Milgard Faculty Council Meeting Minutes
April 14th, 2023
12:30pm – 2:00 pm
On Zoom
https://washington.zoom.us/j/4099314657 [washington.zoom.us]

FC Member Attendees: G. Viers, S. Norman, J. Ni, M. Eberly, H. Smith
Non-FC Member Attendees: A. Merchant, J. Cao, J. Core

1. Approval of FC Meeting Minutes from December (resent per February minutes) and February meeting (March cancelled for DEI session) Dec/Feb **Minutes approved**

2. Voting Items: No voting items

3. Discussion of non-voting topics
- **PTL Support and Review from Area Coordinators - Gary**
  - Requesting input on how we can get the PTL info to the FC sooner.
  - FC voted not to renew PTL based on performance and PTL would like to discuss further.
  - What is our approach/policy on PTLs who are questionable on teaching experience? Do we have a process? If we vote no on a PTL, is there a workback process to help them grow and allow them to come back and have a second chance? What do we require to give another shot?
  - PTL eval scores were low, and we worked with that, but they came back again lower the next year, and the comments were similar regarding the area that needs improvement.
  - PTL spoke to Associate Dean on how we can improve in the future. PTL came in when we were in the pandemic and there was a disconnect between PTL and faculty feedback. Another challenge PTL had, PTL contract on quarterly basis, and PTL likely didn't receive the teaching evaluations for the past two years. Associate Dean followed up and sent the teaching evals for the past 2 years.
  - Our plan for PTL, are to be mindful of the efforts that PTL put into the course. PTL will join us on a consulting project on PTL onboarding and support.
  - A more formal PTL onboarding program launched in spring quarter. The session included a presentation of a variety of topics, 4 of 5 area coordinators were there, 10+ PTLs joined us and we got good feedback. By actually seeing and meeting area coordinators it made them feel more welcome. Welcome gifts prepared for PTLs, too.
  - Do we rehire for those who was turned down by the FC? PTL is happy how we are proceeding.
  - PTL evaluation and management
    - Should we have new PTLs have a mid-quarter review in effort to be proactive with area coordinators?
    - All area coordinators are required to do a peer evaluation for every new PTL, and AD has discretion to provide peer evaluation to others. Encouraged to take advantage of that.
    - Maybe the ACs could provide more information to the FC. Maybe AC could submit their name again to the FC for teaching consideration?
    - Teaching 101 workshop may also be helpful for standalone development opportunity.

- o When a new PTL joins us, is the AC the point of contact for questions regarding the course?
- o First, they should connect with AC who can help them connect with another colleague. We also provided contact information for other support staff as well.

- **AACSB updates - Jinlan**
  - ▫ Preparing for the Mid-cycle review (due by July 1).
  - ▫ 2013 vs 2020 AACSB Standard comparison: based on AACSB virtual Seminar in November, learner success is a main focus and aligns with the changes that we needed to make soon.
  - ▫ Regarding the AACSB concerns:
    - ▫ Concerns on Intellectual contribution (IC) and faculty qualification: ABDC list adopted and implemented for faculty qualification. IC data collection in progress now for 2020-2023.
    - ▫ Concern on learning goals: rigor of learning goals if always met on a consistent basis. May need to adopt more refined learning goals to ensure a high standard of excellence. Continuous program-level curricular improvements expected. UPC and GPC will discuss concerns at their next meeting.

  - ▫ Highlight initiatives with a positive societal impact: CFW, Entrepreneurship, Acct Hub, SAB, CBA, CLSR, Global Studies (Arindam, Zoe, Evy/Jill, Greg/M. Turek). Waiting for data and will start drafting in May.
  - ▫ AACSB Timeline: in year 3 now: CIR mid-cycle application due by July 1st, including dates for peer review team's visit.
    - Question regarding the three concerns noted: what are we doing between now and the review to make sure we are looking better? Who is working on that?
      - o Regarding concern 1:
        - Data collection: Juliet sent out annual merit review email. Jinlan will send out a form for faculty to report about intellectual contribution.
        - What are we doing to support research output? Awards our faculty earn? Are we putting our money where our mouth is?
      - o Regarding concern 2:
        - Aubree/Juliet will help with this concern. Closely tied to our hiring plan and will collaborate closely with Juliet. The two faculty lines we searched for this year were inspired by Concern 2.
        - Are our ratios any better? Worried about our PTL load still. When Spring census data comes in, we can share with each area and we can collectively improve ratios. We are in the process of hiring plan, maybe some of the language can be included.
      - o Regarding concern 3:
        - Specifically concerned about the UG part. UPC – discussion just started and will continue at the next meeting. Refresh will come back next year, it was paused due to focus on enrollment this year. It may be a tall order by the year 5 review. For the refresh we could set up a tracking method for the learning goals and objectives.
    - Should we collect on the old or new learning goals since we have not updated the curriculum? Need to show progress and improvement. Could assess the new

learning goals to see if we are meeting them - to have concrete data to show how we can improve.

- **Merit review and merit adjustment - Juliet**
  - Email reminder out to all faculty. Summaries for faculty with different ranks will be posted on OneDrive folder after individual reports and materials are submitted.
  - Tentative merit review meeting dates are May 26th and June 2nd. 1st meeting to review PTLs, FTLs, Teaching Asst Profs and Asst Profs. 2nd meeting to review Assoc Profs /Profs
  - Will ask for feedback on how we can streamline the reporting on the annual activity report.
  - Merit increase: Altaf shared that there is a suggestion of 2% merit increase with an additional 2% of merit (unofficial), subject to dean's discretion on how to distribute. He suggested that all of our faculty are engaged in different ways. It's been a challenging year for teaching and research. Not sure if it makes sense to break it down. Asked for FC's input on whether to break it down whether to apply additional merit (if any) equally. Currently there is tiered reward for research through summer support.
  - FC members agree that the suggested approach (equal additional merit) makes the most sense and is supported by research on merit increase. Differential merit may cause bad feelings and disrupt faculty moral.

- **Updates on fiscal control policies and budgeting process - Juliet**
  - New fiscal control policies implemented in March.
  - Fiscal control office hour held in first week of Spring Quarter. Productive session with good faculty and staff attendance.
  - Working on policy for budget proposal and review process for AY23-24.
    - With many more activities/events taking place at MSB, need to streamline the process for budgeting.
    - Budget proposals expected by the end of each academic year.
    - Budget review committee would review budget proposals from centers, initiatives and fee-based programs. Once budgets get approved, budget committee will review whether budgets are being followed as previously outlined.
    - Altaf's comments: This is partly in response to the internal audit suggestions to organize spendings better. The Dean can delegate fiscal responsibilities and it improves accountability among the centers/initiatives/fee-based programs. Will need a faculty representative on the budget review committee. Would be great to have an FC member.

- **Hybrid/DL Policy – Juliet**
  - The hybrid/DL policy was submitted to FC last spring regarding what DL policy we allow at MSB. Modality, 100% in person, 0-99% Hybrid, Synchronous remote and Asynchronous remote. MSB allows the use of the original 39% cutoff for in-person classes. Expected to update our policy on teaching modalities for AY23-24.
  - Noticed some confusion regarding the definition of modalities among MSB faculty. Campus categorizes classes according to the new pilot program.
  - Asked FC for input on which definitions to use and revisions of the policy.
    - FC members suggested that there is no benefit to doing it differently, and it may be better to align with what is being used by campus (pilot program). Uniformity is preferred.

- o FC members asked whether certification is needed to teach DL/hybrid modality. Hybrid and Online Teaching certification (formerly iTech Fellows) is needed.
  - o Will we need to add to our policy about the frequency of repeating certification or continuing our education. Campus level teaching workshops continue to add relevant content and may be useful. FC member suggested adding some element of professional development to the policy to remain relevant.
  - o It is agreed that we update the policy to align with the teaching modalities currently used by campus.

- **Extra Credit for Course Evaluations – Juliet**
  - ▫ Dean's Office received a faculty request to provide course evaluation participant lists.
  - ▫ Altaf and Juliet met with the Director of Office of Educational Assessment in March. It was confirmed that there is no central policy on how we use extra credit. Each school can set its own policy.
  - ▫ Seeking feedback from FC:
    - o Do we allow extra credit for participation in course evaluation? If so, do we allow student names to be identified? Or do we keep student names anonymous (e.g., entire class gets extra credit if meeting a target response rate)? Is it appropriate for the Dean's Office to disclose participant names?
    - o Feedback from FC members:
      - ▪ If students know their names will not be anonymous, they may not complete the evaluations.
      - ▪ Extra credit use should be minimal use. If a particular response rate is reached, give an extra point or two on their final. Slippery slope if we take anonymity out of the course evaluation.
      - ▪ Incentivize participation but not give extra credit. Take a screenshot of the confirmation email for completing the screen. Can we prohibit a faculty member from doing this? Altaf's comment: it is up to us, we decide our own policy.
      - ▪ The consensus among FC members is that faculty should be able to give extra credit, but requesting a participant list from the Dean's Office is not appropriate.
    - o It is important to provide time within the class to complete the evaluation. It is good practice for faculty to leave while students complete the evaluation so they can give anonymous feedback. 15-20% evals are still on paper at MSB. Can give time in class but complete the evaluation online. It's good practice to allocate time in class for them to complete the evaluation.

- Peer Review Policy – Juliet
  - ▫ Peer evaluation policy last adopted in October 2020.
  - ▫ Clarification on "Trained faculty observer" or "Trained experts"
    - – Who are trained? We don't have a list. It was suggested that everyone with a good teaching track record can be a peer observer.
  - ▫ Will need to update the policy to make it easier to understand. It may be great if someone who has taught that class before with good results would be an optimal first choice, or faculty in the discipline.
  - ▫ It may be good to define the trained expert.
  - ▫ Sample template, rubrics or how we can evaluate online classes.

- □ Howard suggests the following to Gary in writing due to connectivity issues:
  - – Relative to requirements for class visits...that is super time consuming and onerous on both instructor and peer evaluator.
  - – Two changes proposed in the policy:
    1. Professors who consistently maintain a 4.0 or greater annual average for their teaching in course evaluations are exempt from required class peer visits.
    2. Professors who have been teaching at a university level for at least 50 years are exempt from required class peer visits.

- **Upcoming FC and Faculty Meeting Changes:**
  - □ June 9 conflicts with commencement – it will now be on Monday June 5th (12:30 – 1:30pm).
  - □ May 19th meeting will be on zoom, June meeting in person. June 2nd FC meeting on Zoom. Announcements will be sent.

4. Adjourn Meeting 1:55pm - Submitted by Jaime Core