Faculty Members Present: Professors Mousumi Bhattacharya, Beth Boquet, Dave Crawford, David Downie, Bob Epstein, Shannon Kelley, Jen Klug, Phil Lane, John McDermott, Rona Preli, Susan Rakowitz (Secretary of the General Faculty), Kraig Steffen, Amalia Rusu (Executive Secretary), Emily Smith, Debra Strauss (Chair), Joan Weiss

Administrators: SVPAA Lynn Babington, Deans Don Gibson, Bruce Berdanier

Student Representative: Jason Abate

Regrets: Professors Alison Kris, Jo Yarrington, Deans Bob Hannafin, Meredith Kazer, Yohuru Williams

Guests: Professors Harvey Hoffman (item 7b), Erica Hartwell (item 7c), Stephanie Storms (item 7d)

This meeting was a continuation of business that we did not conclude previously.

7d, Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees: report on October meeting.

Prof. Strauss welcomes Stephanie Storms:

Prof. Storms reports that on October 1 the committee visited the active learning classroom along with board members, she reported progress on goals, and suggested that future meetings will focus on goals. The next meeting is December 3rd with the objective of talking about study abroad and other learning opportunities. Prof. Storms reported that the meeting was very collegial, and the trustees had questions about pedagogy. They are very interested in talking about academics rather than finances. Board Member Bob Murphy thanked committee for responses to the “what makes us happy” survey.

SVPAA Babington noted that the role of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board is to advocate for academics at the Board level. After discussion with the Committee on Conference and seeing the active learning classroom, the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board decided it should monitor progress on updating all of the classrooms and advocate for increasing video conferencing capabilities.

Prof. Rakowitz asked whether we were done with the joys and challenges survey, especially given the disappointing response rate last time.

Prof. Storms acknowledged the issue and said that we will send it again in the middle of the semester this time. She asked what issues and concerns the Council would like the committee to bring to the board.

Prof. Rakowitz asked whether the committee had ideas.

Prof. Weiss asked for specifics on the goals.

Prof. Storms reported that the committee intended to monitor progress on 2020; monitor study abroad; support areas of strength, especially in the College of Arts and Sciences, specifically in the areas of Communication and emerging media programs; there is a desire to
increase visibility, pay attention to core revision, and look at educational technology and classroom design.

Prof. Boquet opined that the strategic plan and core revision both loom large. She had no specific suggestions for the agenda, but as we move task force ideas forward, it is important that the committee stay in dialogue with the Board.

SVPAA Babington noted that the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board and the faculty committee on conference wants to wait until the core revision process is further along in development before presenting it to the Board of Trustees.

Prof. Boquet emphasized that we should be underscoring the importance of supporting faculty work.

Prof. Lane asked whether those goals were vetted before the Academic Council.

SVPAA Babington responded that the faculty and Board of Trustees came up with them. It was a joint process.

Prof. Storms affirmed that they were shared goals.

Prof. Epstein offered what he considers his “standard comment:” support from the Board for pedagogical resources is appreciated, but technological innovation is only one component. This is one sort of support, but only one. Staffing and infrastructure are others. Pedagogy broadly should always be supported.

Prof. Kelley asked whether the Board knew about digital humanities, and noted that we are trying to get the digital humanities off the ground here.

SVPAA Babington noted that there was a presentation to the Board last year, but did not remember who made it.

Prof. Rakowitz agreed with Prof. Epstein, and noted that there are many areas of strength in the College. There's no reason to single out Communication; it's no stronger than other departments in the College.

Prof. Klug also affirmed the importance of making the Board aware of the variety of things we do.

Prof. Storms assured the council that they seem to support the visibility of the faculty with the Board.

Prof. Preli noted that one area of innovation is collaboration. She suggested that looking for mechanisms or funding that would facilitate collaboration in teaching would be welcome.

Prof. Storms thanked the committee.

7b, the Proposal for 5-year BS/MS Management of Technology (MOT).

Prof. Strauss welcomed Prof. Harvey Hoffman of Engineering.

Prof. Hoffman noted that there are already five-year engineering programs. We have five-year plans, this is an additional one. The most significant difference with what students take as core is that two courses (senior design) is replaced by MOT program capstones. Undergrad engineering has approved this. Students will still do a year long project, but in their fifth year. They do not receive a bachelors until their fifth year. Software engineering currently does the same thing. This should help young engineers.

Prof. Weiss asked about data on five-year programs. She also wondered whether students could do what looked like 15 credits of graduate work a semester.

Prof. Rusu suggested that there were really 12 credits.
Prof. Downie noted that there are many programs where students take 15 or 18 credits, but not in the sciences. “It’s the new normal.”

Prof. Boquet noted that this program is in line with programs we already have, but that we should be tracking completion rates. What do we do with students who are not on track? What happens to students who in their fourth year are not able?

Prof. Hoffman noted that students can transition to a regular engineering degree if they don’t think they can make it.

Prof. Weiss asked when students declare their intention to stay for the fifth year and Prof. Hoffman noted that it would be at the end of their second year.

Prof. Weiss wondered about accreditation.

Profs. Hoffman and Rusu noted that only undergrad are ABET accredited.

Prof. Weiss noted that since a Management of Technology degree is a professional degree, students ought to have a residency.

Prof. Hoffman questioned why.

Prof. Weiss suggested that students need experience before they begin managing.

Prof Hoffman suggested that there were all sorts of ways to make the program stronger by adding more time. “I could make it better still by demanding three to five years of experience. I think it would be terrific. Only 5% go into academics. The rest will be working for managers.” His point was that when our students get out right now, they have no idea what to expect. They go into industry and discover they need more than design. They need schedule, budget, return on investment. We give that to them in this program so that they are prepared to work in industry. They will know the questions that managers will ask. They get the equivalent of 36 credits of management.

Prof. Steffin noted that it is always good to have these kinds of things, and there is a temptation to say that they will not take new resources. This proposal does not seem to ask for resources as it grows. How do you manage the increasing workload? Are you considering new resources?

Prof. Hoffman noted that we have about 55 students in the MOT program. About half are full time, all of whom are international students. All of the faculty other than Prof. Hoffman are adjuncts (he is full time, Professor of Practice). All of the adjuncts are experts in the field that they teach. Intellectual property is taught by a patent lawyer, for instance. Basically, if the school could afford it, we would take full time positions. But we’re doing a good job getting experts at the undergraduate level. I don’t see a significant impact in the short run.

Prof. Epstein asked who was teaching these capstones. They are required for full and part time BA level MOT? That would also be the capstone for the masters? Where do the projection numbers come from. What’s this based on?

Professor Hoffman noted that he has two students who are interested. That’s where he got the initial projection of two students. He notes that we would need to market the program, but that he thinks it would grow.

Prof. Epstein returned to the issue of resources. “Would you not need greater resources if the program grows how much you expect?”

Prof. Hoffman suggests not.

Prof. Epstein asks whether there are ways it requires resources no matter how much it grows (or does not).

Prof. Hoffman responded that the program does not require laboratories. It does not require computer resources. It requires expertise in certain engineering management areas.
Prof. Rakowitz noted that while Prof. Hoffman teaches half the classes but his Professor of Practice term is complete in two and a half years. What’s the plan?

Prof. Hoffman agreed that the school is going to have to replace him with a full time faculty member. That’s a question for the Dean, who had left the meeting early.

Prof. Hoffman departs and the Council moves to the discussion phase.

Prof. Epstein noted that other things like this exist, but wondered what people would be finishing in the fifth year.

SVPAA Babington suggested that because the senior design courses are not taken during their 4th year they cannot walk with the BS degree at the end of the 4th year.

Prof. Epstein asked whether people in the five year program they walk with their four year class.

Prof. Rusu: They will get both BS and MS at the end of 5th year so theoretically they could walk in both ceremonies but at the end of the 5th year not 4th.

SVPAA Babington: they just need to take the capstones.

Prof. Boquet wanted to follow up that in discussions over resources, one need is support for scientific and technical communication. I can’t see how a masters program with a senior design project happens. Engineering students need lots of support for writing. As we grow our graduate programs, especially in sciences and technology, we have to grapple with other resource questions.

Prof. Steffen noted that it sounds like this one guy is doing all these capstones. And I really think we should require some sort of writing course.

Prof. Lane pointed out that this is an addition to an existing program. He did not think it was a big deal. His more serious concern is that this thing is driven by one person.

Prof. Preli noted that a lot of engineering programs have work experience and internships. It fits with our institutional mission. Also, at the graduate level it seems like 15 credits is extraordinary. 9 is more typical.

Prof. Rusu noted that all projects in Engineering are real-world projects, including the capstone projects. Even the senior design projects for undergrads have industry mentors.

Prof. Preli wondered whether this meant that they are getting management experience.

Prof. Rusu opined that we should not confuse management of projects with leadership. This is not a leadership program.

Prof. Preli noted that it specifically says you are going to manage projects.

Prof. Rusu suggested that this is really about being better engineers at managing projects.

Dean Gibson noted that we have a fifth year MBA. That does not mean you leave the program as a manager. The general trend is for fifth year programs to teach these things.

Prof. Rusu noted that some of the courses might be spread out, with students taking only 12 credits at once.

Prof. Smith echoed the resource question. International students are tough. It’s a chicken and egg situation: you need the students to justify hiring a professor, but you need the professor to get the students. I empathize with the situation. It is common in the professional schools.

Prof. Epstein wanted to echo that. If there is no interest, why have a program. If there is interest, then we have to provide resources.

SVPAA Babington explained that the program already exists. This is just a new pathway into it. That’s a common thing. Five-year programs in engineering are becoming the norm nationally.
Prof. Epstein agreed that we have been doing lots of these five year programs, but asked why these particular ones?

SVPAA Babington replied that the suggestions came from the faculty.

Prof. Boquet again noted that the resource issue is not separate. We have industry professionals, but they need support. Many of them are teaching students with acculturation issues. This is great, but we need to support them in all different ways.

Prof. Rusu makes a motion to approve the Five Year Masters of Management Technology.

Prof. Lane seconds.

Prof. Downie: I speak in favor of it. These students will already go through the core. They can opt out and just get a BS. I speak for it.

Mr. Abate says that on behalf of the students, expediency is also a positive thing. But there is already a Management of Technology masters degree; this is just a five-year thing. It’s just making it more convenient.

Prof. Rakowitz questions why we are expanding a program which is based on one person who is here for a maximum of two and a half more years.

Prof. Strauss wonders whether we need to have the Dean of Engineering here.

Prof. Downie suggests that if the program is successful, they will hire somebody.

Prof. McDermott speaks in favor of the motion. If this is another pathway, then I speak in favor of the motion. He does not want to conflate the bigger issues with this smaller one.

Prof. Preli is concerned. What do you do if there is a sudden influx?

Prof. Downie believes they’d have to be accepted into the college.

Prof. Rusu notes that the decision is made at end of sophomore, beginning of junior year. Students might come for the undergrad degree and see this as another opportunity.

Prof. Preli: so we’re saying the adjunct-only courses would service this?

Prof. Babington thinks there will be plenty of time to plan for it. She suggests that the Council doesn’t need to look at resources. New faculty in the SOE have been growing each year to meet the needs of the school and increased student enrollment.

Prof. Preli suggests that perhaps this is far more planned than it seems, but that we at Fairfield have a tendency to put things in motion and then figure out the resources. We have a habit of doing this.

Prof. Lane calls the question.

Prof. Downie seconds.

Only two opposed to calling the question; question is called.

Motion to approve the program now on the table. (Rusu / Lane)

11 for; 5 opposed; 1 abstention.

7c: UCC proposal for revision to US Diversity criteria

Prof. Erica Hartwell enters. She was on the US Diversity Committee last year and is chairing it this year. She explains that they were asked by the UCC to examine the language in the US Diversity criteria. We decided that there were two points for revision. We decided to examine this as a result of a specific course that we were presented with that dealt with disability. We wanted to have the focus on race, class, and gender. Other things are OK if they intersect with those categories. So we made some changes including changing race and ethnic to race-ethnicity.
Prof. Rakowitz asked whether this would this impact any existing courses. Prof. Hartwell: no.

**Prof. Lane makes a motion to accept the language on page 82; Prof. Weiss seconds; unanimous approval. The text of the new language is:**

“In order to help students develop a critical consciousness of self and society, all undergraduates are required to take one course that gives significant treatment to aspects of diversity and pluralism in U.S. society. Such courses will explore, in a systematic manner, connections among race-ethnicity, class, and gender, and will examine issues of privilege and difference in U.S. society. Additional aspects of diversity may be considered provided that their intersection with race, class, and gender are examined.”

**Election of Faculty Members to the Search Committee for University Librarian**

Prof. Rakowitz notes that we agreed last time to vote for people to serve on the committee to hire a new head librarian. A vote is conducted by the council and Prof. Rakowitz reports that Profs. Gil-Egui, Miecznikowski, Etemad, Planas have been chosen to serve.

**7e, Change of name of program in Russian and Eastern European Studies**

**Motion [~/ Rusu] to change Russian and Eastern European Studies to Russian, Eastern European, and Central Asian Studies, approved unanimously.**

The meeting is adjourned at 5:02.

Respectfully submitted,
David Crawford
Recording Secretary