

University of New Hampshire

University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository

Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes

Faculty Senate Documents

2-26-2018

2017-18 FACULTY SENATE XXII - February 26, 2018 Minutes Summary

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "2017-18 FACULTY SENATE XXII - February 26, 2018 Minutes Summary" (2018). *Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes*. 158.

https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty_senate_agendas_minutes/158

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
2017-18 FACULTY SENATE XXII

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 3:11 p.m. on February 26, 2018

MINUTES SUMMARY

I. Roll – The following senators were absent: Ballestero, Barnett, Bauer, Coppens, Gardner, Hatcher, Herold, Mathieson, and Simos. Bstieler, Eshbach, Lewis, Ramsay, Scherr, R. Smith, and Terry were excused. Senier served as proxy for Del Hierro. Beth Kilinc and Nancy Target were guests.

II. Remarks by and questions to the provost – The provost had no remarks, and asked for questions from the group. A senator asked the provost about the administration’s plans for the recruitment of international students, and what role the ESL Institute (English as a Second Language) will have in terms of recruitment. The provost said that it would be worthwhile to sit down with campus community stakeholders in this area – herself, the VP for enrollment, representatives from the Office of International Students and Scholars (OISS), and the ESL Institute. She said she would like to see as diverse a portfolio as possible, and that pathways or bridge programs, to build language skills, would be an important part of that, although she said it is unclear right now just what that would look like. She said that ESL leadership are welcome to reach out to her directly, and that her assistants will help coordinate something going forward.

Another senator asked when the report from the President’s Task Force on Campus Climate might be distributed. Nancy said that it will be sent out after the spring break. A presentation will first be made to the provost and the university president, and then to the rest of the campus community.

The senator then asked about accessibility to department chairs of the Student Success Collaborative (SSC) data, and Nancy said that work is ongoing to make that information accessible to chairs. She said that she will be meeting with the chair of the Senate Information Technology Committee (ITC), and that she has invited the senior vice provost for academic affairs, who has been working closely with the SSC project, to join that discussion. She said that the hope is to make this platform available to all departments by the end of the semester, and noted that there are many who have seen the data and results and are anxious to utilize the program. She noted that using SSC is not mandatory, but said that with our UNH-specific data, SSC is a powerful tool, and that the faculty responses have been very positive.

III. Remarks by and questions to the chair – The chair said that the presidential search has moved to the Board of Trustees with an unknown number of names. Once the board has selected a candidate, an announcement will be made.

IV. Approval of the Senate minutes from February 12, 2018 – It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the February 12, 2018 meeting of the Senate. A number of corrections

were suggested, in Items II, V, VI, VIII, and IX. Thus adjusted, the minutes were unanimously approved, with 1 abstention.

V. Addressing motion of censure – The chair informed the group that the Agenda Committee and the movers of the motion of censure against the dean of COLA met last week with the COLA dean and SVPAA Vasudevan to discuss concerns about the pause placed on the double counting of Discovery courses in that college, and the pursuant motion of censure that was seconded and tabled at our last Senate meeting. During that conversation, Dan said that he presented three possible options to the dean.

1. The dean would take no action, the pause would continue, and the motion of censure would go forward in the Senate
2. The dean could convene the COLA department chairs on this issue to learn their wishes and respond accordingly. If done in a timely manner, the chair said that this option would eliminate the need for a vote on the motion of censure. If not done in a timely manner, the motion on censure would go forward.
3. The dean could drop the pause in COLA while her office studies the issue, convening the COLA chairs to determine their wishes on the subject. This would eliminate the need for a vote on the motion of censure.

Dan reported that the COLA dean replied that it has been her intention to follow the third option above. She reported that the Academic Standards and Advising Committee (ASAC), made up of the college associate deans, is studying Discovery, and it had been her understanding that this included examining the practice of double counting Discovery courses.

A member of the Agenda Committee added that a meeting is currently scheduled for the chairs of COLA departments on March 6, and that the dean said she would bring up this topic at that meeting. Another member of the committee said that he understood that she expressed a willingness to give her department chairs the option to allow double counting while her office studied the issue. It was noted that the motion of censure can only be paused if action is evident on the part of the dean as noted above. The chair said that the issue needs to be resolved in time to be useful to academic advisors as they help students plan their schedules for next year.

The chair suggested that it might be useful for the Senate to bring forward a motion today to urge prompt, identifiable action on this. A member of the Agenda Committee suggested that the Senate could charge that committee to draft a resolution for the next meeting, but concerns were expressed at allowing that much time to pass. It was noted that the dean does not seem to understand why any faculty outside of COLA would have any interest in this matter, and that a statement from the full Senate will emphasize that this is not just a COLA issue, but a university-wide policy that applies to Discovery courses in all colleges. The chair noted that the issue is that she placed a pause on the approved practice before forming her argument against it, and did so against the vote of her department chairs.

A senator moved the following:

“The Faculty Senate applauds the Dean of Liberal Arts for supporting the spirit of shared governance in the area of discovery and urges the Dean to move forward with as much haste as possible given that advising for F18 will soon commence.”

The motion was seconded. Questions were raised about what the actual financial impact of double counting is on COLA, and it was noted that there is no data on this, only speculation. A member of the Agenda Committee reminded that the point to the motion of censure has never been about the value of double counting, or lack thereof, but about disregard for the processes of shared governance when the pause was enacted. After several friendly amendments, the group agreed upon the following revisions:

“The Faculty Senate thanks the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts for supporting the spirit of shared governance in the area of Discovery, and urges the Dean to expeditiously end the pause on double counting in COLA, following Senate Motion #XX-M24, given that advising for F18 will soon commence.”

Once the wording was established, the chair moved to suspend the rules in order to vote on this motion today. The motion to suspend the rules was seconded, and that motion passed unanimously.

The motion to end the pause on double counting in COLA was then put to a vote and passed unanimously, with four abstentions.

VI. SAC report on Study Abroad GPA requirement – The chair turned the time over to the Senate Student Affairs Committee chair, who introduced Beth Kilinc, the administrative director for UNH Education Abroad, here to discuss the Study Abroad GPA requirement for students. Beth said that there are two kinds of education abroad experiences, study abroad and international experiences. This relatively new category includes non-classroom based experiences, such as practicums, internships, service learning, volunteering, club trips, etc. For this kind of experience, a lower GPA of 2.0 is required to participate.

Study abroad programs are the ones to which the 2.5 GPA standard applies. There are three kinds of study abroad experiences – managed, exchange, and approved. Managed programs are led by faculty directors who supervise the students’ experience in a foreign country, affiliated there with an academic institution. 60% of our study abroad students participate in managed programs. These programs are based in our programs and colleges, and students know going in just how their academic experience abroad will fit into their overall degree from UNH.

Exchange programs are traditional reciprocal arrangements with academic partners in other countries where our students participate in classrooms abroad, while students from those countries participate in coursework here at UNH.

UNH approved programs are run by third parties, with students enrolling in coursework abroad, and those credits being transferred to UNH.

Last year we sent 714 students abroad, about 26% of our undergraduate population. There is a large gender gap in our study abroad participants. The general population of UNH students is

53% female, and yet 71% of our UNH study abroad participants are women, which is also above the national average.

Beth noted that the most popular duration for study abroad is a full semester, and that spring is by far the preferred semester. Traveling abroad during a student's junior year has been most common, which reflects a national trend. However, eligibility requirements are changing to allow more students to travel during their freshman and sophomore years, and Beth supports developing appropriate programs for first year and rising sophomores based on the research of the academic benefits post program participation (lower attrition, higher GPA attainment, and on-time graduation). There has been significant growth in the number of students participating in shorter-term experiences, as well.

Based on national research, the greatest barrier to study abroad experiences for students is the cost. Grade point average does not seem to factor into the research.

Beth noted that UNH's new online enrollment management system will enable the Global Education office to gather important data regarding students' socio-economic status, race and ethnicity, and first-generation student status which will help their office better understand students who are interested but don't go abroad, as compared to students who do go abroad. Beth said that she is not comfortable discussing GPA as a barrier to students studying abroad, as she is not aware of data on that.

She said that the managed programs are set up in a variety of ways. Not all of them have faculty directors on site. The programs run anywhere from eight or ten days abroad to a full year. These managed programs enroll students from a variety of colleges, not just within their own majors. Within these programs there are a variety of ways to earn credits; some come as transfer credits from courses taught by the host institution, and other credits are earned from courses taught on site by their UNH faculty director. For transfer credit, students must earn a C or better, just as any other transfer credit. Students can earn both UNH credit and transfer credit on the same program, taking courses from their UNH faculty director as well as courses taught by local faculty for transfer credit.

Beth said that college deans determine eligibility to participate. The petitions are reviewed by ASAC, which includes all associate deans from the colleges. This allows for a consistent application of policy across all colleges, and also provides a weekly forum for the associate deans to discuss relevant issues. She said that ASAC does consider individual students' circumstances when reviewing petitions. She said it is important for students to have clear, consistent standards in order to make the necessary complex decisions regarding study abroad.

She said that her department manages the UNH approved programs lists. There are no programs she is aware of that allow lower than a 2.5 GPA for students enrolling to study abroad; this is a national baseline. She acknowledged potential unintended consequences of varying requirements among all the different programs, and recommends an analysis of all barriers to study abroad at the university before changing any policies and protocols.

Beth invited faculty with information or questions to contact her at beth.kilinc@unh.edu or by phone to 862-0128.

A senator asked if the international experiences, such as internships, can be credit bearing. Beth said that they can, but that these are not classroom-based courses. The credit earned, when available, comes from UNH. Another senator noted that most of our students enroll in managed programs, with approved programs next, and that exchange experiences are the smallest group. She asked if this is a financial gap. Beth replied that popularity of exchange programs continues to drop each year. Such programs require a great deal of independence on the part of the students. She said that for a long time, the assumption has been that the exchange experience is the most economic one, but that is not the case, particularly for out-of-state students. For some students it may still be the best option, but other programs can be less expensive, depending on a variety of factors.

A senator asked how many students at UNH are carrying a grade point average less than 2.5, and what that demographic looks like. Beth said that the number of UNH students with a GPA between 2.0 and 2.5 is about 10% of the student body. The senator asked for the justification of this standard of a 2.5 GPA for enrolling in study abroad managed programs. Beth replied that the standard is a result of observing student experiences with studying abroad, and that 2.5 is a standard nationally, adding that at some institutions, the standard is actually being raised rather than lowered.

Another senator asked if there is data that shows that students with a 2.2 or a 2.3 perform more poorly than students with a 2.5 GPA. Beth said that she is not aware of any such data, but that she would look into the research. The senator pointed out that the 2.5 GPA is not just for managed programs, but for any study abroad program. She asserted that students return from their study abroad experiences and have done much better in their courses afterwards, calling the experience transformative for many students. She asked if Beth has actually seen that petitions from students with lower than 2.5 have been approved by ASAC, saying she has not seen such exceptions made for students in her department. The senator added that in her department she has seen the petitions of students with 2.499 GPAs rejected by ASAC. She suggested that students who have above a 2.5 GPA in their major (which requires a study abroad experience), but an overall GPA under 2.5 are particularly challenged by this policy.

Another senator asked about the process of petitioning the ASAC. Beth said that the 2.5 GPA eligibility must be established at the time of application, and that the standard applies to all study away programs, and that any waivers or variances must come from ASAC.

A senator said that she spoke with the registrar and learned that the average GPA for a UNH student is 3.13, which is well above the 2.5 standard for study abroad. She said that some feeder schools for particular programs in COLSA actually have higher GPA requirements of 3.0 or 3.5.

Another senator asked if Beth's office has communicated with the Hamel Center for Undergraduate Research about their requirements, which set a 3.0 GPA standard. Beth answered that other units at the university may have a higher threshold, based on their own experience.

The chair thanked Beth for her time.

VI. AAC update on Navitas – Shelley Mulligan, chair of the Senate Academic Affairs Committee (AAC), said that the committee’s full written report from last spring on Navitas (now called Global Student Success Program) is located on the Senate SharePoint site for those who would like to read it. A self study was done on the program in 2015, and last year’s joint AAC/SAC report offers several recommendations going forward. The AAC met with Kerry Ellen Vroman, Interim Associate Vice Provost for International Affairs.

There has been a significant decline in the number of students enrolled in Navitas/GSSP. Historically there have been about 40-60 students enrolled, and this year there are fewer than ten. The diversity of the students participating has not changed significantly; the vast majority come from China. The number of students brought in by Navitas/GSSP is not enough to meet the goals the administration has set for the internationalization of our campus. The graduation rates of our Navitas students are high, but there continue to be problems with students not integrating well into the campus community. The provost’s office is working to address the weaknesses of the program. The AAC is still waiting for additional information from the director of Navitas/GSSP. The AAC put forward seven recommendations in their report last spring:

AAC Recommendations:

- 1. Close monitoring of the Navitas program is necessary. Any renewal of contracts between UNH and Navitas will need careful consideration.*
- 2. Student recruitment in terms of qualifications, diversity and numbers needs attention. UNH needs to pressure and support Navitas as necessary to recruit a larger, and more diverse student pool including expanding efforts beyond China.*
- 3. UNH cannot depend solely on the Navitas program to meet its internationalization objectives. Therefore, other options/activities, efforts and resources need to continue through the Office for International Scholars and Students to expand internalization on the UNH campus.*
- 4. Support and resources for ESL coursework for the students that are here will continue to be an essential part of the success of students. Students also require support and strategies to compensate for their English competency deficits in the context of other academics/coursework.*
- 5. Faculty would benefit from training on how to best instruct and support international students, without jeopardizing the academic rigor, and expectations of students within their classes.*
- 6. Resources are needed to help support student orientation and integration to community life on campus.*
- 7. More information is needed from faculty and students to identify specific areas of concern, and their perceived needs in facilitating a positive experience for international students. Perhaps the Student Affairs committee could address the quality of the Navitas*

program from the perspectives of Navitas students, and explore student opinion on the strengths, challenges, and overall nature of their experiences here at UNH.

A senator asked if the decline in enrollments is due to general attrition, or if it has been a dramatic drop that might be attributed to current political issues around immigration. Shelley replied that it has been a dramatic drop this year, and that it's unclear if it is due to immigration issues. She added that the program here has a reputation for taking a long time for students to get through the English portion of the program. There has also been an increase in competition for international students. The AAC understands that the university cannot rely solely on Navitas/GSSP for recruitment of international students.

The AAC perceives a need for the quality of the program to be reviewed from the students' perspective in order to address the needs of students who do not feel engaged in the campus community. It was noted that the connection between Navitas/GSSP and the ESL Institute has been problematic. Currently there is no ESL director, and there is concern about establishing and maintaining good communication between the two entities.

A senator pointed out that the program is no longer called Navitas, but that it goes by Global Student Success Program. Many of the documents in the self-study and the joint report use the former name. The senator asked if the AAC met with the GSSP leadership to answer these questions. Shelley said that the director has not responded to their inquiries, and that the committee posed their questions to the Academic Affairs Office, believing that that office has an established relationship with GSSP. The senator said that the fall numbers for enrollments are not as dramatically lower as those shown for the spring semester. She added that the difficulty in getting student visas may be seriously impacting enrollments.

A senator asked who made the decision to renew the contract with Navitas/GSSP. Shelley said that there has been no renewal as of yet. The initial contract was for ten years, and the self-study was done five years into that contract. The senator asked if there is an escape hatch in the contract. A member of the AAC said that all contracts they were able to view were heavily redacted, so they do not know the answer to that question. The provost may have that information.

A member of the Agenda Committee said that the senior vice provost for academic affairs told that group that he would like to bring Navitas/GSSP leadership to speak to the Senate and answer questions. That arrangement is in the works.

The chair thanked the AAC for their work.

VIII. AAC motion on use of common exam time – Shelley then spoke to the Senate about Student Senate Resolution XXXIX-R1, brought forward last October:

Be it resolved by the Student Senate of the University of New Hampshire to urge the Registrar's Office to disallow classes held during common exam time, and Be it further resolved to urge that common exam blocks only be designated periods for professors to hold exams and make-up classes.

The AAC did a brief survey of college administrators, including four associate deans and twenty-five chairs, asking them to report on their opinions of the use of the common exam time. The data show that the majority of UNH departments would prefer to keep the common hour time for its intended purposes, knowing that there are bound to be some exceptions.

The AAC presents the following motion, the intent of which is not to change the current policy, but to remind leadership to following the current policy when scheduling courses. It was noted that the common exam time is used for undergraduate courses.

Motion: The Faculty Senate supports the resolution passed by the Student Senate of the University of New Hampshire (Student Senate XXXIX – R1 – Disallowing Classes During Common Exam Blocks, October 1st, 2017) to urge the Registrar’s Office to minimize classes scheduled during common exam time so that this time can be used as time blocks for professors to hold exams and make-up classes. The regular scheduling of classes should only be made by the Registrar’s Office after discussions with the College Deans’ Offices who request to do so, and when it is determined that there are no other feasible scheduling options in consideration of classroom space availability, faculty or student scheduling conflicts.

A senator asked for clarification on the phrase “professors to hold exams and make-up classes,” noting that a certain professor is currently using the common exam for a weekly ten-question quiz. Shelley said there currently is no specific definition for “exams” in that context. Another senator suggested amending the motion to say “...minimize classes **and labs** scheduled during common exam time ...” The AAC accepted this change as a friendly amendment.

A senator from the Thompson School of Applied Science said that he has sent an email to the Senate office with a request from that school for exemption to this policy, based on an unofficial poll of TSAS faculty who currently hold classes during common exam times for the following reasons:

- 1) **Operating 2 student run restaurants** (Culinary Arts) – people in the courses prepare food and serve it in some cases during the common exam time*
- 2) **Veterinary Technician program...students help run an on-campus vet clinic** with customers, to offer students experience...cannot close it during common exam times.*
- 3) **Applied Animal Science** courses with animal components and multiple lab sections **using visiting animals**, (such as swine, goats, sheep, beef cattle) creates a hardship to try to recreate the labs on multiple days. Also night labs are not an option, as we cannot run the classes in the dark with live animals which are outside.*
- 4) **Forestry and Wildlife and Civil Technology** classes that require **long field trips to remote sites** (Including COLSA Forestry and Wildlife classes - Kim Babbitt statement). Using the common exam time minimizes conflict with other courses, when a class leaves campus for 4 or more hours to visit outdoor operations or facilities.*

5) Most labs are taught by faculty not graduate students, and flexibility in when labs are offered is more limited

His email went on to explain that Thompson School classes do not have students in the hundreds, nor do many students take the large UNH classes where common exam times are necessary, and ended by asking the AAC to consider allowing the TSAS to keep the exemption. He suggested that “minimizing classes and labs” is wording sufficient to allow such exemptions, and Shelley agreed. It was noted that scheduling conflicts are inevitable, and this motion is intended only to make those who set the schedules more aware of potential issues.

A senator from UNH-Manchester asked if his unit would be excluded from this, as they have no common exam time. Shelley said that this would apply only to UNH-Durham. Several senators expressed the desire that students with scheduling conflicts would be allowed to make up labs or whatever they are missing due to the conflict. Shelley agreed that this is a good point, and part of the reason that the Student Senate put forward their resolution.

This motion will lay over until the next meeting, at which time the discussion may continue.

IX. CPC motion on AED units on campus – Bill Berndtson, chair of the Senate Campus Planning Committee, shared the following motion with the Senate:

Rationale: CPR and the use of AEDs are lifesaving procedures that are advocated by the American Heart Association and other medical organizations. UNH currently has only 152 static units in the 231 buildings on the Durham campus. The location of these units does not appear to be well known among the campus community. During a medical emergency, an appropriate, timely response is crucial. The administration of CPR and the use of an AED may be required but the number of people trained in their use appears to be quite limited.

Motion: The Faculty Senate moves (1) to encourage the University to provide and maintain a minimum of one AED unit in each campus building; (2) increase awareness of the location of AED units on the campus by broadly disseminating the URL showing buildings with AEDs and their location within those buildings; (3) each University building should post adequate public signage that would direct one to where the AED is located in that building in case of an emergency; and (4) to promote and provide training in CPR and the use of AEDs to the campus community.

A senator asked how this topic applies to the Senate’s purview over the academic mission of the university. This motion is not related to any charge to the CPC. Bill said that this is a community safety issue, and it was suggested in our last Senate meeting that the committee should present such a motion. A senator noted that this is not much different from the motion regarding lactation rooms on campus that was passed two years ago.

A senator suggested spelling out Automated External Defibrillator once within the motion for clarity. The committee accepted that as a friendly amendment.

The motion will lay over until the next meeting.

X. ITC report on charges, including Faculty Enlight - John Gibson, chair of the Senate Information Technology Committee (ITC) made a brief report on new charges to the committee. Faculty Enlight is the new Barnes and Noble tool for ordering textbooks for courses through the UNH Bookstore. The bookstore would like to replace the current Academic Technology tool, Booklist, with Faculty Enlight. The ITC has been asked to review the new platform and make a recommendation regarding dropping Booklist. John said that in order to use Faculty Enlight, faculty will need to register with Barnes and Noble to establish login credentials which would then be stored by Canvas. He noted that while Booklist has been used by both the UNH Bookstore and Durham Book Exchange, Faculty Enlight would only work with the UNH Bookstore, as it is a Barnes and Noble outlet. UNH Academic Technology would like to eliminate Booklist, and it is their hope that Faculty Enlight will be a solution for the campus community. John said that there are issues to iron out, but that his committee will bring back a motion in the future regarding this subject.

A senator from English said that faculty in the ESL institute get their class lists late, and that in the past, Booklist has been able to accommodate their last-minute requests. She said that Faculty Enlight has not been as accommodating. This is a concern that needs to be taken back to Barnes and Noble.

Due to time constraints, the ITC will complete their report to the Senate at the next meeting.

XI. New Business – There was no new business.

XII. Adjournment – Upon a motion and second to adjourn, the meeting was adjourned at 5:01 p.m.