Call to Order

B. Katzenmeyer, Chair, called the meeting to order at 11:05 am.

Review of Minutes

Minutes to be reviewed at next meeting.

Chair-Elect

C. Mullen was nominated for Chair-Elect and passed by acclamation. She will serve as Chair of the Research Committee for 2003-2004.

Dean’s Statement

The Committee expressed a sincere welcome to Interim Dean Harold Keller and thanked him for setting forth a vision for the College under the rubric of three or four themes (see attached speech).

The need to become intellectually revitalized with kindred minds and spirits who work together, i.e., minds, culture, time commitments has become of great concern. Dean Keller explained a pilot data base system currently in the College of Arts and Sciences. The system would enable faculty to input their personal information once with regard to background, education, faculty expertise and expectations, curriculum vitae, et cetera. Upon completion, faculty members could run through the data to link up with those who have the same focus in life.

Differentiating Faculty Roles

The concept of differentiating faculty roles is an area that should be vigorously pursued. Due to FTE requirements of faculty and students ratio quantity seems to override quality
and the importance of preparing quality teachers should take precedence. Measures should be developed to support those interested in integrating this proposal. Since funds are necessary for implementing any idea, different ways of generating finances were suggested.

- Contact Development Office – Dick Dearolf
- Highlight a department in Alumni paper and ask for contributions
- Solicit support from Adult Literacy Consortium, October 18, being sponsored by the Tampa Tribune and TECO
- Secure resources from local schools; pull superintendents and principles together


**Mentoring**

The Committee held a discussion about the multiple dimensions of mentoring with a focus on research. How do we get the focus on research? Collaboration is vital in the enhancement of mentoring. It is essential there be a grass roots effort to discover individual’s strengths and working together toward a common goal, we strengthen and help one another. More can be accomplished together than alone and support from associates is essential. This idea could be developed in small groups and then brought together in a large gathering.

**Committee Member Terms**

Committee members were assigned one and two-year terms as required by the Constitution and By-Laws. The terms are as follows:

One Year Term
- William Katzenmeyer
- James Paul
- Michael Stewart

Two Years Term
- Susan Homan
- Kofi Marfo
- Carol Mullen
- Joyce Nutta

**Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 1:10 p.m.

**Next Meeting**

The next Research meeting is scheduled for October 17, 2002 at 11:00 am in the DAC Conference Room.
The following is the speech given by Interim Dean Harold Keller at the September 13, 2002 COE Faculty meeting:

I want to use this time to make some personal statements about the “state of the College of Education” and our direction as a college. First, I want to express my appreciation to everyone for your words of support. Today and in the future, I am looking for action consistent with our words. I particularly want to thank Carine Feyten for agreeing to partner with me in this exciting set of challenges.

I am on a steep learning curve concerning our College of Education. I do know a few things about the College of Education. We have multiple strengths and assets, social and intellectual capital, including:

• Some excellent faculty scholars;
• Some excellent teachers (though we need to find better ways to document our quality teaching);
• Outstanding young, recently tenured, newly tenured and tenure-earning faculty;
• And some excellent programs (indeed, a few premier programs). As a College of Education we need to serve as a model of effective pedagogy and of quality academic programs.
• We also have a significant number of faculty and initiatives that are engaged with the community and schools. (Hopefully, you have provided documentation on our COE/Provost’s Community Engagement Survey). We do need to increase our engagement via research, via teaching, and via the integration of research, teaching, and service (we have some excellent faculty models of this integration).

Much of this engagement is disconnected, involving individuals – and probably related to our individualistic entrepreneurial spirit that is engrained in all of us as
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university faculty. Our engagement, as I see it and as many of our constituents both inside and external to the university see it, is like the tentacles of an octopus. The impact of such disconnected engagement is diminished and dissipates with time. We will have a much greater potential impact if our engagement activities are connected, multidisciplinary, and collaborative with our partners in the schools and communities, and if the engagement activities are driven by a common mission. We clearly need to coordinate our engagement activities, in order to maximize our impact on the field and P-20 education. Incidentally, the most recent alumni surveys and potential private funders indicate they expect and want coordinated engagement. Such coordination may enhance tangible economic supports for our efforts.

Similarly, our scholarship is individualistic. At the same time, some of the best research nationally (in terms of quality, importance and impact) is conducted via multidisciplinary, collaborative research partnerships. Such multidisciplinary, collaborative research partnerships are also more likely to result in increased external funding opportunities.

I believe our research or scholarship needs to be focused. We need to identify 3-4 research themes or clusters around which many programmatic research agendas can be developed. Themes will relate to our unique strengths and assets within the college. These articulated focuses will enable individuals to be part of programmatic efforts to address important questions in a systematic manner, so that these questions are examined through multiple disciplinary lenses and through multiple methodologies (even if done individually). More importantly, from my perspective, these articulated focuses will enable working groups to systematically address these
research themes. I’d like to see working groups on each theme, framing questions, planning and engaging in a programmatic research agenda to address the questions, and mutually seeking external funding.

As a professional school, I believe our research needs to be engaged research. If we are serious about moving research into practice (i.e., “evidenced-based practice”), then I contend (along with a recent task force of the National Research Council) that we must engage in multidisciplinary, collaborative research partnerships with school and community professionals. Such collaborative research partnerships will:

- Mutually frame important questions;
- Understand the results of our scholarship within real or ecologically valid educational contexts;
- Assume shared responsibility for dissemination (including dissemination beyond journals that only we read) and for diffusion of research into practice; and
- The diffusion process itself can also become a focus of our research agenda.

The multidisciplinary aspects of our engaged research need to cross departmental boundaries, as well as outside the College of Education. Great potential disciplinary partners can be found in the College of Arts & Sciences, the Florida Mental Health Institute, the Medical School, and the USF Center for Community Partnerships.

Focusing our research around 3-4 themes will connect us with the USF Strategic Plan (specifically, Strategy One). Coordinating our community/school engagement activities, and especially through engaged research, will connect us with the USF Strategic Plan (Strategies One and Nine). Doing both will increase the likelihood of increased external funding, and connect us with the USF Strategic Plan (Strategies
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One and Eight). We in the College of Education are a natural to take a leadership role in establishing and nurturing high quality pedagogy and academic programs, another USF strategic goal (Strategy Four).

Nanotechnology, bioengineering, and Florida’s technology corridor (and USF’s contribution to the corridor) will only be successful with high quality teachers, high quality school support professionals, high quality school leaders and administrators, high quality schools, and healthy communities for the families of those moving to the corridor. The health of communities is indexed, among other variables, by high quality communities of learning (including schooling). So focusing on maintaining and enhancing high quality pre-service programs for teachers, school support professionals and administrators will also address or support those components of the USF Strategic Plan.

Two other aspects are infused throughout the USF Strategic Plan and must be central to us and to our actions. One aspect relates to our reality as a university and College of Education in an urban setting, leading to self-attributions of “urban research university” and “urban College of Education.” As an urban College of Education, diversity is highly valued and grounded in mutual respect. We must increase the diversity among our faculty, students, and administrators, and diversity issues must be infused throughout our curriculum. In this way we will contribute to the creation of culturally competent colleagues, professionals and graduates of our programs. We have 24 new searches for 2003-2004, with 14 of those being new faculty in tenure-earning or tenured positions. We need to ensure that we put our
words into actions these searches, so that we enhance our diversity and more closely approximate an urban College of Education.

A second aspect that is infused throughout the USF Strategic Plan (and in fact relates directly to Strategy Seven) is concerned with providing a student-centered, user-friendly administrative and service infrastructure. This applies to faculty as well, not just to administration and college services. This emphasis on student-centered and user-friendly interactions, grounded in mutual respect, must be carried out at all levels and with all our constituents – each other, faculty, students, support staff, and schools/communities. Genuine caring goes a long way toward our success, to student/graduate success, and to creating a welcoming environment into which students even want to enroll and be admitted.

Clearly, what I am suggesting is that we must examine the USF Strategic Plan. There are multiple points of access and multiple windows of opportunity for individuals, programs, departments, and colleges (including our college) to connect with and contribute to the USF mission. To return to the “state of the College of Education,” financially we are hurting badly. We are in serious trouble economically. We do have many assets in the form of social and intellectual capital. Increased allocations will come our way to the extent that we articulate our mission and focuses, and to the extent to which we connect with and contribute to the USF Strategic Plan. Allocations will be made to colleges, departments, programs and individuals on those bases. Limited resources do not allow across-the-board allocations; that strategy is self-defeating. Allocations will be based on documented progress toward strategic goals.
We have done much work on curricular reform, and verbally it aligns us well with the USF Strategic Plan. We now need to develop action plans to bring our actions in line with our words. Interestingly, both SACS and NCATE are necessary and both help us in this effort. SACS and NCATE are process-based and assessment/outcomes-driven approaches to decision-making, program development, and action. They both ask us to demonstrate how we use our data to inform our decision-making, program development, and goal attainment. The approach relates to all programs in the College of Education, not only teacher education or P-12 preparation programs.

I challenge us to move beyond our words to actions, actions aligned with our curricular reform efforts and with the USF Strategic Plan. We have an opportunity to move forward and to address the challenges. I look forward to working with Carine and with you all to seize these opportunities and to move forward as a College of Education. Thank you for your continuing support. Let’s move forward together to put our words into action, our research into practice ("improving the schools of today"), and to create our College of Education and education of the future at P-20 levels ("inventing the schools of tomorrow").