Meeting called to order at 3:42 p.m. on November 7, 2016

I. Roll – The following senators were absent: Baldwin, Boucher, Bstieler, R. Collins, Edwards, Herold, Hasseldine, Puccilli, Sample, Taylor, and Warner. Barnett, Brewer, Carr, Hopkins, Kowalski, Simos, and Theimer were excused. Debbie Dutton was a guest.

II. Remarks by and questions to the Senate chair - Chair Dante Scala reported that the provost is unable to join us today because of President Obama’s visit to campus, which also has caused the reception scheduled for this evening at President Huddleston’s home to be postponed. When the new date for that reception has been determined, all senators will be informed.

Dante recalled that a senator had asked about the cap on out-of-state students enrolled at UNH at the last Senate meeting, and the waiver of that cap by the Board of Trustees. He reported that this limitation has been in place for many years, and that the Board of Trustees has the right to waive the cap, although not permanently. Thus, each year they waive the cap. As far as the chair knows, there is no way to make that waiver permanent.

III. Minutes – It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes from the October 24, 2016 meeting. With no corrections suggested, the minutes were approved unanimously as presented, with 5 abstentions.

IV. Motion from Agenda Committee to amend Senate bylaws to update corresponding administrator list – Emily Poworoznek, representing the Agenda Committee, shared the following motion with the Senate:

Rationale: as a matter of routine housekeeping, it was noted that the title of the position of the corresponding administrator to the Senate Campus Planning Committee has changed. Therefore, the Agenda Committee moves that:

Motion: Item 6 of the Bylaws is amended, updating it to the current version of the position title, to read that the Corresponding Administrator of the Faculty Senate Campus Planning Committee is the Associate Vice President of Facilities and Operations or his/her representatives.

A senator asked if there was any reason not to suspend Senate rules and vote on this motion today. The Agenda Committee agreed that there was not, and the senator moved to suspend the rules to
that end. His motion was seconded, and the group voted to suspend the rules, with 56 in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions.

No discussion was offered, and the motion to amend the bylaws was put to a vote, passing with 56 votes in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions.

V. Annual Summary Report, Senate Session XX – Past Senate chair, Deb Kinghorn, offered the following report on the activities of last year’s Senate:

*Report on Senate Session XX, Academic Year 2015-2016*

*Presented by Past Chair Deborah Kinghorn*

**Overview**

From a welcome from Chief Paul Dean congratulating us on a successful move-in to the resounding crack of the gavel at the final meeting of the session, Senate Session XX discussed many topics with 16 invited administrators and passed 34 motions. At the beginning of the year, Ham-Smith deconstruction began, the common exam time change went into effect, and we returned to a newly-approved lecturer’s contract. 3200 students began their college careers, testing the carrying capacity of our residence halls and classrooms. The Gallup Poll indicated that the public university experience was not appreciably different from the private one in a number of indicators. The new on-line add/drop system began successfully, and we embarked on the move from Blackboard to Canvas. We were deep into the search for a new Provost, as well as a new Dean for COLA and one for UNH-Manchester. The Curran Report on Professional Success and Career Planning was being considered in earnest, Navitas began its mandatory self-review, and Senate elections were conducted online via Qualtrics for the first time; elections included CCLEAR faculty for the first time.

Discussions that dominated throughout the year included: Title IX, the Central Budget Committee, the growth of top level administrative positions vs. faculty positions, and the salary disparities therein; changes to RCM and credit-hour weighting; the policy on Start-up Companies; teaching evaluation implementation, and the branding of the University, especially in the realm of website page access and control.

Senate elections were conducted online via Qualtrics for the first time; elections included CCLEAR faculty for the first time.

**Standing Committee Work**

*Agenda Committee, Deborah Kinghorn, Chair*

In addition to the preparation of the Senate’s agenda each week, The Agenda Committee undertook revision of the bylaws to accommodate the inclusion of CCLEAR faculty. Motions that grew out of this were: Standing committee operations would now reflect the introduction of sub-committees, especially for committees like the Academic Affairs Committee, which has a substantial workload each year; the members of the Agenda Committee must be tenured faculty; and the Agenda Committee is authorized to act on behalf of the Senate when it is between meetings (a power to be exercised only as a last
resort). The Senate retains the power to reverse any decisions made by the Agenda Committee in such circumstances. The AC also presented the motion that the UCAPC become the default faculty committee to approve courses without a college level or department home. The Discovery Committee was added as a permanent committee of the Senate. Undergraduate Student Senate and the Graduate Student Senate are also to be invited annually to appoint one student from each body to the Academic Affairs Committee, the Student Affairs Committee, and the Campus Planning Committee. Although they will not have voting privileges, this motion attempts to close the communication gap between the Senate and the students. The AC also created a new ad hoc committee to be called the Teaching Evaluation Committee, whose purpose is to explore best practices in teaching evaluation and report to the Senate their recommendations for appropriate procedures for evaluation of teaching at UNH.

**Academic Affairs Committee, Scott Smith, Chair**

This committee reviewed the Discovery Review Committee’s Report to the Senate. Their overall response was that Discovery, after only 6 years, was still too new for substantive changes in its makeup to be considered; however, they did introduce eight motions for consideration. These included:

- Senate passes [Motion XX-M28](#) for positive advocacy of Discovery 5-2-16
- Senate passes [Motion XX-M27](#) to encourage even distribution of Discovery seats 5-2-16
- Senate passes [Motion XX-M26](#) to end "decommissioning" of Discovery courses 5-2-16
- Senate passes [Motion XX-M25](#) on oversight authority of Discovery Committee 5-2-16
- Senate passes [Motion XX-M24](#) on double counting of Discovery courses 5-2-16
- Senate passes [Motion XX-M23](#) to leave Discovery Categories unchanged 5-2-16
- Senate passes [Motion XX-M22](#) to discontinue Discovery Dialogue 5-2-16
- Senate passes [Motion XX-M21](#) to retain Discovery writing and quantitative reasoning requirements 5-2-16

In addition, the AAC presented motions on increasing transfer credit from two year schools up to 72 credits; revising language for the Honors Program to allow those who graduated in September and December terms to participate in Convocation; cancelling classes on the Wednesday before Thanksgiving and ending the October break (to be reviewed this year); and instituting a two week add/drop period (down from three), with the first week being online, and the second on paper, and keeping the drop period to five weeks; and encouraged the registrar’s office to consider an email alert to late-add students to contact their instructor, and the creation of instructor-controlled wait lists. The AAC recommended continued monitoring of online courses and development of a policy to reduce the dependence on online courses. Along with the Student Affairs Committee and the Finance and Administration Committee, the AAC recommended a feasibility study on the cost of renovations of Hubbard Hall before continuing discussion of the possibility of a residential Honors College.
Finance and Administration Committee, Erin Sharp and Dan Innis, co-chairs

This committee’s work was hampered by lack of timely information from administration, and the breakdown of communications through the loss of the Central Budget Committee (CBC). This resulted in the motion to the administration to restore the CBC or put in place something similar so that faculty could be fully informed about budgetary matters, especially those related to the academic mission. The first motion called for a response by the end of January 2016; when this had not occurred, the committee presented another motion, which again called for the reformation of the CBC, and in addition, called for temporary suspension of the implementation of the revised RCM weightings until such time as the faculty could be informed by someone with knowledge in that area as to why the changes were made without faculty input. (While the replacement CBC is now formed, the administration has not, to my knowledge, suspended implementation of the revised RCM weightings.) The FAC also moved that the administration meet with its committee no less than twice a semester regarding all budgetary matters. They presented reports on where graduate tuition money goes as well as hiring trends between tenure-track, non-tenure-track, and administrative positions, with the recommendation to follow-up when data from the 2014-15 and 2015-16 is available.

Student Affairs Committee, Jo Laird, Chair

This committee studied and reported on the increased enrollment and its effect on residential halls. Many rooms were “built-up”, meaning more doubles and triples, and even residence lounges being used for dorm space. The administration said plans were in place for the reduction of student lounges being used for residence, and SAC encouraged the Senate to continue to monitor this situation. The committee also investigated background checks, focusing on the different checks required, who bears the burden of the cost, and the impact on programming. With the AAC, the SAC presented the motion to raise the Honors GPA from 3.4 to 3.5 for consistency. The committee reported that while the Professional Success and Career Planning initiative was good in intent, it questioned how 18 new career directors would be “found”, and particularly where the money would come from to support this initiative. Administration answered this by saying that staff positions were being re-shuffled to accommodate this plan.

Information Technology Committee, Siobhan Senier, Chair

This committee had good relations with administrator Terri Winters, and oversaw the migration from Blackboard to Canvas. It alerted IT/AT about the loss of “SafeAssign”, the plagiarism detection software on BB; deemed “HostChecker”, a program which checks for anti-virus software, as a reasonable addition, since it primarily affects staff and not faculty; called for IT/AT to investigate the potential loss of the BB portal for areas outside of course delivery; advised continued follow-up on the possible expansion of TEAL classrooms; and reported that the small pilot of the Open Educational Resources (OER) program would commence last year. It recommended that this year’s ITC make web governance a top priority.

Library Committee, Todd DeMitchell, Chair
The Library Committee worked closely with the new Dean of the Library, Tara Fulton. It presented reports on paper vs. on-line journals, demonstrating the complex educational and financial decisions faced by the library when choosing what to subscribe to and what to let go. This led to further investigation of funding for the library, which resulted in a report from the committee on the negative impact of level funding for the library acquisitions budget on the academic mission, advising the provost to take a strong look at this.

Research and Public Service Committee, David Finkelhor, Chair

This committee thoroughly investigated the proposed changes to the policy on Start-Up Companies. Many objections to the policy were raised in the Senate over the course of the year, but the predominant objections were to punitive measures directed at faculty who continue in a CEO role with their start-up company, including dismissal, and the lack of a grandfather clause to protect start-up companies already in operation. The administration was unable to make its case to the Senate, even after several visits to both the committee and to the full Senate, and the motion to endorse it was defeated. The committee advised that this matter should be taken up again by the current Senate.

Campus Planning Committee, John Carroll, Chair

In addition to updating the Senate on construction projects and general campus planning issues, the CPC brought three motions to the floor. First, it called on the administration to protect in perpetuity University lands as valuable academic assets. Second, it called for more lactation facilities on every campus. Finally, it called for administrative support and funding for high quality, affordable childcare for the UNH community. All three motions should be followed up this year to determine if implementation is occurring.

Permanent Committees

The Professional Standards Committee and the University Curriculum and Policies Committee had no business before them last year.

Ad-Hoc Committees

Teaching Evaluation Implementation Committee, Alberto Manalo

This committee put forth motions to revise questions 4, 6, and 10 on the evaluation form. It also, after much discussion on the Senate floor, moved that all evaluation of faculty be performed online beginning in the Fall of 2016. The Senate agreed that it would provide to deans and department chairs and the Provost appropriate adjustments for the weighting of student evaluations, should there be a difference between online and paper. This is to protect faculty in the process of advancement. It also called on the faculty to follow-up with a commitment to analyze evaluations for faculty from under-represented groups and women to determine implicit bias.
Committee on Calendar Options, Christine Shea, Chair

This committee presented a report to the Senate which reviewed current calendars and examined quantitative and qualitative evaluations of each proposed calendar option. As well, it included hundreds of comments gathered from faculty and students on the topic. On average, although some departments could see benefits, the overall results indicated that both faculty and students prefer the current calendar, and do not view any of the other options as a helpful change.

Invited Speakers

In addition to standing invitations to the President and the Provost:

Paul Dean, Chief of Police and Assistant Vice President for Public Safety and Risk Management
Sheila Curran (Curran Consulting Group, regarding Professional Success initiative)
Victoria Dutcher, Vice President for Enrollment Management
Terri Winters, Director of UNH IT Academic Technology
Tara Fulton, Dean of Library
David Richman, Chair, Discovery Review Committee
Barbara White, Chair, Discovery Committee
Joel Seligmann, Chief Communications Officer
Mica Stark, Associate Vice President for Public Affairs
Jaime Nolan, Associate Vice President for Community, Equity, and Diversity
Donna Marie Sorrentino, Title IX Coordinator
Jan Nisbet, Senior Vice Provost for Research
Kathy Cataneo, Office of Research Development
Mark Milutinovich, Office for Large Center Development
Debbie Dutton, Vice President for Advancement
Mark Sedam, Associate Vice President for Innovation and New Ventures
Bill Hersman, Professor, Physics

The chair accepted the past chair’s report and thanked her for her efforts.

VI. Conversation with Debbie Dutton, president of the UNH Foundation and VP for Advancement – Dante welcomed Debbie Dutton, President of the UNH Foundation and Vice President for Advancement, and asked her to update the Senate on the current campaign. Debbie said that we are in the final two-year public phase of the six-year campaign. The final goal, by June of 2018, is to raise $275 million. She noted that UNH’s fundraising program is still young, and so they selected a goal that is challenging but attainable, and said we have raised about $225 million so far, with $50 million to go. She noted the marked increase in donations received recently, up from an average of $15 million per year to about $40 million per year. She said that this increase is evidence of the love that alumni have for this institution, and their desire to see UNH thrive.

The funds raised are divided as follows: $86.2 million for student support, $16.6 million for research support, $79.7 million for program support, $6.7 million for faculty support and $39 million for capital purposes.
University-wide, she noted that $65 million of the funds available for financial aid are not restricted to specific scholars or departments, and that bequests are broadly designated.

She said that the categories for funds have been broadly designated so that donor passions can be aligned with UNH needs. Six years ago, the deans were asked to come up with suggestions for most-needed projects in their colleges. The Foundation tries to match up donors who come forward with various college needs. When large donations come in, the university has identified items that can be moved up in priority in order to better align donors’ foci with college and university needs.

A senator asked if there has been any feedback from donors regarding the negative press surrounding the use of the Morin donation. Debbie replied that it was difficult to have the university in that negative spotlight, but that those donors who have given more than $5,000 to the university have been in close contact. Some shared their concerns about the videoboard controversy, but Debbie reported that with one exception, once the donors heard the president’s rationale (which he also shared with the Senate a few weeks ago), they were supportive of the decision. She said that the president met with donors at a lunch before the homecoming football game, and made a number of conference calls to communicate with concerned donors.

She said that the majority of negative feedback they received has come from individuals who have actually not made any donations to the university to this point, many of whom are not alumni. She reported that she has answered hundreds of emails in this regard, and while she believes that the $275 million goal is not in trouble, she acknowledges that the annual fund may be challenged.
Another senator said that there has been a national discussion regarding what universities should do with their endowments. With UNH’s branding as an innovator in sustainability, he asked how much money will go towards programs in sustainability here. Deb replied that for now, it will be about $2 million. She said that sophisticated investors know that the smaller a pool they’re investing in the more limits it has in terms of that return. As investors look to maximize their return, it presents a challenge to find large donors willing to invest in a smaller fund, but she asserted that we have selected some excellent funds in that sustainable endowment, and said that there is more that we can do to marry our endowment with our brand pillar of sustainability.

The Senate chair asked if large donors have options as to how their donation will be spent, and Debbie said that they do.

A senator asked if there are guidelines or practices employed to foster socially-conscious investing, by using corporate screens to find appropriate investments. Debbie said that the Foundation seeks to find criteria to meet as many of the needs of current social causes as possible in order to meet the interests of investors. She said that Prime Buchholz is the Foundation’s asset advisor, and they have put together a number of primary funds. She is willing to share information about the large funds being employed for the sustainability option.

Another senator asked if she is aware of the percentage of graduates who are donating, and Debbie replied that it is about 7%. The Foundation has a goal to increase that to 10%, but Debbie said we are bucking a national trend over the last five years which see a decline in participation by graduates, although the average gift, nationally, is increasing.

A senator asked how donations are broken up between large and small donors. She said that there are thirty people on the Foundation Board, and those thirty have given almost $80 million. She noted that it is a very small number of donors who contribute a half million or more, and the next level would be from $100 thousand - $499 thousand. She said that there is a push to engage more people at the levels below that, to invite people to serve on advisory boards, come to events, and participate in donating in order to build a broader base and not rely solely on the few very large donors. She noted that there has been an influx of younger members of the Board, and an increase in $1-5 million donors. She offered to send a breakdown of those investor groups, if that would be helpful.

Another senator asked if donations of property could be made. Debbie said that this often happens, as it is a tax advantage to the donor. However, such donations are complicated, and often the property is sold by the university upon its receipt. She said the Foundation is working to make this process simpler for donors.

A senator asked if there were any large donors in mind who might provide the funds needed for a new creative arts center. Deb said that it is very hard to raise money for bricks and mortar projects; people like to contribute to scholarships and programs. She said that they are still looking for a donor to bring in who would work with faculty to create a plan in a symbiotic manner. She said that with the right plan, the right visuals, they are hoping for success in the future.
A senator said that he has made a few donations to the university in the past, and has noticed that it takes some time for his checks to clear. He also indicated that a collection sent by his department appears to have vanished altogether. Debbie called this information troubling and invited him to speak with her after the meeting to see if she could resolve the problem. She said that when funds are received by the Foundation, they are date-stamped and deposited promptly. She will look into this.

Another senator asked about the relationship between the foundation and the university. Debbie said that many institutions handle their foundations differently. The university and the foundation can be two totally separate entities, where the foundation charges fees in order to support itself. In such cases protections exist to keep things separate.

In other cases, a foundation might be fully integrated into the university system. In the case of the UNH Foundation, Debbie called it a hybrid of sorts. It is a 501C3 non-profit institution, formed in 1985 amid concerns of alumni that an extra layer of protection was needed between the Foundation and the state legislature to protect funds over time and provide additional privacy.

The Foundation charges no gift fees on arriving gifts, although other institutions may charge from 1-10% on incoming gifts. There is a 1% operating fee on returns of the endowment, which they announce to donors from the start. This fee (about $3 million) helps supplement the budget for the Advancement program, which includes the Alumni Association staff, Communications/Public Affairs, and the Foundation.

A senator asked if the Foundation has considered investing in the university itself. Debbie said that the vast majority of the endowment is restricted, and that all investments are FDIC insured. She said she’s not aware of other institutions who would do this.

Another senator said that UNH’s identity as a state university is not as positive as some other state universities enjoy in their states. Debbie acknowledged his concern, and said it must be a strategic priority of the university to improve its image in the state, which will be a challenge. The senator asked if this negative image could be due to the legacy of any particular news outlet, or with sharing the state with Dartmouth. She answered what she has heard from people across the state leads her to believe it may just be part of the legacy of a culture of questioning, and concerns of NH citizens about bloat in public institutions.

The chair thanked Debbie for coming today.

VII. New Business – Academic Affairs Committee chair Scott Smith asked for assistance from the senators as his committee reviews the practice of cancelling classes the Wednesday before Thanksgiving. He asked senators to be observant of problems or advantages they see with this practice as the holiday approaches, and then to report to him with positive or negative feedback for his committee to examine. He also noted that his committee will begin to look at the next five-year academic calendar and requested faculty feedback on potential calendar items.

He also said that the AAC has been asked to consider a social identity attribute for Discovery courses, and he would like to gather information through his committee members on that as well. He said that when Discovery was implemented, there was discussion of a social identity category,
which was voted down twice in the Senate. This new request from Discovery is for an attribute instead, which would be required for all students, but exist within other Discovery courses. He said he has had a mixed response to this point and would like more feedback, by mid-December if possible. He asked the Senate admin to post the reports on SharePoint and invited the senators to review them and offer feedback/broad opinions to him by email at scott.smith@unh.edu.

A senator asked if the discussion about the Wednesday before Thanksgiving also included the fall break, which was eliminated at the same time. Scott said that for next year there are two options:

1. Keep fall break and hold classes the Wednesday before Thanksgiving
2. Eliminate the fall break and cancel classes the Wednesday before Thanksgiving

As they look at the five-year calendar, they will also consider the third choice, which would be to keep the fall break and cancel classes the Wednesday before Thanksgiving as well. His committee welcomes feedback, and will come back with recommendations on the five-year calendar.

A senator said he has a question regarding website design. The chair asked him to speak with the co-chairs of the Senate Information Technology Committee, or to speak with him after the meeting.

Another senator brought up the fact that the dormitories are scheduled to close on Tuesday at 6 p.m. this year, which causes problems for students who have evening classes. Last year, she noted, that the dorms didn’t close until Wednesday.

VIII. Adjournment - Upon a motion and second to adjourn, the group voted to adjourn the meeting at 4:54 p.m.