

Minutes
College of Education Faculty Council Meeting
November 19, 2014
9:30 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.
COED 205

Members Attending: Lyndon Abrams, Cindy Baughan, Lindsay Flynn, Susan Harden, Jennifer Hathaway, Do-Hong Kim, Pam Lassiter, Drew Polly

1. Call to Order

- a. Approval of October 28, 2014 Minutes
Susan Harden made the motion to approve the minutes. Drew Polly seconded the motion. Minutes were unanimously approved.

2. Update on Workload Policy Revision

During the College meeting, the Dean shared that the default teaching load is 3:2. The Dean sets the workload policy, but is interested in providing a pathway for a 2:2 load. The Workload Policy Taskforce shared an early draft of the rubric with the Dean and incorporated her ideas. These included identifying high-quality work and the number of publications expected. This was presented to departments for feedback. The Taskforce is striving to balance the charge to the College and the needs of faculty. The rubric needs to be rigorous, yet attainable.

Sticking points in discussion at the department level include:

- The terms high-quality vs. top-tier. While a case can be made for high-quality, top-tier is limiting.
- There is a concern that these descriptors may lead to inauthentic efforts by faculty to match what is required by the rubric rather than matching what is best for their work. There is also a concern about the role books play in the rubric. The Taskforce recognizes that even those faculty members publishing books need to be engaged in disseminating research through journal publications.

The impact of the work load policy on the RPT document was discussed, as were ways the RPT document might interfere with the charge from the General Administration.

- The question was raised whether there is a case for the Faculty Council to vote to revisit the RPT document. There are changes in the University level procedures that haven't been incorporated into the College's RPT document. The suggestion is that the Faculty Council representatives gather information regarding changes at the University level and also consider the language within the proposed workload rubric in light of the RPT document. This will help support any argument for moving forward with a call for a revision of the RPT document. We will revisit this in January's meeting.
- The question was raised as to whether it would be possible to hold off on making decisions about the workload policy until the RPT has been revisited. This isn't feasible because of the concern that there are some faculty members who are producing the quality of work that would support a 2:2 assignment and the Dean

would like to provide a way for those faculty to continue without interruption in their work.

- There is some concern that there is a form of “classism” privileging people whose work is “quality.” That term is subjective. It is difficult to suggest that faculty members who are working equally hard don’t deserve the same recognition.

3. Continuing the faculty mentoring discussion

In the past, there was a panel held for associate professors in which full professors within the College shared their experiences and paths to full. This type of panel could be helpful for faculty at each level seeking promotion. Drew Polly made a motion that the Faculty Council sponsor panel discussions with faculty who have successfully been promoted under the current RPT document. Susan Harden seconded the motion which was unanimously approved. Each representative will seek out people recently promoted under the new RPT document (or who served on CRC recently) to serve on those panels and bring possible names to the meeting in January. Other logistics will also be determined at this meeting.

There was discussion about ways to make the mentoring relationship mutually beneficial. For example, there might be a way to think about a process like the peer observation for teaching that could be used for research mentoring. However, that’s still different than an individual mentoring relationship. There seems to be a need for a more formalized structure. Even simply an awareness of the work others are doing could help as faculty members are looking for people to support their own work. This might be an area that Dawson could support in his role as Associate Dean. There could also be a need for this structure for mentorship in service.

The suggestion was made that we begin a database of people interested in collaborating with or mentoring other faculty in the College. This can include faculty members’ research interests and methodologies. Drew will generate a template and distribute to the Council members for consideration.

Pam Lassiter motioned that the Faculty Council support regularly scheduled college-wide brown bag lunches (perhaps once a semester) that will support research work within the college and create opportunities for mentoring relationships. Drew Polly seconded the motion. It was unanimously approved. The Chair will take this idea to the Dean and Associate Deans for consultation.

4. Faculty credit for dissertations

A concern from a faculty member was shared with the committee regarding the credit faculty members receive for dissertation work. This member described a system from another institution in which chairing three completed dissertations allowed for one course release. This type of system recognizes the importance of this type of work, even if recognition isn’t given until the work is completed.

There was also discussion that other members of dissertation committees (such as the methodologists) are not receiving any credit for that work. This is a topic the Faculty

Council would like to explore more. There is interest in whether there is a way of accounting for these and whether this issues could be addressed during an RPT revision.

5. Other Business

A faculty concern was shared that in the past student workers were assigned to individual faculty members for 5 hours per week. However, that is no longer available. The council discussed ways this worked in the past for undergraduate student workers and graduate students. The council member will return to the faculty member for clarification.

6. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned 11:05 a.m.

Next Faculty Council Meeting:

Wednesday, January 28, 2015

9:30 am – 11:00 am

COED 205