Meeting called to order at 3:10 pm on February 3, 2020

MINUTES SUMMARY

I. Roll – The following senators were absent: Evans, Kim, McHugh, Pietro, Plachetzki, and Robin. The following senators were excused: Charpentier, Hollis, Knowles, Minocha, and Shannon.

II. Remarks by and questions to the chair - David Bachrach welcomed back senators who have been on leave or are new to the Senate.

- David offered thanks to those in the Senate who volunteered or offered suggestions for the four Huron Project implementation teams focusing on RCM, Library, Information Technology, and the BSCs. The provost will be reaching out to those who have been assigned to a team.

David reported that a number of faculty members have expressed concerns about the Huron project and about the media reports about the administration indicating that there will be layoffs. From the Agenda committee’s point of view, it is very important for the faculty to be involved to shape the process and to have a faculty perspective in all of the implementation committees so that the worst instincts of folks who are not committed to the academic mission will be mitigated and the best instincts of the faculty with regard to the academic mission will be front and center. David said that although we will not know what the implementation teams come up with for a little while he will urge the provost to make regular updates to the Senate about how that process is going. Faculty members serving on the teams are encouraged to give regular updates as well so that the Senate is fully informed.

- David encouraged senators to attend President Dean’s State of the University Address tomorrow, February 4, at the Hamel Recreation Center. There will be other people available at the event to answer questions about current initiatives on campus, including Scott Smith who will be available to talk about the Discovery Review Committee.

There will also be four town hall sessions this month, two in Durham, and one each in Concord and Manchester to review the Huron Report.

III. Approval of the minutes from December 9, 2019 - It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of December 9. Changes were suggested in Sections II, III, IV, VII, X, and XI. Thus adjusted, the minutes were unanimously approved with one abstention.

IV. One-minute reports from Senate committees -

Liese Zahabi from the Information Technology Committee reported that the committee is discussing the patch (security update) by Microsoft and that some users did not have installed on their computers this past summer and that some users did not want the patch installed by UNH IT. The committee will be examining the issue over the next month or so and will be meeting with some experts. If there are any faculty in the Senate who have had issues with UNH IT applying patches or if they know of any faculty with this concern, they should contact Michel Charpentier, Liese, or David Bachrach to discuss further.
John Hasseldine, chair of the Library Committee reported that there are no real issues to report on but there is a lot open.

Subrena Smith, chair of the Research & Public Service Committee reported the committee has begun work on a report to the Senate on the matter of engaged scholarship.

Bill Woodward, chair of the Student Affairs Committee offered that the gender question on student evaluations of teaching will be discussed at today’s meeting.

Lisa MacFarlane from the Academic Program Committee shared that the committee hopes to bring a motion to the floor soon about the second charge which is a faculty statement about student learning. They will also be digging into the credit hour question.

Joe Dwyer, chair of the Academic Affairs Committee explained that the committee has been working on the calendar and this will be discussed today.

Ed Hinson, chair of the Campus Planning Committee shared that the committee hosted a meeting with Bill Janelle, Associate Vice President, Facilities, and Doug Bencks, University Architect and Director and they gave the committee a fairly detailed report. There are many construction projects happening and construction maps are available at the Facilities website https://maps.unh.edu/Html5Viewer/Index.html?viewer=unhconstruction.

There are other projects scheduled for the summer including installation of an elevator for the music wing of the Paul Creative Arts Center. This is an ADA categorized project but it will also allow for the movement of large musical instruments without the involvement of stairs.

Ed explained that CORPAD, the campus committee manages acquisitions and disposal of real property that is often received by the university in the form of bequeaths. For example, some of this property might be in a downtown location and may present a good investment opportunity for the university or it could be a property further away that may not be useful. The committee has been somewhat active recently and it has acquired 4 properties and immediately turned around and sold one of them.

There has been significant discussion about the graduate student housing proposal. The news last week was that the project was still up in the air and there was supposed to be a meeting toward resolving things. However, there is no update at this point. This is one of the issues that has contributed to the master plan being pushed back.

Bill Janelle was asked about the impact of the Huron Report and the implications for Facilities and he responded that they are still scratching their heads over that. The Huron Report pointed to some things in facilities but the implications are unclear.

Bill Knowles, chair of the Finance and Administration Committee -David Bachrach reported that Bill has had to step down from the senate this semester because of a class conflict. David is in touch with the committee about the next steps for leadership.
V. Discussion and vote on AAC motion on 5-year Academic Calendar - Joe Dwyer, Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC), presented an amended version of the motion on the 5-year Academic Calendar that was presented at the November 25 meeting of the Senate, as follows:

Academic Affairs Committee Motion  
**to approve the 5-year Academic Calendar**

1. Motion presenter: Joseph Dwyer, Academic Affairs Committee

2. **Rationale:** In order to maintain an approved five-year Academic Calendar, the AY 24/25 must be reviewed and included as the last year of the five-year Academic calendar.

   For purposes of campus safety, it is desirable for the students to be off campus during St. Patrick’s Day. Because St. Patrick’s Day falls on the Monday after the normally scheduled spring recess in 2025, following recommendations from the Registrar’s office, the Dean of Students and the UNH Police Chief, spring recess in 2025 should be moved one week later to March 17-21.

   “Senior Day,” which occurs on the day before the commencement ceremony, has been on the calendar for many years and was originally a day for senior events prior to graduation. However, senior events no longer occur on just one day and instead are spread over several days. As a result, the commencement office has requested that “Senior Day” be removed from the calendar since it is causing confusion for the students.

3. **Motion:** The Faculty Senate approves the proposed 2024/25 Academic calendar as provided by the Office of the Registrar (see Appendix A) with spring recess in 2025 moved one week later to March 17-21 and “Senior Day” removed. 2024/25 will be added as the last year of the five-year calendar, which includes the start and end dates for each of 4 regular terms throughout the calendar years starting from AY 2020/21 through AY 2024/25.

Appendix A

2024-25 Faculty Senate PROPOSED Calendar

**SEMESTER I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday, Aug. 26</td>
<td>Classes begin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, Sept. 2</td>
<td>Labor Day, University Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, Oct. 11</td>
<td>Mid-semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, Oct. 14</td>
<td>Mid-semester Break; No classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, Oct 15</td>
<td>Classes follow a Monday schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, Nov. 5</td>
<td>Election Day - no exams scheduled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, Nov. 11</td>
<td>Veterans Day Observed as University Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed-Fri, Nov. 27-29</td>
<td>Thanksgiving Break (Offices open 11/27; no classes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, Dec. 2</td>
<td>Classes resume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, Dec. 9</td>
<td>Last day of class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, Dec. 10</td>
<td>Reading day; 6:00 p.m. final exams begin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, Dec. 17</td>
<td>Final exams end</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Class days: M: 13; T: 15; W: 14; R: 14; F: 14. So have to convert a Tuesday to Monday class schedule (Tuesday, October 15 follows a Monday class schedule)
Joe explained that this calendar includes the proposed change for the date of Spring Break during the 2024/2025 academic year to allow for St. Patrick’s Day to fall during the break. This change is supported by Ted Kilpatrick, the dean of students, the Registrar, and Police Chief Dean because of the problems with excess drinking on campus on St. Patrick’s Day. Any change like this is likely to cause problems with some people and one of the impacts is that the break between sessions in the E-UNH (online courses) will now not be aligned with the spring break in the Academic Calendar for 2024/2025.

The second change from the original motion is to remove “Senior Day” from the calendar. This has traditionally been designated as the day before commencement when many activities for seniors take place. But, activities for graduating seniors are now spread throughout the week prior to commencement. The Registrar has, therefore, asked that “Senior Day” not be included in the 2024/2025 calendar and that it be removed from any calendars beginning this year and going forward. The amended motion includes language about this.

The discussion that followed included questions about whether there was an academic decision for moving the spring break or whether this is just a safety issue. Joe explained that this has been framed more as a safety issue. However, one senator responded that there is both a safety issue and an academic issue with a high number of academic hours likely to be lost as students recover from whatever happens on St. Patrick’s Day.

One senator who is a Durham resident shared that he has had some first-hand with some of these incidents of large groups of students gathering and drinking and that the concerns extend to property damage as
well as to safety issues. He said that anyone who lives in Durham understands intuitively why it would be a good idea to have the students off-campus for St. Patrick’s Day.

Patty Bedker who teaches a course on Ireland and takes students to Ireland each May shared that the country of Ireland itself is working to change the focus away from drinking on St. Patrick’s Day.

There were no comments made about removing “Senior Day” from the calendar.

The motion to approve the 5-year Academic Calendar was put to a vote. The motion passed with 49 in favor, 6 opposed, and 4 abstained.

VI. Discussion and vote on Academic Affairs Committee motion on 5-year E-UNH Calendar - Joe Dwyer, Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) reintroduced the motion explaining that it is unchanged from the presentation at the November 25 meeting:

APPENDIX 6.2
Academic Affairs Committee
MOTION to approve the 5-year eUNH Calendar

1. Motion presenter: Joseph R. Dwyer, Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee
2. Rationale: In order to maintain an approved five-year UNH E-term Calendar, the AY 23/24 and AY 24/25 must be reviewed and included as the last two years of the five-year UNH E-term calendar.
3. Motion: The Faculty Senate approves the proposed 2023/24 and 2024/25 UNH E-term calendars provided by the Office of the Registrar (see Appendix B). 2023/24 and 2024/25 will be added as the last years of the five-year calendar, which includes the start and end dates for each of 5 terms throughout the calendar years starting from AY 2020/21 through AY 2024/25.

2020 - 2025 University Holidays not set

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revised May 14, 2019</th>
<th>Proposed 2023 - 2024</th>
<th>Proposed 2024 - 2025</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-Term 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes Begin</td>
<td>August 14, Monday</td>
<td>August 12, Monday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Day; University Holiday</td>
<td>September 4, Monday</td>
<td>September 2, Monday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes End</td>
<td>October 6, Friday</td>
<td>October 4, Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-Term 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes Begin</td>
<td>October 16, Monday</td>
<td>October 14, Monday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election Day; no exams scheduled</td>
<td>November 7, Tuesday</td>
<td>November 5, Tuesday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran's Day; University Holiday</td>
<td>November 10, Friday</td>
<td>November 11, Monday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanksgiving holidays</td>
<td>Nov 23-24, Thur-Fri</td>
<td>Nov 28-29, Thur-Fri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes End</td>
<td>December 12, Tuesday</td>
<td>December 10, Tuesday</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The calendar is subject to change.

Joe explained that the committee was asked to consider changing the E-UNH calendar to ensure that the session break in March aligns with spring break in the Academic Calendar in 2024-2025. However, there is a whole chain of things that need to fall in place to make this happen and there are many parts and pieces. The committee was worried about unintended consequences. Joe said that the committee can review it again to see if it is possible to align the term breaks with the spring break dates in the academic calendar.

A senator from Paul College pointed out that there are face to face courses that also follow the E-UNH calendar in the Business School including the full-time MBA program and the part-time and full-time online MBA program. If the breaks don’t align those faculty will not get a spring break. There may be other colleges that also have in-person programs that follow this schedule.

VII. Agenda Committee motion on amending the UCAPC charter - Jim Connell from the Agenda Committee presented the following motion:

Agenda Committee Motion to Amend the Charter of the University Curriculum and Academic Policies Committee

Rationale:

Provisions have existed over the years to assure that the University Curriculum and Academic Policies Committee (UCAPC) membership includes at least two faculty senators. Originally the Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee and the Chair of the Senate, or a member of the Agenda Committee designated by the Chair, were members. Later this was changed to the Senate electing one or two of its members to serve if the membership elected by the colleges did not include two senators.
Based upon experience over the years, the Agenda Committee sees no benefit in this provision. Furthermore, given the many other demands of Faculty Senate membership, finding senators willing to serve is challenging.

**Motion:**

The Charter of the University Curriculum and Academic Policies Committee Article 2, Section C. “Membership”, is hereby amended as follows:

Strike subsection 1., paragraph b., reading “A minimum of two members of the UCAPC at any time must be members of the Faculty Senate.”;

Under subsection 1., paragraph c., strike the sentences “If fewer than two members elected by the colleges are also members of the Faculty Senate, the senate will elect from among its members one or two additional representatives to the committee as necessary to meet the requirements of 1.b. above. If the senate elects two members, they will not be from the same college.”;

The paragraphs that remain under subsection 1. shall be re-lettered sequentially after 1.a.

From UCAPC Charter, Section 2.C

The UCAPC will consist of members described by the following:

1.a. Tenured faculty members who are not also administrators shall represent the schools, colleges and the library in proportion to the size of their faculties. Specifically, each school, college and the library with less than 75 permanent full-time-equivalent faculty (tenure track and non-tenure track combined) will have 1 representative; more than 75 but fewer than 150 will have 2; and greater than 150 will have 3.

1.b. A minimum of two members of the UCAPC at any time must be members of the Faculty Senate.

1.c.b. The faculty representatives from each college will be elected by written ballot by the members of the faculty in that college eligible to vote for faculty senators. If fewer than two members elected by the colleges are also members of the Faculty Senate, the senate will elect from among its members one or two additional representatives to the committee as necessary to meet the requirements of 1.b. above. If the senate elects two members, they will not be from the same college.

1.c.c. The term of service for faculty is three years, with staggered terms. Committee members may be re-elected. When a member is unable to complete his or her term, the Faculty Senate will appoint a replacement for the balance of the term, provided that replacement represents the same college as that represented by the member who left the seat vacant.
Jim explained that UCAPC, (University Curriculum & Academic Policies Committee) is a permanent committee of the faculty senate. The UCAPC charter currently requires that two senators be elected as members of the committee if two other elected members are not also senators. Jim pointed out that a review of the history of UCAPC shows that the committee’s membership initially included the chair of the faculty senate, and alternately a member of the agenda committee appointed by the chair of the senate and the academic affairs committee chair.

This motion is being presented because it has been difficult to fill the seats of the two required senators when needed and it is not at all clear that we need this. In particular, David Bachrach has shared his experience chairing UCAPC in recent years with a complicated case. His experience was that he had interactions with the Agenda Committee, and this was far more effective than having to put additional senators on the committee.

The motion removes the requirement for a minimum of two members of UCAPC to be faculty senators.

There were no questions about this. A spelling error in the motion was pointed out. The word “herby” should be corrected to read “hereby.”

The motion will be laid over until the next meeting of the Senate.

VIII. Update on Discovery Review Committee by Scott Smith - Scott Smith, chair of the Discovery Review Committee (DRC) introduced Nicky Gullace, Director of the Discovery Program, who is joining the meeting today. He explained that Nicky and the committee members have worked very hard on this process which is both extremely important and extremely stressful. Scott also offered thanks to Andrew Coppens from the Education Department for his help. Scott said that it is his job to persuade the Senate that the committee’s work is worth investing in. This is going to be a deliberative process, and this is the first step. There will be a presentation of the full and coherent version of the DRC proposal before spring break. Today’s presentation is about just one part of the proposal and it will be shared with other key stakeholders as well.

The DRC has been meeting all of last semester every other week and every week during this semester. The committee has been reviewing the existing Discovery Program as well as looking into other general education policies and a number of theoretical and practical documents. Scott offered that if the committee continues on the path they are going on now there will be a slight change in the ways that we conceptualize the general education program which will reduce the categories but build explicit skills and ethical attributes that faculty and students seem to appreciate. The outcome of the review process will be vetted by the Faculty Senate and then returned to the committee. The goal is to present a full and coherent plan.

The committee, with the help of Amy Oliva from the Discovery Office, has done some samplings of real students and their paths towards graduation in various majors and applied the new draft process to their path. At this time, it appears that the new process would actually increase flexibility and this ties in with the first charge of the committee. It doesn’t diminish the general education program. Instead, it adds flexibility.

Scott explained that right now the committee has focused on a signature first-year experience with a view towards student success. While we are looking forward to seeing what the Academic Program Committee comes forward with for student success, we also know that this is a focus of the administration with it being defined in terms of retention and graduation rates.
The initial Discovery Program proposal included a provision for every single freshman to take a small seminar-style class that would satisfy the Inquiry requirement. However, because of fiscal and other reasons, this proposal lost thrust. Instead, an Inquiry attribute was added. Currently, 85% of Inquiry requirements are satisfied via the attribute, not in small classes. The current DRC has explored a number of first-year experiences, one of which would be a big year-long interdisciplinary class that would bring, for example, engineers and historians together to build a trebuchet or something like that. There were concerns about a year-long plan. Therefore, the committee is proposing a one-semester first-year seminar that could be taken opposite a student’s ENG 401 semester. This plan would increase a student’s ability to write early on. The committee has a pedagogy that this class would be based on. The tentative name for the program is WildC.A.T. Seminars with the C.A.T. representing “critical thinking and analysis” or “critical analysis and thinking.” This plan along with ENG 401 could help focus our attention on retention, student success, wellness, etc. This plan could be a differentiator for UNH. Imagine, for example, if the press said that UNH is bucking the trend of large classes and going back to classes with small student/teacher ratios.

Scott admitted that some senators may be wondering what makes this proposal different this time and whether it will be shot down as not being feasible. He explained that the Provost has advised him that the job of the DRC is to bring forward what we think is the best general education experience and that the provost’s job is to implement it. The president’s strategic plan includes an emphasis on general education and academic success. Scott added that it is an important job of the faculty senate if members think the plan is good, to advocate for it back in your departments. One of the things that has been identified in the review of the Discovery program is that, although the program is a good thing, there is a lack of buy-in. During the advising process Discovery does not seem to be put forward as equal to the major and we want to change that. This first-year experience seminar is one of the ways that we want to do that.

A senator asked what Scott is referring to when he says “buy-in.” Scott responded that If you look at the degree plans that are posted online back in 1999/2000 the catalog reads “here are the requirements for engineering or math, etc. and here are the general education requirements and here are your major requirements.” But now there is a heavy focus on the major and Discovery gets pushed aside. Our structures don’t advocate for general education. Advising tends to focus on the major over general education. Students see Discovery as an appendage or an obstacle to the major. Scott said that it seems obvious that we do have a problem advocating for the Discovery program.

The same senator followed up asking for further explanation, “I'm still confused because the students still have to take those courses because they are requirements so what’s the wedge you are driving? To the extent that I understand it, the Discovery program has various categories and students have to take a certain number of courses to graduate and so there’s no option. I don’t understand how you are measuring buy-in when there’s no evidence for buy-in or not.” Scott responded that 5 years ago, the Discovery program ran a survey in which students reported that Discovery was an obstacle to taking more interesting classes. We would much rather see a general education program where students were excited about it, where they could take compelling courses early, and have good faculty members in front of them at an early age. We really think that would change the way general education was viewed on campus, although it might not solve all the problems. It takes a collective effort of students, faculty, and administration to really pitch the idea that general education is something worth having. If this entire body decides, for example, that we don’t need general education and instead just have majors, then we have a different conversation on our hands. But if you are committed to a general education program, we need to really advocate for it.
Jim Connell pointed out that the survey Scott referred to was conducted by the Discovery Review Committee 5 years ago.

Scott presented a slide with an overview of the first-year experience plan that he has been discussing and he invited Nicky Gullace to add some context

---

**Discovery Review Committee**

*Update February 3, 2020*

---

**Rigorous Analysis, Reading, Writing**

- To that end, “Critical Analysis” courses “draw back the curtain,” so to speak, since they:
  - 1) focus on *big questions* impacting human experience, broadly writ;
  - 2) are based in *information literacy* and/or *epistemology* (how do we know what we know?);
  - 3) employ *rigorous analysis* and *interpretation* of evidence for answering the big questions posed for the course;
  - 4) focused on *substantive reading*;
  - 5) use *debate and dialectic* to test and sharpen interpretation and presentation; and
  - 6) result in *persuasive written and oral presentation* of answers to the big questions.

---

**What have we done?**

- Considering proposal to reduce categories, but build in skills and ethical attributes (in progress)
  - increase in flexibility and student/faculty buy-in
- Revitalize first-year experience with view toward student success
- WildC.A.T. Seminars (see handout)
- Key Points
  - With ENGL 401 = powerful first-year shared experience
  - Inquiry Attribute = 85% of fulfillment
  - Shared experience
  - Retention/Student Success Efforts
  - Rigorous
  - Differentiator
Nicky explained that we are only presenting here a tiny bit of the overview of the Discovery program. The committee is still working on a larger template that is going to keep many of our older categories. The plan being presented today is just about the first-year experience: two semesters with English 401 and the seminar and then a math course since we would like students to take math a little earlier if that is feasible.

Nicky shared that the Discovery categories are not going away. Some of them are being truncated. Some of them are being put together, but they are not going away. The Senate will be seeing a first draft of the template relatively soon so there will be a lot of time to discuss it. Our hope is that students, by having fewer things they have to do, by being able to double up some of their requirements, and by being able to take some of their requirements at the upper level if they are intellectually ready to do that, will find Discovery to be less meaningless.

Scott added that one of the things that the committee deliberated over was how to present this. One of the things that we are really interested in is to create an experience where students can see what is compelling to their own lives. Scott shared that some of the students that he teaches want more big questions about ethics, sustainability, and social justice. These kinds of courses could be done well in a small seminar-style format in which we advocate for very specific skills that we can give to students but also market to the outside world about what UNH is doing. For example, information literacy and epistemology is a really difficult thing to do. It is about knowing what we know, about figuring out how do we know the things we know, about how we are able to find information to make our best judgment. We want to think about rigorous analysis and interpretation. Scott explained that substantial reading would be something great to get students in the habit of early and often and to have students be able to debate in dialectics and to test ideas and answer the big questions. This seminar-style class would involve written and oral presentations to give the answers to big questions and to give students the agency to come up with their own answers based on rigorous analysis of it.

Scott admitted that there are many questions to answer but the committee is looking to the Senate to give us some new questions and to answer some of the questions we have. For example, ENGL 401 is currently a kind of “one class fits all” class. What happens if you have the seminar the first semester then you go into ENGL 401 in the spring? Is there something we could do with ENGL 401 that would allow students to build on what we do in the first semester?

Scott and Nicky offered to take questions:

A Senator from UNH Manchester: What about transfer students?

Scott: This is a good question. Andy Colby, the Registrar, is a member of the committee and we've put forward a couple of possibilities. One idea is to waive that requirement for transfer students. There are other possibilities, but we have to think carefully. I'll be quite honest we don’t have all the answers to the details but we're trying to figure out the general conceptual aspects of it.

A Senator from COLA: Would it need to be labeled a 444?

Scott: They have to have some designation to separate these classes from other classes. So, for example, what we don’t want is, for example, PYSCH 401 be repurposed to be just an introductory major course. We want these to be Discovery courses, but I think the 444 designation would make sense. One of the things that we're going to propose is not up here. I am going to have Kathy send out a conspectus you can look at it, take it back to the departments and think about it. You can ask questions but that document will
have a shift from Inquiry which had a couple of issues that the Discovery committee and our committee felt might need to be shifted so there will be a full discussion of that and we will come back to that down the road.

A Senator from COLSA: My issue is going to be faculty buy-in and so who is going to teach these courses? That is the question they are going to ask me.

Scott: That's a great question. So, for big question seminars with a small class, it seems like liberal arts would have a central role in this, but we also want to be clear that we're not envisioning this to be a single sector. We're envisioning multiple departments contributing. I can't answer that right now because we are going through a review of classes right now that might be able to be repurposed. The question about who is going to teach these classes is a central question. If the faculty don’t want this then the Faculty Senate needs to tell us if there’s buy-in. Because if not we might have to rethink this. But if there is buy-in that we can actually do something meaningful to change the curriculum at UNH I believe we will have buy-in and at that point, we will work extremely hard to make it happen.

A senator from HHS: My understanding of this presentation is that we're moving away from Inquiry courses or there have been some problems identifying courses and thinking about replacing it with vigorous analysis big questions kind of course. I wanted to think about what that means in terms of inquiry courses offering students a more hands-on approach to learning and more of a constructivist approach to learning where students are engaged in real-world experiences versus asking questions. Where does that leave students just beyond asking questions? What do we value more - experience in the world or asking questions about the real world?

A senator from COLSA: I’ve been here for a long time. I was here at the beginning of the Discovery Program and we were promised funding and that faculty would be rewarded for teaching Discovery courses. Is there a discussion about funding for this program?

Scott: The short answer is yes and no. There was a statement by some administrative leader at some point "No more resources." Then, I asked the question of why are we even reviewing something if there are no resources? That statement was firm, but it shifted over the discussion. I believe strongly that we're in a position now more than ever to do something substantive, to do something that might require some resources, that might take some of the UNH “daring do” to get it done but we will probably need some investment. If the president is good for his word, if he believes that reforming general education is worthwhile, the money will come. It's my job and our job to put it forward, to be rhetorically powerful and compelling. If we don’t do our job, they’re not going to believe us. I know that it seems like a long shot, but I'd rather shoot for the moon and reach the high atmosphere than just sit here and not try.

A senator from HHS: I think the lynchpin for buy-in among faculty will be whether they can get a course under this framework and whether they perceive that it isn’t locked down to one college or school.

Scott: If this is something we are marketing to new students and want students to be excited about, we have to put the people in who are going to make the class exciting. We need to think about the quality of education at this point. It is an entry point. For retention, we need to have people who are interested in talking to students and guiding them through those things. We have many faculty who do that and we have to identify them. The one thing that we need to deal with in the committee – a tough one – is how to deal with the weaponization of Discovery. The RCM model is being reviewed. The provost seems very committed to getting RCM out of the general education game, to find ways to make it equitable. There was a time you may remember when we didn’t have enough Discovery seats. But, now that it is a way to
get in the market. Discovery has become a game, an arms race. I’m glad to hear that there is some thought that faculty would want to go there.

**Erin Sharp from the Agenda Committee:** I think that the Senate can play a role in this because with the Huron project one of the goals of the financial deep dive was to find money that could be used for strategic initiatives. We could have a motion that would require at the start of this Huron implementation for specific funding of the Discovery Program and general education. There will be an RCM review and we could also put forward a motion that demands that the RCM review takes general education out of the calculation. It is good timing and perhaps we can push some of these things forward.

**Scott:** I appreciate that and the argument that we can find a little extra Huron money to fund this was advanced by at least one person talking to an unnamed administrator.

**A senator from CEPS:** It sounds quite exciting. Is it going to be conflicting with the Honors program? A lot of these issues seem to overlap. It seems quite exciting, but I know that with the college I'm in it is hard to get faculty to teach in the Honors Program because the faculty have other responsibilities as well. I wonder if this is going to be a struggle. Is it going to be competing?

**Lisa MacFarlane, Senator, and Interim Director of the Honors Program:** We, as you know, have been charged with designing an Honors College and we have been trying to stay in Discovery’s slipstream- not get ahead but not be so far behind that we have to catch up. It's fair to say we're in your wake, but close enough in there. So, we think this is really workable. Some of the things from the Honors Program that is likely to happen is that we will have a fair amount of flexibility about the upper-level requirements for our students. We would have some increased emphasis on high impact activities that would deepen students’ work, particularly in their major areas, but also stretch them a little bit further. So, from our point of view if it’s good for Honors students it’s going to be good for everyone and we will find ways to further challenge those students as much as we can. We are kind of in a conversation with the Discovery Review Committee. I am an ex officio member of the Discovery Committee, so those conversations are useful to me as well. I think we'll try to bring something in so you can see them in tandem a bit.

**Nicky Gullace, Discovery Program:** Yes, I also think we want to try to bring some of the successes of the Honors Program to a more general population, like exciting seminars, a more intimate mentoring relationship with faculty, a smaller cohort of students. I want every freshman to know that during both semesters they can come in and find a teacher that knows their name. That is something the Honors Students have that our students don’t have always. The other thing is that our seminars would be easier. I wouldn’t assign War and Peace in one of these seminars, although Lisa might in one of hers.

**Scott:** As a final comment on faculty buy-in, we envision that faculty members from every single college would be welcomed to and encouraged to put in for a seminar if they wanted to and if they were dedicated to the idea of mentoring small groups of students. But we also understand that not all colleges have that kind of flexibility. There are pockets of under-enrollment in the university and we think that faculty who are experiencing a low enrollment, not because they are bad teachers but because student demand has declined, are a natural place to find faculty to put in the time and who would be happy to develop a new course where there is a pretty secure enrollment of 22 students in it. So, I think instead of saying this pie has to offer five even slices we allow the market to work its way in places where people who need students will put in for it. Others are welcome to, encouraged to, and we'll do what we can to give the resources to do it, but I think if we take a pragmatic view, as many universities are doing right now, we'll
have a much easier time than we did ten years ago when we stipulated that all the colleges had to have equal investment in Discovery.

**A senator from CEPS:** I want to talk about faculty buy-in currently. For example, I teach two courses that have Inquiry. One is a 444 class so it’s an outright Inquiry course and the other one is a large lecture class that has an Inquiry designation. The one that is 444 is everything that is written on that slide. So, you have 100% buy-in from me because I enjoy teaching this class and I think these students have a really good experience because it is a very small class and I teach it as a seminar-style class and students participate a lot. But if I had a nickel for every time the previous chair of my department said ‘butts in seats’ I would be very wealthy. So, that is where I think we will struggle with the buy-in. Because the course that I teach that is large and has Inquiry designation is one of those “butts in seats” classes and this will be perceived by the chair of my department and the chairs of many departments as a threat.

**Scott:** I think if a small seminar-style class is a threat to the overall structure of our university, we have bigger concerns. If all we care about is butts in seats then we've lost our identity as an institution. So, I hope that we can at least bring that up and say if you are trying to get 300 people in a lecture hall for no academic reason, then we need to rethink that.

**Lisa Macfarlane:** Just to follow up on what Nicky said, it is important to remember that the Honors Program has always been a little bit of an incubation place in the broader larger campus. Honors has a senior thesis that became capstone; the Honors Program had small class seminars and these became 444s and the Inquiry attribute. Over the many many years in the Honors Program, it has constantly been a place where we try something out and we think about whether or not it is good for students. If it is good for students, the Faculty Senate tries to think about how we can make this available to anyone. That should never change. The Honors Program will always be a place to try things. You assess them and if they are good for some students, chances are that they will be good for many students and we try to always be thinking on those terms. The other piece to know is that, from Jim [Dean] and Wayne’s [Jones] point of view, the Honors program should grow. So, one of the things we have been doing is to make pathways for any student at whatever point in their career at the university they catch fire. We all know that people develop at different rates at different times. So, at any point where a student takes one of these small seminars and catches fire and is incredibly excited and says that I want more of this, I want more of these kinds of challenges, we will have a pathway for the Honors Program to streamline that for them. Other students may find that they have other things they would like to do, and that is totally ok. At least they will have had one of these. I think we will try to calibrate this according to a student’s sense of excitement and development readiness.

The issue about cost and butts in seats, I totally agree with that. But there is nothing in RCM that ontologically says that we have to do it the way we do it. It is up to deans and administrators to calibrate RCM to account for our academic and institutional priorities. That is their job. That is what the folks in finance do. They run simulations to figure out how we can afford to do the things we want to do without completely starving all of the various obligations we have on campus. I would urge the DRC to stay tough on this and ask that T Hall runs its models and think about what the options are in there.

The last thing that I have to say is that over time what happens in all of these programs is that they start off wonderfully and then there is drift over time and we slide away a little bit, largely out of goodwill because we want to be flexible and creative and we want people to do stuff. But, I would like to make a pitch to the DRC and the Discovery Committee that one of the pieces of buy-in has to be that each of us as faculty understand that our obligation is to work with the metacognitive that you are articulating and
that our obligation is, when we teach these courses, to make sure our students know that explicitly and that we submit to having our courses evaluated and being told, “you shifted, you drifted, and you need to sharpen up a bit” I commit to that, Nicky and Scott.

**Scott:** To summarize, be on the lookout for a document from Kathy. Share it, chew over it and get back to us. You can send me an email directly to scott.smith@unh.edu. Thank you for your time.

**David Bachrach:** I met with the deans a few months ago and they were very nervous that the faculty were going to do something with the curriculum, and they don’t control it and we do. Nevertheless, it is very important that as faculty senators we are in conversation with our deans and it is even more important that you as faculty senators have conversations with your colleagues. We will have no buy-in if you are not talking to your colleagues about what is going on and getting their feedback to share with the senate. We are a representative body so we have to get the approval of our colleagues and get their comments and feedback and buy-in.

IX. Student Affairs Committee discussion on the gender question in Student Evaluations - Nena Stracuzzi and Susan Endrizzi explained that they were hoping to present a motion on this issue today. However, they are still waiting to hear back from a number of people on open questions. So, instead, they are presenting a draft of the report which will be submitted with the motion when it is finalized and their hope is to get some feedback and questions from the Senate. Nena and Susan walked the Senate through the slides in Appendix IX to these minutes.

Nena and Susan offered to take questions:

**Senator from Education:** I am going to comment on the relationship between the number of response options and the usefulness of the data to the university. I don’t see those as mutually exclusive. For example, we could have as many response options as are up here, 56 or even more, and that would check the box around the importance which I totally endorse, the importance of student expressivity and being seen by the categories. But, the importance of inquiry and for reports about where there is bias across categories, they don’t have to be reported in terms of these 56 categories. They can be combined into half of this. So, it is an analytical problem that doesn’t need to be solved at the level of response options.

All of these could be categorized into the male/female binary if that is the kind of analysis someone would want to do. But, the fewer of these that we have on the analytical side, the less inquiry we are able to do into the data.

Nena - That is fine with me. It is one of those things – do you frontload or backload? There is going to be pushback from somebody.

**Senator from sor from CEPS:** My concern is the privacy issue, keeping information away from faculty which could help people evaluate their teaching. I never heard before about the correlating of Question 14 to gender. Where is that coming from?

Nena: Vasu told us this. (PT Vasu Vasudevan, Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs)

**Same Senator:** There are real concerns here about who has information that the faculty do not have. If somebody is throwing these kinds of things at you when you are in some kind of meeting with a lawyer, administrator or AAEO (Affirmative Action and Equity Office) who has some of this data that is available to the administration and not to the faculty that is a real serious problem.
The tenure track faculty union has agreed to participate in student evaluation of teaching, but it was under the past practice of the senate controlling this. What just happened in the J term is that the Senate didn’t approve this and yet it was put in there and the administration was told this by the leadership of the senate but also by the leadership of AAUP. I have really deep concerns about privacy. I also have concerns about what it says if I am to vote for this thing and they say we are going to make it private. What does it say about what I’m saying about my fellow faculty, my colleagues? Does it say that they’re not ethical enough to use the information properly? Those are the things I’m concerned about. So I have to go back and really look at this proposal.

**Nena:** It seems like there should be two separate motions. They're two separate things and two separate issues. I don’t know if you’re in favor of just getting rid of the question altogether.

**Senator:** My concern is when we go from this one to the next one. If you are going to eliminate it from this one, what is the next one that is going to be taken from faculty and we won’t know about it?

**Nena:** Well, it is interesting that there is no information about race. It is just on gender which I found interesting. So, we're just tracking based on gender?

**Another senator from CEPS:** First I want to say that was a beautiful summary of the complexity of the issue. I really enjoyed it. So, thank you. My concern is about how is the data being used? The question is, if it’s truly being used to protect these smaller populations, the vulnerable populations, that’s important. But if it’s being used as a way of evaluating and pushing back on faculty then that’s difficult. Plenty of my colleagues and myself need to grow on this issue and we're all trying to grow. But, in that light, it might even be better to remove it.

**Nena:** I know that they say it’s being used. So, if it really is important to track people by gender, we really should be purposeful about the LGBTQ community as well. That’s genuinely about what’s going on.

**Jim Connell, Agenda Committee member:** In addition to the four [issues] you have up there, I have a fifth, which is the need for this body to reassert its control over this issue. It is a serious issue of shared governance which has already been alluded to a couple of times peripherally, but I think that is one of the most important issues.

**Nena:** Well, yes, and the fact that the question was changed

**Ann Bartow of the UNH Law School** - I liked your presentation and I agree with a lot of what you said but I just wanted to raise the issue that when you start out with sex and gender stuff like that’s some sort of fixed thing that everyone agrees with, that’s not true and it doesn’t map on the law. So, I'm just putting that out there.

**David Bachrach:** Obviously, this is a complex issue and we are not going to resolve it tonight. The SAC, we hope, will bring a motion in 2 weeks and we will have a chance to have a conversation about this material.

X. New Business – There was no new business.

XI. Adjournment – The meeting was adjourned at 5:02 pm
Some UNH acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAC</td>
<td>Academic Affairs Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Agenda Committee of the Faculty Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASAC</td>
<td>Academic Standards &amp; Advising Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APC</td>
<td>Academic Program Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>Academic Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAC</td>
<td>Budget Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaPS</td>
<td>Career and Professional Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&amp;PA</td>
<td>Communications &amp; Public Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCLEAR</td>
<td>Clinical, Contract, Lecturer, Extension, Alternative Security, Research faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEITL</td>
<td>Center for Excellence &amp; Innovation in Teaching &amp; Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORPAD</td>
<td>University Committee on Real Property Acquisition and Disposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPC</td>
<td>Campus Planning Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>Finance &amp; Administration Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>Faculty Activity Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRA</td>
<td>Institutional Research and Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITC</td>
<td>Information Technology Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSMB</td>
<td>Joint Strategic Management Board (Navitas review)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Library Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OISS</td>
<td>Office for International Students &amp; Scholars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>Operating Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACS</td>
<td>Psychological and Counseling Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAT</td>
<td>Professional and Technical Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC</td>
<td>Professional Standards Committee (FS permanent committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPSC</td>
<td>Research &amp; Public Service Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAARC</td>
<td>Space Allocation, Adaptation and Renewal Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC</td>
<td>Student Affairs Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHARPP</td>
<td>Sexual Harassment and Rape Prevention Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSSC</td>
<td>Student Success Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVPAA</td>
<td>Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCAPC</td>
<td>University Curriculum &amp; Academic Policies Committee (FS permanent committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPFA</td>
<td>Vice President for Finance and Administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The “Gender Question”

As it pertains to course evaluations
Problem in a nutshell

• Male & Female as response choices to the “gender question” are outdated and inadequate

• Such narrow response choices are alienating and can act as a barrier to participation

• To be supportive of those who are transgender and gender non-conforming, we need to recognize the complexity

• Challenge: balancing our ‘need’ to collect data (i.e., useful data) with the importance of creating an inclusive range of choices

• There are also a number of stakeholders and competing agendas, but we’ll get to that. First ...
Sex and Gender are NOT Interchangeable!
But they sure are frequently treated that way ...
SEX

- refers to biological differences between males and females, i.e., genitalia and genetic differences
- the terms *male* and *female* are labels assigned to (most) newborns at birth on the basis of whether they have a penis or a vagina
- In the case of unclear or ambiguous genitalia, the term intersex is used

GENDER

- instead of being about body parts, it’s about how you’re expected to act in society, because of the sex category into which you were assigned at birth.
- Gender is social. *Masculine* and *feminine* are words to identify societal expectations about our thoughts, behaviors, and characteristics
- *Gender expression* is a term that refers to how we act, dress, behave, and interact with others.
What about gender identity?

• Gender *identity* is how you feel inside and how you express your gender through your clothing, your behavior, and your personal appearance (e.g., hairstyle, mannerisms).
  • It’s a feeling that begins *very early* in life; it may or may not line up with your assigned sex category at birth.

• The terms *man* and *woman* are used to express one’s gender identity and are reflective of *the extent to which* someone feels better adhering to societal expectations of masculinity or femininity
  • Sex, gender, and gender identity lie along a continuum – not binary

• The question we should be asking on course evaluations – and elsewhere – is about people’s gender identity.
There are many, terms with which people are more and less comfortable and prefer to use to identify themselves along the gender continuum, e.g., genderqueer, agender, third-gender, bigender, two-spirit, gender nonconforming, gender fluid, gender variant, pangender, androgynous, gender questioning, gender neutrois, genderless, gender neutral, et cetera. The same is also true for people who are transgender, i.e., there are multiple terms and transgender people express their identities in multiple ways ...

Importantly – these terms do NOT all mean the same thing. So, we cannot randomly choose terms from a list to include on a survey question.
Adapted from Sam Killermann’s “It’s Pronounced Metrosexual”
What does it mean to be transgender?

- “Transgender” is an umbrella term describing those whose gender is different from their sex assigned at birth.
- “Transgender” is a term meant to capture the many different ways people’s gender identities can be different from the sex they were assigned at birth.
- There is no one way of being transgender.
  - transgender people express their gender identities in many different ways
    - whether assigned male at birth and identify as a woman, some combination of both men & women, or something else altogether – OR – they were assigned female at birth and identify as a man, or some combination of both men & women, or something else altogether
    - there are multiple terms use to describe those who are transgender (e.g., trans man, trans woman; trans male, trans female; transfeminine, transmasculine; repeat the aforementioned using “transgender” instead of trans; F2M, M2F, et cetera)
  - When your sex, gender, and gender identity align, the term is cisgender.
This is nothing new ...

• **Non-binary people are nothing new.** They’re not confused about their gender identity or following a new trend – non-binary identities have been recognized for millennia by cultures and societies around the world
Why are we asking about gender in the 1st place?

• In other words, how is it useful to collect this data for our purposes?
  • We track graduation rates/retention rates by gender. We also, apparently, correlate average Q14 scores (Overall, how would you rate this instructor?) with gender as well as ‘expected-average-grade-in-course’ (track retention/graduation? With course evaluations?)

• Okay, then. If we’ve seriously determined that the gender question is important, we need to broaden our thinking.

• AND, if retention & graduation are so important, the LGBTQ+ population, which is a vulnerable group, is more at risk of not finishing than others

• And finally, why is gender the only characteristic we’re asking about? What about race for example?
“Gender Question” on Course Evaluations

Previous response choices *(was there a question – or just a place to check the box?)*

- Male
- Female

Starting J-Term 2020, Academic Standards Advising Committee Plus (ASAC+) changed the response choices as follows,

Question: What is your gender?

- Male
- Female
- Nonbinary / Third Gender
- Prefers Not to Say
Todays agenda re: this issue

• What Students want ...
• Brief timeline – how this discussion came to pass
• Issues at Stake / Areas of Controversy
WHAT STUDENT SENATES WANT ...

• Student Senate Resolution: Passed December 10, 2017
  • change the requirement of asking students to state their sex, to asking students to state their gender with options to state: man, woman, non-binary, prefer not to answer, and other.
  • encourage Administration to remove the requirement to choose a sex on course evaluation form

• Graduate Student Senate Resolution: Passed December 10, 2019
  • replace the multiple choice gender question with a fill-in box that students can use to type in their gender in the least restrictive manner,
  • to collect information on gender identity for the sole purpose of generating statistics on student demographics, but not to disclose information on respondents’ gender to instructors so as to protect student identity and privacy, which may be of particular concern in small classrooms or departments,
  • to add a disclaimer on teaching evaluations indicating that gender information will not be revealed to instructors.
Timeline: how did this discussion come to pass?

- Last Spring as people were considering making a change to course evaluations in response to the 2017 resolution, Student Affairs Committee (SAC) was brought in.

- Lots of background work.

- SAC almost presented a motion at the end of the semester, but, met with Vasu at the last minute, and realized the privacy issue was a big deal.

- This past Fall, picked up where we left off.

- Further background work - discovered that a change had already been made by the Academic Standards Advisory Committee without input from the Senate.
Four Issues

• Privacy
• University Statistics
• Faculty Statistics
• Sensitivity to Students

Bypassing the Faculty Senate is what Jim Farrell sees as a 5th issue – he’s referring to us not having been consulted by the Academic Standards Advisory Committee when they changed the “gender question” on the course evaluations.

He said, “we need to take back control.”
No clear motion yet; we’re currently working with three choices

• Open-ended fill in question requested by GSS
• Current Option (ASAC+ question added J-TERM 2020)
  • Question: What is your gender?
    o Male
    o Female
    o Nonbinary / Third Gender
    o Prefers Not to Say
• Recommended Options (TPACC)
  (Some have recommended the Higher Ed Consortium’s question; it’s still a little too narrow - see slide 18)
POTENTIAL PROBLEM WITH OPEN ENDED QUESTIONS – SO MANY POSSIBILITIES (how to code?)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Androgyne</td>
<td>22. Intersex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Androgynous</td>
<td>23. Male to Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Bigender</td>
<td>24. MTF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cis</td>
<td>25. Neither</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cis Female</td>
<td>27. Non-binary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Cis Male</td>
<td>28. Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Cis Man</td>
<td>29. Pangender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Cis Woman</td>
<td>30. Trans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Cisgender Female</td>
<td>31. Trans*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Cisgender Male</td>
<td>32. Trans Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Cisgender Man</td>
<td>33. Trans* Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Cisgender Woman</td>
<td>34. Trans Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Female to Male</td>
<td>35. Trans* Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. FTM</td>
<td>36. Trans Man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Gender Fluid</td>
<td>37. Trans* Man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Gender nonconforming</td>
<td>38. Trans Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Gender Questioning</td>
<td>39. Trans* Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Gender Variant</td>
<td>40. Trans Woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41. Trans* Woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42. Transfeminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43. Transgender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44. Transgender Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45. Transgender Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46. Transgender Man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47. Transgender Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48. Transgender Woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49. Transmasculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50. Transsexual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51. Transsexual Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52. Transsexual Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53. Transsexual Man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54. Transsexual Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55. Transsexual Woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56. Two-Spirit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Problem with Current ASAC+ Option

- Question: What is your gender?
  - Male
  - Female
  - Nonbinary / Third Gender
  - Prefers Not to Say

- male & female refer to biological sex
- we should be asking what is your gender identity
- nonbinary & third gender do not have anything to do with transgender people – *most* transgender people are NOT nonbinary
- third gender is likely not the most inclusive choice in thinking about alternative gender options from which to choose
Response choices Recommended by the the Transgender Policy and Climate Committee (TPACC)

What is your Gender Identity? - Or simply - “Check your Gender Identity” (not sure of the question they had in mind – only the response choices; short of removing the question altogether, this is what the SAC recommends)

- Man
- Woman
- TransMan
- TransWoman
- Nonbinary/Genderqueer/Gender non-conforming
- Something else
- Decline to Answer
Gender Identity (choose all that apply)

___ woman
___ man
___ trans or transgender (please specify): ________________________________
___ another identity (please specify): ________________________________

(likely way too open-ended, but, more importantly, in this instance, the consortium was primarily concerned with transgender people, hence this question not addressing gender nonconformity)
Sensitivity to Students

• Discussion of the reasons why we need forced choice gender options and why we need the appropriate categories
Questions? Feedback?