

**September 23, 2002**  
**Room 158 Norman Hall**

Members Present: Jim Archer, Elizabeth Bondy (alternate for Jane Townsend and Elizabeth Yeager), Dale Campbell (alternate for Phil Clark), Vivian Correa, Maureen Conroy, Silvia Echevarria-Doan, Lamont Flowers, Bridget Franks, Paul Sindelar, Nancy Waldron

Others Present: Associate Dean Rod Webb, Associate Dean John Kranzler

The meeting was called to order by Correa at 2:06 p.m.

**Action Items**

1. Approval of the agenda for September 23, 2002.

Sindelar made a motion to approve the agenda as submitted by Correa. Franks seconded the motion. The FPC unanimously approved the agenda.

2. Approval of the Minutes of September 9, 2002.

Correa requested two minor changes on page 5 (“due process” instead of “process” in paragraph 3 and remove specific references to data information in paragraph 4). Sindelar made a motion to approve the minutes (as revised) of September 9, 2002, which was seconded by Echevarria-Doan. The minutes were unanimously approved.

**Discussion of Lastinger Center Concept Paper**

Don Pemberton, Director of the Lastinger Center for Learning, is seeking college-wide input regarding the Lastinger Center Concept Paper. Feedback will be used to revise the paper and inform discussion at a meeting of the Lastinger Center Advisory Council that is scheduled for October 4.

Pemberton outlined the following goals of the center:

1. Challenge and enable teachers, principals, schools, and districts to raise student achievement in Florida’s elementary schools;
2. Provide educators with proven strategies that are needed to increase student achievement; and
3. Mobilize and align resources to support Florida’s elementary schools

He cited the center’s four core practice areas:

1. Improving the quality of teaching and learning;
2. Securing and sustaining family and community engagement in schools;
3. Transforming high poverty schools into high achieving schools; and
4. Providing a clearinghouse for effective practices, tools, resources, and initiatives to students, teachers, principals, schools, and communities.

Pemberton elicited input from committee members to assist him with focusing and prioritizing the Lastinger Center initiatives, as outlined in the Lastinger Center Concept Paper (August 19, 2002 revision) and the Lastinger Center Portfolio of Programs.

Pemberton reiterated his commitment to align the work of the Lastinger Center with the research interests of COE faculty members as the center continues its partnerships with the Florida Department of Education, school systems throughout the state, and the business, educational and civic leadership of the state to improve the quality of teaching and learning in Florida's elementary schools. He indicated that center resources must be focused to ensure their maximum effectiveness.

Sindelar asked about the role of COE faculty in the leadership and governance of the Lastinger center. Pemberton stated that he hopes to identify a core group of faculty that will be involved in identifying, leading, evaluating, and disseminating information about key initiatives. Echeverria-Doan asked how faculty went about bringing ideas for new initiatives to the Center. Pemberton stated that he plans to meet frequently with faculty to provide information about initiatives and collaborative opportunities. He also will be working with the Center's Advisory Board to come up with a process for considering new initiatives for the Center.

Archer suggested that families receive more prominent mention in the concept paper. He indicated that there is a need for grass-roots involvement with families at each school. He also noted that school counselors are key to connecting with students' families.

Bondy asked if the center would accept applications from schools and school districts. Pemberton responded that the center constantly seeks partnerships with schools and school districts. She asked about the center's relationship with the Holmes Partnership. He expressed interest in learning more about Holmes Partnership initiatives, although the center is currently focusing on in-state partnerships. He indicated that policy matters are not the primary objective of the

center and noted that the donors emphasized the importance of “effective practices” when they funded the center.

Franks asked if high-performing schools are also involved with the center. Pemberton discussed national research results, such as the Education Trust, that have provided and will continue to provide important information about high-performing schools. Bondy indicated that the DOE Office of School Improvement provides a list of high poverty-high performing schools to Florida’s schools that have been designated as “F schools” as part of a statewide partnering plan.

Sindelar expressed concern about the appropriateness of the “faith in schools” concept in a publicly funded university setting. Pemberton discussed the possibility of recruiting tutors and mentors from many different areas, including businesses and possibly faith-based institutions in order to improve academic achievement. A number of faculty stated that the title of the initiative, “Faith in Schools” seems to imply something very different than recruiting people from faith-based organizations to volunteer in schools. Pemberton stated that the Lastinger Center Advisory Council will carefully explore the implications of such partnerships and establish guidelines with regard to this issue.

Conroy noted the impressive initiatives and inquired, given limited staffing, how he planned to prioritize and mobilize the center’s resources to address the center initiatives. Pemberton replied that this is an important issue. He plans to prioritize initiatives in areas where there is substantial interest and support. There need to be teams of faculty working around each initiative, and discussions with faculty about their role, individual level of involvement, and need for support.

Pemberton noted that he is also conducting discussions as department faculty meetings to receive input about the Concept Paper and proposed initiatives. Faculty are encouraged to e-mail additional ideas and reactions to Pemberton directly.

### **Reports of FPC Committees**

- College Curriculum Committee. Waldron stated that the meetings for the CCC have been scheduled. The first meeting is September 30.
- Undergraduate Admissions/Petitions Committee. Franks reported that this committee tentatively plans to meet on October 9.

- Graduate Admissions/Petitions Committee. Echevarria-Doan announced that this committee would meet on Friday, October 18.
- Research Advisory Committee. Conroy reported that the committee has met to establish a preliminary agenda, which includes (a) a continued discussion of the EdD-PhD issue and (b) working with the Dean's Office regarding the research infrastructure of the college.
- Long-Range Planning Committee. Archer announced that this committee would have to reschedule the meeting that had been scheduled for October 11 at 3 p.m. because of a conflict with the College of Education Fall Faculty Meeting at the same time.
- Ad Hoc Committee on Assistant/Associate Dean Review. This committee has not met yet but plans to meet with Dean Emihovich and Associate Dean Webb.

## Unfinished Business

### 1. Tenure and Promotion Procedures (Faculty Affairs Committee).

The proposal made last year to the FPC by the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) about tenure and promotion procedures in the college was discussed. The FAC spent last year collecting and reviewing information from each department and soliciting faculty input.

One part of the proposal is the requirement for a three-year review of untenured faculty as part of a mentoring process for junior faculty. The task given to FAC clearly specified the need for consistency of procedures and equity across all of the departments in the College. The wording of this proposal was reviewed.

Concerns were expressed about how faculty, particularly junior faculty, would react to the idea of a three-year review. Feedback was received from Townsend, who recommended the insertion of "informal" before "pre-tenure review" (item 4 under the *Support for Tenure-track Faculty* section of the proposal). The advantages of "informal" versus "formal" reviews were discussed.

Waldron stated that providing formalized feedback to junior faculty members regarding their progress toward tenure would allow them to set goals as they move toward tenure. Archer indicated that he preferred the idea of a formal review. Franks expressed concern about the legal implications of the results of the three-year review, particularly for faculty who are not subsequently granted tenure. Webb indicated that this review process would be designed to assist faculty members and thus should not have liability implications for the college. Conroy asked if similar reviews are done at our peer institutions and other UF colleges. Waldron indicated that pre-tenure reviews are standard at many peer institutions. Webb stated that it is important that such evaluations be formal and consistent.

Correa asked where the evaluative summaries from the three-year reviews should be maintained. Kranzler recommended that these summaries be placed in the junior faculty members' personnel files as a record that can be reviewed by their department chairs. This would be particularly informative to new chairs, who may not be familiar with junior faculty members' work.

It was decided to:

- add a clarifying statement in the proposal regarding preparation of documents for pre-tenure review to follow the tenure dossier format. This would allow untenured faculty to begin preparation of the tenure dossier, which can be added to as they progress toward tenure.
- forward the revised proposal to the chairs and to faculty for discussion and feedback. Departments will be asked to discuss the proposal at a department faculty meeting, and faculty will be encouraged to provide individual feedback. All feedback will be sent to the Faculty Affairs Committee to review and forward a final version of the proposal to FPC for adoption.

### **New Business:**

#### *1. Filling Vacancies on Operating and Standing Committees*

A vacancy on the Undergraduate Admissions and Petitions Committee was discussed. Correa indicated the need for a formal procedure for replacing faculty members who have been elected to serve on operating and standing committees. This needs to be addressed as revisions are made to the Constitution. Campbell suggested that the faculty member who was the runner-up in the college-wide election should serve on this committee. There was consensus that this procedure should be used in the future to fill vacancies on college-wide committees. The election committee will review the Spring 2002 election results to identify a runner-

up for the Undergraduate Admissions and Petitions Committee and forward this name to Correa.

## *2. Scheduling College-Wide Meetings*

The policy of holding Monday afternoons open for college committee meetings was discussed. This was developed to facilitate scheduling of college-wide committees. There have been some issues this semester due to conflicts with department and individual faculty schedules. Department chairs and faculty will be informed again about the need to hold the Monday 2 –4 time slot free. Also, all college-wide committee meetings should be posted via college email.

## *3. Discussion on loss of faculty lines in the college (Archer)*

The change in the UF policy regarding faculty lines (which will no longer be “owned” by departments or colleges) was discussed. Archer asked what the impact on the college would be from the shifting of resources to other colleges and departments as faculty retire or leave UF for other positions. Webb indicated that the new policy is a change for the university, and is part of the President’s Strategic Plan. The college will have to make its best case to the Provost for retaining faculty lines that become vacant. Department chairs have begun discussions with Dean Emihovich about faculty needs in the college and departments and are reviewing priorities and collaborations. The Dean will use this information to make the case to the Provost for retaining faculty lines in the College. This topic may be scheduled as a discussion item for the meeting when Emihovich reports to the FPC about the college budget.

Correa indicated that the college constitution may provide guidance regarding the discussion of this issue among faculty. She suggested that the Long-Range Planning Committee might be alerted at some time in the future to examine this issue. Webb indicated that Emihovich would welcome conversations on these issues with the FPC.

The UF Strategic Plan was discussed. Sindelar stated that the college should have its own strategic plan that would provide guiding principles for the allocation of resources and faculty lines. Archer suggested that the FPC (as the voice of the faculty in the college) should be concerned about specific programs and how resources are allocated.

Correa presented information about the College of Education report that former Dean Ben Nelms prepared as the college’s response to Glover’s Strategic Planning Task Force. This report indicated areas that are strong in the college and that will be

further strengthened. Campbell noted that if the College report to Glover's task force was being used for the purpose of strategic planning, there may be a need for further faculty input on the report.

Discussion focused on whether FPC should take the time to discuss the various reports (College report to Glover's task force, President's Strategic Plan), whether it should go to a committee such as Long Range Planning, and the need to coordinate faculty efforts with the Dean's Office as this area is discussed.

## **Announcements**

### *1. The College of Education Fall Faculty Meeting*

The College of Education Fall Faculty Meeting will take place on Friday, October 11 from 3 to 5 p.m.

#### **Adjournment**

Archer moved that the meeting be adjourned. Sindelar seconded the motion. The committee voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 3:58 p.m.