

**College of Education
Faculty Policy Council Meeting
March 21, 2022, 2:00-4:00, Zoom**

Chair: Angela Kohnen

Chair Elect: Julie Brown

Dean's Office: Glenn Good, Tina Smith-Bonahue, Thomasenia Adams

HDOSE: Chris Curran, Helena Mawdsley, Chris Redding, Anne Seraphine, Cathy Atria

SESPECS: James McLeskey, Carla Schmidt, Meg Kamman, Tara Mathien,

STL: Magdi Castaneda, Maya Israel, Shelley Warm, Mark Pacheco, Matt Schmidt

ZOOM Attendees Protocol:

- FPC members and Deans' microphones will be open (if applicable)
- The chat room will remain open to all participants throughout the meeting. During the Deans' reports, Chris Curran will bring forward questions to the Deans for response.
- A temporary copy of the entire chat transcript will be kept and the FPC Agenda Committee will review those for possible future agenda items.

Approval of the Agenda

Motion to approve – Shelley Warm 2:02pm, Meg Kamman seconded motion with consensus of the group to follow.

Approval of Last Meeting's Minutes (2/21/2022)

Minutes stand approved with no corrections at 2:04pm.

Announcements/Reminders:

- Upcoming FPC Meeting Dates: April 18th (Spring faculty meeting, Norman Conference Center)
- Spring Budget Forum, April 27th, 12-1pm, Norman Conference Center, sponsored by BAC and hosted by Dean Good
- FPC elections committee (Maya Israel, Meg Kamman, Helena Mawdsley) is soliciting FPC and Senate nominations. Please encourage colleagues to run
- At the spring faculty meeting, all FPC committees will deliver their final report. If you are a representative to a committee, please work with the chair to make sure the final report is prepared before the meeting.

Deans' Reports

- Associate Dean Tina Smith-Bonahue
 - EduGator Central – Admissions information presented. Thanks to all for work on these. Programs are being notified soon.
 - Accepted doctoral applicants have been notified and we are waiting on their decisions.
 - Advising – let Chris Cooke know if there are any issues.
 - Coming soon: BAES strategic planning opportunities. Where do we want the program to go from here?

- Coming this May: New process to keep better track of students from application to graduation. Goal is to streamline requests for information about students.
- IDP implementation is now housed in GIMS. These are flexible, should meet the needs of each program. We will be asked to report on implementation at the end of this year.
- Our college is in good shape regarding legislation about how we do business with students – be ready to answer questions about this.
 - We do not have information on implications of this or guidance about it, but we will let you know when we have more information regarding different issues.
- Associate Dean Thomasenia Adams
 - OER: 52 Awards. \$121 million so far (we have until 6/30/22).
 - There are many internal awards that faculty can apply for. Current awards are presented, and faculty who are eligible are encouraged to apply and nominate others.
 - New T&P cycle is getting started. Workshops for faculty have been announced. It's never too early to get information on this. Workshops are face-to-face and online.
 - OER is still trying to find technical writers, search is ongoing.
 - If anyone can think of things to help us support faculty, let us know how we can improve our work at OER.
- Associate Dean Tom Dana
- Dean Glenn Good
 - There is a lack of information regarding budget, which is implemented on 7/1/22. We are not sure what our budget is going to be, but we are doing the best we can with this lack of clarity. We are avoiding requests aside from essential requests until we have more information.
 - US and World Report Rankings are discussed.
 - New hires and hiring news are discussed across the College.
 - Erica McCray is the new Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs, Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Community Engagement
 - Presidential search is discussed.
 - An apprenticeship program is proposed – this is an approach in COEs and districts across the country. We will see what feedback we get, more information will be provided later.

Discussion and Action Items

- Committee Updates
 - Budgetary Affairs: James McLeskey
 - Working on merit review process with FAC, CBA issues. COE budget forum plans are presented. If you have topics you would like to see addressed, let BAC people know. There will be a virtual option for the forum. Come to this forum if you have questions about summer, how to maximize salary over time, etc.
 - College Curriculum: Julie Brown

- Looked over CS education, Science Ed program, providing feedback. Work is going effectively and efficiently. Impacts of legislation are being considered.
 - Final meeting is 4/11/22
 - Diversity & Inclusion: Anne Seraphine
 - Had their EduGator discussion. If you have any responses, post to the repository on Canvas. Faculty DI award – please put forth your materials if you are interested. Submit materials by 5pm on 3/25/22.
 - Faculty Affairs: Tara Mathien
 - Discussed T&P, and still working on CBA.
 - Meeting 3/23/22 at 10am to continue discussion.
 - Lectures, Seminars & Awards: Shelley Warm
 - Provided an honorarium for a virtual guest lecturer on 3/21.
 - Meeting Wednesday to review excellence awards.
 - Long Range Planning: Chris Redding
 - Dean’s evaluations are open right now.
 - Research Advisory: Julie Brown
 - Several awards that are going to be reviewed, plan is to meet twice this month to keep up with this.
 - Technology & Distance Ed: Maya Israel
 - Meeting 3/25 and 4/8 to synthesize recommendations from feedback from programs.
- Updates from Faculty Senate: Julie Brown
 - Senate report will be sent out.
- Discussion: Guest speakers for the spring faculty meeting
 - Let us know if there is anyone you would like to hear from at this meeting.
 - Examples from past include Zucker Center, Laster Center, another idea is a discussion about PK Yonge with Brian Marchman and Lynda Hayes.
- Discussion and vote on next steps: Recommendations from the Ad hoc committee on doctoral research requirements
 - Most common: 12-16 credits, combination format (vs. open format) – a few required courses with others at the student’s discretion
 - Minimum Research Methodology Requirements for PhD Students is presented.
 - A lot went into making sure these requirements compare to peer institutions
 - Question: what are the other approved courses (outside of REM)?
 - There will be a curated list hosted by a team at HDOSE. We want to switch from a static document to a dynamic document that will update as new courses are presented and added.
 - Question: How does a course get added to the list? Is there a way to submit an application for a course to get added?
 - This information would not go on the document (because it’s a student tool), but this is a great question that needs to be considered. This is a future topic to explore.
 - Question: For non-REM methods courses, what is currently on the list?
 - Nothing for now, but these were discussed. For example, new courses with AI applications, meta-analysis course, single-case analysis. The

intent was to be rigorous but inclusive to what the practice has become (without need for excessive exemptions from the dean's office).

- Recommendation: Table this for now, re-visit when we get more information about the list of non-REM methods courses.
- Action item: getting input from program coordinators to find anything that's missing and get feedback. Also, a college advisory committee where we can get student feedback. Then, we can bring this back to FPC at the next meeting.
 - When this is circulated, a list needs to be included.
- There may be a working list / link that can be shared for now. We will look for that.
- Should we ask this ad hoc committee to add the link to the list, then FPC can circulate this to program coordinators and students for feedback before 4/18?
- Question: Can FPC take time to provide feedback once we get the link? Then we may be able to skip this extra step
- The list is extensive, there are more elements to it than just the course list.
- A big change to look at is requiring introduction to quantitative and qualitative courses.
- Motion: Anne Seraphine 3:06pm, Seconded by Maya Israel: Circulate document (with the link), get feedback for faculty commenting period, and bring feedback to 4/18 meeting.
- Open Town Hall: Proposed changes to the composition of the Tenure and Promotion Committee
 - Ran a Qualtrics survey, results are presented.
 - No change: 5
 - Allowing an associate tenured professor to serve only in the event that a school does not have two available full, tenured professors: 10
 - Always allowing associate tenured professors to serve, with at least half the committee comprised of full, tenured professors: 13
 - Comments from survey:
 - 6 comments specifically asked about opportunities for clinical faculty members on the T&P committee
 - 1 comment worried that always allowing associate tenured professors on the committee could create a challenge if the committee had a lot of full promotion cases to consider
 - Other comments asked to hear what others think of the issue
 - Survey participants:
 - 18 tenured/tenure track
 - 10 non tenure track
 - 18 have been through the promotion process at UF
 - 10 have not
 - Are we going to be able to get this done? Or will it push into next year?
 - It is possible for us to get it done, and we can add an extra meeting for this purpose. We would have to move fairly quickly. If it moves on to next year, they will aim to get it done quickly.
 - Who votes on this?
 - All faculty are eligible to vote on this.

- If always allowing associate tenured professors to serve moves forward, are we putting too much pressure on these professors? And how does a 3-0 look?
 - When the Dean writes their letter, they can include information about the committed makeup and why there are only a certain number of votes.
 - A colleague needs to be ready to be equipped and ready to have deep conversations about their peers. We should build in mentoring, so they are ready to have these conversations.
 - If issues occur, we need to act upon it quickly.
- Is there pressure on associate professors to run for the committee?
 - Probably, but this may be a good and necessary thing.
- Is it common to only have 3 votes?
 - It just depends on how the committee is made up. This can always be explained in the deans letter
- Is the vote simple majority?
 - No, 2/3 of faculty who are present at regular or special meeting.
- Providing context when presenting this information would be helpful. To show people that this is not outside the norm.
 - How should we provide this information?
 - People have assumptions that may be incorrect, and need to think about it to overcome these assumptions.
- We need to circulate for one month, then have a special meeting to hold a vote.
 - Can we circulate, talk about it at 4/18 FCP meeting, and then have a vote right after?
 - Need to explain there is going to be a vote, organize and present the information, explain the process and where we are, so we can move forward with a vote.
- All clarity on details needs to be documented.
- 3:29pm James McLeskey: motion to move forward with the option: always associate tenured professors to serve, with at least half the committee comprised of full, tenured professors – Anne Seraphine seconds.
 - Wording: One opening for full professor, and one open seat (full or associate)
 - We can wordsmith this later (even after vote) as long as there is no substantive change to the amendment
 - “Tenure & Promotion Committee. This committee will consist of two tenured professors from each school. At least one professor from each school shall be at the full, tenured professor rank. The second professor from each school may be at either the full, tenured professor rank or at the associate, tenured professor rank. Each member shall serve a two-year term. Start dates of terms shall be staggered within schools.”
- Do we need to capture the election component in this amendment? We are required to have a half-elected committee.

- Let's find out where that is written down somewhere but discuss this later. If we can't find it, we can be the ones to write it (in another area).
- Next Steps: circulate this to full faculty, explain that this is proposed, then we will have a meeting (after 30 days) to vote on this. We will work on wording to make sure it is a nicely crafted message to faculty.

Adjournment

Meeting Adjourned: Meg Kamman 3:41pm, Tara Mathien seconded with no objections.