

Faculty Senate Minutes

January 10, 2019

4:00 pm

Charles Hunter Room

Attending: Dave Berri, Nathan Barker, Steve Barney, Chris Monson, Kelly Goonan, Daniel Eves, Joel Judd, Scott Lanning, Doug Wayman, Michael Kroff, Tim Lewis, David Tufte, Kelly Goonan, Matthew Eddy, Jonathan Holiman, Liz Olson, Jennifer Sorensen, Daniel Swanson, Scott Knowles, Benjamin Sowards, Lynn Vartan, Cynthia Kimball-Davis, Matthew Roberts, Bill Heyborne, Selwyn Layton, Shalini Kesar, Mark Meilstrup, Randall Violett, Grant Shimer for Brandon Wiggins, Brianne Kramer for Tony Pelligrini

Guests: Scott Wyatt, Johnny MacLean, James Sage, Jacob Dean

Not Attending: Joel Judd, Lee Montgomery, Danny Hatch, Jason Smith Michael Crotty, Hala Sweringen, Mark Baltimore.

- Call to Order (4:02 PM)
- Recognition of Presenters and Guests (4:03)
 - a) Scott Wyatt (President of SUU)
- Approval of minutes from last meeting. (4:04 PM)
Approved
- Spring APEX speakers (Lynn Vartan) (4:05 PM)
Starting next Thursday (1/17) – many partnerships – 2 international guests a filmmaker and a German animal/leadership expert.
- SUU Women's Network (Jennifer Hunter) (4:07PM)
Women's Network Conference at Dixie – Friday, April 5th – invitation to all who are interested in professional development (do not need to take a vacation day, considered a work day) the first 20 to apply will received full paid coverage for cost of the event. Dave Tufte asked if students can also be included and covered by the scholarships -- TBA. Email Jennifer Hunter for registration information.
- Scott Wyatt and On-Line Teaching (4:10 PM)
There are approximately 980 degree seeking online students – 1/2 grad and 1/2 undergrad – almost 11,000 students (8,000 are on campus – more than 10%). Online enrollment is growing – the (1) question we have to address is whether we want to put more energy into growing at a faster rate. The (2) second question is what do we do to make sure quality stays. It's helpful to begin with, "What do I need to be worried about?" Face-to-face instruction will rise not decrease. No one will be required to stop face-to-face and only do online. The people that are hired to teach online will be hired by a normal/same process. No adjuncts will be hired without faculty or department approval. Faculty in each department get to determine the extent of their online presence. President Wyatt sees no negative impact on university instruction. Additionally, he sees reasons why we may want to speed up the online pace. For instance, to get ahead on people seeking degrees in rural areas – UT is a growing state and in about 6 years, high school graduates will start dropping and the competition will turn aggressive. Today everyone can grow at their own pace but in 6-7 years we will begin to

experience a decline (as in East Coast states). Pres. Wyatt sees his job as making sure that we are secure for the future and expanding online to hedge our odds. If student enrollment does not decline as we expect, we are not at a disadvantage. When thinking about online what had an impact on was the research regarding online dating. In 2009, 20% of Americans found their partner online. In 2017, 60% of Americans found their partner online. The new generation is handling most of their social and educational requirements online.

This is the question:

Grow online programs – per department faculty choice – at a modest pace **or** steepen the growth to meet anticipated challenges?

What you do well at SUU is to elevate people's education – why not expand our reach to elevate people in these additional ways and protect ourselves from future recessions or other circumstances, and expand our international and online involvement in order to increase stability for the organization.

There are possibilities to hire a company to manage our programs (OPMs) – currently in discussion and assessing three companies who would like to work with us.

The appropriation committee has two members (Vickers & Milner) who have been connecting with Grand Canyon University to hear their approach to online learning and toured their campus. We were invited to tour Grand Canyon University and sent a few people to that University. And then we sent a sizeable group (28) of faculty and staff to visit Grand Canyon and Arizona State to get the feel of a place who has decided on a big online presence for learning. Not sure if the universities in AZ are interested in forming partnerships with us. Our tuition is low and a lot of their partnerships have higher tuition. But we are still in talks. Pres doesn't think it's likely that we'll partner with Grand Canyon.

Mike Kroff commented that GCU has infrastructure to support faculty. AZ is comfortable in hiring their own instructional designer – ending 10 year relationship with Pearson as designer. Lower tuition is great but it's great that these universities pay their online faculty well.

As info: AZ budget numbers

2001 budget 850 million – 45% was state appropriated

2018 budget 3.4 billion -- state appropriation 9%

We need alternative revenue sources for our stability in future. Pres. Wyatt mentioned that SUU currently has a legislative ask to develop 3-year degree programs. He said a significant portion of that money (if granted) could be justified in funding online initiatives, since online courses would help students to graduate sooner.

Dave Tufte asked why is it instructive to compare online dating with online college degrees

Pres Wyatt responded that students are making increasingly difficult decisions online compared to 100% face-to-face 20 years ago. There were no alternative education paths when Pres was in college. The world has changed and we've reviewed GC and AZ to see how they are negotiating this shift in our academic/social culture for the future.

Concerns were expressed about transferring the debt load to students (GC University). The financial dealings are suspect. Grant Schrieder/Geology said he's concerned about their reputation in academia and modeling our approach after theirs.

Cynthia Kimball-Davis asked to have another model/more models for contingencies planning to see how they navigate these issues as we plan for our future.

Tim Lewis asked if these providers have the same acceptance criteria?

Pres Wyatt -- We will not accept a student unless they already have 24 credits.

Mike Kroff – They look at GPA and big test scores as indicative of good students. Non-traditional students do very well, as well as Masters students. Traditional students are largely going to face-to-face classes, and online students are largely non-traditional (30+ years old) Completion rates for online students are higher with mid-career students.

Pres. Wyatt – One of our hopes is to propose to the legislature a 3-year Master's degree, which means increasing summer offerings for students. UofU is a good example (though not a 3-year pathway) but have expanded their offering and encouraged students to take online courses.

Shalini Kesar – expressed concern about instruction quality with adjuncts – who will design courses? The faculty? What are the resources to preserve quality?

Pres Wyatt: The quality will go up if we make a decision to invest in more designers – content would always remain with faculty for control. It's important to all of us that our faculty retain control. GCU tried to create benchmarks between the online and face-to-face so they know the online classes are being successfully taught.

Mike Kroff: AZ State pay faculty to create courses and give them rights to teach the course (1st choice rights) there is a lot of oversight for their programs, everyone has a designer who checks the quality. Heavy on support.

Pres Wyatt: We will offer everybody support and infuse the resources where necessary – this idea forces us to take it seriously.

A concern was expressed that resources spent in these efforts will take away from face-to-face learning experiences. How does it not affect face-to-face instruction?

Pres W: Scenarios of cost: 1. By year three revenue exceed cost 2. By year 5 revenue exceeds expenses overall. A years of investment and then there will be an infusion of. In March we'll find out if the legislators will grant us 2.8 million for bachelors programs and we can then invest half of that in online instruction. We have some reserves and donors to contribute to help us with financing through the first few years. It may only cost us 2-3 million investment in the first year, and we could get a good portion of that through state appropriation. We can also loan to ourselves the needed financing. Shakespeare is in the black.

Kelly Goonan – Will it be required that department/faculty invest more in online degrees or will we be hiring more faculty to help design and teach. Would faculty be here or working remotely? Quality will be at risk for collaborative working.

Pres W: Our online faculty will be a combination of on campus and remotely, as we are now. A continued mixture of all this. It will be the department's choice – administration does not choose who you hire. You make those decision on whether they are here or elsewhere. MFA at SUU all the adjunct faculty all come to campus and meet and engage with the students at the beginning of the semester. Music faculty do not but are doing very well.

The quality is our responsibility – we are assuming that the quality of education is the same online and face-to-face. As it stands now, the majority of the university are supporting online education – it is the future.

David Berri— what specifically do we want to achieve? Do we want 100,000 students? Or more in the range of 20,000 students? What are our end goals?

Pres Wyatt: I can imagine that if we made an effort with our resources that in 10 years we may have 10-15 thousand students online. Purely speculative. If the marginal cost of each additional online student in quality programs, is less than the revenue why would we ever put a cap on it? The revenue and cost is not what we'll pay to shareholders, rather it will be reinvested into the quality of the university. Our existence is at stake unless we are competitors. Again, it's your program to creates hybrids requiring students to come to campus at least once during semester.

We have not done a feasibility study. 60,000 hits for SUU online – students exploring what we have.

We are going to continue to explore this – Daniel Bishoff is strategically assessing with other team members to explore the feasibility of our online presence. Still assessing – hopefully we'll have more information in a few more weeks.

Revenue sources – plans to expand the endowment (YES) what is endowment now (declined) we like all other universities in UT find that donors are not interested in operation and maintenance (building and scholarships – yes) most of our endowment effort is focused on scholarships and instruction. We make pitches but no interest in funding operations, etc. We are limited on our investment because we are a public institution.

- Clarifying F vs UW grades (Mark Meilstrup) (5:19 PM) GET HANDOUT?
What is the difference between these grades – policy has not specified the differences. If students stop attending they will often receive a UW for the course. Academically, GPA is an F for a 0. If you have a UW, federal financial aid will give you a hard time. Others may not care about the UW. A UW indicates student did not attend your course or do enough work. Zero indicates that the student attended but did not complete enough work/or do well. Policy is not clear. The registrar says it is at our discretion. If the only implication is financial aid why are we not given clear guidance?

Discussions/suggestions --Give an F only the student has attempted every assignment and failed. Some base on final exam – if taken F if not UW.

Suggested that financial aid would like to see UW to those who give up and quit, and Fs for those who try and endure but do poorly. Policy is not clear. Registrar's webpage says very little. It was suggested that financial aid be contacted for clarification. Do we have control of the policy on this? Up to us to solve the problem theoretically.

Dave Tufte: Who would like to write it up and we can vote on it. Steve and Scott will work out the policy.

- Report on P&T Transition (Shalini Kesar and David Tufte) (5:31)
Shalini Kesar: The P&T met in Dec – Anne Diekema can give you access to your P&T and any resources you require. Deans will want drafts by 15march – provost → April ??
Engineering CSIS reach out to your departments to see what is going on. We are meeting every week and working on it together.
Dave Tufte: Concern at beginning of semester about dynamic of committee we worked with departments that wanted to get into this first. Maybe we don't want department to have examples and copying them – but going out on your own about what P&T means to your department. You do not need to adhere to the examples.

Steve: Steve and Johnny are here to for guidance. Make sure to take a step back to determine what we want to be as a department and quantify this. Hopefully we can resonant that with other departments.

Tim Lewis: Can we choose whether we want to do P&T or LRT

Steve: There are broad parameters but it's up to the department

Emphasize the things departments really care about and make that about measuring success or failure in your departments.

This is a good chance to reflect and redo

- Report on On-line Education: (Cynthia Kimball-Davis) (5:39)
Gave an Executive Summary report to the Provost – posted on Canvas page. Meeting each month until the end of the year.
- Report on Course Evaluation Committee: (Daniel Hatch) (5:41)
Expressed the impression that they had not been officially charged yet. It was confirmed that they in fact have been approved to go forward as a committee. Daniel said they would like department participation in making recommendations, e.g. what questions do you want the university to ask? Committee should have something to report soon.
- Report on Academic Dishonesty Policy: (Daniel Swanson) (4:31)
Jason and Dave went over the cheating and plagiarism/copyright. Graph for demerits 1-3 demerits. Minor infraction is a 1 the next will be 2. Adjudicate is still sorting out procedure – if you have suggestions for the definitions contact now. 5% should be greater if cheating on exam. Some things were left the same. Complicity definition, would appreciate input to refine. Consult with your departments on this.

- New Senate Elections in April – Steve Barney (5:48)
Elections on article of bylaws (in April) the senior retiring senator from each college is supposed to conduct a secret ballot. Each college gets 2 senators + ??? for full time faculty. If that is you, you are responsible. After April meeting new will take over. Come up with ideas for electing new senators. Who do we want representing here in the senate?

- Motion to Adjourn (5:53 PM)
 - a.** Next Meeting – February 14th (4pm in the Charles Hunter Room)