Meeting called to order at 3:10 on September 8, 2014

I. Roll – The following senators were absent: Glauber, Mulligan, and White. Garofalo served as proxy for Smith. Benoit, Denis, Kinghorn, Slifer, Tenczar, Ware, and Wu were excused. P.T. Vasudevan was a visitor.

II. Remarks by and questions to the senior vice provost for academic affairs – Senior vice provost for Academic Affairs P.T. Vasudevan greeted the senate and offered the provost’s best wishes, as she was unable to attend due to the Board of Trustee’s retreat. He introduced himself and noted that his interaction with the faculty senate is through work with the UCAPC and the Academic Affairs Committee, although he did serve on the Academic Senate before the formation of the Faculty Senate.

The senior vice provost presented eleven items the provost’s office would like to address with the faculty senate during the 14-15 academic year, adding that this was by no means a comprehensive list. (see presentation here) These items include:

- The policy on approving interdisciplinary programs
- A proposal to change the common exam time
- Library storage and maintenance policy
- Non tenure-track faculty and governance – participating in senate, rights in department
- Teaching Evaluation
- P&T standards (driven by dept/college)
- Discovery program review
- Strategic planning refresh/RCM review
- New proposal for revised Honors program – Univ. Honors and Honors in Major
- Possible motions dealing with writing intensive courses (WI) – non-UNH courses, online, etc.
- Purview of the Writing Committee – authority to approve/review WI courses to ensure consistency?

The first item the senior vice provost discussed was the proposed pilot for Academic Year (AY) 15-16 and 16-17 for a changed common exam time, saying that the change is necessary due to the renovation of the Hamilton-Smith building which begins in 2015. This renovation process will reduce registrar controlled classroom space by 17 classrooms and over 1,000 seats. The cost of accommodating seats is quite large as there is no other space on campus, and new space would have to be constructed. The proposed change to the common exam time is one way of minimizing those costs and providing a long-term solution to space needs.
The benefits of this proposal include: 1) reducing the existing pressure on dining halls during the current common exam time (TR 12:40-2:00 p.m.) to a level similar to current MW levels, 2) the renovated Ham-Smith building will have 4 additional classrooms, including TEAL (Technology-Enhanced Active Learning), 3) the pilot will give valuable data on the long-term viability of such a change, 4) instructional space will be better utilized during prime time and, 5) savings in university resources resulting from better utilization of critical classroom space can be diverted to worthwhile projects.

The senior vice provost used UMass Amherst as an example of a campus that has made a similar change with positive results.

Vasu also noted that there will be challenges with attempting such a change. He noted that the Chemistry and Physics lab schedules will be impacted, but suggested that there are solutions to those scheduling problems. He also noted that faculty and other meetings now scheduled during the common exam time will be particularly disrupted. He also said that this change could pose problems for student athletes who use the common exam time to make up exams missed while traveling to games. Vasu acknowledged that he has not yet addressed this issue with the athletic department.

To analyze the impact on MWF 12:10-2 p.m. classes, his office did a study that indicated that there will be a balance in seats needed versus seats available with the proposed change in the common exam time.

Vasu discussed this with Professor Sam Shore in the Mathematics Department, who thought that this was an interesting idea that was certainly worth exploring.

The things that the senior vice provost asked the Faculty Senate to consider are the following:

- Priority should be given to large classes with multiple sections that use the common exam time effectively.
- The email exchange from last year, between the AAC chair and other faculty members, suggests that while some departments have serious concerns, those are only a few departments.
- Since Chemistry and Physics currently have Thursday night labs, it is possible that they could use Friday common exam time slots.
- The Math department can use Thursday night time slots.

A senator asked about departments that have lengthy labs that might conflict with the new common exam time on Friday afternoons. Vasu acknowledged that that could be a problem. He noted that changing the common exam (CE) time to T/R 3:30-5 p.m. only frees up two additional classrooms. Changing the CE to W/F 4-5:30 p.m. adds 4 classrooms, but changing the CE to Friday between 2 and 5 p.m. (or any other weekday after 5 p.m.) frees up seven classrooms.

A senator asked how many exams are actually given per semester as common exams. Vasu responded that there are generally three periods during the semester when the common exam time is used. The senator pointed out that while only three exams are given, there are many faculty and others who use that common exam time for many other purposes, and asked if it would not be
easier to simply use the empty classrooms she sees in her own building. Vasu replied that the Interim University Registrar has informed him that there are no other classrooms available, and that our current scheduling system is not an effective way of using space. He said he is happy to share the data given to him by the registrar’s office, noting that the faculty senate will have a voice in this decision. The senator reiterated her concerns about the impact of such a change on faculty schedules.

A senator asked if Saturday mornings might be considered for exam times. Vasu replied that many students work to support themselves on the weekends, and that Saturday scheduling is not being considered.

Several senators commented about the domino effect of such a change. Interdepartmental communication was noted as an important factor, as well as appropriate lead time in communicating any kind of change in order for departments to have time to make necessary alterations to current schedules. The senator from the nursing department noted that their undergrads are not even on campus on MWF. Vasu indicated he had not heard concerns from the associate dean of CHHS, and recommended that the senator consult with the associate dean.

The senate chair thanked the senior vice provost for his time, noting that the charge to investigate this proposal will be sent to the AAC. He assigned all senators to take this information back to their departments and bring back concerns and issues. The chair of the AAC asked about the time frame for this proposal and Vasu said that a decision should be made by mid-October in order to be on schedule for changes to begin next fall.

III. Remarks by and questions to the chair – The senate chair welcomed the senators, and began his remarks by reviewing the past chair’s summary report of the senate’s work from 2013-14, including the approval of the Carsey School of Public Policy, the review of the dual major in sustainability, the authorization of changes to UNH’s academic misconduct policies, and the formation of a joint panel on teaching and learning, in collaboration with the provost’s office.

The chair then referred to the charges to the various senate committees, outlined in the agenda to this meeting (Appendix 3.1). He recognized each of the chairs of the standing senate committees and thanked them for their willingness to serve.

The chair informed the senators of the UNH Advance team open forum which will be held on Thursday, October 2, from 12:50 – 2 p.m. in Spaulding G26. At this forum, reports will be given regarding the 2013 Annual Climate Survey. Results regarding the demographic characteristics of the tenure-track faculty who responded to the survey will be shared, as well as those faculty members’ opinions on influence, fit and fairness in campus departments.

The chair next discussed the senate planning session held on August 18th. He shared that part of the conversation that day related to the need of senate members to be more direct in communicating the work of the senate with their colleagues. The senate website is currently being updated, which update will hopefully provide a better resource to senate members. Alberto asked the senators to secure 5-10 minutes at each department faculty meeting for communicating issues from the senate and requesting feedback and input from department members.
IV. Minutes – It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the last senate meeting, May 5, 2014. The senate chair suggested three items to be edited and the minutes, thus adjusted, were unanimously approved.

Discussion/Report Items:

V. Report from past chair Todd DeMitchell on Library de-selection process – The past senate chair shared his perspective with the senate regarding meetings he attended last spring during the controversial library de-selection event. He noted that the review of policies regarding library de-selection is part of the current charge to the senate library committee. Todd explained that de-selection of materials is a regular process for all libraries, and that there are two kinds of de-selection. Routine de-selection is the ongoing removal of materials, a few at a time. Comprehensive de-selection is more occasional, and involves the removal of large amounts of materials. The comprehensive de-selection in the Dimond library last spring was prompted by the need to move the Bio-science library and involved a large number of volumes. Todd reported that at that time, there was no existing policy to drive the de-selection process. The result was quite controversial, reflecting two major problems; poor communication regarding what was happening, and the lack of faculty participation in the process itself. At that time, several steps were recommended to correct these problems. The de-selection was stopped, the faculty were to be consulted before the process resumed, the Bio-science library would still be moved, the library faculty would have the final say, and a draft policy would be developed and sent to the provost and deans for review to guide all types of de-selection in the future.

A senator commented that the lack of a formal policy in this matter is hardly an excuse, pointing out that consultation with the faculty should always be the default on any matter regarding the academic mission of the university. He suggested that the policy may provide constraint to provide a deterrent against abuse of what should be the default. Other senators heartily agreed. It was suggested that sharing a list of books about to be de-selected with faculty would be a very simple task.

The past chair noted that he has reviewed policies from other institutions regarding de-selection, and said that this review caused him to ask what meaningful faculty input would look like. For this reason, he feels, the policy developed needs to be clear and specific. He has not yet seen the current draft policy on this matter. He suggested that a list, as recommended above, could be made available for a month for faculty review before de-selection occurs.

A senator from last year’s library committee suggested that librarians were feeling pressured to move quickly at that time. She commented that this was an erroneous perception and that it is good to see what other institutions are doing, and to inform ourselves of the process.

A senator asked what kinds of materials are involved. Todd noted that any kind of media stored in the library could be impacted. He said that some volumes cannot be removed from libraries by law, or by stipulations of donors. Another senator asked what happens to de-selected books. Some are destroyed, some are recycled, and some are given away or even sold. Another senator asked for background on the impetus for this de-selection, and asked if the senate had been involved in the early decisions regarding the move of the bio-science library. Todd responded that a member of the agenda committee heard about the recycling dumpster being filled with books, and that this is what prompted the past senate chair to approach the dean of the library, meeting with her in
person to quickly determine the nature of the problem. The campus-wide outrage was concurrent and separate from the senate leadership action.

A senator from the senate library committee last year noted that in their conversations with library staff there seemed to be disagreement among those staff members regarding what the correct methods of de-selection should be. It was asked if there is always a library faculty member on the senate library committee. That is not always the case. A senator noted that books do become obsolete or outdated, and that sometimes such purges are necessary, whether in personal or institutional libraries. Another senator asked if there is a strategic decision being made to re-configure library archives to digital format? The senator from the library faculty said that there is movement in that direction for space needs and also for convenience, pointing out that younger students much prefer digital copies of materials that they can access at any time of the day. She emphasized the need to look at new ways of preserving information, and to build strategies to balance the needs of faculty and students and to provide ways for faculty to review those strategies.

The second item the past chair presented regarding the library was the question of whether the physics library should be moved from Demeritt Hall to Dimond Library to make room for a TEAL (Technology Enabled Active Learning) classroom. Todd served on a committee to review this matter from February to September of this year, and that committee recommended that the physics library should not be moved at this time. The matter might be revisited in the future if the move were a part of a comprehensive plan for an integrated science center.

A senator asked if this plan was reviewed by the senate. The reply was that there was review by some committees, and that the move was linked to the changes going on in Kendall Hall. A senator from Biological Sciences said that the issue became a matter of whether the physics library was a teaching facility or a laboratory, suggesting the importance of a comprehensive discussion on the matter before making any changes.

**Action Items:**

VI. **Motion on amendments to the constitution of the faculty senate** – Kerry Kazura of the agenda committee presented proposed changes to the senate constitution and bylaws to include the recently added School of Law and the newly formed Department of Classics, Humanities, & Italian Studies. The changes are noted below:

**Rationale:** The University of New Hampshire has added the Department of Classics, Humanities, and Italian Studies and the School of Law as academic units, and they are eligible to elect representatives to the faculty senate.

**Motion:** Senate Constitution Item 2 wording will change from

**Membership.** Each academic department shall elect one member to the Faculty Senate for a two-year term. Departments with more than 20 tenure-track faculty shall elect two senators. *For purposes of Faculty Senate membership, the Library, the Thompson School, and UNH-Manchester* shall be treated in the same way as departments. (See Bylaw 4). Elections shall be by an approval ballot in which every tenure-track member of the department is nominated and in which faculty members can vote for as many candidates
as they wish. Only tenure-track faculty may vote. The Faculty Senate shall supervise the elections.

to

**Membership.** Each academic department shall elect one member to the Faculty Senate for a two-year term. Departments with more than 20 tenure-track faculty shall elect two senators. *For purposes of Faculty Senate membership, the Library, the Thompson School, UNH-Manchester, and the School of Law* shall be treated in the same way as departments. (See Bylaw 4). Elections shall be by an approval ballot in which every tenure-track member of the department is nominated and in which faculty members can vote for as many candidates as they wish. Only tenure-track faculty may vote. The Faculty Senate shall supervise the elections.

**Senate Constitution Item 6.C. wording will change from**

**The Professional Standards Committee.** The Professional Standards Committee will concern itself with matters affecting the welfare of the faculty including academic freedom, promotion, tenure, workload assignments, faculty personnel policy, and professional ethics. This committee has a role established by the collective bargaining agreement relating to termination or severe sanctions placed on faculty members. The Professional Standards Committee will be elected by bargaining-unit faculty by approval ballots in *CEPS, COLSA, COLA, CHHS, PCBE, UNH-Manchester and the library*. All tenured faculty members will automatically be the nominees on their respective ballots. The Faculty Senate will supervise this election. The Professional Standards Committee will have seven directly elected members, one from each of the following: *CEPS, COLSA, COLA, CHHS, PCBE, UNH-Manchester and the library*. In addition the vice chair of the Faculty Senate will be the eighth member and the chair of the committee.

**The Professional Standards Committee.** The Professional Standards Committee will concern itself with matters affecting the welfare of the faculty including academic freedom, promotion, tenure, workload assignments, faculty personnel policy, and professional ethics. This committee has a role established by the collective bargaining agreement relating to termination or severe sanctions placed on faculty members. The Professional Standards Committee will be elected by bargaining-unit faculty by approval ballots in *CEPS, COLSA, COLA, CHHS, PCBE, UNH-Manchester, the library, and the School of Law*. All tenured faculty members will automatically be the nominees on their respective ballots. The Faculty Senate will supervise this election. The Professional Standards Committee will have eight directly elected members, one from each of the following: *CEPS, COLSA, COLA, CHHS, PCBE, UNH-Manchester, the library, and the School of Law*. In addition the vice chair of the Faculty Senate will be the ninth member and the chair of the committee.

**Senate Bylaws Item 4 will change with the addition of Classics, Humanities, & Italian Studies, and the School of Law to the list of academic departments.**

This motion will lay over until the next senate meeting.
VII. Motion proposing a five-year review of the Discovery Program – Past senate chair Todd DeMitchell explained that when the Discovery program was first proposed and implemented, it was suggested that a five-year review of the program would be appropriate, but no motion was presented at the time to trigger such a review.

**Rationale:** The implementation of the Discovery Program was endorsed by the Faculty Senate in the spring of 2009. Planning discussions at that time included a proposal for a program review in five years. The Discovery Program is now in its fifth year and data are available for a meaningful review.

**Motion:** The Faculty Senate endorses a review of the Discovery Program. The Faculty Senate will form an ad hoc review committee which will have faculty representatives from each college and UNH-Manchester. The committee membership will include at least one faculty senator and at least one faculty member of the Discovery Program Committee. The Faculty Senate will invite the Director of the Discovery Program, and selected non-faculty members who could contribute to the review, to serve on the committee. The Agenda Committee will establish the goals of the ad hoc committee. The review committee will report its findings and recommendations to the Faculty Senate by the end of March 2015.

A senator suggested that the Capstone element of the Discovery program is too new to be effectively included in the review of the entire program, which suggestion was noted by the past chair.

This motion will lay over until the next senate meeting.

VIII. Motion regarding procedure to fill vacancies on the ad hoc committee on Teaching Evaluation Form Implementation – Pei-jou Kuo of the agenda committee presented the following motion, which is designed to speed up the process of replacing members of the Teaching Evaluation Form Implementation Committee:

**Rationale:** The ad hoc Committee on Teaching Evaluation Form Implementation (TEFIC) was formed by Senate motion XVI-M20 in April 2012. It includes elected members from each college. The task of moving the teaching evaluations from a paper-and-pencil format to on-line has proven to be more challenging than expected; there are many technical and policy issues to be considered. To address these issues, a University Committee, the TEV (Teaching Evaluations) Policies and Practice Committee, will be formed and include representation from the administration and faculty, ideally from each college.

The agenda committee has decided to charge the ad hoc Committee on Teaching Evaluation Form Implementation to serve as the faculty representatives on the TEV Policies and Practice Committee. In this way TEFIC, with its experience to date, will be integrated into the overall process. Furthermore, the TEV Policies and Practice Committee deliberations can inform TEFIC when it meets independently to consider faculty-only aspects and make reports and/or recommendations to the Faculty Senate.

A few of the original members have stepped down from TEFIC. Filling the vacancies immediately is necessary to allow TEFIC and the TEV Policies and Practice Committee to complete their tasks in Spring Semester 2015.
**Motion:** The Faculty Senate authorizes the Agenda Committee to fill the vacancies on the ad hoc Committee on Teaching Evaluation Form Implementation by appointment from within the relevant college rather than by election in the college.

This motion will lay over until the next senate meeting.

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

X. **Adjournment** - The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.