Kogod Faculty Council Minutes
February 18, 2020
Minutes (Agenda attached), prepared by Sophia Florestal

Attending Faculty: Ajay Adhikari, Kent Baker, David Bartlett, Sheila Bedford, Carol Bruckner, Valentina Bruno, Meredith Burnett, Erran Carmel, John T. Delaney, Frank DuBois, Alberto Espinosa, Casey Evans, Brett Gilbert, Sonya Grier, Robert Hauswald, Ron Hill, Yujin Jeong, Itir Karaesmen-Aydin, Nandini Lahiri, Gwanhoo Lee, Emily Lindsay, Robin Lumsdaine, Stacy Merida, Alex Mislin, Ghiyath Nakshbendi, Jennifer Oetzel, Ayman Omar, Chris Parker, Leigh Riddick, Ali Sanati, John Simson, Ioannis Spyridopoulos, Catalin Stefanescu, Tim Timura, Tommy White, Don Williamson, Yijiang Zhao
Staff: Sophia Florestal, Reena Dwire, Adrian Mihailescu

Faculty Attending Online: Bill Bellows, Engin Cakic, Mark Clark, Augustine Duru, Heather Elms, Dave Harr, Jeff Harris, Asad Kausar, Tom Kohn, Kimberly Luchtenberg, Sarah Mady, Anu Mitra, Mahsa Oroojeni, Paolo Petacchi, Ed Wasil, Heng Xu, Nan Zhang

Absent Faculty: Frank Armour, Wendy Boland, Michael Clayton, Derrick Cogburn, Parthiban David, Richard Devine, Tara Fisher, Kelli Frias, Rick Gibson, Manoj Hastak, Octavian Ionici, Jill Klein, Jeff Lee, Gerald Martin, Michael Mass, Sanal Mazvancheryl, Joseph Mortati, Tomasz Mroczkowski, Randy Nordby, Jay Pope, Joe Prendergast, Girish Ramani, Jeff Rinehart, Bob Sicina, Jay Simon, John Swasy, Mikhail Wolfson, Benjamin Wright, Yinqi Zhang

1. **Approval of Minutes from Dec. 3rd meeting**
   - Minute stand as approved.

2. **Comments from Dean Delaney**
   - AU President Burwell visiting Kogod on March 17th at 1:30 pm at AUCI in the Don Myers building. Q&A format.
   - On the road to for the Capital campaign meeting with alumni. Need help with engagement from faculty. Need more connections from everyone.

3. EPC Actions – Prof. Nandini Lahiri

The following EPC actions were considered during the meeting via electronic votes and proxy paper ballots. (Votes reported in order: "YES", "NO", "ABSTAIN",)

   - **S20.01   FIN-450/65- Investment Banking: Valuation Tools and Techniques**
     Action: Create new cross-listed courses

       o These cross-listed courses provide the intellectual framework used in the investment banking process: financial analysis, valuation and the mechanics of deal structuring.
       o The course will provide an additional critical skill set for our BSF and MSF Students. Successfully completing this course, will position students to be more competitive in the workplace and entrepreneurial endeavors. The course will be a finance elective.
       o It has been offered twice before (in Summer 2018 and Summer 2019). The offerings of this Special Topics course were well subscribed, and both the undergraduate and graduate

students taking the class used the theoretical background and skills gained in this course to participate successfully in internships and real jobs. We see the trend towards an increasing

role for deal structuring and valuation to continue in business and need to position our students well for this market and trend.

- o The undergraduate and graduate course will differ in content, work product and assessment. The differentiation is outlined in the memo on pages 1 and 2 of the EPC Actions packets.

==S20.01 was APPROVED== (35:1:0)

- **S20.02   Change to BS in Finance**
  <u>Action</u>:   **Reduce the minimum major requirements by 1 credit hour**

  - o The Department of Finance & Real Estate proposes to change the *MATH-211 Applied Calculus* course from the core curriculum. With this change (a reduction of the number of credit hours in MATH-211 from 4 to 3), the Core Required Courses will be changed from the current 19 to the new 18 credit hours. Thus, the total minimum credit hours in the major will also change from 72 to 71.
  - o The Math department worked with the Department of Finance and Real Estate to convert MATH-211 from a 4-credit course to a 3-credit one that focuses on topics relevant to the BSF.   Because the 4-credit version of MATH-211 no longer exists, it is important to make this change, so students continue to be able to take it. With this change, students that take the 3 credit MATH-211 will have satisfied the Calculus requirement. In addition, they still have the option to take the more rigorous MATH-221 should they choose to.
  - o Students that took either MATH-221 or the previous 4-credit version of MATH-211 will still receive credit toward the BSF.
  - o Also, the Math department has created a 1-credit "bridge" course (MATH-220) that goes over all the material they cut out of MATH-211 (to bring it down to 3 credits), in case students discover they want to take more higher math courses.

  ==S20.02 was APPROVED== (42:0:0)

4. Revised KSB Policy for Developing and Evaluating Teaching, open discussion – Sr. Assoc. Dean Ajay Adhikari)

- Backdrop
  - o Senate Committee Reports, "Beyond the SETs" and "Revision of Existing SETs" (August 2014) Chaired by our very own Mark Clark.
  - o KSB Policy for Developing and Evaluating Faculty Teaching Performance (January 2015)
  - o Senate Beyond SETs Task Force Report, "Reframing SETs" (March 2019)
  - o Provost Memo Requesting Information on How Units Implementing Recommendations of Senate Task Force
- Beyond SETs Task Force Recommendations
  - o Notes shortcomings of SETS
  - o Recommends a portfolio approach that include peer, student, and self-assessment with SETs customarily weighted for no more than 50% of the portfolio.
  - o Practical Issue:
    - ▪ Low response rates on SETs

- Current Proposal
  - Require Peer Classroom Observation for all faculty actions
  - Peer classroom observation both a developmental and assessment component
  - Sets frequency and timetable for peer classroom observation
- Tenure Line
  - All new full-time faculty will have a peer review assessment during their first year
  - Faculty on tenure track will have a second peer review in the fourth year before they come up for tenure.
  - Tenured faculty applying for promotion to full professor in consultation with their department chair will schedule a peer class observation in the two-years timeframe before applying for promotion.
- Term Faculty
  - All new full-time faculty will have a peer review assessment during their first year
  - Term faculty applying for promotion to Senior Professorial Lecturer, in consultation with their department chair, will schedule a peer class observation in the two-years timeframe before applying for promotion.
  - Term faculty applying for promotion to Hurst Senior Professorial Lecturer, in consultation with their department chair, will schedule a peer class observation in the two-years timeframe before applying for promotion.
  - Term faculty applying for a multi-year contract, in consultation with their department chair, will schedule a peer class observation in the two-years timeframe before applying for a multi-year contract.
- Setting up the process:
  - The department chair will appoint two senior faculty to serve as the peer reviewers.
  - They'll consult with the faculty member being evaluated on understanding the syllabus and how the class is being delivered.
  - Based on the mutual agreement of the candidate the date will be agreed upon.
  - Once the date is set up, we'll create a draft rubric in consultation with CTRL. Faculty will also have input on as well. That rubric will be used by the peer observation team.
  - After observation it will be shared with the faculty, then the faculty will summarize with a half page write up on the reflection.
  - The CTRL is advocating for a more detailed observation, but he would like to keep it a lot simpler. He'll leave up to the faculty governance to see how detailed they want to go. The proposal is expanding and add this peer observation as another metric for teaching evaluations. Just for faculty actions, not for merit evaluation.

- Discussion:
  - Topics that various professors brought up:
    - Is this a one-time observation or is multiple? It's one time only.
    - Can we update the questions that are asked? How many are given? The amount of questions is pretty much set.
    - Peer review will be available for whenever they want one. Priority goes to those that are up for promotion. This is a new potential resource that'll be available.
    - An observation: Is the object is to provide feedback, the peer review should take place in the first year of incoming faculty. Then again before the third-year review. Then again before coming up the tenure decision. Two types are needed: mentors and assessment faculty would be needed.
      - Currently the first year is already in practice. Kogod has wrestled with the third-year evaluation and then a follow up review. Then it became a question of how many reviews does one want? The EC felt that three reviews was a little bit too much. There was a compromise on having a

first-year review and fourth year review. In a tenure decision a person must put in their file at the beginning of the sixth year.

- Confusion lies in the third-year assessment. It should not be an assessment.
    - First year is for development.
    - Fourth year is to see if improvements have been implemented.
    - Third year more of an intermittent review. Other metrics are being used as well.
- Assessment will also be coming from different departments and levels faculty as well.
    - The faculty pointed out that peer assessment should be for improving teaching performance, not part of the review process because that could lead to potential conflict of interest. The merit review currently relies on FARS and SET data so that we should separate peer teaching assessment for merit purposes from those to improve teaching effectiveness.
        - Third year has a non-teaching semester for tenure track faculty. That's why the fourth year would be a better time. We can revisit the above timeline mentioned. There was a discussion on this very point in the EC also on what should be the right combination.
- Peer grading for faculty? Peer reviews will also be part of the process.
- Suggestion of peer observations from junior faculty, same level and upper level faculty. A 360-degree review from all our peers.
- Many faculty members love this idea.
- Revisiting how we administer the SETS? We need to revisit how we administer the SET given that 175 face to face sections and less than 20% of all online class sections have 50% student response rates.
    - Response - Electronic administering is the only way that the university will be doing them.
- How do we prevent faculty getting an excellent grade when being peer evaluated?
    - The rubric is still being developed by CTRL and the senate.
        - Example: "Meets expectation", "Needs improvement in this area".
        - Assessment committee should not be restricted to the department. Get a faculty from another department. Non-bias review.
- Peer observation should be given by various levels: junior faculty, same level and upper level.
    - Junior faculty will bring newer teaching ideas to the table.
    - Same level would bring similar experiences to the faculty being evaluated.
    - Senior faculty would bring experience to the table.
    - This way would truly give a well-rounded evaluation of that faculty.
        - Great idea of adding the composition of the assessment team. Should students be part of the assessment team? Students already fill out the SETs, so this idea would be redundant.
- Is the peer assessment one way of clearing the hurdle for promotions or to provide the faculty with good feedback?
- Loves the idea of unannounced visits as opposed to setting up a time to be evaluated. They feel that the faculty being evaluated should always be ready for evaluation.

- This is an opportunity to illustrate to the students that Kogod is always in search of improving classroom teaching. Hopefully this will help in the way that students fill out their SETs.
- We need to revisit how we administer the SET given that 175 face to face sections and less than 20% of all online class sections have 50% student response rates.
  - Not an option.
  - Could there be a new requirement set up that for students to get their grades, they must fill out their SETs?
    - A variety of discussions have been held on this topic, but not many are for that idea. These barriers are not a good idea.
- The earliest this would be implemented would be Fall 2020. It depends on many factors.
- In the EC meeting the questions on if there should be an option of recording the peer review session? Is this still on the table?
  - It will be an option. Many online faculties already record themselves, so it shouldn't be an issue.
- Term faculty change of wording to follow the timeline of reviews. Initial contracts vs. Renewal contracts.
  - We'll change it to "Applying for initial contract".
  - Please send further feedback regarding the document that was sent to all faculty.
- Other schools have in place the withholding of student grades if they haven't completed their SETs. Is that something that AU can implement?
  - This is a university wide decision.
  - One faculty member pointed out, many other schools already do this, why hasn't AU implemented this? Why can't they tell us why they don't want it in place? Is it a question of, we cannot do this, or we do not want to do this?

5. Additional announcements/ Celebrate faculty accomplishments

- Michael Mass is a first-time grandfather.
- Ioannis Spyridopoulos has a new baby boy, a 3-month-old.
- Department Chair of ITEC, Gwanhoo Lee congratulated Prof. Chris Parker on having three papers accepted to three different premier journals.
- Also, Prof. Engin Cakici has one paper accept to a premier journal.
- Prof. John Simson Grammy nomination won, for best Historical recording. He gets a certificate and the Smithsonian gets the statue.
- Department Chair of ACCT/Taxation, Don Williamson congratulated Casey and her team about the excellent presentation they did at Preview Day.
- The Marketing department:
  - Prof. Kelli Frias was awarded a National Science Foundation grant. And published an article on, An experiential approach to teaching mixed methods research.
  - Prof. Jeff Lee had his paper, Reversing the placebo: Performance-Branded Experiences can undermine consumer performance in the Journal of Consume Psychology.
  - Prof. Anu Mitra and Prof. Manoj Hastak had an article accepted in the Journal of Consumer Affairs entitled "Consumer Skepticism of Claims in Food Ads vs. on Food Labels: An Exploration of Differences and Antecedents".

- o Prof. Sonya Grier has published a paper as Food restrictions as pleasure and another one on Social justice project for Diversity Education based on research with her class.
- o Prof. Ron Hill:
  - Poverty, consumption, and counterintuitive behavior in the Marketing Letters journal
  - Freedom of the Will and Consumption Restrictions in the Journal of Business Ethics
  - Evidence-based cannabis policy: a framework to guide marketing and public policy research in the Journal of Public Policy & Marketing
- o Prof. Sonya Grier's Dog Parks and Coffee shop journal article was the winner of the inaugural recipient of the AMA-EBSCO Annual award for Responsible Research in Marketing.
  - Ron Hill also had 2 articles that were also in the running, but someone had to win.
    - "Broadening the Paradigm of Marketing as Exchange: A Public Policy and Marketing Perspective", Ronald P. Hill and Kelly Martin, Journal of Public Policy & Marketing
    - "Saving and Well-Being at the Base of the Pyramid: Implications for Transformative Financial Services Delivery" , Kelly Martin and Ronald P. Hill, Journal of Service Research

6. Good of the Order
- AUCI report from Interim Director, Tommy White:
  - o AUCI last week hosted the latest in our Entrepreneurship Journey Series of presentations with a presentation from Michael Bleau, KSB 07, whose startup, Event Hub is growing quickly in Los Angeles. Last month, we hosted David Gardner, co-founder of the Motley Fool.
  - o Last weekend, AUCI hosted the Mid-Atlantic Venture Capital Investment Competition (www.vcic.org) with Duke, UNC, Georgetown, JMU, and Emory participating. UNC won. Kogod's team goes to NYU on February 29 to participate in the NE Regional.
  - o On Feb. 25, AU will be participating in the fifth annual DMV Top 150 meetup of university entrepreneurship programs, hosted this year by George Mason at their Arlington campus. This is a rotating program Tom Kohn initiated and has grown to include every DC area university and now reaches out as far as Towson. AU will be represented in the pitch competition by Austin Burrell, a Business & Entertainment major whose AU Incubator Venture, Set List Booking is an online platform for musicians and performance venues to find each other and schedule appearances. Thanks to Tom Kohn for organizing for 5 years!

  - o We are designating March 24 Innovation Day this year. We will kick this off in MGC on the main floor from 11:00 to 1:30 pm. (Last year we were joined by the Provost for an hour)
    - Innovation Day will extend our annual Showcase Day for AUCI Incubator ventures to include innovative labs and student projects from around campus. We have invited faculty colleagues and their students from Biology, Genomics, Math, Physics, Computer Science, the Game Lab, the Design and Build Lab, the Dance Studio and Blockchain program to join us. Others, that we may have overlooked, are welcome to participate. Just

let us know if you and your students are interested in tabling and being part of building awareness for the breadth of innovation going on at AU.

- Innovation Day will also be the conclusion to our campus wide AUCI Big Idea video competition, which is now open for registration and was emailed to faculty earlier today. This year's competition offers $3,500 in prize money and for the first time our finalists will be chosen through a live pitch competition on Innovation Day.

- Prof. Grier gave an update regarding "On the Table".
    - Prof. Williamson and Prof. Bruckner will be hosting a table on Tax.
    - She's spoken to Chris Parker on doing some research around it.
    - They're opening to more ideas on ways to participate in terms of hosting a table. Getting your students involved.
    - Informational email will be sent out to all faculty regarding the May 20th event.

- Prof. Stefanescu talked about the monthly series features different real estate professionals sharing their industry insight. The next event will be held at Constitution Hall, we have outgrown KSB event space.
    - Jan. 15th was the first of this semester: Regional Director, Research Cushman & Wakefieldv- Student lounge
    - Feb. 12th: Stanley W. Sloter President & Founder Paradigm Companies
    - March 18th Owen Thomas, CEO Boston Properties in Constitution Hall – East Campus
    - April 15th John Westerfield, Chief Executive Officer at AUCI in the Don Myers building.

7. Adjourn

- Upcoming Council meetings:
    - Tuesday, Mar. 17, 2020, President Burwell @ 1:30, then Council meeting 2:30.
    - Tuesday, Apr. 14, 2020

Council Chair Robin Lumsdaine - Meeting adjourned.

****

Faculty Council Chair: Prof. Robin Lumsdaine
Faculty Council Vice-Chair: Prof. Robert Hauswald

Kogod Faculty Council Agenda
February 18, 2:35-4:20pm
KSB 118

2:30 Refreshments

2:35 Call to order (Prof. Robin Lumsdaine, chair)

1. Approval of Minutes of December 2019 Council meeting

2. Comments from the Dean (John, 15 min)

3.   EPC (Nandini Lahiri, 15 min)
   - **Action S20-01 requires vote**
   - **Action S20-02 requires vote**

4.   Revised KSB Policy for Developing and Evaluating Teaching – open discussion (Sr. Assoc. Dean Ajay Adhikari, 20 min)

5.   Additional announcements (5 minutes)

6.   Good of the Order (5 min)

7.   Adjourn

Council Voting Procedures

Device: Smartphone and laptop/tablet (no "dial-up" phone)

Adrian has created a text number "22333" and a web site page, www.POLLEVERYWHERE.COM/KOGODCOUNCIL to facilitate voting.

Both permit easy voting. Once you've created the first text message to 22333, texting is simple. Similarly, once you've bookmarked and opened the webpage, it automatically shows your choices.

Adrian can open, tally and close a poll easily. The web page updates the status and your options. We believe the most efficient procedure is to create a generic "Yes / No / Abstain" poll and activate it as required.

Presentation of the action at Council

The action under consideration will appear in the power-point on screen in KSB 118 as we've done in the past. To simplify matters, any editing or construction of motion will be done directly "on screen" in 118 using the PowerPoint slide. Separating the "vote" page from the "motion" slide seems to be operationally quick and simple.

Establishing Quorum and The Baseline for Passage of an Action

Quorum count. Attendance will be confirmed two ways at the beginning of Council: normal headcount and by asking all members to e-vote "Present" (by smartphone/ipad/laptop) OR by initial sign-in for any paper ballot. This paper ballot option is reserved for those who are physically present and wish to vote by ballot rather than smartphone/laptop/pad PLUS those who hold a proxy for another member.   (Adrian will create a "Vote Present" poll for this opening exercise for the quorum count.)

The attendance headcount defines the baseline and thus the "hurdle" (67%) for passage for any general vote taken at that Council. **If required,** a second "Present" vote may be taken for restricted votes (e.g., only tenure-track faculty are eligible to vote on certain issues).

Phone dial-in

Currently, we have no simple and reliable system for members who listen via phone. (If you are a multi-tasker presenting at an academic conference and listening to Council, you have the option of requesting a proxy ahead of time.)

Side Comments / Issues

1. Risk of double voting. To maintain anonymity, we will not collect a name or id. Thus, we cannot prevent someone from voting via laptop and a second device such as a smartphone. We are on an honor system.

2. Dropped internet connections while you are home / off-site. There is no 'back up' system. A lost internet connection during a Council session means a lost vote. (Note, the hurdle remains the same since it may be too troublesome & time-consuming to repeat the "All Present Vote" routine before every action vote.)

Summary

With a computer or other internet capable device (e.g. iPad, Android tablet): go to pollev.com/kogodcouncil and select the response. Please bookmark the page for future use. At the beginning of the Council meeting we'll run a count to establish the quorum, please click on the "Present" button at the beginning of the meeting to get counted.

If you do not have access to a computer, you can use a phone to text the code corresponding to your chosen response to 22333.

Instructions for texting the response:
1. Start the text messaging application on your phone
2. Enter 22333 for the recipient address
3. Type KOGODCOUNCIL in the content field and press Send to join the session4. After you joined the session, you can enter the corresponding letter (A, B, or C) for the response (the letters will be projected on the screen next to the response alternatives) and press Send.

For people responding by SMS it basically introduces a new step, they will need to text "kogodcouncil" to join the session, then things will be easier because the choices can be "A", "B", "C" or "1", "2", "3" instead of a long random number. The system is also nicer and easier to use from the point of view of the person who conducts the poll.

The easiest way to respond is still by browsing to pollev.com/kogodcouncil with an Internet-enabled device. If you have technical questions, please contact Adrian.

Adrian Mihailescu
Director of Technology
adrian@american.edu
(202) 885-2114