MINUTES
Department of Aeronautics & Astronautics
April 2, 2020

Attending: Acikmese, Bragg, Breidenthal, Dabiri, Ferrante, Hermanson, Knowlen, Kurosaka, Little, Livne, Mesbahi, Morgansen, Salviato, Shumlak, Williams, Yang; Maczko, Reichert

Absent: Bragg, Jarboe

MINUTES
Minutes of the March 12, 2020 meeting were unanimously approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS
- Faculty merit materials were due March 31st and all faculty turned in materials on time. Kudos to the faculty.
- A&A Chair’s Distinguished Seminars are being moved to the 2020-21 school year due to the coronavirus. SPARC seminars have also been moved.
- Erik Hurlen has accepted the Senior Lecturer position. He will be joining the department in August.
- Prf. Uri Shumlak asked faculty for plans for teaching remotely for spring quarter. Everyone responded and seemed thoroughly prepared. Plans were very thoughtful and the faculty is doing a great service to our students. Prof. Morgansen thanked Prof. Shumlak for spearheading that effort.
- Faculty are encouraged to attend the instructor’s meetings scheduled for April 3rd. and they can share their methods. There will be a meeting at 10am for grad instructors and another meeting at 12pm for undergrad instructors. Faculty are welcome to attend both but should plan to attend at least the meeting that applies to them.
- Prof. Morgansen will be holding a Town Hall meeting on April 6th. This meeting is mostly focused on students but everyone is invited to attend.
- Prof. Behcet Acikmese will be out on leave Spring quarter for a NASA appointment. He will, however, be teaching a class at UW during this time.
- Announcement from Mitsuru. Dougherty, affiliate associate professor.
- Candy Housholder will not be going on leave during spring quarter as previously planned. Faculty should continue to send grant items to her.
- Grant manager position and budget fiscal analyst position interviews will start soon. Rachel Reichert hopes to have offers out by the end of April.

REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES
No report from the following committees: Undergraduate Committee, Computer Committee, Faculty Search, Graduate Committee, Peer Evaluation Committee, Safety Committee, Aero/Astro Working Committees, Space Allocation Committee, Strategic Planning, AIAA, Sigma Gamma Tau, Boeing Professor Selection, Diversity, MAE-CMS Advisory, Space Systems Center, UWAL, PSI Center, Accreditation, Educational Policy, COE EDGE/UWEEO, COE Executive, Promotion & Tenure, College Council, Academic Conduct, Engineering Manufacturing, FAA Center of Excellence, GISE, Technical Japanese, Certification Program, Faculty Fellows, Faculty Senate
**MERIT REVIEW PROCESS**

Merit surveys will be sent out soon. Responses are due by May 1st. Faculty make recommendations to Prof. Morgansen, who in turn makes her recommendations to the Dean. The Dean then sends on the recommendations to the Provost. Last year, full professors were asked to provide a merit review process for reviewing all full professors (attached). The suggestion this year is to do something similar for assistant and associate professor reviews.

**Discussion:**

- Has the self-assessment been useful? If I score myself too high, I look ridiculous. Some faculty score themselves all 5’s while others score themselves 3’s to be modest. The majority of the faculty agree that overall assessment is not useful.
- Make comment boxes required. Write justification for each score given.
- What is the primary role of the numerical scoring? Is it only used for merit or is it used for any other function? This is used only for merit. Merit and raises are two different things.
- Many of the faculty want to see the numerical scores and the raw comments from their colleagues. Harsh comments could also help the faculty to improve.
- If the current system isn’t working, can we change it? It did work well; it just needs to be tweaked.
- Comments should be constructive and there should be no rudeness. Rude comments should go to the chair in confidentiality.
- Faculty might try to figure out where comments came from.
- Comments should be based on fact and not judgement.
- Can we create a system where each numerical value is supported by a short comment? There should be separate comments into those that go to the person and those that go to the chair.
- Process needs to be as fair as possible. Everyone needs to be constructive, not mean and false. If you make a rude comment, justify it.
- Even good comments need to be substantiated.
- We don’t need separate comment to the chair. That information is still useful to the person. We need to trust each other.
- Maybe there could be a numerical value that has to be backed up by the data. If it’s not backed up, it can’t be considered. There should be some kind of filtering. Faculty should agree on all comments.
- Score like they do in gymnastics, remove highest and lowest score.
- If we remove the highest and lowest score, then we’re all average.

**Summary:**

- For each score given, there should be a required justification comment box. The raw comments from these boxes should be reported to the person being reviewed.
- There should be a separate confidential comment box that goes to the Chair only.

**HIRING PLAN DISCUSSION**

We are at the time year that Chairs are asked for hiring plans. The department had three open lines at the start of the year, plus Prof. Jarboe’s retirement. Prof. Morgansen feels it is likely that we are going to fill 2 of the lines at the end of the current hiring season. That will leave us with 2 remaining open lines.
Any faculty member who has a hiring area they would like to be considered for the 2020-21 Hiring Plan, please submit the following information to Kim Maczko (copy Prof. Morgansen) by the end of April.

- description of area
- rank desired
- connection of the area to the department strategic plan and mission
- connection of the area to any relevant active or planned college cluster hires
- connection of the area to any other initiatives or opportunities in CoE or UW generally
- infrastructure needs for the area
- impact of the area on department/college/UW research, teaching and service
- national funding outlook for the area for the past few years and projection for the next 5-10 years
- job prospects for students graduating in the area (MS and PhD in particular), both in AA and beyond
- connection of the area to regional industry

Note that "replacement for retired faculty" is not considered a viable justification by the provost's office.

NEW BUSINESS
None

ADJOURNED
Meeting adjourned at 2:26pm.
UWAA 2019 Full Professor Merit Evaluation Committee Process and Assessment Criteria

Full professors in the UWAA Department are expected to make substantial contributions to research, teaching, and service.

In research, substantial contributions mean scholarly leadership, as measured by:
- Publications in leading journals and conferences and publication of books.
- Mentoring of graduate students at the PhD and masters levels.
- Development of unique experimental, analytical, or numerical capabilities, or other major impacts on the field of Aeronautics and Astronautics at the national and international level.

In teaching substantial contributions include:
- Excellence in teaching graduate and undergraduate courses.
- Development of new courses, new educational approaches, or new educational programs.

Excellence in service means substantial contributions to:
- Management of the department and the university.
- Service contributions to the profession at the national and international levels.

The updated 2019 merit process requested faculty to provide information about their contributions over the last year as well as a full CV in the UW Promotion and Tenure format. The UWAA Department also instituted a new faculty merit evaluation system and process in 2019 in which all faculty members, regardless of rank, have the option of evaluating all faculty members by submitting evaluative scores on a scale from 1 to 5 for performance in the research, teaching, and service categories. Faculty members can also submit notes on the performance of their colleagues.

The numerical scores and notes are collected by the Assistant to the Chair of the department and are presented to senior faculty when they discuss, in a dedicated meeting, the merit of the faculty who are junior to them.

To evaluate the merit of the full professors in the department, the Chair appoints a special committee of three full professors, each from different disciplinary areas, that is tasked with the evaluation of all full professors. The special committee submits to the Chair the criteria it will use in the merit evaluation process. Once accepted by the Chair, the Chair provides the special committee the merit evaluation information scores and notes from all professors to serve as one of the sources of information the special committee will use as it follows the process and criteria that were accepted by the Chair.

Merit evaluations of the full professors prepared by the special committee serve as advisory information to the chair.

The following guidelines will be used by the Special Committee in its discussions and deliberations:
- Committee members will not see their own assessment data or comments, nor will they participate in the discussion of their merit recommendation.
- Average scores of 3 and above by all faculty in all categories (research, teaching, service) will lead to a “meritorious” recommendation by the special committee without further discussion.
• Average grades of 4.5 and above in all categories, would lead to an “exceptionally Meritorious” recommendation by the committee, if all grades by all faculty are 4 and above, with an allowance for 3 and above in the service area.

• Average grades that are substantially below 3 in all categories would lead to a “Non-Meritorious” evaluation by the special committee.

• Desirably, self-scores by faculty would be made available to the committee together with self-evaluation notes submitted in the survey. The committee will consider major differences between the way individual faculty members evaluate their own performance and the evaluations by colleagues to make sure that no information is missed.

• The special committee will pay special attention to two particular situations:
  o Cases in which there are large differences among faculty in the way they evaluate a colleague. If a faculty member receives good to excellent grades from most faculty but a very low grade by a small number of faculty, the special committee will study the notes submitted and revisit the merit materials provided by the faculty member discussed.
  o Cases in which average scores in any one of the research/teaching/service categories are very low.

In both such cases, members of the special committee will work independently to prepare their evaluations based on the scores and notes by the faculty and the information provided by the professor discussed. The members of the special committee will then meet to compare notes and reach consensus. When consensus is reached, the special committee will provide the Chair with an explanation of the considerations that led to the outcome. The summary explanation will include the Committee’s final score (which may be different from the statistical average of the faculty responses) and a statement on meritorious/non-meritorious/exceptionally-meritorious. If consensus is not reached, members of the special committee will submit to the Chair their individual final score and merit assessments.

The special committee recognizes that research in a leading research university may not produce consistent year by year measureable results (papers, grants, grad students, etc.) and that sometimes periods of preparation are required (building new experimental capabilities, writing books, venturing into new areas, etc.) before yielding the measurable results or the impact expected from full professors in a leading research university, as also reflected in the Faculty Code. If low measurable contributions in research are reported by a faculty member for a one-year period, that faculty member is expected to explain in his/her statement why this is the case, what scholarly work was pursued in the period discussed, and what the planning was behind such efforts that would later lead to impactful scholarly work. The special committee will evaluate such statements carefully and submit to the Chair its evaluation of any such cases.