

Minutes of Faculty Assembly Steering Committee Meeting January 16th 2004

The Faculty Assembly Steering Committee met on Friday January 16th 2004 at the Melby Center. The meeting was presided over by Michele Acker Hocevar. Those present: Ali Danesh, Mike Brady, Deb Floyd, Paul Peluso, Perry Schoon and Dilys Schoorman. Guest: Glenn Thomas.

Welcome

Michele welcomed everyone to the first meeting of the New Year. She noted that we needed to be thinking about how we demonstrate our success as a Steering Committee. She also noted that a crucial concern among faculty was the leadership for next year, so that the reciprocity of dialogue would continue among faculty and between faculty and administration. She encouraged the members to think about people whom they would encourage to run for office.

Michele also noted that she had heard nothing but good news about our new Provost, and that we should think about inviting him to meet with the Faculty Assembly. Deb added that we should use the opportunity to present him with data. With regard to the review of the constitution, Michele noted that the Democratic Decision Making and Communications Committee (DDMCC) had also reviewed the document and had made suggestions. She noted that this did not constitute a duplication of efforts, but rather, a useful set of alternate perspectives.

Presentation by Glenn Thomas

Glenn Thomas had asked Michele for permission to address the Steering Committee on a matter of urgency (undisclosed) and had been granted the courtesy. His concern stemmed from the fact that the newspapers had reported plans - that were still in dialogue state - about a potential dual enrollment program between students and Henderson and FAU, to be known as "FAU High." He noted that he hoped that the Steering Committee would serve as a conduit of information to the rest of the faculty. He handed out copies of a power point presentation. The committee agreed to consider giving Glenn an opportunity to discuss this further with faculty at the next Faculty Assembly meeting and provided some suggestions on how the ideas should be presented. Glenn left the meeting at this point.

Approval of the Minutes

Mike moved and Paul seconded that the minutes of the last meeting be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

Departmental concerns

Perry addressed concerns about potential problems arising from his new appointment as interim chair and his current role as vice chair, and indicated his willingness to submit his resignation as an officer. Dilys noted that the current constitution allowed for the position of officer to be held by a department chair. There was some discussion about whether the fact that chairs were no longer in the bargaining unit had/ should have any impact on that clause, and whether an interim chair was similar to a permanent chair vis-a-vis the bargaining unit. It was unanimously decided that at the next Faculty Assembly meeting a

motion would be presented from the Steering Committee to have Perry continue as Vice Chair of the Faculty Assembly.

Dilys, speaking on behalf of Allison who had e-mailed the officers, noted that a member of the ESHP department had requested that Faculty Assembly put on its agenda the following proposed change in P&T criteria: Candidates would be required to publish one book (or article) per year of service. (The current criterion is one article per year or one book for the entire 5 years.) Perry suggested that this, as well as any other changes relating to P&T, be referred to the DDMCC, which was responsible for crafting recommendations for P&T. Deb noted that it was important that all changes suggested with regard to P&T criteria be made such that candidates already in process towards tenure be "grandparented" in, so as not to be adversely affected by changes made halfway through their tenure. Michele also added that the DDMCC had been concerned about the best way to gather data about P&T. The committee recommended the use of an electronic survey, as had been conducted by Faculty Assembly.

Additional concerns from the departments included the need to examine the departmental procedures for voting on P&T (process unclear in one department; published procedures ambiguous). Dilys also informed the committee about an anonymous letter written to the Department Chair of Teacher Education, which appeared to attack the democratic procedures that were being established in that department.

Review of Constitution

Michele noted that the DDMCC had already addressed the following as areas for change in the constitution: term of officers, functions of officers, standing committees and support.

Dilys distributed copies of the constitution, as well as copies of a constitution on which notes on revision had been written (found in the secretary's file.) The committee agreed that we would look at broad issues initially, and then meet at a "retreat" to discuss specific wording. It was agreed that we would meet at Mike Brady's residence on Friday February 27th and invite members of the DDMCC to participate with representatives from the Steering Committee. Additional issues that emerged were:

- clarification of who should be members
- clarification of the role of department chairs in the context of the new bargaining agreement
- the need to add guiding principles of the Assembly to the Preamble
- attendance requirements for Steering Committee members
- clarification of the link between the COE Assembly and the Faculty Senate
- correcting the numbering system within the document.

With regard to the connection between the COE Faculty Assembly and the FAU Faculty Senate, the committee agreed that we should invite Dr. Fred Hoffman to present to the Steering Committee an overview of how the various faculty governance organizations intersected.

Additional business

Responding to a request of a committee member, Dilys clarified that the dates for Faculty Assembly meetings were: February 6th and April 2nd. Although there seemed to be no need for the Steering Committee to meet on March 5th as originally planned, Michele asked that we keep that date free, in case we added a meeting.

Added discussion on inviting the Provost included the importance of a) making this an invitation specifically from Faculty Assembly and b) using this as an opportunity to provide him with useful data about our college. It was underscored that this would be a different meeting than the one planned for President Brogan.

Perry noted the importance for Faculty Assembly to show results, and that we should make sure that we vote on recommendations made by each sub-committee this semester.

Deb emphasized the importance of negotiating release time for the officers, including the Vice Chair. We also addressed the importance of finding ways to archive information, so that we had a means for maintaining records on decisions taken by the Assembly. (This is in response to the fact that we have found minutes from past meetings, which have indicated the adoption of policy about which we have been unaware.)

Michele thanked everyone for their input. The meeting was adjourned at 12 noon.