

Faculty Senate Minutes
Thursday, September 27, 2001, 3:30 P.M.
Hunter Conference Center, Yankee Meadows Room

In attendance: Senators - Steve Evans (Pres.), Brian Heuett (Pres. Elect), David Lund (Secretary), Joe Baker (Treasurer), Virginia Stitt (Parliamentarian), Robert Eves, Art Porter, Greg Colf, Rick Lambson, Ben Davidson, Steve Heath, Rea Gubler, Lamar Jordan as proxy for Boyd Fife (proxy letter on file), Deborah Hill, Tom Cunningham, Ron Martin, Steve Barney, Eric Brown, Richard Dotson as proxy for Idir Azouz (proxy letter on file), Jim Mills, Kay Anderson, Darin Wadley, and James Aton; Visitors: Carl Templin (Provost), Cynthia Wright, Rhiannon Bent (Journal), Diana Graff, Ken Mumford, John Groesbeck, and SUU President Steven Bennion. Senator absent: Curt Bostick.

I. Call to order: President Steve Evans, at 3:30 pm

II. Review and approval of minutes from previous meeting. Two corrections were made: First the section on the Governor's 2.5% holdback of funds to higher education was to be clarified, and it was suggested that some of the longer sections be broken into paragraphs. Motion to approve with amendments: Tom Cunningham; Motion seconded: Joe Baker; Vote to approve as amended unanimous in the affirmative.

III. Priority Items for Discussion

A. Leave, rank, and tenure questions: Steve discussed two difficulties we all experience in forming LRT committees. He first suggested some sharing of members between departments. Second, he brought up the issue of the new LRT policy, and indicated that it is to be used now; however, those reviewing files/portfolios will need to use good judgment in reviewing files of those who have been hired under the old LRT policies.

Darin Wadley specifically questioned what review committees were to do as they reviewed files created under the old policy, in light of the fact that the new policy was to take effect immediately. John Groesbeck, who drafted a policy on grandfathering, discussed the problem of grandfathering with faculty members applying for tenure, and whether faculty who had been hired with Masters Degrees could or could not apply for tenure. Carl Templin indicated that the source of the grandfathering question was a faculty member who had applied for tenure with only a Masters Degree.

John Groesbeck was then given the floor as an invited guest to discuss the recommendation that department/unit LRT committees be the deciding group to determine whether those affected (those with Masters only) can

or cannot apply. Richard Dotson brought up the legality of changing policy and John indicated that Mike Carter had determined that the University could in fact change policy. Robert Eves asked if this was not addressed in the discussion of the Deans' Council. John replied that the recommendation was based on the fact that since the departments/units themselves have established the criteria for LRT, it followed naturally that the same committee should be in charge of deciding how to grandfather in employees who have been hired under old policy. Robert Eves then moved that the FS support a resolution to support the resolution of the Deans' Council as worded. The motion was seconded by Rea Gubler. In the ensuing discussion Art Porter indicated that the resolution actually gives the department the right to disqualify someone from tenure track and proposed that we amend the resolution to preclude the department/unit from such an action. The amended motion passed unanimous vote. The resolution as amended is to be returned to the Dean's Council by John Groesbeck.

- B. General Education Policy: Diana Graff indicated the general education revision document was approved by the Deans' Council on Monday, Sept. 24. She wanted us to convey to individual university departments the immediate need to evaluate general education classes and to refine existing general education classes so all classes will be in compliance with the guidelines established in the general education document. Eric Brown asked why the changes were being made, indicating that the Art department is not totally pleased with the change which has reduced the Art requirement from two classes to one. Diana indicated that the driving force behind the changes was the need for a general education philosophy and assessment plan to meet Northwest Accreditation requirements. All classes must help develop students' communication skills, higher order thinking skills, information management skills, and the valuing process. The last day for submission of curriculum for the general education program is Dec. 1, 2001. She also reminded us that one of the directives from Provost Reutzler was to decrease the general education offerings at the University as part of the prioritization/reallocation process.

Steve Evans then reminded the senate that one opportunity afforded the faculty and students by the general education changes was that of developing new interdisciplinary courses that meet the new general education guidelines. Diana made a plea for the development of such courses. Tom Cunningham asked if there has been any discussion of team teaching in some of the general education courses (in particular interdisciplinary courses). Diana said there has been some talk of this and the administration has indicated a willingness to allow instructors to divide classes; for example 1.5 hours each. Lamar Jordan asked about what

students will think of fewer class offerings. The answer to his question was that there would be more sections of classes offered and some classes would have larger enrollments. Eric Brown questioned the reduction when we compare ourselves with Utah State or the University of Utah; there was no explanation given. Lamar Jordan asked why we had a general education requirement of 37 hours (an amount which is not divisible by the three hour classes generally offered); the answer to his question was that we have a one hour class for information literacy. Art Porter asked about the actual number of general education courses. He wanted to know if it was small and if the specific number of classes had been set. He indicated that in business they had received information that the number of classes was fixed and that if they proposed a new class, they had to drop another one. Provost Templin indicated this was not always the case.

- C. Applied Technology Education: Ken Mumford updated us on the Utah College of Applied Technology. Originally these applied technology campuses were set up for secondary education, but now up to 80% of enrollment consists of adult students due to the high demand for people trained in the various fields associated with applied technology. The new Utah college is not to take Applied Technology Programs away from universities. Ken passed out a single page of the legislation and discussed how we would fit into this program. Our region consists of Kane, Iron, Garfield, and Beaver counties. The driving force behind the establishment of the new college is the failure of higher education to meet the demand for employees in applied technology fields. He then covered the main points of the handout and how it relates to us.

The specific points covered were:

- A regional applied technology college shall (ATC) avoid any unnecessary duplication of applied technology instructional facilities, programs, administration, and staff between the regional applied technology college and the other public higher education institutions.
- A regional ATC may enter into agreements with other higher education institutions to cultivate cooperative relationships.
- Before a regional ATC develops its own new instructional facilities, it shall give priority to coordination with the president of a higher education institution and entering into any necessary agreements to provide applied technology education to both secondary and adult students that:
 1. maintain and support existing higher education applied technology education programs, and
 2. maximize the use of existing higher education facilities.
- Coordinate funding requests with the president of a higher education institution if possible.

- A regional ATC may not engage in any construction processes with legislative approval
- Before acquiring new fiscal and administrative support structures, a regional ATC shall review the use of existing public or higher education administrative and accounting systems, financial record systems, and student and financial aid systems for the delivery of applied technology education in the region.
- The higher education institution for the region shall have the first opportunity to offer the general education courses that are required for an associate of applied technology degree offered by a regional ATC, at the applied technology site.
- The general education courses described in the above statement, shall be defined by the higher education institution for the region.
- If the higher education institution for the region is unable to offer the general education courses described above, other institutions of higher education may offer these courses.
- The regional ATC shall be responsible to provide technical training and basic skills as required by business and industry towards an associate of applied technology degree.

Other considerations associated with the new Utah College of Applied Technology: Carl Templin brought up the similar problems created by the Western Governor's University which has general education requirements embedded within specific courses. Robert Eves asked if the associate degrees would complete general education requirements at the institutions of higher education—Ken Mumford was adamant that they will not. He said that we need to take advantage of these ATC's as feeders to the university. Here at SUU, we are exploring the creation of a School of Applied Technology to make the interface between the regional ATC's and SUU more efficient. President Bennion indicated that approx 1 in 6 students on campus are in Applied Technology. Funding for these students is \$4000+, as opposed to \$3600 per student in other areas and our funding is generated based on both of these numbers. Many of the computer labs and facilities on campus have been funded as a result of these applied technology monies. Steve Barney reminded the senate that classes in applied technology were generally assessed through competency based measures and asked how we would find time as a faculty to develop competency based classes to meet these requirements. Eric Brown asked why the state recognizes that Tech students need higher funding. Ken Mumford's final plea to the senate was for us to try to determine how we can be partners with the Utah College of Applied Technology.

- D. Prioritization meetings and process: Steve Evans called for an open discussion on the progress of prioritization. Some meetings are resulting in changes in the prioritization recommendations. Will the timelines change to allow the changes to take place? Ron Martin said some of his faculty had some major concerns, he had a handout of the concerns, the major one of which was that the process was flawed. The basic problem was the subjective scoring between deans, and how it could be made more objective across colleges. As a result of the subjective nature of the dean's evaluations, programs that may not be productive could be protected. Carl Templin said the deans should follow the rubrics and if there are questions they should be raised in the meetings.

Steve Barney introduced a second problem: The deans have too much say in the overall importance of the programs. Robert Eves also mentioned that not all deans were as thorough and objective in the application of the rubrics for the prioritization process. He said that our job as a Faculty Senate is to decide how we can correct the major flaws and disparities in the process so that it is equitable. Eric Brown asked why if we were going for equity, do we give the bottom program in a department a shot in the arm—i.e.; the theater program (see Eric's addendum at the end of the minutes). President Bennion then discussed the analogous situation of trying to get a new education building. We have to realize that the whole process cannot be completely formula driven. Some programs need to be retained to see if they will in fact meet projected potential. Carl Templin added that a great deal of the work will still need to be common sense.

Steve Heath made a comment by way of analogy about dropping too many things—like Albertson's dropping bread and milk because it was unprofitable. We can't give up the bread and milk. Joe Baker then reminded us all that we do have a big say in the process and we need to make sure we take advantage of it by attending the prioritization meetings.

Joe Baker was also concerned that there is a great deal of scrutiny on the academic side of the process and asked President Bennion to comment on the process as it relates to the administrative side. President Bennion indicated that the administrative side has been very involved in the process and that many positions in administration have already been eliminated. They are continuing to look at how to streamline the administration.

Steve Evans then asked what we should do as a faculty senate to deal with this, suggesting that we might form a committee to draft a resolution to look carefully at the overly significant say of deans in the process. A motion to do this was made by Robert Eves and seconded by Ron Martin.

In discussion, Robert Eves suggested that we organize a committee of five to get involved in drafting the resolution. The motion was carried with 20 votes in favor and three abstentions.

IV. Officers' Reports

A. President – Steve Evans

1. Committee assignments: We will deal with this in the next meeting.

B. President-elect – Brian Heuett

1. Report on Utah Council of Faculty Senate Leaders: This will also be tabled to the next Faculty Senate Meeting.
2. Policy Review Committee: Brian indicated that the committee has reviewed the policies under consideration and they are trying to delegate the policy reviews to appropriate committees to make recommendations to the review committee. They will try to get them out for scrutiny within the next few weeks.

C. Secretary – David Lund

1. E-Mail addresses/communications: David agreed to address this issue via email to the faculty.

D. Treasurer

1. Communication received: No report was given, this was tabled to the next meeting.

V. Committee Reports

- A. Faculty Senate Scholarship Committee: tabled to next meeting
- B. Distinguished Faculty Lecture Committee: tabled to next meeting
- C. Faculty Achievement Committee: tabled to next meeting
- D. Faculty Development and Evaluation Committee: tabled to next meeting

V. Old Business

- A. Faculty Senate Website: Tom Cunningham had communicated earlier to Steve Evans that the site is still in process of undergoing a change to be more like the University Website.

VI. New Business

- A. Surveys: Lynn White's committee is in the final stages of analysis of the survey data.

VII. Motion for Executive Session: Tom Cunningham; Motion seconded: Steve Barney; the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

VIII. Adjournment: Motion to adjourn: none made but meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Special addendum from Eric Brown clarifying a statement he made regarding prioritization. This is part of the official minutes and is added here at his request and as a result of the a vote of the faculty senate.

Faculty Senate,

Several members of my college have expressed concern about a statement ascribed to me in the September Faculty Senate Minutes and I feel that I must clarify one place where I am quoted. No one who read the minutes, and was not at the meeting, could be expected to understand the intent of my statement. In fact, they could easily construe it to mean its exact opposite. I was expressing a deficiency of the prioritization model that we are laboring under. I said that even if we were able to make the system perfectly equitable (for most of the discussion centered on its fairness) it would still have a significant shortcoming. The model's premise is that the program in the bottom quintile should be scrutinized for extinction. Whereas I feel that a struggling program might more appropriately be singled out for enhancement rather than extinction. I think that, for example, it would be manifestly absurd to have the Utah Shakespearean festival associated with S.U.U. and have S.U.U., at the same time, have no theatre department. In the past (I stress past), by the Theatre Department's own account they were struggling (and were coming under scrutiny by the administration). Rather than axe the program, it was determined to give them somewhat of an infusion. By all indications the program is now thriving. I conclude, for this and other reasons, that it was a correct decision. Nevertheless, that decision did run counter to the Prioritization Model (which, I believe, was already underway at that time).

I can't say how much of the misunderstanding came from the way I made my argument and how much from the necessarily abbreviated minutes. Be that as it may, while some may have misunderstood me, that President Bennion understood my intent seemed clear by his comments, part of which follow mine in the minutes, wherein he responded ". . . that the whole process cannot be completely formula driven." He also said, as I recall, that Prioritization was only a tool.

Eric A. Brown