

Minutes of the Faculty Assembly Meeting - December 5th 2003

The third Faculty Assembly meeting was held on Friday December 5th at 10 a.m. in ED 119. The meeting was presided over by Dr. Michele Acker-Hocevar (Chair). Those present: Drs. Perry Schoon, Dilys Schoorman, Greg Aloia, Eileen Ariza, Ira Bogotch, Michael Brady, Valerie Bristor, Gail Burnaford, Ray Cafolla, Carlos Diaz, Mary Lou Duffy, Deborah Floyd, Allison Ford, Michael Frain, Barbra Fries, Penelope Fritzer, Rose Gatens, Lucy Guglielmino, Deb Harris, Toni Kirkwood, Larry Kontosh, Susanne Lapp, Mary Lieberman, Joan Lindgren, Philomena Marinaccio, Pat Maslin-Ostrowski, Carmen Morales-Jones, Dan Morris, Dan Oswald, Paul Peluso, Don Ploger, Barbara Ridener, Sally Robison, Lydia Smiley, Dale Williams, Cynthia Wilson, Hanizah Zainuddin.

Welcome and Update

The meeting was called to order at approximately 10.10 a.m. when Michele welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked those present for making it though it was finals week. She also informed everyone that because Dilys had experienced difficulty taking adequate notes and participating meaningfully at the October meeting, that the Steering Committee had decided that she be allowed to tape record all meetings held under the auspices of the general Faculty Assembly. (i.e. This would not include the Faculty Assembly sub-committees.) The minutes of the October 17th meeting were then approved. Lucy Guglielmino moved and Dale Williams seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Reports from Committees

Democratic Decision Making and Communications Committee (DDMCC)

Pat Maslin-Ostrowski, chair of the DDMCC reported that the committee had met that morning with Vilma Petrovsky to discuss budget and fundraising. She also reported that the committee had been involved in crafting some of the questions for President Brogan (who had been scheduled to attend the meeting). Pat clarified that the DDMCC committee would be willing to address issues pertaining to Promotion and Tenure that had been raised by faculty. Pat also noted that the committee had wanted to know why President Brogan had not come to our meeting, as planned. She also reminded us that the members of the DDMCC were: Don Ploger, Rose Gatens, Carlos Diaz, Lilyanna Zmijak and Mary Lou Caldwell. Michele Acker-Hocevar sits in on these meetings as a representative from Faculty Assembly.

Michele went on to explain that one of the three officers sat in on all sub-committee meetings in order to facilitate communication between sub-committees and the Steering Committee. This allows the leadership team to be in touch with the emerging issues and concerns on all committees.

Equity in Assignments Committee (EAC)

Ira Bogotch, chair of the EAC reported that the committee had met twice since the last Faculty Assembly meeting - once on the McArthur campus and then on the Davie campus. The committee had designed a survey to identify differences in assignments across departments, which would be given to the chairs. He and Dilys had asked to be on the agenda of Executive Committee Meeting where they would present the survey to the chairs on December 10th. The committee had also designed a survey that would measure perceptual variables, which would go out to individual faculty members after the chair survey. The faculty survey would be administered following the Faculty Assembly format of the electronic survey. Ira also reminded us of the membership of the committee: Ray Amirault, Joan Lindgren, Marta Cruz, Bob Zoeller, Lydia Smiley, Alex Miranda and Dilys Schoorman. He emphasized that the meetings were open and invited faculty to join.

Pat, speaking on behalf of the DDMCC and Michele, on behalf of Faculty Assembly clarified that all meetings were open to all faculty members. Pat noted that the DDMCC met every 2nd Friday of each month at 9.30 (usually at the Melby Center, Educational Leadership offices). Dilys volunteered to e-mail the faculty the meeting dates of the sub-committees as and when they became available to her.

Faculty Connections Committee (FCC)

Members of the FCC reported that the FCC had not met since the last Faculty Assembly meeting. However they were planning another "Open Mike" session after the Assembly meeting in Spring to involve the departments that had not participated. Joan reported that there had been 33 faculty members present at the previous FCC gathering. Dan Morris suggested that the FCC consider organizing Brown Bag Lunch sessions where faculty could present their work. Many others agreed that it would be a good idea.

Michele asked that if faculty members would e-mail her suggestions on appropriate venues for Faculty Assembly meetings. Several faculty members recommended that the FCC meetings be held in the college rather than at the Henderson School.

Salary Equity Committee

Perry Schoon reported that this was a 10 member committee comprising representatives from all departments appointed by the dean or the chairs as well as at-large members representing Faculty Assembly. The committee had met to come up with a working definition of equity, working goals and methods for proceeding with their work. Their last meeting had not had an adequate quorum due to insufficient notification. A new date for the next meeting would be e-mailed.

Plans for the Spring

Date changes

Michele announced the date changes for Faculty Assembly meetings in the Spring.

February 6th - Changed from January 30th because of the Literacy Conference

April 2nd - Changed from March 26th because of the Graduate Student Research Symposium

The next Steering Committee meeting remained unchanged and was scheduled for January 16th 2004.

President Brogan's visit

Michele then explained to the faculty the sequence of events leading up to the day's meeting that had originally been planned as a meeting with President Brogan. She clarified that it was the president who had asked to be present. However, now that he had been unable to attend (he was at the FAU football game; FAU was in round 2 of the play-offs), that it was the plan of the Leadership team to approach him directly and invite him to a Faculty Assembly Meeting where we would be in control of the agenda. She underscored that Faculty Assembly's values going into the meeting with the President were not to say anything negative about our college but rather to appraise him of the concerns that we had as a faculty so that we could build a support system for our college. Michele then made clear the process whereby the questions (copies distributed at the meeting) that we had planned to ask President Brogan had been derived. The Steering Committee been involved in the question development. The committee members had read all the questions that had been presented through the survey of the faculty, had identified themes emerging from those questions and then crafted general questions, identified people to pose them and determined a sequence in which to pose the questions. The wording of the questions was modified by both a) members of the Steering Committee

and b) faculty members who had been assigned to pose the questions. Once it became clearer that president Brogan might not have as much time with us as originally planned, the Leadership Team combined and edited questions that were distributed at the meeting. The Steering Committee had been involved and kept apprised of all developments with regard to planning this meeting.

Dean Aloia commented that although the President had visited other colleges, no other college had organized the visit in this way. He noted that he had shared this idea with other deans who had received it with interest. He also observed that the deferred visit gave us time to take another look at the questions and modify them if needed.

Procedures for Elections

Dilys distributed a rubric which demonstrated how the Leadership Team was thinking about running elections. In keeping with the current constitution's position that nominations should be made at the last Faculty Assembly meeting and the results announced before the end of the semester, a timeline was passed out to faculty. The plan was to take nominations for all three positions on April 2nd, conduct an electronic vote for chair in the week of April 5th -9th. Then the results of that vote would be announced on April 12th and the vote for Vice Chair would be held April 12th -16th. (Nominees who did not win in the previous election would be given the opportunity to run for subsequent positions.) The results of the Vice Chair vote would be announced on April 19th and the secretary's position would be voted on in the week of April 19th -23rd and the result of the vote for secretary would be announced on April 25th.

There was some concern among faculty that this procedure was cumbersome. Michele, Perry and Dilys said that they would be open to taking suggestions for alternate formats. In response to questions from the floor, Michele, Perry and Dilys informed the faculty that they would not be running for re-election as Assembly officers. Pat Maslin Ostrowski and Deb Floyd requested that the members of the Leadership Team reconsider their decision.

Code of Ethics

Michele noted that the survey conducted by Faculty Assembly had yielded the suggestion that the Assembly consider creating a Code of Ethics for the college. She noted that the Leadership Team had thought it might be an appropriate idea to craft a set of core values that would capture how we thought we needed to function as a college. She posed the question to the Assembly about whether they thought that such a document was needed and should be crafted. If needed it could be a task to be taken on by the Steering Committee. The silence that followed was broken by Carlos Diaz who agreed that it was needed. Deb Harris agreed and suggested a preference for the term "Code of Ethics."

The discussion that ensued yielded different perspectives. Among them were: Mike Brady who noted the symbolic value of a code of ethics. What does it mean for this Assembly if we say we don't want one? Michele noted that all highly functioning organizations had one. Deb Floyd suggested identifying a set of values that were central to us as an institution. Penelope Fritzer and Toni Kirkwood expressed concern about having a faculty member's behavior dictated by a code. This was a perspective shared by others who expressed reluctance about having to be governed by yet another set of rules. It was also noted by Larry Kontosh that if professional organizations in which faculty members belonged had a Code of Ethics, it was unnecessary for the College to have one. Lydia Smiley asked whose values would be central to the code. Dilys Schoorman asked if it would be possible for us to have a set of values to which we all could agree, noting the need for some guidance on how to respond when there were cases of ethical

violations. Given the lack of consensus, Michele noted that the issue would have to be revisited (if needed) at another time.

Survey data

Michele explained that in the interest of confidentiality, data gathered through surveys administered by **this** Faculty Assembly would remain with the Leadership team. A version edited to assure confidentiality would be shared with the Steering Committee. This would be made available to individual faculty members who might be interested in specific data. All results emerging from data would be shared with the Assembly. This decision resulted from a concern raised within the Steering Committee that an individual faculty member might not be as forthcoming in their responses to surveys if they knew that the raw data would be distributed widely. Pat Maslin Ostrowski applauded the Leadership Team for their data gathering efforts, especially their use of technology for this process. Michele acknowledged the invaluable role that Perry Schoon had played in allowing a quick turn-around on data gathered.

Sally Robison posed a question on the confidentiality of the voting process proposed. Perry explained that the voting would be set up in the same way as the first survey had been, where sign-up information went into a separate data base from the actual responses.

Constitution

The Leadership Team noted that the Steering Committee would be looking at the constitution in order to update and make necessary modifications. This had become necessary because of several documents located in the Faculty Assembly archives that indicated that amendments to the constitution had been proposed and accepted but not reflected in the current version available. Faculty were asked to e-mail their suggestions of any modifications to the constitution to their Steering Committee representatives or to Michele, Perry or Dilys.

Dean's Report

Dean Aloia announced that he would be meeting with Palm Beach County Schools and would like to have information about what it was we already did in partnership with the district's schools.

He also noted that it appeared that we would get an extension on NCATE. We had asked for a two year extension given the fact that since the last NCATE visit we had experienced three and a half governing boards, three Presidents, three Provosts and three deans.

On the issue of searches, the Dean noted that with the three different provosts, three different budget cycles and three different funding formats, the university was going through an unusual and significant time. The simultaneous searches for Provost, Executive Vice President and Vice President for Advancement would define the nature of our institution. Dean Aloia noted that we should have an announcement on the Provost before the Holiday break.

He announced that the College had an application in with the university to establish a Faculty/Student Exchange Program with the Netherlands. He praised Tony Townsend and Allison Ford for their work on this project. He also noted that the college had notified the President of a desire to host an International Education Conference in 2005 and in 2007.

Dean Aloia also noted that he was hoping to host an informal Friday Forum every couple of weeks beginning on January 16th to appraise the faculty of 'what was happening on the

third floor' and give faculty the opportunity of getting together. He asked for preferred times and the faculty decided that 12-2 was the best.

With regard to budget goals, Dean Aloia noted that in his first year he had few responses on how the college determined its budget, and in his second year, the departments developed budgets from which the college budget was extrapolated. He underscored his desire to align departmental and college needs in a manner that was rational and simple, and to make sure that, if there were a budget increase, money would come back to the college. He noted his concern that currently there was no relationship between the efforts of the college and its budget.

Responding to questions, Dean Aloia confirmed that faculty members would have an opportunity to provide input on their department's budget needs, and that departments working on Ph.D. proposals should continue that work. He noted without the proposals we would definitely have no means for requesting funding for graduate programs. He underscored the support that the college had received through Larry Lemanski's office, in the fact that we had quadrupled the number of graduate assistantships for this year.

Adjournment

Michele asked if there was any other business to be discussed. There was none. Ray Cafolla moved and Joan Lindgren seconded that we adjourn. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 11.55 a.m.

Submitted by:
Dilys Schoorman
Secretary, Faculty Assembly