Minutes for February 14, 2017
Peabody College Faculty Council Meeting
12:00 to 1:30 pm
Peabody Administration Building Room 318


Meeting called to order by John at 12:03 pm

Approval of Minutes for The January Faculty Council Meeting (Andrea motioned, Nina seconded and all in favor)

**Immersion Vanderbilt (John Geer and Dawn Turton):** Geer noted they were invited to Faculty Council to respond to Velma’s subcommittee questions. He proceeded to discuss the responses and shared a PPT (which will be shared with Faculty Council members); noted there are 4 overlapping pathways (international, civic and professional, creative expression, and research); the idea is for students to start thinking about the immersion experience during their freshman year and to file an individualized pre-immersion plan by end of their sophomore year, then complete the experience, and finally produce a tangible final project (note that the immersion experience can be completed during the sophomore year, underscoring the flexibility embedded in the design of the timeline); learning outcomes include: student participation, individual learning plan, develop skills/knowledge, and network of support; Geer reiterated that Peabody already has an immersion experience as part of program requirements and showed various slides illustrating what students have done to date; he underscored that the immersion experience is a faculty-driven idea, with over 60 faculty having participated in this over the past 2 years; feedback from faculty included the 3 following: having a review stage, expansion of immersion supervisors to non-faculty, and tangible final project; concerning #1 (review stage), there is a full review scheduled in 7 years, for 2023-2024 AY, to revisit the model; by then there will be 3 full years of data as this will start in fall 2018 and thus the 7 year review seems reasonable; Dean noted that this plan seems appropriate as there will likely be iterations during the first couple of years; concerning #2 (expansion to non-faculty), this will depend on approval; concerning #3 (tangible product), the immersion experience can be completed at VUs ten colleges and schools, thus providing students with the opportunity to work with world-class faculty on a student-designed project; there will also be transcript recognition, thus differentiating students’ resumes; there will be supporting infrastructure, with a centralized location that will include campus partners, student i-fellows, immersion supervisors, registrar’s office, and faculty advisory committee; there will also be resources to support faculty, including funds to school deans to support faculty effort (which will be individualized by school), new philanthropy for students to do the immersion experience, and new resources for advising and central support; next was the discussion of responses to questions posed by Velma’s subcommittee (document was distributed with the responses to each of the questions) and Geer asked if there were any questions; Velma noted this was very thorough and that the next step is to think about how to identify i-courses and i-seminars in each department, as well as to approve the proposal; John Braxton underscored that giving students the opportunities to work across the different schools is very valuable for undergraduates; John Braxton asked what the benefit is for faculty and Geer responded that includes potential course buyouts, working with fantastic students on a topic they and you are passionate about and this is not mandatory (faculty decide whether or not to participate in mentoring students); Andy noted that many students...
engage in experiences that may be under this, but the end result varies so wondered if there is a common tangible project; Dawn Turton noted that there is no standard project result, but there will need to be a tangible outcome, as will very widely based on what students pursue; Nina asked if there will be a course students sign up for and Dawn Turton said it depends by school and that this can work like an independent study, but the bottom line is there needs to be a plan and a rationale for why their proposed project qualifies as an immersive experience; Nina also asked how this will appear on the transcript and Dawn Turton said it will say Immersion Experience and the title of the project; Craig asked what supports will be in place for students who are having difficulty academically and Dawn Turton noted that they are thinking of how to handle this and may be something like a Maymester (as one possibility) they would have to complete if they do not fulfill the Immersion Experience; John Braxton asked about implications for inter-collegiate athletes and it appears there is a plan in place that is satisfactory for these students; Dawn Turton stated that they have a subcommittee for special populations, such as athletes, international students and transfer students; with Opportunity Vanderbilt, there is more diversity in the student population and thus working on a plan to ensure all students have access to the immersion experiences they would like to engage in, independent of resources they may or may not have (Doug Christiansen is working on this)

Proposal for Scheduling of Afternoon and Evening Courses at Peabody (Amy Palmeri): work began by polling faculty members about the shift in time for 4-7pm courses (see report); they are recommending scheduling classes vertically rather than horizontally; as an example, moving back to having a 1:10-4pm class but with a companion (thus pairing classes); if policy is approved, we will be back to the way classes were originally scheduled; Nina asked how this would work in practice and Amy noted that there is usually someone (assistant chair) who oversees the scheduling and would ensure it works; Nina seconded motion from committee and all approved

Curriculum Committee Items for Action (Nina Martin): 2 proposals were discussed; proposal 1 = new course proposal from LPO (Introduction to data science); this is a follow-up from an intro stats course and is something other universities offer; the curriculum committee thinks this makes sense; proposal 2 = program revision proposal with 2 parts; part 1 is from 48 to 39 credit hours to still meet requirements; part 2 is to ask for consideration that this change in credit hours be retroactive such that students who originally signed up for 48 hours be able to fulfill the requirement with 39 hours; Dean noted that students have the choice of following the catalog they came in with or the current one, but Nina was not sure and noted that since it is a Master’s program there might financial implications, but seems that is not the case; Craig clarified that changes made to benefit students have always been instituted so this seems reasonable; for part 1, Amy seconded and no need to vote on part 2 as that is automatic; all in favor of both

Dean’s Remarks – Redacted since offered with assumption of confidentiality to encourage honest and frank discussion.

Election of Faculty Council Chairperson for 2017-2018 (John Braxton)- Georgene will continue as past chair as Braxton will retire; Andrea is willing take this role.

Faculty Council Awards Deliberation Process (John Braxton): last year they were due by April 4, per Naomi; John wonders if should have an ad-hoc committee to make recommendations to Council; Andrea noted that EDI committee will make recommendations and Dean noted we can use that model to make recommendations; Georgene noted that we also need to attend to who already received
awards and some attention to distribution across programs should be in place; we can use Box to collaborate on nominations; Naomi, Georgene and I will be the ad-hoc committee; we will add the list of past winners since beginning in the announcement that is sent out; Naomi added that past nominators have been asked if they want to re-nominate with the same letter submitted so they do not have to resubmit a letter; Dean noted may consider alternating on a yearly basis the faculty award at undergrad and grad level, and also include scholarship and scholarship in action (to tap into outreach efforts); John noted we can add new awards and Dean agreed

**Adjournment:** John adjourned the meeting at 1:56pm