

Faculty Senate Minutes
Thursday, November 15, 2001, 3:30 P.M.
Hunter Conference Center, Yankee Meadows Room

I. Call to order by President Steve Evans at 3:30 p.m. Those attending: Steve Evans (Pres.), Brian Heuett (Pres. Elect), David Lund (Secretary), Joe Baker (Treasurer), Holly Haddad as proxy for Virginia Stitt (Parliamentarian), Robert Eves, Art Porter, Greg Colf, Rick Lambson, Ben Davidson, Steve Heath, Rea Gubler, Lamar Jordan as proxy for Boyd Fife, Kate Bell as proxy for Deborah Hill, Tom Cunningham, Ron Martin, Steve Barney, Eric Brown, Ty Redd as proxy for Idir Azouz, Jim Mills, Curt Bostick, James Aton, and Kay Anderson; Visitors: Rhiannon Bent, Dean Lou Workman, Provost Carl Templin, Doris Williamson, Jean Adams, and Ron Granger. Absent: Darin Wadley

II. Review and approval of minutes from previous meeting: Motion by Rick Lambson to approve previous minutes as amended; motion seconded by Steve Barney; motion carried in the affirmative by unanimous vote.

III. Priority Items for Discussion

A. Prioritization Recommendations: The draft of the recommendations, as unanimously approved by the Dean's Council, was discussed. Greg Colf presented some information from the Information Systems/Business Education faculty. He had 2 handouts to illustrate the concerns of the IS/BE faculty. A copy of his handouts is held in the official notes of the Faculty Senate Secretary, David Lund; however, the 5 concerns are listed here in brief form.

1. The statistics used regarding the future demand for Business Education jobs is in direct conflict with statistics provided by the Bureau of Labor Statistics *Occupational Outlook Handbook*. And increases in computer support, office management, and clerical work will also occur.
2. The recommendations fail to consider that the majority of the courses offered within the department are limited enrollment courses (25 for writing courses, 30 for computer-related courses).
3. The cost savings of the proposed program cuts will be negligible, or even negative, due to loss of state Applied Technology Education monies.
4. A survey of Utah public schools conducted by the Department found that courses offered for the Business Education degree were in line with the teaching requirements that our graduates will be expected to fulfill within the state of Utah.

5. The hearings for the various Colleges on campus were not conducted in the same manner. The IS/BE department was not allowed the opportunity to have any input.

After Greg Colf made his comments, Steve Heath indicated that it appeared that many of the programs, slated to be discontinued, were in secondary education, even though some of them are needed in the schools around us. If we are saving all of this money through the process, where is it going? What will happen with other funds; for example what would happen to overload monies that have been used in these programs? He recommended that we have an accounting of the reallocation of funds. Where is money going to be spent? What changes in funding will occur across the university?

At this point, Provost Carl Templin answered some of the concerns of Greg Colf. He said that the job information used in the prioritization process came from the Utah State Office of Employment. He asked if the contradictory information about the increase in market had been given to the Provost's office.

Greg Colf wanted to know why the whole business education department was being dismantled?

Provost Templin said that the recommendation was to cut five 2-year programs to two—these programs feed the two four-year programs. We will not lose any ATE funds if the students move into one of the two programs. We are eliminating secretarial programs, which should move to the ATE.

The Provost reminded us that our role as a Faculty Senate is only to consider/vote on the recommendations to discontinue courses recommended for discontinuance.

Greg Colf asked, if the programs are not of value to the university, is it also true that the faculty teaching those courses are of little value?

The Provost said that the faculty members were of value as information systems instructors.

Doris Williamson says she has done a survey with local high schools, and they also say that our business education programs are needed.

Art Porter asked what the Education Department had to say about these changes.

Provost Templin indicated that the Education Department was also in agreement with the changes—moving courses to ATE and the Information Systems program in the College of Business, since the same certifications would still be available.

Doris Williamson said it will hurt students in applications (beyond secretarial) by cutting from 8 or 9 skills classes to 4. She also indicated that the college had already addressed some of these concerns by integrating skills into other classes.

Robert Eves asked if the Department of IS/BE would cease to exist and become part of the College of Business and also part of the new College of Applied Science and Technology? The Provost answered, “Yes.”

Robert then asked if the whole department would move into Applied Technology? The Provost responded, “No,” and then clarified that the secretarial programs need to go to the newly formed Utah College of Applied Technology.

Doris Williamson mentioned her impending retirement and voiced concern that her area in IS/BE will not be able to hire a Ph.D. level person to replace her.

Steve Heath again wanted to know where the money saved through the reallocation/prioritization process is going to go.

Provost Templin reiterated that there are no savings to be realized from the reallocation; resources will be freed to meet suggestions of Northwest Accreditation to streamline the university and also to move the University in a direction more in line with the current trends of universities across the country away from business education and towards information systems programs.

Jean Adams thinks that the business education program will cease to exist.

Steve Heath said that the process has been very difficult for the faculty, and that it is offensive that no savings have been realized.

Provost Templin said he has done what was required to try to streamline the university and make life easier for the faculty based on the work of the previous Provost, Ray Reutzel, the Deans’ Council, and the requests of the Northwest Accreditation Association.

Rea Gubler wanted to know how the education/pedagogy aspects of the courses that move to other colleges and departments would be handled.

The Provost replied that there were to be two pedagogy/methods classes instead of one—a business course in teaching methods for information systems and an applied technology methods course.

Greg Colf added that in 6 years here, he has worked with some great people; but through the prioritization process he has seen these good people's morale destroyed, with a result that some of the scholarships provided by them have been withdrawn.

Lamar Jordan asked if anyone would be without a job. Provost Templin said, "No."

Greg Colf agreed with the Provost, but also indicated that everyone would have to be retrained, since the things they have been teaching would no longer be taught.

Steve Barney asked how tenure would be affected when someone had to change teaching/track. Provost Templin said tenure would not be affected.

According to Doris Williamson, the changes in methodology were not discussed among those who would be affected. She then added that the previous provost, Ray Reutzel, had the view that Business Education should be dropped at SUU just as it was done at BYU.

Provost Templin defended his stance again by saying that eliminating Business Education is the wave of the future—that degrees should be in Information Systems under the auspices of a Business Department or College.

Steve Barney said that since the reprioritization process was initiated by a provost who is no longer here, had the deans thought or discussed pulling back on the process or reevaluating things to see where we need to go based on national standards and accreditation entity requirements.

The Provost said that the current recommendations do not go as far or deep as was originally thought, and that the deans and most department chairs have made the recommendations that have been made.

Steve Evans asked where we wanted to go now in terms of the information we have seen and heard? Are there other concerns?

Robert Eves indicated that there are no problems with Science. He also indicated that the move of Agriculture programs to the ATE was also a good idea and Ron Martin concurred.

President Evans asked Rea Gubler if there were any problems with Family and Consumer Science, and she said they were in agreement with the document as it concerned their department.

It was reiterated again by the Provost that, according to policy, our role as the Faculty Senate was only to consider the discontinuance of programs.

Robert Eves pointed out that the document we have is both for action and for information—we are only to vote on those programs to be discontinued. He also noted the need to be careful to not vote on the whole document if we are not in agreement.

Rea Gubler wanted to know the rationale for limiting the elementary education options.

Provost Templin indicated that the most marketable were being retained and that those with limited activity in recent history were being dropped.

Doris Williamson indicated that Business Education might be the wrong program to drop from the elementary education options; especially in light of the recently revised technology core curriculum in the state of Utah, which requires keyboarding in grades K-12.

Robert Eves moved that we endorse the specific recommendation to drop the BA/BS in Earth Systems; the motion was seconded by Ty Redd. The motion carried by unanimous vote in the affirmative.

Joe Baker moved that we accept the entire document as written. The motion was seconded by Jim Aton. In discussion, Eric Brown wanted to know if our recommendation had any weight. It was decided that it did influence the final decision of the President of the University, to whom the Faculty Senate recommendation would go. A vote was called for and by a count of raised hands the motion was defeated--10 votes in the negative, 8 votes in the affirmative, with 3 abstentions

Discussion continued—Ben Davidson asked what keyboarding K-12 meant. Doris Williamson replied that it meant keyboarding instruction in every grade in the public schools, with specific curricula designed for each grade. In order to teach keyboarding, teachers would need to have a methods class that covered keyboarding. Even regular teachers could be certified to teach it with

the appropriate course work. The state office can also certify such teachers through a workshop. Eric Brown asked for clarification. Would every elementary teacher have to have this certification, or would there have to be a specialist in each school? The answer to his questions was yes.

Rick Lambson wanted to know if this concern shouldn't be taken up in the College of Education. He then moved that we accept the recommendation of the entire document with the exception of the section detailing programs to be discontinued in Business Education; the motion was seconded by Steve Barney. In discussion of the motion, Art Porter asked that it be amended to indicate that this motion is not necessarily a vote against Business Education, rather that no action is being taken in regard to IS/BE. The motion as thus amended carried with a vote of 22 in the affirmative, 1 negative vote, and no abstentions.

Greg Colf made a motion that the Senate recommend that the four Business Education programs currently flagged for discontinuation be moved to the School of Applied Technology and be allowed to do so with an intact faculty who are to find those areas where programs could be streamlined, but allowed to be continued in the College of Applied Technology when created; that Business Education be placed under the Information Systems division of the College of Business and that the terminal-degree qualified person hired to oversee Business Education strongly coordinate Business Education efforts with both the business areas and the applied technology skills and technical education purposes. The motion was seconded by Rea Gubler.

Discussion of the motion included information regarding the paralegal program. This program will be in a battle to stay intact, since Northwest Accreditation says no adjuncts should teach classes within the program. The program exists because the Board of Regents was impressed that classes were being taught by practicing attorneys or paralegals. It was further clarified that the motion by Greg Colf did not include the paralegal recommendation.

Lamar Jordan wanted clarification as to who would streamline programs. It was noted that proper university channels would be followed with faculty beginning the process, recommendations going through approved channels to the curriculum committee, then the Deans' council, and so on.

Robert Eves wanted to know why the streamlining was not proposed during the reprioritization process rather than waiting until now.

Doris Williamson replied that they have done some streamlining for the past two years in her department and Greg Colf said that is also true of his area.

Art Porter wanted to know how hard it would be to reinstate these classes if they are not moved to Applied Technology, but rather discontinued as recommended.

Provost Templin indicated reinstatement would need to be done through proper channels. He noted that specific courses needed to be evaluated for their utility in other programs.

Tom Cunningham wanted to know if there is a backup plan if we make a mistake in making these changes.

Provost Templin said the backup plan is to follow established university channels and repropose the program.

The Provost then reminded us that Northwest Accreditation said we had far too many programs for the number of faculty at SUU, and that we needed to review our programs for the purpose of streamlining the university. It was not clear from the discussion if the Northwest Accreditation recommendation was mandate or suggestion.

Greg Colf repeated his motion, and a vote was called for. The motion failed to be approved with a hand count of 6 votes in the affirmative, 9 votes in the negative, and 3 abstentions.

It was then clarified that the Prioritization Recommendations Document would be passed on to President Bennion with the approval of the Faculty Senate on all recommendations except those four programs slated for discontinuance related to Business Education and that no action was taken regarding these Business Education recommendations by the Faculty Senate.

Due to the late hour, President Steve Evans elected to defer all of the following items on the agenda until a later meeting.

B. Policy on Annual Report of Academic Colleges and Schools:

C. Policy on Grading:

D. Policy on LRT ("Grandfathering"):

E. Policy on Faculty Preparations:

F. Policy on Travel:

G. Policy on Conflict of Interest:

IV. Officers' Reports

A. President:

B. President-elect:

V. Committee Reports

A. Faculty Development and Evaluation:

VI. Old Business

A. General Education follow-up and proposals:

VII. Other Business

VIII. A motion for Executive Session was made by Art Porter, seconded by Ben Davidson; and carried in the affirmative by unanimous vote.

IX. Motion to adjourn was made by Ben Davidson and seconded by Tom Cunningham.

X. Adjournment at 5:25 p.m.