

University of New Hampshire

University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository

Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes

Faculty Senate Documents

4-11-2022

2020-2021 FACULTY SENATE XXVI - April 11, 2022 Minutes Summary

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "2020-2021 FACULTY SENATE XXVI - April 11, 2022 Minutes Summary" (2022). *Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes*. 64.

https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty_senate_agendas_minutes/64

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
2020-2021 FACULTY SENATE XXVI

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 11, 2022, via ZOOM MINUTES SUMMARY

I. Provost Jones comments and questions

Provost Jones began with 3 items to share:

- The university experienced a small COVID wave this past week. This wave was student centric and did not appear to translate to faculty and staff. The administration is sending a message to students this week reminding them that COVID is still with us and booster shots are available. In addition, faculty should note tents are up and can be used for outdoor classes. Booster shots are available through Health and Wellness for all students and faculty/staff 50 years of age and older.
- There are continued efforts around process improvements. Provost Jones met with Josh DuBroff this week. The work continues on U-Shop. Calls to the helpline have continued to drop off significantly. This indicates that the original calls were successful, and callers have found their path to get their questions answered. Josh would like to come to FS to offer an update on U-Shop. Currently over 80% of transactions are being processed within 12 hours. Given that Josh would not be ready to provide Senate with an update until the last week of class, Provost Jones recommended he wait and offer Senate a more comprehensive review to either the AC this summer or even the first Senate meeting in the fall. A core challenge is the 25 year old Banner system, the ERP. This fall it is time to update the banner system. There will be a team put together to develop the new system. FS will be invited to participate. Changes will be system wide and will take at least a year and half to move through development to implementation.
- The university has a LinkedIn subscription available throughout campus and includes LinkedIn learning. This resource is now available to all students, faculty and staff. The LinkedIn learning tools are very helpful and might be useful to incorporate into classes. There will be a planned rollout of the service. Grad students will be made aware first, undergraduates likely in August. It's helpful to know about the service as many of the learning tools are valuable for both personal and teaching purposes.

Questions and Answers:

- Vice Chair Matt MacManes asked for clarification surrounding an email some faculty received regarding summer support. Is he correct in understanding this is a process change in paperwork only? Answer: Yes, this is accurate. Last summer, there were problems with faculty not getting their summer pay. All of the colleges were processing

payments differently. Administration worked with HR and the research department among others to make the process of submitting for pay more efficient and streamlined. The purpose is to have everyone using the same process. Changes do not relate to the guidelines surrounding summer work.

- A senator shared her department is excited and looking forward to moving into “new Spaulding”. As the Bio department gets ready to move, some classes are being held on the third floor of Nesmith. The problem is the 3rd floor is not ADA compliant. Faculty are being told they cannot hold their classes somewhere else. Is the administration ok with classes being held in spaces that are not ADA compliant? Answer: Absolutely not. In fact, administration is working on a proposal to the state legislature right now to renovate Nesmith. In the interim, the registrar’s office is helping to identify under-utilized classrooms. If there is a particular issue or need, please reach out to Scott Lipinski who can help identify an adequate interim classroom space.
- A Senator asked if there is there anything new to share with regards to contract negotiations? Answer: nothing new right now. Lectures and the NEA union had meetings in the past few weeks. Provost Jones is awaiting the fact-finding report. From there we will work to find closure. The goal remains to finish contract negotiations this year.
- A Senator asked if Provost Jones was aware of the construction projects which are creating safety issues? Answer: Construction is moving along on time and on schedule. Provost Jones shared he will check with Bill Janelle who is going to be the lead on this work. In addition, Provost Jones will check with Chief Dean to see if more can be done around safety on McDaniel’s drive.
- Chair Kevin Healey asked if there was anything Provost Jones wanted to share with regards to the upcoming commencement. Secondly, can you say more about the drop off of calls related to the call center. The call center represents just one metric within the communications around the restructuring. Answer: Administration pays close attention to the metrics within the call center. There are three areas which are tracked:

1. Calls into the generic helpline;
2. Calls that are confidential to the helpline;
3. Calls related to STAR, the financial team, the HR team and procurement and accounts payable. All have been dropping. There is now stability in all departments. Identifying the right person to manage the calls has helped the call volume. Provost Jones is paying close attention to ensure the graduate research appointment are happening in a timely manner.

Commencement: The university is continuing its success in recognizing all of the colleges. Each student will have their name read. Commencement will be held outside at the Whittemore Center. College deans are taking the lead in speakers and programs. Students are very excited to participate in all of the commencement activities.

Provost Jones left the meeting.

Chair Kevin Healey recognized guest Sarah Batterson, director of liberal arts at Granite State College. Sarah joined Senate as an observer.

II. Approval of minutes from 3/28/2022. An edit was raised regarding Tom Cronin's comments regarding the New Hampshire state legislature. Edits will be placed in brackets. Minutes were approved by unanimous consent.

III. Updates from Chair

- Next year Senate will remain on Zoom for the duration of the 2022-23 academic year.
- FS and HR management reached an agreement that an MOU / shared governance agreement will be drawn up between the two entities. This will include a set of shared principles underscoring a commitment to shared governance.
- Kai Germaschewski and Julee Holcombe met with Bill Poirier, the CIO. Bill is proactive in listening to and addressing concerns. The work of new email standards is underway and being shepherded by Julee and Kai.
- New charges were given to the AAC and APC. This charge allows FS oversight over aspects of the UNH-M and GSC merger process.
- Reading day will not be used as a class make-up day. Making reading day a class day would be too disruptive at this point in the year.
- Kevin shared he has begun the process of writing a statement related to academic freedom.

IV. Research and Public Service Committee

Chair Ivo Nedyalkov shared his committee's 2 motions. The group was reminded the original motions were amended to include a 7th bullet that reads "Update the RSPC of the faculty senate on the implementation of items 1-6 in two years." Secondly, in the first sentence of the final paragraph, the word "recommended" was changed to "instructed". The committee reconfirmed they would not be offering direction as to who should be reading the land acknowledgement statement at university events.

1st motion passed with 54 in favor, 0 nays, 1 abstention

2nd motion passed with 55 in favor, 1 nay and 1 abstention

Ivo went on to share that he wanted to propose a motion related to removing My Elements. He was suggesting a motion regarding departments requiring the use of My Elements.

V. FAC Final Report.

FAC Chair Stephen Pimpare shared highlights from the FAC final report. Highlights included:

- The PowerPoint slide deck is available electronically and is designed to be self explanatory.
- The report lays out what the FAC sees as the upper level financial state of the institution.
- The committee is still waiting on historical and current data on the number of courses being taught by adjunct professors.
- The challenge is there are a large number of employees in the system who are working under contracts but listed in the system as adjuncts. This also includes staff in all areas of

the university including food service workers. There is no easy way to separate out the adjunct faculty from the other contract staff.

- The merger will complicate this issue as the merger will likely result in double the number of adjuncts.
- The FAC has requested even the most simple cost analysis of the financial impact / cost of the merger. So far, the committee has not seen any such data.
- Dean Mike DeCelle had presented a figure of 4 million +/- to effectuate the merger itself. Plus another 8 million plus to bring aspects of UNH online.
- Stephen thanked Roger Allen Ford, Mark Lyons, Roger Grinde, and Ruth Sample for their help in preparing the report.

Questions for Stephen Pimpare

1. A question referencing a chart in the report re: tenured track vs non-tenured track, does this include other types of faculty? Answer: yes, everyone but adjunct professors.
2. GSC and UNH faculty have different titles and job descriptions. GSC faculty are also administrators. How will this be reconciled. SVPAA Kate Ziemer shared the Substantive Change document that addresses this issue. Amanda shared the document with the full Senate during the meeting. GSC faculty will be faculty and thus will have a role on Senate. This is included in the report that was sent to NECHE. The report includes a broad projection of faculty with an expectation this will be financially stable.
3. Stephen shared it came to light that the HR merger committee was missing a faculty member. Has this been fixed? SVPAA replied this was a matter of timing. The plan is to bring in the right faculty groups at the right time, but the first group that will be involved is the GSC faculty. The issue has not yet been resolved.
4. A senator asked if there has been thought as to how GSC faculty will be brought into Senate. Kevin shared this has been discussed in AC. Vidya shared the reason there is a GSC faculty guest today is for just this reason: to bring GSC colleagues into the fold.

VI. Motion from Ad Hoc Committee on Diversity Requirement for GE

A motion was introduced by Anna Wainwright, chair of the Ad hoc Committee on the Diversity Requirement for GE. The committee has focused this semester on gathering history and information with regards to what the university is currently doing around this issue. The committee felt the first step was to put forth a motion affirming the university's commitment to diversity by endorsing the university's diversity statement. This motion represents a foundational agreement.

There was a discussion around whether the committee intended this motion to be a draft motion or an actual motion. It was determined that any language tweaks would not be substantive enough to prevent introducing the motion at today's meeting.

A Senator clarified the intent of the motion and tweaked the language to clarify the purpose. The motion was intended to endorse 3 statements:

- UNH's Public Diversity Statement
- The university's assertion that UNH students be prepared to "function effectively in diverse settings" and be
- "engaged and ethical global citizens".

A suggestion was made that Anna share the statements with Amanda so that they may be linked to the FS website.

Another Senator shared that she does not support the public diversity statement of the university as it has not been her experience that the statement is true. She did not support the committee using the university's diversity statement as a starting point. Though she does want to ensure the university be welcoming to all students, faculty and staff.

Chair Kevin Healey suggested the motion either be tweaked or amended to address the concerns that have been raised. The committee chair will be taking the motion and comments back to the committee to make the language more reflective of the FS discussion.

VII. Vote on Motion of Ad Hoc Committee on Student Evaluations of Teaching.

Barb White, co-chair of the Ad Hoc Committee on Student Evaluations of Teaching read the committee's motion. Barb pointed out the motion has 3 friendly amendments that were added from the previous Senate meeting:

- Changing the name from Student Evaluation of Teaching to Student Experience of Learning.
- The committee was made aware of a 2017 FS motion related to student evaluations of teaching. The new ad hoc committee reviewed the previous Senate work and incorporated the previous committee work into this new effort/report. Both committees went through a similar process and came to similar conclusions. The 2017 committee had not developed a new evaluations tool.
- Language was added to the report that stated "promotion, tenure, post-tenure, analogous reviews for CCLEAR faculty, and reviews for any teaching faculty of record, and guidance for students"

A Senator shared department feedback regarding the tool and asked about reversing the order of the Likert items. Barb shared another department had raised the same issue/question. The Senate Parliamentarian asked if the committee still intended to share the instrument with CEITL and the Survey Center. Barb answered that CEITL has already done their piece but yes, the tool would be sent to the Survey Center for review. Currently, the motion as written locks in the language of the evaluation tool. The motion was amended to reflect language tweaks the Survey Center might add to make best use of the tool. The new language is "Senate hereby approves the Student Experience of Teaching instrument and its further development as described in the report for pilot use".

Questions: A Senator asked a question about the area in the tool allowing colleges/department to add their own tailored questions. The concern is the “blank slate” aspects of these questions might diminish the intent of the tool. Should there be some guardrails or parameters placed around these individualized questions. A discussion continued on the use of the discretionary aspects of the questions colleges and departments can add. Chair Kevin Healey suggested that concerns around this aspect of the evaluation tool need not prevent Senate from voting on the motion and in fact, voting today does not prevent Senate from drafting a follow up motion addressing these process questions at a later date.

Question: Another Senator raised a concern around the question of whether a student would recommend this instructor to another student. The idea of recommending an instructor felt akin to a restaurant review. Instinctively, students will base this question on whether the instructor was fun or easy to work with, etc., but not on learning per say. Secondly, the same Senator agreed with the previous questioner that the opened ended aspects of the questions departments and colleges could insert could go against the intended spirit to the evaluation tool. Lastly, there was a concern on the qualitative nature of the evaluation and the lack of guidance on how to use the information gleaned from the evaluation. The sample questions provided by Paul College were appreciated in that the question asked “did this instructor help me think and learn” vs “would you recommend this instructor”?

SVPAZ Ziemer was asked if she would like to comment on the Likert scale and the concerns raised by Senators on this issue. She responded to the importance of educating students on how to effectively use the tool. To this end, work is being done with Student Senate on a campaign directed at educating students on the appropriate use of the tool. In addition, the area within the evaluation tool where instructors can insert her/his individualized questions either as a Likert scale or in an open-ended format could also be a place to address the concerns raised. In developing the tool, the committee thought by providing both the Likert scale and the opened ended questions gave the instructor the opportunity to dig a bit deeper on student answers. This approach provides an opportunity for self-reflection.

Questions and feedback continued with a Senator from Paul College also commenting on the Likert scale question related to students recommending teachers. This question will be very different for students in large, required lecture courses vs a junior or senior taking a course within his/her major. Offering an evaluation of an instructor in a required large lecture class has little value as students really have no choice in whether to take these courses. In fact, too much data from this question could be misinterpreted. This question is not helpful to instructors teaching large lecture courses. This point was echoed by another Senator from Paul College. In addition, the Senator pointed out what was missing from the tool. In particular he felt students should be asked the following questions:

- How many classes did you miss?
- How many hours a week did you spend on this course and its work?
- What is the final grade you are expecting?

As an instructor, answers to these questions provide valuable information, particularly in light of the fact that no tool will be perfect and instructors have little control over how these evaluations are used. Questions like those above help put the other information gathered via to the tool into context.

A third Senator agreed with the previous comments. He added that perhaps it is faculty and not colleges/departments that add additional questions.

Chair Kevin Healey reminded the group that this evaluation tool is in a pilot phase. Talking about the tool and raising concerns is exactly right. By definition, a pilot program is one whereby Senate continues to raise concerns and make changes on an as-needed basis. Barb appreciated Kevin's comments and agreed. The tool needs to be put to use so that all can understand how it preforms. The committee did not want to make assumptions which is why the pilot is for 3 years allowing the tool to continue to be evaluated.

Chair Kevin Healey called for a vote on the motion via raised hands. The motion passed with 37 in favor, 8 nays, 5 abstentions.

VIII. Motions on Constitutional Amendments

Vice Chair Matthew MacManes introduced two Constitutional Amendments.

1. The first pertains to the Faculty Senate Agenda Committee. The amendment would continue the practice of ensuring both the FS chair and vice chair remain tenured faculty, however the 3 remaining at large seats could be held by any sitting Senator including CCLEAR faculty. This item relates to point 5 in the current Senate Constitution. The AC appreciated the concerns regarding the ratio between tenured and non-tenured faculty. The committee intended to address this in part by requiring the chair and vice-chair be tenured faculty. In theory, with two tenured members required to be on the committee this could create a bias but that's a balance the committee is willing to accept with the current amended language.
2. The second amendment refers to point 2 of the Senate Constitution and seeks to remove restrictions on CCLEAR faculty from serving as the first Senator for departments with 15 or fewer faculty.

IX. New Business

Betsy Coleman a Senator from the Computer Science Department raised a question regarding common exam time. She was seeking feedback concerning an instructor teaching a course that meets at multiple times and wants to do something during exam time that is not a test. This Senator builds guest speakers into her curriculum but may need to offer these speakers at times when some of her students may not be meeting. Guest speakers may only be available during a given time slot. Currently instructors cannot use common exam times for mandatory attendance unless they are giving a test. Do others have this issue? Chair Kevin Healey encouraged Senators to reach out to Betsy directly. Betsy should circle back with Kevin to put this issue on the AC agenda.

The meeting was adjourned.