

**College of Education
Faculty Assembly Meeting
Friday, April 17, 2009
10:00-12:00
Boca Fleming Hall 424, Davie LA 139
Jupiter EC 202C, Port St. Lucie JU 112**

Approved Meeting Minutes

Welcome/Sign In

President Warde called the meeting to order at 10:06 a.m.

Attendance

CCEI- Nancy Brown, Gail Burnaford

CE- Greg Brigman, Paul Peluso, Linda Webb

CSD- Deena Wener, Dale Williams

Dean's Office- Valerie Bristor, Donald Torok, Eliah Watlington

EL- Ira Bogotch, Deborah Floyd, Lucy Guglielmino, Patricia Maslin-Ostrowski, Meredith Mountford, Robert Shockley

ES&HP- Joseph O'Kroy, Michael Whitehurst, Robert Zoeller

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

Henderson School- John Hardman

OASS- Lorraine Cross

Teaching and Learning- Jennifer Bird, Ernest Brewer, Victoria Brown, Ray Cafolla, Penelope Fritzer, Joseph Furner, Alyssa Gonzalez-DeHass, Deborah Harris, Susanne Lapp, Joan Lindgren, Philomena Marinaccio-Eckles, Barbara Ridener

Guests- John Pritchard, Barry Rosson, Connie Sokolowski

Approval of Minutes

January 30, 2009 meeting

Approval of Minutes was tabled until the first 2009-2010 Faculty Assembly meeting.

New Business

Graduate College Requirements – Discussion with Dr. Rosson

Dr Rosson began by thanking the COE for time at the Faculty Assembly.

Dr. Rosson then presented a PPT (Attached) that was created to address the talking points.

Questions and Comments after the Presentation:

Slide five states that, "Credits more than ten years old may not be used to fulfill graduate degree requirements". This is a change, from seven, that the faculty was not notified of until today. It was asked that the Graduate College please e-mail all information to advisors, as well as the students.

Faculty had concerns as to why students would turn in their Plan of Study on time, if they are not checked until the semester before they graduate. Dr. Rosson says that because of the backlog, the Graduate School needs the Plan of Study (POS) before ½ of the POS is complete. Students need to be aware of the importance of turning in the POS and keeping up with their progress. The problems with the Graduate forms seems to be systemic, shouldn't we look at the system?

Yes. The Graduate College is a young college and it is not a perfect system. But the college is working to take care of concerns. For example, The Graduate College is moving towards web-based forms that will be expandable.

There are a number of Dissertations that have procedures already set up to vet, we know that vetting is completed in the Graduate College office. It would be helpful if the COE faculty could receive a checklist to know what the Graduate College looks for, such as the formatting.

Dr. Rosson agreed that we need to move towards a standard formatting.

What supersedes APA or the Dissertation and Thesis guidelines?

Dr. Rosson stated that we need to follow the guidelines, but allowed that the guidelines need to be clearer.

How long and how often will we have to resubmit forms?

Once the POS forms go online (VIP and Web-Based forms), faculty will not have to resubmit forms.

The advisors and committee are held accountable for the Thesis and Dissertation forms; however, the advisor does not get the approved POS. Can the Graduate College better connect with COE advisors and committee members?

Dr. Rosson stated that we have VIP and we will have web-based forms in the future. In the meantime, we should ask the students and remind the students that their POS is their responsibility.

We should revisit in the middle of the fall semester to see if the problems have subsided.

This is something that can be looked at that time.

When is a POS revision due?

The POS is due the last semester before graduation.

Can we have "The last semester before graduation" placed on POS?

Forms are not sent back from the Graduate College because courses are out of order.

Dr. Rosson requests that COE faculty have students fill out POS forms, even if there are uncertainties about the courses.

Dr. Rosson again thanked the COE faculty and left.

Follow-up Suggestions and Questions

VIP is not available unless faculty has had Banner 1, 2, and 3 training.

Faculty should be able to put on the POS general outline, such as 18 elective credits, rather than having to list courses that may or may not be offered.

Some faculty expressed concern about the number of forms, and lack of staff, at the Graduate College.

It was noted for clarification that the reasons that some students are not submitting the new POS forms early in their programs, especially the doctoral program, appear to relate to an attempt to avoid having to resubmit the form once the actual sequence of courses can be predicted. The fact that the Graduate College POS form is not routinely submitted early, however, does not indicate that COE faculty are not continuing to meet with new graduate students early in their first semester (or sometimes before) to discuss requirements and develop a draft program of study. The College of Education faculty understand the importance of early advisement and routinely offer it. The new information that a POS will not be returned because the courses are not listed in the order taken should remove this problem.

President Warde then presented talking points and expressed how they were met by Dr. Rosson and his presentation.

1. Lack of two (three) –way communication between graduate school staff, students, and faculty advisors.
VIP and Web-Based Programs should solve this problem.
2. Plans of Study (POS) forms are not reviewed by graduate school until student’s last semester prior to graduation. This creates a myriad of issues for both faculty and student if deficiencies are found at such a late date and jeopardizes student’s graduation.
There is a backlog, explained earlier that it is time frame based on time utilization.
It is a goal to get POS out before the last semester.
3. Advisors cannot access student’s POS to verify acceptance with grad school or to make any necessary changes while students move through coursework.
VIP and Web-Based Programs should solve this problem.
4. Committees need to be named on Form 5 for doctoral students. Neither students nor their program advisors have any idea who these people will be at the beginning of their doc programs.
For Doctoral students there is some flexibility; the forms only require the advisor or major professor’s signature. The Candidacy form must have dissertation committee signatures.
5. It is difficult to know which courses the students will take so early on in their coursework, particularly electives.
Faculty should create the POS using best judgment.
6. Form Platform is Unfriendly to Users: Using Adobe Reader for form processing. Faculty unable to sign without printing out, signing, rescanning and so on. This is also a problem with most students. Forms are unfriendly in current platform used.
This will be changed with Web-Based forms. There will also be an electronic signature.
7. The COE faculty recognizes the need for students to have POS and also understand these programs are and should remain somewhat fluid based on student needs and academic direction. However, forms should only serve as a means to document these shifts, not barriers to students or their advisors to encourage program changes to better meet the needs of the students. Therefore, while we recognize the need for a university wide POS, we also believe these forms should be for documentation purposes only, not time consuming excess paperwork. As things stand now, keeping up with the forms is a difficult requirement that serves to diminish the encouragement of students changing scholarly directions.
VIP and Web-Based Programs should solve this problem.

Dean’s Talking Points- Dean Bristor: Priorities for next year
Dean Bristor began by outlining the COE priorities for the near future.

Overall her goal is to help faculty, staff, and students meet their goals and potential.

Strategic Planning- At the University level and College level

Goals From Academic Program Review

Goal 1: Assessment System

- Work with DOE to reach closure on program approval of Rule 6A submissions.
- Start up of new student data collection system to address lack of ability of current system to meet accreditation needs.

Goal 2: Diversity

- Student recruitment through the Office of Student Services.
- Initiatives to help students navigate institutional policies and procedures.

- Faculty-mentor task force for recruitment and retention. Contact Dr. Deborah Shepherd if interested.

Goal 3: Technology

- With the help of Steve Diaz, ED 313 will be turned in to a full-fledged video conferencing room.
- Other rooms will eventually be turned into video conferencing rooms, as well.

Goal 4: Faculty/Adjuncts

- Visiting lines now, possible searches later. Try to add more visiting lines and keep those in place and then maybe move these position to tenure-earning lines.

Goal 5: Enrollment/FTE

- Review degrees, programs, and the direction of all departments.
- Review schedules.

Goal 6: Research/Grant Opportunities

- American Recovery and Reinvestment Act/Stimulus
- Lewis-Burke Associates-Government relations firm (D.C. in April; June)

Goal 7: Service

- Work with departments and school districts to generate revenue from collaborative initiatives.
- Work with new colleges (formerly community colleges) to explore the need for doctoral cohorts.

Dean Bristor thanked the 2008-2009 Faculty Assembly Executive Committee, and welcomed the 2009-2010 Executive Committee.

Old/Continuing Business

COE Research Committees Report

- COE Research Committee – Dr. Joe O’Kroy

The COE Research Committee was concerned that others would wonder about the two different Research Committees. The COE Research Committee is active. The purpose of the COE Research Committee is to help faculty research, name researcher of the year, and, when available give seed grants.

- FAUS & COE Research Committee – Dr. Ira Bogotch

The FAU Schools-COE Research Committee was established in 2003-2004, by the former Dean Gregory Aloia in consultation with Executive Director Glenn Thomas. Ms. Lorraine Cross was asked to establish the Committee which comprised representatives from each COE department as well as faculty and administration from A.D. Henderson University School (ADHUS).

Initially the goal of the then-called COE-Henderson Research Committee was to create a climate and culture for pursuing classroom/school research. In this way, ADHUS faculty would not only be subjects of on-going studies but now become researchers themselves. Their employment contracts were modified to provide incentives for engagement in research. A concomitant mission of the Committee was to encourage COE to use ADHUS as a laboratory to test hypotheses, curricular ideas, and pedagogies.

In order to fulfill state mandates, ADHUS’s student population has become more diverse as it seeks to mirror the statewide population of Florida itself. Thus, the work of the FAU Schools-COE Research Committee was part of a larger mission to enhance research both within the laboratory school[s] and among COE faculty.

According to Florida Law 228.053, Laboratory Research School[s] have a three-fold mission of (1) being a demonstration site for student teaching; (2) developing curricula; (3) conducting

research. While that mission has been associated primarily with the ADHUS K-8 School, Florida Atlantic University and its COE have expanded the mission to include the FAU High School, Karen Slattery on FAU Campus, Pine Jog Environmental Education Center in Palm Beach County, and Palm Pointe in St. Lucie County. We have learned a great deal from our work within ADHUS. The challenge facing us is to scale up research endeavors to include the other/newer FAU Schools.

Past and Current Leadership

The committee has benefited from having stable leadership since its inception. Ms. Lorraine Cross was a founding member. Other charter members who continue to serve are Dr. Marla Brady [now retired], and Ms. Tammy Bresnahan, from ADHUS and Professor Ira Bogotch from the COE. Representatives from other departments and schools have rotated on and off in the four year history. We encourage new members, but also seek to maintain stable leadership including the Directors/Principals of the FAUS schools. The recent appointment of Dr. John Hardman will help in coordinating projects and initiatives.

Current Status

In 2007-2008, the committee officially expanded its mission to incorporate all FAU Schools including Slattery, Pine Jog Environmental Center, and Palm Pointe. The new Research Coordinator, Dr. John Hardman has been instrumental in making this expansion successful. A second research Mixer was held at ADHUS introducing the research community to the many current and future projects at the FAU Schools. This year also included a procedural meeting of members of the Research Committee with the University's administrators of the Institutional Review Board (IRB). Documents have been drafted which protect researchers, K-12 students, and the FAU Schools as well as the integrity of the IRB process. The documents are posted on the Committee's website. In addition, administrators from the other FAU Schools have been attending Committee meetings to see how best to encourage on-going research at their respective institutions. Areas identified for future research include:

- a. The impact of diversity on student achievement and the implications for the curriculum from ages 3-18.
- b. The implications of growth and diversity for specialist support programs (Reading, ESE, Speech and Language)
- c. The impact of a comprehensive wellness program, integrating health, nutrition and exercise, on student achievement
- d. Early childhood education (Slattery)
- e. Environmental education (Pine Jog Environmental Center)
- f. Teaching and learning through ICT

Highlights and Accomplishments

Monitoring of Research Projects to ensure that the integrity of the IRB processes and on-going education at the FAU Schools is maintained. Disseminating Research Opportunities and Findings by holding University-wide Research Mixers Encouraging Action Research Projects. A new course on action research was first piloted and has now been approved by the College Curriculum Committee. It was developed under the supervision of Dr. McLaughlin and Dr. Burnaford. The students have received FAU IRB approval which officially denotes the legitimacy of action research at FAU. Piloting the first Graduate Course on Action Research at ADHUS; the course was approved by the COE Graduate Programs Committee in 2008.

University P&T Study Committee – Andy Brewer

Due to time constraints, there was no report.

Report on Provost's P&T request – Pat Maslin-Ostrowski and P&T Committee members / FA action plan

Dr. Maslin-Ostrowski began by giving a brief background on the Provost's request for faculty to review the COE's criteria for promotion and tenure. Each department shared its notes from departmental meetings.

CCEI- The department of Curriculum, Culture, and Educational Inquiry discussed this issue on several occasions during departmental meetings. We unanimously passed two motions pertaining to this issue.

- 1) Earlier in the semester, CCEI sent a memo to the Chair of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee requesting that the Committee review the criteria per the Provost's request, in collaboration with departments and propose revisions. If the Committee did not choose to pursue this process, then CCEI would like Faculty Assembly to organize an ad hoc committee for this purpose. However, CCEI would like to acknowledge that all of the Departments in the College are short-staffed and that this process would be extremely time-consuming, given the current demands of service in the college and university.
- 2) CCEI is a new department as of 2007. We wish to review the criteria during the 2009-2010 academic year in order to provide greater *clarity* and more explicit indicators of *quality* with respect to our academic disciplines. This process will result in program area specifics and more clarity with respect to processes and specific indicators in place and may not need this approach. We affirmed that it is the responsibility of departments to provide appropriate detail and explication for the College and University Promotion and Tenure Committees to interpret portfolios within the academic disciplines, while adhering to the criteria and indicators in the College of Education document. In our view, candidates and reviewers would benefit from departmental attention to the two issues of *clarity* and *quality* with respect to the criteria and indicators.

CE- On February 11, 2009 the Department of Counselor Education faculty discussed the issue of P&T criteria during our faculty meeting. It was concluded that, on the whole, the current criteria seems to work for our department. The department did discuss possible changes for the department which are summarized below:

1. Some criteria appear in both Service and Scholarly activity, such as service on a professional journal board. The department wants to count that item only under one of the two categories. The candidate may choose under which to count the activity.
2. Under the Service category, there is a need to clarify what counts under "service to public schools". Since this is an important category for our department, and required by law, we want to count day long staff development training with school districts separately and not lump all such training as only one item of service. For example, if a faculty member conducted five one day trainings for one or more school districts, the department wants to count this as five items of service and not one.
3. Additional items were discussed to be included under the service category. They include:
 - a. Mentoring junior faculty and adjuncts.
 - b. Serving on community or school advisory boards.
 - c. Extraordinary service to the Department which has significant impact.
 - d. Extraordinary service to the College with significant impact.

CSD-The department sees the value of indicators, for example, various journals. All examples were from the Departmental level, not the College level. The indicators should be at the Departmental level.

EL- The department discussed the Provost's second request to review the College of Education's criteria for promotion and tenure. Individual program areas had an opportunity to discuss this prior to the full faculty meeting, similar to last year's review of the college criteria process. Faculty agreed that overall, the current College of Education criteria are clear, fair and rigorous. While faculty appreciate the importance of reviews of this type, given the present pressures of coping with extreme budget cuts, e.g. unfilled faculty lines that have increased individual faculty load, no funds to travel to meet professional responsibilities, concerns of losing positions, etc., people feel like they have a great deal "on their plate" at this time. As such, faculty concurred that a revision of the criteria is not a priority in need of an "emergency" overhaul.

Yet, given that the Provost has expressed his desire for more faculty review of the criteria, the EDL faculty recommend, if faculty colleagues across the College agree, that the COE form a special College-wide committee to respond to the Provost's request. The Committee will be charged with studying this issue and making a recommendation to the COE Faculty Assembly. In other words, this special College-wide committee will determine whether the College should move forward with a review and, if a review is recommended, the processes and timelines for such a review will be established by that committee and presented to Faculty Assembly. If the current criteria are deemed appropriate, the College-wide committee will articulate the reasons why they support the existing criteria.

This College-wide committee should be comprised of one elected faculty member with tenure at the associate or professor level from each department in the College. Additionally, three (3) tenured full professors will be elected to serve at large. It is recommended that this new committee not include current members of the COE P & T Committee because of their major responsibilities. If a special College-wide committee is formed, however, they could meet with the College P & T Committee at any point in the process. This College-wide committee should be elected no later than September 1, 2009, meet no later than October 1, 2009 and conclude their work with a report to the Faculty Assembly no later than March 1, 2010.

If changes are recommended, it is understood that the College's document of approved criteria remains in place until a year after any changes are approved at the final level.

ES&HP- In lieu of an actual vote, ESHP is generally not in favor of pursuing change to the current P&T document. The "no-change" position is particularly favored by the tenure track faculty in ESHP. However, if it turns out that the college does examine the document, the ESHP faculty would like to see a minor reworking with that work performed by the P&T committee.

ESE- In response to the continuing request to reconsider the P&T criteria in the College of Education, The Department of Exceptional Student Education offers the following.

On four occasions, faculty in the ESE Department have responded to the Provost's request to review the P&T criteria in the COE. The prevailing response each time is that the criteria currently used provide both depth and breadth of experience, and allow a substantive and collegial review of a faculty member's work. Flaws in the P&T process are not primarily a function of the College criteria. P&T criteria should not promote a process in which portfolio review is an "accounting procedure" - a checklist of items accomplished. Rather, a professional review of a faculty member's body of work and activity will incorporate best professional opinion (a *subjective* process) of work products and events, the value of which are stated a priori (an *objective* content). The *context* that pervades the overall P&T process is already stated clearly in the Provost's Guidelines: a question that must be addressed is whether the University (and Department) is best served by providing a life-long affiliation of the faculty member with

the University. That is not a popularity expression, but an explicit statement of academic values ascertained during the review process.

Faculty in the ESE Department advocate the addition of a pre-amble to the COE P&T Guidelines to make explicit the following points:

1. A professional review of a faculty member's body of work ought *not* reflect a simple accounting procedure – a checklist or an accrual of discrete activities.
2. There is no single model or format of a successful P&T portfolio. The onus of demonstrating the strength of one's portfolio is on the faculty member applying for P&T;
3. Scholarship that reflects a single line of inquiry is valuable, as is scholarship that is more eclectic, and might reflect the changing opportunities that arise from changes in state and national educational reforms;
4. Scholarly works by single authors is valuable, as is scholarship that is collaborative and reflects contributions by multiple authors;
5. Service to schools, agencies, and organizations is a highly valued activity in the COE, particularly service that shows a clear link to a faculty member's professional role and discipline.
6. Departments in the COE that wish to customize the COE criteria to accommodate teaching, research, and service trends and values in their own disciplines should be encouraged to do so, linking those criteria directly to the COE (baseline) criteria.

T&L- The department of Teaching and Learning feels that the COE criteria are good. We have discussed the possibility of Departmental Standards.

There will be a summary of these ideas shared with the Provost.

Departmental Reports

Due to time constraints, there were no Departmental reports.

Committee Reports

Due to time constraints, there were no Committee reports.

Announcements

- P&T Workshop immediately following FA meeting 12:15-1:30
Rooms: Boca- Fleming 401; Jupiter- SR 268; PSL – MP 114; Davie- LA 134
- Officers and Senators for 2009-2010
Faculty Assembly:
President- Beverly Warde
Vice-President-Meredith Mountford
Secretary-Philomena Marinaccio-Eckles
Archivist-Connie Keintz
Senate:
Andrew Brewer, Valerie Bryant, Joseph Furner, Peggy Goldstein, Dilys Schoorman,
Lydia Smiley,

Open Discussion

Due to time constraints, there was no Open Discussion.

Adjourn

President Warde adjourned the meeting at 12:05 p.m.

Submitted by,
Ernest Andrew Brewer
Secretary, Faculty Assembly

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.