School of Education  
Academic Council Meeting Minutes (Adam Kennedy)  
October 25, 2017, 1-3 PM  
Lewis Towers 1030

I. Present: Samantha Etkorn, Susan Graham, Lynne Golomb, Adam Kennedy, Brad McDonald, Demetri Morgan, Kate Phillippo, David Slavsky, Amy Shuffelton, Wendy Threadgill, Meng-Jia Wu, Eunju Yoon (Voting members boldfaced), Darren Pierre, Hank Bohanon, Markeda Newell  Absent voting members: Mike Boyle (proxy vote given to Lynne Golomb), Karen Ritter (proxy vote given to Brad MacDonald)

II. Call to Order – Kate Philippo

III. Approval of September 2017 meeting minutes and October 11 2017 Special meeting minutes

a. September minutes – Eunju Yoon motioned for approval, Lynne Golomb second, unanimously passed

b. October 11th minutes – Meng-Jia Wu motioned for approval Demetri Morgan second, approved with one abstention

IV. Announcements

a. Kate Philippo reviewed the meeting time limit and a desire to complete all agenda items while also being respectful of all participants’ time.

V. Consent Agenda: Discussion – Demetri Morgan: Should ongoing Curriculum Committee discussions conclude before moving forward with the consent agenda? Amy Shuffelton (representing CC): it was appropriate for AC to move forward and that Curriculum Committee could proceed with their work. Motion Lynne Golomb, Amy Shuffelton second, unanimously approved.

Lynne Golomb: reiterated steps in the approval process in order to ensure that items do not skip Graduate School approval in cases where it is required.

a. Items approved in Consent Agenda (documents posted to Sakai under “Approved by Curriculum Committee”):

i. Higher Education Ph.D. Redesign
ii. Increase Higher Education Ph.D. electives from 12 to 18
iii. Removal of ELPS 427 ELPS 431 and current requirement for minor from ELPS Higher Education Ph.D.
iv. New ELPS Course: Advanced Developmental Theory in Higher Education
v. Program Modification: English Language Teaching & Learning M.Ed.
vi. Program Modification: Five Year B.S. Ed/M.Ed. Math Program
b. Item removed from Consent Agenda: Bylaw changes approved by AC at 10/11 Special Meeting (Draft bylaws posted to Sakai, new language highlighted in document)

i. Amy Shuffelton requested via an email to all AC members prior to this meeting that this item be removed from Consent Agenda. These changes were discussed separately. Discussion – Demetri Morgan asked whether voting on these changes be deferred until questions regarding the exact relationship of AC to the Dean’s Office be resolved? Present changes to bylaws, he argued, leave open questions about what is/is not within the purview of AC and how both typical and unusual issues should be resolved. **Motion to amend 5G made Amy Shuffelton, seconded by additional voting member. Seven in favor, three opposed, two abstentions. Motion carried.**

**Motion to adopt bylaws Amy Shuffelton, eight in favor, one opposed, two abstentions**

Bylaws will remain on AC agenda for future meetings – Sue Graham will share her ideas as to how to address/resolve confusion/clarity issues in bylaws to begin future conversation.

VI. Old business

a. FEC evaluation of faculty, inclusive of the role of program area faculty:

FEC and program area representative feedback. Guests: Hank Bohanon (FEC Chair), Darren Pierre (FEC Clinical Faculty member) Discussion – Hank Bohanon: shared the rationale behind the recent changes to the faculty evaluation process (e.g., providing more feedback and detail). FEC divided into teams of 2-3 to complete reviews, which were sent to faculty in advance of meetings with the Dean and with an opportunity to self-evaluate. Clinical faculty have also expressed that they have received minimal feedback, so adding a standing clinical faculty member to FEC was a response to this need. FEC collaborated with the Dean’s office to resolve questions. FAS does not provide the qualitative information from IDEA ratings. FEC attempted to balance qualitative and qualitative information in rating Research. FEC would like feedback on narratives on rating forms. Darren Pierre: shared details of efforts to consistently evaluate faculty who may have varying levels of documentation (e.g., IDEA ratings, narratives). Faculty are encouraged to run IDEA reports to ensure their accuracy. David Slavsky: shared that he oversees IDEA and FAS at LUC. Faculty may elect not to print out reports because they contain a significant amount of empty page space. The university is working with outside consultants to reprogram the interface to improve this process and its clarity/transparency. Dean Slavsky will be emailing faculty to express his perceptions of the FEC process and assure the School that FEC is serving the School well. Demetri Morgan: expressed the importance of providing time and space for preparation for the evaluation process, and that program and field-specific criteria should be addressed in conversations about the evaluation process. Amy Shuffelton: the information FEC must work with from FAS is often limited or missing (e.g., due to low student response rates). In addition, FEC lacks a framework for evaluating the quality of service.

Other issues discussed included:

- Disproportionately low number of clinical faculty on FEC.
- Lingering question of who it is appropriate for FEC to evaluate
- Clinical faculty have widely differing roles, some of which are not captured by the FAS process.
- The possibility and dangers of a parallel process for clinical and tenure-track faculty.
- Need program area feedback on evaluation process.

Eunju Yoon – group of clinical faculty could develop an evaluation system that represents their work and roles. Kate Phillippo: asked in what ways is FEC creating a record of what happens this year in order to inform next year’s process. Hank Bohanon – documents on Sakai, systematic protocol for evaluation, need for job descriptions and entry point to each person’s annual work.

Next steps: FEC plans to meet with Dean Slavsky after November 15th to review work and future plans. FEC invited to share ideas on clinical faculty in December AC meeting. Dean Slavsky proposed using Community Meeting as context for this work. FEC and Dean will continue to work together and be a focus in upcoming Community Meeting.

b. Research exceptional criteria (Document posted to Sakai)

Questions and concerns have arisen since implementation. Are criteria sufficiently clear? Diversity of SOE makes consistent criteria challenging to develop. Dean Slavsky: in 2016-17, 21 of 33 tenured or tenure-track faculty had Research Exceptional status. The cost to the school is not high in relation to the School’s budget and deeper questions about RE status and its relationship to School identity are more important. Kate Phillippo - risk of creating competitive climate with faculty compared to one another. Amy Shuffelton – effect of dissuading faculty from engaging in other things, risk of reinforcing disparity among faculty, without it the School could be perceived as a less desirable place to work.

Suggestions: Revisit length of term and criteria for qualifying. Examine clarity and fairness of the process. Is it actually a problem if faculty are continually Research Exceptional? Is this a bar for all faculty to attempt to achieve, or is it a competitive process? Is 2/3 of faculty too many?

Kate Phillippo will request that Hank Bohanon visit in November’s meeting to discuss the process as long as this timeline is acceptable.

c. Follow up items from SOE Task Force (Documents posted to Sakai: Task Force Report and Document with only items recommending AC action)

i. Recommendation #2c: Create a SOE Strategic Planning Committee – Dean Slavsky reported that Leadership Council met. One recommendation emerging from this meeting was the need to identify a group to examine broad ongoing issues (e.g., trends in education, continuous improvement/monitoring, ways to enhance program viability). Leadership Council will take this on, with relationship between LC and AC is to be determined. Amy Shuffelton: asked about the decision-making and policymaking responsibilities of this group. Dean Slavsky: one role of the group is to make recommendations to AC, assist Dean in operations. They would not take on any role or action that overlaps or undercuts the role of AC. Sue Graham: will this group take minutes? To what extent will group’s work be transparent and shared? Kate Phillippo – stressed the importance of clarifying this relationship. Regular updates to AC on this development process. Demetri Morgan – should AC decide on whether this body should be created? Amy Shuffelton expressed the need to continue the process and share written plan before AC acts.
Motion to postpone decision on whether Leadership Council should take on strategic planning role until we have a written statement outlining policy. Amy Shuffelton, Meng-Jia second, 11 in favor, one abstention.

ii. Recommendation #2e: Create a Staff Council
Wendy Threadgill reported that staff will go forward with this idea. Staff will meet (review other universities and university staff council) and update AC as the process unfolds within Staff Updates.

d. Diversity Committee—Microaggression survey next steps (AC Communication to DC after 9/17 meeting posted on Sakai) – Markeda Newell attended to respond to AC’s communication with DC regarding plans for microaggression follow-up in 2017-18. Markeda Newell: School-level activity has been designed with the idea in mind to bring closure to this process. Session with SOE community is planned to discuss how to respond and to address microaggressions. Proposed PD session would focus on communication strategies about and in response to microaggressions, with an education component (including articles and a video posted before meeting) to take place in the spring semester. Motion to conduct this training at February Community Meeting – Sue Graham, Amy Shuffelton second, unanimous approval. Students will lead student meeting with faculty support. Diversity committee is working with students on the details of this process.

e. SOE Climate
No specific issues or questions brought to AC. SOE is dealing with this in several different ways. Demetri Morgan: What communication has taken place/is planned to student body about the dean search and action/activity around climate, given that this will impact the student experience. Dean Slavsky: SOE students have not received the Task Force report. Students on AC along with Student task force representative will develop communication to be shared with student body regarding these recent efforts.

Wendy Threadgill recognized the climate changes that have taken place but also that the SOE remains largely empty: this has an effect on the sense of community on the SOE, and on both new employees and students. Sue Graham reiterated the importance of faculty showing up to participate in the community.

David Slavsky – Faculty serve diverse roles on campus and in the community; highlighted importance of posting office hours. Discussion took place around various barriers preventing faculty from working in their offices. Kate Phillippo – this remains a complex situation with a range of solutions and it will therefore remain on the agenda.

f. SOE Service Award (Document posted to Sakai) - Kate Phillippo: committee is full and they are reviewing criteria for the award.

g. Student representation on and participation in Academic Council, access to AC materials – Kate Phillippo: AC website hosted by SOE with bylaws, links to minutes, committee memberships, meeting schedule, agendas. AC materials will be posted for one academic year. Marie Hatland will be invited to November of December AC meeting to
share work on this. AC chair will be responsible for managing and conveying documents to Marie.

h. Staff council function within the SOE (subsumed under Item Vbii above)

VII. New Business

a. Protocol for designation of program chairpersons - deferred to November meeting agenda.

VIII. Standing committee reports

IX. Report from Administration – Dean Slavsky: met with academic financial planning group appointed by President. He presented to this group the task force work, projections for path forward. They were receptive, recognizing the value of the SOE and an appreciation that budget neutrality will take time.

X. Report from Staff – no additional updates other than staff council

XI. Report from Students – Brad MacDonald: Student development committee is meeting, Brad MacDonald is chair. Met once with two more meetings this semester. Kate Phillips: Second graduate student representative is needed.

XII. Closed session (if needed)


Approved by unanimous AC vote, 11/15/18