

DRAFT 2/7/05

**Faculty Policy Council Minutes
February 7, 2005
Room 158, Norman Hall**

Members Present: Ellen Amatea, Dale Campbell, Maureen Conroy, Hazel Jones, Ester deJong, Mirka Koro-Ljungberg, Linda Lamme, Tracy Linderholm, Terry Scott, Larry Tyree

Members Absent: None

Others Present: Dean Catherine Emihovich, SAGE representative Karen Kuhel

Conroy called the meeting to order at 2:09 p.m.

Agenda and Minutes

1. Approval of the agenda for February 7, 2005

Scott motioned to approve the agenda. Jones seconded the motion. The FPC unanimously approved the agenda.

2. Approval of the minutes of the January 10, 2005 meeting

Campbell motioned to approve the January 10, 2004 minutes as submitted. Tyree seconded the motion. The FPC unanimously approved the minutes. (Later on in the meeting, the agenda was amended so that the Dean's Report came before committee reports.)

Announcements

1. FPC Agenda Committee Meeting – February 14, 2005

Conroy reminded those present that the next agenda committee meeting will be on February 14. Members can send agenda suggestions to her, Tyree, or Jones.

2. Open Forum – Tenure Probationary Period – February 14, 2005

The Faculty and Budgetary Affairs Committee is hosting a forum from 2-3 pm to get faculty feedback on whether faculty will go up for promotion in either their 6th or 7th year.

Koro-Ljungberg expressed concern about the short notice about this forum. She would like to attend, but is unable due to another commitment out of town. Conroy,

Jones, and Dean Emihovich stated that they were given a very short timetable from the University for getting this feedback, and that suggestions could also be communicated by email or proxy.

3. University Committee Nominations 2005-2006

Conroy noted a concern that no College of Education faculty are on University-wide senate committees.

Dean Emihovich sent an email calling for nominations for the Scholarship of Engagement Award. The banquet will be held in the Touchdown Terrace instead of Emerson Hall.

Tyree questioned whether the Dean should stay at the meeting beyond her report. Conroy stated that she did not get a clear sense from the last meeting that there would be a change. Jones read the applicable portion of the minutes.

Tyree moved that the Dean make her report at the beginning of the meeting and then be given the opportunity to exit, starting right away. This was seen as an agenda amendment. Scott seconded the motion. The FPC unanimously approved the motion. The February 7, 2005 agenda was amended to make the Dean's Report the next agenda item.

Report from the Dean

1. COE Strategic Planning Update

Dean Emihovich invited faculty to come to the department chairs meeting tomorrow morning at 10AM to join a committee working on the Faculty Research Symposium discussed for March 11. There is a question as to whether this event is coming up too soon. There are also strategic planning discussions taking place and there have been four recent events focused on the strategic plan. There seems to be enough information gathered on the strategic plan to start discussing next steps. It is clear that the college plans to increase masters and doctoral enrollments considerably. There is also a consensus on building a research community. Now how do we accomplish the goals we have set for ourselves?

Dean Emihovich questioned some comments that she received from the Dean's Advisory Committee regarding the Research Symposium. She envisioned an event that would bring faculty together with students to get ideas on how to create a research culture. Based on Advisory Council feedback, she suggested it may be premature to have a symposium in March and that the event might be better for the fall when new faculty arrive.

Dean Emihovich also expressed concern that faculty still seem to think that she is dictating to them from on high. She feels as though everything is up for discussion. For example, she suggested themes, or strands, for the symposium

and some faculty interpreted this as a mandate. She did not intend it that way. She emphasized that communication and collaboration are essential to building a strong research-based culture in the college. She also emphasized the importance of mentoring doctoral students so that they leave with strong vitas. She did not understand why students would not be involved in the planning process for the symposium. Conroy explained that the committee chose not to involve students in the early stages so faculty could decide on the strengths to emphasize. Students would be involved later. Different people may have interpreted this differently. The Advisory Committee did question whether the event was coming too early and whether six hours was too long. Dean Emihovich clarified that the event doesn't have to be six hours, only that this was the block of time reserved at the hotel.

Conroy asked about how the College gets from talking about a strategic plan to working on goals. Dean Emihovich responded that the College has really already created a strategic plan, which has been developing over time with faculty input. The program review that was turned into the provost has all our strategic plan ideas in it. Now the real need is to develop the ideas on how to get there. How are we going to work together? For example, she suggested that a starting point would be learning what other faculty in the college are doing.

Dean Emihovich suggested that the March 11 date be changed and that something be done in September instead. It could be called "The Changing Landscape of Educational Research" and have a panel to discuss different examples of how people are conducting research and adapting to changes in the political environment and funding. Then there could be roundtables for faculty and students to discuss their work. The idea is that faculty members would explain what they are doing, with the goal of increasing interest and attracting people to collaborate with each other. She believes the College can build a research culture by including students and engaging people in ideas. The event could be considered a mini-conference or an opening fall convocation.

Tyree suggested that it be moved to October instead of early in the fall so new faculty have a chance to prepare and present as well. Dean Emihovich added that new faculty would also benefit from the event. They are interested in who their colleagues will be, and she wants them to see a vibrant, rich culture of possibilities.

Campbell suggested an interim step to accomplish this term to determine what changes need to be made to become a top five institution. It is still not clear what this means. What do we need to offer that others do not?

Dean Emihovich stated that the goals are clear, and the way to get there is to get people excited about working on them. There is a research office opening, endowed professorships coming up, a new gift coming up that will create an

endowed research fund (focused on slow learners)... Donors are excited to give when they know they are giving to a college that's doing cutting edge research.

Linderholm noted that an open forum would give students a chance to get involved and help them become involved in a culture of research. She described a first year research project requirement at the University of Minnesota that gives students an opportunity to get involved in research right away. She also noted the need for information on all the projects to be available on the Web. Dean Emihovich stated that the research office can help compile the inventory to put on the Web and concurred that a student's first piece of research should not be their dissertation.

Dean Emihovich restated her invitation for FPC members to attend tomorrow's department chairs meeting.

Dejong asked Dean Emihovich if she had anything to add about the tenure probationary period. She responded that the general standard in education is 6 years. She believes the idea of 7 years was put forth to accommodate social science faculty who are expected to publish books instead of articles in referred journals. Amatea asked what competing institutions use and Dean Emihovich answered that typically they use six years.

Dean Emihovich also commented on voting rights for non-tenure accruing faculty, noting that there are people in these roles who have been with the College for a long time and play an important role. She finds it hard to see why there would be a group that makes decisions regarding them if they have no voice.

Jones mentioned that she would like to see clearly articulated steps and activities that will move us toward our strategic goals. Dean Emihovich explained that those steps would come from the work of the strategic planning committee. Conroy stated that the college may need to make some hard choices to avoid being schizophrenic and doing anything and everything. Dean Emihovich responded that she doesn't want the Dean's office to make all those decisions. She wants to do that together with faculty.

Tyree asked whether there are efforts underway to increase the resources for attracting more graduate students? Dean Emihovich responded that the biggest source is when faculty write graduate students into grant proposals. The Lastinger Center has money for students. PK Yonge has money for students. This information needs to be available on the website. A big piece of the Graduate Advisor's role will be to make information available. The College has a lot more resources than most people are aware of. Lamme asked about strategies for recruiting graduate students since it seems to be hard to recruit people. Dean Emihovich responded that the strategies need to come from individual departments. Faculty should come to administration with ideas, and administration then needs to find ways to fund those ideas. One of the things

administration started was career night. That arose from a desire to recruit potential graduate students from outside the College of Education. When people think of this College they think teaching. We need to change that perception. If we want to increase the number of math and science people in education we have to think creatively.

Koro-Ljungberg commented on the diversity of ideas regarding the strategic plan that came from the last faculty meeting. We are really still looking for our direction. Others agreed.

Emihovich concluded her remarks and left at 3:10

Committee Reports

1. College Curriculum Committee: Jones reported that the committee met to discuss new courses and course numbers. There were no policy discussions
2. Faculty and Budgetary Affairs Committee: deJong reported that the committee is continuing its work on the criteria for promotion and merit pay. It is developing a promotion guide for lecturers.
3. Lectures, Seminars, & Awards Committee: Amatea reported that the committee has been asked to take responsibility for developing a year-long speaker series, as well as possibly bringing in a national speaker for the centennial in 05/06.
4. Long Range Planning Committee: Lamme reported that the group has not met because there is nothing clear to do. Amatea asked if strategic planning fell under this committee's charge. Conroy responded that the strategic planning committee should be composed of people who volunteer for the task and can continue in the role beyond this year. The LRP committee has been charged with developing policy regarding space. There has been discussion about whether we need a LRP committee since strategic planning is organized through the Dean's Office. Faculty have input, but they aren't directing it. Campbell stated that faculty need to drive some of the strategic planning process if they are to have maximum leverage. Lamme responded that she does not feel free to take on a new strategic planning charge because the committee has only been asked to develop policies on space.
5. Research Advisory Committee: Koro-Ljungberg reported that the committee has exchanged emails but has not made much progress since the last FPC meeting.
6. Student Recruitment, Admissions, & Petitions Committee: Linderholm reported that the committee plans to meet to work on fellowship applications once they all come in.

7. Technology Committee: Scott reported that the committee is still trying to schedule a meeting with Kathy Bergsma.

Report from the Faculty Senate

Discussion Items

1. FPC Representation & Committee Structure

Conroy passed out a Jan 11 proposal that named the four committees that would remain if committees were streamlined. Conroy explained that the idea is to make faculty's time better spent. She also passed out comments gathered from faculty regarding the changes. Some faculty have mentioned to Conroy that research, seminars and awards might be too much for one committee. Overall there weren't many comments. The chairs didn't see the committees as a huge concern.

Amatea recommended that FPC participation be streamlined into a monthly meeting. She indicated that more people could make a commitment to it if the quantity of work was not as voluminous. She also addressed meaningfulness, noting that the faculty needs to see how the FPC is addressing issues that are important to them. Faculty also need to know that if they do make recommendations that these will be honored by the dean recounting the history of faculty in the College being in token positions. Some worry that the FPC might be more of the same and that their commitment was hindered by these concerns. As far as restructuring committees, Amatea reported that faculty in her department agreed that the existing committees need to have work.

Jones stated that having the FPC structure in place has been helpful for faculty. She believes the College is in a new time, one in which faculty really do have input. She provided an example of how the FPC currently provides a way for faculty to provide input on the 6 vs 7 year tenure cycle which would have been impossible in the past on such a short timetable. Amatea responded that there needs to be more public information about the successes to counter people's perception that the FPC is a pro-forma group.

Conroy provided another example of FPC effectiveness: Recently administrators created a policy on the three year review that conflicted with the policy developed and voted on by faculty. The faculty's policy is the one that will be followed. She tried to highlight the things that the FPC has done at the faculty meeting.

Lamme mentioned that it is difficult to find the FPC web page from the College of Education homepage. Members seemed to agree that it would be better to make it more prominent on the page.

deJong stated that decision-making has always been department-based and that moving to the college-level decision-making is a huge shift. Lamme commented that the universities that are really faculty-run are very different from ours. She asked if we want to remain an administrative-led faculty policy council.

Conroy brought the discussion back to the issue of changing the committee structure, which requires a constitutional change. She asked for more comments.

Tyree responded that he would like to streamline the committees to provide greater potential for more involvement. Campbell suggested the LRP committee fold into another committee. Conroy added that she believes FPC shouldn't develop a space policy because FPC members don't know all the issues. So far it has been a struggle between getting input and developing a policy. Lamme stated that when someone else is going to make the decision anyway it is very hard to get faculty to participate.

Campbell moved that the committees be restructured as in the handout. Tyree seconded.

Kuhel noted that the change would eliminate a graduate student representative because graduate students don't have a seat on the faculty and budgetary affairs committee. Jones questioned whether that was an oversight or something in the constitution.

Linderholm stated that her department doesn't want the research and advisory committee combined because it is too important. She also stated that there should also be a standing committee for technology. She and Koro-Ljungberg don't support the committee changes.

Scott stated that there is no problem in having a committee that does not meet. It might make sense to keep the committees. He doesn't feel like they should be meeting or trying to meet if there is nothing to do. Tyree stated that if there is a need for a technology committee it could also be adhoc. Koro-Ljungberg responded that if participation in technology decisions is important to us, we should have a committee that indicates our interest.

deJong added that the issue is not the number of committees, but the nature of FPC work. Jones suggested that faculty who are sitting on committees doing important work need to tell people about it. Tyree stated that if the chairs know they don't have to meet when there is nothing to meet about that is helpful.

Based on the need for further discussion, Campbell withdrew his motion and Tyree withdrew his second. There will be no changes at this time.

Action Items

1. FPC Representation & Committee Structure

Conroy stated that the Faculty and Budgetary Affairs Committee brought a proposal to the FPC with recommendations on non-tenure accruing faculty and their role in governance. deJong summarized the proposal. The idea is to give faculty voting rights if they are full-time appointments during the academic year and have a role in the departments. Voting faculty would be those who know what's going on in the departments. It really only effects 16 people right now. If they are doing everything that tenure accruing faculty are doing then they have a right to participate. Campbell recommended that the proposal be sent out for faculty comment and it should be on the FPC agenda to discuss next time.

Lamme commented on the Senate voting structure of the FPC and how the department of Teaching and Learning is only represented by two people on the FPC. If non-tenured people were voting members, conceivably there could be only one tenured person represented all the tenured faculty in the department. deJong asked if there should be slots for both tenure and non-tenure accruing faculty. Koro-Ljungberg also mentioned that there are more adjuncts in certain departments so the representation of non-tenure accruing faculty may change the balance of a faculty-wide vote. This issue will be discussed further at the next FPC meeting.

Conroy asked for a motion to adjourn. Amatea motioned to adjourn. Jones seconded the motion. The FPC unanimously approved the motion to adjourn at 4:03 pm.