

University of New Hampshire

University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository

Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes

Faculty Senate Documents

2-20-2023

2022-2023 FACULTY SENATE XXVII - February 20, 2023 Minutes Summary

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty_senate_agendas_minutes

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "2022-2023 FACULTY SENATE XXVII - February 20, 2023 Minutes Summary" (2023).
Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes. 25.
https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty_senate_agendas_minutes/25

This Text is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate Documents at University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes by an authorized administrator of University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository. For more information, please contact Scholarly.Communication@unh.edu.

UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
2022-2023 FACULTY SENATE XXVII

The fundamental function of the approved minutes of the Faculty Senate is to accurately document actions taken by that body. Additionally, the minutes traditionally seek to provide context by capturing some statements of Senators, faculty in attendance, and guests. The minutes do not verify the veracity, authenticity, and/or accuracy of those statements.

Meeting called to order at 3:10 PM on February 20, 2023 via ZOOM

MINUTES SUMMARY

Roll: The following senators were absent: Stocz, Wainwright, Healey, Magnusson, Kim, Burdin, Krasner, McKinsey, Caron, Innis, Kazura, and LeBlanc. Guests were Provost Wayne Jones, SVPAA Kate Ziemer, Catherine Peebles, Sarah Batterson, Emily Dennison and Christian Lipovsky.

I. Comments by and questions to Provost Jones

Governor's Budget: The Governor's Budget did include a funding increase for USNH, and UNH in particular. Tom Cronin can come back to the Faculty Senate with a more thorough update.

NECHE: The NECHE process is moving along. Provost Jones encouraged members of Faculty Senate to attend one of the open forum meetings. If you have any questions, please refer them to SVPAA Ziemer.

Transportation and Safety Committee: The committee is making both short and long term changes. There will be physical barriers placed around the staircase where the most recent accident took place. There are already flashing lights, a yield sign, and marks on the road, but it seems there needs to be additional safety enforcements. The stairs may need to be blocked off. In addition, UNH is partnering with an outside firm to take an analysis of how the university is messaging in students. On the longer term, UNH will continue to work with the town of Durham. There are several points where safety could use reinforcements. Garrison Road, and in front of T-Hall and Main Street. There should be a stop light there or a bridge perhaps. Closing the road to vehicle traffic, even for part of the day, would be helpful. The committee is continuing to work on these issues.

ERP: This will be a long process. The student side of this will not even begin for another two to three years.

CEITL Webinar: CEITL is having a webinar on AI this Wednesday. The information is on their website.

Michigan State University: This event was a travesty that we never want to experience, but we always want to be prepared for. President Dean addressed these events in his State of the University last week. There is a link at the top of the Provost's page where you can view President Dean's remarks. Provost Jones and Chief Dean were speaking just this morning about what do we need to do to ensure we are prepared. Currently, the university does ongoing trainings with senior administration and law enforcement. The relationship the police have with the FBI is strong. How do we communicate with students and faculty? What do we need to put into place? If you have ideas, please share them with me. The senior administration does exercises every year for emergency preparedness. These exercises help to determine areas that need improvement.

Question: A COLA senator had a question regarding information from the January Board of Trustees meeting. She had reviewed notes that a faculty observer had taken during the meeting and wanted to ask about a discussion focused on the possibility of aligning the calendars across Keene, Plymouth, UNH, etc.

In other words, a master calendar. In addition, there was a discussion regarding harnessing technology and exploring shared course delivery across campuses. These ideas represent a departure from previous conversation with Faculty Senate and present the possibility of moving in a different direction. Provost Jones was asked for update about the current status of the thinking about shared courses, a shared course catalog, and so forth.

Answer: Provost Jones answered with regards to shared courses, there are already shared courses with Keene, Plymouth State and high schools, though it is currently not done very well. It's a manually intensive process. As Keene struggles with enrollment, they are looking at new ways of delivering course materials. There are opportunities UNH can provide for course sharing with Plymouth and Keene. The barrier is that the registrar's at the different schools are not on the same software platforms. Financial aid is completed differently causing problems transferring dollars between schools. In addition, the calendars are different. Currently the universities are about 70% aligned with Keene being the predominate outlier as they start on a different date. Keene Faculty Senate is having conversations about moving their spring break so that their spring start date can be aligned with UNH.

The senator follow-up by saying she hopes Faculty Senate will be engaging in rigorous and vigorous debate about what this means for academic freedom, for faculty concerns about modality and modality being part of the purview of the faculty in terms of pedagogy. There are a lot of things shared that will probably cause some good and spirited discussions within Faculty Senate.

Provost Jones said he welcomed the thoughts of UNH faculty. At this time, there are no changes required by UNH. The issues raised represent work that has been addressed between departments and faculty. Provost Jones is working to support those changes.

Question: A COLA senator followed up on the MSU shooting and asked what UNH is doing, either at the state level or in cooperation with other universities at the national level to try and move this school shooting conversation beyond thoughts, prayers and preparation, and actually do some sort of gun control or policy to make this less likely to happen. As this happens again and again, schools settle into a position of reluctant acceptance and inevitability. And it'd be nice to hear what sort of active actions the university has taken to with regards to progress on this issue.

Answer: UNH currently has a policy of no guns on campus and there are those in the State Legislature that would like to change that. The university took a strong stance related to guns on campus at the last legislative session. At the national level, the ACLU and the Association of Land Grant Universities have strong stances related to gun-free campuses. UNH has endorsed these policies. This is a national conversation and what UNH is trying to prevent is exposing the university to more challenges than they are already getting. University leadership and law enforcement have been clear with regards to guns on campus.

It was pointed out in the chat that you can have a gun on campus, but it must be contained in a lock box at the police offices.

Question: A COLSA senator asked about the ERP process and how moving to Workday will impact faculty? In particular UShop and Kronos as well as student information systems. Will consulting firms be needed to bridge the transition to Workday?

Answer: The ERP process is a 5 year process and there will be no changes to student systems for at least another 2 years. The thought is Workday will replace Kronos. Workday will not replace UShop. The idea is to find software that is more seamless. Currently, there are several systems that don't talk to one another creating multiple touch points to get work accomplished. There were approximately 140 faculty

and staff across the university that tested the software from several vendors. The feedback received on Workday was that it was intuitive, has a mobile app, and there is a seamless application that eliminates the need for paper. Once it became clear Workday was likely the platform UNH will be using, Provost Jones spoke with his counterparts at both the University of Iowa and The University of Arkansas to inquire as to their experience. He was told HR and finance speak well with each other, but the student side needed more engagement. The benefit of these two universities is they can help provide a roadmap for bumps during the transition.

With regards to hiring outside vendors to support the transition, Wayne answered he typically prefers to use internal personnel, but both aforementioned universities recommended hiring a consulting firm with expertise in Workday to guide the transition. There is currently an RFP out in search of a vendor for this purpose, though Wayne did not know more at this time. In addition, the university will be seeking personal to guide the transition related to student records. This will include the registrar's office, admissions, and the graduate school.

There was a question in the chat regarding the ability of Workday to support earned value accounting? Wayne shared he does not know but he would find out.

Question: A CEPS senator wanted to ensure there was research faculty represented in the ERP/Workday selection process. Secondly, what is the plan for ensuring faculty have adequate support and training to learn the new systems?

Answer: With regards to research faculty involvement in the selection process, yes, absolutely. With regards to training, this will be absolutely critical. There will be training videos, and one-on-one as well as face-to-face trainings. One of the benefits of an outside vendor is they have expertise on best practices in both training as well as implementation. This is also why the rollout is gradual. The idea is not to overwhelm. HR will be rolled out first, then finance and last student information systems.

Conversation continued about ensuring faculty have adequate time and space to learn the new ERP.

II. Comments by and questions to the Chair

Matt shared he is going to largely cede his time to the subsequent agenda items. Provost Jones addressed the points Matt had planned to address including ChatGPT CEITL workshop that Wayne referenced. Wayne also addressed pedestrian safety and the Michigan State shooting.

Matt opened the floor to questions and responded to a question in the Chat pertaining to the CEITL training. Matt continued to share that CEITL has the link on their website.

III. Discussion and Vote on a Motion titled *Development of a Joint Committee for Honors College Development and Implementation*

The motion was introduced at the February 6 Faculty Senate meeting and instructs the Agenda Committed to form a committee to develop new curriculum program requirements for the Hamel Honors and Scholars College in the summer of 2023.

Matt opened the floor to questions.

A question was asked about how the Agenda Committee will select faculty to be on the committee. How will they be appointed and what makes a faculty member qualified to carry out the committee's purpose?

Matt answered committee members must first be interested in the work. Secondly, the Agenda Committee will ask for volunteers. There will be a mechanism for soliciting nominations of both self and other. Ideally this will result in a pool of people willing and able to do the work.

Matt continued to share that the next motion related to the committee does have some draft charges. The idea would be to fill the committee with faculty who possess expertise in the relevant domains. The process for committee selection will be open and available to all. The full Faculty Senate has the ability to reject the recommendations of the Agenda Committee and to amend language presented.

A CEPS senator asked about the “strings attached” to the donation that could dictate the committee’s work. It was noted that the word “college” needed to be in the name of the honors college. What other criteria are outlined in the donation that might hamper the work of the committee?

Matt recognized SVPAA Ziemer and asked if she might have insights with regards to this question.

SVPAA Kate Ziemer shared this is a difficult question to answer with an explicit list of criteria because the donor’s requirements are qualitative with the exception of the name of the college. By qualitative, he's looking for something distinctive and gives honors students a deep depth of experience they won't get in other areas within UNH. It's going be part of this committee's role to lay out why this honor’s experience is distinctive and is a value add to UNH. It will then become the job of advancement, honors, and the provost’s office, who's ever interacting with the donor, to then show what was developed has met his vision.

The senator went to express concern that aspects of the new honors college seems counter intuitive to other efforts related to the UNH experience. For example, with work being done on DEI and inclusivity. This college is moving in a different direction. In order to achieve some university goals, aspects of the new college may not be palatable to the donor causing the university to lose the money. It’s concerning that there are not going to be programs in this college because the university will not have honors as a major. There are already issues about whether the university can actually give courses which are housed in this new college, or whether this would be an add-on on to other colleges.

Matt appreciated these points and felt that was the purpose of the committee. To work out these issues. The honors college is happening. President Dean has announced it, there is funding to create and sustain it. This committee gives faculty an opportunity to have agency in the creation and curriculum.

Catherine Peebles shared in the chat that DEI is already built into the honors curriculum.

A PAUL Senator remarked that Paul College already has a robust honors program. When seeking committee members will the Agenda Committee consider committee members who can speak to existing programs and how to two will integrate.

Matt answered yes. Those faculty who serve on the Paul College honors committee will have valuable insights and expertise.

Vice Chair Vidya Sundar assured the questioner that the Agenda Committee has already discussed how the Paul College honors program could be impacted. The goal is to seat a joint-committee with individuals who are familiar with the honors programs in the respective colleges. The motion related to the make up of the committee does not specify specific categories of faculty due to a lack of knowledge related to faculty interest and availability. However, the point of the joint-committee is to work through these kinds of concerns and questions.

There was a question in the chat asking if the donors qualitative goals could be shared with Faculty Senate. Matt again recognized Kate Ziemer as best equipped to answer that question.

Kate shared that work on a vision for an honors college has been going on for several years. Work has been done to get the donor excited by the idea. When funds became available, senate leadership and Kate began pulling together a vision. The university has been clear that it is the role of the committee to establish the program. Advancement, who is actually the team working with the donor, made it clear this committee, which is led by faculty, will be designing the program.

There was a question in the chat regarding UNH-M and the honors college. UNH-M would like to develop an honors college. There is excitement on the UNH-H campus for participation.

Catherine Peebles was recognized to share that the donor has been excited about the involvement of students and faculty in imagining an honors college. During his 2018-2019 State of the University address, President Dean talked about how raising UNH's academic status might include getting honors college status. To this end a group of faculty, staff and students started work developing priorities and ideas for what a UNH honors college might look like. The joint-committee being convened by the Agenda Committee and by default, Faculty Senate, will not be starting from the beginning. There are several years of thoughtful work to be shared.

A COLA senator shared she understood in today's political environment around donations and external influences on college campuses, it makes sense to wonder if the donor has an agenda they want to impose upon a campus. This is not a donor like that. This is a donor who is just super excited about students taking the lead and having a lot of agency and ability to run with ideas. This donor been extremely responsive and interested in what faculty and students have to say about their education. He has been really excited by UNH. The honors program has worked with this donor for several years. The senator went on to say though she appreciates anxiety about external influences on UNH, this is not a donor about whom senate should have those concerns.

In responding to a question about criteria for committee members, Matt shared the most important attribute of a committee member is an interest in participating, and beyond that, perhaps a graduate of UNH's honors program, faculty who teach honors courses including labs. Faculty who have had experience working those high-impact learning situations.

Vidya reiterated the Agenda Committee did not discuss specific qualifications per say, only that faculty have experience with the honors programs within their respective colleges. There is the intent to include different classifications of faculty, but not yet an understanding of how work release and other accommodations would be made.

A CEPS senator shared the idea of an honors college pre-dates President's Dean's comments that were mentioned early in the meeting. The idea has been out there for several years now.

Matt asked if there was further discussion related to the formation of a committee to oversee the development and implementation of the Hamel Honors and Scholars College. Seeing none, he called for the vote.

Motion:
Development of a Joint Committee for Honors College Development and Implementation
Faculty Senate 2022-2023

Rationale: To meet the charge associated with the donor's generous gift, innovative and dynamic educational and pedagogical co-curricular experiences need to be incorporated into new honors curricula and requirements.

Motion: Faculty will be appointed by the Agenda Committee to form a committee to develop a proposal of new curricula and program requirements for the Hamel Honors and Scholars College in the summer of 2023.

The motion passed with 49 in the affirmative, 0 opposed and 1 abstention.

III. Membership plan for Honors College Development & Implementation Committee

Matt shared that this motion has been substantially changed since the last time it was discussed. The first change was related to the name of the motion. The word "curriculum" was removed from the title of the motion to demonstrate that the committee will be involved with more than curriculum development. Though curriculum will certainly be an aspect of the committee's work, this will not be the only focus.

The next point is to make it clear that Faculty Senate is the ultimate arbitrator of the decisions and/or recommendations of the committee.

Matt referenced language in the motion highlighting where the above point is made clear in the motion. In sharing this language, Matt hoped to allay fears from a previous senate meeting which concerned the ability of the full senate to participate in the committee's work.

There was a recommendation from a previous senate meeting to include an alumnus of the honors program on the committee so this was incorporated.

Matt then shared a list of draft charges. These charges were drafted in response to comments and requests made at the last Faculty Senate meeting. Matt took a few minutes to review the list of draft charges.

Matt opened the floor to questions.

There was a question in the chat concerning the broad set of charges. Would this inhibit the committee's ability?

Matt answered this is a big committee and there is a lot of work that is going to be needed. For precisely that reason a joint committee with students, administration and faculty working together is needed.

Discussion ensued about the number of draft charges and were there too many? Would the number of charges prevent the committee from accomplishing anything? In addition, some of the charges are not typically associated with senate work. Matt shared this is why a joint committee is necessary. Faculty wants a role in developing the honors college. This committee guarantees that role.

Vidya reminded the group that there had been questions during the last meeting with regards to charges directed at administration. The draft charges being presented are in response to those questions. In addition, Vidya shared the committee may decide to divide and conquer with administration focusing on charges most relative them, while faculty members may be more focused on curricular decisions.

A COLA senator asked if the committee would be focusing on the distinction between Honors in Major and the Honors College? Matt asked Catherine Peebles if she would like to say anything.

Catherine Peebles reiterated to the group that a significant amount of work and thought has already gone into an honors curriculum and an honors college. The thinking and work on this has led to the

understanding that a priority needs to be placed on simplicity and flexibility for students. Her vision for the committee is one in which they will be able to build on this work and also get pushback among committee members when needed. Catherine has ideas about the relationship of Honors in Major and the Honors College and is happy to share them. The goal is make this student friendly. Catherine again shared that DEI has been a huge priority in the honors experience and has been for a long time now.

A CEPS senator with experience teaching chemistry honors courses shared the feedback he has heard from his students is they would like more engagement with the honors program. He wanted to ensure student experience and thought was considered. Will the students on the committee really have the knowledge base necessary to speak on behalf of all students?

Matt felt a committee charge related to surveying students would be helpful. Matt and Vidya have had very good conversations with the members of the Student Senate and Student Government. Both appreciate students who are appointed to the committee are there to represent all students and not a specific issue. The Student Senate is well positioned to identify students representatives to the committee who can ensure they speak for all students and not their own personal interests. Matt asked if that answer was helpful. The senator said yes, but he feels there is room for adding a charge related to this issue.

A Paul College senator asked for clarity between the Honors College and the current Paul College honors program and how they would interact with each other.

Matt asked Catherine Peebles to answer that question. Catherine gave an overview of the current honors program that included both Honors in Major and/or Interdisciplinary Honors. The senator then reiterated her question as to how the current PCBE honors program will interface with or change as a result of the new Hamel and Honors and Scholars College. Catherine answered that will depend on the what the committee determines. Catherine then shared her thoughts as to how the interface might play out and it was her hope that the honors programs across the university will provide a more student driven program rather than a top-down model.

Matt addressed a question in the chat related to Faculty Fellows. Faculty Fellows in relation to the joint-committee are not representative of an existing program, but instead represent a new position. Just what these positions will look like and the needed qualifications are still being worked through.

Matt then recognized Christian Lipovsky, Chair of the Student Affairs Committee of Student Senate. Christian shared in his role as chair of the Student Senate AAC he is regularly approached by fellow students with questions and concerns regarding the honors program. Christian went on to share that a lot of students are passionate about either changing the honors program to make it better or conversely getting rid of the honors program. There are not many students particularly fond of the way that the current honors program is running making it important to include students in new committee's work. Christian shared he was expressing his support for adding a committee charge that is specifically about gaining student feedback, from both students currently in the program, but also from those who have chosen to leave the honors program.

Catherine Peebles shared there is good data on why students choose to leave the program as current protocol is to ask why students have chosen to leave.

Seeing no more hands raised in the chat, Matt called for a vote on the motion. Before the vote, the senator who had asked that a charge be added to include student feedback on the current honors programs and any changes/developments that are made. Matt reiterated that the charges in the motion are just in draft form. He will be adding that charge to the charging document before it is sent to the committee.

Motion: February 6, 2023

Membership Plan for Honors College Development & Implementation Committee, Faculty Senate 2022-2023

Rationale: To meet the charge associated with the donor's generous gift, innovative and dynamic educational and pedagogical co-curricular experiences, a committee is needed to guide this work.

Motion: Faculty Senate endorses the Agenda Committee's framework for an Honors College joint committee, including the committee's membership and reporting structure.

The motion passed on a vote of 51 in favor, 1 opposed and 2 abstentions

IV. Discussion and Vote on Agenda Committee Motion: re: the Formation of the 2023 Discovery Committee

Matt turned the floor over to Vice Chair Vidya Sundar to share the motion related to the formation of a 2023 Discovery Committee. Vidya then invited AC member Andrew Seal to open the discussion on this motion which was introduced at the previous Faculty Senate meeting.

Andrew reminded the group the purpose of this motion is to form an ad hoc committee to reimagine the current Discovery Program. There will be more resources from the administration to get the work done. Previous obstacles have been overcome and the time is right for addressing updates to the Discovery Program.

A COLA senator shared that this motion had been circulated within her department which includes the chair of the previous ad hoc committee charged with reviewing the DC. This former chair had raised some concerns. These concerns included the question "why now?" The previous ad hoc committee had felt the implications of the UNH/GSC merger along with the expected changes to the budget model were barriers to rethinking discovery at that time. Given that the merger is not complete and the budget model is still under development, it appears the recommendations from the previous committee are being discarded. So again, why now? Shouldn't these big changes be implemented prior to moving forward?

Andrew answered that although the recommendations from the previous committee represented a prudent course of action, the fact that the RAM is still being developed, might provide faculty an opportunity to plant their flag and define their core values. The committee can define what should be part of a general education at UNH. If faculty present a successful unified front, faculty can then put pressure on the administration to back those kind of high engagement learning experiences and interdisciplinary courses this committee may identify as important.

Vidya commented that the timing is right for to form this committee. The new budget model may have some flexibility, the University is undergoing its NECHE accreditation and the new Honors College is being formed. Reimagining the Discovery Program is timely.

Jim Connell added that the Ad Hoc Committee on a Diversity Requirement in GE will be wrapping up their work soon. Given there has been a desire to bring a DEI requirement into the gen ed program, there needs to be a review of the existing GE requirements as some majors have little to no room to add new course requirements. Recommendations from the current DEI committee will be an important contribution to a new Discovery Program.

A COLA senator reiterated that the findings from the GERC were that no further changes be made to the existing Discovery Program until after the new budget model was implemented and the merger complete.

Moving towards establishing a new committee now feels as though the GERC recommendations are being ignored. What's to prevent another committee from undertaking hours and hours of work, only to come to the same conclusions.

Matt responded by saying, though it is true the merger is not fully complete, the majority of the policies and practices related the merger are already in place. UNH and GSC have a good understanding of what the joined entities will look like in July. This is also true with the Resource Allocation Model. While it is true the final model has not yet been presented, we do have a very explicit idea about what the RAM is going to look like. There is an understanding of how colleges and departments will be funded. Faculty Senate is more now more familiar and educated on the issues you are raising. By waiting, the university runs the risk of waiting too long. Lacking a modernized Discovery Program causes UNH to loose ground to competitive institutions.

Vidya reminded the group that there have been quick fixes to the current Discovery Program. The Discovery Review Committee is evaluating petitions from students to have courses meet the discovery requirements. The committee has been looking at courses with a broader set of criteria and what GSC courses might meet discovery requirements. The review committee can only do so much, and these quick fixes are becoming unsustainable.

A CEPS senator shared he has been given instructions from his department to vote against re-opening discovery at this time. He is also hearing a conflicting message regarding the RAM. On the one hand it's still being developed and has flexibility, on the other it's been defined and there is a solid understanding of what it will look like. Based on Wayne's presentations all details have not been worked out. This senator's department feels strongly that these details need to be worked out before proceeding with discovery. So which is it? Is RAM in place and the committee can work within or will the committee be a lever against RAM?

Andrew asked to clarify his remarks regarding RAM. Andrew shared there are numerous strategic priorities that are defined as categories within RAM, but those strategic priorities have not fully been identified. Interdisciplinary courses are one item on the list, but there are still many things that could be incentivized through the RAM process. It's natural for faculty to make sure they have input as to what things in the curriculum are going to be incentivized. Andrew continued that he was not saying that the entire RAM is fluid and apologized if he gave that impression.

Vidya shared in looking at the previous RCM model versus this new model there is more equity in terms of different colleges and different departments and how revenue may be disbursed to different colleges.

Matt seeing no more hands in the queue suggested he would like to call a vote on the motion.

Again, the issue was raised regarding the recommendations from the previous GERC. Information being shared today was new to many members of senate and shouldn't senate wait to vote until senators have more time to gain clarity on these issues?

Andrew shared the committee submitted its report 2 years ago. Their intention was not to block further work, but rather to place a pause on the work. The committee recommended that changes needed to take place before work could begin. The Agenda Committee believes those changes have sufficiently changed enough to move forward with a new committee.

Seeing that the meeting was now 2 minutes past 5:00 PM Matt recognized it was too late for a vote on the motion.

The meeting was adjourned.