

University of New Hampshire

University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository

Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes

Faculty Senate Documents

10-24-2016

2016-17 FACULTY SENATE XXI - October 24, 2016 Minutes Summary

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "2016-17 FACULTY SENATE XXI - October 24, 2016 Minutes Summary" (2016). *Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes*. 180.

https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty_senate_agendas_minutes/180

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
2016-17 FACULTY SENATE XXI

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 3:42 p.m. on October 24, 2016

MINUTES SUMMARY

I. Roll – The following senators were absent: Baldwin, Edwards, Shea, and Taylor. R. Collins, Manalo, Marone, Schefer, Thurston, and Wilder were excused. Lyon and Cook served as proxies for Boucher and K. Collins, respectively. Dan Carchidi, Eleta Exline, Cathy Overson, Nancy Targett and Terri Winters were guests.

II. Remarks by and questions to the provost – Provost Targett said that in her first hundred days at UNH, she has been listening across campus as she has met with departments, programs, and organizations. Her intent is to pull together the threads of what she has learned to make a presentation.

Today, she announced that on November 2 at 1 p.m., she and President Huddleston will host a town-hall style meeting for the campus community, in the Granite State Room of the MUB. She invited all to attend, and said that it would mostly be a question-and-answer format.

She also announced that the president will be hosting a reception for all Faculty Senate members immediately following the November 7th Senate meeting, and said that senators should be receiving those invitations.

At the last Senate meeting, the provost said that a senator asked if the university is required to pay itself to rent the new stadium for commencement. She said that under RCM, all units and offices have their own budgets, but that there is no unit that will be paying to rent the field for commencement. She did note that we do need to pay for services such as to cover the field, or if dining services are hired from separate cost centers.

A senator recalled that President Huddleston had mentioned in his last address to the Senate that the advertising revenues from the stadium videoboard would be used for scholarships, and he asked if those were for athletic scholarships. The provost responded that the president had said that he could have used the \$1 million to provide 2.5 UNH students with scholarships, noting that he did not specify student athletes, so it is her belief that he meant those revenues for any student, but she said she would check to confirm that.

Another senator said that some faculty have been asked to be value leaders for the Student Success Collaborative software pilot, noting the time involved in learning to use the system. He asked if there is a sense of what the cost will be to the university should we choose to not implement it in the long term, in terms of faculty hours spent implementing the system for the

pilot program. Nancy replied that that is one of the things the team will determine by setting benchmarks for success. She acknowledged that some of the advising pieces may be harder to target than others. She hopes that the community will put forward a full effort for the one-year trial in order to truly see if it will work for us. If it is not a good fit for UNH, then we are free to discontinue the program.

The Graduate Student Senate representative asked how graduate students will be connected to this trial. The provost responded that the program is essentially for undergraduate, at-risk students. The GSS rep asked if graduate student tuition dollars will be used to fund the program if it continues beyond the pilot. The provost said she is not sure how the program would ultimately be funded. She said she has recently met with two GSS leaders and committed to them to do a comprehensive overview of graduate stipends and fees.

The chair thanked the provost for her time.

III. Remarks by and questions to the Senate chair - Chair Dante Scala offered additional information regarding the president's reception on November 7th. He said he would try to end the Senate meeting early that day so that senators could walk over to the president's residence together after the meeting. He encouraged senators to attend if their schedules would permit.

He informed the Senate that the Academic Affairs Committee and the Information Technology Committee have each been charged with reviewing the Student Success Collaborative pilot program for student advising.

Dante then noted that in Senate meetings, he has become aware that he may not be seeing everyone who has a hand raised to speak, and apologized to those he has missed in past meetings. He said that if senators who wish to speak will raise their hand and keep it raised until he acknowledges them with a silent nod, he will keep notes of who is waiting to speak. He hopes that this will help to manage the larger number of senators in our meetings this year.

IV. Minutes – It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes from the October 10, 2016 meeting. A senator noted that she was in attendance, though marked absent. A correction was offered in Item VI, and another in Item VIII. Thus adjusted, the minutes were approved unanimously, with 8 abstentions.

V. Academic Affairs Committee motion on transfer credits – The chair turned the floor over to Scott Smith for discussion on the proposed AAC motion on credit transfers that was proposed and held over from the last meeting:

That UNH policy on transfer credit be that up to 72 credits within an associate degree program would be allowed to transfer, provided that the courses are college level and that the student has earned a C or better in those courses.

A senator asked if there were limits or restrictions on the timing of earning these 72 credits. A member of the AAC said that this motion changes nothing from the motion that was passed last spring, and that all procedures are the same. Scott said the purpose of this is to facilitate

enrolling students with Associate degrees from community colleges, meaning that the 72 credits could not be the final credits of a UNH degree.

Another senator noted the wording regarding earning "...a C or better....," and asked if departments will still have the right to determine if transferred credits would apply towards a major. Scott said that departments should work with the registrar regarding that.

A senator asked about the three-credit versus four-credit issue, and Scott said that the credits will transfer to UNH as they are; three credits will not be expanded to four.

The motion was put to a vote and passed, with 62 votes in favor, none opposed, and 1 abstention.

VI. Discussion with Terri Winters, Director of IT Academic Technology – The chair welcomed Terri Winters, UNH director of IT Academic Technology, as well as Dan Carchidi, Academic Technology Associate Director; Eleta Exline, Digital Collections Librarian; and Cathy Overson, Associate Director Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, who came to discuss Open Educational Resources (OER). Terri said that the university ran a pilot last year to implement OER in the classroom, and that a new initiative is ongoing this year, which they would like to share with the Senate, as well as solicit feedback.

She said that the fact that UNH is trying to address the use of OER is good news, particularly in light of data from the College Board, which indicates that the average student paid \$1328 on course materials in the 2014/15 academic year, with amounts varying by discipline and major. She said according to statistics from a student interest group, two out of three students choose to not buy some course materials because of their cost. This choice negatively affects the student's experience in the classroom, and their grades. One in two students report taking fewer courses because of the cost of materials. She asserted that students cannot learn from materials they cannot afford, and said that one solution to this problem is the use of Open Educational Resources.

Dan Carchidi said that OER is one way to address these cost issues. He defined OER as teaching, learning and research resources that reside in the public domain, or which have been released under intellectual property licenses to allow their free use or re-purposing by others. He said it is helpful to think "free" in two ways: free in cost to students and teachers, and also free in terms of instructors' and students' abilities to adjust, build on, share, and make modifications to these materials. He said that Academic Technology began last year with a modest pilot to work with nine ambassadors who were provided with incentives to incorporate OER into their courses, and then share their reflections on the benefits of OER from their own perspectives and from the perspectives of their students. The other goal of the pilot was to help build a model to support faculty at UNH in using OER. This led to a partnership with the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CEITL) to develop assessment tools to measure the success of the program. A partnership was also established with the Library, who provided specific expertise regarding content, and Academic Technology for instruction design and development.

Cathy Overson shared some of the results of the pilot program. She said that when CEITL began looking at ways to assess this program, they started with cost comparisons. She gathered information from faculty about possible course materials, and then she looked at the costs of those materials, using Amazon.com as a resource. She looked at the most expensive, hard cover versions of textbooks, and found savings of up to \$149,000.

The next area examined was whether student performance would be affected by the use of OER. What they found was that, using exams as the major assessment, performance outcomes using OER were about the same or a little higher than in prior classes when the instructors used traditional materials.

They also asked what the faculty thought of using OER, and found that faculty reported that while using OER was initially a labor-intensive effort, they also reported that using OER enlivened their courses, and that they would use them again.

Students reported that the OER were more accessible and easy to navigate, and that they appreciated the wider variety of materials which provided new ways to approach the topics studied. She noted that some students did report a preference for hard-copy texts.

Eleta Exline, from the Library, noted that the first challenge in using OER is often just finding suitable resources, which vary widely from small components of a course to entire textbooks. She acknowledged that it is easier to find entry-level textbooks online, and harder to locate texts for advanced or specialized subjects. Knowing where to search is helpful. OER have open licenses attached, which makes it possible for faculty to re-mix and combine materials for their needs. The OER support teams (from AT, the Library, and CEITL, helped faculty find materials, understand licensing issues, troubleshoot technical challenges, design instruction, and develop assessments.

Dan said that the benefits to faculty in using OER, beyond cost savings, include the opportunity to evolve the content of a course, the chance to engage students as creators in course content, as well as facilitating new ways of sharing and curating course content.

He reported that UMass Amherst reports saving \$1.3 million to date by using OER since 2011. The Maricopa Community College OER program began as a faculty-recommended initiative, serving over 260,000 students across its system, saving about \$1 million per year over five years. Some courses there are identified in the course catalogue as “no cost “ or “low cost.”

Dan said that the pilot at UNH was sponsored by every school and college, the provost’s office, Academic Technology, and the Library. He noted that there is interest from the other system schools in implementing similar practices. With the help of a long-range technology grant, UNH now has fifteen ambassadors involved, at no cost to UNH. The desire is to build OER awareness and make OER adoption common in the university system.

In order to do this, they have been reaching out to the Student Senate and the Graduate Student Senate. Open Access Week is October 24-28, in partnership with the Library. Partnering with CEITL and the Library, there will be a hands-on workshop in January 2017. A system-wide UNH OER Ambassador outreach is scheduled for Spring 2017. Cable Green,

director of Open Education and Creative Commons should also be here next spring to talk about Open Education.

A senator talked about the real costs to students to have technology available, noting that the course materials may be free, but that there are high costs to having access to the kind of hardware and technology needed to access the free materials, including high-speed internet. She said this is a good way to help upper-middle class students save money, but could be a real burden on students with minimal resources. She asked how OER supports cultural production, when what we're doing is trying to get around it. She asserted that one reason the cost of textbooks is so high is because many texts are linked to expensive websites with licenses that expire, which then cannot be re-sold or re-used.

Terri said that these are salient points, and noted that the university does make public computing available to our students in the library and in computer labs across campus.

Another senator called OER a timely idea, saying that the cost of education is a national problem. He said he could see faculty having difficulty finding new online resources, and spoke about the Kellogg Foundation support for a national digital image library, to which scholars can submit images and videos with explanations, which are then peer reviewed and made available through open access. He suggested that scholars could form regional or national consortiums to develop materials for collaboration. Eleta said that the UNH Library has a repository, which may not be as broad as the senator described, but it is a significant resource. She also said there is funding available from various sources because of high interest in building these kinds of resources.

A senator asked for more concrete data about the number of students referred to by Terri who took fewer courses or avoided courses because of the cost of materials. She also asked what departments are represented by the UNH OER ambassadors, noting that different departments face different challenges in finding suitable OER.

Dan directed the group to the UNH Open Education Project website (<https://at.usnh.edu/university-new-hampshire-oer-ambassador-project>), saying that the 2015 and 2016 ambassadors can be found in the left-hand menu list. Terri said she would share today's PowerPoint presentation with the Senate admin for distribution.

Another senator said that according to a study a few years ago, it is still cheapest for students to purchase used books, and asked how much students save with OER over used book prices. She also asked if there is any research on how students are succeeding in writing, assessment, and conversing about topics when using digital materials and printouts rather than taking their own notes. Terri replied that the data gathered from the bookstore from two years ago, regarding what students were paying, it may be true that used books are the best alternative for students. Some concerns are that when purchasing online textbooks, access to those online resources may end after a six-month period or so. She turned the other question over to Cathy to answer.

Cathy replied that in the pilot, they mostly used exam scores as the measure of performance. Using new and unusual sources altered the dynamics of the courses in positive and

unexpected ways for both students and faculty. She said it's hard to determine whether it was the use of OER that made the difference, or if it was simply the nature of the instructor and students doing things in a new way that shaped those perceptions.

Another senator expressed concern about quality control of OER materials, saying that so much of what is available online is mediocre. She agreed with the earlier senator who talked about the need to support cultural production, stating that technical production also needs the support of the academic community. Eleta responded that there are those in the academic community who are working to address the issue of identifying quality issues, which are a concern. Terri added that curation and evaluation of materials is a time consuming process that further complicates this issue. She said that Library faculty and staff can be of assistance in this area.

A senator asked if any studies have been done on electronic media fatigue for students and faculty, saying that he has experienced this as he has worked to learn the new Canvas system at UNH. He said many students express a preference for physical copies of books, and asked if electronic media is available at the same level as can be found in hard copy texts. Eleta invited him to come speak with her personally after the meeting to see what hard copies are available. Cathy Overson noted that in a survey of students, hard copies are often preferred particularly by students in the Biological Sciences.

A senator expressed enthusiasm for utilizing OER, and said that faculty might be more supportive of this if it were introduced as a money-saving initiative. He said he doesn't love the title Open Education Resources, and suggested that something like "free texts" might be received more positively.

Another senator noted that the UNH book list is put out in order to help students identify available and economical books early on, and asked if students are using this resource. Terri responded that AT still supports the book list, and that many professors are using this resource to give students options.

A senator said that OER is a good way to reduce student costs, and that he supports encouraging faculty to use OER where quality can be maintained, but that he is worried about this becoming a proscriptive program. He wondered if "low cost/no cost" identifiers on courses in a catalogue might cause an arms race of sorts that would challenge content quality.

Dan responded that he and his colleagues are here today as a sounding board for the faculty, and are interested in feedback whether OER might work for their individual courses.

A senator noted that there are other costs associated with education beyond course materials, such as lab fees, and she suggested that we need to examine what students are actually receiving for the fees they pay. She encouraged avoiding purchasing pre-packaged courses that limit faculty control over content.

Dante encouraged the senators to send additional questions to Terri, and thanked her and her colleagues for their input today.

VII. Motion on Morin donation from Agenda Committee – Dan Innis, Senate vice-chair, reminded the group about the previous Senate discussion on the use of Professor Robert Morin’s donation to the university. At the last Senate meeting, it was decided that the Agenda Committee needed to revise their proposed joint motion. To that end, Dan presented the following amended motion, using the same rationale as before:

Motion: Resolved:

- 1. The Faculty Senate most gratefully acknowledges the incredibly generous gift of the late Professor Robert Morin, '63, to the University.**
- 2. While the Senate agrees that the administration has primary responsibility and authority for strategic planning, budgeting, and advancement ([FACULTY SENATE MOTION #XIII-M15](#) on a joint shared governance document), the Faculty Senate is extremely disappointed in the absence of consultation with faculty (which is a positive duty) and deans in the use of the gift, particularly for non-academic purposes.**
- 3. While aware that most of the gift will go towards a student career and professional success center, the Faculty Senate questions the use of \$1M from the gift for a videoboard.**

He pointed out that Item 2 above clearly references the Senate motion on the joint statement on shared governance, as requested in the last discussion, to remind the administration of existing language, as well as clear wording regarding the concerns of the Senate about the use of these funds for non-academic purposes.

A senator suggested that it would be appropriate to place Professor Morin’s name on the videoboard, as he is now identified as the donor of funds for that board. Another senator suggested that the advertising revenues from the videoboard might be appropriately earmarked to support the Library. He said that the Library Committee’s initial motion on this subject reflected concern that the Library’s current financial needs were ignored in the distribution of Professor Morin’s gift, and said that adding wording to Item 3 above that would encourage the use of those profits to fund Library programs might give more substance to that item of the motion.

Another senator said that he can see that the Agenda Committee has tried to blend the two previously proposed motions, and that he doesn’t think any wording should be added to this motion.

A senator suggested that Media Services could produce a brief presentation on Professor Morin to display before each football game, to honor the man and encourage others to donate. Yet another suggestion was that the career center could be named after him. Dan asked if the Senate has the ability to direct the administration to make such decisions.

Another senator said he liked the wording of the new motion, saying that it broadens the issue to address the aspect of communication and consultation between administration and faculty. He called the videoboard a case study of a larger issue.

A senator said his greatest concern was to see the advertising revenues from the videoboard go towards academic scholarships rather than athletic scholarships, and suggested that a new motion to that effect might be appropriate in the future. Dan said that the provost will look into where those scholarship dollars will go.

A senator said that he would vote against this motion, asserting that while the president made a mistake which has cost the university, he has generally done a good job and that the senator would be reticent to vote for something that will drag out publicity further on this topic and perhaps damage the president's ability to lead effectively. Dan said that this motion was revised with restraint in mind, noting that the issue of consistent lack of shared governance has been an ongoing concern for many senators. Another senator said that the president knew his decision would be controversial. A senator said he also would vote against this motion, saying that he does not want to send a message that the Senate believes that the administration needs to speak with this body about every financial decision. It was noted that this gift was unprecedented in size and in the fact that it was unrestricted in how it was to be used, and it was suggested that such wording might be included in the motion.

A member of the Agenda Committee said that when we ask for consultation from the administration, that doesn't necessarily mean consultation with the entire Senate. There are standing committees with which the administration could communicate such information. Dan asserted that even a conversation with the deans would be a more acceptable solution. A senator pointed out that the president made it clear that he consulted with numerous entities before making this decision, and the fact that faculty were not among those entities feels like a dismissal of faculty; that faculty are irrelevant in the community.

Another senator said that this controversy has been exposed to the world, and that if the faculty say nothing, it appears that we are supporting the president's decision. He asserted that we need to state that we do not support his decision. Another senator called this a clash of cultures, noting that the president spoke in the language of business, which may not translate well before a group of academics. He said that if communication between faculty and the administration is to improve, the president will need to explain his business strategies in more relatable terms.

A senator said that she supports Items 1 and 2 in the motion, but not Item 3, noting that the decision has been made, and that some faculty, students, and alumni do like the videoboard. It was moved that Item 3 be removed from the motion. That motion was seconded. A senator said that his department feels strongly that something like the wording of Item 3 needs to be expressed. Another senator said that the motion is more palatable without Item 3. Several senators expressed a desire to keep Item 3, as it expresses appropriate concern with how the president spent the funds. Others said that Item 2's assertion of the academic mission of the university is sufficient.

The motion to amend the original motion in order to remove Item 3 altogether was put to a vote, passing with 30 votes in favor, 27 votes opposed, and 2 abstentions.

Thus revised, the amended motion was then put to a vote and passed, with 45 votes in favor, 12 votes opposed, and 4 abstentions.

VIII. Annual Summary Report – Due to time constraints, this report will be postponed until the next Senate meeting

IX. New Business – The Senate representative to the Board of Trustees reported that the Board voted to suspend a state law requiring that no more than 25% of students enrolled at UNH may be from out-of-state, and said she found this curious. Another senator said that she believes that the Board does this every year. Dante said he will check into it.

X. Adjournment - Upon a motion and second to adjourn, the group voted to adjourn the meeting at 5:24 p.m.