

University of New Hampshire

University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository

Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes

Faculty Senate Documents

5-7-2012

2011-12 FACULTY SENATE - May 7, 2012 Minutes Summary

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "2011-12 FACULTY SENATE - May 7, 2012 Minutes Summary" (2012). *Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes*. 246.

https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty_senate_agendas_minutes/246

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
2011-12 FACULTY SENATE

MAY 7, 2012

MINUTES SUMMARY

I. Roll – The following senators were absent: Chavda, Peshkova, Shore, Simos, Townson and Veal. Guests were John Aber, Christina Bellinger, and Sonic Woytonik.

II. Remarks by and questions to the president and/or provost – The provost said that he thanks the senate chair and the Agenda Committee for their hard work and for the good working relationship with his office. The provost asked that faculty sign up to attend commencement and the honors convocation. He said that, not counting the Separation Incentive Program and the university's contribution to the system, the budget of the central administration will be flat through FY 13, including advancement; and he added that the budget for athletics is down significantly. Twenty-seven full-time-equivalent positions were lost during a two-year period. Regarding the discussion about schools, he expressed thanks to the University Curriculum and Academic Policies Committee for working on this matter all year. He said that UCAPC's report had a lot of content and that the amended senate motions follow UCAPC's report and identify a way forward. He said that the primary question is the budget for the Marine School and that this issue is addressable. He said that the proposal for the Marine School included a statement that there are no intended costs to other units. The provost said that he has not considered cluster hires as a part of the school proposal. He stated that all parts of the university must follow the standard policies and procedures. He said that the senate rightfully protects the undergraduate mission of the university and that the schools proposal does that as well. The faculty members proposing the new schools have put in a great deal of effort on these proposals, which would be very beneficial for both faculty and the university. He said that he does not see schools as leading to a redistribution of the pie but as increasing the size of the pie.

III. Remarks by and questions to the chair – The senate chair said that the senate's Finance and Administration Committee will send its report to the senators via email. The idea of an archive of committee reports could be considered by the Agenda Committee. The senate chair said that it is good that the provost views the senate's motions on schools as they are intended, which is to establish an effective policy for schools. The senate chair added that, while everyone acknowledges the hard work of the Marine Program faculty, it is important that the Faculty Senate weigh in on the written proposal. The senate must look out for the faculty and the university as a whole. Due to the press of business, the rules for today's discussion will include the following. Only 2011/2012 senators may speak; and speakers should direct their comments to the chair, limit their remarks to two minutes, and keep their comments pertinent to the motion or amendment at hand.

IV. Minutes – The minutes of the previous Faculty Senate meeting were approved with all ayes.

V. Motion about the Campus Master Plan Steering Committee – **On behalf of the Campus Planning Committee, its Chair Erin Sharp presented a motion, including friendly amendments, on Faculty Senate representation on the Campus Master Planning Steering Committee, as follows.**

Whereas faculty representation in the campus planning process is essential in order to maintain faculty involvement, allow for faculty concerns to be heard, and minimize

potential disruptions to academic and research programs and the educational mission of the university; and

whereas faculty representation and input in the current planning process appear to have been limited, leading to much outcry and pushback at various parts of the proposed revision to the Campus Plan; and

whereas the Faculty Senate is the one body on campus that is intended and designed to be fully representative of the faculty, especially in matters pertaining to the university's academic mission; therefore

let it be resolved that the Faculty Senate should henceforth appoint two (2) Faculty Senators to the Campus Master Planning Steering Committee, in order fully to represent the voices and concerns of the faculty in the Campus Master Planning process and to ensure that developments to the Campus Master Plan, which may have impacts on the ability of faculty effectively to deliver high quality research and academic programming, will be communicated in a complete and timely manner to the Faculty Senate. One of the these faculty senators will be chosen by the chair of the Faculty Senate Campus Planning Committee, while the other shall be chosen on an annual basis by the Agenda Committee of the Faculty Senate. Faculty Senate representatives should be kept fully informed by the Campus Master Planning Steering Committee chair and invited to attend all meetings relevant to the Campus Master Planning process, including meetings that take place during the summer months; and

let it be further resolved that the Faculty Senate urges the Campus Master Planning Steering Committee chair to consult closely the leadership of any college, program, or institute whose facilities and/or academic programs are directly impacted by changes to the Campus Master Plan; and

let it be resolved that the Faculty Senate calls on the Faculty Senate and the administration to sponsor an open forum next fall in which UNH's vision of public private ventures is presented and the pros and cons of public private ventures are debated.

The motion passed unanimously.

VI. Motion on interdisciplinary schools policy – On behalf of the Agenda Committee, Deb Kinghorn presented a motion, including friendly amendments, on the proposed Policy on Interdisciplinary Schools at the University of New Hampshire, as follows.

The Faculty Senate accepts with gratitude the report of the University Curriculum and Academic Policies Committee on the proposed Policy on Interdisciplinary Schools at UNH from the Office of the Provost, April 9, 2012, presented by committee Chair Christina Bellinger on April 30, 2012. UCAPC flags important concerns and issues, insufficiently addressed by the policy on interdisciplinary schools, that should be addressed in any proposal for an interdisciplinary school.

The senate resolves that the policy governing any proposal for a school and the proposals for the schools themselves must address UCAPC's concerns and issues as conditions for approval. Those conditions include but are not limited to the following:

(1) Any school proposal must include clear, transparent, and thorough budget models in support of statements that address concerns and issues elucidated in the UCAPC report (Part 1.II, para. 3; Part 1.III.C entire; Part 1.III.D entire; Part 2.B, para. 2; Part 2.C entire).

(2) Any school proposal containing graduate degree programs must make explicit the "division of graduate degree administration between a school and the Graduate School" while retaining the oversight authority of the Graduate Dean and the Graduate Council (Part 1.II, para 2).

(3) Any school proposal must contain an explicit statement that maintains "the oversight roles of existing College and University review bodies in addition to the School's Advisory Council" (Part 1.III.E).

(4) Any school proposal must contain an explicit statement of the school's location within the university's administrative structure, that also explains how its location within or among other administrative units (e.g., colleges, central administrative unit, institutes) will enable furtherance of the school's goals (Part 1.III.B, para 1).

(5) Any school proposal must pursue hires according to "the current principles and practices, whereby new positions are the product of consultation between the Departments and Deans, and approved by the Provost" (Part 2.A., para. 2).

The Faculty Senate further resolves that any proposal forwarded to the Faculty Senate or its committees, including UCAPC, must contain in addition to items cited in condition (1) the budgetary details called for in senate motion XVI-M17 on budgetary details and that cluster hires cease until a requisite hiring policy is in place as called for in the motion XVI-M19 on that matter on April 30, 2012.

The Faculty Senate further moves that any section of the collective bargaining contract is presumed in effect, without need for explicit statement, but that any details that may give rise to conflict about the document's meaning get resolved prior to submission of a proposal (e.g., the nature and extent to which MOUs are used).

An amendment was proposed by Jim Connell and seconded by Art Greenberg to insert the following wording after item (4) and to renumber subsequent items. The insertion, after a friendly amendment, was: "Any schools should, in view of the concerns raised in the UCAPC report (Part 1.II, para. 1), be located only in colleges or institutes, not in administrative units such as Academic Affairs or the Office of the Senior Vice Provost for Research." The amendment proposer said that item (4) of the motion does not require change because the wording includes "among other administrative units". After discussion, the amendment passed unanimously and so did the motion.

VII. Motion on marine schools policy – On behalf of the Agenda Committee, Art Greenberg proposed a motion, including friendly amendments, on the Proposal for a School of Marine Science and Ocean Engineering, as follows.

The Faculty Senate accepts with gratitude the report of the University Curriculum and Academic Policies Committee on the Proposal for a School of Marine Science and Ocean Engineering, as presented by committee Chair Christina Bellinger on April 30, 2012, and makes the following motion.

The Faculty Senate moves against approval, at this time, of the Marine School proposal revised April 9, 2012, for the following reasons:

(1) The idea of a Marine School was under discussion for at least four years. UCAPC and the senate's Agenda Committee requested throughout the 2011-12 session a complete budget including but not limited to details about projected revenues and costs over time. UCAPC received a response to that request on Friday, April 27; and the Agenda Committee chair first saw that budget on Monday, April 30. The senate cannot be expected to meet its responsibility for shared governance without sufficient time for reasoned consideration and discussion of *complete* budget proposals. Eleventh-hour responses run counter to meeting our responsibility for reasoned deliberation and, thus, impede adequate opportunity for shared governance.

(2) Consistent with the budget issue addressed in (1), a proposal must be in complete and final form for proper consideration and cannot be a work-in-progress until the end of the academic year, so that there can be proper vetting of the proposal.

(3) The Marine School proposal does not incorporate the budget discussed in (1) in its narrative and, thus, does not address the concerns raised by UCAPC about budgetary clarity, transparency, and thoroughness, as elucidated in the senate motion on the proposed Policy on Interdisciplinary Schools. (See the motion on the interdisciplinary schools proposal, condition 1.)

(4) A review of the budget received by UCAPC on April 27 does not include provision of the impact of cluster hires on the colleges.

(5) The practice of joint appointments and cluster hires that locate tenure track faculty in colleges creates the possibility, if not the likelihood, that those locations are mere "place holders" for faculty whose duties are primarily in the school.

(6) The proposal's statement that "Promotion and Tenure processes for jointly supported positions will follow existing policies" is questionable since circumstances for faculty whose duties are primarily in the schools but who are located in a department are different from those specified in existing policies. The practice elucidated in (5) leaves ambiguous how the usual promotion and tenure process will work according to existing policies, since the faculty members' primary duties will occur outside the colleges and departments and, thus, leave the colleges and departments with minimal adjudicative

roles in that process. (See item 5 and item 3 of the motion on the proposed Policy on Interdisciplinary Schools.)

(7) The role of the Graduate School through its Graduate Council and dean in adjudicating graduate programs is conspicuous by its absence and, thus, does not address UCAPC's recommendation on the proposed Policy on Interdisciplinary Schools as elucidated in item 2 of the motion on the proposed Policy on Interdisciplinary Schools.

The Faculty Senate respects the legitimate aspirations of the faculty involved in the Marine School proposal. The Faculty Senate recognizes that the proposal herein rejected was prepared in the absence of a clear established policy on schools, leading to frustration on all sides. Nonetheless, only a complete and timely proposal, effectively addressing the policy and above concerns, can be effective in establishing a school and minimizing future conflicts among stakeholders (colleges, institutes, departments, etc.).

Once an Interdisciplinary Schools Policy has been approved and accepted for the university in accord with the conditions set in the Interdisciplinary Schools Motion, the Faculty Senate would welcome resubmission of a Marine School Proposal which complies with that policy.

A senator said that the Marine School proposal originated with faculty and that the proposal provides a focus and a historical perspective for marine studies. Faculty are trying to reorganize the ongoing program in order to better use the resources. A steering committee was formed; a draft proposal was prepared in spring of 2010; and open fora were held. The steering committee worked with UCAPC, which decided to use the Marine School proposal as a test case for the proposed Policy on Interdisciplinary Schools. UCAPC worked on those two proposals for more than a year. The senator said that the Marine School final budget was neutral regarding university funding and that all the language about tenure-track faculty sitting in the school has been removed from the proposal. He added that the marine faculty, with a Masters Program since the 1980s and now a Ph.D. program, work closely with the Graduate School. Another senator said that item (4) of the motion appears to couple cluster hires and schools in a way that is not apparent. He also objected to items (5) and (6). A professor said that his department would like the senate to have more time to analyze the budgetary proposal. What will be the costs to COLSA, especially in F & A funds and graduate tuition? Also, what will happen if there is a shortfall of funds for the proposed new school? How would the university respond? He said that those concerns have not been discussed fully enough. Jim Connell said that in general he is supportive of the Marine School but that he is in favor of the motion, in order that the Marine School can start correctly and succeed. **He proposed an amendment seconded by Karsten Pohl, to insert after item (7) the following: "In view of the concerns raised in the UCAPC report (Part 1.II, para. 1), schools should only be located in colleges or institutes, not in administrative units such as Academic Affairs or the Office of the Senior Vice Provost for Research."** The amendment passed with all ayes except for 3 nays.

A senator asked whether the Marine School proposal could wait until the fall, and the senate chair replied that passing today's motion would give direction for submission of a revised proposal for the Marine Schools. A senator with a joint appointment said that the appointment was not clearly designed. The senator expressed support for this motion and a strong, clear policy for the school.

Other professors agreed, saying that there will be more proposals for schools and so the senate must exercise due diligence now. The senate vice chair said that it is quite clear that, by SAPC rules, a three-to-five-year budget is required as an integral part of the proposal for any such new entity. Another senator said that the marine PAU has been in existence since 1967, that there is an \$11,000,000 endowment, and that the Sea Grant Program is also associated with the proposed Marine School. He added that the Marine School budget is a reshuffling of those funds, so that the new Marine School can have better visibility and a more coherent package. He said that the proposal is budget neutral. He said that many other universities have such programs, that the UNH Marine School is not asking for more money, and that cluster hires are not part of this. **The motion as amended passed with 32 ayes, 7 nays, and 1 abstention.**

VIII. Report for the Committee on Organization of Other Entities, on instructional technology – The chair of the Committee on Organization of Other Entities said that, since the beginning of the second semester, the committee has tried to gather information on instructional technology but that it was difficult to get the data. He said that the educational technology budget was up 18% and that the combined enterprise systems and items from the student technology fee were up 28.8%. Staffing is up 10% or more. This issue should be reviewed by the senate next year.

IX. Report from the Student Affairs Committee, on advising – The Student Affairs Committee has circulated to students a survey on advising, and 700 to 800 students responded. Next year's Student Affairs Committee should have the results and can act on them.

X. New business – The senate chair said that the senate has done a remarkable job this year, particularly in regard to shared governance. The tenure-track faculty play a significant role in the governance of the university. He added that nearly 20% of the faculty have served either as senators or in Faculty Senate appointments, for example on committees on the Campus Master Plan, Promotion and Tenure Standards, and the revised teaching evaluation form, and that we have set the stage for a coherent policy on interdisciplinary schools. He said that the Agenda Committee members were very thoughtful and committed. We have accomplished our work well. He thanked the senate's program coordinator for her hard work and said that her guidance and institutional memory have been invaluable. The senate vice chair said that the senate chair has worked very hard and effectively on central issues, has been the driving force, and that we are grateful for his outstanding work as chair.

XI. Adjournment – The meeting was adjourned.

UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
2012-13 FACULTY SENATE

MAY 7, 2012

MINUTES SUMMARY

I. Roll – The following senators were absent: Caron, Carter, Guo, Halstead, Peshkova, Scherr, Senier, Shore, Simos and Veal.

II. Election of officers – The Agenda Committee proposed a motion to elect Willem deVries as 2012/13 chair, Todd DeMitchell as vice chair, and as at-large Agenda Committee members James

Connell, Gene Harkless and Nancy Johnson. Larry Prelli will also be a member of the 2012/2013 Agenda Committee as past chair. The motion passed unanimously.

III. Remarks by and questions to the chair – The 2012/13 senate chair said that there are many projects for next year, such as implementing the new teaching evaluation form and looking at a revised proposal for the Marine School and perhaps other schools. There may be budget issues to deal with and other issues as well. This summer there will be a planning meeting, at which the senators can propose agenda items for the coming year. In addition, the Agenda Committee will meet throughout the summer. The administration should not make decisions on academic matters without approval by the Faculty Senate in the summer or at any other time, as such an action would be a violation of shared governance. A senator said that the Campus Master Plan Steering Committee will continue during the summer and that the senate must appoint two representatives to that steering committee. The senate chair said that the previous senate appointees to committees are invited to serve until new representatives are selected.

IV. Adjournment – The meeting was adjourned.