Meeting called to order at 3:10 p.m. on February 11, 2019

I. Roll – The following senators were absent: Gass, Hemstock, Innis, Khanlari, Kim, Knezevic, Knowles, Shipe, Simos, and Tucker. The following senators were excused: Byam, Came, Sharp, Richard Smith, Nena Stracuzzi. The following guests attended: Nicky Gullace, Wayne Jones, and Tom Kelly

II. Remarks by and questions to the provost - The provost gave an update on work being done by the four retention workgroups using the slides that appear in the Appendix to these minutes. He also offered to take questions.

David Finkelhor asked whether any analysis has been done on the relationship between retention and residential units. Wayne responded that they are just starting to unpack data by residential hall. Although he has been told that there is no correlation between retention rates and residential unit he has asked for additional data.

David also asked whether there were any plans to use undergraduates as peer mentors. Wayne shared that this is a big part of the plans. Neil Niman’s workgroup, in particular, is looking at this. Paul College’s FIRE (First-year Innovation and Research Experience) program runs, to a large extent, on peer mentors. Wayne suggested that we leverage more of that in an appropriate way across all of the colleges to allow students an opportunity to engage with a discipline or to explore a career path where they feel more connected to that exploration.

Lu Yan suggested that there is a need to address a culture issue that seems to sway some students to treat the higher learning institutions as a marketplace to earn or buy a piece of paper. Wayne said that culture shows up in a number of places. In many ways, students are smarter than they were 25 years ago. SAT scores are higher and tests they are taking suggest that they know more material. But culturally they are in a very different place. They appear to be less resilient and they are less likely to ask for help and more likely to ask for the most grade for the least amount of work. In terms of culture, the sophomore experience and the realignment and engaged experience are where most of that conversation has taken place. Wayne encouraged Lu Yan and all senators to send any suggestions in this area to Neil Niman.

Wayne also shared that as we look at the gateway courses and at the early engagement and early warning system, we need to have more conversations with faculty about making sure that we get our best faculty in front of students as early as possible and making sure that when a faculty member knows that they are going to have a large number of first-year students that there may be some things to do about giving students an early warning sooner. There will be some additional training with any faculty who will be teaching a gateway course or a course with a lot of freshman or first-time students.

Patty Bedker commented that research tells us that academic advising really improves retention and that she hears from faculty that advising is not worth the time because it doesn’t count for P&T and other things. Instead, the rewards come from research and teaching and advising is often left out. She suggested that we
need something to highlight the best advising. Wayne said that he liked that idea. Generally, at a research university, we talk about advising being one of those reasons that our teaching loads might be different than some of our peers at Keene or at Plymouth. But how do we go about evaluating that or highlighting it? He also worries about how well we are doing to get students to take advantage of advising, especially early in their careers when they are reluctant to talk to anyone. He agreed that we need to do a better job.

John Gibson said that he was a little apprehensive about the reliance on myWildcat Success as a platform for tracking students’ attendance and grades as it is a separate mechanism from the Canvas course software. He is concerned about the additional impact to faculty is from using two systems and wondered if there is information from the pilot program about this. Wayne said that he too worries about the faculty workload piece. We are using myWildcat Success to try and be the easiest touch for faculty. One of the assessments out of the pilot is to learn about the extent of any workload increase. However, faculty are not entering daily attendance and they are not entering a full set of grades into MyWildcatsSuccess. There is work being done to identify ways to flag data in Canvas for the faculty member to see without having to take action. For this pilot, it should be just a single entry for the faculty to flag a student for whatever reason they want using a drop-down menu (i.e., lack of attendance, grades, other personal issues). Hopefully, it will be as minimal as possible so that the faculty member feels that it is part of their regular responsibility and it doesn’t become an extra burden. The reason myWildcat Success was chosen over Canvas was just for ease of implementation.

John Berst asked about the reference to DC in one of the slides. Wayne explained that this refers to Directed Communication – sending out emails.

Kat Karaivanova asked how the touch points in myWildcat Success would work for her since she doesn’t have access to this system. Wayne explained that there are several parts to the system and the one being used in the pilot is available to faculty members who have been selected to be part of the pilot study. It is not being rolled out to all faculty at this time. One of the reasons for the limited scope is that we want to be sure to have the resources to support students in CFAR.

III. Remarks by and questions to the Chair

The chair, Scott Smith, introduced Jordan Coulombe, the Graduate Student Senate representative for the Faculty Senate. Jordan shared information about the upcoming Graduate Research Conference, an event for graduate students who are early in their career as it is a low-stress place to present. Jordan also shared information about the upcoming 3- Minute Thesis event for students working on dissertations or other projects as it helps them to ensure that they can summarize their work effectively and develop their “elevator pitch.” Jordan asked the faculty to encourage their students to register and, if possible, to attend these events themselves.

IV. Approval of the minutes from January 28th, 2019 - It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the January 28, 2019 meeting of the Senate. Corrections were offered in Sections VII and IX. The minutes were unanimously approved with 2 abstentions.

V. Discussion and vote on the RPSC motion on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Special Report - The chair reminded the Senate that this motion was presented at the January 28 meeting. Scott Ollinger and Tom Kelly, the director of the UNH Sustainability Institute offered to take questions about the motion:
DRAFT Faculty Senate Resolution
on the IPCC Special Report

Whereas, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has issued a Special Report on the impacts of global warming and finds that adverse impacts on human and natural systems are already occurring at the current 1°C of warming and that risks will be much more severe and destructive at 2°C than previously projected and beyond the capacity of our societies to adapt, and

Whereas, the IPCC report recommends limiting global warming to 1.5°C and finds that this goal can be achieved if global greenhouse gas emissions are reduced to a target of 45% below 2010 levels over the next twelve years, and to carbon neutrality by 2050, and

Whereas, UNH has become a national leader in climate action and sustainability and has already developed an aggressive Climate Action Plan (WildCAP) that is on track with near term goals and seeks carbon neutrality by 2100.

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

To urge the community of the University of New Hampshire, including faculty, staff, students and university leadership to collectively commit to adopting the IPCC goals of 45% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions from the 2010 baseline, by 2030, and net-zero emissions by 2050 as part of a revised UNH Climate Action Plan.

To urge the University of New Hampshire to develop and implement a plan to meet these goals through continued coordinated actions among students, staff, faculty, administration and community partners and in a manner that ensures that all members of the university community understand the urgency and importance of the issue, and

To urge the University of New Hampshire community to commit to providing its students with an education that prepares them to respond creatively and effectively to the unprecedented challenges outlined in the report, insuring that they have the skills to contribute to solutions in their professional and civic lives.

David Bachrach expressed two concerns in response to the discussion at the previous meeting and in connection with the FAQ that had been distributed by email in the previous week as follows: 1) The vast majority of reductions are due to the methane transport and energy from the Rochester dump. The amount of methane in the dump is finite and will eventually run out and will require the replacement of this methane with energy sources which are not at present available in a way that does not increase the greenhouse gas emissions. 2) Bringing about a net 45% reduction in our greenhouse emissions from 2010 level requires technology that doesn’t yet exist. Therefore, in the absence of the technology necessary for carbon capture, it seems irresponsible to pass a motion along these lines that doesn’t explicitly state that the technology for this doesn’t exist and doesn’t explicitly state that the university community will be required to undertake substantial behavioral changes.
Danielle Pillet-Shore read an email she received from a faculty colleague who also sits on the Durham Energy Committee in support of this motion and she asked for this email to be entered into the record of the meeting:

From: "Lannamann, John" <John.Lannamann@unh.edu>
Subject: Re: Faculty Senate resolution on climate change
Date: February 8, 2019 at 4:54:43 PM EST
To: "Pillet-Shore, Danielle" <Danielle.Pillet-Shore@unh.edu>
Cc: Mary Downes <mary.downes.7@gmail.com>

Hi Danielle,

I serve on the town of Durham’s Energy Committee. At our meeting Tuesday night, I took the liberty to read aloud to the committee the Faculty Senate’s Resolution on Climate Change. The committee voted unanimously to offer our support of the resolution. I realize that the town does not have standing on the Faculty Senate, but I thought that you might enter our statement into the record to show our support and to share our sense that this is an urgent problem.

Here is our statement: "The Town of Durham Energy Committee endorses the University Faculty Senate resolution urging members of the University of New Hampshire community to implement actions toward meeting the goals outlined in the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Special Report. As members of the larger community, we applaud bold action on this front and look forward to exploring ways to collaborate with the University in efforts to achieve a 45% reduction of greenhouse gas emissions by 2030 and net-zero emissions by 2050."

Cheers,

Jack

Ollinger responded to Bachrach’s comments saying that he disagrees that the technology doesn’t exist. He explained that the current climate action plan calls for a 50% reduction by 2020 and 80% reduction by 2050. Taking into account the trajectory that we have been on and extrapolating forward we appear to be set to meet this goal. We would fall a little bit short of 45% below 2010 levels, but not by much. He said that the EcoLine plant has been a major part, but not the only part, of what we have achieved so far. When the first climate action plan was put in place those exact same comments were shared and a number of people said that this is impossible because the technology doesn’t exist, and it is going to require a dramatic change of behavior. But, using the 2001 baseline that was part of that first plan, we have hit 50% reduction because of EcoLine and other sectors.

Ollinger shared that when WildCat 1.0 was put in place he was very skeptical. But here we are with platinum standing nationally in sustainability and a greater reduction in emissions than many people thought was possible. Although it was because of one big project we don’t know what other big projects lie around the corner. For the long-range goal of the university reaching net zero emissions by 2100, we don’t have the technology to do that. But we didn’t pretend to have the technology when we put WildCat 1.0 in place. He said that he doesn’t think there is any problem acknowledging that the technology for a net zero goal doesn’t exist. We do hope it will exist by 2050 and that is what this resolution is really about, about committing to try to get there with whatever new technology develops. By not setting that goal new technology may become available that we would simply ignore because we haven’t set it as a goal.
Ollinger shared that he doesn’t think it won’t be hard to meet the goal of 45% reduction by 2030. There are some things have helped us out unintentionally. We have had a fairly substantial reduction in airline travel emissions and some of that is because of the energy efficiencies in airplanes. Those kind of things are likely to happen between now and 2030 and they will help us out. The 2050 target is more ambitious. This motion is about urging the University to meet the goals.

Jim Connell commented that to meet this goal requires building more efficient buildings and so much of our infrastructure depends on state support that we don’t have. Tom Kelly explained that the planning as of now looking ahead is much less about new buildings and much more about upgrading existing buildings in terms of the footprint of the campus.

David Bachrach proposed a friendly amendment that the motion state that we understand that whatever efforts the university makes will not require substantial changes in behavior by the university community. The chair responded that a friendly amendment is not likely to work, and we would need a formal amendment.

Allison Wilder made the statement, “If not now, when?” She also shared that she can’t think of a more pressing issue than the sustainability of the planet.

Cristy Beemer asked for clarification on Ollinger’s comments. She wondered if this about whether it would be better for us to vote for something unachievable at the moment and fail at it but try than to not pass this at all. She also asked is it detrimental at all to have a goal at the moment that we know we can’t meet.

Ollinger responded that he is not saying that he knows we can’t meet it. The goal isn’t to meet the net zero at the moment – it is by 2050. He suggested that we look at the progress that has been made over the past several decades. If the past is a sign of future progress, we can feel confident that we can meet it. If we don’t try, we will definitely fail and if we do try and fail then we did the best we could. You don’t get there at all and you won’t even get as close to that if you don’t make a commitment. He also explained that the goal is around net zero emissions, not gross emissions. As well, there is an incredible amount of development going on right now about carbon store and sequestration and capture and reuse. Between now and 2050 a whole bunch of things are likely to happen to make it possible.

In response to the concerns raised about behavioral issues, Ollinger said that it will likely require some behavioral changes. In part, it is behavior that got us into this problem in the first place. So, if we don’t think that we are going to change our behaviors then we are basically telling people who are impoverished and living at sea level, “sorry, you lose, and we are not going to change our behavior.” So, some level of behavioral change is expected and will be required. But what we don’t want those changes to result in is any reduction in our standard of living or health or well-being. The goal is not to achieve this at the expense of health, happiness, and well-being. The goal is to have all three met at the same time.

Andrew Coppens pointed out that fundamental uncertainty is a part of all scientific endeavors. For example, oncology research is based on fundamental uncertainty that we are addressing problems and yet, our compass is pointed at problems that we don’t have the technology to address. And on the issue of personal responsibility behavior change, yes, we would like to have everyone eat differently and exercise more but yet, we continue to pursue oncology research. We shouldn’t be put off by the uncertainty here. All of us are engaged in uncertain work every single day. We should look at the urgency of the problem and not what obstacles are in the way.

Lori Hopkins pointed out that although state money is an issue there are ways that wouldn’t cost very much that could help us.
Jo Laird asked for clarification on the last paragraph of the motion about educating students. Ollinger said that, to a large extent, we are already doing this, but it would help to have a more focused look at this to identify if there are deficiencies in what we are doing. This is not intended to say that all students have to take a climate science course. This is a very multi-dimensional problem. There are social issues associated with it as well as scientific issues. He shared that his feeling is that denialism is increasing in breadth. Students are growing up in a world where basic pieces of information that we know are true are denied and that there is a machine out there that is backing that denialism. More than anything we want to produce students that are skilled at critical thinking and can go out in the world and digest information and make sense of it on their own terms as educated people. The goal is not to make planet scientists out of all of our graduates.

Daniel Chavez shared that he thinks that new generations are much more worried about this than we might understand. This effort could be a recruiting tool to invite students to a place that is taking into consideration something has become an urge for them on their own.

Jim Ramsay thanked Ollinger and his team for putting this motion together. Jim explained that he teaches about this subject as a national security issue and if we are going to pretend to be a leading institution that instills the correct role modeling and people that come out of our classes are going out to run the world, this is the least we can do. In connection with the last paragraph of the motion, he shared that he comes from an institution in Wisconsin where environmental literacy is a general education requirement. The institution is a role model and we are dropping the ball as visionary educators if we don’t focus on this.

David Bachrach wondered what danger exists in the university community undertaking a program for which the technology is not yet ready. He explained that in his own state of Minnesota there was a series of efforts to introduce green energy as part of its energy supply, replacing coal plants with wind power. But, when the state suffered some of his coldest weather in 30 years and the wind power failed because there was no wind in ND, SD, Minnesota, the state suffered rolling brownouts where people had no heat in their homes because of the replacement of stable energy sources with unstable energy sources. So, there are in fact, inherent dangers in entrusting ourselves to energy regimes for which the technology is not yet mature. And, it is something to keep in mind when we are asked to change our behavior. We have to ask who is asking us to change our behavior, under what circumstances, and under what level of compulsion.

The discussion ended and the motion was put to a vote: **The motion passed with 61 to 1 with 1 abstention.**

VI. AAC motion on Test-Optional Admissions Appendices – Shelley Mulligan, chair of the Academic Affairs Committee presented the following motion:

**Academic Affairs Committee Motion on Test Optional Admissions**

**Preface:** The Office of Admissions would like to move to a test optional admissions policy that would no longer require UNH undergraduate applicants to submit standardized test scores (e.g., SAT/ACT) as part of their application materials. The primary reason cited for this change is that the Admissions office believes this to be an effective strategy for increasing the quantity and diversity of the applicant pool. Further arguments provided to support this change are that SAT/ACT scores provide little additional predictive information regarding likelihood of students’ first-year success beyond high school GPA. Admission decisions are currently primarily driven by HS transcripts (i.e., grades, course difficulty, etc.), and by placing the high school transcript in context (e.g., by using characteristics of HS, curricula). In addition, research
suggests that standardized testing may include bias that misrepresents the abilities of social and class groups marginalized or underrepresented at UNH or in American society. Thus, requiring SATs/ACTs may be embedding this bias in UNH Admissions Policy.

**Motion:** The Faculty Senate supports the move to a “test optional” admissions policy for undergraduate admissions at UNH, provided that:

- students decide whether to submit standardized scores or not based on which approach the student believes makes the strongest application;
- additional resources to review applications if necessary would be provided to the Admissions Office;
- the review process and criteria for reviewing and evaluating applications for university scholarships be modified appropriately as needed to ensure the process remains equitable and fair;
- individual departments, or Colleges reserve the right to require additional admission criteria to select programs which may include ACT and/or SAT test scores upon consultation with the Admissions Office, to ensure satisfactory admission criteria for such programs;
- the Office of Admissions collects data yearly to monitor and evaluate the impact of the test optional policy on student outcomes, and the quality, quantity and diversity of the applicant pool, and matriculated students, making a report to the Faculty Senate each year for the first three years; and
- the policy undergoes a formal review by the Faculty Senate three years after it is implemented.

Scott Smith pointed out that Rob McGann, Director of Admissions, has weighed in on the 4th bullet point about individual departments having the right to establish additional criteria. Rob was concerned that this would possibly allow departments to go too far afield but Rob does feel comfortable with the “upon consultation” phrase in the paragraph.

Shelley reviewed that applicants have an option on the application form or the Common Application to indicate if they are going to submit test scores or not. She said that another point was a point of contention in this motion is whether departments can opt out altogether. The Office of Admissions would really like Test Optional to be a comprehensive UNH policy, However, there could be a department or program for which the best predictor is an SAT or ACT grade. If a department felt very strongly that they wanted to keep that as criteria they could consult with Admissions. Admissions has agreed that they will entertain those requests.

John Gibson asked what the committee conclusion was on the issue of some high schools moving to a competency-based assessment policy instead of grades. Shelley said that this didn’t come up as something that would be changed. Scott shared that he has talked to Rob McGann specifically about this question. Rob explained that this has presented a few challenges. But, in general, it has not affected the way that Admissions can do a test-optional read of material. They have workarounds for that, but it does take a lot more effort on the part of Admissions to read the material that comes out of these applications. Overall, Admissions does not think this will be a problem. Shelley said that Admissions has convinced the committee that they already use a process that considers all kinds of factors, not just test scores. So, in a ‘test optional’ era they wouldn’t be doing anything unusual as they are already considering all the other kind of materials that are being submitted.

There was a question about whether an application without an SAT score might be interpreted to mean that the applicant has a poor SAT score. Shelley said that Admissions would not be making that assumption at all. Admissions would continue to request that enrolled students voluntarily provide their test scores for data
purposes. Jim Connell expressed concern that this would be a very biased response that would render the data as utterly useless. Shelley agreed that the data would be biased in a number of ways as we wouldn’t have clean data.

The chair closed the discussion and commended the Academic Affairs Committee for their work on the motion, explaining that they have been working on this issue for two years now to get to the point where they feel comfortable presenting this motion of support.

This motion will lay over until the next meeting, at which time the discussion may continue.

VII. Report by Campus Planning Committee on SAARC (Space Allocation Adaptation and Renewal Committee) – Danielle Pillet-Shore presented the Fiscal Year 19- SI Eligible list and SI Approved Funded List. She explained that she is a non-voting faculty representative of SAARC. However, she does have an opportunity to speak at the meetings. SAARC has the responsibility to decide how to allocate funds – varying between $4 and $6 million a year – in response to a very long list of requests for renovation, adaptation, renewal, study, or design for already existing buildings. SAARC does not deal with capital for new projects.

There were four SAARC meetings in the fall and out of these meetings funding was approved for 30 out of 78 items on the SI Eligible list with $6.33 million in funds allocated. This is an increase in funding from the past two years. Items that were not funded will be considered again in the next year.

Danielle encouraged faculty to email her if there are items that they are concerned about. The deans are responsible for prioritizing the requests, but it is useful to have an additional voice.

Elsa Upham asked what percentage of building renovations actually get funded if they make it to the planning stage. For example, the PCAC got $100,000 for planning work this year and she wonders if that is an indication that the renovation is going to happen relatively soon. Danielle answered that she doesn’t have any specific information to prove that. The order of funding is planning first, then design, and then construction. So, the fact that PCAC got funding for planning work is a good sign. In that regard, Danielle expressed appreciation to Bob Eshbach for his presentation to the Campus Planning Committee and other groups on the PCAC issues. Danielle pointed out that there was also funding approved this year for a Johnson Theatre modernization project.

Cristy Beemer asked if ADA compliance requests can be prioritized. She pointed out that some of these requests were not approved this year.

Casey Golomski wondered if it was moral that some delays result in UNH wasting money, citing a ceiling collapse and flood in Huddleston Hall in January that resulted in some computers being destroyed.

Scott Smith asked about the $1 million item for Horton Hall air conditioning and wondered what the oversight is for costs. Chris Reardon also pointed out the high cost of $10,000 for fans for Horton Hall.

VIII. Ed Hinson shared a report from the Transportation Policy Committee (TPC) – Ed explained that he is a member of the Campus Planning Committee and, as a member of that committee he served as the delegated member that committee on the TPC. The TPC is a large group that meets in full about 4 times a year with smaller subgroups meeting more often than that. The committee attempts to get input from as many groups on campus and is generally successful in that.
Ed explained that he had hoped to present the TPC update report on the original 2004 review of the transportation and parking situation on campus. However, the plan is not officially finalized yet. He will ask the Faculty Senate office to distribute it to senators once it is available.

Ed reviewed that in 2003 and 2004 there was lots of angst about parking and the relativity low levels of alternate transportation. The 2004 implementation of the management system called for upgrading the bus systems, both in their frequency to outlying town and locally increasing the number of connectors and other bus links for students in order to alleviate traffic in town. This was success for some time, at least based on the data that the committee has collected. In the meantime, however, there have been some disruptive occurrences that have changed the situation on the ground from the point of view of the TPC. About 4 or 5 years ago, numerous residential buildings were built in Durham, all of a sudden and all at once. As a result, there are approximately 3000 beds in the Durham area now compared to 5 years ago. Some of these are on campus, but approximately 2500 are in the town. This has changed the dynamic of transportation and, therefore, parking, in the area. There has been increased traffic congestion due to the fact that students are no longer distributed in the outlying towns but are here on campus and in Durham and they bring their cars with them, using them for intra-town trips. By the same token, with fewer students in the outlying towns, the Wildcat Transit ridership has gone way down and the original investment in buses and drivers for those buses is seeing less of a return. As a result, the TPC felt that it was high time, in the face of these changes, to return to those management principles to see how they might reorient resources toward trying to meet these new challenges.

Ed explained that the report that will come out is quite extensive, 20 pages, and his comments today are to explain the motivation for the committee to have undertaken a review. In doing the review, the TPC has come up with a few strategies that it feels it needs to address. Here are some relevant items from the list

- Electric vehicle charging stations - This is, by no means, the centerpiece of the strategy at all. It has come up for discussion in the committee and it has attracted enthusiastic support, not only from our own university administration and staff but also from the town of Durham. The current operating station on Pettee Brook Lane is jointly funded and it is anticipated that there is a strong move in that direction given the amount of enthusiasm that was expressed.

- There is one matter that was a disappointment to the committee in 2004 and remains an important part of their strategy this time. Transportation demand management, as a principle, is geared toward using differential pricing in the control of various resources, for both transportation resources and parking resources. One recommendation that will come out is that the university should continue to, through its bargaining units, obtain access to differential parking charges in moving toward a “per use” charge and away from the sort of unlimited parking permit model. The committee simply tries to construct a program that is true to its particular management structure and it leaves the implementation or lack of implementation entirely to the collective bargaining process

- There are other more functional recommendations that are made with respect to making sure that the bus and other transport resources are redeployed in a way that serves the needs of the community. In conjunction with the town, there is a need to manage what it calls vehicle storage for parking where students live. For example, students who have cars on campus have access to certain lots for vehicle storage. In working with the town of Durham the committee wishes to develop policies that will enable the minimization of traffic in the town and on campus.
In response to a question from the chair about whether the faculty have a strong voice on the TPC, Ed said that the faculty have reasonable input with two or three voting faculty members on the committee. There is a very wide set of constituents for this committee, including numerous student representatives and there is a general invitation for all members to give input.

Allison Wilder asked if the report addresses the wild west of parking for faculty, including the dirt lot by the police station, and also the erosion of close-in parking for sold spots. For example, all the spots in front of the field house are now designated for paid parking and more and more spots are being converted to paid parking in front of the Communications Sciences parking lot. Ed shared that the plan does speak to this issue and one of the broader strategies that the report foresees is a movement toward that. Generally speaking, correcting for location, parking availability and the amount of spaces has held pretty steady. In fact, permit parking needs have gone down somewhat. It is also true that pay spots have popped up in various places. The general idea – the plan, such as it is – is to have a robust bus system with remote lots some minutes away but not fractions of hours away. One of the things that has changed over the years is an increase in Durham traffic due to that increase in student beds in town. This has slowed traffic down to such a degree that that leg of the strategy – rapid bus service – is unable to occur.

David Bacharach asked whether the committee has considered the impact of per unit pay on the willingness of faculty to come to campus regularly and how that would affect the provost’s retention efforts in the area of increasing faculty connection with students. He also asked whether under a per-use plan the number of hours that faculty could stay in a specific spot would be extended beyond the current 4-hour maximum limit. Ed said that there has not been a tight connection between the specific strategy of interaction and parking, as such. He also shared that he doesn’t believe that a parking permit model will be eliminated in the near future. However, one of the things that the report does point out is the development of electronic or digital strategies, similar to transponders for tolls, that allow for parking management. As to the parking limit, that has not been addressed this year, since this fall. The committee does not wish to keep faculty from doing what they want to do. Rather they see the per-use lots as an ability for faculty and others who are only going to be here a short time to be able to have convenient access.

The chair thanked Ed for his report and encouraged senators to submit their ideas to Ed and other TPC representatives so that they can represent our voices with a big a mandate as possible.

IX. Agenda Committee motion on the Amorous Relationship Policy - The chair advised that most of the conversation on this motion will be postponed until the next meeting. Jim Connell explained that this is a relatively complicated motion and it is not intended to propose fixes for the policy. We don’t want to jump in and provide a solution which would, in some sense, violate shared governance with the students, and with the other employee governance groups. Instead, this motion is intended to urge the return to where we were so that a good process can go forward to produce a policy that is better than the one that was imposed by the Board of Trustees.

Resolution on the USNH Amorous Relationship Policy

Rationale

The Faculty Senate recognizes the importance of UNH having a strong amorous relationship policy. The entire UNH community will benefit from a well-developed, clear policy that supports the highest ethical and professional standards, academic fairness, and a campus community free from sexual misconduct.
A university is “a community of scholars,” scholars being faculty as well as students. Indeed, all faculty should be, as scholars, students; and, for many students, teaching is a significant part of their learning process. It is also far more than a workplace, and to treat it as such, demeans it. This is particularly true for traditional undergraduate students, for whom the “university experience” is their first move into independent adulthood, albeit in a transitional sense. Yet, the undergraduate populations of universities such as UNH extend far beyond traditional undergraduate students, with non-traditional students who may be only a few years older than traditional undergraduates, as well as students who have retired after successful careers and now seek to start or complete an undergraduate degree they never found time for, and veterans who are making their own transition to civilian life. As any faculty member knows, these students add richness to the undergraduate experience.

Any policy must accommodate the vast and rich diversity of students, staff and faculty at a university. Shared governance is crucial to these many voices being heard and recognized.

Resolution on the USNH Amorous Relationship Policy

In response to the imposition of the new Amorous Relationship Policy, which did not involve shared governance, the Faculty Senate of the University of New Hampshire resolves that any amorous relationship policy for UNH must:

I. Support, and not undermine, the academic mission of UNH:

1. Any coercive or exploitive relationship, amorous or otherwise, particularly under color of university authority, undermines the academic mission;

2. Relationships in which there is, or is perceived to be, an unequal power balance do not necessarily fall under 1), but must be monitored and managed to avoid such a case;

3. This said, any policy that unnecessarily or unfairly discourages, disadvantages or disincentivizes participation in academic opportunities (e.g. peer teaching, internships, service or volunteer opportunities) by putting onerous restrictions on participants as is the case with the present policy (i.e., prohibiting undergraduate from amorous relationships with all other undergraduates), profoundly undermines the academic mission (see also Student Senate motion R40.06);

II. Be fair, clear and equitable both in intent and application:

1. The new policy is confusing and subject to widely varying interpretation;

2. Further to the above, an effort is underway to develop an UNH “implementation plan” that, it appears, will modify the policy, despite the policy being, presumably, the governing document, further exacerbating confusion;

3. Any policy so subject to such varied interpretations, even supposedly official interpretations, is ripe for abuse, and therefore inherently unfair;

4. The policy places sole (for each campus) responsibility for its application in the hands of one administrator and is also ripe for abuse, real or perceived;
5. Any policy that is unclear, ripe for abuse and lacking in due process can only have questionable legitimacy;

6. Statements and justifications by representatives of the administration that the policy is in response to “the current climate” profoundly undermine fairness and equity, and even more so, the academic mission, as the basis for the policy;

III. Be adopted under the norms of shared governance and input from, and consideration of, all stakeholders:

1. The policy was developed and adopted with no considerations of shared governance with the UNH Faculty Senate, Undergraduate Student Senate, or Graduate Student Senate, PAT or OS Councils, nor, so far as the UNH Faculty Senate leadership has been able to determine, with similar bodies on any other USNH campus;

2. The policy was developed and adopted with no input from UNH staff, non-traditional students (including veterans) or others, and, so far as the UNH Faculty Senate leadership has been able to determine, the same applies to other USNH campuses;

3. Had the policy been developed within the norms of shared governance and with broad participation, the many serious issues with the new policy would have become apparent and been addressed;

IV. The new policy must improve upon the preceding policy:

1. The UNH faculty Senate believes the previous policy needed to be strengthened, but was serviceable pending adoption of an improved policy;

2. Given the specific issues above, the UNH Faculty Senate considers the new policy, far from being an improvement, is inferior to the previous policy;

V. The UNH Faculty Senate therefore finds the new policy unacceptable:

1. The UNH Faculty Senate calls for the previous policy to be reinstated immediately, at least on the UNH campus;

2. The UNH Faculty Senate calls for a plan, one that respects the principles of shared governance and meaningfully involving by all stakeholders in the process, to developed a truly improved, widely respected and accepted, Amorous Relationship Policy.

Jim suggested that senators email him or Scott Smith before the next meeting so that we don’t have to spend the meeting time word crafting the motion on the floor. Jim also suggested that senators discuss this with their departments.
Buzz Scherr asked whether the policy applies to graduate students. Jim explained that, as he reads it, it does apply to graduate students if they are working as research assistants or teaching assistants as they would be treated as staff in connection with dating undergraduate students and the policy states that faculty and staff cannot be involved with an undergraduate. As between faculty and graduate students, it would be an issue if it were your graduate student or if they were in a class you were teaching.

David Finkelhor expressed concern about the length of the motion and wondered if it is going to be unnecessarily complicated because of the length. Jim explained that the motion has already been boiled down from where it was, but the Agenda Committee will take the concern under advisement. The focus is that concerns about the policy be communicated to the BOT in no uncertain terms.

This motion will lay over until the next meeting, at which time the discussion may continue

X. Discovery Committee motion to lift the moratorium on online Inquiry courses - Nicky Gullace explained that this is a continuation of the discussion from two weeks ago when she presented the following motion on behalf of the Discovery Committee:

To remove the 3/18/2013 moratorium (Motion XVII-M12) prohibiting Inquiry 444 and Inquiry Attribute courses from being delivered in an online format, with the exclusion of Inquiry Labs, which must be offered in a classroom format pending further investigation of best practices for delivering Inquiry labs online.”

In response to the friendly amendment proposed at the last meeting, the Discovery Committee is agreeable to limiting this motion to Inquiry Attribute courses only. The amendment was offered as a way to preserve that signature seminar of the Discovery program while still allowing our colleagues to move forward.

Nicky reminded the Senate that the reason for this motion is to allow UNH Manchester to launch a completely online cybersecurity degree and we think this is desirable. They look at it as a protentional avenue out of their financial straits. As well, cybersecurity is an extremely desirable major these days and, to be able to offer this degree internationally seems to be a good strategic move. Although there were concerns expressed at the last meeting about writing and grading and whether it would be too much work for the faculty involved, she believes that the colleagues at UNH Manchester proposed this with an understanding of how much work it would be and with a willingness to do that in order to embark on this very exciting new program.

Sterling Tomellini said that he had two concerns. The first issue is that this motion is so wide open that once you approve it there are no restrictions on it. Given the concerns expressed about the amount of work involved in teaching this kind of course online, he suggests that there be a restriction added that the only people who teach this course are those that volunteer.

Sterling’s second concern is about the statement made in the attachment 10.2, a report that was submitted with the motion, requiring any faculty teaching an online inquiry course to work with Academic Technology (AT). He asked if voting for the motion results in an endorsement of this statement. Since the statement says that the faculty member must do something, he is concerned about the academic freedom issues there. It is not encouraging somebody to do something; it is telling one of our faculty members that they must do something. He said that, to him, that shouldn’t be there, and the Senate shouldn’t be endorsing that.

Nicky responded that the motion is not open-ended. It restricts from offering online 444 and online inquiry labs. The motion will only apply to Inquiry Attribute courses. She explained that as UNH has moved to offer J-term and summer online courses many of our faculty have become of well versed in the pedagogy of online
teaching. So, it is not the brave new world that we once thought it was. We had a faculty member last week talking about ways to create community online. We do trust them to do that. The fact is, however, that any change in mode for any Discovery course, in particular for Inquiry, comes back to the Discovery committee for approval. So, the Discovery committee itself could be regarded, as has been debated, as a violation of academic freedom. We are a committee of the Faculty Senate and we are empowered by the Faculty Senate and all voting members of the committee are faculty. Currently, when faculty put forth a course it can be rejected by the Discovery Committee if the committee doesn’t believe the course meets the standard of Discovery. The idea that the person proposing this course would have to talk to AT is simply because any authorization for a course to be changed from a face to face mode to an online mode requires that we know that the faculty member has the technical expertise and understands how to launch an online course. This is to ensure against a problem we have had in the past with colleagues who didn’t understand the principles in teaching an online course. Once that course is approved for online that faculty member doesn’t have to come back and keep getting it approved. It is a one-off working with AT to set up the course in compliance with best practices.

Sterling asked about cases where a course is approved and then a different faculty member is scheduled to teach that course. Nicky said that she would need to review her notes, but she believes that a change in instructor doesn’t require continual AT review unless the faculty member wanted to get support.

In response to a question from Cristy Beemer, there was a discussion about intellectual property rights for online courses. Nicky had understood that the university owns these rights. Further, in regard to online Inquiry courses, she doesn’t think anybody is going to be forced to do an online course.

Scott suggested that the question about intellectual property rights for online courses is tangentially related to the discussion on the motion and that we should ask the IT Committee to look into whether or not the rights for online courses or canvas modules can be transferred.

Nicky pointed out that whenever the issue of online teaching and pedagogy comes up all of the pitfalls and fears surrounding it surface. However, although she doesn’t blame anyone for their concerns, the university is now heavily invested in online teaching. In some ways, the boat has left the harbor. It is a valuable thing to discuss but it won’t stop that we are already invested in online teaching.

Harriet Fertik said that she was persuaded about the argument as to the advantages to UNH Manchester and that removing the 444 courses does help. However, she is concerned that having this on the table may create pressures for other departments and programs not to offer high touch courses in person as they may be perceived to be less efficient in this format. There may be a move to encourage online courses as a less time-consuming option that would involve retraining people without giving them the resources and time to do that. So, while there might be opportunities but there might be an adverse incentive. Nicky responded that she would be surprised if there was a retraction from high touch teaching, particularly for the 444 courses, because the faculty value the high touch teaching in the classroom environment, and students and parents do too. The reasons parents choose to send their kids to UNH and not to Phoenix University is basically because they want their students in a residential environment with a physical space. However, there are possibilities for programs like this completely online cybersecurity program that aims at an international clientele. Nicky said that this is not going to destroy the face to face university because we have offered online already. In fact, there is competition to teach online courses.

Jim Ramsay said that he wanted to speak in favor of the motion because he thinks there are lots of reasons why we can conceive of teaching an inquiry course online and looking at the four features of inquiry courses, these can be eminently accomplished online in this day and age. He shared that the University of
Pennsylvania, a pretty good university, has entirely online art and science bachelor’s degree now. So, as we look at margins and population demographics and financial issues, we are excited about the ability to bring our brand to audiences that are not able to move to southern NH. He said that agreeing to this motion doesn’t compel programs or departments one way or the other in how they offer Discovery courses. He strongly encouraged the faculty to support the ability to at least produce this kind of concept if one were so inclined.

Buzz Scheer had the final comment. He said that it is a huge mistake to refer to residential courses as high touch courses in comparison to online courses. He shared that in every online course he has taught the student evaluations include complaints that there was so much work and students can’t hide from the professor. Nicky responded that the language about “high touch” is taken from the original motion that banned online inquiry course.

Because of time, this motion will lay over until the next meeting, at which time the discussion may continue.

XI. New Business - There was no new business.

X. Adjournment - Upon a motion and second to adjourn, the meeting was adjourned at 5:05 pm.

SEE NEXT PAGE FOR APPENDIX
Student Success
Increasing Retention

Wayne Jones, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
February 11, 2019

A View of UNH Retention 2010-2017
Four working groups
57 faculty, staff and students

• Early assessment and engagement
• First year programming
• Personal and financial causes
• Sophomore year as a pivot point

Early assessment and engagement

• Led by Associate Dean Brett Gibson, COLA
• Academic focus, but will funnel students to appropriate resources
• Goals:
  – Shift culture for faculty to consider earlier assessment
  – Build structures to assist in early identification/support of students at risk
    • ASAC pilot spring 2019
  – Implement 4-week assessment for early intervention (currently 8 weeks)
• Timeline
  – Pilot myWildcatSuccess campaign (spring 2018)
    • Anticipate reaching over 350 students
  – Evaluate and reach out to faculty to broaden participation (late spring for fall 2019)
## Student Feedback

**Your information is secure.** By submitting your responses, you choose to allow government rules and regulations concerning FERPA and other student privacy.

Thank you.

---

### Professor Notes:
You have been asked to fill out progress reports for students in the following classes. Update each student based on your best knowledge of their performance at this point in the term.

### Progress report initiated in mWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Name</th>
<th>Student ID</th>
<th>Semester Progress?</th>
<th>Course/Assignment</th>
<th>Alert Reason(s)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elle Smith</td>
<td>12345678</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>L1302</td>
<td>Incomplete Assignments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Johnson</td>
<td>87654321</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>L1302</td>
<td>Alert Reason(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Davis</td>
<td>78901234</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>L1302</td>
<td>Alert Reason(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Submit only marked students [but not removed] by clicking the button.**

This button will submit students you have marked as being complete (effectively removing them from your list of students). However, the students you have not marked will remain on your list. As a result, you can re-use the link in the progress report email, at any time, to continue marking the rest of the students in your dataset. Repeat this process until all students have been marked in some form or fashion.

**Submit unmarked students as not defined.**

This button will submit the students you have marked as not being defined (students you might consider to be at risk, but not enough information is available to categorize them). You can mark the same students again as not being defined, or mark them in a separate category, or mark them in your own way. You can also mark students as not being defined, but you might want to consider marking them as being complete instead.

---

**Coordinator contacts student**

**Advisor contacts student**

**Referral/appointment made**

**Case closed/faculty notified**

Follow-up needed?

No further action

---

University of New Hampshire
First year programming

• Led by Associate Dean Neil Niman, PCBE
• Focus on “connectedness” of first years to each other, faculty, and UNH, especially during first 6 weeks
• Strategic and implementation plan to be complete by end of year, including current action items for incoming class of 2020

In process for class of 2020

• Expand LinkedUp mobile app for entire campus
• Transform Wildcat Days, first weekend on campus
• Pilot early arrival program for students who aren’t part of an existing early arrival program
• Create alternative major pathway plan so students not accepted to their first major can find a home at UNH
• Ease transition for students with health-related issues
• Make lower-cost course materials available on the first day
• Target Sophomore Summit
Longer term initiatives

- Develop strategies for establishing deeper connections between students and faculty
- Identify strategic times during the first year for students to “reboot” and find their place
- Work with student orgs to hold “welcome new members week” late in the semester
- Create traditions and rituals to inspire loyalty and affinity to the institution

Personal and financial causes

- Led by Dean Mike Ferrara, CHHS
- Biggest challenge is lack of good data distinguishing personal and financial reasons for leaving
- Created four sub-groups
  – Revise leave/withdrawal form to capture better data
  – Continue data review
  – Formalize a return process to increase retention of students on leave
  – Increase financial literacy
- Piloted use of Call Center for J-term/Spring 2019 enrollment
Proposed new undergraduate exit form

Personal and Financial Retention Workgroup: Withdrawal Data (5 years)

The data were confounded because the 2 most common reasons (excluding transfer) for withdrawal are “personal” and “financial” that could not be distinguished/parated on the old form.

Proportional comparisons of “personal” and “financial” combined were used to evaluate groups, for example:

- the withdrawal rates of residents and non-residents were compared to their proportions in the population.

HIGHLIGHTS:

- 70% of withdrawals = frosh & sophs; return rate = 22%; GPA was not important (50% had GPA >2.5)

- Withdrawal rates were proportional to the population in the following categories:
  Residency, first generation, first choice of major

- Withdrawal was proportional to college enrollment (± 2% except COLSA 4%) if omitting COLA undeclared

- COLA undeclared = 51% of COLA first years/sophs & 43% of COLA and 20% of university withdrawals.
Increase financial literacy

Current status:

• A collection of financial literacy offerings spread across Durham and Manchester campuses including credit courses, annual events, and programs.
• Offerings are independent of each other and lack campus-wide outcomes coordination or branding.

Recommendations:

• Develop a center for financial growth and development that will coordinate financial literacy offerings.
  – Present to university community
  – Start a task force on student financial growth and development
  – Include dedicated physical space
  – Hire students (proposed peer-to-peer program model)
  – Develop and track metrics to determine program efficacy

Sophomore year retention

• Led by Associate Dean Reginald Wilburn, COLA
• Surveying sophomores via DC and tabling.
  Preliminary results with 10% response:
  – Most sophomores feel supported and satisfied
  – Top reasons to leave or stay are cost, academic performance and sense of community
  – Top interests for programming are career exploration, internship exploration and selecting a major
Sophomore appreciation day

• Create a unifying sophomore year experience across UNH as an annual signature event
• Hold smaller events throughout the year to maintain momentum
• Design a tee-up event at the end of the first year to create anticipation