

College of Education
Policy Council Meeting Minutes
 12:30-2:30 PM, Wednesday, February 17, 2016, EBA 347

Bold means Present; *Italicized means arranged a proxy*
 2/3 of elected members required for quorum (11 elected members total)

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>Alfaro, Cristina</i> (DLE) <i>Sera Hernandez</i> | Kraemer, Bonnie (SPED) |
| Bredvold, Marilyn (Staff Rep.) | Gallego, Margie (STE) |
| Butler-Byrd, Nola (CSP) | Lozada-Santone, Patricia (Student Rep.) |
| Duesbery, Luke (STE), Co-Chair | McClure, Mendy (Lecturer Rep.) |
| Farnan, Nancy (Dean's Office) | Taylor, Brent (CSP), Co-Chair |
| Frey, Nancy (EDL) | Tucker, Mark (ARPE) |
| <i>Ritblatt, Shulamit</i> (CFD) <i>Vanja Lazarevic</i> | IVC Rep. (Vacant) |
| Johnson Jr., Joseph (Dean's Office) | |

Quorum was reached.

Welcome and Introductions

1.0 Approval of Agenda

Duesbery moved to approved; seconded by McClure.

2.0 Approval of Meeting Minutes of December 16, 2015

Frey motioned to accept; Tucker seconded.

3.0 Old Business

- None

4.0 New Business

- COE RTP Policy Revisions
 - The University has not yet finalized RTP Policy changes (see December 2015 minutes for more details.) Farnan said that University Policy states that lecturers pursuing subsequent three-year contracts “may” receive departmental evaluation letters more frequently. Faculty Advancement has commented that the existing policy on this matter is permissive, and that it is left up to colleges as to how frequently they evaluate (Annually? Only once during the contact period?) We could decide that we revise the COE Policy to require a specific frequency and formal letters of evaluation. Discussion about the wisdom of balancing sound policy with language that is neither too constraining or permissive ensued. The

Dean made the point that by the time concerns about the performance of a lecturer should be old news by the time it reaches them. No one should be blindsided at a three-year review with concerns they are formally hearing for the first time.

Duesbery moved to table this discussion until the University finalizes RTP policy. Lazarevic seconded the motion.

- Results of Vote on Liberal Studies Program Move
 - Policy Council had previously approved, followed by an ad hoc work committee, as well faculty from the School of Teacher Education, AR&P and APP. The last step is that this will go to the Senate on March 1, 2016 for approval, and finally the President of the University. Providing this is finalized, the start date would be July 1, 2016. There is no discernible impact on policy.

5.0 Announcements from the Dean

- *The Provost reviewed RTP processes* across colleges and departments and expressed concern about an overreliance on student course evaluations, especially in looking comparatively at department averages, which is statistically questionable. He noted that RTP committees should look more closely at a candidate's progress in teaching over time (are they learning from student course evaluations?) and at course content, especially the quality of course syllabi. As well, course materials that are submitted as evidence of teaching effectiveness should receive more scrutiny. Peer reviews are inconsistent across colleges, and are inconsistently utilized by RTP committees when evaluating teaching effectiveness. The Provost also discussed the rigor of review at the department level on the quality of publications. He invites Deans to stress the importance of critically considering the question, "*How has this person's research moved the field forward?*" The Provost asked the Deans to present the discussion to their respective Policy Councils to consider following the lead of the College of Sciences, which requires an external review for candidates who are up for tenure or promotion. He also cautioned that while research grants are of value, it should be the quality of the scholarly activity, rather than the simple metric of the dollar amount. The Provost addressed concerns about the service of new assistant professors. While he stated that new professors would and should have a lesser record of service, that by the time a person is petitioning for tenure, service should be more substantial. He said that granting tenure is an invitation to join the academy, and that their service should be of leadership, not simply membership.
- *The Provost discussed the use of codes for assigned time across the campus.* The Dean recommended that Policy Council review language. The newly revised policy has aided COE positively in ensuring that research assigned time is properly vetted and approved. The Provost reiterated that research assigned time is not transferrable to others.

6.0 University Committee Reports

- none

7.0 College Committee Reports

- none

8.0 Adjournment Meeting adjourned at 2:10 PM

Respectfully submitted by Nancy Frey