College of Education
Faculty Senate, Minutes
Wednesday April 4, 2018 12:20-1:20pm 116 Aderhold

In Attendance: Peiper, Campbell, Heckman, Mativo, Hamilton-Jones, Harrison, Hughes, Sharma, Mojock, Gitlin, Guay, Harmon, Luft, White, Garrett, Hill

Minutes by: J. Luft

Agenda

1. Updates –
   a. Jim is staying in touch with administrators about insurance, student protests, etc. University administrators will share information as it becomes available.
   b. Trolling – A committee has been convened to develop recommendations pertaining to Trolling. Jim is working with Annaliese and Jenn to develop informational items which can be shared with faculty about handling trolling.
   c. Awards – Online instruction is acceptable for award consideration.
   d. Faculty governance – There has been discussion about shared governance at administrative meetings. Shared governance is important for many different areas in the college.
   e. Statement about guns in schools – Jannette Hill has a draft about this statement.
   f. Dean’s search – Make sure you stay involved in this. Information will be shared with faculty about the candidates.

2. President- Elect Election
   a. Chris Mojock – President – 14 for, 1 abstention

3. Steering Committee – Assist the faculty senate President in Agenda setting, and college elections
   a. Julie Luft, Jim Garrett, Chris Mojock, Bethany Hamilton-Jones, Linda Campbell (15 votes for this steering committee)

4. Graduate faculty status – Summary: Recommendation that the practice of approving graduate faculty continue to occur at the department level. Also there is a recommendation that we allow a person from faculty senate on the college committee.
   a. Comment- Appeals would be handled at the college level, and not the graduate school committee

5. Service discussion – The senate has already recommended service as part of our contract. How should service work?
   a. What should be the amount (10%, 20%, or other % of the time?)
   b. What recommendations should be made regarding promotion and tenure guidelines?
   c. Comments –
      i. 40/40/20 is similar to our peer and aspirational, and we likely do this in our work already.
ii. There was concern that the buyout may be too little for a 40/40/20 (department heads want more revenue)

iii. Our raises are part of our evaluation, but it’s not part of our distributed time. It is budgeted and you are getting credit for this.

iv. There is an equity argument for service – it is getting done. People who are doing the work need to be recognized.

v. Accountability brings oversight

vi. Tiered expectations could happen

vii. Buyout could be equated to the fiscal generation of revenue.

viii. 10 more attractive to department heads, but 20 may be more accurate

ix. There is clearly a need to discuss service in the department

x. The loss of service was not discussed in 2010, it was mandated

xi. Going to the 20% keep us from having this discussion again in a few years

xii. If we have 40/40/20, do faculty have the option to be more research oriented? Yes, faculty can re-budget their time in negotiation with the department head/leadership

xiii. Buyouts should be reflective off the fiscal return (different amounts for undergraduates and graduates)

**Recommendation:** Faculty senate recommends 40/40/20 as a baseline expectation for teaching, research, and service, which is subject to negotiation between a faculty member and the department head. 80/20 would be the recommendation for clinical faculty.

Each department should be revisit their guidelines be reviewed in light of this recommendation and in reference to the university guidelines for promotion and tenure.

Vote was 14-1 in favor of this recommendation.

**Action Item**-

1. Jim will call a meeting of the Steering committee over the summer