Faculty Development Committee-- Annual Report, 2013-2014

Committee Members 2013-2014 Academic Year

Adam Maltese       C & I       Bloomington       2012-2014
Lynn Gilman          CEP        Bloomington       2012-2014
Andrea Walton      ELPS       Bloomington       2012-2014
                  (chair)
Paula Magee        C & I       IUPUI                2012-2015
Mary Piontek        CEEP       Bloomington       2012-2014
Hannah Schertz        C & I       Bloomington       2012-2015
Mitzi Lewison       LCLE       Bloomington       2012-2015
Dubravka Svetina    CEP        Bloomington       2012-2015
Randa Fathy           IST        Bloomington       Grad. Student
Allison Hagenbuckle          Bloomington       Staff
Joyce Alexander                  Bloomington       Ex-Officio

The Faculty Development Committee met six times during the 2013-2014 academic year
September 25
October 30 (rescheduled to November 6)
December 11 (cancelled)
January 22
February 26
March 26
April 16

During its September meeting, the Faculty Development Committee set its agenda for
2013-2014. Below are brief summaries of the projects on which the Faculty
Development Committee worked. Some of these projects, such as selecting recipients of
annual teaching awards or planning invited lectures, are regular parts of the Committee’s
charge. Other projects, notably the work on the issue of grade inflation, represented work
done by the committee at the request of Policy Council. In a number of cases, an individual committee member took on leadership of a particular project (as noted).

**New Faculty Luncheon**

On December 12, 2013, the Faculty Development Committee hosted an informal end-of-term lunch with new faculty members. This was the first year such a lunch gathering was hosted by the committee. The lunchtime meeting provided a follow up to the fall orientation meetings and an opportunity for committee members to field questions about end of term matters, such as the Faculty Annual Report. The committee received enthusiastic feedback about the event and will likely continue to host an informal gathering of new faculty in the fall term.

**Guest Speaker Support Fund**

Adam Maltese continued his work helping to administer the Guest Speaker Support Fund. This Fund provides matching funds, up to $1,000, to help defray the travel expenses and honoraria to bring outside speakers to the School of Education (Please note that the limit of any request of matching funds was increased from $500 to $1,000 in 2013). Applications were reviewed on a rolling basis with the assistance of Linda Hanek, Dean’s Office. Applicants were asked to document sources of matching funds and to outline the ways the event would be publicized within the School of Education.

In the Spring of 2014, the following events of interest to the SoE community were funded:

- $500 IST   Darlene Russ-Eft, Talk on Evaluation
- $500 ELPS  Sofia Villenas, two public lectures and 2 class visits
- $500 IST   Ronald Jacobs, talk on Workforce Development
- $1000 ELPS  Macke Raymond, speaker in “Economics of Education” series

There are no future commitments for these speaker funds. A new call for applications will be issued early in 2014-2015.

**David and Beatrice Miller Lecture Series**

Hannah Schertz organized a campus visit by Professor Barbara Rogoff, University of California Santa Cruz, on April 2, 2014. The visit included a group discussion with 30 interested students and faculty and a well-attended public lecture.

Our next invited speaker to visit the School of Education through the Miller lecture series will be Dr. James D. Anderson, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign. Dr. Anderson, a noted historian of African American education, is tentatively scheduled to visit campus on September 18-19, 2014. The FDC has asked Dr. Anderson to direct his lecture toward the 50th anniversary of the Civil Rights Act. Andrea Walton will work with faculty
members Dionne Danns and David Rutkowski (ELPS), who submitted the nomination, to help plan Dr. Anderson’s visit.

**Grade Inflation Project**

In 2013-2014, the Faculty Development Committee, at the request of Policy Council, continued its work on the issue of grade inflation in the School of Education. The Committee had already conducted a survey on grade inflation (spring of 2012) and committee member Adam Maltese had provided an analysis of grading practices in the School of Education and across various academic units of Indiana University.

In response to Policy Council’s request that the Faculty Development Committee continue its efforts to address issues related to grade inflation, FDC decided that the best course of action was to work on updating existing grading policy documents. Because the Committee could not locate a written grading policy for undergraduate courses, the Committee undertook a review of an existing graduate-level grading policy, 87.36R, (dated 1987) and sought to develop a more detailed guideline for grading at the graduate level.

Committee members solicited feedback from their respective departments and have proposed a revision to this grading document for Policy Council’s review (see attachment).

The process of reviewing the 87.36R grading document with departmental colleagues was an instructive exercise, helping to illuminate the varied approaches to teaching and learning in different fields of study as well as the differences in philosophies and emphases among faculty members. Distributing the existing but outdated grading policy for graduate education (87.36R) heightened awareness among faculty that such a written policy exists. Asking faculty to discuss the document and provide input for possible revision of the policy forced a close examination of what level of performance each letter grade reflects.

Issues related to grade inflation and teaching practices are complex and require school-wide consideration. We believe the FDC’s work on issues related to grade inflation has helped to start a conversation that needs to be continued. Some faculty were unaware of the 1987 grading policy and, equally striking, only at the end of the Faculty Development Committee’s work did we come across a general statement about grading in the 2010-2012 Graduate Bulletin¹ (page 114). We are unclear of the history of this bulletin statement but believe the revised grading policy submitted will be a more useful guide to faculty members.

The Committee recommends that the revised graduate-level grading policy be adopted by Policy Council (Attachment A). This revision will serve as a point of departure for a school-wide discussion of developing a suitable grading policy for undergraduate education during the 2014-2015 academic year.

Feedback garnered from faculty members in each SoE department pointed to the need to study whether the timing and use of student evaluations affects grading. The committee feels that the creation of a subcommittee specifically focused on grade inflation and student evaluations will be useful to advance this investigation.

Teaching Awards
The Faculty Development Committee coordinated the nomination and selection of the teaching awards for achievement in 2013. At its January meeting, the Committee reviewed and updated the call for nominations, rating sheets, and website descriptions of the criteria and submission procedures for the various annual teaching awards. A 3-page limit, double-spaced, was instituted for the candidate’s personal statement for Trustees’ Teaching awards, and a 5-8 page limit was instituted for the statement the Burton Gorman award. This guideline for the Gorman award is similar to those of university-wide teaching award competitions.

The Committee recommended that a total of eight Associate Instructor awards be given for achievement in 2013, and endorsed allocating the awards to the SoE departments in proportion to the number of AIs employed by the unit. Accordingly, C & I received 3 awards; CEP received 2 awards, and ELPS, IST, and LCLE each received 1 award to give. The selection of outstanding AI awards was completed at the departmental level.

The committee held discussion regarding the placement of limits on the total number of Trustees’ Teaching Awards one individual can receive but no recommendations are being put forward at this time.

The Faculty Development Committee selected the following award winners:

Burton Gorman Teaching Award: Mary McMullen (C & I)

Outstanding Adjunct Award: Kathy Pomeroy (C & I)

Trustees’ Teaching Awards:

Lynn Gilman (CEP)
Phil Carspecken (CEP)
Nomination materials for the Burton Gorman Teaching Award were also received from Barbara Dennis and Chris Leland. Nomination materials for the Trustees’ Teaching Awards were also received from Sharon Daley, Ben Edmonds, Barbara Erwin, and Mary Beth Hines, Wendy Marencik, and David Rutkowski.

The members of the Faculty Development Committee were impressed with the creativity and commitment documented in the teaching materials and evaluations that were submitted. The awards will be presented at the Celebration of Teaching, to be held on April 21, 2014.

Committee Reflections and Suggestions
The committee suggests there are still ways to streamline and improve the Trustees Teaching awards competitions and some policy issues related to the awards that the committee would like to take up in 2014-2015.

The committee plans to pick up the following topics as discussion points for 2014-2015:
- Revisiting criteria for teaching awards and limits
- Creation of a subcommittee to investigate grade inflation and student evaluations

The 2013-2014 FDC has compiled documentation and timetables for future committees to facilitate the planning for the Miller Lecture series as well as the Trustees’ Teaching awards competition. Updated materials and the minutes of meetings are available in the Faculty Development Committee’s Oncourse website.

Finally, the Committee would to thank the Dean’s Office for their help with administering the Guest Speaker Fund and their assistance throughout the year in scheduling and providing the Committee with timely information and support.

We also thank Joyce Alexander, Executive Associate Dean, for her help, leadership and ongoing support.

Respectfully submitted by Andrea Walton, Chair
GUIDELINES FOR GRADES IN GRADUATE EDUCATION COURSES

The following definitions of letter grades are a guide to the evaluation of student performance and an indication to students as to what level of performance earns a given grade.

A Extraordinarily strong performance and high achievement; exceeds expectations or demonstrates an exceptionally high degree of originality and/or scholarship.
A- Outstanding performance; thorough command of the course content.
B+ Very good work; above average performance and command of course content.
B  Good work; solid and acceptable performance and command of course content.
B- Fair; acceptable performance on most but not all aspects of the course.
C+ Not wholly satisfactory; marginal performance on several aspects of the course.
C  Marginal; minimal performance regarding important aspects of the course.
C- Largely unsatisfactory; inadequate performance regarding most aspects of the course.
D  Unacceptable work: performance falls substantially below acceptable standards.
F  Wholly unacceptable; little or no command of the course content and/or failure to meet performance requirements.

Counseling by the department is recommended if the final grade is C or below;
The Student's suitability for continuation in the program should be reconsidered if the final grade is below C-.