

FAU College of Education Faculty Assembly  
Friday, November 19, 2004  
10:00 – 12:00

**Minutes**

Present: Michele Acker-Hocevar, Gregory Aloia, Eileen Ariza, Ira Bogotch, Michael Brady, Valerie Bristol, Valerie Bryan, Gail Burnaford, Lorraine Cross, Ali Danesh, Carlos Diaz, Deborah Floyd, Julie Lambert, Jodi Leit, Joan Lindgren, Philomena Marinaccio, Paul Peluso, Don Ploger, Barbara Ridener, Dilys Schoorman, Tony Townsend, Michael Whitehurst, Dale Williams

Meeting called to order at 10:10am by Dale Williams.

1. Welcome

The handouts will be referred to throughout the meeting.

The August 19<sup>th</sup> minutes. Moved to approve by Don Ploger and seconded by Paul Paluzo. Minutes approved as written.

September 24<sup>th</sup> minutes. Don Ploger moved to approve as written and seconded by Carlos Diaz. 1 abstention. Minutes approved.

2. Summary of Survey Results

Dale Williams discussed the survey results. A number of comments were made by faculty about communication. All documents, including an updated matrix and literature, will be available on the faculty assembly website to help people stay updated.

The issues outlined as important on the 2<sup>nd</sup> page of the survey and the matrix was a confirmation of the issues we have been addressing. Not much change since items from last year. Salary and equity were priority items. Faculty questions should be sent to Dale and he will seek answers or find the right person to answer them then post them on the website. In some cases, they will be sent to committees for response. Today we will address the Equity in Assignments as well as the Dean's evaluation. Improving academic standards will be discussed at future meetings. There will be a large number of reports today that will deal with these issues. A research committee report and meeting this afternoon that will touch on the sharing of research agendas and research support. Specific items and comments can be viewed for more detail.

While the search process received the most positive feedback, the Chair evaluations received mixed results as did the Dean/Associate Dean evaluations. There was satisfactions with the evaluations but there was confusion in the clarity of the evaluation process.

When it comes to P&T issues, comments were divided by the steering committee as process or procedure. The process comments were forwarded to DDC and the procedure comments were sent to the P&T committee. Lydia Smiley said that many of the comments indicated that some faculty are unaware of how things happen (processes) about various issues

3. Membership

This item came up at last year's retreat, at the steering committee, and in the survey. The question is whether we have disenfranchised some individuals given the current climate.

Questions:

- Should the criteria for membership in FA be altered?

- Should the list of included members to FA be expanded to some non-tenure track positions (student services, instructors, Henderson)
- Can these individuals contribute to the mission of the College?
- Should individuals serving as instructors be required to serve on committees as representatives of faculty?
- Is it morally and/or ethically appropriate that the FA serve as a voice of reason for these non-tenured individuals who have served the COE for extended years, often on one-year appointments?
- Could we identify those who qualify for the bargaining unit who are eligible for membership?
- What is the purpose of FA? Are we trying to let all members of faculty have a common voice?

Carlos Diaz reported on the initial drafting of the language as identifying everyone who had faculty rank as a member. This is not the College of Education assembly, but the Faculty Assembly. Lorraine Cross asked about the purpose and recognized that times and missions change. The Executive committee could put together a paper that looks at the history, the issues, and where we are now, along with recommendations.

Motioned by Tony Townsend and seconded by Michele Acker-Hocevar, moved that the steering committee should develop a discussion paper and proposal to be distributed to all people so they can have a chance to read this before the next meeting.

Discussion: Lydia asked why people on sabbatical lose their vote? Dilys Schoorman said it might be useful to look at the constitutions of other assembly's around the university. Could it have been written from a blueprint that was handed out from the provost's office? Henderson has their own assembly, called Faculty Council. It may be that we have a faculty assembly and a college assembly. That is a discussion for the steering committee. We were one assembly but now we are two. Motion carried.

#### 4. Committee Reports

- a) DDC – Carlos Diaz reported for Pat Maslin-Ostrowski.

Each time the leadership team meets with Dean Aloia, the matrix is brought to the meeting and updated. To assure that academic procedures are followed for grant or cohort programs, waivers should be approved by the graduate program committee prior to the program. There should be a signature page to assure this.

The technology recommendation - The technology issue of spamming should be addressed with Dean Aloia and Jeff Schilit. Technology is doing a piecemeal approach to solving this by going through and putting spam on identified messages. They are looking for a better approach.

- a) Salary Equity – Barbara Ridener

This committee was created last year to develop a process to distribute equity money. This was done from the basis of equity within the university but not from the perspective of market equity which is mandated by the collective bargaining agreement. Another committee was formed with equal departmental representation to address market equity.

- b) Market Equity – Deb Floyd –

Thanks to Val Bristor who served as staff support for the committee. The committee's charge is to implement Article 23.3(b), the market equity piece of the union contract and to deal with the BOT equity money, \$49,524.00. Dean Aloia added \$75,000 to this pool.

Eligible faculty: Permanent bargaining unit faculty with 3 or more years of continuous service and a 3 year average evaluation of satisfactory or higher.

Market equity formula:

- satisfactory annual evaluations – 80% of mean OSU salary survey data;
- Above satisfactory – 100% of mean OSU salary survey data;
- Excellent – 120% of mean OSU salary survey data.

It was decided to take an average of all institutions for the survey.

Key committee decisions – Annual 3 years evaluations and round them to create a multiplier in the contract. (a minimum of one year needed)

1.00 – 1.50	Excellent (1)	1.2 multiplier
1.51 – 2.50	Above Satis (2)	1.0 multiplier
2.51 – 3.50	Satisfactory (3)	.8 multiplier
Above 3.51	Ineligible	

Convert 12 month salaries to 9 month for comparison purposes and compare them by rank and OSU discipline. Combine BOT pool of \$49,524 with COE pool of \$75,000 into one pool and use the negotiated union contract language for distribution. Allocate available Market Equity money proportional to the difference between a faculty member's FAU salary and the evaluation (per contract) adjusted OSU salary. Allocate monies based on a distribution proportional to the salary deficit as measured by the OSU salary study. (see sample distributed and discussed)

A question was asked about how the increment was determined. Don Ploger said the increment was 10.35% of the difference. Dan Morris will send out the formula when he returns. Our plan is to submit the report to the Dean prior to Thanksgiving. Our deadline is November 30, 2004.

Questions:

- Will the base salary be adjusted for people who got promotions? No. The promotion doesn't go into effect until August.
- After allocating \$124, 524, where are we now with equity? COE faculty moved from 75.29% of the OSU comparison salaries to 77.80% (a 2.51% gain). COE needs an additional \$1,077,766.99 to bring faculty up to the OSU market equity comparisons.

It is recommended to the Dean to ensure that all faculty be evaluated by their respective chairs/unit leaders utilizing consistent formats. It will also ensure that all faculty evaluations include an overall evaluation figure (item for FA?). While these equity monies are helpful, our analysis of the data shows that these funds are inadequate to address salary deficits that remain. We recommend that the Dean continue to allocate recurring COE monies to address continuing market inequities and compression inequities within the COE. Mike Whitehurst said the formula used will be sent to the faculty and comments will be forwarded. Carlos Diaz mentioned the issue of consistency in evaluations that came up in the DDC. Depending on the department and the criteria, it may be tougher to get a 1 in one department than in another. The more disparity in departments, the less comparable the multipliers will be. There is one annual evaluation that is done with different interpretations of the criteria.

Michele Acker-Hocevar complimented the committee and although grateful for the additional money, it is still over \$1million away.

Motion:

Whereas...We are grateful to the dean of the COE for allocating \$75,000 to help deal with the salary inequities in the COE.

WHEREAS the work of the Market Equity Committee resulted in a strong case for support that the COE is still over \$1million dollars away from the OSU salary comparisons.  
WHEREAS the total equity monies brought faculty salaries up to 77.80% of the OSU salary comparisons (a 2.5% gain).  
WHEREAS even with the union negotiated monies and the recurring funds from the COE Dean, faculty salaries in the COE are still substantially inadequate compared to the OSU benchmarks.

THEREFORE...Be it resolved, that the COE Faculty Assembly recommends the Dean of the College of Education and the University Administration allocate recurring salary monies to address salary inequities, including compression, for faculty with at least three years of service in the amount of monies that will ensure at least a 5% per year gain using the current OSU salary comparisons, beginning with the 2005-2006 fiscal year.  
Seconded.

Discussion:

- Remind everyone that the OSU data is the average salary and we are in the bottom quartile.
- The 75K is approximately a 1 year assistant professor salary and benefits for 1 year.
- The assembly needs to decide what they will do if the money is not given by the university, what is their position?
- The raise received was from the BOT and not from the state.
- We are 48<sup>th</sup> in the country in higher education support.
- Why is the UFF not mentioned in the motion since they represent faculty at the bargaining table. They should be involved. Any money given out must be approved by the union and can not just be given out.
- Tony mentioned that at a time when the trustees are publicly saying they are going to move forward, we should be careful of using our own money. It is a statement of principle. If we use our dollars, then our bargaining position becomes weaker. If we are using our lines for salary and not for hiring, we won't be given the lines.
- Could we just say that this assembly recognizes compression as an issue?
- Why not say that within 5 years the salaries will be in the top quartile instead of saying 5%, and hold their feet to the fire.

Michele will send a copy of the motion to everyone rather than parse out the words right now. Please send Michele feedback.

Motion withdrawn.

We need to make sure it is known that the average figure from OSU was used and if it is compared to other Research Intensive universities, the figure would go up.  
Suggest compression and market equity are dealt with separately for future actions.

The College of Education Faculty evaluation will have an overall evaluation rating. This is an issue that might be taken into consideration by the chairs (?)

c) Research

Everyone is invited to the meeting at 1pm.

d) Ethics – Dilys Schoorman. Don Ploger, Jennifer Sughrue, and Dilys are participating but looking for others. They have met twice. They are dealing with the committee operating principles, transparency, and open to multiple perspectives.

Questions:

- Do we need a separate code of ethics for the college?
- What is the current code of ethics in existence at the university level?
- Oct/Nov Identify what exists – Dec. Creation of faculty survey – Jan – administer survey
- Conversation with Robin Fiore (Ethics Initiative): Discussion of code vs culture; multiple contexts of ethics; Input from faculty
- Other concerns to Dilys or Jennifer - equity in Assignments - postpone

5. Updates/Announcements

- a) Meeting date - Jan 28<sup>th</sup> 10 am in this room
- b) Promotion & Tenure
- c) Faculty Assembly Web Sites
- d) Dean's Evaluation – Michelle Acker-Hocevar:

On Oct 15<sup>th</sup> we met with the Provost to revisit where we are. The Provost commented that we will pilot the Dean's evaluation instrument in this college and it may be used by the whole university. The model is different in that it includes a 360 degree feedback process. The evaluation is used in conjunction with focus groups and other data gathering by the Provost and then shared with the Dean for what it means for the college. Michele shared the Dean's duties as perspectives of the Provost. The Dean has been asked to share artifacts for consideration. They have working documents and they want to make it valid and reliable based on what the Dean is expected to do. Send questions and comments to Val Bryan, Dale, Dilys, or Michele. The Provost recommended talking to Dale Bussart in Economics who has developed a chair evaluation.

6. Dean's Comments:

- Met with FA this week. We will work to establish FAQ page.
- Compliment the Market Equity committee for their work. We hope to build on it next year.
- Mike Whitehurst has done a great job with the research committee.
- Question about travel policy. Should be circulated to chairs to make sure it is consistent. You get \$750 to travel and \$1000 if you present. You can spend the money on more than 1 conference. It does not prevent your chair from using other accounts to supplement travel money. Everyone going to Barcelona should submit to Lemansky's office.

7. Open Forum:

Ira requested permission to send an email to the faculty to lay out the history of the Equity in Assignments committee and an invitation for each department to be represented. We operated last year with only 4 departments to be represented.

8. Adjourn:

Meeting adjourned at 12:07 pm.