Meeting called to order at 3:10 pm on September 23, 2019

MINUTES SUMMARY

I. Roll – The following senators were absent: Ballestero, Feldman, Kies, Kim, Knezevic, Merenda, and Minocha. The following senators were excused: Andrews, Coppens, Hiller, Ikegami, and Subrena Smith. The following guests attended: Wayne Jones, Pelema Morrice, and Barbara White.

II. Remarks by and questions to Pelema Morrice, vice provost for enrollment management – Provost Wayne Jones introduced the newest member of the leadership team, Dr. Pelema Maurice. Pelema shared that he was delighted to be at UNH. His background includes work at Great Bay Community College, University of Missouri, Bryn Mawr College, and the University of Nebraska, Omaha. About UNH, he said that we have work to do. He is hoping for some good long-term planning and some good short-term planning so that UNH is positioned for success in the future. Pelema opened the floor for questions:

Question: Last year there was a big push to move UNH admissions to be SAT optional and I am wondering what your attitude is on this and what progress there is with this?

Pelema: I am excited that UNH made that decision. There will be lots of things to learn in the first year that will important for us to be mindful of in terms of how that affects the applicant pool. It usually does come with some financial repercussions and that is what we have to dig into this year so that we can figure out what that looks like because it does tend make the applicant pool one that we need more resources for.

Question: One of the things we talked about is initiatives to get more faculty into New Hampshire high schools. Have you had a chance to think about that or do you have experience with similar initiatives and whether or not we should be investing our faculty time in visiting high schools?

Pelema: Normally, what we what end up doing in environments that I am in is we provide an opportunity to faculty and we let individual departments and colleges figure out how to structure that.

Question: I wonder if you can offer what you think of online undergraduate education as an enrollment strategy.

Pelema: Good question. I think I will have to learn about what everybody else feels. There are different approaches to this work. My approach is that we don’t drive those decisions. We actually work in concert with the community and those decisions are made in the schools and colleges and at the provost level. We support the academic mission wherever those decisions are made. Online education can be a tool for some programs in some areas. But that is not in our purview.
III. Remarks by and questions to the provost - Provost Jones walked through a set of slides (See Appendix A) and also offered the following additional information:

- Enrollment is down by 300 students from what was projected for full time, first time freshman. However, we are currently at 100 students above what we projected in the budget. However, the actual results won’t be known until R + 30. Wayne explained that there were several strategies put in place in the areas of orientation and first engagement (out of retention teams) and it is expected that this has had a positive effect on our enrollments. He also shared that strategies implemented in other areas of the university are very encouraging. Professional Masters is up significantly, online education is up, Manchester numbers are up, and transfer numbers are flat to a little up. Enrollment for PhD students is up, including at UNH Law. The new ADA approved executive JD program at UNH Law came in at double the enrollment compared to projections for the first year.

- The search for a Senior Vice Provost for Research is in the finalist stage. Wayne said that he was very pleased with the diversity and quality of the pool.

- The CEPS dean search is about to kick off. Erin Bell, chair of Civil and Environmental Engineering, and Megan Carpenter, dean of UNH Law, will be co-chairs.

- In connection with the CFO search, we did not close the loop with the top candidate from the CFO search in the first round. That search is still open and there are 2 or 3 current candidates that are qualified, and they may be invited to campus. In the meantime, Catherine Provencher has been appointed as an interim CFO. Catherine was the state treasurer and has been working at the System Office for about 4 years. She has agreed to spend 2 days a week here. Wayne said that he is excited that she will help to bridge the gap with how the university and the system do budgeting.

- In connection with the budget, UNH ended very strong for 2019, largely because of two one-time “plus ups.” A post retirement plus up that showed up in July for FY 19 added $7 million and in December/January the stock market was down and then the market came roaring back, so the endowment looked very good for the first 6 months of 2019. As a result, we posted a margin that was better than we expected. The result was a margin of 2.5 plus .1 or .2 additional. The Board stuck with their commitment that they were not holding us to the 3.0 margin. More importantly, they said that the windfall money could be used to leverage forward for some strategic initiatives.

For AY20 we posted a budget that was at 3.0 but we are now working with the board to get some margin relief. Some of that will be app. $3 million in strategic money that we are deploying right now. $1 million is for marketing/advertising support for our graduate and our undergraduate programs. The other $2 million is for a series of projects about which you will receive communication in a week or two. After R+30 we are hoping we might be able to deploy a couple of million more based on requests from deans.

- Wayne shared information about the Huron Consulting project. He explained that he has worked with Huron in the past and President Dean is familiar with them from their work at UNC. Huron works with about 100 research universities across the country, including all of the top 50 universities. They will be working with us on a flat rate model. They will be bringing 8 people to campus on a full-time basis for the next 12 weeks. In addition, they bring experts from their pool of 500 in different areas. The timeline for their work is displayed in the slides.
Huron will be doing a deep dive into 66 different data sets across the organization and they are going to be doing follow up conversations in specific areas where they see opportunity. Their first task is to talk with every RC head, every BSC director, and every #2, (associate deans, etc.) They will then explore different areas, process functions across the university, where they are seeing that, compared to other research universities, there are inefficiencies and opportunities for cost saving. They will compare us to ourselves and to other universities to identify opportunities for improvement and process. Wayne said that we are not looking for vertical information. Instead, they are looking for process improvement across the whole organization. Their next step is to identify 18 areas where there are opportunities - maybe from efficiency, coordination, maybe removing policy barriers - and they will estimate cost savings. The steering committee, which includes faculty, staff, and students, will make recommendations on which of these 18 areas they see the most opportunity with a plan to dig deeper into 6 or 7 areas. The Faculty Senate rep on the steering committee is Scott Ollinger. The last 6 weeks of the project will be a very deep dive. They will report out on specific incremental strategies that we can do.

The second part of the Huron work focuses on academic cost analysis. At UNH we have always looked at the cost structure as revenue only. Huron has developed a method of looking at degree by degree, to identify the cost of delivering that degree. That can lead to more robust conversations about how we in the academic organization might be able to do things differently. Wayne said that he told Huron that he doesn’t want recommendations at this phase. Instead, he is interested in the methodology. He wants to be able to share the cost relative to our revenue in order to brainstorm the college level and department level.

- On the topic of the Concurrent Credit Program, this pilot is allowing high school students to take some of our courses at their school with UNH training the teachers. The students will receive UNH credit. We are already accepting this kind of credit from other universities that are coming into high schools in the state. This program allows us to compete with them. Pinkerton Academy is the first high school that we are working with on computer science with UNH Manchester right now. A number of UNH departments have reached out about this program. Wayne explained that we need to see how the pilot goes before growing this. Wayne offered that he will share outcomes with the Senate before any decision is made to move forward. The administration is also receiving requests from many high schools.

- In connection with the retention initiatives, the four teams have delivered their reports. Funding has been given for 8 different initiatives of the 18 or so that were recommended. Wayne has asked each of the retention teams to develop an implementation plan about how to institutionalize the initiatives. As well, a search has been opened for a faculty fellow who will be driving that institutionalization. This position will report to Vasu and will working with academic advising, the associate deans in ASAC, and the deans’ offices to ensure that that the initiatives keep going.

- Wayne announced that there is a purchase and sale agreement with a developer for 66 Madbury Road for the construction of graduate student housing. This project will include 140 units of graduate student only housing that will be targeted directly to UNH graduate students. It will be a mixed-use facility that will include some retail space and parking. The negotiations require that the cost of the housing must be below market rate and linked to the current cost for Forest Park. Increases will be based on the cost of inflation. The project will also include family housing for graduate students. Because the property will generate property tax, any children of graduate students in the building will be able to attend the ORSD schools without the university paying fees for this purpose.
The provost opened the floor for questions.

- In response to a question about the lecturers’ contract, Wayne said that the negotiations didn’t go as fast as he wanted last year. He and President Dean are committed to moving forward as fast as they can. The last meeting was very productive and, if we stay on that positive pace, he would love to get it done by this semester.

- A question was asked about how the results of the Huron deep dive will be communicated. Wayne explained that a webpage will be up soon off of the provost page and off of the Unh.edulfuture page (https://www.unh.edu/main/future-of-unh/financial-strength.) The webpage will include information about 1) the steering committee 2) most of the slide deck from Huron’s presentation to the steering committee and 3) weekly updates.

In the area of updates, Wayne will be making arrangements to go around to all colleges to share more detail on the budget, more on Huron as we learn more, and about the student success initiatives. He has started the “all chairs” meetings again. There will be two this semester and three next semester.

- Wayne was asked to speak about the post-doctoral diversity fellowships. Last year we came up with 5 lines and advertised with UNC Chapel Hill since they have a robust program. We got some strong candidates, made 3 offers, and landed one. Wayne shared that this year he has been working with the deans and he believes that every college will have at least one line this year. The call for applicants is out now and we are getting ready to advertise it to the diversity associations. The page https://www.unh.edu/engagement/postdoctoral-diversity-and-innovation-scholars will be up on October 1 with an application deadline of February. We have solid funding for 5 positions with the hope of landing 4 candidates.

- Wayne shared that UNH has slipped in the US News and World Report rankings again. Institutional Research is doing some work to try to understand how we can go up in so many categories and still slip in the rankings.

Wayne did share a slide showing that UNH made top 10 in the country in the category of 4-year graduation rate for 4-year public institutions. Wayne said that he is sharing because this is the kind of metrics we care about – student success. (See: https://www.chronicle.com/article/Colleges-With-the-Highest-and/246882)

IV. Remarks by and question to the Chair - Chair David Bachrach said that the convocation at the end of August went very well. But there is no recording available. More information will be available soon about a post convocation survey.

On October 15 (a Tuesday with a Monday schedule) senators are scheduled to hold caucus meetings with their deans. David suggested that senators can send any agenda item suggestions directly to their dean in advance or to David for forwarding to the dean.

The myElements FAR survey ends on September 25. Ann Bartow suggested that a shareable link to the survey be distributed to senators for easy sharing with faculty colleagues. Kathy will send out the shareable link today.

Members of the Agenda Committee joined many of the Senate committees last week in an effort to help explain the charges and answer questions. Please be sure to contact David or any members of the Agenda Committee for help along the way.
There are a number of university-wide committee positions to fill. David shared a slide of these positions and Kathy will send out information by Email. Senators were asked to nominate someone or themselves to fill these positions.

V. Approval of the Senate minutes from August 26, 2019 - It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of August 26, 2019. Changes were suggested in items II, VII, and VIII. Thus adjusted, the minutes were unanimously approved with no abstentions.

VI. One-minute reports - The chair reviewed this new feature of the Senate agenda, explaining that this is an opportunity for committee chairs to provide a brief update on the work of their committee. Senators should contact any chairs after the meeting or by email if they have any comments or questions.

Joe Dwyer, chair of Academic Affairs Committee, reported that the main charge being worked on right now is the 5-year calendar, specifically the 2024-25 calendar.

Lisa MacFarlane, Chair of Academic Program Committee, shared that there are charges are 1) to make recommendations about extending the date by which students, particularly first year students, can drop a class in the fall 2) to provide a list of potential metrics for academic success that are qualitative, not necessary quantitative. The recommendation will be coming in January and 3) to conduct an analysis of whether or not UNH should go to a 5 course x 3 credit model. The due date for this charge is not until the end of the academic year. The committee has divided into three groups to canvas colleagues, stakeholders and constituents. As well, the committee is working to stay in close touch with the Discovery Review Committee and the AAC.

Ed Hinson, chair of the Campus Planning Committee, reported that committee members have been assigned to monitor the university wide committees within their purview, including CORPAD (University Committee on Real Property Acquisition and Disposal), Transportation Policy Committee, SAARC, and the Energy Task Force. As well, they are in the process of lining up administrators to interview.

Bill Knowles, chair of the Finance and Administration Committee, reported that Rob McGann met with the group to review enrollment information, including the fact that the discount rate is now 33 to 34%. They are waiting for a breakdown of the cost of tuition from employees and their children. Deb Dutton and Kerry Scala are scheduled to come talk to the committee.

Michel Charpentier, chair of the Information Technology Committee, shared that the committee has been focused on security issues including user passwords, two-factor authentication, and computer patching. A representative from the IT Security Committee has been meeting with the group. As well, members of the committee have been assigned to the various university wide IT committees so that they can keep an ear on what is happening.

John Hasseldine, chair of the Library committee, reported that the committee met with the dean of the library to receive an overview of the state of the library, including a look at national trends that are affecting UNH as well, particularly with financial budget matters. The committee is looking at the subscription structure which is a difficult area for the library because some of the journal publishers continue to raise their prices beyond inflation rates. John explained that this Friday, department chairs and library reps will get an email about a journal cancellation exercise that is taking place. Feedback will be taken through October 18 with lists developed by November 1. This also connects to another charge which is how the liaison system works.
Bill Woodward, chair of the Student Affairs Committee, explained that the committee has 9 charges. They are currently working on a motion about chosen name and also about the costs and benefits of CFAR. Bill said that this is an important topic since there is just a handful of people who support students who are not keeping up in courses. Dani Adler and Donna Perez talked to the committee about what it is like in the trenches and also gave suggestions about letters that go out to students who have been dismissed from the university. The current letter used is not very friendly and doesn’t share information about resources and information about how to reapply. Bill said that it looks like we will be recommending more staff for CFAR. Bill will also be presenting a motion today about a pilot program for 5-week evaluations. Finally, the group is interviewing PACS.

Subrena Smith, the chair of the Research and Professional Service Committee, was not available. She will report at the next Senate meeting.

VII. Student Affairs Committee motion on relief from mid-semester report for participants in Early Assessment Pilot - Bill Woodward, chair of the Student Affairs Committee, presented the following motion:

Rationale: As part of the university’s retention efforts led by the Provost’s Office, a small group of faculty members in key courses have been asked to take part in a pilot program to conduct earlier assessments of student progress, around week five, which the committee under Brett Gibson (Associate Dean, COLA) found to be consistent with best practices. This assessment will be initiated through MyWildcatSuccess. However, Student Rights, Rules and Responsibilities (07.12(fs)) mandates progress reports to be given “shortly after mid-semester” in all courses though WebCat. The following motion is meant to free those instructors participating in the pilot from having to complete a second assessment later in the semester.”

Motion: Instructors participating in the early assessment pilot program under the Provost’s Office retention efforts are not required, as mandated by SRRR, article 07.12(fs), to complete the mandated mid-semester progress reports for freshmen and transfer students. This motion is valid only for AY2019–2020.

Scott Smith made a motion to suspend the rules which mandate that a motion must lay over until the next meeting before a vote is taken. He explained that the next meeting of the Senate is in late October and that waiting until then would render the motion moot.

The motion was seconded. There was no discussion on the motion to suspend the rules. A vote was taken, and the motion passed.

In connection with the original motion, there was a suggestion to spell out “Student Rights, Rules and Responsibilities” instead of the using the acronym in the motion. The committee had no objections to the suggestion.

Scott Smith shared that the Registrar’s office has no problems with this motion, and they have a method to take care of any logistical issues for implementing it. The Registrar’s Office has also agreed that they could accommodate faculty who want to do the normal mid-semester progress report in addition to this earlier version.
The motion, amended as follows, was presented for a vote:

**Motion:** Instructors participating in the early assessment pilot program under the Provost’s Office retention efforts are not required, as mandated by *Student Rights, Rules and Responsibilities*, article 07.12(fs), to complete the mandated mid-semester progress reports for freshmen and transfer students. This motion is valid only for AY2019–2020.

The motion, as amended, passed unanimously with 49 in favor and 4 abstentions.

VIII. Agenda Committee motion to amend the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate to reflect new and renamed departments - Jim Connell, on behalf of the Agenda Committee, explained that the Senate has a constitution and bylaws. One of the duties in article 4 of the bylaws is for the Agenda Committee to keep the list of departments and units that are eligible to elect senate members up to date. The bylaws can be amended by a simple majority.

Jim presented the following motion:

**Agenda Committee Motion to Amend the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate to Reflect New and Renamed Departments**

**Rationale:** The Faculty Senate Bylaws, Article 4, lists University departments or units for purposes of membership, and further states, “The Agenda Committee is responsible for monitoring this list annually.” The College of Liberal Arts has established a new department eligible for Faculty Senate Representation, while a department in the College of Engineering and Physical Sciences has a new name. Pursuant to Article 4, the Agenda Committee hereby submits the following motion.

**Motion:** The table listing departments in Article 4 of the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate of the University of New Hampshire is amended to include “Women’s and Gender Studies” and to replace “Physics” with “Physics and Astronomy”; the table shall be suitably adjusted to keep the list in alphabetical order.

There was no discussion. The motion will lay over until the next meeting.

IX. Update on Discovery Review Committee (DRC) – Scott Smith shared that the DRC has had two meetings, both of which have been very productive with the focus being on ways to make the Discovery Program more flexible. One item of discussion has been a suggestion to move away from lab-based science work to science literacy for non-science majors. This may be a controversial matter.

Another focus is on the size of the Discovery Program. No conclusions have been made at this point. A survey was conducted of deans and chairs about the relative size of the major to the Discovery program. Scott reported that the current size appears to not be overly problematic as long as we can be a little more flexible about how it is organized.

X. Conversation with Barbara White on NECHE preparations for the 2023 self-study – Barbara introduced herself as a professor in the Occupational Therapy Department and as the former director of the Discovery Program. She explained that she helped the university with the ten-year self-study in 2013/2014 and was asked to continue on to do some similar work. She has worked on the refresh for the strategic plan and she facilitated the 5-year interim NECHE report. As well she has participated as a peer reviewer for several of our peer institutions.
Barbara presented information (see slides in Appendix B) about where we are and what our plan and goals are for the next few years to prepare for 2023 when our assessment is due.

Following the presentation, Barbara offered to take questions:

**Question:** This is obviously a complicated process. Why isn’t the workflow already established? We have administrative structures in each college/school and department chairs. If the goal of UNH is for every department to give learning outcomes on their website or for syllabi to have this information, it would seem to be an easy initiative. We already have to provide our syllabi. Why do we need additional structures and committees? Is there someone in every college looking at the syllabi?

**Barbara:** Unless things have changed dramatically when I stepped away from the Discovery program two 2 years ago there were departments on campus that didn’t collect syllabi. So, we had to track down syllabi. My college has external accreditors but not every college does, so it is not familiar to some colleges. There isn’t an infrastructure to track that. But we need to fully engage in doing that. So, I think maybe a committee to touch base with areas that need the most help may not be a bad idea.

In particular, COLSA and COLA are areas where there aren’t student learning objectives across the board in all departments. Paul College has them mostly, Law has them, and COLSA has some but not across the board. HHS yes, except for Kinesiology, and CEPS is fine. We have a mixed bag across campus, and I agree that we should all be participating. I’ll let Wayne speak to it.

**Wayne Jones:** It is a great question and I am relatively new in the role. I thank Barbara for her effort. She has been a single voice in the darkness trying to track this and has done a wonderful job for UNH. I asked a similar question and there are 2 approaches. One approach is to hire people that do this full time and to create an office and invest money in it. The other approach is to take our existing processes and tighten them up. So, for example, as pointed out correctly, UNH has a pretty good process for program review and has for a number of years. If we turn on that, it has to include this. Then, that is an internal process and we can add an additional requirement, but it doesn’t require us to pour resources into an office that does that. We still have an office for support for Barbara.

Another thing that we can link it to is carrots and sticks on what the faculty wants to do. But the program review is the key. When the Deans and I talked about it we liked this structure. We liked the idea of pulling faculty and administrators together to ride herd on this. But rather than making them do all the work, I think that building it into our existing systems is the right solution.

**Scott Smith:** I am extremely interested in the documented compliance with federal credit hours. The reason why is about 3 years ago the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) was told that we might be out of compliance by having 3 credit hours of class and 4 credit hours given. I teach a class that meets 3 hours a week and the reported hours that they put into class is 4. I teach a 4 day a week class and the reported hours they put into class is 9. We have a deeply inconsistent application of our credit delivery in some ways. Is it enough to say to students that I expect you to spend 9 to 12 hours outside of class with the expectation that they may or may not do it?

**Barbara:** To be truthful, none of us have control over what our students do outside of our classroom. All we can do is stay transparent to them what we expect of them. So, I think that from a reviewer perspective, this faculty member has put forth a reasonable expectation for the amount of credit hours conferred. Whether they do it or not we can’t control.
Scott Smith: The reviewers can look at the document evaluations and see a range of hours. Do they do that? Or do they accept the syllabus?

Barbara: On the ones that I have participated in no one has dug deep to make a match between what the students have done vs. what the faculty has requested or expected. That is like in health care giving a prescription and then being responsible for the patient to take the prescription. No one can be responsible for that. We can’t unless we are hovering over our students. What we can do is be up front and tell them what we expect of them and make a robust syllabus that has work that looks like it fits. When I have looked at syllabi for other institutions, I am looking to see if they have, first of all, 12 hours of work per week for a 4 credit course. Do they have a listing that shows 14 weeks’ worth of topics. Sometimes it is done in a 4-week immersion course. But you can get a sense that there is a whole lot of meat in there that matches with what the faculty member is expecting. If that is the case, that looks like a really well-done syllabus. I don’t think anyone would go any deeper than that to make the match.

Scott: One of the fears is that NECHE will say that our credit hours don’t match the number of face to face hours. Do we have any reason to fear that they will all come after to us for that? I remember that Brown university took it upon themselves to revisit the 4-credit model and they went to a “per face time” hour credit model and it took a lot of work and a lot of grinding and sweat and tears. Is that possible or unlikely?

Barbara: If, when they are on campus, we don’t demonstrate that we are giving appropriate credit to a 4- credit course, that could come back at us. I think what we could do is be proactive about that and just make it so that when you have a 4-credit course you are doing 4 credits worth of work, that you are expecting it. That would serve us well rather than to upheave the entire system that we have. So, if we have a number of course and syllabi where we are light on that, I suppose they could come and say, you say you offer 4 credits, but doesn’t look like everyone is offering 4 credit. So, I think it behooves us to be proactive.

Lisa MacFarlane: in 2013 we made that argument, particularly for the courses that were 4 credits but met for 3 contact hours, that part of how we were meeting the federal definition of a credit hour was through the additional work that we expected the student to do. In 2013 that was acceptable. Was it acceptable in 2018 for the 5-year review?

Barbara: They don’t do a site review at the 5-year mark. But, if they were to come to campus now and look at some of the syllabi that I pulled the other day, we would get a check for not being clear about how we were doing that. The standards have changed. They are not going on inference anymore.

Jo Laird: How many credits do you give for a lab.

Barbara: That depends on your department. If I remember correctly 11.5 hours a week for a D lab in the Discovery Program. So, we have, as an institution, agreed that if you are going to get a Discovery lab credit you have to be in lab for 1.5 hours equivalent for at least 10 weeks over the semester of a 14 week semester.

Jo: If you have class for 3 hours and a lab for 2.5 hours, is that 6 hours?

Barbara: It sounds to me that you have your students engaged in 6 hours of contact time per week in a semester and you probably have work that you expect to do in addition to that. So, if you are offering 4
credits for that, it seems to be pretty easy to say that you are expecting them to do 12 hours’ worth of work a week.

**Adele Marone:** We have students that are in class for their 3 contacts hours (50 minutes, 3 times a week) and then do a lab but still only get 4 credits. Sometimes they are in lab in 4 hours for some courses. So, how does that compare to someone in a Discovery course that meets 3 times a week with not a big expectation outside of the classroom and they get 4 credits too? It just doesn’t seem that there is equity there in the distribution of the credit hours.

**Barbara:** There have always been differences in disciplines in how we engage our students in different ways. That is also honoring that we are an institution with all different kinds of disciplines. So, some of our colleagues might have reading books as a substantial amount of time of their credits and that absolutely is within their discipline. We might have them in a lab doing mechanical engineering or chemistry in another one and that it is also an appropriate way to have them spend time. I don’t know if there is any way to, without stepping on academic freedom, have that look like it is equitable, but I think that we have to assume and believe that it is.

**Question:** As we go back to our departments is it best for us to say not just how many hours per week, but to be specific about actual assignments?

**Barbara:** Engaged time. That is your best bet. If you say engaged time for assignments, in class, online, doing research, watching a performance, it could be anything that has them working with your content in that course in a meaningful way and all of that counts.

**Question:** I am hearing you say 12 hours for a 4-credit course. Is that the recommendation that is coming from NECHE?

**Barbara:** 12 credit compliance is 1 hour per week of engaged time per credit inferred over a 14-week period. So, in a 3-credit course it would 9 hours and a 4-credit course it would be 12. That makes our students working a 50 hours week.

**Question:** Can you clarify the Academic Assistant Inventory that you were hoping to revitalize? Is the idea there that as the different programs and departments are generating student learning outcomes the committee has a bird’s eye view and is able to see the lay of the land in terms of good learning outcomes and to see if there is any coherence or guidance? What is the benefit of that?

**Barbara:** It is a good tracker that every program has some marker, some event, some culminating experience that if a student is participating in it and they are successful in that participation that they have achieved something in our program that we have set them up to achieve. There is also a form that is called a Series E form. That is the form that really has the student learning outcomes tracked so that you can see that every department has student learning objectives for each program or degree. With the AAI I think we are going to work on blending it into what NECHE requires in a big form and put that as an additional feature of the final event. What it really did, I think, and what they liked about it is that it showed the landscape of all the different things we have our students doing and it is really a nice marker of the variable successes that are all over this whole institution. So, it is a nice tracker for us. It also helped us in the Discovery Program in trying to track capstones. It has been a feather in our cap, that we have a capstone experience. Not all institutions have that. So, for us to have had that is one of the things that they really liked about us, that we had myriad ways that we were capturing student successes. We do a nice job, but we have a few things that we have to tighten up.
Michel Charpentier: 2 separate things. One is that there is already a motion from the Senate from February 2012 that describes that all of the things that we count toward hours of work. So, if people are curious about this, they can go back to it.  

The second thing is that in CEPS all of our programs in our department are already accredited by ABET. Am I correct in assuming that we can leverage what we do for ABET and use it for this accreditation?

Barb: Yes, absolutely. Looking at CEPS and all the websites, it is an easy job.

Jim Connell: Just a reminder that not every department in CEPS is ABET accredited. So, the habits, to some extent, are there.

Barbara: In psychology we call it behavioral momentum.

Barbara - When your colleges name folks - Law and Library has already named a liaison - I am hoping that between the liaison and myself we will be able to check in and see how you are doing and if you need help. If we need to meet department by department, we will do that. I think it would be nice to have a Senate connection, at least for being able to have conversations about or touch in with folks about how things are going, or if there are concerns. This is for us.

The chair thanked Barbara for sharing with the Senate.

XI. New Business – No new business.

XII. Adjournment - The meeting was adjourned at 5:56 pm.

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>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>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</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>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPENDIX A**

Remarks by Provost Jones
Project Timeline Overview

The project will follow a four-task, twelve-week engagement with checkpoints for deliverables and Steering Committee feedback.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Tasks</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 1 - Project Initiation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2 - Opportunity Identification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3 - Hypothesis Development and Testing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4 - Solution Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other stakeholders to participate in project meetings include the Deans' Council, Cabinet, Academic Standards and Advising Committee, Faculty Senate, Budgeting and Financial Planning Group.

Initial Project Scope

Based on initial discussions with UNH and Huron's experience conducting similar reviews at other institutions, we have recommended the following eighteen (18) focus areas for our initial phase of work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Auxiliaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Service Delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement &amp; Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement &amp; Strategic Sourcing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Business Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition &amp; Financial Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the above focus areas, Huron will partner with the Academic Program Costs Team to review UNH's academic portfolio, providing a platform for greater insights into the distribution of academic resources.
Status of UNH Concurrent Credit Pilot

- Concurrent Credit Pilot formally announced August 22, 2019 and branded as “UNH First Step”
- Pinkerton Academy named as pilot launch partner
- First Step has been well-received by NH high school community with several schools across a range of subjects expressing interest in participating in pilot
  - Schools: Bow, Manchester Central, Alvirne, Concord, Londonderry, Merrimack, Manchester Memorial, Manchester Central, Campbell, Nashua, Manchester West, ConVal, Bishop Brady
  - Subjects: Computer Science, Chemistry, Theater, Dance, Anatomy & Physiology, Journalism, English, Graphic Design, ESOL, Math, Biology
- Pilot is beginning this Fall with a year-long programming course at Pinkerton earning current credit in one, semester-long course at UNH
  - Pinkerton course being taught by UNH CS program graduate
  - Pinkerton students will earn 6 high school credits concurrently with 4 credits in UNH COMP 424
  - For pilot, Pinkerton students will not be allowed to register for both First Step and Running Start credit
  - Registration opens September 16 week
  - OTHER departments (Theater and Dance at UNH) have expressed an interest in creating a similar program.

2019 Results

THE CHRONICLE OF HIGHER EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Bachelor's-degree-seeking adjusted cohort</th>
<th>Graduated within 4 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>College of William &amp; Mary</td>
<td>1,481</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>U. of North Carolina at Chapel Hill</td>
<td>4,019</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>U. of California at Los Angeles</td>
<td>5,791</td>
<td>74.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>U.S. Merchant Marine Academy</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>College of New Jersey</td>
<td>1,371</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Binghamton U.</td>
<td>2,402</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>U. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign</td>
<td>7,240</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>U. of Connecticut</td>
<td>3,271</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>St. Mary's College of Maryland</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>U. of New Hampshire</td>
<td>2,794</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B
Slides from Barbara White’s presentation

NECHE
New England Commission on Higher Education
Planning ahead for 2023

As a reminder

• NECHE is our regional accreditor, approved by Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA).
• There are 7 accreditation bodies across the US: NECHE’s area includes Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont and international schools.
• NECHE reports to the USDE and accreditation is required for all federal funding
• Accreditation is optimal for recruitment and retention of students

Educational effectiveness, accountability, transparency


Regional accreditors vary by how heavy-handed they were in implementing.
- 2019 CHEA report that just 51 percent to 75 percent of their programs and institutions provide adequate evidence of student learning, indicating there is room for further development.

NECHE, in New England and oldest accreditation body in higher ed, has been last to fully comply to transparency in educational effectiveness, per pressure from USDE, bringing us into closer alignment with other agencies across US.

• Standards modified in 2016 to strengthen accountability in educational effectiveness, including a new Standard 8 (Ed Effectiveness)
• In 2018, NECHE breaks away from NEASC, which remains focused on k-12.
What does this mean for us?

- Historically, NECHE (NEASC) has designated APR and learning outcomes as areas that we need to address.
- Further, the Ed Effectiveness standard #8 carries greater requirement for objective evidence over inference (e.g. Learning expectations, federal credit hour).

1/16/15 Final decision re: 10 year accreditation (commission mtg 2014)

Areas we needed to address in fall 2018 5-year interim report

1/2019: Response from commission regarding the 5 yr. interim report submitted 8/15/18

- Excellent news:
  1. NECHE likes our direction in developing learning outcomes and reflective assessment
  2. We tightened up APR calendar and compliance
  3. We “rock” at gathering multiple metrics of student success

Durham, NH 03824-3529

Dear President Dear:

I write to inform you that at its meeting on November 16, 2018, the New England Commission of Higher Education conducted the reviews submitted by University of New Hampshire and voted to take the following action:

- that the interim (fifteen-year) report submitted by University of New Hampshire be accepted;
- that the information submitted by University of New Hampshire regarding the accreditation status of its Master of Public Health program with the Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH) be accepted;
- that the University provide an update on the accreditation status of its Master of Public Health program when CEPH next takes action, prior to December 31, 2019, on the program’s accreditation status;
- that the comprehensive evaluation scheduled for Fall 2023 be continued;

that, in addition to the information included in all self-studies, the self-study prepared in advance of the Fall 2023 evaluation give continued emphasis to those of the items specified for attention in the Fall 2018 interim report and to its success in an additional manner:

1. continuing to implement a comprehensive approach to assessing student learning and using the results for improvement, including a regular review of all of the University’s academic programs;
2. updating the strategic plan and developing metrics to measure success in achieving its goals;
3. continuing to give attention to meeting the goal to increase the diversity of its undergraduate student body and to close the gap in success rates between minority students and students of color.
Key areas of focus we need to address for 2023

1. We need to reach 100% compliance in student learning objectives (SLO’s) across all programs and they must be visible on websites. We stalled after 2018 mid-term report was submitted, at ~ 65% for non-accredited programs
   - Post SLO’s on all program websites (see CEPS for exemplars)

2. We need to demonstrate reflective assessment (self-study) of some aspect of student learning/development in each program
   - Objective evidence must be made available (randomly) to peer reviewers that we do this systematically and that we use it for making any needed changes in our curricula
   - Many programs do this effectively already but a large number of programs will need to develop plans that make sense for their disciplines or document what they are doing for public view
   - Revitalize the Academic Assessment Inventory (AAI) --- dropped after our 10 year review. NECHE likes it because it demonstrates system wide measures of educational effectiveness across all programs

Key areas of focus we need to address for 2023 continued...

3. We need more efficient tracking of APR documents, timelines, decisions.
   - Develop coordinated systems of tracking ed effectiveness metrics and MONITOR to ensure that everyone is participating.
   - Need a more systematic method for receiving the information/data for APR’s (IR&A)

4. We need to ensure NECHE compliance in transparency
   - All syllabi contain key essential elements (e.g. SLO’s, grading expectations, clear & objective compliance with federal credit hour). They do not have to look the same but they all need specific elements.
   - Websites
     - Have SLO’s posted up front
     - Relevant professional/disciplinary metrics easy to find (e.g. pass rates on regional/national exams, etc.)

In the absence of an educational effectiveness office, we have to share this work

- This work exemplifies shared governance.
- Suggest a senate committee to work with Provost’s office.
- In addition to Provost’s office and Faculty Fellow, we have asked each college to name a representative to coordinate efforts and work with departments.
Action steps to address Standard 8 (Ed Effectiveness), delegated among faculty, colleges, administration

Captains: Deans in colleges/schools; designated faculty “coordinators”, dept. chairs, IR&A

- Develop coordinated systems of tracking ed effectiveness metrics and MONITOR to ensure that everyone is participating.
  - Example: APR BOX folder uploads
  - Example: IR&A, grad school, etc.

- Reach 100% compliance in SLO’s across all programs. We stalled after report was submitted, at ~65% for non-accredited programs.
  - Post SLO’s on all program websites (see CEPS for exemplars)

- Develop and implement reflective assessment in each program

- Revitalize the AAI (or an alternative) -- dropped after our 10 year review

- Ensure NECHE compliance in transparency
  - All syllabi contain essential elements (e.g. SLO’s, grading expectations, documented compliance with federal credit hour)
  - Websites
    - Have SLO’s posted up front
    - Relevant professional/disciplinary metrics easy to find (e.g. pass rates on regional/national exams, etc.)

Captains: VPAA, Provost’s office fellow, CEITL, college/school faculty coordinators, department faculty

- Develop coordinated systems of tracking ed effectiveness metrics and MONITOR to ensure that everyone is participating.
  - Example: APR BOX folder uploads
  - Example: IR&A, grad school, etc.

- Reach 100% compliance in SLO’s across all programs. We stalled after report was submitted, at ~65% for non-accredited programs.
  - Post SLO’s on all program websites (see CEPS for exemplars)

- Develop and implement reflective assessment in each program

- Revitalize the AAI (or an alternative) -- dropped after our 10 year review

- Ensure NECHE compliance in transparency
  - All syllabi contain essential elements (e.g. SLO’s, grading expectations, documented compliance with federal credit hour)
  - Websites
    - Have SLO’s posted up front
    - Relevant professional/disciplinary metrics easy to find (e.g. pass rates on regional/national exams, etc.)