Meeting called to order at 3:12 p.m. on September 17, 2018

I. Roll – The following senators were absent: Ballestero, Bauer, Gibson, Knezevic, Minocha, Neefus, Shipe, Simos, and Swift were absent. Byam and Wilder were excused. Wayne Jones, Cliff Brown, and Catherine Moran were guests.

II. Remarks by and Questions to the Interim Provost, Wayne Jones - Wayne opened the meeting with news that he would staying for the full length of the meeting and that he is hoping to bring some of the deans with him to future meetings so that they can get a better feel for the work that the senate does.

Wayne focused his comments on two subjects. First, the deans have collectively said that this year they are going to make a major push around student retention. The student retention teams are now populated and there are a couple of faculty senators on every team:

1) first year experience
2) early assessment and engagement of freshmen
3) one on sophomore year
4) finances and other challenges

These groups are up and running. Wayne hopes that by the time of the next faculty senate meeting he will be able to give an update from each team. Wayne offered that if senators have any ideas - for example if you or a colleague who is teaching one of the large gateway courses, where we can take some action to have an impact on retention, or if you have colleagues who would like to come together - he would be delighted to find some resources to pull folks together. Wayne said that it is going to take all of us to have an impact in this area and he is counting on everyone to help.

The second topic Wayne talked about relates to a series of meetings that some faculty may be involved with soon. The last 2 years have not been smooth in terms of the budgetary situation. Wayne has been working hard in the last 3 or 4 months with Vice President Chris Clement to try to build a common path so that UNH can avoid big financial swings and mid-year budget cuts. In response to bad communication – in both directions – Wayne and the office of the VPFA plan to meet with groups on campus to do three things: 1) share what has been going on with the finances of the university over the past few years 2) unpack what went wrong last year and explain where the headwinds were, including headwinds external to UNH, and 3) unpack what we learned during the last 12 months and what we are
going to do differently going forward, including how we are going to get more engaged and provide more communication.

Wayne explained that the presentation is being rolled out right now to groups on campus and that the presentation will be made to the faculty senate.

Wayne opened the floor for questions:

Q: What is the Status on the T-School? Are the tenured faculty assigned spots?

Wayne: The way that rolled out last year was interesting. But one common theme we are working on is trying to make sure that in every case we possibly can we can find a landing place. I know that we are not 100% in terms of finding a landing place. We are working on it now. The TSchool faculty have asked to meet with me and president Dean and we are going to try to arrange that meeting so that we can have a conversation. Our goal would be that, in response to the market, that the streamlining of the Thompson School will move forward. But, we would prefer to find a placement for every faculty member that we possibly can. We are close but not at 100%.

Q: David Bachrach: What is the target on the retention issue? How many students are we trying to increase and retain?

Wayne: Last year we had a retention rate of about 86%. 86% is good. The national average is about 19 percentage points lower than that. But, if you look at our peers in New England that barely gets us into the top 10. In fact, we may not be in the top 10. As I look at peers there are research universities that have a commitment to student success like we do. I see no reason we shouldn’t be above 90%. I have said to the deans and what I am saying to our retention teams is we want to get that up above 90% as soon as we possibly can. And, to put some body count behind that, for UNH that would work out to about 150 students. That is a significant bottom line benefit but, more importantly, it is contributing to the student success which is what we are all about. And, it is going to help our graduation rate.

Q: Bill Woodward: At the Liberal Arts faculty meeting last week the interim dean, Michelle Dillon, suggested it was about qualitative retention, more than quantitative. I thought that was a helpful balance to the numbers. She mentioned keeping an eye on students who are not performing well. I’m in the Psychology Dept. Try to be aware of family circumstances, and depression, insomnia, all those intangibles that might be underlying. That really means one on one and noticing when someone is underperforming.

Wayne: I think you are absolutely right, Bill. Oftentimes what the student needs is some level of engagement. Those faculty that are teaching the large gateway courses, those are places where right around now – that 3rd week – is a critical juncture. They are getting their first quizzes back, students that never saw a “C” before are in an environment where a “C” is not a bad first grade. We have to be sensitive to that and listening. I appreciate the comment. Qualitative as well as quantitative.

Q: Does UNH have data about whether there is overrepresentation among certain groups of who drops out? One theory might be family troubles or a bad exam score when you aren’t used to. But, we know
from literature that there are certain demographic groups as well that are especially vulnerable. Do we have that in UNH data?

Wayne: We do have data. But, it is not as robust or longitudinal as I would like it to be. We didn’t really start paying attention until very recently. In some cases, we only have a year or two of data broken all the way out. We have looked at that data by college. We have looked at it by whether they have a major or are undecided, regardless of what college they are in. We have looked at it by gender, by race, by ethnicity, by first generation, by socioeconomic background and we are in the process of unpacking that data. Two things are very very clear: that strong retention rate that we have does not show up for all of our students. It shows up in our graduation rate where UNH as a whole is at 76 or 77%. But, we have some populations that are 50%. I haven’t seen specific retention numbers by population. But, we got similar drops of 10 to 20% retention. That is, actually, in my opinion, our first target areas. Rather than saying we are going to take every course at UNH and implement an early assessment strategy - which would be great - it is not realistic. Instead, if we can identify those populations that we can support better and help them feel engaged and give them that critical support they need when they need it and if we can target those gateway courses where we know we have significant losses and try to find some additional ways to support for early retention that is what we are targeting. The group that is chaired by Brett Gibson is focusing on the early assessment piece and the group that is focusing on the “early in the program” piece is chaired by Neil Niman of the Paul School – those are the two that are early impact. I’m actually also excited about the sophomore group because the sophomore group shows the same trends as the freshmen group and yet we have never really had a strategy there.

III. Faculty Unions - Scott introduced guests Cliff Brown from the tenure track chapter of AAUP and Catherine Moran, President of UNH Lecturers United, AAUP to speak.

Catherine shared that members of the two unions are visiting as many departments and organizations as possible before October 1st, in part because of the recent Supreme Court Janus decision. As well, they are trying to get out in front of their constituents for the respective unions to engage about what members would like to see from their unions. They want to put faces to the unions and do more direct outreach so that all who are covered by the bargaining agreements have the opportunity to see them, to have their voices heard, and to raise any issues or concerns. They are also trying to engage membership. As a result of the Janus decision, public sector unions can only collect agency fees on an opt-in basis from non-members of the union.

Catherine explained that if you are already a member of your union no action is needed. But, if you are not a member and you were an agency fee payer, you can sign on as a fair share payer on an opt-in basis. She further explained that having a voice in your union is important. During discussions with administration a high membership level gives the union representatives a stronger voice in speaking for the respective units. Also, union members have the prerogative to help set the priorities for the union. However, she clarified that the unions cover all of the people who are members in the bargaining unit, irrespective of whether you are a member or not. This includes grievance proceedings and any sort of contract defense, as well as the goodies, including negotiated raises or benefits as these apply to all. She reiterated that you are all covered by the contact, whether you are a union member or not. If you are not a member of the union, a fair share payer status gives you a chance to pay a share of what you are getting out of the union.
Cliff explained that, as part of this initiative, members of the Lecturers United as well as the Tenure Track union are going around to department meetings and also knocking on individual doors to have one-on-one conversations. There is some urgency because HR has asked that members who want to join the union or start paying a fair share do so before October 1st. He noted that if one wants to continue as a non-union member but contribute fees, this is an opt-in situation now and one now needs to make that decision before October 1st – or probably wait another year to sign up. Cliff shared that they have gotten a really good response from individual faculty members and departments and that currently 20 or so departments have 100% union membership. Those departments are heavily concentrated in the liberal arts, but not exclusively. There are also a number of departments at 98% membership where one person hasn’t joined. He emphasized again that if, previously, you were not a member but contributed to the union through agency fees, that disappears after October 1st.

Cliff offered that Mike Carter, president of the tenure track union, as well Catherine or himself, are happy to address questions. He indicated that he would be leaving flyers, one for AAUP and one for Lecturers United, on the table for senators to take. The flyers have the weblinks for signing up as a member or fair share payer as well as more info about the Janus decision.

Scott closed out the discussion by reviewing that the faculty senate does sometimes discuss items that pertain to the union. But, the senate is not to act on these items.

IV. Remarks by and questions to the chair

• Scott asked senators to use the microphone, if possible, for substantive questions or comments and to provide their name and department. If it is a simple question the presenter can repeat the question for all to hear. Scott advised that this will help Kathy prepare accurate minutes.

• Scott shared that the faculty senate, in parallel with the administrative leadership, will be participating in a SWOT analysis, a process to analyze the UNH’s strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats. He explained that he would prefer that the faculty senate do their analysis independently rather than respond to the administration’s analysis. The senate’s SWOT analysis will start out with a Qualtrics survey and this will be sent out soon. Scott asked that senators respond to the survey as soon as possible so that we can deliberate over the results at the next senate meeting.

Wayne added that the goal is to have the SWOT analyses completed across campus by the end of October. He indicated that there is also an interest in collecting responses to the question “What would you like to see the university be in 5 years?” This will take place after the SWOT analysis.

• Scott offered the floor to Dan Chavez, chair of the senate Library Committee. Dan shared that the library is trying to change its agreement with the consortia that manages the sale of large packages of journals. This effort involves identifying journals that are not frequently consulted. A list of journal subscriptions that are being considered for cancellation, both paper and electronic, have been distributed to the library liaison for each department. Dan asked the faculty to flag journals that are crucial for research or classes and notify the liaison to ask that the journal not be canceled. October 1st is the first deadline for the first round of review. There will be second round of review after that.
Dan assured the senators that we are not losing any power of searching or database access. That will still be there. As well, even if a journal is cut, articles can be obtained via interlibrary loan with a usual turnaround time of 24 to 48 hours.

One senator asked what sort of information needs to be provided when requesting that a journal not be deleted and how the feedback from faculty will be weighed. Dan responded that Jen Carroll will be the contact and that requests will be subject to negotiation.

- Scott shared that the Agenda Committee recently discussed the continuing problem of food insecurity among UNH students and he proposed that a collection bin be available at senate meetings for food donations. The food will be delivered to the Cornucopia Food Pantry in Durham after each meeting. Waysmeet Center has a list of suggested food items and staples that are appropriate for students. There were no objections to this proposal.

Cristy Beemer asked if a report that 25% of UNH students are hungry was true and where this information came from. Lori Hopkins responded that a senior thesis by a nutrition student was done 2 years ago on this subject. Lori clarified that the issue is more about food vulnerability or insecurity rather than flat out not having food. The study included reports from app. 900 students showed that about 25% of UNH students are not getting nutritious food.

Lori also shared that Larry Brickner-Wood from the Waysmeet Center has anecdotally reported that, while this used to be more of an issue with graduate students, he has seen a rise in every kind of student in terms of their vulnerability in connection with food and housing. Cornucopia provides “student only” food pantry hours on Wednesdays. Lori also shared that the number of hours students are working has gone up exponentially and it is not unusual to see students working 30 hours a week. (Link provided by Lori Hopkins)

A senator asked if one could contribute a meal pass for a student. Scott shared that there is a “Swipe It Forward” program that allows Ted Kirkpatrick, in cases of extreme need, to give students a certain number of free swipes. (https://www.unh.edu/dining/swipe-it-forward) Scott understands that there are discussions going on to expand this program.

- Scott explained that we need an additional senator to serve on the University Curriculum and Academic Policies Committee (UCAPC) in order to meet the requirement that at least two members of UCPAC are also faculty senators. Currently, only one senator, Drew Conroy, is a member of UCAPC. Jim Connell shared some information about the responsibilities of UCAPC, explaining that it mainly deals with conflicts over curriculum between colleges. David Bachrach spoke to the time commitment as he has been on the committee for the past 2 years. During the year when the Sustainability major went through there was a substantial time commitment—app. 50 hours over the course of the year. And, the next year, when no cases were assigned to UCAPC, there was a 15-minute time commitment for the year.

No nominations were made in response to Scott’s email sent out the previous week. Therefore, Scott asked for nominations from the floor. Buzz Scherr nominated Tama Andrews to fill this UCAPC seat. A voice vote was taken, and the nomination was accepted unanimously with no abstentions.
V. Approval of the Senate minutes from August 27, Session XXIII - It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the August 27th meeting of Senate Session XXIII. Corrections were offered in Items II, III, and V. Thus adjusted, the minutes were unanimously approved.

One senator offered his complement to the administrative assistant for the level of detail provided in the minutes.

VI. Motion to Amend the Senate Constitution - Jim Connell, on behalf of the Agenda Committee, reintroduced the motion to amend the constitution to add the Academic Program Committee:

Motion: To amend the Faculty Senate Constitution, Article 6, Committees, Section b. Standing Committees, by inserting the following new paragraph after paragraph 1.:

2. The Academic Program Committee will concern itself with the University's long-term plans and strategic initiatives, as well as any major changes or issues requiring particularly extensive study or deliberations related to the academic mission.

The succeeding paragraphs (currently 2-7) are to be renumbered accordingly (3-8)

Jim explained that this motion arises from the vast differences in the amount of work that the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) sometimes has compared to other committees. An attempt was made following the inclusion of CCLEAR faculty and the expansion of the senate to try to remedy this by having the committee form 2 or 3 subcommittees. However, this has not seemed to have worked as well as was hoped.

The motion allows for a new committee, Academic Program Committee (APC). Jim reminded the group that Shelley Mulligan had pointed out at the last meeting that the descriptions of the AAC and the APC were almost the same. Jim explained that this is a deliberate ambiguity since we don’t know what the future will hold, and the agenda committee would like to have the flexibility to divide the work load in an equitable manner. Jim said that the main goal is work load and the second goal is flexibility to deal with what we cannot possibly anticipate right now.

The motion was put to a vote and passed with 63 in favor and 4 abstentions.

Jim Connell presented the motion to amend the Bylaws to include the Academic Program Committee:

Motion: to amend Article 6 of the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate to add a new row to the table, under “Academic Affairs” and above “Campus Planning,” titled “Academic Program” that lists (as for Academic Affairs) the “Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dean's Council.”

The motion was put to a vote and passed with 64 in favor and 3 abstentions.
VII. GaoKao initiative – Jim Connell explained that the following motion was introduced at the August 27 senate meeting:

**Motion to rescind Motion XXIII-M1 on conditional admission post-Gaokao students until the administration provides details on how to implement the presence of Gaokao students.**

Jim explained that the motion was introduced and seconded at the last meeting and debate was closed. He reviewed the senate’s standing rule that motions that are substantive have to be voted on at the following meeting and also that a motion to close debate only applies to that first meeting and not to the next meeting. Therefore, the senate can resume debate. Jim also explained that there are various options of what can be done with the motion at this point. The senate can pass it, withdraw it, send it to committee, or vote to postpone it for a period of time or indefinitely.

Buzz Scherr explained that he made the motion at the last meeting and that he did so because he was unsatisfied with the candor with which the senate acquired information from the administration about the details of how the Gaokao initiative was conceived and formulated without virtually any attention to shared governance. Buzz explained that, since then, the agenda committee, particularly Scott, has found out more and laid it out in detail in an email. Buzz now feels that there is a more transparent version of what occurred and a recognition by the administration that shared governance was not followed in an appropriate way in that circumstance. Buzz said that he is now satisfied based on what Scott reported. So, having gotten what he wanted from making the motion, he would like to withdraw the motion. Scott asked for any objections. No objections were given.

Scott said that he looks forward to the faculty senate working with university leadership to create new structures to ensure the positive outcomes of internationalization efforts. He shared that he and David Bachrach are planning to meet with Victoria and Rob once a month on efforts to engage with the broad university to create the circumstances that will allow us to recruit and also retain international students. Scott said that he was very optimistic that we are entering a new phase in relations with university leadership and he is pleased that he had some leverage from the faculty senate in discussing the Gaokao situation. But, he is also glad to have come to a good conclusion and can now look forward.

Regina Smick-Attisano shared that, while she applauds taking the motion back, and that the explanation was satisfactory, she does want to share again her concerns about shared governance. She said that the Thompson School has yet to receive a good explanation about what happened to them and that there was no shared governance. She hopes that, in going forward, we will see a difference but, if not, we won’t just get a cursory explanation and that will be that. She said that this is too important and with faculty losing their positions it is not something to gloss over.

Scott indicated that he agreed that it is important for the faculty senate to have the power, but also the will, to communicate and vice versa. Scott said that he believes we are moving in the right direction and that he is hopeful that we can insist on shared governance and also make sure that we do communicate our ideas as well.

Scott explained that when he and David spoke to Victoria and Rob there was a preliminary agreement to create a faculty-dominated group that would be called upon for issues of recruitment, especially in the area of internationalization. In connection with this goal Erin Sharp and Lori Hopkins prepared and
presented the following resolution on behalf of the Agenda Committee. Scott explained that we can’t mandate some of these things. But, we can resolve that these things are important to us.

**Motion: Resolution from Agenda Committee on the Recruitment of International Students**

WHEREAS, UNH continues to engage new initiatives designed to recruit international students to the University, such as the recent efforts to recruit Chinese Students post-Gaokao exam through a relationship with WholeRen Education Group;

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate is the legislative body that reviews and develops policies concerned with the academic mission of the University, and has a responsibility for shared governance, and must therefore be concerned with any actions that impact the academic mission;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate reinforces its endorsement of the support structures, outlined by the Agenda Committee in Motion XXIII-M1 Conditional Admission of Post-Gaokao Students, needed to provide for the academic success of international undergraduate students admitted to UNH;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate urges the UNH Administration to place the academic mission of the University and student success at the forefront of all efforts aimed at increasing international student enrollment;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate encourages the UNH Administration to seek faculty insight and rely on their expertise early and often in all efforts to increase international student enrollment.

Erin shared that the responsibility for how successful these students are when they come to UNH is a responsibility of academic administrators, faculty, and the faculty senate and that it is important that we understand how the academic side of the administration is looking at the success of these students.

There were no comments. Scott advised that the agenda committee would take any feedback off-line. The motion will lay over until the next meeting.

VIII. Vice Chair’s report on actions taken on Senate motions from Session XII - David Bachrach explained that it is important for the work of the senate that the motions passed are actually implemented by administrative leadership. He shared this report based on his review of motions passed by the senate last year:

**Report on Motions Passed During the 2017-2018 Session of the Faculty Senate (XXII)**

- Motion #XXII-M1 on model of mutual respect. **Has been adopted.**
- Motion #XXII-M2 establishing process for converting first reading day in Spring semester to make up class day. **Implemented**
- Motion #XXII-M3 to establish a policy for reimbursement of mileage for senators who are required to use personal vehicle for official senate business. **Implemented**
• Motion #XXII-M4 approval of 5 year UNH E-Calendar. **Implemented**
• Motion #XXII- M5 urging all units located off of UNH-Durham Campus to establish a reimbursement policy for senate representatives traveling to senate and senate committee meetings. **UNHM and UNH-LAW deans will reimburse for travel to Durham for full senate meetings and ask that senators participate in committee meetings remotely through zoom.**
• Motion #XXII-M6 to adopt newly drafted charter to the Discovery Committee. **Implemented.**
• Motion #XXII-M7 urging of COLA dean to end pause on double counting. **Implemented**
• Motion #XXII-M8 disallowing classes during common exam blocks. **Procedures have been put into place to minimize this occurrence.**
• Motion #XXII-M9 regarding the maintenance of an AED in each regularly occupied campus building. **Implemented**
• Motion #XXII-M10 regarding the interpretation of exam policy in last week of classes. **This motion is being forwarded by the Provost’s Office to all associate deans, and department chairs.**
• Motion #XXII- M11 on the use of Enlight and inclusion of the Durham Book Exchange. **Implemented**
• Motion #XXII- M12 on pushing back student course evaluations in 8 week courses. **P. T. Vasudevan implemented**
• Motion #XXII-M13 on developing test-optional admissions. **Implementation scheduled for the fall of 2020.**
• Motion #XXII-M14 urges UNH administration to develop and make clear to the faculty their policies and procedures for closing or significant alteration of any academic programs. **Waiting for information from the provost’s office**
• Motion #XXII-15 for four semesters that 1. Minimum GPA for UNH-faculty led and managed study abroad programs be 2.0, 2. Students can be undeclared and have 12 earned UNH credits to establish GPA to participate in UNH-faculty led programs, 3. Individual study abroad faculty program directors and coordinators may create additional standards as dictated by the needs of their programs. **Waiting for information from the vice provost’s office for international programs (Kerryellen Vroman).**
• Motion #XXII-16 that the faculty senate agrees in principle with the proposed “policy on conflicts of interest in start-up companies, but cannot approve them as written for the following reasons: 1. Any such committees must have a majority of faculty as voting members, 2. Any such policy must have clear and adequate provisions to protect the interests of existing start-up companies. **The policy that the provost’s office is willing to bring forward will not use the term grand-fathering but will simply go into effect for all startups created after 1 July 2018. Part 1 of the senate motion is not consistent with the provost’s plan, which calls for a faculty advisor group, who may have input the process. This part of the motion will have to be discussed again by the senate and the provost’s office.**

David explained that most of the motions have been implemented and that some of them that have not been implemented merit discussion, in particular the motion related to the Thompson School (Motion #XXII-M14). He advised that he sent a notice to the provost office asking for information and Wayne did write back and said that they are working on it and will give us information as soon as they can.

In response to a question about Motion #XXII-15 about student requirements for study abroad, David is still waiting to hear back from Kerryellen Vroman. Scott shared that COLA has enacted it and is
working on a college response to it. So, he thinks that the implementation may be handled by the individual colleges.

There were several questions about the status of Motion #XXII-M13 on developing test-optional admissions. Several senators who had worked on this motion explained that the motion provided guidance to the Admissions Office and included details about what information the senate would need in order to make a decision about test-optional admissions. Therefore, the status of “implementation scheduled for 2020” is concerning since it is not clear if that is when Admissions will consider this initiative or implement it. David agreed to follow up with Admissions to get clarification.

David said that the other policy that is now in flux involves the Motion #XXII-16 on the policy on faculty and start-ups. There is disagreement between the provost office and the faculty senate regarding what it means for the faculty to have voting rights over various decisions made by the administration regarding start-ups. David Finkelhor, chair of the Research and Public Policy Committee, asked for more information about this. Bachrach explained that his understanding is that Vice Provost Marc Sedam did not fully accept the motion passed by the senate and, in particular didn’t like the word “grandfathering” of start-ups. But, did say that they would not apply the policy to any start-ups from before July of this year. So, in that area they were in agreement with the faculty.

Bachrach explained that Marc Sedam said explicitly that he did not accept the senate’s discussion of a majority of faculty voting members on the committee relating to start-ups because of fiduciary responsibility. So, there is a significant area of disagreement there. Scott suggested that the Research and Public Policy Committee might get this issue back to look further into it. David Finkelhor remarked that he believes this is an issue for the new provost and Marc Sedam to work on. Scott said that he will make sure that he and David Bachrach are involved and will follow up on this issue, especially since there was an agreement with the previous provost and the new provost was not aware of that agreement.

Marc Hiller asked about the motion involving AEDs. David explained that he heard from the Police Chief and he was assured that all the local and state ordinances regarding AEDs have been fully implemented and that all machines were regularly checked.

Marc Hiller asked about the senate motion for a tobacco free campus (from 2017, Motion #XXI-M13) Scott shared that he did mention this to Jim Dean and we will press that issue and remind him of the motion.

Danielle Pillet- Shore shared information about a motion that was passed in 2016 (Motion XX-M20) when the Campus Planning Committee and the faculty senate requested additional lactation rooms after completing a study of comparable institutions. In 2016 there were only two lactation rooms and they were geographically close together. Danielle reported that the university has now added two additional lactation rooms and they are fully operational, one at West Edge Drive, Room 103 and one in Morse Hall. She noted that there is a website to book a room (https://www.unh.edu/hr/lactation-resources). Danielle asked that senators share word about this with their students, faculty and staff.

Scott pointed out that there is also an outstanding from March of 2016 about the Teaching Evaluation Standards Motion (Motion # XX-M1) and this will require the senate to talk to CEITL to develop a plan for how to implement this motion.
Scott thanked David for presenting the update on last year’s motions so early in the semester.

IX. Academic Future: Scott asked the senate members to consider the academic future of the university and whether we want to provide some guidance to the university leadership. Scott asked for a frank and open discussion of issues that pertain to the academic mission. He asked what senators want the Agenda Committee to think about. He explained that we have charges and planning meetings, but, there may be other charges that are more pressing or interesting that have not been considered. Scott shared that he wants to think about improving the academic climate on campus.

Senators shared their thoughts as follows:

Erin Sharp: I talked to a faculty member recently who asked if the senate was considering making SAT scores optional and their concern about the quality of students. I personally bristle at that because I was not a very strong HS student. I flunked out my first attempt. So, I bristle at the idea of teaching only these super high-quality students, however we define quality. But, I do think we are in a budget crisis. We need students and I think our admissions standards have changed over time and I think we need to consider what type of institution we want to be and how we think about student quality. I don’t think the SAT is an indicator of student quality and I wonder does it change our vision of UNH to be more a school of access? What are we defining ourselves as? I think it is an important discussion. I think we should be able to teach a wide range of students in terms of the abilities that they come to us with. But, if we keep lowering standards what does that mean? Or, are we lowering standards? And what kind of support services do we offer to the students if we are changing our standards?

David Bachrach: I would like to add that in terms of supporting our students we have done a very good job in helping students with challenges on campus. With physical challenges, in some cases with identifiable challenges that are reported to the SAS [Student Accessibility Services] office. We have not done as good a job with invisible disabilities that students who come to us with, including executive function challenges such ADHD. I would like to see faculty and administration work together to figure out how we can help all of our students and put them in a position to succeed. And, in some cases, that may mean a lot more one-on-one work – not just by faculty but by resources on campus in a more systematic way and I think the senate can help lead the way on that.

Elsa Upham: Ted Kirkpatrick came to our SAC meeting on Monday and he seems to be very aware that there are lots of student issues that are not being dealt with and he said that, in his mind, now is the time to re-find a way of thinking about student support. He seems to be on the same wavelength as we are. I don’t know if it is the change of administration that is also bringing, not necessarily new good will, but will in different directions. But, I think that this may be a good time to address that.

Buzz Scherr: One of the things the university has got to do over the next 5 or 10 years is to become more nimble in responding to changes in the culture and the educational environment, nationally and internationally. I have been working on developing a number of new programs, the online program for the law school, different programs that are also online. UNH Manchester is working on an accelerated master’s program, involving homeland security and our master’s program in international criminal law and justice. What I see in the university is we are strangling ourselves with - understandable, but difficult – processes for getting new programs approved. It takes nine months to a year to get a new
program approved. It is counterproductive if we want to be nimble and responsive to the new environment. I would suggest that this would be a valuable focus for the agenda committee.

Scott added that he had an interview with a candidate once who was astounded it took nine months to get something innovative done. I agree, Buzz, and I will add it to the agenda for the agenda committee.

Andrew Seal: In response to the reports about the number of students experiencing food insecurities and an increase in hours worked, we seem to have relatively poor data on that. I think that this is something that the faculty senate can spearhead - a collection of better data. I think that is something many other universities are doing. It is important in publicizing, but also in gathering data, if we can duplicate some of those efforts here. That is a very important.

Regina Smick-Attisano: Further to what Erin was talking about, one of the things - I have been here for 21 years - that we lose sight of is that we are the University of New Hampshire, not the Harvard of northern New England. And sometimes I think we forget about our constituency and who we are serving as a public university which might help people in Concord be a little more generous to us. And, further to what Buzz said, if we were nimble and things that come up, for example, micro-credentialing, we could respond. We are really slow at making those kind of changes that might help us to gather some of those students that go other places than UNH that live here in our state.

Jim Ramsay: I wanted to echo something that was just said – Erin’s point as well as Buzz’s point - I don’t know how radical this is. But, I’m wondering where the conversation might be around undergraduate online education. In terms of reaching new publics and financial issues and the fact that people are not swarming into New England and the fact that we have markets that we can bring our brand to all over the place that we are just not doing. So, we (UNH Manchester) do almost everything right now online, except for a couple of Gen Ed categories. We do a ton of courses online and we just don’t cluster anything into a degree. I don’t think we are far from that concept. But, I think that it is worthwhile asking that question.

Scott: One thing we need to consider is our online presence and how far do we go into online education. Do we want to strategically think about certain places that make sense, or do we want to go more broadly? I think the issue is that UNH doesn’t have resources for broad scale online education like a Yale. We need to be strategic about it. But, we also need the data and one thing that we have been doing over the last 10 years is tracking the number of online courses to see the percentage and that is something that we are going to have to do this year and see where we are and then think strategically what it is the faculty think we should do. I think that is a very important conversation.

Buzz Scherr: I’m very much an advocate of online education, especially in the area of the law school. The UNH Law School has a national reputation in internationalization and intellectual property law and we have an online program in intellectual property law. We believe that Concord NH is the center of the universe. Of course, there are some doubters. And, they will take master’s program and LLMs in patent law. We are now experimenting with what I call “pop-up certificate” programs. For example, we have developed one in Blockchain law and cryptocurrencies and another one I’m working on with Mike McCann, our Sports Law guy, sports wagering and integrity. The US Supreme Court has said that states can have sports betting and there are going to be lots of regulators. The idea behind these “pop up certificates” is they may evolve into a master’s program. They may remain a certificate program but
bring in law students that are all online from around the country. Or, they may be a flash in the pan with 2 years of high enrollment and then it tails off. We now, at the Law School, have the nimbleness to develop those programs pretty quickly. I think getting the university as a whole to think broadly about certificate programs and “pop up” programs in the online space in specialty areas that we are known for can be very successful.

David Bachrach: We saw the SWOT diagram on the screen. One of the dangers that UNH faces as a brick and mortar institution is the same danger that a lot of the now defunct brick and mortar stores have. They are not able to compete against online competitors and some of them have not survived. One of the things that UNH needs to figure out and we, as a faculty, need to figure out is what is the value added that we provide that justifies a higher tuition cost for UNH versus some place like SNHU - which is cleaning our clock with internal NH students. We know that our education is better. How do we convince people on the outside that our education is better and worth more money? And we, as the faculty, have a big leadership role in that. It is not something we can leave to the administration.

Marc Hiller: With regard to our recruitment of HS seniors is there some sort of measure of assessing a student’s true interest and desire, that love of learning, that we can tap into as opposed to, as we have traditionally done, looking at SATs? Having been around UNH now for 40 years plus, I am seeing students who may or may not be good students but who do not convey that burning desire to learn and to achieve whatever their pursuits may be that I saw in the past. I sense that that lack of desire may be contributing to some of the attrition that we are seeing and also to not admitting students who could really gain considerably more from the environment that we offer and the education that they get here, simply because they aren’t high scorers on standardized testing.

Scott Smith: There is a committee working on thinking about how faculty can be more visible to the community and also to high schools. In other words, that our faculty can tell our story better than administrators -- I think that is a good thing. David and I are working behind the scenes with some other folks for thinking about creating a swat team of faculty members that may be able to go to high schools to meet with school counselors to tell our story. So, there are things that faculty can do to help these issues of finding the students who are eager to learn, encouraging them to come to UNH rather than SNHU or any other schools. I think it is our responsibility to, at least as much as the administrations, to do it for us. I do not want to leave the power in enrollment management to recruit students. I think we can do it even better.

Erin Sharp: I study adolescents and I am learning this from my dad who was an academic administrator - as long as there are teenagers there is a need for residential campuses and I think that it is true, especially given how much longer it is taking for teenagers to become adults these days. I personally don’t think that residential campuses are going away. But, I think that we at UNH can distinguish ourselves as being a place that does that really well. If you invest a lot in undergraduate online education to me that is taking what makes us unique and I think it comes back to retention because people don’t complete online classes. Very few complete an online degree and it is there for a certain kind of person. But, again, where are we? What are we committed to? I think we are committed to our students and our students’ success.

Bill Woodward: I want to offer a dissenting voice from someone who has lived for almost 5 years in Germany where they select who will get on a college track at age 10. Germany has great automotive
plants and they have great unisex haircutters because they train them and test them for 5 years. They don’t have everyone choosing college, less than 50% - maybe 30% going to universities. Everybody deserves excellence, but vocations are as mighty as college educations. I would like to hear from guidance counselors. Do you know that high schools have school career programs where K thru 12 they get exposure to careers? Someone who is doing school career programs can talk to us. How do we go about finding the passion in the right population? We are looking for retention. But, are we bringing in the right population that we want to retain?

Chris Reardon: I have been here long enough to go through two different presidential commissions on internationalizing the curriculum and so forth and I would like to know where we are standing right now on this. We just had a discussion about the foreign students coming here and then finding out that this environment is not as conducive for their studies. I would like to know what happened here. In addition, all of this talk that we have had since the early 90s – talking about internationalizing the curriculum, doing this and doing that. What have we done so far and what could we continue to do?

Scott Smith: I had a conversation with Jim Dean who realized that only BA students have a language requirement. We talk about internationalizing business, internationalizing science, etc. and we don’t have a language requirement. All he could say was “Wow!” With these kind of questions, we have to be willing to do this and we have to be willing to maybe make sacrifices in our college for the good of the whole university. But, I think that this is the first conversation to get there. Let’s find out what it is we really want to do and look for those outcomes.

Lori Hopkins: I wanted to respond to an increasing dialogue that is taking place about the question of going to university vs. vocational schools. One of the fears about jumping on that bandwagon is that there is a fear that, in a country that hasn’t dealt with race and class very well, we are really going to be excluding people in the same way that we are doing 50 to 100 years ago. So, we need to be very careful when we talk about that it may be hard to get plumbers or other vocational specialists at this point. But, I’m afraid about what kind of lesson will be told and to whom.

Jim Connell: One thing that UNH seems to be very good at – the people in this room and our colleagues seem to be good at – is mentoring students and we see that in the undergraduate research conference. In many respects we are what Nancy [Targett] used to call high touch experience and I certainly think that is one of our strengths.

Jordan Coulombe: I am a Ph.D. candidate in the History Department and president of the Graduate Student Senate. One thing that we are really facing this year is a housing crunch for graduate students, particularly with the imminent closure of Forest Park. If you haven’t heard Forest Park is going to be closing this coming July. Our challenge is that for international students and for students with families that is really the only option that they have for housing. We are working with the administration to look for a solution for this. But, at this moment we don’t really have a plan for years 2 and 3 and this is becoming more and more pressing as time goes on, particularly as a lot of graduate programs are already entering their recruitment period. So, we are going to be working on that and we are going to be coming to you in the future with some of our challenges with that. But, we really look forward to the faculty senate support on how to handle that.
Anita Tucker: I want to comment on the online program and the idea that we need to focus our efforts on online. I feel that online education is a social justice issue. And, that a lot of people who can’t afford to come to Durham – for graduate and undergraduate – I think online is the wave of the future and we can do it and do it well or someone else will do it for us. I think, at least in Social Work, we have kept it in-house. It is full, and we have a waiting list. It is high touch. For me, I was initially against it. But, I found that the students blossomed, the students got more face time with me. The pride students come out of the woodwork on discussion boards. So, I really think we need to think differently about academics and there is a way to touch people and connect with people and build relationships in an online environment, especially if students feel supported by their context and their limitations. Think about the north country and how we really support those students. Guess what? They are not coming here, and they may not go to college. So, I think we need to think really hard about this. I agree with Chris on this idea of internationalism. How about first serving the students of our state and then maybe how well are we serving the students internationally. Because I think sometimes we are not doing as good job in our state as we could be, and I think online is a part of that.

Scott: I do not expect that this is the last time we have this conversation. I think we need to think about this. The agenda committee will take this up. If you have other comments or concerns my door is always open Thursdays from 1 to 3. I have seen a bunch of you. Thank you for coming. So, hope to see some of you. I hope to have a lot of good ideas and then we can take this and make them to the administration.

X. New Business: Shelley Mulligan presented the AY 23–24 calendar on behalf of the Academic Affairs Committee with a motion as follows:

Motion Presented by the Academic Affairs Committee

Rationale: In order to maintain an approved 5-year Academic Calendar, the AY 23/24 must be reviewed and included as the last year of the 5-year Academic calendar.

Motion: The Faculty Senate approves the proposed 2023/24 Academic calendar as provided by the Office of the Registrar (see attachment provided). 2023/34 will be added as the last year of the 5-year calendar which includes the start and end dates for each of 5 terms throughout the calendar years starting from AY 2019/20 through AY 2023/24.

Shelley reviewed the calendars. Shelley also mentioned that one of the things to think about is whether we need a policy to deal with exam week when there is a snow event during that week. For 2023, final exams end on December 19th. So, one idea is to make December 20th a make-up day, if it was needed.

She pointed out that there is a curtailed operations make-up day or reading day on May 7th. That is an optional day, built into the calendar. In the event of a bad winter, with 4 or 5 snow days, this day could be used to make up a snow day.

There was a question about whether commencement will be on Memorial Day and it was confirmed that Memorial Day falls on the weekend after commencement.

There was a concern that students would be returning to campus on March 17th, St. Patrick’s Day, and that this could result in a high level of drinking that night and affect students the next day. One senator
pointed out that most colleges do take St. Patrick’s Day into account when they plan their spring break to ensure that the students are not together on campus on that day. She pointed out this is a very serious issue given the concerns about a drinking problem on campus. Shelley agreed that she will look into this concern. It was pointed out that in the current academic year we will face the same issue since St. Patrick’s Day, 2019, also falls on the Sunday when students are returning to campus.

There was a question about Jewish holidays and a commitment made in the past to checking these against the calendar. Shelley said that she will review the Jewish holidays. Scott shared that his understanding was that the bigger concern was with the event calendar and Jewish holidays and that there were discussions to ensure that we have every possible way to announce it so that everyone is aware of these sort of things.

The motion will lay over until the next meeting.

XI. Adjournment - Upon a motion and second to adjourn, the group voted to adjourn the meeting at 4:58 p.m.