SET Faculty Council Meeting Minutes

Date: November 3, 2022

Room: MDS 312, Zoom link: https://washington.zoom.us/j/91987592328

Attending FC members: Donald Chinn (Chair, CSS), Orlando Baiocchi (ECE), Joel Baker (CivE) Thomas Capaul (CSS), Heather Dillon (ME), Michael McCourt (ECE), Deveeshree Nayak (IT), Mark Pagano (ME).

Absent: Yan Bai (IT), Emese Hadnagy (CivE)

Others in attendance: Raj Katti, Ka Yee Yeung

Minutes were taken by: Yan Bai (IT), Orlando Baiocchi (ECE), Joel Baker (CivE), Thomas Capaul (CSS), Heather Dillon (ME), Emese Hadnagy (CivE), Michael McCourt (ECE), Deveeshree Nayak (IT), Mark Pagano (ME). Highlighted person is the one who took the minutes.

1. Approval of the minutes from the October 20, 2022 meeting

FC Meeting Minutes 22-10-20.docx

Motion: Mark Pagano motioned, Second: Tom Capaul

Vote: Yes 8, No 0, Abstain 0

2. Update from the Dean (7 min)

Raj: No updates other than ABET (but there were in fact other updates, see below)

- a. need fixing of assessment in CS and IT: must do this current and next quarter and give a reply. We did averages but need more specific data to see if Outcomes have been met.
- b. CS faculty need to better educate themselves and understand process and why we are doing it.
- c. Heather: ABET moving to student level of tracking of assessment data, so we should think in these terms as faculty. If you think of it as a student to outcome mapping it is more straightforward.
- d. Raj: All programs should do the same kinds of assessment. We have an ABET committee, so everyone should learn/know what everyone else is doing and make sure it is consistent. We need a playbook that has our process and everyone uses that. More CS faculty should go to ABET workshops and learn about the process of continuous improvement.
- e. Donald: I have been to a workshop and it is very interesting.
- f. Raj: note what went well and what did not. Continuous process.
- g. Raj: 10 year review list of questions for external reviewers was sent out, need to discuss before December 9. Would like to submit at end of November if possible, so programs please work on this.
- h. Heather: we have grant funding, but should join network (20K), Engineering Unleashed is website. Many materials that are shared and are free to use.
 - i. Raj: faculty learn techniques about entrepreneurship and pass on to students with this? Heather: yes.

- ii. Deveeshree: went to workshop and was fantastic for techniques and how to convey mindset to students innovative way of learning rather than just taking tests. Every faculty prepares a scorecard and shares this information. Very collaborative group that believe in sharing knowledge.
- iii. Raj: very much support this and we should do this -let's create entrepreneurs
- 3. Selection/vote for the Vice Chair of the committee (10 min)
 - a. Donald: we are in violation of our by-laws because we have not done this yet as specified.
 - i. 6 people are eligible
 - ii. On hold for now, someone needs to decide to step up
 - b. Raj: I need advice from this group on budget for next couple of years, so need a good leader to help out
- 4. Update on working groups (15 min)
 - a. SET Policies and bylaws
 - i. Mike, update on SET policies regarding number of faculty representatives on Faculty Council. Need to rewrite by-laws to make it general (not department specific)
 - ii. Donald: updated wordage in draft (dated 2021 May 28), an announce at next SET meeting and vote in winter
 - b. Workload: Tom and Emese
 - i. Mike: look at workloads in other programs
 - 1. Raj Milgard: tenure 5 courses, teaching 8, with caps of 45 on enrollments
 - ii. Faculty assembly is working on this too in a workgroup, so can also see what they come up with
 - c. Graduate faculty membership
 - i. Orlando: what about faculty from other programs/departments? Can they vbe members of a Graduate Faculty for a program?
 - d. Peer evaluation of teaching
 - i. Donald: no update from him other than he and Raghavi are doing a much deeper dive into this process as they evaluate one-another it's more of a discussion
 - ii. Heather: have some things to drop into document
 - iii. Raj: maybe we should create a similar system for research
 - 1. peer evaluation of research
 - e. Criteria to judge additional merit
 - i. Heather: added a document on this
 - 1. gist is there are a lot of inconsistencies across departments
 - 2. we need to think about what we really care about and put a rubric together, this would be especially helpful for junior faculty
 - 3. University of Dayton: have rubrics that we could use as a starting point
 - 4. Joel and Heather have not yet met but are scheduled to meet next Wednesday
 - ii. Raj: there is a critical structural issue when we vote on this: there is a conflict between review and additional merit based on who can vote on what
 - f. Mentoring system
 - i. Mike: nothing yet

- g. Tasks from climate survey
 - i. Donald: someone needs to talk with Lorne about this
- h. Hybrid/Distance learning (from Monika): we need to develop a policy
 - i. Raj: all faculty need to decide what the best way to deliver curriculum is. Can't be single faculty telling Zaide what they want to do. We need a quick policy that says faculty are in agreement and must approve a hybrid delivery of a course
- i. Indirect cost recovery
 - i. Donald: There is a UWT policy regarding this
 - 1. general policy
 - 2. specific policy: do we want the luxury of working on an ICR policy. We might need to do something about this now and develop something more for longer term later
 - ii. Ka Yee: should keep two independent and Joel agrees
 - iii. Joel: we should have a couple of us get together and discuss this
 - iv. Ka Yee: explanation of items in posted pdf on ICR
 - v. Joel: should hire because of qualifications not because of costs if at all possible
 - vi. Ka Yee: we have to make sure unit faculty goes into provides the support the org code should be the unit affected
 - vii. Joel: don't push everything down to departments
 - viii. Donald: would like some direction with regards to what to do with the particular case