COLLEGE OF EDUCATION COUNCIL

September 13, 2021

12:00-1:30 pm

**Attendance**: James Wolfinger (Dean), Robyn Seglem (TCH, Chair), Kristina Falbe (TCH, Vice-Chair), Stacy Otto (EAF), Amanda Quesenberry (TCH), Erin Quast (TCH), Gavin Weiser (EAF), Melinda Snodgrass (SED), Jeongae Kang (SED), Mike Jones (Lab Schools), Sarah Ballard (SED), Jamillah Gilbert (EAF Student Rep),  Livi Swiech (TCH Student Rep)

**Guest:**Stacey Jones-bock (Associate Dean)

**Members not in attendance:**Kara Hirano (SED), Diane Dean (EAF), Andy Goveia (Lab Schools)

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

* Robyn Seglem called the meeting to order.

**2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

* No discussion. No Opposed. All approved to adopt, 12:03.

**3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM AUGUST 23, 2021**

* No discussion about the minutes.
* Jamilah moved to approve the minutes. Sarah seconded.
* Minutes were approved.
* Abstained Gavin , Livi S. abstained

**4. INFORMATION ITEMS**

* None

**5. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

Bylaw Revisions (Senate Questions, Robyn Seglem)

* The following discussion items were tabled.
  + Definition of NTT’s eligibility (Section III, 2, A)
  + Clarifying definition of “faculty and students” in reference to attending COEC meetings NTT (section VI, 1)
  + Expanding all mentions of faculty to be more inclusive. (Multiple Sections)
    - Robyn shared a quick survey of staff was completed see if staff and APs want to be represented on Council and the majority overwhelmingly was yes.
    - Melinda commented it is a large sweeping change when we are unclear if it is better or worse.
    - Stacey Otto suggested tabling the issue, arguing there may be insufficient time to address.
    - Dean Wolfinger suggested informing Senate that no change will be made to current bylaws specific to this issue and COEC will address in future to avoid losing spot in Senate cue.
    - Robyn clarified the issue emerged from Dakesa Pina’s audit.
    - Amanda noted it may be another 5 years before we can revisit.
    - Robyn suggested tabling it from the bylaws at present time and using other strategies to expand inclusion.
    - Amanda indicated that it may be problematic to have surveyed and then say we don’t have time.
    - Discussion around timing.
    - Committee also discussed risk of stepping out of the cue and the possibility of waiting another 2 years.
    - Robyn clarified revisions to bylaws can occur sooner than the required 5-year requirement.
    - Discussion on tabling these revisions to allow additional time to explore and pilot.
    - Consensus was reached on spending additional time and potentially addressing earlier then the 5-year required deadline for review.
    - Agreement to proceed with remaining bylaw revisions.
* The following discussion items were approved.
  + Can students petition? (section VI, 1)
    - Current language is inclusive of students because language allows anyone to do so via their representative. No change.
  + Senate recommendation to expand section (section VII, 1, Duties)
    - Gavin suggesting adding language to refer to committees.
    - Stacy Otto suggested language around membership on standing committees within the College Council.
    - Stacy Otto identified sections 1-3 may not need to be separated out.
    - Gavin and Jamillah gave suggestions around combining items.
    - Suggestions of adding references to specific sections describing duties for committees.
    - Stacy Otto recommended making sections 2 and 3 a part of section 1 to make clear what all the duties are of the whole body (inclusive of standing and special committees).
    - Agreement on collapsing sections 2 and 3 into 1 and adjusting the headers accordingly.
  + Questions from the Senate about the Curriculum Committee:
    - How is an objection to a curriculum proposal filed?
      * Stacy Otto: A letter is filed by the person who initiated the curriculum proposal change or by an affected department or unit.
    - Who may file an objection?
      * Stacy Otto clarified the affected department or unit and COE TT faculty may file an objection, with multiple avenues for filing, including contacting reps or sharing objections in curriculum meetings.
        + Melinda raised question is there an anonymous process to object
        + Stacy O. also indicated potential for a way for everyone to be informed by announcement that there is a new curriculum proposal
        + Robyn suggested opening new proposals for comment
        + Gavin commented that there are survey strategies to help identify role, without identifying names
        + Dean shared curriculum falls under the governance of faculty
        + Stacey indicated a provision in the UCC that may be beneficial
        + Robyn indicated potential of using UCC language
        + Robyn also proposed using an anonymized
        + Gavin indicated it can be both in a relatively simple way
        + Erin suggested continuing to limit tenure line faculty
        + Consensus to limit to tenure line faculty at this point in time and inform Senate that COEC will continue to explore the different roles outlined in the bylaws.
    - Does the COE Curriculum Committee vote on the proposal within the next two meeting after receipt of the curriculum proposal?
      * Stacy Otto: Generally, voted on within first meeting. Sometimes by second meeting, if the committee has questions and a representative is not available.
      * Agreement that within two meetings is appropriate for bylaws.
    - Consider moving #6 to the top of the procedures of the COE Curriculum Committee.
      * Agreed
    - Why was the language regarding electing a chairperson and secretary for the Curriculum Committee deleted?
      * The vice chair often serves as chair in the subsequent term however the position is voted on.
      * Agreement on clarifying that there is an election for all three positions.
  + Should committees specify one member from Metcalf and one from U-High in terms of lab school representation? (section VIII 3, B. Membership)
    - Mike clarified that the voting process already results in one Metcalf and one U-High rep.
* Should references to COEC newsletter be changed to COEC website in all the committee procedures? (section VIII, 3, b)
  + - Agreement yes.
  + What does "high quality use of technology "mean?" (section VIII, 9, A)
    - Melinda suggested replacing “high quality” with “accessible and equitable”
    - Agreement
  + What does it mean to evaluate the COE itself? (section IX, 2)
    - Mike shared when need arises. Stacey J.B. added under special circumstances.
    - Gavin indicated no less than 3 years to eliminate time consuming assessment when not needed.
    - Consensus that section is unclear.
    - Melinda noted that the language does not fit under the Departments section.
    - Stacy and Robyn suggested narrowing to procedures
    - Discussion around if COEC currently evaluates. Mike asked if it was preventative or reactive?
    - Jeongae suggested to move from section from current placement to COEC duties.
    - Robyn indicated that retaining would allow the council to have access to any evaluations.
    - Agreement to move section to duties (section VIII, 1) and remove second sentence.
  + For search committee compositions, clarification on statement: “In order to ensure sufficient diversity, the Dean may add up to two other members to the search committee” (section IX, C, 4)
    - Melinda indicated that 50% were dean appointed, leaving only 50% elected.
    - Gavin pointed out that we now have search advocates, however these are ad hoc and non-voting.
    - Mike suggested having the dean appoint chair and student
    - Gavin suggesting having someone else appoint.
    - Agreement on DEC appoints 1 faculty, Dean appoints 1 staff.
* Review of suggested language to clarify the search process for Assistant and Associate Deans
  + Robyn explained the proposed language was developed for the last dean search.
  + Stacy Otto expressed concern that we are “creating pathways” and “limiting voices” when the search is pre-determined as internal.
  + Gavin noted internal candidates can still apply for an external search..
  + Robyn discussed leaving open may allow for circumstance when an internal search is appropriate.
  + Melinda suggested the removal 1 a. in new proposed language.
  + Robyn indicated this may offer less guidance.
  + Stacy Otto expressed concern about codifying that these are always internal searches.
  + Discussion around removal of 1a., surveying faculty, full College Council discussion, external searches as inclusive of internal applicants.
  + Gavin drafted replacement language based on the discussion that was agreed upon, as follows:
    - In general, the search should be open for the associate Dean, however, in some situations an internal search may be preferred. Should an internal search be preferred this needs to be done by a vote of the COEC.
  + Stacy Otto noted additional references to internal searches. Robyn will address.
* Remaining discussion items
  + Agreement to address remaining items via email.
  + Robyn will send out via email for discussion and later an electronic vote.
  + Remaining items include:
    - Questions 13, 1, and 2 (Bylaws Discussion Questions)
    - Stacy Otto asked to remove tailgate language (VII 8, section, A, 2)

**6. ACTION ITEMS**

* Election of COEC Secretary (Robyn Seglem)
  + Robyn asked for someone to take on the role of secretary. Sarah asked if it would be an option to share the role. Robyn shared that the bylaws are not currently written that way.
  + Amanda asked if we could do an audio recording transcript.
  + No opposition to Sarah being the secretary. A vote was taken (it was unanimous).

**7. DEAN’S REPORT**

* None.

**8. ADJOURNMENT**

* Amanda Q. moved to adjourn. Gavin seconded. Meeting was adjourned at 1:35