

**College of Education
Faculty Assembly Meeting
Friday, November 6, 2009
10:00-12:00
Boca COE 313, Davie LA 139,
Jupiter EC 202C, Port St. Lucie MP 114**

Minutes

WELCOME

President Warde called the meeting to order at 10:00 p.m.

ATTENDANCE: Please advise Marinacc@fau.edu if you attended and your name does not appear below.

CCEI- Yash Bhagwanji, Nancy Brown, Carlos Diaz, Jim McLaughlin, Dilys Schoorman, Noorchaya Yahya, Hani Zainuddin

CE- Paul Peluso

CSD- Connie Keintz, Deena Wener, Carol Hess

Dean's Office- Valerie Bristor, Donald Torok, Eliah Watlington, Rick Laliberti

EL- Valerie Bryan, Pat Maslin-Ostrowaki, Dan Morris, Meredith Mountford, Daniel Reyes-Guerra, John Shockley, Anne Mulder, Steve Rios

ES&HP- Robert Zoeller, Susan Graves

ESE- Mary Lou Duffy, Ramasamy Ramasamy, Beverly Warde, Cynthia Wilson

OASS- Deborah Shepard, Lorraine Cross

Teaching and Learning- Ernest Brewer, Philomena Marinaccio-Eckel, Barbara Ridener, Jennifer Bird

Guests- Edwin Bommel, Michelle Gauntlett

GUEST SPEAKER: Edwin Bommel, Division of Research

An introduction to Time and Effort Certification

Effort reporting is a federally-mandated process to confirm that the salary and wages charged to sponsored projects are reasonable and reflect actual work performed. FAU will require this for all contracts, grants, and projects funded by an outside entity. The effort reporting/certification system will go live in spring 2010 when principal investigators and others dealing with contracts and grants will be trained. All faculty members who receive any portion of their salary from a sponsored research project, or otherwise provide effort on a sponsored research project, must self certify their effort. In addition, principal investigators are required to certify the efforts of their students, post docs, and staff members who devote effort to his/her sponsored projects.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The September 25, 2009 meeting minutes were approved. A motion to approve the amended minutes was made by Dr. Mary Lou Duffy; the motion was seconded by Meredith Mountford. The minutes were approved by a majority vote.

SPEAKER: Dean Valerie Bristor

College of Education Allocation of Positions for 2010-2011

The current allocations are for faculty lines only and these positions were only to fill faculty lines. OASS did not present positions.

Possible new faculty positions for 2010-2011

1. **CSD** Clinic Director
2. **EL** Assoc/Full Research Methodology
3. **ESHP** Any Rank Strength Conditioning
4. **ESE** Instructor Field Placement
5. **TL** Any Rank Instructional Technology
6. **CE** Assoc/Full Mental Health
7. **ESHP** Assistant Exercise Physiology
8. **EL** Assoc/Full Adult Ed-Higher Ed
9. **CCEI** Assoc/Full C&I (ECE/TESOL)

Timeline

September 15, 2009 Chair Meeting (including Faculty Assembly President, associate deans); discussion of process

September 25, 2009 Faculty Assembly; President Pritchett on budget, etc.; Dean Bristor provided process information

October 6, 2009 Executive Committee meeting; discussed process details

October 20, 2009 Chair presentations and discussion

October 20-23 Reflection time

October 23, 2009 Meeting; opportunity for further discussion after time to reflect; recommendations made by rating and ranking; 8 positions allotted

October 26-29, 2009 Consultation with each chair and associate dean resulted in unanimous support for a 9th position to be allocated

November 3, 2009 Executive Committee meeting included information about searches

November 6, 2009 Faculty Assembly meeting, process presentation by Dr. Bristor to Faculty Assembly

November 2009 Block advertisement to be submitted to Chronicle

December 2009/January 2010 application deadline

December 2009 Possible update on budget situation for 2010-2011

January 2010 Contingent upon budget update, Dean Bristor will announce when the active search process may begin

Financial Outlook Update

At the November 3, 2009 Council of Deans meeting, Norm Kaufman reported that he was not expecting a mid-year budget cut, however, prospects for next year are probably not looking good. This will mean the same budget for 2010-2011 as 2009-2010. Therefore, we will be building our searches with the assumption of no new money.

Strategic Planning

The University is continuing its strategic planning/visioning process; no additional meetings with Sue Clemmons and the CoE have been scheduled. There has been no directive from the

university so the CoE will be conducting its own strategic planning process. Dean Bristol is working with the Executive Committee to establish a process. Important to note, this is not a “budget” procedure. It is a framework for reviewing purposes, new opportunities, and college initiatives. The tentative starting date for the process is January 2010. The tentative timeline is January 2010 through April 2011, as the college will be reflective and take time to create a vision for the CoE.

Difference between the Executive Committee and Chair Meetings

The chairs meeting grew out of Dean Aloia’s leadership as an idea for deans and chairs to chat. Dean Bristol is investigating meetings where attendance is determined by topic rather than rank or position. She is also considering adding a directors/coordinators meetings as well. Associate deans have been included in chair meetings when they are required to present information. Associate deans voted at the budget meeting concerning current allocations for faculty lines because, as Dr. Bristol explained, they have a college perspective since they have no personal territory.

The Executive Committee is advisory to the Dean of the CoE in matters pertaining to the conduct of the affairs of the College. Issues of interest concerning programs, procedures, and other matters of general professional concern to the College are examined and discussed. These discussions frequently result in recommendations to the Dean for appropriate actions. The Executive Committee is chaired by the Dean of the College. It is comprised of Associate Deans, Department Chairs, Faculty Assembly President, Executive Director of FAU K-12 Schools and Programs, Coordinator of Advancement/Alumni Affairs, and Director of Business/Finance Auxiliary Services. (*Excerpt from the CoE Policy and Procedural Manual*)

Chair Meetings address issues pertinent to the Chairs’ responsibilities. Dean Bristol will begin having “topical” meetings so only people who are responsible for topics at hand will attend. Others are invited if the topic is relevant to their responsibilities: Associate Deans (ex. F.A.I.R., course schedules, undergraduate/graduate policy changes); Faculty Assembly Chair (ex. Budget reduction meetings spring 2009), Director of Business (budget), etc.

Dean Bristol Question and Answer

QUES: If it is the same group of people at two meeting could there be a faculty assembly representative at both meetings?

ANS: There could be an adjustment for the president of faculty assembly to attend such meetings. The original idea was for everyone to be allowed to come and this could have been expressed better.

QUES: Could these meetings be podcasts?

ANS: According to Florida’s Sunshine law, all state and local collegial public bodies are covered by the open meetings requirements.

SUGGESTION: Is there a way that departments could collaborate, share, and hear from other departments?

QUES: Is this final set of positions the best indication of the urgency for the college? Specifically in respect to of 17 requested positions only 9 were allocated?

FOLLOW-UP QUES: At some point we need to balance the amount of money the state of Florida is giving us with the products we are producing. While we don’t control resources we do

control capacity. We need to discuss capacity. The only thing that gets the state's attention is when a student or voting public goes to congressman and says "I couldn't get into FAU master's degree why aren't you supporting Florida Atlantic University".

ANS: Dr. Bristol agreed and recognized this dilemma as being valid.

QUES: What is it FAU wants from us? If I am spending 30 hours a week working on national recognition as a teacher, how can I do research as well?

ANS: These things have to be part of this strategic planning thought process.

QUES: It seems that the university system doesn't know what it wants. The real issue is that there is no plan. The state university system has no plan and the reduced budgeting is going to cause a train wreck. This is what Dean Bristol referred to as what Dr. Proctor is talking about. No one knows how they are going to fund the budget. On November 12th at Scripts on the Jupiter campus there will be the first joint meeting of the board of governors and the state board of education to discuss how we can work together. They don't know how this is going to work out; either we define ourselves or others will define us.

COMMENT: Perhaps it is too late; the Palm Beach Post reported we are moving to become a major research institution.

OLD/CONTINUING BUSINESS

Results of Departmental Discussions in Response to Proposed Changes to P & T:

Departmental reports and faculty discussion will follow in the order of importance determined by departmental meetings. We will attach to these minutes what each department said in entirety. FASC will create a draft document after this meeting that will be sent to the faculty for revisions before sending to Dr. Alperin before Thanksgiving vacation.

- 1) The P and T issue of most urgent concern is that of required annual evaluation to full professor. What we are technically opposing is that letter that you are on track for full professor.
- 2) Internal letters are evaluative and valuable and the CoE recommends that we specify two internal and external letters. However, we need to clarify the purpose of the letters and who they should come from.
- 3) The College consensus is that any administrator should not be able to vote at a P and T meeting. However, at this point we respond that for an administrator to come in and sit in on a P and T discussion should be a committee level decision.
- 4) The college consensus is in support of the collegiality concept but would like to be part of the operationalization or defining of this fuzzy concept.
- 5) The college consensus is that we want to keep SPOTS, including the student comments, because they are important for qualitative data. However, all SPOTS should be included to avoid professors including only favorable SPOT evaluations.
- 6) The college consensus is that term limits for P and T committees should be a college decision not a university decision. It is important to consider that some departments are small.

7) The college consensus is that we want to remove the mandate that every three years the college would review P and T criteria. The CoE already has measurable standards for criteria and is most likely the most specific college in the university. Alternate suggestions include allowing individual colleges to decide on term limits or extending the term to ten years.

8) The college consensus is that the standardized vitae should be up to each college.

9) The college consensus is that the contents of the P and T portfolio not be manipulated from one level to the next because this might result in is a misrepresentation of material in the folio. However, we need to insure the right to respond at each level.

10) Specifically at the associate level progressing to full professor, years at rank in FAU has to be eliminated. The college consensus is that we should be considering years in rank at any university and delete “years at FAU” as a requirement to go up for promotion. The language should be about sufficient number of years and body of work to go up for full professor.

Faculty Assembly Discussion of responses to the University’s proposed changes to P and T procedure:

COMMENT: The wording is that, this is what will happen. Concerns surround the following questions: What if you don’t want to pursue going to full professor? What happens if you go up for full professor and do not make it? Departments agree that it should be a career path decision. Also to achieve full professor you will have to receive national recognition. This is defined more in principles stated but not in the specific guidelines.

QUES: Are we thinking more narrowly about national recognition or it is still evidenced by having a paper accepted at a national conference? We prefer to define it as we wish by department. Our departments say that it is the responsibility of the candidate to build the case that they have achieved at a national level.

QUES: The CoE already has tightly written P and T criteria. If these changes are at the university level, have we already done what we have to do?

QUES: How can we obtain national distinction with only 8% or 5% of our time allotted time for research? Our job assignments require quality teaching, advising, research and often total much more than 100% time and effort.

COMMENT: There are so many things that we are already doing with this very little percentage of assignment allotted.

QUES for Pat: As a college can we make clear whether we are publishing at a national distinction level is accepted as national recognized or are we supposed to be on a national subcommittee to receive national distinction recognition?

ANS: For research, scholarship, and teaching to be recognized at a national level means that you don’t just publish in your state and you are published in a blind peer review. In the CoE, paths for full professor in areas of distinction for teaching include being a full bright scholar.

COMMENT: We need to take control of this national recognition part of the university promotion and tenure policy. We need to be proactive.

ANS: Dr. Warde: Once this is all settled, by the spring, we as a college will have to go back and look at what we have as criteria for nationally recognized distinction.

COMMENT: We need language that even if a professor is not going for full professor they would be productive and to go up for full professor would be an individual choice.

COMMENT: The annual assignment and annual evaluation should be linked with the P and T document otherwise the chair letter is superfluous.

ADJOURN President Warde adjourned the meeting at 12:55 p.m.

Submitted by,
Philomena Marinaccio-Eckel
Secretary, Faculty Assembly

Future Faculty Assembly Meetings / Steering Committee Meetings

- Faculty Assembly Meeting – Meetings will be held from 10am-12:00 pm: Jan. 22, 2010, April 16, 2010
- Steering Committee – Meetings will be held from 10am-12pm: Jan. 15, 2010, (last to be determined)

The Faculty Assembly is an advisory body. As such, it passes along the faculty concerns, recommendations, and motions to the Dean. The Assembly does not create or prohibit programs/policies. It does, however, communicate issues to which the Dean is expected to respond.