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Attendees by Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AF</th>
<th>MGT &amp;MKT,BC</th>
<th>MSIS</th>
<th>Admin. Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arindam Bandopadhyaya</td>
<td>Benyamin Lichtenstein</td>
<td>Noushin Ashrafi</td>
<td>Maureen Scully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Zafer Yüksel</td>
<td>David Levy</td>
<td>Daniel Shimshak</td>
<td>Richard Wong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Chiawfey</td>
<td>Edward Carberry</td>
<td>Ehsan Elahi</td>
<td>Kathryn Archard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junghun (Jay) Lee</td>
<td>Vincent Xie</td>
<td>Gordon Corzine</td>
<td>Jeffrey Masse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KoEun Park</td>
<td>Jurui Zhang</td>
<td>Haijing Hao</td>
<td>Domingo Altarejos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kun Yu</td>
<td>Marc Lavine</td>
<td>Jean-Pierre Kuijboer</td>
<td>Amy Mei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marius Popescu</td>
<td>Mohsin Habib</td>
<td>Jonathan Frankel</td>
<td>Andrea Reardon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mengying Wang</td>
<td>Nardia Haigh</td>
<td>Jonathan Kim</td>
<td>Victoria Dzindzichashvili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rui Li</td>
<td>Pacey Foster</td>
<td>Kui Da</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sangwan Kim</td>
<td>Stephan Manning</td>
<td>Michael Miller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wan-Ting Wu</td>
<td>Varghese George</td>
<td>Peng Xu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xiaolu Xu</td>
<td>Vesela Veleva</td>
<td>Pratyush Bharati</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yong-Chul Shin</td>
<td>Werner Kunz</td>
<td>Ramakrishna Ayyagari</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaur Rzakahnov</td>
<td>Martin Calkins</td>
<td>Ricardo Checchi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi Wan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Roger Blake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wei Zhang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Chair – Noushin Ashrafi
Ashrafi opened the meeting at 10:00 a.m. The agenda for the meeting was approved. She encouraged the faculty to be active participants and ask for clarifications and explanation when needed.

II. Interim Dean - Maureen Scully
Welcomed the Faculty and spoke about variety of issues such as faculty development funding. Click here for the full report.

Discussion: faculty members ask about the possibility of expanding categories of participation that are acceptable for conference funding such as possibility of funding for conferences as a learning experience/professional development and being on an editorial board. Dean Scully responded that it would be a good question to bring to department chairs when interested in going to a conference for professional development.

Another faculty member asked how the funding is being tracked between FSU and CM? i.e. is it a supplement or a substitute, to which she responded that it is a bit more of a substitute than a supplement, but they are separate line items. In general though, the range of total funding is $1,500-$2,500. Question was raised about the amount of fixed budget for faculty development and Maureen responded: Not from CM, but from budgeting office at UMass Boston; new person Sue Wolf is helping us to figure that out. Ideally we would have a certain amount that we can plan with, instead of asking for funding little by little (which is the current situation).

Regarding online MBA program; faculty wanted to know the role of CAPS in online MBA. The response was that when offering courses through CAPS, the CM retains the tuition. CAPS has a charter to operate online, off-calendar, and onsite. It can also be a source of discretionary funding. They are also a good source of knowledge on online pedagogy. They will help with marketing, sign people up, and collect tuition.

Art Goldsmith remarked on AACSB requirements that for different delivery methods of the same program, the curriculum generally is required to be the same. So if the online MBA has fewer credits that might be an issue. David Levy responded that he was in touch with AACSB and was told that the college can offer an online program with different requirements as long as we are very clear in why that is and what purpose it serves. No problem in having a degree defined differently, but have to be clear what the quality control is for each one. Key thing is that you have adequate quality and resources for each program and don’t dilute one with another.

A faculty member remarked that regarding keeping of tuition, be mindful of the fact that tuition is not exclusively belonging to CM, and may be shared. We should be sure to be mindful and know exactly how the funds are being distributed. Certificates being run through CAPS will be a good test case in how this works. Maureen agreed and added running first course through caps (MBA AF 618) and we will watch the revenue streams closely. Assistant Dean Domingo commented that his understanding is that through the division of academic affairs, there is a policy in place on how we actually do the revenue sharing with CAPS and...
 remarked that “There is an actual algorithm to this. I am not highly familiar, but I have read it once and we will be able to follow it.” David Levy remarked that is a real concern, but we also see this as a joint venture where we jointly do marketing, facilities, etc. – and the joint pool of revenue will go to the supports that we need.

III. Associate Dean – Daniel Shimshak
College needs to work on a strategic plan this spring for accreditation purposes.

IV. Associate Dean – David Levy
David and Jeff Masse spoke about recruiting efforts – info sessions, GMAT/GRE lists and email outreach, hosting webinars, visiting MBA World Tour and David mentioned that Online MBA needs to be distinctive, branded Boston, content that reflects our areas of expertise and specialization. He added the need for faculty members as volunteers to take on online learning. Click here for full report by Jeff and David.

Discussion: A faculty member asked if 37 was the final number, to which Jeff responded: NO – it is as of today. Additional deposits will be coming in between now and January. Another faculty member asked: Separate from number of apps, are you seeing any trends/changes in acceptance rate? Jeff responded: Not so much, but something we are looking at more closely is the number of automatic denials from Graduate Admissions. Most of the students who are not screened out tend to fall within what we’re looking for.

A faculty asked about time to finish MBA program and commented that if a student wants to finish in 12-15 months, you have to make sure the required courses are offered consistently. David responded that is partly why we are doing certificates, to bring in new students and this allows us to offer courses more consistently in these areas. A faculty member remarked that there is segmentation in the online MBA market. We don’t want to compete with U of Phoenix (for example), we want to be competing with a place like Emory. I think it is good to compete internationally, but I think many times we will have national competition.

In terms of best practices, what can we do and how is CAPS going to help us with that? We need to be careful how we position ourselves in the online MBA market. David responded that focus on areas where we specialize, relationships with Boston area employers.

Faculty commented: Who are our main online MBA competitors? David responded: Mid-rank universities; however we might also want to model our pedagogy after the outstanding. We need to get our own budget and our own contract with these employers.

Faculty commented that Online MBA development has to be dynamic and faculty have to be engaged, have to be innovative and also have to tap best practices.

Faculty commented that it sounds like teaching more CAPS courses or courses cross-listed through CAPS. How does this affect our teaching load? Currently CAPS courses in the summer do not count toward our course load. Maureen responded in the spring we are starting teaching through CAPS to count toward course load.

V: Assistant Dean – Domingo Altarejos
Doming warned faculty that “Pet peeve is last minute request – if faculty need something done, make sure to communicate it with your chair, the dean, or Domingo. He added “If we are not aware of your purpose, we will also be cramming at the end to make it happen. I can more easily facilitate the process if I am aware in advance of what your projects, plans, and daily activities are. Need proper documentation to process requests. Faculty must consult OITA regarding international travel. Keep information in your PC to a minimum.” Regarding deadlines, Domingo advised faculty to submit documentation within 10 days of returning from trip. Every expense that you want reimbursed should be accompanied by receipts and proof of payment. If more than 120 days go by, reimbursements will be taxed (also applies to other reimbursements). Other Supplies: Process has to go through the UMB system. Need to use approved vendors.

Faculty asked about proof of payment stating that “I know most receipts might stand by themselves. What else is needed? - There might be privacy issues. Domingo responded if it is travel, the e-ticket should have a notation that serves as proof of payment. If this is not there, then a credit card statement would be required. Another faculty asked about cash payments, to which Domingo responded that anything below $25 does not require a receipt. It was asked if at the college level we have any discretion over the vendors that we use. The answer was that every time we use a vendor, the university requires that they have an established vendor ID. If another vendor is used, they need to have an ID number generated through the university. Another faculty remarked that different funds have different deadlines. It is a bit hard to keep track of – would it be possible to put those deadlines in a format that we can easily follow? Domingo responded generally for fiscal purposes our year runs from June 1 to July 1 of the following year. We want to stay within the fiscal year with reimbursements, so please be sure to submit reimbursement requests with at least 2 weeks’ time for them to be processed. It is not advisable to have reimbursements carry over into the next fiscal year. Maureen remarked that we are in a time of cultural change, so I know we are talking a lot about what we used to do. Now, we are obligated to be much more careful. Also, many of these things are tracked more and more carefully through IT, which requires us to be more conscientious about attention to detail.
VI. Director of UG Program – Amy Mei

Amy provided an overview of advisor roles, UPO programs (MAP, LEAD, PASS, etc). Click here for full report

**Discussion:** Faculty asked about update on applications, enrollments, etc. to which Amy responded that is all handled through the undergrad admissions office. Trends have been dipping a little. Classes are growing, but by less. Freshmen are making up a larger chunk of our students, however. The faculty asked if there will be an update on the pilot grading systems. Amy said yes, we will have one later in the year. Thank you to faculty who participated!

VII. Academic Administrator for the PhD programs – Richard Wong

Discussed the PhD programs and shared data on enrollment and number of courses offered each semester. Click here for full report

VIII. Faculty Council Representative-Vincent Xie

Vincent updated the faculty on the Faculty Council activities:

- **MSIS Certificate Programs:** The Council approved certificate programs in Business Analytics and Healthcare Informatics (and the new course proposals) on Nov 4th.
- **PhD Programs:**
  - The Council approved the Stage II proposal for the PhD program in Applied Physics in the College of Sciences and Mathematics.
  - The Council approved the Stage II proposal PhD and MS programs in Transnational, Cultural and Community Studies (TCCS).
- **Academic Calendar:** The Council approved the proposal to extend the deadline for the P/F/W decision by at least one week (no more than 2 weeks).

IX. Dean Search Committee- Mohsin Habib

Mohsin reported on the work of Dean Search Committee and invited questions from faculty members. Question was asked regarding whether the committee makes recommendations to the Provost, and the Provost makes the decision. Mohsin responded my understanding is that we will recommend 3 candidates and the Provost will make the decision to make an offer. Faculty asked if the committee has a folder of pre-screened candidates from the search agency. He answered yes. The faculty asked about the relationship between CM faculty and the search firm, to which Mohsin “the role of the firm is primarily to be facilitating – collecting and providing information ahead of time for us to look at, and the meetings we are having are essentially to figure out who we think should be part of the process.” Faculty asked “are you comfortable with the questions they will be asking candidates?” Mohsin responded the questions that we can ask potential candidates are given by the Provost’s office and we have to follow those rules. Faculty asked how many people will be coming to campus. Mohsin responded we haven’t reached that point yet, but we anticipate it would be approx. 3-5 candidates. Noushin commented that the qualifications list, which was created at the Faculty Retreat, was used qualifications portfolio for dean search.

X. UPC - Kun Yu

Kun reported on UPC activities and revised Gateway course proposal – click here for full report

**Discussion** – faculty asked how many times UPC met. He responded Approx. once every 2 weeks. Faculty asked about the next meeting? Kun responded it depends on the amount of feedback we receive. Another faculty commented that in the implementation stage, it would be a good idea to include implementations in the beginning, and work with learning coordinators at the end (mgt 490). He added that one of the critical difficulties is going to be students who transfer in late. Asked how UPC can accommodate that, to which Kun responded; we are considering establishing criteria to waive these requirements.

XI. 3-year Plan

Noushin mentioned the reason for 3-year plans was to establish consistency reporting for faculty performance for every three years. Faculty must be accountable and justify the funding they have received for professional development.

XII. There was no new Business

XIII. There was a motion to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously, and the meeting adjourned at 12:00 noon.