



Minutes

Monday, November 16, 2020
Online via Microsoft Teams 4:00 – 5:30 p.m.

Recording of this meeting is available on Microsoftstream:
<https://web.microsoftstream.com/video/f69bcab6-fb37-40bb-a0bb-b791b08f401d>

The meeting was called to order at 4:03 p.m.

Senators in Attendance: 72

Absent: Senators Calkins (Family Medicine), Evans (Surgery), Lach (Radiology), Terrien (Medicine), Toedt-Pingel (Pediatrics), Vizcarra (Economics)

-
1. **Faculty Senate President's Welcome Remarks** – Thomas Chittenden made the following remarks:
 - At their November meeting, the Student Affairs Committee (SAC) unanimously passed a motion to extend the Standardized Testing Requirement Waiver. The motion: "In part due to the challenges and risks associated with COVID-19, as well as inequity and bias that may be ingrained into standardized tests, the SAC moves to extend the test-optional option for UG admission, for TWO admission cycles, with later consideration of making this change permanent. This would apply to students entering for the fall of 2021 through 2023."
 - Thomas acknowledged that he was elected to the Vermont State Senate and will resign the office of Faculty Senate President effective January 1, 2021. Senate Vice President, Chris Burns is willing to perform the duties of Faculty Senate President until July 1, 2021. In accordance with the Senate bylaws on succession, the most senior at-large member of the Executive Council who is willing and able to serve shall assume the office of Vice President when that position is vacant. Evan Eyler qualifies and has accepted the Vice Presidency. Chris and Evan will serve for the next six-months while we carry out a nomination and election process for President-Elect. The President-Elect will assume the role of Senate President on July 1, 2021.
 - The Faculty of Color Group have graciously offered to move their resolution to the December Senate meeting to provide more time for discussion and debate on the other items on today's agenda.
 2. **Consent Agenda** - The following items were voted as a consent agenda:
 - Minutes of the October 19, 2020 Senate Meeting
 - CAC: Report Out (no vote required)

Motion: To approve the Consent Agenda
Vote: 96% approve, 2% oppose, 2% abstain

3. **General Education Requirements** – Pablo Bose, Faculty Senator and Provost’s Faculty Fellow for General Education presented the next stage in the adoption of the General Education Framework. The presentation slides are attached to these minutes, which included the Guiding Principles, the timeline, and an overview of the General Education categories. The Core Skills and Common Ground Values categories were presented for vote.

Motion: Pablo Bose moved to approve the proposed requirement language, including description, approval criteria, and student learning outcomes for the Quantitative and Data Literacy, Writing and Information Literacy Tier 2, Oral Communication, and Global Citizenship Catamount Core General Education requirements. The motion was seconded.

Discussion included: One course can fulfill two different designations, and in rare circumstances could fulfil three designations. The Gen Ed Central Committee will work in collaboration with units with externally accredited programs to make sure that some required courses also fulfill General Education requirements.

Vote: 92% approve, 3% oppose, 5% abstain

4. **UVM Re-organization Preliminary Report**– Provost Prelock and Dean David Jenemann presented a conceptual model for reorganization and a plan for gathering input from the UVM community regarding the model. Their slide presentation is attached to these minutes. In Fall 2019, the Faculty Senate Financial and Physical Planning Committee (FPPC) began discussing the idea of an evaluation of our academic organization. In April 2020, the Provost charged a working group to explore the possibilities and potential for academic reorganization at UVM. The following four key areas were included in the charge of the committee: enhance the student experience, reduce complexity and redundancy in the curriculum framework, increase forward-thinking academic alignments and reduce administrative costs. Provost Prelock named three additional factors important to consider: enrollment trends, price point and value proposition, and the changing landscape in higher education. Dean David Jenemann presented UVM 2050, describing the model as ambitious and a fundamental transformation of the current academic administrative structure of the University. The model aligns our academic offerings with our institutional values in a bold new vision for UVM. The four thematic areas (see slide) emphasize the current areas of research and pedagogical strength, complement our strategic priorities and create the conditions for program innovation. In order for the model to thrive, investment and cultivation will be needed in the following: interdisciplinary research institutes, commitment to our Land Grant mission and public engagement, a strong educational model for nontraditional students and lifelong learners, increased efforts for inclusion and equity, and building efficient and effective business services infrastructure. Provost Prelock and Dean Jenemann emphasized that faculty input is essential in the process and asked faculty to help to answer the following questions: Where do you see your discipline and your work fitting into the UVM 2050 model? How might these four interdisciplinary areas impact student and scholarly outcomes? What’s missing from this vision for UVM 2050? The suggested timeline and approach to consider reorganization includes working with the Faculty Senate Executive Council to discuss how to gather input, who should be involved in organizing facilitated discussion, focus groups, and/or survey responses. The working group will come back to the Faculty Senate in March to share the summary of input received and determine the next steps. The floor was opened for discussion. Comments and questions included:

- More details are needed to understand the vision. Where do programs, departments and colleges fit into the vision and model, specifically the natural sciences, the College of Medicine, and the Department of Education.
- What affect will the model have on transdisciplinary research?
- How will the proposed reorganization help achieve the five goals? The goals are vague. Metrics and criteria are needed to evaluate decisions. What costs are being cut? What benefits are gained? Reducing administrative costs and redundancies to what factor?
- What research supports the understanding of the problem that this model of reorganization is seeking to address? What is the research on alternatives? What is the analysis of how particular models are designed to address particular questions?
- How did the working group arrive at this model? What methodology produced the model?
- At the September meeting Dean Jenemann stated that the working group was creating a report that presented restructuring along four different lines: do nothing; keep the current administrative structure; develop a restructured university; or radical reorganization, and that would include modeling of various scenarios including financial modeling to determine potential savings and efficiencies. Where is that report?
- What has been learned from the success and failure of reorganization efforts at other institutions?
- The timeline is aggressive and seems untenable during COVID. The pandemic has created stress and anxiety. The timing of this effort is creating more stress.
- What is the future of IBB?
- Consulting with the Faculty Senate Executive Council is not enough. Faculty are supposed to be partners in governance. This does not feel like shared governance or collaborating partners. This effort seems too fast and top-down. Faculty do not feel adequately represented. Faculty want more than to give feedback, or to be consulted. Faculty want to participate and to share in governance.

President Suresh Garimella and Provost Prelock responded to questions raised by the faculty. The working group was advisory to the President and Provost, and came up with different versions of reports, but ultimately it was clear that they needed to work at an aspirational level, and not get down into the weeds in terms of what departments go where. Are these the right buckets? Does it make sense? Can we be better organized this way? President Garimella stated that it is too early in the process for financial modeling. However, there will be administrative cost savings. The UVM administration is lean and he is interested in keeping it very lean. Provost Prelock recognized the responsibility to get input, advice and consult with faculty and stated that the plan was always to hear the feedback from the faculty and to work with the Faculty Senate Executive Council to talk through the concerns and to plan next steps. The Provost also acknowledged the disagreement on timeline, and the administration's greater sense of urgency. Provost Prelock expressed appreciation for the concerns and questions that were shared. A copy of the comments written in the meeting chat will be provided to the Provost.

Thomas Borchert presented a motion with the goal of starting the process over with a collaborative committee that has substantial representation of both administration and faculty. Thomas Borchert read the following resolution:

Introduction

In the spring of 2020, the Financial and Physical Planning Committee (FPPC) approached the Provost with an interest in beginning to reconsider the organization of the University. In a resolution passed by the committee on May 4, the FPPC noted, “there has been no significant change to the academic structure of the University of Vermont over past decades, during which time its student body, academic offerings and curriculum have grown and changed significantly.” They also raised concerns that overlapping programs increased challenges for students and increased the cost of academic administration for the University of Vermont “without commensurate benefits.” The FPPC’s resolution also recognized UVM’s system of shared governance and called for a “collaborative partnership with the academic administration” to review UVM’s academic organization. In the wake of this resolution, and in combination with similar discussions happening with a committee of Deans of UVM’s colleges, Provost Patricia Prelock charged a committee, chaired by Professor David Jenemann, Dean of the Honors College, to take up the request of the FPPC and to consider models of organizing the University in order to achieve these ends. This committee presented a report to the Provost and President Garimella in October, and they are now presenting a proposal to the Faculty Senate for consideration.

Whereas the University of Vermont has a strong rich tradition of liberal arts education, including a variety of professional degrees that is more than two centuries old; and

Whereas the University of Vermont’s academic organization has changed many times over the last century, but has remained relatively stable, even as its programs and curricular offerings have increased; and

Whereas the Financial and Physical Planning Committee of the Faculty Senate of the University of Vermont resolved that the academic organization of the University be reviewed in a collaborative manner with the academic administration to determine if there are efficiencies that can be found in administration and academic programs; and

Whereas the models presented by the administration for the reorganization of the university merely provide a bare outline for reorganizing the University of Vermont, leaving many questions unanswered; and

Whereas the country finds itself in the midst of a global pandemic which requires heroic efforts on the part of both faculty and the administration to do their work; and

Whereas the academic reorganization of the University of Vermont requires substantial work and time to investigate models for organization and best practices; and

Whereas “The administration and the Faculty Senate of the University of Vermont share responsibility for the effective management of the academic affairs of the University. Authority in matters related to the academic mission of the University is vested in the faculty by the Board of Trustees” (Preamble to the Constitution); and

Whereas the “Under the authority of the Board of Trustees the University of Vermont Faculty Senate is empowered To review, to recommend, and to participate in the formulation of policy

with regard to Academic organization, including the establishment or elimination of colleges and departments and the reorganization of the general university and college academic structure” (Bylaws 1.2.c)

Therefore be it resolved that

The Faculty Senate and the Provost’s Office of the University of Vermont jointly establish an ad hoc committee to investigate models of academic organization for the university;

That this committee shall include representatives of the Provost, the Deans of the Colleges, the Faculty Senate leadership, and representatives of the Faculty;

That this committee shall request feedback from UVM’s stakeholders and also seek out the input of UVM’s experts in higher education prior to bringing a model to the Faculty and the administration for review;

That this committee shall bring forward its findings over the need to reorganize as well as proposal(s) based on their investigations with a report to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the Provost, no later than December 2021 and that the Senate shall consider During Spring 2022.

The motion was seconded.

Discussion included a desire for more specificity in the motion regarding proportion of faculty representation, how the faculty will be chosen, and the authority of the committee; addressing the urgency; faculty desire to participate and share in governance; ability of the Senate to create its own committee about reorganization and provide feedback.

In keeping with the bylaws, motions in which one-week notice was not given require a quorum of three quarters of the total number of currently elected senators. The quorum was verified prior to the vote on the resolution. 71 of the 79 elected senators were present.

Vote: 63 votes were cast. **84% approve**, 5% oppose and 11% abstain. **The motion carried.**

5. **Faculty of Color Resolution – Faculty of Color Group** - This agenda item has been moved to the December meeting agenda.
6. **Resolution supporting the UVM Libraries in their negotiations with Elsevier – Mary Cushman**, Chair of the Research, Scholarship & the Creative Arts (RSCA) Committee of the Faculty Senate presented a resolution unanimously passed by the RSCA for vote by the Faculty Senate. Meredith Niles, and Jennifer Sisk represented the Faculty Library Advisory Committee (FLAC) and reported that the FLAC unanimously approved the resolution. Meredith Niles described two possible outcomes of the negotiations. Success would mean access to Science Direct at a reasonable price, and no change in research habits. The alternative would be cancelling the Elsevier subscription and developing new means of access to research materials. Questions from the floor included the impact of canceling Elsevier on patient care/clinical decisions when waiting for interlibrary loans,

on faculty in the health-related sciences, and on UVM's drive to become a Research One Institution. Kirk Dombrowski, VP for Research, stated that if negotiations fail, and UVM walks away from Science Direct, UVM would retain access to about 64% of the literature that is now available in Science Direct. A portion of the savings could purchase individual subscriptions to journals that our use statistics show are in high demand.

Resolution Supporting The UVM Libraries In Their Negotiations With Elsevier

WHEREAS UVM's contract with *ScienceDirect* expires on December 31, 2020; and

WHEREAS *ScienceDirect* provides UVM's faculty, staff, and students with a wide range of essential literature; and

WHEREAS Elsevier does not permit UVM to grant access to *ScienceDirect* to citizens of the state of Vermont, thus hampering UVM's land-grant mission; and

WHEREAS Elsevier relies on UVM faculty to obtain research grants, conduct research, populate its editorial boards, serve as its reviewers, and edit its journals—usually without compensation; and

WHEREAS Elsevier requires UVM to buy back—through subscriptions or individual article fees—the publications UVM faculty produce on Elsevier's behalf; and

WHEREAS Elsevier has achieved a near monopoly in the literature of some disciplines; and

WHEREAS Elsevier exercises said monopoly to charge prices UVM can no longer afford; and

WHEREAS UVM paid over \$1.8 million last year for *ScienceDirect*, an amount that consumed 25% of UVM's entire collections budget; and

WHEREAS Elsevier has, to date, shown no willingness to offer the UVM libraries a fair and sustainable price for *ScienceDirect*; and

WHEREAS Elsevier likewise failed to negotiate a fair and sustainable price with the University of California system or the State University of New York system, all of whose libraries thus allowed their *ScienceDirect* contracts to expire; and

WHEREAS universities around the world and throughout the U.S. have cancelled subscriptions to *ScienceDirect* after failed negotiations;

RESOLUTION: THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the UVM Faculty Senate supports efforts by Libraries and the Office of the Vice President of Research to negotiate a fair and sustainable price for *ScienceDirect*, and it endorses the Libraries' commitment to obtain necessary journal literature through other means if negotiations fail.

Vote: 95% approve, 3% oppose, 2% abstain

7. New Business – none at this time

The meeting was adjourned at 5:34 p.m.

Refined General Education Framework

Pablo Bose
Provost's Faculty Fellow
for
General Education



Guiding Principles

- **Three curricular areas:** Liberal Arts, Core Skills, Common Ground Values
- **40 credit rule:** Students can “double dip,” but they must still take 40 credits of Gen Ed approved courses overall
- **Central Approval:** A university-wide Gen Ed Curriculum committee will approve courses; current Gen Ed committees will be folded into this larger committee
- **Criteria-based Approval:** All courses must be approved by the University General Education Curriculum Committee based on established approval criteria for each General Education requirement, not an offering department.
- **Multiple designations:** A course can carry multiple designations. In most cases, a course will carry no more than three designations. There are two types of cross-designation that are not allowed: MA courses cannot fulfill the QD requirement; and a single course cannot carry two different liberal arts category designations.
- **A Gen Ed Coordinator** will oversee the curriculum. Half-time, faculty position



Timeline - General Education at UVM

- Fall 2006 – first Gen Ed requirements (6 x diversity, either 6 x D1 or 3 x D1 and 3 x D2) established (revision of requirements in 2011, 2015 and 2020)
- Fall 2011 – SU requirements (x 3) added
- Fall 2013 – FWIL requirements (x 3) added
- Fall 2017 – QR requirements (x 3) added
- Spring 2019 - General Education Alignment Task Force formed; begins Gen ed alignment process and presents an initial set of requirements in early fall 2019
- Fall 2019 – Call for new general education requirements campus wide; 11 proposals received
- Spring 2020 – 8 proposal areas (incorporating new and old requirements) accepted/developed – faculty working groups established to refine and finalize criteria, language and assessment)
- Fall 2020 – Catamount Core General Education Framework finalized and approved by Faculty Senate





CATAMOUNT CORE CURRICULUM: Revised April 2020

CATAMOUNT CORE is made up of 42 credits in courses distributed across three main areas: LIBERAL ARTS (21 credits); CORE SKILLS (9 credits); and COMMON GROUND VALUES (12 credits).

Students will be able to take courses that fulfill more than one category BUT they MUST still take at least 40 unique credits of courses that have been approved to fulfill CATAMOUNT CORE CURRICULUM requirements.

LIBERAL ARTS

21 CREDITS

AH1, AH2	ARTS AND HUMANITIES 6 credits
S1	SOCIAL SCIENCES 6 credits
N1, N2	NATURAL SCIENCES 6 credits
MA	MATHEMATICS 3 credits

CORE SKILLS

9 CREDITS*

QD	QUANTITATIVE AND DATA LITERACY 3 credits
WIL1	COMMUNICATION 1 Foundational Writing and Info Literacy 3 credits
WIL2	COMMUNICATION 2 3 credits from: Writing and Info Literacy Tier 2
OC	or Oral Communication

*IA has been removed

COMMON GROUND VALUES

12 CREDITS*

D1	DIVERSITY 1
D2	3-6 credits DIVERSITY 2 0-3 credits
SU	SUSTAINABILITY 3 credits
GC	GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP 3 credits

*SJ has been removed

Motion

- Motion to approve the proposed requirement language, including description, approval criteria and student learning outcomes for Quantitative and Data Literacy, Writing and Information Literacy Tier 2, Oral Communication, and Global Citizenship Catamount Core General Education requirements.

Agenda 4: UVM Re-organization Committee Preliminary Report– Dean Jenemann [30 min]

Academic Reorganization: Recommendations from FPPC Resolution



**Enhance the student
experience**

**Reduce complexity &
redundancy**

**Reduce barriers to student &
faculty success**

**Increase academic
alignments**

Reduce administrative costs

REIMAGINING A UVM 2050

CATALYZING the impact of our students and our distinctive research and scholarly contributions,

PROMOTING a culture of inclusive collaboration across disciplines, and

SPURRING innovation at all levels.

CONSIDER POSSIBLE
COLLEGES THAT MIGHT
LOOK LIKE THIS . . .

AGRICULTURAL, BIOLOGICAL & ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

“Ensuring a healthy environment—
meeting our needs without
compromising our future.”

ARTS, LETTERS & THE HUMAN EXPERIENCE

“A liberal education at our core—
thinking critically and solving
real problems.”

SOCIETAL HEALTH

“Promoting & delivering
on our commitment to
building healthy
societies.”

ENGINEERING, BUSINESS & TECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATION

“Entrepreneurship in
responding to 21st Century
needs for a healthy
environment and society.”

FACILITATORS

- Interdisciplinary research institutes
- Land grant mission/engagement
- Nontraditional education
- Inclusion and equity
- Improved business/service practices

Faculty are essential to this process

If we were to pursue reorganization . . .

- *Where do you see your discipline fitting in the **UVM 2050** model?*
- *How might the 4 interdisciplinary areas impact student & scholarly outcomes?*
- *What's missing from this vision for **UVM 2050**?*

Based on Executive Council feedback, we are proposing the following approach:

- Work with Faculty Senate Executive Committee to discuss how to gather input, and who should be involved in organizing facilitated discussions, focus groups and/or survey responses.
- Schedule conversations over the coming months with faculty, staff, students, etc. to gather input on the four proposed areas of academic alignment and the overall vision.
- Come back to Faculty Senate in March to share the summary of the input received and a determination of next steps.