Meeting called to order at 3:10 p.m. on March 18, 2019  

MINUTES SUMMARY

I. Roll - The following senators were absent: Bedker, Beemer, Gass, Innis, Knezevic, Knowles, Laird, Merenda, Ross, Roth, Schefer as proxy for Robin, Seal, Simos, and Taylor. The following senators were excused: Greenberg as proxy for Bauer, Laird. The following guests attended: Wayne Jones.

II. Remarks by and questions to the provost – Provost Jones shared that in connection with the Governor’s budget that has come out with some capital investments for the university he spent Friday morning at the state legislature advocating on behalf of the biological science’s initiative, the health science’s initiative, and the CSDC proposal.

The search committee for the Sr. Vice Provost for Research has been constituted and a firm has been selected to run this search.

There was an unfortunate incident that occurred over spring break during the Clark Terry jazz festival. This festival involves 60 high school and middle school jazz bands. The incident happened when some students from the Boston area received a racist image and negative comment about Black History month on their phones via iPhone AirDrop. UNH took this seriously and put out a press release. Chief Dean and his police worked with folks in several other states and jurisdictions on this incident and it was determined that it was a juvenile who inadvertently shared this image with the whole room at the event. No more information about this incident can be shared because a juvenile was involved.

Wayne shared that there have been some conversations about MyElements and the faculty activity reporting. The goals are 1) How do we report and share with our colleagues the great work that we are doing and 2) how do we curate for ourselves and for the world what are the products of our scholarly activity? The original goal of the MyElements was to have something to make the curation part as easy as possible and to minimize the work the faculty has to do. At this point, it has not been achieved well. But AT is working very hard to make it better although they aren’t there yet. Wayne suggested that, like anything with software, we should not make a decision in the first couple of months and we should give it a little bit time. He is very hopeful. Nonetheless, that component is separate from annual reporting which we also want to make easier for faculty. Terri Winters has been very responsive. If you see anything that you think they could do better send her a note.

On the issue of MyElements and faculty with a preferred publishing name different than their HR name, a solution has been identified that involves the Banner HR system, but it will take several months to implement. They have guaranteed that it will be done this calendar year.
The provost offered to take questions:

David Finkelhor asked how helpful it is for the Senate to weigh in on the Amorous Relationship Policy at this point. Wayne said that this is a doubling down on what has already been shared. The feedback that has been shared with the Agenda Committee, Donna Marie Sorrentino, and the Provost office has all gone in. The Student Senate and the Graduate Student Senate also passed motions about the policy. A new draft of the policy has been crafted and he hopes to be able to share it in a week with the Agenda Committee before it goes to the BOT. He has asked for a line edit of the proposed changes and a sidebar explaining each change relative to the recommendations that have come in from faculty and students alike.

Harriet Fertik asked about MyElements, pointing out that, until last year, faculty reporting was completely separate from the creation of public-facing efforts. She asked, from the administration’s perspective, whether there is an advantage in having these combined. Wayne explained that when the decision was made to couple the two efforts the focus was on how to make it easier for faculty. Data was already being pulled from the MyElements databases when snapshots of the University were made. But, because the information was not as precise, deans had to turn to the FAR information and extract information from CVs. This involved a lot of work and each dean wanted to hire someone to do that work. The goal was to create something that is easy for faculty to update easily once a year because of the auto-populating features. That is the goal. Wayne acknowledged that we haven’t achieved the goal, but we haven’t given up on trying to get there. We need to give a little more time. In summary, the goal is to make it easier for the faculty to keep their information curated and for the administration to extract it.

Wayne also pointed out that MyElements does not connect to the Promotion and Tenure (P&T) process at all. For P&T committees the CV is prepared by the faculty member for their colleagues for their discipline and this will be the CV of record for the P&T case.

John Gibson asked the provost about what he sees as a process going forward to have better faculty involvement in IT decisions that affect faculty and how this can be done in a timely manner.

Wayne responded that he has talked to Terri Winters about the need to be very responsive to faculty. He has asked Terri to roll out more broadly a mechanism for any faculty member to try MyElements and give feedback. As well, he has asked the library to step in and provide some resources that can help faculty who want to get in and try it and to capture what is working and to identify the bugs. Wayne has suggested that, in connection with updates from Terri, they should go to the IT committee and the Agenda Committee and then push them out as a whole to faculty.

John said thinking of projects like using MyWildcat Success as a platform for advising for early intervention for students there are questions about this that are very important to the faculty. However, as a member of the IT committee, he feels that he is not getting sufficiently involved in the decision on whether to go forward on that project. We are, with MyWildcat Success, where we were with MyElements a few years ago. The questions should be addressed up front now rather than come to a head later. Wayne responded that he thinks that the IT Committee would be the focal point for this. The IT Committee working with the Agenda committee would have a group of faculty working with Terri to figure this out. In any case, based on feedback, they are backing off on the idea of rolling out the early warning system to every adviser. The data that is being generated indicates that it is better
used in our communication to students prior to arrival so that we can ensure that they are getting support from the beginning, not waiting till they are 8 weeks in.

George Roth from the IT Committee said that, while Terri does a great job doing what she is directed to do, the faculty involvement needs to be on the strategy and goals of the software and the implications for the faculty and the work and how we understand the goals of teaching and delivering content to the students while we are trying to manage an administration process. If the feedback happens when it is getting ready to roll out, we are just way behind, and it makes it hard to get the faculty excited because we don’t see the strategic connection and it feels that we are reacting rather than being engaged. The Faculty Senate needs to be involved when the strategy is set to understand the expectations, why the software is being purchased, what is going to be accomplished, and how to get faculty input.

Wayne agreed with this and said that he was surprised that there weren’t more faculty involved with MyElements and the motivation for implementing it wasn’t known ahead of time. George said that there is an operational agenda and a strategic part. But, by the time the faculty and Faculty Senate get involved there are clashes that feel hard on all of us. Scott Smith shared that myWildcat Success was implemented after a 30-minute presentation before the Faculty Senate. It was a rapid demonstration from EAB and the system was implemented with no consultation or endorsement by the Faculty Senate. The same occurred with MyElements and FAR in that there was no attempt to make the case to have the Faculty Senate vote to embrace it. In the future, when there is a major IT initiative that has an impact on the faculty, the full faculty should be able to weigh in.

Jim Connell explained that there is a difference between study groups, beta tests, and the Senate weighing in on whether overall it is a good thing. There are grander concerns than whether the software works.

Wayne agreed with these comments and said that there is also a concern with mission creep that showed up with both myWildcat Success and MyElements. Something that was not supposed to touch the faculty is adopted, but the faculty should have weighed in at the beginning. We need to do a better to when the pendulum swings in terms of the mission.

III. Remarks by and questions to the chair:

- The chair, Scott Smith, announced that there is a forum on Indigenous People’s day tomorrow in Ham-Smith 220. He encourages senators to attend if possible as this issue is being discussed by one of the Senate committees.

- Faculty registration is open for Honors convocation and commencement. All faculty are encouraged to sign up and attend since it is best to have as much faculty participation as possible.

- The Campus Climate survey has been distributed via an online survey. All senators are encouraged to complete this survey and to urge their colleagues to complete it.

- The Discovery Review Committee is being formed and the draft charges are being considered and will be reviewed by the Agenda Committee at their next meeting. Nominations are being accepted for faculty for the Discovery Review Committee until Friday.
- A brief update on the Honors College committee is planned for the next Senate meeting. An Honors College was part of the president’s strategic plan.

- As we approach the end of the year committee, chairs are encouraged to wrap up work and contact the Senate chair to get any final reports or motions on the calendar. We have two consecutive meetings in the last two weeks of the semester.

IV. Approval of the minutes from February 25, 2019 - It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the February 25, 2019 meeting of the Senate. Corrections were offered in Sections VII and IX. The minutes were unanimously approved with 2 abstentions.

V. Discussion and vote Agenda Committee motion on FAR and My Elements.

The chair explained that the Agenda Committee has, in discussion with the IT Committee, prepared a substitute motion that, it is hoped, will satisfy the majority of faculty members and also take into consideration the late date where we stand in the year in connection with faculty reporting.

The chair advised that If there is any faculty member who has concerns about replacing the original motion, we will need to immediately stop discussion on the substitution motion and discuss and vote whether we can move forward with the substitute motion.

David Bachrach explained that the original motion on this topic was presented at the February 25 Senate meeting as follows. The text of the substitution was presented, and David gave Senators an opportunity to read it on the display screen since this motion was not distributed in advance due to it being crafted over the weekend and finalized on the day of this meeting. David also read the text of the Motion, but not the Rationale, out loud.

Substitute Motion FAR/MyElements

**Rationale:** While we recognize that the use of MyElements as the platform for conducting the Faculty Activity Reporting has benefits for the university, there are three non-trivial concerns that the Faculty Senate has concerning both the decision to use MyElements as well as the implementation thereof. First, the decision was not endorsed by the full Faculty Senate, but left in the hands of an AT-led committee with limited faculty representation. The use of MyElements as the platform for FAR was presented as a fait d’accompli as a way to ensure compliance in using MyElements. Second, a broad-based survey of the faculty, departmental leadership and college leadership in fall 2018 revealed near-universal frustration with MyElements as the faculty activity reporting tool. Third, the resultant use of faculty data from MyElements in populating university web pages has further frustrated faculty because they and their work are often not being presented accurately or as they desire it to be presented, including choice of name to be presented to the public.

We thus find ourselves forced to use a system that is difficult to use, time consuming, sometimes inaccurate or misleading, and was imposed upon us without the senate’s full consent.

Recognizing, however, that making any strong motion to decouple FAR from MyElements this late in the year would likely result in chaos and confusion, and acknowledging the good-faith efforts by AT to address the concerns of the faculty and to tailor the software to make it more
field-appropriate and user-friendly, as well as the IT Committee’s continued work with AT to ensure continued improvements in the process, we here limit ourselves to set benchmarks for faculty satisfaction that establish the *sine qua non* to continue using MyElements for FAR past AY18–19:

**Motion:** We call upon the central administrative leadership to acknowledge that the implementation of MyElements as the platform for Faculty Activity Reporting was initiated without the full consent of the Faculty Senate (and thus was a violation of the spirit of shared governance), and to recognize that the Faculty Senate should be able to decide for itself the method of reporting faculty work. In the future we urge the university administrative leadership to seek a full vote by the Faculty Senate before the adoption of any major technological system that directly impacts faculty.

Furthermore, we move that the Faculty Senate Agenda Committee, in consultation with the Information Technology Committee, conduct a second survey of faculty, chairs, and deans in August 2019; if faculty dissatisfaction with MyElements as the platform for FAR remains high, the motion to decouple FAR from MyElements is to be brought to the floor of the Senate for deliberation by the whole body.

Finally, we strongly encourage Academic Technologies to work closely with faculty (ITC and others) in order to resolve the still serious and unresolved issues with MyElements and develop the system to facilitate an accurate submission of faculty annual achievements in a way that is both transparent and responsive to different disciplines, responsibilities and functions. We also urge central administrative leadership to offer AT the necessary support to address faculty concerns.

The floor was opened for discussion. Briggs Bailey said that the consensus in the English Department seems to be that the concern is not about individual unresolved elements in MyElements, instead, it is the whole thing. She said that she promised to vote against the coupling of MyElements with faculty annual reporting (FAR) as tweaking does not seem to be the right approach to this.

The chair declared that this remark was enough of a reaction to the substitute motion to stop and have a discussion about whether the substitution motion should replace the original motion.

The chair asked that the original motion be displayed, and David read the text of the motion:

**FAR/MyElements Motion**  
**Presented by Agenda Committee at February 25 Faculty Senate Meeting**

*Whereas the faculty of each of the colleges of the University of New Hampshire work in fields that are widely divergent from each other with substantial differences in expectations regarding the nature, type, scale, conduct, and product of their research, as well as significant differences in teaching and service*
And whereas MyElements was never intended to serve as a platform for faculty activity reporting

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

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

Allison Wilder asked about the language in the substitute motion that calls for the administration to seek a full vote by the Senate before the adoption of any major technological system that impacts faculty. She wondered whether this was inconsistent with another motion that was presented for discussion about shared governance and whether we could get some economies or consistencies in how we think shared governance carried out.

The chair responded that these are two concerns that are slightly different. On the one hand there are things that come to the provost office that are “report only” so we can decide if we want to act on them or bring them to the full Senate. But there have been so many technological issues that have come and gone without any real faculty debate on the floor and the language in the substitute motion is trying to solve that problem.

John Gibson responded to the response by Briggs explaining that one stopgap measure that has been proposed is to restructure the FAR form so that the first thing to upload is your CV and narrative. Faculty could then go down further in the form as they like. This is the kind of revision of procedure that Terri Winters and Alicia Medros are speaking to all of the deans about in an effort to identify what would be appropriate for each college. This process would potentially satisfy a department by allowing a pretty clear form submission followed by whatever revision you care to do to keep your faculty profile accurate while still using the software infrastructure that is in place to get the information submitted. So, even if you don’t think that MyElements has a chance to succeed it might succeed in that manner.

John said that he isn’t sure if the substitute motion would give departments the freedom to say that an upload of the CV and narrative would be all that is required. But, if the colleges still retain that degree of control it would allow us to continue to use MyElements just for the mechanism of submitting the reports and to go further so that your profile would be up to date.

Scott reviewed that Terri winters went to each of the deans and worked with the colleges to come up with a series of forms or changes to the actual form for submission to make it more appropriate for that college. However, we won’t know what the FAR/MyElements platform looks like until Wednesday when it gets unveiled. The question is: do we act now, or do we wait?
Erin Sharp said that she was supportive of this substitute motion because of the work that AT has been doing at the Dean’s level. Her understanding is that the deans have been given a sense that this needs to continue and the Dean of her college has asked for faculty to try it for another year. Therefore, voting to decouple the two isn’t going to change anything because the deans have already said that they want to be patient with AT. Erin said that voting for this motion gives us more control over what happens after the new implementation.

Briggs pointed out that the drop-down menus are not particularly friendly for non-tenure track lecturers, are who nevertheless are required to submit their annual report through MyElements. John responded that this was addressed as one of the customizations addressed with the deans was to provide an interface that was appropriate for both different colleges and different faculty types.

Lu Yan asked for clarification about what would be involved in voting for this motion since none of her publications can be extracted by MyElements. Scott clarified that this would mean that we would not decouple until the next version and therefore we would use MyElements for the FAR this year, remembering that there might be a limited approach that would involve only uploading a CV and narrative and anything further that you are able to do. He said that there has been a good faith effort to tailor a college specific FAR and he expects that this has been productive, but we don’t know yet what it looks like.

The discussion ended and the chair asked for a vote on the question of whether to amend by substitution the original motion. The amendment motion passed with vote passed with 47 in favor, 13 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

The chair invited discussion on the substitution motion.

Casey Golmoski pointed out that we appear to be putting the onus on AT instead of HR in connection with the name issue. Scott shared that the Agenda Committee is considering a separate motion on the current problem that professional names cannot be used if they are different from the HR name. Scott explained that this motion addresses the FAR and MyElements.

Andrew Coppens explained that he voted no to consider this substitute motion because his broader concern is what we, as a senate, do when there is some sort of collective opinion that there has been a violation of shared governance and how strong of a tack to take against the current direction. He encourages the Senate to consider whether with this motion there is a strong enough countervailing force.

David Finkelhor asked whether the MyElements system can be fixed or not. He pointed out that the IT Committee thinks it can be fixed and they have taken that perspective and he does have confidence in their judgment about this, but we won’t have an understanding for a week or longer what it looks like. Making a motion at this point appears to be presumptuous. He would like to have a stronger set of recommendations from the IT committee based on better knowledge before we decide what to do. David proposed that we table this motion until we better information.

Jim Connell advised a motion to table is usually reserved for extreme circumstances. Instead, a motion to postpone to the next meeting or another meeting could be made. This motion would be subject to debate and voted on. Another option is to send the motion back to the Agenda Committee with
instructions on what to do before bringing it back to the next meeting. David Finkelhor said that he will wait for further discussion before considering whether to make a motion.

Lori Hopkins responded to Andrew’s comments about shared governance explaining that she had proposed an earlier version of this substitution motion after the Agenda Committee met with a lot of people on the issue. The response has been that AT is working to fix this and they are listening to us. Lori said that her idea of shared governance is that we are getting a response, they are listening to us and hearing us and that this is the moment we say, “Get these changes done because they are important to us as a faculty.” There have been strong efforts on the part of many people to make these changes. When something really egregious happens like the T-School situation that would have been a moment to draw a line in the sand. Lori said that she completely understands that we want to be in control of how we present ourselves and that her original language in the motion used language about “an accurate submission of faculty annual achievement” because this is about giving us a chance to show what we do. Lori closed her comments by asking that we not draw the line in the sand. There are things where we want to maintain a little bit of power and we should acknowledge that some efforts are being made and we are being listened to.

Scott Ollinger said that Lori’s comments resonate with him. He said that he has had as much frustration as anyone with MyElements and probably the biggest problem is that it doesn’t list the courses he teaches, and this is a problem. However, Terri Winters and the AT office have been very responsive and have been working hard. Any system like this is bound to have growing pains and we should be careful to not be too reactionary too early on in the process. Scott said that his concern is with the first paragraph that states that the Faculty Senate should be able to decide for itself the method of reporting faculty work. He is concerned that, in a good spirit of collaboration between faculty and other elements of the university this should be a shared process and it shouldn’t be us dictating how we think we should report on our work. He is happy with this motion, but the first paragraph makes it appear too defiant.

Jim Connell pointed out that in the Joint Agreement on Shared Governance between University presidents and the AAUP (https://www.aaup.org/report/statement-government-colleges-and-universities) one of the things that was acknowledged was that faculty have primary responsibility for the evaluation of teaching. Jim pointed out that this is on the FS website. (See the first line of the Senate constitution at: https://www.unh.edu/fac-senate/senate-constitution-bylaws-4-3-2017-version-updated-02042019-include-changes-motion-xxiii)

Buzz Scherr said that he echoed Andrew’s comments and he voted for the original motion. He thinks the real issue here is that over the past 7 or 8 years he has observed that when the administration has done something the Senate has asked what about this and what about that. This is a good example. When AT first started thinking about MyElements and coupling it with faculty reporting that is when there should have been a process in place that involved asking the Agenda Committee if the faculty wants to have input here. Buzz said that he encourages the Agenda Committee going forward to have a discussion about a process that deals with any new initiatives from AT or any other body is thinking of doing something new to get input so that we are not always in this position of being cranky and deliberating on whether to draw a line in the sand or not.
Elsa Upham said that she sees both sides of the issue, but she doesn’t see that the first paragraph is going to be effective in requiring the administration to obtain approval from the Faculty Senate on things like this in the future. However, if there is a broader motion coming up maybe the hammer could be heavier. Chris Neefus responded that he doesn’t see, besides triggering another survey, what difference this motion makes whether one votes yes or no. If we vote “yes” you use MyElements for the time being and if we vote “no” you continue using MyElements until the issue blows up again. So, there doesn’t seem to be much point to the motion.

David Bachrach explained that there are 2 issues: 1) We all suffered under MyElements in terms of its, particularly bad performance. The broader issue is about what is “faculty business” and what is “administration business,” That first paragraph does – and this is why a vote for this motion means something – say that faculty has control of this aspect of faculty business. We are asserting control over something that was taken from us illegitimately through a violation of shared governance. If we vote no on this the Faculty Senate is basically saying, we don’t care if important aspects of our academic lives are taken from us through violations of shared governance. So, it is not a matter of whether we use MyElements this year or next year. It is really a matter of where we as a faculty see our interest and our control.

John LaCourse asked about the phrase in the motion; “…if faculty dissatisfaction with MyElements as the platform for FAR remains high,…” He asked what does “high” mean and who will decide what is “high.” Scott Smith answered that this has been left precisely vague to allow the Agenda Committee to make a reasonable judgment. We can’t really find a way unless we have a statistically viable survey. If there is a general sense on the floor of the Senate and in a survey that it is still not satisfactory that ought to empower the agenda committee to go forward and make a strong statement. We need to give some discretion to the IT committee and the Agenda Committee.

Allison asked whether this is really a vote about shared governance and David said yes. She said that this goes back to her original comment.

Rose Came suggested that she sees a simplification in separating some of these things by offering a motion on shared governance on FAR and MyElements and then proceed to the next thing. She said that some of us agree with one aspect but not another. Jim Connell spoke about the parliamentary procedures for this kind of request and advised if Rose wants to bring a motion to the body of the question and vote upon the individual paragraphs and then it would be up to the senate. If seconded there would be a vote on whether or not to divide the question. Rose said that she won’t be making such a motion.

John Gibson said that one reason to vote for this motion is that it ratifies a lot of work that the IT Committee and Agenda Committee put into crafting a compromise between them. There had been a fair amount of distance between the two committees and we have hammered this out. The IT Committee has not met since this motion has been proposed so they haven’t been polled yet. Jon said that, from his perspective, he does have disagreements on some aspects but will vote for the motion since it is a good compromise and does a good job as a whole. To put a stamp of approval on the Senate’s own working is a reason to vote for this motion.

The motion to approve the substitution motion was put to a vote and passed with 52 in favor, 6 opposed, and 4 abstentions.
The chair encouraged all to go into the FAR in MyElements with an open mind to see if it is actually problematic or whether we are predisposed to think it is problematic.

VI. Discussion and vote on the AAC motion on the concurrent credit motion - This motion was previously presented at the February 25 Senate meeting. Shelly Mulligan shared the motion again and explained that this is a pilot program meant to establish whether these concurrent credit programs are viable. She had a meeting over the break to discuss and gather information from the three faculty members who submitted this program to address questions that had come up from the Senate. One of the questions was about how the high schools were being selected since there was a compelling concern at the last meeting about certain high schools delivering this course content and others not. Shelley reported that high schools have to be interested in these courses, have the resources, and have the course already part of the curriculum. That is the starting point. Any high school that wants to offer these courses can contact UNH to go through the process of having a course approved.

Another concern was about not having a formal structure and administrative process in place. In response to this concern, the Academic Affairs committee has offered an amendment to the motion based on the conversation with the three faculty members involved as follows: “A formal structure and process be developed to guide the UNH implementation and administration of all current and future dual credit course offerings, including an ongoing plan for oversight of all dual credit course offerings.”

The Academic Affairs Committee feels good about this program. The conversation was around it being a pilot program. The motion was put on the floor for discussion.

Jim Connell asked whether, in connection with the text of the amendment, the formal structure will come back to the Senate for approval. Right now, there doesn’t seem to be a manual or document for reviewing this. He asked if this will be developed. The chair asked for a friendly amendment to be added to the committee’s amendment, to add “to be reviewed by the Faculty Senate.” Shelley agreed to this.

Sterling Tomellini shared that he brought this motion back to his department faculty and he talked to several people on the CAPC (Curriculum & Academic Policies Committee) in CEPS. He has concerns and those concerns should be looked at by CAPC. Sterling suggested recommitting the motion to the Academic Affairs Committee so that they can seek guidance from CAPC in CEPS and the equivalent committees from each college. Shelley pointed out that the courses are approved, and they are not new courses. It is believed that courses offered at these high schools are equivalent. The schools work with faculty to get approved for actual credit. This is not the development of new courses.

Sterling said that he understands that these are not new courses. But, the offering of the course is in a high school setting. There may be unintended consequences that people aren’t thinking about. The only way to get an answer on that is through CAPC. This committee has 9 members from different departments. We can find out what they feel and concerns there are. Sterling said that faculty are asking him questions for which he doesn’t have answers.

Sterling offered a motion to recommit the motion back to committee with a specific instruction. The motion was seconded by John LaCourse.
Erin Sharp said that she is thinking that this proposal differs a bit from other things that we consider that are initiatives from administrators. This is an initiative from faculty. She said that she challenges us to think about if we were putting forward a program with a curriculum that we are familiar with and schools that we work closely with, how would we feel about the micromanagement of an initiative that is coming from faculty.

Skip Tenczar explained that as you look at student’s portfolios at advising time, we have hundreds of students, possibly thousands who arrive here with Running Start credits and credits from other institutions that are being accepted at UNH. He explained that he originally became interested in this because he is an advisor for four video production programs at the regional technical centers and a couple of them of cover all of the competencies of his introductory video production class. When these students arrive at UNHM he would waive them through to an advanced class so that they don’t have to take the introductory class. In the computing area, they are running into a similar thing.

Skip said that he has been rebuffed by the administration for years about doing this kind of program and it wasn’t until we were encouraged by the Nancy Targett, the former provost, that he and his colleagues brought it forward. Skip said that if we recommit this motion he wonders how much longer it will take.

Maryann Clark asked if Andy Colby, the Registrar, has been consulted or has weighed in on this. Skip said that there have been discussions at the dean level and the associate dean level. So, he assumes that the consultation with the Registrar has been done at UNHM.

Maryann asked that an amendment to the motion to recommit to add an instruction for the AAC to consult with the Registrar.

Discussion was opened on this amendment. There was some support voiced.

Regina Attisano spoke against the amendment. She said that she believes there is enough information and there have been discussions about this going on to decades and that we don’t need any more information. As far as the Registrar goes, he can definitely offer insights. But, remember these will be UNH courses on the transcript.

A vote was taken on Maryann Clark’s amendment to Sterling’s recommit motion to add an instruction that the AAC shall consult with the Registrar. The amendment passed with 30 in favor, 29 opposed, and 3 abstentions.

Discussion resumed on the recommit motion.

Subrena Smith asked whether, instead of recommitting, can we accomplish the goal of getting answers to the concerns of the CEPS faculty in another way.

Sterling pointed out that this is not just Manchester and that is not clear what courses are being talked about. The new part is that we are giving grades in the university and saying that those are UNH courses. There are some things that are new and there are things going on that may not be understood. That is what the members of these committees should find out. Although these are already approved courses it may not be approved for a high school venue.
Erin Sharp asked if, instead of recommitting, can a friendly amendment be added to the motion that these courses need to go through the academic review committees in the given related colleges? The chair advised that we need to vote on the motion to recommit first before we consider this.

Elsa asked if it wouldn’t be a waste of time to have the course approved again by the same body that approved them in the first place.

Skip explained that when we are talking about these equivalences, the way Running Start works, you look at a particular course that you are offering and what the various content areas and competencies are within the institution that you are working with and you create a document with the instructor and others to say that these are the content areas that need to be covered.

Rose Came summarized that the body in CEPS that deals with approving these courses is CAPC and Sterling is on that committee and he is asking for more work for himself because he thinks that he and his committee will have some insights and we should give them that opportunity.

Jim Connell said that he thinks that there is some validity to this point. With Running Start, the grades don’t carry through. I know that every time that I have talked with a high teacher that their pressures in terms of grades are very different from ours. It is a different environment and another set of eyes can’t hurt. We are talking about essentially a listening session with these different groups by a committee. There are still questions in this room, and they are not answered and getting the handle on the unintended consequences seems to be a worthwhile thing.

Erin said that she is against recommitting the motion and suggested that the motion to recommit be put to a vote. It is the faculty in the department that is forming the relationship, and they are the appropriate people to evaluate these courses.

John LaCourse said that he agrees with Jim and Rose on this. This is an opportunity to have internal shared governance and another opportunity to look at the course material and the environment and how it is being taught.

Skip asked for clarification on the recommit motion. If, in the case of his course, would he go to his curriculum committee at UNHM for approval before moving forward? Sterling said that there is a second part about a grade being given. The question is whether the councils would approve that or whether there are other issues that go along with it. There are two issues: giving credit and giving the grade.

**The question was called to approve the motion to recommit the proposal to the AAC with 2 specific instructions: 1) consult with the Registrar and 2) Seek the council of CAPC or the equivalent in each college. The motion failed with 23 in favor and 31 opposed.**

The discussion resumed regarding the motion itself.

Adele Marone said that the Faculty in MCBS do have concerns, not about doing this, but about ensuring the rigor. Some comments from her colleagues included “without knowing the details and knowing the formal review process should be in place first” and “we should know what the review process will be” and there was a suggestion that standardized exam be used to demonstrate that the students have achieved a similar level of competence to a UNH taught course. There was also a
suggestion that the high school teacher should be required to enroll in the UNH course before offering it at their high school.

Jim asked if any of these departments have looked into the implications of ABET accreditation on having what amounts to UNH courses taught by high school teachers and then carrying over as credit and grades and how their work folds in with ABET.

Phil Hatcher said that he agrees with Sterling that this could be a slippery slope and that the key thing is the grade issue. Right now, what happens in Computer Science when these courses are happening in high schools we have to decide whether students skip our first and even second course. We make those decisions now, and that is all overseen by accreditation, and we are comfortable with this and have not had any problem with those decisions. So, what is different is that the student would get UNH credit with a grade. Is that what we want to do? Computer Science thinks that this is a pilot program and we should move ahead and see what happens. The courses are going to be overseen by Computer Science faculty that are involved in working with these high school teachers. We aren’t sure whether this is going to work well and or whether it will make CAPC and other groups happy. But we would like to move forward with a pilot program and figure this out.

Nena Stracuzzi said that, as a social worker, she sees this as an access piece. For some of the students who can’t afford AP and other things this allows them to take fewer classes at UNH and pay less tuition and possibly graduate early. She worries that sometimes we, as faculty, need to step back and think about accessibility for other people. We have a great product and so do some of these high schools. It is a pilot program and we can get rid of it. It feels like “us versus them” instead of collaborating with these teachers who are providing the content. She closed by saying that this is her social justice stand for the day.

The chair called for the motion to be put for a vote. The full text of the motion is as follows with the text of the Fall 2018 Pilot Program proposal referred to in the motion attached as Appendix 6.1:

**Motion regarding approval for the UNH Concurrent Credit Pilot Program**

**Preface:** A Proposal for a Dual Credit Pilot Program was submitted to the Office of Provost Fall 2018 from the following departments and individuals: Communication Arts and Sciences Department, UNH Manchester-Anthony Tenczar, M.F.A., Associate Professor; Applied Engineering and Sciences Department, UNH Manchester- Mihaela Sabin, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Computer Science and Chair; and Computer Science Department, CEPS- Radim Bartos, Ph.D., Professor of Computer Science and Chair. UNH Manchester has select academic programs that have developed special relations with NH high schools such as Pinkerton Academy that are eager to offer UNH courses for UNH credit. USNH yielded the awarding of early college credit to the Community Colleges through the Running Start Program. Community colleges and SNHU credential all dual credit courses, and transcribe college credits earned while in high school, and although high school students can transfer these credits to UNH, the process is believed to be too far removed for them to recognize that they can bring such early credits to UNH. High school students see the courses as offered by the Community Colleges and SNHU, and therefore these institutions become their default points of entry rather
than UNH. Offering the courses for UNH credit therefore is believed to be a strategy for student recruitment.

This proposal recommends the establishment of a pilot program in select disciplines to provide early college credit in a limited set of courses that provide entry into UNH Manchester computing and communication arts programs, and CEPS programs in Computer Science. If this pilot program proves successful in recruiting students and in providing the academic quality expected of UNH courses, the program can expand slowly to other high schools where UNH faculty can build relationships, where there is a sufficient student cohort that meets the academic qualifications, and where high schools express interest, and resources in delivering content as part of their curricula. Initial High School partners include Dover High School, Hollis-Brookline, Milford High School, Pinkerton Academy, Moultonborough Academy, and Windham High School, and a computer science course offered by the Applied Engineering and Sciences Department, UNH Manchester is ready to be piloted at Pinkerton Academy.

Motion: The Faculty Senate supports the implementation of the proposed UNH concurrent credit pilot program for offering students from select high schools the opportunity to take UNH courses for credit that are taught within the high school curriculum, and by high school teachers supported by UNH faculty provided that:

• the program is implemented as a 2-year pilot with the collection of relevant outcome data and will undergo a formal review by the Faculty Senate after 2 years. At that time recommendations for any future implementation will be made.

• a formal structure and process be developed to guide the UNH implementation and administration of all current and future dual credit course offerings, including an ongoing plan for oversight of all dual credit course offerings, to be reviewed by the Faculty Senate.

• participating high school students meet eligibility criteria including being in grades 11 or 12 with a minimum overall “B” average

• high school teachers delivering UNH courses be provided with support and oversight by a UNH faculty member to ensure the rigor, content, and grading follows UNH standards; UNH faculty time and UNH resources to do so needs to be monitored

• participating students be charged an administrative fee that would cover the cost of establishing a UNH academic record, registration, and transcripting.

The motion passed 43 in favor, 12 opposed and 2 abstentions.

The chair said that he hopes that the feedback that has been given here and the concerns that have been noted are brought back to the individual departments involved in this pilot and that we hope we can find a positive way forward.

VII. New Business – There was no new business

VIII. Adjournment - The meeting was adjourned at 4:58 pm
APPENDIX 6.1

Proposal for UNH Concurrent Credit Program Pilot
November 6, 2018

Participating Departments

- Communication Arts and Sciences Department, UNH Manchester
  - Anthony Tenczar, M.F.A., Associate Professor of Communication Arts
- Applied Engineering and Sciences Department, UNH Manchester
  - Mihaela Sabin, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Computer Science and Chair
- Computer Science Department, College of Engineering and Physical Sciences
  - Radim Bartos, Ph.D., Professor of Computer Science and Chair

Background and Motivation

UNH Manchester has select academic programs that have developed special relations with high schools in the state.

Mihaela Sabin in the Applied and Engineering Sciences (AES) Department has run professional development programs for high school teachers through UNH STEM Discovery Lab. She serves on the advisory board of Computer Science programs at Windham High School, Pinkerton Academy Career and Technical Center, and Dover Regional Career and Technical Center. Dover and Windham have teachers who are currently participating in a state-wide professional development program organized by the Code.org through the UNH-Code.org Regional Partnership.

New CS education developments in the past two years have created a very favorable environment for improving CS education in the NH K-12 schools. Established in 2016, CS4NH is an advocacy group that works to increase access to and participation in CS education. NH Tech Alliance and CS4NH entered into an alliance in early 2018 to support education and training programs for tech workforce development. Governor Sununu signed into law NH HB 1674 on June 18, 2018 to add Computer Science as a core K-12 subject area. Shortly after, on August 8 2018, the NH State Board of Education adopted the new NH Computer Science standards.

As a founding member of the Computer Science Teacher Association (CSTA) NH Chapter and principal investigator of teacher professional learning programs funded by NSF and Google for Education, Professor Sabin has collaborated extensively with computing faculty across the state to
develop computing curricula that align with the new AP CS Principles College Board course and K-12 Computer Science Framework.

Similarly, Anthony Tenczar in the Communication Arts and Sciences (CAS) Department serves on the advisory board of some of the state’s CTE centers and has reviewed the schools’ video production courses. He asserts that they are equivalent to our introductory course and are worthy of being awarded college credit. Professor Tenczar is an advisor to Pinkerton Academy’s Video Production Program and has worked closely with Pinkerton faculty member Chris Lord. Pinkerton Academy is an important source of first year admissions for UNH Manchester. The value of strong relationships with Pinkerton Academy is focused on recruiting. Other high schools are eager for UNH to accept rigorous courses vetted by national standards for college credit, as are the AES and CAS departments at UNH Manchester.

New K-12 Computer Science Education Developments in New Hampshire

Governor Sununu signed into law NH HB 1674 on June 18, 2018 to add Computer Science as a core K-12 subject area. Shortly after, on August 8 2018, the NH State Board of Education adopted the new NH Computer Science standards. NH Tech Alliance

Early College Credit in New Hampshire

The primary problem in New Hampshire is that USNH yielded the awarding of early college credit to the Community Colleges through the Running Start Program. Community colleges and SNHU credential all dual credit courses, transcribe college credits earned while in high school, and therefore provide portability. Although high school students can transfer these credits to UNH, the process is too far removed from their desire to attend college for them to recognize that they are bringing early credit to UNH. High school students see the courses as offered by the Community Colleges and SNHU, and therefore these institutions become their default points of entry. Directly competing with the Community College System of NH by offering dual credit is not a position that UNH should take. Thus the dilemma is how to craft an early college credit program that does not compete with CCSNH but still awards portable UNH college credit.

UNH Concurrent Credit Pilot Program

This proposal recommends the establishment of a concurrent credit pilot program in selected disciplines and with selected high schools. The UNH Concurrent Credit Pilot Program is to provide early college credit in a limited set of courses that provide entry into UNH Manchester computing and communication arts programs and CEPS computing programs in the Computer Science (CS) Department.

---

1 College Board AP: Computer Science Principles [https://apcentral.collegeboard.org/courses/ap-computer-science-principles/course](https://apcentral.collegeboard.org/courses/ap-computer-science-principles/course)

2 Conceptual guidelines for CS education developed through collaboration among Association for Computing Machinery, Computer Science Teacher Association, Cyber Innovation Center, and National Math and Science Initiative [https://k12cs.org/](https://k12cs.org/)
If this pilot program proves successful in recruiting students and in providing the academic quality expected of UNH courses, the program can expand slowly and in limited ways to other high schools and other programs where UNH faculty have strong relationships and where there is a sufficient student cohort that meets the academic qualifications.

Initial High School Partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dover High School</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>Deborah Minassian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollis-Brookline</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>Lorna Spargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milford High School</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>Tammy Andrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinkerton Academy</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>Mike Kulick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moultonborough Academy</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>Joanne Lau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windham High School</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>Mike Koski</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objectives and Requirements

Faculty Mentorship
The UNH Concurrent Credit Pilot Program will identify high schools with which AES, CAS, and CS department faculty have strong advisory and mentorship relations. UNH faculty will be involved in the curriculum of the courses and, where necessary, with assessment of student work. The strong, ongoing relationship between selected high schools and UNH faculty will distinguish our program from Running Start and will assure academic quality.

University Standards
Running Start provides students a safety net since college credit is transcripted only if students perform at an acceptable academic level. A UNH transcripted course would provide no safety net. All grades, including failing grades, would appear on the student transcript, which runs the risk for students to begin college at a disadvantage. To avoid such situations, students would have to be vetted carefully for participation, courses would need to be an integral part of the student academic experience rather than an add-on, and grading would need to follow University standards.

Student Eligibility Criteria
We will establish eligibility criteria along the lines of UNH’s Early College agreement with the Oyster River School District, where students must be in grades 11 or 12, be engaged in college preparatory coursework, have an overall “B” average, and must be on track to be admissible to a four-year college. We would also require a school counselor or faculty recommendation to allow the student to register for UNH credit. The students who participate would be charged only an administrative fee that would cover the cost of establishing a UNH academic record, registration, and transcripting.

Ongoing Review
High school programs will be reviewed whenever there are curricular changes either at the high school or University level to concurrent credit courses. Should curriculum and learning objectives become incompatible, the high school course will need to realign or the concurrent credit agreement will be terminated. Changes in faculty for either the high school or UNH programs will prompt a review of ongoing mentor relationships and will provide new high school faculty with the opportunity to enter into a mentorship with the appropriate UNH faculty member.
Expansion of pilot program
For each new program/school proposed as part of the concurrent credit program, the proposing faculty member must provide a description of the relationship between the UNH faculty member, High School faculty member and programs, and a rationale for the addition, to the Provost’s Office. Approval of each program rests with the Provost’s Office.

UNH ACRONYMS

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