



FACULTY SENATE

Minutes

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Memorial Lounge **3:30 – 5:30** pm

The meeting was called to order at 3:33

Senators in Attendance: 51

Absent: Senators Salembier (Education), Varhue (Electrical & Biomedical Engineering), (Mechanical Engineering), Bessette (English), Toolin (ERTC), (Family Medicine), Mieder (German & Russian), Busier (Leadership & Developmental Science), Single (Mathematics & Statistics), Teuscher (Medicine), O'Meara (Nursing), Nelms (Orthopaedic Rehabilitation), Ambaye (Pathology), Cuneo (Philosophy), Eyler (Psychiatry), Naylor (Psychiatry), (Rehabilitation & Movement Science), Ricketts (RSENr), Patterson (Social Work), Moore (Surgery), Carleton (Theatre)

1. Approval of Minutes of the April 24, 2017 Meeting

Motion: To approve the minutes of the April 24, 2017 Meeting

Vote: 86% approve, 0% oppose, 14% abstain

2. **Presentation of Degrees**

It was moved, seconded and voted that the following numbers of graduates be recommended by the Senate to the President for the awarding of the appropriate degrees or certificates as authorized by the Board of Trustees. Individual names of the graduates are recorded with the Minutes of this meeting in the permanent Senate records.

Agriculture and Life Sciences (328)

Arts and Sciences (777)

Education and Social Services (146)

Engineering and Mathematical Sciences (184)

Grossman School of Business (179)

Graduate College (330)

Honors College (131)

Larner College of Medicine (114)*

Nursing and Health Sciences (192)*
Rubenstein School of Environment and Natural Resources (133)
University Honors (247)

Motion: To accept the degrees as presented

Vote: 100% approve, % oppose, % abstain

*Due to the change in meeting time, the Deans of the Larner College of Medicine and the College of Nursing and Health Sciences presented the degrees later in the meeting agenda. The degrees were presented and a hand vote was held.

Motion: To accept the degrees as presented by the Larner College of Medicine and the College of Nursing and Health Sciences.

Vote: 100% approve, 0% oppose, -0 % abstain.

3. **Senate President's Remarks.** Cathy Paris thanked the Senators for participating in the shared governance of the University of Vermont, and noted that the success of the Senate is possible through the hard work of Senate committees, and engaged participation of Senators. President Paris provided a short year-in-review of the accomplishments of UVM, and of the Faculty Senate. Some of the Senate highlights presented include support for the creation of the university-wide Gund Institute for Environment, organization of a panel discussion on the Incentive-based Budget Model, approval of an array of innovative academic programs, and expansion of our General Education curriculum with the approval of a new Quantitative Reasoning requirement. The Faculty Senate also collaborated with the Provost's Office and Student Affairs in the planning of the first ever campus-wide faculty conference. President Paris asked Senators to mark their calendars for the second campus-wide conference, scheduled for Monday, August 21st.

4. **Curricular Affairs Committee Business,** Laura Almstead, Chair (vote)

- a) **Uncontested request to terminate the Gund Institute for Ecological Economics** – The CAC approved a request from the Dean of the Rubenstein School of Environment and Natural Resources and the Director of the Gund Institute for Ecological Economics, to terminate the Gund Institute for Ecological Economics (GIEE). GIEE was founded in 2001 through support from the Gund family. The Gund family has recently made a donation that will support the creation of a new University-wide Gund Institute for Environment. Current GIEE staff will transition to the new Gund Institute for Environment, and faculty who participate in the GIEE will be able to continue their work through participation in the new institute.
Motion: Laura Almstead called a vote to approve the uncontested request to terminate the Gund Institute for Ecological Economics
Vote: 89% approve, 4% oppose, 7% abstain

- b) **New Minor in Law and Society** – The CAC unanimously approved a proposal for a new Minor in Law and Society submitted by the Department of Sociology in the College of Arts and Sciences. If approved, the program will be offered beginning

spring 2018. The newly proposed minor draws upon existing course work to construct a curriculum in an area that is both timely and of interest to students. Expanding the understanding of law and legal institutions among undergraduates may prove useful to those pursuing careers in legal, public service, and other professions. Although it primarily draws upon Sociology and Political Science courses, inclusion of courses from other departments and colleges provides breadth to the curriculum. With over two-dozen courses, as well as relevant special topics courses and internship opportunities, the curriculum also gives students the opportunity to tailor the major to their interests.

Motion: Laura Almstead called a vote on the proposed new Minor in Law and Society

Vote: 89% approve, 4% oppose, 7% abstain

- c) **Request to change the name of the program, major, and BS in Exercise and Movement Science** – The CAC approved a request from the Department of Exercise and Movement Science to change the name of the program, major, and BS degree from Exercise and Movement Science to “Exercise Science”. The request included a request to change the course prefix from EXMS to “EXSC.” The change would affect thirteen courses. No curricular changes are accompanying the name change request.

Motion: Laura Almstead called a vote on the request to change the name of the program, major, and BS in Exercise and Movement Science to “Exercise Science”

Vote: 81% approve, 2% oppose, 17% abstain

- d) **Report of items approved by the CAC that do not require a Faculty Senate vote.**

The CAC approved the following:

- Proposal for significant revisions to the B.S. in Engineering Management
- Request to eliminate the Language Studies and Formal Linguistics Concentrations in the Linguistics major.

5. **Undergraduate Retention and Reenrollment.** Stacey Kostell, VP for Enrollment Management presented the third in a 3-part series on enrollment management. Slides from VP Kostell’s presentation on retention are included in these minutes. The prior presentations were around recruitment (March), and international enrollment (April). This presentation provided an overview of the retention goals, and UVM’s retention rates over the last several years. UVM’s one-year retention rate has remained consistently around 86%, but the rates at many of our peer institutions are higher. Factors that impact retention include student characteristics, as well as institutional experiences. There are four main categories around institutional experience that faculty/administration can impact: 1) level and quality of engagement, 2) integration (academic, co-curricular, social), 3) academic challenge, and 4) supportive campus environment. VP Kostell highlighted some of the initiatives around each of the categories. VP Kostell also spoke about the important role of faculty in retention. Student Affairs coordinates a survey of students at the 6-week point to find out how students are feeling about their UVM experience. Data has shown that students are mentally making decisions about continuing during their first 6-weeks. The results of the 6-week survey at UVM show that

only about half of the students had met with their advisor within the first 6-weeks of the fall semester. Advising and Retention software is being considered to assist faculty in increasing engagement. The software would enable faculty to quickly access information on their advisees and build electronic relationships. Continued discussion is needed around the engagement of commuting students.

6. **Update on Program Assessment.** J. Dickinson, Faculty Fellow for Assessment and Brian Reed, Associate Provost for Teaching & Learning presented a progress report on the UVM Assessment Initiative, and a preview of coming events. The project is designed to establish sustainable, robust systems to assess whether students are achieving the learning outcomes that faculty aspire for them in terms of academic programs and general education. This initiative is also linked to the next accreditation review from New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC). NEASC will be coming to UVM in Spring of 2019, and the assessment project will help identify work needed to meet the nine NEASC standards. In the next year, a self-study report will be developed and committees will be formed. The Assessment Initiative will also be tied more closely to academic program reviews. J. Dickinson reported that work is being done at the department level on drafting outcomes, and assessment plans. The goal for 2017 is to get more programs ready to complete the assessment plan form. The emphasis for next year is to bring diverse voices into the assessment initiative, including faculty at the department and program level, and student voices through indirect methods such as focus groups and survey research.

The following services to support program-level assessment are offered, or being developed (see full list at uvm.edu/assessment):

- scholarship of teaching and learning (SOTL) research techniques that can be used for assessment of learning outcomes.
- opportunities to participate in a faculty learning community, and to propose and receive support for some course based SOTL research.
- LimeSurvey support through the Center for Teaching and Learning
- student-led focus group initiative providing qualitative focus-group data to programs, academic units and Gen Ed committees.

7. **Library Advisory Committee Report.** Jennifer Sisk, Chair of the Library Advisory Committee introduced the committee as a free-standing faculty committee acting as an advisory to the Dean of Libraries. This committee is linked to the Faculty Senate through the Research, Scholarship and Creative Arts committee chair, Chris Burns, and Senate President Cathy Paris, who serve as members. Although this is a new committee, it is also a revitalization of a 2012 ad hoc Faculty Senate committee, which was formed in response to cancellation of journal subscriptions caused by pressure on the library. The establishment of the new free-standing Library Advisory committee is in response to a space crisis in the Libraries that resulted in a collection weeding project. The goal of the Library Advisory Committee is to open dialogue between the Libraries and faculty about issues that affect collections and the research profile of the libraries. Current issues include a crisis of inadequate space for the collection, and financial constraints. The Libraries have been level funded in recent years, but costs to maintain subscriptions to electronic journals and new acquisitions have continued to rise. The Libraries are a cost

center under IBB, and undergo a budget review process every year. The Libraries operation budget is separated from the acquisitions budget in order to protect the acquisition budget from cuts. In order to open dialogue with the University community, two subcommittees were established: collections, and communications. The Collections subcommittee, headed by Nicole Phelps (History Department), has been working with librarians to learn about how collections are developed, and maintained, and how decisions are made for deaccession. They are working to develop a document that details the collection development policies. Plans are also being made to encourage more faculty involvement in the weeding processes that will continue to be necessary. The Communications subcommittee, headed by Dan Fogel (English Department), is working to help the UVM community understand the situation that the library is in, and have conversations about the resources that will be necessary in future years if the costs continue to escalate. A presentation was made to the CAS faculty, and the committee is interested in connecting with other units. In May, the committee met with the Provost, and VP for Research, Richard Galbraith to discuss concerns and share ideas about moving forward. The committee has requested a fall meeting with President Sullivan and the President/CEO of the UVM Foundation, Shane Jacobson to discuss strategies for resource allocation and fundraising.

8. **Senate Committee Reports: Financial & Physical Planning Committee**, Andrew Barnaby, Chair of the FPPC noted that the charge of the FPPC is extraordinarily broad, and does not have specific, organized tasks. Over the last two years, the FPPC has explored the “what” and “how” of the part of the charge that states “the FPPC shall have responsibility for . . . University Budget.” What defines the university budget and the activity involved in “shall have responsibility”. The FPPC focused on the “what,” by studying IBB. Deans of various colleges attended FPPC meetings to share the initiatives underway in their colleges, especially around increasing revenue. The committee also investigated how the model works at other institutions. Investigation of the “how” included a look at how committees work at other institutions, including their authority and how the responsibility is enacted. Two outcomes of this investigation were 1) understanding that the senators and committee members represent their units, and a clear flow of information is essential, and 2) the creation of a calendar for FPPC meetings that includes regularly scheduled visits from administration to ensure that the faculty are involved early enough in the decision-making process, so the interest of faculty are addressed prior to decisions being made.

9. **Discussion of Petition to Senate Executive Council**

Cathy Paris reminded the Senate that although the Executive Council generally prepares the meeting agenda, there is a provision in the Faculty Senate bylaws that allows items to be placed on the Senate meeting agenda if presented in the form of a petition signed by ten percent of the members of the Faculty Senate. A petition with two specific motions was received from members of the Senate. The principle author, Thomas Borchert, introduced the petition to the Senate:

Preamble: The Senate bylaws state “[a]uthority in matters related to the academic mission of the University is vested in the faculty by the Board of Trustees.” In this academic year, concerns have been raised about how the Senate is fulfilling its function, specifically about the appropriate scope and procedures of Senate decision making, such as the procedures for deciding when something is brought to a vote of the full Senate and the organization of discussion in Senate meetings. If these concerns are left unaddressed, it is not clear that the Senate can truly fulfill its Board approved function within the shared governance model. The following two motions are offered to ensure that the Senate operates from a solid foundation of consensus in the future. The first is more general, the second offers a specific mechanism for enacting the goals of the first.

Motion 1) The Senate will review the appropriate scope and procedures of Senate decision making, including but not limited to when and how debate is conducted during Senate meetings, procedures for choosing which items to bring for a vote, and the relationship of Senate committees to the Senate as a whole. The motion was seconded. Discussion on Motion 1.

Vote: 89% approve, 9% oppose, 2% abstain

Motion 2) An ad hoc committee made up of Faculty Senators will be appointed by the full Senate Executive Council to 1) investigate issues that have been raised about Senate process, 2) explore possible changes to procedure that could clarify issues, and 3) within a reasonable time frame, present a report to the Senate with recommendations. The motion was seconded. Thomas Chittenden proposed an amendment to Motion 2. The amendment was not viewed as a friendly amendment.

Motion to Amend Motion 2 as follows: The Executive Council will 1) investigate issues that have been raised about Senate process, 2) explore possible changes to procedure that could clarify issues, and 3) within a reasonable time frame, present a report to the Senate with recommendations. The motion to amend was seconded. Discussion on the amendment.

Ann Wittpenn called the question to end debate. The motion was seconded.

Vote to end debate: approve 95%, oppose 5%, abstain 0%

Vote on the Amendment to Motion 2: approve 24%, oppose 68%, abstain 7%

Additional discussion was held on Motion 2.

Vote on Motion 2: approve 85%, oppose 13%, abstain 3%

The Faculty Senate Executive Council will take up consideration of the ad-hoc committee at their first meeting in the fall 2017.

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.