



**Minutes of the Meeting
October 6, 2022**

The Boston University Faculty Council convened on October 6, 2022 in the Metcalf Trustee Ballroom, 1 Silber Way, 9th floor. Kimberly A.S. Howard, Chair of the Faculty Council, presided over the meeting.

Officers and Committee Chairs								
X	Howard, Kimberly	Chair	WCEHD	X	Furman, Jeff	Faculty Policies	QST	
X	O’Keefe, Eileen	Past Chair	Sargent	X	Barbone, Paul.	Graduate Programs	ENG	
	Will, Leslie	Secretary-Treasurer	GSDM		Murphy, George J.	Research and Scholarly Acti.	MED	
	Kinraide, Rebecca	Academic Freedom	ENG		Will, Leslie	Student Life and Policies	GSDM	
X	Gavornik, Jeff	Administrative Policies	CAS	X	Andres, Andy	Sustainability	CGS	
X	Reed, Marnie	Awards	WCEHD	X	Pani, Pinelopi	Teaching Resources	GSDM	
X	Ritter, Brigitte	Compensation and Benefits	MED		Andres, Andy	Undergraduate Programs	CGS	
X	Hughes, Jeffrey	Credentials and By-laws	CAS					
	Karin Schon	Equity and Inclusion	MED					
Representatives (R) and Alternates (A)								
	Afasizhev, Ruslan (A)	GSDM		Gopalan, Srikanth (R)	ENG	Polychroniou, Kelly (R)	CAS	
	Allen, Lynne (A)	CFA		Hall, Adam (A)	MED	Rawassizadeh, Reza (A)	MET	
	Allenberg, Diane (A)	CAS		Han, Jingyan (R)	MED	Ritter, Brigitte (R)	MED	
	Alosco, Michael (R)	MED		Hesse, Petra (A)	WCEHD	Schon, Karin (R)	MED	
	Austin, Judy (A)	COM		Jackson, Hayes (R)	COM	Schwartz, Peter (A)	CAS	
X	Bai, Mabel (A)	SHA	X	Joyce, Kathleen (R)	LAW	Semeter, Joshua (A)	ENG	
	Bania, Thomas (A)	CAS		Juilen, Charlene (A)	MED	Shetty, Malavika (A)	CAS	
X	Barbone, Paul (R)	ENG		Kahn, Shulamit (R)	QST	Smith, Kevin (R)	CAS	
X	Benoit, Greg (A)	WCEHD	X	Keohane, Ana (R)	GSDM	X	Smith, Shively T.J. (A)	STH
X	Brown, Lisa (R)	Sargent	X	Lakin-Schultz, Katherine (R)	CAS		Stevens, Aaron (A)	QST
	Brown, Shelley (R)	Sargent	X	Leahey, Kristin (R)	CFA	X	Straub, John (R)	CAS
	Sandra Buerger (R)	CGS		Lee, Elaine (R)	MED		Suchdev, Kushak (A)	MED
	Burton, Deborah (A)	CFA	X	Levin, Leonid (R)	CAS		Sullivan-Soydan, Anne (A)	CAS
	Byrne, Tom (A)	SSW	X	Liao, Peixi (A)	GSDM	X	Sushkov, Alexander (R)	CAS
X	Byttebier, Stephanie (R)	CGS		Loechler, Edward (R)	CAS		Tallman, Sean (R)	MED
	Canelli, Robert (A)	MED		Lumpkin, William (R)	CFA	X	Tripodis, Yorghos (R)	SPH
X	Cohen, Alan (R)	QST		Lunze, Karsten (R)	MED		Ünlü, Selim (R)	ENG
X	Conley, Christopher (R)	MED	X	Maseli, Vasiliki (R)	GSDM		Villegas-Reimers, Eleonora (R)	WCEHD
	Cozier, Yvette (A)	SHA		McKeen, Bill (A)	COM		Volk, Robert (R)	LAW
	Craigen, Laurie (R)	MED	X	McLaughlin, Donna (R)	SSW		Walker, Gigi (A)	LAW
	Cronin, Shea (R)	MET		Menéndez-Antuña, Luis (R)	STH		Walsh, Brian (A)	CAS
	Currie, Richard (R)	SHA		Michalakakis, Konstantinos (A)	GSDM	X	Walsh, Joyce (R)	COM
X	DeNatale, Doug (R)	MET	X	Muirhead, Philip (R)	CAS	X	Weinstein, Jack (R)	Pardee
X	Desilets, Sean (R)	CAS		Mustafa-Kutana, Suleiman (R)	MED		Wippl, Joe (A)	Pardee
X	Dobbs, Christina (R)	WCEHD	X	Nash, Kate (A)	LAW		Wise, Lauren (R)	SPH
	Edwards, Heather (R)	MED	X	Noor, Jawwad (A)	CAS	X	Xing, Hao (A)	QST
X	Ellis, Theresa (R)	Sargent	X	Oller, Thomas (A)	CAS	X	Yang, Shi (R)	MED
	Fazio, Catherine (A)	QST	X	Onorato, Amelia (A)	CELOP			
	Feng, Hui (R)	MED	X	Pani, Pinelopi (R)	GSDM			
X	Finke, Beth (R)	CELOP		Park, Hee-Young (A)	MED			
X	Furman, Jeff (R)	QST		Pendleton, Rebecca (A)	LAW			
	Genovese, Salvatore (A)	CGS		Pinsky, Eugene (A)	MET			

Guests: Associate Provost for Undergraduate Affairs Amie Grills; Assistant Provost for General Education David Carballo; Associate Provost for Graduate Education Daniel Kleinman

Meeting called to order by Chair Kimberly Howard.

I. Undergraduate Education—Hub Assessment

Adjusting the order on the distributed agenda, the first order of business was for Chair Howard to welcome guests – David Carballo, Assistant Provost for General Education and Amie Grills, Associate Provost for Undergraduate affairs- to discuss Hub assessment. AP Carballo first reported that survey results were available on the Internet. He emphasized and discussed direct assessment of the Hub that happened over the summer. He first described the contours are of assessment –at baseline there are some accreditation rules that must be observed. NECHE, our accrediting body, requires that we have 40 credits dedicated for general education - approximately 10 4-credit courses. There are also some restrictions as to how much can count in one course – two broad domains of knowledge. We interpret this as, for example, knowledge PLUS modes of inquiry. A skill category could also be added on, such as communication. Our Hub program currently requires students to complete 26 units. Each 4 credit course meets about 2.4 units (range – 0-4). Lab courses and cross challenges could get 4 units. If carefully planned, Hub requirements could be done in 10-11 courses; however, this is usually not possible due to redundant units and scheduling problems. We need to determine how many courses are necessary to fulfill requirements for different student populations.

AP Carballo said the goal of the assessment is to improve student learning: what are students coming away with after 4 years? What are the transferrable skills? We also want to consider the faculty governance aspects of the program: the course was created with some intent in mind - how is it working? Two committees address these issues. First, the General Education Committee, which reviews all courses that come in, was formed when Hub started. Second, the Hub council was formed 3 years ago and charged with assessment and continual evolution of the Hub. Lynn O'Brien Hallstein, a former Faculty Council committee chair, was a valuable member of the Hub council. As she is no longer on Faculty Council, AP Carballo asked Faculty Council to select someone to be on Hub council.

AP Carballo said they have been doing assessment 3 ways: 1) indirect assessment – enrollment, completion, and attrition of courses; 2) meeting with groups of students for feedback; and 3) surveys. In addition to an annual student survey every spring, they also piggyback some questions on individual school surveys. What's new is doing direct assessment. For a first experience, a Direct Assessment Institute of BU faculty chose 9 different areas of the program to assess this spring, between finals and summer session. The Hub has 6 capacities: 3 follow modes of inquiry and 3 are new for GenEd at BU except for writing – civics, communication and the intellectual toolkit. A full report on the assessment was published on Hub webpage.¹

First the Institute established baseline for direct assessment of general education on campus: are we meeting targets? what does the Hub program look like on the ground? what are learning outcomes? Learning outcomes are the cornerstone of the program – they let students know what we prioritize. Each course's learning outcomes make learning transparent to students and are prominent on syllabus.

¹ https://www.bu.edu/hub/files/2022/10/HAW_Report_October2022.pdf

The assessed areas under Civics/Diversity: individual in community, global citizenship & intercultural literacy, ethical reasonings. The assessed areas under skills in thinking & communication: critical thinking, research & information literacy, teamwork/collaboration, creativity/innovation. They also looked at writing-intensive courses, and digital/multimedia expression. They also did not include oral and signed communication; those presentations are not recorded so there are no artifacts to look at, so they will need to determine how to assess.

The Institute thought about how to do direct assessment. Some rubrics had been recommended, but were tailored to capacities of Hub and the learning outcomes. They piloted assessment of Digital Multimedia Expression and worked through issues that arose during the assessment. They created rubrics tailored to the experience and to the learning outcomes. Then faculty groups scored these looking at actual assignments. They aimed to sample 10% of assignments. Each student product was reviewed once; a quarter were reviewed twice for inter-rater reliability. Statistics are available and quantitative data are available on website. Not all learning outcomes were ultimately reviewable. Process-oriented learning outcomes turned out to be harder to grade than product-oriented learning outcomes. Of those assignments that were observable, what percent were scored 3 or 4 on the rubric? This gives a better idea of engagement with the course and matching learning objectives with course content.

Several recommendations came out of workshop. The Institute knew there would be problems with quantitative analysis; for now they are establishing baselines. More valuable was the faculty discussion on why the Hub has certain requirements, and whether the learning outcomes were appropriate. There were reports by subcommittees, and different resources and training are available. The Hub Council will also work with new faculty to help them understand the program and how to teach within it. There were some calls from the Direct Assessment Institute to update learning outcomes - usually to broaden them, not to add requirements. These suggestions are included in the report. The Hub Council will now discuss and implement what changes should happen to the learning outcomes. For example, the Civic Engagement and Global Citizenship group recommended broadening and adjusting the framing language to include social and racial justice. This is a learning outcome that could be added within this capacity and would add the possibility for other courses to earn units in a particular area.

It was also clear from the assessment that in some courses do not include learning outcomes are not on syllabi. This is critical to the program and requires the addition of a mechanism to make sure learning outcomes are listed. As courses are passed to new faculty, the courses must continue to teach to the specified areas.

AP Carballo said that the next steps include implementing suggestions from Direct Assessment Institute and deciding how we are going to assess going forward. They will not assess 9 areas in future; it's better to target a smaller group of areas and look at a portfolio for a given semester. The Hub Council is also doing other forms of indirect assessment – survey students – to determine whether students are gaining a breadth of knowledge. Different cohorts of students have had widely different numbers of courses available- those who came in in 1st or 2nd cohort only had 400-700 courses available; this year's first year students now have close to 2000 courses to choose from.

The Hub Council is also looking at how we as a university are doing over time. The National Survey of Student Engagement findings show longitudinal changes in how the University compares with peer groups. BU used to be ranked significantly lower than the mean on some dimensions (2-3 of 5) of engagement in 2014-16; now we are being ranked higher than the mean on 1-2 of 5 dimensions of engagement.

AP Carballo showed some examples of suggestions and how they were addressed: calls for social/racial justice to be integrated led to a new course this year. A pathway to meet Hub requirements was also worked out. There was also a concern regarding inventory issues, such as having enough science courses, particularly for nonscientists. Consequently, the Hub Council is working toward building a cross-disciplinary course curated through Hub. They are also looking at the graduation rates as well as the number of courses students need on average to complete requirements. Another approach is to investigate how the Hub is working with a particular department or program for its majors and nonmajors, creating grants for programs to rethink how Hub is working within their program.

A Council member commented that it seemed like this process looks at how Hub fits within its own structure. The member was interested in how courses become Hub courses, how the Hub structure fits into everything else, and how the Hub has affected the goals we have as educators. For example, doing a year abroad does not give students Global Citizenship Hub units. Language courses also don't count for Hub units. Some students don't take certain courses and programs because they can't get Hub units for it and enrollments are declining because of this.

AP Carballo replied that the Hub Council needs to find out how many courses students are taking. Prof. Luis Carvalho, a member of the Hub Council, is looking into this. The Hub Council is also working with Gareth McFeely in the Office of Global Programs to credit some abroad opportunities with Hub units. We need to hear from students and faculty when these courses don't fit into the Hub.

A Council member asked if there is a way for faculty to provide feedback about these missing links in Hub units. AP Carballo said that the Hub Council needs to hear from faculty about these matters and invited Council members to contact him and Amie Grills directly. Associate Provost Grills replied that she spent some time last year trying to hear these issues. Now that first cohort has graduated, the Hub Council needs to determine where the gaps remain and needs to be resolved. This process is ongoing. The broader question about the Hub structure has been raised before. It is hard to address this with only 1 cohort graduated. AP Carballo commented that the Hub Council will be gathering data, which will be compiled in a report. Then there will be a workshop to review the results, so that actions can be planned.

Chair Howard replied that with this initiative, is there a way for faculty to identify pain points – could there be a structured way to reach out to faculty? AP Carballo encouraged faculty to get involved. Join Hub council. If not, then participate in the workshop.

A Council member asked whether the Hub Council would consider do a faculty survey and getting feedback along with student feedback? AP Carballo replied that the Council has thought about this. They received feedback from CAS departments.

A Council member had a question regarding study abroad. Now that many courses are provided by non-BU providers, could these courses become Hub courses? Is there a way for faculty to apply for these courses to be counted? Or if students ask? There is a real difference in enrollments with fewer BU courses. AP Carballo said there are two issues. First is the issue of transfer credits –there is a limit as to how many external units can transfer to BU, regardless of Hub. Second, there are occasional workarounds. There were two courses – Kyoto and Athens – that were made to work by adding reflective exercises done in their home programs once students return. However, as a rule external courses do not fit for Hub.

Chair Howard thanked Associate Provost Grills and Assistant Provost Carballo and reminded the members that a FC member was needed and requested to be on Hub council. Director Khosla also

noted that the Hub Council will also give a report at the December University Council meeting, if members have additional questions.

II. Graduate Education

Chair Howard then introduced Associate Provost for Graduate Education Daniel Kleinman. Associate Provost Kleinman first talked about a task force that Provost Morrison initiated in the spring. This is a faculty task force with one staff member cutting across many schools and colleges. The motivation was to address the many changes that have been proposed for graduate education, including a shorter degree, full funding of PhD students, a different dissertation format, and preparing them for different careers. These issues had been addressed in a one-off way previously and deserved comprehensive consideration. The members were listed on a slide as well as the website for the task force that also lists questions the task force will address. For example, some departments fund students 12 months/year, others only fund them for 8-10 months. Another issue is the 'one in-one-out' policy implemented at the University of Chicago – departments don't get more PhD slots until students graduate to make sure faculty are paying attention to their progress. Most PhD students don't go into faculty careers – how do we prepare them for the variety of careers available? Funding for different careers involves internships. Are our programs the right size? Can we make our programs more interdisciplinary? How do we respond to larger undergraduate class sizes without just adding more PhD students? Are there ways to break down barriers between areas? Different schools and colleges have different policies – perhaps appropriate, perhaps not. We need to look at this. We need mentoring structures. How do we create a more inclusive PhD environment? Are there things we are not doing now that we need to be doing? Many questions should be addressed; all this began before President Brown announced his stepping down and before the PhD union activities began on campus.

The task force has established a set of shared readings and will announce 4 stakeholder meetings – two with grad students, one with directors of graduate studies, and 1 for program administrators. Because there are 16 questions to address, the group was divided into subgroups of 4 people; each will address the questions and present their findings and recommendations. The task force's goal is to have a report with recommendations late spring or early summer. Provost Kleinman then took questions.

A Council member asked why PhD students who wish to take wellness classes are required to pay tuition for these out of their pockets, even if they have full tuition covered. If Faculty Council wanted to address this issue, how could we go about it?

Associate Provost Kleinman explained that early PhD students are enrolled full time in classes. When they go to work on dissertations, however, they are classified as 'part time certified full' for budgetary reasons. BU is forgoing tuition for all PhD students, but they appear in our books in two places as both income and expense. But as 'part time' they can't take classes at Fitrec for credit. Associate Provost Kleinman tried to solve this a few years ago but could not –the bureaucracy is complicated, but there may be ways to address. If Faculty Council passed a resolution regarding this, there might be some change.

Chair Howard asked whether if a PhD student in their second year was registered for 15 credits, could they take a 3-credit course and still be below 18 credits? If they are full time there isn't a problem? Associate Provost Kleinman replied yes.

Associate Provost Kleinman commented that in the past, there have been ways to get students to take some courses needed for their dissertation such as foreign language or data science but typically there is resistance to them taking courses outside their department. Maybe some guidelines could be created to allow wellness class.

A Council member noted that according to GRS policy, the tuition waiver is only for degree-related courses.

A Council member noted that one thing that sticks out as a problem is the one in-one-out policy. The member's department is small and fluctuates in their capacity for graduate students—there may be one faculty with a multimillion grant that can accommodate more students while other faculty members only have one student. The member commented that having someone external deciding their capacity is problematic.

Associate Provost Kleinman pointed out that the U of C program was for social sciences only. He also invited the member to come to the meeting. On CRC, slots are allocated by the University Provost, formally speaking, but this is done in consultation with the department. This will likely not change. However, he opined that the number of PhD slots should not be decided wholly by grant money, but also by looking at job markets, or the quality of mentoring in the department. In general, it's a privilege to have PhD students, and they aren't just hands to advance the research of the faculty member. This is a complex issue, and the complexity won't change depending on the task force recommendations. There are plenty of scientists on the task force. The one-in-one-out policy is to prevent faculty from forgetting that they have students. In certain fields like humanities, there are faculty members who meet with their students every week; others leave them alone for lengthy periods of time.

A Council member commented that their faculty tries carefully to enhance DEI in their departments as well as compete for the best applicants. However, they feel that they are at a significant disadvantage because they lack duty free fellowships, often offered by competing institutions. The number of these fellowships has decreased in their department. If the university would invest in these fellowships that would help the departments compete for the best applicants. Is this a priority for the university?

Associate Provost Kleinman replied that creating a diverse and inclusive college is complicated. It won't simply be solved by having non-service fellowships. There are other factors. For example, we have talked to students and found that if they are the only one of their URM group, they won't come. However, these fellowships may help and may be possible. He wrote down this suggestion for follow up.

A Council member asked about Dean's fellowships. They could be for the first year only. If these were a priority in the Capital Campaign, the number could be increased significantly. As much as this is discussed, however, it doesn't seem to be a priority.

Associate Provost Kleinman replied that he has been talking with Development about related matters. There is also the proposal to offer all students in the first year duty-free fellowships. This would help them get used to school, look at different labs, etc. He will raise issue.

A Council member asked whether Associate Provost Kleinman could comment about the use of teaching professionals to cover teaching sections and do grading, and what the implications might be for pedagogical outcomes?

Associate Provost Kleinman replied that he has not heard of the category of teaching professionals. However, if money were raised for PhD programs, or if programs were moved to 12 months and all first years were given fellowships, the size of some of our programs might be reduced, resulting in a deficiency in teaching staff. This deficiency would not justify getting more graduate students, and in this scenario, we might need to hire permanent teaching staff like teaching professionals.

Chair Howard asked about the process of reviewing new Master's programs some time down the road. Should new programs be reviewed in 3-5 years to see if they are as successful as proposed and hoped?

Associate Provost Kleinman agreed; since BU embarked on the Master's project a few years ago, it is really important to look at them, particularly their graduation vs. attrition rates. His office is beginning to collect data and look at this. This review could possibly happen every year, and then go with any problems to the department or school to discuss. The goal is to do this regularly and keep on top of it.

A Council member commented that she is building such reports for GMS by herself. If they could collaborate and work together on these evaluations that would be great. Associate Provost Kleinman asked the member to send him an email so that this can be discussed.

Chair Howard then thanked Associate Provost Kleinman for his contributions, and then returned to earlier items on the agenda.

III. Announcements

There were several announcements:

1. A special meeting of Faculty Council on Tuesday 10/18 at 11 am with Tonie Leatherberry, Trustee and chair of presidential search committee along with representatives of Storbeck Associates. Faculty Council members should make every effort to attend or ask alternates to attend. Members should ask questions and provide feedback on council priorities. The meeting will be on Zoom.
2. The Presidential search website launched last week at www.bu.edu/presidential-search. It is under construction, but there is a letter from Trustee Leatherberry, along with a link to either email the committee directly OR take a survey and give input. There is also a tab for community participation to list listening sessions as they are organized.
3. President Brown will be a guest at the November 1 FC meeting; the December 6 meeting will be at GSDM. Finally, the fall Faculty Assembly meeting will be in the Trustee Ballroom at 3 p.m. on November 7.
4. There will be a special celebration to honor the Perkins award winners for 2020 and 2021, when we could not gather. This will be held on November 10 from 5-7 p.m. in the Trustee Ballroom. More information will be sent later.

IV. Chair's Report

Chair Howard reported that two dean's searches have been launched. Requests for nominations for committee members from both Faculty Council and faculty in the schools and colleges were sent out.

We have identified two people for each search committee. For the Sargent College search, those faculty chosen were Dr. Christopher Robertson, Professor and Associate Dean for Strategic Initiatives in the School of Law, and Dr. Leslie Will, Chair and Anthony A. Giannelly Professor in Orthodontics at the Goldman School of Dental Medicine. For the School of Social Work search, the faculty members are Dr. Jennifer Green, Associate Professor in the Department of Special Education in the Wheelock College of Education and Human Development, and Dr. Eileen O'Keefe, Clinical Professor in Health Sciences at Sargent College. These names have been forwarded to the University Provost.

Faculty Council also concluded the election for cochair of the University Council Committee on Research and Scholarly Activities. The selected chair is Dr. George Murphy, Associate Professor of Medicine and Director of Research of the Section of Hematology and Oncology at the Chobanian & Avedisian School of Medicine.

Chair Howard then opened floor for new business.

A Council member reported that he was passing along recommendation from the recent CAS faculty meeting – someone wants Faculty Council to write a statement about the presidential search, including our concerns, our priorities, and the amount of faculty representation on the search committee.

Chair Howard asked whether the feeling was that there isn't enough faculty representation.

Another Council member commented that it was great that Chair Howard is on the search committee (applause from the audience).

Chair Howard stated that she was pleased to be asked as chair of Faculty Council – not for herself but pleased for the Faculty Council to have such representation. She encouraged the members to send an email with any ideas or concerns.

Another Council member commented that the CAS faculty meeting happened before we learned that Chair Howard was on the committee. That being the case, a statement from the Faculty Council is not necessary since she will be there to represent the concerns of the Faculty Council.

A Council member gave feedback from MED campus. They are grateful to be involved and be a part of the larger university. However, there is a question of access. Would there be some consideration for a hybrid meeting? Many members who don't come often are from MED. They have many patient responsibilities that are not predictable and often don't allow extra time for travel. Chair Howard allowed that this could be discussed.

Chair Howard then adjourned the meeting.