

Minutes
College of Education Faculty Council Meeting
January 28, 2015
9:30 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.
COED 259

Members Attending: Lyndon Abrams, Cindy Baughan, Bettie Ray Butler, Lindsay Flynn, Susan Harden, Jennifer Hathaway, Do-Hong Kim, Drew Polly, Rebecca Shore

Guests: Bob Rickelman, Diane Browder

1. Call to Order

- a. Approval of November 19, 2014 Minutes
Drew Polly made the motion to approve the minutes. Lindsey Flynn seconded the motion. Minutes were approved unanimously.

2. Review of the Workload Policy

Lyndon explained that our role as Faculty Council is not to make a final decision on the policy or vote regarding our approval or disapproval, but to decide whether to receive it from the committee and forward it to the faculty. There is discussion of whether or not there is an implied approval of the policy by moving it forward or an implied disapproval if Faculty Council chooses not to move it forward. There is also discussion about the possibility of including an amendment to the motion as the Faculty Council considers making a motion to move this forward to the College Faculty.

The co-chairs of the Taskforce explained that the document reflects a compromise between the faculty and the Dean. The numbers within the policy are benchmarks and the policy provides faculty members and Department Chairs with flexibility.

While some faculty council members reported that their departments are comfortable with the final iteration of the workload policy, others shared concerns raised within their departments. When possible the co-chairs of the faculty workload policy provided relevant information (this is italicized and listed beneath each bullet). These concerns included:

- the lack of recognition of doctoral committee work within the policy
This type of work was clearly identified as being outside of the scope of what the workload policy taskforce was charged with doing. However, there are still other ways to justify a reduction in course load beyond research.
- the possibility that the 3:2 category will become the defacto tenure standard for new faculty members
When gathering feedback on earlier versions of the policy, concerns were raised from Assistant Professors that the standard for a 3/2 was not consistent with what was required for tenure and promotion.
- tenured faculty with a 3:2 load are being asked to produce the same amount of research (and with increased quality) previously expected with a 2:2 load even though their teaching load is being increased
The high-quality language and characterization in the rubric was included to address concerns about predatory journals and vanity press issues.

- there is still confusion about who we are as a College and University and whether or not this workload policy clearly reflects our identity
As included in the workload policy, we are a doctoral granting institution and therefore should have a teaching load of 5. The College will not be going backwards and there is an intent to continue moving forward. However, even at the next level of research productivity (high research activity) the teaching load is still 5.
- there is concern about how the workload policy impacts the valuing of service work
The workload policy provides clear guidance regarding how one's research might impact teaching load. However, there are other ways to justify a reduction in teaching load.
 - There needs to be equity in how these other situations are considered. Some of these guidelines already exist, but there is a need for clarity and possibly additional policies addressing how service work or other teaching responsibilities (e.g., mentoring graduate students) might impact a faculty member's workload.
- within the policy, it is unclear how books and their quality are considered (Is 1 book equal to 1 journal article? How can one discuss quality of a book as a publication since high quality is only defined within the policy in terms of journals?)
The workload policy committee felt there was enough flexibility within the document to allow a faculty member to make an argument for how a book is a high-quality publication and might serve as evidence for a reassignment to a 2:2 load. However, there is a requirement within the policy that faculty members working at a 3:2 load publish at least 1 article in a high quality peer reviewed journal, so books alone will not be sufficient.

Lindsay Flynn motioned that the title of the policy be changed to “Faculty Research Workload Policy.” Drew Polly seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Lindsay Flynn made a motion that the following change (in red) be made in the introduction to the workload policy: “This **Research** workload Policy provides the process and criteria to follow when a change is to be made in the number of courses a faculty member will be assigned **based on research productivity**.” Drew Polly seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Lindsay Flynn motioned that the Faculty Workload Policy including the friendly amendments above be sent forward to be voted on by the College Faculty. Drew Polly seconded the motion. During the discussion, Susan Harden noted her concern about whether or not the policy will be applied fairly and the equitable impact of implementation. Several other Faculty Council members echoed this concern, yet felt that it was important for all faculty members to be able to vote on the policy. The motion was put to a vote. 8 council members voted in favor of the motion while 1 was opposed.

The Faculty Council believes it will be important that moving forward a Teaching Workload Policy and Service Workload policy be established so that they can be used in conjunction with the Research Workload Policy to guide workload decisions for faculty members.

3. Faculty Mentoring

While the bulk of this discussion was tabled until the next meeting, Lyndon reported that after discussing the Faculty Council's previous suggestions regarding faculty mentoring with Dawson Hancock, he learned that Dawson was working on similar ideas. The Faculty Council requested that Dawson be invited to the February meeting to discuss this topic further.

4. Revising the RPT Document

Susan Harden shared changes in the University's RPT document (along with CLAS's RPT document) addressing specific definitions of *Engaged Scholarship*. The President's office is in the process of approving changes to the RPT document for the University. This will ultimately mean a revision to the College's RPT document to ensure that it aligns with the University policy. We would want to make sure that our College document reflects the notion of "engaged scholarship" through defining it and modifying language throughout. CLAS currently defines this similarly to how it is defined from University Faculty Council.

We need to gather additional information regarding the process for making changes to the College's RPT. Specifically, would it be possible to make alignment changes (e.g., changes in language for engaged scholarship) to the College's RPT document before actually revisiting the entire document in light of changes in the workload policy and suggestions for developing similar guidelines for teaching and service? This topic will be revisited in a future meeting.

The other agenda items were tabled until the next meeting.

5. Adjournment

The other agenda items were tabled until the next meeting. Meeting adjourned 11:19 a.m.

Next Faculty Council Meeting:
Wednesday, February 25, 2015
9:30 am – 11:00 am
COED 205