Meeting called to order at 3:15 p.m. on April 16, 2018

MINUTES SUMMARY

I. Roll – The following senators were absent: Baldwin, Ballestero, Barnett, Eshbach, Gass, Herold, Mathieson, Puccilli, Simos, Tenczar, and Winans. Andrews, Golomski, Karaivanova, and Ramsay were excused. Lembree served as proxy for Kowalski. Amanda Johnson, P.T. Vasudevan, and Kerryellen Vroman were guests.

II. Remarks by and questions to the SVPAA – Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs P.T. Vasudevan had no comments, and there were no questions.

III. Update from SVPAA on Navitas and the Global Student Success Program – The SVPAA introduced Amanda Johnson, the new Executive Director of the Global Student Success Program (formerly Navitas). He also noted that Kerryellen Vroman, Associate Vice Provost for International Programs, was also in attendance.

He said that he’d like to update the Senate on the progress made in implementing the recommendations of the external review team. The items that he was jointly reporting with Amanda Johnson were approved by the Joint Strategic Management Board (JSMB), whose membership consists of senior leaders from both UNH and Navitas. He reported that:

- All marketing materials will be agreed upon and approved through Enrollment Management and the Provost’s office. A designated UNH liaison will be assigned to manage the approval process and attain approval from appropriate UNH departments, and provide final approval to Navitas/GSSP.

Amanda added that her office is currently working on a joint international student guide, with the intent that UNH will vet all marketing.

- The UNH VP for Enrollment Management will establish a joint UNH/Navitas marketing/recruitment meeting each semester to provide recommended, mutually agreed upon enrollment goals to the JSMB for approval.

Amanda says that her team meets with Enrollment Management and Admissions frequently to discuss international recruitment.

- UNH will conduct an internal audit of admissions records for GSSP students at the end of each add/drop period utilizing internal or external resources.

- As of summer 2017, UNH Admissions is seeking training opportunities to expand the knowledge base of its in-house admissions counselors.
Meetings will be held each semester with GSSP and ESL faculty to facilitate regular communication on changes to academic programs, academic outcomes, student challenges, strategic initiatives, campus integration, and sharing of teaching and learning best practices. There will be the creation of an ESL committee, meeting once per semester with three representatives from the GSSP and three from ESL/UNH to discuss all matters listed above. Committee outcomes will be reviewed by the JSMB.

Amanda noted that the ESL committee has not yet been established, but that this is a work in progress. A senator asked if “once per semester” means “at least once per semester,” and Vasu said that it does.

Current conditions in Nesmith need to be addressed. A target date of Fall 2018 is set for an appropriate change/upgrade in office and classroom space.

Amanda said that some cosmetic updates will be going on in the foyer and halls of Nesmith, and that the bathrooms will be updated this summer. If there are funds left over, classroom space will be next.

The new Academic Transition and Integration Advisor (Gillissen Green) has been working closely with GSSP and the Colleges/Academic Resources to provide a more comprehensive transition program/orientation.

The JSMB is to identify a champion to develop an internal communications plan that will gather and disseminate data on student success to university faculty and staff.

Navitas has hired a full-time faculty trainer and curriculum expert who can provide training and support for faculty.

Amanda said that this teaching and learning specialist, Dr. Elsa Wiehe, will be working with Kerryellen Vroman, Leila Paje-Manalo, Gillissen Green, and CEITL to begin offering training this fall for faculty and staff across the community.

A senator asked if there are definite plans to target better integration of Navitas/GSSP students into the campus community. Amanda said that integration of students is one of her goals, and she hopes to begin this process this fall, particularly focusing on students in their second or third semester in GSSP. She mentioned that Chemistry is one of the classes that is being considered as a place to begin. She has been working with the associate deans on this. The senator said that there are other, non-academic methods of bringing students together, particularly where food is involved, pointing out that the rec center has a community kitchen where students could gather together and learn about foods of different cultures. Kerryellen Vroman said that the Office for International Students and Scholars regularly holds social events that integrate food in this way.

Another senator asked if the GSSP leadership has examined how other institutions are integrating their international students. He said that the segregation of international students here at UNH is extreme. Amanda said that she is committed to ending that segregation, and that her office is indeed looking at the approximately 100 U.S. institutions with Pathways Programs.
A senator asked about the concerns expressed last year to broaden the base of our international student pool and asked about the numbers of international students coming to UNH from China and other countries. Amanda said that her goal is to attract a variety of students. Right now, the target is 56 international students for the fall, with 10-12 students through the summer terms. Another senator asked who pays for the faculty trainer, and Amanda said that Navitas bears that cost.

A senator asked if there is an explanation for the sharp drop in international student enrollments in the past year, and asked why we might imagine we can turn this trend around. Vasu replied that there are several reasons for the decline, including that, nationally, we’ve seen an almost 10% decline. Navitas is working with eight institutions in the U.S. rather than just five as in the past, which increases the competition for enrollments. Students have been told that their anticipated time in the Pathways Program, before matriculating into UNH programs, may be as long as one and a half to two years, which is discouraging to some students. He said it is a combination of several problems. The senator asked how the current plan will address these problems.

Amanda said that Navitas is increasing its scholarships to recruit more students to UNH. They’re also contacting students directly to seek them out. Right now Canada, the United Kingdom, and Australia are our main competition for international students.

The Graduate Student Senate representative, an international student, said that while she doesn’t feel unwelcome at UNH, she does feel less than welcome in the U.S. as a whole. She said that it is hard for students to come to the U.S. knowing that their parents will be unable to join them here because of immigration policies.

A senator from English said that the ESL faculty are looking forward to working with Amanda, and praised the improved marketing efforts. She noted that in the past there was a belief that ESL wasn’t working well with the Navitas/GSSP students, which was not true. She also said that housing is a large piece of the integration issue on campus.

Dan thanked Vasu, Kerryellen, and Amanda for their time.

IV. Remarks by and questions to the chair – The chair informed the group that the Discovery Committee has approved a draft of a report on student learning outcomes for UNH Discovery courses. This document will be sent out to all senators for review. At the next Senate meeting, the Faculty Director and Chair of the Discovery Committee will report to the Senate.

The chair passed along an announcement from Dean of Students Ted Kirkpatrick regarding a Social Media Policy Forum which will be held on Tuesday, April 24 from 12:30-2 p.m. in the Strafford Room of the Memorial Union Building (MUB). The new policy itself can be found on the university’s website at: https://www.unh.edu/student-life/32-student-social-media-policy

A senator asked if the Faculty Senate had any input in the formation of this policy, noting that there may be first amendment issues with the wording of the policy. Dan said that the Senate was not consulted, but that we have an opportunity now to comment on the existing policy. A
senator said that the policy was released early this semester, and students have been notified of this. The forum is designed to raise awareness of the policy in the campus community. The president’s task force on campus climate has requested that students have an opportunity to ask questions about the policy, and the forum has been set up to facilitate that.

Another senator asked for clarification about why this might be a controversial policy. A senator from the School of Law said that provisions in the policy suggest that students can be disciplined for the content of what they post on social media, which could infringe on freedom of speech. The chair said that comments or concerns could be sent to him and he would share them with the administration.

A senator said that when students feel threatened by the social media content posted by other students, there should be consequences, particularly when certain groups are targeted. The senator from the School of Law pointed out that the definition of hate speech becomes very complicated. He said that the threat of consequences is not the issue in question, but the implementation of those consequences that raises some concern.

The forum is advertised for students, but the dean of students forwarded the announcement to the chair to be announced here, so it appears that all are welcome.

The Senate vice chair announced that a report from the Academic Standards and Advising Committee (ASAC), made up of the college associate deans, on the Discovery Program has been submitted to the provost. He said that the Faculty Senate leadership should ask to see this report, as the Discovery Program is overseen by the Senate and no Senate input was sought in the creation of this report. The chair will ask the provost to see a copy.

The chair then provided an update on the closure of several programs in the Thompson School of Applied Science. The Agenda Committee has met with faculty from the Thompson School, with the dean and associate dean of COLSA, and with others key individuals, as well as reviewing a number of documents related to the background and history of the proceedings leading up to the announcement of the elimination of these programs. The Agenda Committee’s basic conclusions are that the final decision to close the programs was clearly done very quickly, with minimal faculty consultation. He said that it is unclear whether this amounts to a breach of faculty governance, but that does not mean that it was handled properly and with appropriate faculty voice in the process. The chair said that the Senate leadership has asked for feedback from COLSA Faculty Senators regarding the opinions of their departments as a whole on this issue, adding that very little feedback has been forthcoming. He asked again for senators from COLSA to seek input from their departments on this, and to share that input with the Agenda Committee. At this point, there is little point in making a motion, as the decision has been made, but the Senate could put forward a resolution pointing out the objectionable issues.

A member of the Agenda Committee said that since the Thompson School is a part of COLSA, it is important that we know the will and mind of the COLSA faculty on this matter. The Senate does not involve itself in the management of colleges, and if the faculty in COLSA find no violation of shared governance in these actions, there is little that the Senate can do.
Another member of the Agenda Committee said that the Senate should say something about this, at least in the form of some kind of resolution. She reminded the group of the history we heard at the last Senate meeting regarding the dire state of the fine arts facilities and, pointing to the provost’s statements regarding enrollments in the humanities, she suggested that the danger exists that an administration could attempt to carry out drastic changes in the academic framework of the university without seeking appropriate input from faculty. She emphasized that there is an appearance of placing blame on faculty for the failure of programs, which might be more rightly attributed to a lack of vision in leadership. Faculty should not be held responsible for monetary gains and losses.

A senator asked if the college procedure in COLSA for shutting down an academic program was followed. Was there a vote by the faculty to close these programs? The chair pointed out that no faculty are going to vote to close their own program. He said that he can look into the COLSA bylaws.

Another senator recommended putting forward a resolution from the Senate for the prompt and adequate consultation between faculty and the administration will be needed for any drastic action taken.

A member of the Agenda Committee said that there are procedures for faculty to follow if they want to take the lead in shutting down a program, but there doesn’t seem to be language specifying the administration’s processes would be. Dan said that “financial exigency” is a phrase used in university documents to justify the closure of a program.

A senator from COLSA said, regarding the feedback requested from the Agenda Committee from COLSA faculty on the T-School issue, that some faculty have expressed concern about speaking out about the matter. He added that there seems to have been fewer opportunities for faculty to respond to the recommendations of the several reports done on the T-School than normally would be expected. He expressed concern about the way this decision was handled.

The Senate vice chair said that he has been studying the timeline of the events leading up to the announcement of closure of the programs on March 9, and he said that an additional environmental scan of the economic situation was done in December 2017, which reportedly convinced the administration that certain programs were no longer viable. He said that faculty, on the other hand, believed at least until around February 9 that there were still viable options to refocus the school. Scott asserted that it must have taken weeks for the administration to come up with and vet their plan to eliminate certain programs, but that faculty (and students, as well) had no insight or input into these plans. This lack of communication is what is of concern to the Agenda Committee. Scott also questions why the college could not have sustained the loss for just one more year in order to allow students already enrolled in the programs to complete their two-year course of study. There has been a rush to close these programs in order to save $1.25 million, when the provost has 27% of total tuition funds to work with. While “bad form” can’t be penalized, he asserted that we can certainly state our dissatisfaction with the fact that no faculty members were advised of or had input into which programs would be sunned. A senator from English said that she sees parallels to the issues faced in the ESL program.
A senator from the Thompson School said that his comments from the last meeting were not well represented in the minutes. He said in that meeting that the provost, had said in the last meeting that she wanted to build robust programs in the Thompson School that would be central to the COLSA mission, and she wanted them to be really successful. He said that the administration continues to dangle this promise in front of the TSAS faculty, who he said have brought forward endless proposals and ideas, and yet were not part of the real discussion. A strategic planner was hired and appointed to help move the changes forward.

He said that the administration says that it wants robust and strong academic programs in the TSAS, but the Professional Development & Training areas being aligned with TSAS courses are not academic – they are non-credit certifications from the Cooperative Extension, which are not tied to tuition-paying students or course-instructing faculty. He said that the faculty are still confused.

A member of the Agenda Committee said that it is his sense that there was TSAS faculty input early on in the reconfiguration planning, but then it seems that about six months ago, that collaboration ended. The senator said that when the strategic planner was assigned to work with the faculty six months ago, there was much excitement and enthusiasm, but that in January or February of this year, things changed.

The chair said that the Agenda Committee will gather more information and discuss drafting a resolution.

V. Approval of the Senate minutes from April 2, 2018 – It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the April 2, 2018 meeting of the Senate. Three changes were suggested, in Items II and VI. Thus adjusted, the minutes were unanimously approved, with 3 abstentions.

VI. Student Affairs Committee motion on policy prohibiting exams during the last week of classes – Allison Wilder represented the SAC. The committee looked at the policy written in the Students Rights, Rules, & Responsibilities Handbook, which states:

**05.23(fs) Examinations.** Examinations at the end of each semester may be given in any course, but all such examinations must be scheduled and given at the time they are scheduled with the following exceptions: Practical examinations covering laboratory work may be given during the last five days of classes preceding the examination period. In courses of a modular nature with several instructors, the instructor of the final module may schedule a final examination during the last week of classes if approval is first obtained from the college dean. These exceptions apart, no announced oral or written test may be given during the last five days of classes preceding the examination period. If a student is scheduled for more than two final exams in one day and chooses to take only two final exams on that day, the middle exam will be rescheduled. The instructor, in consultation with the student, will schedule a makeup exam.

The committee wholeheartedly supports this policy, as written. Several items have recently brought this policy to the attention of the Senate, including communications from the administration, beginning in 2014, that have introduced the word “quizzes” into the directives regarding the administration of final exams during the last week of classes. Also at issue, less
clearly covered in the policy are performance pieces in dance and other arts majors, proficiency testing in language courses, and possibly other instances.

The committee noted that practical examinations are expressly allowed by this policy. Those examinations are called laboratory work, and many disciplines have “performance testing” that fits into this category and which should be allowed during the last week of classes.

The committee had a harder time determining what truly constitutes an exam versus a quiz, and after discussing high stakes vs. low stakes assessments, they agreed there is no easy definition.

The policy was designed to protect students from an overwhelming burden of work in the last week of class, to eliminate the practice of scheduling final exams during the last week of classes, and also to protect faculty so that they have time to appropriately instruct for the full number of weeks of the semester.

The committee offers three recommendations on this matter:

1. We recognize this is largely an enforcement issues, and recommend department chairs as the enforcement mechanism.
2. We rely on the current language in the Student Handbook, and assume that quizzes are allowed.
3. Allow “performance” and language proficiency evaluations to be conducted as if they were a “lab” as it is indicative of student ability, similar to clinical lab testing.

The committee presented the following motion to the Senate for consideration:

**Rationale:** This motion was drafted by Student Affairs Committee in response to a request from the Agenda Committee of the Faculty Senate to clarify the policy related to the administration of exams during the last week of classes.

- Whereas, recent communications from Administration have erroneously included the term quizzes as being included in the policy;
- Whereas, practical examinations are expressly allowed (i.e. “laboratory work”) in the current policy, and as such, SAC recommends laboratory work be interpreted to include practical performance testing in all disciplines, such as dance or theater performances, or language proficiency evaluations;
- Whereas there is lack of consensus as to what differentiates an oral or written test as qualitatively or quantitatively different than a “quiz”;
- Whereas enforcement of the policy protects both the students from having multiple high stakes tests in too concentrated a timeframe and ensures faculty have a full semester of instruction time, and
- Whereas, the Faculty Senate seeks to positively affirm its support for the current exam policy, we submit the following motion:

**Motion:** The Faculty Senate supports the existing policy regarding the administration of oral or written tests during the last 5 days of classes during the semester, preceding the examination period (Student Rights and Responsibilities Handbook, 05.23(fs)
Examinations). We urge a broad interpretation of what constitutes “laboratory work” so as to facilitate such examination, during the last week of classes, as appropriate for the discipline/major/program.

Allison noted that the “last week of classes” is clearly defined in the policy and in the motion as the “last five days of classes during the semester.”

A senator asked how the wording of the motion guides the administration to not add in the word “quizzes,” and Allison replied that if the original wording of the policy as written in the SRR&R is maintained as stated in the motion, that should be addressed. Another senator asked if wording should be added to instruct the administration to not go beyond the original wording. It was suggested to remove the third “Whereas” in the motion above. The committee accepted that as a friendly amendment.

The chair said that the SVPAA has reviewed this motion and is supportive of it, as long as there is an understanding that final exams, or extensive “quizzes” acting as a final exam, are not given during the last five days of class. This motion will lay over until the next Senate meeting.

VII. Information Technology Committee report and motion on the Faculty Enlight platform – John Gibson, chair of the Senate ITC, reported to the Senate that the university currently has two software systems for placing book orders at the bookstore. Booklist is an in-house system written by UNH Academic Technologies (AT). FacultyEnlight is a system developed by Barnes & Noble and is used at many of their university partners, of which the UNH Bookstore is one. The UNH bookstore and UNH AT would like to retire Booklist and consolidate on FacultyEnlight.

The committee met several times with stakeholders from the bookstore, UNH AT, and Assistant Vice Provost for Digital Learning and Communication Terri Winters to learn about and compare the programs. One significant difference between the two systems is that AT’s Booklist automatically forwards book orders to both the UNH Bookstore and the Durham Book Exchange, whereas FacultyEnlight only forwards to the UNH Bookstore.

UNH AT would like to relinquish management of Booklist to free up their resources for other projects, and eliminate redundancy and potential confusion for faculty and students. They would also like to increase the portion of UNH textbooks purchased via Barnes & Noble. John pointed out that Barnes & Noble’s agreement with UNH includes the return of a portion of profits from sales to the UNH Library. The current net annual revenue to the library is about $70,000. Barnes & Noble estimates that it gets book orders from about 20% of UNH students, which is less than its national average of 30%. Increasing Bookstore sales would presumably increase the return to the library’s budget.

Disadvantages to making the change would be requiring faculty currently using Booklist to learn a new software system, and requiring faculty to register usernames and passwords with Barnes & Noble in order to fully utilize the systems features (such as remember books from year to year), and eliminating the automated forward of book orders to the Durham Book Exchange. John reported that several senators have spoken out in support of DBE as a local business that is also helpful and responsive to faculty.
As a result of the committee’s investigations and discussions with stakeholders, the following agreements were reached:

1) UNH AT will retire and not support Booklist, but will maintain a copy of the Booklist software in its archives, should it be needed in the future.

2) Book orders should be regularly forwarded from FacultyEnlight to the Durham Book Exchange, whether directly from the UNH Bookstore or from UNH AT after it receives the book orders from the Bookstore, for posting booklists on courses.unh.edu. This should be done on a weekly basis, at least.

3) Book orders often require review, reaching out to faculty, and correction. The ITC recommends that the Durham Book Exchange and the UNH Bookstore share any such corrections.

4) The ITC will put forward a motion supporting these actions to the Faculty Senate on April 16. That motion states:

**Motion:** The Faculty Senate accepts the termination of UNH Academic Technology's Booklist in favor of consolidation on Barnes & Noble's FacultyEnlight as the software system for registering book orders with the UNH Bookstore, starting with courses in Fall of 2018. The Senate appreciates the role of the Durham Book Exchange as a supplementary source of course materials and recommends that either the UNH Bookstore or UNH Academic Technologies regularly forward all book orders to the Durham Book Exchange.

A senator asked what is meant by “regularly” in the last sentence of the motion. John said that that would mean forwarding book orders weekly to the DBE. John said the committee hesitates to include more specific wording. Another member of the ITC said that there are three entities involved in this process: the bookstores themselves, the FacultyEnlight web portal, which we cannot fully control, and UNH Academic Technology, which will act as a backup plan to forward the book orders. While the committee acknowledges the retail competition between the Bookstore and DBE, the real interest of this is to serve the students.

Another senator asked if the Senate can do anything more than just recommend this, expressing concern that our recommendation could easily be ignored. The chair said that this is what we can do, adding that the university generally pays attention to our recommendations. John noted that the two retail entities seemed to agree to this recommendation. A senator asked if there could be a written version of the agreement which was reached. John said that the report submitted to the Senate outlines the details of the agreement.

Another senator pointed out that if we agree to use the Barnes & Noble software, it would be in their best interest to not share information with DBE, and that it would be important to maintain balance between the competitors with more specific language. A senator agreed with these concerns, saying that the cost of books is a large piece of the cost of college, recommending that we strongly support the DBE. Gibson reminded the group that dollars spent at the Bookstore generate revenue for our library.
A senator asked what will happen when Barnes & Noble’s contract with UNH is up. John said that Academic Technology retains the contract. There was additional discussion about actual revenues for the library. These are issues that might be addressed by future Senate committees. The ITC reviewed this matter within its scope, recognizing that there are other important questions related in non-technology areas.

VIII. AAC report and motion on online student evaluations for 8-week courses – Shelley Mulligan, chair of the Senate Academic Affairs Committee, said that concerns have been raised about eight week online courses, mostly in the Education Department’s master’s programs, which are falling under the standard policy to distribute online student evaluations of teaching with two weeks left in the term. She noted that the term “E-UNH” below should be changed to “UNH online.”

**Rationale:** The Department of Education has expressed concerns that student course evaluations for the 8 week E-UNH courses are made available too early (currently at week 6) prior to the delivery of a great deal of content and often prior to review of assignments. This does not allow students to give a fair assessment of the course.

**Motion:** The Faculty Senate recommends that student course evaluations for E-UNH 8 week courses not be made available to students prior to week 7.

A senator asked if this policy would be applied to split courses in the summer terms, where two faculty split a class. Currently both faculty are evaluated at the end of the class, potentially leaving the first instructor at a disadvantage because of the time lapse. Shelley asked the senator to email her so that the motion could possibly be modified.

Shelley noted that the current policy, requiring evaluations to go out two weeks before the end of an eight week course, requires those evaluations to be filled out with 25% of the class still to go. The recommendation to reduce that to one week before the end of the course better reflects the time frame of regular fourteen week course. She said that for a fourteen week course, the evaluations go out during the eleventh week, and asked how senators feel about this time frame. Some senators said that they would prefer two weeks to three. A senator from the School of Law said that the evaluations for their fourteen week courses go out during the thirteenth week, with no deleterious impact. Another senator said that last year, some faculty complained that beginning the online evaluations in the eleventh week of a fourteen week class didn’t give students enough time to complete the evaluations.

The Senate vice chair recommended that the conversation regarding the scheduling for fourteen week courses be postponed until next year, so that a Senate committee could be properly charged and give full attention to the matter. Another senator asked if the Blue system could be programmed to allow the teacher to choose when to distribute the online evaluations.

This motion will lay over until the next Senate meeting.

IX. Academic Affairs Committee report on test optional admissions policy – The AAC chair presented the following memo the committee drafted to send to the Admissions office. The Senate parliamentarian reminded the committee chair that such memos, if addressed as from
The full Senate, would need Senate approval before being sent. Shelley thanked him for that information.

The AAC was asked by the administration to provide feedback regarding faculty concerns and to offer guidance in forming the proposal:

*The Office of Admissions has informed the faculty of their intentions to develop a proposal for consideration of moving to a test optional admissions policy – i.e., no longer requiring applicants to submit standardized test scores (e.g., SAT/ACT) as part of their application materials. (communicated via presentations by Victoria Dutcher & Rob McGann in Faculty Senate Meeting, 1/29/2018 and by Rob McGann to the Academic Affairs Committee Meeting, 2/19/2018). The primary stated reason for proposing this change was that it is a possible effective strategy for increasing the quantity and diversity of the applicant pool. Further arguments provided to support this change include:

- SAT/ACT scores provide little additional predictive information regarding likelihood of students’ first-year success beyond high school GPA. Admission decision are primarily driven by HS transcripts (i.e., grades, course difficulty, etc.), and by placing the high school transcript in context (e.g., by using characteristics of HS, curricula).
- Standardized testing may include bias that misrepresents the abilities of social and class groups marginalized or underrepresented at UNH or in American society. Thus, requiring SATs may be embedding this bias in UNH Admissions Policy.

The Academic Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate have lead efforts to solicit questions and/or concerns regarding this issue from the faculty. Based on preliminary discussions of the issue, the Faculty Senate encourages the Office of Admissions to address the following questions as part of any proposal that they develop for recommending that UNH move to a test optional policy:

1. State clear goals of the policy change, with supporting evidence that the policy change will accomplish such goals
2. If, as suggested, the reduction of bias in admissions policy is a goal of this change it underscores the importance of a large effort to increase equity. How does this policy change fit into that larger effort?
3. Include a plan for tracking whether goals are being met. For example, over the course of several years, has the “test optional” admissions policy resulted in a larger and more diverse applicant pool?
4. How is the policy change likely to contribute to UNH’s mission as a land-grant public institution serving the changing communities and demographics of the State?
5. To what extent is the policy change aligned with the renewed UNH Strategic Plan, which includes “strengthen[ing] and diversify[ing] enrollment” as a key focus?
6. Enrolling students entails a responsibility to those students’ retention and success. We urge the Admissions Office to take up this responsibility in the proposal by making clear how the needs and interests of a more diverse applicant pool, if enrolled, will be served by UNH.

7. As UNH expands its recruitment efforts to new markets, how will HS GPA be used to compare applicants in cases where contextual information such as familiarity with curricula and course difficulty has not yet been developed?

8. How will applicants who choose to send in test scores be fairly evaluated against those who do not submit test scores, especially in high-demand competitive programs where many more qualified students apply than can be enrolled due to space limitations?

9. How will merit-based scholarships be fairly evaluated without the use of test scores?

10. To what specific purposes will test scores be used when applicants choose to submit them?

A senator noted that test scores are used as a data point, and asked if test optional admissions would eliminate that data point. Would we be allowed to use that data point for students who do submit test scores?

Another senator asked how the admissions office might adjust their staffing to deal with the more complex and subjective task of evaluating test-free applications. Another senator asked what the implications might be for university rankings that are based in part on test scores of our admitted students. Shelley said that the administration has said that organizations do use scores for rankings, but that once students have been admitted, their scores will become available and will become an accessible data point. This applies as well to using those data points for funding requirements, as for federal funding.

A senator noted that the University of Connecticut has made this change already, with about 80% of students submitting their test scores, and 20% not. Another senator said that she is not confident that those numbers won’t drop further, saying that where less is required, less participation is to be anticipated. She supports the establishment of another data point.

A senator asked about how student outcomes can be monitored without these data points. Shelley replied that there are issues here that need to be addressed, but it’s possible.

A senator asked if the administration has vetted comparator institutions. Shelley said that they have done their homework, although some of the comparator institutions cited are more closely aligned with UNH than others.

The chair thanked the AAC for their work on this, and invited the senators to send questions and input to Shelley.

X. Finance & Administration Committee report- Chris Shea, chair of the Senate FAC, reported to the Senate on Charge #5. The committee has reported previously on its other charges. She noted that communications with financial administrators have improved since last year, with
the Budget Advisory Committee meeting regularly. She reported that operating target number 
has dropped from 3% to 1.5%, and the administration anticipates meeting that margin.

5. *Determine what factors are driving tuition increases and how this impacts enrolments, both in-state and overall, retention, and graduation rates.*

Chris reported that, compared to other Northeast Public institutions, in 2017, UNH had the:

- 2\textsuperscript{nd} highest out of 8 for in-state tuition, fees, housing and board ($28,562) after UVM
- 5\textsuperscript{th} highest out of 8 for out-of-state tuition, fees, housing and board ($42,272) after UMaine and URI
- Highest fees of any comparator school (noting that some schools include fees in tuition)

She said that the tuition and fees can be found online.

Chris demonstrated with a graph the average published and net prices (tuition/fees/room/board) in 2017 dollars, for full-time in-state undergraduate students at public four-year institutions, looking at 1997/98 to 2017/18, and observed that net tuition and fees increase at a much slower rate than the published costs. Financial aid bridges the gap between published and net prices.

UNH tuition has increased 14% since 2012 for in-state, and 10% for out of state. Nationally, the increase for in-state tuition is 8%.

The factors driving tuition include

- Low and declining NH State appropriation, which is the second lowest in the nation
- HEPI (Higher Education Price Index) at 3.7% in FY17, which is the highest since 2008 (5%); fringe benefits are at +5.9%
- However, the student/faculty ratio is 19-1 at UNH compared to 14-1 nationally

Chris also showed the annual percentage changes in the eight HEPI cost factors, noting that fringe benefits, supplies and materials, and utilities showed dramatic increases and volatility.

A senator asked if our state appropriation has decreased as our fees have increased. Dan replied that the university has been flat funded since 2011 at $100 million for the system.

Chris noted that UNH is not seeing a substantial impact in enrollments related to our tuition increases, yet, as evidenced by steady undergraduate enrollment growth (9.9% from FY08 – FY16), historically high (54.5%) out of state enrollment, our high first year retention rate (about 86%), and high graduation rate.

Regarding tuition increases, Chris showed that the average public four-year tuition and fees have tripled in thirty years (1987/88 – 2017/18), while private nonprofit four-year tuition and fees have increased by about 229%. Public two-year schools costs have increased by a similar percentage.
A senator noted that we’re becoming increasingly dependent on wealthier students who can afford to come here. He asked what impact this has on our institutional mission over time as a land grant institution, and if we’re becoming something different.

I. New Business – There was no new business.

IX. Adjournment – Upon a motion and second to adjourn, the meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.