Minutes
College of Education Faculty Council Meeting
Wednesday- February 22, 2012
9:30 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.
Dean’s Conference Room
COED 205

Members Attending: Mary Lynne Calhoun, Ya-yu Lo, Lisa Merriweather, Drew Polly, Peggy Ceballos, Lan Kolano, Laura Veach, Heather Coffey, Paola Pilonieta
Guests: Jeanneine Jones, Bruce Taylor

1. Call to Order - Dr. Veach
   a. Approval of January 18, 2012 Minutes – Dr. Ceballos made the motion to approve the minutes. Dr. Lo seconded the motion. Minutes were approved by common consent.

2. Action item: Proposed COED Faculty Council By-Law change
   Laura presented the new proposed language for the by-laws: The Dean and the College Representative to the University Faculty Executive Committee shall be ex-officio non-voting members of the Faculty Council. Drew Polly made the motion to approve and Lan Kolano seconded the motion. There will be a first reading at the college faculty meeting on Friday, February 24th and a vote in March will take place. Also at the March meeting we will take nominations for the college’s representative for the Faculty Executive Committee.

3. Review of changes in proposed RPT revision as a result of recent discussions
   The Dean stated that at this Friday’s college meeting, a new draft of the revised RPT document will be presented to faculty and the main changes will be reviewed. The document will be posted on Moodle for discussion and then a vote in March. Some of the big changes that were discussed are:
   - The use of NCATE language for distinction in teaching when going for Full Professor. This replaces state of the art language.
   - Material referencing how to put the dossier together/electronic submission process will be separated from the material referencing governance issues. This material will not be a part of the governance policy document.
   - Language around directing student scholarship and student advising will be changed to reflect the diverse departmental cultures, needs and roles occupied by faculty. For example, faculty whose classes involve the development of electronic evidences will be able to list this as a form of directing student scholarship.
   - In addition to the broad standards that apply to all clinical faculty seeking promotion, individual clinical faculty will be evaluated against expectations consistent with their individual job descriptions.
   - Standards for supervision of students will also be placed in the broad standards for teaching for tenure-track and clinical faculty.
   - The composition of the review committees, both DRC and CRC, will be expanded to include clinical faculty when a clinical faculty member is being reviewed. It will be an elected representative from the clinical rank.
Clinical reviews will take place in the spring. These will stay in the college and not go forward to Academic Affairs as the tenure-track reviews do. Bruce added that some other minor changes to the draft document were made such as a chart was inserted of courses taught, some of the due dates were changed to give external reviewers more time, a date added of Aug. 15 when the candidate gets with his chair to review and candidate supervision was added to the vita template under teaching to be used when it applies.

4. Departmental feedback to proposed RPT revision
Council members discussed feedback from their departments on the revised document. Some of the items discussed were a clearer direction on responsibilities by listing requirements at the beginning of each section, the standards and distinction in one area, the use of service reviewers from inside or outside of the college, what does external review consist of for associate professors seeking promotion based on distinction in teaching, how would recruitment for tenure track positions be affected with having more clinical positions, and can clinical faculty jump to a higher level of promotion to which Bruce responded no and that there can only be one review for each contract period. Bruce and Jeanneine stated that they will come to your department by invitation only to further discuss any of the issues that faculty may have after the draft document is posted. It was highlighted that faculty as a whole were not against a promotion pathway for clinical faculty but some were concerned about equity issues around clinical titles. For example the equity of an assistant clinical faculty being promoted with fewer publications than a tenure-track assistant professor was questioned. Mary Lynne summed up the conversation on the use of clinical titles by stating that we are strengthened by our clinical faculty’s work and want to recognize it. She also stated that our College of Education Voting Policy is that eligible voters consist of full time faculty holding professorial rank, therefore, clinical faculty are not eligible to vote on the revised RPT document.

5. Other business
Drew Polly remarked that FITSAC met yesterday and discussed the potential security breach of the H-drive. A computer forensics agency is investigating the situation. We will be informed when there is more information. In the meantime, he recommended that we should password protect our data files as another level of protection.

6. Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 11:10 AM.

Next Faculty Council Meeting:
Wednesday, March 21, 2012