

College of Education
Faculty Assembly Meeting
Friday, September 7, 2012
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Boca COE 313, Jupiter EC 202C, Davie LA 148

WELCOME

FA President Susannah called the regular meeting of the Faculty Assembly to order at 10:00 a.m.

ATTENDANCE

CCEI: Traci Baxley, Gail Burnaford, Rosanna Gatens, Dilys Schoorman
CE: Irene Johnson
CSD: Connie Keintz,
Dean's Office: Valerie Bristor, Don Torok
ELRM: Valerie Bryan, Deborah Floyd, Meredith Mountford, Bob Shockley
ESE: Mary Lou Duffy, Cynthia Wilson
OASS: Deborah Shepherd
T&L: Ray Amirault, Susannah Brown, Philomena Marinaccio-Eckel, Penelope Fritzer, Joe Furner, Alyssa Gonzales-DeHass, Deborah Harris, Patty Heydet-Kirsch, David Kumar, Barbara Ridener
ES&HP: Bob Zoeller
Coll. of Science: Donna Chamely-Wiik

*Please advise **Ray Amirault** (amirault@fau.edu) if you attended and your name does not appear above.*

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Dr. Susannah Brown announced that there are no minutes available for approval at this time, but that approval of minutes would be conducted at the next Faculty Assembly meeting.

DEAN'S TALKING POINTS

Dr. Valerie Bristor, COE Dean, speaker

Welcome Back

- Dr. Bristor welcomed the COE back to the new academic year.
- It is recommended that all faculty members listen to President's State of the University address if they were unable to attend the event on 9/6/2012. The recording should be made available on the FAU website at some point in the near future. The associated PowerPoint may also be available online.
- The COE was well represented in the President's speech, and Dean Bristor was very proud of the College's special highlighting in the presentation.

SACS Accreditation and Credentialing

- The SACS report will be submitted by Monday, September 10th, at which time the SACS reviewers will begin examining the report.
- The SACS visit will occur during the first week of February 2013. There will be an electronic system where all credentialed faculty will be recorded, and in which Departmental Chairs can check and update the credentialing status of each faculty member. (Up until now, a paper-based process has been used, because the database had to be locked off during the generation of the report.)
- The Dean is aware that there have been concerns with the strictness of the SACS credentialing process, but she has attempted to maintain awareness of both sides of this issue. (FAU had received a notation from SACS for some ten years ago, and then again five years ago in the Mid-Report, but the Deans and the broader university body were not aware of these findings until recently.) The reason for the great caution being shown in this process is the importance of maintaining SACS accreditation. As the university moves past this current SACS phase, the strictness levels may be reduced. The SACS review teams should have some helpful input on this issue once they begin their review of the submitted report.

Faculty Comment: The Union is pursuing this SACS issue, because some people lost their jobs because of this, and because the Administration has not always responded to faculty inquiries concerning the process. (Don Torok, for example, went to the Provost with documented exceptions that have been made in the Exercise Science department, but there was still a loss of some adjuncts in that department, and ongoing concerns with keeping GA's.)

Response from Dean Bristor: Once the COE receives our SACS review response, the COE will be able to address issues again from that point forward. She noted that she was aware that the Union is addressing this issue, and that this is a positive reaction.

Strategic Plan/Strategic Plan Metrics Update

- There are no "priorities" in the portion of the Strategic Plan that has been distributed (the 11 pages that deal with the Academic Affairs portion of the full University Strategic Plan). ALL of these items will be addressed (*i.e.*, each item is considered by the COE to be a priority).
- Yellow highlighted items on the Strategic Plan represent goals and objectives with measurable outcomes in which the College can be successful. Some of these, for example, do not apply to the COE, and others are under the Provost's Office. Faculty salaries ("C1") are at the top of Dr. Bristor's own list, and all the Deans were all very glad that this is in the Strategic Plan. But it was pointed out that the Dean has no control over this, and that coming up with measurable outcomes for this item can be challenging.

Faculty Comment: Item "C1" was in the previous Strategic Plan.

Response from Dean Bristor: The Provost is forming teams for each item, and each team will meet and report three or four times during the year. When the Board of Trustees meets in May, there will be a report for each item. (Diane Alperin is the team leader for item "C1," as she is in the Provost's Office, which has control over this area; Dr. Bristor also volunteered to be on the "C1" Team). Dr. Bristor may ask for input on how to address this issue. This year's budget cut was unexpected and much larger in scope than expected, so there were no increases this year, but Dr. Bristor recognizes there have been no increases for a number of years now; her view is that the University should be strategizing for saving money and put money into salaries.

Faculty Comment: There is strong concern that, although "C1" is on the Strategic Plan, it is not highlighted. The COE should formalize this as a priority; in the past, this process was done in an orderly, collegial manner when funds were available, based on CIP Codes, etc. There are Faculty Assembly approved reports that specified what was to be done to deal with inequities and compression issues. Because this work has already been done, we do not need to reinvent the wheel, but simply refresh the salary data/CIP Codes for the current situation, particularly since compensation packages are inadequate and deductions continue to increase.

Response from Dean Bristor: The Dean will keep everyone up to date with progress on this, and the Provost indicated a report should be completed by May. She noted that it is a matter of public record that the Board of Trustees does not want to give across-the-board raises.

Faculty Comment: In past efforts, CIP codes and the OSU database were used to determine where FAU falls in terms of salaries, and this approach may again help in current efforts, because it proves for data driven decision-making.

Response from Dean Bristor: The recruiting and retaining star faculty is one of the five priorities of the COE Strategic Plan.

Faculty Comment: Two proposals regarding salary on the table from the Administration would both significantly cut our summer salary (one, that in summers, one can supervise dissertations and internships, can advise students, conduct DIS's, but the Administration reserves the right to pay or not; the other, a maximum of one class may be taught in the summer for a maximum of \$12,500).

Response from Dean Bristor: If nine-month salaries were where they should be, we could actually dedicate summers to research and writing, and this is why we should be working to raise the nine-month salary amount.

Faculty Comment: Will the Administration be proposing do this?

Response from Dean Bristor: Not for the current year, since the Strategic Plan is already out. The Collective Bargaining Agreement always goes back to the Board of Trustees, who has the final say in the matter, and it is necessary to find a way to get the message of what COE faculty members do to the Board members.

Faculty Comment: This reinforces the need to use data from OSU and CIP codes to run simulations to support these efforts. It was brought up, however, that the administration may be questing the OSU data itself, saying that is biased towards institutions towards high research institutions.

Faculty Request: Can Dean Bristor provide a spreadsheet with current data to simulate market equity?

Response from Dean Bristor: Dean Bristor agreed to look into that task.

Faculty Comment: It is also important for faculty to look at “C2” in the Strategic Plan, which seems to indicate that the University is planning to hire only five faculty across the entire university. If possible, our Senators should clarify this important issue. However, this issue is not currently on the Senate agenda. The FAU President was invited to come to the next Senate meeting, but is not available to attend until the October meeting.

Response from Dean Bristor: Signature Issue 3 (Societal Issues) is the theme to which we are attempting to link. The College has attempted to connect with Kenneth Lanning (the President’s point person for defining that theme). Kenneth Lanning will be at our November 2nd Faculty Assembly meeting; he will also additionally meet with Dr. Bristor. Our College is all about SOCIETY; the COE does a lot of community and society-related functions, and so we want to be a part of defining that theme.

Faculty Comment: Traci Baxley gave kudos to Dilys Schoorman for spearheading this effort, and the group quickly agreed.

Faculty Comment: Two out of three signature themes involve only a small portion of the university. This implies that resources will be allocated to these signature themes (Signature Theme 1: marine and costal, Signature Theme 2: biotechnology), and therefore not coming to the COE.

Response from Dean Bristor: The purpose of the signature themes was to identify what FAU is known for (and different from other Florida universities), and so the university quickly seized on things like marine, etc. We should not expect that every department and/ or program would connect to a theme.

Faculty Comment: It might help to describe how we connect the departments to the themes.

Response from Dean Bristor: We will do whatever we can do to connect to the themes.

Faculty Lines and Hiring

The Provost plans to meet soon with each Dean to review position requests. These meetings have not happened yet. The meeting will not be the week of September 10th, as the Provost will be at the Board of Trustee’s Retreat, as well as the Board of Governor’s Retreat. Faculty should regularly check the Board of Trustee’s website to be aware of upcoming agendas.

Update on the Budget

The COE was required to give up one million dollars for the beginning of the fiscal year. The COE put much effort into preventing any layoffs, and was successful in doing so. The COE wanted to retain Visiting lines, and so began the year with a \$250,00 deficit. To continue doing so, the COE may have to dip into Carry Forward funds, which presents a problem, because the COE still does not have its Carry Forward funds, and these also are continuing to shrink over time. There is currently no information that there will be additional cuts, but this is not known for certain at this time.

College Credit Memorandum

For each credit hour in a course, there should be 50 minutes seat time. This rule is not new, but what is new is the requirement for documentation that the rule is being implemented in each individual class. COE syllabi are already very detailed, so this requirement may be being met already. But how does one fully document two hours of out-of-class assignments per credit hour for 15 weeks (3 credits x 2 hours x 15 weeks = 90 hours per semester)? This time is made up of readings, quizzes, assignments, etc., and so it would seem that most courses would already meet this requirement. Some of this focus is possibly arising from syllabi where the entire syllabus document is only half a page long, and with no schedule or listing of assignments. Reminder: ensure that your syllabi have weeks and assignments listed in the syllabus.

Faculty Question: What about the differential speeds that students need to complete assignments, which compounds the difficulty in documenting such a requirement?

Response from Dean Bristor: The requirement is that each syllabus specifies the schedule and the assignments, and Departmental Chairs will have to sign off on this.

Faculty Comment: This issue came up in two University groups. The first, Senate Steering (with the Provost present), gave the precise language that the faculty are to use in their course syllabi, with the burden on the faculty to do so. The Steering Committee asked the Provost to revisit that language, because Department Chairs and Deans will certify this, but at the graduate level, all syllabi should be providing this information as a matter of course. This therefore may be more of an issue outside the College, but from the Senate Steering perspective, the alarms went off saying that it had to be documented in the course syllabi. From the Graduate Council perspective, the suggestion to Barry Rosen was that on the new course form there be a checked box that states that this new course meets these requirements of the memo. If language is required for use by faculty in syllabi, standard language needs to be developed (*e.g.*, “this course meets the requirements for number of hours per week of outside work,” etc.).

Response from Dean Bristor: And an additional issue is how this calculation is affected by modality of class, such as fully online, blended, etc., and that clarification on this subject would be helpful.

Faculty Comment: If such boilerplate language was used, there is potential for students to say that they had studied this amount of time in a given course, yet did not receive the grade they felt they deserved. It was mentioned again that this was the Directive of the Provost in a Memorandum.

Response from Dean Bristor: The Dean does not feel at present that the specific number of hours must be listed in the syllabus, but that the assignment descriptions themselves would form the necessary documentation, interpreting this Directive as an average, not a requirement for an equal amount of hours each week.

Faculty Comment: One way to think about this is that the Executive Committee and the Dean offer a college interpretation of the word “certify,” which has to do with the goals and standards in each syllabus and the credibility of the faculty member who created the syllabus, that the assignments match the goals. The certification would not be specified in hours, but that the assignments are both appropriate and rigorous, and will require a sufficient amount of time to meet these goals and standards. The Departmental Chairs and Deans could certify the syllabus as reaching this level of rigor. It was also noted that the procedures don’t align with the definition, which is part of the underlying issue.

Promotion and Tenure

- It might be time to look at the College criteria for Promotion and Tenure to ensure that that these align with the University criteria. If Departments have unique situations in regards to Promotion and Tenure, these might want to develop Departmental criteria that could be included in the faculty member’s Promotion and Tenure portfolio.
- Dean Bristor asked how the COE can assist other colleges understand the functions of the COE.
- Dean Bristor also recommended that all Departmental Chairs work with their faculty early and often, or to have a mentor assigned, because the Promotion and Tenure process is likely to get more challenging over time.

Quality Enhancement Program (QEP)

Dr. Chamley Wiik (visitor guest to Faculty Assembly), College of Science, speaker

- The initiative is linked to SACS that culminates in a large document provided to SACS for the onsite visit Feb 5-7 2012.
- The latest draft of the document will be presented to the SACS Leadership Team on September 18th.
- SACS is asking institutions to establish a 5-7 year plan designed to enhance student learning.
- The plan is under the auspices of the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), which seeks to expand a culture of undergraduate research and inquiry at FAU. Dr. Wiik represents more than 40 faculty, students and staff that have been working on QEP for over a year, including Don Ploger (a steering committee member), Patty Heydet-Kirsch (assessment coordinator), Charles Dukes and Nancy Romance (who provide important feedback to the initiative), Sue Graves, Michael Brady, Barbara Ridener, and the other Departmental Chairs (who have been providing data specific to the College that shows what our best practices are, and how we can build from that).
- QEP is a part of SACS re-accreditation. FAU’s “QEP” is “Undergraduate Research and Inquiry,” because we want FAU faculty, staff and students to clearly understand the focus of the initiative.

- QEP is based on our institutions best practices in undergraduate research and inquiry and assessment, including ones from the College of Education, such as the assessment structure, the placement of students in field work, COE grants awards that have been showcased throughout FAU, COE's encouragement for students to contribute to surveys and other research opportunities, etc., and to integrate all these into the curriculum and challenge students through that curriculum. These are the best practices that QEP is commencing with, and further wishes to expand upon. Charles Dukes has just established an ESE honors program, which is a good place to start to continue encouraging students to excel and to foster student excellence.
- QEP has established four major goals/plans, which are broken down into a curricula goal, integrating teaching and research, and integrating learning outcomes that are focused on research into the curriculum.
 - Goal 1 is a Curricular goal for integrating research and inquiry into the curriculum - including building student skills such as content knowledge, plan of action, information literacy, critical thinking, ethics, and communication.
 - Goal 2 focuses on everything outside of the curriculum, including showcasing student successes, field placement, internships, fellowships, grants for students to participate in research and inquiry.
 - Goal 3 is recognizing, rewarding and providing support for faculty and students that are interested in participating in this process.
 - Goal 4 establishes a very small infrastructure to help coordinate this effort to ensure it is recognized and visible, so that this will be sustained beyond QEP (the best way to sustain this is to integrate these efforts into what we are already doing, called "integrated value").
- There are a number of major initiatives underway connected with QEP:
 - QEP started with the upper division and then later extended to the lower division on a formal basis (informal lower division effort has already begun) in the SLS Program (introductory seminar courses for Freshman that introduces FAU to the students).
 - The offices that are hosting these courses have helped them place undergraduate research in inquiry as one of their priorities. This helps get starting students involved and interested in research.
 - A club has been established from the Student Council to the QEP, and this club has established an FAU undergraduate research journal, which is currently in the peer review process, and hopefully, by the end of the year, they will have about 15 reviewed manuscripts that will form the basis of the inaugural edition of the undergraduate research journal.
- How can we participate?
 - The curriculum grants program (Fall, 2013) provides faculty, programs, and departments opportunity to integrate with the QEP and receive some funding to integrate research into the curriculum.
 - We should think about ways that the COE can continue to participate, and jump onboard with efforts starting the next two weeks. These include participating in:
 - QEP-focused faculty learning communities – Fall 2012
 - Encouraging our students to participate in the Undergraduate research grants program (\$600 fellowships per student which are used to help develop research)
 - Help with review and feedback of the document which will be posted on the QEP website www.fau.edu/qep
 - Participation in any of the three open forums that will be hosted (Davie, Boca, and Jupiter) for faculty and students to get together and talk about research, the QEP, and to help establish a culture of research at FAU.
- Questions, concerns, and comments can be sent to Patty Heydet-Kirsch, or to the QEP Group.
- Dr. Wiik applauded the assistance of Dean Bristol as the effort gets underway, and thanked her for her support.

Update on Tuition Benefits Policy for Graduate Students Draft Document

Dr. Deborah Floyd, speaker

- Susannah Brown began by highlighting that, in the Spring Faculty Assembly meeting, a memorandum was brought forth from this body, and that document, in addition to a second one, was circulated on the subject to make everyone aware of a proposed change in the tuition benefits for graduate students serving in research associate and assistantship positions. Documents were distributed in advance and available for faculty during the meeting.
- Deborah Floyd (COE Graduate Programs Committee Chair and University Graduate Council Chair) began by referencing an April 24, 2012 draft revision of the policy regarding graduate assistant tuition stipends. This document was first distributed on March, 2012 (dated 2/28/12) and the COE Graduate Programs Committee took action on by developing a memo that was sent to Dean Bristol and to Barry Rosson asking that currently matriculating students be grandfathered should be policy change. The COE GPC also expressed other concerns about the proposed change. Faculty Assembly took a similar action, as well. The main rationale for changing this policy is to better utilize limited fiscal resources.

- The essence of the issue is that the university is very likely to make changes in the graduate tuition stipend policy across the university. A document on this issue was distributed last spring, and the COE immediately responded via two avenues. It then emerged again when the University Graduate Council met this fall and Deborah Floyd (University Chair) asked that before any action was taken all college faculty have an opportunity to comment through their Faculty Assemblies and Graduate Council representatives. She further stated that this topic will be on the September University Graduate Council agenda and that a final decision about the policy is planned for the October University Graduate Council meeting.
- A number of colleges have also expressed concerns on this issue. Dr. Floyd said that this is the time for comment to make the draft policy better and not just state that we disagree with many elements of the policy. Specific, constructive input was recommended.
- One concern reiterated by the COE faculty was that currently enrolled students should be “grandfathered” in. However, the April 24th draft policy document does not provide that feature with only a two-year extension for currently matriculating students. Other concerns were expressed about dissertation hours and the role of the major professor in determining how many hours students should take to successfully matriculate.
- Some other highlighted concerns follow:
 - The proposed policy will affect currently enrolled students, and it is the position of the COE that all current students be grandfathered in, not just given a two year extension.
 - All students that are on graduate student benefits would have to have an approved program of study on file and approved by the Graduate College before the end of the first semester, or they will not be allowed to continue to matriculate. This was brought forward as a concern, due to the time frames associated with getting a student program of study approved. Graduate students who have completed all requirements listed on the plan of study must remain enrolled in order to complete their thesis or dissertation by remaining enrolled in one credit per semester. This policy would cause a significant problem for students enrolled at the dissertation level: it means that they would continue to matriculate with one credit each semester, even though they have not yet defended their dissertation. This is problematic for faculties that are supervising such students.
 - A concern about the ten percent requirement, which results in students not being able to get the tuition benefit if he or she has exceeded the ten percent requirement of the published program of study.

Faculty Comment: A reading of the document appears to say that this policy came into effect in by the second semester.

Response from Deborah Floyd: Yes, this change to the language has indeed been made from the earlier draft and so it appears that this element of faculty input was implemented with this newest draft

Faculty Comment: “Form 6” is driving this process, and another problem is the manner in which an instructor documents dissertation hours, as well as the distribution of these hours across semesters. Ultimately, it is the faculty member that should be able to decide on the one-hour registration requirement. (*e.g.*, what if a student is not progressing to a level to where it merits the dissertation hour?).

Response from Deborah Floyd: It is clear that this policy will be implemented, so we might indeed need to adjust the language to reflect these concerns. We need to offer editorial and “wordsmithing” changes to the draft document so it is acceptable to our faculty regarding dissertation hours required.

Faculty Comment: In CCEI, there are many areas of specialization electives that cannot be predetermined in the first or second semester, nor should they be, and the ten percent rule is extremely difficult to implement in this department.

Questions from Deborah Floyd: One, Is it the consensus to adjust the wording so that if there might be allowable exceptions to the ten percent rule? Two, is it still our position that students currently matriculating not be limited to a two-year period for matriculation? If this is our position, then Gail Burnaford and I will do our best to suggest the university provide a mechanism for exceptions to the ten percent rule.

Faculty Comment: It should be a MINIMUM of one graduate course hour, rather than EQUAL to one credit hour. In addition, since this policy is directed at tuition benefits for graduate assistants, what connection is there between this and other graduate students? Is there an expectation to apply this policy to other students, and does this result in diving graduate students into essentially two groups? And how would this policy affect those on grants where the tuition is built into the grant?

Response from Deborah Floyd: Yes, all these students would also be affected by this policy. These are excellent questions that deserve an answer at the university level as this policy is revised and eventually implemented.

- Susannah Brown concluded this portion of the meeting by stating that Deborah Floyd and Gail Burnaford would take the faculty's suggestions, along with the concerns expressed in the meeting, forward to the University Graduate Council. The College of Education has two representatives on the University Graduate Council which is the faculty governing body charged with revising this proposed policy change as presented by the Graduate Dean Barry Rosson.

Promotion and Tenure

Dr. Cynthia Wilson, speaker

- After a welcome from Susannah Brown, Cynthia Wilson began by welcoming anyone to contact her at any time with questions, and that she remains open to meet and discuss with anyone who would like to do so.
- Promotion and Tenure (P&T) is both an important and serious item. Faculty members should be proactive and become involved with P&T immediately upon hire, and not wait on others to get started.
- All P&T information is available online, both on the Provost's Website, and the COE website. This information is updated every May. This information should be carefully examined, because it is essential to achieving tenure.
- Some key factors in promotion and tenure:
 - The Research and Scholarship Section of Provost's Memo (p. 6). When a faculty member is pursuing promotion from Assistant to Associate, it is very important that one be able to tell one's story in regards to research and scholarship. The story should be summarized in the self-evaluation. It should meet the requirements in the tenure memo, and be placed in the Annotated section of the portfolio. This description should match what is said in the vita (*i.e.*, if a publication is listed in the vita, the Annotated section of the portfolio should describe this publication). The Annotated section should contain detailed information on each of a faculty member's work, and if that work is collaborative in nature, specific information on the faculty member's role should be included.
 - Using terms like "Coauthor" does not provide enough information for a collaborative work; there should be specific information on the part or role one played in the collaborative effort behind the publication. This description is especially important for the COE, since COE faculty members collaborate on so many scholarship efforts.
 - The Annotated section provides opportunity for one to establish the quality of the work beyond merely reporting that the work was completed (*e.g.*, how many citations make use of your work? If a book is peer reviewed, what is the peer review process used?).
 - There is an assumed difference in quality between an empirical research publication and a position paper, or a book review. There is an expectation that faculty conduct research beyond the dissertation, and therefore, being proactive includes planning for time to invest in research. The arguments between quantitative and qualitative research are no longer an issue, but faculty should have some data-based publications as part of the P&T process.
 - The Annotated section of the portfolio should be detailed enough so that someone not familiar with one's specific field can come to the conclusion that quality work is being produced by the faculty member.
- On the topic of external reviewers (p. 8 of the Provost's Memo):
 - There was some question as to whether five or three review letters are required, because a Memo did come out this past year that changed the number to five. The Union fought back on this issue, saying that the rules cannot be changed midstream, so the requirement for five external review letters was pulled back, and requirement for three external letters remains in place for the 2012-2013 academic year. A **MINIMUM** of three must be provided (but more can be included, if desired).
 - All external letters should come from qualified people who are at credible institutions, so that the P&T committee members can read the letters and determine that the external reviewers are qualified to conduct the review (*i.e.*, are leaders in the field).
 - Reviewers should not be co-authors, dissertation advisors, or personal friends.
 - Faculty members preparing to go up for tenure should work with the Departmental Chair in developing a list of potential reviewers.
 - This item is now in bold in the Provost's Memo, highlighting its importance in the P&T process.
- On promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor:

- An area of distinction must be established (this is done in the Self Evaluation section of the portfolio). See this in the Principles for Creating Criteria and Standards for Promotion and Tenure document (available on both the COE and Provost's website).
 - After establishing an area of distinction, one must still show commitment and competency in the remaining two areas.
 - If one chooses an area other than research and scholarship, the burden is heavier (this can be done, but the task is more challenging). If teaching is selected as the area of distinction, for example, one must be able to document national impact in teaching, something that is already assumed to be true of the research and scholarship area of distinction as long as the candidate has manuscripts that are published in national refereed journals.
 - The P&T criteria states "there needs to be clear evidence of longstanding leadership, national recognition, and substantial contributions both within and outside the university in which ever route of distinction is chosen by the candidate."
- Cynthia Wilson reminded us that every year, the university has a forum on promotion and tenure, and this meeting is important to attend. In April, there is also a COE promotion and tenure forum held after the last faculty assembly, so this forum should also be attended (she will bring information gathered from the University forum to the COE forum if that information is available at the time of the COE P&T forum.)

The floor was opened to questions.

Faculty Comment: It was brought to the floor that last year's decision about a particular professor's tenure review outcome was shocking to many peers in the COE, and it was asked if there is some "systemic bias" present in the P&T process.

Response from Cynthia Wilson: She feels that no such bias is present.

Faculty Comment: This is an issue facing colleges of education across the country. It was brought to the floor by a Full Professor that her own tenure process was clear, transparent, and supportive, and that both of her interviews were good.

Response from Cynthia Wilson: The COE is not the only college where promotion has been denied, and that tenure is always decided on a case-by-case basis using the provided portfolio documents.

Faculty Comment: The faculty member under discussion who was denied tenure met many of the criteria in the promotion and tenure memo, but might not have necessarily stated his specific role for every published work. Additionally, in regards to external letters, a faculty member cannot control everything that a reviewer will say, and it was brought to the floor the example of an external reviewer from an R1 institution who stated that he had known the person for twenty years, but this was not meant to imply a close, personal relationship, as the only contact the external reviewer had with the candidate was a meeting at a conference some 20 years ago.

Response from Cynthia Wilson: This should be controlled by having the Chair's letter state, "please explain the nature of your relationship with the candidate," or similar language, so that misunderstandings do not occur.

Faculty Comment: Everyone in the Department of Teaching and Learning felt this professor should have been promoted, and when such a unanimous feeling is present, but the person is turned down, something is wrong in the process.

Response from Cynthia Wilson: She reminded the audience that the university's recommendation is a recommendation to the Provost, and the Provost can overturn or concur with any such decision (and has overturned decisions in both directions at various points).

- Susannah interjected that we completed our two-hour time, and would the group wish to continue discussion. Connie Keintz made a motion to extend the meeting for 10 minutes, and Rosanna Gatens seconded the motion. A voice vote to proceed was unanimous (no nays, no abstentions).

Motion: Mena Marinaccio-Eckel made a motion that Faculty Assembly commends the work of Dr. Ernest (Andy) Brewer at the University. Meredith Mountford seconded the motion. Discussion: it was asked if voting in favor of the motion implies rejection of the decision of the University P&T Committee. It was affirmed that no such implication

was present in the motion, and that this commendation is separate from decisions made by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and is simply a formal recording reflected in the minutes.

Vote Result: The motion was carried by voice vote with a majority of ayes (no nays, with two abstentions).

Faculty Comment: It was asked what has been learned from this particular P&T outcome. There could be, for example, a lack of adequate mentoring present. One faculty member stated that, at a university at which she previously taught, a screening process was used to assist faculty members as they move towards achieving promotion.

Response from Cynthia Wilson: The third year review serves this process at FAU.

Faculty Comment: The annual evaluation process, if consistently shown to be excellent for a given faculty member, should correlate with a successful tenure review. For the annual evaluation to be meaningful, it should be fully aligned with promotion and tenure guidelines. Susannah Brown stated that, in the spring, Faculty Assembly was charged at looking at the college promotion and tenure document, and throughout this year, this will remain on the agenda as a continuing item.

- Cynthia Wilson asked to be able to respond to faculty comments about service. She stated:
 - It is extremely important that the service work of Assistant Professors be considered very carefully.
 - Assistant Professors must also take some control of their own decisions regarding service activities.
 - Faculty should talk to their Chair about service activities.

Cynthia Wilson presented her own experience that, as Departmental Chair, she had inadequate time to achieve Full Professor, and that this factored into her decision to step down as Departmental Chair.

Faculty Comment: Mentoring is an important part of promotion and tenure, and in CCEI, the faculty member always felt supported in her achievement of promotion, and that there should not be blanket statement that mentorship is lacking throughout the College. Question: the Provost had said that she would meet with all the candidates prior to making a tenure decision, but this did not happen last year. Is this was a change in language, and if so, did it go through Faculty Senate prior to a change.

Response from Cynthia Wilson: The statement about meeting with all the candidates was made by the previous Provost (Dr. Pritchett) not the current Provost (Dr. Claiborne). The Provost Claiborne announced to the University Committee that she was not going to meet with candidates. Such meetings are not part of the written promotion and tenure procedures. The Provost did not meet with the University Committee after the recommendations were made, and it is the Provost's prerogative not to do so.

Faculty Comment: If there are changes to procedures, we should all be made aware of these changes.

Faculty Comment: The Faculty Assembly and the COE at large might want to review the College Promotion and Tenure guidelines to determine if any revisions are necessary.

Visit by Robert Marzano

Dr. Meredith Mountford, speaker

- Meredith Mountford announced Dr. Marzano's October 4th appearance at FAU. In conjunction with this:
 - Meredith is currently forming a research committee that Marzano will meet with during his visit.
 - She will share additional information on November 2nd.
 - Nancy Brown reminded us that we have an early childhood education program (from birth to 5), and asked that Dr. Marzano be made aware of this.
 - Meredith Mountford stated that Dr. Marzano will be providing his own background in getting started in his research, the research behind the teaching and leadership framework, and working with students with special or diverse needs.

Susannah Brown adjourned the meeting at 12:16pm.

END OF MINUTES