

UHD Faculty Senate Meeting

January 17, 2012

Minutes

Present: A. Allen (President), G. Preuss (President-Elect), J. Schmertz (Secretary), P. Lyons (Past President)

C. Bachman, R. Beebe, C. Burnett, A. Chiaviello, G. Evans, S. Farris, J. Hackett, J. Harned, V. Hrynkiw, P. Kintzele, P. Li, C. Nguyen, W. Nowak, A. Pavelich, S. Penkar, R. Scott, A. Sikka, L. Spears, K. Switzer, W. Waller, I. Wang, K. Wright, V. Zafiris

Absent: J. Ahmad, M. Benavides, V. Tzouanas

The minutes of the previous meeting were passed, with the addition of Anthony Chiaviello to the list of attendees.

Report from Senate President Austin Allen

Allen will soon circulate the room schedules and dates for this spring's Senate meetings.

A proposed revision to the Chairs' policy created concern among faculty at the end of December because it had not first gone through the appropriate policy writing committee (Faculty Affairs). Discussion of the document was tabled at the last Academic Affairs Council meeting of 2011.

New Branding/Marketing Campaign

Vice President for Public Relations Johanna Wolfe introduced Diane Summers. Summers has been hired as Executive Director of University Relations after working on a contract basis marketing the MMBA.

UHD put out an RFP for an advertising company in July and 19 vendors responded.

Richards/Carlberg was selected. In preparation for designing the campaign, Richards/Carlberg reviewed existing data on perceptions of UHD, built and distributed a questionnaire to test their findings, and conducted listening sessions, phone interviews, and on-campus student interviews.

The information gathered showed that students valued the competitive cost and individualized attention provided at UHD. UHD was perceived by some students as "under-rated." The primary problem identified was that there is lack of community awareness and identity, caused in part by misattribution/confusion with UH.

After a workshop conducted by Public Affairs, components of the new branding campaign emerged. The new phrase associated with UHD will be "Major Opportunity."

Brand Promise: "Changing Lives, Building Futures." Every form of communication coming from PR will reflect this promise.

Brand Positioning: UHD will be a university for people seizing opportunity for a transformational educational experience through personal interaction.

Brand Personality: UHD will be seen as a visionary, supportive, approachable expert.

Brand Affiliation: UHD will be affiliated with students ready for success.

Advertising for this campaign will feature images and stories of student success. These will be featured in print ads, on Metrorail trains, outdoor billboards, REV Ecoshuttle, and guerilla marketing.

Summers showed examples of various forms of advertising. UHD alumnus David Hinote, a recent graduate from computer sciences who won an international computer science competition, was the student featured in the examples. Another example featured Erik Ibarra, CEO of an intra-downtown shuttle company, who developed the plan for his company while a student at UHD.

An example of guerilla marketing was a giant briefcase with the new catchphrase which could be placed at strategic locations downtown.

Other marketing opportunities include sponsoring events in partnership with Discovery Green (concerts), Buffalo Bayou Partnership (regatta), and Dynamo. Youtube will have videos of student success.

There will be online marketing as well. Facebook ads will target specific markets. Adnetwork will track prospective students in our target markets who visit .edu sites. Our ads will pop up when these students visit potential advertising websites like Chron.com and Culturemap.com.

Evans asked Summers about the timeframe for the outdoor marketing campaign, and whether sufficient money had been provided to Richards/Carlberg by UHD to conduct all the proposed campaigns. Summers responded that the goal for the billboards was February/March, and that the resources provided by UHD were being very well-managed by Richards/Carlberg to create a big impact. The goal is to capture the downtown market first and later expand to the various freeways used most by our prospective students. There are already ads in the student newspapers of HCC, Lone Star College, and San Jacinto.

Lyons asked about permanent signage on UHD's buildings. Summers agreed that these were needed but were not part of the current campaign. Sikka suggested bookmarks and luggage tags as promotional tools. She suggested that public school websites should be part of the online campaign so that high school counselors would see our advertising. Summers said her office is working with Admissions to update the promotion materials used by UHD advisors when they visit the schools. UHD magazine is a new promotional tool featuring our promise of high-impact experiences. She said she would mention the suggestion of targeting public school websites for ads to Richards/Carlberg.

Yvonne Kendall expressed concern about university funds being directed toward the branding campaign when financial support for faculty is suffering; for example support for faculty research is "non-existent." She also expressed concern that the campaign's emphasis on personalized attention could be an "empty promise" given recent pushes towards increasing class size and online course offerings.

Summers said that UHD has been “way behind” in marketing; we have been spending 60% of what institutions our size typically do. She said “students love our small class sizes” and agreed with the importance of keeping the brand promise real.

Preuss said that UHD students primarily come from the three areas west of the Beltway. Why not target where students live rather than where they work? Summers said that the NW Corridor is a big market for us and we are working on refining our information on where our students are coming from. Right now the pattern we are seeing is that our students live near major freeways.

A student in the audience said students would respond to I-Phone apps that routed them to things like videos of student testimonials, directions to UHD, and degree plans. Summers said we do have an app but she needs to learn more about it. Evans said it was a good app but she learned about it only by chance; faculty need to know these publicity tools exist so they can market the university themselves.

Pavelich asked when the UHD website would be made more “inviting.” Summers said this was important but a “big task” that was not on the six-month horizon. Evans said that the new visuals and brand promise needed to appear on the UHD website so that the message conveyed about UHD would be carried through consistently.

Li asked if there was a specific enrollment target and notes that he had been pleasantly surprised to see UHD being effectively marketed in advertising channels for Chinese language speakers. Summers responded that we need @700 more students, and that her office hopes to continue to improve its ability to identify particular markets by tracking where people saw our advertising. This has been done with the MMBA program, and we learned that our outdoor billboards had been an effective marketing tool.

Sikka emphasized the importance of taking what worked from the MMBA campaign and applying it to promote other programs such as our masters’ programs. Faculty have been “wearing down their shoes” recruiting for the masters’ programs. She also noted the importance of marketing the brand internally. She was very happy to see signage welcoming students at the Commerce St. Building,

Summers responded that her office is looking to market the “major opportunity” slogan inside the university with wall graphics of successful students. Evans said she was impressed with the new brand and hoped Summers would publicize its language to faculty and administrators so they could promote the university too.

Wang asked how we could make the UHD logo identify our location. Summers acknowledged that this was part of the challenge of marketing UHD. Harned emphasized that the university community had opposed previous attempts to change the name of UHD. Summers said that despite the confusion with UH, there is some “equity” in the name; it is the job of Public Affairs to emphasize the “Downtown” part of UH-Downtown.

Switzer asked if the campaign would feature faculty and said that our students were more likely to pick up the Houston Press than visit chron.com or culturemap.com. Summers said that she would look into Houston Press. Students found faculty “intimidating” and were more likely to respond to people they perceived as being like themselves. However, the campaign would mention specific faculty through the student success stories.

Sikka said there should be more emphasis on the pun in “major” opportunity and that specific majors could be highlighted in advertising.

Summers closed by asking faculty to continue sharing examples of students we could feature by emailing her at summersd@uhd.edu.

Report from Provost Brian Chapman, substituting for President William Flores

Chapman said the largest issue on our horizon is the new core curriculum mandated last fall by the Texas Higher Ed Coordinating Board (THECB). The new core requires 42 hours in traditional topic areas, but all courses approved for the core must fit learning objectives produced by the THECB. These learning objectives must be measured. Universities’ new cores must have gone through the full approval process in time to be put in place for Fall 2014.

Chapman said he had circulated a plan for the new core to the deans and is planning town hall meetings to discuss the new core with the university.

Some community colleges are planning to pick single courses to meet each foundational area component. UHD will probably have a range of options for students to choose from in satisfying those areas.

Evans asked about enrollment numbers this semester. VP Bradley said student headcount is down 2% and SCH’s are down 1.5%. Pavelich asked how to handle the resulting low enrollments—are program administrators still bound to the higher caps (15 minimum for undergrad courses, 8 for graduate)? Chapman said program coordinators should check with deans before cancelling classes for low enrollment. Last year some classes were cut prematurely and we lost students. If a class is cancelled, there must be courses to move them into. Switzer asked who had the responsibility of finding classes for students whose classes had been canceled. Chapman said that depends on the department. Faculty members themselves could make recommendations to students.

Sikka asked about the finals schedule (which had not been posted). Chapman said that our scheduling is particularly difficult because of our “round-the-clock” class schedules. Gary Stading (Assistant VP for Academic Affairs) said a draft of the schedule had been sent to the chairs and deans for revision.

Pavelich asked about the subcommittees that would be established to make decisions about the foundational component areas. Chapman responded that he had gotten lists of names from the deans and had circulated his own response and was waiting to hear back from the deans.

Sikka asked Chapman what role Senate would play in the Core Curriculum revision. Chapman did not have a plan regarding Senate involvement. The ultimate overseer of our plan will be the Coordinating Board. There will be a UHD oversight committee which ensures UHD's curriculum meets the core requirements of THECB. The subcommittees mentioned by Pavelich will be "first look" committees representing the foundational component areas. Chapman stated that after the curriculum meets the approval of the Oversight Committee, it will go to the University Curriculum Committee.

Evans said the normal procedure was for Senate to review proposals put forward by UCC. This ensures that a wide range of eyes view any university initiative involving curriculum. Chapman said faculty have no choice about accepting the new foundational component areas prescribed by THECB.

Schmertz noted that the phrase "academic discipline" was absent from the Provost's and Coordinating Board's language. She asked how UHD's committees reviewing the new core curriculum would protect the integrity of the academic disciplines and their role in the instructional mission. Chapman said that 50% of the faculty on the subcommittees would come from the degree disciplines. For example, the subcommittee for the "Communications" foundational component area would have 50% of its members be from Communications and English. The "Mathematics" component area would contain 50% members of the Math department. The Coordinating Board wants the classes in the core to be "foundational" rather than department-based. The remaining 50% of each foundational area component subcommittee will consist of faculty from other colleges to ensure that university needs are met rather than department needs. The Learning Objectives for the core that have been set by the Coordinating Board will also need to be met by the degrees themselves.

Farris noted that SACS has its own learning objectives for degree programs that may be out of line with the learning objectives mandated by THECB. Chapman said SACS only cares that universities have measurable outcomes and assesses them. Degree programs can add learning objectives of their own to meet SACS requirements.

Harned said that outcomes that can't be measured can't be assessed. The Coordinating Board has left universities "high and dry" with no way to assess the learning objectives it mandates. For example, are there nationally accepted standardized tests that will be available to measure the success of the core curriculum?

Chapman said UHD is behind in its knowledge of assessment and would need to catch up. However, he acknowledged that he had no idea how a learning objective like "personal responsibility" would be measured.

Switzer asked if there were still FACS (Faculty Assessment Coordinators). Chapman said yes, but they are at the college rather than the department level. Switzer pointed out that the time of the FACS was no longer being compensated (through equivalent course releases) but rather

through a stipend. Chapman said this was because a survey had indicated that the FACS were not spending enough time to justify course releases.

Sikka asked about the status of the SACS report. Chapman said it is in its final draft and must be submitted by March 15.

Preuss noted that since 75% of our students work, they can only take classes at specific times. When a class closes due to low enrollment, there are often no appropriate classes for them to take at that time. Chapman said we are starting to do smarter scheduling using a program called “Ad-Astra” that adjusts rooms to class sizes so that more rooms will be available. This will also help our SUE scores (Space Utilization Efficiency) so that the Coordinating Board does not deny requests for new buildings based on underused classrooms.

Moosally pointed out that since assessment is now handled differently from before (at the college level rather than by departments) and our last SACS review showed assessment to be a weakness, we needed to make sure resources are allocated that will enable assessment to be conducted properly.

On the Town Hall meetings proposed by the Provost, Moosally hoped that these would result in a clear process being laid out for communication with the departments, since departments were being excluded from the decision-making pathways. Chapman said that the Provosts’ Council had emphasized that universities were to be less discipline-specific than before and more practical in approach. For example, a course that met the foundational area component for mathematics could be co-taught by Sociology and math professors. He acknowledged that team-teaching would require examining workload policies. He encouraged faculty to work on being innovative.

Sikka said she applauds the idea of team-teaching but there are other obstacles to implementing it—she has been told Banner “can’t do it,” which in her experience is not the case.

Sikka emphasized the importance of departments and majors over what the Coordinating Board wants. Department faculty recruit for and oversee the majors, and the core needs to teach the academic skills and knowledge necessary to support the majors. She hopes that all the task forces appointed to address the new core will consider requirements in each of the majors and how the core helps support them. Evans added that whatever core curriculum we implement, it needs to contain courses that are recognizable on transcripts when they are transferred to other universities.

Update from the Academic Shared Governance Task Force

Schmertz passed out a handout to Senators containing an update of the work of the shared governance committee, which has been charged with examining best shared governance practices at other universities and formulating recommendations on changes to PS.01.A.03, the academic shared governance policy: (<http://www.uhd.edu/about/hr/PS01A03.pdf>)

The task force has reviewed 14 universities to learn how academic shared governance was defined and implemented at these universities. Specifically, the committee had a list of 10 questions they were seeking answers for, pertaining to the scope of academic shared governance at those universities and how that scope gets written into policies and other public statements.

The committee saw a wide range of shared governance policies and practices, some very well-articulated, and will examine these further. Some interesting options that emerged included the development of college-level governance structures and bylaws, clear pathways between faculty and administration on policy revision/approval, and articulated timelines for action at all levels.

The committee asked that Senators begin discussions in their departments about shared governance. Send feedback to members of the taskforce: Austin Allen (co-chair), Johanna Schmertz (co-chair), Susan Henney, Michelle Moosally, Larry Spears, Yvonne Kendall, Penny Smith. Faculty should expect an email from the committee requesting feedback on the following questions:

1. What do faculty perceive to be the strengths and weaknesses of our current shared governance policy? <http://www.uhd.edu/about/hr/PS01A03.pdf>
2. What are faculty's experiences of shared governance at UHD?

The committee will use faculty input to guide their recommendations, which they will present to Senate for discussion and review. They are asking faculty to respond by Feb 1.

Preuss asked what the committee's findings were. Schmertz was not prepared to generalize, but noted that faculty at the universities the committee had examined generally had a primary role in decisions involving instruction and curriculum.

Committee member Henney noted the importance of universities working within their stated policies. Problems arise when there is lack of clarity in such policies. The goal of the shared governance task force is to keep those parts of the policy that seem to work well.

Sikka requested that the committee put together a statement based on their findings that would articulate what shared governance means for UHD. The statement should be placed on the website and should articulate the role of faculty in the shared governance process.

Sikka also asked that the committee invite a guest speaker on shared governance to campus.

Moosally added that the February 1 deadline for faculty response was not a rigid one; responses coming after that date will receive consideration.

Respectfully submitted,
Johanna Schmertz, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of English
Faculty Senate Secretary