

Philosophy of Education Society  
Business Meeting Agenda  
March 8, 2020  
Pittsburgh PA

**Call to Order Cris Mayo 5:35**

**Approval of Agenda Doron Yosef-Hassidim motion, Heather second. Approved.**

**Approval of 2019 minutes: Sam Rocha motion, Heather Greenhalgh-Spencer second. Approved.**

**New Business**

1. Proposed change to SIG bylaw:

Any member can propose a Special Interest Group (SIG), ~~whether temporary or permanent~~, on a topic they believe holds the interest of a group of members. To propose a SIG, the member must show the interest of at least 5 other members and have the proposal approved by a simple majority at the annual business meeting. A SIG is not entitled to a paper or alternative session on the program, but can request of that year's Program Chair the inclusion of a breakfast meeting on the program. If a SIG submits a proposal for a paper or alternative session, it will be subject to the same review process as other paper and alternative session proposals. **On a regular basis, the Exec Board will review existing SIGs to see if they still attract sufficient interest. If not, they will be deactivated.** Heather Greenhalgh-Spencer move to accept, Clarence Joldersma second. All in favor

2. Two proposed new SIGS:

Environmental Humanities Nassim Naroozi move to approve, Samantha Deane second.

All in favor

Autonomy: Doron Yosef-Hassidim motion, Sharon Todd approve

3. Proposed Revision to publication plan for PES Yearbook (see handout; attached to these minutes) Amy Shuffelton and Cris Mayo go over handout, which explains what this committee will do. Heather G-S move to approve, Glenn Hudak second, all in favor.

**Reports**

***Just Community Committee Report*** Proposal shared to make JCC a committee. Kathy Hytten: notes that PES bylaws already include this committee; Amy Shuffelton notes that this version is not on the website. Ron Glass moves to add pledge that members must sign in order to become a

member. Motion withdrawn after discussion of pros and cons of this change, but Ron asks for straw vote: 10 for; 20 against; 14 abstentions.

Doris Santoro reports on committee activity this year – a year of working towards cultural change. Taking on more challenging work of how we are responsible to each other. While there are no mechanisms to ask someone not to attend, there are now mechanisms to take serial offenders out of mentoring roles. JCC is able to help make these decisions, as JCC tracks behavior over time (confidentially).

**President's Report** Thanks from Cris Mayo for a successful year, especially to those who made PES 2020 Pittsburgh happen.

**Executive Director's Report** Docs from Amy (see attached). Major events this year include: new customer management (so-called) software, which works much better than our previous software. Also, this year was spent developing a plan to get *Philosophy of Education* out on time, as the Exec Board suspects delayed publication has suppressed conference and membership numbers. This year, the delayed 2018 volume was published, and the 2019 volume was also published within a calendar year of last year's conference. With the new plan developed by the ad-hoc Publications Committee this year, Amy is optimistic about publications, membership, budget going forwards.

**Program Chair's Report** Heather Greenhalgh-Spencer

### Numbers

These numbers come with the following caveats:

1. I did my best to count the people on the program without double counting anyone. I may have got this number wrong.
2. I did my best to determine the gender of each participant. In some cases, this involved an educated guess.

# of people on the program: 175

# of women on the program: 87

% of women in the program: ~50% (.497)

% of concurrent papers accepted from all submissions: 23%

# of women who submitted a concurrent session paper: 26

# of women accepted for a concurrent session paper: 13

% of women accepted for concurrent session papers compared to submitted concurrent session papers: 50%

### Review Process

The review process consisted of the following practices:

1. A program review committee was selected in a way as to include racial, gender, and cultural diversity.
2. All submissions were anonymized as best we could to ensure a fair review process.

3. All papers were reviewed by a group of at least three reviewers.
4. Each of these groups of three reviewers included gender and racial diversity.
5. Reviewers were able to give a yes or no vote; they were also able to give a numerical vote (1-5), for each of the submissions.
6. Reviewers were *encouraged* to give feedback to both the program chair and the author or submitter, but reviewers were not *required* to provide comments to the author or submitter.
7. Acceptance of a submission was purely tabulated based on the votes and scores of the three reviewers.
8. For some concurrent paper submissions, the reviewers thought that the paper should not be accepted for a concurrent session, but should be considered for a WIP session.
9. In these cases, the submissions were reviewed by the program chair, and then, if the program chair agreed with the reviewers, the authors were contacted and asked if they wanted to consider having their paper presented at a WIP session.
10. Some people did not want to have their rejected paper considered for a WIP session.
11. Many people did want to have their paper considered for a WIP session, but they recognized that their fully formed paper was not the normal submission style for a WIP submission. Furthermore, they wanted the chance to actually present their paper. In fact, many authors told me that their universities would not pay for them to attend unless they could formally present their paper. They worried about whether or not a traditional WIP session would “count”. In order to address this need, we set up alternative round table sessions. In this way, we allowed people to present their papers, while also respecting the decision of the reviewers to reject the paper as a concurrent session paper.

### **Innovations**

This year, we tried several new ideas that were meant to address specific needs.

1. We wanted to be able to have a broader array of voices and more people on the program, while also respecting the high standards of the program review committee. In order to address this need, we created the round table sessions.
2. We wanted more people to attend the WIP sessions. For this reason, we created the WIP session as a way to hear from past PES presidents, while also allowing those who had their WIP session accepted to get the personalized feedback they have come to expect from WIP sessions.
3. We wanted to address the concerns of members who said they wanted to be able to have the kind of interaction, and paper length, that is common at venues such as PESGB. We created the “Conversations in the Field” sessions to address this need.
4. We heard that some people wanted to read papers before the session where the paper would be presented. We experimented with having access to papers in a Google drive for some of the sessions.
5. In order to address the fact that many new members have trouble navigating the conference, we created a “Navigating the Conference” page at the beginning of the conference program.

### ***Communication Director’s Report – Sam Rocha.***

No report was submitted. Thanks to Sam for his years of service to PES. Jane Blanken-Webb is the new Communications Director.

## *Reports from Committees*

- **Commission on Professional Affairs (COPA)**

The committee welcomed David Waddington and thanked Doris Santoro for her service. Sarah Stitzlein was elected chair for 2019-2020.

The PES Jobs Manuals (written accounts of PES committee responsibilities) requested by Barbara Applebaum as part of her 2016 Presidential Project were submitted and posted on the PES website for ease of consultation.

COPA also has reinvigorated the call to promote the visibility and impact of that work done at PES by further developing its GroundWorks series. Previous GroundWorks papers have now been published on our website. COPA editor Cara Furman crafted a call for papers, which were reviewed by COPA members. Papers authored by David Backer, West Chester University, and Benjamin Kearl, Purdue University Fort Wayne, were selected and were featured at a session at this year's conference. Cara and members of COPA will work with these authors to see their papers through to publication on the PES website and wider distribution beyond PES.

COPA continued its exploration of the role of its regional and international affiliates by hosting a session at this year's conference which discussed the role of these groups as well as general stewardship of the field. The panelists and discussant came from different regional organizations. COPA has also been an advocate for the evening social sessions sponsored by The New England Philosophy of Education Society as a way to increase awareness of and participation in the regional PES organizations. We recognize the importance of these locations for sustaining philosophical work in education throughout the year, developing regional communities amongst the membership, and providing opportunities for additional presentations and publications, especially for newer scholars in the field.

Respectfully submitted, Sarah Stitzlein, COPA Chairwoman; Lauren Bialystok; Michael Gunzenhauser; Ashley Taylor; David Waddington

- **Committee on the Status of Women (COSW)**

No report was submitted

- **Committee on Race and Ethnicity (CORE)** CORE sponsored the preconference workshop. 6 papers included.

- **Membership Committee**

The Membership Committee (Terri Wilson, Bryan Warnick, AG Rud & Tomas Rocha) did some rebuilding this year, after three members transitioned off the committee. Last spring and summer, we reviewed some of the good work of the previous group--including a helpful membership survey and early efforts to do personal appeals--and also spoke to a range of members to get their advice and feedback (thanks to everyone who reached out to share ideas!). Here is a report on our work:

1. Working with the executive director, we made some suggestions for creating a better and more consistent **membership management** system. Part of this involved reviewing membership software systems, and making a recommendation (Wild Apricot, which has now been adopted; Amy reports it is much more useful). We anticipate that the major advantage will be the automatic reminder and renewal features, making it much easier for members to track & renew their membership, and for PES to have better tools to encourage folks to renew. There are 225 current members (and more will likely renew with conference registration).
2. We also proposed, moving forward, **a yearly action plan** for the membership committee, working with the ED and current President, in order to organize a regular membership drive and reach out to encourage members to renew. Many of these steps were not possible last year--because PES changed financial institutions and introduced new software--but our committee did create a prioritized list of lapsed members, and made some direct appeals in December. Moving forward, here is the proposed yearly action plan:
  - a) June 1: Include an initial membership renewal appeal in the PES monthly bulletin; this could also include a brief note from President (this would be short)
  - b) September 1: The President, or Past President, sends a personal appeal to only the people who have not yet renewed; so only go out to still-lapsed members
  - c) October 1: Membership committee sends out personal appeals, tailored to different audiences, and sensitive to different members' interests. These would only go to the members who had not yet renewed, and would reference the President's letter
  - d) November 1: ahead of the submission deadline, continue to emphasize membership and track who has not yet responded, etc.
3. In addition to addressing the current issues, and making a better plan moving forward, we also discussed a range of **new ideas** for attracting new members, encouraging former members to return, etc. We had a number of thoughtful conversations, which we prioritized and summarized in [a memo to the Executive Committee](#) in August 2019. As summarized in the memo, we noted that membership numbers now closely parallel conference registration numbers, suggesting that individuals see conference attendance as the primary reason to be a member of PES. Two possible responses to this dynamic are to (1) expand the conference initiatives and programming to increase interest and broaden attendance, thereby increasing membership numbers, and (2) find ways to increase the meaning of Society membership beyond the conference. The memo offered several suggestions for initiatives the EC might consider in both areas, including modifications to

the conference program and schedule, more support for graduate students and emerging scholars, developing more awards and recognition programs, an expanded website, with electronic access to portions of the conference for members, as well as strategies for reactivating lapsed members, and bringing in new members.

- **Mentorship Committee**

The Mentoring Committee held two sessions at the 2020 conference, both of which focused on mentorship through guided conversations. Although the planned format included mentors for different groups (graduate students, assistant professors, associate professors) with specific topics on which each agreed to speak, the majority of attendees were graduate students and as such the sessions mostly consisted of free-flowing conversations about topics such as publishing and the job search for graduate students, with a smaller number of assistant professors seeking advice on topics such as balancing teaching with other responsibilities.

- **Elections Committee:** Congratulations to AG Rud, new Executive Board member, and Ron Glass, President of PES 2022.

- **Resolutions Committee**

**Passing of the gavel from to Cris Mayo to Kal Alston.**

**Meeting adjourned 7:18**