

Dean's Response to 5-year Review of Construction Management Technology

Overview:

The CMT has a mostly strong faculty base that serves its mostly non-traditional student base well. They are tightly linked to their industry partners – perhaps more so than any other department in the college – and have the resource support to show for it. Their focus is the non-traditional student already working in the industry and they can safely argue that they are recognized state-wide for creating a superior graduate. The concerns include the possibility of being spread too thin with teaching across construction, facilities management, Ogden, Davis, and SLCC. This issue will need resolution in the 2013/2014 year although the decision likely will benefit from several coalescing factors. There is some concern that the time is critical to address the needs of this important department.

Recommendation 1: Faculty needs to be able to go into industry to obtain BIM knowledge.

Response: The faculty response is to look to training. This has been effective in other departments. The potential for learning in industry would be interesting. We have lately found a way to get a sabbatical for one of the tenure track faculty. Also, summers could be used in the future. It is true that the non-tenured faculty need time to do scholarship. However, faculty members throughout the college have managed this balance before. In addition, working in industry does count for some scholarship in this college. We shall see what their industry advisory board indicates.

Recommendation 2: Faculty needs to be able to go into industry to obtain BIM knowledge.

Response: The new facilities in Davis will have improved computer equipment available. The department will need to investigate bringing in the skill levels through adjuncts if they cannot handle it with current faculty. We often bring in specialized skills into this college through adjuncts. If this is not possible then we will have to look to alternatives.

Recommendation 3: In order for the department to have adequate annual budget planning, the department budget should be set at the beginning of the academic year.

Response: In addition to the salaries and other operational costs covered by the college, the department has enough soft funding to cover their yearly expenses for many years into the future. The College takes the position that this frees up the small amounts of monies used in operations for the many other areas of the college. The travel/training approach is the same used for all departments in the college although recently the college agreed to pay for another (international) trip for the chair. Monies in COAST are handled centrally. A comparable department (such as Engineering) receives more funding from the college than CMT but the amount difference is in the mid single digit thousands. That is far less than CMT brings in through soft funding on a yearly basis and has stockpiled.

Recommendation 4: If adequate resources are not available to support SLCC and Weber programs as well as construction management and facilities management, the program must choose what programs can be adequately supported.

Response: The Provost's office originally supported keeping the SLCC aspect of the program. However, given the various issues with accreditation and resources that have come to light, it has agreed that it is less critical. In addition, it is a small amount of Continuing Education (CE) monies that would be in jeopardy if we backed out of SLCC. I would recommend that CE grant the amount for CMT as it is a strictly night program moving to Davis. This would not be enough to change the number of faculty in the program either negatively or positively.

The issue with Facilities Management (FM) is that it has low enrollment and an associated single instructor with a higher salary. While the FM program has strategic value, it is not fully established in the industry and has never had high enrollments. Nevertheless, we are making efforts to increase enrollment. We've given the professor a course release and will evaluate this late fall to see if the efforts have paid off. It is likely too early to say what the horizon on this program looks like and the faculty member is highly skilled in the area but it might have to be put on hiatus if a solution to resource management cannot be found.

The final issue is faculty. The chair believes that only a minority – two, and one un-tenured - of the current faculty have the skills to teach most of the upper division classes. One of those skilled faculty (the chair considers him the second-most skilled after himself) members has recently run into a snag in his tenure process. Another non-tenured faculty member (a woman, and our ratio of males to females in technology is extremely weighted towards males) has run into problems with mid-tenure review. That individual is up for another round of mid-tenure review in the 2013/2014 year. It is possible that the department doesn't have the right collection of skilled individuals. This puts a small department like CMT in jeopardy.

Recommendation 5: SLCC brought up to level.

Response: no response necessary

Recommendation 6: The tenure and promotion document must be clear to new faculty who need to be mentored in this process.

Response: The College is addressing this issue. We will float a new version of the College PPM this fall. In addition, we have begun assisting faculty with understanding the tenure process through lectures (the department chair of CMT conducted two) and mentorships as well as help with writing their files (handled by a senior sales faculty).

Conclusion:

The current department chair demands rigor – something the current faculty admit. This approach has likely contributed to the department's stature in the industry. The hope is that his faculty will rise to the level he requires of himself. However, that takes time. The concern is that the department's reputation might suffer and the faculty will burn-out before that level is reached. To this point we have delayed asking for resources to bring in another faculty member given the current flux with reviews and SLCC. It is tempting to think of, however, for the reasons noted. There are other reasons as well. The department chair would like to take time to develop engineering management and, as it stands, he does not have time for that. Another reason is that a well-regarded graduate of the program is interested in

coming back and teaching as well as continuing his education – an opportunity to bring some vigor and skill into the program. It is difficult to find people to teach in this field. The dean will ask the provost for time to review these matters.