I. Roll – The following senators were absent: Baldwin, Ballestero, Barnett, Gardner, Herold, Mathieson, Mulligan, Puccilli, Simos, Swift, Theimer, Thurston, and Woodward. Knowles, Lewis, Onosko, and Shea were excused. Zang served as proxy for Dwyer. Megan Berman, Amy Culp, and Nancy Targett were guests.

II. Remarks by and questions to the provost – The provost was pleased to recognize Dr. Larry Mayer, faculty in the UNH School of Marine Science and Ocean Engineering, who has been elected into the National Academy of Engineers.

She also said that, in reviewing the American Geophysical Union list of awards from their meeting held last December, she noticed that three of our graduate students have received outstanding paper awards from the AGU. In one of the sections, eleven awards were given, and two of those eleven, from across the country, went to UNH students.

The provost said that an impressive 90 percent of UNH faculty have uploaded information to the Elements faculty reporting program.

Nancy report that student groups have joined forces with the administration and the town of Durham to begin plans for a campus-wide day of service on May 5 of this year. The hope is to create a new tradition of serving our community.

The Behavioral Intervention Team reports that referrals and arrests are both down by about one third this year.

The report from the Presidential Task Force is due around March 16, which falls during spring break, so the provost is hoping that the report can either be moved up to before the break, or put off until after the break.

The Student Success Collaborative (SSC) platform from the Education Advisory Board continues in its pilot programs on campus. This technology will help identify students at academic risk earlier in their UNH experience. Units in COLA, CEPS, CHHS, and COLSA have already begun using the program. The Paul College will have access in May. We have been rolling the platform out slowly, and the feedback we have received so far has been very positive. Users have been asking how to get more people on board.

The provost explained that the SSC is a software platform which applies a historical perspective to academic data gathered about our students. This allows us to identify certain “gateway” courses in our curricula; courses in which failure or success may have a direct
correlation to a students’ overall success in a particular major. With the data provided by SSC, academic advisors can step in early to assist students who are doing poorly in these crucial classes, either to provide support to help the student succeed, or to redirect a student towards a major better suited to that student’s interests and skill sets. Across the country, this program has demonstrated that advisors can intervene early and help. The UNH SSC is now using data specific to UNH students. It took some time to implement data that is usable for our students.

A senator noted that the EAB presentation on SSC two years ago raised concerns among faculty about stereotyping and profiling of students that was not appropriate. Nancy expressed surprise that such generalizations would be made in an EAB presentation and said that she wished she had been notified of these concerns earlier. The senator said that the senators did speak out about their concerns, and were told that SSC was only under review for use. Another senator present at the EAB presentation acknowledged that there were no administrators in the room when the presentation was made. He asked if the contract for SSC, which has been funded by the university system, will be renewed. Nancy said that we have renewed the platform for another year, and that we’re now rolling it out with data that is specific to UNH.

Another senator asked how often the data is renewed. Nancy said that once the historical data was input, all updates will come as new data is added with each academic year, meaning that the “gateway” courses in any given discipline could change from year to year. Faculty using the program would be aware of such changes. She said that the data is malleable by department chairs. A senator asked when the rollout will be for all departments, not just the few pilot units. The provost said that she is not sure, but she will find out. She said that any department or unit wishing to implement the software could let her office know.

A senator asked if advisors will be notified when students are found at risk. Nancy said that the advisors are part of the program, and that they will have access to this tool to use in their work with students. The Graduate Student Senate representative asked if the software could be applied to graduate students as well. The provost said that it’s possible that the platform could work in that application, but noted that the needs and challenges of graduate students are quite distinct from those of undergrads. She is not sure if the graduate student numbers are in the database as of yet. The chair requested updates on the platform going forward, and the provost agreed to provide those.

III. Remarks by and questions to the chair – The chair asked all standing Senate committee chairs to create a list of reports and motions their committees would like to present this spring relevant to their committee charges. By the next Senate meeting, he hopes to have a schedule of reports and motions ready for the upcoming meetings.

He said that the dean of students has updated him on the policy on animals on campus, saying that the proposed policy was rejected by the president’s cabinet. The dean’s office has set a new goal to have an updated policy by July 1, when the new administration will step in. For now, there is no policy on animals in place.

A Consensual Amorous Relationship Policy Committee has been formed by the administration to examine and update our current policy. Jim Connell from Physics has been asked to serve
as faculty representative to the Senate on this committee. Dan said that the provost feels that our current policy may be too lax in regards to relationships between faculty and students. There is particular concern when a faculty member is in a position of authority over a student. A senator noted that the policy needs to be more clear and concise.

IV. Approval of the Senate minutes from January 29, 2018 – It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the January 29, 2018 meeting of the Senate. Four corrections were suggested in Items IV, V, VII, and VIII. Thus adjusted, the minutes were unanimously approved, with 2 abstentions.

V. Discussion and vote to adopt proposed Discovery Charter – Jim Connell, representing the Agenda Committee, presented the motion discussed at our last meeting regarding the adoption of a charter for the Discovery Committee, reminding the group that the purpose of this charter is to bring all of the pieces of the committee’s organization into one place. Such a charter would provide members of the committee and administrators a better understanding of how the Discovery Committee works. Any future changes to the committee may be made by amending this charter. He added that the Faculty Director of the committee is appointed by the administration, and so the Agenda Committee has added to the charter an election for a vice chair, voted on by the committee members. There were no questions about the motion.

The motion was put to a vote and passed, with 53 votes in favor, 0 votes opposed, and 2 abstentions.

VI. Update on COLA Discovery double counting – The chair reported that he received a voice message from the dean of COLA, indicating that she is still studying the question of double counting of Discovery courses for major credit in her college. She said that the Academic Standards and Advising Committee is working on this issue. Dan said that he asked the provost if ASAC has received such a charge and the provost said it has not. When Dan met next with the associate dean of COLA, the associate dean repeated that ASAC is looking into the double counting issue. Dan suggested to the associate dean that a meeting between the dean and the chairs of COLA departments would be seen as a sign of goodwill on this issue, but he received no response from the associate dean to that suggestion. Ultimately, at this point, double counting of courses for both major credit and for Discovery credit is not allowed at all in COLA, contrary to Senate Motion #XX-M24, which authorized the practice generally, and left the decision about its utilization to chairs of departments and units. Dan said there is, in his opinion, not much willingness to consider the Senate’s views or to work more closely with the departments in the spirit of faculty governance.

There was a brief discussion that there are various kinds of “double counting.” In this context, double counting means only that a Discovery course is allowed to count for both Discovery and towards the first major requirement.

A member of the Agenda Committee said that the motion that was passed by the Senate took the power out of the hands of the deans and put it into the hands of the department/unit chairs to determine if they want to use double counting or not. There was a vote by the chairs of COLA to allow up to two courses for double counting in their college, with chairs having the authority to allow or disallow the practice for their own units. That vote by the chairs was
countermanded by the dean of COLA, who stopped all double counting in the college with a “pause” in the practice, which has made advising students very difficult. He asserted that this is a shared governance issue. Does a dean have the ability to manage Discovery courses differently in one college than in all other colleges, and can a dean prevent a student from using a Discovery course to fulfill a major requirement if the department is willing to count it? In all other colleges, this kind of double counting is allowed.

Another member of the Agenda Committee said that the default policy on this kind of double counting is that it is allowed, and this “pause” is a violation of two principles. It is a shared governance issue, but the fact that Discovery is a university-wide program puts it clearly within the Senate’s purview. Most such academic programs are within individual colleges, but Discovery functions across all colleges.

A senator from CHHS said that it seemed that if the dean wished to examine the practice more carefully, the default practice should be to follow the Senate’s recommendation and allow the chairs to choose to use or not use double counting during the investigation.

Several senators were surprised to note that COLA is the only college not following the Senate’s recommendation, and agreed that all colleges should manage Discovery courses in the same way. There was some discussion as to whether the COLA dean’s decision is an academic decision or an economic decision. A senator from CEPS said that this issue seems to reflect an attitude that is related to the non-renewal of lecturer contracts in COLA, and asked if there is a procedure for censure that might apply here.

Scott Smith, of the Agenda Committee, cautioned against conflating the two issues, reiterating that this is an issue of shared governance more than about the value of double counting. He asserted that the Senate has several options besides censure that might be utilized to resolve this issue. He said he was reluctant to move to censure at this point.

The chair asked Senate Parliamentarian Jim Connell to briefly outline the censure process for the information of the group. Jim reminded the senators that the Faculty Senate follows Roberts Rules of Order. We also have special rules, for example, which instruct that substantive motions must be held over until the next meeting for any vote. Under Senate rules, should a motion of censure be seconded, the motion must be immediately tabled and discussion on the topic must end. The motion would be sent to the Senate Agenda Committee, who would meet with those who proposed and seconded the motion, and the object of censure to see resolution of the issue. If the matter can be resolved satisfactorily, the Agenda Committee would report back to the full Senate of its resolution. If resolution cannot be achieved, then the motion of censure would be sent on to the Professional Standards Committee for further discussion. This process is in alignment with the AAUP tenure-track contract. The Senate chair noted that, should censure be moved, the process takes about a month.

A senator asked what options the Senate has to ensure that the policy on double counting is carried out. The chair said that the provost told him she would speak with the dean about the issue, but that as of today, that conversation has not taken place. Another member of the Agenda Committee pointed out that one group that the Senate has not heard from is the
department chairs in COLA, whose vote was overruled with the pause on double counting. He said it would be helpful to get their input as they are the group most directly affected by this issue. He asked if the Agenda Committee should reach out to the chairs, or if each COLA senator might be asked to consult with their respective chairs to ascertain their positions.

Another senator asked if the vote of the COLA department chairs was documented. The chair suggested that the vote might be recorded in the meeting minutes for the college chairs meeting, and asked if those minutes are available electronically.

A senator asked what the difference is between a vote of censure and a vote of no confidence. The chair responded that the Senate has the ability to choose either option, but that a vote of censure is related to a specific issue or action, and that a vote of no confidence is a broader criticism of the individual.

A senator from COLA pointed out that while faculty from COLA may understand this issue and its negative impact on students, it is important to know how many faculty from other colleges recognize this issue as significant to the larger community. She asserted that any move by a single dean to reject shared governance has an impact on all colleges. The chair replied that the dean’s actions reflect a degradation of faculty governance that could change the community over time.

A senator from UNH-Manchester said that his unit recently lifted a similar restriction on double counting, sending the issue to the curriculum committee for review. He asserted that faculty have control over curriculum, and that the COLA dean is overstepping her bounds.

A senator suggested that the Senate could begin the censure process, which would allow the Agenda Committee to begin the conversation that might resolve this issue, asserting that the longer we wait to begin the process, the longer it will be before the issue is resolved. The Senate Parliamentarian said that the Agenda Committee could be charged to create a motion of censure and bring it to the Senate. The senator suggested that the Senate charge the Agenda Committee in this matter. He also recommended that the Agenda Committee consult with the deans of each college regarding any economic impact observed from the practice of double counting.

A member of the Agenda Committee suggested another option, that we could invite the dean to speak to the Senate and let her explain her reasoning. There was some agreement with this idea, and it was noted that should she decline to speak with the Senate, that would be an indication in itself.

A senator said that, should double counting be allowed, and should students go outside their college for their Discovery courses, that would be a maximum of eight courses in four years. Being that the total number of Discovery courses is unchanged, he questioned how serious an impact this would actually have on total enrollments. He then asked if there is something wrong with our Discovery requirements that would cause the COLA dean’s concerns about the double counting of courses negatively impacting COLA enrollments. The former chair of the Academic Affairs Committee said that when the pause was placed on double counting, the AAC asked the dean to gather data from students regarding how many of them take Discovery
courses outside of their college to determine if the concerns were justified. There has been no indication that any such data has been gathered.

Another senator moved that the Senate request that COLA act immediately to follow the default policy to allow double counting, per department chair decision, while the dean waits for the input she has requested. Acting now would impact fall enrollments. The chair expressed concern that giving the dean additional time would ultimately delay the resolution of the issue.

A senator suggested that we need to wait to see if the dean responds to the anticipated conversation with the provost about the matter, although a backup plan would be appropriate.

Buzz Scherr, senator from the School of Law, moved to censure the dean’s actions. Martha Byam, from CHHS, seconded the motion, which was then immediately tabled per Senate rules. The motion may be withdrawn if the concerns raised are resolved. The Agenda Committee will arrange a meeting between the movers and the dean.

VII. Information on Title IX mandatory reporting from S.H.A.R.P.P – The chair turned the time over to the chair of the Student Affairs Committee, who introduced Amy Culp, Director of UNH SHARPP (Sexual Harassment and Rape Prevention Program), and Megan Berman, who were invited here by the SAC to provide information about their services related to Title IX regulations, as well as faculty responsibilities and resources as mandatory reporters.

One of the questions that has been raised in the Senate discussions on mandate reporting has been whether mandated reporting only applies to incidents which occur on the UNH campus or in connection with a UNH course of study, or whether incidents that are reported which occurred many years ago, or in a location in no way related to UNH must also be reported by faculty as mandatory reporters.

Amy replied that in this case, the SHARPP office’s recommendations vary from what the university administration might recommend. She said that while the administration would prefer that any incident be reported to our Title IX office, regardless of where or when it took place, the SHARPP staff believe that knowledge of non-UNH related incidents does not trigger mandatory reporting for faculty and staff. Amy said that SHARPP staff report to the dean of students, who helps to shape the rules on mandatory reporting. SHARPP’s focus is on the needs of students.

A senator said that one of his concerns regarding the university’s policy on confidentiality for ordained ministers is that there are ministers serving our community who are not ordained, but to whom students might be referred, who are not protected by the policy. Some of the ministers on the website’s list are not ordained. He asserted that there is not sufficient deference given to survivors who seek help from religious leaders who are not officially ordained. These non-ordained religious leaders thus fall under mandatory reporting rules.

Amy said that a flow chart would be useful to show the steps as they exist right now. Clear policies would also be helpful. SHARPP’s position is that students who have already been
victimized do not need the additional stress of having to deal with the reporting system until they’re ready for it.

A senator said that he worked last year with Donna Marie Sorrentino setting up the administration’s system for mandatory reporting, and that one solution for faculty who are unsure what to do would be to call Donna Marie and speak to her in the hypothetical. He said that she welcomes those kinds of conversations, and this is one way to manage difficult situations. Amy urged faculty to refer any survivor to SHARPP as quickly as possible so that they can help with receive counseling, find new housing, or a multitude of other ways to help.

A senator noted that in the statement faculty are asked to include in their syllabi about mandatory reporting, it states that students can report confidentially at SHARPP, and asked if that is accurate. It is. Another senator asked if faculty who suspect that a student may have experienced harassment or violence might contact SHARPP for direction, or to bring the student directly to SHARPP, and Amy recommended that they do. Another senator reminded the group that sending a student to SHARPP does not fulfill the requirement for mandatory reporting.

A senator asked if a faculty member could stop a student in anticipation of them revealing an incident, to remind them about the mandatory reporting policy. If no details are shared, does the faculty member need to report? Amy said that they do not, but that it would be wise to recommend that the student go to SHARPP for services and support. Another senator said that faculty are sensitive to mandatory reporting rules, and asked if students are equally concerned. Amy replied that it is case specific, and noted that while the administration asserts that reporting survivors maintain control over who is involved and what happens, they may have less control than SHARPP would like them to have. She said that there are advocacy groups in the area that are pressing for mandatory advocacy, to automatically direct survivors to these groups rather than only referring them to law enforcement agencies.

SHARPP works with the Student Senate to get information to students about services and resources available for survivors of assault and abuse. One challenge is that, even when students are informed about available support services, they cannot be forced to take advantage of those services.

Amy and Megan are happy to receive feedback from faculty, either directly or through the Senate SAC members. The chair thanked them for their presentation.

VIII. Student Affairs Committee report – The chair of the Senate Student Affairs Committee reported briefly on the charges to her committee. The SAC has been charged to address six items, most of which have carried over from last year. The committee will be soon providing an update on Navitas, seeking transparency, communication, and academic integrity in our association with that organization.

The committee is also charged to examine faculty experiences with technology in the classroom, and she said that a survey may be sent out soon to gather feedback from faculty in that regard.
The committee is also looking at the university’s grade point average policy for participation in study abroad programs. Since 2004, that GPA is set at 2.5, and a conduct policy is also in force. Martha reported that at the time the policy was put into place, the feeling was that studying abroad was a privilege that students needed to earn. However, some concerns have been raised, particularly in programs in which a study-away experience is required for the major. The SAC has been examining this policy, focusing only on UNH sponsored, faculty-led programs and the students who are impacted. About 23 programs are affected by the policy. The committee will report at a later date on this topic. A senator from the Languages, Literatures, & Cultures department said that it is important to establish a way to petition the policy in the cases of students with extenuating circumstances. Martha noted that in the past four years, 53 students have petitioned that policy, with 13 petitions approved, 38 denied, and 3 withdrawn. She asked any faculty with experience with these programs and the policy to contact her or Joe Onosko from the SAC to offer input.

The SAC is also examining the policy to prohibit exams during the last week of classes, which policy appears to have been implemented in 1970. There is concern that the letter going out from the SVPAA and the dean of students now includes wording, distinct from the original policy, which prohibits quizzes as well. The committee will have a report in the future.

IX. Annual Summary report on action on motions from Senate Session XXI – Senate vice chair Scott Smith reported on the motions that were passed in the last Senate session, as follows:

Motions related to calendar items:

- Senate Motion #XXI-M7 on establishing the Thanksgiving break – implemented
- Senate Motion #XXI-M11 on approving the five-year calendar – implemented

Housekeeping motions:

- Senate Motion #XXI-M3 to amend bylaws to update the title of the “Associate Vice President of Facilities and Operations” – implemented
- Senate Motion #XXI-M9 – to amend bylaws to include the newly formed department of Agriculture, Nutrition, & Food Systems as an academic department eligible to elect Senate members – implemented

Motions regarding student rights, rules, and responsibilities:

- Senate motion #XXI-M15 to expand the “leave of absence” policy – implemented
- Senate motion #XXI-M4 to clarify MISA violations which apply to students – implemented
- Senate motion #XXI-M6 to revise the UNH Misconduct Policy – implemented

Motions regarding the academic mission:

- Senate motion #XXI-M17 to support, in principle, a residential honors program – decision is in the provost’s office, no further progress
• Senate motion #XXI-M16 on Writing Program and Committee – NEASC standards/Center for Excellence and Innovation in Teaching and Learning (CEITL) aspects; Agenda Committee charged with reviewing. The Agenda Committee is considering the creation of a charter for the Writing Committee that will codify its structure and function.

• Senate motion #XXI-M10 on the Library budget proposal – the 2% increase for collections secured last year has come up against this year’s budget margin issue, making those funds unavailable to the Library after all. Departments need to be aware that this is likely to impact the availability of library subscriptions to large packages of journals.

• Senate motion #XXI-M4 on the online course assessment questions – implemented

• Senate motion #XXI-M18 on the new teaching assessment process – This motion requires further action from the Agenda Committee and possibly a charge to one or more standing Senate committees to work with the Center for Excellence and Innovation in Teaching (CEITL) to implement the recommendations of the Teaching Evaluation Standards Committee.

• Senate motion #XXI-M1 to allow up to 72 transfer credit hours from 2-year schools – implemented. The registrar has reported that it is too early to tell if there are effects on enrollments or revenues, or how it is affecting students’ experiences either academically or financially.

Miscellaneous:

• Senate motion #XXI-M8 on right-to-know requests – We urged the university to use the narrowest possible definition for these requests. Ron Rodgers, UNH Counsel reports that the administration “continues to take the interests of the Faculty Senate motion seriously, and have adopted a policy that embodies the principles therein.”

• Senate motion #XXI-M13 to establish a tobacco-free campus – President Huddleston has seen the motion and recommendations, and has sought additional input from other stakeholders to consider the feasibility of implementing such a policy. It is an ongoing discussion.

• Senate motion #XXI-M2 on the Morin donation – distributed to the administration

• Senate motion #XXI-M5 on inclusion and civil discourse – distributed to the campus community.

• Senate motion #XXI-M12 on the policy for private ventures – Scott said that he is unsure what feedback has been received on this. The chair of the Senate Campus Planning Committee said that this motion is in the provost’s office, and that despite one particular sticking point, the administration seems to be taking the Senate’s recommendations seriously.

X. New Business – The Senate vice chair announced that he is looking for those who are interested in serving in a leadership position in the Senate next year, to guide the standing committees or serve on the Agenda Committee, and invited any interested senators who will be continuing to represent their units in the next academic year to let him know of their interest.
XI. Adjournment – Upon a motion and second to adjourn, the meeting was adjourned at 4:51 p.m.