**Runstad Department of Real Estate Faculty Meeting**

**November 16th, 2021**

**2-3pm**

Attendees: Sofia Dermisi, Arthur Acolin, Gregg Colburn, Rebecca Walter, Gordon Louie

**Agenda**

1. **Approval of 11/9/21 minutes (see attached)**
   1. The previous meeting minutes were unanimously approved.
2. **Chair Updates**
   1. **BE Commons Discussion**
      1. Arthur Acolin & Sofia Dermisi met with Daniel Coslett (Acting Director of Academic Planning/CBE) —recommended that 100/200 level courses are better for BE to introduce the college to students or interdisciplinary studios. Additional questions were raised regarding the funding model for BE courses but there are no details that have been shared yet. Daniel Coslett is meeting with faculty across CBE — funding questions were raised by others (in past interdisciplinary studio paid this).
      2. There is no indication yet of how many classes will be created, but BE commons will not take the form of a separate department—potentially a more permanent BE committee composed of people from existing departments may form.

* 1. **Remote Desktop Access update**
     1. The Dean and Associate Dean of Students have received a letter from students regarding this issue; Josh Polansky and Associate Dean of Students provided an update at the CBE Executive Committee, and, with Ross McKenzie, are trying to come up with a solution.
     2. The administration’s position is that we’re in-person, and they want students back on campus and doing things as they had pre-COVID although the request is not because students want to be remote but want equitable access to all software without having to install the software on their own computers.
     3. Administration’s proposed solution: installing software on students’ computers—students who need laptops can take laptops for check-out with the specific software required. Some students may need different hardware (e.g. bigger screens) and that is also a possibility.
     4. While a cloud solution was suggested, that’s apparently not an immediate option as it would need to be purchased, in addition to additional software license(s). The current proposed solution is a ‘band-aid’ for now, but a more permanent solution will be needed for long-term sustainability.
     5. An increase in tuition or an additional technology fee were both proposed to fund this—ultimately, a tuition increase was decided since financial aid can help offset at least some of the cost for students as opposed to another fee (which is not covered).
  2. **Holiday Remote Work**
     1. Gordon Louie & Melissa Best will be working remotely from Dec. 20th, 2021 through Jan. 2nd, 2022. The Runstad Dept. office will be closed during this time and an announcement will be posted on the door with both of their emails.
     2. If faculty/students need to reach Gordon or Melissa, they are available via email.
  3. **GNM Review**
     1. In the first-year cohort, there are 2 GNM students, and they will be reviewed later today (11/16). All instructor information has been gathered for the review.

1. **Operational Items**
   1. **Peer Teaching Observation Form**– link
      1. The current version of the form (linked above) was unanimously approved.
   2. **Department Chair Hiring Update (Guest: Brian McLaren—Chair of Search Committee)**
      1. Process
         1. Per the current version of the schedule—today is the preferred deadline for applications. Candidate materials will be posted for search committee review on 11/23; provisional selections for 1st round interviews will be made by 12/3; phone interviews will be conducted on 12/14-12/15; departmental review of candidates will occur on 12/17; virtual interviews (2nd round) will take place from 1/3-1/14; the departmental review for finalists will occur on 1/14 as well; the final search committee meeting is scheduled for 1/17.
         2. Note about 12/14-12/15: the committee may not circulate ALL the names (out of concern for time and privacy of candidates) if, during the first-round interviews, the committee decides that any candidate(s) are unsuitable.
         3. Regarding the final recommendations by the committee, Deans don’t want a rank-order of finalists for chair —rather, it will be a system of ‘pluses and minuses.’ This is different than faculty searches.
      2. Rubrics
         1. The principles are the same for rubric-creation even if the rubric is different than the one used by the cohort hire.
         2. The first 5 items are part of the job description and prioritized for that reason.
         3. The Dean does not want the rubric physically shared with anyone outside of the committee, but Brian is happy to share point-by-point via discussion.
            1. Faculty brought up that the ‘best practices’ handbook sent by Assoc. Provost Chad Allen suggests involving the department in creation of the assessment rubric—this seems counterintuitive to these suggestions if the documents cannot be shared and the department is not involved.
         4. Over the Summer, there had been a lot of debate on the job description and the department needs that should be reflected in the position posting (e.g. a preferred specialization in finance, corporate RE, or data analytics has not been made explicit but this need exists)
            1. Brian asserts that it’s still among the priorities of the search , but it’s not listed as a requirement in the job description
         5. Criteria for selection (in order of importance—the first 5 criteria are listed in the job description):
            1. Managerial capacity (internal)
            2. Leadership (external) demonstrated through leadership in national associations/organizations, sustainable partnership building, and community engagement
            3. EDI (consistent across all hires and position types in CBE)
            4. Teaching
            5. Research
            6. Current Departmental Priorities
            7. Work experience in public or non-profit sector (*outside of job description*)
         6. How can we make changes (as a department) to the current iteration of the rubric?
            1. Proposed changes can be brought it to the committee, the dean, and to the search consultants.
            2. There is concern about a less engaged committee and representation of the tenured vote—there isn’ a tenured person as part of this search from the department despite all institutional guidelines suggesting departmental involvement. The goal is to make sure this won’t end in a failed search. Besides effective leadership, we need to make sure a new faculty colleague can also contribute to the department’s academic profile and reputation.
         7. There are 4 requests on the part of the department:
            1. Adding another faculty member from the department to the search committee, particularly as one of the current members has recused themselves until the final part of the process.
            2. Since we are a small department, opening first-round interviews to all faculty members to help inform the departmental review scheduled for 12/17.
            3. Removing the final item from the current rubric (work experience in public or non-profit sector) since it is neither in the job description nor a core requirement of tenure.
            4. All search committee documents regarding the process and rubric are shared with the department for feedback
         8. Is there a process document/recommended guidelines available for greater transparency about what’s informing this search?
            1. There is currently no process document in addition to the job description, timeline, and rubric.
         9. Within the department, we have a clear consensus about what constitutes a strong candidate, and it doesn’t sound like this vision is currently shared outside the department (with the committee, leadership, search firm, etc.).
         10. It would be helpful for an email with the collective sentiments of the department to be circulated to Brian by the Chair of the department and cc’ing the Dean.
             1. The salary concerns should be included in the letter to tackle the potential problem this poses earlier rather than later.
             2. We also don’t know what Witt-Kiefer has provided to candidates who have inquired about salary ranges for this position.
2. **Announcements/Upcoming Events**
   1. **Next Faculty Meeting (11/30/21)**
      1. There will be no faculty meeting next week—our next meeting will be on Tues., Nov. 30th.
   2. **Thanksgiving Week Faculty/Staff Availability**
      1. Gordon will be in office on Mon. 11/22. Sofia will be in office Tues. 11/23. Melissa will be out-of-office next week. The department office will be closed 11/24-11/28.
   3. **Scheduling Dept. Meeting on Dec. 17th**
      1. Melissa will send out a Doodle poll to find available times for this meeting specifically for reviewing applicants to the current Department Chair search.
      2. The search committee is doing interviews on 12/14 and 12/15 so it will be necessary to schedule the department meeting asap after those dates.