Meeting called to order at 3:10 pm on April 27, 2020, via ZOOM

MINUTES SUMMARY

I. Roll – The following senators were absent: Ballestero, Bedker, Davis, Evans, Herold, Laird, McHugh, Merenda, Miller, Robin, Shannon. The following were guests: Wayne Jones

II. Remarks by and questions to the provost – Provost Wayne Jones provided shared the following updates:

- Deposits for full-time, first-time students currently total 1420. This is lagging compared to deposits received at this time last year, but this isn’t an equal comparison since this year’s deadline has been extended from May 1 to June 1. The graduate school enrollments look good. UNH Law enrollments are very good. Course registrations for rising juniors and seniors are better compared to last year at this time. Rising sophomores have not yet begun to register for classes.

- A survey was sent to all students to gather feedback about the current remote learning situation and student plans for next year. Wayne said that it is clear that students are being patient with us as we come into this remote learning environment. 50% of students said that they are being prepared to continue their academic career without too many bumps and 50% are perceiving bumps. In response to the question “Prior to COVID-19, were you planning to return to UNH in the fall to continue your degree?” approximately 92% indicated that they were planning to return. In response to the question about their plans post-COVID, that number went down about 4 or 5%. When the question was asked about their plan to continue if UNH were still remote in the fall, the number of students who said they are uncertain jumped by about 65%. This is not a surprise given that our students choose to come to UNH because they want real-time engagement with faculty experts. While they accept getting through this remote learning experience, they do want the full UNH Wildcat experience.

Students were also asked, “Do you agree with the statement that this experience makes you want to pursue an online degree or online education?” 75% said that they strongly disagreed with this statement. Wayne said that the key to the future is to recognize what we do well: face to face interaction, engagement with students, and having experts who are developing the class with students as they do the work. We are going to have to be flexible about that in the fall. But that is our bread and butter and if we do that well and find ways to make it more flexible that will be our sweet spot.

- UNH has now officially applied for the CARES funding and the money is expected in approximately one week. The plan is for the website for students to apply for this money to be ready at that time.

In a separate effort to provide financial assistance for students, a solicitation has gone out to encourage donations to the recently created Student Emergency Financial Assistance fund (SEFA). At this time the fund has received $125,000 in donations and the fund has provided support to approximately 200 students, with grants totaling $83,000. This money is helping to bridge some students until the CARES
money kicks in. We believe that we will be able to reimburse a lot of the SEFA account with the CARES money and this will allow the donated money to go further and help students into the future.

**Wayne offered to take questions:**

**Question:** Will the health and mental health of faculty be given priority when considering student desires to return to campus?

**Wayne:** To be exceptionally clear, the health and safety of our faculty and staff and students is absolutely the number one priority and everything we are doing right now to plan and work around scenarios is the number one bullet. If we cannot hit that we won’t be back on campus in the fall. Even if we can hit that for the majority of folks we know that there are at-risk populations among faculty, students, and staff that may have acute asthma, another respiratory disease, or other things that may compromise their system. It behooves us to recognize that even if it is 5 or 10% of our population we need to set up a flexibility mechanism for them to be engaged without putting themselves at risk. There is no question that we have to be sensitive to that, first and foremost. And a key aspect of that is going to be testing and there is lots of debate and discussion about that and a key aspect will be the recommendations from the DHHS, the Department of Health and Human Services for the state, and the CDC. Our state numbers are looking exceptionally good. The CDC came out with some rough guidelines for when a state should consider opening and for two of the numbers that were looked at – 1) how many tests are you capable of doing in a day given the population and of those tested and 2) what percentage of the population is showing up positive - the state of NH is already in a position where we can do that. But there will still be waiting a few weeks to be sure that we are well over that position for us and our neighboring states because we have porous borders.

I am happy to follow up with anyone and would be happy to receive an email with any questions.

**COLA Senator:** Thank you for communicating to the Board of Trustees about students’ support for on-campus and face to face learning. That is what I am hearing from students in advising meetings. Students are eager to return to a real classroom. I know you are looking at June 1 as a deadline for enrollment for various kinds. Students in advising meetings have suggested that they are considering multiple possibilities based on whether they think we are likely to be back in the fall for what they want to choose to enroll in. I wonder if you are thinking about how students might be not registering based on what they most want to take, but registering based on their concerns generally about the situation, when you are making decisions about courses or renewing contingent faculty contracts or anything like that going forward?

**Wayne:** That is a great point and that is something we are thinking about. That is why Vasu is checking on numbers very carefully trying to keep our fingers on the pulse of what students are thinking about in the fall.

**UNH Manchester Senator:** As someone who has been teaching online in undergraduate and graduate programs, I want to encourage us not to confuse what it is that we are doing with online education. Just as there is a pedagogy to effective teaching and learning on the ground, there is a pedagogy to teaching and learning in online space and those are often very different pedagogies. What many of you are discovering who haven’t done this before is that things done in a physical classroom don’t necessarily translate online. I do want to encourage us to not confuse these things and dismiss online education as inherently inferior because I think it can be done as well and sometimes better.
Another question is about some reporting over the weekend that said that the Chancellor of the System is looking for $6 million to – as the reporting put it - equip 50% of all classrooms with remote technology so that students who don’t want to come to campus could dial-in. The implication seems to be that we would be creating a world in which we would simultaneously be teaching on the ground and online. Can you speak to that?

Wayne: In connection with online learning, I agree with you completely. I think traditionally we have assumed that online education is a monolith and it is not. There is a difference between having an expert that is more synchronous and more face to face and more directly engaged with students but doing so in a remote learning situation. It is a very different enterprise. It is a completely different education product than an online course that is built and designed to be delivered asynchronously with high-quality materials developed by an expert, but perhaps being delivered by someone who is not quite that expert. There is a Venn diagram about this, and they overlap in the middle at some point. I think what has exploded in the last 4 to 6 weeks is the synchronous piece and that is the piece the students say they can deal with that but that they do want more of the real thing.

That being said, I was at the [BOT] board meeting and listened to the chancellor’s presentation and they [reporters] missed about 95% of what he had to say. The core of the money that has been requested, 90%, is to enable more of our classrooms to have the ability to have zoom connections for faculty, staff and, students and to do some recording where appropriate. We have about 25% of our classrooms already there. This would take us to 50 or 60%. The design is not to have all our courses running that way and to have all of our students doing that. But it is to recognize that until we have a vaccine, we want to be respectful. If a student is quarantined for two weeks, we don’t want to take them out of their educational experience. If a faculty or staff member is at risk, we don’t want them to have to take a long-term disability leave of absence. We want to keep them engaged. These are some tools we think will do that. Some of those tools will be in the library and will be available for faculty to check out for home if they need it. So, the idea is to have a more robust presence to facilitate remote learning when necessary but not for the majority of our students. I think the majority of our students want the on-campus experience.

COLA senator: It sounds like from this morning’s meeting that students would have a choice about whether to be on campus or not, whether they are comfortable with face to face interaction. Would faculty have the same kind of choice? Or, will it only be the case that faculty that have some kind of designated health condition have some resources available to them to help them stay safe?

Wayne: It is a bit more of the latter than the former. As a residential institution, we assume that most of our faculty are engaged. We are trying to protect the safety of our faculty and staff. To be clear, it does not mean that [the policy would apply] only to yourself being at risk. It might be someone in your household, or that your wife is a physician or your mother lives with you and may have a health issue. We have not fleshed that all the way out yet. But, the key to that flexibility is the safety of our faculty.

Question: Who gets to make that choice? Is the faculty member able to say, “I am not comfortable because I have preexisting health conditions” and that is the end of it?

Wayne: It would be more of a dialogue with the dean and the department chair.

COLSA senator: I am coming from this as someone who never taught online before. But I know that I would be doing it very differently if I had more than one week of lead time. So, I am not surprised by the results of the survey. But I am also thinking that there are some interesting ways that the online tools that
I am using work well and in some cases they work well because we already had a half a semester of face to face time to get to know each other. I wonder when the dust settles if there might be some ways to put our heads together and think about what we learned from this that we might want to keep after we are all back at campus. Some of it has been very interesting to me and I would not want to throw the baby out with the bathwater.

Wayne: I love your point and observations. I know that some faculty have already been doing some assessments around that. And some faculty have filed IRB requests because they wanted to do some evaluations of their students and have a control group. In particular, I would highlight the laboratory courses. A couple of laboratory course instructors have gotten together have said let’s try out a few things and see what works best and learn from this. One of the things that I hope to do is to create some forums this summer to get together and share. We have not fully mapped out what the summer will look like. One of the things in the funding that was requested by the chancellor’s office is funding for faculty to do some additional stuff in the summer if they wanted to with some resources available. Stay tuned.

Student Senate representative: Can you clarify about the student survey? I see that students are patient with professors, but I wanted to know if you did find that students were having a negative and hard time with online classes? From the students I have talked to who have taken the survey, they said that this is a lot of the sentiment that they provided in the survey. Can you clarify?

Wayne: Yes, you are right. Some of the written comments were particularly good and we are looking at how we can provide more support for students in how to be more effective learners in a remote environment. That was probably the most common theme and the other theme was the balance of the workload. The perception from some students was that faculty wanting to have a rigorous course ramped up the amount of things the students had to do outside of the regular class and that was overwhelming them because they still had to show up for the Zoom class.

Actions going on right now are 1) AT is working on some additional resources for students to help them through the last couple of weeks and 2) we are talking about building an online course that students can take on their own over the summer or perhaps synchronously with a faculty member prior to arrival so that if they wanted to get some support on how to remotely learn more effectively, that would be there. I am thinking about telling every admitted freshman that submits a deposit that this is part of orientation since it would helpful to them and 3) most of our students said that the home situation in terms of technology wasn’t a problem but finding a quiet space to get their work done was an issue. As we come out of the crisis mode, how can we partner with some sites to make that more effective? For students who do need technology support, can we use some of the funding from the state to support some of that. It turns out that this is something we can use CARES dollars for so there might be some flexibility there as well. Those were a few of the additional observations.

Devon: You mentioned the CARES money. Do you know when the information will be sent out to students?

Wayne: The decision was made to not put the website up until it can be live. And it cannot be live until we have money from the government. It is supposed to be a week from today, but we will see. I know that faculty are interested in this as well. The way the CARES act was written, the money was going to be put in student accounts and if students needed it to pay rent, they would have to request a check. We are going
to take out the middle step. Students will have two choices, a deposit into their checking account or their UNH account and the students will have a choice.

**Question:** Some students have applied for SURF and REAP fellowships and are needing funds for summer expenses. However, these students seem to be in limbo. Can you comment?

**Wayne:** I have been agonizing over this. The funds are available, but the question is whether it will be safe to have students on campus in groups doing research the way we usually would do. I have said that if the project allows them to work remotely, we are saying yes to those. If we can get to a point where the research is up at 100%, they would be available, but I can’t commit to that right now. I am trying to advance a fine line between the safety of the research enterprise. As it comes up, faculty will be first and then graduate students next. That will be in phases. The undergraduates in the lab would be in a later phase.

**CEPS senator:** I have research students and I am ok transitioning some of their work, who do I follow up with on that?

**Wayne:** I would follow up with the office that you applied to. If you have any questions or it does not add up, let me know.

**Erin Sharp, Senate vice chair:** Thank you for being so available and transparent. I realize that this is an extremely overwhelming time.

**Wayne:** It is for all of us. The president and I have been trying to get together with groups of faculty. We met with one group earlier today and I am so impressed with the creativity and flexibility of the faculty and, in many ways, with a partnership with our students to show us what makes a UNH education special. Thank you for all that you are doing.

### III. Remarks by the chair:

- The Senate chair, David Bachrach, shared that he and the vice chair, Erin Sharp, met with the provost on Wednesday to discuss the working groups focused on the COVID response. 11 or 12 groups are working on various aspects of planning. 5 or 6 of these groups would benefit from faculty input. The provost has agreed to provide a description of the committees and how they work together and information about membership of the committees. The Faculty Senate and the Agenda Committee will be in a better position to assign faculty to those committees when we have this information. Approximately 20 senators have volunteered to work on these planning committees. David said that as soon as we have this information from the provost he will get back to the volunteers.

- Shari Robinson, Director of UNH Psychological and Counseling Services (PACS), shared additional information following her meeting with the Senate last Monday. PACS WILL be able to provide services during the summer for continuing students who were enrolled at UNH during the spring term even if the student is not enrolled for the summer term. However, PACS will not be able to continue services past this semester for students who graduate in May. PACS will be able to provide services for students enrolled in summer classes as students are always eligible for PACS services during the semester in which they are enrolled, including the summer.
The Senate administrative assistant forwarded to Senators an email from Shari on Sunday with some resources for helping students deal with the stress of online education. Senators are encouraged to share this information with their colleagues.

- The Graduate Student Senate (GSS) has had conversations with the Graduate School dean and with the Graduate Council on the question of pass/fail for graduate courses and they all concluded that a pass/fail option doesn’t work with the graduate education structure. Casey O’Heran was asked to share any additional information. Casey explained that the GSS had passed a resolution hoping to have some kind of resolution to provide a pass/fail option for graduate courses, but they were told that the current system is unable to handle this. Casey said that graduate students are hoping for general flexibility. David offered that Cari Morehead, the Graduate School Dean, has communicated to faculty that flexibility is the order of the day.

IV. Approval of the minutes from March 2, 2020 - It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of March 2, 2020. The minutes were unanimously approved with one abstention.

V. Approval of the minutes from April 20, 2020 - It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of April 20, 2020. Changes were suggested in sections III and VII. Thus adjusted, the minutes were unanimously approved.

VI. Amendment to Rationale for previously adopted Change to the rationale in the previously adopted motion on the gender question in Student Evaluations of Teaching - The chair, David Bachrach, explained that the rationale in the motion that was passed at the April 20 meeting was not very detailed because it was presented as a motion to amend by substitution. This lack of detail can be problematic in the future when someone tries to understand the motion.

The following amended rationale was prepared by Kathy Brunet, the Senate Administrative Assistant, and Michel Charpentier, chair of the ITC and presented to the Senate

Motion on the Gender Question on Student Evaluations of Teaching.

Rationale: The Student Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate was charged with reviewing Student Senate Resolution 39.17 (Dec. 10, 2017) requesting that the binary question included on Student Evaluations of Teaching (SET) forms regarding biological sex (male/female) be changed to a self-determined gender question with more inclusive gender non-conforming response choices.

The values of diversity, inclusion and equity are inextricably linked to our mission of teaching and research excellence, and we embrace these values as being critical to development, learning, and success.

The SAC presented a gender question option to the Faculty Senate based on a recommendation from the UNH Transgender Policy and Climate Committee and the Trans UNH Student Organization.

The Faculty Senate considered the recommended options and information about how the gender question is used at the university and came to the following conclusions:

- At this time, there is no clear consensus on what an appropriate and inclusive gender question looks like and best practices in this area are changing. Therefore, any proposal is still likely to not
be accepted by some people.

- There is a belief that, even in its current form, the gender question hampers student anonymity. A gender question that includes more refined options is likely to amplify this concern and further affect the participation rate or the accuracy of the gender information provided.

- The university has not provided any compelling information about how gender question data from SET results is used. While some faculty reported that they find gender information useful, there was not a strong advocacy for retaining the question for this purpose.

- Analysis on the relationship between gender and grades can be done at an institutional level, although we recognize that, at this time, the analysis is based on the binary gender option, Male or Female.

**Motion:** Therefore, the Senate moves to remove the gender question from the Student Evaluation of Teaching forms.

David noted that this change to the rationale does not change the actual language of the motion. He believes that there is no need to vote on this change. There were no objections to this decision and the new rationale will be published with the motion.

VII. Discuss and vote on APC motion on including common language on credit hours - Lisa MacFarlane, chair of the Academic Program Committee, reintroduced the motion that was initially presented at the March 2 Faculty Senate meeting.

Lisa explained that this motion is intended to affirm our collective understanding as a faculty that we understand what it means to be in compliance with both federal and New England Commission of Education (NECE) requirements for contact time and credit hours earned.

Changes from the March 2 version of the motion are highlighted and marked below:

APC MOTION on Including Common Language about Compliance with the Federal Definition of a Credit Hour

**Rationale and Preamble:**

The U.S. Department of Education has a specialized definition of a credit hour: one credit is defined as 3 hours of work per week over a 14-week semester (4 credits x 3 hours = 12 hours/week). Because UNH uses a 4-credit system versus a more typical 3-credit system, we seek to clarify our expectations for student work per credit. The purpose of this motion, therefore, is to affirm that understanding, in accordance with both federal and New England Commission of Higher Education (NECHE) requirements for contact time and credit hours earned.

The Academic Program Committee therefore submits the following three-part motion:

**The Motion:**

1. All syllabi should include a brief section that explains how credits are counted and conferred. We recommend some version of the following:
“This syllabus reflects the federal definition of a credit hour. Federal regulations define the amount of effort students should commit to their classes as follows: 3 hours of work per week per credit over a 14-week semester. For example, the expected effort for a semester-long 4-credit course is 12 hours/week, or (4 credits x 3 hours = 12 hours/per week).”

Examples of work include class time, assignments, papers and examinations, laboratories, participation in course-related experiences (attending a talk or performance, speakers and events, field work, etc), and conferences and office hours. For more information, please see: https://www.neche.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/Affirmation-of-Compliance.pdf .”

2. An outside evaluator should be able to see in a course syllabus a reasonable amount of content to meet the above standard. A syllabus without sufficient assignment expectations or a work schedule reflective of 14 weeks would likely be seen as not meeting the standard. We urge faculty to include in their syllabi a sufficiently detailed schedule of topics and assignments/activities to support compliance with the federal definition. Faculty should include in their syllabi a sufficiently detailed schedule of topics and assignments/activities such that an outside evaluator would see in the course a reasonable amount of content to meet the above standard. For example, insufficient assignment expectations without a schedule reflective of 14 weeks of content would likely be inferred as not meeting the standard.

3. The Provost’s office should develop a website or page with useful resources on credit hour and workload expectations for faculty to consult as they draw up their syllabi. In addition to the comprehensive information already provided in the pre-loaded materials on Canvas (UNH Policies and Procedures for Students), this page should include all relevant information for the development of syllabi, including current policies and recommendations, the federal definition of the credit hour, and a tool for a course workload estimator. For a useful work estimator, please see Rice University’s on-line tool: https://cte.rice.edu/workload.

In response to questions, Lisa explained that this motion was supposed to reflect the faculty’s understanding of the federal law. We cannot guarantee what our students do with that.

There were several comments about the evaluation of the faculty load – not only in expecting what the students are to do but also in faculty evaluating what students do - and this is important to take into consideration when teaching 4 or 5 courses. There was a suggestion that this should be reevaluated very carefully. Lisa agreed but clarified that whether we pass this motion or not, we are still bound by the federal definition of a credit hour.

Lisa shared that the discussion of this motion at the committee level did indicate that there might be other issues for the Senate to take up around workload, evaluations, student behavior, etc.

Jim Connell pointed out that his syllabi are now quite detailed and lengthy. Also, his syllabi get less specific for upper-class courses and graduate courses. Lisa offered that she has moved her policies into a separate section of myCourses to deal with the length. She said on the issue of having advance students or courses that are likely to be adjusted as they progress, she would likely include a statement on the syllabus to the effect of “How this course will proceed will entirely depend on the tenor of our discussion and the direction our curiosity takes us. Nonetheless, you should expect the following…”
A senator from COLSA pointed out that different students require different amounts of time to master the content of a course. Some students may interpret the recommended statement to mean that the expectations for the course are too high. In response to this comment, suggestions were made to describe the work time as “minimum” or “average” or “typical.”

Another faculty member asked that “papers” be removed from the list of examples of work because it is covered by “assignments.” There was also a suggestion to add learning activities to the list of examples. Lisa clarified that faculty could choose whatever they want in terms of work examples in their own syllabi. But Lisa agreed that she is comfortable changing the motion to remove “papers” and that the committee will take it as a friendly amendment.

David Bachrach, the chair, clarified that this does not mandate that anyone put anything into a syllabus. At its core, this motion puts the Faculty Senate on record that we accept federal law regarding credit hours.

A senator from CEPS explained that there are some very difficult courses and his thinking is that they should be heavier in credit hours since it takes more work than the number of hours proposed. How does this motion get interpreted as it stands when there is a course that requires more work? Lisa said that she thinks that this is a question for the associate deans. One response might be to look at the credit hours each course has assigned to it. And this would be idiosyncratic by department and college. She may be able to ask ASAC for their response to that question.

A question was asked about 8-week courses and whether the syllabus would need to recommend 24 hours of work per week. Lisa responded that it is up to the individual faculty member what they think best. But, yes, that is what the federal regulators would consider for a 4-credit course.

It was agreed that the motion will layover until the May 4 meeting. Questions or concerns should be shared with Lisa directly.

VIII. Discuss and vote on APC motion on Student Success - Lisa MacFarlane, chair of the Academic Program Committee reintroduced the motion that was first presented at the March 2 Senate meeting.

**Rationale:** “Student Success” is a term of art among university administrators and is, in essence, an index of retention and graduation rates. It does not include measures of academic learning, student well-being, or any other educational goals that faculty regard as markers of student success. This is our attempt to establish what faculty regard as “Student Success.”

**Preamble:**

In *The Future of UNH: Four Strategic Priorities*, President Dean identified quantifiable metrics that would indicate enhanced student success:

- graduation rates for both the total student body and for those receiving Pell Grants;
- the percentage of graduates who are paying back their loans;
- the percentage of first-year students in the top 10% of their high school class; and
- student participation in high-impact learning experiences.

We endorse these as indices of the ambitious scholarly and material goals of the administration’s strategic plan for improving the University’s position in a competitive higher education market.
As faculty at an R1 public institution with a distinctive focus on and commitment to undergraduate education, we urge that additional, less tangible more qualitative values be equally prioritized, and that the pursuit of quantifiable benchmarks not overshadow the aspiration to support a student’s full and holistic development.

**The Faculty Statement:**

We affirm that the full value of an outstanding undergraduate experience both encompasses and lies beyond numerical metrics. It is manifested over the totality of a life well-lived, both personally and in service of our social and civic responsibilities; and in the ability both to thrive in changing times and to shape those times for the better.

In addition to quantifiable metrics, then, the Faculty Senate advises the senior administration to attend to other factors of the student experience. These include but need not be limited to: a love of learning for its own sake; a preparedness to be an engaged citizen; an ability to flourish in a global society; and a confidence to navigate life’s uncertainties.

(Alternate phrasing: We also like these phrases: an aptitude for creative yet prudent judgment; a capacity to exercise tenacity and grit; an appreciation for compassion and wisdom.)

There was a discussion about the phrase “a love of learning for its own sake” and suggestions were offered to change the way this was phrased. A friendly motion was made to remove “for its own sake” from the phrase. The motion to amend was seconded. The committee accepted the motion and there were no objections from the floor.

**The motion was put to a vote and the motion was passed with 54 in favor, one opposed and 4 abstentions.**

IX. Agenda Committee and Information Technology resolution to recognize Academic Technology personnel

- Erin Sharp presented the motion on behalf of the Agenda Committee and the ITC.

**Faculty Senate Resolution of Thanks to the**

**University of New Hampshire**

**Academic Technology Personnel**

**Introduced by:** Faculty Senate Agenda Committee and Information Technology Committee

**Date:** April 27, 2020

**WHEREAS,** UNH announced on Thursday, March 12th that students would not return to campus after spring break due to the COVID-19 emergency; and

**WHEREAS,** the COVID-19 emergency response required all faculty and instructors to transition their courses to a remote learning environment quickly; and

**WHEREAS,** within a day, the Academic Technology personnel organized and communicated significant resources and supports for this transition to remote learning. These included an online link to submit all questions and needs, resource selection based on individual comfort level with remote teaching, face-to-face sessions when allowed and then webinar and Zoom sessions when required, direct call center availability, and access to collected resources on best practices in online teaching.
THEREFORE, the Faculty Senate extends profound gratitude and appreciation to Academic Technology. We recognize and salute you for your selfless dedication to the service of UNH students, faculty, and staff.

There was a motion to suspend the rules to allow for a vote on this today instead of having it layover. A voice vote of ayes and nays was taken. The motion to suspend the rules was unanimously approved.

The motion to thank Academic Technology was put to a vote. The motion passed with 59 in favor, none opposed, and one abstention.

X. AAC report on the Confucius Institute and international enrollments (Appendices 8.1 – 8.4) - Tu Lan from the Academic Affairs Committee shared a report on two of the committee’s charges. The following information is taken from the PowerPoint presentation:

REPORT BY THE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
ON THE CONFUCIUS INSTITUTE

Charge regarding the contract with Confucius Institute

In connection with Motion #XIX-M17, signed on 09/30/95*, on six recommendations regarding the Confucius Institute a) research and report on the terms of the newly signed Confucius Institute contract and b) research and report on whether the requirement for hiring a professor who is not beholden to the Chinese government was met. *Should be 09/30/15

AAC report on the contract with Confucius Institute

- In response to the Motion #XIX-M17, a special review committee was convened in 2015 to revise the CI contract. The new contract requires UNH to (1) establish a committee to oversee all matters related to CI, and (2) hire a tenure-track professor in the Chinese Program.

- (1) As a result, an eight-member Advisory and Oversight Committee (Advisory Committee) was formed in 2015: six from UNH and two from the Durham community. This Advisory Committee meets every January to review CI’s annual activity plan.

- (2) Meanwhile, in 2015, Department of Languages, Literatures, and Cultures (LLC) hired Dr. Wenjin Cui, as the tenure-track professor of Chinese language and literature. Dr. Cui has since been supervising the Chinese Program at UNH.
Charge regarding international enrollment

- Monitor the University’s international recruiting efforts (i.e., Gaokao, Navitas, Shorelight, etc.) and offer guidance on whether to continue these programs and in what way. If time allows, consider whether the admissions criteria for Gaokao could be extended to students of other nations that have similar national tests. Report on the progress of these programs at UNH and also on whether/how the University supports the needs of international students after they have matriculated.

AAC report on international enrollment

- Gaokao is the national college entrance examination in China which is held once every year. In 2019, UNH started to allow students from China to use their English score in Gaokao when applying for undergraduate programs at UNH. However, so far, UNH has not received large numbers of Chinese applicants who used their Gaokao score. Due to the results, UNH currently has no plan to expand it to other countries.

- Navitas, aka. GSSP (Global Student Success Program), is an Australian education company which has been running UNH’s international pathway program since 2009. International students in GSSP usually spend one to three semesters on language courses before they can matriculate into our undergraduate programs. GSSP had 400 international students at one point, yet the number was down to 50 in 2019. The decline has been caused by visa restrictions and the change of ownership of the Navitas company, but not due to UNH.

- Navitas’ contract with UNH will end in Fall 2020 without renewal.

- Shorelight is another education company based in Boston, with which UNH recently signed a contract starting Fall 2020. Unlike the contract with Navitas, this contract with Shorelight is only for direct entry students in both graduate and undergraduate programs. UNH has learnt from the past experiences with Navitas and will meet regularly with Shorelight to ensure that we have full control of the program.

- Shorelight has also expressed the interests to take over the pathway program, although the negotiation has not formally started.

- UNH’s plan is to enroll 10% of its students from overseas, although at this moment we are far from our goal.
Statistics on international enrollment at UNH

- Statistics of international enrollment by OISS at UNH: [https://www.unh.edu/global/international-student-statistics](https://www.unh.edu/global/international-student-statistics)

- In Spring 2020, there are 847 international students from 70 countries on all UNH campuses, which account about 5.13% of the total student population.

Tu offered to take questions. Elsa Upham from the English Department said that in connection with the Gao Kao initiative it is true that we only had 2 students. She pointed out that it was only offered for half a semester. It is possible that there would be more students applying for the program if it had been offered more than one time.

Elsa said that her understanding about Shorelight is that they are have made it clear that they are not
interested in taking over the UNH pathway program. Instead, Shorelight wants to stay with direct entry students only. Elsa said that, as a consequence, this may affect the ESL Institute.

Tu said that the information in the report came from Vasu and the committee meeting minutes. He suggested that it might be worthwhile for Elsa to follow up. He also shared that the meeting with Vasu was two months ago and things may have changed since then.

Jeffrey Halpern commented that he has a friend who works with the recruitment of Chinese students to all American universities and when this person saw UNH’s announcement about GaoKao he saw it as revolutionary. A professional friend in his field is also involved in international organizations and visited UNH last semester to attempt to talk to people about how we are facilitating that process. This person is interested in doing this at the University of Connecticut, but he can’t figure out a logistical pathway. Jeffrey asked are the shortcomings due to the logistical pathway or truly a lack of interest? We should look more into the logistics before shutting down this mode of recruiting?

Erin said she thinks that the Agenda Committee can continue to ask these questions.

Lori Hopkins shared that, although she wasn’t on the Senate at the time when the Senate made the step to influence LLC to make a hire in Chinese, it was very problematic at the time to be told by faculty of other departments who we should hire and why. It did work out that a faculty member was hired for the Chinese Department because a new line was added by the dean at the time. She said that while she understands that this is a long and complicated issue, sometimes things are not understood at the level of what we are doing for our students within departments. It did have a good outcome, but she wants to put on record that if LLC went to another department to direct about hiring, it would not be well received.

XI. Remarks by and questions to Erin Sharp on the Professional Names, and Gender Identity - Steering Committee - Erin Sharp shared that she recently met with the committee that is been working to implement the professional name changes into IT systems. The IT project manager for this effort is Amy Hodgdon. The initial charge was to provide a way for faculty and staff professional names to be used as the default name for populating department webpages and in other academic systems. The committee is also taking up the issue of allowing faculty and staff to identify pronouns and gender identity within the same project.

Erin suggested that the Faculty Senate can use this work as well as the work of the Student Affairs Committee this year to offer recommendations for all of the different forms at UNH that ask for gender.

Erin shared the following overview:

**UPDATE ON PROFESSIONAL NAMES, AND GENDER IDENTITY PROJECT**

*by Erin Sharp*

The Professional Names, and Gender Identity project includes a cross-functional team focused on developing standards and conventions regarding name types, pronouns, and gender identity selections to be utilized across USNH institutions and populations. This Standards and Conventions team consists of the following members:

- **Allyson Ryder, Chair** (UNH Community, Equity & Diversity; Transgender Policy & Climate Committee)
- **Elena Long** (UNH Physics, representative from Faculty Senate)
• Hunter Kirschner (KSC Office of Multicultural Student Support and Success)
• Janette Wiggett (PSU Title IX/504)
• Jay Colbert (UNH Library, representative from Faculty Senate)
• Maggie Hyndman (GSC HR)

Working with the Engineering group and the Core Team, this group has developed the following Name Types and selections for Pronouns and Gender Identity. Although this does not reflect the team’s ideal state, it harnesses the capabilities of the existing tools to improve the current state; the team would have preferred that Gender Identity and Pronouns be multi-select fields which would have condensed the list of options. Given the existing tool capabilities and the complexity of reporting on multi-select options, the group agreed to the following selections.

What further approvals may be required to institute these selections as the standard across institutions and populations? Note: The team will also develop a review process for any adjustments required as the landscape and lexicon changes over time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>The name officially recognized by government entities and necessary for USNH to meet its reporting obligations and production of official documents like W-2s. The legal name will continue to be managed and updated via the existing process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chosen/Preferred</td>
<td>The name by which an individual chooses to be addressed, such as an individual who goes by their middle name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>The name an individual is known by in a professional capacity, such as an individual publishing under a former legal name.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronoun Selections</th>
<th>Gender Selections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any pronouns</td>
<td>Cisgender Man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He/him/his</td>
<td>Intersex Man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No pronouns/use my name only</td>
<td>Man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per/per/pers</td>
<td>Transgender Man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She/her/hers</td>
<td>Non-Binary/Gender Queer/Gender Non-Conforming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They/them/their</td>
<td>Cisgender Woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They/them/their and He/him/his</td>
<td>Transgender Intersex Woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They/them/their and She/her/hers</td>
<td>Woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ze/hir/hirs</td>
<td>Something Else</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ze/zir/zirs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Something else</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UNH Useful Acronyms:

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