

College of Education
Faculty Assembly Meeting
Friday, February 15, 2013
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Boca COE 313, Jupiter EC 202C, Davie LA 148

WELCOME

FA President Susannah Brown called the regular meeting of the Faculty Assembly to order at 10:03 a.m.

ATTENDANCE

- CCEI:** Judy Allgood, Traci Baxley, Nancy Brown, Gail Burnaford, Dilys Schoorman, Evelyn Torrey, Judy Somers
CE: Irene Johnson, Paul Peluso, Michael Frain
CSD: Connie Keintz, Deena Wener
Dean's Office: Valerie Bristor, Sheriann Namer, Don Torok, Eliah Watlington,
ELRM: Ira Bogotch, Valerie Bryan, Deborah Floyd, Mary Lieberman, Dan Morris, Meredith Mountford, Bob Shockley, Diane Wright
ESE: Mary Lou Duffy, Michael Brady, Sheriann Namer
OASS: Deborah Shepherd, Traci Catto
T&L: Ray Amirault, Andrew Brewer, Susannah Brown, Julie Lambert, Philomena Marinaccio, Penelope Fritzer, Joe Furner, Alyssa Gonzales-DeHass, Deborah Harris, Patty Heydet-Kirsch, David Kumar, Barbara Ridener, Angela Rhone, Janet Towel, Jan Andrews
ES&HP: Bob Zoeller

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

FUTURE MEETINGS

- *Faculty Assembly:* Friday, April 19, 2013, 10-noon Boca ED 313
- *Faculty Assembly Steering Committee:* Friday, April 5, 2013, 10-noon Boca ED 356

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Dr. Susannah Brown welcomed the Faculty Assembly. Minutes for the 11/2/12 faculty assembly were not yet available for review, and therefore, no motion was made to approve minutes at this time.

GUEST SPEAKER

Dr. Jeffrey M. Anderson, Associate Vice President for Research

- Dr. Anderson is also Director of Technology Transfer.
- He assists with larger grant projects.
- See web site for background with grants and academic work (<http://www.fau.edu/research/execstaff/anderson.php>)
- A liaison to help with larger projects, meetings, project management, etc.

Question:

Can you share one project as an example of your duties at FAU?

Response from Dr. Anderson:

A faculty member from the College of Medicine, Dr. Joseph Ouslander built a quality assurance tools for use in nursing homes to reduce rehospitalization rates (see INTERACT at <http://interact2.net/>). This has been funded through a group of grants including a \$7M Center for Medicare Services grant, and Dr. Anderson has been assisting Dr. Ouslander with various intellectual property (IP) issues and helping with the process of commercializing this technology through discussions with a number of software companies. Securing patents is also within his scope of his duties .

Question:

Are you involved in any research initiatives that span across the colleges?

Response from Dr. Anderson:

Multi college grant proposals are more difficult to build, but this is part of what we do. This is a tough time for federal funding. A large percentage of grant funding is flowing into large interdisciplinary projects, to help us solve the complex social and technological challenges of our time...the easy problems are are solved. For example how can you help children in the home and the school setting, how do we best learn within large organizations, how can educational findings inform brain science? Even in these times interesting projects are getting funded.

Question:

Is there any possible collaboration available between, say, Neuroscience and the COE?

Response from Dr. Anderson:

The NSF puts much money into projects, including STEM, which can be a collaboration between engineering and education. Part of what I do is to meet with faculty and help them identify areas that need to be expanded outside of one particular domain. I encourage them to get outside of the department and college and work with other faculty outside the group that they interact with on a regular basis.

Question:

How can this be set up? I wish we could break down some of these barriers to foster such collaboration.

Response from Dr. Anderson:

I would be glad to have a meeting with all interested parties so we can investigate these topics. I like the motto “Think big, but act small”. I like to ask faculty members “what are you passionate about, and how can I help you to achieve that?” I like to facilitate “permeable silos” within universities. It has to be a win-win for both groups of faculty. I would be glad to assist in creating faculty teams to help accomplish funding goals.

Question:

For those not in the COE, it is not unusual to understand the diversity of expertise within the COE. K-12 is an important part of what we do, but we also have internationality known faculty in policy, teacher education, and other areas, and much of what President Obama’s State of the Union mentioned (10:16) has been well known to us for many years. We need to speak up for parts of our faculty that work in K-20 and beyond. We have a wide variety of available expertise.

Response from Dr. Anderson:

Yes, I agree that the COE brings deep expertise across a wide spectrum of intellectual challenges. For example, how do educational programs meet the needs of those in health care, non-profits, and business? Within STEM, there is a dream that all undergraduate students will go on to be PhD’s in one of the STEM fields, but these students typically branch out into many areas, not just stay within a specific area of study. How do we best encourage students to explore education as a career which may find expression within educational institutions or within businesses?

Question:

The COE has programs that go from early childhood education all the way to Lifelong learning, and the COE has a tradition of working across all colleges. One suggestion we could make would be for you to meet with the department chairs to learn about who we are, what we do, and our various research interests.

Response from Dr. Anderson:

Absolutely. I would be happy to meet with all departmental chairs within the COE.

GUEST SPEAKERS – Electronic Plan of Study

Janelle Petak and Angela Lints

- The Graduate College Electronic Plan of Study (EPOS) is now coming to the COE.
- The EPOS makes no content changes to existing, paper-based forms.
- Initial meetings have already occurred in the COE, and initial trainings will start next week for those who will be inputting settings.
- Training will then expand to those who will be using the EPOS.
- Everyone who advises students and submits Plans of Study will be trained in EPOS.
- The current procedure is not changing, but is simply going digital.

Question:

Can a person be both advisor and an approver?

Answer:

Yes.

Question:

Are revisions to the Plan of Study still done on paper?

Answer:

Yes, but electronic changes will be implemented in a second version of the system, which is currently in development.

Question:

In Graduate Programs, is it possible to add attachments and supporting documents to the EPOS?

Answer:

Yes, and this will be covered in training. This function is already built into the system. We also have an online training option for those who cannot attend face-to-face training.

Question:

We would like to have documentation if we are allowing, for example, a student to transfer in credits, etc. We would, in this case, wish to have a letter, etc., to be included, but no need for a petition. Is this allowable?

Answer:

Yes, there is a feature in the EPOS that allows notes, correspondence, files, etc., which will be permanently connected to the EPOS.

OLD/CONTINUING BUSINESS

GUEST SPEAKER - NCATE

Dr. Robert Shockley

- Factors impacting accreditation process:
 - A long-standing tradition of joint accreditation and program approval review (NCATE and DOE).
 - FL DOE has suspended program reviews until Fall 2014; NCATE on-site visit scheduled for spring of 2014.
 - New FL DOE Standards in Reading, ESOL, Uniform Core Curriculum, FEAPs, FL Principal Leadership Competencies and Skills.
 - New Common Core Standards.
 - Merger of NCATE with TEAC (Teacher Education Accrediting Council) accrediting bodies; these are now called CAEP.
 - New CAEP standards will be announced shortly.
 - First CAEP reviews to begin in 2014-15.
- Alignment Process
 - Have ongoing discussions with FL DOE, CAEP, and University administration to resolve these factors to best interest of the COE.
 - Meetings are being scheduled later this month.
 - A full report will be provided to the faculty once a plan is agreed upon.
 - Goal: to position the College to maintain our identify, beliefs, values, and to preserve our shared vision.

PROMOTION AND TENURE

- P&T process is currently being discussed at the university level.
- Cynthia Wilson, the COE P & T Committee Chair will discuss the promotion and tenure process in the next meeting, which will be followed by our COE P&T Forum.

Question:

What are changes are being made?

Answer from Dr. Brown:

Cynthia Wilson does not specifically say in her e-mail response, but if changes are proposed then these changes can possibly be implemented in the following year. Cynthia Wilson will provide more detail on the April 19th FA Meeting.

Question:

Usually, task forces are given direction, or a commission. Can we find additional information on this?

Response from Dr. Brown:

I don't have information on this, but I can look into it.

Question:

Does the COE have representation on the task force?

Response from Dr. Brown:

Cynthia Wilson is our COE P & T committee chair, and I will request further information.

Question:

We could put into the minutes, that, before April 19th, the Task Force may be finished at that point. I would like to put forward that we put in for this information before that meeting so we can find the purpose and mission of the task force, and to provide Cynthia Wilson with our support.

Response from Dr. Brown:

I will send an email to clarify issues concerning P & T to Cynthia Wilson and send an announcement to all COE faculty through Kristy DeMeo to distribute information.

Question:

Are changes still under discussion at the university level?

Response from Dr. Brown:

I get the sense this is a discussion that is currently taking place at the university level.

Question:

Is input from the university faculty senate been requested by the Provost?

Response from Dr. Brown:

There is a University Faculty Senate meeting this afternoon and COE senators attending this meeting will keep COE FA informed through the report on April 19th.

NEW BUSINESS

Dean's Talking Points

Dr. Valerie Bristor, Dean, College of Education

Topics: Summer Pay and Schedule; Budget Reports; Auxiliary Accounts for Departments; Strategic Planning Update on Faculty Salaries; Faculty Support for Travel; Faculty Lines/Searches; OSU Data Report for Market Equity Committee; Marketing to Increase Enrollment across Campuses.

- During the SACS visit, some questions/statements were made about QEP as part of P&T. Dean Bristor will attempt to find more information.
- There is some light at the end of the tunnel concerning budget coming from the Governor and the Legislature. The College may not have to give anything back this year.
- Some universities may have the reserve money reinstated.
- However, our million dollars will not come back to the COE, but, rather, to the university. IF we get some of this money back, a nice chunk should be set aside for faculty salaries.
- Faculty Lines and Searches. Terry Rossi will schedule with each Departmental Chair and the Dean, and we will work with the Provost, who has final approval. QEP will now be connected with each new hire. We will be looking at data to see where lines are needed.
- No definite dates have been given for turning in requests for new lines.
- Dean Bristor will meet with Dr. Robeson to see if we can complete new searches.
- Auxiliary Accounts. There are different budget sources. E&G is the fund that is usually affected with budget cuts from the legislature. Other accounts are Grants, Foundation, and Auxiliary.
- The link and handout sent to the College this morning shows how auxiliary accounts may be used (foundation money, for example, must be used for food.) In each department, reception food must come out of foundations.
- Auxiliary accounts used to be called Professional Development funds, but this approach never really took off.

- Departments get 75% (the college gets 25% in order to pay the administrative “tax,” etc.)
- Some departments have gained funds through programs with external sources. This money can go into auxiliary funds. Each department should explore these, and check with Dr. Robeson and the Dean to ensure these fall within guidelines.

Question:

What about the PDT \$300?

Response from Dean Bristol:

This has not been here for years. Travel money is from auxiliary money, and is the same across all departments. We were able to offer \$1,100 this year (for presenting).

Question:

Is there a definition of terms for the handout?

Response from Dean Bristol:

I don't see one here, but will look into that.

- We have been thinking additional sources of support through the research initiatives. Can we, for example, come up with a plan where people can apply for QEP, with graduate students (who have been accepted to present) and the faculty member is the mentor, so offer funding above the \$1,100. This question will be put to the task force.
- The deadline for the research task force is past, but we can still accept members. Please e-mail Terry Rossi to join.
- One priority in Strategic planning is in Marketing and Branding. An invitation for this will be going out, with Sheriann as the point person.
- Summer Pay: we do not know the exact outcome of this as of yet. It appeared a strong possibility that course 1 would be 12.5%, and course 2 a fixed amount. Andrew Robeson is still working on this with a spreadsheet for courses and salaries. At the last collective bargaining meeting, one of the UFF members was very unhappy with this approach, because one college seems to be offering only an adjunct rate for courses. Nothing has been approved yet. The date for new articles to review is still open. We don't know if we will be asked to pull this back. The next meeting is February 26th. Andrew Robeson will continue to analyze and plan as though it is as we said.

Question:

Thank you for the update. One way to do this is that, as your instructional program is cut back, administration can also be cut back. Are we looking into this as a possibility (i.e., anything that is not generating tuition revenue)?

Response from Dean Bristol:

During the severe budget cuts, this was discussed as moving to a nine-month year. This could be examined.

Question:

Including a proportional cut in pay. All people have the same living expenses, so can we spread the pay across all personnel, not just faculty, to absorb this cut?

Response from Dean Bristol:

This discussion can happen.

Question:

The Collective Bargaining Agreement has agreed that the Dean's make the second course payment up to 12.5%. How does this account that this is computing off the base (rank). Can we use a flat rate for everyone?

Response from Dean Bristol:

But it cannot exceed the amount for the first course, and the second course must be a flat rate.

Question:

There are quite a few problems with the collective bargaining agreement. We should not give away our right to bargain. If we are taking a cut, I would rather see that cut as a fixed percentage. Also, every summer, we will have to figure out if we can pay

our mortgages. The Medical School will continue to draw funds, and every summer from this point on we will have to go through this same process.

Response from Dean Bristor:

I understand the concern.

Question:

With conversations outside of the college, they do not see this as an issue, because their base pay is so high. But here in the COE, our base is much lower, making it a big issue.

Response from Dean Bristor:

Absolutely. We are doing our best. Faculty are supposed to know 30 days before the summer, and we are working on this.

Question:

This should not set precedent for recurring summers. Will it?

Response from Dean Bristor:

This is worrisome.

Question:

We all have a say in this. If you look at article 8, we can see how this will affect all of us.

Response from Dean Bristor:

Most articles have been voted on, but not all.

The union put forward some issues such as equity, but I don't believe this has been voted upon.

- Goal 1, C1. This is in the strategic plan. Everything will be look at in May. The year one target is to define peers for merit increases.
- The IEA person took the OSU data for the whole university, and did two comparisons (high research activity comparison group, and southern high research activity comparison group).
- There is more discrepancy in the southern metric for the COE (although not the university as a whole).
- They took the CIP codes, and Diane Alperin will send this to all the Deans.
- Select CIP codes were used, but there may be other codes that could also be used.
- The deadline is in March.

Question:

Previously, the COE modeled the manner in how to distribute this money using CIP codes, a faculty representative, etc. This process seemed to work very well at that time. Who is "at the table" now?

Response from Dean Bristor:

Diane Alperin is the leader. Two faculty members from College of Business – Bill Bosshardt and Julia Higgs, Bill Miller (Dean of University Libraries), Marlene Smith (Dean, College of Nursing).

Question:

How can we help? Previously, we put together a committee, and did it all in a few weeks. If you are being asked to look at data and provide feedback, should we re-form a committee to do this?

Response from Dean Bristor:

That was brought up at the last meeting. In the FA Executive Committee, I recommended keeping this process simple. Faculty list, salaries, CIP codes, that would be simple. But a duplicate of the previous study would be a much more involved process.

Question:

We still have the files from the previous work, so it might save additional work.

Response from Dean Bristor:

If we are just looking at this current year, we really don't need the evaluation data.

Question:

So, would you be supportive of getting that data?

Response from Dean Bristor:

Yes, it would cost \$75, and we could distribute hard copies.

Comment:

This money could come off the auxiliary funds, because it concerns research.

Question:

Once we crunch all these numbers, how serious will they be to address this?

Response from Dean Bristor:

I have heard nothing about this. But it is in the Strategic Plan. All they are saying is that they hope this money will come back, and also discussion about a performance based piece, STEM, etc. from the BOG. But salary would likely have to come from whatever money is restored.

FACULTY SENATE REPORT

Dr. Mena Marinaccio

- For the January 18th meeting, the President and the Provost could not attend, so there is currently nothing new to report at this time.
- One raised concern was micromanagement during the SACS accreditation process.

Faculty Assembly Constitution Amendments

Dr. Susannah Brown, COE FA President

- A. *Section 2 Membership- All full-time members of the higher education faculty of the College who tenure or all members who have tenure earning positions, are voting members including those on leave of absence, sabbatical, or medical leave. (This was brought up for discussion in the November 2, 2012 Faculty Assembly.)*

Discussion

- First issue: the word “including”
- Comment: there were two issues with which we wrestled in previous sessions. We selected “including” this because it does not inflate the quorum necessary for a session. The second issue is that it is difficult to argue that one is involved in a discussion if that individual is not present due to sabbatical, etc. So, these were two reasons that argue for the existing wording.
- The wording on the *web* has been changed, but we cannot locate in any previous FA minutes an approved motion to make such a change.
- Motion: point A, keep the word as “excluding” motioned by Mike Brady. The vote was approved by unanimous vote, with no abstentions.

- B. Section 2 Membership- *Non-tenure earning faculty (e.g., Core Teaching Instructors, instructors and visiting professors) may attend Faculty Assembly and serve on committees but are not voting members.* (This was brought up for discussion in the November 2, 2012 Faculty Assembly.)

Discussion

- This is the college of education FACULTY Assembly, not just tenure earning positions. The COE has many non-tenure earning faculty who are valuable to the College, and so we should represent ALL faculty.
- The FASC asked that more discussion on this issue needs to occur within each department, and then to bring this back to the faculty assembly.
- Inclusiveness is hard with which to disagree. But there are times when the interest of tenure track faculty and non-tenure track faculty do not necessarily align.
- There will be times even when the interests of entire departments will be unaligned. Non-tenure track faculty have a voice, but they are excluded only on voting for tenure earning lines. This is a basic value. We are supposed to be representing all faculty, and we have many more non-tenure faculty positions than in the past.
- The roles of instructors, when it comes to promotion, are shifting. This parallel vote means that we believe in integrity of these positions.
- But there is a difference between promotion and tenure. The contracts and job security of non-tenure earning faculty are based, not on acquiring tenure, but other factors.
- May individuals serving in administrative roles vote, or not? This is another aspect of the discussion.
- If non-tenure earning members cannot vote, should they form their own group, where they can vote?
- Please review the preamble again. It is very open describing the intent of faculty assembly, and should be looked at as a whole, and in light of the changing landscape of the university.
- Faculty assembly has shown what goes on in different departments, and if non-tenure earning faculties would regularly meet, it would be a way to learning this information (across departments).
- In the FASC, some people were uncertain about a number of issues, including the meaning of the word “tenure,” and research had to be done to clear these questions up. So further discussion is needed to help understand these issues.
- Connie Keintz made a motion to table the discussion. Mike Brady seconded. The vote passed unanimously, with no abstentions.

- C. *Section 3 B. Term of Office.* Presently, no terms are set for the Archivist position. Discussion to include: *Archivist shall serve for a one-year term.*

Discussion

- This typo needs to be corrected. The archivist is not listed as a position with a 1-year term.
- This position has traditionally been for one year.
- These issues can be discussed at the next Faculty Assembly meeting.

- D. *Article II: Administration Section 3. Evaluations* *The Assembly shall establish a formal procedure evaluating the performance of the Dean and Associate Deans. This shall be done on an annual basis. The results shall be provided to the Dean and Associate Deans respectively.*

Discussion

- Discussion of this section since the 360 Dean’s evaluation at the university level includes faculty evaluation. With the new evaluations that include opportunity for faculty, we wish to discuss this article, and decide if we plan to go ahead with this or not. The Faculty Assembly did some of this a number of years back, but not lately. The wording is still in the constitution, however.
- This was an online situation, but discussion was postponed for some reason this past year. We previously discussed the possibility of online surveys, etc. for this evaluation.

Question

If we have lost the ability to do online surveys, can we get these back? Should not the university provide the support to do this?

Response

We were asked to apply for a grant to do this.

- This is the time frame, according to the constitution, when we need to discuss how to do this.
- During the year of a 360 evaluation, this evaluation would be redundant, so do we want to do this only on years when no 360 takes place?
- This issue will be discussed on the April 19th meeting. Please take back to Departmental Chairs for discussion.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

- COE FA and University Faculty Senate Elections - Nominations for COE FA Officers (Vice President, Secretary and Archivist) and 2 UFS seats (2 year term) are being currently accepted until February 22nd. Please email Ray Amirault, COE FA Secretary, at amirault@fau.edu
- Welcome to Sheriann Namer, who is the new College of Education's Director of Development and Outreach. Sharon is now finishing up her sixth week. It is her goal to raise money for the COE, and to represent FAU and the COE in the community. If one has potential donors to bring to her, please do so. This will be a team effort.

OPEN DISCUSSION

Online Spots

- Some questions were raised at the University Senate as to whether all SPOTs would be made electronic, and the Senate agreed to refer this to the university assessment committee.
- The University Assessment Committee has been looking into this question for two months, and will be reporting on this soon.
- Dr. Deborah Floyd will be meeting with the committee again to help develop some principles for use in online SPOTs. For example, what data is available on how to increase student participation in assessment? The committee is leaning towards asking a core number of questions, rather than the current 25, if we go fully electronic (colleges could add individual questions). The committee is also looking into incentives, such as prizes, etc, and is looking also into whether grades can be held back until the SPOT is submitted. This is all part of the ongoing discussion.

Mena Marinaccio made a motion to extend the discussion at 12:00pm. Michael Brady seconded the motion. A unanimous vote followed, with no abstentions.

- Online evaluations are often lower than evaluations carried out in face-to-face settings, and the sample can therefore become more biased. So, until the online method is improved, it may not be wise to shift to online mode.

ADJOURNMENT

Susannah Brown adjourned the meeting at 12:03pm.

Submitted by Ray Amirault, COE FA Secretary.