

University of New Hampshire

University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository

Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes

Faculty Senate Documents

11-4-2019

2019-2020 FACULTY SENATE XXIV - November 4, 2019 Minutes Summary

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "2019-2020 FACULTY SENATE XXIV - November 4, 2019 Minutes Summary" (2019).
Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes. 117.
https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty_senate_agendas_minutes/117

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
2019-2020 FACULTY SENATE XXIV

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 November 4, 2019 MINUTES SUMMARY

I. Roll – The following senators were absent: Ballestero, Bartow, Haines, Kim, and Magnusson. The following members were excused: Davis, Hiller, and McMahon. Wayne Jones was a guest.

II. Remarks by and questions to the provost – Provost Wayne Jones shared a number of updates:

- The graduate student housing project at 66 Main Street did not come up for a vote at the recent Board of Trustees (BOT) meeting. Wayne explained that the System has taken over the negotiations. However, he made assurances that we are fully engaged in the project. The holdup has nothing to do with what is important to the university and its graduate students.

- Navitas (Global Student Success Program) has decided to no longer continue at UNH in response to the university's decision to not enter into a 10-year renewal contract that was offered. Navitas has pulled out of most US universities and they have shifted their strategy. Our Navitas contract will officially end in November of 2020. Therefore, we won't be taking Navitas students beyond the spring semester. However, we will be teaching out the current students in the program and we are negotiating with Navitas about how they can pay us to do this. Shorelight, with whom UNH recently signed a contract for recruiting direct entry students, is very interested in stepping into the void that Navitas leaves behind. That will involve a new negotiation and contract.

- The BOT did approve a tuition freeze for in-state undergraduate tuition for next year. That freeze was in concert with the approval by the state legislature for a signed budget that is going to add about \$8 million to the system over the course of the biennium. The whole \$8 million doesn't come to UNH, but we should get about 74% of it. No decision has been made on fees, out-of-state student tuition, or graduate student tuition. There is a desire to freeze fees, however, there are requests from students to raise fees. With 300 fewer students this year, the Student Senate has less revenue to hand out to the student organizations and, as a result, they have had to cut some organizations. An increase in fees would help to offset the lower number of students. There are also discussions about how to use some of the fees to increase graduate student access to Career and Professional Success (CaPS).

- Wayne shared that we are at the midpoint of the Huron project. The first piece involved looking across all of our expense and revenue categories across all units. This effort is focused on processes that touch every unit, i.e., BSC units, procurement, and research administration services. The second part is focused on looking at the financial cost of every degree.

Huron has identified between \$22 and \$42 million dollars in opportunities through revenue generation or cost savings. We have identified our top 5 priorities and we want to go back to get more information. One example is the high number of internal transactions handled by the BSC units that involve one part of UNH paying the other. There is an opportunity to be more efficient without losing

anything with our service. There are another 4 areas after the top 5 that Huron will take a look at to see if there is anything there. We have identified 5 opportunities that we are already working on and don't want Huron to spend time on since we have the facts we need, and we can make a decision without them digging further for us.

Wayne said that he and Chris Clement have begun their budget roadshow which began with COLA and HHS last week. More meetings are scheduled with other parts of the university. The PowerPoint deck for the roadshow will be posted to the provost website later this week. As well, the [Financial strengths website](#) shows the weekly updates from Huron and other information about the project. Wayne offered that faculty are welcome to contact him directly with questions.

- The NCAA recently announced a new ruling that allows student-athletes to receive compensation for the use of their name, likeness, or image. Currently this is approved in two states and the NCAA. The ruling doesn't impact UNH too significantly right now, but it could at some point. Wayne shared that he is more concerned about Title IX issues. Title IX requires that the ratio of women to men in sports is supposed to match the institution's population ratio. But, over the past 20 years, there are a lot more women going to college than men. Approximately 1/3 of campuses nationwide are not compliant in this area. UNH is compliant and Marty Scarano, the UNH athletics director, is paying close attention to this.

Provost Jones offered to take questions:

- In response to questions about Navitas, Wayne clarified that UNH did not put out an announcement about the program discontinuing. Instead, Navitas put out a national announcement about this and their staffing on campus changed last week. Wayne said that he notified Dean Dillon about the change at the end of last week. In connection with Shorelight stepping in, we don't know what the terms of the contract will be. There are two possible models for running a bridge program to replace Navitas. One way is for UNH to run it with a 12 to 18-month program to prepare students for entry as first-time freshmen. The other way is for Shorelight to run the bridge program. The decision about this will involve the English department and the COLA dean. At this point, we haven't seen a proposal from Shorelight.

- In response to a question about the status of the lecturers' contract Wayne said that the parties continue to meet weekly. Catherine Moran, a representative of the lecturers' union said that we are continuing to try to come together where we can. At this point, there are still some places where we are not able to come together. She added that they have been signing off on things where both sides can reach a tentative agreement. Wayne shared that the president and he would really love to get the contract done this semester.

- A question was asked about efforts to ensure that we have enough PhD students. Wayne said graduate student enrollment is a very positive thing for us this year. UNH has had the highest graduate student enrollment ever this year with 8 to 9% growth at the masters' level and a 1% increase at the PhD level. However, in connection with PhD programs, we have a very leaky PhD pipe. For example, there was an analysis done on all graduate students between 2012 and 2018 that showed we had 154 PhD students who were paid for 5 or more years and left without graduating. Wayne said that we can tighten that up so that we can deploy more of those resources to ensure that we have good quality graduate students and that we are able to help them finish in a timely manner.

III. Remarks by and questions to the chair

- David Bachrach requested that Senators keep their department colleagues informed about the ongoing work of the Senate. The Senate body can only function well if all faculty know what we are doing and are able to provide feedback to senators on the course of action to take. It is helpful if we are speaking as an informed voting body and not just for ourselves.

- Police Chief Paul Dean will be joining us at the next Senate meeting to give us an overview of the state of affairs at UNH. Senators are welcome to send questions in advance to the Senate office to pass on to Chief Dean so that he can be prepared with information or statistics.

- The chair offered a reminder that open enrollment for health care coverage ends this week on Friday, November 8th. If you don't enroll you will not have health care coverage for the coming year.

- The chair explained that two senators are needed for UCAPC to meet the charter's requirement since none of the elected members are senators. Liese Zahabi nominated herself to serve. The move was seconded, and the Senate voted unanimously in favor of the nomination. Ivo Nedyalkov also nominated himself to serve. But the parliamentarian pointed out that he believes that the UCAPC charter requires that all members of UCAPC must be tenured faculty, even though the language in the charter is vague on this point. The decision was made to delay moving on the nomination until the charter can be reviewed more carefully.

IV. Approval of the minutes from the October 21 meeting - It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of October 21, 2019. Changes were suggested in Sections I and VII. Thus adjusted, the minutes were unanimously approved with no abstentions.

V. One-minute committee chair reports -

Michel Charpentier, chair of the Information Technology Committee, reported that the committee has been meeting with the IT Security Committee and the new CIO, Bill Poirier. As well, Michel has been talking to faculty who teach IT security courses in the UNH Computer Science department. He is finding that there is a great deal of consistency in the view from these three groups. The committee is working on a report of their work in this area. They may have a motion ready for the next meeting.

Once their work on security issues is complete, they expect to review the computer purchasing program as their next order of business.

Ed Hinson, chair of the Campus Planning, shared that the committee had hosted Dirk Timmons, Director of Transportation, and Steve Pesci, Special Projects Manager, for a conversation about some of the challenges in transportation, including issues that were brought up by the Graduate Student Senate about Newmarket bus ridership and the consequence for bus service. Dirk, Steve, and Chris Clement, Chief Operating Officer and VP of Administration, will be visiting the Senate in January. The committee also discussed the SAARC priorities since this committee will soon be setting the priorities for infrastructure and renewal projects.

Joe Dwyer, chair of the Academic Affairs Committee, reported that the committee has received grade data from the Registrar going back 20 years. The committee will be reviewing this in connection with its charge on grade inflation. At this point, they are seeing that over the past 20 years, the percentage of As has gone from 30% to 45%.

The committee is also looking at the 5-year rolling calendars, including the E-term calendar. The E-term starts much earlier in the fall than the regular academic calendar and there have been some grumblings about this. Joe asked the senators to contact him if they have any strong feelings about the E-term calendar.

Bill Woodward, chair of the Student Affairs Committee, reported that the committee had hosted a panel of 5 or 6 university mental health and health experts. He said that he was surprised to learn that there have already been almost 3000 appointments for mental health services this academic year. There were over 5000 total appointments for the 2018-2019 academic year. Based on trends, this is twice as many appointments compared to 5 years ago. The biggest users of these appointments are white females. Bill reported that there are group services offered in the areas of sleep, eating disorders, and homelessness. The committee was told that faculty should flag the office of the Dean of Students if a student doesn't show up for two weeks of **class**. The best person to contact is Joan Glutting in that office.

Bill Knowles, chair of the Finance and Administration Committee, explained that they are meeting with Deb Dutton, President, UNH Foundation and Vice President of University Advancement, at their November 18 meeting and then Catherine Provencher, Vice Chancellor for Financial Affairs & Treasurer, on December 2nd. The committee hopes to finish out their charges in January.

John Hasseldine, chair of the Library Committee, shared that the committee recently had a tour of the Library's Special Collections and the University Museum. As well, they took a tour of the Library storage building at Leavitt Lane where there are concerns with the roof and HVAC system.

The committee was surprised that the library was listed as an area of opportunity in the preliminary list from the Huron consulting work since the Library's budget has been squeezed so much already. However, the committee will wait to see what comes out of the final report.

The committee is also waiting to hear about the outcome of the contract negotiations between the library and the four journal publishers (Wiley, Taylor & Francis, Sage, and Elsevier) following the journal cancellation exercise. Once they receive this information, the committee will possibly ask for help in crafting a motion for supporting the library's budget.

Scott Smith, chair of the Discovery Review committee, explained that the committee is contemplating 5 templates and they expect to whittle these down to no more than 3 options. The options range from tweaks to the current system to something more radical. Scott asked the senators to share feedback with him on whether we have the constitution to do something that is truly different.

One area that the committee is looking at is having a robust first-year experience. The original Discovery program had, as one of its core components, a first-year seminar. However, this was discontinued for various reasons. The committee is looking at the possibility of bringing this back.

At the center of all the discussions is the realization that on campus, we are relatively parochial in our own majors and the idea of a central curriculum as the centerpiece for the university has not been front and center. One of the problems with the current Discovery Program is that not everyone seems to have bought into it. So, we have an advising issue and students see it as checking off boxes.

One of the things that the committee looked at was the idea of “majorism” and whether the real attention is on getting Discovery requirements done or whether it is on the major. This has created a challenge, especially for the heavily prescribed majors in trying to increase flexibility. One of the things we have come up with is that if we have majors with large requirements, the flexibility for those students is going to be minimal and this is something we can’t get around. For other students, we can find small pieces here and there. The real challenge is in allowing someone to have a coherent self-driven experience vs. a breadth requirement as we have now.

Scott explained that regardless of what direction we go in we must go to the Faculty Senate in order to pass anything. Also, whatever we do, we need to have full buy-in from faculty, administration, and students. Scott commended the student leaders, Ally and Jenny, who came up with their own template suggestion. This is one of the five that the DRC is considering.

Scott shared that the DRC will be working with the Academic Affairs Committee and the Academic Program Committee when we get concrete language on a plan.

Subrena Smith, chair of the Research and Public Service Committee, reported that the committee has developed a survey on the topic of engaged scholarship. It will be distributed to faculty within the week. Subrena asked the senators to please spend the time to complete the survey. This topic is important and is consequential for tenure and promotion decisions.

Lisa MacFarlane, chair of the Academic Program Committee, said that the committee was grateful to colleagues who offered questions and prompts offline in connection with the work of the committee. The committee is continuing to work on the charge dealing with the deadline by which first semester students need to drop a course. They will be talking with Professor Tomellini about how this impacts Chemistry students at their next meeting. As well, they will be talking to Dean Zercher of CEPS and Associate Dean Babbitt of COLSA about the issue. Lisa pointed out that the committee has a great student member. The committee is getting close to having all the information they need to make a thoughtful motion.

Lisa reported that a statement has been drafted in connection with the committee’s second charge dealing with student success. It will be presented to the Agenda Committee after it has been gone through wordsmithing.

On the committee’s charge to explore a 4 credit vs. 3 credit system, work has begun in digging into the variability of credit hours on campus, a very complex task. Different colleges, different courses, and different majors have different variable credit hours. It will be critical for us to really understand what Barb White was talking about with accreditation. The committee is trying to make sure that we are completely, fully, and unambiguously in compliance.

VI. Update from Lisa MacFarlane, Interim Director of Honors, on the Honors College – Lisa reviewed that she is the interim director of the program, stepping in while Catherine Peebles is on leave. She offered the following update:

The move from an Honors Program to an Honors College was announced by the president as one of his strategic initiatives. He put no language and set no expectations around it. Therefore, it is up to the faculty through the Academic Affairs Committee and the Academic Program Committee, in concert with the Discovery Program review, working with the Honors Program faculty, to figure out exactly what an Honors College will look like. There was an Honors College committee report produced last year. Lisa clarified that this report was high level, aspirational in nature, and it talked about principles. It was not a detailed plan that can be directly implemented. The goal in the Honors Program this year is to put some flesh on the bones of that report to get it closer to the specifics. It is fortunate that the Discovery review is happening at the same time so that when we think about what Honors means in general education, we can do it in a way that is informed by the conversations we are having across the university.

Lisa explained that the first principle in the review is that “college” in Honors College definitely, unequivocally and absolutely is NOT an RC unit. Faculty will still be in their own departments and colleges. Instead, the word “college” is used to describe a like-minded group from across a wide range of backgrounds and disciplines who come together in common intellectual and social ferment.

She shared that the second principle is that we are really firmly committed to the idea that any honors program or college at UNH has to be about opportunities for everyone and it should not replicate privileges that students come with. We have a number of first-generation students and we have a lot of students who are low income. Anyone who knows this state knows the disparity that we have in publication education across the state. We do a good job in general at UNH in taking kids as they come and moving them to wherever it is they need to be. We have a ton of kids who come who are not really sure of who they are intellectually. At some point, usually, sometime in sophomore year, they catch fire and become terrific. We always want to have that opportunity to be there for the students who come in that way.

The third principle is that we look at holistic student development. In the past, the Honors Program was focused more on a set of courses, intellectual experiences, research, and that sort of thing. But if you think about student development more holistically, that opens up a lot of different options. This will involve a reinvigorated set of partnerships with our colleagues in Student Affairs and this is exciting.

The fourth principle is a commitment to flexibility and self-design wherever that is possible. Our conversations with the Discovery Program are critical in this regard. Lisa shared that we really want to emphasize for honors students a kind of metacognitive view of their own education and we want to emphasize and find avenues for students to reflect on what they are doing and whatever they want to do and to have the opportunity to talk that through with peers and with faculty. We want close relationships with the Hamel Center, the Center for International Education, and the University Fellowships Office. Those relationships have been important over the years. To the degree that we possibly can, we are committed to having any rising tides to lift all of these boats. This is not a zero-sum game. Anything that happens that benefits the Honors Program, also benefits people in those other programs as well.

Lisa pointed out that the Honors Program continues to be a place to pilot curriculum innovation. For example, some may remember that the capstone experience for Discovery came out of the Honors thesis experience. Also, the idea of a first-year interdisciplinary seminar came out of INCO 444 which became the 444 courses. We have always tried to be the place where we have piloted ideas. If it was good for someone, could we make it good for everyone? As well, we are committed to better data because we have really lousy data about what works for our students.

The move to a college requires that we think about governance issues. We have a patchwork of long-term practices about how we have done things. In moving to a College, we have to take a look at the network of practices to see which ones work well and which would need to be codified a little differently.

Lisa explained that part of moving to an Honors College and having a plan means working with Student Affairs, Res Life, Campus Planning, Admissions, Alumni Affairs, and others. This is not just an academic program moment. It is also a moment that allows us to think more strategically about where Honors is across a lot of different domains. That is going to be helpful for us to reinvigorate some of those programs. We are continually interested in working with Admissions and trying to understand how it is we identify and target talent in and out of the state and then recruit that talent at the university. How might we formalize a relationship with Trio Programs and the McNair Scholars program? It is often the case that these students come, and they catch fire. How can there be an avenue for them to enter the honors program?

Lisa offered that there is a desire to pilot something next year, but it won't be anything that requires Faculty Senate approval, although it may require Discovery approval. More likely the pilot will be something that is off to the side a bit and may be of interest and provide data to the Discovery Review Committee.

In terms of timing, the goal for this year is to get the next version of this plan out so that next year can be spent vetting, editing, changing, making it work, and getting it approved. The fastest that anything is likely to happen for students is for those entering in the fall of 2021, given the approval and planning process. That gives us time for the budget discussions happening in other quarters so that we know what it is that we have to work with. Lisa pointed out that when a college president says that something is part of their strategic plan it is a pretty strong indicator that they are going to go out and do some strong fundraising that is targeted for that item. Lisa said that she hasn't been told anything about this. She doesn't have a number and she doesn't know whether there are donors for the program. So, we are trying to move at a pace that doesn't outrun the questions.

In closing, Lisa said that there has been a bit of a surge of juniors who are participating in the interdisciplinary honors program which allows student experiences that are not necessarily upper-division courses in their major. So, faculty may start seeing some students who are coming to ask for advising on senior projects, capstone experiences, or theses who may not have been in major courses in the upper-division. We are trying to keep an eye on how the work that is done with serious distinction in a department, which can either be honors or an awesome student that you have in your major, meshes with the idea of interdisciplinary honors which has a more exploratory broader multi-disciplinary experiential piece to it. That question is kind of at the core of thinking about how a general education broad-based 4 years honors program meshes with the work that faculty do in their departments their majors. Lisa suggested that, as you get students who come to talk to you, it would be

great if you could give us a sense of how that works as we are thinking about teasing out that major piece and making sure that those students who are getting outstanding upper divisions honors and majors pieces keep that. But, how do we work with students for whom their honorific moments are non-standard? We think that we may be able to do that. We are a big university, and these are our great kids and we want to find ways to make all of that work.

Lisa offered to take questions. In response to a question about how many students are in the Honors Program and how students enter the program, Lisa explained that there are currently three moments when students can enter. The first is through the Admissions process and currently, Admissions and Finance make the decision. In the past, the Honors Program staff read student admission files and were part of the process. The second point of entry is at the end of the first semester of freshman year when students who are in the top 10% of their class in their college are invited to join the Honors program. The third point of entry allows students to make an application to Honors. This is done in cases where the student feels that the University is not yet fully appreciating them, or the student is seeking more opportunities. Generally, if a student is making the case that they want additional opportunities, they are accepted.

Overall, there are roughly 900 students in the Honors program. For incoming students there are 200ish. By the end of the freshman year, there are approximately 300. So, there is a fall off along the way. There are some students who come in and just do honors in major. Sometimes that is counted and sometimes it is not. Part of the challenge is that the program manages to be variable and rigid at the same time. Right now, the accretion of practices has led to things that just don't hang together terribly well. There are variations based on majors, especially with some students who are in tightly scripted majors. The question is how you manage something that works for a range of people across a really wide range of disciplines.

Lisa said that she doesn't necessarily think that bigger is better. At the same time, she doesn't think that we should be rigid in limiting the program to a certain number of students. One of the questions for our new enrollment manager is how he sees Honors fitting in strategically in terms of the university's long-term recruitment and enrollment efforts.

Lisa invited senators to contact her with ideas or questions.

VII. Discussion and vote on Agenda Committee and Information Technology Committee motion on myElements as a platform for FAR - Erin Sharp, on behalf of the Agenda Committee and the Information Technology Committee, reminded the members that a report was shared at the last meeting of the Senate on the results of the surveys of faculty and deans/chairs about using myElements for faculty activity reporting. At that time a motion was presented.

Suggestions for changes to the motion were made when it was presented and some suggestions were made by email following the meeting. An amended motion was prepared in response to the suggestions, as follows. The changes from the first version of the motion are underlined.

***Agenda Committee and Information Technology Committee Motion
on myElements as a platform for FAR
(updated 10/28/2019)***

Rationale: *The faculty has used myElements as the platform for submitting Faculty Activity Reports (FAR) for two years. In this period, the Faculty Senate Information Technology Committee has worked diligently with the Academic Technology office to try to improve both the user experience and outcomes achieved using myElements for FAR. However, a first survey of faculty, department chairs, and deans conducted in the fall semester of 2018 revealed that myElements did not meet the needs of a majority of the faculty for FAR. The Faculty Senate passed a motion in the spring of 2019 consenting to the continued use of myElements for reporting done by faculty for the academic year 2018-2019, with the proviso that a new survey of the faculty, as well as deans and department chairs, would be conducted, to determine whether additional updates to the myElements system had improved its performance as a platform for FAR. The results of this second survey are unambiguous in showing that myElements remains unsuitable for a majority of the faculty for numerous reasons, which are included in the report produced by the Agenda Committee. **Therefore, the Senate moves,***

Departments or corresponding units shall have the primary role, in consultation with the deans of their respective colleges or units, in determining both the format and platform for faculty activity reports; the use of myElements for this purpose is not required.

The floor was opened for discussion. Jim Connell made a remark that the current situation of using my Elements for FAR is “beyond all reason and beyond all repair” and that he plans to vote for this motion.

The motion was put to a vote. **The motion passed with 60 in favor, 1 opposed, and 1 abstention.**

VIII. New Business - There was no new business.

IX. Adjournment - The meeting was adjourned at 4:19 pm.

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
CORPAD	University Committee on Real Property Acquisition and Disposal
CPC	Campus Planning Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)
FAC	Finance & Administration Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)

FAR	Faculty Activity Reporting
IRA	Institutional Research and Assessment
IT	Information Technology
ITC	Information Technology Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)
JSMB	Joint Strategic Management Board (Navitas review)
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)
SHARPP	Sexual Harassment and Rape Prevention Program
SVPAA	Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
UCAPC	University Curriculum & Academic Policies Committee (FS permanent committee)
VPFA	Vice President for Finance and Administration