Meeting called to order at 3:12 p.m. on April 29, 2019

MINUTES SUMMARY

I. Roll - The following senators were absent: Ballestero, Berst, Gass, Innis, Kies, Kim, Knowles, Merenda, Neefus, Simos, and Swift. The following senators were excused: Came, Clark, Endrizzi, Khanlari, and Taylor. The following guests attended: Andy Colby, Nicky Gullace, Wayne Jones, and Catherine Peebles

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

- The testing center that was approved in the fall with the support of the Faculty Senate is now open and available for use. If you have students who need extra time, a separate location, or a separate proctored situation to do their exams please reach out to Michael Shuttic, the director of Student Accessibility Services (SAS).

- The USNH Board of Trustees met on the UNH campus last week from Wednesday afternoon through Friday. There were interesting and robust discussions including presentations on things we are doing around student retention, a fairly detailed review of UNH Manchester and UNH Law, and presentations by some students and faculty about the breadth of research and scholarship going on across all of our colleges. Overall, it was probably summed up best by Marjorie Smith, a representative from Durham, who said that she had no idea that all of this was going on at UNH and we need to tell the world.

- On Friday afternoon Wayne went to Concord to the Senate Budget hearing. The governor’s budget had no base funding, but it included for the first time in 6 years, capital funding, around biological sciences initiatives and health science initiatives. That budget then went to the House Budget Committee and they zeroed out the health sciences initiative and left in the bioscience initiatives, but added base funding of $12 million over the biennium. At the Senate, they are trying to figure out what they want to do. They have reconsidered the health science initiative and the bioscience initiative is still there. So, we are really in good shape on the bioscience initiative. The question is what will they do around base funding, how that will be linked to a tuition freeze, and what is going to happen to health sciences. They are still trying to work through that. Wayne shared that many of the questions he was asked have nothing to do with the budget

- In response to a question about a tuition freeze, Wayne shared that, in principle, what the president and he would like to do, in a fiscally responsible manner, is to start to change the tide in terms of tuition, fees, and room and board costs. Our tuition is high, but not the highest when you take into account our discount rate, which is approximately 31% right now. Our room and board cost is one of the lowest in New England. Our fees are almost the highest in the nation. This year the decision has been made to freeze fees and we are going to try to keep tuition down as much as possible. Wayne
suggested that faculty can go to a website about how much college costs that uses IPED data to see that our cost to students has been basically flat, relative to inflation, for the past 5 years.  
(https://nces.ed.gov/collegenavigator/?q=University+of+New+Hampshire&s=NH&id=183044#expenses). But, with the legislature’s help, we hope to do better than that.

III. Remarks by and questions to the chair

- Scott asked if the lecturers who had a FAR deadline of April 15 noticed any improvement in the process and whether we should do a Qualtrics survey now or wait until the tenure-track faculty have completed their FAR. In response to the lack of any comments, Scott proposed that a Qualtrics survey be conducted after the tenure-track faculty have submitted their FAR.

- We still need nominations for faculty for the Student Success Steering Committee. This is a front side committee which is going to be looking at the myWildcat Success platform including the new features that make up the Navigate system. Please submit nominations to Scott as we are looking for three faculty to participate.

- Next week will be the last meeting of the 2018-2019 of the Faculty Senate and it will end at approximately 4:30. The senators who are not returning are welcome to leave at that time. The new senators will be invited to attend for the first meeting of the 2019-2020 Senate. The first order of business is to vote in the slate of officers, including the chair and vice chair. The new chair will then make some comments and then the meeting will be adjourned for the rest of the summer. However, the agenda committee will be meeting monthly over that time. Please share any concerns that you have over the summer with the Agenda Committee.

- Scott presented the proposed slate of Faculty Senate officers as follows:

  **Chair:** David Bachrach, History  
  **Vice-chair:** Erin Sharp, Human Development and Family Studies

  **At large members:**  
  Ann Bartow, UNH Law  
  Rosemarie Came, Earth Science  
  Jim Connell, Physics

  **Prior chair (ex-officio):** Scott Smith, Classics, Humanities, & Italian Studies

Scott explained that members of the Senate can nominate from the floor competing members to this slate. This hasn’t happened before but it is within the rights of a Senator to do so.

IV. Approval of the minutes from April 15, 2019 - It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the April 15 meeting of the Senate. There were no corrections. The minutes were unanimously approved with 3 abstentions.
V. Report on the SAC Motion in Support of Student Senate Resolution R.40.16 on Title IX

Hearings - Elsa Upham presented the report on behalf of the Student Affairs Committee in connection with the following motion that had been presented at the April 1 meeting:

Motion in Support of Student Senate Resolution R.40.16
Committee: Student Affairs Committee

Rationale: The State of New Hampshire, in a statement found in the State of New Hampshire Governor’s Commission on Domestic and Sexual Violence (2017: 3), advocates for a victim-centered approach. It reads:

*It is the expectation of the New Hampshire Attorney General’s Office that all disciplines involved in the response to adult sexual assaults will work collaboratively using a victim-centered approach. This means prioritizing victim’s needs, honoring their rights, considering their perspectives, and supporting their decisions.*

The Faculty Senate also supports such an approach. Therefore, the Faculty Senate supports Student Senate Resolution R.40.16 (“On Further Urging Mandated Response in the Title IX Office,” dated Feb. 10, 2019), which calls upon the administration “to adopt the mandated advocacy system to SHARPP from the Title IX Office,” and furthermore to “increase direct communication from the University of New Hampshire to SHARPP in cases of sexual assault to ensure that survivors understand what options are available for them.”

We further note that the Graduate Student Senate also expressed formal support for Student Senate Resolution R.40.16, dated Feb. 12, 2019, with unanimous support.

**Motion:** The Faculty Senate supports Student Senate Resolution R.40.16 (Feb. 10, 2019), as well as the Graduate Student Senate’s motion of support (Feb. 12, 2019), that mandates the presence of SHARPP advocates in Title IX hearings, unless survivors decline such services.

Elsa explained that motion deals with a complex issue with many different entities involved. The goal has been to provide the students with the best possible support while following state and university guidelines while also looking at best practices at other universities. The goal is to make sure that the presence of an advocate at the time of reporting is an opt-out option rather than an opt-in option.

The committee, in particular, Susan Endrizzi, has met several times with SHARPP advocates, Title IX coordinators, Ted Kirkpatrick, Monica Chiu, and the Chief of Police. There was also a meeting that included Tracy Birmingham from USNH Legal counsel, and someone from the Conduct office.

Some of the hurdles for the SAC in working through this issue revolve around misconceptions about what the reporting is, the number of scenarios for reporting, as well the complex dynamic between the various groups. The committee has tried to change the online reporting system to ensure that any submitted reports also go to SHARPP but that was not feasible. The committee has also worked toward mandating the presence of an advocate at the time of reporting through another sort of mechanism but that hasn’t worked out. Therefore, the focus has been to present a motion that supports the Undergraduate and Graduate Student Senates motions about encouraging the presence of an advocate.
Some of the questions raised at the last meeting were about the nature of the hearing. However, “hearing” is the wrong term. It is not a hearing. There is nothing legal about it. Instead, it is actually an initial meeting. Those meetings are small and usually involve the reporting party, the Title IX coordinator and, if the reporting person chooses so, a support person that could be a friend, parent, roommate, RA, etc. The police are not involved in the initial meeting. It is not an investigation. However, based on the information shared, the Title IX coordinator will advise whether an investigation is necessary.

Another question was whether the Title IX office communicates about SHARPP and the committee has been told that information is given to the student about SHARPP services more than once. The SAC is trying to identify what the perceived problems are from the student and graduate student perspective in this area.

Another question was raised by the Senate was whether the responding party has access to an advocate. The committee has learned that they do. But, it isn’t clear whether SHARPP provides this service.

The goal for the next session of the Senate is to collect more data since it is important that the motions that are put forward should be convincing and meet the goal.

Another idea being discussed is to develop a specific committee to review Title IX issues. This might include Faculty Senate, Student Senate, and the Title IX officer. There has also been a suggestion to develop a new “report and refer” system that would require the faculty to refer the student to SHARPP at the time of reporting.

In response to a question about whether UNH was following best practices in the area of Title IX, Elsa said that it isn’t clear. But, they do know that other universities do have an advocate present at the time the reporting is being done.

There was also question about a discussion two years ago in the Senate about whether a report made by a faculty member to the Title IX office would be forwarded to the police as well. A member of the Senate offered that the Reportit.unh.edu site explains that information submitted for mandatory reporting will automatically go to the title IX office and the Chief of Police.

The Senate chair asked if there was any interest in moving to vote on the original motion on this subject. No motion was offered. The chair moved to indefinitely postpone the motion so that the SAC can continue their work on this subject next semester. The motion to indefinitely postpone the motion was put to a vote and passed unanimously with 59 in favor and no abstentions.

VI. Report on the motion on Engaged scholarship - David Finkelhor explained that after this motion was initially presented at the April 15 meeting.

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.

On the day that the motion was presented the committee learned that the Faculty Senate had previously made a report about Engaged Scholarship in 2014. Given that previous members of the Senate had put time and effort in preparing the report in 2014 the current committee believes that it should be incorporated into the process. However, due to lack of time, this can’t be done this semester.

The Senate chair asked if there was any interest in moving to vote on the original motion. No motion was offered. The chair moved to indefinitely postpone the motion so that the RPSC can continue their work on this subject next semester. The motion to indefinitely postpone the motion was put to a vote and passed unanimously with 57 in favor and 1 abstention.

Following the vote, a senator asked how we can prevent this from happening in the future where reports or important information from previous years is available and known. The chair explained the challenge is very much due to the changing nature of the Faculty Senate membership. One goal over the summer is to create a system to make reports available through SharePoint or another system. It needs to be addressed so that things don’t fall through the cracks.

VII. Discussion and vote on the SAC motion on Indigenous Peoples’ Day - Bill Woodward reviewed the motion that had been presented at the April 15 meeting and summarized some of the discussion from that meeting. It was agreed at the April 15 meeting that the last sentence of the motion should be removed.

The Senate chair also clarified again that there is a Faculty Senate rule that if Fall Break exists it should fall on the federal holiday of Columbus Day for practical reasons of allowing families to be together on a day off. This could be read as an implicit approval of Columbus Day.
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 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.

It was pointed out that there is a problem with the list of universities in the motion since there is no North Carolina University of Utah. The committee agreed to research this and correct the motion.

A professor from the History Department said that, as a historian, she wants to echo her history colleague in the Senate that it is important to always talk about context to any historical occurrence and to change Columbus Day to Indigenous Peoples day exactly does that as it recognizes the broader context that we now have the wisdom to see. Another point she made was that celebrating any holiday is always in the present tense, not in the past tense. It also is a way of making a statement today about what legacy we want to uphold and what legacy we want to reject, and it is certainly a bridge to the future to say what kind of future we want to build.

There was a concern that the second paragraph in the motion was not necessary. Instead of being negative we should be focusing on the positive and saying that this is an international type of problem and that we should be looking at any indigenous people around the world.
The SAC committee was not agreeable to making a friendly amendment to strike the second paragraph of the rationale given that they had already agreed to remove the last sentence of the original motion. A motion was made to leave in the second paragraph but remove “Italian” and “Spanish” from the paragraph. The motion was seconded. There was no discussion about this particular motion. The motion was put to a vote and the motion passed with 54 in favor, 4 opposed, and 1 abstention.

The discussion returned to the question of whether to remove the second paragraph of the rationale. One professor pointed out that, based on her experience, the historical debate involving different scholarly perspectives on Columbus and the contemporary criticism offered by las Casas is probably familiar to a number of our students in their high school education but may not be as familiar to faculty from their own high school experience.

The motion to strike the second paragraph in the rationale was put to a vote. The motion failed with 22 in favor of striking the second paragraph, 29 opposed and 8 abstentions.

In response to a question about whether the Student Senate or the Graduate Student Senate (GSS) have taken any action about Indigenous Peoples Day, the Student Senator in attendance said that she found some discussion in the Student Senate records from 5 years ago but there was no motion passed. The GSS representative explained that there have been discussions about this and that the GSS is on board with the spirit of the Faculty Senate motion even though they haven’t passed a motion.

The motion was put to a vote, conditional on a correction being made to the list of universities in the Rationale, and the motion passed with 53 in favor, 1 opposed, and 8 abstentions.

VIII. Discussion and vote on Discovery Committee motion on awarding Transfer and Study Abroad Discovery Credit - Nicky Gullace, Faculty Director of the Discovery Program reviewed the motion that was presented at the April 15 meeting.

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.

Andy Colby, the Registrar, pointed out that the big sticking point for some students is that a class at another institution that is the same class here does not currently get approved for Discovery credit in the transfer process because the same UNH course isn’t offered as a Discovery course. Painting is a good example of that. There are courses that are currently approved for transfer to fulfill the Discovery requirement on topics we don’t offer here. It is that one-to-one connection that this motion is trying to address.

A question was asked if this motion would be applied retroactively. Nicky suggested that, if the motion passes, a student can petition and it will be reviewed taking into account the provisions of this motion.

A senator shared that a question was brought up at the COLSA executive committee when he asked for feedback from the deans, associate deans, and chairs in that committee. Does this motion refer to UNH students who went abroad and are transferring the credits back, even though they knew what Discovery courses they should have taken at UNH, but chose not to? Nicky, said that in most cases, no. But, in some cases, yes. Students are supposed to get prior approval for study abroad but often, by the time they reach the institution they are visiting, the courses have completely changed. But, we have low numbers of students studying abroad and that is declining further and further, despite hopes to raise the international experience of our students. She said that this motion will make it easier for students who study abroad and have taken a course that fits our category description and SLO even though it isn’t precisely what we require students to do.

Nicky clarified that there is no limit to how many courses can be transferred in to fulfill the Discovery credits. She explained that there are many articulation agreements that UNH has with the community colleges to try and assist students in getting to UNH to finish their degrees. Our hope is that those that choose to can do their general education course somewhere like Great Bay Community College and come here to finish the last 2 years of the major. This is a decision administration has made and faculty have been largely in agreement with because of the financial benefits for students. Admittedly, this pattern will cost us Discovery enrollments. From the point of view of trying to give access to less advantaged students, this is a hopeful step.

Allison Wilder from APC mentioned that there are discussions afoot in terms of branding student success at UNH and it involves Discovery as a mechanism whereby we can potentially ensure that all UNH students have a common experience and wondered how this would affect transfer students. Nicky said that the Discovery Review committee would like to create something like a first-year program that gives some more cohesive continuity. But, for a transfer student coming in as a
sophomore the priority for them and their family is about getting them through the degree process on time. The question of whether they go back and do a first-year experience or not is something that this body will vote on and this committee will have to weigh in on and decide.

The motion was put to a vote. The motion passed unanimously with 60 in favor and 1 abstention.

IX. Discussion and vote on Discovery Committee Motion on allowing Discovery credit for transferred 2.5 credit courses - Nicky reviewed the motion that was previously presented at the April 15 meeting and explained that this motion does not change the requirement that students graduating from UNH must have 128 credits. Students will not take fewer credits. But, if the motion passes, students will be allowed to take fewer discovery credits because we will accept a 2.5 credit course(s) to fulfill a Discovery requirement.

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.

Nicky clarified that this motion deals purely with Discovery credit.

A question was asked about whether a review of contact hours was considered for approving a 2.5 credit course for Discovery credit. Nicky said that this was discussed quite a bit in the Discovery committee. She pointed out that UNH J-term courses have few hours so, even here at UNH, we have a variety of contact hours for courses that do get Discovery credit. She also said that the 2.5 credit designation is based on a translation of credit hours and it probably is fewer contact hours than a 3.0 credit course. But, we know that it varies.

Andy Colby, the Registrar, explained that most of the international situations with a 2.5 credit for study away are based on the ECTS (European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System) standard and the most accepted translation of the credit is 2 to 1. This means that the contact hours from a 2.5 credit course are pretty substantial and he has good confidence that the contact hours for a 2.5 credit course is sufficient for the 3 credit Discovery requirement.

The motion was put to a vote. The motion passed with 59 in favor, 1 opposed, and 1 abstention.

The Senate chair thanked Nicky and her committee for their hard work on these motions and the Senate showed their support by acclamation.
X. Discussion and vote on APC motion on Expanding Academic Engagement across the Entire Week - Allison Wilder, chair of the APC reviewed the motion that had been presented at the April 15 meeting.

Academic Program Committee

Motion on Expanding Academic Engagement Across the Entire Week

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.

A professor in the English Department reported that she received feedback from several members of her department who were, on the one hand agreeing with the motion and, on the other hand, not agreeing to it. Allison reviewed that, at the end of the day, the scheduling decision still lies with the department. Another member of the English Department that there was a concern that lecturers would be stuck with some terrible schedules and that student evaluations would be affected if a course were offered in an unpopular time. There was also a concern that any change along scheduling should be based on academic consideration rather than scheduling or room availability.

Another professor responded that he has taught courses in all kinds of schedules and his evaluations weren’t affected and he doesn’t buy into the idea that students won’t do Friday schedules if they don’t have any other options.

There was a question about the student-developed scheduling app that allows students to filter for “no courses before 8 am” and “no Friday classes” and whether this app was still up and running. The provost responded that this software package was developed by a few students and is still being used. But, it was modified at the request of his office to not do this kind of automatic filtering anymore. Students are able to manually filter for this kind of thing but it isn’t an automatic feature.
Allison summarized that the beauty of this motion is that those who wish to try alternate structures are encouraged to do so and that, hopefully, they are supported in the scheduling from the administration. For those departments where moving schedules around creates problems, this may not be for them.

One faculty member from HHS pointed out that there are different cultures in different departments and we need some broad strategies for this. We should be thoughtful about how to do this so that it doesn’t harm lecturers and faculty. It will require a real culture shift for some departments.

In response to a question about where the MWF issue is a problem Scott Smith shared some examples from his view of the data: for senior Paul College students, only a little more than 10% of them have Friday classes. Only 26% of Paul College juniors have Friday classes. The data for COLA is not that much different. There is always fear from faculty that teaching a Friday class will result in a canceled course. Scott said that this has to be a concerted effort and we have to figure out how to get deans, chairs, and faculty all on board with this.

Allison shared that the expressed reality is that we are absolutely squeezed in that 10 am to 2 pm time period. To the extent that we can optimize how we might structure courses for faculty and students, we are moving in the right direction.

One senator asked whether this applied to graduate courses as well and pointed out that a commuting graduate student tends to be much better off if they are only on campus 2 or 3 days a week because of work and other commitments. She also pointed out that although the motion says that the authority for course scheduling lies with the department, departments don’t have the flexibility at a department level to schedule as they want because of room scheduling issues.

Allison pointed out that the committee did review research that supported the notion of more immersion leading to better outcomes. The second “whereas” statement is important to make a statement that we are not taking away the authority of anyone as it currently exists. The concern about room scheduling is addressed at the end of the motion with the statement “Further, we move that administration work with faculty to facilitate more flexible course offerings befitting a R-1 university.”

Andy Colby, the Registrar, explained that there is department-controlled space and Registrar-controlled space and there is more flexibility in the department-controlled space to hold classes at non-standard times and there is less flexibility for Registrar-controlled rooms for non-standard times. There are some different things we can start thinking about. It would be hard to find a Registrar who has figured this all out. However, he would like to make sure we have a conversation that doesn’t create more classroom issues with people not being able to have a class at a time. The question is “how can we have a course time offering that is modern but uses our space as well as we can also?” Andy pointed out that Jackie Snow from WebI has done a review of classroom usage and in that report, you can see that on Friday afternoon around 2 pm course offerings just dissipate quite quickly. A Fall 2019 report showed a high percentage of non-standard time classes on the books than there are standard time classes.

There was a comment made that there also needs to be a focus on arranging these courses so that a professor doesn’t find themselves teaching every day of the week because faculty have other responsibilities as well. Allison responded that the last phrase “befitting an R-1 university” speaks to that to some extent, recognizing that there are tensions that arise as a result of the demands for an R-1 university.

The motion was put to a vote. **The motion passed with 55 in favor, 1 opposed and, 4 abstained.**
XI. SAC Motion on Universal Expectations for Syllabi - Harriet Fertik presented this motion on behalf of the SAC. She explained that this motion was developed in response to a Student Senate motion as described in the rationale. She said that the SAC was surprised to learn that some students were encountering courses where instructors did not provide this basic information.

Student Affairs Committee Motion on Universal expectations for Syllabi

Rationale:
In April 2018, the Student Senate passed a motion “to recommend the addition of a policy to the Student Rights, Rules, and Responsibilities that mandates that all academic courses are accompanied with a syllabus within the first two weeks of the semester” and “to urge that the mandate states that all syllabi must include as least the following: the grading policy, professor and teaching assistant contact information and office hours, semester requirements, the Academic Honesty Policy, and the Disability Statement” (Student Senate Resolution XXXIX – 43). Although there are very limited mechanisms to enforce a mandate that faculty provide syllabi, a syllabus that outlines required assessments and assignments for the course, grading policy, instructor contact information, and office hours is crucial for students’ success and will make courses more accessible to all students. The courses taught at the University of New Hampshire are enormously diverse in content and format, and syllabi will necessarily be similarly diverse, but all instructors should be able to provide basic information about the expectations and requirements for their courses. Many units at UNH already request that faculty submit copies of their syllabi at the beginning of each term.

Motion:
The Faculty Senate moves that all department chairs and/or program coordinators request that all instructors distribute syllabi to all students enrolled in their courses and submit copies of the syllabi to department or program staff within the first two weeks of each semester. Syllabi should include information on required assessments and assignments, grading policy, instructor contact information, and office hours, as well as the statements on the Academic Honesty Policy, Disabilities, Mental Health, Classroom-Behavior Expectations, and Confidentiality and Mandatory Reporting distributed each year by the Dean of Students.

There was a question about the word “distribute” and whether this would cover electronic distribution. Also, a professor from English pointed out that in the interest of creating a lean and digestible syllabus some professors include some of the required information from the Dean of Students in a separate document and that this information should be made available at the same time but not necessarily as part of the syllabus. Harriet explained that providing a link or including it on a Canvas site would count as fulfilling this.

A suggestion was made to work with AT to preload all of that required items on every Canvas page for every course so that it would not be left to a faculty member’s discretion.

A question was raised about whether this was a protective mechanism for faculty or is this a way to actually ensure that students get this information. There are times when students will have the information but don’t realize that they have it. Harriet pointed out that there seem to be actual
situations where students have not been provided a syllabus and this motion was developed to ensure that students receive this information.

A professor from Physics pointed out that she tweaks some of the required documents. Also, it is normal that not all assignments will be included in the syllabus and asked if that was going to be a problem in connection with this motion. Harriet said that is why the motion is worded to say that “information on” the required things and she agrees that she also doesn’t give detailed information on everything that will happen in the class.

The motion will lay over until the next meeting. Senators were instructed to address any concerns with the motion to Harriet.

XII. SAC Motion in support of the efforts the Transgender Policy and Climate Committee on gender question on Student evaluations - Nena Stracuzzi from the SAC presented the motion.

Student Affairs Committee Motion
on Self-Identification of Gender on Student Evaluations

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 regarding sex (male/female) be changed to a gender-based question with non-binary answers included on students' course evaluations. In reviewing current best practices as outlined by national organizations (e.g. The Consortium of Higher Education LGBT Resource Professionals’ Trans Policy Working Group) and the university’s Transgender Policy and Climate Committee, we agree that students should be able to self-identify in terms of their gender, not only on student course evaluations, but on all campus records and documents. The Faculty Senate realizes that it has no authority to speak on this matter beyond student evaluations, but for the sake of consistency, it urges university administrative leadership to adopt a consistent set of categories across the board.

Furthermore, we found that in some cases these changes are already being made, for instance on the Graduate Student Application Form, a change that is supported by Monica Chiu, Interim Associate Vice President of Community, Equity, and Diversity, as well as Ted Kirkpatrick, Dean of Students, and Donna Marie Sorrentino, Affirmative Action. In fact, it is already being implemented. Plans are also in place to do the same for Undergraduate Student Applications.

Given the above, two things are clear: 1) the University should follow best practices and allow for self-identification of gender, and 2) the University should adopt a consistent set of categories for all of its forms, documents, and student evaluations so that data collection is consistent. The categories in the motion itself are, therefore, those found in the Graduate Student Application Form, which is already being revised.

A question was asked about the term “student evaluations” and “student course evaluations’ and there was a clarification that this refers to course evaluations of faculty.
There was a question about whether, because of these more detailed gender identification, it is possible that someone’s confidential response is revealed. Scott Smith pointed out that the data is current disaggregated but that this is something that should be checked into.

A question was raised about why we even collect gender information on student evaluations. Scott pointed out that the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs through Institutional Research can make some conclusions based on gender and performance and self-identified number of hours, etc. This does raise the question about how this determination can be made if the data is only available in a disaggregated way.

The motion will lay over until the next meeting.

XIII. Agenda Committee report and motion on Professional Name issue - David Bachrach, on behalf of the Agenda Committee, presented a report and motion on this issue in the absence of the author of the report, Jim Connell.

The report was included in the agenda and the motion is below.

**On Profession Names and FindScholars@UNH and Associated Software and Websites**

1. The Faculty Senate repudiates discrimination of any kind for reasons of technical expediency, including taking FindScholars@UNH and its associated software and websites on-line prior to resolving UNH’s long-standing (4+ years) failure to accommodate professional names;

2. The Faculty Senate apologizes to those faculty members with professional names who have been publicly misrepresented by UNH’s adoption of FindScholars@UNH and its associated software and websites to the detriment of their professional standing and careers;

3. The Faculty Senate calls for FindScholars@UNH and its associated software and websites to be disabled if, by 31 December 2019, any faculty are not represented under their chosen professional names, until such time as they are so represented;

4. To mitigate the disadvantagements pending this correction, the Faculty Senate calls for the following warning to be displayed prominently on all webpages generated by, or drawing data from, FindScholars@UNH and/or its associated software,

**WARNING**

Mandated by UNH Faculty Senate

Faculty with professional names owning to marital status, ethnic or cultural naming conventions or other reasons, are misrepresented here or missing entirely. When present, their information may be incomplete or in error.

Please contact their departments directly for further information.

said warning to be placed above any such data on any websites, boxed in black or red so as to best contrast with the background, and to be in a font of the same color, no smaller than the largest displaying information from FindScholars@UNH and/or its associated software;
5. The Faculty Senate calls for FindScholars@UNH and its associated software and websites to be disabled if, by 1 June 2019, the aforesaid warning is not in place, until such time as they are represented as per section 3;

6. The Faculty Senate further calls upon the administration to provide guidance to all departments with faculty going up for tenure in the fall semester of 2019 that letters to outside readers should include information regarding the gaps in FindScholars@UNH, and should encourage these outside readers to consult directly with the department concerning the faculty under external review;

7. The Faculty Senate calls for the UNH Administration to conduct a survey within two months of passage of this motion designed to reach all UNH faculty and staff in order to identify all UNH employees whose name currently published on UNH websites does not match their professional name; identifying all of those affected now is crucial for ensuring that USNH addresses the full range of concerns (e.g., marital status name changes, ethnic or cultural naming conventions, and gender identity) when developing and fixing the system;

8. The Faculty Senate further calls for the UNH Affirmative Action and Equity Office to monitor UNH Academic Technology, Information Technology and the Human Resources Office for a minimum of 5 years with yearly compliance audits to prevent similar discrimination in the future.

David explained that for, at least the past 4 years, there are difficulties in identifying faculty and staff on various university websites in cases where an individual uses a professional name that is different than their legal name. The issue has become greater since the introduction of FindScholars@UNH and the connection between the Faculty Activity Report and MyElements. The overall conclusion of the Agenda committee is that the inability to display professional names that are different than legal names was not done out of malice, but out of expediency. The provost office has informed us that a fix is in process at the System level because that is the source of the problem. We have every expectation that this will be resolved by the end of this calendar year.

A professor from Physics pointed out that she is personally affected by this issue. She asked for some relief early on. She is in her 4th year as an assistant professor. She has to explain to her students that the name that she uses is different than the information they will see about her on the UNH website. This is a branding issue that sows confusion. It may affect a small number of people but it is an important problem. She has been told in the past that it would be fixed. She said she would appreciate the Senate passing this motion even if a fix is on the horizon.

John Gibson, a member of the ITC Committee and a former chair of the ITC shared that he has a very different perspective on how we got to this issue and about the roles of the various players mentioned in the report. He explained that, as chair of the IT Committee last year, he wasn’t aware of the issue and its importance and how it was hitting people. Therefore, as the chair of the committee, he didn’t push that committee to make anything out of it. He learned about the significance of this issue through the Agenda Committee’s work this year. His experience and observation is that AT has actually been at the forefront for pushing on this issue, talking to the provost and talking to USNH to get it fixed. But, the report and the motion don’t reflect that assessment, including the 8th point calling for affirmative action to monitor AT for 5 years with yearly compliance audits. John said that the whole thing is written as if it was malice or, at best, callous indifference, and this does not comport with his experience.
John also said that there are a number of inaccuracies in the 8 points of the motion in connection with
the various organizations named and this needs to be cleaned up. For example, UNH HR is not
involved. Instead, USNH HR is involved. IT doesn’t have anything to do with this.

Scott asked John or anyone else who has concerns or other ideas to contact him in writing about this so
that the Agenda Committee can review the feedback at their Thursday meeting. Scott pointed out that
the main thing for us is that the warning be published so that it is recognized that there is a problem

A member of the Agenda Committee said that while she respects John and the ITC’s perspective, this
is a critical issue, even if it is a small number of faculty. We cannot finish this year out without doing
something to address it. She pointed out that she has two pre-tenure colleagues who are affected by this
name issue and it is critical to protect the faculty who are impacted.

Scott said that we want to get this motion right and to reach an appropriate tone.

The motion will lay over until the next meeting.

XIV. Honors College Report presented by Catherine Peebles, Director, UNH Honors Program – The
Senate chair introduced Catherine Peebles to provide an overview of the work her committee has done.
She was charged by the president to offer an aspirational view of what the Honors Program or College
should be. This report is not going to be enacted without further Faculty Senate input. We are at an
aspirational phase. Senators should reach out to Catherine with any questions or thoughts.

XV. New Business – Lori Hopkins encouraged Senators to talk to their department colleagues about
the upcoming 5th of May and to ask them to encourage students to be culturally sensitive. She said that
we avoided problems last year because there was a lot of chatter about it on campus after problems two
years ago.

Scott also reminded the Senate that Saturday is Unity Day.

XVI. Adjournment - The meeting was adjourned at 5:02 pm.

List of common UNH Acronyms

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