

## **COE Roles and Rewards Task Force**

February 11

10:00 – 11:45

Members Present: Delores Liston, Kent Rittshof, Lorraine Gilpin, Susan Trimble, Meta Harris, Maggie LaMontange, Cindi Chance, Randy Carlson, Bryan Griffin, Deborah Thomas

Dr. Griffin called the meeting to order and guided the review/discussion of the Draft of the Effort Assignment and Evaluation Policy for Faculty in the College of Education. The following recommendations were made by task force members:

1. Line 222: provide examples of differentiated effort
2. Keep definitions of teaching, scholarship, and service. Provide specific examples of what counts as teaching, scholarship, and service.
3. Factors to consider in Workload Assignment related to Teaching:
  - Class size (there was discussion related to class size, the dean will seek clarification from provost)
  - Teaching Assistance (we currently don't have access to assistance but there was some discussion of the possibility, perhaps in lab courses)
  - Developing new courses
  - Revising courses
  - Developing on-line courses
  - Mentoring students (dissertations, projects, thesis, undergraduate projects & programs, comprehensive on-going mentoring)
  - Mentoring peers (workshops)
  - Work with schools (long-term commitment—needs to be defined in departments)
  - Supervision of field experience students
  - Work with student organizations
4. Factors to consider in Workload Assignment related to Service:
  - Work in schools (workshops, one-time or short term consulting)
  - Program coordinator
  - Other, such as accreditation work
  - Administrative duties full-time faculty assume
  - Service grants or contracts
  - Professional service such as conference program chair or journal editor
  - Chair or member on a system, university, college, or department committee
5. Factors to consider in Workload Assignment related to Scholarship
  - Submitted and funded grants
  - External funded grants

- Internal funded grants
  - Scholarly presentations
6. Line 367: add “assuming needs being met”
  7. Timeframe: Workload agreement must coincide with the annual review
  8. Wording related to deadline by which workload agreements cannot be changed approved as written in draft
  9. The task force will address a broad outline or broad definitions of what it means to be unsatisfactory, deficient, satisfactory, good, very good, excellent in teaching, scholarship, and service. It was agreed that departments should develop specific definitions
  10. Task Force members agreed that evaluations should be based on one-year
  11. Dean Chance will get clarification from the provost related to how differentiated workload corresponds with expectations for tenure and promotion. (specifically if one opts to take minimum loads in scholarship or service every year.
  12. After lengthy discussion, it was agreed that summer workload should be included in workload agreement. Dr. Griffin asked for someone to suggest wording to make this clear.

The next meeting of the Task Force will be Friday, March 4 at 10:00 in the Dean’s Conference Room.

Minutes submitted by Deborah Thomas