

University of New Hampshire

## University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository

---

Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes

Faculty Senate Documents

---

4-10-2023

### 2022-2023 FACULTY SENATE XXVII - April 10, 2023 Minutes Summary

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty\\_senate\\_agendas\\_minutes](https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty_senate_agendas_minutes)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "2022-2023 FACULTY SENATE XXVII - April 10, 2023 Minutes Summary" (2023). *Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes*. 31.

[https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty\\_senate\\_agendas\\_minutes/31](https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty_senate_agendas_minutes/31)

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](mailto: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 April 10, 2023 via ZOOM

MINUTES SUMMARY

**Roll:** The following senators were absent: Hasseldine, Wainwright (on leave). Laird, Burdin (on leave), Krasner, Innis, Kazura and Grandy. Guests were SVPAAs Kate Ziemer, Sara Batterson, Emily Dennison and Christian Lipovsky and Karl Grindal

**I. Comments by and questions to Provost Wayne Jones**

Undergraduate Applications: There have been 22,604 applications for incoming undergraduates. As of this morning, the university is short 15 deposits from where we were last year. However, last year, there were more than 200 new students enrolled beyond what was projected in the budget. Last year's graduating class was particularly large. Wayne then went on to talk about admitted student days and how much he appreciated faculty participation. He spoke with one family that noted the presence of faculty and what a difference that made.

Funding and the State Legislature: The State Legislature increased university funding by \$2 million over the Governor's budget. The funding bill now heads to the Senate.

Discovery: Five years ago, in 2018 UNH came up with its Four Strategic Priorities. The number 2 initiative in the Four Strategic Priorities was updating the Discovery curriculum. Faculty Senate moved forward and created a committee. The university told NECHE about this initiative and now five years later as the university undergoes NECHE reaccreditation, NECHE is asking about changes to Discovery. In addition, there is a lot of pressure from the students. Wayne encouraged Faculty Senate to set the budget concerns aside and focus on student flexibility. Additionally, Wayne shared that the university has been operating with centralized budgeting for the last three years. This began when COVID started 2020. As a result, no dollars have been allocated in support of Discovery courses in any college since 2020.

Faculty Hiring and Head Counts: On April 28<sup>th</sup> the College Deans will be submitting to the provost's office their three-year faculty hiring plans. In addition, Wayne will be reporting on faculty headcounts to the Finance and Administration Committee.

The floor was opened to questions.

Question: A COLA senator shared an article that was recently published by ProPublica regarding the CIGNA practice of denying claims without review. The senator asked, "what is the university's response to CIGNA going to be?" Furthermore, "What kind of advocacy is the university system taking to ensure that all of us, who have no choice in our benefit provider, are able to access the benefits that we are entitled to?"

Answer: Wayne too read the article. As a result, he reached out to the office that administers the university system-wide benefits program. He was told they too are concerned, but as of now, they have no evidence there has been a change in employee claims' experience. CIGNA's practices are no different than any

other large health insurance provider. If an employee feels a claim is unfairly denied, Wayne encouraged her or him to reach out to the benefits office for support. A link to the benefits office can be found on the HR webpage.

**Question:** A Paul College senator asked if Wayne could give a few more details about the priorities for the additional money that's being allocated in the next two years. In the 2024 and 2025 budgets, it looks like the funds mostly for the Whittemore Center.

**Answer:** There are three components to the allocation. The two simple ones have 6 million for the Whittemore Center but that money is being matched by donor and private money. The other is a project around cyber currency, cybersecurity, and Bitcoin. Wayne went on to say, "In answer to your core question if we are successful and able to get an extra, \$1.5 to \$2 million a year, the number one priority is raises. Right now the university is holding in-state tuition flat and growing out-of-state tuition by a modest 2% amount. Inflation is eating up most of that. That net increase in revenue [from the Legislature] is going to help guarantee the raises, which are the number one priority. And even as the fiscal year 24 budget is being developed, Wayne has heard from Marcel that units across campus have requested an additional \$30 million in positions. Those positions are being held off to the side because until there are dollars to point to them, the priority is raises. The 2<sup>nd</sup> priority is new positions that will generate revenue. The third priority is positions that are mission-critical, or compliance related.

**Question:** A COLA senator asked about a new policy whereby as much as 60% of gift funds are reallocated at the department level. This senator's department is already seeing concerns that donors both large and small, believe that money intended for what she would refer to as enrichment is being used for other purposes. There is frustration that what people thought they were donating for may not be what the money is used for.

**Answer:** The management of gift funds became acute after March 2020 with COVID. What happened was endowments took off and donors became more generous. Wayne shared to a large extent, he was going to blame the originators of RCM. There was not a mechanism in RCM to reliably bank dollars in a department or a college funds. For many years the messaging was, "don't spend your gift dollars." As a result, the university is up to \$62 million in unspent gift funds. Now we have federal and state compliance guidelines regarding how and when to spend gifts. Options are limited.

The senator followed using Justice Studies as an example and shared that Justice Studies had a gift fund for which there was a three-year spending plan. Suddenly there was a realization 60% was moved out to possibly support the operating budget. The department can't responsibly spend the remainder of these funds for the purposes for which they were promised by June, the end of the fiscal year. What do you envision happening at that point?

Wayne and the senator then discussed the three year plan, which was disrupted for the department due to COVID. Wayne referred her to Sarah and Michelle. He has let the deans take the lead. He is more focused on ensuring the dollars are built in upfront and getting the BOT to move gifts out of the operating margin.

**Question:** Chair Matthew MacManes hears that students are choosing not to come to UNH due to the discovery requirements. Perhaps the requirements are too cumbersome or antiquated. In addition, students transfer because they can't do research due to the weight of discovery requirements. Is there data to support these anecdotes?

**Answer:** No. In speaking with the admissions counselors, this is not something that regularly comes up. With regards to students transferring out of UNH it's typically because they want to move onto a top 20 school or for financial reasons, move to a smaller less expensive school. What is more common is honors

students dropping out of the honors program or forgoing a study aboard because they can't fit it in. Another issue is students taking classes over the summer somewhere else to ensure the required box gets checked. This is anecdotal. The most common feedback is what Faculty Senate is hearing from Student Senate. Students want more flexibility in their schedules.

Provost Jones left the meeting.

## **II. Approval of the March 27, 2023 minutes.**

The minutes were approved by unanimous consent.

Matt went on to share that he was ceding his time on the agenda to hear updates from Student Senate and Standing Committees. Before moving on he asked re-elected senators to confirm their interest in serving another term by emailing Amanda their confirmation. Also, senators were encouraged to take the need for department election confirmation back to their respective departments.

## **III. Updates from Student Senate and Standing Committees**

Student Senate: Student Body President Emily Dennison thanked faculty for participating in the Student Senate faculty mixer last week. In addition, Emily shared Student Senate recently held elections for next year's president and vice president. The winners are Joseph Skehan and MJ Condon. With 1,500 students voting, they won by 8 votes making it a very close election.

### Standing Committee Updates:

- *Academic Affairs:* The committee is working on the SEL redaction process as well as test optional policies.
- *Academic Programs:* The committee is waiting for some updates from the registrar. The APC and SAC are planning a joint meeting soon.
- *Campus Planning:* The CPC has a motion concerning endowment investments related to ESG investing and the environment. They also have a motion they would like to bring to the floor related to supporting graduate student transportation to areas with more affordable housing. Lastly, a new topic the committee is interested in looking at relates to the older buildings on campus and health and safety issues posed due to their age.
- *Finance and Administration:* Provost Jones will be meeting with the committee next week followed by a meeting with the Chief Human Resources Officer.
- *Information Technology:* The chair of the committee temporarily left the meeting. No update was given.
- *Library Committee:* At last week's meeting the committee met with a member of the Agenda Committee. At the next Library Committee meeting they will be reviewing draft documents related to changes in the committee structure.
- *Research and Public Service:* The committee has been working to get Faculty Senate approved motions from last year into the university's P and T guidelines. The motions are related to engaged scholarship, DEI activities, and service to secondary schools.
- *Student Affairs:* The committee has been working with Donna Perez on Early Alert Messaging and the language used. Additionally, the committee heard from Dean Blackman regarding updates to the Student's Rights, Rules, and Responsibilities.

## **V. Constitutional Amendment regarding the College of Professional Studies**

On behalf of the Agenda Committee Jim Connell presented the motion related to the pending UNH/GSC merger. The merger will result in the College of Professional Studies (CPS). This new CPS will include faculty from both UNH-M and Granite State College. UNH-M has historically been treated as a single constituency electing senators as though it were a department within Faculty Senate similar to the Library and the Law School. Post merger, the faculty from the former Granite State College would like their own representation, separate and apart from UNH-M. The motion calls for an election this summer to bring a representative(s) from the Online Division of the CPS into Faculty Senate.

The amendment requires an alteration to the acronym currently known as CCLEAR. This acronym would become COCLEAR, the O representing Online Professional Faculty. Under this amendment, faculty representation from UNH-M will require a name change to the In-person Division of the CPS.

Jim yielded the floor to Vice Chair Vidya Sundar to share the job descriptions for Online Professionals.

Vidya shared there are two new classifications of UNH faculty that the Agenda Committee would like to welcome to Faculty Senate. The two classifications are Online Professional Faculty and Senior Online Professional Faculty. Both classifications refer to faculty who teach in the online or hybrid modality. One of the big differences between the online classification with other existing faculty classifications is the Online Professional Faculty do a mix of teaching and curriculum development as well some supervision of adjuncts, in particular helping to create their syllabi. Most of the courses of the soon to be online division of the CPS are taught by adjunct faculty who are not at-will employees of GSC. The Online Professional Faculty are the ones who manage the curriculum and ensure the learning objectives for accreditation are being met and that the course is being administered as intended. The job is similar to what a lecturer or clinical faculty member might do, but with curriculum development too. Online Professional Faculty are not engaged in research. The job descriptions presented provide the unique responsibilities of an Online Professional Faculty member.

Matt recognized Faculty Senate guest Sarah Batterson, a current faculty member of GSC. Sarah thanked Vidya and shared that she did not have much to add to Vidya's description of Online Professional Faculty. Overall, the GSC faculty are happy with the job description they have been given. Sarah welcomed questions from members of the Faculty Senate.

**Question:** A COLA senator shared she had reviewed the job descriptions provided and noted that the definition did include a combination of "teaching, scholarship, and service" which, to this senator, looked like this could be a tenure track position but is not. Yet, this is a new category of faculty that is outside the collective bargaining unit. The senator asked Sarah if she thought the new online faculty were ok with this given the lack of representation and the potential for the exploitation of labor.

**Answer:** Sarah answered this transition has been going on for a year. Online faculty do not have a scholarship requirement, nor do all full-time Online Professional Faculty have terminal degrees. This category includes 13 or 14 faculty who have had many conversations but have not reached consensus with regards to several items including collective bargaining. Sarah went on to say that she appreciates there may need to be changes in the future because it is true there is a concern with regards to, "Who are we? Where do we belong? We don't want to get stepped on. We do want our voices heard, but we also want to support the whole faculty as a whole. We don't want to be coming in as a threat, so we are open to conversations."

A COLA senator asked what the A in the COCLEAR acronym stands for. The answer shared is A stands for Alternative Security faculty. The questioner asked who represents that group? Jim Connell answered, "that's a classification within the law school." Roger Ford from law school further explained, "it's a thing

that is required by the American Bar Association, which is our accrediting agency. Basically, they require that there be a classification that has many of the protections of tenure whether or not there is a scholarship expectation.” Roger went on to say, “For certain clinical faculty and program directors and things like that, there is a classification that has a review process similar to tenure without the scholarship expectations of tenure.”

A CEPS senator asked about the faculty level titled *Online Professional Faculty Academic Center Director*. He asked “does that sit among the administrative arm or is that actually a faculty member?” He went on to say, the reason he is asking is a couple of fold. “One, if it sits within the faculty body, are they serving as a sort of like a chair of a department, but a little bit different? Which is clearly part of our faculty and how we consider soon to be COCLEAR. Which is important because this body is supposed to represent faculty, not necessarily administration. Or are they considered an assistant or associate dean?”

The question was given to SVPAA Ziemer for additional clarification. This faculty classification was discussed among the merger groups. They too wanted to better understand if this category would be better aligned with administration or faculty. The GSC faculty within this category considered themselves faculty and not administrators and as such wanted to be recognized as faculty.

Sarah Batterson with GSC was asked to offer her thoughts. Sarah responded she would agree with Kate’s assessment, but it is tricky. This category of faculty is not 100% teaching. There is a fair bit of administration though on a smaller scale. In many ways, this faculty category is similar to a department chair, though that too isn’t quite right. The center director will be a conduit between the associate dean and the other program directors and online professional faculty. This position will manage communications with adjunct faculty. Despite the responsibilities, this faculty category will teach. Sarah thought the course load would be four or five courses a year. The identification is still full-time faculty, but there is an administrative component to the position.

Conversation continued around this position with Sarah sharing that center directors were elected by their peers for this position and not “appointed” in the true sense of the word. Vidya suggested perhaps the disconnect is due to the fact that the new OP faculty positions can’t easily align with current UNH faculty categories. These faculty job titles represent new categories and as such will not match existing ones.

Kate Ziemer was again asked to clarify. Kate said GSC is modeling their structure around UNH Manchester which has program directors. UNH-M doesn’t have department chairs, but rather program directors. There will be an associate dean. Currently that person is Tamara. Administration [at GSC] starts with Tamara’s position. Kate said she remained unclear on the center directors’ position, but that she knows there are two faculty classifications, the *Online Professional Faculty* and the *Senior Online Professional Faculty*.

Sarah shared that GSC faculty is still trying to figure out the role of the center director position, but that it is a position that is supposed to rotate every 3 years and is not intended to be a permanent position.

There was a discussion related as to how Online Professional Faculty might fit in with the practice of Shared Governance. The conversation continued around the HR classification of Online Professional. Is this faculty category open to change? A UNH-M senator provided clarity around the hierarchy of faculty at UNH-M.

A Law School senator asked if perhaps Faculty Senate’s apprehension and concern with accepting Online Professional Faculty into Faculty Senate isn’t whether they belong, but rather a concern that this is a classification of faculty being mistreated by the university. Does this classification represent an effort by the university to create a new classification of faculty that has fewer protections, fewer academic

freedoms and academic duties as existing faculty classifications? Perhaps senators are feeling the same trepidation and wondering if the confines of the OPF represent watering down what the faculty is? The senator went on to say, his concern did not represent a reason to vote against an amendment to recognize this class of faculty as a part of the senate but rather from a faculty protection standpoint. Should Faculty Senate be wary of the establishment of this class of faculty.

Matt asked senators to bring this motion and thoughts back to their respective departments.

## **VI. Discussion and vote on the Ad Hoc 2023 Discovery Committee membership**

Matt shared he and Vidya had met with Vanessa and Lisa last week and had a very productive meeting. The result of which will be shared now. He then turned the floor over to Vanessa.

Vanessa Druskat [who had proposed the amendment to the motion at the last meeting] shared the changes to the original motion. These changes included,

- The number of faculty moving from one per undergraduate serving college to two faculty from each undergraduate serving college.
- One faculty member be added from the Library.
- Added to the amendment is that one of the two senators from each college be a sitting member of Faculty Senate. This is because senators already possess a history of the issue as well as an understanding of the need.

Vidya then noted that there had been a suggestion from Nikki Gullace, the director of the Discovery Program and chair of the Discovery Committee [a permanent committee of Faculty Senate] that this new ad hoc committee ensure differentiation by going by the name of Discovery Overhaul Committee.

A COLSA senator called for a Point of Order and shared that the minutes from the previous meeting reflected an additional change to the amendment which included 6 students, one from each college being represented on the committee. Is this something that has been dropped?

Vidya responded that the change was not unintentional. There have been several discussions about the size of the committee. If the committee includes 13 faculty members plus six or more students and administrators, there was a feeling that the size of the committee could get unwieldy and cause difficulty with scheduling. While student voice is really important the thought was to keep the number of students at two but increase the number of outreach efforts throughout the process. The intent is to build this outreach into the charges to ensure extensive outreach from students, not just the students noted as voting members of the committee, but all students. This will include Student Senate and students within the undergraduate serving colleges.

The COLSA senator noted he was not saying he disagreed with the changes, but rather he was not sure changes could be made outside of a FS meeting to a motion that was already on the floor and noted in the minutes approved earlier in the meeting. The motion that was amended on the senate floor has come back from an Agenda Committee with added changes. Is this possible under Robert's Rules?

Matt replied that the motion was not changed by the Agenda Committee but rather during a meeting with the amendment sponsor and second during a separate meeting. The questioner asked if the amendment on the floor could be changed outside of a regular session of Faculty Senate.

Parliamentarian Jim Connell was asked to provide procedural guidance. Jim answered it is customary in this body that if no one objects, amendments are accepted, but anyone could force it technically as a point of order to be voted upon. In essence last time, because the people moving the amendment to the motion

accepted it [2 students to 6 students] and no one objected, it became part of the amendment. The amendment was amended by unanimous consent. What is in essence being done here is the Senate is being asked to do the same in removing that amendment to the amendment. And if anyone wants to vote on it, the senate will have to vote on it as an amendment to the amendment.

The COLA senator who had seconded the amendment to the motion shared she wanted to reinforce that implicit in this motion is the development of an incredibly robust process for input from all different parties, including students and also faculty who won't be on the committee. That process would be both formal and informal, face-to-face and reciprocal in the sense that there would be both information given and views exchanged and recorded and thus ensuring people are accountable. Whether or not people are formally on the committee, Matt and Vidya were clear the process would account for a lot of different possibilities and ways for people to have input.

Matt went on say that what he was hearing is that neither Vanessa nor Lisa have objection to backing down the number of students to two from what had previously existed at six. Matt asked if anyone in senate would like to vote on this or shall we approve this change by unanimous consent?

A COLA senator suggested the group vote. Vidya asked that Christian and Emily be allowed the floor first. Matt opened the floor to Christian and Emily.

Christian shared that he was deeply saddened that the number of students has been decreased. The discovery program is ultimately a program that is for students and enriches their UNH education. Decreasing the number of students makes him sad and when voting, he encouraged faculty to consider the student's perspectives and not just the faculty. Emily added that scheduling shouldn't be enough reasoning to justify not having students be on the committee. Students really want changes to this program and will be there if you want them to be there.

Discussion ensued about the amended language under consideration. The senator from Paul College who had originated the amendment to the motion shared it's difficult to think that the number of students on the committee could significantly outvote faculty members who are so invested in their education. Students don't know what they don't know and when it comes to designing courses for their future, people who are specialists in their area should have a significant vote on this over and above of students.

A CEPS senator shared large committees are often not terribly successful in bringing forth recommendations. Not unless they divide it up into subcommittees. A general education has to be a holistic thing. Secondly, what senate is aiming for here is success. If this committee brings something that cannot pass the Senate as a whole, that would be very unfortunate.

A COLA senator shared that the committee would be better served with more students on the committee not less. Given that students are living this experience, their voices are important. Without greater student input it might be easy to lose track of what are important changes to make in order to enhance discovery and make it more meaningful for students.

Christian and Emily were again given the floor and reiterate their shock and disappointed at what faculty are sharing.

The Paul College senator reiterated she does not disrespect students but is more concerned with both group dynamics and topic expertise on the committee.

Conversation continued with senators from CEPS and COLA expressing their support for more student participation on the committee rather than less. In addition, a COLA senator reminded the group that



curriculum development is the responsibility of faculty and by extension Faculty Senate. Faculty should not abdicate this responsibility.

Given the time Vidya suggested this conversation be continued at the next senate meeting.

A motion to postpone consideration until the next meeting was offered and seconded.

A CHHS senator offered a motion to amend the motion to postpone stating that consideration of the discovery committee membership be placed first on the agenda of the next meeting. Matt asked for a second on the motion to amend the motion to postpone. A CHHS senator seconded.

Matt called for a vote on the motion to amend the motion to postpone consideration until the next meeting. The motion to amend the motion to postpone passed with 49 in favor, 0 opposed and 3 abstentions.

Following this Matt called for a vote to postpone the discussion on the Ad Hoc 2023 Discovery Committee Membership to the next Faculty Senate meeting. The motion passed with 46 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions.

The meeting was adjourned.