

**April 5, 2004**  
**Room 158, Norman Hall**

**Members present:** James Algina (for Mirka Koro-Ljungberg), Jennifer Asmus, Dale Campbell, Maureen Conroy, Linda Lamme, Ann McGill Franzen (for Elizabeth Yeager), Nancy Waldron, Craig Wood

**Members absent:** Jim Archer, Mirka Koro-Ljungberg, Terry Scott, Elizabeth Yeager

**Others present:** Catherine Emihovich, John Kranzler, Doti Delfino

Waldron called the meeting to order at 2:09 p.m.

## Agenda and Minutes

### *1. Approval of agenda for April 5, 2004*

Lamme made a motion to approve the April 5, 2004 meeting agenda as submitted by Waldron. Asmus seconded the motion. The FPC unanimously approved the agenda.

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

Algina made a motion to approve the March 22, 2004 minutes. Asmus seconded the motion. The FPC unanimously approved the minutes.

### **Announcements**

#### *1. FPC Agenda Committee Meeting*

The final FPC Agenda Committee meeting will be held on April 19<sup>th</sup> from 11:00 – 12:00 noon. Issues to be placed on the agenda for this meeting should be forwarded to Waldron or Conroy.

#### *2. Call for nominations for 2004-05 FPC Representatives*

John Gregory sent an e-mail to faculty and department chairs regarding nominations for 2004-2005 FPC Representatives. Nominations are due by Monday, April 12<sup>th</sup> and elections will follow soon after.

#### *3. Presentation on Shared Governance and Union Representation*

An open session will be held April 5<sup>th</sup> at 3:30 p.m. During this session Joe Glover and Kim Gregory will be presenting information about shared governance and union representation.

### **Committee Reports**

Waldron noted that a summary of 2003-2004 committee activities are due by April 16<sup>th</sup> and should be forwarded to her by that date.

#### *1. College Curriculum Committee*

Conroy reported that the committee discussed two issues at their last meeting: a) off book courses needing to go through the College Curriculum Committee and b) revising the language of the graduate catalogue regarding transfer of credit for an Ed.S. degree. Both will be placed on the agenda for next year.

*2. Faculty and Budgetary Affairs Committee*

No report

*3. Lectures, Seminars & Awards Committee*

The committee finished making recommendations on faculty awards. 12 awards have been distributed. Original guidelines were created with the Research Advisory Council. Revisions to the guidelines may occur next year. Kranzler noted that the Faculty and Budgetary Affairs Committee and the Lectures, Seminars, and Awards Committee would work together to revise the procedures with input from Emihovich. General procedures, however, will be worked out within the Faculty and Budgetary Affairs Committee.

*4. Long Range Planning Committee*

Lamme reported that the committee is discussing distance education programs and long term benefits.

*5. Research Advisory Committee*

Wood reported that the committee is discussing criteria for the CRIF Grant and B.O. Smith Professorship.

*6. Student Recruitment, Admissions, and Petitions Committee*

No report

*7. Technology Committee*

No report

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

No report

**Report from Dean**

*1. Provost Meeting*

Emihovich reported that she met with the Provost to review the COE Program Review. The Provost and Emihovich discussed several initiatives including:

- a. Community College and COE partnerships for teacher preparation in math, science, and/or early childhood,
- b. Distance education and online teaching,
- c. Resources needed for doctoral student recruitment,
- d. Use of P.K. Yonge as a research school across the COE campus (especially in Science),
- e. Increasing enrollment, especially through online initiatives,
- f. Funding requests for faculty lines.

### *2. Dean's Advisory Council Meeting*

Emihovich also reported on President Machen's visit to the Dean's Advisory Council on March 30<sup>th</sup>. She stated that President Machen is well disposed to COE and was receptive to the concerns raised at the meeting.

Emihovich briefed President Machen about Universal PK and EC Readiness activities. They also discussed the Teacher Education Program and how it will be important for the program to demonstrate how its pre-service teacher preparation connects to student achievement.

Conroy asked Emihovich if Provost Colburn's goals were in line with President Machen's goals. Emihovich reported that, presently, Provost Colburn's goals are targeted more toward legislative issues than President Machen's. Emihovich added that COE has to demonstrate that it's responding to issues of teacher quality.

### *3. Budget Report*

Emihovich noted that the budget report contains the same information as was presented in the fall report except for the addition of summer information. COE has a deficit of \$378,132 due to the tuition waiver fee and deficits in various program offices. Emihovich added that the president has talked about returning money to colleges for deans, department chairs, and faculty members to manage. As such, the current budget model is in transition. Preliminary numbers (research money, publications, doctoral students produced) reifies an existing structure but does not take into account future changes. COE has to consider a funding model that recognizes contributions spread across different entities.

Emihovich reported that her office took several steps to develop the summer budget. Emihovich asked each chair to prioritize the courses needed for students to complete their programs and stay on track. Enrollment from previous spring and

summer semesters were compared. Special requests as well as practicum supervision and thesis advisement were considered. Emihovich noted that next year her office is considering a weighted model for faculty FTE.

Conroy noted that in the fall, the deficit was a concern and questioned what had changed. Emihovich responded that the deficit was covered in other ways. She added that 5 new fellowships have been created. 29 doctoral students have been funded while 28 requests have been made.

Algina commented that the UF Administration used to deliver money for the summer. Emihovich replied that the budget for the entire year is now delivered July 1<sup>st</sup>.

Emihovich noted that she is now asking faculty to sign a contract for summer courses that requires minimum enrollments of 7 students for advanced seminars, 15 for graduate level courses, and 20 for undergraduate courses. However, the department chair can petition for adjustments to these numbers.

Algina commented that in the past, anyone who wanted to teach in the summer could and now, chairs have to start early at getting programs together. Emihovich agreed and noted that this would be discussed more in the future.

Lamme commented that faculty needs to be kept informed and that the summer could be used to accommodate those with low salaries.

Emihovich noted that because of the FTE the college is generating, COE would get more back from the University. Department chairs have to carefully plan with faculty in order to make sure that the year is budgeted well.

An FPC member asked if load was a part of the union contract or an administrative decision. Emihovich responded that load is part of the union contract. Wood added that state rules and regulations govern faculty load. Emihovich clarified her previous statement agreeing with Wood and adding that all Florida state faculty members are on a 9-month contract and load is not an administrative issue.

Emihovich noted that money for salary increases and merit will be distributed to departments and the decision as to how the money will be distributed across faculty will be done at the department level. Lamme commented that department structures vary in size and salaries. Lamme asked Emihovich if any thought was given to dividing the School of Teaching and Learning into separate program areas. Emihovich noted that the salary would not change regardless of department budgets. Lamme noted that it is problematic to have differential salaries. Emihovich

replied that salaries are applied to individuals. Lamme asked Emihovich if she was considering salary changes. Emihovich responded that President Machen has discussed salary compression and she noted that any move made would include a college discussion. Emihovich added that as of now, salary raises occur with counter offers and dividing up the School of Teaching and Learning would raise costs because of administrative needs. She also noted that departments are funded based on size.

### **Unfinished Business**

#### *1. Minority Recruitment and Retention Plan*

Tabled

#### *2. Participation of non-tenured faculty in college governance (Faculty and Budget Affairs Committee)*

### **New Business**

#### *1. COE Procedures for Tenure Review*

Waldron disseminated ideas generated from the last meeting regarding COE procedures for Pre-Tenure Review in a draft document. Waldron asked FPC for further discussion and next steps. She added that pre-tenure review procedures need to be in place by the end of the academic year. Waldron also noted that the new pre-tenure review procedures mirror the tenure process except for the outside letters.

McGill-Franzen questioned if there would be repercussions for faculty members if departments voted no and if there were guidelines if this occurred. Conroy replied that the review informs the faculty member that they are not making satisfactory progress but was not to be used to terminate the contract. Emihovich agreed.

Wood asked if assistant professors were under 5 year contracts. Emihovich replied that assistant professors are under 1-year contracts. Wood questioned if a glowing review would create an expectation of tenure. Emihovich commented that the department would have to be clear that the review is a candid assessment that can be used positively in order to suggest support.

McGill-Franzen asked what mechanisms were available for supporting faculty the year or semester prior to tenure. Emihovich replied that the support would be within the college. Kranzler noted that CRIF is available to faculty members. Emihovich noted that she would like to provide some release time prior to tenure. McGill-Franzen clarified her question and asked if endowments were available.

Wood asked if just samples of the candidate's research papers, publications, and papers submitted for publication would be submitted for review. Lamme advised that the publication portfolio be kept as close to tenure process as possible. Asmus noted that a publication portfolio is not submitted with the tenure packet.

FPC discussed when the pre-tenure and promotion packet would be submitted. The committee decided that the packet would be submitted by February 1<sup>st</sup> for review. The departmental faculty would vote by March 1<sup>st</sup>. The chair of the department will submit the packet to the Dean's office by April 1<sup>st</sup> and the Dean's office will provide feedback by the end of the semester.

Waldron noted that she would post the new Pre-Tenure Review Policy and that it would be sent out to chairs to comment on. Additionally, Waldron noted that it would be voted on at the next meeting.

Emihovich noted the importance of everyone following the same dates during the Pre-Tenure Review process.

Emihovich ended the meeting by presenting Waldron with a basket of goodies showing her appreciation.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:25 p.m.

Waldron announced that the next FPC meeting is scheduled for Monday, April 19<sup>th</sup>, from 2:00 – 4:00 p.m.