

Faculty Assembly –MINUTES
April 3, 2009
1pm to 3pm
Video Conference

Chairperson Dr. Brenda Richey started the meeting by determining if there was a quorum. It was decided that we did have a quorum and the meeting was called to order.

The first order of business was reviewing minutes from prior meetings. An email was sent out from Dr. Richey with the minutes from the March, 2008 and October 2008 meetings. Dr. Richey stated that if there were no objections to the content of the minutes that the reading of the minutes be waived. There were no objections so she then asked if there were any corrections to the minutes. There were no corrections so the minutes will stand.

The next order of business was to welcome new members and visitors. There were no new faculty members or visitors.

Dean Coates then spoke about the budget situation. We did get the amount for our budget cut for this year. Last year we had a \$930,000.00 budget cut. This year our budget cut will be \$2.3M additional, so that puts us just over \$3M total. The Dean mentioned that last time he spoke to us he said that one of the plans to deal with this was to pull out of Port St. Lucie. A meeting was held with the Provost and several of her staff at IRSC (Indian River State College) on April 2 to talk about some strategies that we may use in trying to help the students that are currently enrolled in our programs in Port St. Lucie to continue to finish those programs if we should actually get the go ahead later this year to pull out. The President has not given a final ok on the plans because he has not received the ok from the Board of Trustees, but as of now it appears that we will be offering courses beginning next Spring at only Boca, Davie and the Tower. Our tenure-track, tenured or tenure earning faculty from Port St. Lucie will be offered employment on the Boca campus or on the Davie campus. The Dean will keep everyone informed as this moves forward. He also told everyone that how to deal with the budget cuts has consumed most of the Spring term; presenting them, revising them, presenting them again, so for the most part that is what has been done this Spring. The Dean also told us that there are a couple of good things that we need to give thanks for and one is that Dr. Eric Chiang won the University wide teaching award. The Dean said that this is the only the second time that he remembers the College of Business winning this. Congratulations Eric! Eric will also be giving the keynote address at the Honors Convocation on April 8. The Dean asked for good representation from our College. The Dean then opened up the floor for questions.

Dr. Richey then asked for reports of the standing committees.

Steering Committee: Dr. Richey reported that the committee has been working on mostly policy issues this year. One of them is the Lecturer and Clinical Professor policies that we will be considering later in this agenda. For the upcoming year the committee will still be looking at policy issues and working with other Universities to compare what we have. The policy issue

the committee will probably work on next is at the request of the Provost office. They have asked the committee to come up with a University wide policy on 3rd year reviews. The starting point for that will be what the department policies are.

Promotion & Tenure Committee: Dr. Pradeep Korgaonkar stated that there isn't much new information from the committee. There was a workshop held today, hosted by the Provost office, for faculty who are planning to go up for promotion & tenure. He said that it is a very informative session and encourages faculty to attend. The workshop is held every year. There are some minor issues that Dr. Korgaonkar thinks should be addressed. One issue is that for those coming up for promotion from the rank of assistant to the rank of associate you have a 3rd review with your chair. He has found out that the other colleges' promotion & tenure committees are also involved in that review. He thinks that if the committee is involved in your 3rd review it protects you and gives you feedback on your progress toward tenure beyond your own department. He also stated that he thinks we should have a college-wide document that includes journal rankings.

By-Laws Committee: Julia Higgs discussed eliminating the Industry Studies department. A vote was taken and in order to pass a by-laws amendment there has to be two-thirds of those present and voting. The proposal is that Industry Studies be moved from the schedule of elections to Faculty Assembly Committees and Councils. The amendment passed.

The Provost attended a portion of the meeting and discussed the Dean's evaluation. He gave some background on how the evaluations of Deans in the University started. The first step was creating a 360 evaluation for department chairs. This is run by the individual Deans in the Colleges and the results are forwarded to the Provost. That went so well that we developed a process for the Deans. The College of Education had a lot of interest in this, so they were the first College to have an evaluation for the Dean. This is done on a three year cycle. The Provost was specific in that the Dean's are evaluated each year, just not as a 360 evaluation. Each year the Dean's prepare a progress report for the Provost for what their accomplishments were for the past year, what their expectations are for the coming year, and how well they met those expectations. This 360 evaluation is much broader. Input is received from the faculty and peers. This includes other Deans, people in the Provost office, people they work with, other constituencies in the University community, and then people out of the University. The way it works is that the Dean prepares a self-assessment. The self-assessment is distributed to the peer groups and to the faculty. Following the peer assessment, the request for a survey form is sent out. The questions on the survey are a little bit different from faculty and the other peer groups because of the difference in relationships. Along with that are the written comments, which is a very valuable part of the evaluation. The Provost did stress and all of this is anonymous. As far as the survey, it is blind kind of survey. Once the data is processed the inputting factors are deleted so there is no way to track anything backwards. After the Provost has received the results of the survey, as well as all of the written comments, we study those very carefully. Earlier in the week the Provost had a meeting with Dean Coates and had a very good meeting, discussing the findings of the survey. Dean Coates has a copy of the numbers,

but did not receive a copy of the written comments. The reason for this is that sometimes you can almost identify a person who has made a comment. The Provost did summarize for Dean Coates a sense of the comments that he picked out and then, in preparation for this meeting, we discussed what the things are that we need to pay more attention to. That is what brings us to this meeting today. On the survey there were 23 different questions listed in different categories. If we look at the survey response rates, and in the case of Business, we had one close date and it kind of superimposed on top of Spring break, so we sent out a another reminder and left it open so we could maximize the response rate. In so far as faculty responses, we have 112 people who could have responded; 57 did respond; that's a 51% response rate. In conducting surveys over the past 3 year, the Provost said that this is about the middle as far as the University is concerned. The College of Nursing had close to a 100% percent response rate. The Provost encouraged all faculty to respond next time the survey comes up. As far as the peer group is concerned, we had 46 peers from throughout the University, 31 of those responded, so that's almost a 70% response rate. The Provost then discussed the analysis of the survey responses. One of the things that the analysis does, is that it takes all 23 questions and it ranks those questions in order of the means in which faculty responded from 1, which means strongly agree, down to 5, which means strongly disagree, on all 23 questions. As far as Dean Coates is concerned, his range did not run from 1 to 5. His range was probably the highest we've seen since we've been doing this. It ranged from 1.65 to 2.5. So even in the least favorable, we were in the upper half of the scale. Some of the items at the high end around 1.5, or 1.6; those high end comments involve such things as informing the faculty, keeping the faculty apprised of activities that are going on, activities within the University. Another one that was high is, demonstrates an awareness of conditions within the College; another one deals with, advocates for resources for the college. The Provost said that he agrees with these, especially the last one because you will not find a stronger advocate than Dean Coates as far as, if there are resources or getting resources. When Marilyn Wiley was the Associate Dean, the case that she and Dean Coates made for differential allocations to this College for accreditation purposes was really outstanding and that it made us able to drive dollars in that direction. At the low end of the range, at around 2.3 or 2.4; encourages debate on issues within the College; promotes effective and fair administration by the Associate and Assistant Deans; and finally, promotes faculty excellence in service. This is the summary of the numerical analysis. The Provost then talked about the written comments, stating that they are a little different. When he reviewed the written comments and categorized them, there was only one series of comments where there seemed to be a consensus throughout the entire College. That consensus is that the Dean has done a superb job in managing finances during tough times for the past couple of years. When you scan through the comments that was almost unanimous, but beyond that there was a dichotomy. Some examples of this are; there were a series of comments that relates to research and creativity – one set would say something like highly supports research and creativity within the department, and the other side would say does not support research and creativity and has a College of failed scholars. The next one deals with; communicates exceptionally well with elements of the College , as opposed to discourages communication and discourages faculty participation. Another one; he does everything he can to promote collegiality and consensus as opposed to, there is no

atmosphere of collegiality and consensus. The Provost stated that there was a lot of dichotomy in the written comments. He said that is obvious to him that, and he has had the same kind of thing in another College, if he looks at the overall results in the numerical summaries and results and then if he looks at this dichotomy, there is something missing. The Dean and Provost have talked about this, and the Provost is aware that everyone is busy and doing things on different schedules, everyone is at a different point as far as their research, and it's easy sometimes to let up on the communication and to let up on opportunities for people to talk to each other. But based on the dichotomy, there is something missing and the Provost and he hoped that what he focuses on is the idea of additional openness, communication and things of that nature. Based on the comments the Provost and Dean Coates have come up with a three stage action plan. It focuses on openness and communication and giving people the opportunities. He thinks the first thing that we need to do, since we are a distributed campus University, is that we need to re-double our efforts as far as being more inclusive in communication with those faculty who have primary assignments on other campuses. He said that he has no way of telling if some of the comments came from primarily from Boca, primarily from Davie or other campuses. But he suspects that some of it has to do with the distributed campus model. The first thing that the Dean is going to do is implement strategies to more fully bring in the partner campuses. Another thing that needs to be worked on is to establish or to enhance direct communications with faculty, rather than just have a meeting once a month, or whatever, as things come up have a formalized way of communicating on a regular basis. We have talked about the idea of reinitiating faculty forums on a regular basis, where people with things on their minds can come in and sit and talk. Also, use more of a "push" technology, as things come up have established mechanisms for communication. The third thing that the Dean and Provost discussed is some sort of a forum. Many times information flow is one way, the Dean needs to be informed as well as faculty. Establish some sort of communication where the Dean gets feedback from the faculty. The Provost stated that a year from now he will come back to the faculty and a new questionnaire will be sent out based on this feedback that he has given here today. The Provost then asked for any questions that the faculty had.

Reports from standing committees – continued:

Strategic Planning Committee: Dr. Cooke reported that the Committee has been working on updating the Strategic Plan. They have identified about 10 goals related to teaching and research. With regards to teaching, they have defined it very broadly. Not just with programs, but also delivery of programs, trying to get more alumni participation in the College. They have spoken with the alumni person in the College and she is going to establish a website of social networking for our alumni. The next step will be updating the service portion of the plan. Once everything is in place, they will have the Dean review the plan and then bring it before the Faculty Assembly.

Graduate Council: Dr. McDaniel reported on a change in admissions requirements for graduate studies at the master's level. One comes from the Board of Governors and then acting on their behalf a board created from the Deans of graduate colleges from around the state. They stated

that you should not have admissions granted purely on a number, such as a score on a standardized test. The new policy says that in addition to a score the College must have a qualitative element to its selection. Things like community involvement, other collegiate involvement, maybe job related elements, those kinds of things. The class will be about 75% or 80% that are fairly excellent in regards to GPAs, and scores on standardized tests. The rest will be a committee decision. Dr. Richey asked for a vote on the new policy. The new policy was approved.

Undergraduate Council: Ethlyn Williams gave the update for Anita Pennathur. The council met on mostly routine matters, such as approving new courses, and prerequisites. There were new courses in Hospitality, and Business Law. The major initiative was a Business Intelligence Program that came from ITOM and the implementation of that has begun. There are also some new courses offered in Risk Management and the Insurance Program that is also being expanded.

Faculty Development Council: Rupert Rhodd was not in attendance and there was no report.

The next order of business was electing committee and council chairs.

Steering Committee: Dr. Richey asked for a volunteer who is familiar with procedure to take over the Chair duties of this committee. The head of the Steering committee is also the head of the Faculty Assembly. Dr. Richey was nominated and seconded and a vote was then taken by acclamation. Dr. Richey was voted to continue in this role.

Promotion & Tenure Committee: Bill McDaniel was nominated to be the chair of this committee. Bill declined the nomination due to his participation on several other college and university committees. Pradeep Korgaonkar was nominated to continue in his role as chair. John Bernardin was also nominated. A vote was taken and Pradeep will continue as Chair of this committee.

By-Laws Committee: For this committee in addition to the Chair, committee members must be voted on. It is an at large membership. The current members were voted on to continue for another 2 year term.

Strategic Planning Committee: John Valentine was nominated and voted to be the Chair of this committee.

Graduate Council: Bill McDaniel was nominated and voted to be Chair of this council.

Undergraduate Council: Anita Pennathur was nominated and voted to be Chair of this council.

Faculty Development Council: Tammy Mangleberg was nominated. She was not in attendance at the meeting, but it was decided to proceed on the vote subject to her declining. She was voted to be chair.

University Senate: The Faculty Assembly elects the 2 College members from the College of Business. We currently have John Valentine and Bob Cerveny as our representatives to the University Senate as College members. Both of their appointments are up this month. The election this time will be one person to a one year term and one person to a two year term. Bob Cerveny agreed to a one year term. John Valentine agreed to a two year term. A vote was taken and Bob Cerveny will continue with a one year term and John Valentine will continue with a two year term.

The next item is the policy on Clinical Professors and Lecturers. The Steering Committee worked with Dr. Hart on the developing the policy. Dr. Hart presented the policies to the Assembly. Dr. Hart started by saying that the proposals have nothing to do with the current budget situation. The proposals have been in the works for over a year. He stated that it is important to realize that the current position of Instructor is a position that is occupied by many individuals who have a wide range of academic background and professional experience. People in these positions have sometimes have many high level degrees and there is a great range of experience. Part of the motivation to propose these positions is to try to fine tune our faculty profile by specifying what we are looking for and the responsibilities of particular individuals who would fill the Lecturer and the Clinical Professor role. We would be better establishing positions that clearly match the person's academic background and professional experience. Also, when we went through our AACSB reaccreditation process we had to establish a framework for AQ PQ criteria. We wanted to raise the qualifications to the maximum that we could and certain departments, like ITOM, had many Instructors. Given the criteria that we established, most of those folks were going to fall out and become "other" when we went through and constructed our report and matched people's qualifications with the document that we had proposed. In the final report we had too high a number of faculty without Ph.D.'s. Dr. Hart showed a spread sheet that showed that 22% of our faculty do not have Ph.D.'s. When we think about accreditation we compare ourselves with our peer institutions and this is an issue that we should be looking at. If you want a Clinical Professor you want someone with professional experience and you want to maintain the integrity of what that position says it is and we would like to be able to take advantage of that experience. The person who would occupy this position would have certain responsibilities in the College that would be related to developing our ties to the business community. That is different from someone you are bringing in as a lecturer. Someone whose primary responsibility is going to be teaching in important ways offset the load that the entire faculty has to occupy. Both of these titles are on the roster of titles we can use. If we approve this, the idea is that we would no longer be hiring faculty in the Instructor line. We would be hiring faculty who met the qualifications of either the Clinical Professor position as described or the Lecturer position. The requirement of the Lecturer is a Ph.D. and the requirement for a professional person is someone who has approximately 10 years of experience. A motion was made to table this.

The motion to table was passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:15pm