

Arts and Sciences Faculty Meeting
Monday, November 10th, 2014 12pm-2pm
Educational Policy and Planning Committee
Policy and Planning Committee

Professor Susan Pedersen began the meeting by outlining the meeting's agenda, which would be mostly business having to do with the Educational Policy and Planning Committee (EPPC). Professor Pedersen explained that the EPPC was formed three years ago by the Policy and Planning Committee (PPC) as a way to try and make sure that faculty talk across the Arts & Sciences about what they are doing. The EPPC has operated as a forum for information sharing, a catalyst for action, and what Professor Pedersen called "a SWAT team for issues."

The EPPC operates four committees: Global Education, which double as advisers to the Office of Global Programs (OGP); Instructional Technology is currently focusing on course evaluations; Curricular Structure, which is covering reforms about point structures and also looking at the complex but not insolvable problem of course numbering; and Learning Outcomes, which has undertaken work vital to the upcoming Middlestates accreditation.

Professor Pedersen further explained that the meeting would be shared with PPC, who would have the last half hour. Before that, EPPC would begin with Global Education and primarily talk about Columbia programs being hosted abroad. The hope was that this would be a discussion of the faculty as a whole. Notes were taken so that follow up could be done with individual faculty members who identified themselves.

As background, Professor Pedersen explained there was a proposal made by Columbia to the Mellon Foundation that would fund additional positions in the Humanities tied to course building abroad. That proposal was accepted in 2012/2013 and last year a part of the IBS process involved proposals related to the Mellon grant. In the first year the selected proposals were from Music, EALAC, Art History and History and in the second year the selected proposals were from Anthropology, Italian, Slavic, and English. Thus far there have been eight positions that have come out of those proposals. The Mellon process was part of the normal IBS and the course building was done by departments. At this point the conversation is moving to what faculty are doing across departments as part of the global education experience. Michael Pippenger from the Office of Global Programs has gathered and worked with various faculty, but this faculty meeting is an opportunity for a larger group to discuss those issues.

The following faculty members had agreed to share their experiences: Martha Howell (History), Karen Van Dyck (Classics), Dustin Rubinstein (E3B), Matthew Hart (English), and Holger Klein (Art History).

Michael Pippenger, Dean of Undergraduate Global Programs, provided an overview of the Office of Global Programs (OGP), which has been in its current incarnation for the last three years. OGP was created during a time of multiple transitions with the aim to centralize all undergraduate (Columbia College, Columbia Engineering, and General Studies) for-credit study abroad programs into one office. A staff of thirteen people help students apply for and attend three types of programs: those offered by Columbia and taught by Columbia faculty; those offered by other universities in the US or abroad; and

programs from third party providers. OGP has 3 units: one oversees the Columbia study abroad programs (17 programs all around the world – 5 during the academic year and 12 during the summer); a unit that works with non-Columbia study abroad; and an administrative unit that is responsible for financial compliance, planning and administration. The Office of Global Programs serves not just students, but also faculty who are interested in developing programs. A handout of programs that have come on-line this year or will begin next year was provided.

Dean Pippenger explained the wide variety of new programs throughout the world – some of which are the result of the Mellon grant (specifically a program in Tokyo, one in Istanbul being led by Professors Martha Howell and Karen Van Dyck, and one organized by Professor Ted Hughes). The Mellon Foundation grant is one of several current initiatives that can assist faculty in building global programs. Faculty can work with Dean Pippenger and OGP on how to develop programs that meet their goals and the goals of their department. Some other programs are the result of President Bollinger's Global Innovation Fund grant and others are from faculty desire to create something from scratch for the benefit of their students and their discipline.

Dean Pippenger then introduced Professor Holger Klein, who is the chair of the EPPC subcommittee on Global Education. Professor Klein began by explaining the Core Curriculum abroad, part of the first round of funding from the Mellon grant, whereby Art History and Music will begin offering Art Humanities and Music Humanities at Reid Hall in Paris. Because Art Humanities and Music Humanities are frequently taken by juniors or seniors and are each only one semester, they seemed a logical part of the Core to be offered abroad. Additionally, it was felt that each syllabus focused sufficiently on French topics that Paris would be an important and logical site for these courses to take place. It was noted that along with the United Kingdom, Paris is one of the most frequented study abroad destinations for Columbia students. The creation of these two course offerings will provide an opportunity for students studying abroad to fulfill a Core requirement while abroad. Beginning in Spring 2015, one section each of Art Humanities and Music Humanities will be taught (in English) in Paris by faculty members from the Departments of Art History and Music. The departments expect these offerings to be regular and sustained, with at least one section of each course being offered abroad annually. Professor Klein reported that thus far the response has been positive and students have embraced the opportunity because it frees up some time in the senior year for electives and major courses. Professor Klein also mentioned plans to experiment with summer offerings of Art and Music Humanities in Paris, which for now are taught at Columbia by faculty and graduate students as part of the summer session, but could in the future be taught abroad in Paris and other cities with an array of art and music resources comparable to the Met, MoMA, and Carnegie Hall, etc.

Next Professors Martha Howell and Karen Van Dyck described a course they will be offering in Turkey. Professor Howell explained that the genesis for this course was the Mellon program since many departments were interested in having a Byzantinist (including Religion and Classics). Columbia already has a relationship with an English-language university in Istanbul and they were happy to partner on a course in the style of a Columbia upper-level seminar. Professor Howell explained that type of course is not regularly done at that institution, which led to many individuals there - who had been educated in the United States or in a similar tradition - to be interested in offering the opportunity to their students.

The course is expected to include Columbia and Barnard students who are abroad as well as students from the host institution (Bogazici) and other European Union exchange students. Professor Howell's course, *Byzantine Encounters*, treats western history in a global context by addressing the interactions with and "stealing from" Constantinople. Professor Van Dyck's course is more about interpretation of Greek history and culture. The two courses will be put together with each faculty member teaching for seven weeks of twice weekly two hour classes. Due to this high number of contact hours, the course will be worth 8 points for Columbia students.

Professor Howell then went on to describe some logistical bumps they had encountered. While the faculty in Turkey were very enthusiastic about the course, there were concerns that the local students are not used to this type of situation. Those students generally do not read as much, respond independently, or write as much as is expected of Columbia students. Additionally, English is unlikely to be their first language.

The other major concern is that the host institution counts credits by contact hours, so four hours per week will be worth four credits to Bogazici students, but eight credits for Columbia students. The COIs at Columbia and Bogazici have accepted the course. However, there is a question as to whether it can count as Global Core. Professor Van Dyck's course has in the past been part of the Global Core, but Professor Howell's has not, reportedly because most sources are Western. However, Professor Howell believes there is an argument for this course to count towards the Global Core requirement because it is an effort to rewrite the western narrative in a global context. She explained that much of what she teaches is not in a general textbook. This is a course that rewrites western/European history from a global perspective.

Professor Van Dyck provided additional information about the courses she and Professor Howell will be offering in Turkey. She explained that both courses are flexible and designed so they could be taught by many different faculty with various regional or historical specificities; the courses are interdisciplinary in nature, drawing from history, literature, and other disciplines. Professor Van Dyck further remarked on the opportunities for co-teaching and what a "Global Core" course is. She also noted that this course at Columbia will never be the same because of the global experience. However, she added that one problem with the Mellon grant is that while many people who are most situated to do this are interdisciplinary, the proposals are submitted from departments.

Speaking further about her course, Professor Van Dyck explained that while the semester begins in the history discipline, it moves into an interdisciplinary second half that will use the region to take advantage of scholars there – specialists and artists in Greece, Turkey, the Balkans and people who are using the Global Centers. The locations are portals that enable connections to different resources and people. Professor Van Dyck explained that she wants to enable students in all disciplines to participate in global study and create a culture where students in a discipline understand the challenge of different regions.

Professor Dustin Rubenstein discussed his courses, which intend to get students in the field to do science first hand. Rather than having lab components, in these courses the lab is the primary teaching

location. Originally students would go to Africa for three weeks after the spring term, but with that model they did not get the desired immersion in the culture. The new version of the program is designed to really immerse students for three months. It is a partnership with between Columbia and Princeton involving Columbia's Department of E3B and program in Sustainable Development. The semester involves four intensive module courses that will last three weeks each. Students will remain in Kenya while faculty members rotate through, which gives students access to different types of faculty from Columbia and Kenya. The courses vary each year, with some core courses in ecology, conservation, biological sciences, engineering, and social sciences. The courses are very intensive – the classes meet from 7am to 9pm over all seven days per week for three weeks, which totals lots of contact hours. The students work intensively on one topic for three weeks and then move on. The courses provide hands-on experiences with experimental design, data collection, and data analysis.

Professor Rubenstein also cautioned that Africa is a challenging place to work; due to terrorist attacks and Ebola concerns, they have seen a decreased number of applicants. They have worked with the global center in Nairobi to co-teach and are using funding from the President's initiative to make a regional program through which students can travel to Ethiopia or Uganda to work with global center programs as well as bringing students to different areas of Kenya (including national parks and private lands). However, there are logistical challenges: it is hard for Columbia students to go abroad for full semester due to the Core Curriculum and only taking four classes for the term would be a relatively light load for many Columbia students. Due to the collaboration with Princeton, the semester abroad is truncated (beginning in February), which might allow for the addition of a Core class taught to the Columbia students before the rest of the program begins.

Professor Matthew Hart discussed a study abroad program that he has been developing with Professor Molly Murray and with the assistance of Michael Pippenger. The Department of English and Comparative Literature requested Mellon funding for the program out of two central motivations – it provided a line for a much-needed specialist in Enlightenment literatures but also a demand for a London study abroad for British Literature (which Columbia is alone among her peers in not offering). Professor Hart noted that the UK is second most popular study-abroad destination among Columbia undergraduates. However, one problem noted by Professor Hart is that there is not a global center in the UK.

The course he discussed, London as Literature, involves site-specific study of literature and culture based at University College London, a top research university and also Columbia existing major study-abroad partner in the UK. A Columbia professor and an advanced graduate student (serving as both TA and administrative assistant) would travel with a group of undergraduates. The Columbia students would take two Columbia seminars taught by the Columbia faculty (or potentially co-taught with the graduate student) and then two or three courses at University College London with local students taught by the local faculty. To make this program sustainable it requires a series of courses that could be taught by a large number of faculty. Courses will therefore focus on broad topics that can have a wide range of subject specializations – for instance a course on London's theatrical culture, a class on literature capitals, and a course on archival studies of literature. Professors Hart and Murray have built into the program graduate student involvement in order to meet an additional need for graduate

students to doctoral research in the UK and grow their professional networks by attending conferences and other academic events in Britain and Europe.

Professor Klein brought the panel to a close by explaining that the classes discussed are at very different stages: having been taught, about to be taught, and still being planned. Most of the programs have been established within departments or by faculty with department-specific agendas. The motivations are different, but all have expectations of sustainability (as Mellon specified), but that is a long way from a university initiative for a global strategy. The next big step would be to think about what a global strategy for Columbia education abroad could look like. The discussion should address both aspects: challenges to specific programs and the broader strategy.

When a faculty member asked about the expected lifetimes of programs, Professor Klein explained that there is not a definitive timeline, but Mellon had suggested programs should think about sustainability although Mellon only funds for two years.

Professor Haruo Shirane, Chair of the Department of East Asian Languages and Cultures asked about tuition for study abroad. He mentioned that in Tokyo and Seoul the tuition is extremely high and scholarships do not cover it. In addition, students must pay for travel and accommodations, which could cost up to \$15,000. He asked whether there were plans to include this in any Columbia College fundraising initiatives. Additionally, Professor Shirane asked about the coordination between global programs and global core. There seem to be concerns about barriers to getting classes to be counted towards the global core requirement. Finally, Professor Shirane asked Professors Howell and Van Dyck about how the coordination was working in their home departments for their course, which would involve each of them teaching abroad for a half semester.

Professor Klein responded that Mellon expected departments getting a line would use that flexibility to free a professor to teach abroad, but the department determines who is teaching abroad, for how long, and what the course load expectation should be. For now, one new course in a new program may be enough work for someone. Professor Klein also noted that the structure of Professor Howell and Professor Van Dyck's program is not the norm. The number of faculty that can be sent abroad is a question of sustainability at the home department. Professor Klein also noted that the tuition issue is specific to summer programs. EALAC is the only of the Mellon proposals that developed summer programs, which is not usually part of the Columbia tuition structure. Currently summer programs abroad are for those who can pay for them. The study abroad program during the year is different; it is not tuition driven in the same way. Summer is also not usually part of what a faculty member is paid for, so some of that summer tuition goes to paying the faculty. How can Columbia make this sustainably available for students, not just those who can pay for it?

Dean Pippenger agreed that financial aid for undergraduates who pursue summer study abroad needs to be addressed. At present it is a "pay-to-play" system that he felt was anathema to most people in the room. The Office of Global Programs is working to help students have access to programs, even those in the summer. There is a fellowship team within OGP to help students apply to Columbia and outside fellowships. Annually OGP applies for funds that they can use to assist students with funding study

abroad. Dean Pippenger also referenced that Dean Valentini is working to provide each student with a summer experience, which may be a global experience. It is a question of finding the money, and Dean Pippenger feels the school is working to address that.

Professor Paul Anderer noted the quality and distinctiveness of several new courses being launched under the Mellon Global Initiative. He said they were good precisely because they came up from the faculty, who have existing affiliations abroad, and reflected specific program or curricular needs. Although a "strategic plan" for going global may be convenient for fund-raising purposes, what is most pressing now is for faculty already substantially engaged in this work, to bring forward initiatives that should receive support. He noted a cruel irony: that Martha Howell's and Karen Van Dyke's Mellon-supported course in Istanbul, did not satisfy the Global Core Committee, so that students who take it will not earn "global core" credit for doing so. But this begs an even larger question. What is the "Global Core?" Does any courses on the approved "global core" list have to be taken by every CC student? The answer is no. So for now, we should just be restrictive and correct in how we use the term, "Core." Reserve it for those courses the College thinks are important enough for everyone to take, and admit that the "global," despite all the rhetoric about its importance, is something on a vetted list for students to pick through: good courses no doubt, but which for now fall into the category of "distribution requirement." In no strict sense can they be called, "core."

Professor Madeleine Zelin suggested that faculty would not want one course to be the "global core." She felt that even if Columbia requires students to learn something about a place other than the place they come from, many faculty would not want one single course that all students are required to take.

Professor Shirane suggested that the Global Core Committee should come speak to the faculty at large to explain how courses are classified. He also raised a few questions about sequencing: How does Columbia coordinate courses abroad with what is offered on campus? For example, should a capstone at Columbia follow an experience aboard? He felt there needs to be coordination between global core, courses abroad, and the curriculum at Columbia. The perception that the restrictions on global core now have to do with centuries/countries being covered by the syllabus seems outdated and there was a suggestion that other paradigms that should be taken into account.

Professor Klein responded that this is why there is a need for strategy: Columbia cannot rely on Mellon funding for sustainability. He added questions about what makes a global experience?, what makes the global core?, and what is a global experience for a global university?

Professor Shirane added that there is an opportunity for a global experience in New York that should be integrated into the conversation.

Professor Van Dyck brought up the idea of sequencing and capstones for integration of the abroad courses into the courses at Columbia. She also stressed the importance of language learning whether in preparation for time abroad or as a result of the encounter with the new culture upon the students' return to Columbia.

Professor Shirane suggested the requirement that the global core be fulfilled by two classes is an opportunity to integrate a course abroad with one at Columbia.

Professor Avinoam Shalem described his experience by explaining that the first trap he fell into was to think that programs needed to go outside Euro-centric thinking if they claim a global agenda. He agreed that a New York experience is potentially no less global. Secondly, he said the thing that makes the student feel they are thinking globally is to feel as if they are looking at the world and the material differently, perhaps look from the viewpoint of someone standing in Istanbul. By looking and thinking from a different place, one can discover a different narrative. Connectivity and mobility must also be part of the conversation about the global core.

Professor Klein felt that one issue for EPPC is the focus on undergraduates. He questioned who is thinking about the graduate experience abroad: Where is it? Is it part of the strategy? Or is it expected that graduate students are more global than undergraduates? Can OGP consider both perspectives? Professor Pedersen agreed to try to facilitate the conversation that people have asked to have.

The conversation then turned to Professor Adam Kosto for a discussion of the topics for the Instructional Technology subcommittee. Professor Kosto explained that faculty had received a long email, so he would try to be brief. The subcommittee is intent – perhaps to a fault, he said – to hear what the faculty have to say. To begin, he highlighted some background: the University Senate addressed evaluations in 2012, encouraging schools to pursue open course evaluations. Professor Kosto described the conversations as exhaustive and interesting with a complex history of complex issues. Last year COSI did its own work and found strong support in the science departments, including some who already publish their evaluations (as does Economics). The current issues are those of implementation, which the subcommittee is considering. While faculty have been discussing, the students have been acting; student-created resources have moved beyond CULPA to sites like Courses@CU, which integrates information from CULPA and other sources. These types of sites will likely want to move to the open course evaluation data, recognizing that CULPA is a flawed evaluation system.

The Instructional Technology subcommittee was formed six months ago and since then has learned a few things, mainly that there is broad support for moving ahead, since evaluations will be made public whether the faculty do it or not. The task now is to build a better mousetrap in order to maintain some control. The current Courseworks-based system is problematic with too many questions and indigestible data. Moving to online evaluations has led to a decline in response rates and the resulting information seems designed for operations research, rather than for use by actual people. The subcommittee would like to develop something that meets needs of faculty and students. One key is to return response rates to those of when there were paper evaluations since response rate is perceived as the key to what makes this more useful to faculty. Professor Kosto emphasized that the world will not end if Columbia moves forward with open course evaluations; peer institutions are doing this, but they had the same debates and they moved ahead without an apocalypse. Open course evaluations have been in place for over a decade and Columbia's peers still stand. However, the plan is to move very slowly so that faculty can be comfortable with what is being done. The committee is open to any ideas, but not moving forward because of fear is not going to happen.

Professor Kosto outlined the following plan:

- 1) Develop an evaluation model with specific questions – qualitative and quantitative – but allow for the model to be personalized and editable by departments. To develop this, the subcommittee is considering results of survey and consulting with colleagues who are up on these ideas.
- 2) Bring basic model to all department chairs and student representatives for a discussion to see if it meets the department's needs and to identify remaining concerns.
- 3) Fiddle with the model and then bring it back to EPPC and then the faculty body for further discussion.

Professor Kosto hopes a consultative and iterative process will get evaluations to a happy place. He then opened the floor for feedback.

Professor Jacqueline van Gorkom asked why move forward slowly and not fast. She noted that the paper evaluation had similar questions, but response rates were higher. If this was because students had time in class to complete the evaluation, why not let them do the electronic version in class as well? Professor Kosto responded that the subcommittee is proceeding slowly, because many faculty have concerns about open evaluations, which the committee wants to take into account. Giving time in class with an app on a student's computer would possibly lead to an amazing response rate.

Professor Zelin asked whether peers require a response before students see their grades. Professor Kosto explained that one fun task of the committee has been researching what others do. One example was a Groupon model where 80% of students must respond for the evaluation to be opened.

One professor asked about undertaking a controlled experiment by looking at different between requiring a response to view the grade or not. That professor felt that currently faculty do not want to opt for this on Courseworks because they don't know whether it works. That professor also suggested the subcommittee look at the responses for the group of faculty who did require it.

Professor Jean Howard supported open course evaluations, but questioned if some groups should be excluded. Specifically, she mentioned new junior faculty, who sometimes get off to a bad start. She was concerned that after bad reviews someone could have a hard time reestablishing himself or herself. If the evaluation was not public, faculty in the candidate's department could still have access to it, but making it open to students has a potentially negative impact on a beginning instructor who hasn't gotten his/her "teaching feet." She suggested that perhaps evaluations should not be public for the first three years of teaching since sometimes people start off struggling but become very good teachers. Professor Kosto explained that many different types of restrictions are being considered, including those for junior faculty, the first time a course is taught, and classes with a response rate or number below a certain minimum.

Professor Alice Hecklen asked about any available data considering the relationship between percent As and the course evaluations. Professor Kosto said that relationship has been brought up, but trends would be difficult to see because there is a narrow range of grades. Someone mentioned a report from

approximately fifteen years ago that had found a correlation of .7 linking expected grades to evaluations, but Professor Kosto reiterated that there is likely not enough variability in expected grades to find helpful results. Professor Heicklen felt that the Sciences have relatively more grade distribution. She was specifically curious as to whether there was a link between a student's likelihood of recommending the course and the percent As of the class.

When Professor Manan Ahmed asked about giving real names to student evaluators, Professor Kosto explained that the University Senate had discussed this – some had claimed if the responses are public is it unfair to make them anonymous - but many felt the power balance between faculty and students is such that names cannot be put on the comments. However, Professor Kosto did not completely close the discussion on the idea.

Professor Susan Pedersen mentioned that she had a discussion with young professors from a range of institutions and found there was a lot of interesting information about evaluations across our peers. People at many institutions have thought through all different ways to get students to do this seriously. It was mentioned that at one institution students rate their own commitment to the course before rating the professor with a question along the lines of: “Did you fulfill what you think are reasonable expectations for a student?”

Professor Kosto references a previously published course guide (from “back in the day”) that included a letter from the university president outlining the standard by which students should judge their courses.

Professor Pedersen asked about modifying the current menu of questions, which Professor Kosto felt was necessary. There are currently 28 questions which some faculty felt seemed designed for broad-based research rather than to be individually useful. Professor Kosto reported that peers have 7-8 core questions and that individual departments can include add-on questions to address individual concerns. Professor Kosto felt it is important to have a compact default evaluation.

Multiple faculty brought up the feeling that something produced centrally will be more accurate than what students have produced. One example of a concern indicated that the students' websites have associated faculty with courses they had never taught. It was also brought up that students have asked faculty for copies of syllabi to publish, but there are concerns that students do not think about how syllabi change over time. There was a sentiment that faculty could produce a better system.

Professor Nicole Wallack suggested that as end of term evaluations become more high stakes there may be a need for a low-stakes response (perhaps mid-semester) so that faculty could respond to how students are doing. Additionally, this would help teach students the genre of course evaluations before it counts in the university records. Professor Kosto agreed. He mentioned that he did this last week because he feels it is important to educate students about the evaluations and educate faculty on how to use the evaluation.

Professor Peter deMenocal added that the students on science committees have provided good feedback and Professor deMenocal recommended considering student voices in the conversation about evaluations. Professor Kosto explained that the committee plans to consult with both students from

various College and Arts & Sciences academic committees as well as those working on their own evaluation tools (whom he called those who are creating their own mousetrap). He closed the discussion by inviting faculty to send emails or talk to someone on the committee with any ideas.

The Planning and Policy Committee (PPC) shared feedback from the last meeting that had shaped the agenda moving forward. There were also some questions to be asked of the faculty who were present. Since it was unclear who in the room could vote and whether there was a quorum, the meeting was used as a forum for discussion that could be followed by online voting.

The following items were covered:

- 1) Minutes taken at previous meetings have been posted online. However, the acoustics in the room are not ideal, so faculty have entertained the idea of recording the meeting. The sense was that recording would change the nature of the meeting for two reasons: 1) people do not like to speak when they are being recorded and 2) there are logistical problems of getting people to the microphones. Instead general minutes that would have the sense of the meetings, rather than a full transcription, will be taken.
- 2) There has been a lot of discussion about doing a faculty survey. There are different ideas about what the faculty at large perceive on a number of issues: for example salary, peer institutions, the Core, etc. A survey would give PPC the authority to pursue issues that faculty care about. Something will be circulated to get a sense of how faculty would feel about having a faculty survey. Additionally, the Provost's office might be interested in doing this beyond Arts & Sciences. Based on the general sentiment in the room, this has support.
- 3) The agenda for the rest of the year is set. There were only two faculty meetings this term, but next term (Spring 2015) they are scheduled for every month. There has been a suggestion that administrators (specifically President Bollinger and Provost Coatsworth) be invited more often. There were also suggestions that people would be interested in hearing more about the budget. The first faculty meeting in January will be about the state of the Arts & Sciences budget. In February the meeting will be about various fundraising initiatives.