Faculty Senate Minutes  
December 6, 2011  
LC 243, 3:00-5:00 pm


Excused or Absent: Bret Boyer, Leslie Farnsworth, Phil Gordon, Carolyn Howard, Farid Islam, Brian Jensen, Amir Kia, Phil Matheson, Kristin Mecham, David Millet, Margaret Mittelman, Jeff Packer, Evelyn Porter, Paul Tayler, Rick Vincent

1. Call to order by John Balden – 3:03 pm – Silent roll sent around.

2. John Balden moved to change the proposed agenda to move item 9 on the agenda to just after item 3 followed by item 9a to discuss the ad hock committee response to the Urquhart white paper. Proposal to adjust the order of the agenda passed.

3. Minutes of the November 22, 2011, meeting were approved.

4. Matthew Holland – Wanted to share with you some observations about some larger forces at work in higher education and the responses to these forces… it has bearing on these things that we are considering with Senator Urquhart’s white paper, etc.

There are things going on which will have a significant impact on higher education and may well change the entire landscape within which we operate. It is important not to over react to the trends, fads, etc. that are at work. But, this is distinctly different. Here is what I think is happening and what we are hearing as we work with civic leaders, etc (and others who have influence with these things). You need to be part of the conversation in how we respond to and address these issues. We need to consider how we can involve the rest of the campus community and how we can respond and navigate the challenges and opportunities.

CURRENT FORCES (Slide Presentation)

I want to mention five forces in the history of the development of higher education. All of these forces are currently putting simultaneous pressure on higher education:

1. Exploding student growth. (true here… not everywhere). We live in one of the fastest growing counties in one of the fastest growing states.
2. Increasing Need for Education (more generally). When I grew up in this valley, you could go off and get some training and forge a decent life. However, those days have changed. A post secondary degree is almost critical. More robust training is critical. The goal for Utah (state level analysis tells us) is to have 66% of adults with post secondary training… So, in terms of natural growth and the rates staying as they are… it puts pressure on our program. Our headcount projections are projected to grow from 33,395 to 46,340 (in the next 10 years)... Annualized FTE will rise as well. Public recognition of where we are can be found in the Salt Lake Tribune, the Daily Herald. Our Unique Educational Mission places us in an interesting position to innovate. UVU is unique in our success so far to offer many two and four year degrees in the same institution. We have been especially noted for the structured enrollment program and the press has given us very positive coverage. Juniors and seniors represent a bulk of UVU’s growth (as they are no longer transferring to other programs). People are noticing…. UVU continues to grow. Students love it here. They don't want to transfer. They have a range of programs to utilize here. We are an attractive place for people to pursue higher education.

3. Slowing or Shrinking of the Economic Growth (things are still precarious nationally and internationally). If things go south with the Euro, we may not be out of the problems of the last few years.

4. Technological Revolution (all around us). There are technologies which are changing the ways which education can be delivered. Students are growing up in a different time than what we grew up in… We have to take stock of that.

5. The Grow of Entitlement Programs. In the context that we are in… these programs are biting into what has historically been general funds towards education. Every year, state and national level spending is going down (for education). These five things put extraordinary pressure on our education.

Here are the national/local responses:

USHE RESPONSE: 2020 Report published
Institutional Mission Definitions
Big Goal is 66% and pushing citizens towards completion
System/Institutional priorities/goals:
  a) Increase participation
  b) Increase Completion rates
  c) Stimulate Economic Development

LEGISLATIVE REACTION
  Governor Herbert's Commission on Excellence in Education
  High school to postsecondary education transition
  Postsecondary education and workforce alignment
  Introduction of a bill to Eliminate Tenure
Regents Post-Tenure Policy

The changing environment was particularly evident in the visit the UVSELF group had with state leaders at the capitol this semester. Ian Wilson was there and I would like him to comment on that experience.

**Ian Wilson:** Executive Leadership program of 12 faculty/staff is a wonderful program to help UVU employees learn the political system, economic forces, etc. in the university. Val Petersen set up an opportunity for the cohort to talk with the legislators. Several spoke about the issues President Holland just discussed. It is not business as usual... they are looking for us to be more innovative and move forward in creative ways and meet these needs and help students get in and out and graduate and get on with their lives. They are looking for less costly and more effective ways....

People tend to believe that higher education is something that the legislature has to take care of and fund... However, this is not true... Legislators understand this... and it will not be a mandate until a new mentality comes together... The legislators are excited about structured enrollment and other ways to access an education. Even if the economy turns around, the money might not flow back to higher education...

**Matthew Holland** – Senator Steve Urquhart, Chair of the Higher Education appropriations committee, put together a white paper to try to think creatively and across the board about how we deal with all these forces. There is a manifestation of that we have been engaging him in a thoughtful reflection on the process. In some ways, he has changed 180 degrees in his attitude... We brought him in and invited him to see things. He has a healthier respect for our mission and ideas. I think that what the Senate put together were useful and thoughtful. There is lots to talk about. Absolutely, this is the kind of thing that we want to do... and are doing. There seem to be some softening of his position particularly where UVU is concerned.

Disrupting Technologies are another force we have to deal with. They are innovations that help create a new market and value network and eventually disrupt existing markets and value networks by displacing earlier technologies. Technology is disrupting education... proprietary schools and for-profit schools are moving in... what does this mean? There is a school of thought that we have to embrace it. The future may be online, virtual, etc. delivery of educational content. These forces are at work and influencing the public and private education policy.

**PUBLIC RESPONSE**

Complete College America is a non-profit organization focused "solely on dramatically increasing the nations' college completion rate through state policy change, and to build consensus for change among state leaders, higher education, and the national education polity community. College America is seeking innovation to progress in:

Accelerated pathways to graduation
Best practice in remediation
Seamless transfer credit policies
Incentizing completion
etc.

These conversations are going to affect us. These things are moving forward. I would like us to be more proactive and more forward thinking. We have a sense for what our students need and what it means to be a serious university. We are going to have to do that in the context of these forces. We do not have to accept such thing as our fate. Unless we think about our response, we will be unable to deliver.

Our Unique Education Mission process is one response to these forces. There are going to have to be some different models. We are pioneering a model. It provides us a way to do something that meets the service needs of this region. The question is: How do we continue to do it and how do we get better at it?

Utah Valley University is the fourth largest, open admissions, four-year institution in the nation. Of the top five institutions, UVU is the only one to award a roughly equal number of associate and bachelor degrees. We are proud of the community college function and of our university function. The state of Utah will not likely build another community college anytime soon…

The public reaction to our Structured Enrollment program has always been about how we intend to maintain a delicate balance act…
  The Daily Herald had a story and op-ed
  The Deseret News had front page coverage.
  Salt Lake Tribune: Two editorials… UVU as a model for other Utah institutions.

In the midst of all these forces, we are finding ways to innovate at the same time that we handle access… not an easy thing to do… But, we are committed to doing it.

We have to work through those things…. If you have questions/feedback, I'm happy to facilitate that… then, let's talk about a larger conversation around campus…

Craig Thulin – The USHE 2020 report seems to be at odds with the goal of completion rates; based on the fact that we are admitting more less-than-qualified students. We are bringing in more people who are unprepared… this may lead to a decrease in the completion rate… These are at least at some level conflicting goals… I had not realized that before. The number of degrees awarded have been going up… the completion percentage of degrees is going down…

Holland – It puts more pressure on the completion concern. It is a daunting task.

Russ Thornley – It seems that there is an assumption manifest in the media that we are changing the ways education can be delivered (it assumes a metaphor for electronic delivery). Clayton Christenson's way is more lip service than effectiveness… in all of
that, I see the role of professorship and what it means to be a scholar or academic being overlooked. Is that role merely one cog in the education machine… In all of this talk, I'm wondering where people are doing studies on faculty satisfaction as it is and where it will be when faculty move to/experience teaching online courses. In my view, delivering education with unfulfilled scholars is the way to get crappy education. Most people don't go into education for the big bucks… we do it for society… it gives us some sense of fulfillment. Education is not just providing content… not just one cog in the wheel… what are you seeing in terms of research in faculty fulfillment?

**Lars Eggerston** - What kind of fulfillment do students receive (with little or no interaction with the professor)?

**Thomas Henry** – The students have different expectations and have different learning styles.

**Merlene Bacon** – having the students in a classroom makes a huge difference in the interaction that adds to the educational process. I recently spent some class time with my online students… it was a give and take… what you can't get online…

**David Connelly**– Just because we do it doesn't mean it needs to be done, and just because we don't like it, doesn't mean we shouldn't do it.

**David Knolton** – I think there is another issue, some assume that the point of education is to imprint content. Education is more than the delivery of content, there are skills, abilities, etc. These abilities are not developed by acquiring content. What we do as we teach interaction interpersonal skills? We need to define what the creation of knowledge is?

**Lorraine Wallace** – The ability to interact is needed to truly transfer many of the concepts that we need to build in our students. It is the synergy. Content is important. Skills are important. It is the interaction is what education is all about.

**Lars Eggerston** - Do you think that the legislator is even open? Or do they have their own agenda because of money or cost?

**Matt Holland** – That will vary with legislators. Senator Urquhart knows the difference… we can engage him in these ideas… he is intelligence and appreciates what happens in education.

There are many people engaged in this discussion. Some are aware that higher education is a significant part of the state budget. Their question is “Do we pay more for medicaid or more for education? What do you want us to do?” They are facing these points. Some understand… others are quite frustrated by the realities that they are faced with

**Stan Jenne** – We need to differentiate ourselves from the problems and make ourselves appear as part of the solution. We need to continue to try to educate, even the legislature.
We need to bring the myths of internet instruction into reality. Online courses often take more time to service by faculty than in-class delivery. We need to teach the value of higher education. Prosperity 2020 is an example of the value argument.

**Unknown** – Trying to deliver more cheaper, faster, and better… is going to take a toll. I'm worried about that. Whatever we do about quality needs to be in the discussion.

**Russ Thornley** – The principle is a utilitarian ethic. Once things have shifted to that ethic, then we will be evaluated on that ethic. We will be blinded by other things at work here. The underlying ethic on which the decisions are being made will prove us out. One of the opportunities that we have is emphasizing ethical education. We need to emphasize that we need to offer emotional and other qualities… things that cannot be emphasized online. The emotion or passion that we as faculty bring to the table is what cannot be packaged and distributed through an online course.

**Lawrence Gray** – Question regarding the privatization of public education.

**Pierre Lamarche** – Question regarding expanding night and summer classes.

**Holland** – We have resources to hire personnel to work with summer and weekends/nights. There is more room to expand. Those are tools that we are trying to develop as evidenced in the white paper. There are other strategies that we need to pursue. The white paper is a start to the process of addressing the changes that we are facing. We have to come at these things with an open mind. These traditions in the academy have developed over thousands of years…. Looking at our local, national, and international situation, we need to look at these things. We are leading. We are seen as an institution that is not just sitting back thinking that we will return to the old ways. There are some philosophical assumptions that we need to follow concerning the delivery of education. Changes will happen everywhere in the country. We want to challenge the students and deliver a value education. That is our commitment. We will seize the moment. I am committed to this.

We cannot just go along as many institutions have gone along… we see problems with the public and privates. Kids are questioning the value of an ivy league degree; many students cannot recuperate from paying for that education. We want to challenge and inspire students in person. Yet, we live in the world that we live in… we have to explore the things in the white paper. That's my commitment: We look at these things (before it is forced upon us).

The question is “How do we lead and innovate? And how do we get this information out to the rest of the faculty?”

**Stan Jenne**- Use smaller groups to inform the faculty, like school faculty meetings.

**Russell Thornley** - Use the SOTE conference to find these ways to innovate and work through these things…
President Holland had to leave for a prior commitment. He wished us all a “Merry Christmas.”

**John Balden** – Did Ian Wilson have any other issues to address?

**Ian Wilson** - No further comments!

**John Balden** – Our next agenda item is the Faculty Senate response to Senator Urquhart’s white paper.

Short discussion on the order of the agenda

**Lyn Bennett** - Move to suggest a time limit for the discussion: 10 Minutes to go over the response paper. Motion was seconded and approved.

**Lyn Bennett** - Under college readiness: Instead of "poor completion rates" we should use something more like "below average completion rates" or "Unacceptable." We should italicized the titles of periodicals, if possible.

**Stan Jenne** - The only reference to technology is on the second page "Less expensive (online classes)." If we could get that point across: Online learning has not been proven to be less expensive.

**Russell Thornley** - Total cost of ownership (has to include the cost of distance education departments and everything that comes to play…).

**Craig Thulin** - Email me comments. The distribution plan is to post to response to the blog in the next day or so.

**David Connelly** – We should send an official copy from the Faculty Senate to the Senator.

**Ian Sorensen** - A large community of people will require remedial courses and developmental courses….

MOTION was made that we accept the document to be sent out to the faculty senate and a 24 period for review and sent by mail. Motion was seconded and approved.

**David Connelly** - January 13th there is a meeting scheduled at the University of Utah to discuss these ideas (from the White Paper). David Connelly has details (is going too). He invited others to attend the meeting.

4. Representative Reports

Student Council Representative David Millet - Not Present
PACE Representative - Leslie Farnsworth also not present.

5. Request for committee members for Policy 632 - Advancement in Rank
Jhn Balden requested volunteers for the Drafting of the Advancement in Rank policy. Arlen Card and Matthew Draper volunteered.

**Lyn Bennett**- Can we seek some faculty at large to participate?

**John Balden** – Yes. Send the names to me by e-mail.

6. This link to SELT’s in Qualtics will give you some idea on how the SELTs might look. In reality, the UVU system might form them differently. The senators were encouraged to go and take a look at the proposed instrument. [http://uvu.qualtrics.com//SE/?SID=SV_cAsvlgUdpL5ByKY](http://uvu.qualtrics.com//SE/?SID=SV_cAsvlgUdpL5ByKY)

This is proposed to take the place of the SRIs. Please send feedback to Ian Sorensen. It would not replace the SRI until Fall 2012.

7. **Lyn Bennett** – Policy Information Items:

Policy 637 - Faculty Tenure - Limited scope
The policy committee submitted our comments for review. Questions or comments? No concerns were expressed. A motion to send the policy forward from the senate was made and seconded. The motion passed.

Policy 612 - Course Content Modification
The policy committee submitted our comments for review. The committee felt very strongly that the faculty senate should discuss the creation of this new policy before any other action is taken. Our concern was whether it should exist as an independent policy or as part of policy 601? Is this policy in the best interests of the faculty? And, should the accommodation be in policy? This policy goes beyond the faculty member's power. Does the policy meet our needs? Do we need it?

**Ian Sorensen**- We need a policy. It needs to dictate specifically how to deal with this problem. We should go forward with the first question: Do we need it?

MOTION That we discuss it in two sections: 1) We do need it? and 2) how do we respond? Then vote on each question separately. Motion seconded

**Arlen Card**- The purpose of this is to set up parameters and provide for protection from liability.

**David Jones**- The policy provides clarification for what to do.

**Russell Thornley**- The description “Course content modification” does threaten academic freedom. To allow the student or anyone else to modify the content that I'm
Choosing is to question the faculty member’s expertise in the subject.

**Unknown** – Don’t we already have policies for accommodation that would cover these issues?

**David Jones** - I believe that accommodation is for disabilities. I am familiar for why the University of Utah has this policy. It was part of the settlement of the lawsuit. It would be helpful to refer to the policy they created. The University of Utah policy is one of the important sources for this policy. The drafter/writers took verbatim some of this information. The student has the burden to show a need for an adjustment to the course requirements. If you want to title it something else, that would certainly be acceptable.

**Matthew Draper**- I’m afraid of the rogue student. Many faculty are against this policy, however, because of the nature of policy provisions, faculty only have input.

Call the question: We do need this policy?

The vote was 14 in Favor, 17 Opposed 1 Abstention: MOTION FAILS

Comments (allowed):

**David Jones**: Senate needs to make a case…. I think whatever decisions you make. We need to articulate our reasons. I think that it’s important. I think that we need to discuss why or why not. We still have recommendations.

**Ian Wilson**- All comments will come forward. They go to Cara O'Sullivan. That's part of shared governance. The fact is that faculty senate cannot veto the policy. Voting against it does not make it go away. Any comment you give us will go forward. We will talk about it (and how we might incorporate the suggestions or make changes).

Consider the IRB policy. It went back and forth… we, as an institution, worked on it. We can do this…. This policy can be revised… there is a ton of space to revise. Yes, there is an approval policy. It is a collective process and everyone has input. We will send forward any comments.

**Stan Jenne**- If a student has substantial objections consistently to a course content, they should be counseled to take another course or major.

**Craig Thulin**- I was given the idea that the input is going to be part of the process. If we had this policy, it would encourage students to try to find a reason to find something wrong with the course.

Other comments and discussion were had regarding the reasoning for having or not having such a policy.

**Thomas Henry** – Motion to adjourn and reconvene on this issue on January 17th.
Motion passed – Meeting adjourned at 5:10 P.M.