

UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
2020-2021 FACULTY SENATE XXV

The fundamental function of the approved minutes of the Faculty Senate is to accurately document actions taken by that body. Additionally, the minutes traditionally seek to provide context by capturing some statements of Senators, faculty in attendance, and guests. The minutes do not verify the veracity, authenticity, and/or accuracy of those statements.

Meeting called to order at 3:10 pm on February 8, 2021, via ZOOM

MINUTES SUMMARY

I. Roll – The following senators were absent: DeJoie and Knowles. The following senators were excused: Barnett and Mitchell. The following guests attended: James Dean, Wayne Jones, Kate Ziemer, Nicky Gullace, and Scott Smith.

II. Remarks by and questions to President Dean - President Dean thanked the senators for their dedication to the university and particularly to our students during this difficult time and acknowledged that faculty have found ways to continue to deliver education effectively despite a raft of challenges. So many have invested time and have developed new skills and online and hybrid teaching. These new capabilities will be helpful to us, both in our existing programs, and in new programs in the future.

The president spoke about the Discovery curriculum that the Senate will be discussing. He said that broad-based general education is the foundation of success for lifelong learners in an evolving global society and our strong liberal arts foundation is an important component of UNH education. He said he was particularly proud of the work done to ensure that diversity, equity and inclusion, as well as sustainability, feature prominently in the new Discovery proposal. The ability to develop and critique a position using logic, analysis and statistics is a core requirement for an educated person in contemporary society and we need these skills in the business and professional arena, in the political arena, and in making decisions that influence our family's health, prosperity, and overall welfare.

In the areas of diversity, equity, and inclusion, President Dean recognized the time and effort of the many faculty who have been involved directly or indirectly in faculty searches under the leadership of Provost Jones and with the support and expertise of Chief Diversity Officer Nadine Petty, as well as human resource partners. Academic departments are making a concerted effort to increase the diversity our candidate pools.

The president also recognized the work that faculty do in the classroom, specifically with students from under-represented groups. This support is particularly appreciated by first-generation, Pell-eligible, or minority students.

President Dean acknowledged the impact that faculty have on students. He shared that early in his teaching career he thought office hours were, at best, a necessary evil. But when he became a dean and asked a number of alumni what they most remembered about their experiences, an incredible number of them talked about conversations with faculty during office hours. This dramatically changed his view not only of office hours but of the impact on students' careers and overall lives that we can have. This is one of the reasons he regularly schedules office hours with students, even though most of them are virtual now.

UNH is due for our New England Commission of Higher Education, (NECHE) accreditation visit in 2023, which means that our self-study is due in about 18 months. The self-study is a time for us to celebrate our accomplishments and to align our strategies as we gather information about learning effectiveness and how we fulfill our mission. He referenced that Provost Jones would have more to say about our collective responsibilities in this area and would answer any questions.

Speaking broadly about the future of the university over the next five to ten years, President Dean pointed out that the largest group of our students and our largest source of income has always been undergraduate students, and this is likely to continue to be the case for some time. But the number of students coming of age for college education is declining nationally and will be for years to come, particularly in the Northeast. Even if we're able to maintain our share of these prospective students, our enrollments will decline and, with it, our ability to build and maintain financial strength. While it has probably already occurred to many that we should try to increase our share of a declining number of students - and we are certainly doing that - this is the same approach of every institution. It truly is a zero-sum game. So, while we will do everything possible to maintain our undergraduate enrollment, we all need to think more broadly about our educational offerings. We have an incredible array of knowledge among our faculty. How can this knowledge be used to develop new and attractive programs - master's programs, certificates, non-credit courses, or perhaps some format yet to be developed? We have been doing some of this already, including with growth in professional master's degrees, some of which are online, and with our Hybrid Program at the Law school. These are two examples that are illustrative of how successful we can be when we put our minds to this. So, if you have ideas along these lines please bring them up with your department chairs and deans. We intend to enhance our process for considering new program ideas and examining the market feasibility of different approaches over the next few months.

President Dean offered to take questions:

- The Senate chair, Erin Sharp, asked a question about **New Hampshire high-school students**. She pointed out that while this is a declining group, it is also a group that UNH hasn't necessarily been able to capture in terms of high numbers of applications and attendance. Have there been any successes in the work that that you and others are doing to reach out to high schools in New Hampshire?

President Dean responded that this work has begun with visits to high schools but with COVID the visits had to be cancelled. We are preparing to start those visits up again. We very much do want to build our in-state resident students. In-state applications are up a bit this year, so we're optimistic about that.

The president also shared that UNH has extended the application deadline this year from February 1 to March 1. However, the May 1st deposit deadline is not changing.

- A COLA senator asked for an update on the **transition that was envisioned for the Honors Program to become an Honors college**.

Provost Jones responded that there was work going on in this area but COVID slowed it down a bit. Professor Lisa MacFarlane was the interim director last year. Catherine Peebles is back now, and she has been engaging with Kate Ziemer about the plan.

Kate Ziemer also responded that we are really asking ourselves what is going to differentiate UNH. Catherine has been reaching out to folks about this. If faculty have any thoughts or ideas, please send them to Catherine. The hope is to have a proposal ready this summer.

- A COLA senator asked about the **recent decision to close the Confucius Institute**.

He understands that the university made the decision under the pressure from the federal government and that the Department of Defense (DOD) has threatened to cancel our grants if we did not close the program. While he appreciates the president's letter which makes it clear that our collaboration with Chengdu University has been fair and transparent, there are many of us that still have to face the consequences of this decision. COLA must squeeze our very limited budget in order to keep the Chinese language program and we may end up losing the program altogether if our budget problem worsens. COLA receives very little, if any, funding from the DOD. However, we bear the full consequence of this decision in order to keep DOD funding for the university. Is there any plan to mitigate COLA's financial loss because of this decision?

President Dean responded that if there are financial challenges associated with this, we will certainly look into that through the budgeting process. We do hope to continue our relationship with Chengdu University, and we hope that we can continue many, if not all, of the programs. He also shared that he had a long conversation with President Wang of Chengdu over Zoom a month or two ago. There is a lot of goodwill there.

- The same COLA senator asked **about academic freedom**. An article in a recent NH newspaper, the *New Hampshire Journal*, hinted that the Confucius Institute at UNH is brainwashing students. We all know that is not true. However, such misinformation has created very serious problems for faculty who teach about China. Last semester, a colleague who teaches about China received a very long and critical comment in her teaching evaluation saying that she is brainwashing her students and that she is brainwashed by the Chinese Communist Party. Has UNH planned any media outreach to correct misinformation? How will UNH support faculty like us and protect our academic freedom?

President Dean responded on the issue of brainwashing that he does remember seeing that and this has been an accusation that's been thrown around fairly loosely. On the issue of academic freedom this is definitely one of the first principles under which he would want to say that we have not only the right but the responsibility to teach the truth about whatever it is that we're talking about, whether it's about China or whether it's about anything having to do with our own country. The US relationship with China is a bit fraught right now. But he believes that more openness and more communication is what we need to try and get to a better understanding of that.

President Dean continued saying that the people who say things about brainwashing can't really have done much in-depth look at what we're actually doing here. We are teaching the Chinese language. It is much better that we have students who understand the language of another country. About teaching Chinese culture, we could teach the culture of any country in the world. China is a particularly important country to us right now and President Dean does not see that is in any way brainwashing. So, he continues to stand by the relationship. China is an important player on the world stage. Helping students to understand what China is and what China isn't is an important role that we play, and he hopes that we can continue playing that.

- A CHHS senator asked what happens when we have **significant melt in our classrooms when more students move face-to-face**. For example, if 80% of a class goes online, is there a tipping point at which the class can move from face-to-face to online?

Provost Jones responded that we have tried to give that decision to the faculty member. We want to keep the mode of operation that we had intended for this semester. But if there is a spike that takes out a

significant portion of a class for a couple of weeks, the modality may have to change in response. But we assume that on the other side of that, they will all be back again. The provost said we are not going to centrally set a specific number. We believe the faculty are in the best position to decide.

Kate Ziemer added that this question was discussed in the spring planning committee. We know that we've done a much better job this spring semester in ensuring that our students know the modality of the course when they sign up for it. We have worked out a lot of bugs from systems so the data that we have, whether its Wildcat Pass or the letters from the Dean of Students, is very robust now and we can stand behind that without any questions. It makes sense that it is in the purview of the instructor to make a determination if you get to that critical mass point and we're here to support you if there's something we can do on the data side.

- The Senate chair pointed out **the increasing number of students who are isolated or quarantining**. Wayne said that this is the expected start of the semester. However, we continue to watch the data in order to make decisions.

III. Remarks by and questions to the chair -

- The chair welcomed back senators who were on leave last semester and proxies covering senators on leave this semester.

- The Senate elections will be conducted in March. For senators who are coming to the end of their term, it is important to communicate with your colleagues to let them know if you wish to be reelected. Kathy, the Senate admin, added that it is very useful in general for faculty to discuss senate representation prior to the start of the election process. She also pointed out that all eligible faculty will be listed on the ballot based on their current employment status. Therefore, the ballot will include the names of faculty who will be retiring at the end of the semester. In the unlikely event that a retiring faculty member should be elected, they would decline to serve, and we would go to the person with the next highest number of votes.

- The Agenda Committee is working with Kate Ziemer and others to co-host with the Provost Office a spring convocation on the topic of free speech, truth, and civility, scheduled for Friday, February 19 at 2:10 pm. There will be additional messaging about this.

IV. Approval of the minutes from December 7, 2020 - Approval of the minutes was postponed until the next meeting of the Senate due to time constraints.

V. Student Affairs Committee (SAC) motion on curtailed operations – Andrew Coppens, SAC, reminded senators that this motion was presented at the December 7 meeting,

Motion on Academic Instruction during Curtailed Operations

Rationale: Although we recognize that (1) a curtailed operations event at UNH does not constitute a holiday or “day off” for university employees or students, and (2) curtailed operation days continue to be programmed days of instruction during academic semesters it is the case that curtailment responds to varied circumstances of disruption in instructors’ and students’ abilities to continue normal and planned operations. These disruptions may include damage to property or persons needing immediate attention, loss of power and/or internet connectivity, etc. The unpredictability of such disruptions and their person-to-person variance require localized and customized accommodations by instructors and have the potential to exacerbate issues of equity

among both students and faculty – the most under-resourced among the campus community are, on the whole, likely to be disproportionately affected by conditions prompting curtailment.

Instructional response to such varied circumstances requires nimble and flexible adaptation, which must respond both to issues of *equity* (i.e., ensuring all students have equitable access and opportunities to learn and succeed) as well as to issues of *pedagogy* (i.e., determining the best way to engage students in learning under rapid changes in the feasibility of course modalities and academic technology support). The Faculty Senate asserts that course instructors are the best informed and most expert in making curtailment adjustments to uphold educational equity and to uphold high-quality pedagogy in ways that conform to specific subject matter demands.

Expansions of course modality diversity during the COVID-19 pandemic have pushed instructors and students to be creative and flexible regarding course delivery modalities and have also underscored the co-dependency of this flexibility with academic technology and internet connectivity. Although non-face-to-face modalities have become more common under COVID-19 campus status conditions, both academic technologies and internet connectivity resources, in addition to concerns such as availability of childcare and other family resources, are specifically threatened in conditions that lead to curtailed operations.

The appropriate standard of instructional continuity to be upheld despite days of curtailed operations is the federal definition of a credit hour, summarized in the recent Senate Motion #XXIV-M18

https://www.unh.edu/sites/default/files/departments/faculty_senate/on_including_common_language_about_fed_def_of_credit_hour_motn_xxiv-m18-050420_1.pdf.

This standard does not require that particular instructional days or synchronous modalities are upheld during curtailed operations.

We therefore endeavor to clarify and further specify the 11/16/2020 direct communication from COO and VP of Administration Christopher Clement (which could be read as suggesting continuation of *synchronous* instruction during curtailed operations), and in the following motion to align policy and recommendations with above rationale.

Motion:

The UNH Faculty Senate affirms the authority of faculty to determine equity-sustaining and pedagogically appropriate responses to conditions of curtailed operations on UNH campuses, given (1) the subject matter and pedagogical expertise of instructors and (2) their local knowledge of student needs and resources.

Faculty may not hold on-campus, in-person classes during conditions of curtailed operations. Students are expected to check course websites and/or follow faculty course-specific guidance for alternate plans. In making alternative plans, we urge academic departments and instructors to appreciate the unique challenges of synchronous remote instruction during conditions leading to curtailed operations and to use temporary asynchronous modalities wherever possible.

Synchronous online instruction during curtailed operations, if chosen, should be communicated in course syllabi in advance as an expectation. Students may not be disadvantaged in grading if they are unable to participate due to, for example, limited access to technology/internet services or family complications. If instructors choose to hold synchronous online classes or meetings during curtailed operations, meeting recordings,

slides, and/or informational notes must be made available to students who are unable to participate. Flexible accommodations such as assignment deadline extensions should be offered, and it is strongly recommended that exams be rescheduled.

We recommend that syllabus language and faculty guidance be added to the newly developed “Faculty Resource Hub” designed and led in part by CEITL and AVP Ziemer, to ensure that faculty and students are able to communicate expectations and have resources for accommodation necessary to respond appropriately to curtailed operations.

Jennifer Hargenrader, the student senate representative, thanked Andrew and the SAC for putting together this motion. She said that many students were concerned about the snowstorm last week and whether faculty would penalize them for not being able to attend Zoom sessions if they had power issues.

A senator from Earth Sciences said that the faculty in her department feel that it would be better to not have classes during curtailed operations even if the class is normally taught online.

Gregg Moore from Biological Sciences said that the reaction from his department was largely very good. However, there was confusion about the statement “Students may not be disadvantaged in grading if they are unable to participate due to....” **A friendly amendment was offered to change the sentence to read “Students shall not be disadvantaged....” Andrew accepted this amendment.**

A UNH Manchester senator pointed out that he teaches in a fully online program and there are an increasing number of students who are outside the geographic area affected by NH weather. Further, based on President Dean’s remarks today, it is likely that more online programs will be developed. He does want the ability to continue to offer his class during curtailed operations.

Another senator from Biological Sciences suggested that from one curtailment situation to the next there are difficulties from different angles. He proposed changing the motion to reflect that faculty may not hold classes, in-person or online when the university has announced curtailed operations.

Andrew pointed out that the committee took into account the HR and staff policy around curtailed operations which says that it is a day of work and it is assumed that people, if able to, are continuing to engage in employment activities. The committee felt that it wasn’t appropriate to stray too far from the notion that people continue to engage whenever possible. The motion was considered a balance, one that didn’t force all faculty to do the same thing.

An amendment was offered by Subhash Minocha to change the second paragraph of the motion to read: “Faculty may not hold on-campus, in-person classes or online classes during continues of curtailed operations.” The amendment also included removing the third paragraph of the motion.

The motion to amend was seconded and discussion was opened on the amendment.

A Computer Science senator stated that she is opposed to this amendment. She shared that a few years ago, approximately 50% of her classes were not held during the first 3 weeks of classes, due to curtailed operations. There was no option to make up those classes. She doesn’t want to see that happen going forward now that the majority of students are able to attend via a remote option.

A senator from MCBS said that he has talked to multiple students during the last year that have been forced to drive to places for Wi-Fi to complete their classes, including students who have driven in a

snowstorm to find Wi-Fi in order to attend a synchronous class during curtailed operations. While the amendment is well intended, it isn't clear how this can be enforced. Faculty holding synchronous classes during a snow curtailment puts students that are not going to be at that lecture at a disadvantage since they will not be able to ask questions and get immediate clarification. Also, they may have limited access to a lecture capture before the next class. The senator said that he is also concerned that, should the amended motion pass, there is no way of keeping track of whether instructors are actually holding to this line of no teaching during curtailed operations and whether this could be enforced.

A senator from Electrical and Computer Engineering pointed out that the amendment is not clear on what happens with asynchronous classes, where all the lectures are pre-recorded, and students choose when to work on the course.

Andrew said that the assumption is that asynchronous classes would be untouched by this motion. A suggestion was made to make this clearer in the motion.

A senator from Nursing stated that, on behalf of her department, she does not support the amendment. The Nursing program has a very full curriculum and the department really relies on any way we can get the education to our students. It is essential that we have the ability to educate our students in the fashion that, as a department, we see fit. It is necessary for nursing students to continue with their coursework and graduate on time.

A senator from Chemical Engineering said that based on conversations with his students who did recently attend his online class during curtailed operations, most of them really enjoyed it and wanted to continue with their learning. They have already felt that the semester is disrupted enough and that any way to create consistency this semester really helps them. For the students who couldn't attend online, he was able to offer a recording of the class.

There was a discussion about whether this amendment applies to asynchronous online classes. Subhash clarified that his intent is that when curtailed operations are announced, there are no classes of any kind.

The motion to amend was put to a vote. **The motion failed with 12 in favor, 45 opposed, and 6 abstentions.**

The discussion returned to the original motion. There was a question about whether the motion impacts asynchronous classes. Andrew suggested that the motion should be inclusive as possible since asynchronous classes sometimes have synchronous exams or other activities. **A friendly amendment was offered to change the first sentence of the third paragraph to read "Synchronous online instruction or activities during curtailed operations...." Andrew accepted this amendment.**

A senator from Earth Sciences pointed out that there is a day at the end of the semester if there are too many cancelled classes. The chair acknowledge that this was added to the calendar by the Faculty Senate to deal with a curtailment during final exams.

Another senator asked why the third bullet of the motion should only apply to curtailed operations. Why wouldn't it be true outside of curtailed operations when a student should not be disadvantaged if there is some glitch in their ability to participate remotely in a synchronous course? Andrew said that he doesn't disagree with the importance of considering that. However, the scope of the current motion is specifically directed to what to do during curtailed operations. He said that he would support pursuing that larger issue outside of our consideration of this motion.

The motion was put to a vote with the final text of the motion as follows:

The UNH Faculty Senate affirms the authority of faculty to determine equity-sustaining and pedagogically appropriate responses to conditions of curtailed operations on UNH campuses, given (1) the subject matter and pedagogical expertise of instructors and (2) their local knowledge of student needs and resources.

Faculty may not hold on-campus, in-person classes during conditions of curtailed operations. Students are expected to check course websites and/or follow faculty course-specific guidance for alternate plans. In making alternative plans, we urge academic departments and instructors to appreciate the unique challenges of synchronous remote instruction during conditions leading to curtailed operations and to use temporary asynchronous modalities wherever possible.

Synchronous online instruction or activities during curtailed operations, if chosen, should be communicated in course syllabi in advance as an expectation. Students shall not be disadvantaged in grading if they are unable to participate due to, for example, limited access to technology/internet services or family complications. If instructors choose to hold synchronous online classes or meetings during curtailed operations, meeting recordings, slides, and/or informational notes must be made available to students who are unable to participate. Flexible accommodations such as assignment deadline extensions should be offered, and it is strongly recommended that exams be rescheduled.

We recommend that syllabus language and faculty guidance be added to the newly developed “Faculty Resource Hub” designed and led in part by CEITL and AVP Ziemer, to ensure that faculty and students are able to communicate expectations and have resources for accommodation necessary to respond appropriately to curtailed operations.

The motion passed with 57 in favor, 5 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

VI. Remarks by and questions to the Student Body President, Nicholas (Nick) Fitzgerald - Nick provided an update on the Student Senate and its accomplishments this year:

- There was a large turnover in leadership. In fact, this was Nicholas’ first year in the Senate. Many of the student senators are freshmen.
- The Student Senate has been working on different ways of operating when it comes to collaboration with the university including the Faculty and the student body in general.
- The councils have been working very hard to reach out to students to discuss compromises and then of course, writing resolutions.
- 21 resolutions were passed in Fall 2020. Many were deemed urgent to better safeguard the community from the dangers of COVID-19.
- In addition to work on resolutions, work is taking place to help make the Senate more productive with a focus on dialogue and discussion with departments on campus. As well, there will be some focus on passing resolutions that support initiatives or to congratulate offices, departments or individuals who have enacted changes to benefit the student body.
- In an effort to increase collaboration, several commissions have been formed. These are designed to work through dialogue on very targeted issues, including diversity, equity, and inclusion on campus, developing a better relationship between the athletics department and the student body, and enhancements to academic advising on campus. The commission on academic advising will be working with the Faculty Senate.

- The Student Senate will continue to focus on COVID-19 and how it is affecting the student population and what can be done to make life better for the students while keeping them safe.
- The Student Senate has started up its bylaws committee again to identify ways to build a stronger governing document to ensure a strong and healthy organization.

In response to a question from the chair about the advising commission, Nick said that the council will coordinate with the Agenda Committee and the appropriate Faculty Senate committee during the semester in connection with this effort.

Erin asked whether the Student Senate has reviewed the recommendations of the Discovery Review Committee. Nick shared that the Academic Affairs Council has reviewed the proposal, including the newly edited version and this council is working on a resolution of support to be presented to the Student Senate for discussion and vote. At this time, there does seem to be support for the proposal. The DEI commission has also looked at it and is supportive. There is also an effort to get feedback from a larger pool of students.

VII. Agenda Committee report on feedback on the Discovery Review Committee (DRC) proposal - Erin Sharp, the Senate chair, reviewed that a Qualtrics survey was distributed for faculty to offer comments, concerns, and ideas in response to a presentation of the DRC proposal at the December 7 Senate meeting. A report has been prepared based on the 140 different points of feedback received. The report was attached to the agenda for the meeting and appears in Appendix VII.1

The Agenda Committee worked with Scott Smith, the DRC chair, and Nicky Gullace, Faculty director of the Discovery Program, to seek some answers in response to the report. As a result, some changes have been made to the proposal. A summary of the changes was included in the agenda packet for this meeting and appears in Appendix VII.2.

Erin noted that were 16 comments about the elimination of science labs. She explained that her understanding is that the COLSA administrators and COSLA faculty on the DRC actually initiated this change. Kim Babbitt, Associate dean of COLSA has explained that there is a real desire to offer some kind of broad-based innovative science classes to Discovery students. COLSA and also CEPS sees this as an opportunity to offer more innovative courses to students and, at the same time, to be able to focus lab experiences on those students who are majoring in areas where lab science is really critical to what they do. They see this as a chance to be more generalized in their science approaches for Discovery courses and be more specific in their science courses for majors who need the lab. It is also important to note that students can still take science with a lab to fulfill a Discovery requirement. Instead, the change is that the lab is not required.

Erin said that the Agenda Committee feels strongly that the DRC proposal should be presented to the Senate for an up or down vote on the full suite of recommendations. This would be different than the approval process for the original Discovery Program where each piece was discussed and voted on separately. Because the pieces are interrelated, it really made the implementation challenging.

If the proposal were to pass, the implementation work would include the establishment of an ad hoc committee to develop the framework around the diversity and inequality courses. Also, the Discovery Committee would work to ensure that there were student learning goals associated with the new attributes. The Discovery Program Committee would conduct the course reviews and approval.

The chair opened the floor for comments and questions:

- A CEPS senator asked about the “Diversity and Inequality, the US experience” component. How is that being defined? Is it a category or an attribute?

Erin explained that this was initially going to be an attribute that could overlap with categories. But the student members on the DRC and some faculty felt strongly that it should be its own category, one that could not be double-counted. The recommendation is that it would be called a Discovery foundation and that it would not be counted as a knowledge category or an attribute.

Nicky said that it was originally intended to be an attribute in an attempt to reduce the overall number of Discovery requirements. But, when the plan was presented to the students, they felt strongly that this should remain a foundational course. They and several members of the faculty worried that if it were an attribute, it could eat up entire categories like History or Humanities or Social Science. Once it was put back in the Foundations area with English and Quantitative Reasoning it made it simpler. It fulfills the spirit of the diversity requirements that students want, and it solves several of the problems that were raised in the Qualtrics survey.

- Is the Diversity component intended for the first year or can it be taken at any time over the student’s four years?

The current proposal is that that course could happen anytime within a student’s four years at UNH.

Scott shared that the original proposal included a diversity component as a first-year requirement and then a second one that could be taken at a different time. This is a compromise that allows us to have a clear dedication to diversity and inequality, separate from an attribute.

- A senator from the Mechanical Engineering Department explained that one concern of his department is student workload. Even if the number of Discovery courses decreases, depending on what the categories are, if the overall work that needs to be completed for the program increases, that would be a significant disadvantage to our students who are already packed with a lot of work.

The other concern is about advising and how easy or difficult it will be to transition to the new program.

As long as these are addressed, I think our department will be in favor. Is it possible that our department could have an option to pick between the two different versions, the old style or the try new style and then, after some time, see what works?

Nicky responded that the DRC considered the Mechanical engineering requirements because it is one of the most highly structured majors at UNH. However, we weren't able to give as many reductions as we had originally hoped. But students would have fewer Discovery course requirements.

She also said that she doesn't think that the courses themselves would be more difficult. Faculty who are teaching Discovery courses generally realize that students have a lot of work. If Mechanical Engineering was concerned about that, we would work on this to make sure that the courses slotted into your free periods where you take Discovery courses would be at the lower level so that you wouldn't have a Mechanical Engineering student taking a 600-level course that had been recently designated

Discovery. We would try to make sure that there were options that balanced well, fit well with their interests, and that weren't overly demanding.

- A senator from Languages, Literatures, and Cultures thanked everybody who worked so hard on this. He said that he received a lot of response in his department and there is a lot of deep concern. He said that he expects that we are not the only department who feels this way concerning the World Cultures requirement and the demotion of global studies and world culture on our campus that is reflected in the shedding of the Confucius Institute. It is also reflected across the country and our concern is that it's going to be reflected unintentionally in the curriculum that we're presenting to our students. Having World Cultures as an attribute rather than a learning category is sort of "tack on" to other courses and it is going to impact a lot of departments on campus. I think it's going to really have a detrimental impact on our students' global awareness.

The last four years have been all about shutting up America's borders. But I think that, and I hope that, our country is going to be turning in a different direction now. The strategic plan for 2020 made global education and internationalization of our campus one of its founding principles, as did the most recent plan for inclusivity on campus. And so, this sort of goes against some of the trends that the university has been setting over the last few years.

We have a lot of concerns about the World Cultures requirement in general. We would like to see it back in its position as a knowledge category rather than as an attribute which is tacked on to other classes.

Another request is that if we are going to have a course on inclusion, that this not be limited to the United States experience, but that it be something that is an issue of global inclusion. We are only 4% of the global population and it seems not very inclusive to limit 96% of the world from the discussion. Our own experiences can benefit from discussions and experiences all across the globe. If we're going to have this required course, we would request that it be opened up for issues of inclusion across the globe and in other cultures and other countries.

The last item is a question and point of clarification. I believe the proposal mentions that a full semester of study abroad is required to meet learning requirements. Currently, there is an 8-week requirement. Is that an intentional change? It seems to me that the push has been to lower the amount of time spent abroad to meet learning requirements rather than to raise it to a full semester.

Scott responded that, in terms of the study abroad requirement, he believes that the 8-week limit would probably remain. We would have to work with that, and it is also for the Senate to settle on.

In terms of World Cultures, the university has a responsibility to increase the internationalization beyond what we do with general education. The fact of the matter is that in order to open up other avenues for other important things, we had to find ways of shifting the things that we do. So, this is an item for the Senate to discuss. The DRC has made a recommendation. It is up to the Faculty Senate to debate.

Nicky added that the World Cultures and Global Literacy attribute and the ETS attribute were chosen because they were the most interdisciplinary of the selections that we had in our kind of list of categories. For example, you could have a global social science, or you could have something on Chinese medicine or technology and the Middle East, or something like that. Under the plan, a student could satisfy Global Studies in almost any discipline. It is no longer something that students can opt out of. So, as many

students would be studying global cultures as would be taking Humanities or History or any other category. Nicky said that it is a more mobile category that we felt could be an attribute and would enhance many of the offerings. As well, this change might enhance enrollments for those teaching world culture. For example, if you are teaching Russian literature, which satisfies World Cultures currently, students could under the new proposal, have this course satisfy both the Humanities category and the Global Culture attribute.

Nicky agreed with Scott that the committee was trying to find the most sensible way of allowing students to double-dip and combine requirements. Students still take 128 credits, but we are taking about between 1 to 8 of those credits and taking them out of the Discovery program and putting them onto the free market. And so, virtually everybody, except for Fine and Performing Arts, will end up in some cases, doubling up. A student who would have, in the past, taken History in a 50-person class and World Cultures in a 50-person class, those two classes could now be combined, allowing that student a free choice on a class. For those of us who are used to working in a very prescriptive market that is worrying. But, for students, it will be liberating.

Nicky asked one of the Student Senate representatives to speak to the comment about the Diversity foundation being US focused only. Jennifer Hargenrader, a student representative on the Discovery Review Committee, responded that students are really in support of the diversity and inclusion, US experience, course and this is coming from all different walks of life across campus, not just the Student Senate. As a US institution it is really important that in sending students into the mainly US workforce, we educate them on what this country is and what things happened in this country. It is important that everybody understands that it is a responsibility of a core curriculum to make sure that students are well-rounded and that they really understand the United States around them. Many students feel that this course, whether it's taught in History or some other department, is going to be beneficial to students overall.

- Another senator from Mechanical Engineering commented that there are several programs in our university that require external accreditation. And because of this external accreditation, our students are now taking 132 credits instead of the 128. So, when decisions about this proposal are made, the number of courses is really important for us. He said that he is ready to discuss this offline to make sure that our program has capacity to accommodate these changes.

- A senator from Physics and Astronomy asked a question about the number of credits required for Discovery. His understanding is 40 credits. But in this discussion, he is hearing 36.

Nicky explained that the Writing Intensive (WI) courses count as being general education. Since we require students to take three of these in addition to English 401, even if they are in the student's own field, this will top up the number. We have fairly hefty requirements, including the Capstone. By the time we add those up, we have a very robust general education program even with students taking fewer courses now.

- A senator from Computer Science said that his department has many concerns about the proposal. Although he won't discuss all of them in this meeting, he was asked to convey today an issue of timing. We feel that this is absolutely the worst time to undertake this change. RCM is gone and we don't know what's going to replace it. We are very much in the dark on the financial flow of the university. This is not the time to make a decision like this.

Moreover, many colleges, if not all, have lost faculty because of the incentive for retirement. We are actually struggling to cover our core courses right now. We are cancelling sections of required courses. We don't have enough teaching capacity for our major courses. Again, this is not the time where we can decide how we're going to participate in this Discovery plan. How possible is it going to be for our students when we are removing courses that were offered both semesters and now will only be offered one semester because we cannot cover them?

We feel that between the loss of RCM and between the shortage on faculty right now with absolutely no plan to replace them in the near future, this is the absolute worst time to do something as disruptive as replacing the Discovery Program.

Scott responded that this is really a question for the Faculty Senate to deliberate over and that he hopes there will be a robust discussion about it. A time like this could potentially be seen as the right time to reorient ourselves to something that could potentially be transformative. However, that is not for the DRC to decide. That is for the Faculty Senate to deliberate. He said that this proposal has administrative and student support. It has a committee support. That ought to at least provide some weight in the discussion going forward.

Nicky added that she appreciates the anxiety. She said that in response to some of the things articulated, this plan may lift some of the weight from your shoulders. I think students will have fewer Discovery courses that they have to take. The elimination of the lab means that colleges like CEPS and COLSA that have been struggling with coverage for things like TA-ships won't have to worry about that. The fact that there are now choices - students can choose any two sciences they want - means that if your department can't offer as many Discovery seats or any, the students will find their place because we know that Geology and Nutrition are concerned about losing students. By opening up the free market, the colleges and departments that can't offer more seats and whose students need relief are going to be some of the ones who benefit the most from this change. Because there are other people who are worried about low enrollments, not low faculty members, the students will welcome having one less course they have to take.

- A MCBS senator said that, like others, his department has multiple concerns with the program as it is constructed. One of the primary concerns is the loss of a lab course. And while there was information given about Associate Dean Babbitt's comments about being able to open up new courses to accommodate the new paradigm, that is not something that faculty in his department have been made aware of. He said that he personally believes that a lab-based science is something that people should at least get at some point in their career and there are a number of faculty in his department who agree with that.

Also, it is important to have experiences in both physical and biological science, especially when you consider the crisis that is going on right now. We are dealing with a sizable population of the United States that has fears over getting a vaccine for a potentially deadly illness. The MCBS department wants to make clear that there needs to be some sort of assurance that there is a biological or health-oriented literacy component to this Discovery Program, simply because of what we're dealing with right now.

Due to time, the chair closed the discussion. However, she encouraged all senators to take this content and discussion to their departments and to continue to ask questions and engage in discussions over this. Questions can be sent directly to Scott Smith and Nicky Gullace.

VIII. Adjournment - The chair asked senators to review the APC motion in the agenda packet with their colleagues. It calls for the formation of a committee to address the way forward for how we receive feedback from students on courses and teaching.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:05 pm.

Some UNH acronyms:

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

APPENDIX VII. 1

Feedback Submitted via Qualtrics on Discovery Review Committee Recommendations Prepared by Agenda Committee and Kathy Brunet

Timeline

- February 2019: Motion passed for formation of Ad Hoc committee (Discovery Review Committee: DRC) for Discovery Review
- April 2019: Committee charges were approved by the Faculty Senate

Charges:

- 1) Investigate ways the Discovery Program can become more manageable for students in highly structured pre-Professional majors.*
 - 2) Investigate ways the Discovery Program can develop the flexibility to allow Transfer Students to achieve their degrees in a timely fashion.*
 - 3) Investigate the First-Year experience at UNH to achieve academic and community engagement through interdisciplinary Discovery offerings.*
 - 4) Investigate ways to encourage High Impact practices (such as Study Abroad and Internships) by aligning the transfer and assessment of credits with the goal of encouraging, rather than deterring, students who wish to take advantage of these enriching opportunities.*
 - 5) Investigate ways Discovery can accommodate qualified students who wish to fulfill distributive requirements in upper division courses, possibly as part of a Minor or Cognate cluster and/or through a deeper understanding of a content area or category (depth).*
 - 6) Investigate the possibility of incorporating Ethical Attributes (such as Diversity, Civic Education, and Sustainability) that are politically, socially, and culturally inclusive.*
 - 7) Review the concerns about Discovery delivery by colleges and “turf” battles over Discovery courses.*
 - 8) Tasks 1–7 should be carried out in concert with a review of the best practices and successful strategies adopted by other universities, especially our comparators.*
- May 2019 – Summer 2020: DRC work
 - September 2020: DRC Final Report submitted to Agenda Committee
 - November 2020: Agenda Committee and Academic Program Committee met to discuss the DRC Final Report. We provided some feedback to Scott Smith and Nicky Gullace on areas for clarification prior to distributing to the full Senate
 - November 2020: DRC Final Report distributed to the full Senate. Agenda Committee set up a Qualtrics link as a central location for the sharing of questions, concerns, and ideas.
 - December 2020: Scott Smith presented DRC Final Report to the full Senate
 - January 2021: Agenda Committee distributed DRC Final Report again to senators along with a 1-pager guide to the recommendations and review process

Summary of Submitted Feedback

February 1, 2021

Comments submitted through Qualtrics were separated into individual points of feedback ($N = 150$), and then these were coded to organize content into broader themes. All comments submitted as of 2/1/2021 are inserted verbatim in a table at the end of this document.

The feedback submitted through Qualtrics should not be considered representative of all perspectives on the DRC recommendations. It should also be noted that general endorsements of the DRC recommendations are probably less likely to be submitted through this process. **Nine separate points of feedback were submitted that offered broadly positive feedback.**

Comments included:

"I like the proposal a lot and I strongly favor it. I think it will enrich Discovery, making it more meaningful to students. It is also more manageable than the old laundry list of requirements and, by allowing "Attributes," it stresses important thematic and "values" content. I'm thrilled with the idea of allowing upper-division courses to count for Discovery."

"I think the report seems sound overall and indeed adds a moral and ethical component to our curriculum that I have long felt was absent. Attention to diversity, inequality, governance and identity are very important and, my word, it's about time!"

"This is a great proposal and would offer a MUCH better Discovery experience for our students. With some modifications, I think the Faculty Senate should adopt it. It was clearly a Herculean task and I applaud the committee with coming up with such a sensible plan."

Broader themes that emerged from the feedback are described below in order from the *most* to *least* introduced in the submissions.

1. World Cultures Knowledge Category and Foreign Language Requirement ($N = 39$)

**The DRC recommendations shift World Cultures from a knowledge category to an attribute.*

Across the 34 comments, there was a consistent concern that the recommended changes could lead to students graduating from UNH without any content specific to global and world issues.

Comments included:

"If students only have to complete 3 of the 4 "Global Challenges and Sustainable Living" categories, they could take 3 courses and get no global, international, or cross-cultural content because only 1 of those 4 categories is explicitly focused on "global" and "world issues. ""

"World Cultures and Global Literacies is just getting shunted rather than uplifted."

"This is incredibly counter-productive at this moment in history and is against the principles of this university. It is a complete fall back to the "America First" focus that so many of us have been opposed to and working against for decades."

Five submitted comments addressed specifically the impact of the World Cultures change on foreign languages.

“Foreign languages should be a required [sic]. Actually, one-year requirement of world languages is not enough in today's world.”

2. Introduction of Diversity & Inequality: The US Experience Requirement (N = 26)

Responses were generally positive about the addition of a diversity requirement for students. Concerns were raised about implementation.

For example, concerns that if the diversity course is not required as an independent course but as an attribute, students could double count and satisfy, for example, the Historical Perspective or Social Science knowledge category with the diversity requirement, limiting students' broader exposure in these areas.

“I very much like the "Diversity & Inequality" requirement, but I think it should be a stand-alone course, rather than an "Attribute." A fact-based historical survey of the experience of inequality in the United States is a crucial undertaking that fulfills President Dean's promise for curricular change and is very much desired by the Student Senate, which has advocated for a Diversity requirement. Yet, such an Attribute course, regardless of what department or college it is taught in, would almost by necessity fulfill an HP or an SS Discovery requirement. If it is allowed to fulfill a Discovery category as well as the Diversity requirement, it could wipe out all other HP and many other Social Science courses, since students would prefer to knock off two requirements at once. This means that the vast majority of Freshman who take the course would simultaneously fulfill HP or SS, concentrating almost the entire student demand in a lower-division U.S. based course.”

Questions were also raised about who would design and teach this category of courses and about the specific course objectives.

Sample comments included:

“Teaching the history of racism and anti-racism is not the same as teaching principles and practices of anti-racism that students can use in their daily lives. There seems to be a conflation of these in DHI:US. And doing this all for white 18-year olds is not easy. You need serious training to do this or the consequences are going to be disastrous, especially for students of color who are in these classes along with their white majority counterparts. Are you prepared to programmatically and financially support and train faculty to do the best?”

“It is unclear what the format is for "Diversity, History, Inequality: US Experience" - is it a giant lecture course with discussion sections? How many will run each year and semester? If only some departments can contribute, what does that mean financially for some departments (like History, which can offer over 10 sections out of the hypothetical 20), as compared to other departments who are unable to offer this due to faculty numbers/staffing, etc.? Are PhD students going to be asked to teach these introductory classes? How will you do equitable staffing among faculty with no expertise in these areas and those who are strong in these areas?”

Comments also highlighted concerns about the DRC's Final Report referring to 1619 as a starting point for content covered in these courses, which does not reflect the earlier arrival of enslaved Black people to the continental US.

3. Changing the Discovery Program is Complex / Onerous (N = 19)

Comments in this theme focused on concerns with having to advise students through a more complex system of requirements (skills, knowledge categories, and attributes).

“The committee needs to address whether the proposed system is trackable. It seems unnecessarily complex.”

Concerns were also raised that an increase in first-year Discovery expectations may be difficult for students that also have required first-year sequences in their major.

“The new requirements are just too complicated. Dealing with two sets of orthogonal requirements will make it unnecessarily complicated for students. Although the proposal claims to reduce the burden of the discovery program for students, I can imagine that it may significantly increase the requirements if there are insufficient number of classes that cover the right attributes for any particular student.”

4. Science Labs and Sustainability (N = 16)

**The DRC recommendations remove the general education requirement to complete a science lab and also allow students to choose to take 2 science courses in either category (biological / physical) rather than requiring one in each.*

Comments reflected concerns that science, climate, and sustainability should have increasing, rather than decreasing, priority in a revised curriculum.

“the global challenges and sustainable living read very much like propaganda. I believe that climate change and environmental degradation is probably the greatest challenge that humanity has ever faced. And we are failing miserably. But I fear that mandating that students care about is the wrong way to make actual progress. Is there another way to engage students in such issues?”

There was also a comment questioning the distinction between a new, general education, minor in Global Challenges and Sustainable Living and the Sustainability Dual Major.

“Under “Process – Phase 2” the document states: “Develop the learning outcomes for the new Knowledge categories and the Global Challenges and Sustainable Living Attributes” It seems to me that our Sustainability Education Goals would be a good place to start. (This is referring to goals set by the University Committee for the Sustainability Dual Major and other interested faculty) Under “specific changes proposed by the DRC”, the document states “Introduce minor in Global Challenges and Sustainable Living”. I think this could easily be accomplished within the existing framework of the Sustainability Dual Major.”

Finally, concerns were raised about the recommendations regarding lab courses and student choice around taking either physical or biological science.

Sample comments included:

“I feel strongly that both a biological and physical science should be required if the aim is to provide a breadth of training/exposure.”

“All students must be exposed to science-based lab work. This is where science happens in real time and in students' own hands. We are already witnessing anti-science policies and publics in our

communities that will no doubt take several generations to correct. (Hello, COVID-19.) Forcing students to understand the scientific method by their own hand will better assure that no one can deny processes of experimentation, collaboration, and technologies that produce data and evidence.”

5. Review and Revision Process (N = 15)

These comments raised concerns about whether enough diverse voices were part of the DRC and review process, that the financial incentives and competitive nature of general education influenced the recommendations, and that it was not clear how the final report reflected faculty-wide feedback during the process.

Sample comments included:

“I realize the criticism here is harsh, but it feels like the committee did not listen to feedback and has been trying to steamroll these changes without given [sic] any weight to the very critical and factually based feedback received. Please listen to your faculty!”

“I worry that the new categories heavily favor humanities programs/departments and are too narrowly construed for broad and enthusiastic involvement by units across campus.”

“I spent three hours reading and rereading the proposal documents and writing these comments. I know you've put in so much more in the long-run. I care. I want our student to succeed and care about them. I think you are going somewhere in the right direction, but with this proposal, you aren't taking everyone along with you, especially those of us you will need to succeed if you want to actually make real ideals of diversity and inclusion.”

6. Table Recommendations for Now (N = 7)

These comments reflect the timing of taking on revisions to the Discovery program in the context of significant disruptions due to COVID.

Representative comments included:

“Why is this needed at this time. I am certainly for a course on diversity, but why so many other changes. The administration, during the time of COVID, has changed purchasing, the computer support, and time keeping. All of this while faculty are struggling just to teach as effectively as possible and keep their research going. Now, we as faculty, are going impose additional work on ourselves. This makes no sense during this time. Faculty are at a breaking point here and we need to let up not make more work for ourselves. So, my question is, WHY?”

“Please delay moving forward until more of us can focus on this and participate in these important decisions.”

7. “Other” Questions and Concerns

Concerns and questions that were raised but had fewer numbers of comments included:

- Where does ETS fit in the recommended curriculum?
- What is the rationale for COLA students to not have to go outside their college while other colleges are supposed to?
- Are graduate students going to be relied on to teach new introductory courses?

All Submitted Feedback

complexity and/or burden	Majors in CEPS and COLSA work very hard to incorporate the Discovery requirements into their degrees. Changes like the proposed cause significant work to be done to figure this out again. We already have issues getting into courses outside our department and this seems like it will only make it worse. This is not just a liberal arts college as so many seem to neglect.
complexity and/or burden	1) The new requirements are just too complicated. Dealing with two sets of orthogonal requirements will make it unnecessarily complicated for students. Although the proposal claims to reduce the burden of the discovery program for students, I can imagine that it may significantly increase the requirements if there are insufficient number of classes that cover the right attributes for any particular student.
complexity and/or burden	In general, this program is unnecessarily complicated.
complexity and/or burden	3) And after spending hours with this document, I still do not quite understand how this program would work and whether the benefit is worth the complexity. Is there a way to simplify the requirements?
complexity and/or burden	confusion (at least intially) and panic for both advisors and students
complexity and/or burden	What will a typical first year student's schedule look like with the newly proposed Diversity course requirement? For our Biological Science and Biotechnology students, we already struggle to fit in First-Year English, a math course, and their year-long Gen Bio and Gen Chem sequences. Adding another requirement to the first year feels like it will cause more delay of their major sequences, even if the overall Wildcat Core requirements are lessened.
complexity and/or burden	This version still seems excessively convoluted. I've heard the motivations for that complexity, but I must deal with the reality of advising. As such, I see two very likely outcomes for more prescriptive majors (both of which are contrary to the motivations). First, such programs are going to try satisfying as many of the requirements as possible using required courses. Then, they are going to evolve well-worn paths along which students can pick up the remaining requirements as efficiently as possible. Students will be free to deviate, but freedom is only as valuable as one's inclination to utilize it. A significant number of students (at least in the highly prescriptive major for which I advise) have little to no interest in exercising this freedom. They recognize the nature of the major before they enroll in it, and in many cases that nature is actually attractive. They're content to just be told what to take. As such, the natural path of least resistance will always be to simply identify a set of courses that will get the job done and leave it to the occasional student to push back against it. Hence, the complexity of this plan is negatively correlated with the motivation for it, at least in highly prescriptive majors. And for those reading this that feel the solution to this is to reduce the complexity of the majors instead, please see my second suggestion below.

complexity and/or burden	Too complex with the attributes in addition to the different categories
complexity and/or burden	<p>Concern 1: Failing of ABET certification</p> <p>Requiring more non-major courses means that less in-major courses can be required in a four-year curriculum.</p> <p>As a result UNH will likely fail ABET certification of some degree programs that require depth, such as Computer Science.</p> <p>While the proposed change claims that fewer courses are mandated, it only reduces on the side of engineering and science courses which, however are required by the ABET certification. Hence, the new program strictly adds more non-major courses.</p>
complexity and/or burden	Changes are not needed for "change sake". Having students take more courses and limit their ability and limiting departments/majors to fewer course is not what science and engineering students need. When they join the workforce while general education courses are useful in overall knowledge and personality, employers are looking for depth in their major not in liberal arts.
complexity and/or burden	The proposed curriculum appears, at least at first glance, to be *even more* ponderous and "gen-ed" heavy than the current Discovery Program. The number of courses and differing types of qualifications that must be fulfilled is highly complex. I am concerned that this will become a) an advising nightmare, b) a turn-off to many students, c) a new "land grab" for departments as they develop new courses to capture Discovery Program revenue dollars, and d) a major frustration for students who would rather spend more of their time focusing on areas of their major rather than fulfilling general education requirements.
complexity and/or burden	Are some of these attributes and knowledge categories overlapping? It's difficult to get a picture of what a course would look like moving into this new format.
complexity and/or burden	Please make it simpler if at all possible.

<p>complexity and/or burden</p>	<p>Drop the requirement for category A and change the plan to simply be a choice of four out of the five categories. Doing so addresses several of the questions I raised above.</p> <p>During several of the public discussions on this proposal I have heard various statements regarding majors that are highly prescriptive reducing their number of required courses. We work very hard to ensure that we are giving our students as much flexibility as we possibly can while still meeting the demands of accreditation and other constituencies. A quick glance at posted program requirements suggests to me that some BA majors (I specifically looked at English and History) can be achieved with only 40 credits of major requirements. By comparison, the BS in IT program for which I advise requires at least 98 credits. And I assure you that none of that is "fluff." Quite frankly, it's insulting when individuals with apparently no first hand experience of our programs, the demands upon them, or the constraints under which they operate respond to our concerns by simply saying how great it would be if we could reduce our requirements to give students more freedom. If you're really that concerned about enhancing students' freedom of choice, you can start by adopting my first suggestion.</p>
<p>complexity and/or burden</p>	<p>Do not have attributes, just gen ed categories, similar to current system. Like the idea of reducing down from 10 to 8 categories.</p>
<p>complexity and/or burden</p>	<p>Acknowledge majors which already cover the requirements via their degree certification (e.g. ABET). Exempt all students of these majors from equivalent requirements, because these are satisfied through other means.</p> <p>For example in Computer Science degree requirements, ABET mandate that Ethics, Writing, and Applications to "Environment & People" are covered anyway. ABET mandates a strict supervision of the efficacy of our education.</p> <p>Increase UNH-wide training in science and technology. The new change focuses disproportionately on text/liberal arts courses. Why not merge Social Science, Historical Perspectives, and Humanities into single category called "Liberal Arts / Human Sciences" and require students to take three courses from this category, and three courses from Math, Science & Technology?</p>
<p>complexity and/or burden</p>	<p>Restrictions to taking at least 24 credits outside their college. Why doesn't COLA do it also? If COLA cannot fill their classes with their majors then their classes should be cut and attempted to be filled by other college students. Labs are very important for other majors/colleges - they should be required for COLA students too lab experience is also part of being diverse in skill sets. Students are not happy with the number of general education classes they take now, we don't need to increase it. Keep what we have without causing busy work for advisors and departments trying to figure out how to fulfill these requirements.</p>

complexity and/or burden	The committee needs to address whether the proposed system is trackable. It seems unnecessarily complex
complexity and/or burden	1) Simplify. Simplify. Simplify. 2) Whenever possible, allow for opportunities for students to fulfill general education requirements within the context of their major. This will broaden their perspectives but will allow them to stay connected to material that they find engaging.
Decision making process	So, How to fix the current model? -- remove the WC and ETS categories. remove inquiry. make it easier for transfer students to meet requirements (already in process). Decide on a maximum of three additional attributes if necessary and make them mandatory (less confusing, accomplishes the same task). This would solve all the critical issues with the current model, NOT remove essential components so that our students receive a world-class education and are well-informed citizens. Having served on the Discovery Committee I can confidently say that this would address the most pressing issues that come forward.
Decision making process	Be aware of who you are and how you are representing yourselves in your visions of Discovery. As it reads, this proposal is heavily biased toward the Departments and Programs from which the Committee members derive, in this case Humanities and History. It proposes to keep Historical Perspectives as a Discovery (both of which these already overwhelmingly dominate), and then claims that the majority of History's introductory level courses can fulfill the now mandatory DHI:US course. It is basically steering students to fill seats in their Department, and this is unethical and repeats the market-like problems mentioned in the opening of the report. They claim they don't want undue burden to fall on a single Department, but are doing the opposite.
Decision making process	I spent three hours reading and rereading the proposal documents and writing these comments. I know you've put in so much more in the long-run. I care. I want our student to succeed and care about them. I think you are going somewhere in the right direction, but with this proposal, you aren't taking everyone along with you, especially those of us you will need to succeed if you want to actually make real ideals of diversity and inclusion.
Decision making process	I am disappointed that the initiative took a rather collegial "us" versus "you" stance. It is unfortunate that it comes across as an attempt to funnel money into course work that our students don't see much value.
Decision making process	Let's try not to push changes through to keep one section of the university happy. Many departments may not realize the extent of these changes.
Decision making process	Please seriously consider all the feedback you have received, not just that which supports your plan.
Decision making process	Please include diverse and minority faculty, staff, and students in your decision making process.

Decision making process	I worry that the new categories heavily favor humanities programs/departments and are too narrowly construed for broad and enthusiastic involvement by units across campus.
Decision making process	I assume the First Year Writing requirement refers to English 401. Is that correct?
Decision making process	I am very curious as to why the Review Committee feels that the proposed curriculum is "better" than the earlier version of the Discovery program. Specifically, what "problems" was the Review Committee attempting to address?
Decision making process	1) Rather than eliminating Inquiry altogether, require that each Inquiry course fulfill a Knowledge or Global Challenges category, so that faculty can continue to teach the small 444 sections to students who find large lecture courses alienating. The courses would thus go from fulfilling an "Inquiry requirement" to fulfilling a Knowledge or Values category, allowing students to choose to fulfill some of their Discoveries through such a low-cap class. I agree that getting rid of the constraining requirements of so-called "inquiry pedagogy" is a very good idea, but I think you are throwing out the baby with the bathwater here. You can get rid of the Inquiry requirement without getting rid of many excellent small cap classes currently taught as 444s.
Decision making process	concerns regarding the university-wide discussions about the report and modifications: while these changes and the rationale behind them have been a focus for the Senate, I doubt that they will be central to any other faculty meeting.
Decision making process	The current issues with the program could have been solved with a few tweaks, not a new program. It is unnecessary, does a huge disservice to our students, and should not be considered any further.
Decision making process	I would love to chat with a committee member to better understand the impact and expectations of the proposed changes. Feel free to email me to arrange a call or zoom: karen.niland@unh.edu Thanks much!
Decision making process	I realize the criticism here is harsh, but it feels like the committee did not listen to feedback and has been trying to steamroll these changes without given any weight to the very critical and factually based feedback received. Please listen to your faculty!

diversity component	<p>I very much like the "Diversity & Inequality" requirement, but I think it should be a stand-alone course, rather than an "Attribute." A fact-based historical survey of the experience of inequality in the United States is a crucial undertaking that fulfills President Dean's promise for curricular change and is very much desired by the Student Senate, which has advocated for a Diversity requirement. Yet, such an Attribute course, regardless of what department or college it is taught in, would almost by necessity fulfill an HP or an SS Discovery requirement. If it is allowed to fulfill a Discovery category as well as the Diversity requirement, it could wipe out all other HP and many other Social Science courses, since students would prefer to knock off two requirements at once. This means that the vast majority of Freshman who take the course would simultaneously fulfill HP or SS, concentrating almost the entire student demand in a lower-division U.S. based course. This could replicate the disastrous consequences of the Business Ethics course which, in counting for HUMA, simply withdrew virtually every Paul College student from ever taking a course in literature, Religious Studies, Foreign languages, or any other Humanities category. Were Paul to create a Diversity course in Economics and make it HP, no Paul student would ever take a History course outside of one focused on the Economic Inequality in the U.S., taught in Paul. While I think this would be a wonderful course and I would applaud Paul adding such a class for its students, I would prefer that those students still be required to fulfill a knowledge category in HP and in SS, choosing from a broader variety of courses taught within or outside their college. The same consequence could be replicated in each college, making this Attribute a potential death sentence for HP or SS courses not focused on Racial Inequality.</p>
diversity component	<p>I'm concerned about the proposed timeline of US history starting in 1619. This is the date when enslaved Black people first arrived in British colonies in the continental US. It is not the first date when enslaved Black people arrived in the continental US. That happened almost 100 years earlier. This also draws an artificial boundary around US borders as if the triangular slave trade was contained, when in fact human beings were freely traded across territories and slavery was substantively under way in the Caribbean by 1619. This date should not be seen as a starting point, although it is certainly a fine date to note.</p> <p>The timeline should start with 1492 and be inclusive of the complex dynamics of slavery with regard to borders, noting that for example some of the Virgin Islands are also in the United States now too.</p>
diversity component	<p>What department designation the "Diversity, History, Inequality: US Experience" (here on out, DHI:US) will be? If a HIST faculty offers it, is it HIST? Is it INCO? something new like COLA?</p>
diversity component	<p>2) There is too much focus on values rather than knowledge. In particular, mandating a diversity class for all freshmen is more likely to generate more ill will towards the subject than to advance the issue. Growing in a post-communist country, I often listened to my parents recount how they had to take a number of Marxism and Leninism</p>

	<p>classess. Needless to say, those classes were considered a farce and did not really convince anyone since everyone took them to be just propaganda. I fear that the diversity requirements will be received in the same way by our students.</p>
diversity component	<p>Teaching the history of racism and anti-racism is not the same as teaching principles and practices of anti-racism that students can use in their daily lives. You need serious training to do this or the consequences are going to be disastrous, especially for students of color who are in these classes along with their white majority counterparts. Are you prepared to programmatically and financially support and train faculty to do the best?</p>
diversity component	<p>Speculation about whether "the US experience" is going to limit the amount of departments that can support all undergrads needing one course.</p>
diversity component	<p>I strongly feel that the category of "Diversity & Inequality: The US Experience" should not be limited to first-year courses/students. This tag should be achievable at any level of the curriculum including in in-major courses. For example, in my program, we're looking at crafting a strong 500- or 600-level required major course that would focus on this topic, and it would be good for this to count toward gen-ed requirements for our majors (our program is already very tight). We could open this to other students as well, as I think the course content would be broadly applicable and appealing. This would also relieve the pressure on developing new first-year courses, better serve external transfers while also ensuring they are exposed to this theme, and be consistent with the change to allowing upper-level courses to count toward gen-ed requirements.</p>
diversity component	<p>In the proposal page 30, under Diversity, History, & Inequality: The United States Experience: We anticipate that this course could be offered by a variety of departments including History, American Studies, Humanities, Sociology, Political Science, Women's Studies, and any other Department or Program equipped to take on a historically informed course on Diversity & Inequality in the United States context. I'd like to slightly alter the paragraph, proposed change: THEATRE AND DANCE MUST BE ADDED TO THIS LIST. Theatre and Dance are equipped to take on such topics and indeed, offer courses on such topics. The current list includes nothing in the fine and performing arts discipline.</p>
diversity component	<p>For the Diversity and Inequality requirement, I am wondering who will teach this course and I'm wondering if it would be good to have all faculty have the opportunity to co-teach this course. For example, I'm in Physics, with a growing but incomplete awareness of these issues. Would it be good to allow folks like me to co-teach with more qualified faculty with the hope of raising my awareness of these issues, how they impact our students, and perhaps the possibility of teaching on my own should I be able to put in the required effort to be qualified? This would be another way of saying that addressing these issues is a problem we</p>

	<p>all need to solve, and isn't relegated to a small portion of the faculty.</p> <p>Also, as we see our country about split evenly in half in the presidential election and as polarized as ever, can this course include good ways to obtain quality, reliable information from perspectives other than our own?</p>
diversity component	2) Make "Diversity & Inequality" a stand-alone, rather than an Attribute course. (See rationale stated above: As an Attribute, the Diversity Requirement will swallow up HP and many SS enrollments).
diversity component	I would argue that a course on diversity and inequality should be global in scope. The US is very much embedded in global discourses of diversity and inequality and a multi-area approach seems important.
diversity component	The restriction of the "Diversity, History, and Inequality" category to experiences within the USA should be expanded to global issues. While we undoubtedly want to understand our own country, this restriction suggests that this understanding can only happen in a vacuum where the experiences of other cultures/peoples are not considered. The very restriction limits diversity and perspective. Our students would benefit from discussing these issues in a global context, particularly as the American experience is largely one of coming from elsewhere.
diversity component	If the faculty senate must remove some of the current requirements in our discovery program to save money, I would urge them to create courses in these new "perspectives" that at least integrate the skills gained in inquiry, ETS, and World Cultures into their curriculum.
diversity component	<p>-Open up the "Diversity and Inequality" attribute to a global perspective (unless you believe that the fight for diversity and equality is strictly an American issue). Although I understand the rationale behind such an important attribute focusing on the USA (in the light of the explosion of these struggles in the country), I think the world has had enough of us applying an American lense to every single political, social, or racial issue! It is time for our students to learn that the world and its problems is not limited to their country.</p> <p>- alternative to the above: reinstate the WC category, or make the attribute mandatory</p>
diversity component	Considerations for what "The US Experience" has to offer as its OWN course in the way of diverse perspectives when it innately leaves out 99% of the rest of the world, which has long undergone similar civil conflict and systemic inequality. World cultures perspectives on DEI should not be elective if the US experience is mandatory
diversity component	(2) Why is the "Diversity & Inequality: The US Experience" limited to the United States?
diversity component	(2) If our goal is for students to become global citizens, we need to address diversity and inequality issues from diverse experiences beyond the American experience. The course title should be "Diversity & Inequality: The Global Experience" to include distinct experiences and perspectives of people from different cultural backgrounds.

diversity component	It is unclear what the format is for "Diversity, History, Inequality: US Experience" - is it a giant lecture course with discussion sections? How many will run each year and semester? If only some departments can contribute, what does that mean financially for some departments (like History, which can offer over 10 sections out of the hypothetical 20), as compared to other departments who are unable to offer this due to faculty numbers/staffing, etc.?
diversity component	On the subject of the Discovery changes – I was appalled by the reference to 1619 as the start date for Black history in the United States when we know that Black people, including enslaved Black people, were in what is now the continental United States since the first half of the 1500s. I say appalled because this seemed like a clear case of academics following the New York Times’s lead when we know that a fact checker for the 1619 project complained that the NYT had not done enough to follow the lead of academics. It is a historical falsehood to begin Black American history in 1619. I also noted in my comment the problem of treating slavery like it had borders. Black history in the United States necessarily includes the Caribbean because people (including my ancestors) were freely traded across the border and because so much of American wealth came from enslavement on Caribbean plantations. (There is also the matter of referring to a place in 1619 as “Virginia” when to a lot of the local, Indigenous residents, that was not the correct name.)
diversity component	I think Diversity is too important in the current environment to have it as an attribute. Diversity be added to the existing required course categories as one of the core required courses. I would not remove any of the existing categories, which are all important. Because the proposed changes are reducing the number of course categories from 8 to 6, there should be room for a new Diversity category.
diversity component	Have we learned nothing from the 444 issues that arose with the introduction of the Discovery program? The 444 courses could have been offered by any department on any subject, and as a community we couldn't manifest enough of them to provide sufficient seats for the first-year students. Now, you're proposing an even more restrictive requirement (where the subject matter is constrained) and hoping for a different outcome?
diversity component	It is unclear what the format is for DHI:US. Is it OR is it a large lecture course with discussion sections? How many will run each year and semester? If History, for example, claims it can offer 10 sections of this DHI:US (out of a hypothetical 20 for all incoming Freshmen), what does that mean financially for History as compared to other departments who are unable to offer this (because of faculty numbers/staffing, etc.)? Who would teach those sections? Do you expect that (non-unionized, low-wage) PhD students to teach these classes? How will you ensure equitable staffing among faculty with no expertise in these areas and those who are strong in these areas? Are you prepared to

	programmatically and financially support and train faculty to do the best?
diversity component	Why is category A the one that gets singled out for that treatment? Aren't all of the categories of equal merit? Why shouldn't every first-year student be required to take a course in climate change, personal finance, digital literacy, or any other equally essential topic? With an audience of this size, the likelihood of getting them all to buy into your prioritization of this topic is infinitesimal. And in singling it out you're effectively tying the whole program to that choice. In short, you're defining a program that will need to be redefined if by some chance it is ultimately successful. And if you have sufficient doubt of its chances for success to dismiss that concern, that itself should be cause for reflection.
diversity component	It is not clear where or under what department designation the "Diversity, History, Inequality: US Experience" (here on out, DHI:US) will be. Why do you focus simply on the US?
diversity component	Teaching the history of racism and anti-racism is not the same as teaching principles and practices of anti-racism that students can use in their daily lives. There seems to be a conflation of these in DHI:US. And doing this all for white 18-year olds is not easy. You need serious training to do this or the consequences are going to be disastrous, especially for students of color who are in these classes along with their white majority counterparts. Are you prepared to programmatically and financially support and train faculty to do the best?
diversity component	It is unclear what the format is for "Diversity, History, Inequality: US Experience" - is it a giant lecture course with discussion sections? How many will run each year and semester? If only some departments can contribute, what does that mean financially for some departments (like History, which can offer over 10 sections out of the hypothetical 20), as compared to other departments who are unable to offer this due to faculty numbers/staffing, etc.? Are PhD students going to be asked to teach these introductory classes? How will you do equitable staffing among faculty with no expertise in these areas and those who are strong in these areas?
foreign language	Foreign languages should be a requirement. Actually, one year requirement of world languages is not enough in today's world.
foreign language	Please don't make the world languages optional. It should be a requirement.

Foreign language	What are the implications of this all for Foreign Language requirements and LLC faculty?
Foreign language	What are the impacts of this for all Foreign Language requirements and the Language, Literature, and Cultures faculty?
foreign language	What are the implications of this all for Foreign Language requirements?
World cultures, global focus	A student could spend four years at UNH and never learn about cultural worlds outside the US! This is incredibly counter-productive at this moment in history, and is against the principles of this university. It is a complete fall back to the "America First" focus that so many of us have been opposed to and working against for decades.
World cultures, global focus	It is unacceptable to spend four years at UNH without ever being exposed to other cultural worlds outside of the US. This is a dangerous road to go down for ALL majors regardless of particular discipline. International cooperation, cross-cultural competence, and global knowledge is necessary for business, healthcare, education, and beyond.
World cultures, global focus	I firmly believe that all students need to study the world beyond the US. It is unthinkable to me that in this global economy/ecosystem that students wouldn't have to take a course on something outside the US.
World cultures, global focus	How do you plan to ensure that all UNH graduates have the global perspective necessary to thrive in our contemporary workforce while also removing the "World Cultures" requirement with no mandatory replacement?
World cultures, global focus	Going back to the table and thinking more globally and responsibly vis-a-vis the rest of the world and university. Doing a forum among faculty. Doing/conducting focus groups!
World cultures, global focus	If students only have to complete 3 of the 4 "Global Challenges and Sustainable Living" categories, they could take 3 courses and get no global, international, or cross-cultural content because only 1 of those 4 categories is explicitly focused on "global" and "world issues."
World cultures, global focus	You mandate that students complete 3 of 4 "Global Challenges and Sustainable Living" categories. How do you square that mandate with only 1 of these 4 categories being explicitly focused on "global" and "world" issues? Basically, a student could take 3 courses and get no global, international, or cross-cultural content (or only white-washed content in other categories)
World cultures, global focus	As a minor, the Global Challenges minor is too vague and wide-ranging. It is not an area of study or expertise, rather a basic awareness that someone cultivates.
World cultures, global focus	The Global Challenges minor - What is it? There can be so many things under this vague umbrella.

World cultures, global focus	As a minor, the Global Challenges minor is too vague and wide-ranging. It is not an area of study or expertise, rather a basic awareness that someone cultivates.
World cultures, global focus	The Discovery Committee's summary of "World Cultures and Global Literacies" category is just a copy and paste from the existing Discovery program. It is clear that while the Committee put in original thought to what they envisioned for the other categories, World Cultures and Global Literacies is just getting shunted rather than uplifted. We have just beheld 4 years of major antiglobalism at the national stage ("shithole" countries, bans on immigration from Muslim-majority countries, the "China virus") that will also take generations to correct if we don't educate correctly, and now we are expecting students to learn less about the rest of the world and how we are inextricably tied to it? Too many of their relatives have already died from antiscience and antiglobalist policies. We are going in the wrong direction by not strengthening World Cultures as an existing Discovery and keeping lab requirements.
World cultures, global focus	- follow-up on the same issue: UNH students could now complete the "Global Challenges & Sustainable Living Attributes" without actually taking any course that is not America-centric! Which is not surprising in the least, given the trumpian worldview that is contaminating academia.
World cultures, global focus	We should think about what the rest of the world thinks of our graduates. We do not want this comment to exist "this person went to college!?"
implementation concerns/questions	Please offer guidance for faculty to adjust current Discovery Program offerings.
implementation concerns/questions	How will the Discovery Program office be affected by this? What is the financial incentive/impact on this office should these transformations take place?
implementation concerns/questions	Have incentives for non-traditional discovery courses in underrepresented departments. For example, a course release to develop a new discovery course/program, through petition, to keep courses fresh and new. Incentives for cross-college co-teaching and collaborating on course development.
implementation concerns/questions	I am concerned that on how to promote "out-of-the-box" and diverse STEM discovery courses in CEPS.
implementation concerns/questions	Are PhD students going to be asked to teach these introductory classes?
Positive feedback	I like the proposal a lot and I strongly favor it. I think it will enrich Discovery, making it more meaningful to students. It is also more manageable than the old laundry list of requirements and, by allowing "Attributes," it stresses important thematic and "values" content. I'm thrilled with the idea of allowing upper-division courses to count for Discovery. Finally!!! I do have some concerns and suggestions, though, stated below...

Positive feedback	I think the report seems sound overall and indeed adds a moral and ethical component to our curriculum that I have long felt was absent. Attention to diversity, inequality, governance and identity are very important and, my word, it's about time!
Positive feedback	Again, thank you for this thankless but worthwhile effort.
Positive feedback	I think these changes make a lot of sense and demonstrate remarkable and sensitive responsiveness to current needs.
Positive feedback	Apart from my concerns about Diversity, the new requirements look good.
Positive feedback	This is a great proposal and would offer a MUCH better Discovery experience for our students. With some modifications, I think the Faculty Senate should adopt it. It was clearly a Herculean task and I applaud the committee with coming up with such a sensible plan.
Positive feedback	I appreciate the effort to achieve more flexibility in the gen-ed program.
Positive feedback	I support the proposed changes.
Positive feedback	Thank you for the hard work preparing this.
questions/suggestions on requirements	<p>I would like to make a case for including a requirement for Financial Literacy. I include a quote from a current student taking Personal Finance:"</p> <p>This course will most likely have a positive effect on my future plans and to have an effective financial future. This course taught me about money management, taxes, savings plans, credit, insurance, and investments! A lot of these chapters that we learned over the course helped me understand a lot of financial aspects that are very important for my future. Not many people are taught these things through school and feel very grateful to have a class to teach me about these things." I have received similar comments over the years from other students who take this course. I decided to offer this course because so many of our graduates (and faculty I may add) do not have this necessary information.</p>
questions/suggestions on requirements	I propose you include Financial Literacy
questions/suggestions on requirements	Should creative writing be one of the possible courses listed under Fine Performing Arts, p. 26? Currently there are discovery courses in beginning fiction 526, poetry 527 and nonfiction 501 listed under Fine performing arts.
questions/suggestions on requirements	4) Do students really need a separate FPA requirement? With the suspension of RCM, would it be possible to fund the Arts without mass enrollments, allowing instruction to focus on students with an interest and talent in FPA? I believe the Arts, Music, and Theater are absolutely crucial to UNH and to serving New Hampshire, but if this requirement could be cut or consolidated without jeopardizing Fine Arts at UNH, I think it would be beneficial to drop FPA as a mandated Discovery requirement.
questions/suggestions on requirements	Why was ETS dropped? Many of these courses provide real-world skill development (example COMP 405 - Web Authoring) that are now expected of most students entering the professional office world.

<p>questions/suggestions on requirements</p>	<p>My sticking point is why the First Year Writing Requirement is still only fulfilled--if it is--by English 401. As one CCLEAR faculty member in English said in a meeting this past term, English 401 is taught mainly by CCLEAR faculty. If this is true it is uneconomical, unethical, and inefficient. Uneconomical and unethical because if TT-faculty in English don't teach it it means English has to maintain a large contingent labor force to do so. That seems like the expenditure of a lot of money and the willful exploitation of contingent labor to protect course share. Why aren't more tenure track faculty required to teach this course esp during an enrollment crisis? Without diminishing or denigrating the expertise or qualifications of CCLEAR faculty to teach this course, which that aforementioned member of CCLEAR faculty was only too willing to do to tenure track faculty at the meeting about the COLA franchise, the present writing requirement seems inefficient. Why is the course anchored to a single department? We are all writers and researchers who must master different ways of knowing, thinking, seeing, and communicating. Why not have a COLA-wide program that draws on the communications expertise of our entire college? I went to a university that wove its writing program into its general education program negating the need for a stand-alone course. A writing tutor would sit in on a gen ed liberal arts class and work with students to develop writing skills in the context of the writing assignments for that class. That allowed instructors time to focus on content and discussion AND to assign meaningful writing assignments knowing they had help assessing written work. I had a marvelous tutor in a humanities and a social science class. His comments and workshops coupled with comments from the instructors transformed my understanding of the thinking and writing process. I see no reason why we couldn't do a similar thing at UNH. This actually might be a way of meaningfully integrating a smaller group of CCLEAR faculty into the broader curriculum while reducing their workload AND freeing up a required course slot for students who wish to pursue minors or dual or double majors. This could be another attribute to knowledge-based classes that might help those who used to teach ETS or WC attract students--I know some folks are concerned about these losses, which I believe were done for very good reason. Logistical and practical challenges of instituting such a program aside, I thought I would toss out a few thoughts. I've long thought the university writing requirement was poorly run. framework.</p>
<p>questions/suggestions on requirements</p>	<p>Can you clarify where ETS courses fit in the new knowledge category?</p>
<p>questions/suggestions on requirements</p>	<p>How will these changes impact "NURS450: Making Babies: Technology, Nature & Social Context"?</p>
<p>questions/suggestions on requirements</p>	<p>I'd retain ETS</p>
<p>questions/suggestions on requirements</p>	<p>Removing the inquiry requirement will deprive students of the skills essential to conducting the independent research that a considerable proportion of employers are looking for.</p>

<p>questions/suggestions on requirements</p>	<p>What is the rationale for COLA students to not have to go outside their college while other colleges are supposed to? As a member of CEPS I can attest to the programs in CEPS being just as diverse as important as programs in COLA.</p>
<p>questions/suggestions on requirements</p>	<p>I can understand why UNH-M students are singled out, but why are COLA students singled-out for special treatment? Students of every other college are asked to step outside their college for a significant number of their credits, but COLA students are only asked to step outside their "division or program" (whatever that means). Is this meant to be some sort of reflection on the nature of COLA students? Is it meant to bolster enrollments in COLA courses? It certainly smacks of bias, though its nature is unclear.</p>
<p>science, labs, and sustainability</p>	<p>Upon reading the report I would appreciate some clarity. I teach the lecture and lab components of the 570 World Food & Culture Course. How do the proposed changes affect the current course as a future discovery course elective? I noticed that all lab course components going forward will be considered as an elective option by the students? Is that correct?</p>
<p>science, labs, and sustainability</p>	<p>Also, the global challenges and sustainable living read very much like propaganda. I believe that climate change and environmental degradation is probably the greatest challenge that humanity has ever faced. And we are failing miserably. But I fear that mandating that students care about is the wrong way to make actual progress. Is there another way to engage students in such issues? Can we encourage more discussion of these issues in other classes without necessarily sticking labels on them? I believe that if we teach students the facts and how to process them, they will make the right choices of their own will without having to deal with the global challenge issues.</p>
<p>science, labs, and sustainability</p>	<p>I am extremely concerned about the change that removes the requirement of taking a course in each of the sciences (Biological and Physical). We need citizens who are informed about both extremely diverse and critical areas of science. There is no reason for this change to be made, and it removes the emphasis on a well-informed student. We need a population who has an understanding about such disparate topics as climate change, genetic testing and pandemics, just to name a few that are currently critical. Removing this diversity of a scientific education IN ADDITION to removing the ability to show our students how science is conducted by removing the lab requirement, does an extreme disservice to our students. There is no need for this change and all it serves to do is water down our existing program. By phasing out BOTH the lab and inquiry parts of the program, we will have students who have NO IDEA how science is done, how research is conducted, how to make a sound hypothesis and use EVIDENCE and that models</p>

	<p>can be changed with new evidence. I have no idea how this seems at all like a positive idea especially considering what the last four years have taught us about how little our population really understands facts, science, and reason.</p>
<p>science, labs, and sustainability</p>	<p>(1) I feel strongly that a lab class should still be required. Its unclear to me how students will gain proper training in the scientific process if they are not engaged in a hands on lab.</p>
<p>science, labs, and sustainability</p>	<p>5) I applaud you for cutting ETS, which had become a dressed-up Science Studies course, dominated by (of all colleges!) COLA. I do, however, think it would be beneficial to cut the second Science Literacy requirement and to explore consolidating or eliminating FPA (if it could be done without damaging the Arts at UNH) in order to add back in a REAL technology course that would teach students coding, graphic design, web design, building, Arc GIS, security systems, and other How-To skills that are absolutely crucial on the job market.</p>
<p>science, labs, and sustainability</p>	<p>All of my World Food and Culture students have thoroughly enjoyed the lab component experience that this course provides. In addition, all of the lecture and lab courses that I have taught have met the enrollment capacity cap that is mandated by the university over the last five years.</p>
<p>science, labs, and sustainability</p>	<p>All students must be exposed to science-based lab work. We are already witnessing anti-science policies in our communities that will take a long time to correct. Forcing students to understand the scientific method by their own hand will better assure that no one can deny processes of experimentation, collaboration, and technologies that produce data and evidence.</p>
<p>science, labs, and sustainability</p>	<p>At UNH we expect all students to be exposed to science-based-lab work. It is important to have hands-on approach in light of the anti-science policies/prejudice in this country and elsewhere.</p>
<p>science, labs, and sustainability</p>	<p>On the surface I must say that I am somewhat concerned about the elimination of the laboratory science requirement at a time when it seems that scientific awareness is increasingly lacking in our society. Perhaps there are hidden motivations behind the move (facilities, staffing, etc.), but they're certainly not obvious to me.</p>
<p>science, labs, and sustainability</p>	<p>On the surface I must say that I am somewhat concerned about the elimination of the laboratory science requirement at a time when it seems that scientific awareness is increasingly lacking in our society. Perhaps there are hidden motivations behind the move (facilities, staffing, etc.), but they're certainly not obvious to me.</p>
<p>science, labs, and sustainability</p>	<p>(2) I feel strongly that both a biological and physical science should be required if the aim is to provide a breadth of training/exposure</p>

science, labs, and sustainability	Keep the existing science course structure. We have seen how the inquiry attribute had its difficulties, so how is adding FIVE attributes moving us into a better system?
science, labs, and sustainability	All students must be exposed to science-based lab work. This is where science happens in real time and in students' own hands. We are already witnessing anti-science policies and publics in our communities that will no doubt take several generations to correct. (Hello, COVID-19.) Forcing students to understand the scientific method by their own hand will better assure that no one can deny processes of experimentation, collaboration, and technologies that produce data and evidence.
science, labs, and sustainability	Could you explain in further detail how the new "Environment and People" requirement reflects the University's excellence in sustainability more so than the former "Environment, Technology, and Society?"
science, labs, and sustainability	The proposed change also makes the environmental requirement optional as students can alternatively choose for any of the other three "perspectives" requirement, provided they complete the one required Diversity and Inequality course stipulated in the program. . Additionally, the category name "Environment and People" doesn't reflect UNH's sustainable excellence any more than the category title currently applied.
science, labs, and sustainability	Under "Process - Phase 2" the document states: "Develop the learning outcomes for the new Knowledge categories and the Global Challenges and Sustainable Living Attributes" It seems to me that our Sustainability Education Goals would be a good place to start. (This is referring to goals set by the University Committee for the Sustainability Dual Major and other interested faculty) Under "specific changes proposed by the DRC", the document states "Introduce minor in Global Challenges and Sustainable Living". I think this could easily be accomplished within the existing framework of the Sustainability Dual Major.
table the proposal	I do not understand why we are not supporting the faculty and helping them instead of always accepting more work from the administration and then adding even more onto ourselves. Take for example, Kronos. I am not a factory worker and punching a time card is demoralizing, ridiculous, and contemptible. Why are we allowing such things?
table the proposal	Postpone any decisions on this until we return to some sense of normalcy for at least 1 year.
table the proposal	Please delay moving forward until more of us can focus on this and participate in these important decisions
table the proposal	Please table this proposal until a better time (FA21?)

table the proposal	Given everything happening right now, this proposal may be great but myself and many others do not have the bandwidth to evaluate it. I recommend this be tabled until the faculty can evaluate it better. This is affecting all of us, but especially those of us with childcare, eldercare, family job loss, and other situations impacting our time and availability to work.
table the proposal	Why is this needed at this time. I am certainly for a course on diversity, but why so many other changes. The administration, during the time of COVID, has changed purchasing, the computer support, and time keeping. All of this while faculty are struggling just to teach as effectively as possible and keep their research going. Now, we as faculty, are going impose additional work on ourselves. This makes no sense during this time. Faculty are at a breaking point here and we need to let up not make more work for ourselves. So, my question is, WHY?
table the proposal	I concern I share with many of my colleagues is that there is too much on our plates now to give this the attention it warrants
World cultures, global focus	World Cultures and Global Literacies categories have not been rethought, while others have. I am curious why. These, in fact, should be central, in my view, to our education (yes one needs to rethink them to be more and not less responsive to contemporary critical global issues because what happens here, in the US, affects the rest of the world and the other way around. We are in this shit TOGETHER. We need to be strengthening World Cultures as an existing Discovery and keeping lab requirements and not getting rid of them!

<p>World cultures, global focus</p>	<p>This proposal devalues your colleagues who teach and work in Departments and Programs that primarily offer World Cultures and ETS Discovery designations, by saying their work is just optional for students to take. This will lead to under-enrollment over the long-term, unless existing courses are reintegrated and strengthened at a structural level within Discovery. The majority of these faculty in these programs are women, non-native English speakers, and people with origins outside of the US. In the long term, these changes will further homogenize and whiten the UNH faculty should their classes continually under-enroll and be canceled.</p> <p>The Discovery Committee's summary of "World Cultures and Global Literacies" category is just a copy and paste from the existing Discovery program. It is clear that while the Committee put in original thought to what they envisioned for the other categories, World Cultures and Global Literacies is just getting shunted rather than uplifted. We are dealing with major anti-globalism in this country, and that will take generations to correct if we don't educate correctly, and now we are expecting students to learn less about the rest of the world and how we are inextricably tied to it? It is wrong to not strengthen World Cultures as an existing Discovery and keeping lab requirements.</p> <p>Finally, if you are intent on basically downgrading World Cultures to a category rather than a Discovery, you can't simply or automatically re-designate those courses without input from faculty who teach them. Many World Cultures courses are also Social Science, Humanities, and Historical Perspectives Discovery courses by another name, and vice versa. IF you are eliminating World Cultures and ETS Discoveries, you must permit Departments to claim, petition, and or rewrite course descriptions and content so that they can requalify as Social Sciences, Humanities, Fine Arts, or or any other Discovery that is continuing over this threshold. You need to go back to the table and use faculty focus groups, surveys, personal interviews, etc. to gather data from all representatives of this educational institution -- grad students, adjuncts, lecturers, and tenure track.</p> <p>Removing World Cultures as a mandatory Discovery requirement is detrimental to the very spirit of education in cultural diversity, equity, and global citizenship and I STRONGLY advocate that it me maintained as one of the core Knowledge Categories in the revised Discovery Program.</p>
<p>World cultures, global focus</p>	<p>World Cultures must keep being a requirement. Otherwise, UNH alumni will lack a broad perspective of the world they live in.</p>

World cultures, global focus	New Hampshire is, primarily, a one faceted culture. It is important for students to study cultures of other countries and ethnicities. The WC category in the existing Discovery requirements offers students an opportunity to study world cultures. I would suggest having this category, as it exists, as required for all students. Otherwise UNH weakens the global awareness and outlook of its students.
World cultures, global focus	(1) Today's global society demands that students gain an appreciation of cultures that are different from their own, and develop global awareness and perspectives of other cultures. Courses, such as "World Cultures" address significant aspects of any culture that is not part of the mainstream American culture should be required for the Discovery program because they facilitate the students' ability to explore cultural products, practices and perspectives of non-US cultures.
World cultures, global focus	I am seriously concerned about the possibility that students can get their degree without taking a World Discovery class, which is absolutely necessary to respond to the global challenges that humanity is currently facing. Also, higher education MUST provide tools to discover other languages and cultures, so it is really concerning that this component may be optional. It should be mandatory as well.
World cultures, global focus	The excision of World Cultures is problematic as is the narrow geographic definition of the now-mandatory DHI:US course and the Ethnicity, Community, and Social Identity. Downgrading World Cultures and making this US based both reassert white and Eurocentric frames of the liberal arts by foregrounding the modern nation-state (the U.S.) as the presumed societal norm for considering how we can best and imagine the future. What about Indigenous or Afrocentric perspectives and forms of living? In its current proposed form, DHI:US, as well as the Ethnicity, Community, and Social Identity, is not decolonial and counters years of internationalizing and globalizing changes to the curriculum.
World cultures, global focus	Finally, if you are intent on basically downgrading World Cultures to a category rather than a Discovery, you can't simply or automatically re-designate those courses without input from faculty who teach them. Many World Cultures courses are also Social Science, Humanities, and Historical Perspectives Discovery courses by another name, and vice versa. (I am now imagining a hypothetical case where the Historical Perspective Discovery was instead downgraded to an optional category, and then faculty who teach HIST405 scramble to claim it is also World Cultures because it considers, in part, according to the course description, "the interaction of European, Native American, and African peoples", or HIST421 because they claim to cover "major civilizations and their interactions; comparisons of social, cultural, religious, and political life and the emergence of distinctive and diverse human societies." You can claim black and white exceptionalism for a

	<p>Discovery category, but the more you look, the more grey this all becomes.)</p> <p>In ending, if you are eliminating World Cultures and ETS Discoveries, you must permit Departments to claim, petition, and or rewrite course descriptions and content so that they can requalify as Social Sciences, Humanities, Fine Arts, or or any other Discovery that is continuing over this threshold.</p>
World cultures, global focus	<p>The discussion and push towards internationalization of the campus/curriculum has been a central idea on campus. The change from a WC category (required of all students) to WC as one of the choices for Global Challenges and Sustainable Living Attributes weakens this theme on campus. Depending on the subject matter of the other choices in the attributes category, courses may not include a focus on international education (cultural awareness and literacy in a level outside of the mainstream of the US.) The standing WC has an emphasis on "other" cultures, while the proposed courses may not include this aspect. Not all students at UNH are required to study a foreign language, the existing WC category is central to a broad undergraduate education.</p>
World cultures, global focus	<p>- an important concern is that after these changes are implemented students at UNH can have their degree without taking one single course in WC (since it is an optional attribute). All the big talk about the internationalization of UNH and preparing UNH students for a "global citizenship" is just that: a big, meaningless, arrogant talk.</p>
World cultures, global focus	<p>The students who have taken the 570 World Food & Culture course have been exposed to a cross-cultural and diverse experience like none other offered on campus. In addition to experiencing cross-cultural global food ingredients and varying food preparation methods, the students work together as part of a project production team. Each team is required to create, prepare, and present a typical menu from the country to which they were assigned. They are also required to write an eight-page report on their specific country of study and conduct a formal presentation in class. I am concerned that this course is being removed via the proposed modifications?</p>
World cultures, global focus	<p>In your report, you base the elimination of the World Cultures category on "under-enrollment". My question is "compared to what?" Traditionally, many of the courses in languages have counted for this category, and since the cap for these courses is lower (for very good reasons!!!!), the consequence is a lower enrollment for the WC courses in the target language. By comparison, the WC courses in English have a very healthy enrollment and are very popular. All students who have completed their Discovery requirements have taken a WC course, just like they have taken courses counting for the other categories, so this perceived "low enrollment" is just a question of optics.</p>

World cultures, global focus	- an important concern is that after these changes are implemented students at UNH can have their degree without taking one single course in WC (since it is an optional attribute). All the big talk about the internationalization of UNH and preparing UNH students for a "global citizenship" is just that: a big, meaningless, arrogant talk.
World cultures, global focus	the report states that "The only shared experience all students have is ENGL 401". This is factually incorrect: since only COLA students have a language requirement (and some can fulfill the WC requirement in one of their language classes), ALL the other UNH students would find themselves, at one point or another, in a WC class.
World cultures, global focus	Removing World Cultures as a mandatory Discovery requirement is detrimental to the very spirit of education in cultural diversity, equity, and global citizenship and I STRONGLY advocate that it be maintained as one of the core Knowledge Categories in the revised Discovery Program. It should not be possible for a UNH student to be here for four years and never learn about cultural worlds outside the US!!
World cultures, global focus	Removing World Cultures as a mandatory Discovery requirement is detrimental to the very spirit of education in cultural diversity, equity, and global citizenship and all faculty should strongly advocate that it be maintained as one of the core Knowledge Categories in the revised Discovery Program.
World cultures, global focus	Anthropology and Geography (and some folks in LLC I believe), almost all of which are also represented here in WGS) are majorly concerned about the proposed changes to Discovery. Their proposal includes eliminating the World Cultures requirement which we all offer, thus drastically impacting our departments, enrollments, and the mission of the liberal arts. Conceptually, we also find it ludicrous to eliminate this given that we've just beheld four years of rampantly antiglobalist anti-nonwestern policies (shithole countries, Muslim majority countries ban, Sinophobia) that have also led us into the isolated morass of 400000+ dead from COVID-19. Under the new model, students could ostensibly NEVER take a course that considers non-US cultures' worldviews/perspectives and places and modalities of decolonization/liberation/freedom and still graduate. This is antithetical to the liberal arts we envision. The new required Freshman course on Diversity and Inequality in the US is laudable, but also problematically demarcates and exceptionalizes America, in our opinion.

World cultures, global focus	To get rid of World Cultures makes no sense to me, and it comes hand-in-hand with the narrow geographic definition of the proposed-now-mandatory DHI:US courses and the Ethnicity, Community, and Social Identity. By not requiring World Cultures we only reassert white and Eurocentric frames of the liberal arts. The US continues to be a social norm, by implication, and other ways of being, living, approaching social/political and economic practices are yet again erased and obscured. There is a world outside of America(s)! This forecloser and focus on the US remind me of the "America First" slogan that led this country into its current turmoil. Reather than focusing on "accommodationism" and "tolerance," we need to foster deep knowledge and respect of other ways of being and thinking. As it reads, DHI:US, as well as the Ethnicity, Community, and Social Identity is not decolonial at all! Some of us spent years, internationalizing, decolonizing, and globalizing education at UNH. What is proposed is counter to these efforts, in my view. Rather than offering creative solutions and revamping education to fit contemporary life, we move back into a nitch US education occupied for a long time - self-centered!
World cultures, global focus	What is going to happen to the majority of the faculty in the programs that are offering WC now? These are women, non-native English speakers, and people with origins outside of the US. What will happen to their job security?
World cultures, global focus	(1) Why is "World Cultures" not required as part of the program?
World cultures, global focus	Why is World Cultures not being a requirement anymore?
World cultures, global focus	What implications of this proposal are to Anthropology faculty/classes (WC heavy)?
World cultures, global focus	A faculty from our department voiced a concern about a course with a world culture designation being in jeopardy of being eliminated (HMGT570) with the new changes and I wanted your advice.

Appendix VII.2

Proposed Changes to UNH’s General Education Curriculum (Revised 2/5/21)

Drafted by Faculty Senate Agenda Committee

This revised document illustrates agreed-upon revisions (in Red) to the initial Discovery Review Committee recommendations motivated by faculty feedback submitted through the Faculty Senate Qualtrics survey.

What are the parameters for UNH’s general education curriculum?

- The New England Commission of Higher Education (NECHE), our accrediting body, requires 40 credits be completed in general education for a bachelor’s degree.
- UNH **recommends** that all students take at least 24 credits outside of their college.

What are the skills, abilities, and perspectives believed to embody an educated and prepared student?

The Discovery Review Committee final report states: “*Our proposal keeps at its core a broad liberal arts experience but aligns with the skills and global challenges necessary to prepare productive, intellectually engaged, and ethically conscious graduates*”

	Current Discovery Program	Proposed Discovery Program (revised 2/3/2021)
Discovery Foundations	First-year writing Quantitative reasoning Writing across curriculum (WI) Inquiry	First-year writing Quantitative reasoning Diversity & Inequality: The US Experience* Writing across curriculum (WI)
		<i>*To be developed: Learning objectives for new Knowledge category.</i>
Knowledge Categories	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Biological Science* 2. Physical Science* 3. Environment, Technology & Society 4. Fine and Performing Arts 5. Historical Perspectives 6. Humanities 7. Social Science 8. World Cultures 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Science or Science Literacy 2. Science or Science Literacy 3. Fine and Performing Arts 4. Historical Perspectives 5. Humanities 6. Social Science
	<i>*Lab required for either 1 or 2</i>	
Perspectives: Global Challenges & Sustainable Living Attributes (all 3 attributes are required and can be stacked – or double counted – with a Knowledge category)		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. Environment, Technology, & Society B. Ethnicity, Community, and Social Identity C. Civic Participation and Democratic Governance D. World Cultures and Global Literacy
Culminating experience	Senior year capstone experience	Senior year capstone experience

What are the specific changes proposed, following Faculty Feedback?

- Phase out Lab and Inquiry requirements; **turn WC and ETS into required Attributes.**
- Add the Global Challenges and Sustainable Living Attributes.
- Add newly designed Diversity requirement: ‘Diversity & Inequality: The United States Experience’ *(Not exclusively a History course; ideally, sections to be offered in all Colleges.)*
- **Eliminate second Diversity attribute, ‘Ethnicity, Community, & Social Identity,’ making remaining three Attributes required of every student.**
- Allow upper-level courses to count toward Discovery requirements.

What are some current institutional motivations in support of the recommended changes?

- President Dean’s Fall 2020 draft of UNH’s Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Initiatives include: *Incorporation of diversity, equity, and inclusion into the curriculum.*
- UNH carries the STARS Platinum ranking by the Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education and integrating sustainability more clearly into the general education curriculum will support our work in this area.
- **DRC charge to reduce the number of Discovery requirements, while adding value to what we offer.**

What are some current areas of challenge?

- Ensuring that there will be an adequate number of seats available to students in the new **first-year experience** courses for the Diversity & Inequality: The US Experience attribute.
- Managing the climate of competition surrounding general education courses.
- Addressing concerns about advising students through the curriculum. **A draft of an advising worksheet has been provided at the end of this document. .**

Process: Options for Approval & Implementation of Proposed Changes

Phase 1: Faculty Senate

- Deliberate and vote on the recommended changes

Phase 2: Ad Hoc Committee(s) and/or Discovery Program Committee

- Establish the framework and **learning outcomes** for the Diversity & Inequality: The US Experience courses (Back to Faculty Senate for approval)
- Develop the learning outcomes for the new Knowledge categories and the Global Challenges and Sustainable Living Attributes (Back to Faculty Senate for approval)

Phase 3: Discovery Program Committee

- Course reviews and approval

Information & Resources

The following [survey link](#) has been created to submit questions, thoughts, and ideas about the DRC recommendations and implementation:

https://unh.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_4TkwlfurK4HOvUZ

You can learn more about the specific charges that guided the Discovery Review Committee work here:

<https://www.unh.edu/fac-senate/discovery-review-committee>

You can learn more about the NECHE accreditation requirements and guidance on general education here: <https://www.necche.org/resources/standards-for-accreditation/>

You can learn more about UNH’s Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Initiatives here:

<https://www.unh.edu/inclusive/>

DRAFT OF ADVISING WORKSHEET

	Discovery Attributes (1, 2, 3)	Course #	Semester	Grade
Discovery Foundations				
First-year Writing (year 1)		ENGL 401		
Quantitative Reasoning				
Diversity & Inequality: The US Experience				
Discovery Knowledge Categories				
Science or Science Literacy				
Science or Science Literacy				
Fine and Performing Arts				
Historical Perspectives				
Humanities				
Social Sciences				
Discovery Attributes (can be stacked with Knowledge category)				
1. Environment, Technology, & Society				
2. Civic Participation and Democratic Governance				
3. World Cultures and Global Literacy				
Culminating Experience				
Senior Year Capstone Experience				
Writing Across the Curriculum				
Writing Skills/ENGL 401				
Writing Intensive Course 2				
Writing Intensive Course 3				
Writing Intensive Course 4				