

October 21, 2002
Room 158 Norman Hall

Members Present: Jim Archer, Phil Clark, Maureen Conroy, Vivian Correa, Silvia Echevarria-Doan, Lamont Flowers, Bridget Franks, Paul Sindelar, Jane Townsend, Nancy Waldron, Elizabeth Yeager

Other Present: John Kranzler, Rod Webb, Dean's Office

Correa called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m.

Agenda and Minutes

1. *Approval of the agenda for October 21, 2002.*

Echeverria-Doan made a motion to approve the agenda as submitted by Correa. Townsend seconded the motion. The FPC unanimously approved the agenda.

2. *Approval of the October 7, 2002 Minutes*

Yeager made a motion to approve the minutes of October 7th, which was seconded by Sindelar. The minutes of October 7, 2002 were unanimously approved with the following revisions:

a. Delete the name Pace and replace with Sindelar in the section of the minutes that involves discussion of Graduate Admissions (page 4).

Reports of FPC Committees

· *College Curriculum Committee*

Waldron reported that the CCC will meet on Monday, October 28, 2002.

· *Undergraduate Admissions/Petitions Committee*

Franks reported that the committee met on October 9, 2002. Presently, there are no plans to prepare a constitutional amendment regarding committee role and focus. The committee will continue to provide due process to undergraduates who are denied admission. The committee plans to stay informed of current undergraduate admission policies and work in collaboration with other COE committees.

· *Graduate Admissions/Petitions Committee*

Echeverria-Doan reported that the GA&P committee met on October 18, 2002. Some policy changes were recommended:

- Single exception master's or specialist degree applicants with a GRE of 900 or above and an undergraduate GPA of 2.5 or higher will be admitted by the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies.
- All double exception applicants will be seen by the GA&P committee.
- All doctoral applicants who do not meet the admission criteria will be seen by the GA&P committee.
- Any master's or specialist applicant that the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies identifies for review will be brought to the GA & P Committee.

· *Faculty Affairs Committee*

Townsend reported that the Faculty Affairs Committee met. Brownell is the chair of the committee and Behar-Horenstein is the secretary. Townsend stated that the committee recommended they explore the question: What rights and responsibilities do faculty have in making decisions? The committee will investigate the degree of faculty voice in matters pertaining to (1) faculty load, (2) course and program development, (3) merit, and (4) tenure and promotion. The next two meetings are scheduled for November 4th and December 2nd.

· *Research Advisory Committee*

Conroy reported that the RAC met last week. The following issues were discussed:

- The role of the proposed CARE office. RAC would like to get faculty input on the types of research support the CARE office may provide.
- The results of a faculty research survey completed by Office of Graduate Studies and Research this summer were reviewed.
- The RAC is reviewing ways to disburse the \$15,000 the Dean has allocated for faculty travel. A draft plan will be developed to establish general criteria for disbursing the travel funds.

The next meeting of the RAC is November 12th. The issues to be discussed at this meeting include: college research requirements for doctoral programs, faculty input on the research office, and the constitutional description of the RAC.

· *Student Recruitment and Admission Committee*

Yeager reported that this committee would meet on October 31st to discuss the graduate admission proposal.

- *Long-Range Planning Committee*

Archer stated that this committee would meet on November 6th.

- *Ad hoc Committee on Assistant/Associate Dean Review*

Correa stated that the ad hoc committee would meet on November 4th to consider existing assessment instruments that might be used as a part of the review of Assistant and Associate Deans.

- *Agenda Committee*

Correa stated if faculty need to have something considered at the FPC meeting as a discussion or action item, they should contact one of the three Agenda Committee members (Correa, Waldron and Phil Clark) in advance of the meeting. A second way for faculty to bring an action item before the FPC is to have a representative present it during the meeting, and the FPC will vote whether or not the item should be added to the agenda.

New Business

1. Continuing the Conversation on "Vision" in the College: Next Steps

Correa stated that there was support in the Dean's Advisory Council (DAC) to continue conversations regarding a college "vision" that began at the Fall Faculty Meeting. How do we continue the momentum from the fall faculty meeting and engage a broad range of faculty in further discussion about a vision for the college? What should the role of FPC be in this effort? The role of the Dean's office?

The suggestion was made to hold one or a series of faculty forums. Specific discussion points could be pulled from the minutes of the Fall Faculty Meeting. The faculty forum could be co-sponsored by FPC and the Dean's Office and probably should be held during the Monday, 2-4 pm time slot that is designated for college meetings.

The following comments were made while discussing the focus for the faculty forum(s) and the question presented during the fall faculty meeting, "Do we have a tacit vision in the College of Education?"

- The vision of the College needs to reflect current directions and the strategic plan the University.

- Last year the COE Long-range Planning Committee generated a list of issues and directions that should be shared with faculty as we discuss a common vision.

- The COE should consider working in coordination with Florida State University. This could allow for more effective lobbying efforts and increase our voice in Tallahassee.
- The issue of internal perception assessment and external perception of the COE was brought up at the Fall Faculty Meeting. Do we want to collect this information? What instruments are needed for us to collect this information?
- A survey of the faculty should be conducted to determine specific issues to be addressed at the faculty forums.
- We may want to survey students who are presently enrolled in COE programs. Why did you choose UF for graduate work?
- Faculty forums may be needed at least once a month to establish an on-going conversation about important issues and directions for the College.
- What is the difference between a “mission” and a “vision”? A **mission** identifies the major tasks of an organization. A **vision** identifies where the organization is going to be in a specified time period. Some comments that we have a mission statement, but no clear vision statement.
- A comment that either there are some “tacit” visions in the COE or we don’t have any “tacit” visions. But there is a desperate need to have more focused conversations about this topic. We may not have a single vision in the College, so we need to prioritize our visions.
- Over the past ten-year period, the COE has largely followed whatever resources were available. There is the perception that we have often reacted, and thus moved in multiple directions in response to the initiatives of others. At this point, the COE appears fragmented. A vision may help us to prioritize future directions for the College.
- Do we have a common vision? If so, we need to lobby for our issues. We need to have open forums on specific issues. What are common themes we need to discuss: teacher education, graduate education? Outreach to state and local constituencies?
- We need to prepare open-ended questions and disseminate them in advance of the faculty forums. Many of these questions can be pulled from the Fall Faculty Meeting minutes.

- We need a purpose for our discussions and we need a specific outcome. What happens at the end of the session? Possibly a list of college priorities, common assumptions, a policy statement is the result.
- A plan of action is needed – just meeting is not enough. We need public relations with the state, university, and we need specific outcomes from the forums. A discussion with the Dean and Provost would be beneficial.
- Need to utilize the FPC and Long Range Planning Committee to assist with the organization of one or a series of faculty forums. At the end of the year, documents could be submitted to the FPC for review.

It was suggested that the Long Range Planning Committee should work with Correa as chair of FPC to further develop ideas for the Faculty Forum(s). Correa stated that she and Archer would meet and develop a proposal regarding dates/times and possible themes/questions for the faculty forums. This will be brought back to FPC for discussion at a future meeting.

2. Collaboration with Santa Fe Community College on Critical Teacher Shortages

Correa opened a discussion on a proposed new initiative regarding collaboration with Santa Fe Community College (SFCC) to provide a teacher education program that would address critical teacher shortages in science, math, and special education.

Webb stated that this initiative is the result of recent state legislative action to address critical shortages in areas such as nursing and teacher education. In response to this initiative, some community colleges have developed their own four-year programs (Miami-Dade Community College), while others have collaborated with a four-year university to provide a joint program (St. Petersburg CC). The President's Task Force has proposed that the College of Education collaborate with SFCC.

At this point, there is no specific plan about how a joint program might operate. SFCC could teach students for the first two years, and the COE could teach the junior and senior years, as well as the 5th year. At the end of the program, a student would be granted a UF degree in education.

To provide additional information, an issue paper from AACTE regarding university and community college collaborative programs was provided. As well as notes from a Dean's Advisory Council meeting where this issue was recently discussed.

Comments from FPC members regarding the initiative:

- Community colleges should be two-year programs that articulate to the four-year institutions for the junior and senior years. Currently, many students who enter our teacher education programs already do this. How is this new initiative different?
- Will this become a parallel program? The joint program with SFCC will provide a 4 year bachelor's degree and UF will continue providing a 5 year Master's degree?
- There are already issues with alternative certification in teaching. SFCC providing a four-year degree on their own may raise new issues. We need to be clear about our perspective on alternative programs.
- SFCC could act as a feeder to the COE. Following the BA/BS degree at SFCC, students could come to UF for the master's degree or for the 5th year program.
- This collaborative program could provide a dignified alternative to people who leave early from our 5 year program. We have students who are not admitted into graduate school at UF and others who leave because of life circumstances.
- Faculty most directly involved with the critical shortage areas, secondary, and special education need to discuss this initiative. This initiative will be on the agenda for the Secondary Proteach meeting scheduled for November 4th.
- A four-year program at SFCC might protect the fifth-year program at UF.
- Is this initiative an opportunity for the COE to becoming a graduate only program?
- This initiative could increase the enrollment in traditional master's programs.

Webb and Correa stated a need to convene a small group that could consider this issue further and develop a specific proposal. If we are to proceed with the initiative an application must be forwarded to the Florida DOE sometime in March. The requirements for the application are unclear. May simply need a general description of the intent to collaborate on a joint program, but developing a specific plan will likely take additional time. Other colleges and programs across the university will also be involved, specifically Engineering and Nursing.

Correa noted that the minutes from this discussion will be forwarded to the Dean's Advisory Council.

Unfinished Business

1. Tenure & Promotion Guidelines out for Review

Waldron reported that the proposed Tenure and Promotion Guidelines have been posted on the FPC Website. A general notice has gone out to COE faculty to review the guidelines and provide individual feedback. Additionally, FPC members and department chairs have been asked to facilitate a discussion of the guidelines at upcoming department meetings. Each department has been asked to provide written feedback by November 22nd. All responses will be assembled and forwarded to the Faculty Affairs Committee for review. If extensive revisions are not required, a final proposal should come to the FPC in December or January.

Adjournment

Archer moved the meeting be adjourned. Echevarria-Doan seconded the motion. The Committee voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 3:50 pm.