**Faculty Senate Minutes**

January 13, 2015

LC 243, 3:00-5:00 pm

***Present***: Scott Abbott, Christa Albrecht-Crane, Jon Anderson, Anne Arendt, , Deborah Baird, Nicholas Ball, Howard Bezzant, Debanjan Bhattacharjee, Kathy Black, Dean Bohl, Mark Borchelt, Mark Bracken, Clayton Brown, Kat Brown, Leo Chan, Marty Clayton, David Connelly, Karen Cushing, Courtney Davis, David Dean, Matthew Draper, Debora Escalante, Wioleta Fedeczko, Doug Gardner, Barry Hallsted, Vance Hillman, Matthew Holland, John Hunt, Yang Huo, Ellis Jensen, Ryan Leick, Dianne McAdams-Jones, Gary Mercado, David Morin, Tyler Nelson, CheolHwan Oh, Jeff Olson, Dennis Potter, Sheri Rysdam, Makenzie Selland, Craig Thulin, Alex Yuan

***Excused or Absent***: Steve Allred, Joel Bradford, Monica Campbell, Gloria Gilmore, Tracy Golden, Laurie Harrop-Purser, Carolyn Howard, Dianne Knight, Gary Measom, Leslie Simon, Cyrill Slezak, Allison Swenson, Violeta Vasilevska, Mallory Wallin (UVUSA)

***Guests:***

Call to order – 3:03 p.m.

Approval of Minutes from December 9, 2014. Minutes approved.

SVPAA

* Enrollments are up. A new legislative session is about to begin with funding of 98% of last year’s budget expected.
* Complimented School of the Arts for a fundraiser event held at Zion’s Bank last week. Students did a great job showcasing UVU and their accomplishments.
* Two UVU students received awards from The Mathematics Association of America along with other students from prestigious universities.

UVUSA

* MLK Commemoration event tomorrow in the Ballroom at Noon.

Faculty Senate Awards of Excellence

* Nominations are due to Department Chairs today, January 13, 2015. This is a great opportunity to recognize adjuncts in your area that you feel are deserving of the award.

President

* Reviewed Legislative Update Handout for UVU’s priorities.
	+ Compensation – represents about a 3% increase across the board. This will include merit pay.
	+ Mission- based Funding
		- Student Participation – Using the equity model to present our case. If we don’t continue to receive funds to address growth, we will be back in a previous scenario.
		- Distinctive Mission – Three categories dictated by the Legislature is completion, economic development, and technology.
		- Performance-based Funding – USHE is trying to take the first step by creating a model based on more than just completion. Needs to be done in concert with Student Participation.
	+ Capital Facilities
		- Arts Building – UVU is the only institution that does not have a performing arts building and our students are being recognized nationally for the work they are achieving. Challenge with the building is that the Legislature has made it clear that UVU needs to obtain a significant amount of the funding before the Legislature will consider additional funding.
		- Holland shared that the reason for private funding is due to the Legislature’s push for STEM.
* Legislature updates can be found on the University Relations website. <http://www.uvu.edu/community/legislative/legislative_2015.html>. If you would like to receive email notifications, contact Stephanie Albach in University Relations.
* Obama’s Community College Proposal – Holland noted that UVU is reviewing the information and trying to determine how this announcement will impact our mission.
* Connelly reminded Senate to not under estimate the power of a single constituent to make a difference with the Legislature.
* Parking Conditions – Holland noted Administration is cognizant of the pressures. Two things in the works already. 1) Plan to expand more parking on the immediate campus at some level. 2) They are also looking at student free parking on the Vineyard property with shuttles to campus. 3) Starting the master planning process for Vineyard which will have some implications for the main campus. The real question for Holland is are people ready to pay for parking on campus. On most campuses, faculty has to pay for it. Charging for parking would create a revenue stream which would allow for the creation of additional parking. Connelly will bring some analysis to senate for discussion.

Constitution

* President Elections – Need to determine when elections would be held if the new Constitution has not made significant progress towards final approval. Connelly noted that it is necessary to have a mechanism in place to ensure a proper election process. **MOTION** – Craig Thulin motioned to move the proposed language forward. Jon Anderson seconded. All in Favor? Motion passed. 3 - Abstentions.
* Representation of Senators – Proposal was made to revise the representation as proportional representation to the size of the departments. Reviewed proposal. Threshold was put at 20. Part of the original discussion was to reduce the number of senators. Under both models presented, we are decreasing the overall number of senators as presently constituted and bring more structure. Bohl feels that we are a senate and not a congress and, therefore, do not need to increase the numbers. Fedeczko supports larger departments having more representation in order to meet the needs of the department. A motion was made at a previous senate meeting. All in favor of accepting the revision to be proportional by department? 19 – Motion passed. 6 - Opposed. 7 - Abstentions. Policy is currently in Stage 1. Connelly will revise the Constitution based on the revised representation model and present to President’s Council to move it into Stage 2.

Online & Distance Education

* Anderson currently serves on the Academic Technology Steering Committee (ATSC) and expressed concern regarding the future growth and quality of internet courses at UVU. He presented a request to the Senate as follows: “The Senate, as a representative body, should consider forming a committee to review the University’s current policies and procedures regarding internet based courses, investigate means of ensuring the quality of internet based courses, provide insight into the appropriate incentives necessary for faculty participation, and to draft a resolution for faculty senate’s consideration on this topic.”
* Distance Education (DE) has been officially dissolved and is now part of the Innovation Center. Money for the incentives has been turned over to the deans and will be distributed to the departments. Departments will now be responsible for all aspects of DE with the exception of Live-Interactive (LI) courses.
* Connelly added that part of the restructure is due to departments claiming they did not have control over scheduling courses. In addition, the modality of delivery is now being treated as part of the overall faculty load. Bracken expressed concern over the development of online courses being done without the approval of the department or dean. Part of the restructure eliminated the perverse incentives which were passed onto the students as fees.
* Connelly proposed that the senate needs to have a resolution or conversation about delivery modes and how they fit within the general nature of the institution.
* Chan inquired about who owns the intellectual property of an online course once is has been developed.
* **MOTION** – Jon Anderson motioned that “the Senate, as a representative body, should consider forming a committee to review the University’s current policies and procedures regarding internet based courses, investigate means of ensuring the quality of internet based courses, provide insight into the appropriate incentives necessary for faculty participation, and to draft a resolution for faculty senate’s consideration.” Howard Bezzant seconded. Bracken recommended a representative serve from each college, with the chair and co-chair coming from the senate. Arendt recommended Seth Gurell serve on the committee. Connelly recommended having a scheduler. Bezzant recommended a member from the FCTE serve. Potter noted that the committee should be formed even if they are not able to get a representative from each school/college to serve.
* Connelly will send a general call out to faculty and see who responds. Arendt recommended that the chairs of the committee select the committee members. Anderson and Leick volunteered to co-chair.
* All in favor? Motion passed. 0 – Opposed. 1 - Abstention.

Clayton Christensen Discussion

* Takeaways
	+ Bezzant considered maybe he needs to reevaluate his teaching and look at all viewpoints.
	+ Abbott asked Holland to share his viewpoints.
	+ Holland provided a brief history. Known Clayton for long time. Request for Christensen to come to UVU was a senate request as part of the speaker series. Does not want people to think that Clayton’s views are a model for Holland’s views. Does not share view in regards to scope of online learning, but needs to be done intelligently with quality. Saw conversation as very thought provoking discussion and now it is up to us to decide and define how we can create the best university this can be in light of our mission and the restrictions we have.
	+ Gardner noted that his take is that Clayton’s ideas due not necessarily apply to all higher education.
	+ Chan not convinced that online learning can replace brick and mortar education.
	+ Abbott expressed that Christensen’s theory suggests if you put forth an inferior product, the people who are doing quality work are going to oppose it because it’s not as good as what they are doing. Then he moved to the theory of the “visible hand” where then the administration is going to have to oppose it because faculty would never agree to deliver an inferior product. Felt it was absurb.
	+ Escalante commented that when talking about the inferior product she interpreted it as having companies that are doing things at a very high level and there are a lot of people who can’t participate at that level so they are non-consumers. Eventually, someone comes up with a product that is more appropriate for those consumers. It sounds like Harvard vs. Community Colleges. Observations in the real world, there is a need for Harvard, Ivy Leagues, and R1s. There is also a need for community colleges. There’s a need for face-to-face and online. She felt Christensen was noting what was happening in higher education.
	+ Connelly reminded all that the invite was an ongoing attempt by Senate to bring speakers to campus. Senate is encouraged to provide recommendations regarding speakers who are also affordable.

Adjunct update

* Arendt noted the committee is still collecting information. They are surveying schools across the Mountain West area and are close to bringing the data to senate.

Abbott Revision

* Think about how we move the conversation forward in regards to material that was sent out.

MOTION – Dennis Potter motioned to adjourn at 4:40 p.m. Jon Anderson seconded. Meeting adjourned.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Faculty | Sens under original | Rep | Sens under amendment |
| **CAPS** |  |  | 3 | 10.0% | 8.7 |  | 3 | 8.1% |
| Aviation Science | 9 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Criminal Justice | 8 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Emergency Services | 9 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
|  | 26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **CHSS** |  |  | 7 | 23.3% | 18.9 |  | 10 | 27.0% |
| Behavioral Science | 23 | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Communication | 12 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| English/Lit | 40 | 1 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |
| History/Political Science | 18 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Integrated Studies | 4 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Interdisciplinary Studies | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Languages | 17 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Philosophy/Humanities | 18 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
|  | 132 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **CSH** |  |  | 9 | 30.0% | 15.1 |  | 12 | 32.4% |
| Biology | 25 | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Chemistry | 14 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Dental Hygiene | 4 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Earth Science | 12 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Exercise Science | 12 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Mathematics | 24 | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Nursing | 20 | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Physics | 14 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Public & Community Health | 11 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
|  | 136 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **SOA** |  |  | 4 | 13.3% | 14.8 |  | 5 | 13.5% |
| Art & Visual Communication | 20 | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Dance | 13 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Music | 14 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Theatrical Arts | 12 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
|  | 59 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **SOE** |  |  | 2 | 6.7% | 14.0 |  | 2 | 5.4% |
| Elementary Ed | 17 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Secondary Ed | 11 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
|  | 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **WSB** |  |  | 5 | 16.7% | 13.0 |  | 5 | 13.5% |
| Accounting | 12 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Finance | 18 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Legal Studies | 6 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Management Marketing | 15 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Marketing | 14 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
|  | 65 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **TAC** |  |  | 9 | 30.0% | 10.7 |  | 9 | 24.3% |
| Automotive Tech | 11 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Computer Science | 17 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Constructin Tech | 7 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Culinary Arts | 7 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Digital Media | 14 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Engineering Graphics | 8 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Engineering Tech | 9 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Informational Systems | 16 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Technology Management | 7 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
|  | 96 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **UC** |  |  | 3 | 10.0% | 18.3 |  | 4 | 10.8% |
| Basic Comp | 17 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Devel Math | 25 | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Student Learning | 13 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
|  | 55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  | **30** |  |  |  | **37** |  |  |

Internet Based Courses

Prepared by: Jon Anderson, Developmental Mathematics

**Issue in need of Consideration:**

Internet based courses are courses where a fundamental portion of the education of the class is done using the internet. This includes, but is not limited to, online courses, hybrid courses, and live-interactive courses. There has been a growing concern over how these classes have been handled across the country. For instance, the rise of Massively Open Online Courses gained some hype and, while decreasing, is still influencing how higher education looks at online courses.

Here at UVU, discussions and conversations have already taken place regarding the creation of more internet based classes. This is partly based on the forecasted growth of the university, providing ways to offer classes to the largest audience possible.

The items to be considered are how to best plan for the future growth of internet based courses, how to ensure that the quality of online courses meets that of the traditional delivery method (lecture), how to support the classes that are being offered, and how to incentivize faculty to participate in the creation, maintenance, and teaching of these courses once created.

**Proposed Request:**

The Senate, as a representative body, should consider forming a committee to review the University’s current policies and procedures regarding internet based courses, investigate means of ensuring the quality of internet based courses, provide insight into the appropriate incentives necessary for faculty participation, and to draft a resolution for faculty senate’s consideration on this topic.

**Cursory Summary of Potential Concerns/Considerations Related to Internet Based Courses**

**Quality Concerns:**

According to the Inside Higher Ed1, faculty members “continue to fear that the record-high number of students taking [online] classes are receiving an inferior experience to what can be delivered in the classroom.” This thought has been echoed by faculty members during various discussions in our own faculty senate. It is important that the use of any internet based course be created in such a way as to offer the highest quality possible. Measuring quality can be a tricky business2,3, so it is imperative that techniques to do so are investigated fully. Faculty need to play a key role in the implementing the quality control mechanisms the university uses in internet based courses.

**Faculty Support:**

A faculty member who takes on an internet based course may need support in creating an environment conducive to online learning. This includes support in creating and maintaining all of the course material found online. It may also require teaching assistants and graders who are able to communicate well in an online environment. Currently, Distance Ed provides much of the support at Utah Valley University for internet based courses7. This support will be relocated based on the type of course offered, but most non-financial support services will still be offered.

**Faculty Incentives:**

Utah Valley University offers incentives to faculty. The current incentive currently encourages large classes – the more students that are involved in the online class, the larger the payout is to the faculty member8,9. There are other models used to compensate and incentivize faculty participation10,11,12. Most of these models rely on cash incentives, as well.

**Financial Rationale:**

Internet based courses provide several incentives to the institution as a whole. An online course does not require a physical location for students to meet. Live interactive courses allow one instructor to instruct several students across a wide geographic area. Blended courses may utilize classroom space less than a full face-to-face lecture. This can allow for a larger student body without necessitating more classroom space. However, there are also costs involved in internet based courses, including educational platforms, third party software, compensation for faculty, and quality control.

**References:**

1. <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/survey/online-ed-skepticism-and-self-sufficiency-survey-faculty-views-technology> - highlights from a survey of faculty attitudes on technology.
2. <http://www.npr.org/blogs/ed/2014/06/27/323329818/chasing-the-elusive-quality-in-online-education> - Chasing the Elusive ‘Quality’ in Online Education
3. <http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/spring141/shelton141.html> - Review of paradigms for evaluating the quality of online education programs
4. <http://www.uwec.edu/AcadAff/resources/edtech/upload/Best-Practices-in-Online-Teaching-Strategies-Membership.pdf>
5. <http://jolt.merlot.org/vol6no2/keengwe_0610.pdf>
6. <http://www.designingforlearning.info/services/writing/ecoach/tenbest.html>
7. <http://www.uvu.edu/de/> - Distance Education
8. <http://disted.uvu.edu/compensation/DE_comp_summary.pdf> - Distance Education compensation model
9. <http://disted.uvu.edu/compensation/cap_115.pdf> - Addendum to compensation
10. <http://www.geteducated.com/teaching-online-courses/253-online-teaching-opportunities> - compensation models
11. <http://provost.ncsu.edu/governance/task-forces/distance-education/2011/documents/faculty-compensation-models-literature-review-summaries.pdf> - 2011 paper
12. <http://cms.bsu.edu/-/media/WWW/DepartmentalContent/OnlineAndDistanceEd/PDF/FacultyCompensationHandbook.pdf> model at BSU

Unanimous Judges’ Decision

on the

Debate Concerning

The UVU Senate Resolution

“On the Value of Teaching and Research in the Context of Existing Salary Structures and Hiring Decisions”

Winner: President Matthew Holland

Loser: Professor Scott Abbott and the Resolution He Sponsored

 It was a smackdown, the judges said, a case of inaccurate information corrected by the true facts. The Senate was schooled, the judges said, reduced to obsequious declarations that “you are the best university president I have served with in 30 years” and timorous requests that the PBA meetings might perhaps be scheduled somewhat differently if possible. It was an open-and-shut case, the judges concluded.

 The judges noted in passing that the Senate missed several opportunities.

1. When the President corrected the claim that *of the top 50 salaries at the university, virtually all are paid to administrators or to people who have been administrators* with a chart that showed that of the top 50 salaries 25 go to members of the faculty, the Senate should have asked to see the list in descending order. That might have revealed a hierarchy like the one the resolution deplored, even if somewhat less striking. It might have shown that some of the 25 members of the faculty are former administrators or that they are financial beneficiaries of large on-line classes. The Senate would have done well, the judges suggested, to point out that most of the three dozen top university administrators are among the top 50 and very few of the hundreds of UVU faculty appear in that group—a clear hierarchy of values.
2. Why didn’t the Senate, the judges asked, point out that the “cupa” averages the President cited so often are simply aggregations of what is currently the case? They mirror a system that has, over several decades, skewed toward administrators. Rather than comparing ourselves to what is the case, why not push for a salary structure that better reflects what we say we value: good professors with good students in good classes?
3. When the President addressed the claim that *salaries for administrators have increased by about 30% over the past five years while salaries for faculty have increased only by several 1% increments during the same period*, correcting those numbers with a chart that indicated that the disparity was not as bad as 30% to 5%, the judges wondered why the Senate didn’t concede the figures and ask why, even so, a disparity exists. If the Senate had been more prepared for this aspect of the debate, it might have quoted extensively from [“The Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession, 2013-2014”](http://www.aaup.org/reports-publications/2013-14salarysurvey) by the AAUP:

. . . the salaries paid to senior administrators are highly symbolic. As we have argued previously, they serve as a concrete indication of the priorities accorded to the various components of the institution by its governing board and campus leadership. Disproportionate salary increases at the top also reflect the abandonment of centuries-old models of shared campus governance, which have increasingly been replaced by more corporate managerial approaches that emphasize the “bottom line.” . . . Increasingly, institutions of higher education have lost their focus on the academic activities at the core of their mission. Spending on administrative overhead continues to draw funding away from academic programs, . . . the pattern of substantial salary increases for a very few senior administrators noted in previous years continues while full-time faculty salaries stagnate; the overwhelming majority of our academic colleagues struggle to provide excellent instruction while mired in precarious contingent appointments. . . .

It doesn’t have to be this way . . . too many decisions regarding the spending and employment priorities of our colleges and universities are carried out in secret by a few individuals, and that secrecy has clouded our collective focus.

1. Most of all, the judges were surprised that the Senate didn’t notice that the President seemed to agree with many of the points of the resolution. He said that he saw the work that goes on between faculty and students as our core value. He demonstrated that he had worked to raise salaries for adjuncts and that he recognized the need for a merit system to reward exceptional work by full-time faculty. He is committed to hiring more tenure-track faculty, he said. Why then, the judges asked, if there was this general agreement, was so much time spent correcting inaccurate numbers?

Looking back, the main problem with the Senate Resolution may be that it was crafted in a way that called for a debate. Debates have winners and losers, as did this one. Although the adversarial form of the debate precluded dealing with important issues, the second part of the Senate Resolution included this explanation meant to encourage discussion about various aspects of shared governance:

The UVU Senate Resolution on Shared Governance (2009) and the newly released [AAUP Centennial Declaration](http://www.aaupdeclaration.org) similarly emphasize the necessity of shared governance in the service of teaching and research. The AAUP Centennial Declaration puts it this way:

*Faculty shared governance is the cornerstone of any university that values teaching and research. The authority of faculty in hiring decisions, promotions, and curricular matters should not be compromised by donors, trustees, or administrators. Similarly, the faculty voice in budgeting, institutional planning, and other internal operations should not be marginalized.*

The current system of “shared” governance at UVU allows only for *recommendations* from the Faculty Senate and by members of the faculty. There is, however, no accountability to the faculty thereafter. Administrators simply announce their decisions.

 If, then, we wish to discuss ways to move to a more robust shared governance, where might we begin? With a focus, perhaps, on decisions being made about curricular matters tied to budgeting and institutional planning. Here are suggestions for several questions that we (and by we I mean the President, the Academic Vice President, and the Senate) might address over the course of Spring Semester, none of which has a yes-or-no answer, but each of which bears discussion between faculty and administrators:

1. As we contemplate increased enrollments, are efforts to increase numbers of students in on-line courses (the “Presidential Report to the Community” states that on-line courses are a “21st-Century Solution”) and in large classes (note the size of classrooms in the new Classroom Building) a weakening of our commitment to quality education? Are they a simple necessity? Can they be done well? What are the tradeoffs? Does the current system that awards additional pay to teachers of on-line courses undermine the salary structure of the university? Does an on-line system meant to teach large numbers of students at a minimal cost undermine the moral status of the university?
2. Departments have been awarded something like 10 new lectureships this year to lessen our reliance on adjuncts (see the PBA report). That is one efficient way to improve the adjunct/full time ratio. What are the tradeoffs for such efficiency? Is adding a separate class of lecturers who teach 5 courses a term in the best interest of our students and of our departments? Are there better ways to address the problematic reliance on adjunct faculty, ways that provide other benefits as well?
3. When the committee currently crafting a merit system finishes a draft of their recommendation, will there be a public discussion of the issue, one leading to an improved draft?
4. And so on.

Let’s award the debate trophy to the President, then, and get on with the meaningful discussion that any shared governance requires.

(This is **not** a suggestion that the Senate form new committees to craft resolutions related to these and other issues. Because we are only an advisory body, that kind of ad-hoc work can feel like spinning wheels. It **is** a suggestion that there should be meaningful discussion among faculty and administrators on these and other issues. It **is** a suggestion that the administration approach us with questions rather than decisions. It **is** meant to raise questions about how we make decisions and to argue that the Faculty Senate, at least, should be part of any planning and decision making related to teaching and research and hiring and so on. When decisions are made about key aspects of what and how we teach, they ought to be made after proposals are put forward for discussion and they should be made jointly.)