UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE  
2018-19 FACULTY SENATE XXIII

Meeting called to order at 3:13 p.m. on February 25, 2019  MINUTES SUMMARY

I. Roll - The following senators were absent: Ballestero, Beemer, Caron, Gass, Greenberg, Hemstock, Innis, Knezevic, Ollinger, Onosko, Simos, Whistler. The following senators were excused: Coppens, Finkelhor, Knowles, Pillet-Shore. The following guests attended: Amy Oliva and Rob McGann.

II. Remarks by and questions to the provost - The provost was not able to attend due to travel commitments. Senior Vice Provost P.T. Vasudevan was scheduled to attend but had to cancel.

III. Remarks by and questions to the chair – The chair, Scott Smith, expressed thanks to the senators who were able to attend the recent Diversity and Inclusion Training organized by the office of Community, Equity and Diversity. Scott shared that he would like to share feedback about the training with Monica Chiu, the interim head of Community, Equity, and Diversity, and encouraged senators to send him their comments about the training.

IV. Approval of the minutes from February 11, 2019 - It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the February 11, 2019 meeting of the Senate. Corrections were offered in Sections V, VI, VII, and X. The minutes were unanimously approved with no abstentions.

V. Discussion and vote on Discovery Committee motion to lift the moratorium on online Inquiry courses - The chair shared the latest version of the motion which reflects feedback from discussions at the January 28 and February 11 Senate meetings:

**Discovery Committee Motion**

To remove the 2013 moratorium prohibiting Inquiry Attribute courses from being delivered in an online format, with the exclusion of Inquiry 444 seminars and Inquiry Labs, which must be offered in a classroom format pending further investigation of best practices.

Nicky Gullace was not able to attend this meeting. However, Amy Oliva, Administrative Director of the Discovery Office, was available to answer any technical questions that came up.

Erin Sharp shared that she is uncomfortable with the idea that we, as a body, would think that classes can’t be delivered high quality online. However, she pointed out that the Senate does have a role in making sure that the appropriate systems are in place to guarantee quality without taking away the opportunity for faculty to teach online inquiry in an approved quality way.
David Bachrach pointed out that if the Senate does not support this motion we affect UNH Manchester’s ability to run their online degree program and this will be a considerable burden to them.

Jim Ramsay from UNH Manchester spoke in favor of the motion and reminded the Senate of the Inquiry characteristics found on the Discovery Program website: 1. Inspire curiosity 2. Develop understanding and perspective-taking 3. Clarify standards of thinking and 4. Create effective communicators. Jim said that he believes these are all eminently doable in an online format and that concerns about not being able to achieve these goals are an artificial holdover from times bygone. The idea of developing our brand and bringing our brand to markets is critical in this time and age and there are good examples of things that we can follow and emulate. He pointed out that we have competition including the University of Pennsylvania which now has some completely online degrees in the liberal arts. Jim encouraged senators to vote in favor of this motion saying that he sees no intellectual or professional reason to have this moratorium in place and, for those who are developing online degrees, this is an important step.

Scott explained that, although he wishes to remain neutral, it was important for him to share that he had a conversation the previous week with the Dean’s Council during which he articulated the idea that instead of having artificial blocks on online degrees we should have a strategic idea where faculty and central administration come together to have some kind of ideal of where we want to be in terms of online education. The Dean’s Council indicated that they were very willing to have these conversations. The central administration recognizes the role of faculty in particular in being the drivers of these programs and not any kind of outside forces.

The discussion ended and the motion was put to a vote. The Motion passed with 53 in favor, none opposed, and 1 abstention.

VI. Discussion and vote on the Amorous Relationship Policy Motion - Jim Connell gave a brief overview of the motion that was originally presented at the February 11 meeting and explained that some small changes were made in the motion in response to feedback from some senators. Text was also added to section V to highlight that the previous policy was a legitimate product of shared governance among all UNH stakeholders.

Jim shared that the Agenda Committee did take to heart David Finkelhor’s comment from the last meeting about the length of the motion. While the Agenda Committee also wishes that the motion could be shorter, the difficulty is that the document is aimed at the Board of Trustees (BOT). Normally if there are any questions about a motion that has been passed, the provost can ask the Agenda Committee for clarification. However, we don’t have that line of communication with the BOT. As well, it isn’t clear that we are going to get a second chance at this. So, we want to cover all of the manifold concerns that have been expressed by different senators and do it in a way that is clearly organized around our shared principles.

Scott reported that he had a conversation with Provost Jones about this motion and the provost reported that Administrative committee of the BOT, as well as the Title IX officers, have been taking to heart the criticism that has already been provided by the Faculty Senate, the Student Senate, and the Graduate Student Senate. The provost is confident that they will be coming back with some kind of response in late March. Scott said that he thinks this motion adds weight to the concerns that have been previously shared.
A suggestion was made to clarify the third sentence of the second paragraph of the rationale. It was agreed to add the word “only” so that the sentence reads “It is also far more than a workplace, and to treat it only as such, demeans it.”

The final motion, including the friendly amendment, appears as follows:

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 only 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.

Motion

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 involved in such activities 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 a 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, which was a legitimate product of shared governance among all UNH stakeholders, 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 develop a truly improved, widely respected and accepted, Amorous Relationship Policy.

The final motion, including the friendly amendment, was presented and put for a vote. The motion passed with 51 in favor, none opposed, and 4 abstentions.

VII. Discussion and vote on the Academic Affairs Committee Motion on Test Optional Admissions - Shelley Mulligan reviewed the motion that was previously presented at the February 11 Senate meeting. Rob McGann, Interim VP for Enrollment Management was also present to help answer questions.

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.

Shelley pointed out that the provision about “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.” She explained that the goal is for test optional to be a university-wide policy. However, the reality is that there are departments and programs, for example in the performing arts and other areas, where there are other criteria that will continue to be used.

Should this motion pass, the plan is for test optional applications to be accepted beginning in the Fall of 2020.

In response to a question about how grants, fellowships, and merit scholarships would be determined in a test optional admissions environment, Rob McGann explained that if the motion passes, he will be working with Admissions staff and partners across campus to come up with other criteria to measure relative competitiveness for these programs. This would include things such as taking a much more granular view of student transcripts, within the context of information about their high school, to identify if they have taken the most competitive courses possible. Rob said that these are issues that other institutions have confronted when they have gone this route. So, there are resources out there that we can turn to get assistance.

Maryann Clark expressed two concerns. In the background material provided on this motion, there is a statement under 4b that says that non-submitters, upon entering college, had a first-year GPA and a cumulative GPA that were comparable lower. Maryann’s second point was that the preface to the motion includes the statement “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.” Maryann pointed out that the backup documentation - in two different places - says that there is no bias at UNH. So, it is confusing that there are statements saying that we have no bias, but we have a motion that reflects that we have bias.

Rob explained that if we were to use SAT scores at face value, and not question the context in which the student earned the scores, we would be introducing bias into the admissions process. But, because we do question the context in which the student had taken the standardized testing and we have practices in place to try to control for the external bias which may be introduced by standardized testing in our country and our culture, UNH has been taking a somewhat responsible position of trying to manage that risk.

There was further discussion about the inconsistency between the language in the motion and the backup material provided. Maryann pointed out that the material says that “since UNH does not use a formulaic approach to admission the probability of bias built into the decision-making process due to score differential realized by various populations is reduced” and “there is little to no bias in the admissions process as it is currently structured.”

Rob responded that, based on the information shared, there is some bias built into the testing environment and being responsible in our approach to how we review applications requires that we acknowledge that potential exists for that bias. It may not apply to every individual. It is a product of circumstances that are reflected in a student’s family, community, upbringing, and opportunities. There is sufficient evidence that would suggest that institutions should be mindful of that and take into account the process. For example, if we are confronted with a student who is applying to UNH and presents strong grades but low scores, some of the routine questions that we ask are “what can explain these lower scores?” For example, did the student take the SAT only once? There is a relationship between the scores and the number of times you take the test. There is also a relationship between the number of times you take the test and the family background and family income, and we try to understand that kinds of thing to understand if some kind of external inputs on the process has created a bias or differential result that requires further explanation.

Connell summarized Rob’s remarks saying that if an applicant’s scores appear to be biased, we examine further to try to correct for it and this explains why we don’t think we have bias in our UNH admissions process.

Erin Sharp said that we do know that the SAT and ACT cost money and that there are people who are not applying to universities because of them. There are other reasons why requiring a standardized test in the admissions process can cause bias beyond how UNH looks at applications. Erin said that she is excited by this motion and that UNH is taking this step. She also thanked the AAC for the research and data that has been provided.

Briggs Bailey spoke in favor of the motion. She pointed to evidence from other institutions that have put it into effect, particularly in connection with the applicant pool. With a testing requirement in place, applicants that perceive that they need a high SAT score don’t apply and they don’t take seriously UNH’s stated claim that other things will be considered. It is clear that other universities that have implemented test optional admission have experienced an upswing in the applicant pool and there are some excellent students in that pool who would have self-selected out of the process with an SAT requirement.
Chris Reardon said that he feels positive about the proposal since he has always had questions about the SAT and the ability for students in private schools and others to get training on how to take the exam. However, he asked whether, if you make testing optional, applicants with good SAT scores are going to report them and those with lower scores or those that can’t afford to take the SAT won’t. He wondered how the Admissions Office would handle this issue. Will there be two separate piles, one for applications with SAT scores and one for applications without scores? Rob answered that that the way other institutions have handled this is that they have a slightly modified approach on how they handle the application review. At UNH the single most significant driver in the admissions decision is the high school transcript. A very distant third or fourth on the list of priorities is standardized testing and he can’t think of an instance where a student has been admitted because of their testing or denied because of testing. Usually, the grades drive that decision.

Rob shared that in talking to other schools that have implemented test optional admissions, 80% of the applicants are still going to submit test scores, and these run the gamut of socioeconomic and academic backgrounds as well. So, UNH will continue to employ the same criteria that we use currently for that population of students who will not be submitting standardized tests. In many ways, it will be the same process because grades and course selection drive everything in the admissions process and standardized testing has very limited input in the process. We will, however, have to spend some time in our planning and preparation for this process looking at the admissions process for some very competitive programs where demand is exceptionally high and standardized testing in the past has been used as a screening mechanism once we get past a certain academic point. To that end, we will be revising the review process to take a more granular approach to what we will do with those applications to look at course selection within the possibilities in that student’s high school and place a greater emphasis on recommendations as we consider applicants for these more competitive programs. When we look at recommendations now they are generally very complimentary and reflect the overall academic achievement of the student through the high school. But, in Nursing, for example, or for scholarship programs like the Hamel Scholar program, we currently emphasize recommendations to a great extent for those programs.

Rob also pointed out that we will need to make sure that in our communication and messaging to school counselors, students, and parents it is clear that there is no benefit or preference given to students who submit or don’t submit standardized testing. We will have to be clear about and repeat that message over time to ensure that people understand and absorb it. Our behaviors in how we review applications will have to reinforce that as well.

Buzz Scherr said that he appreciates what people said about this improving access for marginalized populations to UNH or, at least, increasing the pool of applicants. With an expectation of receiving more applications, Buzz wondered if there is a commitment from the administration that this is going to take more resources because it is going to require a more granular look. Rob answered that he doesn’t think we are going to need more resources because of how we are already structured. UNH Admissions uses a territory management model that requires that a single staff member serves as the first point of review for applications by territory. By extension, this staff member understands those high schools and nuances of those high schools in the territory and is responsible for understanding the demographic composition of those schools and the curricular opportunities and the patterns of experience that we have had with those institutions. So, in that regard, it is not expected that we will require any additional resources. The part
that will potentially take more time is what we talked about earlier in connection with developing a
different approach for considering students for honors programs, merit scholarships, the Hamel program,
etc. That will take more time, but it will not be a quantum leap because of this prior understanding of the
culture of the high schools and the opportunities that are available. Rob shared that they will address
resource needs when they come to it. But he is not anticipating an increase of resources right now.

Maryann Clark said that, in response to comments made about the costs associated with taking the SATs,
the NH Department of Education has made the SAT the required standardized test used for 11th graders
and it is given to students at no charge. Rob responded that, while it is free in NH, this is for the first
testing only, not the second, and it is recommended that students take the SAT twice, once in the spring of
junior year and once in the fall of senior year in connection with both practice and maturation. The other
point is that 75% of UNH applicants come from outside of NH.

Lori Hopkins asked about students that have difficulty in high school but are really good test takers. Rob
said that this is a question the presents dilemmas to admissions officers across the country. The data does
show that grades earned in high school over 4 years bear a greater relationship to how well a student will
do in college, more so than does standardized testing. That being said standardized testing does have a
predictive relationship, but the grades have more of a predictive relationship that we want to reward and
emphasize. When an application with high scores and low grades occurs, it often gets presented to us in
some atypical circumstances where students or parents are asking questions. Often this results in no
change to the decision. But sometimes there is a change to the decision based on information provided by
the school counselor that is useful to know.

In response to a question about how UNH would deal with applicants from a high school that does not
provide grades, Rob explained that there are a few schools out there that truly have no grades, only
competency-based evaluations. These evaluations are very useful in helping us make an informed
decision about what the student’s skill set is. But, a small minority of schools only have a narrative
description of what the kid has accomplished. These are tough to review. They require a lot of time and
conversations with counselors to interpret what is being shared. We don’t have a lot of reference points at
this time about how those students are doing at UNH. In connection with home-schooled students,
standardized testing can be helpful as it provides a 3rd party validation about what is happening in a
student’s academic career. Typically homeschool students tend to do pretty well here at UNH because of
the kind of learning environment they have had. They tend to have independence and self-discipline to be
successful.

A final question was asked about the internal data on the relationship 1) between high school GPA and
student success, however that is measured and 2) between SAT scores and student success. Rob answered
that validity studies are conducted every couple of years, and we are now updating our regression
analyses on the relationship between high school GPA, class rank, standardized testing score and the
relationship between those factors and first-year GPA. Over the years, it has been shown that high school
GPA is the most predictive value of what a student’s first year GPA will be at UNH. Standardized testing
certainly has predictive value, but not as much as the first year GPA. Not requiring standardized testing
doesn’t detract from our ability to be confident in our admissions decisions based on the information we
are seeing. Rob offered to share this data.
Scott pointed out that we have some important structures built into this motion, including a yearly report and a 3-year review.

The discussion ended and the motion was put to a vote. The motion passed with 54 voting in favor, 4 opposed, and 1 abstention.

VIII. Discuss and vote on Discovery Motion Procedural vote to create the Discovery Review Committee:

Scott announced that as the Agenda Committee and the Discovery office were getting ready for this review, we realized that there is no mandate to be found that the program has to be reviewed every 5 years. Instead, the requirement was that it be reviewed after the initial 5 years. However, the Agenda Committee voted for the Discovery Office’s recommendation to proceed with a 5-year review. We will be working toward codifying language for a regular 5-year review as we move forward. It is a good idea and timely to do this review given that President Dean named the core curriculum as one of the central strategic priorities.

Scott presented the motion and a correction was made so that the final motion was presented for a vote as follows:

**Rationale**

The implementation of the Discovery Program was endorsed by the Faculty Senate in the spring of 2009. A review of the program was conducted in 2015. Although another 5-year review is not required, the Discovery Committee and the Faculty Senate Agenda Committee feel that a review is warranted as we approach the 5-year anniversary of the last review.

**Motion**

The Faculty Senate endorses a review of the Discovery Program. The Faculty Senate will form an ad hoc review committee which will have faculty representatives from each college. The committee membership will include at least one faculty senator and at least one faculty member of the Discovery Program Committee. The Faculty Senate will invite the Director of the Discovery Program and selected non-faculty members to serve on the committee. The Agenda Committee will establish the goals of the ad hoc committee.

The student senate representative, Jake Adams, asked if the “non-faculty members” in the motion would include students. Scott responded that this will be an all-encompassing group that will include students as well as administrators and ASAC.

There was also a question about whether the language of the motion should include that it is a 5-year review. Scott suggested that we would deal with a requirement for a regular 5-year review as a separate motion in the future.
The discussion ended and a motion was put to a vote. **The motion passed with 60 voting in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions.**

**IX. AAC presentation of Concurrent Credit motion** - Shelley Mulligan, chair of the Academic Affairs Committee, gave a brief overview of the motion, explaining that some local high schools would like to be able to offer UNH courses with UNH credit. The reality is that other universities and colleges are already doing it. UNH is interested in doing this as a recruiting initiative. If students are receiving UNH credit, they are more likely to come to UNH. In schools with similar programs, including Great Bay Community College and SNHU, there is some evidence that students tend to go to those schools.

This proposal was initiated by UNH Manchester and the proposal recommends establishing a pilot program to provide early college credit in a limited set of courses that provide entry into UNHM in the Computing and Communication Arts Program and in CEPS programs for Computer Science. If it is successful in recruiting students and providing the academic quality, the program might expand to other high schools. There are other faculty at UNH who already have partnerships with a number of high schools. Pinkerton Academy is right now ready to go, and they want to begin a program there. If it goes well, then it could be expanded after that.

Shelley explained that a recurring concern is whether the quality and rigor of the courses being taught are going to meet UNH standards and we want to make sure this happens. The courses will only be open those students who meet the criteria outlined in the proposal. The proposal identifies that the participation of UNH faculty in this program is voluntary. This voluntary aspect was a concern when the committee talked to the Computer Science department and the chairs involved. There is a question about how this work factors into the teaching load for the UNH faculty member. It appears that it doesn’t factor in at all. This work is gratis.

In summary, the focus is on how to provide support to the high school teachers involved to ensure that the content is being delivered in a way that meets UNH standards. The tradeoff, in terms of effort, is that students in these courses are more likely to apply and come to UNH.

The following questions were raised:

**Kat Karaivanova (Psychology):** Can the UNH credit that they receive for these courses be transferred to a different university?

**Shelley:** That would be up to the university that is being asked to accept them, in a similar way to UNH being asked to accept credits transferred from another college.

**Elsa Upham (ESL and French):** I want to speak from experience. At the beginning of my career, I was teaching French at Newport High School which was one of the 26 best High Schools in the nation. We did have this program and I was teaching classes that were giving the students credit at the University of Washington and other places. I am mentioning this for anyone worried that the quality of the teaching will not be as good as if the students were actually here. The process that I went through was extremely complicated and long and serious. In addition to providing our CVs, we had to provide written curricula, lesson excerpts, and there were visits by university staff. I’m not sure if that will be happen here. It is a
lot of work up front to get a teacher accredited or certified for this. But once the system was streamlined it was very effective and we did see increased enrollment at the university level. But we also saw an increase in enrollment for some of those high school classes that were not necessarily sexy, if I can put it that way. Those classes became much more appreciated and much more competitive because of that program. It worked well to the benefit of both sides.

**Subrena Smith (Philosophy):** I take it that these students who would be participating would be seen favorably by UNH Admissions? I am wondering if we have this relationship with these schools and these students are doing well if this isn’t an additional worrisome question as we had earlier about Admissions Policies. Only some schools are participating and, therefore, only some students will be advantaged by participating in this program for which UNH will take a favorable stance for those students.

**Shelley:** Yes, I would expect UNH to look favorably on these students if they did well in the class. Right now, that UNHM Computer Science program is really pushing for this and is really hurting for enrollments. So, I don’t know that there is a huge competitive number of students that will be affected. I think that those with the UNH credit will be viewed like everybody else. Hopefully, there would be a fair evaluation.

**Erin Sharp (Sociology):** Does UNH already have a system in place for how they are going to evaluate and oversee these programs? I am also a little bit concerned that UNH as a whole would benefit from enrollment of these students but the faculty who are supposed to be doing the oversight and training are receiving no compensation. To me, it sounds like a job. So, I am wondering has UNH set enough of the structure to do this and do this well before we vote on this?

**Shelley:** We talked about this as a committee too and asked what the system was. We do know that there is an established partnership that has been going on in terms of the mission of UNH faculty to support curricula at the high schools. There are a lot of places where training resources have already been put into place. So, if it is successful there is a way to model that. But I don’t think there is a guidebook on how this is supposed to happen. That was one concern expressed by one of the chairs about how much faculty time this is going to take. And there was a concern about resources.

**Buzz Scherr:** It sounds like from an earlier comment there is a reasonably rigorous process for seeing if these courses are high enough in quality. But, is there going to be a requirement that these courses go through the normal UNH course approval system or is whatever structure that is already in place for reviewing the rigor of these courses going to suffice?

**Shelley:** It is my understanding that they are all existing courses. There are no new courses. So, there will not be an additional review process with a course that is already here. I would imagine if it were a new course down the road, it would.

**Daniel Chavez:** What could be the effect with the AP credit? Would it limit the credit? Would they combine it? I’m all for it if they accumulate. But, are there set rules?

**Shelley:** - There are so many different models. You can take a course with university credit or college credit from another institution or take an AP course and sometimes AP credit doesn’t count for the major
that you want. These will be viewed as UNH credit and that won’t change the way in which other courses like AP courses will be reviewed.

**Maryann Clark:** I have a couple of concerns about this. The rigor of the courses is important to me. I like what Elsa said about the course that she taught and that there was a lot of structure in place to keep the rigor at a certain level. I haven’t seen anything here that really defines what the steps are for that process. And the other concern is with the short list of high schools and what the process is for a high school interested in participating and what the process is for doing that. It just doesn’t seem that it is fair if there are certain relationships that are established in some schools and no opportunity for other schools.

The next question has to do with course evaluations. We all teach a course and have course evaluations that go through our departments. Will students who are taking these courses provide course evaluations and generate that feedback?

**Shelley:** There are a lot of questions. On the first two points, there are concerns about how to monitor the rigor and there is a sort of system based on relationships people have. On the second question, I’m not sure how a high school would get involved. They would have to initiate a partnership and I don’t know how that happens. But you are right, that is a concern that if this continues into the future there are some high schools that offer UNH credit and some that don’t. That could be a problem since we certainly can’t offer it everywhere.

And, finally, as far as I know, in connection with evaluations, however a teacher gets evaluated at the high school is how that will happen and there will be no collection of course evaluation data because it is not a UNH faculty member teaching the class.

**Scott Smith:** There are lots of questions for which we don’t have answers. It might be useful to compile the questions. There is some urgency. We need to think about getting some answers as quickly as possible.

**Shelley:** The actual proposal will answer some questions. It has a lot of details. But you can share feedback. There are many different feelings about this. How do we feel about a freshman being admitted with 20 credits already? Is there a potential problem in that we think we are going to increase enrollment, but we are giving all these credits out and the student is only here for 3 or 3 ½ years for a 4-year degree because they come in with so many credits? This is already happening, not with UNH credits but with other university credits that we have accepted.

**Scott:** we are looking at this as a driver of students toward Manchester. There is no safety net in this. There is no way that a student can opt out and be listed as withdrawn. If the student fails the class they fail the class and that will have an impact on what they think about coming into UNH. There are lots of questions. We need to look at the proposal and have a response to that.

**Allison Wilder (RMP):** I want to speak in favor of this, particularly as it is couched as a pilot. I am less concerned about the number of institutions that have access to this. If the pilot is successful, that will begin to increase. The one thing I want to put out there for all of us to think about is that, as we are
encouraged to keep trying these entrepreneurial ideas to drive folks through our doors we should be mindful of the drift of our jobs and that we keep picking up things gratis. It is all well and good to be thoughtful and entrepreneurial, but we also have to monetize that for ourselves so that we don’t wind up burnt out at the end of this.

Joe Terry (Communication): I am also concerned about this issue that it is actually re-inscribing bias and privilege, especially to see private schools on this list like Pinkerton Academy. It is one thing if it were public schools and finding a way to spread that around the state to make it fair and equitable. But we are working with some of those privileged students and providing extra opportunities.

Phil Hatcher (Computer Science): Pinkerton is a public school. From a Computer Science perspective, I am not sure that I speak for all my faculty. But I am a former chair and I think that the way this would work would be similar to how we fulfill articulation agreements with the community colleges. It does take time and it is not clear how the faculty time gets accounted for. What we are interested in is building relationships with these high schools. We would like to manage it. It is not exclusive at all. We want to build connections to computer science education around the state which is getting better and better. Some of those teachers are alums of our program, actually, which is new and exciting, and we want to build those relationships and we will manage it like we manage these articulation agreements that we have.

Regina Smick-Attisano (Thompson School): I am in favor of this credit pilot program. We don’t have to figure out all the answers ourselves. The community college has been doing this for the Running Start program for close to 10 years and other universities like SNHU and Plymouth State have been in our High schools. UNH has been conspicuously missing. So, I think that this proposal has a lot of merits. We don’t have to figure it all out ourselves. There are other places that are doing this, and nationally they are doing this.

Sterling Tomellini (Chemistry): With Running Start when the credit comes in there is no grade established, as I understand it. With this case, if somebody took a course in high school and gets a UNH grade on it will that UNH grade be applied to their GPA? (Shelley: I believe so, yes.) I think that is a big difference. I have seen some things happening with Running Start where the student comes in and they really don’t have the background, but they get the credit. I think that it is a really big issue if students are bringing in grades from high school before they are even accepted in a UNH Program. To me, it is a big concern unless you know that those grades are consistent with the type of grades they would get here. That is very different than Running Start. At least with AP credit, you have an independent exam.

Shelley: They do have the Wildcat program at Oyster River HS now and seniors can take UNH classes. But they actually come here and are taught by a UNH person. They actually have a UNH grade but they took the class here. There is a bit of a difference.

Rose Came (Earth Science): I wanted to bring up, once again, the concerns expressed by the gentleman from Admissions and from the senator from Philosophy. I don’t know how I feel about this pilot program. However, if we do decide that we want to endorse it I think we could easily put some language in here that says that we would like to see something that suggests that the effort, as this grows and expands into more schools, will be in line with our desire to increase the representation of those who are in currently underrepresented groups.
Erin Sharp (Human Dev & Family Studies): I want to clarify. I was looking over the proposal a little bit more. I guess I feel that we can’t vote on this unless we know what UNH’s plan is for monitoring the quality of these classes. Do you feel that, looking at the proposal, that this is clear? Can we ask for that before we have to vote on this?

Scott: I think that any question we have concerning the proposal we ought to find out the answer before we consider voting on it.

Shelley: I don’t think that there is an answer. I don’t think there is a protocol on how high school teachers are going to be supported. There isn’t a recipe for that. They explain the partnership. We could ask those that wrote the proposal to come back and explain or maybe we put it in the motion that, before this is accepted, there should be a clear plan on how the rigor or standards are monitored and how the high school teachers are going to be supported?

Elsa Upham (English): I think what I am hearing are issues of trust. Do we trust high school teachers to do their job or to do as good of a job or to follow the criteria and I don’t know that there is an answer. It is the same idea as trusting admission counselors to make a good decision when a student is applying. So, I really think that defining what those criteria are is essential to having anybody consider that seriously.

Erin Sharp: I guess that my concern about trust is more with UNH administration in that we don’t keep entering these things that are going to increase our enrollment without doing it in a thoughtful way. I know we are under a time crunch since this needs to get moving. I feel that if the institution has not done the work to know that this was going to be a successful plan then is it really ready to get moving?

Scott: I think the best way to proceed is to ask those questions and provide that information and get a sense of whether we want to move on this. I don’t think that voting on something because the college wants to have it is a good idea. But, if those things are in place that will satisfy us, I take comfort in the fact that it is a two-year pilot program. The only problem I have with pilot programs is that they tend to become a fait accompli and it is hard to stop it. We have to have a structure to be able to pull the plug with dignity after two years. I think that is the important thing for me is that if we decide to go into this venture. I think we have to have clear objectives and clear outcomes that need to be met. Otherwise, we have to stop it early. Or, we find ourselves in a position where we have to continue it even though we are not happy with it. There is no guarantee that this is going to result in a huge enrollment for us.

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

X. Agenda Committee Motion on Faculty Activity Reporting -

The chair, Scott Smith, gave some background explaining that there were robust discussions earlier in the year about MyElements and Find Scholar in relationship to Faculty Activity Reporting (FAR). In response to the concerns expressed in those discussions, the Agenda Committee conducted a survey and came up with a response that was sent to the IT Committee. We are at a point now where we have two committees, the Agenda Committee, and the IT Committee, with varying recommendations.

David Bachrach from the Agenda Committee introduced the Motion
Agenda Committee Motion
on Faculty Activity Reporting

Whereas the faculty of each of the colleges of the University of New Hampshire work in fields that are widely divergent from each other with substantial differences in expectations regarding the nature, type, scale, conduct, and product of their research, as well as significant differences in teaching and service

And whereas MyElements was never intended to serve as a platform for faculty activity reporting

And whereas a broad-based survey of the faculty, departmental leadership, and college administrative leadership has revealed near-universal frustration with MyElements as a faculty activity reporting platform because it does not meet the needs of faculty, departmental leadership or college leadership

The Faculty Senate moves that the faculty shall no longer be required to use MyElements for faculty annual reports. Rather, each college shall be free to determine its own system(s) for faculty annual reports. The department chairs in each college shall work in conjunction with their dean to develop a system(s) of annual reports that meets the specific needs of the faculty within each college.

David explained that faculty activity reporting has long been a part of the university requirements for faculty. However, the imposition of a digital faculty reporting system was not. Digital faculty reporting was discussed by the Senate eight years ago and at that point, the Senate stated that any imposition of a digital reporting system without a formal vote of the Faculty Senate would involve a breach of shared governance. No vote was taken by the Senate and the digital reporting was imposed on the faculty as a whole. The first digital reporting system is different than MyElements, the current system. MyElements was never voted on by the Senate or even discussed by the Senate. The results of the Qualtrics survey were overwhelmingly negative. The Agenda Committee, having discussed this, is asking the Senate to consider not eliminating myElements for use by the university or even prohibiting colleges from using myElements, but instead giving colleges a choice about what kind of faculty activity reporting they wish to have and to encourage chairs and deans to discuss what kind of reporting system is appropriate for each department and each college.

John Gibson, representing the IT Committee, spoke against the motion stating that the IT Committee’s position on this motion is that it is not well timed. Further, it interferes with what is an effective relationship between the IT committee and Academic Technology (AT), a relationship that is an example of working shared governance. Everyone on the IT Committee understands and has experienced the pain of submitting FAR via MyElements. But the committee feels there are current and potential benefits to the
university’s efforts in this venture. There are good faith efforts underway to fix the problems and the IT Committee has suggestions for alternatives to this motion.

John reviewed the benefits of using MyElements explaining that while we could revert to paper and hand the decision to the deans about what method to use for faculty reporting, there are actually current potential benefits to the university’s efforts to organize its records of faulty scholarship and other activities. One of these benefits, which is currently live, is the faculty profiles which are now on the web and all faculty have faculty profiles on their department websites. These show a summary of their scholarship. That did not exist a few years ago. John explained that a few years ago he was maintaining his own website to convey that information. Now the university does it for him and for everyone. This has also elevated the representation of faculty scholarship to the public and to peers in other institutions. The university has benefited from elevating the representation of university scholarship to the public and this came about from MyElements. FindScholars is the same thing to a greater degree.

John also explained the benefit of reducing duplication of reporting, explaining that when he went through P&T a few years ago he experienced a duplication of effort that involved updating or preparing his CV and website, preliminary annual report for merit & equity decisions, annual report for the department, promotion and tenure package and FAR. This added up to 6 or 7 ways he had to maintain a record of his scholarship. The only system that has the potential to consolidate those efforts is a university-led online academic reporting system.

John said that the IT Committee does acknowledge that FAR has been painful and it doesn’t do the right thing for every kind of scholarship and for every field and for every level of the faculty. But AT is making good faith efforts to fix existing problems. The committee has been working with AT on a variety of platforms for several years and we have had great success working with them on the department and college websites. They have listened to the IT committee suggestions and, as a result, we are much happier with the websites now than 2 years ago or 4 years ago. This is the result of very effective work between the IT Committee and AT. The same thing is going on now with the FAR system. It is rough, but AT is working with us to find and identify the problems and fix them. AT is also visiting all the colleges and talking with the deans and associate deans and representative chairs about what the issues are for that college and discipline and how should the profile be organized. They are working on ways to deliver guidance for faculty on how to fill out the FAR. We feel that there is ongoing work to improve this system and it is premature to pull the plug on it. Or, if we wanted to stop this, we should have stopped it 8 years ago. But, right now to pull the plug on it while it is under improvement and potentially within reach of being beneficial to the faculty and university, it is the wrong time.

John summarized by saying that AT’s good faith efforts have a reasonable chance of success at arriving at a system that satisfies faculty and provides benefits to the university and form a consistent and streamlined record-keeping and better representation of our scholarship to the public. We have faith in AT’s working with us toward that goal.

As alternatives to this motion, John proposed 1) allowing at least one more year to see if AT’s changes to online FAR will put us on a path where everyone is reasonably satisfied 2) Working with AT to make it easier for faculty to report frustrations with AT systems as we encounter them and 3) Drafting an
alternative motion, one that focuses on the fundamental issue, which is the university administration doing end runs around shared governance by implementing policy through technology.

The chair opened the floor for discussion:

**Jim Connell:** I am speaking about an issue that came up two years ago. I thought it had been resolved. But, instead, I found out that this is still a problem. Faculty who change their name upon marriage are disadvantaged by this system. The system is prejudiced against primarily women who choose to take their spouse’s name. It is a mistake when you say that all faculty have their profile up because those who have a legal name and use a different professional name have had them taken down because it was so misrepresentative of them. I don’t consider not fixing this for two years or more to be good faith.

**John Gibson:** There is good faith on the part of AT. The problem is related to HR which demands to have a unique name.

**Erin Sharp:** I come from a relatively small department and out of the 8 tenure-track faculty, for 6 of these faculty the information about where they received their Ph.D. is wrong and there have been efforts to change it for about 8 months. Terri Winters is amazing. But this incorrect information has still not been changed. There is also a case of a faculty member in my department where the students are confused because her name is different. As well, I understand that my dean and chair are not able to pull reports necessary to evaluate their faculty using MyElements. So, my concern is that using the system for FAR is the issue.

**John:** In regard to the information about incorrect degrees, a paper form to HR is required and it worked for him when he encountered the same problem. He agrees that HR needs to be more responsive to these problems.

In connection with the reports, AT is having discussions with the chairs and the deans about what reports they need and working to give them the ability to pull them.

Four years ago, I was very angry about the websites and what AT had done. I got on the IT Committee and spent two years hammering things out with AT and two years later I think they are pretty good. But, from my 4 years on the IT committee, I can see how much work it is to get this stuff right. And I see AT working in good faith to do it and listening to us and responding to issues that we give them. Again, I would prefer to work with AT effectively rather than to pull the plug on the system now.

**Adele Morone:** I think that it is a misrepresentation to say that this motion is pulling the plug on MyElements. I don’t think that this motion is actually pulling the plug and for all we know, many of the deans and department chairs may continue on with MyElements. I do know that there are a lot of complaints from faculty that when they had their own web pages, they could represent themselves the way they want to be represented and now they can no longer represent themselves with the publications that they want to highlight and they are discouraged in the way that they are being represented.

**John:** AT has heard from the IT Committee about this and has addressed it by enabling a feature that allows faculty to indicate what their preferred publications are and those are the ones that will appear now on the faculty profiles. I agree that I like to have a personal representation of my work. AT has provided a system, OpenScholar, as a platform for anyone to develop a personalized professional website in a
manner that they prefer. That is another system. But, to have a consistent faculty profile available to college and dept websites seems to me to be a reasonable goal.

**David Bachrach:** The Agenda Committee has discussed this at great length, and we all know what our departments have said about the conflation of faculty reporting through MyElements as part of the university’s effort to consolidate research in a public way and faculty activity reporting as an individual and with department activities. This motion in no way pulls the plug on MyElements. It doesn’t prohibit any department or college from using MyElements. All it does is ask that colleges and chairs have a conversation about what serves their needs best and eschews the proposition that the university should impose a one size fits all model on every single department. I think we should avoid conflating a decoupling of MyElements from FAR for the discussion of faculty websites. They are not related. FAR has nothing to do with faculty websites. FAR is an obligation of the faculty members imposed by the university to discuss our yearly activities and that need not have anything to do with our faculty representation on websites.

**Briggs Bailey:** Has the committee ever discussed the opportunity for different colleges to use different kinds of technology to represent themselves? One of the issues is the way bibliographies look consistent. But consistent is terrible because humanities, social sciences, sciences, the way publications look on the page, and the way my colleagues at other universities would recognize what is on my page is different from this. Is there any conversation about using different kinds of software for different colleges?

**John:** Not so much different kinds of software, but different configurations. This is part of the discussion that is ongoing between AT and the colleges and deans, what kind of bibliographical style is appropriate for each college. That is under discussion. They are creating lists of ways that the completely uniform approach is not working and working toward adapting one software system to both have an interface for faculty that is appropriate to the discipline and also an appropriate presentation of that information.

**Scott:** At the Dean’s Council meeting last Tuesday I got a report that Terri had talked to all the colleges and they have been working hard to tailor every single college to fit better what that college does. Whether that works out I have no ability to say. I just want to be clear that there have been reports that every college has met with Terri and worked out various things.

**John:** Let me address the idea of what I said about pulling the plug as that is too dramatic. There is a distinction between myElements and FAR. But we are going to maintain the online faculty profile in FindScholar when we are entering that information into MyElements. Effectively, colleges are not using the reports. Deans, in my experience, are looking at my narrative and my CV when doing annual reports and not generating reports from myElements. So, I don’t think this motion actually effectively changes practices.

**Scott:** Once you have this it becomes normative. That is the problem. It will become ingrained in this.

**Lori Hopkins:** One of the things that struck me was that you said that after working for 2 years, studying it, and working with AT, that you have come to understand it. That is a huge curve. Most of us don’t want to spend those 2 years and that is our biggest problem. With this mandatory reporting, it takes over and consumes our lives in terms of struggling with it. Having to write to HR to me seems ridiculous. In other words, spending our lives reporting to our university and organizing what we do should not be what we
are doing and that seems to be a heavy burden to be taken on when we know that this is not a friendly interface with many of the disciplines. Many of us write. We don’t fill in forms. We took a Qualtrics survey and we asked what do the faculty think. The overriding response was we don’t like this. It makes me feel that we need to be responsive to our faculty and our body that says we don’t like it, it doesn’t work for us. It doesn’t reflect who we are and we feel that we are simply recording so that we can be policed.

**Lu Yan:** I want to say quickly my own issue as a person of a special ethnic group at a time when the university is now considering going to the direction of inclusiveness. My issue is linked to the issue of my legal name. Earlier there were comments about communication through websites as a means to connect to the profession. Since I arrived here, I use Lu Yan as my name. And, my colleagues in the my department are tolerant, and they accept that. But, with the new system, again this is an issue of spending time, I have to travel to the library to have someone help me to put in stuff and to get things right. Because some things cannot be used to generate from the automatic machine. The final thing that they can’t do or refuse to do, or say we are considering this – it has been two months – is my name. It appears very different than what students know and what my colleagues call me and what colleagues in the field call me.

**John:** I feel this too. I feel that one thing that is going on here and it is really happening with FAR and MyElements, the systems are being given to us and were used as sort of testing ground and this is very dissatisfactory. I wish we could find a way to work with the administration. The way I feel things happen is that things come down from the administration - the provost office or the president – and are given to AT and they work things out and there are kinks in them. But they run through too quickly and all these issues with names is terrible. I’m with you that it is totally terrible. But I think it is a work in progress and it is too premature to stop it. I think these issues will be fixed. As a member of this committee, we have worked on this subject with AT for 4 years now.

**Anita Tucker:** I think a lot of the muddy water here is because MyElements was a way to mine data so that people on the outside can see what we are doing and what we are doing is great and I think that is a great goal. I think the FAR got it all confused. So, I don’t know the answer. But I think that if there is a way to have two different goals to make sure that they can be done separately but at the same time the university can get what they want. I think they are trying to do both in one fell swoop and that didn’t work. I would like a clearer goal. The way I understand it the better I do MyElements the more I am visible to the outside world. If the goal is to use MyElements for faculty reporting, I agree with my colleagues that it is terrible. But if the goal is if we do it and there are metrics, we can measure that we get more exposure, then maybe there is a willingness to stick with this. But I haven’t seen that yet.

**Scott:** It is important to get feedback from your constituents on this. This is a big step. This is a very large step to take and I think we should make sure we have all our ducks in a row.

The motion will lay over to the next meeting, at which time discussion may continue.
XI. Agenda Committee motion on Shared Governance - Scott shared the motion as follows:

**Agenda Committee Motion on Shared Governance**

Whereas both the Senate and administrative leadership are in agreement that effective cooperation between the faculty and administration depends upon frequent communication and collaboration throughout all stages of policy development.

The Faculty Senate Moves that:
All matters that affect faculty in more than one college and that rise to the attention of provost’s office, inclusive of all of the members of the administrative leadership within the provost’s office, should be shared by the provost’s office in a timely manner.

Scott explained that in response to the fact that we have been blindsided by a number of items that have come up, including MyElements being sprung upon us, the Agenda Committee has created a motion that urges the Provost office to alert the Agenda Committee of anything that rises to the level of the provost office to ensure that there is not any miscommunication.

Although the Agenda Committee might not act on every item it is important to have knowledge about what is going on. Provost Jones and President Dean are remarkably interested in communicating with the faculty. We don’t know if future administrators would have the same interest. So, we want to formally structure our communication with them that we get timely reports concerning things that have real impact on faculty. As John Gibson suggested a short while ago, it would have been nice to stop the digital FAR 8 years ago. This motion is about trying to stop instances where something might be creeping up and we really need to act earlier rather than later.

The motion will lay over to the next meeting, at which time discussion may continue.

XII. New Business – There was no new business.

XIII. Adjournment - Upon a motion and second to adjourn, the meeting was adjourned at 5:02 pm.
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