

Dear Stephen Everse, et al. –

Regarding your request for confirmation of a rebuttal/response: The program has offered a response below and copy/pasted the Faculty Senate CAC report with appropriate highlights and corresponding numbered comments. Concurrently, this response is attached in pdf format. This response does not contain the amount of detailed evidence collected and presented to members of faculty senate. Dr. Brett J. Holt may be solicited at bjholt@uvm.edu to provide a full copy of the ppt presentation containing detailed evidence and facts referred to in this response. Given the current report continues to contain inaccurate narratives, ‘selective’ context, assertions lacking evidence, and fails to convey the exhaustively detailed (and evidenced) disposition of the program faculty, students, community partners, and alumni presented to members of the Faculty Senate on Feb. 15th, a more detailed response/rebuttal may be presented at a future date that will not be limited in scope of audience and/or outlet.

Brett J. Holt
Associate Professor

Response as Follows:

Below find the report dissected and highlighted along with a corresponding numerical response to each highlighted statement appearing in the report:

Green Highlight = Incorrect statement (evidence has been offered to dispute)

Yellow Highlight = Statement that omits pertinent contextual information (not the whole truth)

Blue Highlight = Assertion without evidence

Corresponding Numerical Responses

1	Contextually, Coaching Education and Physical Education are linked through governing bodies.
2	Contextually, the process has already resulted in failure to replace a programmatic faculty line.
3	Contextually, NO concern regarding enrollment was shared with this PC until Fall 2020 during a pandemic. Contextually, the first indication was the cancellation of programmatic courses having less than 15 enrollees even though there were: a) documented ‘safety’ concerns regarding Physical Education activities, b) classrooms had size limits less than 15 posted on doors, and c) other programs (e.g., EDLP) continued ‘elective’ courses enrolled with less than 15 students.
4	Contextually, Provost Prelock’s directive occurred Nov. 23 rd 2020 and Dean Thomas indicated deactivation approximately 43 days later (including Thanksgiving, Christmas, New Years, and MLK) on Feb. 5 th 2021. As stated/printed by Faculty Senate report, this date perpetuates a narrative of occurring over an entire academic year.
5	Incorrect: Dean Thomas NEVER offered the program an opportunity to redesign.
6	Contextually, while no ‘redesign’ was put forth, the acting PC did propose possibility of ‘reorganization’ to address esoteric programmatic issues as many sister institutions (University of Wyoming, New Hampshire, North Dakota, etc) organize and structure Physical Education programs under Health Sciences rather than Education for compatibility purposes.
7	Contextually, the proposal for dual endorsement was worked on by faculty in Sp 2019 and Sp 2020 only to be ‘stopped’ by the very administration that now proposes focusing attention???. Dual endorsement was a priority of the program and collaborating faculty preceding deactivation. Thereby, this current administrative post-hoc attention toward dual endorsement is viewed as disingenuous.

8	Incorrect: The ‘official’ vote parameters were to have been closed by the end of April. The vote questionably was extended past the expiration into May.
9	Contextually, the vote was extended violating the initial parameters and reported incorrectly for at least five days.
10	Contextually, approximately three weeks were offered to complete this task. For further context, the main Health faculty member was on sabbatical and the main Physical Education faculty member was attending a conference during one of those weeks. Finally, for context, resources had prematurely been removed (i.e., lab equipment and spatial needs in sp ’21 without programmatic notice) when the parameter of “only utilizing existing resources” was applied.
11	Contextually, a proposal, given the parameters, would have failed. Contextually, upon advice of a trusted and successful external administrator, this proposal opportunity was viewed as a ‘set-up’ for future failure engineered by internal administration. Concurrently, the Faculty Senate President (Brochert), regarding these alternative proposals’ states, “Negatively, the reading might be, ‘come up with your own firing plan [1].” [1] Edgar, C. (2021). ‘Major fallout: UVM scholars argue that cuts to the humanities would imperil the university’s mission’, Seven Days, 27 January.
12	Contextually, the reason appears to have changed. Please refer to the presentation slides in which administrators have been evidenced propagating false and changing narratives throughout this process.
13	Contextually, the CESS CAC specifically indicate that their role (purview) was to vote on the ‘process’ following guidelines...yet, below they appear to have considered and voted with influence from false narratives including but not limited to: a) Contextually, the CESS CAC reports, “A review of enrollment and graduation numbers by the Provost’s office in <u>Fall of 2020</u> initiated a College level review (CESS). These coincided with ongoing conversations about low enrollment <u>which pre-date the current chair.</u> ” This is incorrect (underlined) as the current chair began in Fall 2019. b) Contextually, “the CESS CAC reports A focus group was held in January of 2020 with then Program Coordinator Dr. Connley, Chair Vannest, and Associate Dean Killeen to explore market opportunities.” This entire statement is incorrect and has been addressed in the presentation to Faculty Senate members on Feb. 15 th and is documented for reference on the power point slides. c) Contextually, the entire section on program history is incorrect and a more accurate and referenced description was provided at the Feb. 15 th meeting with Faculty Senate and evidenced in the provided slides. Voting by the CESS CAC is thereby questionable as it is both unclear if they considered items outside their purview and if they considered false narratives that they failed to validate.
14	Contextually, the primary faculty member ‘agrees’ that dual endorsement would be a competitive advantage...that is why the primary faculty member advocated for a dual endorsement and administration appeared disinterested until now?
15	Incorrect: Over the years analyzed within Provost/Dean’s parameters, staffing remained the same.
16	Contextually, ‘reduction in faculty’ means an unexpected death in which the Dean’s office never saw fit to replace the line, thereby lacking leadership foresight and causing other documented problems as a result.
17	Assertion without evidence: How are ‘pedagogies’ compromised? The EDPE program awaits evidence to this assertion. “Pedagogies’ is misused vernacular in the current statement.
18	Contextually, there is agreement on a ‘few’ points. There is disagreement on ‘many’ points. Contextually, which points does the CAC assume agreement?
19	Incorrect: At NO point in time during the 13-slide power point presentation nor in documented discussion with administration did the primary faculty member express concern over “deactivation leading to discontinuation” of the program. This appears to be a continued ‘false narrative’ propagated by administration.
20	Assertion without evidence: The second time this narrative has been perpetuated in this report (#17). Still awaiting evidence of said assertion. “Pedagogies” is still misused vernacular in this statement.
21	Assertion without evidence: a) Adjuncts offer different styles of teaching, b) External programmatic faculty offer diversity of style or teaching, c) Implies that with different individuals guarantees different teaching styles, and d) The primary faculty is adept and experienced (Under Ericsson’s framework of Expertise) in all of Mosston and Ashworth’s spectrum of teaching styles and frequently changes teaching

	styles. This assertion is offensive and if our program is to be held accountable, we expect other programs to be held accountable to “diversity of style or teaching.”
22	Contextually, this is not the case with the teacher deficiency current (sidebar: a deactivation will as previously articulated negatively affect said supply line of teachers), however UVM students should be offered opportunities to be ‘competitive’ in the marketplace.
23	Contextually, the ONLY NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED program in VT is the UVM program!
24	Assertion without evidence: This is a presumptuous statement that lacks foresight. Interruptions have already occurred and been documented.
25	Assertion without evidence: How can one be certain that “advising will continue as normal?” The afore mentioned death of a colleague has placed double advising loads on the remaining faculty member with NO plans by administration to rectify.
26	Incorrect: External programs (most notably K-12 programs) are relying on this program to continue the supply line. Further, internal programs such as ‘Fit Kids’ in the Psychology Dept and Sociology Dept have frequently registered for courses in this program (e.g., EDPE 166, 055-A, & 220).
27	Assertion without evidence: Interim Dean Shepherd has NOT indicated to program faculty or students a commitment on “identifying issues and developing a viable program.”
28	Contextually, the full-time faculty member will SELECTIVELY ‘participate/lead the charge’ in further discussions with individuals that understand, respect, and possess necessary competencies/skillsets to meet the esoteric needs of a Physical Education major, Exercise Science major concentration, Coaching minor, Sport Management shared minor, and possible dual endorsement in Health Education.

To: Curricular Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate

From: Rosemary Dale and Rosi Rosebush

Date: March 26, 2022

Re: Approval of a proposal for to deactivate the Physical Education (Grades PreK-12), B.S. Ed. described in the UVM 2021-22 Undergraduate Catalogue and leading to teacher licensure in PK-12 PE settings

We have reviewed the contested proposal to deactivate the existing undergraduate major in Physical (PE) submitted by the Department of Education, met with the appropriate parties, and collected supplemental documentation. Our recommendation is to support the proposal as submitted. If approved by the CAC, the Faculty Senate, and the Board of Trustees, the deactivation would be implemented in May 2022.

The proposed deactivation request pertains to the Physical Education (Grades PreK-12), B.S. Ed. described in the UVM 2021-22 Undergraduate Catalogue and leading to teacher licensure in PK-12 PE settings. The PE program as a whole includes the PE licensure programs, as well as a Coaching Minor, Exercise Science Concentration, and a cross-college Sports Management Minor. The request for deactivation (1) does not apply to the concentration or minors. (2) The proposed deactivation will not result in reductions of any faculty or staff.

Steps Taken in the Evaluation of the Proposal

- Subcommittee received the proposal on Monday, January 24th.
- Subcommittee met with the Program Faculty Brett Holt on February 15th and February 22nd.
- Subcommittee met with Departmental Chair Kimberly Vannest on February 9th.
- Subcommittee met with Interim CESS Dean Katharine Shepherd on February 8th.
- Subcommittee met with Vice Provost for Academic Affairs Jennifer Dickinson, Faculty Senate

President Thomas Borchert, and Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Co-Chair Stephen Everse on March 9th.

- Subcommittee held two open forums for faculty members in the Department of Education on February 25th and March 3rd.
- Subcommittee received one document from Dr. Holt on February 14th.
- Subcommittee submitted their report to the CAC Chair on March 26th.

Rationale for Deactivation of the Program

- Describe the proposers' rationale for implementing the deactivation at this time. Indicate who initiated the deactivation.

(3) The status of enrollments in the PE program have been of concern for some time and was under review when the minimum thresholds for enrollment and completion were put forward by the Provost's Office in (4) AY2020-2021. Degrees awarded in AY 18,19, and 20 were 4, 8, and 2. (5) The Dean at that time, Scott Thomas, offered the program the opportunity to redesign. (6) As no redesign was put forward, the Dean introduced the idea of DEACTIVATION to allow the EDPE program to examine this major, to revise the program appropriately, (7) including working on dual endorsement with health education.

Is 5 possible? is there email evidence that he offered?

Where does he get this?

As per policy, the Department of Education Faculty voted on the deactivation in (8) May 2021. (9) The vote was 18 to 18. The current Dean, Dr. Katie Shepherd, (10) offered the program an opportunity to identify alternate proposals during the fall of 2021. (11) No proposal from the program was brought forward.

(12) For this reason, Dean Shepherd and Chair Vannest identified that the proper course of action for the EDPE program was a deactivation. The CESS Curricular Affairs Committee reviewed the proposal on December 10th and 17th, and voted on December 17th in favor of the proposed action, (13) with five members in support of the proposal and two abstaining.

Argument for deactivation for curricular improvement

The Chair, the Dean, the Director of Teacher Education, and the (14) primary faculty member agree that the program's low enrollment is due in part to the fact that the degree does not include course work and field experiences needed for endorsement as a health educator. This preparation is common on a national scale and required for most jobs post-graduation. (15) The program has also undergone changes in staffing and (16) a reduction in faculty. (17) The limited number of faculty and students compromises the pedagogy.

Why is the deactivation contested?

(18) There is agreement on many points. (19) The contest seems to revolve around the concern on the part of the primary faculty that the deactivation will lead to the discontinuation of the program.

Curricular Viability

(20) The current enrollment numbers do not support excellent pedagogy. (21) A single core faculty member, despite excellent support from other departments, does not allow for diversity of style or teaching. (22) Additionally, the configuration of the program, without the dual endorsement in health education, compromises the employability of the graduates.

(23) Physical education programs are offered at Norwich University in the Department of Health and Human Performance. Castleton University also offers a degree in Physical Education.

Effect on students

(24) Students will finish with no program interruptions. (25) Advising will continue as the core faculty member will be here. (26) There is no program relying on this Physical Education degree. Courses offered that students in other majors take will continue to be offered.

Exit deactivation

(27) Dean Shepherd has indicated that her plan is to formulate a committee to identify issues and to develop a viable program. (28) The current faculty member agrees to participate, either leading the charge or actively participating in the discussions.

Our recommendation is to support the proposal to deactivate the Physical Education (Grades PreK-12), B.S. Ed. described in the UVM 2021-22 Undergraduate Catalogue and leading to teacher licensure in PK-12 PE settings.