

April 29, 2002
Room 158 Norman Hall

Members Present: Phil Clark, Vivian Correa, Bridget Franks, David

Honeyman, Hazel Jones, Max Parker, Tina Smith-Bonahue, Joe Wittmer, Stephen Smith (Chair), Jane Townsend

Members Absent: Dick Allington

Others Present: John Kranzler, Rod Webb

Smith called the meeting to order at 9:08 a.m.

Action Items

1. Approval of the agenda

Two items were added to the agenda for April 29th: (1) Waldron will report on the Faculty Affairs Committee regarding Tenure and Promotion recommendations, and (2) a discussion regarding the election of a Secretary to the FPC will be added. Clark moved and Smith-Bonahue seconded to approve the agenda as amended. The FPC voted unanimously to approve the agenda as amended.

2. Approval of the minutes of 4/15/02

"Members Absent" on the minutes of 4/15/02 was corrected with the addition of Allington. Smith-Bonahue moved and Parker seconded to approve the minutes of 4/15/02 as amended. The FPC unanimously approved the minutes as amended.

3. Research Advisory committee recommendation (Ed.D.)

Elizabeth Bondy's concern about the language in the Graduate Catalog regarding the Ed.D. and the Ph.D. was discussed. Differences are related to the focus of the coursework and other program experiences, the nature of the qualifying exams and dissertation, and the kinds of positions for which the student would be prepared. Suggestions included: (1) make the requirements (e.g., qualifying exams) for the Ph.D. and Ed.D. more generic, giving departments the power to set specific requirements, and (2) make the focus/purpose of the Ed.D. more distinct and clear.

Smith distributed the following DRAFT recommending language which could be used in the Graduate Catalog:

Doctor of Education (Ed.D.)

The Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) degree is offered for students who desire advanced professional training and academic preparation for the highest levels of educational practice. Programs are available in various areas of concentration within the School of Teaching and Learning and the Departments of Counselor Education; Educational Leadership, Policy, and Foundations; Educational Psychology; and Special Education. A minimum of 90 credit hours beyond the bachelor's degree is required for the Ed.D. degree. All master's degrees counted in the minimum number of credit hours must have been earned in the last seven years. Specific course requirements vary with the department and with the student's plan for research. With the approval of the supervisory committee, the student may choose one or more minor fields of study. The qualifying examination and a doctoral dissertation are required of all candidates for the Ed.D. degree. See material presented under the heading Requirements for the Ph.D. for information relating to transfer of credit, minors, leave of absence, supervisory committee, language requirement, campus residence requirement, qualifying and final examinations, admission to candidacy, dissertation, guidelines for restriction on release of dissertations, and certification. These statements are applicable to both the Ph.D. and Ed.D. degrees.

There was a suggestion to review Linda Crocker's language regarding the Ed.D. and Ph.D. differences. Kranzler reminded the FPC that Crocker's language is not related to the Graduate Catalog, but refers to dissertations only.

Kranzler remarked that Crocker's language regarding the quantitative and qualitative research requirements can be found on the Graduate Studies and Research web site.

Webb stated that case studies can be considered Ph.D. work if based on an appropriate philosophical and theoretical framework.

Correa remarked that the review process regarding dissertations was on the agenda for the Research Advisory Council, and added that further guidelines are needed.

Smith stated that recommendations from the RAC needed to be discussed and other internal documents needed to be reviewed by the Agenda Committee.

Kranzler recommended that a change be made regarding the context of the qualifying exam so it will be more in line with the Ph.D. requirements. Kranzler asked, "What is the requirement of the minor and what is the process for the qualifying exam?" Possibly more flexibility needs to be granted to departments and committees regarding the Ed.D.

Clark addressed a comment regarding changing the residency requirement. He stated that no changes have been made to date.

Wittmer stated that clarity was needed in paragraph #2 of the Draft regarding the student's choice of one or more minor fields of study. He asked whether this required at least one minor.

Smith suggested that the discussion be tabled until the fall 2002 FPC meeting. Clark stated that the FPC needed to vote on the Draft.

Smith-Bonahue moved and Clark seconded the motion to approve the language as presented in the Draft with provisions for the concerns raised by faculty regarding procedures and guidelines related to acquiring an Ed.D. and that these concerns be forwarded to next year's Agenda Committee. The FPC unanimously approved the motion.

Discussion Items

1. Student Recruitment and Admissions committee recommendation (wrap up and transition)

Issues concerning the Student Recruitment and Admissions Committee focused on (1) Proteach admissions where more flexibility in the admissions process are needed at the departmental level, and (2) the issue of the Dean's screen needing to be changed in all departments or none. Even if students already have a master's degree, are not required to go before the Admissions and Petitions Committee, and the student is capable of doing work at the doctoral or specialist level in the Proteach area, the student's name still needs to be forwarded to the Dean's Screen on NERDC to complete the admissions procedure. The main issue for Proteach students is the faculty in the department are already familiar with the student's performance academically. If these students do not do well on the GRE and are denied admission by the A&P committee on that basis, the department has issues with this decision. Wittmer brought up the 48-hour on-line program in Counselor Education. How will these students be monitored? Kranzler stated that the Graduate Studies office will continue to monitor acceptance to all degrees until a final decision is made. Correa stated that the FPC needs to find an alternative assessment method, collect data for master's only and Proteach candidates, and place this information on the agenda for the Student Recruitment and Admissions Committee. Kranzler stated that the process can be changed, while retaining the Dean's screen in the Graduate Studies office.

Correa suggested that this issue be broken into smaller pieces: Proteach, other master's programs, and doctoral programs. These three different issues need to be brought to the table and referred to the Student Recruitment and Admissions Committee.

Clark made a motion and Smith-Bonahue seconded it to divide the Graduate Admissions and Petitions issue into three different topics: Proteach, master's only, and doctoral admissions. The FPC unanimously approved the motion.

Information Items

1. *Associate Dean Review*

Section 2 – Associate and Assistant Deans: “...The service of the Associate and Assistant Deans shall be reviewed every two years by the faculty.”

Smith stated an internal process needs to be developed regarding input in reviewing Associate and Assistant Deans. The Provost or Board of Regents has in the past evaluated the Dean every five years. The College Development Committee prepared an evaluation form for the purpose of evaluating the Dean. Dean Webb stated he could locate one of these forms. Associate and Assistant Deans are reviewed every two years. Clark suggested that the faculty form a review panel to poll the faculty and find out if the faculty actually know what the duties of the Dean are. Correa suggested that the FPC work with the Dean on this survey. Webb recommended that this is a time that faculty give information regarding the evaluation of the Dean. Clark stated that the FPC should review the positions of the Associate and Assistant Deans as part of their responsibilities. Smith raised the question as to why faculty evaluations were posted on the web, and not dean's evaluations. Waldron asked, “What are the roles of the deans? Could a survey be developed which points out what the faculty desire from the deans?” Clark suggested an ad hoc group be developed to sort through the data and present it to the FPC. Correa suggested that the FPC maintain archives of these surveys.

Note: Clark stated that all colleges are being asked to develop shared governance structures. Clark also stated that this is a good opportunity for our Dean to display how well the College of Education's shared governance is working.

2. *Tenure and Promotion Procedures (Report from the College of Education Faculty Affairs Committee)*

Waldron presented the report from the Faculty Affairs Committee regarding the Tenure and Promotion procedures. After a summary of the background of the process the FAC used to develop their proposal, Waldron discussed the proposal before the FPC. The primary issues identified by the FAC were the following: (1) no written policies exist within departments to specify the procedures used for tenure and promotion decisions, (2) there is considerable variability across departments in

the college as tenure/promotion decisions are made: role of the department chairperson, process used to identify external reviewers, whether department meeting are held to discuss candidate, time lines for conducting department votes, (3) tenure and promotion criteria are unclear, (4) the role of the college-level committee is unclear, and (5) limited support is provided to non-tenured faculty from the point of hiring through the tenure/promotion process. The proposed changes you will see in the attachment to the minutes are recommended to: (1) assure equity across all departments and candidates, (2) establish a clear set of procedures to be used for all tenure and promotion decision, (3) establish procedures that are consistent with other faculty governance roles in the COE, and (4) provide non-tenured faculty consistent communication and support as they are preparing for the tenure and promotion process.

Correa suggested that the proposal be posted on the web so departments could discuss them and the FPC could receive faculty input.

Clark then moved and Townsend seconded to accept the report of the FAC and that the proposed changes be addressed by the new FPC in the fall 2002. The FPC unanimously voted to accept the motion.

3. Election of the FPC Secretary

Correa stated that a new secretary for the FPC needs to be selected prior to August in order to establish the .25 percent of released time by their department chair. Faculty eligible for this position include: Waldron, Conroy, Archer, and Yeager. The FPC will convene on Thursday, May 2nd, from 8 – 9 am in room 158 to vote on the new secretary and have a transitional meeting. Correa also stated that the new FPC members will all serve a two-year term. She also stated that the secretary “released-time” was not a total buy out of time. It is what the department chair and FPC secretary agree on (e.g., one course). Correa stated that the old FPC secretary will become the new chair of the FPC.

Other Information Items

Clark questioned how well the funding went for the purchase of Dean Nelms picture of Marjorie Kinnan Rawlings home in Cross Creek. Smith stated that approximately \$400 was generated of which a portion was used to purchase the picture, the frame, a \$75 gift certificate for Vivian Correa, and three flower arrangements. Smith stated that Larry Deutsch has the bookkeeping on these expenditures.

Smith stated that he was pleased with the achievements and accomplishments of the FPC and the committees and commented that the FPC's performance would be even better next year. The FPC members thanked Smith for chairing the FPC during its first year of operation.

Clark moved and Wittmer seconded the meeting be adjourned. The FPC unanimously voted to adjourn the meeting at 10:51 a.m.