

**Reich College of Education
Administrative Council
Minutes**

October 28, 2008, 10:00 am, Room #314 EDH, Greene-Oakes

Members Present: Charles Duke (chair), Roma Angel, Richard Culatta, Michael Jacobson, Dick Riedl, Cathy Clark (for Lee Baruth), and Jim Killacky

Members Excused: Dolly Farrell, Doris Jenkins

Guests: Terri Mitchell

1. **Approve Minutes from September 23, 2008, Meeting:** Minutes were approved without changes.

2. **Proposals:**

RCOE- Department of Human Development and Psychological Counseling

HPC 1: Delete the College Counseling concentration (496B) from the Master of Arts in College Student Development (Major Code 496*/13.1102) **Proposal was approved.**

RCOE-Department of Curriculum & Instruction

C&I 1: Request the addition of a new course, Health Education 1000(2 SH), Personal and Family Health, be added to the Wellness Literacy component of the 2009 General Education Program. **Proposal was approved.**

3. **Revised Mission Statement:** The revision proposed by the AC was edited slightly (see attachment with edits noted). **Approved.** The Council also considered two new drafts of the college's vision statement (see attachment); although there were aspects of both drafts that the Council liked, they were not ready to approve until further work had been done. Revised draft will be brought to the next meeting for further review.
4. **Work on Strategic Plan:** C. Duke explained that the college would be asked soon to provide evidence of how the college would contribute to meeting the university's strategic goals. The college will not be expected to submit a full blown strategic plan but instead will be called upon to

propose initiatives that would assist the university in meeting its goals. The Council was encouraged to review the university's strategic plan which can be accessed off the university's home page.

5. **Budget Update:** C. Duke discussed the formulas used in arriving at both positions and budgets. He noted that according to the UNC system formula, each FTE teaching at the undergraduate level should generate 535.4 SCH's; at the graduate level 303.93; and at the doctoral level 110.16. Using the Delaware formula, the FTE/SCH ratios, the college usually does not qualify; this year the formula showed RCOE as about 3 FTE down but since only a limited number of positions were available, Arts and Sciences, and FAA were given those and the college received no on campus positions. Running classes of 20-25 does not make the college competitive for these positions. C. Duke noted that student teaching is placed a level higher than the rest of the college's courses which resulted in only 406.24 SCH's per FTE at the undergraduate level being required. He also noted that when Communication Disorders completes its transfer to the Health College, the program will move to Category II where the ratios are lower.

C. Duke noted that mention has been made of using the same formula approach for distance education – a separate funding stream – but thus far, no matrix had been presented to the deans.

6. **Nepotism:** C. Duke cautioned the Council that the university was taking a very close look at grants that involved husband/wife teams; the university wishes to avoid any appearance of nepotism which might attract the attention of grant auditors. C. Duke noted that he was currently working with the university attorney and the Graduate School to determine what options, if any, might exist for situations where relationships could include hiring relatives from one's family to work on projects where you might be the director.
7. **Core Update:** C. Duke noted that the task force on the professional core was continuing to meet and that some progress had been made in identifying where certain new standards from DPI might be addressed in the core; the hope is to have something designed no later than the end of the semester.
8. **General Education Requirements:** The Council discussed briefly the junior writing requirement and the capstone course; chairs indicated that program directors were reviewing the requirements for both; mention was made of student teaching as serving as a capstone course; however, that has not yet been determined. Program coordinators are working to identify course(s) that might satisfy the junior level writing requirement; this requirement would have to be met within the major.

9. **Post-tenure Review:** C. Duke shared the proposed key revisions to the post-tenure process; these include the following:
- 1) Peer review committee will be selected by a process agreed upon by the tenure faculty in the unit;
 - 2) Faculty member being reviewed will not have the option of selecting members of the peer review committee;
 - 3) Department chair must consult with the peer review committee;
 - 4) Review outcomes must be reviewed by one or more administrative levels.

Chairs asked for clarification on effective date of the changes; also raised questions about what was meant by “must consult with the peer review committee.”

C. Duke indicated he would seek clarification and report back at the next meeting.

10. **UNC Tomorrow Planning Phase II:** C. Duke noted that a number of changes were being proposed regarding the submission of new programs; these changes focused on levels of review and who would be doing the review; emphasis is placed on creating panels of in-state and out-of-state individuals to do much of the reviewing prior to any action by the UNC Graduate Council. A number of concerns about adding layers of review, delays of program actions, etc. The UNC Graduate Council is expected to raise a number of objections to the proposed changes.

Units have been asked by the Board of Governors to prepare brief summaries of programs they might anticipate offering within the next three years; the RCOE will be submitting its proposed doctorate in literacy studies although at this time no formal deadline for submission has been established and there is at least one other doctoral program (Psychology) that is in line for submission before our literacy doctorate.

11. **Timing of Graduate Faculty Appointment and Reappointment:** The Graduate School is proposing some changes in the timeline for when recommendations for graduate faculty status would be submitted; the recommendation is that such requests should be aligned with reappointment/tenure/post-tenure review.

Beginning assistant professors would be appointed initially as associate members of the Graduate Faculty with an initial term of four years. Faculty appointed with varying terms of appointment (credit towards tenure) depending upon when they will be considered for tenure and/or

promotion. Associate Member status will be granted only to faculty who have not yet been tenured.

Faculty appointed with tenure and who have graduate responsibilities will be eligible for appointment as Full Members of the Graduate Faculty.

The Council received a draft document explaining the proposed changes, providing a timeline, and suggestions of what constituted possible baseline graduate faculty credentials in three categories: “Staying current in the Discipline,” “Engagement in Graduate Education and Research,” and Effective Teaching and Mentoring at the Graduate Level.”

Council members were encouraged to provide feedback on the proposed guidelines to C. Duke.

12. **Priorities:** Not discussed.

Next AC Meeting is on Tuesday, November 11, 2008, at 10:00 am, in Room # 314 EDH, Greene-Oakes.