

**College of Education
Faculty Assembly Meeting
Friday, January 30, 2009
10:00-12:00
Boca BOT room, Administration Building
Davie LA 139, Jupiter EC 202C, Port St. Lucie JU 112**

Approved Meeting Minutes

Welcome/Sign In

Attendees

CCEI- Gail Burnaford, James McLaughlin, Dilys Schoorman, Roberta Weber

CE- Michael Frain

CS&D- Constance Keintz

Dean's Office- Valerie Bristol, Donald Torok

EL- Valerie Bryan, Deborah Floyd, Lucy Guglielmino, Patricia Maslin-Ostrowski, Dan Morris, Meredith Mountford

ES&HP-

ESE- Michael Brady, Mary Lou Duffy, Rangasamy Ramasamy, Lydia Smiley, Beverly Warde, Cynthia Wilson

Henderson School-

OASS- Deborah Shepherd

Teaching and Learning- Jennifer Bird, Ernest Brewer, Susannah Brown, Alyssa Gonzalez-DeHass, Susanne Lapp, Joan Lindgren

Approval of Minutes

It was requested by President Warde that the minutes be moved to the end of the meeting to ensure a quorum.

Dean's Talking Points- Interim Dean Bristol

- Research Committees- There are currently two Research Committees-College of Education's Research Committee and the Henderson, Slattery, Pine Jog, and Tradition Research Committee. Interim Dean Bristol plans to meet with both committees to discuss the purposes and missions of each committee.
- Strategic Planning- The Administration has already been discussing strategic planning and will be waiting until April to create a committee that would include a facilitator who would be in charge of the committee. The faculty should be hearing about this and faculty should start thinking about a strategic plan. The discussion of a strategic plan has come from many meetings, not just the executive committee. Educational leadership has already started the strategic planning process.

Questions for the Interim Dean

- Have you explained the different funding?
Yes, at yesterday's (January 29) budget proposal discussion. It was a beginning slide. At yesterday's discussion there was a discussion of the different funding: E&G (State Allocated Dollars), Auxiliary (Money from contracts with school districts), and Foundation (Money from donations).

Also discussed the units attached to the college that are not E&G: Pine Jog, Tradition, Henderson, and Slattery. They have to do some major restructuring as they are also funded by Foundation money.

FIAT has no E&G funding, it is funded through the Auxiliary money and donated money. Donors are making specific donations to Good Fit and S.M.A.R.T. Those five units are separate from our E&G. Each one of these is looking to restructure under the budget.

- Will the proposal given to the Provost be made available to all the faculty, staff and administrators?

The Interim Dean will follow whatever the Provost's lead is on the process.

- Can we make the document (The Interim Dean's proposal) available to the faculty, staff, and administrators?

The Interim Dean was not sure and will have to ask the Provost, because the proposal turned in was a draft. Whatever the Deans are allowed to do with the proposal, the Interim Dean will do the same.

- It was stated that faculty wanted to make sure that the Interim Dean made an explicit mention of accreditation to the Provost.

The Interim Dean will make this aware to the Provost. In doing this, the Interim Dean will bring up statements from COE Academic Program Review, COE's successful NCATE/DOE visit, and that COE was chosen as an NCATE training site. Included in the presentation will be a slide that compares tenured faculty and adjuncts. It will also be shown how we need to keep full-time faculty and not be moved to only hiring adjuncts, for accreditation.

- It was also brought up that there was a concern about two slides from yesterday's Budget proposal PPT. The first being the cost of particular programs. It was suggested that this slide was helpful for internal purposes, and that might be misleading if discussed with the Provost without further data. The other slide was one about the decreases in faculty numbers by department. One department pointed out that the information on the second slide was wrong.

The Interim Dean stated that the slide about the cost of programs will not be included in the presentation to the Provost. The slide on faculty numbers was based on internal numbers and discussions with Chairs. The slide will not be a part of the presentation.

Old/Continuing Business

- Update on Dean search - Dr. Ramasamy
On January 29, the COE Dean's search Committee met to finalize the candidates for the campus interview. Three candidates have been identified and Dr. Barry Rosson is working on the campus interview schedules. He called this morning and stated that he has already contacted two candidates and is trying to reach the third. He is in the process of working with Steve Diaz to upload each candidate's resume, cover letter, and yesterday's meeting minutes to the COE's website. Once back in their offices, faculty members should have the updated information.
- Statement of Principles from College Climate Survey Action Plan
The Statement of Principles was passed by faculty and is on the website, available to faculty.
- Online Faculty Resource Guide / Opportunity for junior faculty service

The idea was to have an Online Faculty Resource Guide as an opportunity for junior faculty to have College level service hours. There was only one respondent as of this date, so the Faculty Assembly Steering Committee decided to table until another date, probably in fall 2009.

Questions

Will the committee start with Faculty Handbook that was developed a few years ago?

Yes, it was discussed and will be used as a starting place, but this handbook will be web-based. We will start this as soon as we have a committee.

New Business

- Graduate Governance – Dr. Burnaford and Dr. Floyd
Dr. Burnaford began with a little history about Graduate Governance Form. The Graduate Dean and Graduate College issued a Graduate College Governance Document in fall 2008. The University Graduate Council recommended that it be put forth to the Graduate faculty for a vote. It was decided that the vote should be 2/3, as opposed to a majority, because it was important that Graduate Faculty vet the document. It was put out for a vote in November and although 61- 62% of faculty approved the document it needed 66% for adoption so the Governance Document failed. The University Graduate Council met in January and, at the insistence of the College of Education representatives, the Council approved another review of the document. Thus, Dr. Bill McDaniel sent out an e-mail and asked for input about the document to a three person faculty committee of which Dr. Floyd is a member. Had Dr. Burnaford and Dr. Floyd not been in attendance at the January University Graduate Procedures Committee meeting, there is belief that the committee would have bypassed the second graduate faculty vote and taken the document directly to Faculty Senate. The Graduate Council will meet February 18th and will decide whether to take the document to Senate and to the Faculty for another vote.

Drs. Floyd and Burnaford said that it is important for faculty to provide input to make the document better because we will have a document one way or another. Dr. Schoorman offered her input about her role last year with a University Senate leadership committee to offer revisions to improve the document. We participated in a similar process with the Thesis and Dissertation Guidelines, and it is suggested that we follow that procedure for the Graduate Governance Document. Because of that process and the input of the COE, the Thesis and Dissertation Guidelines is a better document today.

The College of Education Graduate Programs Committee meets Thursday, February 6. Before then, it is suggested that the Graduate Faculty read and discuss the Graduate Governance Document and give specific changes to your College of Education Graduate Programs Committee Representative. Another option, if a faculty member misses the February 6 deadline, is to e-mail Dr. Deborah Floyd with specific changes. Ideally, it is hoped that these changes will be discussed at the college level, so if you could please respond to your GPC representative by Thursday, it would be appreciated.

It is hard to make a case for not liking the document, if we do not have some viable alternatives. Please consider this, because, not liking the Document is not enough.

Questions, Concerns, and Suggestions Discussed During the Meeting

- Can you develop a “top ten” of things we should be looking for in the Graduate Governance Document?
I am not sure if we can do a top ten, but here are some of the concerns:
- The first section under general organization states clearly what the Graduate Dean is responsible for. Pay close attention to this area, this is an issue because of the language.
- Watch the language in the document.
Faculty members can be approved, but can be removed by the Graduate Dean.
- Has there been a discussion about what it means for the Graduate Dean to be an authority?
Yes. It appears that the document is top down, coming from the University.
The only College to vote against taking it to Faculty Senate was the College of Education.
- There was a lot of concern in other colleges about Faculty Status being rescinded.
- It was recommended that UFF be a part of this discussion because of the personnel issues. However, the University Graduate Programs Committee did not see the necessity.
- The Role of the Graduate Dean-regarding approval and removal.
If someone is denied by the Graduate Dean, a reason does not need to be given. This is a concern. This is not due process. There needs to be language that protects faculty. Removal procedures do not appear to be criterion-based.
- Page 6 blends between Graduate Committee and Supervisory Committee, is not clear.
- We need a purpose for the Graduate Governance Document, before we can clarify the Document.
- It was stated that Dr. Schoorman had made strides for the faculty by getting the termination clause changed. We need to pay close attention to the language.
- Other colleges have questioned the necessity of such a document at this time, and have noted how cumbersome the document is.
- What is the alternative to top-down governance, especially if other Colleges have no experience in dealing with Graduate programs?
- It was stated that the extremes (for and against) are becoming volatile. Please make sure we have continued support at meetings.
- No adjunct can teach a Graduate Class unless the Graduate Dean approves of the adjunct-Page 2 and 3. This is a feasibility questions. What happens to last minute additions?
- It appears that this Document should be a two-way governance. Where is the accountability and responsibility of the Graduate School to process our students’ paperwork, get them in a place where we, as advisors and chairs of dissertation can access forms and student progress? Can you draft this out in e-mail so we can discuss this at the College and University level? Maybe we can add an area of rights and responsibilities.

All Associate Deans meet with the Graduate dean to work out concerns with the Graduate College, and this will be a standing committee. The paperwork trail is being handled. It is now in a backlog, and they are working on a tracking system that will be accessible for all colleges. It is recommended when bringing up paperwork issues to identify that Graduate faculty understand that the Graduate College is working on a paper trail process. Also, that each Chair identifies faculty or staff to be trained in VIP, because that is where the Graduate information will be stored.

- Who requested the standing committee between Associate Deans and the Graduate dean and what is the Committee's responsibility?
Meetings have been on-going with the Graduate Dean. The committee will address frustrations with the new process with faculty, staff, and students. OASS is looking for problems with the new Graduate paperwork, and will let faculty know if there are issues.
- We should be clear about what happens at all levels-program, department, college, Graduate College, and Provost Office.

Thesis and Dissertation Guidelines

Regarding the memo dated January 12, 2009, the copy of the revision does not include the appendices. There was a request to receive the complete document. The response was that Dr. Rosson did not feel it necessary, because all we are looking for is in the narrative. It was pointed out that about 90% of questions or comments have been about the appendices. The document on the Graduate website is dated November. It was supposed to be updated in January, on the Graduate website.

The Thesis and Dissertation document is not up on the web, but faculty were told that the document will be sent with appendices included.

- P&T Study Committee – Dr. Brewer
Dr. Brewer discussed his inclusion on the University P&T Study committee. He was asked at the beginning of fall 2008 if he would mind having his name put forward to the Provost as a possible COE and Assistant Professor Representative on a Study Committee for Promotion and Tenure. He agreed and was chosen. He stated that there is one meeting per month and the focus of the meetings are on existing Criteria and Procedures in the different colleges within the University, and other University's P&T Criteria and Procedures. The goal is to connect the missions and criteria.

Questions:

- Why is it necessary to have a university wide committee appointed by the provost, not elected by the faculty, to address tenure and promotion issues?
- Is this not a duplication of the tenure and promotion committee elected by faculty?
- Where does the work of this appointed committee fit in FAU's faculty governance? (To whom will reports of this appointed committee be made and what weight will they carry?)

These questions will be addressed at the next P&T Study Committee and the answers will be reported back at the April Faculty Assembly Meeting. It was made clear that P&T criteria have always been faculty governed, and that should not change.

Departmental Reports

- **CCEI-TESOL** Master is moving through the approval process. The Department is discussing a Masters in Early Childhood Education. The department has two course proposals out, one for an undergraduate core 2000 level class and the other for a doctoral course in Critical Theory. The Department has had continuing discussions about the budget.
- **CE-** No Report
- **CS&D-** No Report
- **EL-** No Report
- **ES-** No Report
- **ESE-** No Report
- **T&L-** Budget discussions and we are in the process of creating courses.
- **OASS-** No Report

Committee Reports

No Committee Reports

Announcements/Questions

- How do we put together feedback for the P&T meeting that is to take place on March 1?
- The answer is in the November 7 Faculty assembly minutes, page 3-4. (Read by the Secretary)
- Nominations for Faculty Assembly Executive Council in March 2009

Open Discussion

- There will Kappa Delta Pi orientation today, January 30, in ED 313, from 1-2:30. All faculty members are invited to join.
- March 25 10-12:30 Alumni Center-Diversity Women's Leadership Forum-All colleagues invited.
- FAU CARD hosted a well received statewide conference at FAU. Governor Crist mentioned CARD at a recent speech.

Approval of Minutes

April 11, 2008 meeting

September 19, 2008

November 7, 2008

January 23, 2009 (Special Meeting)

A motion to approve all four sets of amended minutes was made by Dr. Mike Brady, seconded by Dr. Ramasamy. The four sets of minutes were approved by a majority.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned by President Warde at 11:30 a.m.

Submitted by,
Ernest Andrew Brewer
Secretary, Faculty Assembly

Future Faculty Assembly Meetings / Steering Committee Meetings

- **Steering Committee – April 3, 2008 10-12**

DRAFT MINUTES

- **Faculty Assembly Meeting – April 17, 2009 10-12**

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.