**Report To**:  College of Education Leadership Council
**From**:  Rebecca Shore, Faculty Council Chair
**Subject**: 2015-2016 COE Faculty Council Goals

1. The Faculty Council (Council) has requested a report from the Dean's office regarding the Workload Reduction in Teaching for Research Guidelines.  The specific request to the Dean was as follows: Members of the Council have been made aware of informal conversations among college faculty members regarding the perceived fairness and fidelity of the recent implementation of the Workload Reduction for Research Guidelines. The Council members feel that transparency is important to ensure understanding, engender trust, and move forward with our shared goals and mission. Thus, we request that Dean McIntyre provide a report with specific numerical and contextual information on the process and outcomes of the implementation to the faculty of the College of Education at the January 15, 2016 COE meeting. (This request was originally made for the November COE meeting and has been revised since that request was not met in November.)

    1. Numerical data related to process and outcomes of Workload Reduction for Research Guidelines:
        1. Number of faculty members that applied for a reduced teaching load in April 2015
        2. Number of faculty members that were granted a reduced teaching load in the May 2015 decision process by the Dean and Department Chairs
        3. Number of additional faculty members that were granted a reduced teaching load as a result of request for reconsideration to Dean or Department Chair between May-September 2015 after the initial Annual Review letters were distributed by the Dept. Chairs
        4. Number of additional faculty members that were granted a reduced teaching load during the official appeals process (appeal submitted for consideration by CRC) in December 2015/January 2016
        5. Number of faculty members moving from a 2-2 (de facto) to a 3-2 (de jure) teaching load in August 2016
        6. Projected numbers of faculty on less-than 2-2, 2-2, 3-2, and  greater-than 3-2 teaching loads as of Fall 2016 (not counting new hires in process)

       2. Process/contextual information related to process & outcomes:
          1. Regarding the absence of lists of high quality journals from departments, how were journals classified as high quality or not high quality?
          2. In addition to the criteria to be met by individuals on the teaching workload reduction application, were there any other goals at the College or department levels (not indicated on the policy document) that were considered at any point in the decision-making process (e.g., a maximum % or # of faculty on 2-2 load for the 2016-2017 year)?

**2.** Explore the allocation of doctoral committee participation and advising toward teaching load.

**3.** Investigate reviewing and revising College of Education RPT guidelines for alignment with University RPT guidelines.

       1. Identify the role of the council in this process and whether there is a precedent at the University level for how this should be addressed.
       2. Concerns have been raised regarding the term "Engaged Scholarship" that is included in the University guidelines but not defined in the College guidelines.
       3. There are additional concerns related to alignment for moving to full professor.

**4.** Seek clarification and transparency on the decision process for Merit Pay. (This goal was met in the November COE meeting.)

**5.** Explore workload guidelines related to a reduction in teaching for community service and engagement.  (This will not be taken up this year.)

**6.** Explore EdTPA Timeline.

       1. Concerns have been raised regarding updates from the two-year pilot period.
       2. Questions have been raised about the role of faculty in the inclusion of EdTPA in coursework as curriculum falls within the faculty domain, and EdTPA is causing significant changes in course curricula and previously approved course outlines. (This item was addressed at the October COE meeting & FC meeting. The EdTPA meeting on November 17, 2015 included a discussion of the continuation of EdTPA.
       3. A vote was taken supporting the continuation of EdTPA (see minutes).

**7.** Explore mentorship of new faculty and faculty new to the College.

          1. Discussions have been raised about the intensive structure to mentor in teaching, but there is no similar structure to mentor in other areas such as research. Should more structured approaches to mentoring in other areas be developed for new faculty?

**<u>Summary</u>**

**Faculty Council Goals Met: 4, 5, 6**

**Faculty Council Goals Ongoing:  1, 2, 3, 7**