

MILGARD SCHOOL OF BUSINESS
Faculty Council Meeting
Zoom / December 2, 2022
12:30 - 2:00 pm

Present Voting Members: J. Ni, S. Norman, G. Seow, H. Smith, G. Viers

Present Non-Voting Members: J. Cao, B. Fuentes, A. Merchant

Meeting minutes: K. Barker

Meeting called to order at 12:32 p.m.

Minutes from October 14, 2022 were **approved**.

VOTING ITEMS

- PTLs for winter 2023—**approved** unanimously.
 - Accounting / TACCT 201 and TACCT 301
 - Robert Forbes
 - Knowledgeable, positive evaluations, previously taught for PLU.
 - Management
 - Richard Wilkinson
 - Eric Spieth
 - Aaron Artman
 - All three have positive course evaluations.

NON-VOTING ITEMS

- **Graduate Faculty Appointments—Juliet Cao**
 - Graduate faculty status requires research-based scholarship, according to the Graduate School.
 - Milgard has traditionally based decisions on whether someone teaches in one of our graduate programs.
 - Concern: Is Milgard following Graduate School policy which says that Graduate Faculty must have research-based scholarship?
 - Shared SIAS policy for tenured and tenure-track faculty eligibility for Graduate Faculty status.
 - SIAS is a diverse and large school that probably needs monitoring.
 - Milgard doesn't need anything formal because we're a smaller program and know each other.
 - Review on a case-by-case basis?
 - There's not a specific benefit to having Graduate Faculty status.
 - Recommendations
 - Tenured and tenure-track—lifetime appointment.
 - Teaching—5-year term.
 - Scholarly-active.
 - For Doctoral Endorsement, AACSB recommends 5-year term for tenure-track faculty. New tenure-track faculty should be considered after 5 years, not immediately.

- Need further discussion.
 - Should Milgard have a formal policy on Graduate Faculty status or not?
 - Policy is general on Graduate School website and Milgard hasn't followed it.
 - Gary and Juliet will ask Aubree to look up list of faculty with Graduate Faculty status and their expiration dates in MyGrad.
 - Will look to AACSB for documentation/guidance.

➤ **Grade Distribution and Policies—Juliet Cao**

- Sharing grade distribution quarterly because of faculty concerns about grade inflation.
- Currently 1-year of data; pre-COVID and now.
 - Grades are higher in recent years compared to the unofficial guidelines that Milgard had years ago. The guidelines stated that grades shouldn't exceed:
 - Undergrad median 3.0
 - Graduate median 3.3
 - Current undergrad median is 3.6
 - Current graduate median is 3.8
 - Foster's grading policy grade ranges:
 - 200-level courses: 2.9 - 3.1 (median)
 - 300-level courses: 3.1 - 3.3 (median)
 - 400-level courses: 3.2 - 3.4 (median)
- Will conduct deeper analysis.
- Information will be shared with ACs so can look at grades and discuss with PTLs and area faculty, if necessary.
- Discussion
 - PTLs, in particular, might be tempted to inflate grades so have positive teaching evaluations.
 - Should do analysis between teaching/tenured/PTLs to see if there is a difference in grading among groups.
 - Need to do a better job of communicating expectations to PTLs to give them confidence that they are grading appropriately.
 - Have to be careful to not tread on academic freedom. What does grade variability mean?
 - Grades were higher during COVID because students were able to use additional resources, exams were online, and extra time was allowed for exams.
 - Milgard serves such a broad range of students at different levels of performance and knowledge. Top will succeed regardless and the lowest students will struggle, even with extra help.
 - Need to work with first-generation students; help set them up for success.
 - It is a balancing act to make curriculum challenging, but not too challenging.
 - Faculty need to hold the bar high for academic rigor. If admitted with 2.75 GPA, but have 3.6 in classes at UWT, either performing miracles or grade inflation exists.
- ACs will decide how to deal with issues within their individual groups. Being informed about grade distribution is important for MSB.

- **Grade Distribution Data and Merit Reviews**
 - Including a 3-year side-by-side comparison of teaching, grade distributions, evaluations, and service might be helpful to see big picture.
 - Hesitation to make grade distribution part of official record for merit reviews.
 - Faculty code only requires evaluations, not grade distributions.
 - Preferable to keep at area level.

- **Minimum Evaluation Requirements for PTLs**
 - Evaluations were previously quarterly, but now at the end of the academic year.
 - Instructors need to be held accountable.
 - If PTLs have low evaluations, need to develop a plan for improvement; if don't improve after third year, need to hire new PTLs.
 - If there is a correlation between grades and teaching evaluations, faculty should consider other things like exams and projects as part of evaluation for PTLs.
 - Where does FC stand? Need to give vote of confidence to PTLs.
 - How should feedback be provided? Which metrics should be used?
 - ACs need to make sure PTLs are held to standards.
 - Timing is important. ACs need to know if PTLs are having issues early on because FC might not approve PTL to teach again. Classes need to be taught, so FC can't be responsible for the situation.
 - ACs are responsible for conducting at least one peer evaluation.
 - Additional data points are available from AUT 22 going forward, so peer evaluations should be up-to-date.
 - Voting authority of FC is delegated by faculty.
 - Merit is voted on by all faculty at the end of the academic year. Should entire faculty vote on merit and PTLs to teach for the following academic year?
 - If a PTL is non-meritorious, Milgard wouldn't want person to teach the following year.
 - ACs could bring a report for PTLs and discuss—in good standing? Improved?
 - ACs could be invited to FC meetings to share information about PTLs.
 - Should Milgard offer long-term contracts?
 - HR doesn't want long-term contracts in the event that enrollments are low; would be contractually obligated to PTL and couldn't cancel class.
 - ACs should be proactive and monitor. If performing unsatisfactorily, identify other PTLs to bring to FC for a vote.
 - At the end of the academic year, all ACs could be invited to have a nuanced discussion about PTLs.
 - In May or June, could have discussion about PTLs who are concerned about.

- **Need to set up structure for ACs**—focus on next year. Need incentives for improvement for PTLs and Milgard faculty.
 - PTLs need to feel appreciated.
 - Provide feedback, guidance, and hold accountable. Positive development.
 - Focus should be on helping PTLs succeed.

Meeting adjourned at 1:57 p.m.

Submitted by Kerry Barker

