

**College of Business and Economics**  
**Faculty Senate ZOOM Meeting Minutes**

Date: 05-06-2020

Subject: Faculty Senate Electronic Meeting Minutes

Attendance: Andrey Simonov (Chair), Sijie Sun (Vice Chair), Terrance Jalbert, Keisuke Nakao, Todd Inouye, Sukhwa Hong, Amirhossein Mohammadian, Kimberly Furumo, Angela Faanunu, Benjamin Zenk, Deborah Hughes, Helen Tien, Emmeline de Pillis (ex officio),

Topics:

**1. Faculty classification**

REPORT: The motion is to discuss the faculty classification.

*Our faculty qualifications are not as fleshed-out as AACSB would like. Below is what we have. Compare to how detailed the attached example is. Suggestion: lightly edit the SFSU guidelines to be consistent with our guidelines. I will volunteer to do this if so directed by the Faculty Senate, or the Assessment Committee can take this on.*

***Criteria for Faculty classification:***

*In Fall 2017, CoBE faculty revised the criteria for sustained engagement activities so that each level of engagement, from SA, PA, SO, to IP, is defined clearly. Following the AACSB basis for judgment, each level is now defined according to “disciplinary-based” activities. In Spring 2019, the faculty further revised the criteria with more details for easy implementation. The revised version for each category is outlined as follows.*

***Scholarly Academics (SA)***

- A Doctoral degree in the disciplinary-based field or related areas
- Scholarly activities satisfying the criteria for scholarly activities (Standard 2: Intellectual Contributions)

*and one of the following two:*

- i. *Services on editorial boards or committees*
- ii. *Participation in recognized academic associations, invited presentations, etc.*

***Practice Academics (PA)***

- A Doctoral degree in the disciplinary-based field or related areas
- Scholarly activities satisfying the criteria for scholarly activities (Standard 2) and one of the following two:

- i. *Documented continuing education experiences*
- ii. *Development of or participation in professional events that focus on the practice of business management or related issues that are in direct contact with business leaders*

***Scholarly Practitioners (SP)***

- A Master’s degree in the disciplinary-based field or related areas

- Writing essays, working papers, or attending in-house symposiums and other presentations on practical issues in teaching or research in the disciplinary-based field or related areas. and one of the following two:

- i. Development or presentation of continuing education activities or executive education activities
- ii. Development of or participation in professional events at the college or university that focus on the practice of business management or related issues

### ***Instructional Practitioners (IP)***

- A Master's degree in the disciplinary-based field or related areas or a combination of a BA in the disciplinary-based field or related areas or at least 20 years of experience in the field with substantial contributions in students' career development activities.

- Development or presentation of continuing education activities or executive education activities and one of the following two:

- i. Development of or participation in professional events at the college or university that focus on the practice of business management or related issues
- ii. Services on advisory boards other than at the college or committees at the college.

### **ACTIONS:**

- Keisuke Nakao moved to motion, and the motion was seconded by Sukhwa Hong.
- The motion is tabled, and Emmeline will provide a draft by May 13.

## **2. Assurance of learning**

a) What are our goals for the four outcomes, (and how do we plan to get there).

b) How do we collect, store, and retrieve artifacts for the quantitative and the oral comm goals in a way that we can still access them when there is a personnel change.

1) Assurance of learning.

*Here are our four learning goals and the associated issues:*

1. **Content Knowledge.** Measure: MFT. We have decades of Major Field Test data, and we are around the national average. Issue: What is our aspiration? To be above the national average? To increase the score by x% per year? To have at least x number of students who are y standard deviations above the mean? We need to make a decision.

2. **Written and oral communication.**

2a. **Written:** Measure: CLA+. The CLA+ is scored on a six-point scale. Earlier, faculty decided 1-3 was below standard, and 4-6 meets standard. This is already a pretty generous categorization, as a level of 4 would probably be barely acceptable in most professional settings.

*We've seen a recent decline in proportion of students who meet standard. Issue: What is our aspiration and how do we reverse the recent decline? What are our plans to reverse the trend? We have long had ENG 209 and MGT 490 as WI, and we have recently instituted MGT 300 as WI. In addition, we have offered at least one section of BUS 290 as WI. We hope the effects of this are positive and visible soon. A WI class requires at least 40% of the final grade to be based*

on writing. But this won't work unless we support our colleagues in assigning students the grades they earned. Pity passes don't help us or our students in the long run.

**2b. Oral communication.** Measure: In-class assessment in MGT 490. The Chair of the Peer Review Team informed us that students must be evaluated individually, not in groups. We need to archive student artifacts, i.e. video recordings, along with records of assessment. Zoom meetings can be recorded with the touch of a button, so at least for SP20 collecting recorded artifacts will not be a problem (Todd: Is this assumption correct? Are you able to Zoom-record final presentations?). If the Peer Review Team wants to see an example of "meets expectations" oral communication vs. "exceeds expectations," we need to be able to produce this and explain the difference. Issue 1: What is our aspiration for this measure? Issue 2: How and where will we archive the student artifacts? (Suggestion: a password-protected Google Drive folder under cobeuhh).

**3. Quantitative problem solving.** Measure: In-class assessments in QBA and FIN classes. Issue 1: What is our aspiration for this measure? Issue 2: How and where will we archive the student artifacts? Issue 3: Our collection schedule has been irregular. Who oversees the scheduling of artifact collection? (Suggestion 1: store student artifacts in a password-protected Google Drive folder under cobeuhh and have the Assessment Committee schedule the in-class assessments. Suggestion 2: Use the scores in the quantitative fields of the MFT to assess quantitative problem solving).

**4. Critical Thinking.** Measure: CLA+. The CLA+ is scored on a six-point scale. The trend is the same as with writing. Issue: What are our aspirations? AACSB would like to see us aspire to improve, not decline.

#### ACTIONS:

- Reduce validity, 5 year trend.
- MFT: National average within 10%.
- CLA: Between pre and pro.
- Storage: how to keep it.
- Quan: financial, accounting, econ sub scores. Quan reasoning section.
- Edu-universal ranking for reputation.
- Measures of CLA, written-intensive classes. Writing expectation: Benjamin, Todd, Helen, strategy.