

COE Faculty Assembly Meeting Minutes
Friday, September 24, 2004
COE Room 313, 10:00 – 12:00

Present: Michele Acker-Hocevar, Gregory Aloia, Eileen Ariza, Michael Brady,

committee. Dan Morris recommended the committee solicit opinions from faculty about whether or not we need a policy.

COE Goals

Tony Townsend reported. We are getting close to something that started at faculty retreat. Tony reported that the process followed was that the Chairs met over the summer and looked at what could be done straight away, in the next semester, and for coming year. Tony also reported that the Board of Governors have a series of goals and the Board of Trustees have a series of goals and ours should reflect the things being asked. Tony drafted the goals, then the draft went to the chairs. Faculty were asked for feedback and chairs were asked to discuss the draft at their department meetings. An effort was made to identify performance indicators if the goals were to be met. Questions and comments were solicited. These are a series of goals that are acceptable to the Executive Committee and if FA can endorse they can be taken to

(I'm) not in favor of world class and there is nothing international here. Why not a goal that revolves around international work? -may be not explicit but within goal 11. -arguing for a goal on its own. It would fit into BOT goal 4. (Jim McLaughlin)

Tony doesn't have a problem with developing a statement around this. If you really want to look at an international goal then we have to commit ourselves to look both ways. If we just insert the word international into the goal so it is explicit. If we insert international into goal 11 and then write a specific performance indicator that specifically addresses this. Also, under curriculum adding the idea that we will have a more international perspective...more diverse perspectives.

Where would other issues of equity that we discussed last year go? Salary equity is taken care of. The policy on assignment and tenure, assignment equity will be there. (Should we) Add ...develop an equitable policy.

Tony restated changes he heard to clarify.

Tony asked for a motion to accept the goals with the changes that were read. Tony can send something around later this afternoon and send major objections to your chair. Vote...Jennifer Sughrue made a motion that we accept the goals as amended. 2nded by Cynthia Wilson. The motion was approved.

Committee Reports

DDC – committee purpose and possible agenda items were discussed by Pat Maslin-Ostrowski. We could address curriculum issues such as course approval process, investigate existing courses that have circumvented this process. If we looked at P&T we would look at process and procedures and not at criteria. They could also address anything new that might come from survey. Emphasize that all processes and procedures are transparent to all. They meet on 2nd Friday of each month in the Melby center. Open to all. Next meeting Oct 12th 10 – 12. Waiting to hear from FA on the direction desired.

Salary Equity – The equity determination is due to the provost by Nov 30th. The charge is to take the pool of money from the university, approximately 49K...The dean also found an additional 75K to put with this. We hope to have a 3 year cycle to address equity. Committee will meet soon.

Assignment Equity committee – not yet convened

Promotion and Tenure

There was a discussion of how to include faculty assembly input? Concerns were raised to the steering committee about the process and about criteria last spring. The issue was delegated to DDC to address this fall. At the faculty retreat similar concerns were raised and a COE task force was discussed being created. The charge of the task force is to address the concerns of process and criteria to determine what, if anything needs to be done at this point. Currently, we have 2 committees that have the same charge. Feedback about how FA should be involved.

Lydia Smiley wanted to know what issues were raised.

Faculty retreat document lists several concerns.

The DDC has people who volunteered, but not representation for each department; a college committee would have ties to each department.

P&T committee has 2 charges (from the university constitution): 1 is a closed evaluation and the other is the open part. A lot of time was spent on policy 3-4 years ago and the committee is planning to spend time this year. If you are forming another committee the P&T committee needs to be aware of this. The question was raised if faculty was happy with that and is there a mechanism through which one can discuss?

Lydia makes a point that the 2nd charge of the P&T committee is to review policy.

Faculty said they were under the assumption that the committee just implemented policy. Do we want to add to that committee? Do we want to move forward with having an additional committee? We need to operate under the umbrella of the university constitution, or decide that we do not want to.

Should FA propose a process for P&T similar to what was just done with the goals. It is possible that if there are concerns that individual faculty have with P&T, they won't voice it to the committee who votes on it.

The committee does not change policy without bringing it to the FA.

Recommend that the 14 concerns be given to the P&T committee for them to look into and brought back to FA. Suggest that everyone read the 4 documents that we are supposed to be familiar with. College of Ed criteria that falls under P&T guidelines, Guidelines for establishing criteria, a lot of questions are in new faculty handbook. Procedures are in the guidelines document.

We need to have a programmatic review of the P&T process. What is the mechanism we use for this?

Motion by Lucy Guglielmino that FA devise and implement a survey to put together a comprehensive list of issues on P&T policies and procedures and these are presented to the P&T committee for response and then present back to FA