UHD Faculty Senate Meeting

February 5, 2013

Minutes


Absent: R. Davidson, S. Yuan,

Minutes

December 4, 2012 and January 15, 2013 (as revised) minutes approved unanimously.

Guests: Witt/Kieffer Consultants Ms. Leske and Ms. Eastham

Witt/Kieffer is the Executive Search firm contracted for the Provost/SVPAA search. There is a very aggressive time frame for the Search Committee; the goal is to have a Provost in place by fall.

Ms. Leske and Eastham reviewed their own and their firm’s credentials. An overview of the firm’s efforts in the area of Higher Education can be found at: http://www.wittkieffer.com/practice-areas/higher-education/

Their first priority is to understand the client’s definition of a successful search. What will the results of a successful search look like? What do we want the new Provost to accomplish? How will we know if he or she has met our expectations?

Concerns/Questions/Issues

1) Transparency of Provost Search.
   a. Some things are confidential within the Search Committee, but what can be shared will be shared.
   b. We are at very earliest stages.
2) Who are we looking for?
   a. Team builder, communicator, visionary
   b. Experience with multicultural populations.
3) How aggressive is the schedule and is this a problem?
   a. The schedule gives about eight weeks to develop a candidate pool. According to the search consultants, this is sufficient.
   b. President Flores has stated to the search firm that he will not sacrifice quality for schedule.
4) What is the search firm’s role?
   a. Partners with the Search Committee. They do not direct the committee, but will give advice.
   b. The process serves the goal of the committee.
c. Search firm has many networks they tap for candidates. They deal with the big issues (like compensation, spouses, etc.) early in the process.
d. Lots of recruitment and marketing of the position.
e. Does referencing throughout on the whole pool.

5) We need a leader who leads by example. However, how do you identify qualified candidates based on intangibles like this? How do you look at this on paper?
   a. We have lots of institutional memory—and baggage—regarding academic-side communication.
   b. We need a shared understanding of what we are looking for.
   c. Search firm looks for lifetime themes and overarching values seen in behavior.

6) An important behavior is the candidate’s support of policy.
   a. He or she should work to change and/or strengthen those policies that need it.

7) Institution has grown, but our infrastructure has not kept up. Building infrastructure and organizational structure should be a priority. Delineate decision-making processes to make them more transparent.

8) Do we have a shared vision of this University?
   a. We have a strategic plan and a Mission Statement.
   b. Strategic plan has not been communicated in a way that would support buy-in.

9) What is Provost’s role in helping us become better at what we do and to give faculty support?
   a. Research expectations are growing without commensurate support (including external funding).
   b. Provost should be more of a leader than a manager.

10) Higher education is changing. UHD needs someone with a vision of where UHD fits into this new era of education.

11) What is the public perception of UHD? Are you proud to work here?
    a. Confusion of UH and UHD is a persistent problem.
    b. We have many positives, not the least of which are our unique student body and our location.

12) It was brought to the Senate’s attention that there is no Natural Sciences faculty representation on the Search Committee.
    a. There are needs specific to NS that should be addressed by the next Provost, and Natural Sciences representation could ensure those issues receive attention.

13) Candidates must be able to navigate the UH System.

14) What kind of “leadership situation” do we have at UHD?
    a. Consultants indicated that we seemed to prefer “servant leadership” to autocratic leadership.
    b. This is a “growth situation”—it will take a strong leader to negotiate us through the changes.

15) Student Government: As a student, UHD has a lot of opportunities; there are so many things just “down the street” from UHD. These “down the street” opportunities include the medical center, city government, law offices, Fortune-500 businesses, etc. UHD also has affordable tuition and is a great value.

16) All stakeholders don’t always work together synergistically at UHD.
a. Provost has to have a vision of how to bring stakeholders together to address our strategic goals.

b. Accountability and rewards should be well-articulated.

17) We need someone who can address online and distance education growth and the unique challenges and opportunities associated with it.

18) Will there be opportunity for students to comment on Provost candidates?

a. A meeting between candidates and a group of students is recommended.

Faculty Senate President’s Report: G. Preuss

An Executive Council meeting was held on 1/31; Dr. Flores reported on the Legislative Session.

- The outlook is somewhat “grim”; no new funding and perhaps less funding. One to two million in cuts is possible. Tuition freezes/guarantees are possible.
- We will need to do more with less.

We still do not have an Emergency Preparedness plan. A Director for this area is being hired. Tests are being run on the alert system.

President-Elect Hale is forming a workgroup for the Faculty Climate Survey. R. Johnson, R. Beebe, J. Herrera, and R. Davidson volunteered to help.

President-Elect Hale will represent us at the Texas Assn of Faculty Senates.

AAC will meet on 2/21 to review outstanding policies.

Old Business

Dr. Preuss handed out a packet containing charges for new Task Forces (please see Appendix A).

- As homework, Senators are asked to review these charges and make recommendations directly to Dr. Preuss.

FAC is taking up the R & T policy as well as alignment of policies. The Provost is getting direction from legal on what needs to be aligned in policy.

A Senator requested that the Core be on the agenda for the next meeting.

Adjourn: 3:59 pm
Appendix A

Teaching and Learning Center Implementation Task Force

The Faculty Senate should constitute the “Teaching and Learning Center” Steering Committee to

1) Review the recommendations of the Teaching Excellence Task Force. The link for the report is available on the library web site: [http://lgdata.s3-website-us-east-1.amazonaws.com/docs/1071/482624/Teaching_Excellence_Task_Force_-_Final_Report_5-12-reduced.pdf](http://lgdata.s3-website-us-east-1.amazonaws.com/docs/1071/482624/Teaching_Excellence_Task_Force_-_Final_Report_5-12-reduced.pdf);

2) Establish a structural and budget recommendation for a Teaching Excellence Center, including its administration, by March 1, 2013; and,

3) Work with the Office of the Provost to implement the development and start of the Teaching Excellence Center, so that resources are equitably distributed between online and face-to-face courses.

The “Teaching and Learning Center” Steering Committee will be responsible to present the budget to the Senate by February 19, 2013. The Steering Committee will be formed of 2 faculty members from each college, nominated by FSEC and ratified by the Faculty Senate, 1 administrator appointed by the provost, 2 student representative elected by SGA processes, and 1 library representative

***The above charge was passed, as amended, at the November 20, 2012, Faculty Senate Meeting***

The following charges are pending revision and adoption by Senate:

Online Education Task Force

The Faculty Senate should constitute the “Online Education Task Force” to compile:

1) An overview of online teaching and learning best practices, specifically addressing issues of academic integrity and assurance of quality.
   a. Best practices should include attention to discipline-specific issues (i.e., “How is it done in my field?”);
2) the best resources for online education; and
3) Suggest policy statements regarding such issues as intellectual property, commercial sites, minimum expectations, etc.

The “Online Education Task Force” will be responsible to present the report of its findings to the Senate by the Fall 2013 semester. The Steering Committee will be formed of 2 faculty members from each college nominated by FSEC and ratified by the Faculty Senate, 1 administrator appointed by the provost, 2 student representative elected by SGA processes, and 1 library representative
Motion to create a task force to address Faculty-Initiated Student Retention Strategies, and charge.
The Faculty Senate should constitute the “Faculty-Initiated Student Retention Strategies Task Force” to compile:

1) An overview of academic best practices that can be used by faculty members to help encourage and increase student success and retention efforts at UHD, including strategies that can apply to online and face-to-face teaching methods;
2) Suggest academic (course and program organization and structural changes) that could benefit students; and,
3) Suggest policy statements regarding academic issues that can help improve student success and retention.

The “Faculty-Initiated Student Retention Strategies Task Force” will be responsible to Submit recommendations to the Provost, Senate and Faculty Affairs Committee by April 1st, 2013. The task force 2 faculty members from each college (1 member from each college must be a junior faculty member), nominated by FSEC and ratified by the Faculty Senate, 2 administrators appointed by the Provost; 1 member from the library; and 2 student members elected by SGA procedures.

Faculty Roles and Rewards Taskforce
The Faculty Senate should constitute the “Faculty Roles and Rewards Task Force” to compile:

1) Find out how publications, teaching, and service are being evaluated across the university community.
2) Find areas where annual evaluations by chairs and R&T are inconsistent with policy/procedures of university.
3) Suggest ways of recognizing and rewarding faculty efforts equitably and evenly across the campus.

The “Faculty Roles and Rewards Task Force” will be responsible to Submit recommendations to the President, Provost, Senate and Faculty Affairs Committee by May 1st, 2013. The task force 2 faculty members from each college (1 member from each college must be a junior faculty member), nominated by FSEC and ratified by the Faculty Senate, 2 administrators appointed by the Provost.

Faculty Research Task Force
The Faculty Senate should constitute the “Faculty Research Task Force” to assess three general questions:

1) What is needed to promote and encourage faculty research?
   a) The strengths and weaknesses of opportunities for faculty research at UHD
   b) What facilities need expansion?
2) Do campus policies and procedures support research opportunities on campus?
   a) What policies need to be implemented?
   b) What policies need to be revised?
3) How do faculty award committees enhance research opportunities on campus?
   a) Are changes needed?
   b) Are awards adequate?

The “Faculty Research Task Force” will be responsible to submit recommendations to the Senate, Provost, and Faculty Affairs Committee by May 1st, 2013. The task force 2 faculty members from each college (1 member from each college must be a junior faculty member) nominated by FSEC and ratified by the Faculty Senate, 1 administrator appointed by the Provost, the Assistant Vice President for Research and Sponsored Projects, and a representative from the Vice President for Advancement and External Relations.