I. Roll – The following senators were absent: Carter, Dowd, and Franczak. McNamara, Rodriguez, and Wilder were excused. Hatcher served as proxy for Ruml. P.T. Vasudevan was a guest.

II. Remarks by and questions to the interim provost – The provost shared a short presentation on changes to Credit Hour Weighting (CHW) that will impact the 5 colleges in Durham in FY 17. He stated that the current budget analysis for starting new programs in a particular college is flawed since it does not assess the impact of starting a new program on other colleges given the fact that we have an overall cap of about 3200 incoming first year students. We have witnessed a decrease in enrollment in COLA over the years (the enrollment in COLA appears to be stabilizing), and significant increases in enrollment in CEPS and PCBE. As part of the RCM review, it was necessary to look at CHW.

Data from 2009-2015 for expenses and credit hour generation for the five colleges in Durham (CEPS, CHHS, COLA, COLSA, PCBE) were analyzed. This presented a comprehensive picture of the enrollment cycle as a whole. The new CHW paid particular attention to the sensitivity of the CHW ratios, and to ensuring the financial health of all colleges. In addition to tuition revenue, differential tuition (tuition surcharge) in CEPS and PCBE were considered in the analysis. The new CHW will be normalized to COLA based on an analysis of various expenses. COLA will thus have a CHW of 1.0. Increase in tuition surcharges (differential tuition) for CEPS (engineering and computer science) and PCBE will be phased in. The increases in tuition surcharge was recently approved by the Board of Trustees. Under the new system (COLA = 1.0), the CHW for other colleges will be COLSA 1.47, CEPS 1.76, PCBE 1.10, and CHHS 1.15. Effectively, all colleges will see a lowering of the CHW ratios with respect to COLA.

A senator commented that there have been limits in the past regarding how the tuition surcharges may be spent, and asked if these surcharges have limits to their spending. Vasu replied that this was certainly the case, but how instructional costs are defined is a conversation that he plans to have with the Dean of CEPS during the budget meeting. He said that there is some concern about the multitude of fees being assessed, and that this should be a discussion that should take place with the deans. Another senator asked if the surcharges varied for residents or non-residents, and when Vasu replied no, the senator called that decision a lost opportunity to improve relations with state representatives in Concord.

Another senator asked if the cap of 3200 students is a flexible cap, noting the issue of carrying capacity. Vasu replied that these are ongoing conversations with the VP for Enrollment.
Management. He said that in COLA for example, we can do a better job of branding, as well as improving career counseling. He said that he has spoken with the current and incoming dean about things that can be done to help COLA students. He said that high enrollments in some programs provides an opportunity for attracting high quality students.

A senator asked about the rationale for raising the surcharge for the PCBE, when its rating factor is almost the same as COLA. Vasu replied that high demand for spots in the program is a key factor and pointed out that across the country, many engineering and business schools charge such added tuition. More than just a revenue source, it also helps to balance the cost of higher salaries for PCBE faculty to remain competitive in attracting new hires, and also helps to address the needs in the PCBE for more space and more faculty.

A senator expressed concerns about the change some years ago from three credit hours to four credit hours per course, and asked about creating equity in the classroom between credit hours and the time actually spent in the classroom. He said the PCBE surcharge was an important factor in raising funds to provide better technology and stay on the top of the market. He expressed concern about majors and non-majors paying different tuition rates because of the surcharge, and that the money from the surcharge seems to be spent in places other than where it is most needed. The provost said that this is a separate issue that can be addressed at a later time.

Another senator echoed the concern about majors and non-majors paying different tuition rates because of the surcharge, asserting that students are smart enough to figure out that they can start in a less expensive major and then switch to their desired major with only a few semesters to go in order to save tuition dollars. Vasu countered that this is not occurring and that the number of students coming to the PCBE from COLA is very small. The senator suggested that RCM is simply a reward to deans and colleges for deficit spending. There followed some discussion about how long it takes for the impact of RCM distribution to be felt in the colleges. Vasu indicated that the current review of CHW examined three different models, and each model impacted colleges in a different way. The models looked at faculty and staff expenses, TA expenses, space costs etc. The proposed CHW is based on a model that provides a proper balance for all the colleges. The senator said that in order for the administration to elicit desired budgetary behaviors from the faculty, there needs to be stability in the budget in order for faculty and departments to plan for the future. A shifting target like RCM is difficult to achieve consistently.

A senator suggested that the unequal payments between colleges seems to be an effort to repopulate COLA, which sends an implicit message that COLA graduates are at a disadvantage. Vasu said that the solution to this problem is one of Victoria Dutcher’s objectives. Academic Affairs is working with her to address this issue, and the senate is already aware of the recommendations contained in the Curran report to address career advising and professional success.

The provost then shared another presentation regarding the online teaching evaluations. He shared a graphic that showed that the online evaluation ratings for Spring 2015 (Q1 through Q13) for tenured professors were slightly lower than the paper ratings (historical AY 2013/14 and spring 2015 for non-tenured professors) by about 0.09; the same was also true in Spring
2015. Question 14 on its own was about 0.1 lower. He said that other schools moving to online evaluations are seeing similar results. He reported that there were very few reported incidents of problems or technical difficulties in administering the online evaluations, with no reports of connectivity issues or bad user names/passwords.

The provost brought up the issue of online student evaluations of teaching, which the senate voted against in the last meeting, due in part to concerns about restricted use for online evaluations for courses with under five students enrolled, as well as a desire from the senators that the deans officially agree to re-calibrate the online evaluations to accommodate lower ratings, should they occur. Vasu said that he met with the deans and that they all agreed to re-calibrate the online evaluation numbers, and upon further request, they each sent him a written commitment that they fully support online evaluations, and if necessary, recalibration. Vasu said that he plans to work with the deans to make sure that this happens.

A senator said that three graduate students in a class of combined graduates/undergraduates were unable to access the online evaluation. Eventually the problem was solved by using paper evaluations, but he wanted to be sure that the provost was aware that there were technical difficulties with evaluations in the fall semester.

There were questions regarding the recalibration of ratings by the deans: one senator asked if the re-calibration of ratings would be done only for online evaluations, and another asked if the recalibration would be done individually or by program. The provost responded that the recalibration would be at the program (college) level and only for online evaluations. A senator said his larger concern is regarding the lower response rate for the online evaluations, suggesting that the online process is less thoughtful and may elicit fewer written responses which responses he finds very helpful. Vasu said that the departments in which faculty have given students in-class time to complete the evaluations have seen marked improvement in response rates. He said that he has seen good comments included in the online evaluations.

A senator suggested that if the mode of distribution of an evaluation (online vs. paper) can change the ratings significantly, it brings into question the validity of the measure itself. He suggested that more analysis needs to be done, both in-house and across the country to see if there is a more valid way to evaluate faculty.

Another senator expressed the opinion that administrators view the evaluations differently than the faculty do. He asserted that faculty need to review the written comments in order to look for areas needing adjustment in their teaching methods, while deans look for different data. He asked what we are trying achieve with the evaluations in general. Vasu asserted that the same issues exist whether the evaluations are paper or online. The senate chair said that some of these issues will be addressed in the next senate meeting with a proposal from the Senate Agenda Committee.

The provost also informed the senate that with the retirement of Toni Taylor, there is now no one in Institutional Research & Assessment to process the paper evaluations. In order to process paper forms, two full-time staff members would need to be hired. A senator asked about the cost of out-sourcing the work.
Another senator brought up the issue of gender-bias in teacher evaluations, saying student bias is more evident in online evaluations. The question of small classes (under 5 students) not being able to use the online evaluations was brought up again. Vasu reiterated that for small classes, paper evaluations can still be used by the departments. The senate chair said that the solution to this problem exists, but that the information is not getting out effectively to departments and faculty. She thanked Vasu for his remarks.

III. Remarks by and questions to the senate chair – Deb Kinghorn informed the group that some of the time delays during senate votes using the clickers is due to the number of WiFi connections in use during the votes. She asked senate members to put their laptops to sleep and otherwise disconnect from WiFi use during senate discussions that will end in a vote. Hopefully this will speed up the process and reduce waiting time while the votes are registering with the base station.

She then referred to the Title IX regulations and several campus community committees working with Jaime Nolan on these issues. Deb would like to see faculty representation, including senate representation, on these committees including the top-level advisory committee as well as two smaller groups, the policy committee and the training committee. Anyone interested in serving on these committees, or who is aware of a colleague who might be interested, should contact the senate chair at deb.kinghorn@unh.edu. The chair said the VP for Community, Equity, and Diversity has invited Peter Lake, an expert in Title IX to come to UNH and speak to the community on March 9, addressing ways in which faculty and staff can support Title IX (specifically regarding sexual violence and harassment) and resolve some of the questions regarding federal regulations. A senator reminded the group that the AAUP is still reviewing some of the Title IX rules.

Deb said that the senate election ballots will be distributed by Qualtrics survey this year, which will go out the first week of March, as per the senate constitution and bylaws. She reminded the group that some things have changed with the addition of CCLEAR faculty to the senate. The first senator elected from any department must be a tenure-track faculty. After that, departments electing more than one senator may elect either tenure-track or eligible CCLEAR faculty (CCLEAR faculty with 75% or greater appointments). Departments with up to fifteen senators will elect one senator. Departments with 16-40 faculty will elect two senators. Departments with over 40 faculty will elect three senators. A list of the number of senator representatives from each department will be shared with the senate members. Senators were asked to alert their colleagues that this is coming up.

IV. Minutes – It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the last senate meeting, February 1, 2016. Two errors were corrected and, thus adjusted, the minutes were unanimously approved with one abstention.

Action Items:

V. Motion to revise wording in Students Rights, Rules, and Responsibilities Handbook , section 06.1.1 regarding advising of students – The senate chair, representing the Agenda Committee, brought up an item presented by senate vice chair Dante Scala at the December 7, 2015 meeting regarding rewording the SRRR handbook.
Senate Motion XIX-M16 suggests that the SRR&R item 06.1.1 read:

“...Either faculty or staff members may serve as academic advisors depending on departmental procedures...”

It was brought to the Agenda Committee’s attention that no Human Resources Operating Staff classification has academic advising as an assigned duty, and OS are not generally expected to possess the educational degrees necessary to discharge those duties at the college level. Professional, Administrative, and Technical (PAT) staff are the ones qualified to carry out academic advising. Thus, in conjunction with the Senate Student Affairs Committee, the Senate Agenda Committee moves to change the wording of SRRR 06.1.1 to the following:

“...Either faculty or **PAT (Professional, Administrative, and Technical)** staff members may serve as academic advisors depending on departmental procedures...”

After a brief discussion, the chair asked for a motion to suspend the rules in order to vote on this item today. It was moved and seconded to suspend the rules, and that vote passed unanimously with no abstentions.

The motion to revise the wording on SRRR 06.1.1 was then put to a vote and passed unanimously with 44 votes in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions.

VI. Report from the Senate Library Committee – Todd DeMitchell, chair of the Senate Library Committee presented the committee’s report on maintaining access to current journals in the Library, offering the following:

- **Journal costs rise about 5% per year. The library budget does not keep pace.** Consequently, choices have to be made as to what to keep and what new purchases need to be made.

- **The library has contracts with some of the publishers. In exchange for a reduction in cost of specific journal, the library must commit to spending X amount of dollars.** Consequently, if a journal is not being used very much but it is covered by a contract, the library could drop that journal but would have to pick from other journal listed in the contract. Therefore, the need for efficiency (less cost) may reduce the choices that are available.

- **Mones are allocated to each department and managed through the departmental liaison. The amount of money is contingent upon costs of journals (hard copy and electronic), which varies by fields. Faculty and student populations and usage are factors in determining the allocation.**

- **Sometimes it is more cost effective to purchase individual articles rather than purchasing a subscription. The first five article requests are free.**

- **Students prefer electronic journals.**
There is less book usage on the part of students.

He also noted the following information from the records of the UNH Library which speak to the use of print journals versus Ejournals:

2010 Print journal subscriptions – 1539  
2015 Print journal subscriptions – 645  
2010 Ejournal Access – 35,628 unique titles  
2015 Ejournal Access – 83,736 unique titles

Ultimately, Todd reported that there is not enough of a library budget for journals that faculty may wish to access for their research and teaching, and that given our diverse faculty and their diverse research and teaching needs, not all requests for up-to-date journals available on demand can be met. He suggested that faculty may use interlibrary loans or seek funding from their respective college Business Service Centers to fund the purchase of journal subscriptions.

The group was informally polled to see how often they use interlibrary loans, either with positive or negative results. The response was that nearly all faculty use the service (many use it daily) with generally positive experiences, both with books and with journals.

VII. Information Technology Committee Report – Siobhan Senier, chair of the Senate ITC, reported on the committee’s meeting with UNH Director of Academic Technology, and UNH Online, Terri Winters. With respect to the committee’s charge to “Investigate and report to the Faculty Senate on any plans regarding the IT campus infrastructure and/or services that might affect the academic mission of the university,” Siobhan shared the following information:

1. Migrating off Blackboard is proceeding apace and faculty appear to be overwhelmingly satisfied with MyCourses. The jettisoning of BB, however, has forced IT/AT to seek alternatives for two features that UNH will lose along with the BB license:

   A. SafeAssign, which is the software that encourages original writing and proper citation. A committee has been established to investigate alternatives, most of which are quite expensive (especially given that only about 12-14% of faculty use plagiarism detection software). The committee seeks to survey SafeAssign users, and also form a working group of SafeAssign users to develop a recommendation for the Academic Standards and Advising Committee (ASAC) by April 15, 2016.

   B. The Portal. The BB portal will remain functional for one more year and could—if this turns out to be a widespread preference—even keep it. IT/AT is currently looking at replacement products and will send a communication soon inviting people to try some demos. We could be on a new portal by July 2017.
2. **TEAL (Technology Enabled Active Learning)** rooms. UNH currently has just a few of these classrooms. UNH is working with a donor at the moment to expand both the number of such classrooms on campus and to increase instructional design support for faculty who might be interested in using these rooms.

3. **Phase II of Open Educational Resources (OER).** Phase I includes nine faculty who are currently piloting the use of open educational resources (OER) in their classes—openly licensed online educational materials (from textbooks to videos to webinars) that, among other things, are hoped to help students save college costs. In Phase II, UNH can enlist another 15 faculty. IT/AT has asked deans to help identify faculty who might benefit (ie., especially those teaching courses with large enrollments); they are also hoping to offer a summer stipend of $2K for faculty who get involved with the project.

4. **Web governance.** Terri is hoping to undertake a two-year project developing governance protocols for unh.edu. At the moment she has a committee of IT and Communication and Public Affairs (CPA) staff working to identify some frameworks, models, scope, etc., of such a project. The USNH Internal Audit department conducted an audit of AT’s programming practices and found “a reputational risk to UNH if inappropriate pages remain.” The university considers this a management problem: unh.edu has about 287 sites and over a million pages, and over 400 people who have editorial capability.

   This new “web governance” would cover things like:
   - Guidelines and templates
   - Design standards
   - Editing and publishing standards
   - Network and infrastructure standards

   CPA wants to create what it is calling a “gated community,” by which they mean a public-facing unh.edu that is heavily vetted by their people. The bottom line is that individual departments and faculty have very little say in the design of their websites. This, then, is an area of potential shared-governance struggle. CPA will say that they are happy for faculty and departments to provide content, but they will to control the style—and perhaps, in some cases, the content too.

A member of the Agenda Committee asked if the senate has faculty representation on the committee designing these governance protocols. The chair said that we should. There was some discussion from the senate membership on censorship, as well as the lack of support for faculty who are trying to promote their research on the web. A senator asked how much was spent on the internal audit. The ITC chair said she could find that out. Another senator commented that the university often outsources such reviews, when there is ample expertise and talent within the UNH community to accomplish the same task. A senator commented on the frustration experienced by faculty and staff with the declining quality of departmental websites. There was a comment about a department choosing to design their own website.

When asked what the real problem is, the ITC chair said that it seems the administration’s concern seems to be over the “reputational risk” to the UNH brand if all UNH-linked websites
are not coordinated. A member of the ITC said it seems to be less about functionality and more about the branding. It was noted that departmental concerns about the functionality of the website do not seem to be addressed, despite repeated conversations on the topic. The ITC has formed a sub-committee to form a survey to gather data from faculty regarding their satisfaction with UNH IT/AT. If senators have suggestions for questions to be added to that survey, they should contact Semra Aytur, Nic Orovich, or Sarah Prescott.

Two senators noted that the university’s drive toward uniformity of departmental websites may have to do with a desire for a professional appearance to the site, as well some research that has indicated viewer preference for uniformity in such websites. Despite all this, concern was raised again regarding the risk of censorship on website pages. The chair thanked the ITC for their report.

VIII. New Business – The Senate AAC chair alerted the group to a proposal from the registrar to shorten the length of the add/drop period from three weeks to two weeks, with online registration. The online registration will reduce faculty control over their class registrations. Any faculty with strong feelings on this topic should reach out to Scott Smith.

IX. Adjournment- It was moved and seconded to adjourn the meeting at 5:29 p.m.