College of Education
COE Leadership Council Meeting Minutes
March 28, 2018
G23 Aderhold, 2:00-3:00pm

Attendance: Nancy Butler, Jim Garrett, Ralph Knapp, Melanie Peiper, Jen Williams
Scott Ardoj, Rob Branch, Janet Buckworth, Cynthia Dillard, Anne Marcotte, Brian Glaser,
Roger Hill, Cynthia Vail, Ellen Evans, Andrew Garber, Stacey Neuharth-Pritchett, Denise
Spangler

Prior to discussing the agenda items Interim Dean Spangler had a few announcements:
• Graduation for graduate students is 9:30am on FRI 04MAY18 and not 10:00am as some
  sources have indicated. See: https://commencement.uga.edu/graduate
• The retirement party for Paula Alexander and Christy Glazer to be held at 3pm in G10 on
  28MAR18.
• Leadership Council is being moved from 25APR to 18APR and the Department Head
  meeting is being moved to 25APR.

Agenda Items:

1. Service Time [next steps and how to move this issue forward]
   • Andy Garber offered that if a change to EFT was to occur it was better to make the
decisions earlier than later due to required budget development implications.
   • Andy also indicated and many agreed that the new OneSource processes may also
influence categorical pragmatics of EFT with regard to changes with service time.
   • Janet Buckworth voiced, although faculty are exempt, the Fair Labor Standard Act might
inform %EFT based on hours dedicated in terms of the mathematical calculation.
   • Jim Garrett offered the following from a Faculty Senate perspective:
     o Essentially there was consensus that we should have service time and that the
logical options are the following: 5%, 10%, 15% and 20%.
     o Many of our peer institutions have a 20% service EFT.
     o If any service time comes from instructional time, it will affect the cost to buy out
a course with external funds
     o There was a general consensus that the time dedicated to service should come
equally from Research and Instruction.
     o Specifically, the Department Heads were asked about the %EFT and offered the
following:
       ▪ A 20% was not supported as the general consensus was that it was too
much of a change (i.e. going from 0% to 20%)
       ▪ A 10% EFT was supported by several Department Heads with an equal
contribution of 5% from research and teaching
       ▪ It was also discussed that the definition of service needs careful attention
across our units and programs:
         • Should reflect internal and external [profession and community]
service endeavors
         • It does not include graduate student mentoring and committee
participation which is categorized as informal instruction
Next Steps: Jim Garrett would report this consensus by the DH’s of 10% EFT for service back to Faculty Senate to gain additional feedback and possibly bring back a recommendation from Faculty Senate

2. Graduate Faculty Procedures: [how to integrate new Graduate School guidelines into COE policies and procedures]
   - A general conversation occurred about the change in policy with regard to Graduate School no longer managing “Graduate Faculty” status and how to interpret and implement the management of this faculty status issue within the College.
   - It was proposed that the status be voted at the departmental level with the College managing the reporting to the Graduate School (similar to current processes).
   - There was some concern expressed about how to handle clinical faculty with regard to active research and recent publications vs. active practice engagement.
   - It was stated by several members that the application of the standard would be highly variable across departments and within each of the respective programs.
   - The following was proposed to move us forward:
     - Guidelines would be developed at the College level to address all faculty tracks
     - Each department could interpret and operationalize the guidelines
     - In short term, we will use a straight forward “find and replace” on the Graduate School document so that we meet the immediate need for process and decisions
     - A committee of Department Head(s) and Associate Dean(s) would be pulled together to create a working document on policy and procedures.
   - Jim Garrett will take these decisions to Faculty Senate to get feedback on the above strategy

3. COE By-Laws: [when is an issue a Shared Governance issue? QOL and curriculum vs. budgetary/financial]
   - Jim Garrett began the conversation regarding a need to revisit our by-laws as they have not been followed for several important decisions in recent years.
   - He also reminded the Council that when an issue or policy crosses departments it becomes a shared governance issue and should be vetted through Faculty Senate (per current by-laws).
   - The following three examples were offered to begin conversations:
     - College Research Scholar Award (CRSA): Crosses all departments but was not discussed with Faculty Senate
     - Minimum Enrollments: Crosses all departments but was not discussed with Faculty Senate (until after the fact)
     - Additional Instructional Support (AIS): Impacts faculty QOL (often tangentially) but more aligned with financial/budget implications.
   - Anne Marcotte pointed out that Leadership Council was not discussed in the COE by-laws
   - Going Forward: There was general consensus that going forth we need to revisit our bylaws after the new Dean/Administration is in place.

Respectfully submitted by: Ellen M. Evans