Summary College of Education Perspectives

The data did not reveal innovative trends, movement in new directions. There was no acknowledgement of the precarious future of colleges of education across the country, in particular teacher education.

1. Enrollment – Degree Production

   a) Elementary Education is the highest producer of degrees and FTE in the college. Clearly, from the numbers, elementary ed is our biggest program and most reliable one. We must be sure to retain it and try to grow it--again, the degree needs to be leaner to appeal more to students.
   b) Data need to be separated where possible into undergraduate and graduate bins.
   c) Other measures are needed to understand enrollment progress such as time to degree and retention; particularly in light of the diverse population we serve
   d) Numbers of students showing are slightly down from high point (but better than last couple of years), especially among secondary students, as the state has made alternative certification easier--we need to overhaul our programs to make them leaner, as anecdotally, they often change majors to the other colleges and then do alt cert.
   e) Doctoral graduates are slightly down--possibly we need to think about college doctoral programs instead of department ones?
   f) It is vital that we maintain a wide range and variety of programs in the college. If our governor had signed the bill passed by the Senate and House in Tallahassee saying the state would not pay teachers for advanced degrees, there would be likely be far fewer graduate students in the College of Education
   g) The undergraduate programs are a feeder to our graduate programs. The range and number of students in our undergraduate programs generate FTE's to support our graduate programs.
   h) Our colleges are having difficulty developing and running smaller undergraduate programs. FAU's undergraduate program is the largest (I think) in the State. It would be politically unwise to eliminate any undergraduate programs in the College.

2. Diversity

   a) The college ranks high on diversity of faculty and students
   b) Our diversity levels of faculty and students are significant across the college and need to be acknowledged.
   c) How important the given state definition of minority is to the collection of that data and how important it is, again, to define what you are reviewing when looking at data.
   d) The diversity of our faculty is misrepresented when charts show only African-American and Hispanic faculty as “minority.” In CCEI, which is the most diverse department in the COE and perhaps one of the most diverse at FAU, here is the breakdown of full-time faculty and graduate assistants:

   **Tenure-Track Faculty** (11 as of January 2011)
   - Asian-American: 4 (3 from Malaysia, 1 from Sri Lanka)
   - Latino: 2 (from Cuba and Puerto Rico)
   - African-American: 1
   - White: 4
   * 8 of the 11 are female
Visiting Assistant Professors and Instructors (5)
Middle Eastern: 1 (from Bahrain) White: 4 * 4 of the 5 are female

Graduate Assistants (6)
Asian: 2 (from India) Middle Eastern: 1 (from Turkey) Russian: 1 White: 2 * All 6 are female
e) Of the faculty, 7 of 16 came here from another country, 8 of the 16 are "minorities," 10 of the 16 speak one or more foreign languages fluently, and 12 of the 16 are female
f) Of the GA’s, 4 of 6 came here from another country, and all 6 are female
g) The 4 Asian-American faculty (none from China or Japan) and 1 Middle Eastern faculty are not represented in the “minority” charts, nor would the 2 Asian, 1 Middle Eastern, and 1 Russian GA be represented in a similar chart for GA’s. Who we are has a lot to do with what we want to do and how we think about the world.

3. Scholarship
a) Scholarship is down - data elements need to be identified –
b) The value of scholarship in the College of Education at the University level is questioned.
c) There are no indirect funds coming to the college from research and developmental grants.
d) Fewer faculty produce fewer articles and grants because there is little time--we need more faculty, and we need a way to assign some productive people more research instead of teaching, so we can keep up our numbers of articles and books, which is good for the whole college.
e) I had a doubt about one thing shared toward the end on one of the slides - over the past 5 years or so that there have been only about 100 or less editors/reviewers for the COE. This seems low. I know for myself I am an editor for one journal and then reviewer for three others, so that is four for me, I am sure that out of the 100+ faculty we all must at least serve as a reviewer or editor for one journal it would seem anyway, this just seems low and I question where this info came from or if it is reported accurately.
f) We also should be willing to seriously address major decreases in areas like research and grants. From our earlier vision sessions, we have heard clearly that other parts of the university, and those outside the university, do not consider us to be very worthy. I hate to say that those numbers (in the most important areas) indicate that our critics' comments have teeth.

4. Technology and course delivery
- I am concerned for the push to do more on-line when I have this internal battle going over the idea that I think of teaching and leading as an art and a science. I'm afraid that we are on the cusp of losing the “Art” associated with what we do by relying to heavily on on-line classes at the expense of traditional classroom learning. I may be wrong, but that is my gut telling me that.

5. Service
a) The data revealed that the COE faculty spend an excessive amount of time doing service to the institution. What are the implications for faculty productivity?
b) We do service for local schools—unlike the rest of the university—we should play up the value added in our local school service as opposed to the level of service done by other
faculty. What do we get from that service? More opportunities for research? Better understanding of how the schools of today operate? Grounded theory?

6. Instruction
   a) Our professors receive higher marks; but is the difference statistically significant? and
   b) Should the difference be greater considering we are the college of education and prepare teachers?

7. Academic Positions
   a) The main thing that the COE needs is more tenure track faculty members. The faculty has been asked to do more with fewer people the last few years, and that will lead to low morale, burnout, and decreased opportunities for research if there is no plan to bring additional members to the faculty.
   b) Clearly, we are losing faculty, almost a quarter (from 136 to about 100), so there needs to be a bigger push to retain faculty. When I go to Secondary Teacher Education Coordinating Committee meetings (held in our college with attendance by College of Science and College of Arts and Letters), I am shocked by how they keep hiring--it seems that ANY position that goes empty is immediately filled with a tenure track person, while many of our empty positions in the past few years just drift on empty and finally disappear. I realize budget is the reason, but how are other colleges filling their positions?
   c) The data revealed that there is an overreliance on non-tenure track and temporary faculty positions. How will this affect the stability of programs and ability to increase research efforts?
   d) Strikingly absent from the data presented was the salary inequity suffered in the COE. This is a systemic problem that requires immediate attention.
   e) I do feel our adjuncts are on par with full time faculty in other institutions—we need to find a way to showcase their talents and not speak only of “having to use more adjuncts”. We need to capitalize on their talents and they should be involved in this process.
   f) I do not feel it is wise to hide all the flaws (faculty recruitment retention issues due to economic issues; number of vacant or lost lines).
   g) May I suggest that we include an elephant in the room which is salary data (equity, market [internally and externally]? I wonder if this is directly tied to morale and/productivity. Certainly reflects values.
   h) We do a lot with about 25% - 30% fewer faculty. It is absolutely necessary to hire tenure track senior faculty in all departments. They only reason the number of adjuncts appears to be decreasing is because we continue to cut course offerings for students.

8. Data
   a. The College must pay closer attention to systematically gathering accurate data from department chairs that is quickly reconciled with the institutional data. The data presented was dated and in some cases misleading. We must be mindful that the data from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness is the only data that matters when policymakers are rendering decisions about the future of the college.
   b) Data presentation needs – in addition to frequency data we need ratio data to truly understand the data and make decisions from it.
   c) Source of data need to be clearly identified
d) Data used by the university needs to be validated by departments and faculty = “garbage in – garbage out”

e) Absent were market, environmental trend, and resource trend data and/or discussions related to these important topics.

f) Data from the college needs to show entire college productivity – i.e. most of the data illustrated represented our school focus but not our postsecondary focus or our exercise science focus. If we only present data from one perspective that is the perspective that the University will have of the college

g) It seems that there are two data issues to consider. Those that are presented to the university brass, and those that would be most helpful for the COE to use in planning. A good example would be scholarly productivity. To be useful for the college, the criteria would need to be well defined and agreed upon and presented “per capita.”

h) Dr. Bristor’s answers regarding your questions on the actual use of data in decision making was helpful.

i) My one impression includes the observation that our faculty did not seem to understand or agree with the method/format/script that the BOG prescribes to look at colleges. I believe we may wish to piece together our own story, and see how we look using variables we choose.

j) We should do a second level of analysis that showcases what we do as compared to the rest of the colleges in the university. Like % of docs graduated.

k) Data that is presented out of context are just numbers, not information.

l) We need to see some disaggregated data. I truly believe that unless we really know our story, as a college, we can’t be evangelists for our cause.

m) The information by Dean Bristor was informative and did help to illustrate how data is currently being viewed at both the college and university level. For our purposes for planning, I feel we need more detail and drilled down data to do an effective self-evaluation.

n) I cannot make decisions to keep or delete a program or service when the data is part of a larger set that may be camouflaging that change or improvements are needed.

o) I feel we need data by department, side-by-side with other department data on a host of like items.

p) I would also like to see the data drilled down to the level that it was program by program so choices could be made with some degree of objectivity.

q) A number of units are heavy in graduate education and the value of that role needs to be highlighted. We need data to reflect recruitment verses attrition verses completion per program area or department area. This data needs to be compared to other heavy graduate programs across campus. I feel the COE is highly competitive in this arena and we are not taking enough credit for the role we serve. Having said that, we also need to illustrate that in spite faculty attrition, we remain productive in this area and continuing to serve the mission of the university in this area. Our doctoral production is high, but we need data on time to degree and attrition. I do feel we are still above the national average.

r) I would like comparisons on graduate assistantships available to COE as compared to other colleges. I suspect our ratios are low.

s) There may be many reasons for students at FAU having a long trajectory to finish their degree programs, but we should know the data on attrition and program completion.
Orientation, advising, coursework, and ongoing communication are all factors that contribute to students’ choices to leave or to stay longer.

t) We need to clean up the FTE data that appears on e-mailed charts and the IEA website. It is often erroneous, and does not represent our “productivity” well. Following up on point 2, we should, as a college, really examine what “productivity” might mean, in light of our constituency (mostly local/regional students, many of whom take courses part-time) and our values (the purposes for teaching and doing research at FAU).

u) I did check into the "source" question and confirmed what I thought. The Chairs complete a spreadsheet for the service information, then that information is submitted to IEA. But your question and concern is a good one, so we need to emphasize common definitions of the requested data and best accuracy as possible. Maybe this presentation will help everyone realize the importance of reporting that information (translation: the data is actually being used!).

v) We need to continue to work to communicate the data we have among ourselves to examine and expand our understanding of the work we do. It was interesting how questions generated from the meeting will allow us to “get at” the data and use it at other levels.

w) Yesterday’s data was all about what “is done” to the college from external forces. Yet is powerful to layout the holistic picture of that data to inform our picture of ourselves. I was proud of the group yesterday to want to understand how the entity involved in collection of important institutional data defines what they are wanting in data reports. Also, how important it is to know the source of the given data.

x) From the discussion yesterday, I have several data sources that I need to revisit to have a solid answer to one particular query. I have thought about that over the evening and feel the need to further pursue.

y) I am not a master at data “stuff” but I did think that because of the questions coming from the attendees, that the data were very superficial in that there wasn’t much there that was “meaty”. Probably by design...

9. Serendipity

a) This college does do things right and needs to find ways to highlight those items that do not disenfranchise others within the college. Teacher education is not the only mission of the college, but most examples used in the summaries were related to teachers and not leaders or counselors or health sciences or all the other sub-specialty areas of study that is in the college.

   1. I would like to see a better effort extended to find opportunities to give recognition for what all sub-disciplines are doing as well.

   2. Highlighting scholarship by department may be a way to give everyone some space to shine regardless of their size in ratio format (i.e., number of chapters/per faculty in unit; number of refereed publications/per faculty in unit; number of awards for students/per students in units; number of refereed presentations by students/per students in unit; etc.)

b) We should take the accolades that the Dean has collected and publicize them Take a look at the UCF website—they let the world know that they have a teacher of the year selected. We have had plenty of students who have been teacher of the year—we need to use that info to market us. Ditto with marketing Doc student accomplishment—how many are at universities, how many
are doing high quality research—writing books, etc? It’s a crazy place to be—regulated by a group of people who have disdain for what you do.

c) It would be good to hear something related to vision even at this time, even if just from the Departments. There is movement forward, and new professors being hired, which is good.
d) I understand that it is important sometimes to be patience, and actually LIVE our questions sometimes. And so I am happy that we had the chance to, in a formal setting, generate questions.