

Proposed Minutes for SBA School Council Meeting, January 22, 2016

Elected School Council Attendees: Shirley Dennis-Escoffier (ACC); Patricia Abril, Second Vice Speaker (BSL); Sara Rushinek (BTE); Phil Robins (ECO); Brian Barrett, First Vice Speaker (FIN); Howard Gitlow (MAS); Linda L. Neider, Speaker of the Council (MGT); Steven Ullmann (HSPM); Arun Sharma (MKT);

Secretary of the Council: Mrs. Blanca Ripoll

Absent: Eugene Anderson, Dean

Other non-voting attendees: D.J. Nanda (ACC); Chester A. Schriesheim (MGT); Ann Olazalbal (Vice Dean, Undergraduate Business); Anuj Mehrotra (Vice Dean, Graduate Business Programs)

The School Council meeting was held in the 217 conference room, Jenkins Bldg., from 9:30am – 11:40am.

A. Comments from the Speaker

Council Speaker, Linda Neider, told the group that the President just signed the school's bylaw on electronic balloting. She noted that departments as well as the Council could now use the electronic balloting process for any matters that require formal deliberation as long as the following conditions are in place: a description of the issues to be voted upon; at least a two week voting period to provide interactive discussion among colleagues; voting anonymity; using two designated members of the voting faculty to verify the voting results; and reporting the actual results to the electorate.

The Speaker encouraged all faculty to attend President Frenk's inauguration, which would take place on Friday, January 29th, at 2:00pm, noting that this represents a new, exciting era for the University. At the Faculty Senate meeting, President Frenk gave a preview of his new vision which includes raising 100 Endowed Chairs for existing and new faculty over the next decade; creating a consortium of schools for faculty and student international exchanges; and building a "culture of belonging," one in which diversity is embraced both in terms of the normal classifications (gender, ethnicity, race, color, age, religion) as well as in terms of differences in opinions.

Speaker Neider also informed members that the response rate for the evaluation of four Deans (Frost School; School of Communication; Nursing; and the SBA) averaged slightly over 70% this year, a rate much higher than previous years. **Both the Provost and President will meet with the regular faculty of the SBA to discuss Dean Anderson's evaluation on February 9th at 4:00pm in the McLamore Executive Dining Room.** The Dean will not be present, and faculty are strongly encouraged to attend and raise any issues they may have. The Speaker also informed the group that according to the Provost and President, Deans will no longer receive five-year appointments but instead, will have renewal one-year terms.

B. Approval of Today's Provisional Agenda

The agenda was approved unanimously.

C. Old Business

The only piece of old business was “proposed grade policy changes for MBA students” which the Council had suggested refining at their last meeting. Vice Dean Mehrotra presented the revised document which had also been reviewed (and approved) by Department Chairs. The new policy, which must be approved by the Graduate Council, allows students with a GPA below a 3.0 to continue in the program under probationary status, and allows them to petition their program advisor to retake courses which received grades lower than a B. A motion was made and seconded to approve the new policy, which was passed unanimously.

D. Proposed Checklist for Course Changes, Course Additions and Curriculum Changes

An ad hoc committee consisting of Shirley Dennis and Arun Sharma worked with Vice Dean, Ann Olazabal, and the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee to develop a checklist that could be used by departments prior to submitting course changes, course additions, and curriculum changes to the School Council. The need for such a checklist developed because in the past some departments sent new course proposals or changes forward to the School Council without informing relevant faculty and without having detailed syllabi. Council members suggested the following amendment to the checklist:

-Under Process for Changes to existing courses:

- Remove “At least four weeks”
- Insert - 1 b. i. “Undergraduate course changes, shall be reviewed by the Undergraduate Business Education Committee (UBEC) before submitting to the School Council
- Insert - 1.b.ii. “Graduate Vice Dean will determine if Graduate Business Education Committee needs to review proposal
- 3 – Remove “At least one week before School Council meeting”

-Under Process for Course additions:

- Remove “At least four weeks”
- Insert - 1 b. i. “Undergraduate course additions, shall be reviewed by the Undergraduate Business Education Committee (UBEC) before submitting to the School Council
- Insert - 1.b.ii. “Graduate Vice Dean will determine if Graduate Business Education Committee needs to review proposal
- 3 – Remove “At least one week before School Council meeting”

-Under Process for Curriculum changes:

- Remove “At least four weeks”

- Insert - 1 b. i. *“Undergraduate course changes, shall be reviewed by the Undergraduate Business Education Committee (UBEC) before submitting to the School Council*
- Insert - 1.b.ii. *“Graduate Vice Dean will determine if Graduate Business Education Committee needs to review proposal*

The Council then suggested that the checklist be put on the next Chairmen’s meeting so that they had the opportunity to make additional changes. A motion was made and seconded to approve the checklist with the School Council’s modification and with changes that might be suggested by the Department Chairs. The motion carried unanimously.

E. Newly Signed Policy on “Amorous Relationships with Students”

Speaker Neider shared with Council members a new policy, signed by the President, on amorous relationships with students. There is now a “zero tolerance” policy with respect to any type of “amorous” relationship with UM undergraduate students regardless of whether or not a member of the General Faculty (this includes all regular faculty, clinical, research, lecturer, instructor, adjuncts, etc.) has or may have evaluative authority over the student. If such relationships do occur, the faculty member will be subject to disciplinary action that could include termination. Exceptions to the policy exist for marriage, and pre-existing relationships. The Council felt that the policy should be distributed to all faculty by the Vice Dean for Faculty and should also be discussed at the next Chair’s meeting.

F. New Curriculum Proposals

Brian Barrett presented three new course requests for approval: FIN442 (Financial Planning and Wealth Management), FIN 446 (Real Estate Market Analysis), and FIN 715 (Pre-seminar workshop for doctoral students). A motion was made and seconded to approve each of the classes, and each class was unanimously approved.

Steve Ullmann presented a new course, HSM 350 (Production and Consumption of Health and Health Care) that, if approved, will replace ECO 386 (Health Economics) for all HSM majors. Currently, the ECO 386 course is over-subscribed and many of the HSM majors are not able to register for the class. In addition, Michael French, a top scholar in this area, has been given a joint appointment within the HSPM department, and is willing to teach the new proposed offering in a way that will make it far more relevant for the HSM majors. Phil Robins, representing the Economics Department, noted that he was fully supportive of this new course. A motion was made, seconded, and the new class was unanimously approved.

Arun Sharma presented a new graduate class, MKT 689 (Information Processing for Consumer Behavior) for council deliberation. After discussion, a motion was made, seconded, and the new class was unanimously approved.

G. Ad hoc Committee Proposals

Proposal to Change the School of Business Committee on Promotion and Tenure Composition: D. J. Nanda presented his committee's (Henrik Cronqvist, Arun Sharma, Chet Schriesheim, Paul Sugrue, Michael Tsiros) report for changing the structure, and developing a new bylaw for the School of Business Committee on Promotion and Tenure. Based on benchmarking of other business schools, the committee proposes having all (full) professors in the school, with the exception of those holding administrative appointments for the Dean's office, serve on this committee. Because an administrator is needed to house the confidential aspects of a candidate's file and write a summary of the committee's deliberation, the Vice Dean for Faculty (who will have no vote or voice in the deliberations) will present each case. Following a discussion of the case, eligible members of the committee will vote via secret ballots. The vote will be disclosed to all members, and the Vice Dean will be responsible for circulating to all voting members a summary of the discussion for their edits and approval.

Council members discussed the viability of having department chairs (who are full professors) present. After the discussion, it was decided that Chairs and faculty who had already deliberated on a case should recuse themselves from the discussions. However, if any eligible voting members of the committee have questions about the specific case, he/she could ask that the Chair (or a member of the department) return to the deliberation site to answer such questions. School Council members suggested that DJ present the new structure to the Department Chairs at their next meeting. In addition, it was suggested that the Council's ad hoc bylaw committee (Linda Neider, Patricia Abril, and Brian Barrett) meet to rewrite the suggestions into a bylaw format which could be sent to the regular faculty for their vote. The Speaker noted that in order for a new bylaw to pass, two-thirds of the voting faculty must vote for approval. A motion was made, seconded, and passed unanimously to have the committee's recommendations put into a form for the regular faculty to consider. The Speaker thanked the committee for their work on this important initiative.

Changes Under Discussion for a new Faculty Performance Appraisal

Process: Howie Gitlow and Chet Schriesheim presented their ad hoc committee's proposal for developing a policy specifying how faculty within the SBA should be appraised. Their ad hoc committee (consisting of themselves along with Rene Sacasas, D. J. Nanda, Linda Neider, Andy Leone, Terri Scandura) was formed due the overwhelmingly negative responses concerning the Dean's current use of all department chairs and his three Vice Deans to evaluate faculty who are not within their respective department. The committee consisted of faculty who had experience with using, developing, doing research on, and/or teaching in the area of performance assessment. Committee recommendations include:

- Decoupling the performance feedback process from the merit increase process. During the fall of each year, they suggest having tenured faculty within each department meet to review and develop specific, constructive

feedback for all untenured colleagues. In the current system, many of the voting faculty are not aware of the activities of their untenured colleagues until they reach the mid-point in the tenure process, and a formal assessment takes place. This prevents tenured faculty from helping assistant professors ultimately succeed in reaching the research and teaching goals that are key for eventual tenure and promotion. The (full) professors in a department (supplemented with other related faculty in small departments) should also meet in the fall to review and give constructive feedback to Associate Professors who are working towards promotion to full, or others who may seek feedback to learn how they can contribute more to our various university constituents. Full professors would meet to discuss how each might contribute more in the areas of research, teaching, and service. The Vice Dean for Faculty is encouraged to attend any of the feedback sessions to learn more about colleague expectations, and how the Dean's office might provide help to those who need assistance. All feedback would be summarized in written form for Assistant and Associate faculty.

-During the spring semester, faculty will be asked to complete an activity report detailing their accomplishments in the areas of research, teaching, and service. A peer committee (consisting of professors) will be formed to rate or rank faculty within the department based on these areas, understanding that research and teaching is paramount to untenured colleagues while tenured colleagues may make contributions in different ways with respect to research, teaching, and service. In small departments, Chairs would be encouraged to ask colleagues from other, related areas to participate as part of the peer assessment process. When completed, the peer assessments would be given to the Department Chair who will do his own independent assessments of each faculty member's annual performance. Both the peer and chair assessments can then be used to determine annual merit increases when the Chair meets with the Dean concerning his respective departmental members. After merit increases have been determined, Chairs will meet with faculty to discuss their specific increase as well as give feedback on areas for commendation and potential improvement.

Council members suggested that Chet and Howie present their recommendations at the next meeting of the Department Chairs to solicit more feedback before the proposed policy is written into a form, which can be voted on by the regular faculty. A motion was made, seconded, and unanimously approved to support the policy recommendations of the ad hoc committee.

H. Updated SBA Bylaws

Patty Abril and Linda Neider gave Council members copies of the newly updated SBA Bylaws. The updates include the three bylaw changes faculty approved at the fall meeting of the regular faculty. In addition, sections were added from the University of Miami Faculty Manual to update the bylaws and to clarify the role that faculty have in selecting department chairs as well as the role of the department

chair in the annual performance assessment of their respective faculty. Now that the bylaws have been updated, the Council asked that they be sent to all faculty and staff.

I. Other Business

Some of the School Council members noted that it was difficult to determine whether or not stipends, overloads, grant money, etc. was actually being included in their paychecks because the new Workday system does not seem to provide this information. They requested that the Secretary of the Council contact Vanessa or whomever else might be involved so that faculty could be provided with such information.

Meeting adjourned at 11:40 a.m.