Meeting called to order at 3:12 p.m. on April 15, 2019

MINUTES SUMMARY

I. Roll - The following senators were absent: Came, Gass, Hemstock, Innis, Kim, Knezevic, Knowles, Magnusson, Merenda, Ollinger, Ramsay, Reardon, Rigg, Simos, Tucker. The following senators were excused: Golomski, Hiller, Tenczar, and Wilder. The following guests attended: Wayne Jones, Nicky Gullace.

II. Remarks by and questions to the Provost: Provost Wayne Jones shared some updates:

- Several searches are in process. The COLA Dean search is in the finalist stage; the Graduate School Dean search is in the semi-finalist stage. As well, the CFO, VP for Research and Enrollment Management searches are underway.

- In response to a concern raised by a faculty member at the last Senate meeting, the provost explained that the insurance provider for USNH made a decision that they didn't want to recognize Airbnb as a viable option for university paid lodging. However, UNH has pushed back on this change and Airbnb will be allowed with advance approval that involves completing a form. There may be some situations where business Airbnb is used that the approval is not required. In any case, UNH has requested that the system go back and revisit this issue.

- In connection with the Amorous Relationship Policy, feedback from the Faculty Senate, Student Senate, and others was shared with the BOT working group headed up by the general counsel for the system, Ron Rodgers. The provost thanked the Senate for their responses to the new draft of the policy. They are hoping to have it on the agenda for the next BOT meeting which will be held here in Durham in 2 weeks. He said that the goal is to work with the system on shared governance to engage sooner, not after the fact.

- In response to questions raised at the last Senate meeting about housing, Wayne explained that work was done on a housing assessment to look at how UNH is positioned with respect to residence halls for undergraduate and graduate students who want to live on campus with a particular focus on the condemnation of the Forest Park buildings. The report on that housing study will be coming forward soon.

One of the considerations with housing is the cost to the university for minor dependents living on campus to attend school in the Oyster River School district—more than $18,000 per child per year. Fortunately, there are no minors living on campus this year. But if we dramatically increase the number the cost be could several hundred thousand dollars per year and that is not feasible in the long term.
Wayne shared that the university has successfully negotiated some partnerships with one of the off-site, barely off campus, units to incentivize students to take that up for a discount on rent. There are some other options in the works as well.

The preliminary version of the housing report indicates that a lot more students want to live on campus in a living-learning environment. But students are also looking for a different kind of residential space than the classic style.

- The provost expressed thanks to the faculty who are working on any of the retention teams. There are four teams and their charge is to provide the provost a report by the end of May. He has asked the chairs of the committees to give their top 3 or 4 recommended projects and then another set of projects that would be nice to do. There will be a group over the summer that will work to identify priorities and funding for immediate projects and then a working group next year to generate new ideas and also elevate some of the other ideas that came out of the teams.

The sophomore retention team is getting ready to run a preliminary sophomore day to get sophomores engaged toward pushing toward a major. There will also be a sophomore leadership summit held off-site during commencement weekend. This summit includes students who were candidates for RA positions but were not selected. This year the summit is being expanded to include some students who are at risk of not returning to UNH.

The team that focused on gateway courses did some preliminary work this semester to try to move up the early warning system and this is going well. The plan for the fall is to double down on this and see how early we can push it using data analytics. To that end, the System has just agreed to purchase an additional aspect of the EAB software called Navigate. This will give us access to a broader set of data which is going to allow students to be able to get a closer look at what their registration looks like, how they might be able to plan their degree and their career. As well, it will give us, as deployed to the professional advisors, an early warning tool to tell us which students need more communication. This, coupled with myWildcats Success, will be very useful for faculty advisors too. A request has been made to Academic Technology to set up some training for faculty to get a look at that.

The engagement retention team is working to extend the app that we use for FIRE (First year Innovation and Research Experience) to extend it and the features across incoming students during orientation. As well, all of the orientation sessions will now be two days because data shows that if students come for a 2-day orientation the likelihood of them staying more than a year goes way up.

Finally, the survey is being redone for all students that decide not to come back. And, the results of that survey are going to roll into next year’s efforts.

The Provost offered to take questions.

Lori Hopkins pointed out it is important for the university to offer an option for new or visiting faculty members as she experienced when she came to UNH. Also, she suggested that it seems short-sighted for the Oyster River School district to not take into account all of the benefits that UNH offers to the school, including the free labor in the form of student teachers, social services, and other opportunities for children in the district and she wonders when the school district started charging. Wayne said that he agrees. He isn’t familiar with the background, but he believes the change occurred about two years ago. He agrees that it would be nice to have a space for visiting scholars or new faculty members for a semester until they find a house. He said that there are active conversations about a joint effort with a
developer for a space that could serve this purpose. But, because of the school district decision, we need to do it in a manner that is adjacent to campus, not on campus.

- Erin Sharp asked about the new system for computer purchasing and that she understands from a colleague that the only computer that doesn’t have a significant backlog is one that costs $2000. She wonders if the computer needs for UNH are not being met with the new system.

Wayne said that he hadn’t heard about a wait list for computers. He understood that there is a method for requesting approval to purchase outside of the purchasing system if there are cost issues, or hardware, or other needs that can’t be met. He suggested that she look into this process and to let him know if there is still a problem so that he can follow-up.

III. Remarks by and questions to the chair:

- Senate chair, Scott Smith, thanked Susan Endrizzi, chair of the SAC, for organizing a suicide prevention training session on April 23 from 12:45 to 2:00 pm. Registration information has been sent out and the Senate assistant will resend the information to Senators for sharing with their departments.

- Scott encouraged Senators to consider stepping up to serve as committee chairs or as a member of the Agenda Committee next year.

- Scott asked current committee chairs to stand. The Senate recognized their work with a round of applause and Scott stated that whatever small success we have had this year is in no small part due to the incredible and tireless work of our committee chairs and of all senators.

IV. Approval of the minutes from April 15, 2019 - It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the March 18, 2019 meeting of the Senate. Corrections were offered in Sections II, III, V, and VI. The minutes were unanimously approved with 1 abstention.

V. Discussion and vote on CPC Motion on the need for UNH Family Housing - Danielle Pillet-Shore, chair of the CPC, reviewed the motion which was presented at the April 1 meeting and offered to take questions.

---

UNH FACULTY SENATE MOTION
On the need for UNH family housing

Whereas, as of June 30, 2019, UNH’s only on-campus family housing option (the building complex known as Forest Park) is scheduled to be closed for demolition; and

Whereas, the Faculty Senate has already passed two previous motions about the importance of family housing at UNH: Motion XV-M7 (2011) and Motion XIII-M14 (2009); and

Whereas, the 2012 Campus Master Plan (pg. 44-45) – citing a 2010 study – indicated the need for affordable campus housing to accommodate at least 40-50 married/partnered graduate students with no children, 15-20 students with families, and 15-20 post-docs/scholars/faculty, and made specific recommendations to meet this need; and

Whereas, dating back to 2006, many faculty supporting UNH’s diversity initiatives expressed deep concerns about a lack of affordable family housing at UNH; and
Whereas, in October of 2018, junior faculty in the College of Engineering and Physical Sciences wrote and sent a letter to President James Dean in which they expressed their concern regarding UNH’s decision to close Forest Park; and

Whereas, the University of New Hampshire is the state’s public flagship research university and an R1 research institution; and

Whereas, such housing is part of UNH’s academic mission in line with President James Dean’s January 24, 2019 Four Strategic Priorities address; therefore, be it

Resolved: that safe, affordable, proximate couple/family housing for use by graduate students, international students, and early career faculty with spouses/families should be a strategic priority to help fulfill UNH’s responsibility to recruit and support, train and retain new scholars; and, be it further

Resolved: that the Faculty Senate urges the University Administration to designate safe, affordable, proximate family housing for use by graduate students, international students, and early career faculty with families.

There was a question about whether the earlier comments from the provost about working with the private sector to create new facilities off campus is covered by the motion. Danielle responded that since the motion doesn’t refer to public, private, on campus or off campus there shouldn’t be any effect. We are all practical and reasonable people and understand that if it has to be housing that is adjacent, that is a conversation to be had.

Jordan Coulombe, chair of the Graduate Student Senate (GSS) shared that the GSS has been working with the administration since the beginning of the year on the issue of housing and they have had a great deal of support from the housing steering committee. The GSS is currently working on a motion in connection with housing. He said that the motions like this one in the Faculty Senate are important in recognizing and providing the historical context that is needed for making informed policy decisions. Jordan thanked the CPC for their hard work on this.

In response to a question about how a new housing proposal that involves a for-profit developer on taxable property in Durham will be affordable, the Provost explained that the university is looking into a public/private partnership that would involve some contribution from the university as a partner in exchange for competitive pricing.

The discussion ended and the motion was put to a vote. The motion passed unanimously with 55 in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions.

VI. Discussion and vote on SAC Motion in Support of Student Senate Resolution R.40.16 on Title IX hearings - The chair explained that he and Susan Endrizzi, the chair of the SAC, have had a number of discussions about this motion since it was introduced on April 1 and it is our recommendation that we have a procedural vote to postpone indefinitely this motion until we have received a letter that is promised from Donna Marie Sorrentino that may weigh in on this motion. Scott advised that we can always bring the motion back to the floor on May 6.

Jim Connell moved to postpone the discussion and vote. The motion was seconded.
Martha Byam stated that she was open to delaying the motion but with a date attached. The chair accepted a friendly amendment that discussion and a vote on the motion should be postponed until April 29.

The motion to postpone the discussion and vote on the SAC Motion in Support of Student Senate Resolution R.40.15 on Title IX hearings was put to a vote. The motion passed unanimously 57 in favor, with none opposed.

VII. Discussion and vote on RPSC motion on Assisting Student Recruitment through Department Website Development - David Finkelhor, chair of the RPSC, reviewed the motion that was introduced to the Senate on April 1 and explained that this motion and the next to be voted on were prepared to indicate Senate and faculty support for administration efforts to improve recruitment and to suggest ways that we might help out. The motion includes a friendly amendment that was proposed at the April 1 meeting to change the first sentence in the second paragraph to read: “The Faculty Senate urges the administration to assist departments in collaboration with Academic Technology and the Communications Managers in each of the colleges to add material to their websites addressed to and relevant for potential applicants to the university.”

Erin Sharp asked how this motion will impact the standard design that was implemented recently for all departments. The provost was asked to respond and he said that he doesn’t have much information about this. But his experience with CEPS is that they were able to add some of their own pages.

Lu Yan pointed out that the format should recognize department needs in working toward recruitment and student success.

Buzz Scherr suggested that the Admissions Office be added to the list of collaborating departments so that the first sentence of the second paragraph would read “… in collaboration with Academic Technology, Admissions, and the Communications Managers in each of the colleges to add…” David Finkelhor agreed to this friendly amendment.

The final version of the motion is as follows:

Research and Public Service Committee
Resolution on Assisting Student Recruitment through Department Website Development

Recruitment of students is a top priority for UNH. Students are more likely to apply and enroll in UNH if they become aware of how academic activities at the university will contribute to developing their interests and furthering their careers. Today’s prospective students get much of such information from the Internet. As a result, interest in UNH can be enhanced by having more Internet content connected to university departments that is appropriate for young applicants that stimulates their excitement about possible fields of study.

The Faculty Senate urges the administration to assist departments in collaboration with Academic Technology, Admissions, and the Communications Managers in each of the colleges to add material to their websites addressed to and relevant for potential applicants to the university. This assistance can be in the form of the provision of resources, training and models for such websites.
The motion, as amended, was put to a vote. The motion passed unanimously with 58 in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions.

VIII. Discussion and vote on RPSC motion on Outreach to Secondary Schools - David Finkelhor explained that the background of this motion was based on the interest of some faculty and, clearly, the view of President Dean on this topic. The goal of the motion is for the central administration to empower and assist faculty who wish to be more involved in outreach to secondary schools.

Research and Public Service Committee
Motion on Outreach to Secondary Schools

Whereas, many UNH faculty participate in outreach to regional secondary schools that is mutually rewarding and,

Whereas, faculty outreach to secondary schools helps to develop and strengthen relationships between secondary schools, potential UNH students, their families and UNH, and

Whereas, additional UNH faculty may wish to participate in these outreach efforts if provided support to do so,

The faculty senate urges administrative leadership to facilitate outreach by UNH faculty to secondary schools. In addition, because the outreach by UNH faculty to secondary schools shares the knowledge and increases the awareness of the work of the university, the faculty senate urges the administrative leadership to identify such outreach as a valued element of their portfolio of service activities.

Scott Smith pointed out that this in no way mandates or sets an expectation for faculty to do outreach to schools. And, he thinks that we need to think down the road about how this ties into promotion and tenure matters. This motion is intended to encourage and support those who have the desire to do this outreach.

Jim Connell pointed out that there should be commas after each “Whereas” in the motion and this amendment was accepted.

Scott pointed out that he was recently at St. Pauls’ School for an event and met 125 Latin students and some parents and had some good conversations. Because he had been thinking about this, he had been trained in a couple of ways to talk about UNH. Having this kind of support gives empowerment to talk in real detail about what we are trying to do.

Regina Smick-Attisano pointed out that the Thompson School faculty have done this for many years. Not every interaction results in a relationship being built with a school. But, more often than not there is. The teachers along with the guidance counselors are important.

The motion was put to a vote. The motion passed unanimously with 56 in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions.

IX - Additional comments from the provost- Provost Wayne Jones asked to share additional comments.

- He said that he loves the last two motions. He pointed out that Daniel Chavez from the Spanish Department had a group of high school and middle school teachers on campus on Saturday as part of a program they have been running for years. It is an example of not always having to go out to schools.
Sometimes you can invite teachers in your discipline to come in for a program. Building these relationships is very important.

- Wayne offered a quick update on Admissions. As of January, our applications were down across all of UNH by 3%. We changed our communications app and we have done a lot of work. We tripled our communication in the last month. There is work we have done but we need to be ahead of the curve next year. As of right now, we are still 1.7% behind in applications. However, we are over 2% above in deposits. The numbers for admitted student visit days are off the chart, in particular for COLA, where there is more than a 100% increase in students attending admitted student days. HHS and COLSA had great improvements in this area as well, up double digits over last year. Paul College and CEPS were up a little bit over last year. We have more admitted student visit days to come. Wayne said that he thinks the work we are doing will pay off and he thanked the Senate for their efforts and for these motions that just passed.

X. RPSC Motion on Engaged Scholarship - David Finkelhor, chair of the RPSC, presented the following motion:

Research and Public Service Committee
Motion on Engaged Scholarship

Contributing to the improvement of the community, state, nation and world and providing answers to our most pressing social, civic, and ethical problems are central goals for UNH and at the same time are crucial to building public and political support for the University. To further such goals, it is important that the incentive structure for faculty promote such contributions.

A concept that embodies and facilitates these goals is the idea of “engaged scholarship.” Engaged Scholarship can be defined as an integration of teaching, research, and service through which faculty combine their disciplinary expertise with expertise of non-university partners for the mutual benefit of scholarship and of communities external to the University. The collaboration can involve the generation, application, communication, and commercialization of knowledge and/or the production of creative works. Quality engaged scholarship can be measured by a variety of metrics. Such metrics can range from conventional scholarly peer-review to the documentation of mutual benefit of community partners.

Universities around the country are increasingly incorporating engaged scholarship into their missions and building incentives for such activities into their policies. To this end, we encourage UNH to recognize engaged scholarship as a valuable part of faculty portfolios and a component of P&T decisions.

Be it Resolved: The Faculty Senate urges the UNH administration and deans to assist departments in promoting and rewarding engaged scholarship by valuing such scholarship more specifically in faculty job descriptions, contracts, and in promotion and tenure guidelines.

David explained that the initiative comes out of the fact that we are trying to demonstrate to the communities that we serve that we, as a university, are making important contributions to resolve
important problems. There are faculty who want to engage in more of those activities but feel that it may not be sufficiently recognized in the promotion and tenure reviews and that departments really need to think about what kind of activities they might want to value more given these needs and desires. Some departments may want to stick with what they have, and others may want to add some additional kinds of statements. There is some question about just what this engaged scholarship should entail and there are some concerns that inevitably come up about whether it is a watering down of the scholarship requirements. But almost everyone recognizes that there are some forms of scholarship that don’t involve traditional peer review publications in journals that do merit recognition. He pointed to an example in his department of a faculty member who has pioneered a prevention intervention that has received a lot of funding and national recognition. It has been piloted and rolled out to universities around the country. It is not a conventional kind of peer-reviewed scholarship, but it is definitely something that is valued by the department and the community at large.

The Senate chair urged senators to bring this motion back to their department for feedback. He opened the floor for discussion.

**Lori Hopkins (LLC):** I would like to think of a way to expand beyond just “to assist departments” but also to include something like “accept that engaged scholarship is changing at the university level” so that a department might encourage it beyond. P&T committees are beyond the department level. So, the encouragement should go further than just departments. In the past chairs would protect their assistant professors and say things like “you can do that once you get tenure.” I would like to see us change the whole criteria or the way to think about what counts. I am also thinking of service, but I think that engaged scholarship is one way of doing that.

**Scott:** You are arguing that the colleges provide some guidance on how to accept what departments decide to do.

**Lori:** Not just administration assisting departments, but I guess think it is at a higher level than departments.

Scott suggested that the committee consider this feedback offline.

**Yu Lan (History):** The term “engaged scholarship” came up this year and there was some discussion in my department about it. There could be a lot of discussion about the nebulous term “engaged scholarship” and my feeling is that engaged scholarship seems to border on the line between scholarship and service.

Also, when I look at the term in the second paragraph, “the commercialization of knowledge” should we think about this also? Already it was beneficial to the individual involved so are we going to doubly reward the individual or not?

I agree with Lori that there is a need for a mechanism above the department level and also coordination across the university.

**Art Greenberg (Chemistry):** In 2014 I chaired an ad hoc committee of the Senate and we submitted a report on outreach scholarship which I forwarded to Kathy Brunet and I will forward to David Finkelhor. I want to say that outreach and service is something we should support and work on, no question about that. Our committee looked at this and said that some of the outreach work can then become scholarship – scholarship is something that is reviewed by experts in the field independently. But, some of it may be service, so that is an issue for discussion.
And, as Lori pointed out, quite rightly, it comes to the college level and it may very well be reasonable for a department to put more emphasis on service than scholarship and that is fine. I think the concern of our committee that this is potentially a slippery slope. I won’t say anything further but have forwarded the report.

**Buzz Scherr (UNH Law):** Did the committee talk about the possible CBA implications for this? I don’t know the answer to this. Is it worth reaching out to the union if there might be consequences?

I’m not an employment expert. But it strikes me that once you start talking about standards for P&T there might be CBA consequences, depending on what changes are. It might be worth a conversation just to figure this out.

**David Finkelhor:** It strikes me that departments have a fair amount of leeway in writing up their P&T criteria. And this doesn’t have to be submitted for the CBA.

**Tama Andrews:** As a senior lecturer I am looking at this in terms of the word “faculty.” Lecturers are not required to produce scholarship as part of their evaluations and contract renewals. However, we are heavily encouraged for service. I wonder if this motion is just for tenure-track faculty or is it also meant to include lecturer faculty, clinical faculty, and research faculty. All of us do versions of outreach and scholarship and if you want to include these other levels of faculty perhaps define that and also encourage departments and colleges to recognize our efforts as well.

**David Finkelhor:** Would it be satisfied by adding the word lecturer?

**Scott Smith:** There are different contractual obligations that I think would cause difficulty with that. I think one of the questions is clinical and research faculty and that could have an impact on them as well.

**George Roth:** I think that the point was really great that the criteria that the union has negotiated does not include scholarship and value in the same way for lecturers. I think this is really a motion for tenured and tenure-track faculty that would not include lecturers and that is union negotiated.

**Jim Connell:** Two things:

1) It would include research faculty for example, and I expect some clinical as well. It is not just tenure-track.

2) Whenever the subject of engaged scholarship in my department comes up one concern is that it is being pushed as being as valuable as traditional scholarship. Whenever you see the word “more” it raises concern. If you want to be massaging this motion before this next meeting of the Senate you might want to bear that concern of other faculty members in my department in mind to make it clear that by “more” you don’t mean this is more important than string theory which is not necessarily engaged scholarship.

**Scott:** “More,” to be clear, modifies “specifically.” But I wonder if it might be better to change the word “valuing” to something like “recognizing” which is a bit less judgmental. I wonder if that would be helpful. I think your point is taken. How do we ensure that this motion does not flip? It recognizes engaged scholarship but doesn’t devalue other scholarship as well.

The discussion ended. The chair thanked David for the hard work of the committee. The motion will lay over to the next meeting.

**XI. SAC Motion on Indigenous People’s Day** - Bill Woodward, a member of the SAC, introduced the history of this motion explaining that it goes back to September when members of the Anthropology
department had formed IndigineousNH.com and asked that the Faculty Senate to consider this kind of motion to honor Indigenous Peoples. This kind of effort is happening nationwide. For example, as shown in the motion and the background materials on the motion, there are several states, cities, towns, colleges, and universities that have already approved Indigenous Peoples Day, including the Town of Durham and the Oyster River School District.

Bill presented the motion:

Student Affairs Committee
Motion on Indigenous Peoples’ Day

Rationale:
Whereas Italian-Americans founded the Columbus Day holiday in San Francisco in 1869 as a celebration of their heritage and President Roosevelt later made it a national holiday in 1937.

Whereas scholars have since shown that the Italian Christopher Columbus engaged in atrocities inflicted on the indigenous peoples, described by himself and edited by the Spanish priest, Bartolomé de las Casas

Whereas in 1977, the U. N.’s International Conference on Discrimination against Indigenous Peoples recommended that Indigenous People’s Day substitute for Columbus Day

Whereas many states, including North Dakota (1990), Hawai’i, Minnesota, Oregon, South Dakota, New Mexico, Vermont, and Maine, have approved an IP Day to replace Columbus Day

Whereas the Town of Durham and Oyster River Schools adopted Indigenous Peoples Day in 2017 and 2018

Whereas the following universities have already adopted Indigenous Peoples’ Day: Metropolitan State University, Minnesota, Minnesota State University, Mankato University of Utah, Brown University, North Carolina University of Utah, Cornell University, and Harvard University

Motion: We propose that Columbus Day be renamed Indigenous Peoples’ Day on the UNH Calendar, and that it be observed on the second Monday in October. This would start in Fall 2019. Recognition of IP Day does not require classes to be cancelled. We are following the example of other universities in honoring the victims of colonialism.

The chair asked whether the last sentence was appropriate for the motion or whether, instead, it should be part of the rationale. Bill accepted the suggestion as a friendly amendment.

David Bachrach from the History Department said that he imagines that many of his History colleagues will be concerned about the imposition of modern standards on past events to judge people in the past. Historians tend to try to understand people in the context of their own times and whether or not we call
what Columbus did an atrocity, certainly his contemporaries didn’t think of it that way. Therefore, he is little concerned about the rationale from a historian’s perspective.

Another senator wondered if there were two issues here 1) to stop recognizing Columbus Day as a holiday given its past and 2) to start recognizing Indigenous Peoples’ Day. Are we really accomplishing the right thing? Scott Smith pointed out that Columbus Day is not listed on the UNH Academic Calendar. We do have a fall break on that day which happens to coincide with Columbus Day. So, it appears that UNH has taken the position that Columbus Day is not necessarily recognized. Susan Endrizzi pointed out that Academic Calendar lists the day as Fall Break and the UNH Master Calendar, which includes religious and cultural holidays, does list the day as Columbus Day (Federal).

Briggs Bailey asked if the Student Senate has addressed this issue. They have not. She also pointed out that a useful panel was recently sponsored by the VP for Diversity and Inclusion on this subject and it included the historical origins of the day rather than just the history of 1492. The discussion was about separating the historical events from their commemoration and monumentalization. The issue is more complex than simply replacing Columbus. We are talking about a US holiday and we are talking about what is the right thing to do there.

Daniel Chavez from the Spanish Department responded to the earlier comment about understanding what people were thinking about when it became a national day. But he said, history is also lived, and we are living it right now that that celebration is not a look forward. He said that he thinks we have the right to rethink that day and we can discuss Columbus’s good deeds and bad deeds.

Bill Woodward shared that he also had attended the recent panel that was mentioned. There were two indigenous people speaking from NH and Paula Salvio from Education spoke on behalf of the Italians.

David Finkelhor said that he thinks the reason to honor indigenous peoples is not solely because they were victims of colonialism but because they were important historical inhabitants and had rich culture and values that we honor. David suggested that the last sentence of the motion be rewritten or changed or dropped so that the motion is not about the victimhood that is being honored.

There was agreement that the last sentence of the motion would be removed entirely.

Andrew Coppens from Education encouraged senators to consider the balance in narrative representation, even just here in Durham, between indigenous peoples and communities whose livelihoods are ongoing and as well the settler colonialism as an institution whose influence is ongoing. He said we can just look around at the names of places, for example, “garrison” and all of those subtle things that are easy to take for granted but are symbols of or represent the settler colonial narrative. What this motion proposes is actually small in comparison. Because the narratives of colonialism are so implicit it can feel like removal of a piece of history but, considering the overall balance, he suggests that we rethink that zero-sum perspective.

Andrew Seal said that he wanted to respond to the comment about the shifting of the revisionist account of Columbus’ record as a settler. It is not entirely correct. From the early 1500s, it was highly contested and there was a debate about the nature of indigenous peoples. There were interventions by the pope and Spain forbidding Indian slavery. This was not seen as simply a clear case of one’s right to settle and enslave Native Americans. This was a highly contested issue from the very beginning. So, I don’t think that we are doing anything to tear at the historical fabric of Columbus.

The motion will layover until the next meeting.
XII. Discovery Committee Motion on awarding Transfer and Study Abroad Discovery Credit – Nicky Gullace, Faculty Director of the Discovery program, explained that the next two motions have to do with trying to remedy problems that we have had for at least the past 10 years.

The first motion is about transfer students who have had a very hard time getting Discovery credit for courses that have successfully transferred to UNH, that do fit our Discovery category description and SLO requirements but are not taught as Discovery courses at UNH. For example, at UNH Drawing is a Discovery course, but not Painting. Therefore, students who take Painting as part of a study abroad program or in their work at a previous institution are not able to count Painting for their Discovery requirement in the Fine Arts category.

The origins of this rule appear to revolve around a question of fairness to the UNH students because they would not have the opportunity for this kind of exception even though transferring in or study abroad students do have that chance. Nicky shared that she has taken the issue of fairness very seriously and has met with the Student Senate Academic Affairs committee to get their take on this. She said that the students were unequivocal, saying that transferring is a very difficult thing, involving a lot of adjustment, and they are concerned that transfer students are being put behind in graduation because UNH is not approving Discovery credit even though the work done at a prior school fulfilled the spirit of what we have here at UNH.

This motion is being brought to the Faculty Senate to change the rule so that the Admissions Office, the Registrar’s Office, and the Discovery Committee, can be empowered to grant Discovery credit for transfer and study abroad courses that fit the category description and the SLO even if an equivalent UNH course would not fulfill the Discovery requirement.

Nicky summarized that this is a much more liberal policy that would encourage transfers and help transfer students to graduate in a timely way. The motion was presented as follows:

**Discovery Committee motion on awarding Transfer and Study Abroad Discovery Credit**

**The Problem (Domestic Transfers & Study Abroad):**

1) **Failure to Receive Discovery Credit:** Transfer students arriving at UNH are not getting Discovery credit for courses that fulfill the spirit of the Discovery Category Description and the requirements of the Discovery Category SLOs unless the course matches a Discovery course currently taught at UNH. These students are often misadvised during their initial visit to their destination departments since faculty, seeing courses that seem clearly to fit Discovery categories, advise students that the work done at their prior institution will transfer with “no problem.” Students on Study Abroad programs frequently face similar challenges. Because foreign offerings can change before the student arrives, the pre-approval process is not foolproof and students are often dismayed to find themselves severely limited in the curricular offerings Discovery will allow. Instead of being encouraged to explore the rich offerings at a foreign university, students can only fulfill Discovery requirements if they enroll in courses that replicate those they already have access to at UNH.
2) **Burden of Petitioning:** If the Registrar’s Office cannot easily resolve a student request for Discovery credit, the student is required to submit a petition to the Discovery Committee with complete documentation (syllabus, course description etc.) regarding the course. At the Discovery Committee meeting, the Registrar correctly reminds committee members that precedent dictates that any course that is not a designated Discovery option at UNH should be denied. Denial occurs with little explanation to the student as to why a course such as Advanced Statistics was rejected for QR, Painting for FPA, or Computer Science for ETS. Transfers and Study Abroad students thus arrive and find themselves mired in a time-consuming petition process and scrambling to fulfill Discovery requirements they believe they had fulfilled abroad or at their prior institution.

**Motion:** To award Transfer and Study Abroad Discovery credit based on whether a course taken at another institution (and transferred with sufficient credit hours) aligns with the UNH Discovery Category Description and Student Learning Outcomes.

David Bachrach said that he thinks that this is appropriate motion given the issues we are having with student retention and also with the dropping number of transfer students that we have had over the last several years. It seems absurd to not remove any barriers we can when we are desperate for as many students as we can.

Shelley Mulligan asked why a UNH painting course doesn’t meet the Discovery requirement if it meets the category description and SLO. Nicky explained that Painting at UNH is an upper division course that requires drawing as a prerequisite and it has a hefty fee. As a result, it won’t be approved for Discovery at UNH.

Joe Onosko thanked Nicky for bringing this motion forward. He said that for years he has seen the heartbreak with families and students, unnecessary costs, and the madness, for example, of a student taking calculus but then being required to take a lower math class in order to fulfill their Discovery requirement.

The motion will lay over until the next meeting.

XIII. **Discovery Committee Motion on allowing Discovery credit for transferred 2.5 credit courses**

Nicky Gullace presented the following motion to encourage study abroad and study away opportunities and to encourage transfer students.

**Discovery Committee Motion on allowing Discovery credit for transferred 2.5 credit courses**

**The Problem (Study Abroad & Quarter System Transfers Credit Threshold):** Students in immersion classes at some foreign universities and those transferring courses from institutions on the quarter system are denied Discovery credit because all quarter system course and some foreign university courses transfer at 2.5 cr, whereas the Discovery Program requires at least 3 credits in a discipline to fulfill a Discovery requirement. Students are not allowed to combine credits from more than one course to achieve the 3
credit threshold since it would be very difficult to tabulate mixed course credits in the Registrar’s Office. Students are thus frequently denied Discovery credit for courses taken abroad, courses taken in a Study Away program on the West Coast, or courses transferred from an institution on the quarter system.

Motion: To allow students to receive Discovery credit for courses aligning with the UNH Discovery Category Description and Student Learning Outcomes but transferred to UNH at 2.5 credits.

Scott Smith asked how many transfer students are currently affected. Nicky did not know exactly but thought it was in the tens, but she pointed out that this also affects our reputation as being an unfriendly school for transfers.

Lori Hopkins from the Spanish Department said that she sees this situation all the time because Spanish majors and a lot of minors are required to do study abroad. She said that the Spanish Department looks at the number of contact hours in courses and she suggested that a review of contact hours be included in the motion and this suggestion be reviewed between now and the next meeting. Nicky said that a member of the Discovery Committee, Charles Vanette, talked about the depth of some of these courses that don’t meet as long during a semester but still cover a tremendous amount of ground.

John LaCourse asked for clarification on how the credits would work if this motion passed. Nicky clarified that the student would still be given only 2.5 credits on their transcript. But the course would count toward meeting their Discovery requirement for graduation.

The motion will lay over until the next meeting.

XIV. Academic Program Committee Motion on Expanding Course Scheduling – Regina Smick-Attisano, a member of the APC, presented the following motion explaining that the APC is a new committee with the task to look at what factors contribute to academic success. This motion was part of that effort to help students get more engaged in academic pursuits during their time at UNH. She presented the motion as follows:

**Academic Program Committee**

**Motion on Expanding Course Scheduling**

**Whereas**, the Faculty Senate recognizes that there is greater potential for student success when they are engaged five days a week, or more, in academic activities,

**Whereas**, the Faculty Senate recognizes that the authority to determine course scheduling and faculty load lies at the Department level,

**Whereas**, the Faculty Senate recognizes that the University is experiencing, and will continue to experience, resource challenges to find space and rooms to meet current scheduling demand (particularly M-R 10am -2pm),

**Whereas**, the Faculty Senate recognizes the importance of the “common hour” on Tuesdays and Thursdays,
We hereby propose the following Motion:

All Departments, in concert with faculty, Department Chairs, and Deans (as appropriate), should undertake a reevaluation of the times, classroom configurations, and faculty schedules for teaching, service, and scholarship to expand the possibilities and potential iterations of course scheduling. This may include considering teaching more early morning classes, evening classes, Monday & Friday schedules, one day a week classes, online or hybrid courses, weekend courses, or other. Further, we move that administration work with faculty to facilitate more flexible course offerings befitting a R-1 university.

There were comments from a few senators that, despite their wanting to schedule classes on Fridays, they were told by the Registrar’s office that a room was not available. David Bachrach explained that this motion is a way for the Faculty Senate to offer guidelines to the Registrar that will make class scheduling more flexible.

David Finkelhor asked if there could there be incentives for departments to help fill up the less desirable time slots. If you want to overcome that, you should do with a carrot, not a stick.

Erin Sharp pointed out that many of the faculty have been at other places where Fridays were a full academic day just like any other day of the week. But, UNH faculty, lecturers, and students do have a culture that will be hard to shift. She thinks that this motion is a good step toward having discussions but she wonders how to change the culture. She agrees that a carrot, not a stick, approach is best.

Scott Smith shared that there are studies that show that students who have at least one Friday class are more likely to take other classes on Friday and that having more than one Friday class increases the likelihood of attendance for those classes. So, it is about getting the student to take more than one Friday class. He also shared that early morning classes on Friday do have a significant impact on Thursday night drinking and we know we have a problem with that.

Jim Connell made a comment that we need to keep in mind that departments like Physics, Chemistry, and Math have service courses and it really is a house of cards in terms of making sure that everyone in departments that are required to take these courses is able to do so. It is difficult for some departments, particularly for CEPS and Life Sciences students where students are taking service courses in math, physics, and chemistry. It is difficult to factor in all of these courses as well as labs.

Briggs Bailey shared a concern that a course offered on a MWF afternoon might not make because students don’t want to take a Friday afternoon class. So, it is not just about finding space, but also in the concern with students showing up. Scott Smith responded that the Provost and Dean’s office would have to hold harmless the people who take the plunge and get fewer students.

Adele Marone remarked that a change to the culture of the students has to start at the student level and suggested that the Student Senate consider how they can change the culture of students who want no classes after noon on Friday.

Jake Adams, the Student Body Vice President, responded that he thinks it is a myth that students don’t want to attend classes on Fridays. He said that many students are fed up with having to take many hours of classes on Tuesday and Thursday because they can’t find enough MWF classes. He said that there is some validity in saying that students don’t want to take 8 am classes. That does require a bit of a culture
shift, if possible. He said that he sees this motion as not mandating that students take those classes but adding more availability in scheduling.

Joe Onosko, a member of the APC committee, explained that this motion simply invites departments to reconsider their course offerings and possibly including Fridays. This isn’t a directive. Departments are still in the driver’s seat on these decisions.

The motion will lay over until the next meeting.

XV. New Business - There was no new business.

XVI. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 4:58pm