PCOE College Council
13 February 2017, 2:00 - 3:30 PM
Minutes - Summary

Members Present: Dean Judy Abbott, Deborah Buswell, Jay Thornton, Claudia Whitley, Sally Ann Swearingen, Ken Austin, George Willey, Lauren Burrow, Chay Runnels, DJ Dean, and Daniel McCleary

Not Present: DJ Dean attended in place of Heather Munro

1. Welcome & introductions
Dean Abbott welcomed the group and DJ Dean introduced herself.

2. Review of minutes/summary
The January meeting minutes were reviewed by the council and Sally Ann Swearingen made the motion to accept the minutes, seconded by Lauren Burrow. The Council unanimously accepted as presented.

3. PCOE policies/practices
Began with feedback from Leadership Council

   Workgroup 2 - Faculty Merit Pay Policy (Daniel, Lauren, Claudia)
   The Leadership Council (LC) requested that the policy be amended to allow units to decide if the unit head needed to provide individual feedback on performance and the amount of merit being recommended to each faculty member. LC was concerned about the time commitment needed to provide individual feedback to each faculty member in the unit and speculated that such information would breed ill will.

   College Council (CC) discussed the need for transparency in merit allocations. The Dean stated that regardless of what units ultimately decide, no unit may decide that everyone receive an equal amount of merit.

   Lauren Burrow recommended the requirement of a meeting be changed to a requirement of notification which would include the rationale for the merit allocation.

   It was also noted that no merit will be allocated this year.

   Workgroup 1 - Promotion & Academic Tenure Policy (Deborah, Jay, Sally Ann)
   In general, the LC supported the spirit of the tenure policy, but desired a higher degree of wordsmithing. In addition, the LC wanted to remove the required practice of annual review of pre-tenure positions in years 2, 4, and 5. Faculty complaints regarding the amount of time required to review dossiers annually was cited as the reason for the revision. Instead, LC proposed the review of probationary faculty during the specified years be optional (i.e., units may decide to provide or not provide annual faculty reviews).

   CC clarified that the unit head would still provide the pre-tenure faculty annual review, but the faculty review would be optional. In addition, CC members reiterated concerns about transparency and lack of feedback.

   No changes to the promotion policy were recommended by the LC.

   Workgroup 3 - Performance Evaluation of Faculty Policy (Chay, George, Heather, Ken)
   In regards to the Promotion policy, LC desired a stronger overlap between the university policy and the college policy. In particular, they wanted a description of the annual administrative evaluation process to be included. In addition, LC wanted the policy to be more comprehensive and the policy to be clear that rigorous standards apply in the College of Education. The two paragraphs from the university policy under Standards for Performance Evaluation of Faculty were requested to be included in the college policy.

4. Name change update
DJ Dean requested more information about structural changes that may occur in addition to the name change. The Dean reported the Interim Associate Dean will be working with each unit to better understand the need regarding accreditation and field and clinical experiences. Furthermore, the college is contacting the Department of Health and Human Services to ascertain how best the college may be able to track licensure of former students.

   Claudia Whitley reported her unit is supportive of the name change, but prefer professional preparation programs propose the new name. Other members concurred with this sentiment.
5. **Subcommittee updates**  
Student Travel – Late submission will not be reviewed because they do not meet the submission criteria. The policy states that the submission must be received two months prior to travel.

Staff Recognition – Staff recognition will occur in April.

Undergraduate Research – CC is responsible for reviewing submissions electronically. Council members voiced concerns about the evaluation form being biased toward research presentations and not accounting for creative works.

Supplemental Travel Fund – Funds will not be dispersed above the amount originally requested and approved.

6. **Issues from the faculty**  
None

The Dean stated that CC would be tasked with defining “collegiality” in the near future. She also commented that faculty vitas need to be accurate and in APA Style.

Meeting adjourned at 3:46 p.m.