

In discussion with the Faculty Senate President Jim Mulrooney, it appears that there was a simple case of misunderstanding (as Otis explained well in his recent email to the UPBC members). In an email to me, Jim Mulrooney explained "As I reread your report after Senate, and taking into consideration the discussion that took place, your intention was clear. That being said, I can understand [Biology's] objection. Read at face value, it could be interpreted slightly different than what was actually meant."

He has suggested that the UPBC write a brief addendum to the report, explaining what happened at Senate and the misunderstanding of the intention of the wording. Below is my suggested wording for such an addendum to be attached to the UPBC annual report before it is officially forwarded to the President (as part of the larger Faculty Senate minutes):

-----

At the April 29, 2013 meeting of the Faculty Senate, a section of the UPBC annual report raised concerns. Specifically, the wording of one piece of the UPBC's April 4, 2013 letter to President Miller summarizing our individual and group comments to the two Ad Hoc Working group reports was discussed at length:

The UPBC believes that the incoming Dean for the School for Engineering and Technology should be charged to collaborate with administrators and faculty from across the campus to develop, within one year, a vision for a CCSU School for STEM.

This statement (referred to as a "UPBC summary" in the letter) raised concern specifically because of the use of the words CHARGED and VISION. It was thought by some senators that the wording could be construed as an indication to definitely move forward with a STEM school rather than to continue with an exploratory stage. The UPBC regrets the confusion and wishes to clarify its "summary" with the following additional language:

The UPBC members feel that the next logical step in the process of exploring the creation of a STEM school is to craft a realistic hypothetical plan (including proposed budget and, most importantly, concrete answers to WHY the university would want/need a STEM school and WHY and HOW it would benefit the university). This is what was referred to as a "vision" for the proposed school in the original document. The UPBC members believe that if such a "vision" can be created in a timely manner (the 2013-2014 academic year), then and only then should CCSU go ahead with such a plan. If such a "vision" cannot be developed, then the idea should be abandoned. As noted in the original summary, all constituencies should be involved in this exploration in a spirit of collaboration. However, as the possibility of a change from a School of Engineering and Technology to a STEM school would, of necessity, directly and significantly impact the administrator to whom all member departments and faculty would directly report – in other words, the Dean of SET – this person should play an important role in this process.

The UPBC looks forward to continued campus-wide discussions of both Presidential Ad Hoc Committee reports during the 2012-2014 academic year.