University Faculty Senate Meeting  
Tuesday, May 7, 2013  

In Attendance:  

Nargis Virani, NSPE  
David Lopato, Jazz  
Emily Barnett, Parsons  
Jurgen Von Mahs, Lang  
Gary Vena, Drama  
Cecilia Rubino, Lang  
Teresa Ghilarducci, NSSR  
Frank Nemhauser, Mannes  
Elaine Abelson, Lang  
Candy Schulman, NSPE  
J.Y. Song, Mannes  
Gina Walker, NSPE  
Peter Haratonik, NSPE  
Marcus Turner, NSPE  
Todd Lambrix, Parsons  
Katarzyana Gruda, Parsons  
Ted Byfield, Parsons  
Margaret Fiore, NSPE  
Susan Yelavich, Parsons  
James Dodd, NSSR  
Chris Stover, Jazz  
Julie Boyd, Drama  
Ragnar Freidankm Drama  

Not Attending:  

Chris Roselli, Drama  
Elaine Savory, Lang  
Diane Walsh, Mannes  
Earl Scott, Parsons  
Aleksandra Wagner, NSPE  
Wendy D’Andrea, NSSR  
Steve Kennedy, Parsons  

I. Approval of Minutes  

James called the meeting to order. He asked for a motion to approve the minutes. A motion was made, seconded, and approved.
II. Co-Chair’s Report

James welcomed some newly elected senators to the meeting and asked them to introduce themselves. New attending members included: Julie Boyd, Drama; Ragnar Freidankm Drama; Marcus Turner, NSPE; Gina Walker, NSPE; Candy Schulman, NSPE.

James then reported on the Parsons Faculty Council resolution in regard to the Full-Time Faculty Handbook. James emailed the UFS this resolution in preparation for the meeting but reiterated its main points. See abbreviated resolution here:

From: PFC - Parsons Faculty Council <pfc@newschool.edu>
Subject: Full-time Faculty Handbook Process
Date: May 1, 2013 2:24:03 PM EDT
To: Tim Marshall <MarshallT@newschool.edu>, Bryna Mary Sanger <Sanger@newschool.edu>
Cc: "Towers, Joel" <Towersj@newschool.edu>, Simon Collins <Collinsm@newschool.edu>, Anne Gaines <Gainesa@newschool.edu>, "Lawrence, Sarah E" <LawrencS@newschool.edu>, "Lewis, David" <LewisD@newschool.edu>, "Mears, Alison" <MearsA@newschool.edu>, James Dodd <DoddJ@newschool.edu>, Chris Stover <stoverc@newschool.edu>, Susan Yelavich <YelavicS@newschool.edu>

To: Tim Marshall, Bryna Sanger
From: Parsons Faculty Council on behalf of the Parsons Faculty Assembly*
Cc: Joel Towers, Simon Collins, Anne Gaines, Sarah Lawrence, David Lewis, Alison Mears, James Dodd, Chris Stover, Susan Yelavich

Context
Throughout the drafting process of the new Full-time Faculty Handbook, Parsons faculty have sought to contribute suggestions through the appropriate governance channels, though our confidence is decreasing that feedback has been addressed in a transparent and timely manner. The PFA acknowledges that the Provost’s Office has made great strides toward a more participatory approach to revising the Full-time Faculty Handbook, yet the process can still be improved. At this juncture, many faculty feel that the process privileges administrative structures over open discussion and debate, and that it provides no specific way to determine whether or how a particular contribution has been addressed. As a result, communication lines and protocols can seem unclear, schedules can seem erratic, and key issues (e.g., workload and leave) seem to drop from publicly announced agendas.

In this vote, the PFA’s concerns focused on the process surrounding the new Full-time Faculty Handbook, not the substance of the Handbook itself. Thus, the goal of this document is to strike a balance between the concerns expressed in the PFA’s vote, on the one hand, and the university-wide need to adopt a new handbook, on the other. Toward that end, we believe that a
commitment to undertake the following measures will address those concerns and allow the President and Provost to present the Handbook to the Board as scheduled.

1. We propose an open, accountable review process in which faculty can consider and debate each others’ comments in both online and offline forums, and if and how they are specifically being addressed (e.g., deferred, resolved, or in-progress).

2. Publicly distributed draft versions of the Full-time Faculty Handbook and supporting materials (such as green and white papers), dating from 2006 to present, should be archived in ways that enable all faculty to review and compare them easily. Proposed changes should be presented in ways that clearly highlight successive drafts, with specific supporting materials explaining each change.

3. Policies that directly bear on faculty employment but are not included within the Full-time Faculty Handbook (e.g., specific benefits packages, grievance policy, etc.) should be published in archival ways that allow for the Handbook’s text to directly and explicitly reference specific versions and sections.

Respectfully submitted,
Parsons Faculty Council

James asked the UFS how it should respond to this vote of no confidence.

Discussion:

Frank shared that on a practical level this handbook revisions process has already been a long one. If the process keeps being opened up for discussion it could go on forever. Frank pointed out that there has been quite a bit of faculty input on the handbook revisions and felt that the revisions should be moved forward. James also pointed out that it is not the case that the entire handbook has been revised. There are still more sections that need revision, for instance, sections concerning leave and workload policies still need revisions. However, James also felt that the Parsons resolution did offer some good suggestions about how the process could be improved. Perhaps the administration could incorporate some of the suggestions. Parsons is a significant portion of the full-time faculty. Susan made the suggestion that divisional bodies (committees like the Parsons Faculty Council) should deliver minutes from their meeting to their senators that way the senators can share any issues that arrive with the UFS. Jurgen asked if there was a vote of no confidence for this process then what concrete steps can be taken to change that. James felt that an open and accountable review process that issued publicly distributed drafts and had more easily available links and resources would help. While these principals have been adopted the question is whether they have been adopted sufficiently. The idea would be to have faculty comments reviewed by the community as a whole and have an open discussion instead of relying on the administrative committees to do so. Ted shared that there is growing anxiety among the faculty at Parsons. They feel left
out of the process. Sixty faculty voiced their concern and frustration and passed a vote of no confidence. These faculty claim that there hasn’t been an open consultation process. Both Ted and Susan tried to assuage this anxiety. The Parsons Faculty Council felt that the handbook should not go to the BoT for approval until December. James asked if the UFS was in agreement that the co-chairs should respond to the Parsons Faculty Council that would acknowledge their anxiety and try again to assuage it. Susan felt that rather than pass a motion the co-chairs should just directly respond and copy the UFS on their response. Nargis added that their suggestions are important but what about the rest of the Parsons faculty? Susan said that the vote accounts for 30% of the faculty. Nargis suggested that it be noted that some of the Parsons faculty did feel that the process was consultative. Jurgen pointed out since the revisions that lie ahead are going to be more contentious (i.e. workload policy), this is an indication that the school needs to improve its process if faculty are already dissatisfied with the process to arrive at these basic revisions.

James brought up a second important issue, which is that of John Galliano being invited to lead a Master’s class at Parsons.

**Discussion:**
Emily reported that the PTF Union passed a resolution which strongly opposed Galliano’s invitation to teach a Master’s class. Emily asked if others wanted to support this resolution to be in touch with her. Susan asked if the UFS as a body wanted to make a comment about this situation. Peter asked about the process of how faculty were hired. Ted pointed out that Galliano was not being hired as a faculty member. He was just being hired to teach a workshop. James also pointed out that it wasn’t the President’s or Provost’s idea to hire him. It was the Dean of Fashions idea. Katarzyana suspected that Simon Collins, the Dean of Fashion, made the arrangements on his own. She pointed out that his faculty have twice passed a vote of no confidence about him, so he has a reputation of not really being concerned about the opinions of others. Jurgen made a motion to endorse the PTF statement. A vote was taken. 9 in favor, 5 opposed, and 1 abstention.

**III. Co-Chair Election (Governance)**

Nargis reported that the Governance committee was more engaged with the divisional elections this year. She suggested that next year they begin the process earlier. To date there were three nominations for co-chairs: Frank Nemhauser, Ted Byfield, and Elaine Savory. All three have agreed to serve. Nargis asked if there was any disagreement. None was voiced. Nargis pointed out that the one proviso was that Frank needed to be re-elected as a senator (Mannes has not yet held their elections). As long as he gets re-elected he will be able to serve as co-chair.

**IV. Open Portion: University Enrollment and Retention Strategies**
A. Chris Ferguson, Associate Vice President of Strategic Enrollment Management

See attached PDF for presentation in full.

B. Elizabeth Ross, Vice Provost for Academic Services
    Jennifer Francone, Director of Academic Support

Liz reported that the university has been trying to also focus on student retention in a way that is similar to that of recruitment. She pointed out that retention belongs to everyone though no one owns it. It is hard to have a comprehensive place for it. The PO created a task force to look into retention, which included both faculty and staff. Two of the top three recommendations made by the task force are now in play. One is a university-wide committee whose focus is solely student retention. The other is the implementation of an early warning system (Starfish), which is software that is compatible with Banner, and helps to follow up with students who are at risk. Starfish offers real time data access.

Discussion:
Ted asked what the percentage of faculty are using Starfish. Jennifer answered that Starfish is comprised of two components. One is a connect piece, which allows students to have access to advisors and learning center appointments, and other is the early alert piece, piloted this year with Parsons. The adoption rate was 48% for Parsons and 37% for NSPE. The goal was 30%. Students have to use Starfish to make appointments at the Learning Center. Divisions use it to schedule appointments for advising. All of the divisions will be using it in the fall. Starfish is a great way to communicate with students. The administration is still tweaking its communications. If anyone on the UFS has feedback or suggestions please be in touch with Jennifer. Starfish is a very adaptable tool. Liz shared that another component they are working on is the data piece. They are trying to assemble data about students, meaning who comes to the university, who stays, who leaves and for what reasons. Liz reported a quick summary: 80% of freshman move on to sophomores; there is a 50% four-year graduation rate; and a 65% six-year graduation rate. Liz is hoping to look more closely at transfer students and graduate students in the future. Liz also stated that the retention committee needs faculty representation. She would like to have someone from the UFS serve on this committee or at least a contact with someone from the UFS.

James made a motion made to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded and approved.
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...a coordinated set of concepts and processes that enables fulfillment of institutional mission and students’ educational goals (Bontrager, 2004)
Strategic Enrollment Management Organizational Chart

Associate Vice President

Manager of Administrative Operations

Marketing, Admission Communications, & Welcome Center

Undergraduate Admission & Operations

Graduate Admission & Operations

Financial Aid

Enrollment Systems
Strategic Enrollment Management
Admission Calendar

September – December
• Recruitment

January – April
• Application Review
• Recruitment

April - May
• Deposit Campaigns
• Yield Management
• Application Review
• Recruitment Planning & Travel

June – July
• Recruitment Planning & Travel
• Yield Management
• Melt Prevention
• Application Review

August
• Melt Prevention
• Recruitment Planning
• Application Review
Admission Lifecycle Model
Communicating Messages—Engaging Future Students

Primary Goal of Recruitment Strategy: ENgAGEMENT

PROSPECT ➔ INQUIRY ➔ APPLICANT ➔ ADMIT ➔ DEPOSIT ➔ STUDENT

To develop and strengthen student-centered relationships while ENGAGING future students with the university through the Admission Lifecycle. This strategy invites future students into the university’s community while exploring it as their institution of choice. After moving through the lifecycle, a personalized relationship has been established enabling the potential for maximum student success.
Admission Lifecycle Model
Best-fit students graduate

Potential Impact of Strategy on Retention

PROSPECT ➔ INQUIRY ➔ APPLICANT ➔ ADMIT ➔ STUDENT ➔ GRADUATE ➔ ACTIVE ALUMNUS

Translation

Introductions ➔ Developing Relationships ➔ Building Rapport ➔ Strengthening Relationships ➔ Experiencing & Creating Community ➔ Successfully Accomplishing Goals ➔ Sharing Experiences
Multi-Channel Marketing

- Website (i.e. Student-Driven Navigation, Virtual Tour, IM, Online Application, Online Event Scheduling)
- Popular Social Media (i.e. Facebook, Twitter, YOUTube, WordPress)
- Feet-on-the-Street Recruitment (Domestic & International, Other Off-Campus Events)
- Videos
- Email Campaigns
- Online Information Sessions
- Postal Letters & Publications (i.e. Storybooks, Postcards, Application Materials)
- P2P Telephone Calls
- F2F Appointments
- Campus Visits (i.e. Tours, Info Sessions, Open Houses)
- Special Events (i.e. Counselor Dinners, Trainings)
Communication Strategy

PROSPECT ➔ INQUIRY ➔ APPLICANT ➔ ADMIT ➔ DEPOSIT ➔ STUDENT
Strategic Enrollment Management

PROSPECT ➔ INQUIRY ➔ APPLICANT ➔ ADMIT ➔ DEPOSIT ➔ STUDENT

✓ Admission Reading
✓ Admission Operations
✓ Academic Divisions
✓ Financial Aid
✓ Enrollment Systems
✓ Academic Advising

Multi-Channel Marketing Methods

Website

Private Social Network, which integrates:
  🌐 Profiles, Blogs, Video Logs, Groups, Events, RSS, Chat, & One-Click Website Hyperlinks

Campus Visits

Yield Events

Financial Aid Packaging

Email Campaigns

Postal Letters & Publications

F2F Appointments

P2P Telephone Calls

Collaborative Partnerships: Alumni & Faculty

Academic Advising
Communication Strategy

PROSPECT ➔ INQUIRY ➔ APPLICANT ➔ ADMIT ➔ DEPOSIT ➔ STUDENT Cast

ADMIT TO DEPOSIT COMMUNICATION PLAN

- Postal Mail 1: Acceptance Folder
- Email 1: Congratulations, Link to MyNewSchool, SNS Invitation
- Email 2: Student Services, Link to MNS, SNS Invitation
- Email 3: How To Deposit, Link to MNS & School Microsite
- Email 4: Deposit Now, Official Transcripts, Housing, Student Services, Financial Aid
- Email 5: Deposit Now Push
- On-Going Yield Event Pushes
- Website Needs:
  - Deposit Received
  - Deposit Lists Sent to Advising
- Future Direct Mail Campaigns (lost adresses)
Strategic Enrollment Management
Challenges & Opportunities

- Strategic Enrollment Goal Planning
- Branding & Public Relations
- Thematic Marketing
- Faculty Profiles
- Student Profiles
- Alumni Profiles
- CRM Technology
- Document Imaging
- Predictive Modeling
- Collaborative Recruitment Partnerships
  - Zinch, Cappex
  - Royall & Company
  - Blue Fuego
  - Ning Networks (ENGAGE & GradCONNECT)
Strategic Enrollment Management

Contact Information

Chris Ferguson
Associate Vice President
fergusoc@newschool.edu
212.229.5900 x4340

Lindsey Martin
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martinl@newschool.edu
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