

University of New Hampshire

## University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository

---

Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes

Faculty Senate Documents

---

4-13-2015

### 2014-15 FACULTY SENATE XIX - April 13, 2015 Minutes Summary

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty\\_senate\\_agendas\\_minutes](https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty_senate_agendas_minutes)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "2014-15 FACULTY SENATE XIX - April 13, 2015 Minutes Summary" (2015). *Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes*. 204.

[https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty\\_senate\\_agendas\\_minutes/204](https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty_senate_agendas_minutes/204)

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](mailto: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 April 13, 2015

MINUTES SUMMARY

I. Roll – The following senators were absent: Denis, Dowd, Fagerberg, Gingras, Mebert, Morgan, Tenczar, and Thompson. Carroll, Minocha, and Scala were excused. Bauer served as proxy for Seitz. Chris Clement and Lisa MacFarlane were guests.

II. Remarks by and questions to the vice president for finance and administration – The senate chair turned the time over to Vice President Chris Clement to introduce himself and share some thoughts with the senate. Chris told the members that he was raised and educated in New Hampshire, and worked for twenty years in global manufacturing before moving into state government, where he served as deputy commissioner and then commissioner of transportation for the state of New Hampshire. As a local engineer with business experience, he was able to help negotiate \$965 million in stimulus funds for the state in 2009. He acknowledged that he is new to the higher education construct, but believes that he is well suited to sell the benefit of the University of New Hampshire to the state community and leadership, and is looking forward to garnering support for higher education.

III. Remarks by and questions to the provost – The provost expressed her pleasure to have Chris working for Finance and Administration, and noted that his office works to support the work of the students, faculty and staff at UNH. She then brought the senate up to date on the Strategic Plan Refresh and the recalibration of RCM, which will align RCM with the strategic plan. She directed the senators to the website [ <http://unh.edu/president/strategic-plan> ] for details about the process of the strategic refresh. The provost then reminded the group of David Hiley’s words that the RCM is a tool, not a substitute for decision-making, judgment, or leadership. She asserted that the RCM is not a rigid template, but a tool to track where money comes from and rationalizes where it goes.

The RCM review was headed up by the provost and Vice President Clement. She said that the VPFA’s office has run hundreds of models to examine the outcomes of various RCM plans, including variations on budgeting for housing, hiring, fees, and other options. From these options, the field was narrowed to three, and ultimately the plan that identified the best balance of what needs to be achieved was selected. She invited the senators to review the new plan and to funnel any concerns through the senate agenda committee by Monday, April 20 so that she and the VPFA will have time to review those concerns before presenting the plan to the president. She noted that it has become apparent that there is a significant lack of understanding of what RCM is among faculty, but for those who feel they understand it, there is a feeling that many aspects of the plan are working well.

The provost then discussed some of the outcomes of the new RCM. She reminded the senate about the 48% cut by the state to funding for higher education in 2011, and emphasized the impact these cuts had in particular to the Marine School, UNH-Manchester, the cooperative extension, and agricultural extension experimentation. She noted that the central administration absorbed much of these cuts to protect the individual academic units. Implementing Separation Incentive Plans (SIPs) and a hiring freeze were other measures taken, but we are still not back to 2000 funding levels. The main items to be addressed in the new RCM include:

- Building up strategic funding, which is lacking at all levels
- Resolving inadequate incentives and support for research (particularly interdisciplinary research), outreach, and graduate education.
- Addressing resource constraints in some areas
- Removing “irritants” from the system; items that ill-use the time, money, and patience of the campus community

The RCM recommendations address these issues by increasing the education and outreach by the central offices and deans, and increasing selected revenue rates for the next five years. Specifically, the plan will:

- Eliminate the central administration funding gap
- Address historically cumulative shortfalls for COLSA and Athletics
- Restore 75% of state funding to COLSA, UNH-M, the Marine School, Cooperative Extension, over a two-year period to provide stability
- Increase funding for strategic initiatives, and strategic operating subsidies from 3.5% of the salary base to 4%
- Review the central administration unit reserves and allocate some funds to strategic initiatives
- Provide strategic initiatives funds to EOS, the Carsey School, and the Marine School
- Work to eliminate those “irritants”

The provost suggested that RCM represents a sort of social contract among the academic units and provides a way for those units to support one another in the natural ebb and flow of fiscal health. The VPFA noted here that RCM doesn’t create money, it only moves it around. He pointed out that funding from donors is not very flexible, and that the state is not increasing monies to the university. He suggested that we must look inward to examine the rules of the past and see if we can adapt them to bring more parity to units that need financial support.

The provost said that the schedule for approving the RCM is as follows:

- Units to provide input to the provost and VPFA by April 7
- Provost then presents recommendations to the senate by April 13
- Provost meets with the senate agenda committee for comments on April 20
- Provost presents recommendations to President Huddleston April 22
- An annual review of retention rates (in the fall of each year), based on actuals

She noted that the models set forward in the RCM are only models, and they must be reviewed for how they play out in reality. Deans, directors, and unit leaders will be involved in these reviews each year. The model helps us take action.

She also noted that all units, auxiliaries, and revenue generating areas will be contributing, not just academic units, noting that housing and dining will contribute more over the next five years. At the end of five years, there will be a full review, including credit weighting.

A senator asked if the retention rate mentioned above has to do with student retention. The provost said that it refers to tuition revenues, which follow each student and is multiplied by the credit weighting. Some of these funds are pulled into central administration to slowly close the \$13.4 million funding gap created in the 2011 cuts. This is why the annual check is crucial to see if our assumptions have been accurate or if we need to make adjustments based on actual enrollments and expenses.

Another senator noted that the list of recommendations did not include COLA, and said that the dean of COLA has said that the RCM recommendations are not favorable to COLA, citing a problem in her own department with hiring needs. The provost responded that it is too soon for the credit weighting to take effect this year, and that her best recommendation would be for the faculty member to discuss this serious issue with her department chair and the dean. She did suggest that strategic funds can be made available to float a position for one year until an affected college can pick up the cost, calling this an appropriate request for COLA to make of the provost's office, but said that such action would need to first be discussed by the COLA executive committee and the chairs, as the provost's office will not micromanage the manner in which deans allocate their college funds.

The provost reminded the senators to send and questions or concerns they have about the RCM to the agenda committee right away.

IV. Minutes – It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the last senate meeting, March 30, 2015. The chair of the senate Campus Planning Committee asked for clarification of two points from Item VII in the minutes, regarding his committee's report on current renovation and construction projects on campus. With those clarifications made, the corrected minutes were then approved unanimously with two abstentions.

**Discussion/Report Items:**

V. Motion from ad hoc Committee on CLER Faculty Involvement in the Senate – Kerry Kazura, chair of the ad hoc committee presented the following overview regarding the motion for the involvement of Clinical, Contract (School of Law), Lecturer, Extension, Alternative Security Faculty (School of Law), and Research faculty in the work of the senate. She acknowledged two members of her committee in attendance at today's meeting, and informed the senate of the addition of two new groups of non-tenure track faculty from the School of Law to the CLER classification, creating the new acronym of CCLEAR.

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:

- Anthropology/Geography
- Chemical Engineering
- Chemistry
- Decision Science
- Electrical & Computer Engineering
- Hospitality Management
- Human Development & Family Studies
- Marketing
- Philosophy
- Recreation Management & Policy

A senator asked if setting the lower limit to 16 total faculty or more in order to be able to send a CCLEAR faculty to the senate was disenfranchising to a large group. Kerry agreed that there is a risk, but said that small departments struggle as it is to find senate representation, and added that CCLEAR faculty could serve as proxy for a tenure-track faculty senator in such departments when needed. A member of the CLER committee pointed out that at the current number of faculty/number of senator ratio, adding CCLEAR faculty to the senate would increase the number of senators only to 65, providing many fewer opportunities for CCLEAR faculty to serve. Using this metric, twenty-five departments would never be able to send a CCLEAR faculty member to the senate. At this rate, the number of senate seats increases, as does the opportunity for CCLEAR faculty involvement, with only ten departments not being able to send a CCLEAR faculty member to the senate.

A senator from a large department asked if such a department would be required to send more senators. Kerry responded that ultimately the decision is the department's, but the opportunity to send more senators would be available as outlined above.

Another senator said that he feels this is a good compromise, noting that the former motion eradicated the weight of the tenure-track system as part of the senate, which he said is the center of shared governance. He said that the tenure system provides special

protections which are important to preserve, and he believes that this motion provides that compromise.

A senator said she still has concerns about undue burdens being placed on CCLEAR faculty if a particular department were to choose to shift the burden of senate service away from the tenure-track faculty. A lecturer serving on the CLER committee said that she has a service expectation in her contract, and so serving on the senate is a natural part of that. She also pointed out that many faculty currently decline to serve, meaning that CCLEAR faculty would also have the option to decline to serve. The first senator agreed that this issue may vary by department.

A member of the agenda committee asked how many departments have enough faculty to send three senators. The answer was four departments; Biological Sciences, English, Molecular, Cellular, & Biomedical Sciences, and Natural Resources & the Environment. Another senator pointed out that since the senate office conducts the elections, it is more difficult for a department to fully shift the burden of service to one group or another. He said that the larger departments are the ones with more senate representation which allows an appropriate balance. A third senator suggested that for those concerned about departments in which CCLEAR faculty do not attend faculty meetings, it should be the responsibility of the tenure-track senator serving to report to the departments, saying this might diminish the shift of that burden of service.

A senator asked how departments might bridge the gap for those CCLEAR faculty who have no voting rights in their departments. Kerry said that with the proposed structure, there will always be a tenure-track senator to report, as noted above. Another senator asked if the senate could recommend that CCLEAR faculty have voting rights in their departments and Kerry said that is a departmental issue that her committee is not addressing. Another senator said that as some departments bypass the senate election by selecting their senators in departmental meetings rather than by the senate ballot, there is still potential for unequal treatment. Kerry agreed that the potential does exist.

A senator asked what percentage of all CCLEAR faculty will have an opportunity to serve. A member of the CLER committee replied that only 10 departments will have no opportunity to elect a CCLEAR representative. These departments represents a total of 84 tenure-track and 28 CCLEAR faculty. Adding the 11 CCLEAR faculty with no departmental affiliation, 39 CCLEAR faculty out of a total of 371 would have no chance to serve, or almost 11%.

The former senate chair said that he still has concerns about CCLEAR faculty who are not affiliated with any department, believing that there should be access to all for inclusion, but said that he feels this proposal is the best alternative to provide the most representation of CCLEAR faculty. He also noted that departments have the capacity to shift the burden of senate service if they so choose, but that they must live with the consequences of such a choice.

The Lecturer's Council Representative to the senate reminded the senate that the

lecturers as a whole want the right to be represented in the senate and asked that senators not attempt to protect the lecturers from the opportunity they are seeking. A senator expressed understanding of the lecturers' desire for voice, but reminded the group that the senate is an advisory body, and thus representation here is not the same as enfranchisement.

A senator asked about the requirement of the former proposal for number of years employed to serve on the senate. Kerry said that that wording was removed for cleanness in the new motion. The senator expressed concern about lecturers who are hired and only teach for one or two years.

**The senate chair thanked the committee for their work and said that this motion will lay over until the next meeting.**

VI. Report and motion from ad hoc Committee on Teaching Evaluation Form Implementation – Alberto introduced Chris Bauer, a member of this committee to report on the progress of the Web Based Teacher Evaluation Pilot. Chris gave a brief history, saying that the pilot was initiated in the Summer Term 2014, when only eUNH classes took part. In the fall, the pilot was expanded to include tenured faculty only, as mandated by the senate, in the PCBE and CHHS.

- The response rate for the summer pilot eUNH was 52%
- The response rate for the fall pilot was 68%
- The average response rate for paper evaluations at UNH is 76%

Follow up surveys were sent to students and faculty who took part in the fall survey. eUNH piloted a new question set, approved by the senate two and a half years ago, specifically designed for fully-on-line courses. This pilot is currently under review. If the senate approves today's motion, the TEV committee will submit a university-wide set of questions for all UNH students.

The motion is as follows:

**Motion:** *The committee recommends that the majority of the teacher/course evaluation question set currently utilized by the University continue to be used for all UNH courses, with the following alterations;*

1. **Question 8:** *“Was the Instructor enthusiastic about the subject matter” be eliminated.*
2. **Question 4:** *“Was well Prepared for Class”;* **Question 6:** *“Encouraged discussion/ and or questions” and **Question 10:** “Was available to students outside of class” each remain unchanged for all face to face and hybrid classes, but that the language be altered as needed for eUNH courses.*
3. **Question 14:** *“Overall, how would you rate this instructor” be replaced by an average of a ll 12 questions asked, if and only if, all 12 questions on the form have*

been answered.

**Rationale:** After reviewing the survey undertaken by the 2011/12 Ad Hoc Committee on Teacher Evaluations, and the feedback gathering efforts by the 2012/13 Ad Hoc Committee on Teacher Evaluation Implementation, the current committee made the following conclusions;

1. The survey conducted in 2012 did not reveal a conclusive direction concerning satisfaction with the overall evaluation. However, the survey's section addressing the satisfaction of each individual question showed clear satisfaction with each question.
2. After reviewing each question with Institutional Research, the committee concluded that each individual question succinctly addresses a unique aspect of course/instructor quality, with the exception of Q 14, which seems to be highly correlated with the entire question set and thus is reflective of the sum and not in and of itself unique. Further, a historical review of 20 years of data on the current question set demonstrates that the set offers a reasonable method (when combined with additional assessment methods like class observation) of teacher and course assessment.
3. Because one of the most powerful attributes of the web-based tool is the ability for "entities" (Discovery Program, Writing Intensive Courses, Capstones, etc) to be able to ask questions, as well as a greatly enhanced ability for individual faculty and departments to also ask questions, the committee sought to eliminate any of the questions thought to be less essential than others. The committee found only one question to be of limited help to the instructor; Question 8, concerning the "enthusiasm" of the instructor. The committee determined that this may be perceived as more of a "personality," question, a common complaint of faculty concerning the overall idea of Teacher evaluations. Further, analyses of the data showed this question to have the weakest correlation to other questions and to be less robust in showing change over time in response to teaching development strategies. However, it is important to note that the survey found strong support for this question. On a scale of 1-6 (6 being extremely useful and 1 being not useful at all) the spread was: 1: 6.4%, 2: 4.4%, 3: 10.5%, 4: 16.9%, 5: 27.1% 6: 34.9%
4. There are certain questions that are not directly applicable for online courses in their current form. The committee would seek to have these questions reviewed and altered as needed by eUNH in such a way to remain reasonably consistent with the question set asked of all UNH students.
5. The committee wishes the Senate to consider the elimination of question #14; "Overall, how would you rate this instructor." The rationale being that an average of the individual questions offers a more concrete view of the overall effectiveness of the instructor. That being said, one problem exists with this



*proposal; if students only answer a portion of the individual questions, the average could skew these results. There is also a concern that students may object to not having the opportunity to have this all-encompassing question asked.*

The senator from the School of Law pointed out that Question 10 is required by regional accrediting organizations, and is needed for online accreditation. He also noted that the School of Law runs its own online courses, and suggested that the words "...for eUNH or other online courses..." be included in item 2 of the motion. Chris said those were reasonable suggestions.

A senator asked if statistics have been run comparing the average of the first thirteen questions answer to question 14. A senator from the English department said that he has reviewed the relationship on about 200 evaluations over the last ten years, for all ranges of faculty. He said that if the overall rating of question 14 is 4.0 or a little lower, then the average of questions 1-13 is 0.3 - 0.4 points higher. He said that if the overall rating is very high or very low, there is little difference in the averages. The first senator said it makes it hard to make an overall evaluation. Chris said he would take the question back to the committee.

Another senator suggested that questions 1-13 and 14 serve separate functions; that 14 provides an overall evaluation of things not captured by the first thirteen questions. Chris said that in some departments, question 14 is looked at exclusively. A senator said that in reviewing the student feedback in the surveys, there were repeated requests to keep question 14, and she wondered why the committee was recommending a change. Chris said that in his opinion, it is statistically better to take the average of the first thirteen questions than to allow one question to weigh so heavily. Another senator suggested that with no clear definition of what question 14 means, it often becomes "do I like this teacher?" It was noted that last year, the average of the first thirteen questions was placed next to question 14 for easy comparison. A senator said that there may be some cultural lag as departments get used to using this new comparison. He asked if question 14 provides a measure of the students' likelihood to take another class or to recommend the class to another student.

A senator said he is aware of many faculty who dislike question 14 because of a perception of abuse by administrators. Another senator asked if there would be any opportunity to use a different form, as not all classes are suited to using the same form; some large classes are difficult to foster extensive class discussion, for example. Chris said there will be an opportunity to look at other questions. **Alberto thanked him for his time and said this motion will lay over until the next meeting.**

VII. Report and motion from Academic Affairs Committee on the Confucius Institute – Michael Ferber, chair of the AAC reminded the senate of the concerns raised last year by the AAC regarding the Confucius Institute (CI), and its request for a thorough investigation of the CI. The AAC had hoped for a joint committee between the senate and COLA, but the COLA dean formed his own committee, and the senate requested that two senators serve on that committee; only one senator was ultimately appointed. This COLA committee met in the fall and their report is attached to the agenda for this meeting (Appendix 8.2). The AAC's report

(Appendix 8.1) is of the COLA report. Michael said that his committee found that the COLA report said little about national and international concerns about the CI, despite the fact that international controversies have continued to grow. He noted that several universities have severed ties with the CI and recommended the book *Confucius Institutes: Academic Malware* by Marshall Sahlins, which cites twenty-five university and school system issues.

The AAC chair said that the COLA report finds no evidence of misconduct here at UNH, and that it recommends the importance of securing a tenure-track position in Chinese. The AAC agrees with this recommendation, which has been urged for the last twenty years. Hiring such a faculty member would provide someone independent of the CI and the Chinese government. This would ease some concerns. The COLA report also recommends a five year renewal of the contract. The AAC would prefer to see a two or three year renewal only, but will support a five-year contract with the strong worded proviso that such a lengthy contract would be contingent upon the hiring of a tenure-track faculty member.

Michael also shared that he had a conversation with the university president on this matter, and that while the president would like to see our own faculty heading up the Chinese language program, he has nothing to say about the hiring of a tenure-track professor.

The AAC offered the following motions for consideration:

***The Academic Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate moves that:***

- (1) The Faculty Senate thanks the COLA Committee for its report on the Confucius Institute at UNH, which contains much useful information. We also welcome President Huddleston's forthright statement in his letter of March 16 concerning academic freedom at UNH and the consequences of possible violations of it by the Confucius Institute staff.*
- (2) We call on the Department of Languages, Literatures, and Cultures and the Dean of COLA to make the hiring of a tenure-track professor of Chinese language and literature a priority, and that the Dean report each April to the Senate on progress made toward that end. We ask the President to encourage the UNH Foundation to seek donations that would forward such a hiring.*
- (3) We call for the termination of the new contract with the CI in its third year (that is, by the fall term of 2018) if by the end of the second year (2016-17) UNH has not acted upon the hiring of a tenure-track professor of Chinese language and literature, as UNH will have demonstrated it does not sufficiently value the teaching of Chinese and the exchanges that have begun with China.*
- (4) We recommend to COLA that it not institute a Chinese minor until a professor is hired.*
- (5) We deem it a violation of shared governance that the Senate was not consulted about the establishment of the Confucius Institute in 2008-10, and we regret that the Dean of Liberal Arts refused to establish a joint committee to review the CI in 2014. We stated in 2014 that we "assert the authority of the Senate to review and develop policies concerned*

*with the academic mission of the university as a whole, and we believe the contract with the CI affects that mission.” We reassert that authority here.*

*(6) We charge the Academic Affairs Committee to continue to monitor the CI and the teaching of Chinese generally, and to report to the Senate when it seems appropriate.*

**The senate chair thanked the AAC for their work and said that these motions will lay over until the next senate meeting.**

**VIII. Statement from the Academic Affairs Committee on the elimination of TAs in COLA** – The AAC chair then shared the following statement with the senate:

*Academic Affairs Committee  
Statement on Forthcoming Cuts of TAs in COLA  
April 2015*

*It has come to our attention that the College of Liberal Arts has ordered the elimination of quite a few teaching assistantships for graduate students in several departments.*

*Art and Art History will lose all of its TAs for MFA students in their second year, Justice Studies will lose one of its two (as well as a GAsip), Political Science will lose one of its three (used for research assistants), Psychology will lose one per year for the next three years (out of 25), and the Master’s program in Spanish will lose two of its half-TAs.*

*English will immediately lose six of its twenty-four TAs, which support two doctoral programs, two Master’s programs, and an MFA program. These losses threaten the viability especially of the Master’s in English Literature, which is already smaller than it was a few years ago; if it shrinks much further, not only that program but the doctoral program in literature, which rides on it, may have to be eliminated.*

*The MFA in Art would now seem highly vulnerable, the MA in Spanish is probably doomed, and the same may be true of some of the programs in the other departments.*

*We recognize that cutting costs and balancing budgets are matters for deans and other administrators, but our committee thinks the possible elimination of whole programs should be of concern to the Senate. It is the view of the Agenda Committee that the Senate has no jurisdiction over such matters, and that the COLA faculty is the proper forum for it. If that is the case, then we alert the COLA faculty here of the impending cuts.*

Michael said that his committee hopes this topic might be addressed next year, and asked the senate to consider how this kind of piece-meal elimination of programs might be of senate concern. He particularly recommended that senators in COLA bring the topic up with their colleagues.

**IX. New business** – There was no new business

**XI. Adjournment**- The meeting was adjourned at 5:01 p.m.