Meeting called to order at 3:40 p.m. on April 17, 2017

I. Roll – The following senators were absent: Byam, Carr, Celikkol, R. Collins, Edwards, Gardner, Herold, Mellyn, Simos, Terry, and Theimer. Barnett, Pillet-Shore, and Stracuzzi were excused. Zang served as proxy for Dwyer. Jennifer Carroll, Tara Fulton, and Nancy Targett were guests.

II. Remarks by and questions to the Senate chair – Dante began his comments by announcing that the course evaluation period starts next week, using the new evaluation software. He said that he and Alberto Manalo, chair of the previous Teaching Evaluation Form Implementation Committee, met with the administrators of the new programs. He thanked Alberto, Wheeler Ruml, and Matthew Plumlee of the Senate Information Technology Committee for their work on this issue. He urged the senators to stay in touch with their department chairs during the evaluation period. If there are problems, Dante asked the senators to contact him directly.

The chair noted that there is much Senate business to cover in the next three meetings, and thanked the group for their attention to the issues that will be addressed in the coming weeks. He encouraged the senators to find ways to share this information with their departmental colleagues, whether in formal faculty meetings or by other means.

III. Minutes – It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes from the April 3, 2017 meeting. Three corrections were suggested in Item V. Thus adjusted, the minutes were approved unanimously, with 1 abstention.

IV. Remarks by and questions to the provost – Provost Nancy Targett said she would like to share several short presentations on the university’s mission. Over the next few Senate meetings, she will make brief presentations to share information that she has presented to other groups on campus recently. The PowerPoint presentations will be made available to all senators so they can share the information with their departments. She doesn’t want to wait until fall to begin sharing this information, but would like to bring faculty into this discussion.

She described the presentation as the view of the university’s mission from the provost’s office, and said that obviously the focus is on our students. Research and scholarship are also part of our mission, as well as our engagement with the private sectors around us. Today’s presentation is a snapshot of UNH right now, beginning with our enrollment numbers. We have almost 16,000 students; 2,100 are graduate students, and 250 are in the School of Law. By and large, the bulk of our students are four-year undergraduate students. Our undergraduates are divided among the colleges. COLA is the largest college, with 32% of our students. The other colleges are relatively even in their enrollments: 16% in COLSA, 18% in CEPS, 13% in CHHS, and 21% in the Paul College.
Our students can be identified in a number of ways: NH residents vs non-residents, first generation students, transfer students, under-represented minorities, and other classifications. The provost said it is heartening that only about 3-5% of our students find themselves in academic or conduct troubles.

Eighty percent of our undergraduates complete their degrees in six years, which rate is above the national average. She said she’d like to see that number up into the 90’s. Of our graduates, 91% get jobs or go onto graduate school. What she is most pleased with is our graduation rate performance, which is an independent national metric that examines the expectations of students relative to institutions’ graduation and retention rates. UNH rates 12th in the nation on this metric. She said that our successes are not only seen in our undergraduate students, and praised the graduate school and the breadth of our graduate programs, particularly the growth of our interdisciplinary degrees.

She said that during the next Senate meeting, she’d like to spend more time discussing her goals around student success. She said that when she first arrived at UNH, she heard it said that UNH was a “public flagship research institution with an uncommon commitment to student teaching.” She would like to amend that statement to say “…an uncommon commitment to student success.” We’re trying to help our students succeed here, to be healthy and safe, and to help them make a difference here and beyond. She asked for questions from the group.

A senator asked about the measurements used in gathering this information. The provost said that this data comes out of the First Destination Survey of our graduating students. It is not yet a perfect measure because we don’t have qualitative data independently at this point. We have about a thousand students out of three thousand who have returned this data to us. The survey is available online for faculty to review. She will share that link with the Senate admin so that senators can access that.

Another senator asked if our ranking as twelfth in the nation in graduation rate performance is for public universities only, or if private institutions are also included. Nancy replied that the ranking appears in US News and World Report, and she believes it includes all institutions of higher learning. She noted that private institutions may have higher admission standards, which may mean that the scope for growth is not as great. We help our students achieve above their expectations.

A senator said that departments and programs are interested in tracking their students as they leave the university. He asked if the kind of data shown here will be expanded, and the provost said that is her intention. She said that in her next presentation to the Senate, she will have information about internships as well.

Another senator asked if the provost has the statistics on undergraduates who complete their four-year degree in four years (rather than six, as noted above). The provost said that she does have those numbers, although she doesn’t recall them at this moment. She said that the six-year rate of graduation is a national standard, which is why she used it here. She noted that our rate for students completing their degree in four years is lower than the 80% noted for six-year completion, but that our rate is still above the national average for four-year completion rate. She said that it’s important to understand why students take more than four years to complete an undergraduate degree, noting that internships, study abroad, and other experiential opportunities
impact the amount of time students take, and also noted that it’s important to distinguish between choices students make and hurdles that impeded degree completion.

A senator asked the provost to discuss her definition of student success, noting that the many intangibles involved in defining student success will shape the vision of the university. Nancy agreed that measuring student success is important, she would like not to lose track of those intangibles, saying that there may be proxies for those intangibles that can be measured. Her measure of success includes whether we retain our recruited students through completion of their degrees. She noted a Gallup-Purdue poll that measures the success of students in the workplace and beyond, and said that UNH students do well in that poll, adapting well into the work place. There are many different metrics that can be used to get a trajectory on student success. The provost said that we don’t measure our students’ co-curricular activities as well as we could, and suggested that there might be a way to include that information on student transcripts. She said that the Education Advisory Board has tracked how, over time, perceptions and metrics for student success have changed. She said that it is wise to look at several different metrics to get a real idea of what is going on.

Another senator asked if this data includes our international students, and the provost said that it does. It was noted that, currently, our international student population is predominantly from China and India, and that UNH is working to diversify our international student base.

The provost said that she also wanted to let the group know that, as far as enrollments go, we are in a slightly better position than we were at this time last year, and that she is hopeful that we’re on an upward trajectory.

A senator asked if this presentation will be posted, and the provost said that she would share that information. She said that all of these slides are available in hard copy on the graduate school website. The Graduate Student Senate said that there is also an interactive world map on the website that faculty can see.

V. Presentation of the proposed slate of new Agenda Committee members for 2017/2018 – Dante shared the proposed slate for next year’s Agenda Committee members: chair Dan Innis, vice chair Scott Smith, past chair Dante Scala, and at large committee members Jim Connell, Lori Hopkins, and Erin Sharp. Short biographical sketches for each proposed member are included in today’s agenda. The members of the 2017-18 Senate will vote on this slate on May 8 when that group meets for the first time.

VI. Agenda Committee motion to add a class day to the Spring 2017 calendar – Dante reminded the group of the motion from the last meeting to change the first reading day at the end of this semester into a regular class day in order to make up for the Tuesdays lost this semester to curtailed operations. The motion states:

Rationale: Curtailed operations during Spring 2017 resulted in the cancelation of many classes, with Tuesdays being the most affected; in consultation with the Provost's office, Registrar and ASAC (Academic Standards and Advising Committee), the Agenda Committee therefore moves:
Motion: The Faculty Senate approves changing the first Spring 2017 Reading Day (Tuesday, May 9, 2017) to a Tuesday class day; Faculty may teach class on this day at their discretion.

Dante said that, to answer questions from the last meeting, he consulted with the registrar, who said that all regular classrooms would be made available to the course instructors. Any study sessions that have been scheduled on that first reading day will need to be re-scheduled into classrooms which are not occupied with regular Tuesday classes. The registrar’s office will be available to help with scheduling of those rooms as needed. The class day would not be universally mandatory, but would be usable by faculty at their own discretion, as needed.

A senator expressed that it seems too late in the semester to pass this motion. The motion’s presenter, Dan Innis, agreed that it seems late now and that had the Senate passed this motion in the last meeting, the timing would have been better. Dante said that the provost and the registrar are aware that we are still discussing the issue today.

Another senator wondered how students might react to this change, and asked if attendance to class on this day would be mandatory, and how it might be enforced. Dante said that the intent of this motion is to put authority into the hands of instructors to decide whether to use the day for class, and how to manage class attendance.

Another senator asked if this would affect the rule on exams being scheduled during the week before class. Because the day added to the calendar would be a regular class day, it was suggested that an exam could be scheduled on the Monday before (May 1), but it was unclear whether scheduling an exam on Tuesday, May 2, would be acceptable. It was pointed out that the calendar has already declared that May 1 is the last day for scheduled exams; to change that policy would complicate things even more. The Graduate Student Senate representative asked if teaching assistants would also have the right to use this class day, or if they would need to consult with their mentors/advisors. Dante said the motion applies to all instructors, but that it would be wise to inform their supervisors.

A member of the Agenda Committee noted that if the motion passes, it will be at the instructor’s discretion to use the day, but that the classrooms will be made available. If the motion fails, there will be no option to hold an extra class day. When asked if senators have polled their departments, there was mixed response, with some senators saying their faculty expressed no need for an extra day and other senators saying their faculty would like to have the extra time. One department reported that the idea was a good one, and had the faculty known an extra day would be made available, they would have liked to have planned for it. If such a plan were to become policy in the future, they were in support of that. Another department was split: faculty with Tuesday classes wanted the extra day, and faculty without Tuesday classes did not want it. A third department reported that their faculty has already adjusted for the missed days.

A senator said he would love to have an extra day for students who needed help in reviewing material. It was noted that such a review session could be held on a reading day, regardless, but that the purpose of an extra class day is to allow faculty one more day to present new material, which cannot appropriately be done during a review session on a reading day. Another senator asked about the fairness of presenting new material on an extra class day when there may be students who cannot attend the extra day because of issues such as pre-scheduled internship interviews or other pre-arranged obligations.
A senator suggested an amendment to change “Faculty” after the semi-colon to “Instructors of record.” The committee found that an acceptable friendly amendment.

A senator asked about the policy on the number of reading days. Dante said that is an issue that bears discussing. The AAC chair said that there is a policy, endorsed by the Senate, that there must be two non-weekend days available as reading days each semester, but he noted that the university has not followed this policy during the fall semester for many years. He said that the AAC will revisit the reading day policy in the future.

The motion, amended as above, was then put to a vote and failed, with 7 votes in favor, 43 votes opposed, and 8 abstentions.

VII. Academic Affairs Committee report on the proposed five-year calendar – Scott Smith, AAC chair, said his committee worked with the registrar to put together the attached calendar, taking three particular things into account:

- The request of faculty and students to reinstate the fall break as well as maintain the Wednesday before Thanksgiving as a non-class day
- The request of the registrar to establish a snow day for the exam period in the fall
- The request of the registrar and the administration to establish the first reading day of each semester as a possible day to make up classes missed for curtailed operations.

The AAC motion reads as follows:

**Rationale:** As we approach the end of the last five-year calendar, we have need to approve a new five-year calendar from AY18–19 through AY22–23. In addition to the traditional factors we endeavored to:

a) follow the will of the faculty and students to have both a Fall Break and the Wednesday before Thanksgiving off, and

b) to accommodate the Registrar Office’s desire to have a “snow-exam-day,” which is held open in case of a snow emergency during exams.

**Motion:** That the Faculty Senate adopt the attached five-year calendar for AY18–19 through AY22–23.

Scott noted that the policy on setting the schedules is to work backwards from the week before Memorial Day to ensure that the schedule aligns with the calendar. He said that an issue may arise in the third year of this proposed calendar (AY20-21), when the final exam period may end on Wednesday, December 23 if a snow day happens during the exam period. If there’s no snow exam day, the last day of exams would be Tuesday, December 22. Senators noted issues with the closing of dormitories and students’ travel plans, saying that the dormitories would have to stay open regardless of the schedule, since students would have to delay their travel until after the scheduled snow date, just in case of an emergency cancellation. Scott said that the registrar would like to have a plan in place so that there are options for final exams that are pre-empted for weather. A senator asked about online exam options for such an event. Scott said that with current technology, online exams could be a solution, but would be difficult for very large classes. The
snow exam day would not cause the entire schedule to shift, but those missed exams would take place on the extra day at the end.

A senator asked why the spring semester always begins on a Tuesday, noting that it seemed appropriate when the first day of the semester fell on the day after the Martin Luther King holiday, but now that the J-term has extended the January break, this is no longer the case. A senator mentioned that the Tuesday start may be related to the preference for a Monday move-in date for the students. Scott reminded the group that our schedule must include an equal number of every day of the week by directive of our accrediting agencies. He also said that when classes begin on a Monday, it tends to leave a large time gap at the end of the semester for our graduating seniors. On a related note, he pointed out that it is unavoidable in one of these five years that a reading day will fall on Cinco de Mayo.

A senator suggested eliminating the fall break in October in order to end the semester a day earlier in 2020, avoiding the possible December 23rd end date. Scott said that both the faculty and students petitioned to reinstate the fall break and to have the Wednesday before Thanksgiving off. Another senator noted that we are still violating the school policy to have two reading days every semester. Scott said that issue will be revisited by the AAC next year, noting that the requirement that “two non-weekend days” be provided every semester as reading days seems excessive, as those two days, falling near a weekend, actually provide four days for students to prepare. He suggested that weekend days could appropriately be used as reading days, and a senator supported that idea.

A senator noted that J-term is the same length, regardless of the way the calendar is set up. Another senator noted the difference between a UNH holiday and a non-class day; the Wednesday before Thanksgiving is not a holiday – it is a non-class day. Another senator said that having finals so close to Christmas will cause serious transportation issues, asserting that students would rather lose the fall break in October in order to have the semester end a day earlier, and recommending eliminating that extra reading day. There was some support for this suggestion. Other senators recommended starting earlier in August in order to avoid the late finals, one noting that starting a week earlier would give students two weeks of class before the Labor Day weekend. It was noted that an earlier start to the semester would affect student internships. Another senator asked if such an early start would only be for those years in which the finals edged too close to the holiday break, or become a general change. Other senators expressed concern about the lack of air conditioning in our classrooms for August classes. A senator asserted that to revise the entire calendar based on the outside possibility that there might be a snow day on an exam day seemed an extreme reaction.

Scott said that he would take these recommendations back to the registrar, but noted that it is quite complicated to revise the calendar and asked for a straw poll to see if there was sufficient support for an earlier start. He also said that eliminating the October break would be going against the directive the AAC received. He said that it might be possible to place the snow exam day in the middle of the exam schedule rather than at the end to eliminate the uncertainty of travel dates for students. The chair said that the group will take up this discussion again in two weeks.

VIII. Library Committee report on the Library budget – Trisha Emison, chair of the Senate Library Committee, presented her committee’s motion in support of the proposed Library budget.
Rationale: The Faculty Senate commends the Library’s efforts to cope with the increasing costs in a time of difficult budget circumstances.

We believe that our status as a research institution depends upon not only consistent but additional help for the library, in particular in the following areas: collections, professional staffing, and maintenance of the building (including off-site storage) and its technological capacities. Replacing the Library Services Platform is one of several basic needs for the Library that cannot be met without substantial investment. The Faculty supports the Dean's efforts to be realistic about the budget report, but the requested increase strikes us as barely adequate with respect to the resources provided at our peer institutions.

Motion: The Faculty Senate endorses the Library's effort to move toward long-range planning, and we hope that the administration will comply by ensuring a baseline for budget increases over a 4-6 year timeframe. We ask that every effort be made to fund the library as is appropriate to our research needs and aspirations.

This motion asks for a baseline budget from which librarians can plan and then negotiate for additional monies as needed. It is difficult to work with an uncertain budget.

The Library Committee’s report intends to bring the Senate up to date on issues associated with the collections budget particularly and the library in general. Jennifer Carroll from Library Collections, and Tara Fulton, Dean of the Library, were also in attendance today to answer questions that might arise. Trisha noted some of the long-term strategies considered by the new library dean to move the library forward in the current financial climate. As libraries change and digitize, our libraries are adjusting, currently with limited resources.

To illustrate some of the changes taking place in the library under Dean Fulton’s direction, Trisha first shared two photographs of a mural from the second floor of Dimond Library, painted by graduate students last year. One portion of mural depicts UNH professor of Mathematics, Yitang “Tom” Zhang, who was a 2014 MacArthur Fellow.

To demonstrate that the Library expenditures as a percentage of institutional expenditures have decreased, Trisha shared the graph on the following page, noting that as university expenditures have risen, funding for the library has declined drastically.

On a positive note, she said that developing Open Access will provide new solutions to some of the collection budget issues. Currently, subscriptions for electronic journals make up 55% of the acquisitions budget, with the cost of those journals increasing by about 5% per year, which is unsustainable with an anticipated best-case scenario of a 2% per year increase for the library budget. To resolve this problem, some of the packages of journals will be broken up, some subscriptions will be lost, and after that, requests will be ordered through inter-library loan on rapid delivery, hopefully providing students and faculty with what they need in an efficient way with some loss of constant access to items that are less frequently used. Hopefully, those lost journals will be increasingly accessible through Open Access. It is also hoped that faculty will stipulate, upon publication of their works, that Open Access can be part of the deal.
The next item from the committee’s report covers the maintenance needs of the library. This item does not come from the same budget, but is a real issue, as demonstrated by one of the photographs shared earlier which depicts a ceiling leak near the painted mural on the second floor. She said there are a number of maintenance issues that need to be addressed.

Next, Trisha discussed the need for a new computer interface between faculty and their library resources. The current interface is eighteen years old and needs updating. This is a major budgetary item.

The archiving of teaching evaluation documents has changed somewhat with the new electronic evaluations. Those records currently are going to the provost’s office rather than Institutional Research and Assessment, and so the Library archiving currently has no evaluation records since 2015. The new electronic forms should be accessible in pdf format soon. The Library has been archiving paper evaluation reports since 1989, and it has been noted that there seems to be little long-term value to those documents, which occupy a lot of shelf space. The recommendation from the Library and the Senate Library Committee is to grant permission to dispose of these records after twenty-five years.

Faculty carrels are also discussed in the report. The policy on carrels has been that they are only for day use, and this policy will be enforced beginning in the fall. Improvements in the faculty carrel use are planned.

Trisha noted that Jennifer Carroll, the collections librarian, is available to address issues about subscriptions. A senator asked if JSTOR is one of the packages that may be split up. Jennifer said that JSTOR is primarily for the one-time purchase of back-files and is different from the subscription packages mentioned earlier. Another senator asked if faculty will have access to
their own publications on Open Access. Dean Fulton said that it varies by discipline, noting that some disciplines have already established solutions to access issues and others are still working on it.

A senator asked if there is an established threshold of usage of online journals that is used to determine which subscriptions will be dropped. Jennifer responded that they look at the cost of delivery models and the cost per use to determine that. The senator asked what proportion of journals fall above that cost point, and Jennifer said that it varies, but that it’s about 50% of the journals.

Another senator asked if the Library Committee’s motion is a time sensitive issue that might need to be voted on today. Dean Fulton replied that she is unsure whether the two weeks until the next Senate meeting will make a difference for those who will make decisions about the budget, but said that there was some indication that they were hoping to address this by the end of April. Trisha said the sooner the better. The senator moved to suspend the rules in order to vote on this motion today. That motion was seconded. The Senate voted in support of suspending the rules with 53 votes in favor, 1 vote against, and 6 abstentions.

A senator asked if there is a mechanism in the university’s budgetary process that can look over the five-year horizon to help plan further ahead. Dean Fulton said that the three-year plan was selected because the strategy that would be chosen to get to a more sustainable model would be different if we’re looking at 0% raises than if we’re looking at 2% raises. She said that an easier and more deliberate process can be proposed with a three-year commitment. The senate asked about the amounts that the departments pay in to the central budget to fund the library. Dean Fulton said that she believes there would not be an increase in the amount that the colleges pay into the central budget, but rather that the library’s request would be considered with all other funds for new initiatives. Trisha said that the motion would call for a pledge from the provost rather than part of the official planning board’s contract.

Another senator asked if there is data about services of our library compared to other institutions. Trisha said that there is data that indicates that we have roughly half the staff of UVM, for example. She said that we don’t do well in comparisons of concrete data with dedication to library budgets and staff to peer institutions. Dean Fulton said that some states have state-wide licenses to many of the databases used by the library, which removes that cost from the university’s budget. Looking across the board at peer institutions, the difference is about $1 million on average, with our collections budget in total at about $6 million. The senator suggested that creating a presentation comparing our library’s resources with other peer institutions might be a persuasive way to make a case to the administration for more substantial funding.

A senator asked how the library’s budget is formulated, and if it is part of the RCM model. Dean Fulton said that the library budget has increased over the years, but not nearly at the same rate as other budgets, and that the decline in purchasing power for that budget has been significant. She said that the colleges’ budgets are based on student enrollments, but that the library is part of central services along with many other units, which falls under the provost’s office. The provost determines what portion of the budget goes toward the library. Dean Fulton’s request for a three-year commitment of a 2% annual increase is made to the provost, through Academic Affairs. A senator noted that the colleges pay a portion into a pot of money for central services, which includes the library. He asked what else is included in central services that is competing with the library for funds. Under the provost’s office fall: Academic Affairs, Engagement and Academic
Outreach, Faculty Affairs, Faculty Senate, Finance and Academic Administration, the Graduate School, Student Life and Dean of Students, Provost and Academic Affairs, and Research Administration. The Library appears as a separate unit, although its budget is determined by the provost. A senator asked if the library has to specify how the 2% increase would be used. Dean Fulton said that she asked only for 2% on the collections budget. Trisha said that her committee had wanted to press the provost for more than that.

Three senators offered the following items as friendly amendments to the motion:

**Motion:** The Faculty Senate endorses the Library's effort to move toward long-range planning, and we hope that encourage the administration will comply by ensuring to ensure a baseline for collection budget increases over a 4-6 year timeframe. We ask that every effort be made to fund the library as is appropriate to our UNH research needs and aspirations.

The motion was put to a vote and passed unanimously with 60 votes in favor, none opposed and no abstentions. Dean Fulton thanked the Senate Library Committee for their work and support.

IX. Agenda Committee proposal for changes to the SRRR – Due to time constraints, this item will be postponed until the next Senate meeting.

X. FAC report on faculty numbers – Erin Sharp, Finance & Administration Committee chair, said that her committee was charged with looking at the allocation of teaching positions at the university compared to the growth of administrative positions. She said that they gathered the data from several different locations to create a picture of not only changes in tenure-track and lecturer positions, but also in cost per credit hour and number of credit hours taught. In the report appended to this agenda, the data is separated by college, but her presentation today will show the data compared between colleges. She noted that the FTE (Full-Time Equivalent) data provides more true information. The report uses data from 2009-2016.

The number of tenure-track faculty at UNH has been relatively stable over that time, with a slight dip in AY14 during the hiring freeze. The number of lecturers has increased in that time by 72%. It is important to note the context of this time period, in which some colleges altered their teaching load policies, switching from a 2/3 load to a 2/2 load for tenure-track faculty. Some of the increase in lecturers came as a result of that shift, which allowed tenure-track faculty to spend more time on research. Over the same period of time, the number of research faculty has declined and the number of clinical faculty has increased. This data is available on the handout passed around the Senate today. Erin also noted that some tenure-track positions shifted to academic administrator positions (an increase of 22% over the seven year period).

A senator asked if these numbers have been compared to national data, and Erin said that her committee did not make those comparisons. Another senator asked if this data includes adjunct professors, and Erin said that it did not. The senator noted that in 2009-2010, adjuncts did much of the work that is now done by lecturers. Another senator said he has heard that COLA is not seeing a savings in cost per credit hour with the increase in lecturers versus tenure-track faculty and asked if the committee’s research supported that finding. Erin said that, for COLA, the cost per credit hour has risen significantly, more than the other colleges. She said that the cost per credit hour includes faculty salaries, fringe on faculty salaries, total space, and teaching assistant
costs. It does not include staff salaries and fringe. The administration says there are several ways to evaluate cost per credit hour. Another senator said that the increase in COLA reflects the change from 2/3 to 2/2 teaching loads.

Another senator said that next year he would like to see the FAC review the total cost of the increase in academic administrators, noting that that cost is not just the salary and fringe for the administrator, but also for any additional support staff hired for that office. Erin said that kind of data is available. Erin said that the report does include total staff counts.

The overall employee compensation rates have increased from 2012-2016 for AAUP faculty by 8%, for PAT staff by 17%, and for Operating staff by 12%, while academic administrators have seen an increase of 51%.

She also shared faculty FTEs by college for tenure-track and lecturer hires from 2009-2016, with each college showing a unique dynamic. The tables in today’s agenda show more detailed information by college.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>AY2009</th>
<th>AY2016</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COLSATT</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLSAL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>+325%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLA TT</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLA L</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>+91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEPS TT</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>+12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEPS L</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>+46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUL TT</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>+16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAULL</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>+57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHHS TT</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHHS L</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBR TT</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>+1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBR L</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHM TT</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>+7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHM L</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>+14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cost per credit hour and total credit hours taught are summarized here:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>FY2009</th>
<th>FY2015</th>
<th>FY2016</th>
<th>%Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COLSA</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
<td>51,414</td>
<td>55,860</td>
<td>55,274</td>
<td>+8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLA</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>+23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
<td>164,974</td>
<td>154,080</td>
<td>152,310</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEPS</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
<td>62,331</td>
<td>79,505</td>
<td>81,502</td>
<td>+31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUL</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
<td>53,696</td>
<td>68,121</td>
<td>72,096</td>
<td>+34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHHS</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>+5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
<td>54,169</td>
<td>57,295</td>
<td>58,209</td>
<td>+7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHM</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>+6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To summarize, Erin said that there has been a marked increase in the number of and compensation for academic administrators since 2009. Some of this can be explained by some shifting of tenure-track positions to academic administrators, the merger with the School of Law, and some new positions which have been created.

We see little change in the number of tenure-track faculty, or in their compensation over time, although we have recovered from the dip during the hiring freeze. We have seen a substantial increase in the number of lecturers during that time period.

A senator who is a research faculty member pointed out that there has been a significant drop in research faculty at UNH. Erin says that this is a good point that her committee did not really investigate. She said that the trend says a lot about the context of research at UNH, noting that research faculty have to secure half of their salary with outside grants. She wondered if the FAC is the best committee to investigate this issue. The senator said that it is clear that the university does not invest in its research faculty, while it does invest in research done by tenure-track faculty. Another senator said that there are people in the provost’s office who are here on soft money, while there are faculty who can’t get grant money.

Another senator who is a lecturer said that he wishes the Senate would send a message to the provost that there are faculty with lecturer positions who should be moved to tenure-track positions. He said that these are faculty who have come to the university with PhDs, who are highly qualified, and who are more active than their tenure-track colleagues, but who are not being appropriately compensated. He asked if the Senate could take action on this matter, adding that the deans have expressed that they would like to see lecturers become tenured, and yet that as tenure-track faculty leave the university, such promotions are not taking place. Erin said that converting lecturer positions into tenure-track positions is not something that her committee discussed with the administration.

A senator from the Thompson School said that their unit relies heavily on adjunct faculty, and said she would like to see adjunct faculty numbers included in a report like this one. Erin said that there may have been some adjunct data in her committee’s report from last November.

Another senator noted that without data on adjuncts, this information is not complete. He noted that a few years ago, COLA made a strong shift from adjuncts to lecturers, and he said that examining that shift might explain some of the dramatic changes noted in this report. He asserted that without this examination, these numbers cannot tell the whole story. Another senator noted that lecturers are more expensive to the university than adjuncts. Another senator said that adjuncts were even more overworked than lecturers have been, and very underpaid.

Erin said that ultimately the cost per credit hour gives an accurate overview of the actual cost of teaching, regardless of who is teaching.

The chair thanked Erin and her committee for their efforts.

XI. New Business – There was no new business.

XII. Adjournment - Upon a motion and second to adjourn, the group voted to adjourn the meeting at 5:36 p.m.