

Parson Construction Management Technology Department

Faculty Response to Review

Overview

The Construction Management Technology feels that the report submitted by the review committee is a fair and accurate representation of the status of the department.

CMT Recommendations

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

Response: Building Information Modeling (BIM) is something that needs to be incorporated into our curriculum. In June 2010, the department provided a three-day training for Revit Architecture (a common modeling tool for BIM) for all interested faculty. In May 2011 and May 2012 the department provided Navisworks (a common scheduling tool for BIM) training for all interested faculty.

The idea of having faculty go out into industry to obtain BIM knowledge is something that we can discuss with industry at our next industry advisor meeting. There are two obstacles that could hamper this effort. First, the courses where BIM is most applicable are taught by tenure-track faculty, neither of which is eligible for to take time off (e.g., a sabbatical). Second, these faculty are struggling to meet basic expectations for tenure (particularly scholarship) and need to focus their efforts on preparing for tenure.

The department has been seeking funding from industry for faculty development, with some success. The department has sufficient funding from industry to get faculty additional training in BIM.

Recommendation 2: The program needs to implement state-of-the-art industry software in construction and facilities management.

Response: We currently have access to modeling software and scheduling software. Access to high-end estimating software and project management software could be obtained with little or no cost. The problem with implementing the software is that we do not have sufficient faculty to cover the programs we are currently supporting (see Recommendation 4) let alone revise curriculum. Also the faculty that teach the courses where this software is used are tenure-track faculty who are struggling meet basis expectations.

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: We have an established budget; however funding from the college does not cover the costs to operate the department and we are reliant on soft money (donations) to cover these costs. The department has long-term commitments from donors that insure we will have sufficient funding to cover these costs.

We receive an annual budget of \$3,000 from the college to cover operational costs. Of that approximately \$2,000 (we paid \$1,543 for the first 9 months of 2012-2013) is taken back by the university to pay for telephone equipment rental for our offices; leaving us with

about \$1,000 to cover operating costs (including printing, copying, office supplies, and training for faculty).

We are given an additional \$700 towards annual accreditation fees (the same amount ABET accredited programs are given). Our annual accreditation fees are \$2,500 and, unlike ABET accredited programs, the site visit fee is included in the annual fees. Unlike ABET accredited programs, we do not get additional funds to cover the site visit.

Additionally, we pay \$550 for membership in Associated Schools of Construction.

After paying telephone equipment rental, accreditation, and membership fees for the program we start the year with a \$1,350 budget deficit, which must be covered with soft money (donations from industry).

The college provides travel (hotel, air fair, per diem) for one conference or training trip a year for each faculty. The department is required to cover the registration fee. Any additional training is covered by the department.

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: With five faculty to support three programs, our faculty are spread thin.

SLCC – Enrollments in SLCC remain low, with most of the student coming out of the construction management program rather than the architecture program. With the cancelation of the articulation agreement with SLCC's construction management program enrollments are likely to continue to drop. We have been working with SLCC to improve enrollments through a joint marketing campaign. We plan to assess long-term viability in January 2014.

For the SLCC program to be viable we need a faculty stationed at SLCC at least two days a week to provide advising and teach some of the upper division courses. Currently there is sufficient funding for adjuncts to teach classes at SLCC, but not funding for a faculty at SLCC. It is important to note that the funding for the adjuncts is money set aside for SLCC and cannot be used or transferred to classes at the Ogden or Davis campus; therefore, if we no longer offer these classes we lose the associated funding. Discontinuing the SLCC program will, however, eliminate the administrative burden associated the program at SLCC, freeing up the resources to address other issues.

Facilities Management – Enrollment in facilities management remain low. Currently there are 11 declared majors with five of these graduating this spring or summer. Pete van der Have has been given a quarter-release time in the fall to focus on recruiting students into the program. At the end of fall semester we will assess student enrollment and decide if there has been sufficient growth in enrollments to warrant continuation of this program, or if it needs to be phased out. The money to fund facilities management classes comes out of the same pool of money used to fund construction management classes and faculty. Phasing out the facilities management program would free up these resources to be used in the construction management program or to support a faculty at SLCC.

Recommendation 5: Also, the SLCC campus program must be brought up to the level appropriate for articulation with the Weber State campus program.

Response: Data from the AIC exam, CLA exam, and course work in senior project shows that students who did their lower-division course work at SLCC are performing at a lower level than student who did their lower-division course work at Weber. In the spring of 2012 we meet with SLCC's construction management program to develop a plan to address this issue. Unable to come up with a workable solution, we cancelled articulation with this program at the end of spring 2012. We are continuing articulation for students who were enrolled in the construction management program at the time we canceled the articulation. This problem will be resolved when these students graduate from the program.

We maintained an articulation the SLCC Architecture program. We are working with SLCC to strengthen this program.

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

Response: This issue must be addressed by the college, inasmuch as the promotion and tenure document must be approved by the faculty of the college, the university's Appointment, Promotion, Academic Freedom, and Tenure Committee, and the Faculty Senate. The college is aware of this problem and discussions about how to best change the document have begun. To help better prepare faculty for promotion and tenure, the college sponsored a promotion and tenure seminar for tenure-track faculty at the beginning of the school year and again in April. The seminar was presented by Steven Peterson, a full professor and department chair.

In conclusions, trying to support three programs with five faculty, combined with the fact that our tenure-track faculty are struggling to meet basic expectations, prevents us from maintaining an up-to-date curriculum that it responsive to changes in the industry. The college needs to take a strategic look at the programs the department offers and decide where the limited resources can be best used.