UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE  
2016-17 FACULTY SENATE XXI

The fundamental function of the approved minutes of the Faculty Senate is to accurately document actions taken by that body. Additionally, the minutes traditionally seek to provide context by capturing some statements of Senators, faculty in attendance, and guests. The minutes do not verify the veracity, authenticity, and/or accuracy of those statements.

Meeting called to order at 3:42 p.m. on May 8, 2017

I. Roll – The following senators were absent: Bonica, Carr, Celikkol, Chapman-Bosco, R. Collins, Ingram, Krzanowski, Mellyn, and Mulligan. Barnett, Onosko, and Scott Smith, were excused. Kathleen Grace-Bishop, Mike Ferrara, Nancy Targett, and P.T. Vasudevan were guests.

II. Remarks by and questions to the Senate chair – The Senate chair had no remarks.

III. Minutes – It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes from the May 1, 2017 meeting. One correction was offered in Item VIII. Thus adjusted, the minutes were approved unanimously, with 4 abstentions.

IV. Remarks by and questions to the provost – Provost Nancy Targett continued her presentation to the senators on her vision and goals for UNH.

Reviewing the topic of student mental health and wellness, Nancy said

It is important to understand what our institutional needs are. Several reports have provided a perspective on where UNH is now in this area. Next, it is important to know where UNH is in relation to national benchmarks, using data from organizations such as the Education Advisory Board, the JED Foundation, and the Association for University and College Counseling Directors, which focus on best practices in higher education.

At UNH, our counseling center has been accredited since 1978, and we are aligning our services with the needs of the students. We’re very fortunate here to have a doctoral internship program as well as a post-doctoral fellowship program that add to the breadth and depth of what we can offer.

The provost offered a quick service profile of who is using our counseling center right now. She said that 8% of our UNH students use our counseling services, which is an increase of a couple of percentage points over past years. That increase in demand is consistent with national trends. The clinical staff to student ratio is 1:1316 (not including the post-docs who are being trained), which is better than our peer institutions. Our program takes a multi-disciplinary approach, with psychologists, psychiatrists, and social workers all working together to provide services for our students. The provost noted that there is a current search for a new director of the counseling center.

The data she shared covers the span from AY2013/14 – AY2016/17, and indicates that the number of unique students utilizing our counseling center has increased from 1,140 to 1,276 in that time.
period. The total number of individual appointments during that same time period has increased from 6,728 to 7,370.

Nancy said that Dr. Joan Gluting, the interim director of the counseling center, has worked hard to bring our facility into alignment with national standards.

The provost also noted that the Cinco de Mayo events did not reflect well on UNH, although the number of arrests this year is down from last year. She would like to open a discussion with the Faculty Senate in the fall to address how we as a community might begin to change the culture of drinking on campus.

Finally, the provost praised Senate chair Dante Scala for his leadership and collegial interactions, and thanked the Senate as a whole for the work accomplished this year.

V. Reports on Navitas – The senior vice provost for academic affairs, P.T. Vasudevan spoke to the Senate regarding the Navitas Review Committee’s report. Committee member John LaCourse, also a Faculty Senate member, was present to answer questions as well. John reported that three sub-committees carried out the work of reviewing the program. The Enrollment, Marketing, and Admissions Subcommittee reviewed the process of admission to UNH through Navitas, the student population, matriculation into UNH from Navitas, the Navitas courses, and also concerns raised by faculty. This committee looked at transparency in materials used to market the program. The committee also made recommendations regarding the review of documentation, establishment of enrollment goals, increase in student diversity, and the hiring of staff.

Vasu noted that Bobbi Gerry has left UNH and there will be search for a new director of the Navitas program.

The English as a Second Language Institute (ESLI) Subcommittee examined the overview of ESLI, English proficiency, course progression, and the interactions between ESLI and UNH. The items they found to be important are mutual respect between Navitas and ESL, better communication, minimum level of proficiency with respect to the IELTS (International English Language Testing System) and TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) exams, review of the curriculum. The committee has submitted a number of recommendations to the provost’s office, and the Navitas Joint Strategic Management Board (which meets once per semester) has proposed to move forward with a review of the ESL program.

John LaCourse responded to a senator’s question by saying that the Admissions Subcommittee is recommending an increase in involvement in the selecting of students to be admitted to the program. There was also a request for increased support for ESL and the Office International Students and Scholars (OISS) from Navitas revenues, if possible. This recommendation is being implemented. Increased support for additional space needs for the Navitas program, particularly in the area of science laboratory space, as well as for teaching assistants. The discussion on targeted renovations is ongoing with UNH Facilities. John noted that some of these revenues have already been provided to the dean’s office by Navitas. The subcommittee also recommended greater transparency with the student progression rates through the bridge program that guides students from Navitas into UNH.
The senior vice provost for academic affairs said that the third sub-committee was the Faculty Concerns and Business Plan Subcommittee. This group recommended that more of the revenue remitted from Navitas be used to support student success (i.e., hiring peer tutors for ESL instruction). Faculty concerns are being addressed through all three subcommittees.

Vasu noted that there is a plan to hire a new integrative and academic advisor for Navitas. He noted that there is an ongoing conversation with UNH Facilities regarding possible renovations in Nesmith Hall. There is also a recommendation to make the writing center available to Navitas students, and Vasu said that some graduate students will be made available to Navitas students for this purpose. The subcommittee’s recommendations will be further examined this fall, and the Senate will be updated on the progress of those recommendations.

Vasu’s presentation indicated that, beginning in July 2017, the name Global Student Success Program (GSSP) will be used for this program. “Students in the program will be referred to as UNH students, and this will be conveyed at all meetings with departments and divisions where the program is discussed. A joint information campaign will be mounted when the new Executive Director starts.”

The Senate chair invited the Senate Student Affairs Committee (SAC) chair to offer her committee’s perspective on the Navitas self-study. Monica Chiu reported that her committee has worked with the Senate Academic Affairs Committee to review the Navitas self-study, as charged.

She noted that in 2010, the administration made the internationalization of UNH priority. She reported that about 12% of UNH students (approximately 1,200) are international students, either in the Navitas program, or direct entry international students. Jointly, the SAC and the AAC have prepared recommendations regarding the Navitas program, particularly regarding the integration of Navitas students socially and academically into the UNH community. They have eight requests for information, seeking responses by Spring 2018:

1. Provide clear information to the campus about Navitas
2. Report on strengthened recruiting efforts in countries other than China
3. Make transparent the opportunity costs of internationalizing a non-profit university using the professional assistance of a for-profit company
4. Provide a definition of “internationalization”
5. Address the possibility of adding a speaking component to admission assessments
6. Reduce the incidence of falsified admission test scores
7. Update Nesmith facilities to bring it into the 21st Century (including providing lab space for CEPS courses) or find facilities that are in better condition and possibly more centrally located on campus
8. Explain clearly how the final student attrition percentage is derived and where it is occurring

In addition, the AAC and SAC have five current recommendations:

1. That the Office of International Students and Scholars (OISS) receive increased funding in 2018, as it is heavily freighted with visa, orientation, advising, and ongoing community building activities related to the increase in international students coming through Navitas
2. That OISS and Navitas work together to build a better joint orientation for Navitas students once they arrive on campus.

3. That English as a Second Language Institute (ESLI) be offered more support from Administration, as the Senate recognizes its strong and ongoing commitment to the excellent education of our students.
   - More inclusion into the administrative committees/structure that govern Navitas,
   - More opportunities for ESLI input into the educational policies regarding Navitas;
   - More regular/standard opportunities to express concerns and make suggestions.

4. That UNH President Mark Huddleston, who prioritized internationalization on campus, urged his office to become more involved in OISS events. Previously UNH-Navitas hosted a president’s event attended by President Huddleston. The event has continued but the president does not attend.

5. That UNH offer more professional development opportunities for administrators, staff, and faculty who interact with international students (Navitas or otherwise), to better meet the needs of these students.

Monica noted that some institutions are dropping their affiliation with Navitas, and she said the committees wondered why this might be. She noted that Navitas partners with only six other institutions: Florida Atlantic, UMass-Dartmouth, UMass-Lowell, UMass-Boston, University of Idaho, and Richard Bland College (a two-year associates degree program connected with William and Mary). UNH is the highest ranked of all these universities, and the committees are interested in knowing if Navitas is adding value to the UNH brand.

Monica informed the group that UNH’s contract with Navitas now continues until November 2020, and that Discovery courses taught through Navitas are equivalent to UNH courses because they are taught by UNH faculty.

A senator asked what the university’s goal is for the potential percentage of international students at UNH. Vasu responded that the goal is 15%.

Another senator said that current policies seem to view the needs of Navitas students as separate, and she asked if there actually are different or special needs that these students have.

Provost Targett responded that Navitas students come into a Pathways program, as their language skills are less facile than our direct-admit students (less than a 5.5 score on the language tests, versus 6.5 for direct-admit students). These writing and speaking skills are their special need. The senator asked if there might also be lifestyle choice needs as well, and the provost responded that there is not really any difference between them and direct-admit students in that area. She said that an important recommendation that came forward is to not segment these students from the rest of the student body. Some of the students with much lower language test scores have been allowed to take longer than the average six months to transition through the Pathways program, and this has been a mistake. She noted that once the Navitas students do transition (with higher than a 5.5 score), their GPAs and graduation rates are actually higher than the average UNH student.

A senator asked for clarification on the recommendation for more professional development opportunities for UNH community members interacting with international students. The recommendation is very broad-based. Another senator asserted that the colleges need to dedicate
resources to helping international students mix in in non-academic ways. Monica replied that that is something that OISS does very well.

The Senate chair thanked Monica for her report.

VI. Information Technology Committee report – Wheeler Ruml, co-chair of the Senate ITC, reported on the committee’s work this year. There was an update mid-year from the committee that covered website design. There has been a disparity between the websites for various colleges. UNH Web and Mobile Development (WMD) has transitioned to a new model, in which it will not charge for services, but will provide a standardized menu for web design across campus. While this may be more of a one-size-fits-all, the upside will be a single design that Public Affairs and Communications will be happy with, and which will provide a uniform face to the public. The data on many pages will be pulled from databases that will need to be updated, including catalogue entries. The ITC believes the new plan will be viable, although there will be exceptions to the standard designs that will need to be considered.

Those who want to learn more may attend the last open forum on this topic tomorrow (May 9, 2017), in Horton 210 from 1-2 p.m.

One concern about the new system for web governance is how WMD will prioritize requests for website design and management. Two committees/teams will be established by Academic Technology for this purpose, which will begin their work this fall. The Digital Team will draft standards and policies, and the Digital Communication Steering Committee will approve the standards and policies. The steering committee will include a Faculty Senate representative. As well, ASAC+ (Academic Standards and Advising Committee) is the entity that makes academic technology decisions, and Terri Winters has invited the Senate ITC to send a representative to the meetings of this committee.

One concern is that there has been no clear policy put forward regarding what departments and colleges may post on their own web page. Hopefully the new unified web design framework will clarify and unify the way our web presence should be deployed. The new UNH data management plan may provide some guidance in this area. The ITC has not been provided with a copy of this plan.

Earlier this year the Senate saw a demonstration of the Student Success Collaborative (SSC), software designed to assist in the advising of students, in the hopes of increasing student retention and graduation rates. The university is currently in a pilot period of the program which will end in the fall. The senior vice provost for academic affairs has stated that we will not be forced to use the program if faculty are not satisfied with the results of the pilot program. Wheeler said that initial reports from the Paul College, one of the pilot colleges, have been positive, and that advising offices dealing with undeclared students are excited to use the program. He also said that the ITC has some concerns about whether the SSC will align well with DegreeWorks, the system currently being used at UNH. The committee also had questions about transparency of students risk rating (high-medium-low), about the workload for faculty advising (in departments where faculty are heavily involved in advising rather than an advising staff), and about the level of faculty input in the decision making process. The ITC will continue to monitor the progress of the SSC, as a decision will be made in the coming months about whether to proceed forward with the program.
Other items begin monitored by the ITC are the Blue teaching evaluation software, the Elements research information system, the one-stop portal OneCampus, the open source OpenScholar (to replace PubPages), and Open Educational Resources (OER).

The ITC survey of faculty and staff indicates overall satisfaction with campus IT, although there are areas of concern to be reviewed going forward, such as limited hours at the help desk, the long-standing concerns about the password policy. With the university’s single-sign-on model, this password policy must be the lowest common denominator of every single system that single-sign-on will authenticate. With a variety of vendors, it is a complicated equation.

Wheeler said that the Canvas roll-out has not been completely smooth, but that scheduled updates should offer improvements. He also said that a topic that should be addressed in the future is the number of hours faculty spend learning new software and going through training. As useful as technology is in our jobs, is there a way to make it easier for faculty to receive the training they need.

A senator asked if obscure majors will show up in the SSC advising software. Wheeler said that this is a reasonable concern, but that there are simple ways to address the issue, based on the specialties that students express as they take other courses. Wheeler also said it is important to note that the “danger warnings” of the software, designed to discourage students from taking courses in which they are statistically predicted to be less successful, are driven by historical data. The data gathered is for UNH students specifically, and noted that if departments are aware of certain tendencies for success or failure in particular courses of study do exist, they can address those issues with their students. He said that hundreds of universities are using the software and praise it, but we can only wait to see how it works for us.

VII. Discussion and vote on CPC motion on private ventures – Senate chair Scala turned the time over to Bill Berndtson, representing the Senate Campus Planning Committee, brought forward the motion presented at the last meeting regarding private ventures at UNH, with an update in Item 1. That motion states:

4. Motion: Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate calls on the University administration to adopt the following guidelines for UNH/private ventures:

1. Because the physical campus and its natural areas are important resources that support UNH’s mission as a Land Grant University, and given the roles and responsibilities of the faculty related to academic programs under the principles of shared governance, the administration should report to the Faculty Senate periodically (at least annually) about any UNH – Private Ventures into which it has entered.

2. Such ventures should clearly and directly enhance the mission and core values of UNH.

3. Ventures that involve collaborative research agreements should include terms to prevent conflict of interest while respecting the importance of communicating research findings for the public good. Precautions should also be implemented
to ensure the integrity of such research, particularly where the private company, University and/or its researchers have a financial interest in the outcome of that research.

4. Potential benefits and adverse impacts of the partnership on the town of Durham must be addressed.

5. The goal of UNH-private ventures should be to partner with the private sector in ventures aimed at catalyzing economic innovation for New Hampshire.

A member of the Agenda Committee suggested rewording Item 1 to ask the administration to report to the appropriate committee of the Faculty Senate, rather than to the Senate as a whole. A senator suggested that they report to the Agenda Committee who could then forward it on to the most appropriate Senate committee. It was determined that “…the appropriate committee of the Faculty Senate” would be the best wording, and the change was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Bill said that the provost was happy with Items 2-4, but that she rejected Items 1 and 5, expressing concern than the Senate might become overinvolved in wordsmithing with the administration regarding Item 1. He was unsure of the concerns with Item 5.

There followed some discussion about Item 5. It was suggested that Item 5 is too complicated for us to deal with, and that the object should be a broad effort to further the goals of the university. It was suggested that the word “economic” be stricken from that item. Another suggestion was made to strike Item 5 altogether, as its subject matter is encompassed in Item 2. The committee agreed to strike Item 5 as a friendly amendment.

A senator asked what Item 4 means when it states that the adverse impacts “must be addressed.” Is there a particular way in which they must be addressed? Bill said that it was left open. Another senator asked if the wording “must be fully vetted” might work in that instance.

A senator said that his department expressed curiosity about why this policy is applied only to the Durham campus. The senator suggested re-wording the motion to include the wording “…Private Ventures on UNH Durham campus.” Another senator asserted that UNH is not limited to Durham. Bill responded that the campus master plan deals only with the core campus, and that there are some parcels of land which have been identified as appropriate for private party ventures. The second senator then also suggested specifying UNH-Durham in the motion, for clarity. Another senator said that if the property is beyond the town of Durham, then the wording should be changed to “local municipality” rather than specifying a particular town.

A senator said that amending Item 1 removed the teeth, and suggested “…which it is considering….” Bill said that this is wording the provost does not want, noting that the deliberative pace of the Senate is problematic. His committee’s aim is to seek core values with annual reports. The Senate chair suggested that there will clearly be negotiation with the administration over such matters, and that it would not be inappropriate to add this wording to the motion. Any issues could be worked out with the administration in the future. The committee accepted the wording as a friendly amendment.
The motion, as amended, thus states:

4. Motion: Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate calls on the University administration to adopt the following guidelines for UNH/private ventures:

1. Because the physical campus and its natural areas are important resources that support UNH’s mission as a land-grant university, and given the roles and responsibilities of the faculty related to academic programs under the principles of shared governance, the administration should report to the appropriate committee of the Faculty Senate periodically (at least annually) about any UNH – Private Ventures which it is considering.

2. Such ventures should clearly and directly enhance the mission and core values of UNH.

3. Ventures that involve collaborative research agreements should include terms to prevent conflict of interest while respecting the importance of communicating research findings for the public good. Precautions should also be implemented to ensure the integrity of such research, particularly where the private company, University and/or its researchers have a financial interest in the outcome of that research.

4. Potential benefits and adverse impacts of the partnership on the local municipality must be addressed.

The motion, thus amended, was put to a vote and passed with 62 votes in favor, 0 votes opposed, and 0 abstentions.

VIII. Discussion and vote on CPC motion on tobacco-free campus – The chair invited Marc Hiller, a senator from the department of Health Management & Policy, to address the Senate. Hiller has been collaborating with the Campus Planning Committee on the motion presented at our last meeting regarding tobacco use on campus. He noted that the motion has been amended slightly to reflect all forms of tobacco use (changes highlighted in yellow), and a request to the administration. The motion also includes a brief addendum to clarify what a policy for a tobacco-free campus should include.

4. Motion: Given the serious negative impacts of all forms of tobacco use on human health, including its unintended consequences faced by the larger population of nonsmokers exposed to exhaled tobacco smoke, and given the absence of any meaningful progress toward establishing tobacco-free campuses for UNH since 2002, the Faculty Senate requests that the University adopt a tobacco-free policy for all UNH campuses, consistent with the “Healthy UNH” tobacco-free campus initiative. We further request that the UNH Administration commence the necessary plans for implementing this policy upon its adoption.

At a minimum, any such policy should:

- retain the elements of the existing University tobacco policy (not specifically addressed by this revised policy);
• continue to provide effective health promotion and education, making smoking cessation programs available to any University individual who wishes to quit smoking;
• ensure a wide dissemination of the new policy to all faculty, staff, students and visitors, including consistent signage across campus;
• develop a mechanism to monitor impact and effectiveness over time.

Several guests were in attendance to speak to the Senate on the proposed motion. First was Mike Ferrara, dean of the College of Health and Human Services. Mike and Kathy Niels (Director of Human Resources, and also in attendance today) are co-chairs of Healthy UNH. Mike thanked Professor Hiller for keeping this issue in the fore-front of our campus minds.

Dean Ferrara noted that the majority of the U.S. population is non-smoking and that 49.1% of the U.S. population is protected by 100% smoke-free work-place, restaurant, and bar law. He added that most state laws do not include college campuses. As of April 2017, there are at least 1,827 100% smoke-free campus sites. Of this number, 1,536 are also 100% tobacco-free. 1,400 prohibit the use of e-cigarettes, 700 prevent hookah use (up from 446 campuses in October 2012).

One of the goals of Healthy UNH is for UNH to be included with these other campuses, in an effort to make this the healthiest campus in America. He said that Healthy UNH strongly supports this resolution and are ready to provide assistance in implementing it into the UNH community.

Kathleen Grace Bishop spoke next to the group, representing UNH Health Services and its director, Kevin Charles, whose letter of support for this motion is included in today’s agenda. Kathleen says that Health Services has been involved for many years in the effort to create a tobacco-free environment for our students, faculty, staff, and visitors. This policy is a positive and powerful tool for environmental management to support positive behavior change, create new social norms, and help support individuals who are trying to quit using tobacco. She spoke about the services available for students who want to quit tobacco use, including one-on-one counseling, nicotine replacement therapy, medication, medical acupuncture or hypnosis, noting that our providers are willing to meeting with faculty and staff to come up with similar plans for them.

A senator said that her department supports this motion in theory, but that they expressed concern about how any such policy might be enforced. Another senator offered an impassioned plea to adopt this kind of policy and expressed dismay that any kind of economic concern might prevent the implementation of such a policy when the health and lives of our students and colleagues are at stake.

There was vigorous discussion for and against the implementation of a tobacco-free policy.

Many senators were concerned about restricting the rights of community members to use tobacco products as they wish, and expressed reluctance to tell others how to live their lives. One senator said that second-hand smoke is a nuisance, not a health issue.

Some who were not in support of a tobacco-free policy did support the expansion of non-smoking areas. Opponents to this idea cited inclement weather issues and increased litter in certain areas as drawbacks to reducing the number of locations where tobacco use is allowed, or to the institution of smoking kiosks on campus. A senator noted that, once established, it would be very difficult to remove such smoking enclaves from campus.
Another senator noted that losing up to 1,200 students because of a non-smoking policy would have a significant impact on UNH. He asked if UNH can establish a policy for public sidewalk areas. A senator who personally would support the policy said that his department is against such a policy, and that it could negatively impact staffing.

Those in favor of a tobacco-free campus called this a public health issue, not a rights issue, and said that enforcement is a red herring; that the culture will change in time because of the policy, in much the same way as recycling policies on campus have changed behaviors on campus. Others said that the policy doesn’t have to be mandatory to have a positive impact on the community, and that it can help model healthy behavior to the community as a whole, if it is a thoughtful policy. It was noted that UNH is behind the pack on this matter; many other campuses have such policies already in place.

The Graduate Student Senate representative suggested that good health should be our first concern, and pointed out that tobacco use is not the only unhealthy activity that is supported on campus. It was noted that the Student Senate has vigorously opposed any tobacco-free policy, largely on the principle of not prescribing others’ behavior.

It was suggested that there could be a pilot to the policy until 2020 to look for the best areas to designate as smoking areas. It was also suggested that the policy could be adopted broadly, with an increase in support for cessation assistance, with a focus on improving quality of life.

Marc Hiller replied that a goal date (such as 2020) has been removed from the proposal, as data from other universities is showing that once a policy is put forward, it takes between three and nine months to adopt and implement whatever changes are to be made.

A senator asked how many tobacco users are on campus, and asked if there is data from colleges with such a policy regarding negative impact on recruitment of faculty and staff. Kathleen said that they do a survey every two years on substance use on campus, and the most recent results (from February 2017, for students only) indicate that 24% of our students report smoking one or more time in the last 30 days, 15% report e-cigarette use, and 8% report smokeless tobacco use.

**The motion was put to a vote and passed with 46 votes in favor, 12 votes opposed, and 4 abstentions.**

IX. Discussion and vote on Agenda Committee motion on SRRR/MISA – The chair brought forward the Agenda Committee’s motion to bring the Students Rights, Rules, & Responsibilities handbook to coordinate with the updated Misconduct in Scholarly Activities policy.

The original motion states:

**Rationale:** The Faculty Senate revised the University’s Misconduct in Scholarly Activity (MISA) policy in January 2017 with specific acknowledgement that undergraduates could be subject to MISA if the misconduct was related to their work on federally-funded research. To provide additional clarity and avoid any possible confusion that the student conduct process (rather than the MISA process) would be the primary mechanism to adjudicate allegations of misconduct in connection with federally-funded research, we
would amend SRRR as follows. SRRR already notes the precedence of academic misconduct policies over Code of Conduct, and the Faculty Senate has already approved the MISA process that explicitly notes jurisdiction over any misconduct involving federally-funded research (even if undergrads are involved).

**Motion:** The Agenda Committee moves that the Faculty Senate requests the Dean of Students to make the following addition to SRRR:

“The procedures and standards of the University’s Misconduct in Scholarly Activity (MISA) Policy will take precedence over the Code of Conduct and the 09.7 “Procedures for Dealing with Academic Misconduct,” for purposes of determining whether misconduct was perpetrated in connection with federally-funded research that falls within the purview of the MISA Policy. If a MISA proceeding concludes that a student violated the MISA Policy, the student will be referred for disciplinary action under SRRR Academic Misconduct protocols.”

There was no discussion on the motion and it was put to a vote. The motion passed with 61 votes in favor, 0 votes opposed, and 2 abstentions.

X. Discussion and vote, AAC motion SRRR/withdrawal policy – Chair Dante Scala brought forward the Academic Affairs Committee’s motion regarding the university’s withdrawal policy for students as outlined in the SRRR. The first sentence of the rationale has been amended from what was presented at the last meeting, but the motion remains unchanged.

**Rationale:** It is timely to consider a change in our “leave of absence” and “withdrawal” policies. At present, we have separate policies and criteria for a “medical withdrawal/leave,” which requires reapplication and readmission to the university, and “leave of absence,” which does not. The college deans and the office of Student Life, in consultation with the Faculty Senate and the Office of the Registrar, propose to simplify the policy and to have all semester or longer absences be referred to as leaves of absence rather than withdrawals that require later readmission. It is very difficult for advisors and other members of the university community to encourage students in crisis to take time away voluntarily when we only have the rather crude tool of “withdrawal.” The change in policy, and the language below, simplifies advising and also favors the mental and physical health of our students.

The following policy has been reviewed by ASAC, the Registrar's Office, and the Academic Affairs Committee, the last of which presents the following motion:

**Motion:** that UNH change its policy and have all semester or longer absences be referred to as leaves of absence, and that the following language replace the current language under Student Rights, Rules and Responsibilities 3.3.

There was no discussion on this motion, and it was put to a vote. The motion passed with 61 votes in favor, 0 votes opposed, and 1 abstention.

XI. Discussion and vote, AAC motion on Writing Program/Committee – The Senate chair presented the Academic Affairs Committee’s motion to endorse the recommendations of the
Writing Committee on the Writing Program. Peter Urquhart, representing the AAC, said that the third recommendation of the committee (see below) seems to be the part requiring action. He noted that a sunset clause is being added for the writing intensive attribute to allow for movement of courses. The rationale and motion follow:

**Rationale:** A self-study of the UNH Writing Program was submitted on March 3, 2016. An external review of the writing program was submitted on June 28, 2016. In it, the reviewers praised UNH’s “enviable commitment to writing,” but also noted tension as to who owned the Writing Program and what body would have the rights and responsibility to enact change. In particular, the external review noted:

- an inconsistency in familiarity with the Writing Intensive requirement, the max capacity for WI courses, and the process to create WI courses.
- a proliferation of WI courses, especially at the upper level
- a lack of training for instructors teaching WI; some faculty “did not even know the course that they were assigned to teach had previously been approved as a WI course.”
- the Writing Committee’s (hereafter WC) lack of power to enact change or monitor the quality of writing courses; the reviewers implicitly suggest that this concern came from members of the WC, whether past or present, a fact that will become important below.
- A lack of “ownership” of WI courses at the college or departmental level; specifically, the reviewers note a lack of coherence or consistency across WI courses, and further detect a tension between WI courses and the larger goals of the university.

The Academic Affairs Committee was charged with studying the reports and making recommendations, which follow below; a contextualized discussion that led to them can be found in the accompanying AAC report dated April 27, 2017.

1. Under the new NEASC accreditation standards, departments will be required to address “educational effectiveness” (Standard 8, pp. 24-25). Each department will therefore be prompted to review its effectiveness in implementing the goals of the Writing Program. We charge the shepherds of the NEASC process with communicating with departments the need to reflect on their approaches to WI and Writing across the Curriculum in their program reports.

2. The CEITL organizational structure, under which the Writing Program is planned to reside, must provide adequate resources to provide faculty assistance and guidance to ensure a smoother and more effective implementation of our writing goals. Whether it should remain in this structure is to be reconsidered next year (see below, #5).

3. Even with the above recommendations, there must be a method to ensure accountability and a mechanism to eliminate WI courses that do not meet the requirements. As for the latter, we recommend a mandated sunset period, whereby every five years a department has to review and resubmit courses, with syllabi, that are to maintain the WI designation. Both the colleges and the WC would thus act in an advisory capacity to ensure that WI courses continue to meet the high standards of UNH’s writing program. Courses not resubmitted would lose the WI designation.1 We feel that the

---

1 So as not to overwhelm either colleges or the Writing Program, a review of courses will somehow have to be staggered somehow so that 1/5 of courses would be subject to resubmission each year.
original language of the charter (AAC Report p. 4) indicates such a review is warranted. A year of preparation will be warranted to ensure a smooth process; we therefore propose to begin in AY18–19.

4. Training for new faculty should include a segment on the Writing Program, its goals, Writing across the Curriculum, and Writing Intensive courses. Faculty teaching a WI intensive course for the first time should be strongly encouraged to undergo WI training, whether in the form of the many workshops offered by the Writing Program but unexploited by most faculty, or in an online training video.

5. The Faculty Senate should consider bringing the Writing Committee under its purview by making the Writing Committee a Faculty Senate Committee, similar to the Discovery Committee. Because this report comes at year's end, we believe it would be in the best interest of all to charge the Agenda Committee next year (AY17–18) with the task of examining the possibility.

4. Motion: The Faculty Senate endorses the above recommendations and authorizes the Chair to forward them to the appropriate administrators for consideration.

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

XII. Discussion and vote on AAC resolution on Honors Program – The chair said that there has been no change to the resolution that was proposed at our last meeting. A senator suggested a friendly amendment to eliminate the words “in Hubbard Hall,” after reading their report. She asserted that any use of the Honors Program and our Honors students to sway donors to contribute to these renovations is unconscionable.

Peter Urquhart, representing the AAC, said that the administration’s work has cited Hubbard Hall specifically as the location for such a facility, but said it might be acceptable to remove the specific location from the resolution. The senator said that the changes to this building seem completely insufficient, including lack of an elevator, making the facility inaccessible to students, faculty, and staff. Peter said that the friendly amendment is acceptable.

Resolution: The Faculty Senate supports, in principle, the creation of a residential and administrative center for the Honors Program in Hubbard Hall, and urges the administration to seek out alumni and donor support to fund the project.

Another senator asked if Honors students will still have a choice regarding where they reside, and Peter said that they will.

The revised motion was put to a vote and passed with 54 votes in favor, 2 votes opposed, and 6 abstentions.

XIII. Discussion and vote on TESC motion on evaluation process – The chair introduced Chris Bauer, the chair of the ad hoc Teaching Evaluation Standards Committee, which was charged to “... undertake a study of best practices in utilizing methodologies for assessing teaching quality, to include peer-review, classroom visitation, mentoring, student evaluations, and any other methods which may be used in the process of evaluating faculty and in the determination of
retention, promotion, and tenure decisions. The committee should examine best practices from other universities and solicit comments from the UNH community.”

Chris said that the AAUP representatives recommended revising the wording in items 3 and 4 of the motion to remove unnecessary references to implementation issues which might impact the contract, and those changes have been made.

The rationale and eight-part motion state:

**Rationale** - Faculty in higher education across the country are seeking improved processes for assessment of teaching with primary focus on the purpose of professional development. In particular, there is movement away from using student end-of-semester ratings as the sole metric. This movement is due to dissatisfaction with the utility of the rating information for improving one’s teaching. Furthermore, emerging experimental evidence demonstrates that student ratings fail to measure teaching effectiveness and are subject to substantial implicit bias. Early-course assessment (similar to the UNH Midcourse Assessment Program), peer observation, and portfolio-based documentation are practices that are gaining substantial traction, and which give more voice for students and more insight for instructors. There is no uniformly accepted ideal model, and reports indicate that faculty at other institutions are engaged in similar introspective activity.

**Motion** - That the Faculty Senate support development of a teaching assessment process that embodies the goal of continual improvement for all faculty, and which provides earlier and more productive engagement of students in this process within each course. That process should include the recommended actions that follow.

1) That a faculty senate committee, working with the Center for Excellence and Innovation in Teaching and Learning, develop specific recommendations and guidance for instructors regarding early-semester course assessment including professional development on engaging students in that process.

2) That the Center for Excellence and Innovation in Teaching and Learning develop instructional recommendations for students on how to provide constructive professional feedback.

3) That a faculty senate committee, working with the Center for Excellence and Innovation in Teaching and Learning, develop specific recommendations and guidance regarding peer-assessment practices.

4) That a faculty senate committee, working with the Center for Excellence and Innovation in Teaching and Learning and the Provost’s office, develop specific recommendations and guidance regarding documentation of teaching activity and effectiveness by portfolio.

5) That a faculty senate committee, working with the Center for Excellence and Innovation in Teaching and Learning and the Provost’s office, articulate a set of components of quality teaching, building on the work of the Study Committee 2016-2017.
6) That end-of-course student input be called surveys and not evaluations.

7) That a faculty senate committee take an entirely fresh look at student end-of-course survey prompts to develop a set (numerical and narrative) that provides more insight regarding student perceptions of learning, instructor behaviors, and course learning conditions. In other words, engage students in commenting on what may have affected their learning.

8) That the Center for Excellence and Innovation in Teaching and Learning, working with faculty senate representatives, develop a workshop and set of resources regarding the literature on the validity, bias, and reliability of numerical course surveys, including use of historical UNH data. This workshop may be deployed for Deans, Chairs, and all faculty.

A member of the Agenda committee suggested adding wording to the motion to clarify that the Senate Agenda Committee will make appropriate assignments to implement these recommendations through standing or ad hoc committees. The statement “The Senate Agenda Committee will implement assignments to appropriate Senate standing or ad hoc committees.” will be added, as a friendly amendment, to the end of the first paragraph of the motion, before the eight items are listed.

A senator asked where the Center for Excellence and Innovation in Teaching and Learning (CEITL) might fall in the organization chart. The answer was that that organization is under the provost’s purview in Academic Affairs. It was also noted that the CEITL director is a faculty member, and that there are liaisons to all colleges in the center.

Another senator asked to add the word “formative” to the first sentence of the motion. That suggestion was accepted as a friendly amendment.

The motion was put to a vote and passed with 54 votes in favor, 3 votes opposed, and 4 abstentions.

XIV. SAC report on emotional support animals – Due to time constraints, the report on emotional support animals from the Student Affairs Committee was not presented. The Senate chair urged all senators to read the committee’s report, included in today’s agenda, and to share the report and its information with all colleagues.

XV. FAC report on RCM – Due to time constraints, the report on UNH’s Responsibility Center Management (RCM) from the Finance and Administration Committee was not presented. The chair urged all senators to read the committee’s report, included in today’s agenda, and to share the report and its information with all colleagues.

XVI. New Business – Dan Innis, Senate vice chair, asked to be recognized, and the chair turned the time over to him. Dan thanked Dante for his good work in the challenging position of Senate chair this year. He presented Dante with an engraved gavel as a gesture of thanks from the Senate.
The chair then acknowledged the efforts of the Senate admin and presented her with a gift of thanks. He next offered appreciation to each of the members of the Senate Agenda Committee for their support and contributions, and included thanks to each of the chairs of the Senate committees for their tremendous work this year. He also expressed gratitude to all members of this year’s Senate, noting the increased size and diversity in our membership, and asserting that when we deliberate together, the whole becomes greater than the sum of its parts.

XVII. Adjournment - Upon a motion and second to adjourn sine die, the group voted to adjourn the meeting at 5:38 p.m.