

March 22, 2004
Room 158, Norman Hall

Members present: James Algina (for Mirka Koro-Ljungberg), Jim Archer, Patricia Ashton (for Jennifer Asmus), Dale Campbell, Maureen Conroy, Dale Honeyman (for Craig Wood), Linda Lamme, Terry Scott, Nancy Waldron, Elizabeth Yeager

Members absent: Craig Wood, Mirka Koro-Ljungberg, Jennifer Asmus

Others present: Catherine Emihovich, John Kranzler, Rod Webb

Waldron called the meeting to order at 2:07 p.m.

Agenda and Minutes

1. Approval of agenda for March 22, 2004

Algina made a motion to approve the March 22, 2004 meeting agenda as submitted by Waldron. Yeager seconded the motion. The FPC unanimously approved the agenda.

2. Approval of the minutes of the February 23, 2004 meeting

Honeyman made a correction to the minutes. Ashton made a motion to approve the February 23, 2004 minutes with the change requested. Algina seconded the motion. The FPC unanimously approved the minutes as amended.

Announcements

1. FPC Agenda Committee Meeting.

The next meeting is scheduled for Monday, April 19, 2004 from 11:00 – 12:00 noon. Issues to be placed on the agenda for this meeting should be forwarded to Waldron or Conroy.

2. COE Spring Faculty Meeting.

Waldron reported that the COE Spring Faculty meeting is scheduled for March 29, 2004 from 3:00 – 4:30 p.m. An announcement was sent out to faculty. A reminder will be sent this week.

3. Dean's Advisory Council Meeting

Waldron reminded FPC members that they are invited to attend the Dean's Advisory Council Meeting with President Machen on Tuesday, March 30th, from 9:00 – 10:00 a.m. in the Terrace Room.

4. Associate Dean Search Committee Meeting

Waldron shared that a message from Kranzler was sent today updating FPC about the Associate Dean search. FPC members were asked to send comments directly to Kranzler or other members of the committee. Kranzler will send out another update after a plan is created.

5. Call for Nominations for 2004-05 FPC Representatives

Waldron will send a message next week to both the general faculty and department chairs to notify them of FPC positions available. Department chairs have already been notified that three nominations per department are needed. Once votes are decided, length of FPC term will be decided as well.

Report from Dean

1. Dean's Advisory Council Meeting

Dean Emihovich asked FPC members interested in attending the Dean's Advisory Council Meeting with President Machen on Tuesday, March 30th, from 9:00 – 10:00 in the Terrace Room to contact the Dean's office because refreshments will be provided.

2. Scholarships of Engagement

Dean Vernetson will be sending out a message asking faculty to nominate a graduate student for the Scholarship of Engagement Award. Criteria for nominees will be distributed as well.

3. Budget Report

Dean Emihovich announced that she would be sharing the comprehensive budget report at FPC's April 5th meeting. Projections for summer funding are positive. Carry over funds will be used for: a) \$18,000 Presidential Fellowships using GRE and GPA as fellowship criteria, b) student recruitment, c) raising TA stipends to attract more students.

Archer asked if these funds would be used this year. Dean Emihovich confirmed that the funds would be used in the fall 2004.

Kranzler noted that 38 doctoral students were nominated for fellowships with offers to the top ranked 24.

Dean Emihovich added that the push is for high quality doctoral-level graduate students and GPA and GRE scores will be used as criteria for fellowships. She encouraged faculty to recruit additional doctoral-level students and stated that her office is committed to finding funding for these students. This type of activity will assist in growing the COE's doctoral programs.

4. President Machen's University Reorganization Announcement

The Deans and Vice Presidents of the University were advised prior to President Machen's announcements of his reorganization plans. Dean Emihovich shared that she is unsure of the implications of reorganizations for COE at this time. One possible influential change is that Provost Colburn has resigned. The search for a new Provost will begin in late summer or early fall 2004. Dean Emihovich suggested that FPC members may want explore with President Machen at the Dean's Advisory Council Meeting his views on the COE. At previous meetings, President Machen has discussed his interest in University of Florida's Colleges having more autonomy, shared governance to improve faculty climate, and interdisciplinary efforts. Dean Emihovich is preparing a packet of COE's Program Review to share with President Machen.

Archer asked if there were internal candidates for the Provost position. Dean Emihovich replied that it will be a national search, but that does not exclude internal candidates.

5. Informational Meeting for Faculty About the Union

Dean Emihovich shared that Joe Glover would like to speak to COE's's faculty about union issues. She needs feedback as to the best venue (e.g., FPC or a faculty meeting). Dean Emihovich asked if there would be time for Joe Glover to speak at the next FPC meeting. Waldron replied yes. However, Archer questioned the implications of giving Joe Glover time. Waldron commented that it might be better to announce a separate meeting to the faculty. Archer suggested providing a forum for a representative from the administration and a representative from the union to present. Dean Emihovich added that Joe Glover wanted a chance to speak in order to give information to the faculty.

Campbell asked if the Administration is working with the Faculty Senate but not talking to the union. Archer and Waldron confirmed that the Administration is not talking to the union.

Campbell commented that Joe Glover should be invited to speak to the faculty. Archer remarked that if Joe Glover is invited, other union representatives should be invited as well.

Honeyman suggested that FPC provide meeting information to faculty members at the spring faculty meeting.

Waldron question if FPC should handle this issue. Dean Emihovich noted that FPC represents COE faculty and it would be inappropriate for the Dean's Office to handle the meeting. Dean Emihovich added that she was relaying information.

Campbell noted that the most immediate issue for a union representative meeting would be arranging a time where both representatives could be present or arranging a separate forum. Dean Emihovich suggested allocating a portion of the FPC meeting on April 5th or April 19th. Archer added doing so with time parameters. Emihovich suggested using the Terrace Room. Archer recommended inviting the faculty and providing 15 minutes to each union representative to speak. Lamme recommended scheduling the union representative meeting with a prescheduled meeting if FPC wants faculty to attend. Conroy added that getting such a forum together is short notice.

Conroy replied that having union representatives share information would be important prior to the faculty vote. Dean Emihovich agreed. Archer questioned if a vote was scheduled. Dean Emihovich replied that no vote was scheduled but that faculty should be thinking about the issues.

Conroy recommended holding an informational meeting on a Monday following a FPC meeting.

Archer commented that if faculty were interested they would attend. Dean Emihovich agreed and added that not having any union representative speak would send the wrong message.

Archer made a motion to invite the union representatives to speak from 4:00 – 4:30 on April 19th after the FPC meeting. Lamme seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Waldron requested assistance in making this happen. Campbell and Honeyman volunteered to assist. Dean Emihovich stated that her office would check the schedules of both union representatives.

6. College of Education Program Review

Dean Emihovich reported that the COE program review with the Provost has been moved to April 5th. The review contains budget information and will be shared with all departments prior to the April 5th meeting.

7. Dean's Review

Dean Emihovich noted that the Dean's narrative summary would be placed on the COE's webpage.

8. Personnel Change

Dean Emihovich shared that Mary Driscoll will be leaving COE to a director position at Saint Bonaventure. Dean Emihovich expressed her appreciation of Mary Driscoll's fundraising efforts including her raising over \$2 million and increasing COE's endowed fellowships. Dean Emihovich added that the position would be posted.

9. Alliance Director and Center for School Improvement Director Search

Dean Emihovich reported that the search for Alliance and Center for School Improvement Directors are under way. These searches are internal searches.

10. Update on National Issues Related to Teacher Education

Dean Emihovich reported that the government is conducting a new study of Teacher Education programs and although the quality of our teacher education program is good, the COE may have to modify the way things are done. The Educational Leadership program as well as the Teacher Education programs will be scrutinized. Dean Emihovich added that attention has to stay focused on our graduate masters, specialist, and doctoral programs (especially in attracting doctoral students).

Campbell asked who specifically is studying COE's Teacher Education Program and where is it in the policy frame? Dean Emihovich asked Campbell to hold his question, as discussions will soon follow.

Committee Reports

1. College Curriculum Committee

College Curriculum Committee Report Deferred

2. Faculty and Budgetary Affairs Committee

Faculty and Budgetary Affairs Committee Report Deferred

3. Lectures, Seminars & Awards Committee

Lectures, Seminars & Awards Committee Report Deferred

4. Long Range Planning Committee

Long Range Planning Committee Report Deferred

5. Research Advisory Committee

Research Advisory Committee Report Deferred

6. Student Recruitment, Admissions, and Petitions Committee

Yeager reported that the Student Recruitment, Admissions, and Petitions Committee is brainstorming about issues related to student recruitment. This committee will review these issues and present them to the FPC. The next committee meeting is scheduled for April 21st, at 9 a.m. in the Educational Psychology conference room.

7. Technology Committee

Technology Committee Report Deferred

8. Ad Hoc Committee on Procedures for Annual Review of COE Dean

Ad Hoc Committee on Procedures for Annual Review of COE Dean Report Deferred

New Business

1. Procedures/Survey for Annual Review of COE Dean

Yeager made a motion to place the Procedures/Survey for Annual Review of COE Dean on the table. Conroy seconded the motion. Campbell reported that the evaluation instrument and procedures were distributed for comments, documentation of consensus, and feedback. No feedback was given on the procedures. The evaluation instrument had the only substantive change where non-tenured accruing faculty members are now given the opportunity to comment.

Algina asked if the evaluation instrument and procedures would be used this year if accepted? Campbell replied that they would be used this year. Waldron added that if it were approved, FPC would move ahead and that she has asked Dean Emihovich to post her goals for COE.

Lamme shared that she was asked to evaluate someone in liberal arts and the form they used was efficient and open ended. She suggested that a similar form be created for COE next year.

Conroy pointed out that non-tenured accruing faculty had been added to the survey. Honeyman added that non-tenured faculty are not accrued.

Waldron noted that non-tenured accruing faculty had to be added to number 5 on the procedures for Annual Review of the COE Dean.

Lamme suggested that non-tenured accruing faculty be changed to not tenure track.

Algina asked what the official definition of who fits in the non-tenured track and the non-tenured accruing faculty category. Webb commented that these are lecturers, full time faculty members, and assistant scholars.

Algina questioned if this would include "soft" and "hard" money people. Waldron replied yes.

Waldron added that this is consistent with FPC's discussion on reconsidering voting faculty and non-tenured accruing faculty participate. Campbell noted that this is consistent with the philosophy that we would give the Dean feedback from everyone.

Algina, Lamme, and Honeyman asked why department chairs and FPC members were being identified. Waldron pointed out that FPC members and department chairs have more contact with the Dean than faculty members. Conroy noted that one faculty chair expressed concerns. Waldron noted that the data was optional. Campbell suggested that this information be left off. Archer added that FPC wants people to be honest when they respond.

Lamme recommended that more space be added for people to write.

Campbell added that if the only issue is identifying department chairs, the survey could be changed in the future.

Kranzler noted that the Dean would not see the raw data if completed via the web.

Waldron summarized that the first line of the evaluation instrument would be removed and the comment section would be expanded.

Yeager made a motion to accept the procedures and evaluation instrument with changes. The motion passed unanimously.

Waldron noted that a minimum of 3 members would be designated to review results and decide on how it would be presented to the Dean. Lamme asked if the instrument would be paper or electronic. Waldron replied paper and that help was available to type the responses. Conroy, Campbell, and Lamme volunteered to help review and present the results.

Waldron thanked the committee members for their work on the instrument and procedures.

2. *COE Procedures for Pre-Tenure Review*

Waldron requested discussion and feedback from FPC members regarding COE Procedures for Pre-Tenure Review. The University requires set guidelines for Pre-Tenure Review. COE and the University's guidelines do not correspond. COE policy needs to be adjusted so that it aligns closer to guidelines by the end of the spring. The issue is coming to FPC for discussion, resolution, and a policy that is OK with faculty members and meets the guidelines. Waldron will work with others to modify current COE policy to make it more consistent to the University's policy. Webb created a document that notes COE's Pre-Tenure Review options towards a policy document.

Campbell noted that COE policy is more enabling and questioned if sticking with COE policy was an option. Honeyman responded that we had to stick with university policy.

Campbell suggested that there could be a 3rd year college review and a 4th year official review that the department head and Dean signed off on. Conroy noted that this would be a lot of work.

Lamme recommended that COE should stick with University guidelines because they give broader options.

Honeyman asked if it was important for chairs to review non-tenured faculty in the 3rd year. Algina responded that chairs should start in the first year.

Lamme added that the policy would have an impact on tenured faculty (e.g., time) and so the policy should be configured to benefit everyone involved.

Honeyman questioned who would have access to pre-tenure reviews, as a non-tenured faculty receiving a glowing report in year 3 or 4 not receiving tenure in year 7 may be an issue.

Archer responded that the information is a part of the personnel file, which may be confidential. Archer questioned what would be the cost benefit and also people would be kept from research.

Campbell noted that new policies would be less of an issue if non-tenured faculty start out with them.

Algina questioned why mimicking the tenure process was thrown out. Waldron replied that COE moved away from mimicking the tenure process because it was too formal. Waldron asked FPC members if they thought the process should mimic. Lamme replied that mimicking procedures would give faculty members experience. Honeyman and Yeager agreed.

Waldron restated the procedures discussed: a) the whole department making a vote statement about faculty progress and the department decides on the procedures, b) materials for pre-tenure review will mimic tenure review materials (including three external letters), c) department chair meets and shares department perspectives with the candidate.

Webb noted that University policy includes the Dean in the pre-tenure review process. Lamme suggested: a) the department head sharing the review with the Dean, b) the department vote, and then c) the department head conferences with the non-tenured faculty member.

Algina suggested that the Department Chair writes and sends a letter to the Dean who endorses and makes comments that will be sent to the candidate.

Waldron noted that she would organize and write down the policy discussion and send to the committee for review.

3. Comments received regarding proposal on Doctoral Research Requirements

Waldron reported that 18 comments regarding doctoral research requirements were received. 14 people supported the proposal. 4 did not support the proposal. 5 commented specifically about the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies approving substitute and alternative courses with 4 saying the Dean should not have this responsibility.

Conroy made a motion to put this proposal on the table. Algina seconded.

Waldron asked the FPC to discuss the proposal to see if it would improve current policy or if doctoral research requirements should be left as they are.

Lamme commented that the committee should make the final decision about the research hours and courses doctoral students must take. Conroy reported that the faculty in Special Education are supportive of the document. Conroy added that classes not listed in the policy could be taken while those listed would provide a research foundation. Honeyman agreed stating that the Educational Leadership faculty requires 22 hours of research for their doctoral students and the classes listed in the policy are merely a base line. Lamme noted that research in her

department is classroom based and so doctoral students there need different standards.

Kranzler question how one person can make a decision about appropriate coursework for every discipline sharing that he has consulted others if he has had any uncertainty.

Scott asked why a list of substitute and/or alternative courses could not be listed up front. Algina and Kranzler agreed.

Waldron noted that that was an issue or further discussion.

Algina noted that procedures for approving courses would have to be developed.

Lamme suggested discussing the policy in parts. Waldron responded that the list of courses is a major concern of faculty members.

Conroy asked if faculty feedback was supportive of the policy. Lamme noted that her department was unanimously against the policy. Yeager mentioned that the email feedback provided to Waldron indicated that some STL faculty supported the plan, but also indicated that they opposed oversight/approval of course substitutions from the Associate Dean's office.

Campbell made a motion to vote to approval the proposal. The proposal passed with 7 approving, 2 declining. Linda Lamme & Elizabeth Yeager, from STL, cast declining votes.

Waldron shared that the next step would be to send the issue to the Agenda Committee including procedures for adding courses to the approved list of courses. Waldron added that if STL had concerns, the department could bring them to the Agenda Committee.

Unfinished Business

1. Minority Recruitment and Retention Plan

Tabled

2. Participation of non-tenured faculty in college governance

Tabled

Waldron adjourned the meeting at 4:04 p.m.