UFC Meeting

November 18, 2013

Lee 411

4:00-6:00

Present: Debra Schleef, Debra Steckler, Steve Greenlaw, Smita Jain Oxford, Jodie Hayob, Courtney Clayton, Gail Brooks, Marcel Rotter.

Ex-Officio Present: President Hurley, Provost Levin, Associate Provost Morello, Dean Finkelstein, Dean Richardson, Dean Gendernalik-Cooper

Visitors: Neil Tibert, Gregg Stull, David Rettinger, Miriam Liss, Surupa Gupta, Anna Billingsley, Philip Pierce

Absent: Tamie Pratt-Fartro, Angela Pitts, Lavar Edmunds

I. Call to Order

 - 9:30 and 12:00 tomorrow will talk about brand platform again in Red Room for more faculty to give input

II. Brand Refreshing discussion, with all faculty invitation (4:00-5:30)

* Bob Brock, President, Marlene Brock, Executive Vice President from Education Marketing Group (EMG)
* Presented PowerPoint on brand platform: articulation of what we want UMW to stand for and be known for
	+ Found that UMW has an involved, engaged and highly motivated community
	+ Very positive internal perceptions of quality and Ump’s competitiveness
* Very good response rate: 2,463 people took survey
* 2800 stakeholders took part in development of brand platform: people took part in focus groups and discussion groups held on campus over a period of several days
* identified attributes that are most important to faculty, students, staff and alumni: number one response was devote and accessible faculty who are master teachers (34%), small, highly interactive classes (20%) was next most important, commitment to liberal arts (17%), honor code (17%)
* EMG didn’t create it; the University created it: branding platform is a result of asking community at large what we stand for and what is special about UMW
* Tested the tagline “where great minds get to work” with high school students to see what their reactions were; blind testing to this tagline (didn’t know it was UMW).
* Two elements: the creative (pictures, colors, typography, slogans, etc. that get pushed out in advertising, web, etc.); the other piece is the strategy. Won’t really be asking for input on creative, but understand how people are feeling about the strategy: the brand platform.
* Brand platform needs to reflect what the institution is today, and brand platforms should be revisited.

David Rettinger: said he thought the brand platform works; the graphics maybe don’t work; said he thought the creative pieces look generic

President asked David to elaborate.

David said if you looked at one of the photos, then it seems pretty generic.

Marlene asked what images would we see/want? Places they saw things come through were passionate, highly curious students; she said that the higher-ability really wanted to see themselves in ads as an individual

Surupa Gupta: asked about the umbrella picture where doesn’t seem to have passion

Alan Griffith: He cares about how students interpret the images and do they match their expectations and how current students see them?

Marlene: said the only creative that has been developed has been for high school prospects, hasn’t had a chance to go to current students, faculty, etc. In year three now, this year, numbers are indicating that there are more inquiries that have come in the past three months than three past years altogether.

Bob: said that perhaps it is time to re-test those images; this would be a good time to retest them with high school students

Marlene: Asked if there is a disconnect between what people coming wanted versus what students see here. Students here felt it was their responsibility to come prepared because of the highly interactive part of their classes. That was what they brought to it, not their classmates. The interactions with their faculty they really love. Students here thought the faculty was very special.

Miriam Liss: said she wasn’t sure she was getting the message from the creative brand. Not sure she likes word “teacher” and might prefer the term “professor”, and, to see more on the academic emphasis and undergraduate research opportunities. School has honor system and we are the school they come to in order to create a better world. Maybe not idealism, per se. We are first in Peace Corps, and we need to punch that more.

Marcel Rotter: international education could be more there; making a better world.

Jodie Hayob: what is the longevity of pictures and how soon they go out of date?

Marlene: What we are seeing is temporary. The work we are seeing in the room today are intended to grab attention and to go to view book to get data points we are talking about. She says that all of the things that together make us who we are.

Gregg Stull: we have hundreds of students who come to create art and make new work; none of this current brand speaks to creative side of learning; we need to be more of a destination to for those students.

They added creativity to strategy poster they were writing on.

Marlene: the brand personality traits also could have the creative

Many faculty mentioned that they liked the picture where the student is standing on the column.

Anna B: she said that they had had a great deal of negative feedback about that picture

Debra Schleef mentioned this idea that people don’t know who we are; doesn’t matter what this says if they haven’t even heard of us; even in Maryland; earlier in the leadership council, can we still use the word “selective” – do we still maintain the right to say we have small classes?

Marlene: asked who the students are we want in the classrooms.

Steve Greenlaw: said he didn’t see this student in his classroom

Miriam Liss: added that students who we want are idealistic students who care

Courtney Clayton: said that she did see these students in her classroom, perhaps because she is in education; mentioned that student at UMW from New Jersey and asked how she found out about it, and she said that it was one of her favorite teachers who had gone here.

Miriam Liss: mentioned the relationships that students develop with faculty because we don’t have graduate assistants.

Marlene: said that the term “relationship” was awkward for some students, but the students said that the piece about “innovative and accessible master teachers” was part of what they loved about UMW.

David Rettinger: honor system gets in here, but maybe worth a bit of a bump up in way strategy gets put into communication. Thinks that number four is great. Number three has outside of the classroom notion, but one thing we do well is inter-relating what we do in the classroom to outside of the classroom. We do things that no one else has done – seamless wrap-around learning that transcends the classroom.

Marlene: she answered that this is addressed in the “so what?” question.

Jodie: Hayob maybe what Gregg was getting at was put part of the “creating something new” in the so what.

Marlene: this is what they send out to the “for whom?” category, or in the “so what?” category

Gregg: he said his sense is that we want smart Art students, but Art students who look at programs don’t want academically challenging and intellectual challenge, per se. So part of language is potentially off-putting to potential students; so words need to reflect we want passionate and creative students.

Marlene: went to “so what?”, and asked where Gregg saw it needed to be added.

Gregg: said creative part was then in the “for whom” category

Marlene: asked us to talk more about adjectives in the “for whom?”

Miriam Liss: said what about putting in language in the “for whom?” that talks about social consciousness.

Philip Pierce: raised idea of “active” in brand since this could mean physically active, socially active, etc.

Smita Jain Oxford: said could take off the name “UMW”, and the brand platform would look like any other school. We have to think about what makes UMW unique.

President: said he couldn’t agree more with what Smita Jain Oxford is saying. He says that he thinks about what differentiates us. One of the reasons he wants them to come back is to identify distinguishing features of this university. Has hard time putting words around the sense of community here. He says that is the challenge about how to pick up our distinguishing characteristics.

Gregg: For Whom? We want students who care deeply; who are into whatever it is they come to study or have the ability.

Philip: when talked about passion, talked about the idea of the “fanatic” and what the “fanatic” means; it can mean anything; strategy of going to fan identity and how identifies with product; the fanatic of being active or the arts

Gregg: said that it should be in the “for whom?” category – passionate

Marlene: went back to the “for whom?” category; we attract talented, passionate, and intellectually curious students who want rigorous academics in a supportive, active community that values and instills honor and integrity.

Bob: said when you are asking students about high-performing students, this is almost a self-selecting kind of thing; they use different tactics to get them because they are much more analytical in their decision-making. This has real impact on how marketing is done.

Marlene: have to market to lowest common denominator that you set; there needs to be criteria for focus groups; did break high school prospects apart based on their GPAs; these were carefully tested to high-performing students who really liked this.

Dean Finkelstein.: want intellectually curious students; faculty member prize these students

Bob: said college search sites will see UMW information based on the traits

Marlene: went through categories from the top; the “So What?” piece will add socially conscious

Jonathan Levin: said supportive is number one that we rank against in student ratings

Jodie Hayob: thinks that supportive could be “hand holding”

Gregg: said that in all experiences here extends beyond classroom, but brand promise ignores everything else that is the student experience that we are talking about above; seems like we are so much more than that.

Lynne Richardson: Said COB came up with their vision statement: “learning and engagement”

Jonathan Levin: back to rigorous academics: two schools we struggle to compete with are with Christopher Newport and William and Mary; CN is not as strong on academics, and W & M bit of a grind and not as supportive.

Had to stop conversation at 5:40pm due to UFC meeting.

III. Approval of Minutes from October 16, 2013

IV. Reports

 A. President’s Report

 B. Provost’s Report

- issue of walking in commencement. Went to the University Academic Affairs Committee. They voted to change the policy from one that says students have to complete all requirements to walk to recommending a change to say that one could walk in commencement if one is within that number of credits to graduating. Wouldn’t get a diploma at that time. Should be within striking distance of completing degree. Common in other VA institutions. Christopher Newport and UVA don’t, but others do. Institution Provost came from was 4 credits or fewer from graduation. Point was made at academic affairs committee that sometimes course doesn’t run in summer so would have to go to fall. The University Academic Affairs motion is 9 or fewer credit hours. i.e. two science classes could be 8 credits. Provost went to student government association. Senate had asked for something similar. He said it is increasingly common, and he supports it.

- President supports it.

- About 20 or 30 students who fall out right at time for degree

- Suggestion was made to have it as 8 credits, rather than 9

- Gayle had discussion with COB, and they were not in favor; part of what will help is that there will be language changed at commencement, but that not everyone is getting a diploma today.

- Mary suggested not putting 9 credits for graduate students

- John Morello said motion was working off of undergraduate catalogue, not graduate

- Members of UFC decided to send it back to University Academic Affairs Committee to have them consider an 8-credit limit, rather than 9 credits

- The Provost will talk to the College governing bodies about graduate students in terms of credit completion

 C. Deans’ Reports (written attachment from Dean Finkelstein)

 D. UFC Chair’s Report – none due to time constraints

V. Old Business - none

VI. New Business

 A. Motion about Faculty Club (below) Neil Tibert

 - sitting in for Angela

- there was an initiative a while back, but now with new construction, there may be a space we can find.

- President asked about whether or not there would be alcohol; he asked because of ABC license that is currently available in Seacobeck

 - yes, there would be beverages and food for sale

 - it was suggested that we get the space and then association would form

- motion made by Debra Schleef to pass

- Courtney Clayton seconded

- motion passed

B. Minutes only:

UBAC (attached) – not addressed

 C. UCC new course proposals: (attached)

 - passed

VII. Announcements

VIII. Adjournment: 6:11pm

Motion on University Faculty Club

Whereas: The University does not currently have a formal club or social organization to foster collegial camaraderie; and the University does not maintain a dedicated space to house social and/or nonacademic functions.

Motion: I move that the University Faculty Council endorse the creation of a University Faculty Club that includes all full-time members of the teaching and administrative faculty from the CAS, COB, and COE and to request of the Master Planning Committee that it make available or designate a permanent room or space in an existing or future building on the Fredericksburg Campus to be utilized by the newly formed Faculty Club for a variety of functions that are primarily nonacademic in nature.

Rationale: Many Universities and Colleges endorse and support Faculty Clubs and organizations that sponsor functions outside of official academic business. The Club might offer holiday dinners and socials, ceremonies (e.g., honor society inductions Phi Beta Kappa), meeting space (e.g., AAUP), and/or nonacademic functions hosted by the Dean/Provost/President (e.g., receptions for new faculty, fall kick-off, President's or Dean's Book clubs). Recurring events might include bi-monthly or weekly socials where members might meet with colleagues at week's end to enjoy reprieve from our teaching, research, and service responsibilities. Social interactions of this nature will inevitably promote closer interaction between teaching and administrative faculty and may foster discussions that are academic in nature (new projects or collaborations). In order for this club to exist, the University will need to make available to the newly formed club a designated room in one of the campus buildings that might include Seacobeck Hall, Eagle Landing, the new Campus Center, or any newly acquired properties adjacent to College Avenue. Given that these functions will not be au gratis, as is the case for many University sponsored faculty events, the costs of operation will be minimal to the University. There will, however, be necessary cleaning and maintenance of the space provided by facilities services, as well as utilities, such that this club will require a modest operating budget shared equitably between the CAS, COE, and COB. The establishment of a Faculty Club at the University of Mary Washington will, without question, help to improve faculty morale and serve as a venue to enjoy informal gatherings of faculty from all of our academic disciplines. A version of this motion was submitted by Neil Tibert, Dept. of Earth and Environmental Sciences, and passed unanimously in the Nov. 6, 2013 CAS Faculty Senate.