Peabody Faculty Council Meeting  
Minutes of Meeting  
January 14, 2010

Members Present: Paul Speer, Rogers Hall, Dan Levin, Rich Milner, Craig Smith, Brian Griffith, Steve Heyneman, Jim Hogge, Camilla Benbow. Absent are Donna Ford and Georgene Troseth.

Chair Paul Speer called the meeting to order. Prior minutes were approved.

Committee Status Updates

Dan Levin (Academic Standards) reports no new business. Paul Speer notes that McClendon, last time, would take the FC recommendations to the dean. Dan proposes his committee look at what other universities do with math course taking.

Donna Ford (absent, Diversity) has her committee reviewing graduate students’ experiences in the college, with an eye to retention for diverse students we have recruited. What is the graduate school experience for these students, broadly? Heyneman asks if there is going to be a survey, why not also ask international students or others who are new to the country. Council members agreed.

Rich Milner (Faculty Affairs) has convened his committee twice. They are reviewing promotion and retention for faculty lecturers and practice faculty. They are finding variance across departments in which policies are being implemented. They are still gathering information from department chairs. Could Jim Hogge organize sessions for clinical faculty that parallel sessions for tenure line faculty.

A second area of discussion is whether $1000 for travel is sufficient for faculty in the college, across different tracks (tenure line, research, and clinical). Dean Benbow says there is an effort underway to return to 2 trips, and there will be a decision on this, soon. It is not likely the amount of money will increase, but 2 trips might be possible. There is a discussion of whether $1000 is sufficient to cover one trip (e.g., to AERA at Denver this year).

A third area was how to systematize the gathering of faculty concerns about the college, including logging and tracking these concerns. Heyneman asks if there is a way to more transparently gather and transmit faculty concerns expressed to Faculty Council members. Paul Speer notes that he and Cliff Hoffwolt are putting up a website for this purpose. Heyneman suggests that the discussion in FC minutes might be posted on this site.

Steve Heyneman (Research) reports no new business. Dean Benbow encourages faculty to give feedback on the new system, and notes there is a hiring process underway for an NIH grants person.
Brian Griffith (Teaching) continues to look at faculty use of teaching evaluations.

Craig Smith (Curriculum) announces 3 course change requests and 10 new requests, mostly from LPO. Course title change to an education reform course (LPO 3510) are summarized by Smith and were unanimously approved. A proposal to split a doctoral seminar (LPO 3620) into two courses (K-12 and higher ed) is summarized, and Dean Benbow asks about enrollment. She suggests the department make sure both classes are sustainable (minimum enrollment of 5). Unanimous approval. A proposal to change the name of an arts policy course (LPO 3630) to focus on policy is approved. Dean Benbow cautions that when a course topic is narrowed, sufficient enrollment may be an issue. Also, if the course were about “arts policy” in general, would A&S faculty be concerned that Peabody College is infringing on A&S programs. Heyneman notes the proposed syllabus is strong and is a solid contribution to the LPO students, so has no concerns on those grounds.

The other 10 proposals are new courses, most having been taught at least two times as special topics. This package is a house cleaning effort, in part to make the Registrar happier about ongoing topics courses. The first is a course on effectiveness of international business (HOD 2470, undergraduate). Unanimous approval. Paul Speer notes that new course proposals should take into consideration accrediting bodies, which will review programs, to make sure new courses will serve well for accreditation. An example of this, offered by Craig Smith, is to consider which courses would include issues of diversity. Steve Heyneman asks that we make sure the meaning of “diversity” is broad, in this case (e.g., variation across cultures). Brian Griffith and Dean Benbow caution about the term “business,” since the Owen School may see this course as infringing on their programs. Heyneman responds with a proposed change to “for-profit organizations.” Craig Smith proposes FC approve with strong recommendation to make these changes in wording, and there is unanimous agreement.

The next course is on leading globally diverse organizations (LPO 3386). Craig Smith summarizes briefly and asks for questions. Unanimous approval. A new course on public leadership (LPO 3451) is summarized and unanimously approved.

A new course on grants, policy and administration (LPO 3525) is summarized and unanimously approved.

Two new policy analysis courses (LPO 3565, LPO 3566) are briefly summarized. The question by the curriculum committee was whether data analysis in policy was sufficiently different from psychology to have a parallel series of courses. The consensus was that these were sufficiently different. Paul Speer asks if these courses would be available to other MA students in the college, and Heyneman notes these are courses for MPP (MA) students, who have been poorly trained in the past. They would be open to other MA students across the college. Hall asks, and Dean Benbow confirms that these courses would not be sufficient for PhD students’ methods requirements. Unanimous approval.
A new course on education accountability and student assessment (LPO 3650) is described, again for MA candidates who are not expected to be researchers or designers of assessments (or program evaluations). Unanimous approval.

A new course on development, reform, and innovation in the Asia-Pacific region, cross listed in two departments (LPO 3685, HOD 2445) and for both undergraduates and graduates, with consent of instructor, is described. Unanimous approval. Brian Griffith notes that the dual policy courses are pretty light, in content, by comparison with these two courses. He questions whether the public policy sequence (LPO 3565, LPO 3566) is as rigorous. Heyneman contrasts substance and methods, as different purposes for these course offerings. He also notes LPO has had a scarcity of good methods courses, and further adds that his department intends to develop a course on every region of the world, in years out (e.g., on sub-Saharan Africa, the prior Soviet Union).

A new course on postsecondary access (LPO 3835) for higher education MA students is described. Rich Milner notes this is a very well developed syllabus. Unanimous approval.

Final new course on research design and methods in education policy (LPO 3912) is described, again with a decision by the CC that this course is sufficiently distinct to policy issues to be needed. Heyneman notes that they have highly capable PhD students with quantitative backgrounds, but they do not necessarily understand what kinds of studies can be done, for which kinds of questions. This course is designed for this purpose. Unanimous approval.

Craig Smith repeats, for Donna Ford, that new course should indicate when their purpose and content are relevant to issues of diversity. In general, does the Faculty Council want to communicate this to faculty who are developing new courses? Paul Speer asks if we would want also to communicate other accreditation (SACS, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools) themes for new courses. Donna Ford notes that 42% of students in US schools are now non-White, so it is pro-active and proper to add diversity as a theme in these courses. She gives as an example a course on assessment that does not deal with diversity. Heyneman argues for adding to this a much broader definition of diversity, to include international, cultural, and language diversity. Diversity is an international issue, not just an issue for historically under-represented groups in the US. Donna Ford responds that in a review of undergraduate courses in the college her committee undertook (about 30 classes), only a few had explicit topics, activities and readings on diversity.

Craig Smith suggests that the Faculty Council make a statement of value, but be careful about infringing on the academic freedoms of faculty developing and teaching courses.

Rich Milner asks if the Curriculum Committee will begin reviewing with a “diversity lens” and giving feedback to faculty? Craig responds that the committee would be
expected to identify opportunities for including these themes in their courses, though it would still be the decision of the individual faculty member, subject to approval of college committees. Donna Ford asks, if we do not want to focus on diversity now, when will we do so? Heyneman proposes that diversity is the core issue, not race. Donna Ford disagrees, arguing that when race and ethnicity are the issue, the issue should be addressed. African American and Mexican American communities are very difficult to talk about in the college, and addressing these specific, historical communities is important for our teaching.