University of New Hampshire

[University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository](https://scholars.unh.edu)

11-1-2021

2020-2021 FACULTY SENATE XXVI - November 1, 2021 Minutes Summary

Faculty Senate

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

Meeting called to order at 3:10 PM on November 1, 2021, via ZOOM   MINUTES SUMMARY

I. Roll - The following senators were absent: Harvey, Herold, Knowles, Ramsay. The following senators
were excused: Kirsch and Ramadanovic. The following was a guest: Wayne Jones.

II. Call to Order - The chair reminded the group of the following meeting guidelines:

- The meeting is recorded for the purpose of preparing the minutes.
- During discussions. Please state your name and your department when you were recognized to speak.
- While faculty are welcome to attend senate meetings, only faculty senators or their designated proxy may
  vote. Also, if you're attending my phone, please send an e-mail to the Senate admin to let her know what
  number you're calling in from
- Regarding the Chat feature, please try to keep all germane conversations on the floor verbally and try to
  avoid using the chat whenever possible.

The chair also introduced Dr. Lydia Reinig, Postdoctoral Research and Teaching Associate in the
Department of Communication. She will be observing the meeting.

III. Remarks by and questions to the provost

About restructuring issues

The provost shared some comments about the financial affairs restructuring and offered a special thank you
to all the folks that have been meeting with him to give feedback. This feedback can be pushed into the
system to identify problems and address them quickly. He shared that the president has convened a group
that is meeting once a week to go over the issues that have been identified and to review progress. The goal
is to get all the issues listed out and then posted onto the SharePoint dashboard. The dashboard is the one
place where you can go to get information, whether you are working on UShop or an employment process or
other things. At this point, the most progress appears to have been made in UShop where many new
tools have been turned on to make it easier to get things processed. There has also been some automation
added for keeping track of how long it takes to get a UShop request out the door. Right now, 85% of those
processes are out the door within 24 hours. However, there is still work to be done. Josh Dunbroff from
Procurement is now working on larger contracts and getting some people involved that can offer personal
support for faculty buying large pieces of equipment.

STAR is not officially part of the FAR restructuring but as a result of the changes in FAR, there were some
adjustments made to STAR. Two new positions were added, and two new people were hired in STAR.

Wayne said that in the HR area he asked for a list of processes that have to be fixed and he estimates that
there are about 12 of them. Of those 12, HR has now built a flow for 75% of them. And now they're in the

process of going back to representative unit heads and the deans and associate deans to identify where the breakpoints are. Three of the twelve have gone through the whole review and new processes are starting to roll out.

Kevin Healey, Senate chair, explained that he met on Friday morning with the chairs of the Senate's Research and Public Service Committee (RPSC) and the Finance and Administration Committee (FAC) to discuss ways to ensure that faculty are more directly involved - or at least more directly informed - about issues related to the restructuring process. A document is being developed to outline what steps are being taken and this has been shared with Wayne before this meeting. Kevin asked Wayne whether the Senate has his preliminary agreement on a plan to collect and curate and then deliver concerns that are a priority to faculty across the university. Kevin also asked if those concerns will be taken seriously and responded to appropriately.

Kevin also said that while faculty don't need to be involved in more meetings to resolve issues, will those from the administration who are involved deeply in these meetings meet with the RSPC and the FAC, possibly in a joint meeting ongoingly so that we can be continually updated? **Wayne** responded that he did read the document sent by Kevin and found that, in many ways, it is aligned with what he has been thinking and doing. He said that he has been going out and meeting with a significant number of faculty and staff, including with the RPSC committee last week [Ivo Nedyalkov clarified later that it was 3 weeks ago.] Wayne said that he welcomes all input. So, if the Faculty Senate pulls together some thoughts and wants to share that as additional input, he welcomes that. Wayne explained that they are starting to curate a list and as soon as that's available he will share the link out so that everybody can look at it. He hopes that the list will be designed to indicate the level of progress. He said that the first draft deals with the HR work that has been going on.

Wayne said again that he welcomes the input. He noticed that in the memo that Kevin shared about 70% of the processes mentioned are research-oriented. They didn't involve the FAR. The other thing he noticed is that some of the issues weren't necessarily on the HR issues list and should be. Concerning the things that aren't working, he welcomes all those emails. He has noticed that some people don't understand that some things have been fixed. For example, in conversations about UShop, some of the issues that people noticed in July are not an issue any longer, but people don't necessarily know that. This is going to be a continuous feedback process. Wayne said that he will follow up with Marcel Vernon and Marian McCord to see if regular check-ins can be arranged.

On the topic of Student protests and the Vice article about Dan Howard

Wayne shared that, as has been communicated by President Dean the previous week, there were student protests around the sexual assault that was reported in Stoke Hall. Wayne said that he along with the president and several other staff were at the protest last Monday night and several senior staff were at the student protest the Friday before. There was a lot of listening and approximately half of the students hung around and talked afterward. There seemed to be a lot of learning taking place. Since then, several groups have come together including groups of students that are meeting with folks in Student Affairs. One group is focusing on policy; one is focusing on action. More of those meetings will be coming and a set of action lists are expected to come out of these meetings.

Wayne shared that it appears that all of the processes were properly followed in connection with this incident. One of the biggest challenges that the university faces is that there have been changes to Title IX over the past 4 years. Under the last federal administration, the changes in Title IX were more favorable to

the alleged perpetrator than they were to the victim. Wayne said that he is aware that the current administration is trying to change that.

Wayne addressed the email from President Dean sent on Friday that also included information about an article in Vice magazine about former UNH professor Dan Howard and his wife, Carrie Hall, also a former UNH professor. Wayne confirmed that they are no longer employed at UNH. They came to UNH in 2015-2016 and their activities at their prior college were not disclosed to UNH. Wayne said that there was something unusual that happened in 2019 involving another group but nothing was formally reported. In the October to December 2020 timeframe UNH learned about some activity that had occurred before they arrived at UNH and that was when the process at UNH started and that led to his resignation.

Wayne said that there will be a deep dive into the hiring processes followed in 2015. This was before his time and before President Dean's time. The Title IX office has had new staff since then and the Chief Diversity Officer is also new since then. The second question is whether any processes need to be changed. He said that we know that the former institution told UNH nothing, not even a hint that there was a problem there even though there clearly was a problem. The administration has asked for an investigation into the way our Title IX processes at that time were functioning and whether they were sufficient. Wayne said that we need to do this in a timely manner, and we need to do it transparently to the best of our ability. He said that he doesn't want to have this lingering because we all want a constructive outcome of this.

Wayne shared that there will be several communications coming out to support students, faculty and staff that may have been collaborating and involved with the groups impacted by Howard and Hall. With the Vice story coming out, there may be some new things coming forward, and we welcome all communication from our community. Further, the collaborators of this individual certainly are concerned about whether they missed something. There is a strong desire to provide support for all impacted people. A memo is being developed that will offer those supports. Wayne said that based on learnings from the past, we want to get out a message that faculty and staff can forward to provide support for anybody that needs that support. We want to be able to extend that support beyond our current students to former students that may have interacted with this professor and this communication is being prepared. More information will be coming, and the administration will share information to the best of its ability.

A senator from the Department of Biological Sciences shared that the events of the last five days have been pretty horrific as a faculty member in DBS. She said that she was heartened to hear that there are plans to make some reforms and potentially figure out where some breakdowns occurred and if they can be remedied. She said that she is pleading to have those processes be somewhat transparent as it could be cathartic both for the faculty and the students to see the process happening and ensuring that it does happen. She said that sometimes there are best intentions and then things don't happen, or we don't hear about them. But in this case, it is imperative that we hear about changes that may be coming as a result of what happened.

This same professor also pointed out that it was really hard as faculty to go into a class an hour or two after learning about all of this, especially in her department and being, rightfully so, bombarded with questions from students. She said that students have the right to be asking questions, but she didn't have any answers. She said that it is hard to anticipate when things like this happen, but the faculty did not have any sort of guidelines about what to say or do. Faculty are not mental health counselors and are, themselves, struggling with this. While there is support coming, she asked that should a next time occur, that information come a smidge faster. **Wayne** thanked the professor for caring to engage with students and said that he doesn't ever want this to happen again. He said that he and the COLSA dean found out only the day before and were up late at night to prepare a message to the community. He said that they were able to put in place some PACS support, some group supports, and opening conversations within 24 hours of that article coming out, and

more things will be happening going forward. He said that he understands the point that faculty are not mental health professionals. There are more than a dozen people on campus that are, and we need to create some forums where students can come together, and faculty come together. With the communication piece that is being developed, faculty should be able forward and leverage it. He encourages faculty to be good listeners, but not to try and be mental health professionals. Students should be encouraged to go to the appropriate places to get support and faculty should also take advantage of support for themselves. He said he, Anthony Davis, the COLSA dean, and Bonnie Brown, the DBS chair, are ready and willing if faculty need anything urgently.

A COLA senator said that it sounds like Wayne is saying that there was no harassment by this professor at UNH like there was at the previous college. However**,** according to the Vice article, a UNH graduate student was given alcohol by this professor and harassed on multiple occasions where she felt like she had to take active measures to evade him. She also asked about Dan Howard's wife, Carrie Hall, who did not report her husband's conduct at the previous university, and whether she is still employed at UNH, and whether she knew about his conduct with the graduate students here. The COLA senator also asked what will happen to the graduate students in Dan Howard's lab. There have been a lot of people harmed here, not just the UNH graduate student mentioned in the article, but everyone in the lab. **Wayne responded** that Dr. Carrie Hall actually resigned from the university before Dan Howard did. She is not employed by UNH. She did have an affiliate status, but he understands that this has been removed. Graduate students of both Dan Howard and Carrie Hall are being reassigned. The Dean of the Graduate School and the COLSA dean and the DBS chair are working through that and there is a great concern for the graduate and undergraduate students who worked in those labs. Wayne said that he is as frustrated as the faculty are. We have to support those students first and foremost and that is being worked on. He said that we are trying to give the students voice in terms of their publication records and their data, to give them additional cover compared to what a typical grad student-faculty interaction would be because that power imbalance is ridiculously bad. Marian McCord is pulling a small group together right now to look at those data IP publication issues to try and provide students with as much cover as possible. Wayne said that there are some legal implications here, but we're going to do everything we can to support those students.

A different COLA Senator said that she echoes much of what other people have said about transparency. She suggests overcommunication and overeducation about Title IX, about processes, and about resources. She asked for clarification about whether Dan Howard is at all affiliated with the university supervising students, working on mentoring students, working on grants or labs, or anything else. Wayne said that to the best of his knowledge, he is not. However, he said that we are still learning things. Wayne said that Dan Howard resigned his position as a tenured faculty member. He was a PI or collaborator on a number of grants, and we have been trying to tease those apart. The department and college took action to remove his affiliate status and to support his graduate students in finding other support. At this time, the Research Office is going to be putting out a separate communication because he did have many collaborations both on campus and off and we need to work through those to make sure that everyone has the facts and that everyone gets the support that they need. But he has not received any paycheck from the university since early in the summer.

About the vaccination requirement

- **Wayne said** that on the topic of the vaccine requirement that has come down as a result of the federal government's executive order, there is a new memo being developed about the fact that while this requirement impacts Durham, it very likely impacts Manchester and Law as well because we are one community, and we are not going to be able to wall off the other locations. This will be official in a day or two.

The system for requesting exemptions is working. Several hundred faculty and staff have uploaded vaccine cards or started that process. Wayne said that we continue to do the right thing for the public health of the community while being respectful of those that have a medical reason or religious reason to not be vaccinated. There are a couple of dozen folks who have taken advantage of the exemption process and as far as he knows, these have all been approved with some still pending. Medical experts and Title IX experts are doing the review of exemption requests.

In response to a question about booster doses, Wayne shared that UNH Health and Wellness now has a full set of boosters available for the J&J and Pfizer vaccine Appointments can be made via the Health and Wellness website. Also, booster shots are available at most pharmacies in the state.

A COLA senator asked about student employees and pointed out that some students are unclear about which students fall under the mandate and which students don't. She asked for a clarification on this. Wayne said that what we know is that student employees working on a grant or working on regular operating dollars at the university would come under the vaccine requirement. There is some question about work-study students. The university is trying to get clarification from the Department of Education on that one. But other than work-study, student employees are subject to the vaccine requirement.

IV. Remarks by and questions to the chair-

- The chair shared a reminder that Monday, November 8 has been reserved for senator caucus meetings with their college deans. Some of these meetings may happen at a different time than scheduled. The Agenda Committee is putting together some recommended agenda items for those caucus meetings which will be sent out.

- The chair provided an update on the General Education Review Committee. The membership has been finalized as follows:

> Nicholas Kirsch, CEPS
> Ellen Fitzpatrick, COLA
> Tim Montminy, COLSA
> Semra Aytur, CHHS
> Neil Niman, Paul College
> Sarah Prescott, UNH Manchester
> Wendy Pothier, Library
> Amanda Lohnes, Undergraduate representative
> SVPAA, Kate Ziemer or designee in non-voting ex officio role

The Agenda Committee had agreed to one faculty representative from each college for this initial committee work. All the nominees, whether they were self-nominated or nominated by someone else, have been notified about the final membership and have been advised that even if they were not selected for this first stage of the committee work, they will be considered if there is a need to move to expand the committee for the second stage.

Kevin explained that two of the members of this ad hoc committee, Nicholas Kirsch and Tim Montminy, are senators.

- The approval of the minutes from October 18 will be postponed until the next meeting because they were sent out to senators only today and this does not provide enough time for senators to read them.

V. <u>Committee Updates as needed</u>:

Andrew Seal from the Academic Affairs Committee asked for feedback about the UNH Testing Center. Andrew said that it appears that the Testing Center is understaffed this year. And because of that some faculty who have sent students there have been told that they need to do much of the administrative work of finding out which students are eligible, what accommodations they need, and so forth. Andrew asked if other faculty have had this kind of experience.

A CEPS senator responded that he has been using the testing center for a year now and his experience is that it is always only staffed by one individual. Jeffrey said that the accommodations come from SAS for the instructor to communicate to the Testing Center. However, this is nothing more than he would expect. The senator said that he has never seen it as burdensome however others may have had a different experience.

The same senator pointed out that the CEPS library used to provide space for testing. However, because the Testing Center handles SAS accommodations, the Library in CEPS has removed the space that was previously used for testing. This has resulted in a struggle to find space for make-up exams due to athletics, sickness, or covid-related issues. Any help would be appreciated.

A CHHS senator said that this issue came up in a recent department meeting. Even though there is space provided by the testing center, it is not appropriate for use by all students, especially students who have difficulty with learning disabilities who may have trouble reading or interpreting the questions. AS a result, faculty in her department end up using open offices or conference rooms so that students have access to their instructor during the testing time.

The CHHS senator said that another issue that has come up in connection with accommodations, is that it appears that faculty have to do a little bit more nudging and pushing students in terms of figuring out what the best accommodation is. Also, she said that she had a situation where the NSA listed five or six accommodations and some of them were not practical to implement during all classes and the student did not initiate a conversation.
Andrew asked that any other comments or concerns about this topic should be sent to him.

Andrew also asked for feedback about the Early Action Alerts. *Following is a transcription of the discussion.*

Andrew Seal: Nicky Gullace has asked for feedback about the early alert system of faculty marking which students are underperforming and flagging them so that their advisors can meet with them and intervene a little bit earlier in the semester. This was extended this semester to upper-class students and Nicky has received some feedback that some faculty felt that it was, particularly for large classes, quite a chore. So, I am interested in hearing from people about that. Also, if you can ask your colleagues if they have had that experience.

COLSA senator: I teach two really rather large courses this semester. And I can tell you that going through the massive list of students was time-consuming. I think what was really hard for me is that students in my courses get to drop one of their exams and they get to drop a homework assignment. So, I was marking students that were having issues but, at the same time, it's very difficult for me to make a

determination so early in the year when, while they didn't do well on this exam, but their homework assignments have been fine. Or they did poorly on this exam and they're poor on their homework.

The other thing that I found is that if you miss a click or a check or a reason anywhere on that document, you cannot submit. And when you have 300 students, like I do right now, that is super time-consuming. For the reasoning, I ended up having to put in comments that provided some context to things and that took a lot of time too. So, I'm not sure if the system can be streamlined a little bit or whether we could just submit a list of names to folks. That would be easier for folks with large classes. It would be just the students that I think are in trouble. That could be a little bit easier than trying to go through and mark each individual student. It is time-consuming.

COLA senator: I understand the reason for including all students in this, but I think that was something that caught some of our colleagues off guard. It used to just be that it was for first-year students. And then all of a sudden, we see all students in all of your classes. And that coupled with the fact that it wasn't really clear that this was something that we were being asked to do and that we could opt into rather than it being something that was required of us. Like Tim said, when you've got a lot of students and you feel like suddenly, you're being required to do something that requires so much more work for so many more students. It seems like it was sort of a sneaky mandate. And I think that's some of the pushback on this. So, I would just say better transparency and better communication about it is needed. And like I said to over-communicate about things is probably not a bad idea. .

COLA Senator 2: I had a question about the follow up email that we got from Nicky Gullace where she notes that alerted student got an automated message listing a variety of support services and that, ideally, academic advisors would contact them. I am concerned about what is the upshot of submitting student names. Someone who is currently on the Student Affairs Committee can chime in here, but what I remember from last year is a discussion where we talked about the desirability of expanding this program to include all students but how different resources in different colleges meant that some students would get followed up from academic advisors and some would get an e-mail with a list of links which, I think we all know is not the ideal way of providing support to somebody. So, I would really like some clarification on what has been accomplished by expanding the program. Are we simply expanding the number of emails of resource lists that we send? Or is something potentially more meaningful going to happen?

Andrew: Thank you. There will be a report later in the term, but I will definitely pass that along and ask that it be part of the report.

CEPS Senator 1: Andrew, thank you for bringing this topic. I also have a large class of over 100 students. And I have a friendly suggestion. Can we have this set up so that instructors can flag students at any time during the semester that a student is basically not in a good standing and has some risk of failing the class? That would allow instructors to do it at the right time. For example, let's say I had a big project that I need to wait the results so that I can make a decision of who are the students who actually need a little bit of extra? And in another class, there is an exam. So being able to flag that at the right time would 1) give the students more time if that information is not available earlier. 2) give instructors more flexibility. It will be easier, for example, right after I finish grading exams. I can just say all right here are the students with the lowest grades, I'll just put them in the system. In this way you are also eliminating the issue of having to address every single student from the class. So, this is just a friendly suggestion. If this can be done, I think it will be achieving the purpose which is great, and it will be less burdensome for instructors.

CEPS Senator 2: I share the same difficulty. Also, we allow students to drop an exam, and we also have our first exam late because otherwise all we're testing is which students had and did not have high school Physics and also the quality of said Physics. Frankly, some of the students who didn't [take high school physics] are better off than some of the ones who did. So, I take advantage of the late option since some of them have to

learn some stuff. But the other thing is, I do the ones who look like they're failing. But I also tell them that they need to see me if they got below a certain grade on that first exam. I also tell them that if they get that message, they're going to go to their advisor, and probably the first words out of the advisor's mouth are, "Have you talked to Professor____? I don't know if that's any help, but I think I think the system needs to understand that most of the faculty are trying to do their jobs and even without this system.

Kevin: Andrew [Seal], I imagine you're hoping to continue soliciting these kinds of comments leading up to the report?

Andrew: Yes. Thank you.

Ivo Nedyalkov, chair of the Research and Public Service Committee (RPSC), shared that the RPSC together with the Finance and Administration Committee (FAC) will be working to solicit information about the issues that faculty are facing, and we will need the help of all senators in all departments to get the most feedback as possible for the administration. The goal is to get good data.

The committee is working on the UNH Land acknowledgment statement. Ivo said that the committee has received some feedback on this. As an oversimplification, the question is whether these kinds of statements are good for indigenous people. The short answer is that if this is done right and there are follow-up actions, they are good. Ivo said that Svetlana Peshkova is on the committee she is an expert in this area. The committee will continue to work on this topic and will then bring a report and motion to the Senate.

Svetlana shared that there is support for the UNH Land, Water, and Life Acknowledgement statement which was written with the support of local tribal leaders and indigenous activists.

VI. Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) motion to approve Academic Calendar 2026-27 - Andrew Seal, AAC chair, presented the Motion to approve the Academic Calendar for AY 2026-27. This motion was first presented at the September 27 meeting of the Senate and is unchanged from that presentation.

> **Rationale:** In order to maintain an approved five-year Academic Calendar, the AY 26/27 must be reviewed and included as the last year of the five-year Academic calendar.
>
> **Motion: The Faculty Senate approves the proposed 2026/27 Academic Calendar as provided by the Office of the Registrar (see Appendix.) 2026/27 will be added as the last year of the five-year calendar, which includes the start and end dates for each of 4 regular terms throughout the calendar years starting from AY 2021/22 through AY 2026/27.**
>
> **Appendix**
>
> **Fall Semester 2026**
>
> | | |
> |---|---|
> | Monday, Aug 31 | Classes begin |
> | Monday, Sept. 7 | Labor Day, University Holiday |
> | Monday, Oct. 12 | Fall break day no classes |
> | Friday, Oct. 16 | Mid-semester |
> | Tuesday, Nov. 3 | Election Day - no exams scheduled |
> | Tuesday, Nov. 11 | Veterans Day, University holiday |
> | Wednesday, Nov. 25 | No Classes (University offices open) |
> | Thurs-Fri, Nov. 26-27 | Thanksgiving holidays |
> | Monday, Nov. 30 | Classes resume |

Monday, Dec. 14 (70 days)	Last day of class
Tuesday, Dec. 15	Reading day; 6:00 p.m. final exams begin
Tuesday, Dec. 22	Final exams end

January Term 2027

Monday, Dec. 28	On-line classes & trips begin
Thursday, Jan. 1	New Year's Day, University holiday
Monday, Jan. 4	On-campus classes begin
Monday, Jan. 18	Martin Luther King, Jr. Day, University holiday
Friday, Jan. 22	J-Term classes end

Spring Semester 2027

Tuesday, Jan. 26	Classes begin
Friday, Mar. 12	Mid-semester
Mon-Fri, Mar. 15-19	Spring recess
Monday, Mar. 22	Classes resume
Monday, May 10	Last day of classes
Tuesday, May 11	Reading day or Curtailed Op day
Wednesday, May 12	Reading day
Thursday, May 13	Final Exams begin
Wednesday, May 19	Final Exams end
Saturday, May 22	Commencement

Summer Session 2027

Monday, May 24 – Friday Aug. 6 Classes in session
Monday, May 31 Memorial Day, University holiday

Note: The Summer session dates above were not displayed but were presented to the Senate on October 18.

There were no questions or discussions. The motion was put to a vote. The motion passed with 60 in favor, none opposed, and 1 abstention.

VII. Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) motion to approve the E-UNH Calendar for 2026-27 -Andrew Seal, chair of the AAC, explained that there was an error in the previously provided dates for this calendar.

The correct proposed dates for 2026-27 are:

E-Term 1:	August 24 – October 16 (8 weeks)
E-Term 2:	October 26 – December 18 (8 weeks)
E-Term 3:	January 19 – March 12 (8 weeks)
	* Jan 19 is a Tuesday; Monday, Jan 18 is MLK day
E-Term 4:	March 22 – May 14 (8 weeks)
E-Term 5:	May 24 – July 16 (8 weeks)

The difference in these dates and those previously presented is that the dates of E-Term 1 are now one week closer to the start of the regular academic year fall semester the other dates are adjusted correspondingly. The only other change is that because MLK date falls on a Monday, E-Term 3 will begin on a Tuesday.

The chair explained that this change in dates could be treated as an amendment by substation. There were no objections to the change. Therefore, the changes are considered an approved amendment by substitution.

There was no further discussion on the motion. The motion, as amended, was put to a vote:

Rationale: In order to maintain an approved five-year UNH E-term Calendar, the A Y 2026-27 must be reviewed and included as the last year of the five-year UNH E-term calendar.

Motion: The Faculty Senate approves the proposed 2026/27 UNH E-term calendars provided by the Office of the Registrar (see Appendix.) 2026/27 will be added as the last year of the five-year calendar, which includes the start and end dates for each of 5 terms throughout the calendar years starting from AY 2021/2022 through AY 2026/27.

Appendix

E-Term 1:	August 24 – October 16 (8 weeks)
E-Term 2:	October 26 – December 18 (8 weeks)
E-Term 3:	January 19 – March 12 (8 weeks)
	* Jan 19 is a Tuesday; Monday, Jan 18 is MLK day
E-Term 4:	March 22 – May 14 (8 weeks)
E-Term 5:	May 24 – July 16 (8 weeks)

This motion passed with a vote of 58 in favor, none opposed, and 1 abstention.

VIII. <u>Charles Vannette motion to extend the suspension of rules on online courses</u> - Charles explained that this is a personal motion as follows:

> **Rationale:** UNH no longer follows the color-coded system for Covid-19 status, upon which Senate Motion XXV-M18 relies. However, the Covid-19 pandemic continues, and a small number of courses not normally approved for online instruction have been scheduled for Spring 2022. Departments have already searched out staffing for these scheduled courses, and the Spring 2022 schedule has already been published online. Furthermore, the Senate does not yet have reports from Discovery, Honors, or the Writing Program regarding the permanent lifting of all online teaching restrictions outlined in Senate Motion XXV-M18. Therefore, there is a pressing, practical need to extend the provisions of Senate Motion XXV-M18 through the end of Spring Semester 2022.

> **Motion: The Faculty Senate extends the suspension of all rules related to online courses for Inquiry 444s, Inquiry Labs, Discovery Labs, Honors courses, and Writing Intensive Courses through Summer semester 2022. We encourage faculty to plan for a resumption of pre-Covid modality protocols for summer of 2022.**

Charles explained that this motion reflects the amendment that was passed at the October 18 meeting of the Senate that extended this motion through summer of 2022, instead of Spring semester 2022.

A CEPS senator pointed out that one of the things about Covid is that it allowed him to increase his flexibility as a teacher. He said that he was assigned his first Inquiry class during Covid, and he taught it successfully online. He said that if he had to deliver this course in person, he wouldn't be able to deliver the same content again. He asked if there is a petition process for teaching Inquiry courses online post-Covid.

Charles responded that these restrictions apply only to Inquiry 444 courses and not all of them are Inquiry Labs. So, the course he is referring to may not be covered by this motion anyway. Charles also explained that the Academic Program Committee also has the charge to gather reports on these limited courses that are covered by the motion, and they are gathering the reports from the Discovery Committee, Honors, and the Writing Intensive Committee about these restrictions. Once all the reports are in, the APC will present to the Senate and the Senate can move forward on what it thinks is best in the future.

Andy Colby pointed out that there was a 2019 motion that removed the 2013 moratorium on Inquiry except for Inquiry 444 and Inquiry labs.

The motion was put to a vote. The motion passed with 61 in favor, none opposed, and 1 abstention.

IX. <u>Interim report from the ad hoc committee on Student Evaluations of Teaching</u> - The chair introduced Robin Hackett, co-chair of this ad hoc committee, explaining that Kate Ziemer, the other co-chair, was not available to attend today. The interim report is attached as Appendix VIII.1.

The following is a transcription of the presentation and Q&A:

Robin Hackett: We spent the early meeting familiarizing ourselves with the substantial existing research about student evaluations and identifying the central issues related to coming up with a new evaluation plan. We came to consensus early on that developing a perfect bias-free instrument is not a realistic goal. We agreed that calling the instrument a survey, rather than an evaluation of teaching draws attention to what the instrument can do in a way from what it can't do. There has been a lot of research about student evaluations. And we decided that our committee's time was best Spence, dividing ourselves into two. One group would cobble together based on best practices a reasonable survey. And the other group would

spend time trying to figure out and propose a plan for how to use those evaluations. We agreed that are timeless, better spent describing and proposing how the evaluations could be used, including by all the constituents, students, faculty, chairs, administrators, and then also trying to describe how we can up the response rate

We divide ourselves into two working groups. One group is coming up with a survey which we will get to you shortly. The other group is working on a plan or proposal for how to use the evaluations and now to make sure we get good response rates. You can expect that the proposal that you get will have a survey that has both open-ended questions and the Likert scale questions. You can expect as well that the proposal will include questions that are common to everybody across the university and there also an opportunity for faculty and departments to design their own questions. The group that's working on proposing a philosophy of how these things will be used, will likely suggest that the student survey be only one of many ways to assess faculty quality of teaching for merit, tenure, and promotion. So, the two groups are in the process of drafting these things. They will get them to Kate and me and then Kate and I will then make them into a tiny proposal and send them to you for feedback. And then we'll revise based on your feedback.

Our timeline is to get a proposal to you by the 22nd [of November]. This is our optimistic timeline to get the proposal to you for discussion at the meeting on the 29th of November and then we will revise based on your feedback. Use the spring to normalize the new tool and to do training as necessary for departments. Faculty and administrators will do a soft launch. We hope to be aligned to do a soft launch in the summer and a then a full launch in the fall of 22.

COLSA senator 1: Admittedly, all of these surveys have biases. This tool alike will have biases, right? Saying that, how do we plan to, or do we have a plan to assess said biases to identify them?

Robin: Short answer. No. We spent a long time trying to describe exactly how the biases would work. And we came to agree that there has been a lot of research that shows conclusively that the student evaluations are biased and there's no way for us to create a perfect tool. And the best approach to mitigating the effects of those biases, which are inevitably going to be there, is to describe how the tool is used and also to reduce its significance in relation to promotion and tenure questions. Calling it a student survey points to what students are good at knowing which is their own experience and it reduces the implications or the impression that they are evaluating us for quality, because we know that those biases are there. The chairs need something to work with, administrators need something to work with, but we know these instruments are biased. There is nothing we can do to repair that. And so, we want to downplay the impact of that bias and use the tool as a way for students to reflect on their own experience.

COLSA senator 1: I understand that. I can't say that I agree with the assertion that we have no way of addressing or understanding the biases, but we will leave that for another time, and I'll let Vidya take it from here.

CHHS senator: I first wanted to react to previous comment and say that I agree. And while I see that it's important for us to collect feedback from students, even in the report, I saw a statement that this will be one of the ways in which faculty teaching effectiveness will be evaluated. Which again, I have problems when given that the committee itself acknowledges that this is a biased instrument.

My original comment had to do with the timing of the evaluations. Will you be thinking about when these evaluations will happen? Is it meant to be more of a summative evaluation at the end of the semester, or formative that happens earlier than the end, sometime in mid-semester?

Robin: So, we discussed that when it came up in the group. I think the proposal you're going to see has us sticking with an end of semester timeline.

COLA senator 1: First of all, thank you for what I imagine was a whole bunch of background reading and research into this issue and I think we all appreciate that. My question has to do with the individual questions that faculty members are allowed to write in addition to the standardized questions. It makes me a little concerned with the bias that already exists in very well thought out questions. If faculty write questions that are maybe not so advisable or not fully thought out, one, is it possible to have the faculty made individualizing questions only be returned to the faculty member themselves rather than something that goes up the chain for tenure and review? . That would be a sort of a concern of mine and I'm not certain that machinery allows for that.

And secondly, have we thought about maybe sort of advising faculty as to the types of questions or communicating to faculty as to where the trip wires are? May you haven't gotten into the process yet to be considering these, but those are two concerns that come to mind immediately with the faculty produced questions.

Robin: So, the idea with the faculty produced questions, you said that those would go only to the faculty and the faculty can share them in part or in whole as the individuals wanted to connection with their P &T documents. And yes, we did talk a lot about one of the things that would have to happen if we do have a new philosophy of teaching evaluations or student surveys would be that there would have to be a lot of training of faculty, of administrators, of students and a re-education process for what these things are and how they can help us improve our teaching and the limits to what they can do as far as informing P & T decisions. So, yes, the easy part on this committee is coming up with the list of questions that are pretty good because there's already a lot of research that we can just borrow. We will come up with some questions. Of course, they can be word- smithed and tinkered with and you'll have opportunities to tinker with them. But the vast majority of the work comes on the other side with describing how they will be used and really trying to reduce their impact in all P & T processes.

Therefore, they are for faculty's own processes of improving, of knowing what students think, knowing what students say. They are for students, ideally, to be self-reflective about their own process about what the connection is between what goes on in class and what they hope to do in their lives. That's what those self-reflective questions are good for. They're not so good at telling us that we're really smart or we are super good or other kinds of evaluative things about teaching or about our disciplines. Students are not the experts. They are the experts in their own experience. and so, the questions that you are going to see in the proposal are designed to help students reflect on their own experience - where they do have expertise.

COLSA senator 2: Robin, did I hear you correctly that you are saying that these evaluations would only go to faculty and would not go to chairs or administrative units?

Robin: The questions are designed by individual faculty - you have a section on the questionnaire that will go up and be disseminated broadly. And then a part of the questionnaire that you get to decide on your own. For example, if you tried something new and you want to know how it works, you'll be able to design your question. Those answers will go only to the faculty.

COLSA senator 2: I guess my concern is once the information is made available to the administration or made available to supervisors, it's kind of hard to take a bit of that information and kind of push it over here and ignore it for items like promotion, tenure, renewal, etc. That is one of my concerns and the other is that I'm not aware of, other than peer evaluation which happens very infrequently, of other avenues that the

administration is going to utilize to determine effectiveness and teaching. And for someone who is non-tenure track like myself, that is kind of important for me to be renewed. So, I think in how these are designed and the language that is around how these evaluations can be used, I just want to stress that once that information is out of the bag - I mean, they're not supposed to use it for that now and I know that they - it plays a role. So, it's little bit of a paranoia on my part, especially when there's very little else that's available for evaluation with regards to teaching effectiveness.

Robin: So, we talked about that in committee at length. That is a huge concern. And there are a couple of ways to try to address those concerns. One is the education that goes along with the new instruments. I know that it is an imperfect system. As you say, once the information is available, then it gets used in ways you can't necessarily control. But we can try with a new education about how to use these things. The other way to deal with what you're talking about - the concern that you have - is to try to de-emphasize the importance of these things altogether. So, the more energy we put into them, the more we tinker with the exact questions, the more we suggest that they are really important for all kinds of evaluations. And we would try to clarify that in the proposal and with the education that goes along with them.

We also agreed that if we have to figure out all the ways in which faculty will be evaluated before we put together a proposal for tinkering with the student evaluations, we will never finish. So, that's a piece that has to happen and everybody on the committee, I think, would agree that after we get this proposal the next step is going to be some more proposals about how else we are evaluated. Peer evaluations, which, as you say, don't happen very often now, are going to have to change if we are de-emphasizing the significance of student surveys - and not calling them evaluations. If we call them surveys that are about students being self-reflective. They're mainly to track, for your own sake, the progress of your own teaching and whether or not you've made changes that are effective. Some of the questions will be passed on to chairs and administrators; some will not. So, it is a multi-pronged effort to de-emphasize these things in the P&T processes. Like I said, if we have to figure it all out before we redesign the instrument we failed before we get anything to you.

Senate chair, Kevin Healey: Thanks, Robin. Your answers so far are so thorough and thoughtful. I guess I had one comment, maybe to tweak the language around de-emphasizing the students survey. The communication part of it as kind of a re-branding PR effort. I know that students have expressed some concern saying, " Faculty Senate doesn't want students to evaluate them, and they don't care what we think." So, I want to avoid that perception . So, I would maybe say that in downplaying we want to de-emphasize the inappropriate use of this data and, but at the same time amplify the useful and appropriate purposes of this kind of data because that is what we are doing, really. I mean, if it served no purpose, we would just get rid of it altogether. So, it must serve some purpose. What we are trying to do is amplify that purpose and de-emphasize the problematic parts that we are all aware of.

My other thought was about Tim's question about when faculty are able to write questions, and actually Matt's concern about that, if we already know that questions are biased, even when we give great thought to them, and faculty can just write whatever questions. I'm wondering if maybe a compromise would be that faculty-drafted questions could initially only go to faculty but if the faculty want them to, they could be entered into some sort of queue that can be reviewed and they could become part of some set of optional questions that people could trigger on and off. If they are approved because we know that they are vetted and we know that they are good valid tools for assessing something, then if you've used those optional questions they would go to the to the chair.

Robin: In the research that this group has reviewed, it's not so much that the questions are biased. It is that no matter what you ask the student responses reliably evaluate women faculty lower than men faculty,

people of color lower than white people, people with accents lower the people who are perceived not to have an accent. This is so well shown that it is not worth trying to get around. No matter what question you design, no matter what survey you design, we shouldn't be too surprised that students own biases are reflected. So, what we decided is that we can spend forever trying to come up with the perfect survey, and it would still reflect student biases because students are human beings. They have biases and they show, no matter what beautiful, perfect, well-crafted broadly vetted question or questionnaire you come up with. So, use best practices, come up with the questions, come up with a slate of questions that are pretty good – that are good enough and then try to mitigate the effect of student biases by asking students to reflect on their own experience. Assume that biases - sexism and racism and homophobia - are going to be evident in the surveys. And, then deal with that inevitability in ways that are appropriate to show students experiences and to show student biases. And we can also, of course, try to work with the evaluations to try to undo biases and unlearn them. I'm going to hope that all of our teaching is informed by that value all the time already. And anything we do in the classroom can be informed by those values. So, we can try to design questions that help students be reflective about all kinds of things but, we don't have to have the survey pass on those biases to P & T processes. We can still have a good process. We can still give students the confidence that we care about what they think by asking them questions, which is perhaps the most important effect of a good survey and take it seriously. De-emphasize is my word. It won't show up on the proposal you get, I'm pretty sure. I think I'm answering the question about how this committee is choosing to spend our time and efforts – not in creating questionnaires that are not going to be perfect, that have already been well-discussed by a lot of really smart people. Just take something that's good enough and then figure out how we want to use it at UNH in a way that is productive for students, for faculty, for UNH, for chairs who need to make decisions, for individual faculty who want to improve their teaching, and for administrators.

And one thing that might be an advantage to a good student survey is individual faculty and chairs cannot differentiate necessarily between good and bad or, or worse and better, but progress, right? If an individual faculty can extract from survey data that one thing works better than something else, then you can keep improving your pedagogies.

CEPS senator 1: Robin, first off, I just wanted to echo a comment in the chat. Thank you and the committee so much for spending all this time on this incredibly valuable work. Very much appreciate it and thank you. I just wanted to make two suggestions about the rollout of this new tool. The first would be that it be sort of phased in, in a way where existing faculty, particularly junior faculty, could choose to use the old survey for up to six years so that they do have exactly that sense of progress that you were just referring to without switching the instrument midstream. So, people be able to opt-in whenever they want and that could be up to six years after it's initially used, six or seven years.

The second suggestion would be to actually hold off the deployment until we get those other prongs - to make all the tines of the fork the same length, in other words. So, we have this new tool. But also, since that's going to de-emphasize the uses to which the tool would be put. I mean, I completely agree with him. Of course, the P&T committees are immediately going to find well, what's the question 14 on this one? And let's focus on that single number. So, I think it's wonderful to try to deemphasize that. But the only way that that could possibly work in reality is if we have the additional methods that are ready to go, and people know how to use them, and it is just instantaneous because otherwise, it's so easy to focus on a single number to the exclusion of all reasonableness. I would hate that all the thoughtfulness of your committee goes to waste to have this misused immediately. So, I would propose that we sort of suspend deployment until we have those other prongs of the fork ready to go in with whatever methodologies are deemed to be best practices according to the careful literature search that you guys are doing.

Robin: I will certainly take that back to the group. And I personally agree with you. I think that this group is going to say we need to create this report and give it to the Faculty Senate. And then let the Faculty Senate respond by approving with the caveat that these other things are done. It's too big to take on all those other things at the same time. It is a lot of moving parts, but we need some other labor going on and, in another subcommittee, perhaps to create some of those other moving parts and a proposal for how they are going to fit together.

COLA senator 2: I'll try to keep this quick. I just want to quickly respond to what Wheeler said. Some of those other pieces are issues that actually fall under labor and contract negotiations. So that's another piece that would be really quite complicated. It is not something that the Senate really would be weighing in so much, the evaluation of faculty. That is something that would be worked out through collective bargaining. So, I think that's another complicating factor here.

But to get to my thinking about what Robin is saying, thank you so much for the work your committee is doing on this. And I'm really looking forward to seeing the questions because so much about the questions and the numerical emphasis on the current evaluations are really deeply problematic as other people have said.

I'm wondering if it's this is the time for you or the place for you to be able to comment on the administration's sense of thinking about the de-emphasizing, for lack of a better word, or properly contextualizing the use of the evaluations is. I don't really have any sense of whether the administration's thinking about ceding some of that control in the way that they have this. And if it's not appropriate to talk about that here, I'm happy to talk about this someplace else.

I also would offer as a suggestion that there is some really good contextualizing language that can be found in some of the college-level guidance for the evaluation of lecturer faculty. I can send that along to you. But the university- wide document on that has some really good language about how high numerical evaluations don't necessarily mean effective teaching and low numerical evaluations don't necessarily mean ineffective teaching. I'll send that to you, but I just wanted to put that out there as a suggestion.

Robin: Thank you. That would be wonderful. To try to answer your question. My hunch is that - this is me personally not the group, is that there's going to be a lot of pushback from the administration because they will say that we have to use something. But we anticipate that and the proposal that you are going to see is going to include a lot of language about why it's a good idea. And that also we understand that there have to be ways for evaluations at the administrative level to also happen. So, we can't fix everything, but I think the reports you're going to get will go a long way toward addressing that concern. We know that whatever we come up with it will fall flat on its face if the administration – and chairs – are in a difficult situation and have nothing to work with. I hope we'll be able to have enough language in there to alleviate those fears.

Senate chair, Kevin Healey: Thanks for answering all those questions, Robin. My sense is that this is exactly the kind of feedback that you were hoping to get. And that and that once you do present a report, you'll get additional feedback on that. Clearly, people are interested and motivated to comment on this.

X. About Student Evaluations of Teaching for Fall 2021 through Spring 2022. - Kevin Healey explained that he will be asking SVPAA Kate Ziemer to send out a communication to clarify where things stand for evaluations for

Kevin shared slides as follow to explain where things stand

<div align="center">

What is happening with
Fall and Spring Evaluations?

</div>

- May 2021 motion indicates that Motion XXV-M12 continues until the Senate approves a new course survey protocol.

- Given the timing, this translates into the Senate- approved questions from November 2020 – delivered via the Blue system – to be used for Fall 2021 through Spring 2022, at a minimum.

- Faculty do have the option to additionally conduct their own survey using the original pre-COVID question. (Faculty can request the Qualtrics template from IT with the pre-Covid questions.)

- Per Senate Motion XXV-M12, neither the surveys nor the standard evaluations are to be used in assessments for renewal, promotion, or tenure decisions unless the faculty member explicitly asks for them to be admitted into the process. At this point, this provision also continues through Spring 2022, at a minimum.

- We recommend that faculty ensure that your chair is aware of their preference for student evaluation data in their renewal, promotion, and tenure files. This applies to evaluation data going back to Spring 2020 through Spring 2022.

Jeffrey asked if this information will be presented in a concise email so that it is easier for faculty to take this information to the chair. Kevin shared again he will be asking Kate Ziemer to send out a communication on this. As well, this information will be in the Final Agenda page and in the minutes.

XI. New Business: Ivo Nedyalkov, chair of the RPSC, shared that he hopes to receive support from faculty senators in obtaining information about issues that need to be resolved. He shared that there will be a communication to all senators and. The Senate chair pointed out that all information is welcome.

XII. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 PM

Some UNH acronyms:

AAC	Academic Affairs Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)
AC	Agenda Committee of the Faculty Senate
ASAC	Academic Standards & Advising Committee
APC	Academic Program Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)
AT	Academic Technology
BAC	Budget Advisory Committee
CaPS	Career and Professional Services

C&PA	Communications & Public Affairs
CCLEAR	Clinical, Contract, Lecturer, Extension, Alternative Security, Research faculty
CEITL	Center for Excellence & Innovation in Teaching & Learning
CERP	Covid Early Retirement Program
CFAR	Center for Academic Resources
CORPAD	University Committee on Real Property Acquisition and Disposal
CPC	Campus Planning Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)
DRC	Discovery Review Committee
ET&S	Enterprise Technology & Services
FAC	Finance & Administration Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)
FAR	Financial & Administration Restructure Project
FAR	Faculty Activity Reporting
FOC	Financial Operations Center
IRA	Institutional Research and Assessment
IT	Information Technology
ITC	Information Technology Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)
JSMB	Joint Strategic Management Board (Navitas review)
KRONOS	USNH Time Management System (now under the name UKG Dimensions)
LC	Library Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)
OISS	Office for International Students & Scholars
OS	Operating Staff
PACS	Psychological and Counseling Services
PAT	Professional and Technical Staff
PSC	Professional Standards Committee (FS permanent committee)
RPSC	Research & Public Service Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)
SAARC	Space Allocation, Adaption and Renewal Committee
SAC	Student Affairs Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)
SAS	Student Accessibility Services
SHARPP	Sexual Harassment and Rape Prevention Program
SSSC	Student Success Steering Committee
STAR	Support Team for the Administration of Research
SVPAA	Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
UCAPC	University Curriculum & Academic Policies Committee (FS permanent committee)
UKG	USNH Time Management System (formerly named KRONOS)
USHOP	Central purchasing system put in place by USNH Procurement.
VPFA	Vice President for Finance and Administration