Community</li> <li>• Initial Partnerships with Schools/systems</li> <li>• Collaboration with other Colleges in degrees, services, and research/scholarship.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Salaries and workload not in line with expectations for faculty in research 1 universities</li> <li>• Lack of a technology committee to oversee tech requests and ensure faculty voice in purchasing decisions</li> <li>• Limited technology</li> <li>• Classrooms/labs lack updated equipment and technology</li> <li>• Lack of system to definitively assess quality teaching</li> <li>• Limited skills in externally funded grant applications, and other scholarly research</li> <li>• No research centers</li> </ul>
<b><i>Opportunities</i></b>	<b><i>Threats</i></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programs, professional learning, certificates, and support to respond to national accountability measures mandated for P-12 schools and systems</li> <li>• Recruitment of research faculty</li> <li>• Creation of research center/s</li> <li>• Collaboration with Health Science campus colleges (quality teaching, 4+2 degrees, etc.)</li> <li>• Collaboration with multiple colleges on research grants/programs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding</li> <li>• Recruitment of students</li> <li>• Open lines to recruit new faculty with research skills/culture</li> <li>• Limited/no student life on computer campus</li> <li>• Lack of community support for new university</li> </ul>

Appendix D: Any additional documentation pertinent to the plan

---

**Georgia Regents University**  
**College of Education**  
**Programs / Units of Distinction**



**Academic Vision Statement**

The College of Education will be recognized as a national / international center for scholarly research, informed and creative teaching, developing human potential, and creation of new knowledge through scholarship, and upholding the highest standards of professional service to the community and society.

**Academic Mission**

The mission of the College of Education is to educate and prepare prospective professionals to be knowledgeable, highly effective, and ethical practitioners who transform learners into thinking, productive citizens.

**Core Value:** Engagement between a great research University and strong local, state, national, and international partners will be the lens through which programs will be viewed to determine distinctiveness. Professional Distinction is achieved when outstanding learning and leadership are seen in these three area: Programs, Students, and Faculty. The outcomes of this work will be: prepared, able and responsive professionals;

interdependent professional communities of learners focused on transformation and reform; and sustainable partnerships that cross over perceived boundaries to address educational and community challenges.

**Distinction Areas** (examples of characteristics—not an exhaustive list, will vary by department/degree):

**4. Programs of Distinction**

- Ensure both quality and quantity of their students
- Meet clearly identified needs of the CSRA
- Have excellent retention and completion rates
- Document excellent employment and retention rates
- Prepare students to be agents for transformation and reform
- Receive state, national, international recognitions
- Maintain accreditation and specialized program approvals
- Collaborate across disciplines and colleges

**5. Students and Graduates of Distinction**

- Demonstrate the ability to respond to needs present in the changing demographics of the CSRA and beyond
- Demonstrate the ability to work effectively in high need areas
- Receive honors and recognitions in the public and private sectors
- Assume roles of leadership in their respective disciplines at the local, state, national, and international levels

**6. Faculty of Distinction**

- Are engaged in collaborative relationships with local, state, national, and international partners
- Exhibit leadership that has a positive impact at local, state, national, and international levels
- Provide leadership in state, national, international professional organizations
- Demonstrate excellent teaching based upon best practice and research
- Are active in discipline specific scholarship and research

# College of Education

## Review and Recommendations Committee

### Final Report

April 5, 2013

## Introduction

On December 3, 2012, Dean Chance met with the members of the COE Review and Recommendation committee to present the goals of the committee. This is the final report after several months of review of the key areas in the initial charge.

The initial charge from Dean Chance is found in Appendix A, but the intent was to look at the future of the College of Education; looking at programs, departmental structure, space reallocations, etc. as the university transitions to a Research 1 institution.

Following is a list of the members of the committee:

Dr. Olajide Agunloye - ELCSE  
Dr. Graeme Connolly - KHS  
Dr. Susan Edwards - TED  
Mr. Bill Gray – Staff, Dean’s Office  
Dr. Paulette Harris - ELCSE  
Dr. Wayne Lord – COE Leadership Team (On initial committee, moved to the PhD committee)  
Dr. Steven Page - TED  
Dr. Judi Wilson – COE Leadership Team (Joined the committee when Dr. Lord departed)  
Dr. Karen Wish – COE Leadership Team and KHS (Committee Chair)

There were two key dates for submission of the findings. The budget was the first item and was to be submitted by Feb. 1, 2013. That was accomplished. The proposed budget can be found in Section One of this report. The second date is to have the remaining topic reports submitted by April 15, 2013. That also was accomplished. Minutes from the meetings can be found in Appendix B, but recommendation summaries can be found at the beginning of each the following sections:

Section One: Budget  
Section Two: COE Structure and Viability of Programs  
Section Three: Collaboration among Colleges and Curriculum  
Section Four: Technology and Online Teaching  
Section Five: Assessment of Faculty Teaching and Research Culture  
Section Six: Entrepreneurial and Centers/Institutes

This was a complex project and in some instances recommendations for other committees to be formed to delve more deeply into the issue was the only outcome. The committee members are to be commended for their dedication to this process and even with sensitive topics, objectivity was maintained, producing a better product.

Respectfully submitted by the Members of the COE Recommendations and Review Committee.

# Section 1

# Budget

## Recommendations

The importance of submitting a reasonable budget was recognized by the committee but the expertise in the entire COE was limited. Until consolidation each department was given a budget within which they were expected to operate. This has been done successfully. Recommending a budget for one year, let alone 5-10 years was a tremendous undertaking. Where feasible, input was requested (e.g. ITS, public relations), but specifics were hard to obtain. There are some important aspects in establishing a budget that are in the recommendations below:

1. Until faculty/staff salaries are at competitive levels it will be extremely difficult to recruit and hire highly qualified professionals needed in a research 1 institution.
2. Increasing salaries of existing faculty/staff and bringing back merit pay, or rewards for excellence, will be essential in retaining the best individuals in the COE.
3. Operating budgets have been the same for the last 4 years or more. Acknowledging that inflation rates, even at a 3% level, were not incorporated in any budget, expecting growth of programs without sufficient funding will be an impossible expectation. Expecting growth with potential 2-3% budget cuts, or more, will make program growth impossible. Therefore there need to be increases in operating budgets in the coming years.
4. Aggressive marketing of programs in the COE will be essential to growing all programs. This marketing needs to be developed, coordinated and conducted by qualified marketing personnel. This can't be done with a few thousand dollars to publish pamphlets. This must be an effort across the state to advertise in high-population areas and will include television, newspapers, billboards, and significant travel to visiting school districts to recruit students for undergraduate and graduate programs. To expect the COE faculty/staff to do this in addition to all their other work is unreasonable.
5. Additional budget lines for graduate assistants are necessary to allow faculty time to develop their research agendas and to conduct their research; to enable them to continue their professional development via travel and conferences, and bring back their ideas to keep their courses and research state-of-the-art; hiring more part-time/adjunct instructors, and paying them at competitive salaries are all necessary to the success of the COE faculty. This is going to be essential for the research 1 emphasis as well as the immediate needs for promotion, tenure, and post tenure review. Again, asking the existing faculty/staff to take on this additional work will not enhance success at any level.
6. Obtaining external funds is a specialized skill set. Therefore, hiring a consultant to get the COE going forward will be essential. Most research 1 universities have staff whose sole function is to generate such funds. Having such an expert at the university level will not be sufficient due to the varied areas of specialization in each college. While there is no budget request for this, there is a void in revenue suggestions in the budget, indicating lack of expertise to take this college forward.

## Section 2

# COE Structure and Viability of Programs

## Recommendations

This was a particularly challenging part of the committee’s tasking because 1) this tends to be emotional when evaluating areas to which each person is loyal and 2) there seems to be inaccurate data regarding enrollment and program completers that makes it difficult to accurately recommend program changes. It is also sensitive because any reorganization that occurs will affect people, and that makes such reorganizations a challenge.

### 1. COE Structure/Reorganization:

The recommendations about reorganization were developed after several organization charts from peer institutions were evaluated. The organizational structure from the University of Alabama, Birmingham (UAB) was the one that seemed the most feasible for the COE should reorganization be the final recommendation. At UAB they have two departments. The committee developed a two department plan for the COE following the UAB structure. Considerations were made for common programs and balance of existing number of faculty.

The recommended structure is as follows:

#### Department of \*Human Studies (22 faculty)

- 1) Leadership/Teacher Leader
- 2) Foundations
- 3) Counseling
- 4) Kinesiology
- 5) HPE
- 6) Research  
(Could move to research center  
in the future)

#### Department of Curriculum and Instruction (19 faculty)

- 1) MGED
- 2) ECED
- 3) Lang & Lit
- 4) SLED
- 5) Ed Tech
- 6) Curriculum
- 7) SS
- 8) Science
- 9) Math
- 10) SPED

\*NOTE: Will need to use some other term than “Human Studies” when naming the new department. Other colleges/departments could have an issue with this name.

NOTE: Having KHS absorbed by another department eliminates the need for a third department chair. The time to do this type of reorganization seems appropriate since the current Chair of KHS is stepping down at the end of this academic year. There was no recommendation for KHS to be moved out of the COE.

### 2. Viability of Programs:

Although there were several documents addressing enrollment numbers etc., the accuracy of these numbers and the productivity data were questioned. Due to the inability to have precise numbers to work from, the committee’s recommendations revolve around what they determined were “at risk” programs and suggestions that the programs be evaluated after a strong marketing effort was in place. The overall recommendation is that no decisions should be made about eliminating any program until

after one to two years of aggressive marketing when the numbers can be evaluated again and recommendations be made at that time.

The “at risk” programs that should be evaluated are:

- 1) All secondary undergraduate programs. Consider expanding the IMAT option for these areas
- 2) SPED Adapted (MAT)
- 3) SPED MEd.
- 4) EDLR MEd. (NOTE: Refer to the minutes from 2/13/2013 in the “Minutes” appendix for key points from the Educational Leadership committee members.)
- 5) HPE MAT. Consider putting this in the MAT program in TED with electives taken in KNHS courses, like what is done for the Ed.S
- 6) The P-12 undergraduate programs are at risk but these cross college lines so will be deferred at this time, but they are recognized as at risk.

# Section 3

## Collaboration among Colleges and Curriculum

## Recommendations

Consolidation has allowed an opportunity to evaluate programs and the essential curriculum as well as expanding opportunities to collaborate with other programs that were not feasible before collaboration. How effectively both efforts are done depends on many factors, most notably the creativity of the faculty and staff to look at possibilities in a broader way than ever before. While collaboration within the COE is an expectation, it is now necessary to expand to other colleges, most notably the College of Allied Health Sciences and other medical programs to evaluate the ability to develop multi-specialty programs.

A major goal will be for the COE to pursue research projects with the other colleges, and then to collaborate both nationally and internationally as programs grow.

1. Collaboration with other colleges. Each department identified current and future collaboration efforts. This committee recommends continuing with the successful collaborations and find interested faculty and staff to develop new collaborative efforts.

a. Teacher Education existing and proposed efforts:

- 1) Extensive collaboration with the community – 52 schools with formal Partnerships.
- 2) Collaboration with the other Summerville colleges regarding P-12 teachers (e.g. math, science, music, foreign languages)
- 3) PRESTIGE grant requires collaboration with the respective STEM instructor
- 4) Collaboration with all colleges with the Classroom Technology certificate
- 5) Collaboration with all Departments in the COE and colleges regarding the success of the PhD
- 6) Jim Mumford from Children’s Medical Center is collaborating with several people to pursue a grant to get a full time teacher for inpatients at the Children’s Medical Center.

b. ELCSE existing and proposed efforts:

- 1) Literacy center collaborates with students from all the colleges and the community
- 2) Collaborates with the psychology department regarding their counseling students
- 3) SPED is a dual degree so various collaborations
- 4) The teacher leader/ed. leadership programs collaborate with various departments in multiple colleges
- 5) Proposed ed. leadership masters will involve collaboration with the Hull College of Business, the MPA program and KHS for elective classes

c. KHS existing and proposed efforts:

- 1) CAHS
  - a) Pipeline for pre-physical therapy students to get into DPT program (also includes the College of Science and Mathematics – the biology department)
  - b) Committee to develop graduate nutrition degree
- c) Department of Physiology (not sure what college)
  - 1) Meetings to assess collaborative efforts
  - 2) Physiology fellows now adjunct for KHS classes (graduate class set for fall)

- d) Georgia Prevention Center (not sure what college)
  - 1) Undergraduate students do research practicums and internships
  - 2) Graduate students do thesis research
  - 3) Faculty are members of thesis committees
- e) Business College
  - 1) Students take grad/undergrad classes for electives
  - 2) Faculty have offered sports-related classes
  - 3) Potential for faculty to be members of thesis committees (being explored now)
  - 4) Possible new “sports management” masters degree (not being explored now)
- f) College of Arts and Humanities
  - 1) Nutrition track incorporated classes in sociology and anthropology as elective classes
  - 2) Other BSK tracks require classes from sociology and psychology

## 2. Curriculum

- a. The committee identified topics that are essential for all, or most, students in the COE. These topics reflect subjects that may be key issues or events that are based on current issues or politics impacting students.
- b. The support document spreadsheet indicates what courses are currently covering these topics, and those topics that are not currently being covered at least in foundations classes.
- c. The list of topics should go to the department chairs who will then determine what topics pertain to their specific majors, and how they will be covered in the curriculum.
- c. The list should be reviewed and modified annually to include new topics and to remove topics no longer relevant.

The committee agreed that the function of the committee is to offer recommendations but not to determine how implementation will be achieved. Once the Dean has reviewed the written report, further actions will be determined by her.

# Section 4

# Technology and Online Teaching

## Recommendations

It is essential that students in the COE programs be exposed to technology that is used in the classrooms in which they will do their training and eventual teaching. The support documents include lists of common technology in the schools, based on survey results, as well as what is currently available in the classrooms in the COE.

The future of online courses and programs is going to expand rapidly. It can no longer be accepted that traditional face-to-face programs will continue. Georgia Regents University needs to be more directed towards online programs and the COE needs to continue to transition to more options for students.

Recommendations for both issues in this section include:

1. Keep an up-to-date listing of technology and how it is being used in the P-12 classrooms, and be sure that classroom instruction opportunities in the COE include this technology.
2. Have classrooms in University Hall that are designated COE technology classrooms and schedule classes in those rooms that will maximize instruction using the technology.
3. Designate a person to be the contact in the COE for technology-based issues. This may be one of the recent new hires, but this person needs to be available for the entire COE and not just the department where they do their primary teaching.
4. Continue to encourage faculty to put more classes online, and when the percentage of courses taught in a program exceed the number as established by the BOR, pursue putting those programs online.
5. Follow the BOR policies as to the approval process of types and numbers of online programs can be offered at each institution; this will prevent efforts by departments to develop such programs, when they may not be approved.
6. Current and future online course and programs must be effectively marketed for increased enrollment numbers.

# Technology

### **Current COE Classroom Technology**

SmartBoards – UH 355, 356, 357

SmartTable – One

Promethean Board UH 250 – One

Table Mount Epson Brightlink Projectors – Three

Infocus Travel Projectors – Two

Nook Color (50?)

iPads

### **SmartBoard Alternatives**

eBeam

Mimio

Epson Brightlink Projectors

### **Apps**

Audio Memos (iPhone/iPad)

Boice Recorder (Android)

# Section 5

## Assessment of Faculty Teaching and Research Culture

## Recommendations

Assessment of faculty teaching is another very sensitive subject. While there are positive and negative aspects to assessment, this is likely going to be a requirement, especially for those faculty who select to be primarily instructors with up to 80% of their time devoted to instruction. The support documents for this section contain some articles and other materials related to faculty assessment.

Recommendations for assessment are as follows:

1. The COE should lead the way related to faculty assessment
2. An instrument should be chosen, training required on how the instrument is to be used
3. Criteria are needed (written procedures) on such issues as how often an assessment will be conducted, differences in assessment for tenured vs. non-tenured faculty, whether it will be part of the annual evaluation, how will it be used in post-tenure review etc.
4. Evidence should come from four sources: Students, Faculty Member (self-assessment), Colleagues, and Administrators.
5. There should be a committee established that is separate from the COE Review and Recommendation Committee, who is charged to develop the policy/procedures. The committee will need to determine how the policy will be approved (e.g. vote by faculty at the Assembly).
6. If the responsibility for assessment of classroom teaching for all instructors in a department is added to the tasks of the Department Chair, then each department will need an assistant chair to assume some of the other administrative duties.

Recommendations for establishing a research culture are as follows:

1. There needs to be a FRANK discussion with the president, provost, VP, dean about where we, as a college, are now and where we can be – realistically.
2. The definitions for scholarship and research should be consistent with BOR policy USG 4.7.2 and 8.3.15.
3. There needs to be a clear structure/organizational chart for the Associate Dean of Research. There needs to be a systematic way for the Dean to come up with the methods/process for proposing the structure.
4. Need funds – e.g. travel to schools/organizations/agencies, technology, structural room designs in University Hall and Christenberry Fieldhouse.
5. Need salaries that are competitive in order to obtain qualified research faculty and increased faculty lines are needed for individuals with appropriate experience to do research.
6. Can't have a 4/4 teaching load along with advising
7. Support is needed from the Grants office to find and write grant proposals
8. IRB process support
9. A writing assistance center is needed for graduate students to write appropriate APA style documents for publications etc.
10. A GRE/MAT test preparation center (no one knows of any in Augusta)...possible revenue from this?

11. Graduate classes must be of sufficient academic rigor to have reputable programs. Do 8-week classes meet that rigor; how about the 2-week summer classes?
12. Constant technology updates
13. Support for faculty on how to guide research
14. Research workshops and consultants – concentration- specific experts (What journals are likely to accept publications?)
15. Centers/Institutes workshops

# Section 6

## Entrepreneurial and Centers/Institutes

## Recommendations

It is the opinion of the members of this committee that entrepreneurial endeavors is an area needs to be addressed at a level different than this committee due to the limited expertise of those in attendance. The committee members did make the following recommendations:

1. Ideas for this need to come from the faculty and staff.
2. Intellectual property rules need to be assessed and communicated now that we have a new university structure.

There were a few ideas mentioned as possible means of generating income:

1. Charge a fee for the ISL conference.
2. KHS could charge for fitness assessments.
3. Workshops, seminars, consulting fees for expertise.
4. Centers could provide services for fees, e.g. testing at the literacy center for a fee
5. Develop apps for phones that could be sold.

Except for those mentioned, there was agreement that this is a specialized skill set that must be sought out in future hiring actions to bring in the ideal person to lead the way in this area.

Regarding centers and institutes, there were several centers identified during the review of organizational structures of peer institutions. Refer to the support documents in Section 2 of this report. The committee did decide on some overarching principles that are offered as recommendations for centers and institutes:

1. The more people that are involved the better – aids sustainability
2. Must be faculty/staff driven
3. Some determination by a committee (e.g. Faculty Development Committee) as to criteria and which ones to support. Examples of criteria are:
  - a. Bring in money
  - b. Can the person in charge be successful?
  - c. Review of competitive centers; avoid saturation of ideas already available elsewhere.

Need to be unique to succeed.

4. Centers must be self-sufficient. There will likely be the need for a small amount of funding for initial support, and the committee in #3 above should evaluate opportunities at the university level, but after that they need to support themselves.
5. Choose centers carefully; need success as a reflection of the COE.
6. Begin slow, become successful, then build.
  - 1) One center at a time
  - 2) Strategic planning of subsequent centers
7. Consider community needs and support before beginning a center.
8. Consider collaboration with other colleges.
9. Develop a project to target underserved populations. An example is:
  - 1) Laney-Walker or Harrisburg areas
  - 2) Address health and dental issues and transition to education. For example, the vegetable truck in Harrisburg transitions to tutoring. Almost a “one stop shopping” model.
  - 3) Must serve the community

# Appendix A

## Initial Charge to the Committee from the Dean, College of Education

## College of Education Review and Recommendations Committee

What should the College of Education look like in 5 years as we grow toward becoming a research one university?

How do we reallocate resources, or position ourselves for new resources, in this time of financial downturn?

How do we develop a culture of entrepreneurial activities and develop a culture of seeking external grants and contracts?

How do we efficiently use our assigned space and other resources while growing numbers, new faculty, and staff positions?

This work is about the *future of the College*. Everything is on the table—programs, departmental structure, space reallocations, etc.

**The committee will be charged to make recommendations based on the following:**

- **Creating a research one culture, including programs, research/scholarship, grantsmanship, etc.**
  - Collaboration among/between colleges in degrees, services, etc.
  - Rewards for research (funding for original research papers vs ‘workshopy’ or practices type of presentations, etc.)
  - Reassigned time (how assigned, assessed, etc.)
  - Valid / reliable assessment for teaching (especially important for those choosing largest percent of time in teaching)
- **Effective and efficient management of all resources**
  - Budgeting based on enrollments, meeting outcomes, etc.
- **Effectiveness, currency, and continued need for programs/degrees**
  - CORE curriculum
  - Integration of mobile technology in classrooms
  - Online learning
  - Dual certifications (meeting new school demands including, special education, ELL, online teaching, etc.)
- **Cutting edge/national leadership of programs/degrees**
  - Futuristic – Needs 5 years from now, 10 years out, etc. (online teaching skills/endorsement for teacher candidates)
- **Creating an entrepreneurial culture**
  - Positioning ourselves for ability to earn funds for COE

**The committee will review and make recommendation relative to:**

- Viability of programs (including enrollments, student/faculty ratios, national recognition or potential for, potential for growth, potential for online options), etc.
- Department structure/College of Education organizational changes, such as:
  - Department/degree/program reassignments
  - Budgeting based on productivity, (enrollments, scholarship, etc.)
  - Ensuring faculty input on prioritizing technology needs in the college—not just the loudest squeaky wheel).

- Potential for Centers / Institutes
- Potential for Certificate programs, new degrees, etc.
- Others as may arise

The committee will report their findings and recommendations to the COE Leadership Team:

**Budget Items (with rationale/data) February 1, 2013\***  
**Restructuring, Program Recs, etc. April 15, 2013**

The Leadership Team will receive, review and respond with final plans for the College no later than May 1, 2013.

Those who accept this role, and serve in an active role, will have earned a \$300 extra travel or materials stipend to support his/her scholarship efforts. This can be used FY13 or FY14. All COE GAs and staff will be expected to help gather info and support the work.

\* Need to have these data to introduce for the FY 14 budgeting process.

Be thorough *and* realistic in projections and need. I do not believe in the game of asking \$10k if you need \$5k. Realistic requests based on data will be better received by me, and other GRU administrators. *Know* that there will be little to no, new funds for FY14. Reallocation of internal funds and funding models is our first order of business. Once the most effective and efficient measures are in place, then we can begin to seek additional funds to support growth and quality needs.

**College of Education Review and Recommend Committee Members (elected by your peers):**

- Wayne Lord, COE Leadership Team
- Karen Wish and Graeme Connolly, Kinesiology and Health Sciences
- Drs. Olajide Agunloye, and Paulette Harris, Educational Leadership, Counseling and Special Education
- Drs. Susan Edwards, and Steven Page, Teacher Education
- Mr. Bill Gray, Staff member

Thanks for taking time to serve on this very important committee. As Dept/Staff representatives, please be sure that you keep your colleagues in the communications loop. I will assume that the recommendations represent all faculty and staff.