

University of Houston-Clear Lake

**2700 Bay Area Boulevard
Houston, Texas 77058-**

Response to the *Report of the Reaffirmation Committee* February 25-28, 2002

Prepared by

**Dr. Bruce Palmer
Dr. Carol A. Kominski
Judy Smith**



RECOMMENDATION 1

The Committee recommends that the University of Houston-Clear Lake provide instruction for all course work required for at least one degree program at the baccalaureate level or seek the Commission on Colleges approval for an alternative approach. (Section 1.4 – Conditions of Eligibility)

Visiting Committee Concern

“The Criteria require the institution either provide instruction for all of the course work required for at least one degree program at each level at which it awards degrees or seek approval for an alternative approach from the Commission on Colleges.”

UHCL RESPONSE:

The University of Houston-Clear Lake, which has been an upper-level and graduate institution since its opening in 1974, requests an exception to Condition of Eligibility 6 of the Criteria for Accreditation.

The University of Houston-Clear Lake (UHCL) is an autonomous unit of the University of Houston System. The President of the University of Houston-Clear Lake reports directly to the Chancellor of the University of Houston System. The University of Houston-Clear Lake is an upper division and graduate institution that provides advanced education for undergraduate students who have completed 54 semester credit hours or more of lower-level college work, and graduate students who hold bachelor’s degrees from regionally accredited four-year institutions. It does not offer doctoral degrees.

The 62nd Texas Legislature authorized the establishment of the University in 1971 (see Document 1.1). The measure was the result of a 1968 report by the Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System (now the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board) calling for a second University of Houston campus to provide upper-level and graduate programs. In

1973, the Texas Senate authorized construction of a permanent campus at Clear Lake.

September 1974 marked the beginning of regularly scheduled classes on the UHCL campus.

As an upper level University, slightly over 81 percent of UHCL undergraduates have attended one of the community colleges in the Houston-Galveston area. The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board has prescribed community college articulation requirements in the form of transfer plans for all academic programs. The UHCL plan has been formalized in a series of articulation agreements with community colleges in the Houston area. A statutorily created council composed of the presidents of the region's nine community colleges advises UHCL's president and reflects its upper-level programmatic orientation toward these institutions.

UHCL utilizes commonly accepted practices established by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admission Officers (AACRAO), the National Association of Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA), Projects for International Research (PIER), and the American Council on Education (ACE) for evaluation of course credit. Courses completed at other institutions are evaluated for transferability, to identify specific prerequisites for courses to be taken at UHCL, or for meeting admission criteria. UHCL accepts transfer work only from COC regionally accredited institutions. The University does not accept in transfer courses from single purpose institutions, Bible colleges, vocational-technical schools, and proprietary schools. Within the U.S. only courses from regionally accredited (COC) institutions and credit recommendations for military work established by ACE are considered. Courses completed outside the U.S. are evaluated using publications and recommendations established by AACRAO/NAFSA/PIER. UHCL also uses nationally recognized credentials evaluation services. All undergraduate students at UHCL are transfer students.

All undergraduates whether they are in-state, out-of-state, or international, must meet the

same set of core, statutory, and program requirements for receiving the UHCL degree. There are two categories of transfer: students from the U.S. and international transfers. Students must meet all requirements for the specific program and degree.

- U.S.A. UHCL has structured articulation agreements with the nine surrounding community college districts that detail all required courses for each degree program. The state of Texas has also adopted common course numbering for lower division courses simplifying transfer evaluation. University catalog course descriptions are used to equate course equivalencies from both inside and outside the state of Texas. If supplemental information is needed to validate course equivalency, course syllabi are requested from the institution of transfer.
- International. International transfer credit is awarded in line with AACRAO/NAFSA/PIER recommendations. All international students must meet the same core, statutory, and program requirements. If students are deficient in core, statutory, or program requirements they are required to enroll in an acceptable upper level course substitute or must co-enroll at a local community college to complete the required lower division course(s) that cannot be offered by UHCL.

The University assesses the performance of all its units and programs with the overall goal of continuing improvement and accommodation of student and community needs. Degree programs in each school are evaluated every six years, as is the core curriculum. Both qualitative and quantitative factors are considered in evaluating program strengths and weaknesses.

Documentation

- 1.1 University History from UHCL *Catalog, 2001-2002*, 1-3
- 1.2 Undergraduate Admissions from UHCL *Catalog, 2001-2002*, 13-19
- 1.3 University Undergraduate Degree Requirements from UHCL *Catalog, 2001-2002*, 77-80

RECOMMENDATION 2

The Committee recommends that the institution define its expected educational results and describe its methods for analyzing the results at all program levels. (Section 3.1 - Planning and Evaluation: Educational Programs)

Visiting Committee Concern

“The institution has implemented procedures to evaluate institutional effectiveness. Since 1998-99 each instructional unit had been responsible for annually setting and documenting expected learning outcomes and assessing the performance of students.” Outside the School of Education, however, “the quality and specificity of educational outcomes and assessment strategies is frequently inconsistent, making it difficult for the programs to demonstrate what their students have learned and to make necessary improvements to the curricula. Frequently student evaluations of instruction, graduating student surveys, and alumni surveys form a substantial portion of the assessment of learning. The ‘Complete Guide To Program Review’ for academic programs does not specify clearly a requirement that instructional departments develop and report on expected learning outcomes.”

UHCL RESPONSE

The University’s Learning Assessment Task Force defined seven University level student learning outcomes (see Document 2.1). As part of the shared governance process, various University committees discussed them and they have constituted an informal guide to University-level assessment at the program level. Although the learning outcomes have not proceeded completely through the shared governance process, the University has accepted them and assesses them annually. The University will, by December 2002, have passed them through the entire shared governance process, making them part of University policy.

Presently the seven University-level student learning outcomes are embedded within the curriculum in each program and evidenced in the four-column assessment matrix. (See sheet from Computing and Mathematics Division plan, document 2.4) In addition, the program review

form requires that programs evaluate learning outcomes in the curriculum (“Discuss student performance, including measurement of student gains, such as entrance and exit measurements”) and in the student sections (“Discuss how this information is used in program planning”).

The four-column assessment matrix demonstrates the assessment measures and the results along with action taken for each iteration of measurement. During the 2002-2003 academic year, the Executive Director for Institutional Effectiveness will meet with faculty from every academic program to advise them on requirements for assessment of each program relative to both University-level goals and program-specific goals and continue with the third iteration of measurements for assessment purposes. The Executive Director will identify programs where the quality and specificity of educational outcomes and assessment strategies are relatively weak and will recommend steps to remedy such weaknesses. Where surveys and student evaluations provide the major way of assessing student learning, UHCL will continue to use supplementary data based upon capstone courses, internships, theses, and other comprehensive measures. These techniques will continue to be included in UHCL’s assessment plans. Every academic program without exception will continue to strengthen its educational outcomes and comprehensive assessment strategies in the coming year.

Documentation

- 2.1 University Level Student Learning Outcomes – Draft
- 2.2 Four-Column Assessment Form
- 2.3 Program Review Form – Template
- 2.4 Page from Computing and Mathematics Division Plan
- 2.5 Example of Completed Four-Column Assessment Form

Timeline

December 2002

- University level student learning outcomes approved and circulated

May 2003

- Specific educational outcomes and comprehensive assessment strategies in place for every academic program and implemented

Fall 2003

- Apply assessment results to improve academic programs

Recommendation 3:

The Committee recommends that the institution, at all program levels, develop and implement procedures to evaluate the extent to which educational goals are being achieved and results of evaluations are being used to improve educational programs, services, and operations. (Section 3.1 - Planning and Evaluation: Educational Programs)

Visiting Committee Concern

“Since expected learning outcomes and assessment strategies at some program levels have not been clearly defined, it is difficult for these programs to evaluate the extent to which learning outcomes have been achieved and use the results for program improvement. In some programs where learning outcomes were well defined, little or no progress has been made in developing appropriate assessment strategies and using the results of assessment to demonstrate quality and improve the program.”

UHCL RESPONSE

As indicated in UHCL’s response to Recommendation 2, the University has developed a four column assessment model (see Document 3.3) by which all academic programs can identify appropriate goals, select a strategy for measuring achievement of those goals, evaluate attainment of the goals on a regular basis, and prescribe actions to improve goal performance on the assessment measures. This model and accompanying forms represent a cycle of activities completed in its entirety each academic year. Each academic program has completed at least two assessment cycles. The University will address any unevenness that may exist in the quality of reports from program to program. Thus, UHCL will use a similar strategy to that used in carrying out Recommendation 2 to strengthen program assessment, improve evaluations of goal achievement, and use the results to enhance educational programs, services, and operations.

Documentation

- 3.1 Assessment Cycles for All Academic Programs
- 3.2 Sample Learning Outcomes Assessment Reports
- 3.3 Four Column Learning Outcomes Assessment Form

Timeline:

May 2003

- Establishment of effective assessment measures of goal achievement

Fall 2003

- Completion of cycle with effective assessment measures and use of results to improve program effectiveness

Recommendation 4

The Committee recommends that the institution formulate research and service goals consistent with its mission, develop and implement procedures to evaluate the extent to which these research and service goals are being achieved, and use the results of these evaluations to improve research and service. (Section 3.1 - Planning and Evaluation: Educational Programs)

Visiting Committee Concern

“Insufficient documentation exists of the institution’s consideration of the role that research and service should have in its mission. The documentation does not provide evidence that the institution has considered the priorities for research and service and developed institutional goals for each.”

UHCL RESPONSE

In 1998 the University completed a Research Task Force Report which made a number of recommendations, some of which UHCL subsequently initiated. In 2000, the University produced its *Texas State Agency Strategic Plan, 2001-2005*. Two of the eight goals in this plan directly pertain to University research and service goals:

“Goal 4. Promote faculty research and creative activities. (State Goal ‘Conduct Research’)”

“Goal 6. Establish a leading role for UHCL, with emphasis in the Upper Gulf Coast region (State Goal ‘Provide Public Service’)”

In September 2002, the Provost’s Office will submit to UHCL’s Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) a draft set of research and service goals, drawn from the University’s mission statement, the Research Task Force Report, and UHCL’s Strategic Plan. (See draft below.) These goals have specific criteria for evaluation that the University can use to improve research and service.

Each of the goals in the Strategic Plan has several objectives. UHCL's research goals replicate the first three objectives of the research goal in its strategic plan. UHCL's service goals replicate the first three objectives of the service goal in its strategic plan.

The draft:

Research goals:

1. *Support faculty research presentations, publications, and exhibitions.*

Criteria for evaluation – on an annual basis: total institutional funds allocated and number of faculty funded by institutional dollars for:

- a) *presentation of research products,*
- b) *attendance at conferences and exhibitions, and*
- c) *publication of research and scholarly activity.*

2. *Increase external funding for pure and applied research and for creative activities.*

Criteria for evaluation –Research grant funding: on an annual basis, the number of grants, total and mean dollar amount of grants, and number of faculty receiving grants

3. *Increase individual faculty research activity and products*

Criteria for evaluation – annually, the number of books, journal articles, reports and monographs, book reviews, chapters and selections in books, paper presentations, abstracts and poster sessions, exhibits and performances, and other scholarly activities.

Service goals:

1. *Develop strong financial and other support from community organizations and*

institutions.

Criteria for evaluation – annual amount of program and school financial support from community organizations and institutions.

- 2. Strengthen collaborative educational, research, and development agreements with community partners.*

Criteria for evaluation – annual number of collaborative partnerships by program and school with community institutions and groups.

- 3. Improve faculty service to UHCL (program, school, and University) and their professions.*

Criteria for evaluation – annually, the number of faculty participating in University or professional service activities.

Strategic goals and their objectives form the framework of UHCL’s planning process.

The planning document requires that all unit, division, and component strategies be linked to the eight strategic goals. For example, in the computing and mathematics division plan (see Document 4.7), the first priority, upgrading and modernizing labs for the capstone and senior design classes, is labeled 1.4, indicating that it fulfills the first University strategic goal— “Prepare well-educated students satisfied with their UHCL experience” —under objective four— “Improve access, by active learners, to educational, artistic, and scholarly programs, and support facilities and services.”

The University Planning System form requires that every unit, division, and component determine the expected result of each strategy in its plan and a year later describe its “actual impact.” These plans, when revisited, provide the ground for the next iteration of the plan. In this way, UHCL evaluates research and service goals and uses the results to improve research

and service.

As part of the comprehensive and ongoing evaluation of individual faculty, UHCL evaluates research goal 3 – “Increase individual faculty research activity and products” – and service goal 3 – “Improve faculty service to UHCL (program, school, and university) and their professions. All tenure-track faculty must conduct research and all full time faculty (tenure track and non-tenure track) must provide University service.

The University evaluates these competencies in several ways. Each year every faculty member must submit an annual report. For tenure track faculty, two parts of that report must cover “Research, Scholarly and Artistic Activities” and “Professional Activities and Service.” UHCL defines faculty service as “the application and dissemination of knowledge or skill for the solution of problems and the improvement of the university, the profession, or the community.” UHCL defines research, scholarly, and artistic activities as “Those which lead to the production and dissemination of new knowledge; to increased problem-solving capabilities, including such activities as design and analysis; to original critical or historical theory and interpretation; or to the production of artistic performance.” (*Faculty Handbook*, section 5.3.2) Faculty also report activities directed at developing research and scholarly skills. The administration of each school differentially weighs these research and service activities in terms of the kind of program and the variety of products or service activities. (For example: the School of Business and Public Administration [BPA] may weigh articles differently from the way the School of Human Sciences and Humanities [HSH] does; in general books published count more than poster presentations; and University committee work may be weighed more heavily in the School of Education [SOE] than in the School of Science and Computer Engineering [SCE].¹) This annual

¹ On of June 11, 2002, the School of Science and Computer Engineering (SCE) changed its name to the School of Science and Computer Engineering (SCE). In UHCL’s SACS Compliance Self-Study, *Who We Are*, the name of

evaluation, in turn, plays a significant role in the allocation of merit money among faculty. The systems used by each of the four schools to differentiate between different levels of merit vary, but the administration of each school must allocate all faculty salary increases devoted to merit according to the annual evaluation. This helps promote research and service activity.

As part of the promotion and tenure process, the University requires that untenured faculty have a third year review. This review assesses the faculty member's progress toward promotion and tenure, noting strengths and weaknesses in the candidate's teaching, research, or service, and suggesting ways to strengthen the faculty member's candidacy. The evaluation is similar to the promotion and tenure review. A committee of tenured faculty carries out the evaluation and the dean provides to the candidate the review committee's assessment and recommendations for strengthening the faculty member's candidacy. At this point, the University carefully evaluates research and service activity.

The University evaluates research and service activities especially carefully in its promotion and tenure decisions. Candidates for promotion or tenure at any level are judged in the three traditional areas of professorial responsibility: Teaching and Educational Activities; Research, Scholarly, or Artistic Activities; and Service. The comparative scale is "poor," "less than satisfactory," "satisfactory," "very good," and "excellent." Any candidate for promotion to associate professor with tenure is expected to be "excellent" or "very good" with the promise of becoming "excellent" in at least one of the three areas of evaluation. (See *Faculty Handbook*, Section 5.3) The candidate must also be rated at least "very good" in a second of the three areas and "satisfactory" in the third one. In addition, each candidate must be at least "very good" in teaching. The same is true for promotion to professor, but the level of performance is much

the school was Natural and Applied Sciences. This document, however, uses the new name: School of Science and Computer Engineering.

higher. “Excellence,” for instance, requires a state, regional, or national reputation.

Finally, the Post-Tenure Performance review provides a further evaluation of research and service. Every six years, a post-tenure performance review committee in each school must conduct a review of each faculty member. A finding of “unsatisfactory” in research and service triggers a developmental process designed to improve the faculty member’s performance. If the dean perceives that a faculty member’s performance in any area is unsatisfactory, the dean can initiate at any time the post-tenure review process.

In addition, UHCL assesses the University research and service goals as part of the annual report of each school. These reports form the basis for planning in the Academic Affairs (Provost) component.

Documentation

- 4.1 UHCL Strategic Goals #4 and #6, *Agency (Texas) Strategic Plan for the 2001-2005 Period*, June 1, 2000 (<http://comp.cl.uh.edu/oie/Planning/SASP2000.pdf>)
- 4.2 UHCL Mission Statement
- 4.3 Promotion and Tenure Policy and Procedures, UHCL *Faculty Handbook*, Section 5.3
- 4.4 School Annual Reports (Faculty Books, Articles, Reports, Research Presentations, and Exhibitions)
- 4.5 Sample Planning Document – Computing and Mathematics Division Plan – FY 2002-FY 2003
- 4.6 Sample University Planning System Form, Filled Out
- 4.7 Post Tenure Review Policy and Procedure, UHCL *Faculty Handbook*, Section 5.4 (<http://b3308-adm.cl.uh.edu/PolicyProcedures/Policy.html>)

4.8 Research Task Force Report, Executive Summary and Summary of Recommendations

Timeline

September 2002

- Introduction of draft service and research goals into shared governance through the Faculty Senate Executive Committee

December 2002

- Service and research goals approved by the University

Recommendation 5

The Committee recommends that the institution demonstrate that its graduates of degree programs are competent in reading, writing, oral communication, fundamental mathematical skills and the basic use of computers. (Section 4.2.2 - Undergraduate Completion Requirements)

Visiting Committee Concern

“Documentation indicates that the [UHCL] core conforms to all state requirements and that many students enter the institution with much of the core already completed. It appears that the institution relies exclusively upon grades in the core courses to demonstrate competencies. No policy or procedures were found outlining the levels of competencies required or how they are assessed and documented for graduates of degree programs.”

UHCL RESPONSE

It is noteworthy that nine out of ten students entering UHCL with all or part of their core courses completed transfer from SACS-accredited institutions. Because they are accredited by SACS, UHCL considers the grading standards at these institutions acceptable.

UHCL’s core currently comprises of 42 credit hours distributed over a number of areas and providing a foundation in general education for all its graduates. This core assures that “all graduating students possess broad intellectual perspectives.” (UHCL *Catalogue, 2001-2002, 78*)

The core requires successful completion of

- Six hours of composition,
- Three hours of college algebra (or in School of Human Sciences and Humanities the option of an equivalent, MATH 1332: Mathematics for the Liberal Arts),
- Six hours of natural science,
- Six hours of humanities and visual and performing arts,

- Six hours of United States history (three of which can be Texas history),
- Six hours of political science (United States and Texas),
- Three hours of a social or behavioral science,
- Three hours of public communication, and
- Three hours (or passage of a exam) of computer competency. (UHCL *Catalogue*, 2001-2002, 78-79).

Thus, all of UHCL's baccalaureate degree programs require a general education core that exceeds the required 30 semester credit hours.² It includes at least one course from humanities/fine arts, social/behavioral science, and natural sciences/mathematics. It provides student competency in reading, writing, oral communication, fundamental mathematical skills, and the basic use of computers.

The 42 semester-hour requirement also complies with mandates in the *Texas Education Code*, Chapter 61, Subchapter S, as well as core curriculum rules from the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. Where individual schools at UHCL specify particular lower-level courses to fulfill core requirements, the required courses are listed in their Texas Common Course Numbering System form.

Since UHCL is an upper division institution, students often complete the core curriculum before arriving on campus. Those students using 2+2 plans almost always arrive on campus with the core curriculum completed. However, UHCL does not require completion of the core requirements for admission. UHCL provides information on acceptable lower level and upper level courses to those students who have not completed their core requirements.

² Students can meet some of these core requirements by successful completion of the appropriate College Level Examination Program (CLEP) examinations.

To evaluate the core courses transferred to UHCL, the University employs the same procedures it uses to evaluate all the lower-level courses it accepts toward any of its baccalaureate degrees. To evaluate transfer credit, UHCL utilizes commonly accepted practices established by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO), the National Association of Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA), Projects for International Research (PIER), and the American Council on Education (ACE). The University evaluates courses completed at other institutions for transferability, to identify specific prerequisites for courses to be taken at UHCL, or for meeting admission criteria. UHCL accepts for transfer only those courses taken at COC regionally-accredited institutions. The University does not accept for transfer courses from single purpose institutions, bible colleges, vocational-technical schools, and proprietary schools. Within the U.S., UHCL accepts only courses from regionally-accredited (COC) institutions and credit recommendations for military work established by ACE. The institution evaluates courses completed outside the U.S. using publications and recommendations established by AACRAO/NAFSA/PIER. UHCL also utilizes nationally recognized credentials evaluation services.

All undergraduate students—whether they are in-state, out-of-state, or international—must meet the same set of core, statutory, and program requirements for receiving the UHCL degree. There are two categories of transfer: students from the United States and international transfer students. Students must meet all requirements for the specific program and degree.

- U.S.A. UHCL has structured articulation agreements with the surrounding community college districts that detail all required courses for each degree program. The state of Texas has also adopted common course numbering for lower division courses, simplifying transfer evaluation. The institution uses University catalog

course descriptions to determine course equivalencies from institutions both inside and outside the state of Texas. If the University needs supplemental information to validate course equivalency, it requests course syllabi from the institution of transfer.

- International. UHCL awards international transfer credit according to AACRAO/NAFSA/PIER recommendations. All international students must meet the same core, statutory, and program requirements. If students are deficient in core, statutory, or program requirements they are required to enroll in an acceptable upper level course substitute or must co-enroll at a local community college to complete the required lower division course/s that cannot be offered by UHCL.

Additionally, in one or more of the courses they take, all students graduating from UHCL with a baccalaureate degree must demonstrate their competency in reading, writing, oral communication, fundamental mathematical skills, and the basic use of computers. The matrices in the documentation identify the courses in each school that reinforce development of each of the five competencies.

Documentation

- 5.1 UHCL *Catalog, 2001-2002, 77-79* Regarding University Undergraduate Degree Requirements
- 5.2 *Texas Education Agency Code, Chapter 61, Subchapter S* relating to Transfer Credit
- 5.3 Core Requirement Matrix – School of Business and Public Administration (BPA)
- 5.4 Core Requirement Matrix – School of Education (SOE)
- 5.5 Core Requirement Matrix – School of Human Sciences and Humanities (HSH)
- 5.6 Core Requirement Matrix – School of Science and Computer Engineering (SCE)

Timeline

Fall 2002

- School of Human Sciences and Humanities completes and implements curriculum changes necessary to insure that all graduates of the school employ each of the five competencies

Recommendation 6

The Committee recommends that the University of Houston-Clear Lake regularly evaluate instruction, and use the results to ensure quality instruction. (Section 4.2.2 - Undergraduate Instruction)

Visiting Committee Concern:

UHCL's "instructional techniques and policies are evaluated annually, but a great deal of variation exists between schools. Some schools use peer evaluations, while others do not. The results of the evaluations are not uniformly processed within and among the four schools."

UHCL'S RESPONSE:

The University evaluates instruction in a number of ways and uses these evaluations to ensure quality instruction. Every faculty member must each year submit an annual report. This report must cover "Teaching and Educational Activities," "Research, Scholarly and Artistic Activities," and "Professional Activities and Service." The policy encourages faculty "to note both the quality of their efforts as well as the quantitative reporting of activities." The teaching section of the annual report contains

- A list of courses and numbers of students taught,
- Student and collegial evaluations of instructional performance,
- The number of students advised,
- The number of supervised theses, projects, internships, independent studies, research projects, and other individual instructional activities,
- Development of courses, curriculum, new degree or training programs, and training grants,

- The development of textbooks, educational publications, and any instructional materials,
- Developmental activities related to improvement of teaching, and
- Honors received for instructional excellence.

While the content of the annual report must be consistent across all schools, the actual form used in each of the four schools differs somewhat.

The administration of each school uses these reports to evaluate the quality of instruction offered in each course and by each instructor. Each school links the annual report of each instructor to annual merit pay. The systems used by each of the four schools to differentiate between different levels of merit vary, but the University requires that the schools allocate all faculty salary increases devoted to merit according to the annual evaluation. This provides incentive for improving instruction.

The University evaluates instruction at other points as well, using the evaluations to ensure quality instruction. As part of “the responsibility of the academic community to provide guidance to nontenured faculty with regard to their candidacy and progress toward promotion and tenure,” the University requires that untenured faculty have a third year review. This review assesses the faculty member’s progress toward promotion and tenure, noting strengths and weaknesses in the candidate’s teaching, research, or service, and suggesting ways to strengthen the faculty member’s candidacy. The evaluation resembles the promotion and tenure review. A committee of tenured faculty carries out the evaluation and the dean provides to the candidate the review committee’s assessment and recommendations for strengthening the faculty member’s candidacy. At this point, the University carefully evaluates instruction.

In the University’s promotion and tenure procedure a wide-ranging evaluation of a faculty

member's teaching record occurs. The evaluation covers all forms of involvement with students, evaluations of instructional techniques, and evaluations of other educational activities. "All university professors are expected to incorporate new knowledge into their courses on a continuing basis." Any candidate for promotion to associate professor with tenure is expected to be "excellent" or "very good with the promise of becoming excellent" in at least one of the three areas of evaluation. Each candidate must also be at least "very good" in teaching. To be promoted to professor, candidates must have state, regional, or national reputations. This reputation may be achieved in any of the three areas of professorial responsibility. Candidates must also be "excellent" in either "Teaching and Educational Activities" or "Research, Scholarly, or Artistic Activities" and at least "very good" in the other two areas (i.e. teaching and service or scholarly activity and service).

The University also provides for dismissal of tenured and non-tenured faculty for "demonstrated neglect of professional duties," including instruction, and "demonstrated professional incompetence or dishonesty in teaching or research."

Finally, the Post-Tenure Performance review provides a further evaluation of instruction and the means for using the results to improve it. This review must be conducted for every tenured faculty member at least once every six years, by a post-tenure performance review committee. A finding of "unsatisfactory" in teaching triggers a developmental process designed to improve the faculty member's performance. If the dean perceives that a faculty member's performance in any area is unsatisfactory, the dean can initiate at any time the post-tenure review process.

The University's annual review policy, promotion and tenure policy, and post-tenure review policy all provide ongoing evaluations of faculty instructional effectiveness and provide

incentives for improvement and ways for that improvement to occur.

UHCL evaluates instruction on a wider scale in several ways. Program learning assessment provides the most direct method. Every program in the University, every year, evaluates the quality of program instruction and uses the results to improve that instruction. Two important University-wide annual surveys—the alumni survey and the graduating student survey—contain questions concerning the instructional quality of programs. Programs use this data in developing learning assessment goals. The University also uses data from the six-year program reviews, several areas of which touch on instruction, including sections on faculty, curriculum, and resources and facilities.

UHCL monitors adjunct instruction in the schools. All adjunct faculty must administer the course/instructor evaluation form used by the school in which they teach. “These evaluations are retained in the appropriate administrative office in the school and are considered as part of the contract renewal process.” In order to be retained, an adjunct instructor “must have satisfactory reviews.” (*Adjunct Faculty Handbook*, Section III, “Evaluation and Renewal.”)

Documentation

- 6.1 Faculty Annual Review Policy, *Faculty Handbook*, Section 5.1 (<http://b3308-adm.cl.uh.edu/PolicyProcedures/Policy.html>)
- 6.2 FY 02 Merit Allocations for Each School
- 6.3 Faculty Merit Raise Increments, *Faculty Handbook*, Section 6.7 (<http://b3308-adm.cl.uh.edu/PolicyProcedures/Policy.html>)
- 6.4 Third Year Review of Assistant Professors, *Faculty Handbook*, Section 5.3.6 (<http://b3308-adm.cl.uh.edu/PolicyProcedures/Policy.html>)
- 6.5 Promotion and Tenure Policy and Procedures, *Faculty Handbook*, Section 5.3

(<http://b3308-adm.cl.uh.edu/PolicyProcedures/Policy.html>)

- 6.6 Dismissal of Faculty Members with Tenure and Special or Probationary Appointment before the End of the Specified Term of Employment, *Faculty Handbook*, Section 5.6 (<http://b3308-adm.cl.uh.edu/PolicyProcedures/Policy.html>)
- 6.7 Four-Column Learning Outcomes Assessment Form
- 6.8 Examples of Completed Four-Column Learning Assessments
- 6.9 Graduating Student Survey, 2002
- 6.10 Alumni Survey, 2002
- 6.11 Sample Program Review Evaluation and Report
- 6.12 Post-Tenure Review Performance Review Policy, *Faculty Handbook*, Section 5.4 (<http://b3308-adm.cl.uh.edu/PolicyProcedures/Policy.html>)
- 6.13 Course/Instructor Evaluation Form from Each School
- 6.14 Evaluation and Renewal, *Adjunct Faculty Handbook*, Section III (<http://b3308-adm.cl.uh.edu/PolicyProcedures/Policy.html>)

Recommendation 7

The Committee recommends that the University regularly evaluate its advisement programs, both on campus and off campus, to enhance assistance to students. (Section 4.2.5 - Academic Advising of Undergraduate Students)

Visiting Committee Concern

“Evidence of regular advisement program review and evaluation was not clearly evident in the self-study or during campus interviews. New software and procedures for distance education advisement are being implemented, and will undoubtedly need to be evaluated for effectiveness.”

UHCL RESPONSE

For the last few years UHCL has evaluated its advising through an Alumni Survey (starting in 2000, reaching back to 1997) and a Graduating Student Survey (starting in 1998). The Office of Institutional Advancement (OIE) administers both. The Alumni Survey has several questions that indirectly address advising, *i.e.*, “I was satisfied with the availability of faculty outside the classroom” and “I had the opportunity to work with a faculty member on a research project (other than thesis).” The Graduating Student Survey has always asked for a response on “Faculty Advising in Major” and “Professional Advising in Major.” In spring 2002, OIE administered to UHCL students a new survey, a “Customer Service Survey,” which went to the Texas Legislative Budget Board and to the Texas Governor’s Office of Budget, Planning, and Policy. This survey also addresses advising directly. The University disseminated the results to the deans, associate deans, and the director of distance education in June 2002. The University has added this survey, which UHCL will administer annually, to its database for use in improving advising services.

Evaluation of academic advising requires evaluation of both the adviser and the services provided. The associate dean of each school evaluates the performance of each academic advisor on an annual basis. The director of distance education evaluates distance education advisers. The supervisor uses the information to improve the effectiveness of each adviser and to determine a portion of the staff member's merit profile.

Individual schools gather additional advising data from sources other than the Graduating Student Survey, the Alumni Survey, and the Customer Satisfaction Survey. The School of Education (SOE) administers an academic advising questionnaire once a year through the ABC Workshop that is required of all education students for admittance into teacher education. The School of Business and Public Administration (BPA) uses the Educational Benchmarking Institute's (EBI) benchmarking survey. The school administers this instrument every semester to the graduate and undergraduate strategic management classes. Benchmark institutions for 2000-2001 were Arizona State-West, California State-Haywood, University of Arkansas-Little Rock, and University of Michigan-Flint. In addition, every semester BPA sends out a survey to all students applying for graduation. The School of Science and Computer Engineering (SCE) also administers a survey that contains items regarding the effectiveness of services provided through academic advising. The School of Human Sciences and Humanities (HSH) uses the Advising Office Survey, distributed to users of the office. HSH uses the collected data to assess the advising program when the associate dean evaluates the advising coordinator. HSH also collects additional data through informal channels by conducting random interviews with students.

Although each school uses a different approach to evaluation and measurement of advising processes, the positive student responses demonstrate advising effectiveness. Changes that have occurred because of the assessment of advising include extending office hours for

purposes of advisement and revision of UHCL's web sites so that students have access to appropriate advisement forms. These changes have improved UHCL's services.

Written procedures regarding academic advising, developed in each of the schools, will appear online and in the school bylaws by spring 2003. UHCL will have an academic advisement policy in place by spring 2003 as part of the effort to strengthen its advisement process.

Documentation

- 7.1 Draft of University–Wide Policy on Academic Advisement
- 7.2 Academic Advising from UHCL *Catalog, 2001-2002*, 24-25
- 7.3 UHCL Alumni Survey Questions, 2000 and 2002
- 7.4 UHCL Graduating Student Survey Questions, 1998 and 2002
- 7.5 UHCL Customer Service Survey Questions, Spring 2002.
- 7.6 SOE Academic Advising Questionnaire
- 7.7 BPA Graduating Student Survey Questionnaire (EBI)
- 7.8 BPA Survey Questionnaire Mailed to Students
- 7.9 SCE Survey Questionnaire
- 7.10 HSH Advising Office Survey Questionnaire

Timeline

Fall 2002

- Academic advisement policy discussed in the schools

Spring 2003

- Academic advisement evaluation procedures implemented

Fall 2003

- Academic advisement evaluation results used to improve advising effectiveness

Recommendation 8

The Committee recommends that the institution demonstrate that it maintains a substantial difference between undergraduate and graduate instruction. (Section 4.3.4 – Graduate Curriculum)

Visiting Committee Concern

“The process of graduate instruction appears to be not too dissimilar in approach to the undergraduate instruction and the difference is not evident in the documentation provided or in discussions with faculty and administrative officers.”

UHCL RESPONSE

UHCL expects graduate students to do more research than undergraduates and more sophisticated analysis, synthesis, and application. Such requirements as theses, projects, capstone courses, internships, and extended course work reflect these additional expectations.

All four schools offer a thesis option to their graduate students. This option requires work at a significantly higher level than that asked of undergraduates. The University requires the master’s thesis to demonstrate the ability to do independent research. (UHCL*Catalog*, 2001-2002, 84) The history program explicitly requires that students undertaking a master’s thesis “are expected to do original work in some field of historical inquiry.” (*Catalog*, 174)

Project options are offered to master’s students in the School of Science and Computer Engineering (SCE), the School of Education (SOE), and the School of Human Sciences and Humanities (HSH). These, like the master’s thesis, require a level of work significantly higher than that required from undergraduates. The student must demonstrate “the ability to do independent scholarship and/or field study: to carry out and/or assess a major practical application of theory or methods from the discipline.” (*Catalog*, 84)

Capstone courses or experiences for graduate students require research and statistical or other discipline-related analysis or practice at a higher level of sophistication than the one required of undergraduates. All of the School of Business and Public Administration's (BPA) programs require a capstone course, as does sociology in HSH.

The internship (or, in one case, the residency) option, offered by some programs in HSH, BPA, and SOE, "must represent application of master's level instruction to materials or situations that are new to students. The internship should provide an opportunity for students to evaluate the relevance of theoretical or academic perspectives to the work environment."

(*Catalog*, 85)

The extended course work option, offered by BPA and three programs in HSH, "requires successful completion of a capstone course or a comprehensive examination." (*Catalog*, 85) As noted previously, nearly all programs in BPA require a capstone course. Sociology, in HSH, offers the capstone course as one master's degree option. History and literature in HSH offer the extended course work option with a comprehensive exam. These exams are geared to the student's graduate course work and designed by faculty working with them. The student and faculty develop reading lists for the exam and decide the areas on which the exam will focus.

Documentation

- 8.1 UHCL *Catalogue*, 2001-2002, 83-85, 174
- 8.2 Capstone Course Syllabi from BPA and Sociology (HSH)
- 8.3 Sample Project Abstracts from All Schools
- 8.4 Sample Internships from All Schools
- 8.5 Sample Thesis Abstracts from All Schools
- 8.6 Sample Comprehensive Exams from History and Literature

8.7 Draft Policy on Combined and Parallel Undergraduate and Graduate Courses

Recommendation 9

The Committee recommends that in courses which combine instruction of undergraduate and graduate students the institution insure appropriate attention to each group. (Section 4.3.4 – Graduate Curriculum)

Visiting Committee Concern

In addition, “discussions [between the Committee and University personnel] revealed that in combined instruction courses, there was not a clear distinction between graduate and undergraduate study. The level of graduate courses should be clearly distinguished from undergraduate courses.”

UHCL RESPONSE

In practice, all parallel and cross-listed courses for graduates and undergraduates have qualitatively and quantitatively distinct requirements. Graduate students are required to exhibit substantially greater and more sophisticated knowledge and understanding of subject matter and to produce work requiring greater independence, synthesis, and research. However, syllabi from cross-listed (combined) courses do not necessarily reflect the full range of distinctions between the two student levels. The University has taken additional steps to ensure that this distinction is clear. By fall 2002, all cross-listed undergraduate and graduate courses will have separate syllabi, stating clearly the requirements for each level. UHCL has drafted a policy designed to ensure that course syllabi establish clear differences between undergraduate and graduate instruction. The Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs will introduce this policy to the Educational Policies and Courses Committee (EPCC) in fall 2002.

Documentation

- 9.1 Draft of Policy to be Submitted to EPCC
- 9.2 Sample Syllabi from Parallel Courses

Timeline

September 2002

- All cross listed (combined) undergraduate and graduate courses will distribute separate syllabi stating clearly the requirements for each level
- A draft of the Policy on Combined and Parallel Undergraduate and Graduate Courses will be introduced to EPCC for approval

December 2002

- Implementation of the Policy on Combined and Parallel Undergraduate and Graduate Courses

Recommendation 10

The Committee recommends that the institution provide an environment which supports and encourages scholarly interaction and accessibility among faculty and students consistent with the qualitative intent of the Criteria. (Section 4.3.5 - Graduate Instruction)

Visiting Committee Concern

“Several discussions between faculty and members of the committee revealed that, although the graduate syllabi were clearly laid out, it was not clear that there was significant focused interaction between graduate students and full-time faculty advisers. This problem could possibly be exacerbated by the extensive use of part-time adjunct faculty.” While employment of experienced adjuncts exposes students to “practitioners, ’...there is also a distinct possibility that over-use of adjuncts carries the risk of minimizing valuable scholarly interaction between graduate students and full-time advisers.”

UHCL RESPONSE

UHCL requires all of its full-time and part-time faculty to keep at least two office hours for every course taught. These regular office hours facilitate contact and focused interaction between graduate students and individual faculty. UHCL graduate students make frequent use of this availability and of the ability to contact faculty members by telephone and email. Every faculty member’s telephone has voice mail capacity and all students have access to faculty telephone numbers through the telephone directory, either in hard copy or on-line. Students can find faculty member email addresses and office telephone numbers on the UHCL web page by clicking on “Faculty and Staff Directory.” Because adjunct faculty cannot serve as graduate (or undergraduate) student advisers, the use of adjunct professors does not affect graduate student interaction with full-time faculty advisers.

While individual UHCL students have considerable contact with advisers and other individual faculty in class and out, only at the capstone experience does this contact become

formalized and susceptible to documentation. Every graduate student obtaining a master's degree from UHCL must complete a capstone experience. A student fulfills this requirement by completing successfully one of the following options: a thesis, a project, a capstone course, an internship or residency, or extended course work with an exam. The following table shows the options available to students in every master's degree program.

GRADUATE CAPSTONE EXPERIENCES BY DEGREE PROGRAM

Program	Thesis	Project	Internship/ Residency/ Practicum	Course Work & Exam	Capstone Course
<i>School of Business and Public Administration</i>					
Accounting, integrated B.S. and M.S.					X
Accounting	X				X
MBA					X
Finance					X
Human Resource Management	X				X
Management Information Systems					X
Environmental Management	X				X
Healthcare Administration	X		X		X
Healthcare Administration/Business Administration	X		X		X
<i>School of Education</i>					
Counseling			X		
Curriculum and Instruction	X	X			
Early Childhood Education	X	X	X		
Educational Management			X		
Instructional Technology	X	X	X		
Multicultural Studies in Education	X	X			
Reading	X		X		

School Library and Information Science			X		
<i>School of Human Sciences and Humanities</i>					
Behavioral Sciences – General	X	X	X		
Behavioral Sciences – Psychology	X	X	X		
Behavioral Sciences – Sociology	X	X	X		X
Behavioral Sciences – Clinical Psychology			X		
Behavioral Sciences – Family Therapy			X		
Behavioral Sciences – School Psychology			X		
Fitness and Human Performance	X	X	X		
Studies of the Future	X	X	X		
Cross-Cultural Studies	X	X	X		
History	X	X		X	
Humanities	X	X	X		
Literature	X	X		X	
<i>School of Science and Computer Engineering</i>					
Computer Engineering	X	X* ³			
Computer Information Systems	X	X*			
Computer Science	X	X*			
Software Engineering	X	X*			
Systems Engineering	X	X*			
Mathematical Science	X	X*	X		
Statistics	X	X	X		
Biological Sciences	X	X*			
Chemistry	X	X*			
Environmental Science	X	X*			

³ The asterisk on project entries means that these are projects combined with a capstone course or with extended coursework. This arrangement is unique to the School of Science and Computer Engineering.

Physical Sciences	X	X*			
--------------------------	---	----	--	--	--

All four schools offer the thesis option, which requires considerable contact between the student and two or more faculty members. The thesis provides the student with the opportunity to develop the research skills and experience appropriate for the next level of graduate degrees or professional advancement. Thesis research and writing requires close consultation between the chair of the thesis committee and at least one other faculty member or expert in the field. The final product must be acceptable to all members of the thesis committee and signed by them. The amount of contact between adviser and thesis student varies by individual student, faculty adviser, program, and school. For example, students working in their adviser’s laboratory will likely have more contact with their adviser than those doing research at an external location. Nevertheless, contact with the adviser occurs on a weekly basis for almost all students completing a thesis.

Three schools offer the project option: the School of Education (SOE), the School of Human Sciences and Humanities (HSH), and the School of Science and Computer Engineering (SCE). The project also requires considerable contact between faculty and student. Like the thesis, the project requires close collaboration between the student and one or more faculty members. In SCE the research project model typically involves a “student team” approach to a “real world” project relevant to the student’s field of study. The students in the team maintain close contact with the faculty member and outside expert, who help them organize and then monitor their work. In the other two schools, the project normally involves individual students working with an adviser and another faculty member. The contact between project students and faculty advisers closely parallels that involved with doing a thesis and described above.

The school administration must review and approve all theses and projects. In some

cases these and projects have been returned for additional work.

The other kinds of capstone experience—internships and course work options—are not offered by every program or by every school. The varieties of these options are described below, by school.

School of Education (SOE)

SOE offers the internship option. SOE's policies on intern supervision do not require any specific amount of contact between the student and the faculty supervisor, but the norm is at least three meetings: one early to ensure that the internship expectations and arrangements are clear, another about 1/3 of the way through to ensure that the internship is off to a good start, and a third at the end of the internship to review and evaluate accomplishments. If problems occur, the intern supervisor schedules additional visits as needed on site or at the University. Further, some programs, such as educational leadership, schedule seminar activities as a supplement to the internship. Others, such as counseling and reading, have practica, which are additional individual and small group experiences required prior to the internship. Seminars and practica increase faculty contact with graduate students.

Advising requires additional close contact between faculty and student. For SOE graduate students, graduate faculty do some pre-admission advising and all post-admission advising. Advisors typically meet with students on a regular basis throughout the student's academic career to discuss both program and professional issues.

School of Science and Computer Engineering (SCE)

SCE offers an internship option only in statistics, which the program structures and operates in much the same way similar programs in SOE and HSH do it. It requires considerable

contact between a faculty adviser and the student.⁴

School of Human Sciences and Humanities (HSH)

Most HSH programs offer the internship option. Three—history, literature, and sociology—offer an extended course work/exam option. One, sociology, offers both an internship and the coursework option with a capstone course rather than an exam.

Internships require a faculty coordinator from the student's subject area. The faculty member approves the student for internship, works with the student to acquire appropriate placement, and evaluates the student's performance throughout the course of the internship. This requires close contact on an individual basis. Several site visits are required with each internship placement. Thus, the student has not only a site supervisor, but also the supervision of the internship coordinator.

Both literature and history offer the extended coursework option. Literature requires a comprehensive written examination; history requires both a comprehensive written examination and an oral exam. The extended coursework option in history and literature requires the student and the faculty adviser to develop a focus for the student's course work, a focus that the comprehensive exam at the end of the course work addresses. Preparation for both exams requires that the student work closely with two (history) or three (literature) faculty members to develop a reading list. This reading list is based on work done in the student's graduate courses as well as new material. The faculty and student work to identify themes within the student's course work focus in order to frame the comprehensive exams. Faculty members then create the questions for the exam. The oral exam in history is taken a week after the written exam and is organized around the student's written exam.

⁴ In fall 2001 environmental science initiated the capstone course option for its graduate students but no one has yet selected that option so the course has not been offered and no syllabus exists for it.

In HSH only sociology has a capstone course. This course focuses on the literature in the field and on the application of empirical and theoretical knowledge to particular sociological issues. Each student must produce a paper on both these areas, the second inclusive of the first. Because of the nature of the course and the assignments, it requires a considerable amount of individual student contact with the instructor over selection of the paper topics, organization of bibliography, development of research skills, and writing.

School of Business and Public Administration (BPA)

Graduate students in BPA have a thesis option but rarely take it. One program, healthcare administration, offers a 12-month residency option and an internship/capstone course option. The internship offered by healthcare administration is quite similar to the internships offered by SOE and HSH and requires the same extensive contact between faculty member and student. Students choosing the 12-month residency option go to healthcare institutions that have formal residency agreements with the program. The program has a faculty member who is residency director. The residency director works with the student on placement and is the student's major University contact throughout the residency. The student must submit a number of periodic reports to the residency director. The student is also responsible for three major projects during the residency. These projects must be worked out between the student, the residency director, and the student's preceptor, a CEO or high administrative official at the resident's healthcare institution. The student engages in regular dialogue with the residency director on how the residency is going and on the reports and major projects. The residency coordinator also arranges the evaluation by the student of the preceptor and by the preceptor of the student.

Most BPA students do a coursework option that requires a capstone course. This course

requires small teams of students to work together and with the faculty member in developing one or more sophisticated case analyses, writing them up, and presenting them orally. The work requires close coordination between the capstone course instructor and the students.

BPA faculty are very accessible to graduate students. In 2001, UHCL MBA students taking an Educational Benchmarking Institute (EBI) survey ranked (on a scale of one to six) their instructors' accessibility at 5.91 (MBA required courses) and 5.83 (MBA elective courses). In both cases the school showed considerable improvement over 1996 results on the same question. (See documentation) In addition, faculty participate actively in student organizations. Most of these organizations are tied to national professional societies and faculty and students meet on issues that are of immediate importance to the students' careers.

Documentation

- 10.1 Thesis Guidelines from Each School
- 10.2 Project Guidelines from Each School
- 10.3 Internship Guidelines from Each School
- 10.4 Syllabi, BPA Graduate Capstone Courses, Two Sections of MGMT 6731, Spring 2002
- 10.5 UHCL *Faculty Handbook*, Faculty Office Hours Policy
- 10.6 Syllabus, SOCI 5931: Seminar in Sociology
- 10.7 BPA Report, "Accessibility to Students"
- 10.8 Abstracts of Theses from Each School
- 10.9 Abstracts of Projects from Each School
- 10.10 Examples of Representative Internship Placements or Reports
- 10.11 Examples of Reading Lists and Exam Questions from History and Literature

10.12

UHCL Faculty and Staff Directory Web Site -
<http://www.cl.uh.edu/uct/helpdesk/Tel/UHCLPHONE.html>

Recommendation 11

The Committee recommends that the institution ensure that a reasonable number of advisees is assigned to faculty or professional staff. (Section 4.3.6 Academic Advising of Graduate Students)

Visiting Committee Concerns

“The documentation that was provided in the self-study shows several relatively large ratios of graduate students to full-time faculty advisers. Furthermore, interviews revealed that the process of advisement for graduate students did not appear to be significantly different from that of advising undergraduate students. Given the large ratios, it is pertinent to inquire if the large ratio of graduate students to full-time faculty interferes with the process of good advisement of the graduate students.”

UHCL RESPONSE

According to the Academic Guidelines of the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA), “The academic advising program must be staffed adequately by individuals qualified to accomplish its mission and goals.” Though NACADA writes its guidelines for professional advisers, its standards reflect a standard for academic advising in general, including faculty advising. The graduate student advising load for full-time faculty members, especially when UHCL reaches its 65/35 ratio (see below), is both an adequate and reasonable.

UHCL determined the number of graduate majors in each school and divided this by the number of full-time faculty members. The University analyzed data at the school level because many faculty members teach and advise in more than one program within a school. In the graduate humanities program, for instance, faculty from history, literature, and the visual arts all supervise theses and projects. The same is true of the School of Human Sciences and Humanities’ (HSH) program in cross-cultural studies and behavioral science-general. The School of Education (SOE) and School of Science and Computer Engineering (SCE) faculty,

particularly in the applied sciences, also supervise theses and projects in more than one program.

The following table below provides information on the number of graduate advisees per faculty member in each school.

Full-Time Faculty Graduate Advising Load, by School

School	Number of Graduate Majors	Number of Full-Time Faculty	Number of Vacant Positions	Number of Faculty Positions Needed to Meet 65/35	Fall 2001	Number of advisees/FT Faculty	Anticipated Fall 2002 (w/ vacant positions filled)	When 65/35 ratio is met
BPA	1280	52	0	0	25	25	25	25
HSH	1137	62	1	9	18	18	18	16
SCE	818	44	2	1	19	18	18	17
SOE	1477	34	4	9	43	39	39	31

The University is in the second year of a four-year effort to increase the ratio of full-time to adjunct faculty. The target is to have each school use full-time faculty to teach at least 65 percent of the SCH's taught during the year. Reaching this goal requires hiring more full-time faculty in those programs and schools in which adjunct faculty teach more than 35 percent of the SCH's. At UHCL's current faculty level, the number of advisees per faculty member is within an appropriate range in three of the four schools: BPA, HSH, and SCE. Among these three, the somewhat larger number of graduate advisees per faculty member in BPA is mitigated by the fact that most graduate students in that school take the capstone course and work with each other in small groups as well as with a faculty member. Only SOE has a high number of advisees per faculty member. When UHCL reaches the desired 65/35 ratio, this number will drop from 43 to 31.

The longer-term goal for the institution is to have 70 percent of its SCH's taught by full-

time faculty. When the University reaches that goal, the number of advisees per faculty member in SOE will drop further.

The University has determined that the number of graduate students advised by a single full-time faculty member in each of the four schools is appropriate to its mission and student body. NACADA guidelines call for adequate levels. UHCL believes it will achieve this adequacy when it fills the fall 2002 budgeted positions. When it reaches the 65/35 ratio in FY 05, the figures will be even better.

Documentation

- 11.1 NACADA Guidelines and Standards
<http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Profres/standard.htm>
- 11.2 Funded Priorities, FY 02 and FY 03, with 65/35 Priorities Noted

Timeline

Fall 2004

- Sixty-five percent of University SCH's taught by full-time faculty

Recommendation 12

The Committee recommends that the University of Houston-Clear Lake formulate clear and explicit goals for its distance learning programs and demonstrate that they are consistent with the institution's stated purpose. (Section 4.5 - Distance Learning Programs)

Visiting Committee Concern

“The University’s distance learning program is very fragmented. All schools use the Instructional Technology Center for course development, but work haphazardly with the Office of Distance and Extended Education. The current Interim Director of Distance and Extended Education attempts to work with each school but lacks the centralized authority to truly coordinate all aspects of course development, delivery, and course evaluation. A draft of the Distance Education Institutional Plan has been prepared, but has not been acted upon. This plan is a substantial base from which to develop goals and procedures for distance education.”

UHCL RESPONSE

UHCL’s distance learning program is decentralized rather than fragmented. The Director of the Office of Distance and Extended Education (ODEE) coordinates rather than directs UHCL’s distance and extended education efforts. At UHCL the control of distance and extended education belongs to the deans of the four schools. The faculty retains control of the curriculum and course content.

At the time of the SACS visit, an interim appointee directed ODEE. That person had been in office for less than two months. During FY 02, a marketing budget and two FTE’s—a senior secretary and an academic advisor for distance education programs—were assigned to ODEE. As of July 1, 2002, the office has a new permanent director. In fall 2004, when space is vacated in the Bayou Building as the Student Services/Classroom building opens up, one thousand square feet will be available to expand ODEE. These institutional commitments indicate that UHCL is moving toward an office more capable of providing wide-ranging support

for distance education in the schools and for improving communication and cooperation among the schools concerning distance education.

In May 2002, the interim director, the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and two ODEE staff members attended an all-day retreat to look into the mission and vision of Distance Education in its current state. The following information describes the status of present-day activities.

The mission of distance education at UHCL is to enrich the quality of instruction and student learning while expanding access to the University's programs and student services. The institution assures academic integrity with ongoing program assessment and evaluation of new technologies. Both enhance content delivery and innovation. Without diminishing the standards or resources of UHCL's on-campus educational programs, distance education leads to expanded enrollments in target markets for selected programs. It also serves as an instrument for faculty and staff development and as a vehicle for creating partnerships with community stakeholders.





To fulfill this mission, the University has set the following goals for distance education at UHCL:

- Goal 1. Develop and deliver high-quality academic programs.
- Goal 2. Recruit and retain students by improving access and enhancing their educational experience.
- Goal 3. Evaluate program effectiveness to ensure the quality of educational outcomes.
- Goal 4. Provide and assess academic and student support services.
- Goal 5. Provide and assess an internal organization and infrastructure.
- Goal 6. Evaluate delivery modes of distance education and integrate new technologies when appropriate.

- Goal 7. Track, monitor, and report student and program data.
- Goal 8. Develop a long-range plan.
- Goal 9. Remain responsive to community needs.
- Goal 10. Assure that these goals remain consistent with the UHCL mission.

These goals form the basis of UHCL's institutional plan as submitted to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) in March 2002, after presentation to and approval from UHCL's Strategic Enrollment Management team. The following table details how distance education addresses its mission and goals and how the mission and goals accord with the overall mission of the institution.

RELATION OF DISTANCE EDUCATION GOAL'S TO UHCL MISSION

UHCL's Mission	DE Mission	DE Strategies to Address Mission
1. Provide fair and equitable learning opportunities to graduate and undergraduate students. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diversity. • Access. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offering courses online and at various off-site locations. • Incorporating accommodations for special students. • Offering a multitude of student services.
2. Emphasize high standards for teaching and learning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing the critical, creative, quantitative, and communication skills of students. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using frequent course, program, faculty, and student evaluations. Using results to “inform” the process. • Ensuring that course and program requirements are equal to those for on-campus offerings.
3. Enhance the educational, economic, cultural, scientific, business, and professional environment of the area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing and strengthening programs which support the region's various commercial, engineering, human services, and trade sectors, especially in the computing, medical, petrochemical, and space industries. • Pursuing global outreach consistent with the community's international perspective. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responding to community/school districts' requests for program offerings and development (e.g. Software Engineering, Computer Science, Instructional Technology). • Marketing programs to a larger audience. • Improving the appearance and content of the website (www.cl.uh.edu/disted).
4. Committed to providing a humane, responsive, and intellectually stimulating environment for productive learning and working by emphasizing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning through teaching, research, scholarship, and professional and community service. • The advancement of knowledge. • Delivery of educational opportunities through new instructional technologies and through distance learning. • Commitment to high academic standards. • Sensitivity to the needs of the students and communities served by the institution. • Above all, integrity in all institutional functions. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring that faculty tenure and promotion and program review and development are based on high caliber faculty teaching, research, and service. • Fostering research partnerships between faculty and students. • Evaluating course content and materials to ensure advancement of knowledge. • Seeking and evaluating new technologies to improve delivery. • Offering technology training and orientation to faculty. • Maintaining comparable quality standards for academic and support services off- and on- campus.

Documentation

- 12.1 UHCL's Distance Education Institutional Plan, Submitted to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board in March 2002 (Without Tables and Appendices)

Recommendation 13

The Committee recommends that the University demonstrate that it achieves its distance learning goals and that its distance learning programs are effective and comply with all applicable criteria. (Section 4.5 - Distance Learning Programs)

Visiting Committee Concern

“The University does not currently have a means to measure the effectiveness of its distance learning program. Once a unified set of goals are achieved for all the colleges [schools] within the University, measures should be developed to evaluate the effectiveness of its distance learning program.”

UHCL RESPONSE:

By offering programs through electronic and off-site venues, UHCL enhances equitable access to its educational programs. In addition, distance education offerings reinforce UHCL’s commitment to serve local and regional communities. UHCL distance and extended education course offerings and degree programs are consistent with the quality standards of those offered on campus. UHCL evaluates the quality of the distance education programs using the following methods.

Course and Faculty Evaluation

At the end of each semester, students evaluate distance education courses in the same manner as they do for on-campus courses, using course/instructor evaluation forms (see Document 13.1). School administrators use these course/instructor evaluation forms in their yearly evaluations of full-time and adjunct faculty. To be rehired, adjunct faculty must have positive evaluations. For full-time faculty the evaluations form part of their annual evaluations. UHCL bases its merit distributions on these annual evaluations. Schools also use the data to help improve instruction. (See the response to Recommendation 6.) Actions may include course or

program changes, deletions and additions to curriculum, faculty mentoring, peer review of methods of instruction, and, in extreme cases, termination of faculty. Every five years the University further evaluates all its programs and courses, including those offered at remote sites or over the web, in a rigorous program review process that complies with SACS requirements. The Office Distance and Extended Education (ODEE) has also developed survey instruments for faculty to evaluate course content and delivery for each web course and to assure quality control of distance education courses delivered over the web. In addition, during the third semester of the web development process, web courses undergo rigorous beta testing by students who participated in the courses. Recursive prototype changes are then made to the web courses after the final course evaluations are completed.

Program Evaluation

The degree programs that UHCL provides through distance education duplicate those offered on campus, which have received approval from UHCL's shared governance process, the University of Houston System Board of Regents, the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB), and SACS. The University, therefore, completes planning and development of the degrees before gaining approval for delivery off-campus. Similarly, the approval process for distance education programs requires the department to submit a request for off-campus delivery of the degree to the school, then to the shared governance process at the campus level, then to the UH System for approval. Finally, the institution sends a notification to THECB and to SACS. As noted above, UHCL evaluates distance and off-campus courses every term, consistent with the evaluation of on-campus courses. Every five years each degree program undertakes a program review, at which time the University evaluates in detail the effectiveness of any distance and off-campus component of the degree.

Evaluation of Student Learning outcomes

For on-line courses, UHCL publishes student-centered standards in all printed and electronic web-course syllabi. UHCL is working to provide on-line learner-centered coursework and graduate certificate and degree programs by addressing 8 specific learner-centered proficiencies, including (a) learner-centered knowledge, (b) learner-centered instruction, (c) equity in excellence for all learners, (d) learner-centered communications, (e) learner-centered professional development, (f) learner-centered leadership, (g) learner-centered climate, and (h) learner-centered curriculum. Student evaluation surveys are administered each semester that cover issues of student service delivery, interactivity with instructors, course transmission, resolution of problems, and other issues not covered in the standard faculty evaluation instrument. The forms are appropriate to the medium of delivery of the course: face-to-face off-campus, internet, interactive video, tape, or combination of two or more of these.

To supplement these evaluation instruments, UHCL conducts a graduating student survey each year, and in spring 2002 administered a Customer Service Survey for the first time. This survey gathers information on the value of a degree program and solicits requests for improvement. UHCL will administer this survey annually. Starting in fall 2002, the University will add to the Graduating Student Survey items specifically related to distance education. Students in web courses are expected to participate in web-course orientations each semester, and each syllabus includes posted electronic office-hours of instructors, along with help-desk contact information. The Instructional Technology Center (ITC) offers a web site specifically to assist students with web courses.

Summary of Steps Taken to Ensure the Effectiveness of Distance Education

Goal	Assessment	How used	Improvements Made
1. Develop and deliver high-quality academic programs.	Employing existing Web Course Certification Process (See Document 13.7).	To improve courses, programs, and delivery.	Providing students with sound curriculum consistent with traditional on-campus offerings.
2. Recruit and retain students by improving access and enhancing their educational experience.	Adding new items to the Graduating Student Survey to determine role of distance education courses in student retention.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effecting curricular change when necessary. • Using information to promote, retain, and terminate faculty. • Using data to determine suitability of site and mode of delivery. 	Responding to student needs with distance education offerings through appropriate modes of delivery at appropriate sites (e.g., online INST, SWEN and face-to-face PSYC and Criminology).
3. Evaluate program effectiveness to ensure the quality of educational outcomes.	Having high scores in student evaluation surveys (see Document 13.1).	To determine strengths and weaknesses and ensure quality control.	Maintaining and updating a curriculum that reflects the state of the industry.
4. Provide and assess academic and student support services.	Using “Customer Service Survey.”	To determine the extent and nature of services to be provided.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using synchronous and asynchronous online and distance technology (e.g. CU-CME) to support students at a distance. • Currently, planning to include financial aid and scholarship services to students at a distance.
5. Provide and assess the internal organization and infrastructure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluating yearly the effectiveness of internal organization. • Developing and implementing assessment program. 	To ensure that the current organization and infrastructure support the development of distance education.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring that training, support, and equipment are adequately functioning. • Ensuring that the administrative structures are efficient. • Adding staff, including a secretary and academic advisor and replacing distance education director.

Goal	Assessment	How used	Improvements Made
6. Evaluate delivery modes of distance education and integrate new technologies when appropriate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using course/ instructor evaluation forms (see Document 13.1). • Using Web Design Development Standards (see Document 13.6). 	To stay abreast of the state of the industry and to meet the needs of students and their marketability in a global economy.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attaining high rates of student job placement. • Exploring and achieving employer satisfaction with UHCL graduates. • Offering ongoing training for faculty/staff in new technologies. • Developing and implementing a portal.
7. Track, monitor, and report student and program data.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administering a variety of surveys on an ongoing basis by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. • Using data supplied by the Office of Enrollment Services. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using data for state reporting. • Using data to evaluate the students' overall experience at UHCL. • To determine success in recruiting, retaining, and graduating students. 	Expanding coursework, modes of delivery, and sites to meet the emerging needs of students.
8. Develop a long-range plan.	Using Distance Education Institutional Plan.	To maintain quality standards over time.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring consistency of policies and procedures across programs and schools. • Attaining long-range goals as a result of sustained efforts.
9. Remain responsive to community needs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using Alumni Survey. • Using Development and Advisory Council feedback (see Document 13.10). 	To expand program offerings and venues.	Involving community partners in decision making.
10. Assure that these goals remain consistent with the University of Houston-Clear Lake mission.	Using Distance Education Goals and UHCL mission statement (see table in response to Recommendation 12).	To use distance education mission and goals as a plan of action consistent with UHCL's mission and goals.	Maintaining DE as an integral part of the institution so that all institutional activities sustain distance education's growth.

Documentation

- 13.1 Sample Course/Instructor Evaluation Forms for Distance Education
- 13.2 Sample Approval for Web-Based Program Delivery
- 13.3 Sample Syllabi with “Student-Centered Standards” from Distance Education Courses, Web and Face-To-Face
- 13.4 Graduating Student Survey, 2002
- 13.5 Instructional Technology Web Site for Student Web-Course Assistance
- 13.6 Web Design and Development Standards for Distance Education
- 13.7 Web Course Certification Process for Distance Education
- 13.8 Performance Evaluation Form
- 13.9 Alumni Survey
- 13.10 Development and Advisory Council Sample Agenda
- 13.11 Off-campus Courses, Spring 2002

Timeline

Fall 2002

- Add items to Graduating Student Survey
- Add items to Customer Service Survey

Spring 2003

- Assessment program for distance education implemented

Fall 2003

- Use of assessment results to improve distance education courses and programs

Recommendation 14

The Committee recommends that the university create a process that will regularly evaluate both credit and non-credit continuing education programs. (Section 4.6 - Continuing Education, Outreach and Service Programs)/

Visiting Committee Concern

“Three of the four schools at the University of Houston-Clear Lake have some type of program in continuing education/outreach and service....All of the...programs operate independently and have no systematic method of evaluation.”

UHCL RESPONSE:

In spring 1999, UHCL decided to alter the way it administered its continuing education programs, moving from a centralized to a decentralized structure. Schools received responsibility for administering, and expanding if desirable, continuing education programs which fell within the school mission. UHCL made this decision primarily in order to capitalize on the specific curricular and knowledge strengths of the individual schools and the needs of their publics. The following describes how each school handles its continuing education programs.

The School of Science and Computer Engineering (SCE)

SCE has very little involvement with continuing education and contracts with the School of Business and Public Administration (BPA) to administer such SCE activities. All continuing education courses for SCE originate with explicit requests from SCE’s strategic partners, such as Boeing or NASA. SCE works with BPA’s Center for Advanced Management Programs (CAMP) and follows their rules in working with the requesting party to assure that the needed goals, objectives, and measures are defined before SCE issues a contract for a continuing

education course. SCE then uses CAMP procedures and instruments (discussed under the BPA response to this Recommendation) to assess the course and assure the school and the customer that the course objectives have been met.

School of Education (SOE)

SOE established, effective August 2002, a policy for evaluating all continuing education activities sponsored by the Center for Educational Programs. This policy is included in the July 2002 update of SOE Policies and Procedures. It requires that the Center director meet annually (in August) with the dean to discuss the Center evaluation and assess its implications for program modification and continuation. The Center director and the dean meet at least twice a year to discuss Center programs and its overall operation. As with all staff, the performance of the Center's director is reviewed annually.

School of Human Sciences and Humanities (HSH)

Formal continuing education offerings as a part of HSH began in 1999 with the dismantling of the University's continuing education office (Professional and Continuing Education, or PACE) and the assigning of ongoing continuing education to the schools where those disciplines resided. HSH appointed Dr. Christine Paul to administer the on-going language classes. The program conducts spot evaluations to obtain student feedback. The audience at the conclusion of each program evaluates programs specially prepared for requesting groups. These evaluations are on file in the continuing education director's office

The HSH continuing education program has an Advisory Committee that helps develop the focus, direction, and goals of the continuing education unit itself and the programs it conducts. Additionally, the associate dean of HSH annually evaluates the continuing education director and the unit, although until now no formal policy required it. HSH will amend its

bylaws in fall 2002 to reflect current practice. When the associate dean evaluates the director of continuing education, the attainment of previous goals and objectives is evaluated and new directions planned. Since the program in HSH has completed only two assessment cycles, evaluative history is limited.

School of Business and Public Administration (BPA):

BPA offers all its continuing education courses through the Center for Advanced Management Programs (CAMP). CAMP offers programs to three constituencies: potential students through GMAT/GRE review courses, the professional community through an array of courses which can be found at <http://www.cl.uh.edu/bpa/camp/events.htm>, and the area community through programs such as Successful Money Management and Successful Retirement. The dean of BPA evaluates CAMP annually and CAMP uses the results to make program changes.

In all three schools, UHCL's purposely decentralized continuing education programs enjoy regular evaluation, the results of which the schools use to improve their continuing education offerings. Continuing education courses have expanded and flourished under this system.

Documentation

- 14.1 *SOE Policies and Procedures Manual, Policy For Regularly Evaluating Continuing Education Programs*
- 14.2 BPA Policy For Regularly Evaluating Continuing Education Programs
- 14.3 HSH Policy For Regularly Evaluating Continuing Education Programs
- 14.4 SOE – Analysis of Fall 2001 CEP Seminars
- 14.5 SOE – CEP Self Assessment/Evaluation Data, Fall 2001

- 14.6 Performance Assessment, Dr. Christine Paul, Director of Foreign Languages and Continuing Education, March 2002, and Evaluations of Continuing Education Program Directors
- 14.7 Center for Advanced Management Programs (CAMP), Mission and Programs
- 14.8 CAMP Procedures and Instruments for Assessing Continuing Education Courses

Timeline

Fall 2002

- HSH bylaws amended to formalize evaluation and assessment of school continuing education programs and director by the associate dean

Recommendation 15

The Committee recommends that the University take all steps necessary to ensure the security of its student records, including storage in a secure vault or fireproof cabinet.
(Section 4.7 - Student Records)

Visiting Committee Concern

“Hard copy student records are not kept in a secure vault or in fireproof cabinets. These paper records are currently stored in regular file cabinets.

“Continuing Education records are currently being stored at three different locations (School of Business and Public Administration; School of Education; and Foreign Languages). These records are stored in hard copy within regular file cabinets, and electronically on office PC’s. Security and fire protection are not ensured.”

UHCL RESPONSE

In order to protect the security of student records, the Bayou Building room in which the Office of Enrollment Services (OES) keeps student records has a locking door and frame with a numeric keypad installed in the existing cased opening between the room and the rest of Enrollment Services. Only staff dealing with student records on a daily basis have access to this number. OES will change the number periodically to maintain security.

In addition, University Computing and Telecommunications (UCT) has a Disaster Recovery Plan to provide an infrastructure for maintaining the ability to recover from a range of possible disaster scenarios. The plan covers all computing and telecommunications hardware and software. UCT performs daily incremental backups and weekly full backups of University data, including 12th class day and end-of-semester backups. With the implementation of PeopleSoft in the Spring 2002 semester, the 12th class day backups have been eliminated because UCT contracts with a vendor to provide off-site storage for the weekly, 12th class day and end-

of-semester backups. Should the need arise, these backups can be returned to the University for recovery purposes.

The construction of the new student services/classroom building, scheduled to be open at the beginning of the fall 2004 semester, will significantly increase the space allocation of OES. The plans include the purchase of a new electronic filing system that is fire proof and requires security access codes for the removal of files. The new filing system will be placed in a secure access controlled area within the OES in the new building.

Continuing education records are currently being stored at three different locations (School of Business and Public Administration; School of Education; and Foreign Languages). These records are stored in hard copy within locked file cabinets, and saved electronically in the office PC's data directories. UCT performs daily incremental backups and weekly full backups of University data. UCT's contracts with the vendor to provide off-site storage for record backups also include non-credit courses. For recovery purposes, these backups can be returned to the University if need be.

Documentation

15.1 Work Order for Door and Lock in OES.

Timeline

Fall 2002

- UCT develops and implements a back-up policy to mirror the procedures now in place

August 2004

- Opening of the new student services/classroom building and provision for secure

and fireproof storage of student records

Recommendation 16

The Committee recommends that each part-time faculty member teaching credit courses at the undergraduate level must have at least 18 graduate semester hours in the teaching discipline and hold at least a master’s degree or be justified by the institution as exceptions on an individual basis. (Section 4.8.2.1 - Academic and Professional Preparation – Baccalaureate)

Recommendation 17

The Committee recommends that the institution keep on file for all full-time and part-time faculty members documentation of academic preparations, such as official transcripts as well as official documentation of professional and work experience where appropriate. (Section 4.8.2.1 - Academic and Professional Preparation – Baccalaureate)

Recommendation 18

The Committee recommends that the institution provide evidence that all faculty teaching at the master’s level hold the terminal degree in the teaching discipline or a related discipline, or provide justification on an individual basis of exceptional scholarly or creative activity or professional experience in lieu of the terminal degree. (Section 4.8.2.2 - Academic and Professional Preparation – Graduate)

Visiting Committee Concern (undergraduate)

“After extensive review of the credentials of full and part-time faculty members’ files, the committee found official transcripts or adequate justification for exceptions were missing from the files of some part-time faculty.”

Visiting Committee Concern (graduate)

“A review of the faculty credential files identified files of faculty members who were teaching graduate courses, but did not have documentation that they have a terminal degree in their disciplines.” This was true of both part-time and full-time faculty. In one instance a faculty member lacked an official transcript.

UHCL RESPONSE:

Response to SACS on Non-Compliance with Faculty Credentialing Criteria

School	Faculty	Course Taught	Credentials/Justification
BPA	Joanne Ashland	ACCT 5335/ISAM 5731: EDP Audit and Security (Accounting students may take 12 hours of MIS courses to qualify sitting for the CPA exam, but the Texas State Board of Public Accountancy requires that they have an accounting rubric)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ M.B.A. with an MIS concentration with 21 hours of information systems-based courses on transcript (ISAM 5631, 5632, 5939, 5931, 5731, ACCT 5332: Accounting Information Systems, GOVT 5133: Decision Support Systems ▪ Certified Information Systems Auditor ▪ Approximately 18 years of experience in information systems-related positions, of which 12 years were with Continental Airlines
	Donald J. Minnick	MGMT 4536: Organizational Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ph.D. in Clinical Psychology, University of Texas-Austin (This is a common degree for business faculty teaching organizational behavior classes) ▪ Extensive experience in management organization and behavior. Clients include companies such as Kraft Foods, Texas Instruments, Tenneco Oil, and Transco Energy
	Carol J. Olson, C.P.A.	ACCT 5231: Individual Income Tax	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ M.S. in Accounting with 39 hours of accounting ▪ Certified Public Accountant ▪ 5 years of experience with CPA firms in taxation

School	Faculty	Courses or Level Taught	Credentials/Justification
	Michael Hagan	MKTG 3031: Principles of Marketing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ M.B.A. ▪ M.S. in Finance ▪ Over 18 years of experience in marketing positions (marketing manager, director of sales, business development manager) with companies such as Coca-Cola, Procter and Gamble, and Riviana Foods
	M. H. Jalilian-Tehrani	ACCT 3331: Managerial Accounting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ph.D. in Biology; 33 graduate hours in accounting ▪ Certified Public Accountant ▪ 5 years in Internal Audit at Baylor College of Medicine
	Katrina LeVert	POLS 4133: Civil Liberties in America	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ J.D. ▪ 4 years legal experience dealing with discrimination and civil rights cases
HSH	Jan Simonds	Dance (Graduate)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ M.A. in Dance (Terminal Degree) ▪ Dossier on file ▪ Current transcript on file
SOE	Teresa Laird	Research (Graduate)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ABD at the time of the SACS visit (transcript was on file) ▪ Ed.D. completed in November 2001 but awarding institution did not award degree until May 2002 ▪ Transcript indicating Ed.D. completion currently on file
	Wendy Reistle	TCED 4232: Science and Health in the Elementary School	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ M.S. (Transcript on file) ▪ B.S. in biology and M.A. minor in wildlife biology ▪ Experience with teaching science in the elementary schools from working at the Environmental Institute of Houston

Documentation

16-18.1 Faculty documents described above

Recommendation 19

The Committee recommends that the institution demonstrate that it has clearly defined and publicized eligibility requirements for faculty teaching graduate courses. (Section 4.8.2.3 - Academic and Professional Preparation – Graduate)

Visiting Committee Concern

“Documentation is provided that tenure and tenure track faculty must have a terminal degree, however, no additional requirement could be found for faculty teaching graduate courses.”

UHCL RESPONSE

As the Report of the Visiting Committee pointed out, in “cases where the documentation was up to date, the Committee found that the faculty had appropriate levels of research and/or scholarly activity relative to their assignments.” The University has instructed the deans of the four schools to collect up-to-date vitae from every faculty member when that faculty member submits his or her annual report at the end of the calendar year.

In addition, in September 2002, the Provost’s office will submit to the Educational Policies and Courses Committee (EPCC) the following amendment to UHCL’s graduate faculty definition, designed to satisfy the Visiting Committee’s recommendation.

Tenure-track faculty with a terminal degree in their disciplines, demonstrated competence in teaching, and an ongoing program of scholarly, creative, or research activity as defined by their school’s bylaws are members of the graduate faculty.

Documentation

19.1 Graduate Faculty Definition, *Faculty Handbook*, Section 3.7

- 19.2 Instructions to the Deans to Provide Up-To-Date Faculty Vita with the Annual School Report

Timeline

September, 2002

- Submission to EPCC of amendment to graduate faculty definition

December 2002

- Add approved definition of graduate faculty to the *Faculty Handbook*

Recommendation 20

The Committee recommends that the institution properly limit the number of part-time faculty members to enhance educational effectiveness. (Section 4.8.3 - Part-Time Faculty)

Visiting Committee Concern

“A review by the committee of the total headcount full-time faculty raised questions about the adequacy of that number to provide effective teaching, advisement, scholarship and curriculum development and planning and governance. This is especially important given that the faculty is involved in graduate level teaching and research....The institution has set a 65/35% goal [65% of all SCH’s taught by full-time faculty] for the next five years....It should be noted that although the committee found the setting of this target a valuable first step, it is still only a minimal one, especially for an institution which plans to move at some time in the future to initiate doctoral programs. A strong and well-prepared complement of full-time faculty with ample research opportunities is absolutely necessary to meet the current goals of the education mission.”

UHCL RESPONSE

The University priorities for FY 02 set a four-year goal of increasing the percentage of student credit hours (SCH’s) taught by full-time faculty to 65 percent. In fall 2001, full-time faculty taught 59 percent of the SCH’s, but this figure varied from 51 percent in the School of Education (SOE) to 77 percent in the School of Business and Public Administration (BPA). For FY 03 recommendations have been made to increase full-time positions in areas where the discrepancy between the target goal of 65 percent and the current percentage is greatest. Recruitment for seven new positions and seven replacement positions has been taking place. When it has filled these positions, the University will have demonstrated significant progress in reaching the target in the planned four-year period.

When the University revises its strategic plan during the coming academic year, it may also revise the 65 percent target to take into account other long-term goals such as the addition of

doctoral programs and information from peer institutions. Current data from a group of nine national peers reveals a range of percentages from 56 to 84 with a median of 60 (inclusive of UHCL). Although the 65 percent ratio may appear to be modest, it is nevertheless demonstrably competitive with those of comparable institutions, five of which grant doctoral degrees (see accompanying table).

In regards to the institution's full-time/adjunct ratio, it is important to note that local labor market environments vary among peer institutions. In vibrant urban markets such as Houston's, the availability of professional expertise in the local economy is substantially greater than it is for institutions located in smaller and less diversified areas. In FY 01, probably nine out of ten UHCL graduating master's degree students completed their degrees in professional programs.⁵ A complex corporate, government, and service environment surrounds the institution. Nearby resident professionals work in research and development, management, and service provision for such employers as NASA, IBM, Boeing, Lockheed, several local school districts and hospitals, and governmental and private service agencies such as Child Protective Services and the United Way. These professionals can bring to the classroom practical insights that are invaluable to students interested in careers in similar areas.

At this time, therefore, the University regards the 65 percent target as appropriate to its mission, suitable to its environment, and consistent with its expectations for institutional effectiveness.

⁵ In FY 01, 816 graduate students received a master's degree from UHCL. Of these, 74 received them in programs not generally associated with professional training: cross cultural studies, history, literature, humanities, biology, chemistry, physical science, math, and statistics. UHCL *Fact Book 2001*, Section 2, 19-20.

**Percent of Student Credit Hours
Taught by Full-Time Faculty at UHCL Peer Institutions⁶**

National Peer Institutions	Percent of SCH Taught by Full-time Faculty	Period	Highest Offering
<i>University of Houston - Clear Lake</i>	59	Fall 2001	Masters
Arizona State University – West	66	Fall 2001	Masters
Governors State University	59	Academic Year 2000-2001	Masters
Oakland University	60	Fall 2001	Doctorate
Southern Illinois University - Edwardsville	77	Fall 2000	Masters
University of Baltimore	72	Fall 2001	Masters
University of Illinois – Springfield	84	Fall 2001	Doctorate
University of Missouri - Kansas City	56	Fall 2001	Doctorate
University of North Florida	75	Academic Year 2000-2001	Doctorate
University of West Florida	60	Fall 2001	Doctorate
Median	60		

Documentation

- 20.1 Percent of SCH’s Taught by Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty
- 20.2 FY 02 and FY 03 Funded (65/35 priority highlighted)

Timeline

Fall 2004

- Sixty-five percent of University SCH’s taught by full-time faculty

⁶ Data for this table came from University Institutional Research websites or from representatives of University Institutional Research departments.

Recommendation 21

The Committee recommends that when entering into consortial relationships or contractual agreements, the institution have sufficient control of the relationships/agreements so as to maintain compliance with the *Criteria*. (Section 4.9 - Consortial Relationships and Contractual Agreements)

Visiting Committee Concern

“It is apparent that UHCL does not have adequate control of the use of its institutional name and identity in affiliate relationships whether these relationships were with the American University of Asia or with Sharjah College and the Institute of Technological Studies.”

UHCL RESPONSE

The University of Houston-Clear Lake’s relationships with the Institute of Technological Studies in Sri Lanka and Sharjah College in the United Arab Emirates date back to 1984 and 1988, respectively. The original affiliation agreements were articulation agreements modeled after UHCL’s relationships with the nine member community colleges of the Gulf Coast Community College Consortium in Texas that supply the majority of undergraduate transfers to UHCL. UHCL advised the two foreign universities regarding an articulation agreement which used syllabi adopted from Alvin Community College, a member of the Gulf Coast Community College Consortium.

The agreements with these two educational institutions preceded the issuance of SACS Guidelines on “Establishing Affiliate or Technical Assistance Relationships with International Institutions” which occurred in December 2001.

Based on a review of the new SACS guidelines and conversations with members of our SACS visitation team and our SACS liaison, UHCL has made the decision to terminate its affiliation or articulation agreements with the Institute of Technological Studies and Sharjah

College. Document 21.1 includes letters from UHCL President William A. Staples on May 8, 2002, to Dr. E.M.S. Edirisinghe, President of the Institute of Technological Studies and Sharjah College informing him of this termination.

Document 21.2 includes letters from Dr. E.M.N.S. Edirisinghe of July 23, 2002, acknowledging that Sharjah College and the Institute of Technological Studies are no longer affiliated with the University of Houston-Clear Lake. The letters also include the action steps and timelines for changes in their catalogs, brochures, and web site. One of the letters in Document 21.2 also indicates that the previous reference to the University of Houston-Clear Lake on the transcripts for the American University of Asia has been deleted.

Document 21.3 also includes a transcript, advertising copy, and a picture of university signage at the Institute of Technological Studies which indicates that any affiliation to the University of Houston-Clear Lake has been deleted.

Documentation

- 21.1 Letters from UHCL President Dr. William A. Staples to Dr. E.M.S. Edirisinghe, President of the Institute of Technological Studies and Sharjah College on May 8, 2002
- 21.2 Letters from Dr. E.M.N.S. Edirisinghe to Mr. Jerry Rhodeback, Executive Director of International Initiatives, at the University of Houston-Clear Lake on July 23, 2002
- 21.3 Examples of a Transcript, Advertising Copy, and University Signage Reflecting That the Affiliation to the University of Houston-Clear Lake Has Been Deleted