

**April 19, 2004**  
**Room 158, Norman Hall**

**Members present:** Maureen Conroy, Dale Campbell, Mirka Koro-Ljungberg, Linda Lamme, Terry Scott, Nancy Waldron, Craig Wood, Elizabeth Yeager

**Members absent:** Jim Archer, Jennifer Asmus

**Others present:** John Kranzler, Rod Webb

---

Waldron called the meeting to order at 2:08 p.m.

Agenda and Minutes

*1. Approval of agenda for April 19, 2004*

Lamme made a motion to approve the April 19, 2004 meeting agenda with the reorder suggested by Waldron. Yeager seconded the motion. The FPC unanimously approved the agenda.

*2. Approval of the minutes of the April 5, 2004 meeting*

Conroy asked FPC to review the pre-tenure packet review dates to make sure they were correct. Conroy made a motion to approve the March 22, 2004 minutes. Koro-Ljungberg seconded the motion. The FPC unanimously approved the minutes.

**Announcements**

*1. 2004-05 FPC Elections*

2004-05 FPC Elections will take place April 22<sup>nd</sup> through April 30<sup>th</sup>. John Gregory is working on the ballot. Nominations from all departments have been received. Each department should nominate three people. 1 faculty member is needed for a two year term from each department and one alternate as well. The ballot will be posted this week. John Gregory will notify faculty when ballots are ready.

Lamme noted her concern with voting over break week. Conroy commented that voting should be finished before break week. Waldron added that she will follow up on when ballots will be posted.

*2. First Meeting of 2004-05 FPC to elect Secretary*

The first meeting of the 2004-05 FPC will take place on Monday, May 10<sup>th</sup>, at 2:00 p.m. The purpose of this meeting is for new and continuing members to elect a secretary early enough to assist the faculty member and department chair in negotiating release time.

*3. FPC Meetings with Associate Dean candidates*

FPC members and alternates have been invited to meet with the Associate Dean candidates. The candidates, dates, and times are as follows:

James McLeskey	April 19 <sup>th</sup> , 4:00	Renee Clift	April 26 <sup>th</sup> , 3:30
Jeri Benson	April 29 <sup>th</sup> , 3:30	Tom Prout	May 6 <sup>th</sup> , 2:00

### Committee Reports

Waldron noted that she sent 3 messages to chairs of standing committees to get one page summaries. She added that she would post all of the reports on the website and place them in the binder.

Waldron introduced Erika Gubrium as representative from the Student Alliance of Graduates in Education or SAGE.

#### *1. College Curriculum Committee*

Submitted final report.

#### *2. Faculty and Budgetary Affairs Committee*

No report

#### *3. Lectures, Seminars & Awards Committee*

Submitted final report.

#### *4. Long Range Planning Committee*

No report

#### *5. Research Advisory Committee*

No report

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

Yeager reported that the final Student Recruitment, Admissions, and Petitions Committee will be meeting on Wednesday at 9 a.m. in the Educational Psychology conference room. The committee submitted final report.

#### *7. Technology Committee*

No report

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

No report

## Report from Dean

No report

## Unfinished Business

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

Waldron reported that the Minority Recruitment and Retention Plan is being reviewed by the Student Recruitment, Admissions, and Petitions Committee as well as the Faculty and Budgetary Affairs Committee. After the review, the feedback will go to Michael Bowie. Webb will facilitate with Vernetson to pull the draft together. It will then be reviewed by the legal council. Revisions of the draft will be sent to the FPC in the fall.

Wood asked if there was currently a plan for undergraduate and or graduate minority recruitment and retention. Conroy responded no. Archer questioned the effect of not having minority fellowships on doctoral student recruitment. Yeager noted that the Student Recruitment, Admissions, and Petitions Committee did not have those statistics. Waldron commented that she would follow up with Kranzler.

## New Business

### *1. COE Policy for Third Year Pre-Tenure Review*

Waldron posted the COE Policy for Third Year draft for faculty to provide feedback. Waldron reported that she received 5 comments: 4 favorable, 3 of which were from chairs. James Algina provided feedback to Waldron via e-mail noting parts of the draft that may be problematic for the college.

Lamme made a motion to put the policy on the table for discussion. Waldron noted that the Agenda Committee discussed James Algina's comments earlier. She asked the FPC to consider whether to keep the policy as is or make changes as Algina suggested.

Webb noted that the committee wanted to emphasize the helpful nature of the 3<sup>rd</sup> year review.

Yeager asked if chairs expressed their concerns. Waldron replied no and added that they felt the policy was reasonable.

Koro-Ljungberg questioned the purpose of the pre-tenure review. Webb replied that the pre-tenure review gives faculty a sense of how they are doing before they are required to apply for tenure and promotion. Mirka asked if the focus is on support or evaluation. Webb replied that the focus is on evaluation in order to provide support, because support cannot be provided without an evaluation.

Yeager commented that if FPC followed Algina's recommendations, the process would still be helpful. Lamme added that FPC should be cautious.

Koro-Ljungberg noted that the policy reads like receiving positive review guarantees tenure. Scott added that this would be the expectation regardless of the intent of the review. Waldron agreed and asked if FPC should accept the changes recommended by Algina.

FPC discussed the wording of the policy draft in terms of Algina's recommendations. Wood noted that it must be in writing that the pre-tenure review does not send an expectation of future success. Campbell questioned if the statement should be in a policy or in a letter. Wood suggested that the statement be in both. Archer and Koro-Ljungberg noted that having a statement at the bottom of the letter would diminish the process. Webb noted that he had not seen such a statement in other departments but recommended that the fourth sentence in the fifth paragraph be changed to: ". goal is to give thoughtful and constructive assessments and suggestions and nothing in the evaluation constitutes a guarantee of eventual success." Waldron asked the FPC if everyone agreed with the changes as recommended by Webb. The FPC approved.

The FPC discussed the second point presented by Algina where he recommended the second sentence in the first paragraph be modified. Webb recommended that the paragraph be restated as, "The purpose of the review is to provide structured feedback on the candidates' progress toward tenure and promotion." Waldron asked the FPC if everyone agreed with the changes as recommended by Webb. The FPC approved.

The FPC discussed one final change to the policy draft. The first and last sentence of the last paragraph will be kept while the sentences in between will be removed.

Mirka asked how current pre-tenure faculty would be reviewed. Webb replied that current pre-tenure faculty would also be reviewed.

Waldron asked FPC if they accept the amendments to the policy draft. Lamme made a motion to approve the policy as presented with changes discussed. Yeager seconded the motion. The policy changes passed with 9 FPC members voting for and 1 member abstaining.

## *2. Participation of non-tenured faculty in college governance*

The Faculty and Budgetary Affairs Committee submitted a report recommending the expansion of the definitions of faculty and participation of non-tenured faculty

in governance. The UF Faculty Senate is also discussing the same issue and is due to vote on it soon. Their definition includes full time non tenured faculty and P.K. Yonge faculty.

Waldron noted that because the definition requires constitutional change, it needs to be discussed by FPC to make recommendations to the faculty. Waldron will provide the information and place it on the FPC website for comments from faculty.

Conroy questioned the rationale for not including P.K. Yonge and non-tenured faculty in the archives. Waldron noted that committee went with university policy. Conroy added that sharing that conversation would be important in making decisions.

Wood asked if P.K. Yonge faculty would be precluded from receiving a degree from UF if they are labeled as faculty. Campbell noted that the question should be explored. Wood asked if the rights of those with tenure and tenure track positions lose their rights.

Waldron asked if it would be helpful to post or if it would be confusing to faculty. Lamme recommended posting next year. Archer questioned if the faculty are complaining. Waldron replied yes. Wood noted that if faculty thought something was unfair, they could file a grievance.

Campbell asked if the university senate takes action to approve P.K. Yonge, is COE still obligated to include P.K. Yonge. Wood followed by asking if P.K. Yonge is a part of the bargaining unit because if so, it would strengthen P.K. Yonge faculty's argument. Campbell noted that the decision may be mute if decided. Wood suggested FPC wait for a vote. Conroy added that FPC would decide how to proceed next year.

### *3. Faculty Review of Dean Emihovich*

Waldron reported that everything is ready for Dean Emihovich's Review by COE Faculty. The Provost's Office also sent a survey for faculty to review Dean Emihovich. COE faculty will be completing both reviews. Waldron will be providing a cover letter and an explanation of the two surveys to faculty via e-mail. The Agenda committee will analyze and share the review with Dean Emihovich, COE departments, and FPC.

Campbell made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Archer seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 3:35 p.m.