

University of New Hampshire

University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository

Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes

Faculty Senate Documents

5-4-2015

2014-15 FACULTY SENATE XIX - May 4, 2015 Minutes Summary

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "2014-15 FACULTY SENATE XIX - May 4, 2015 Minutes Summary" (2015). *Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes*. 202.

https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty_senate_agendas_minutes/202

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
2014-15 FACULTY SENATE XIX

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 3:12 on May 4, 2015

MINUTES SUMMARY

I. Roll – The following senators were absent: Dowd, Gingras, Kun, Morgan, Murphy, Potter, Thompson, and Wu. Aytur, Benoit, Carroll, Freedman, and Minocha were excused. Ruml and C. White served as proxies for Ware and Denis, respectively. Mark Huddleston, Lisa MacFarlane, and Barb White were guests.

II. Remarks by and questions to the senate chair – The senate chair welcomed members of the 2015-16 faculty senate, session XX, to today’s meeting, and reminded the new senators that all votes during this meeting would be for members of the 2014-15 senate, session XIX, only. He also announced that due to a schedule change, President Huddleston and Provost MacFarlane would be joining the meeting at 4:45 today. The chair had no other remarks.

III. Minutes – It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the last senate meeting, April 27, 2015. The chair of the Student Affairs Committee noted that the motion from that committee was cited incorrectly in the minutes, although the more recent, correct version of the motion was included in the meeting agenda. The senate admin will adjust the minutes to reflect the most recent version of the motion. A senator from UNH-M requested clarification on a comment made during the discussion of CCLEAR faculty representation on the senate regarding representation of small departments. The senate admin accepted his request and will adjust the minutes accordingly. Thus amended, the minutes were then unanimously approved with no abstentions.

Action Items:

IV. Discussion and vote on Motion 3 from ad hoc Committee on Teaching Evaluation Form Implementation – Barbara White, representing the ad hoc Committee on Teaching Evaluation Form Implementation reported to the senate that, after reviewing questions raised at the last senate meeting, the committee has decided to withdraw the third motion from their report for the time being. This motion related to removing question 14 from the teaching evaluation form. At the current time, there is insufficient data regarding the new evaluation form. She did say that four semesters ago, 98% of students who completed the form answered all questions on the form, and that this provides a good base for comparison. Once sufficient data has been gathered on student response with the new form, the committee will return to the senate with additional information. The senate chair thanked the committee for its efforts.

V. Discussion and vote on motion from ad hoc Committee on CLER Faculty Involvement in the Senate – Kerry Kazura, chair of the Committee on CLER Faculty Involvement in the

Senate, presented the committee’s motion regarding inclusion of CCLEAR faculty in the work of the senate, according to the following overview:

Overview of Motion for CCLEAR faculty involvement in the Senate

Number of voting faculty (TT + CCLEAR)	Number of Senators	Classification of Senators
15 or less	1	TT
16 to 40	2	TT or CCLEAR
More than 40	3	TT or CCLEAR

1. CCLEAR faculty must have a 75% or greater UNH appointment to vote and serve.
2. CCLEAR faculty just like TT faculty will represent their department.
3. The faculty senate will grow from 51 senators to approximately 83 senators.
4. Ten departments would not be able to send a CCLEAR faculty member to the senate

When the senate last met, an amendment to the original motion was pending to change the wording of the existing motion by removing the words “except in departments with fifteen or less faculty.” This amendment was returned to the floor for discussion. Concern was expressed that the proposed amendment to allow either tenure-track or CCLEAR faculty to represent departments with fifteen or less faculty might create a minority of tenure-track faculty serving on the senate.

The senate vice chair moved to limit the length of discussion on this amendment, or any subsequent amendment to this motion, be limited to ten minutes today, in light of the full schedule for today’s meeting. **This motion to limit discussion on amendments to the motion in today’s meeting was put to a vote and passed, 24 in favor and 5 opposed.**

The senator who proposed the amendment to the original motion asserted his opinion that basing the eligibility of faculty to serve in the senate on the size of their home departments is unfair. He said the issue is eligibility, not electability, and also noted that there are clear differences in the cultures of various departments which will influence whether or not any given department chooses to elect CCLEAR faculty to the senate.

Another senator raised the issue of the tenure system and its value in the university community. He suggested that the reflection in the senate constitution of the importance of the tenure system is essential for representation in shared governance. He acknowledged the asymmetry across UNH faculty that results from the tenure system, and said that if we support this amendment, the result will be that the importance of tenure-track faculty being at the center of shared governance will be diminished as it would not be essential for some departments to have any tenure-track representation at all. He also pointed to the large differences between service requirements of various positions, noting the asymmetric obligations of tenure-track and CCLEAR faculty appointments. He asserted that the genuine differences between faculty in this context are part of the diversity of this community.

A senator from Education stated that he will vote against the amendment to the motion, stating that while he appreciates the interest in equity, this amendment will not provide full access to all CCLEAR faculty, as there remain some CCLEAR faculty who are not associated with any department at all.

A senator who served on the CLER committee expressed his own ambivalence about this issue and suggested that perhaps the issue should be tabled until the fall. The CLER committee chair responded that the committee had attempted to incorporate feedback received in the meetings of the Committee of the Whole in order to find a workable compromise to initiate CCLEAR faculty involvement in the senate, and that she felt it was important to move forward at this time, even if the original motion is less than perfect, knowing that adjustments can and will be made in the future. She also reminded the senate that CCLEAR faculty in small departments would be eligible, under the original motion, to serve as proxies for the elected tenure-track faculty representing those departments, and called this a first step.

The amendment to this motion, to remove the words “except in departments with fifteen or less faculty” was then called to a vote and failed, with 8 voted in favor, 26 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

The discussion on the motion continued. A senator from Physics shared his department’s opinion, which is that their department supports the motion above, with the removal of lecturers and contract faculty from those eligible to vote for and serve as senate representatives. He also asserted that, as it stands, this motion would be a gift to any administrator who wants to replace tenure-track faculty positions with lecturer positions. He also asserted that the decrease in the number of tenure-track positions across campus has adversely affected the academic mission of the university. **He then proposed an amendment to the current motion to include only Clinical, Extension, Alternative Security, and Research Faculty in the motion**, stating that he would like to see some kind of representation for Lecturers and Contract Faculty, but that his department feels that equating those positions with tenure-track positions is not tenable under the senate constitution.

The senator from the School of Law asserted the equality of Alternative Security Faculty there to tenure-track faculty, and pointing out that they have been functioning as such since the school’s inception. He acknowledged the differences in departmental/school cultures, and expressed the School of Law’s overwhelming support for this motion as it stands.

Another senator expressed the feeling that the motion as it stands is a good compromise, maintaining the tenure-track faculty at the heart of the senate constitution, and called it sufficient for his support.

The senator who had proposed the failed amendment above said that he will vote in favor of the motion as it stands, calling it imperfect, but an improvement to the current alignment. He suggested that there are other ways to engage in a debate with the administration about the number of tenure-track positions.

A senator spoke out to second the Physic’s senator’s amendment. A senator from the CLER committee said that any such amendment essentially would mean starting over from

scratch, and reminded the senate that there are more than 200 lecturers on campus who would negatively impacted by this amendment. Another senator said that he is not concerned about providing a gift to the administration; he does not believe that keeping tenure-track positions in order to maintain shared governance is a strong motivator to the administration. He said he would support the original motion, saying that the CCLEAR faculty are dedicated and have much to bring to the table.

The senate chair called for a vote on the amendment to the motion proposed by the senator from the Physics department. The amendment failed with 2 votes in favor, 31 opposed, and 3 abstentions.

The discussion on the original motion continued. A senator said that he strongly supports the Physic's senator's concerns. He asserted that the administration has created a new class of faculty with the heavy hiring of lecturers, and said that while he strenuously objects to the administration's replacement of tenure-track positions with lecturers, he holds the lecturers themselves in high esteem. His objections are to this shift in the balance of positions, not to the lecturers themselves.

Another senator said that his department is concerned about the increased size of the faculty senate that will result from this proposed motion. He said that with the senate's current size it is hard to get a fulsome discussion as it is, and while he does not object to CCLEAR representation in the senate, he does not support this construct.

The senate chair asked if the senator would like to offer an amendment. The senator did not have an amendment to offer, but did say that he preferred the notion of a few representatives from each category of CCLEAR faculty. Another senator agreed that with more voices in the senate, there will need to be adjustments made in how the calendar is handled, but said he believes it can be done as proposed in the current motion.

A senator asked, referring to the just failed amendment, what boon the original motion might be to administrators, pointing out that it only allows for senate representation, and does not mandate any departmental rights for CCLEAR faculty. The senator offering that amendment said that there is concern that there may be some administrators who would declare equality between tenure-track and lecturers based on the senate's inclusion of those faculty. The senate vice chair said that in her experience, the dean of her college has fought hard to keep tenure-track positions. Another senator said that in her department, she has had a different experience with the same dean. A senator asserted that this motion does not declare parity between lecturers and tenure-track faculty, but rather states that it is essential for every unit to have a tenured representative in the senate. The amending senator agreed, but maintained that some administrators may take a different view of the senate's decision on this.

Another senator pointed out that the reason many faculty have lightened teaching loads is because of lecturers, calling them an important part of the faculty of this university.

The senate chair asked for a vote on this motion to amend the senate constitution, noting that it requires a two-thirds vote to pass. The motion passed with 27 votes in favor, 10 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

The chair then asked for a vote on the motion to amend the senate bylaws. This motion passed with 32 in favor, 1 opposed, and 4 abstentions.

It was clarified that these amendments will take effect for the March 2016 election of senators who will serve during the 2016-2017 academic year.

VI. Discussion and vote on motion from senate Library Committee – The senate chair then reintroduced the motion from the Library Committee for the senate to approve the revised library collection maintenance policy:

*UNH FACULTY SENATE
MOTION # XIX-M14*

on senate approval of the revised library collection maintenance policy

- 1. Motion presenter: Carolyn Mebert, Chair of the Senate Library Committee*
- 2. Dates of Faculty Senate discussion: 4/27/15, 5/4/15*
- 3. Motion: The senate Library Committee moves that the senate approve the revised library collection maintenance policy.*
- 4. Rationale: A few weeks ago, the library committee reported that we had, last fall, sent to all faculty (via senators) the draft library collection maintenance policy, written by the librarians in response to the deselection episode of last spring. We asked for feedback and received none, except that the history department had some issues and were working with the librarians. The history department achieved resolution of their issues in December and we were all set to go and that's what I came to the senate with.*

Subsequent to that report, the history department realized that they were really not satisfied with the policy and so went back into negotiations with the library faculty. A new resolution was achieved in late April, and the library committee is satisfied with this resolution.

The senator from the Library spoke out for the library faculty, saying their hope is that the senate will pass this motion, with ample faculty input on collection reviews or reviews of maintenance of collections.

The chair of the library committee thanked the library faculty and members of the history department for their work on this report and motion. The assembly offered a round of applause.

The motion was put to a vote and passed with 36 votes in favor, none opposed and 1 abstention.

VII. Resolution from the Agenda Committee on closure of branch libraries – The senate vice chair read the following:

Resolution from Agenda Committee on branch libraries

Introduction: *The Information Access Working Group started meeting in December of 2014. The Chair of the Senate’s Library Committee has been a participating member. The working group was tasked with*

- 1. studying how to efficiently provide access to information within our fiscal and space challenges, and*
- 2. identifying and recommending specific teaching and research services which will become a part of the consolidated science resource center under development within Dimond Library and within the branch libraries.*

The working group is scheduled to complete its final recommendations after its May 8, 2015 meeting. This is after the senate adjourns for the summer. Because of the timing of the recommendations and the hiatus of the senate, the Agenda Committee deems it prudent to present a motion that states our position on an important aspect of this work and one that has been under consideration in the senate for over a year—the role of the branch libraries in the academic program of our university.

Therefore, the Agenda Committee moves the following Resolution on Branch Libraries:

WHEREAS, the University Library system is central to all aspects of the academic mission including teaching, research/scholarship, and outreach; and

WHEREAS, UNH branch libraries provide important discipline-based services in support of the academic mission of the University, therefore, the closure, consolidation or movement of any branch library can profoundly impact the academic mission of those disciplines as well as all disciplines through the reallocation of scarce collection space in the University Library System; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate is the legislative body that reviews and develops policies concerned with the academic mission of the University and, has a responsibility for shared governance, and must therefore be concerned with any actions that impact the academic mission;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED *that no UNH branch library should be closed, consolidated or moved without full consideration by, and consultation with, the Faculty Senate as manifested through a vote of the Faculty Senate.*

The senator from the library commented that the library faculty has been divided on this issue, and asked what level of consultation with library faculty might be involved, as well as what limitations this resolution might place on the library faculty in accomplishing their work. The

senate vice chair responded that the intent of this resolution is not to interfere with the work of the library faculty. Instead, she asserted that this resolution intends to address unresolved issues regarding the closure of branch libraries, pointing out that any library unit that is closed on campus has a direct impact on the academic mission of the university. She continued by saying that the senate agenda committee is asking that the senate be consulted and permitted to carry on a discussion regarding such potential closures, but does not seek to orchestrate.

The senator from the library asserted that such consultation would happen naturally, and asked what the method of consultation through the senate Library Committee might be. A member of the agenda committee responded that the usual process is for a question or concern to come through the senate chair and agenda committee to the appropriate senate committee, which then reports directly to the senate. The chair of the library committee also meets with the dean of the library committee. The chair of the senate Library Committee asked if this kind of resolution shouldn't come through the library committee rather than through the agenda committee.

The senate vice chair moved to suspend the rule on laying over substantive motions to the next senate meeting in order to vote today on this resolution. The senate voted unanimously in favor of suspending that rule.

The senator from the library said that she must abstain in this vote because she will have no opportunity to consult with the library faculty, who she knows are split on this matter. She said that having the backing of the senate might provide the library faculty with leverage to delay a closure recommended by the administration for senate discussion, but that rushing this through makes things difficult for library faculty. A member of the agenda committee stated the urgency of voting today on this topic because of the summer break, and the need for the senate to assert its desire to be part of any discussion regarding the closure of a branch library.

The senate Library Committee chair asked what teeth this resolution has; if a branch library were to be closed without senate consultation, what would be the consequence? A senator said that the senate can pass another resolution deploring the action, which would place pressure on the administration to account for such an action. There continued some discussion regarding whether such a resolution could have any actual power to effect change. A member of the agenda committee said that the resolution doesn't mandate the actions of the library, but rather is aimed at the administration to remind them that the senate should be part of any discussion of closing any branch library, even if the end result is not what the senate might wish.

A senator asked if the Agenda Committee is empowered to act for the senate during the summer when the senate is not in session. The chair indicated that the Agenda Committee does have some authority to act on behalf of the senate during the summer break.

The senate then voted on the proposed resolution, and the measure passed with 33 votes in favor, 1 vote opposed, and 2 abstentions.

VIII. Discussion and vote on motion from the Information Technology Committee – Maria Basterra, the chair of the ITC, told the senate that the USNH IT group will not eliminate the

requirement to change passwords on IT accounts every six months in the current proposed IT policy for the system. The current motion is for the senate to approve the proposed policy as it stands. If the senate is unwilling to vote in support of the proposed policy, the committee can revisit the proposal next year. There was some discussion regarding the policy's wording regarding "significant portions" of users' names in the password.

The motion to approve the proposed IT policy was put to a vote and failed, with 15 votes in favor, 16 votes opposed, and 2 abstentions.

IX. Report and motion from the Joint Panel on Teaching and Learning – The senate chair turned the time over to David Pillemer and Senior Vice Provost P.T. Vasudevan, co-chairs of the Joint Panel on Teaching and Learning to present their committee's report to the senate. David introduced Eleanor Abrams, Ruth Varner, and Suzanne Graham (not in attendance) as the chairs of the three working groups of the joint panel. He thanked these three chairs for the work they have accomplished.

Eleanor described the joint effort between the university's Academic Affairs Office and the Faculty Senate, which included thirty total faculty and staff from across the university. Within the report, attached to the agenda for today's meeting, a timeline is included as well as the data gathered. After gathering the data and examining best practices from other institutions, the committee made the following recommendation:

"We recommend that the Office of Academic Affairs form a Center for Innovation in Teaching and Learning. The Center will be designed to create and encourage the use of evidence-based teaching and learning strategies in a variety of contexts to support a broad range of learners from preschool to graduate education (P-20)."

The panel's recommendations are dependent upon three actions:

- 1. We recommend that the Provost bring together existing, but separate, resources on teaching and learning under one umbrella to leverage resources, personnel, and efforts.*
- 2. We recommend that the Provost identify a leader/position to chair a university-wide advisory board for the creation of the Center. (Before Provost MacFarlane leaves in July, 2015).*
- 3. We recommend that the core of the center's mission is the creation of a strong culture of innovation and excellence in teaching and learning through the development of structures and activities supporting the pillars of teaching and learning, assessment, scholarship, and engagement with community partners. (2015-2016).*

The report also identified potential themes for the proposed Center for Innovation in Teaching and Learning:

- 1. Create a culture that embraces excellence in teaching and learning*

2. *Stimulate and support interdisciplinary, collaborative research and scholarship on innovations in teaching and learning*
3. *Develop and support a culture of assessment with the goal of improving teaching and learning*
4. *Invest in and external engaged partnerships that support research on, and improvement of, teaching and learning in school and community settings*

A senator asked if there had been any input from the School of Law to this panel, also asking if these recommendations would apply to the School of Law, and noting that the School of Law has spent much time examining teaching and learning issues. Eleanor responded that the panel's recommendations are intended to all three campuses. She acknowledged that there was not as much response from the School of Law as the committee had hoped.

Another senator asked about responses on the Qualtrix survey indicating faculty opinions on funding for the proposed center and hiring of staff/faculty for the center. Eleanor said that six of the 136 responders to the survey indicated that "no new administrative hires" was a priority to them. The senior vice provost said that tenure-track hires in each college are up to the deans according to the RCM, and that he will not micromanage the deans in this aspect. Eleanor went on to say that the hope is that there will be grant funding for the center, noting that both external and internal resources are being examined.

Another senator asked where the numbers came from for the estimated number of staff for the center in the report; are these internal hires, tenure-track, non-tenure-track? She asked about the impact on faculty individually and by department. Neither of the co-chairs of the panel had clear answers on this question, partially due to the fact that the senior vice provost was unable to speak for the incoming provost. A senator suggested that the provost is able to identify leadership positions. The senior vice provost said that such positions would probably be faculty members and not new hires.

The senate past chair moved on behalf of the agenda committee to accept the report by the Panel on Teaching and Learning. A motion was made to suspend the rules on substantive motions in order to vote today on this issue rather than laying it over to the next meeting. **The motion to suspend the rule passed by vocal vote, with one vote in opposition.**

The motion to accept the joint panel's report then passed with 30 votes in favor, 2 votes opposed, and 2 abstentions.

X. Discussion and vote on Student Affairs Committee on Student Senate resolution re: advising – Jo Laird, chair of the SAC, briefly presented her committee's motion to add the following statements to the faculty advising handbook and the Students' Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct (SRRC) handbook: MOTION from the Student Affairs Committee (20 April 2015):

1. *Add the following statement to the general Faculty Advising Handbook (www.unh.edu/uacc/advising-handbook).*

“Faculty advisors

- *Help students plan their course schedules and provide information pertinent to the major*
- *Help students monitor their progress in the major and toward graduation*
- *Provide guidance on opportunities (e.g. internships, post- graduation employment, and graduate studies) and direct students to relevant support services when appropriate*
- *Establish clear communication guidelines with each advisee, respond to their questions in a timely manner, and direct students to relevant support services when appropriate”*

2. *Add the following to section 06.1 of the Student Rights, Rules, and Responsibilities*

“06.1.1 Sources of information

Students can find information concerning each department and college on their web sites and can go to the university advising and career center web site (www.unh.edu/uacc<<http://www.unh.edu/uacc>>) to get answers to many questions pertaining to course selection, graduation requirements etc.

Either faculty or staff members may serve as academic advisors depending on departmental procedures. Academic advisors typically help students both schedule classes that meet university and departmental requirements and monitor their progress throughout their academic career. Either academic advisors or other staff of the associated department/college may assist students in various ways, for example to learn of internships and post-graduation opportunities, and they may direct students to relevant support services when appropriate.

06.1.2 Student responsibility for effective advising

Students are ultimately responsible for their academic careers. Students should meet with the appropriate advisers early and throughout their university careers to devise strategies suitable to meet their specific needs and goals.

To help maximize the effectiveness of academic advising, students should schedule appointments so as to discuss the advising question(s) before forms need to be signed or letters of recommendation are due and follow up on plans and suggestions made during meetings with their advisors.”

Jo pointed out that the statement added to the SRRC will help to clarify to students where they can get information, remind them that not all colleges or departments handle advising in the same manner, and also reflect what each student’s responsibility is. The two items above are to be voted upon as one motion.

The motion was put to a vote and passed with 33 votes in favor, none opposed, and 1 abstention.

Discussion/Report Items:

XI. Remarks by President Huddleston – The university president was welcomed to the meeting and given an opportunity to share some thoughts. President Huddleston welcomed the new senators attending and thanked the senate membership for their service. He reported that the state budget is now sitting with the state senate, and that the Senate Ways and Means Committee has indicated that revenues are up somewhat, but that it appears that in-state tuition will be frozen again. A senator posited that tuition cannot remain frozen indefinitely. The president replied that a freeze on tuition could be eliminated if the state would increase their funding each year, but he also said that he is exploring ways for the university to control expenses ourselves, holding budget increases essentially to inflation.

The chair of the senate Campus Planning Committee asked the president how the state views appropriation of funds for projects that are not directly related to the academic mission of the university. He asked if projects like the football stadium expansion or the outdoor pool bring criticism from the legislature. The president pointed out that funding for these projects has not come from any state monies. He noted that there are always those in the legislature who are looking for reasons to criticize the university community, but his intent is to move forward.

A senator asked about how next year's freshman class is looking. The president says that the numbers are just coming in, but that unofficially that the class is comparable to last year's with even a somewhat higher level of quality.

The president reported that the search for the new Vice President for Enrollment Management is moving slowly but steadily. He also said that the search for the new provost was moving more quickly, with candidates coming to campus this week.

The Provost took a moment to thank the senate for the pleasure of working together for the past two years. The senate vice chair suggested a vote of thanks by acclamation for the provost's good work over many years at the university, and the senate responded with applause.

The senate chair thanked the president and the provost for being vigorous proponents of shared governance.

XII. New business – The senate chair presented the senate admin with a token of appreciation for her service. The senate vice chair then asked for a few moments to speak. She offered heartfelt thanks to the XIX Senate members, who have worked very hard this year on serious substantive changes. She observed that senate service is time consuming, requiring substantial reading, research, and time to keep colleagues informed. She praised the current senate chair for his commitment and passion for shared governance, and his willingness to hear all points of view. She thanked him for his tireless efforts to handle the myriad of duties that must be attended to before any items of business can even come before the senate as a whole. She then presented the outgoing chair with a gift, and the senate body offered their thanks by applause.

XIII. Adjournment- It was moved and seconded to adjourn this final meeting of the XIX senate session *sine die* at 4:52 p.m.