AGENDA for FACULTY SENATE XXIII
2018-2019
Faculty Senate Agenda
December 10, 2018

The XXIII Session of the Faculty Senate will meet on Monday, December 10, 2018 from 3:10 to 5:00 pm
in 205 Hamilton Smith Hall

Feel free to come early or stay late to socialize
Cider and cookies will be available

Faculty Senator Sign-In - Proxies for senators must check in with Kathy Brunet

1. Comments and questions by the chair
   - Results from FAR survey (Appendix 1.1)
   - Update on Amorous Relationship Policy (Appendix 1.2)

2. Remarks by Monica Chiu, Interim Associate Vice President for Community, Equity and Diversity
   on upcoming Diversity & Inclusion Training opportunity (Appendix 2.1)

3. Approval of senate minutes from November 26, 2018 (Appendix 3.1 is attached separately)

4. Discussion and vote on Academic Affairs Committee motions: 1) Religious holidays on calendar
   and 2) how to respond to curtailed ops during Dec. exam week. (Appendices 4.1-4.2)

5. Academic Affairs update and discussion on test optional admissions (Appendix 5.1)

6. Report from Finance & Administration Committee from the meeting of the System Board Finance
   Committee. (Appendix 6.1)

7. Listening session to prepare for Strategic Planning Retreat

8. (4:25 pm) Discussion with Stan Waddell, CIO and Associate Vice President, UNH Information
   Technology, about recent IT Service Changes (Appendix 8.1)

9. (4:40 pm) Presentation from UNH Career and Professional Success, Kimberly Clark and Tyler
   Wentworth (Appendix 9.1 is attached separately)

10. New Business

11. Motion to adjourn
Initial Summary of FAR Survey  
Prepared by Faculty Senate Chair, Scott Smith  
Presented to Faculty Senate on 12/10/18

Summary of Number of Responses:  
Deans/Chairs: Has electronic reporting helped in aggregating? - 18  
Deans/chairs: What challenges have arisen? - 19  
Deans/Chairs: Other comments - 17  
Faculty- What problems have faculty encountered? - 34  
Faculty - What benefits do you see? - 25  
Faculty - Other comments - 21

0. Executive Summary
While some responses indicated that there were some benefits to an electronic reporting system, the vast majority of comments were strongly against the current software used for Faculty Activity Reporting. It is also important to note that some faculty articulated the view that the current version of FAR must benefit chairs and deans, but there are indications from other responses that this is not necessarily true. The overwhelmingly negative response suggests that we should revisit the mandate that faculty use MyElements for FAR, as well as the associated use of that platform in populating FindScholars and college websites. While there remain concerns over the process that led to this point (i.e. shared governance), this document simply seeks to summarize the data collected in a Qualtrics survey concerning the benefits and challenges, both perceived and real, of the current iteration of FAR. We note here that by the time this summary was composed (December 7), we had not received a response from the provost’s office about the benefits to the university of using such a system. We will continue to seek out cogent arguments for and against using such a system of reporting from all key stakeholders, as well as a cost/benefit analysis that will offer insight into the value of continuing to use MyElements.

1. From the Deans and Chairs (In some cases, it is unfortunately unclear which responses come from the deans and which from chairs.)

Benefits to aggregating and analysis of FAR:  
While some said simply “yes” (3x) or somewhat (4x), the vast majority of responses were negative (12x). “More of a hassle” one reported; others mentioned that after the electronic reporting manual reports were still necessary. One chair said, “The reports I pull for the department have been useless,” and points to the need to do the aggregating manually. Many report that, either because of tedium or an active departmental vote, faculty are not using FAR.

One Associate Dean noted: “To my knowledge, the benefits were not improved over the previous system used here (which predated my arrival and involvement). There is no way for us to run our own reports, so we are dependent on Academic Technology each time we want to pull an aggregate report. We also had to do a great deal of data cleaning in many cases due to faculty confusion about exactly what to report where. If we get to the point where we can pull our own reports, I can see that it will be very helpful for things like pulling data for annual reporting and accreditation self-study reporting.”
By contrast, another Dean writes, “The electronic faculty activity reporting is critical to our abilities to complete our pre-tenure faculty annual reviews, post-tenure faculty reviews, workload evaluations and assignments (by chairs with dean approval) and other important tasks. It would be a huge burden should these not exist or be in paper format.”

**Challenges to FAR:**
There were numerous challenges noted. Among the most common were: 1) the process was tedious, a waste of time, not intuitive and therefore onerous (esp. when the system changes every so many years); one chair (it seems) put it this way: “it is time consuming and administrators can’t get what they want.” 2) Several responses pointed to the confusion where to put a publication, grant, or other activity (see “not intuitive” above). 3) Metrics further do not lend themselves equally to all fields—the system seems appropriate for scientists (but see criticism of Chemistry and ECE in the data). 4) The population of publications FindScholars was consistently noted as a problem. 5) Pre-populated data from courses, etc. not always accurate. 6) Several chairs complained that they were not able to see their comments/assessment after they submitted them to their deans. One Associate Dean also comments on the challenges of pulling data from MyElements into the college websites, which can be erroneous or misleading, noting also that faculty wish to be able to curate their own publications online.

**Additional Comments:**
Frustration was a common comment (5x, implicit in others), and some were concerned that the inability to opt out may be a violation of academic freedom. One wondered what the point of FAR was if the results are not helpful to the deans. Only two additional comments suggested that the FAR was positive and much needed—despite the condition that it can be much improved. One asked about the cost, and another plaintively stated, “Can we just forget the whole thing?”

2. From Faculty (Senators)

**Faculty Concerns**
The phrase “onerous and not intuitive” best captures the general sentiment of the faculty. Further, there were consistent concerns about where to put a specific faculty activity. In many cases, faculty wondered if the administrative leaders of colleges actually used the reports—which had to be generated after putting in the basic information, thus leading to tedium on the parts of some faculty. One of the chairs noted that her or his dean expressed frustration about the current platform, specifically that she or he could not get what they wanted. It is clear that part of the frustration is with the specific platform used, but many expressed the desire to simply revert to a simpler structure, with many suggesting that, for administrative purposes and P&T cases, a CV and supplemental narrative works best. As for the extension FindScholars—we acknowledge that this is a pendant to our question about FAR, about which there is some confusion—there were many concerns about the automatic generation of faculty research, which was often extremely problematic and erroneous, and the inability to curate one’s own work. Just as frequently faculty noted that the MyElements system was oriented mostly toward the hard sciences, which privileges articles; Humanities and Law faculty, as well as clinical faculty, felt that the system was not designed to highlight their work, and in some cases faculty felt that they “looked” less successful than others because of the particular nature of the platform. The responses also suggested that faculty should have the ability to opt out of FindScholars.
Benefits according to Faculty
By contrast, some faculty commented that there were benefits, although most saw the benefits as accruing to the administrative level. The sense is that FAR is helpful to administrators, for instance, “can be helpful for culling data across departments, etc.,” although it is not clear how helpful it is to deans. Chairs, as noted above, do not see a great benefit. Others saw the benefits of having a consistent record of data, as well as a place to store it and preserve documentation. A few thought that it was more efficient than paper.

3. Final Summation:
There is great frustration on the part of faculty, chairs, and some deans with the input side of MyElements. Chairs do not see the positives of aggregating data, and there seems to be disagreement on the part of deans concerning the benefits of the MyElements software. We have yet to receive a statement from the provost’s office. It is not clear whether their frustration is a criticism of online reporting writ large, or if the criticism is focused on the specific software that has been chosen for our online reporting. According to Terri Winters, MyElements was not originally chosen for FAR, but was purchased by the Research Office to promote UNH faculty research. Initial usage was low (4%). At some point, perhaps in 2016, the decision was made to eliminate Digital Measures, a far more intuitive platform, and commit to MyElements as the FAR system. Since MyElements was not created, it seems, as a Faculty Reporting Tool, it was perhaps inevitable that it would cause consternation among faculty and other administrators. It is possible that, if there was another, more intuitive and less tedious platform to enter faculty activities, that FAR would be more welcomed by faculty and chairs. It may be useful to consider the possibility of disassociating the MyElements tool from Faculty Activity Reporting and to use another, more intuitive platform, perhaps one designed in house, specifically tailored to faculty activities broadly conceived.

4. Raw Data - all comments received via Qualtrics Survey or via Email:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses from deans and chairs to the question “Has electronic reporting of faculty activities helped in aggregating faculty activity?”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have not used it to do this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not significantly as far as I can see.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not currently. It has seemed to be more of a hassle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not really, as the problems of updating the report outweigh the benefits. It would seem more efficient for the chair to receive a description of the year's activities and an updated CV in .pdf form from each faculty member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not really. Because our program (in Humanities) really emphasizes narrative--and often SLOW research, like books--we usually have to write up separate documents anyway describing the scholarly trajectory. Our work is not always easily captured by pre-fab fields and metrics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, to a certain extent. I have not found it to be necessary to aggregate data on a frequent basis. Grant funding aggregation is available via the research office. A summary of manuscripts, scholarly works, and presentations are of value at the department/program level, but less so at the college level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat. The interface is difficult to retrieve information from.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I have not found it helpful at all. Last spring was the end of my first year as Chair and given the frustration of faculty with using MyElements (and the lag time in getting everything migrated in the spring), I did all of the annual reviews, wrote up the department annual report (and earlier in the year had finished writing/revising a ten-year self study) without the help of FAR or MyElements AT ALL. Rather, for merit-equity, annual/post-tenure reviews, and the annual report we use a mix of questionnaires/surveys, highlighted CVs and Box. As a faculty member coming up on my post-tenure reviews in the past, the only thing that I found helpful about the FAR summaries was that it automatically listed the courses I’d taught and enrollments, as well as the number of advisees I had. I never found the summary of my research (either published or in various stages of progress) to be very clear or helpful.

Somewhat. I appreciate being able to add my own activities, but the categories and entry mechanisms don't seem to match well/capture what we do. The reports that I pull for the department have been useless and we need to do it manually.

Not in my view. Using a CV plus a 1-page supplement for student and program/dept work not captured on a CV is far more effective and far less time consuming.

yes, somewhat. The automatic publication finding/notification is working well

No, I find that even after reporting my activities electronically, I'm asked to provide the same information again individually to the Dean's office (under Dean Bostic), as well as to the Department Chair. I also had to compile my activity separately for my department's ten year self study.

The previously-used software package, Digital Measures, had finally evolved to the point where it was useful and pretty straightforward in terms of data entry. Creating reports was also straightforward and it created documents containing relevant information. The current program, myElements, has not provided the features described above, and many of our faculty no longer use it. Instead, narrative reports are sent to the the Chair.

No it is tedious and always incorrect or missing information that cannot be manually entered

(COLSA) The electronic faculty activity reporting is critical to our abilities to complete our pre-tenure faculty annual reviews, post-tenure faculty reviews, workload evaluations and assignments (by chairs with dean approval) and other important tasks. It would be a huge burden should these not exist or be in paper format. That said, we had challenges with the previous Digital Measures FAR software as related to the underlying design not matching our college’s faculty activities as well as it could/should have. The new activities reporting software is in the ‘growing pains’ stage, so we’ll see how it works out, with fingers crossed. The ease (or not) of downloading summaries of the individual reports has sometimes been an issue. Ultimately, while there have and will presumably continue to be some challenges in implementation, the ability to have digital faculty activities reporting is absolutely critical to our operations. We consider that these should also be a resource for our faculty in preparing their tenure, promotion, post-tenure and other materials.

(Paul College) To my knowledge, the benefits were not improved over the previous system used here (which predated my arrival and involvement). There is no way for us to run our own reports so we are dependent on Academic Technology each time we want to pull an aggregate report. We also had to do a great deal of data cleaning in many cases due to faculty confusion about exactly what to report where. If we get to the point where we can pull our own reports, I can see that it will be very helpful for things like pulling data for annual reporting and accreditation self-study reporting.
Responses from chairs and deans to the question: “What challenges have arisen with the use of electronic faculty activity reporting?”

Honestly, it’s a mess. I don’t have access to all faculty in my department. Even when they post reports, I can’t see them on my list. I also really hate that once I forward my remarks to the dean, I no longer have access to what I wrote. (On a side note: Gaining access to teaching evaluations, especially for courses that are housed in COLA yet taught by my department faculty, has proven difficult. Despite the fact that course evaluations are public, I can’t get access without going through the COLA dean’s office. Moreover, the low response rates for course evaluations (not to mention the biases inherent in them: higher grades → higher scores) makes them relatively useless for evaluating faculty teaching.)

Generally speaking, the faculty in my department faced a number of challenges including consistency with SPA and the metrics showing up in my elements. They also had misinformation (degree, title, etc.) as well as difficulty determining the "boxes" where information fit. This was especially evident to engaged service and with clinical faculty members.

The chosen fields do not apply to all the various faculty roles so in some cases only uploading a narrative covers the unique aspects of faculty work. Having to upload a narrative seems to negate the value of an online reporting system.

Unable to move the process from individual review, to chair review, to department/dean review. There are no "super users"

With multiple changes in software, faculty have lost interest in participating. Time is short, and faculty have more important items to address than electronic reporting.

(A) the reluctance of faculty to use it, and faculty irritation with the platforms; and (B) the fact that these platforms are generally designed with scientists in mind. It can be hard to figure out where to PUT different activities, and they have not (at UNH, historically) always been configured in ways that help scholars in Liberal Arts.

In addition to faculty time being wasted in the process of entering data, confusion with respect to the consistent use of fields is the biggest one. For example, different department cultures impact the way scholarship with undergraduate students is reported.

Frankly, the problems are that people continue to have to fix the errors in FAR about their CV information, hard to account for long-term work (like books, etc.) -- it seems best set up to handle articles, discourages significantly thoughtful reporting on faculty activities, and a nightmare for reporting service activities. FAR is also incompatible for our promotion and tenure process so we have two parallel processes for reporting out for our junior faculty, who really don't need the extra work.

Faculty do not use consistently. Faculty do not update fields that are then aggregated across other fields. Information is often missing or incorrect.

No support for collaboratively reviewing reporting with the faculty member. Lack of clarity about what goes in certain sections. No support for uploading an attachment with the chair’s review Confusion about how items are selected to appear in the report (based on dates that must be provided when items are created)

Lots of fields listed when items are created, which makes the process tedious.

Multiple challenges regarding the use of MyElements. The categories used by MyElements are rigid and often times don’t accurately depict the reality of various academic pieces. Navigation of MyElements is not at all easy. Additionally, faculty approach electronic FAR from vastly different perspectives. For some the electronic FAR is simply a recording device, and they continue to write multi-page self-assessments annually. Others do their entire self-assessment in MyElements (although with differing degrees of completeness). This makes the job of Chair challenging as it is not always clear where to go for what information.
Many faculty had difficulty with MyElements importing publications last spring and much of the information that has been curated has not been productively codified. For example, some faculty have book reviews or grant proposals, or even conference presentations, mixed in with publications. In my own MyElements, none of my books were included or were migrated to FindScholars. Also, the citation measures in MyElements seem way off for all of us—and very different from what you’d find in Google Scholar. Also, faculty who have had long careers now find that there is a quite a lot they have to retroactively add in to MyElements now, which is time consuming and also seems useless as the potential for a new system in the next few years seems probable.

Whatever is going on with MyElements and how it is populating the new webpages is really off. Everything needs to be reentered manually. For example, it does not list books for our faculty in recent publications. Books are far and away our most important efforts, so this is a head scratcher. The formatting for all entries is super wonky. Why can’t it just put things in Chicago (or similar) style? That would seem like a pretty basic essential function for software of this type.

The software makes reporting far more time consuming than the prior method, thus creating incentives for non-compliance by faculty. Specific problems include: 1. inability to import a range of publication formats. 2. extensive questions that encourage over-reporting of all kinds of activity that are not really necessary to collect data on in the first place. 3. Way too much time required of faculty already overburdened by extensive budget cuts.

Lots of reporting categories are not particularly appropriate for a given discipline; the time frame (how far back should we go) is also unclear for the many specific categories (the things that are not harvested from online sources).

It doesn't seem to work as designed. Several activities don’t fit neatly into the categories, and it is time intensive to enter the information into the system. On top of that, once we do invest the time, administrators/department chairs/personnel committees often don’t seem able to access it readily, and ask us to submit the same information to them individually.

Much of the data imported and/or entered into myElements is corrupted. Creating reports with myElements requires more effort than editing the narrative reports provided by faculty. Cutting and pasting from myElements reports requires reformatting, in part due to the use of boxes in myElements. Because of the myriad problems experienced in using myElements, our faculty voted unanimously to move away from digital reporting of activities and to use activity narratives instead.

Many fields and pages are blocked from adding missing information and there is no easy way to load you publications from google scholar. Many grants and publications are always missing and service is not easily understood or entered in these drop down menus.

(Paul College) Our biggest challenges have been with the effort to use MyElements to feed our website. We are still chasing down problems created by this transition, which have included duplicate and/or erroneous titles, missing or incorrect degrees, incorrect publication counts, inclusion of conference proceedings as most recent publications, and the inability for faculty to make any web corrections/changes on their own. For example, many faculty wish to include their seminal publications (which may not be their most cited) in the list of 10, but are currently unable to do so. Faculty have also complained that they can no longer ask their admins to help with clearing up these issues without sharing their login information, which is of course not a good practice. I believe Goksel Yalcinkaya may have copied you on his lengthy and detailed email about these issues.
### Responses to deans and chairs to the question “Is there anything else you would like to share about electronic faculty reporting?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty report spending a lot of time listing past activities and research and being frustrated by the process. Perhaps more training would help. But generally speaking, I think we should consider another interface for faculty reporting.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essentially, our faculty got really frustrated. Teaching scores, evals didn’t automatically populate, which forced another step. The time it took them to complete it was not efficient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is cumbersome and I have heard many individuals express frustration over the limitations and incorrect data entered automatically by the university systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having an opt-out possibility with publishing one’s research profile as represented by electronic reports would seem to violate academic freedom. Faculty should have the right to decide how to present themselves publicly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be super helpful to get a clear sense from the deans, especially, about when and why these are used. A couple of deans ago, we were being required to use the FAR when the associate dean himself did not understand how to use the platform. That causes obvious resentment and hostility. Is it the numbers of publications and peer-reviewed journals they are really after? Fine: Symplectic makes it much easier to go in and approve our publications. But do we really NEED to be entering all of this information about our service activities, which are (a) usually enumerated elsewhere in our c.v.s and narrative reports; and (b) not taken seriously in any administrative decisions about our lives?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An updated CV (perhaps greater department oversight on consistency in the CV would be of value) and a short narrative is likely to be of equal or greater value in assessing the performance of an individual faculty member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university seems unable to figure out how they want this reporting to happen. I dealt with the first attempt which my chair and I found terrible. And this one has its own issues -- they miscategorized faculty, I spent time giving the implementation team documents but never heard back from them, etc. I find the whole thing very frustrating. And this is all before I work with my dean on this which is another host of problems. There has got to be a better way. I wish I wasn't so negative (I'm upbeat about it in public discussions with my faculty) but here we are.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The FAR systems to date have been difficult, but I think a more user friendly system would be quite helpful. It is better than having paper submissions and no way to aggregate or automate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online faculty reporting is a much needed system. More feedback should flow from faculty to system's designers and maintainers to improve the use of the system. We should continue the conversation about how we name and categorize items that go in the system. There should be a better integration with the course evaluations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think it is universally despised. It is a lot to ask of faculty--especially lecturers who are asked to fill this out by April 15 or something like that--one of the busiest periods of the semester. Also, the FindScholars seems to mis-represent humanities scholars research and the pull-down options for research areas are woefully inadequate to describe the many varied sub-disciplines in which we work. As a Chair, I see no way that this could be helpful, but perhaps I have yet to discover all of the possibilities of aggregate data. That said, CVs have worked for decades and I was able to do all the reporting/evaluating that I needed to with this &quot;old school&quot; method last year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope we aren't paying much for it!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It represents an unnecessary burden and should be discontinued in favor of electronic submission of CV's and 1-page supplements, shared through the existing department/dean sharing Box files.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not clear to me how I can aggregate as chair to assemble results from a specific category for my department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: this is a continuation of my previous survey submission in which I did not fill in this question. Our faculty voted unanimously to have control over the FindScholars privacy settings so that we can have control over how the our information can be searched. Currently, we do not have control over this feature.

Can we just forget the whole thing?! The chairs and deans admit to not even looking at these for annual reviews so I see no reason for this whatsoever

### Responses from faculty to the question “What Problems have faculty in your department encountered with electronic reporting? ”

Married faculty who changed their names cannot have all their papers included, only those under one name. There is no clear narrative or coherence in the FAR. It takes a great deal of time. Everything is reduced to numbers with no real information. It is generally worse than the old system. There is no way for co-I to receive a fair (or any) share of credit on grants.

- The new websites (the new Paul College website, and the FindScholars@unh website) are not flexible enough to allow faculty members to display their professional name which may differ from their legal name in the HR banner system. I am sure there are several faculty members who are facing this problem, especially female faculty members who may have chosen to use their maiden name in the past. For instance, one faculty member at the marketing department, has different names showing on these two platforms, none of which match her chosen professional name (Billur Akdeniz) https://findscholars.unh.edu/display/mbe27 https://paulcollege.unh.edu/person/m-billur-billur-talay  Dr. has been communicating with Terri Winters, and this is the most recent update Terri has provided: "I have been in contact with USNH Human Resources staff and have relayed the issue and the importance of resolving it. They are scheduled to start a project in the new year which will address this issue. They will be inviting participants from the campuses, and we will have working with USNH on this issue. They will be using this EDUCAUSE approach outlined in this article: https://library.educause.edu/resources/2018/4/gender-identity-in-higher-education"

- Undergrad and grad and honors data is merged. For Promotion cases, P&T committees are asked to respond to prompts about teaching of undergrads vs. teaching of grads. The current data presentation tells you how many of each responded but doesn’t separate the two groups (or if it does, it is really not obvious). As a result, we lose the written evaluations as a source of information for the promotion narrative. - Low response rates. In my experience, it takes quite a lot of effort from the instructor (repeated reminders and/or a loss of class time for students to complete the evaluations in class, which defeats one advantage of switching to electronic from paper) to get anywhere near the rate from the paper evals. This low rate also likely means that people at the extremes are the most likely respondents (love the class/hate the class). Pre-populated data for teaching and research is often inaccurate in MyElements. Entering in data for conferences attended and related entries is very labor-intensive. FindScholars lacks flexibility in customizing the outward facing information in the profile. I particularly dislike the automated listing of publications using criteria selected by the administration. Faculty should have the freedom to post whatever publications they feel are most appropriate.

finding the correct spot for their achievements

From Law School (collected via ): Many: — The only available citation form bears no resemblance to law citation forms, making our website profiles look bad. — The information feeds for citation counts do not pull from databases of legal publications, and so are basically random for law publications. — Selecting a publication as a “favorite” does not appear to do anything; in particular, it does not appear to change which publications are listed on a website bio. — Many of the publications are inexplicably in all caps, despite changing the relevant fields in MyElements. The only apparent way to work around this problem is to reject the publication in MyElements and reenter it from scratch. — Only being able to list the five most recent publications and the five “highest cited” ones may skip important publications.
Entering data into the system is cumbersome. It should be easier and/or faster to input data. There are too many clicks and sub-pages that need to be accessed in order to put information into the correct place. The system has not always captured external data correct. For example, one published article was found and another was not. This created extra work to input the doi and/or article information manually. It is not always clear where some information should placed (for example presentations vs. non-peer-reviewed articles vs. peer-reviewed articles).

Specialty areas for degrees are wrong; Entry form data entry blanks suggest material will be grabbed from all fields, but it is not. No online tutorial or examples of entries.

Categories not matching our activities

Faculty members should be given control of the privacy settings for FindScholars so that they can set the manner in which their own content can be searched.

The biggest issues are: 1- changing the reporting mechanisms often over the last 5 years so that lots of effort is required each time a new system is chosen. 2-taking information from UNH databases that are incorrect. 3-faculty losing control of what is reported with no ability to correct information that is wrong.

Have many issues with the process. For starters-it really only captures pertinent information for tenured/tenure track faculty and publications. There are three other types of faculty appointments that are not week represented with the current system. For example, as a clinical faculty member my administrative positions and my clinical presentations/reports are not included in the report. My few peer-reviewed publications are also not easily accessible via the system and require much effort on my part to find them and connect to the system. I also have small, administrative grants that are not represented - nor are the ones for which I am not a PI but am a research team member. I also think the way myelements includes course information does not allow for evaluation reporting.

It's somewhat onerous and not intuitive.

The obvious prioritization of peer reviewed journal articles, when that may not be the best way to assess lecturers, clinical faculty and heavy teaching TT faculty, or faculty who work in a field where books and not peer reviewed articles are the norm.

Not seeing how the input will be displayed in the report or on our websites. Its very unclear where certain items go and what will be displayed, even when using that master sheet of categories.

VERY clunky and time consuming to add information. Further, this is really focused on promoting faculty with research/publishing activities. It marginalizes lecturers -- makes it seem that we don't do as much.

not intuitive to figure out on your own

The biggest issue with the whole FAR process is I have never received ANY feedback or review comments from any of the people that are supposed to be reading these reports. I specifically requested feedback at the end of a report over 5 years ago, and got nothing. So guess what? I stopped doing them, haven't done one since. And nobody has ever said anything to me. So that tells me that nobody ever reads them, they are just busywork. I don't have time for busywork.

Software not appropriate for the social sciences.

The problems had by faculty in my department are legion, ranging from the lack of appropriate categories to record information, to the great difficulty in finding their publications using the tools provided by the system, to the lack of effective models for recalling information. In addition to the basic set up of the My Elements, which is clearly not designed for people in the humanities, the sheer amount of time required to use the system is an enormous drawback, particularly given the very easy model that we had before electronic FAR, which allowed us to record all of our information quickly and easily and in a manner that allowed members of my department to recall their work from past years. This was particularly valuable aspect, now lost, for preparing candidates for promotion and tenure cases as well as for 3 and 5 year reports.
(English) Learning a new system every 5 years, for the benefit of the university (where is the benefit for faculty?), has taken valuable time away from my scholarship and teaching. I spent many hours on the phone and in training sessions, and the final printed format from, say, FAR or MyElements, never looks as good as my own self-constructed cv, which means I input information in two different places.

(English) At year’s end or for self-study purposes, the chair often asks faculty to send her a list of publications for annual reporting. My assumption is that electronic uploading would give the COLA dean’s office, from where the request arises, the ability to download this information from MyElements without having to request it, again, from faculty.

(English) “Many of our colleagues feel deeply dissatisfied with electronic faculty activity reporting. Electronic reporting forces choices upon faculty to “count” certain publications and discount others. It is very difficult to use—it is also extremely difficult to make corrections once information has been submitted. Electronic reporting also seems ill-suited to faculty working in the humanities.”

(English) “I really had a difficult time using MyElements. It's not at all intuitive, even after watching some of the how-to videos. I find it to be overly complicated and cumbersome. I'm usually a fan of software—especially when it streamlines my work, but this just added hours upon hours to my day. (I wasn't even able to include my recent grant award of $100,000 from the National Park Service--apparently because the project doesn't begin until August 2018, though I spent this last six months writing the proposal and meeting NPS staff in order to secure the grant. Anyway, I submitted the report and now I'm unable to edit it).... So, in short, I find the software itself to be cumbersome, complicated and time consuming to use/navigate, in part because the categories don't fit my work.”

(English) “It is cumbersome and very time-consuming to use, especially for a humanist. The system is geared to the needs of a scientist, so categories don't fit humanists' work; for example, the assumptions are that works will be co-authored (rare in the humanities). And I'm supposed to return again and again to this to report on when each stage of a project is hit?!!? Some of the categories also encourage the entry of minor admin activities, rather than keeping the focus squarely on reporting of key faculty activities like publication and teaching. Also, we all have CVs, so this means entering data twice for every publication or accomplishment we have. It is exceptionally wasteful of faculty time simply to provide a convenience for administrators. Faculty time is the university's most precious resource - it is how research and good teaching are made - and this tool squanders it. I filled out some of mine, but eventually I quit because it was so time-consuming and frustrating to work with.

Just as important, systems shape perceptions - they are not neutral. This system encourages administrators to treat research and teaching as decontextualized data points that can be plotted on some master spreadsheet, rather than having a familiarity with the faculty's research areas and teaching and a nuanced understanding of differences in quality and significance. That is to say, this system divides administrators from the basic work of faculty and contributes to mutual lack of cooperation and suspicion between the two groups.

The third issue has to do with the university spending our very precious financial resources on these kinds of tech management tools. They are expensive and involve the university in the consultant-industrial complex, at a time when basic academic programs are being told they must trim budgets to handle a never-ending financial crisis.

Lastly, there was considerable benefit to our writing year-end evaluative reports of ourselves. It was a means for faculty to engage in self-reflection and self-presentation of accomplishments, a means to provide some context for the work we do while at the same time providing basic accounting of our activities. In our department's evaluation of faculty, we have found those documents enormously useful in providing a fair picture of faculty labor. What I sense is that over time administration has become less and less interested in reading these kinds of documents, so we are moving to push-button programs. A crazy suggestion: why don't those in administration just read our CVs?”
I’ve been to two help sessions and written to someone, to no avail. So much trouble with this system. First, it won’t let me use my full name even though I put that in as an alternate, and only pulls for initials + last name, so there are tons of docs, but not mine. And, of course, the search engines don’t work for creative work: novels, poems, essays, short stories. Then for reporting and placing things in my record, there are no places for novels, short stories, poems, etc. … not a fan!”

The software does “not ‘populate’ with all of our publications automatically, as they have been advertising they will. There are works that are not available easily in electronic format so they seem not to be searchable…. The system doesn’t seem to know what to do with the nuances of genre in what we write, [or how] to express our scholarly research and what we are researching as subject matter…. One quick example – some of my own work doesn’t work in the current classifications as it simultaneously exists in several disciplinary and genre categories at once.

There are way too many segmented pieces of information asked for that a traditional bibliography or CV could so much more efficiently record and reveal…. Narrative is always preferable in the humanities…

There is also no efficient way … to fill in publications from the last 20 years, before the last six or so when we have begun to adopt these electronic systems. All those prior publications are not getting populated or visible in the system.

The cost of the program and its administration on top of the wasted time of the faculty trying to do the reporting is so expensive as to militate against the adoption of any more of these systems at this moment.”

The main issues that have been mentioned are the system is difficult to use, is too complicated and does not adequately represent the information which is important to the faculty in our department. No one appears to be even close to satisfied with the FAR reporting system.

There is ambiguity as to where to enter data into fields. It seems many activities could fit into more than one place.

The MyElements web interface looks straightforward but has a number of quirks, and demands an endless collection of data. I easily spent eight hours this year getting information in the right place. The transition to faculty webpages populated directly from MyElements was a disaster that caught many of us by surprise. One day, I had a faculty web page that was easily updated and where I had a lot of local control; the next day, my web page was a disaster and I had to scramble to get all the right boxes filled in on MyElements. This was poorly thought out and implemented.

Faculty compliance in my department has been mixed and our department chair has not said a word as far as I know. He should be encouraging all faculty to keep this up to date but seems to care only about junior faculty. We still have a lot of faculty webpages with jumbled and missing information.

Extremely redundant of the CV. Stilting and amazingly time consuming.

It is hard to want to invest time in a technology format that is likely to change, extremely consuming, and redundant of other standards in our field for demonstrating our work.

Responses from Faculty to the question “What benefits do you see accruing from electronic reporting?”

The new system for finding papers works relatively well. Aside from Co-I’s, the grant system seems to work relatively well.

No comments received on this item.
It’s much easier to read the student comments, since they are typed and not hand-written. There are no preferable alternatives to electronic reporting, so I support continuing to use this mechanism for faculty to record their outputs.

| more efficient than paper easier to gather data |
| None |

It is helpful to have a consistent record of data and a main location to access that data.

| Saves paper and gives some (though not perfect) insight into the degree to which scholarly work is used by others. |
| None |

None! The ECE faculty prefers the narrative form of reporting activities (teaching, research, committees)

| There are no benefits from this approach. It takes longer and results in incorrect information. The administration tells everyone it is working fine, but that is "fake news". |
| I think having an electronic reporting system can be immensely helpful in culling data across departments, faculty position types, and within departments. I also think it serves as a record of faculty accountability. |
| Perhaps it keeps a more accurate, long-term storage of faculty information. |
| It is a way to capture what someone has done over time and keep an easy to access record for all, but the record also needs to capture what the faculty person is or has been assigned to do, for example 25% teaching, 25% research, 50% cooperative extension, which again would show someone with many outreach activities and popular press articles. |
| Less paper. |
| TBD. The system has yet to impress me. |

preservation of documentation

| I do agree that it is a good idea to track course evaluation score stats, although in my case I generally have only about 30% return rate of students that take the time to fill out evaluations, so they are mostly irrelevant. Otherwise, I see no benefit from this reporting process at all. |
| Limited, if software does not meet the need of the discipline |
| Not a single member of my department identified a single benefit from electronic reporting. |
| (English) None so far. FAR was started under Ken Fuld’s leadership (I think) to assist in counting faculty publications and other work, but to what end? Who sees the accrued information and for what purposes? How does it assist faculty? Where are the uses of MyElements posted so faculty can understand how it helps our college and department? |
| (English) The benefits for administrators are many: you don’t have to read CVs or faculty self-evaluations, you can readily construct spreadsheets, you can create (potentially false) comparisons between decontextualized ‘data points,’ you have yet another instrument of administrative control. Perhaps there may be some benefit for outside parties interested in judging what faculty are working on. But we have other tools that would be better for communicating that information. I see little benefit for rank-and-file faculty, especially those in the humanities. This duplicates what is already in CVs and other reports we produce.” |
| (Chemistry) I personally do not see any benefit to the faculty. Entering the FAR using the last to systems provided results in the wasting a lot of faculty time. Not money well spent. |
| (Chemistry) None. |
| (Chemistry) What exactly are we reporting? Who is reading it? What are the tangible outcomes? Why and how has this sort of activity become a normality? None of this is clear in any way, and the whole process is an exercise in futility. It should be eliminated. |
**Responses from the Faculty to the question “Is there anything further you would like to share about electronic faculty activity reporting?”**

Beyond grants and publication, the overwhelming majority would prefer to return to a simple narrative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No comments received on this item.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One size doesn’t necessarily fit all - does it really need to do that?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have also been asked to enter all my activities — conference presentations, panels, &amp;c. Going back to the beginning of my CV, this would take days and days, and there is no chance I am going to remember to do it on an ongoing basis. I have asked if faculty assistants can do this and am told that they will be able to, but haven’t been trained yet. In general, this entire process seems to create work but no benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 main suggestions: 1) make it easier and faster to input data and 2) allow the creation/modification of outputs, for example a certain CV format.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFAR is extremely time consuming to complete and it lacks the detail that can be reported in narrative form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, it lists my teaching incorrectly and no one can fix it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the reporting structure captured the main areas of all our faculty appointments - allowing for manual inputting of service and program direction and clinical scholarship for clinical faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It should capture all of the activities various faculty do, and then share that back to the larger university community for use in other areas, so that it accurately reflects what the person teaches, does for research, outreach and publications and all other forms of scholarly activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unless someone is going to provide feedback to the faculty member filling out the report, then the whole thing should be abolished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why not something simple so that it fits into a normal cv?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is the unanimous view of the 20 members of my department that the entire electronic reporting system should be scrapped, and that the department should be allowed to return to its former model of reporting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(English) The university has done a good job in making sure we are supported in learning the digital reporting platforms they choose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(English) My own sense is that it has been an expensive mistake to buy a one-size-fits-all software program that does not report—and CANNOT report—accurately the work of humanities scholars and teachers. ESL faculty also do not feel that it accurately reports service work. Based on what I’ve heard and on my own experience, I would advocate for the solution noted in 3.b: get rid of it—at least for COLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Chemistry) Go back to using a simple narrative form with whatever tables, etc are appropriate for the specific discipline. Stop over managing what should be a straightforward and simple process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the corporate model that is now pervasive at UNH, this all makes complete sense. But when I read back through my annual reports written earlier in my career at UNH, I have a deep sense of loss. Those earlier reports chronicle my career in a way that the current electronic system cannot approach. They earlier narratives were also essential for department chairs to keep up with faculty activities. In the electronic FAR, very little is requested in narrative form and I have zero expectation that anyone is reading this. It is all about the numbers. I am very active in my professional field but our department chair seems to know almost nothing about my professional activities.

One serious issue connected to the current system is faculty webpages. These are tremendously important as our professional window to the world. I work part time for a funding agency and I spend a lot of time searching faculty webpages in my field to find reviewers and panelists. By comparison to what I see elsewhere across US academic institutions, the boilerplate directly-populated faculty webpages at UNH are subpar - unattractive and minimally informative. These need a substantial redesign. One inexcusable blunder was the virtual elimination of a web presence for emeritus faculty, who are now relegated to a minimal description on a graveyard page that might just as well read "Not Dead Yet". The emeritus faculty in my department are very unhappy about this disrespectful treatment. Emeritus faculty - who are often still active professionally - deserve an option to be listed on departmental web pages.

When they went to electronic reporting, I found the form far too burdensome and complicated to fill out. I think faculty should have the option of doing it the old way.
USNH Amorous Relationship Policy announced on October 10, 2018

3.6 Amorous Relationship Policy (not included in Spanish version)

3.6.1 Purpose. For the University System of New Hampshire (USNH), as at all institutions of higher learning, it is necessary to acknowledge and establish relationship boundaries in our living, learning and working environment, especially where there are existing hierarchies and power dynamics. This policy provides clarifications and guidelines to prevent conflicts of interest that can occur when members of the USNH community engage in amorous relationships, and especially those whose institutional roles place them in an uneven power dynamic.

The power difference inherent in the faculty-student or staff-student relationship means that any amorous relationship between a faculty or staff member with a student is potentially exploitative and either should be avoided, or is prohibited as indicated in 3.6.4.2 below. In the event of a charge of Sexual Harassment arising from such circumstances, the institution will in general be unsympathetic to a “consent” defense when facts establish that a faculty-student or staff-student power differential existed within the relationship.

3.6.2 Scope. This policy is applicable at all locations and to all persons employed or who hold a volunteer status by USNH. This includes, but is not limited to, adjunct and status faculty and staff. This policy also informs actions that relate to third party contractors who provide outsourced services to USNH. This policy does not regulate amorous relationships between undergraduate students, except to the extent that students are also USNH employees.

3.6.2.1 Faculty includes tenured, tenure-track, or non-tenure-track faculty appointments (includes ranks of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and or professor) and non-tenure-track faculty (includes, but is not limited to, clinical, research, lecturer, extension, ROTC, visiting, adjunct, post-doc, graduate/teaching assistant, research assistant, emeritus, and affiliate faculty).

3.6.2.2 Staff includes employees and volunteers not classified as faculty (includes but is not limited to salary paid staff, hourly paid staff, adjunct staff, casual staff, Extension Educator (EE), Executive Officers, Academic Administrators, student employees, Resident Assistants, volunteer coaches and other volunteers, and emeritus staff).

3.6.2.3 Locations includes but is not limited to, any USNH property, any sponsored activity outside USNH property, such as USNH sanctioned internships, study abroad programs, online learning, or other education or employment context.

3.6.2.4 This policy does not address non-consensual interpersonal behaviors not countenanced by USNH under any circumstances (see USNH Discriminatory Harassment Policy USY.V.D.3.5 and applicable Discrimination and Discriminatory Harassment (including Sexual Harassment) Policies at each institution).

3.6.3 Definitions
3.6.3.1 Amorous Relationship: Any interpersonal relationship that is intimate, sexual, and/or any other type of amorous encounter or relationship, whether casual or serious, short-term or long-term. Amorous relationships covered by this policy might exist between Faculty members, Staff members, Faculty and Staff, Staff and Students or Faculty and Students at USNH.

3.6.3.2 Student: All persons taking courses at USNH, full-time or part-time, and including undergraduate, graduate, certificate or non-degree students; residential, commuter and online.

3.6.3.3 Uneven Power Dynamic: A circumstance where one party has the professional responsibility to evaluate the other party's academic and/or work performance and/or the responsibility to perform in a "check and balance" (e.g. signing off on timesheet or expense payment) role relative to the other, or where there is a reasonably foreseeable possibility that one party could be called upon to participate in decisions affecting the other party's employment or academic prospects. This dynamic exists in the context of grading, promotion and tenure decisions, salary-setting, hiring, termination, provision of references or reference letters, or any other category of action or influence relevant to academic and/or professional advancement or demotion. An “uneven power dynamic” also exists when there is a relationship between peers who work in positions where the relationship creates a real or perceived conflict of interest (e.g., where both parties are members of a work or academic group and the relationship impacts group dynamics).

3.6.4 Statement of Policy and Process

3.6.4.1 The parties involved in any amorous relationship with an uneven power dynamic are immediately required to disclose the relationship to the proper supervisory authorities and Equal Employment Opportunity Officer as applicable at each institution, and cooperate fully in steps necessary to eliminate the dynamic. Where an amorous relationship is suspected but the parties did not report, the supervisor is required to report to the Equal Employment Opportunity Officer so that an investigation can be initiated.

Steps to eliminate the uneven power dynamic may include, but are not be limited to, reassignment of supervisory and/or check and balance oversight duties in which decisions affect the other party's academic and/or professional advancement, or demotion and recusal of one party from all institutional decisions related to the other. When the power dynamic cannot be eliminated, one or both parties may be moved to a different role, or if no other role is available or appropriate, leave the institution. Parties who find themselves in an uneven power dynamic with someone from a past amorous relationship, or current spouse are also subject to the disclosure and recusal requirements. All relationship management plans must be approved in writing by the Equal Employment Opportunity Officer as applicable at each institution, Human Resources and the employee(s)’ supervisor.

3.6.4.2 Students. Subject to limited exceptions herein (i.e., past amorous relationship or spouse), all members of the faculty and staff are prohibited from pursuing or engaging in an amorous relationship with any undergraduate student. With respect to graduate students, all faculty and staff are prohibited from pursuing or engaging in an amorous relationship with a graduate student under that individual’s authority or who might reasonably be perceived as
having influence over employment or academic advancement/opportunities. Situations of authority include, but are not limited to, teaching, mentoring or advising, supervision of research or employment, supervision of internships, exercising substantial responsibility for grades, honors, or degrees, and involvement in disciplinary action related to the student.

3.6.4.3 Obligation to Provide Truthful Information and Follow Policy. All USNH members are expected to provide truthful information in any report, investigation, or proceeding under this policy. Submitting or providing false or misleading information in bad faith or with a view to personal gain or intentional harm to another is prohibited and subject to disciplinary action. This does not apply to reports or information provided in good faith, even if the facts alleged in the report are not later substantiated. Faculty or Staff refusing to cooperate with the reassignment of duties or other steps, or who deny the existence of the relationship where evidence supports its existence, will be subject to disciplinary measures.
Dear Members of the UNH Community,

The University System of New Hampshire amorous relationship policy has been approved by the board of trustees. It provides an update to the UNH policy and will now apply to all institutions of USNH. We thank you in advance for increasing your awareness of this policy as we work to reduce the risk and conflict of interest that is inherent with amorous relationships that involve an uneven power dynamic. An amorous relationship is defined as any interpersonal relationship that is intimate, sexual, and/or any other type of amorous encounter or relationship, whether casual or serious, short-term or long-term.

Please review the policy as well as a list of FAQs. Some key highlights:

- Faculty and staff cannot pursue or engage in amorous relationships with undergraduate students.
- Graduate assistants, teaching assistants and all student workers (graduate or undergraduate) are also subject to this policy, and cannot pursue or engage in amorous relationships with any other student who they may teach, grade or supervise.
- A current or past amorous relationship must be disclosed if there is currently an uneven power dynamic, a possibility that one party may participate in employment or academic decisions affecting the other, and/or risk that the relationship impacts the dynamics of a work group or academic group/department.
- Supervisors who suspect an amorous relationship with an uneven power dynamic that is denied or not disclosed must contact the Affirmative Action & Equity Office for investigation.
- Disclosing an amorous relationship will result in a written plan to mitigate an uneven power dynamic or potential negative impact to the work or academic dynamic.

If you don’t know if you should disclose an amorous relationship or you have questions
about the policy, reach out confidentially to your Human Resource partner or the Affirmative Action and Equity Office for help.

Wayne Jones  
Interim Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

Christopher D. Clement  
Vice President for Finance and Administration
Highlights - Amorous Relationship Policy update

- Why was this policy updated and does it apply to me?
  UNH wanted to clarify its existing Consensual Amorous Relationship policy and the USNH Board of Trustees wanted a system-wide USNH Amorous Relationship policy. Utilizing the UNH Consensual Relationship Policy as a foundation, the USNH institutions collaborated to clarify and then extend the policy beyond UNH to GSC, KSC, and PSU. This policy is an important part of the university’s ongoing effort to provide an equitable workplace, protecting employees in amorous relationships from a violation of the USNH conflict of interest policy and potential legal claims, and helping ensure no perception of favoritism or undue influence by those who are in such relationships. The policy applies to all faculty, staff, volunteers, student employees – including graduate and teaching assistants - and the policy informs actions related to vendors/contractors providing services to our community.

- What’s the difference between this updated policy and the UNH Consensual Amorous Relationship policy?
  Key clarifications in this policy include:
  o Faculty and staff are prohibited from pursuing or engaging in an amorous relationship with undergraduate students
  o Graduate and teaching assistants are prohibited from dating any undergraduate student who they supervise, or may have impact to the student’s academic/employment dynamic, or are in the same academic program by the department
  o The policy applies to undergraduate students who supervise or may have impact to the student’s academic dynamic
  o Parties involved in any amorous relationship with an uneven power dynamic are required to disclose the relationship to authorities
  o Parties must disclose a past amorous relationship if there is currently an uneven power dynamic
  o Supervisors who suspect an amorous relationship with an uneven power dynamic that is denied or not disclosed must report to AAEO for investigation
  o When an uneven power dynamic cannot be eliminated, one or both parties may be moved to a different role, or if no other role is available or appropriate, leave the institution

- What is the policy definition of an amorous relationship?
  Any interpersonal relationship that is intimate, sexual, and/or any other type of amorous encounter or relationship, whether casual or serious, short or long-term.

- What if I am unclear if I should disclose or not?
  You can confidentially reach out to your HR Partner or the Affirmative Action and Equity Office who will help you determine if there is a need to report the current or past relationship.

- What is an uneven power dynamic?
  A circumstance where:
  o one party has professional responsibility to evaluate the other party’s academic and/or work performance, and/or a “check and balance” role relative to the other (e.g., sign off on a time sheet or expense report),
  o one party could be called upon to participate in decisions affecting the other party’s employment or academic prospects (e.g. promotion, grading, work evaluation, etc.)
• where both parties are members of a team/work group/academic group and the relationship can reasonably be perceived as having influence on others of their team/group.

• Does this apply just to the campus environment?
The policy applies to all locations and venues where work or academics are performed, including but not limited to, our Concord and Manchester locations, off site internships, workshops, conferences, athletic/recreational events and trips abroad.

• To whom do I disclose the existence of an amorous relationship?
To your supervisor, who will then contact Human Resources or the Affirmative Action and Equity Office.

• What is the process after I disclose?
You will work with your supervisor and/or your HR partner to create a written plan to formalize steps taken to mitigate an uneven power dynamic or potential impact to the work or academic dynamic. The plan will include reassignment of supervisory and/or check and balance oversight duties and recusal of the parties from all institutional decisions related to the other. In some circumstances, it may be necessary to modify employment roles.

• The following are examples which would be considered violations of this Policy:
  o Lecturer engages in a relationship with an undergraduate student who is pursuing a degree in another College.
  o Administrator pursues a relationship with a non-traditional age undergraduate student working at an off-campus location affiliated with UNH.
  o Faculty of similar status go out on a couple of dates. One faculty is promoted to Chair. Parties fail to disclose the amorous relationship.
  o A faculty and a staff member were married and then became divorced. They remained employed at UNH. Several years later, the faculty becomes a PI (Principal Investigator) on a research grant and the ex-spouse assists with the administrative duties in managing the grant. They failed to disclose their prior marriage.
  o The spouse of a faculty member is accepted into the graduated program of the department. They failed to disclose their marriage. When other graduate students learn of the marriage they raise the issue and believe that the spouse is receiving special treatment.
  o A member of the community volunteers to coach a Campus Recreation Sport Club Team and engages in a relationship with a member of that team.
  o An undergraduate work-study student with supervisory responsibility begins dating an undergraduate student who they supervise.
  o Two Resident Assistants (RA) live in the same residential hall and are engaged in an amorous romantic relationship. The following year, one elects to not be an RA and becomes a resident of that residential hall. They failed to disclose their relationship.
APPENDIX 2.1

DIVERSITY & INCLUSION TRAINING
to be offered by Higher Ed Talent
February 21, 2019

Possible topics:
1. Defining concepts such as privilege, power, social identity, unconscious bias, microaggressions

2. Defining cultural competence

3. Skill building, especially around difficult conversations, such as whiteness. How do we approach these necessary conversations among ourselves, with those we work?

4. Understanding daily systemic inequalities and how subjects are affected. Understanding what an inclusive environment informed by everyday social justice look like at UNH.

5. Learning the relationship between social justice and education, social justice and student learning outcomes

6. Understanding the contexts and cultures within institutions that affect the operation and management of effective diversity change efforts

7. Understanding contemporary issues related to social justice in higher education

8. Engaging participants who might resent doing diversity work in their units (often required by deans or chairs or supervisors), thus learning how organizations can present the significance and value of social justice for all

9. Best practices for incorporating diversity and inclusion in daily conversations and work, pedagogical style, recruitment, retention

10. Write in:

Possible pedagogical approaches most valuable to approaching this material:
1. Experiential and interactive work
2. Case studies
3. Modeling difficult conversations
4. Self-exploration
5. Mainly informational relay
6. In-depth discussions
7. Write in:
APPENDIX 4.1

FACULTY SENATE MOTION
on recognition of religious holidays in academic and campus calendar

Rationale: To create a fully inclusive campus community that is respectful of the needs of all students.

Motion: The faculty senate recommends the following actions to acknowledge major holidays and observances, and to increase awareness of needs for accommodations:

1. The faculty senate recommends that significant religious holidays and observances, such as Yom Kippur, both days of Rosh Hashanah, Eid al-Adha and Eid al-Fitr be identified on each year’s academic calendar.

2. The faculty senate recommends that course instructors include the following statement in their syllabi to address the needs of students of all faiths, “In the event that a student needs accommodation for a religious or cultural holiday/observance, that student is encouraged to make that request as early in the semester as possible”.

3. The faculty senate recommends that the university not schedule significant campus events on major religious holidays and observances.

4. The faculty senate recommends that the UNH Students Rights and Responsibilities Handbook be updated to include consideration of religious observances for excused absences in section 04.13.

The proposed change is as follows: (e is added).

04.13(fs) Excused absences. The designation of excused absences and the assignment of any subsequent makeup work are the prerogative of the course instructor. It is expected that instructors will be reasonable in the exercise of this prerogative. In general, students may be excused for reasons such as (a) ill health, (b) participation in official intercollegiate events, (c) personal emergencies, (d) instructional trips, and e) important religious holidays and/or observances as discussed with the instructor, and they will then not be subject to academic penalty.

APPENDIX 4.2

FACULTY SENATE MOTION
on how to respond to curtailed operations during December final exam period

Rationale: A need for a plan to respond to curtailed operations during the December final exam period.

Motion: In the event of a curtailed exam day make up alternate exam time blocks will be made available by the Office of the Registrar as scheduling permits during the exam week, including Wednesday and Friday 6pm-8pm, and 8pm-10pm, if instructors would like to reschedule. For curtailments on the last day of exams, exams will be not be rescheduled, and it will be up to instructors to make other arrangements such as an on-line exam.
APPENDIX 5.1

Response from Rob McGann, UNH Admissions, to the Academic Affairs Committee to the April 30, 2018 Memo regarding the development of a proposal for UNH to move to a “test optional” admissions policy for undergraduate admissions at UNH. See Motion # XXII-M13 at the end of this document for additional background.

Note: the blue text is memo and questions submitted by Academic Affairs Committee. The black text is the response from Rob McGann

Memo: To the Office of Admission
Date: April 30, 2018
Subject: Developing a proposal to move to a “test optional” admissions policy for undergraduate admissions at UNH

From: The Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee

The Office of Admissions has informed the faculty of their intentions to develop a proposal to consider 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.
  - Note: since UNH does not use a formulaic approach to admissions, the probability of bias built into the decision-making process due to score differentials realized by various populations is reduced.

The Academic Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate have led 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
   a. Goals:
      i. Reduce real or perceived barriers for applying to UNH for populations that typically do less well on standardized testing (FG and multi-cultural)

1. Anecdotal evidence—Udelaware, WPI
2. In the 10 years following WPI’s decision to go test-optional, applications from women increased by 99 percent and those from underrepresented minorities rose 146 percent. Enrollments for women were up 81 percent and for the minorities, 156 percent.
3. The percentage of women enrolled in the WPI Class of 2021 was 44 percent, the highest ever.

   a. ‘The experiences of institutions in this study provide evidence that the adoption of a well-executed test-optional admission policy can lead to an increase in overall applications as well as an increase in the representation of URM students (both numeric and proportionate) in the applicant pool and the freshman class. Roughly two-thirds of our TOP institutions experienced URM growth above that of a matched test-requiring peer institution. A similar but smaller magnitude increase was seen among Pell recipients.’

   b. ‘We also found that Non-Submitters were often admitted at lower rates than Submitters, but, on average, enrolled (yielded) at substantially higher rates. Their HSGPAs were modestly lower than the Submitters, and, upon entering college, their First Year GPAs and Cumulative GPAs were comparably lower. However, they ultimately graduated at rates equivalent to, or marginally higher than, Submitters, the ultimate proof of success.’

   c. ‘Furthermore, our data indicated that high school GPA had a stronger correlation with college success for NonSubmitters than the ACT/SAT (for the 27% of Non-Submitters for whom we had test scores) -- both in terms of college cumulative GPA and graduation rate. While test scores had a generally stronger relationship with college GPAs for the Submitters, for the Non-Submitters they tended to show a weaker relationship, essentially underpredicting the college GPA. The test scores continued to most strongly correlate with family income.’

5. **Crossing the Finish Line**, William Bowen and Michael McPherson, the former Presidents of Princeton and Macalester, respectively

   a. In the chapter which examined the predictive value of test scores and high school grades, they reported that: ‘The findings are dramatic. ...the coefficients for SAT/ACT scores are always less than 0.02, which means that an increase in test scores of one standard deviation is associated with an increase of less than 2 percentage points in six-year graduation rates; this relationship is even negative at the historically black colleges and universities (HBCU’s).... The consistency of the results is extraordinary: In all but one of these more than 50 public universities, high school GPA remains a highly significant predictor of six-year graduation rates after taking account of the effects of test scores... Test scores, on the other hand, routinely fail to pass standard tests of statistical significance when included with high school GPA in regressions predicting graduation rates, especially when we leave the realm of the most highly selective public universities.... ...the remaining incremental predictive power of the SAT/ACT scores disappears entirely when we add controls for the high school attended, whereas the predictive value of the high school GPA increases.’ (Bowen, Chingos, McPherson, 2009)


   a. These Non-Submitters went on to graduate at virtually the same rates (a 0.6% difference) and with nearly the same college GPA (0.05 of a Cum GPA point) as the Submitters whose test scores were considered in the admission process. Their research also concluded that
Non-Submitters were more likely to be first-generation-to-college, underrepresented minority students, women, Pell Grant recipients, and students with Learning Differences. And, using large volumes of HSGPA data, their findings underscored the sturdiness of the HSGPA as a predictor of college performance.

ii. Encourage more applicants from noted groups, but also from groups that might be reluctant to apply because of a misunderstanding about the relative importance of testing, i.e., students think that SAT or ACT scores are more important than they are.

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?

a. Our effort is designed to address/respond to the level of societal bias that influences college going rates of students regionally and nationally. There is little to no bias in the admissions process as it is currently structured. We eliminate bias by having multiple reviewers consider applications from MC students to ensure that we are considering the totality of their experiences and that their grades are sufficiently strong to warrant admission.

b. The policy change will reduce barriers that some students believe exist or perceive, encouraging them to apply and engage the university with this process.

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?

a. Easily done through existing reporting tools in admissions that track the number and percent of applicants by residency, race/ethnicity, FG status, college division, among other criteria.

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?

a. This policy change will amplify our contribution to the UNH land grant mission. We will be providing greater access to UNH’s educational opportunities to both residents of New Hampshire, as well as students from other states where we draw students.

b. Demographics are changing in NH and other primary markets. This proposed change will serve this changing populace well by providing encouragement to a portion of the of the population that either excludes themselves from the process or under-estimates their ability to engage competitive academic environments. Note the following data from WICHE:
   i. https://knocking.wiche.edu/nation-region-profile/
   ii. https://knocking.wiche.edu/state-profiles/
   iii. https://knocking.wiche.edu/state-profiles/

5. To what extent is the policy change aligned with the renewed UNH Strategic Plan, which includes strengthening and diversifying enrollment as a key focus?

a. Directly addresses issues of strengthening and diversifying enrollment.

b. As envisioned, would allow/encourage greater diversification of applicant pool (and, by extension, the accept and enrolled student populations). Recent experience at U of Delaware, and many other institutions, suggests that this experience would be possible.
I. Being a test optional school is part of a larger strategy to engage under-represented populations; being test optional will not be the sole reason why a student applies or enrolls at an institution. When working with students and discussing both the admissions process and the opportunities available at UNH, being test optional would provide additional reasons for particular groups of students to look more closely at UNH.

c. The applicant pool would be strengthened in several ways
   i. Enlarged—providing UNH with greater stability in a challenging enrollment dynamic
   ii. Diversified—creating a more diverse applicant pool would only enhance the educational experience of all students and further UNH’s mission.
   iii. Academic quality—quality, as measured by classroom performance, would likely increase, and would not decline.

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.

   a. A more diverse applicant pool, and/or a larger applicant pool, does not imply or equate to a less well qualified applicant pool. The central purpose of any admissions office is to identify, recruit, admit and enroll students capable of academic success at the institution in question. The data collected by this office and other organizations that examine student persistence routinely point to the information contained on a high school transcript as being the most reliable predictor of success during the first year of college. Specifically, the information examined on the HS transcript is the following:
      i. Courses taken
      ii. Level of difficulty of the courses taken
      iii. Grades earned
      iv. Patterns of achievement

   b. This information is reviewed within the context of a student’s high school experience, acknowledging that most students have little or no choice of where they attend high school and that bright, capable students can be found at every high school. Reviewing applicants within the context of their high schools allows us to make more nuanced decisions that are not rigidly wedded to an absolute measure such as class rank (i.e., only students in the top X% of a class can be accepted to UNH) that, if utilized, might result in poor decisions. Rather, we tend to focus on GPA as a measure of readiness for college level work at UNH and restrict ourselves to students who fall in an acceptable range of performance. For example, the average GPA of an accepted student from outside of NH this past cycle was a 3.45, with the interquartile range being 3.1-3.78 (all on a weighted 4.0 scale).

   c. We do acknowledge that grade inflation occurs in many institutions. Data resources noted below allow us to better interpret a student’s HS GPA within the context of their HS and relative to our expectations.

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?

   Several data points exist for us to consider the academic context of students from communities where we have less familiarity
   i. School profiles—this information provides useful context to any student’s academic experience at a given high school by contextualizing that experience through some key data points such as % going to 2 and 4-year institutions or grade distributions within the HS.
   ii. College board data—college board data available to us through various subscription services that we utilize for planning purposes also provide additional context for us to learn about high schools in different parts of the country.
iii. School counselors—we routinely have conversations with school counselors at high schools across the country to better understand a high school, its offerings, its students and its outcomes.

8. Will added resources be required to review applications, and if yes, is there a commitment from UNH Administration for allocating the necessary resources?

No added resources are necessary to review applications. Any changes will be changes to process and existing protocols and can be managed by existing staff.

9. How might this proposed change impact third party ranking such as, those conducted by US News and World Report?

UNH will report our SAT or ACT scores in the manner that we have in the past, with the following important change. If UNH becomes a test optional school, we will report our SAT or ACT scores with a qualifier that explains our new policy and its implications. For example: For those who submitted testing, our averages/interquartile ranges were... We would also indicate what percentage of the enrolling class or admitted population chose to submit/not submit standardized testing. This is how most colleges who are test optional manage this process, and this approach has no impact on their rankings by assorted agencies. Currently, there are over 500 test optional schools at all levels of selectivity that are still included in any ranking organization’s results.

a. We will collect test data for all enrolling students, including those that select the test optional program, following their decision to enroll at UNH (after the May 1 candidates reply date). This will allow us to examine our enrolled students to determine if not using SAT or ACT data in the admissions process masked student deficiencies that manifest themselves in a student’s first year GPA.

10. Will admitted students under a test optional policy be as well prepared for college-level work as our current students?

The data from our latest and past validity studies would suggest that students admitted under a test optional policy will be as well prepared as those students submitting standardized test scores. Validity studies all point to a student’s HS record (courses taken, grades earned, and level of difficulty of those courses) as having the greatest impact and relationship with a student’s first year college GPA. Standardized testing can add additional predictive value to an admission decision, but in all analyses available the HS record carries the greatest value in any admission decision at UNH.

Some excerpts from the latest validity study indicate the following:
Predictive strength of admission measures in your study

Mean Cumulative GPA through first year by HS GPA Quartile and SAT Total Score Quartile

Notes:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAT Total Score</th>
<th>Cumulative GPA through first year</th>
<th>Cumulative GPA through first year</th>
<th>Cumulative GPA through first year</th>
<th>Cumulative GPA through first year</th>
<th>Cumulative GPA through first year</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>790 - 1080</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1090 - 1160</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1170 - 1250</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1260 - 1540</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For HS GPA Quartile: 3.45 to 3.81 [3rd quartile]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAT Total Score</th>
<th>Cumulative GPA through first year</th>
<th>Cumulative GPA through first year</th>
<th>Cumulative GPA through first year</th>
<th>Cumulative GPA through first year</th>
<th>Cumulative GPA through first year</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>790 - 1080</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1090 - 1160</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1170 - 1250</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1260 - 1540</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For HS GPA Quartile: 3.14 to 3.44 [2nd quartile]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAT Total Score</th>
<th>Cumulative GPA through first year</th>
<th>Cumulative GPA through first year</th>
<th>Cumulative GPA through first year</th>
<th>Cumulative GPA through first year</th>
<th>Cumulative GPA through first year</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>790 - 1080</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1090 - 1160</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1170 - 1250</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1260 - 1540</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For HS GPA Quartile: 2.13 to 3.13 [1st quartile]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAT Total Score</th>
<th>Cumulative GPA through first year</th>
<th>Cumulative GPA through first year</th>
<th>Cumulative GPA through first year</th>
<th>Cumulative GPA through first year</th>
<th>Cumulative GPA through first year</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>790 - 1080</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1090 - 1160</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1170 - 1250</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1260 - 1540</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
11. 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?

The preliminary thoughts we have on this issue focus on a few items. One, is to maintain the emphasis on the primacy of the high school transcript, with an added emphasis and more dissection of the course selection choices made by students within the context of the student’s high school. Second, rely more heavily on recommendations in the review of applicants for more competitive programs. This approach must be considered carefully given the disparity in the quality of recommendations among different schools that is caused by a range of issues, ranging from training of teachers and counselors in how to write recommendations, to student to staff ratios and their impact on the ability of school staff to write effective recommendations, to name but a few issues. Third, we might need to modify the review protocols for applicants to more highly competitive majors and employ more of a committee-like structure for a far greater percentage of these students than is currently the case (currently, a minority of students applying to competitive majors go through a multi-person/committee review process.). This committee structure may insure greater consistency of decision making if we are emphasizing a larger number of criteria with some of those criteria (recommendations) more subjective in nature.

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

The details of how to award merit scholarships have not been finalized or resolved, but the common approach is to rely solely on transcript information to make scholarship decisions. This process would use standard measures such as GPA but may also assign a greater emphasis to the level of rigor found in a student’s course selection relative to the opportunities found in the student’s high school. Historically, about 1/3 of our enrolling students receive a merit scholarship. This goal is reasonable given our financial resources and desire to maintain the integrity of our merit scholarship program. Past practices have used SAT scores as both a measure to identify ‘merit’, but also as a tool to limit access to merit scholarships as the institution has limited funds available for this purpose and we want recipients to be ‘meritorious’ within the context of our applicant and accepted student pool.

13. Are there external funding agencies that support our programs that require standardized test score reporting?

There are no external agencies that require the submission of standardized testing for all students if the institution has a formal policy of being ‘test optional’; if UNH were to implement a test optional policy, we would provide standardized testing data for those students who elect to submit this information as part of their application materials and/or for as many enrolled students who have taken the SAT or ACT. Institutions have the latitude to define their own admissions processes if these processes are thoughtfully constructed and can establish a relationship between the admission criteria utilized and student success measures (typically first year GPA).

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

Test scores submitted will be used in the way we currently use them—as a supplemental data point to the primary academic information (the transcript). Test scores never drive an admission decision but are typically used a means to validate decisions and impressions of an applicant provided by the student’s high school transcript and other supporting documentation.
UNH FACULTY SENATE
MOTION #XXII-M13
On memo to admissions office on test optional admissions policy

1. Presenter: Shelley Mulligan, Academic Affairs Committee chair

2. Dates of Faculty Senate discussion: 4/16/2018, 4/30/2018

3. Rationale: To demonstrate Faculty Senate support for sending a memo crafted by the Academic Affairs Committee to the Office of Admissions regarding the development of a proposal for UNH to move to a “test optional” admissions policy for undergraduate admissions at UNH.

4. Motion: The Faculty Senate supports sending the attached memo from the Academic Affairs Committee to the Office of Admissions regarding the development of a proposal for UNH to move to a “test optional” admissions policy for undergraduate admissions at UNH. The intent of the memo is to provide guidance for the development of a proposal that addresses faculty concerns and questions about making this policy change.

5. Senate action: The motion passed with 47 votes in favor, 9 votes opposed, and 5 abstentions.

6. Senate chair’s signature: [Signature]

Forwarded to the following on May 16, 2018
President Mark Huddleston
Wayne Jones, Interim Provost
P.T. Vasudevan, Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
Rob McGann, Director of Admissions
Victoria Dutcher, VP for Enrollment Management
All deans
All department chairs
APPENDIX 6.1
Report from Finance & Administration Committee
from the meeting of the System Board Finance Committee

Overview

- Performance dashboard
- Identified synergies
  - IT service delivery and collaboration
  - Branding and communication strategy
- Ongoing system-wide initiatives
  - Strategic Procurement
  - Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP)
- Actual and projected financial results, budgeting and MY modeling
- Presentation of 2018 audited financial statements
- Review of Fall 2018 enrollment reports
- Confirmation of preliminary assumptions and parameters for FY20
- Update of state operating budget request
- Status report on UNH Law and UNH Manchester
- Financial summary
- Strategic outlook
- Capital items
  - Update on ongoing capital projects
  - Update of state capital appropriation request

Identified Synergies

- IT service delivery and collaboration
  - The overall spend for IT across the system was reported as approximately $50 million for FY 18 (includes personnel, hardware, software, and contracts) or about 6% of total system-wide operating expenses.

- Previous targets were aimed at 20% or $10 million savings annually. A shift down from 6% to 5% of total system-wide expenses results in reduction of about $8 million annually. Based on EDUCAUSE benchmarks this does not appear unreasonable.

- Branding and communication strategy
  - USNH has engaged external consultant Martha Terry to work with an internal ad-hoc committee to develop a multi-campus communications plan that promotes and builds recognition of the value of public higher education in New Hampshire.

- The plan will be complimentary to institutional branding and communication efforts
Fall 2018 Enrollment FTE
All Incoming & Continuing
APPENDIX 8.1

Updated FAQs for IT Service Changes (November 13, 2018)

Over the next several months, UNH is changing the way it sells, repairs, services, and disposes of its computers for students, faculty, and staff. This includes the closures of the UNH Computer Store and UNH Computer Repair Services, and the introduction of a new e-procurement system and new service and repair models. Based on feedback, we have combined FAQs from previous communications into a master list and it will be updated on a regular basis.

First, here are some important dates on the horizon:

- Happening Now – UNH Computer Store Closing Sale – 50% off all in-stock items, not including computers, iPads, or special-order items. For updated information, please visit [http://computerstore.unh.edu](http://computerstore.unh.edu)
- Friday, November 9: Last day to place special orders at the UNH Computer Store
- Tuesday, November 13 – early January 2019: Freeze period on Windows computer orders

UNH Computer Store

Why is the store closing?
Along with other retailers, the UNH Computer Store has been impacted by the increasing popularity of online shopping and high competition from other box stores. UNH IT has decided to restructure to a more sustainable model.

Will the store continue to accept returns?
The store will accept returns under its normal policy until November 16. There are no returns on final sale items.

Will the store continue to accept gift certificates?
The store will accept gift cards under its normal policy until December 7.

Will there be a sale of remaining UNH Computer Store inventory?
Yes. The UNH Computer Store will continue to sell current inventory until December 7. In-stock inventory will be sold at a discount.

Can I still place a special order?
The last day to place special orders was Friday, November 9.

Procurement and Purchasing

Will I still be able to purchase a computer through UNH?
Yes. UNH IT will provide guidance to faculty and staff for the purchase of standardized desktops, laptops, and peripherals through an online e-procurement system. Details are forthcoming.

What type of computers will UNH offer?
For Windows machines, USNH has awarded Connection, a Value-Added Reseller. UNH will be switching from Dell to Lenovo Computers. IT is currently working with Apple to provide an online purchase portal, we anticipate availability on November 13, 2018.

What are the standard Lenovo models? Will they meet my needs?
UNH IT has partnered with groups across campus to form an Advisory Team to review the standard models to ensure they meet the majority of business needs at UNH. It is understood that there could be valid reasons and requirements where the standards will not meet specific needs for example in the areas of research and grants. Exception requests will be reviewed and may be granted in those rare cases.

**What if I need to purchase a computer between November 13 and early January?**

Please plan accordingly. We understand unplanned events happen. If an unplanned need occurs, please call the UNH IT Service Desk at 603-862-4242 and they will forward your request to the appropriate team to assist.

**How will I get my new computer?**

Computers will be ordered online and shipped directly to departments. Students and personal purchases will be delivered directly to address supplied by the customer.

**Will the Employee Payroll Deduction Program still exist?**

The last day for personal purchases using the payroll deduction program was **Friday, September 28**.

**Will UNH IT still provide/sell licenses for software? (e.g., Office 365, Adobe Creative Cloud)**

Yes. UNH IT will continue to oversee the distribution/sale of institutional software licenses.

**Computer Repairs**

**Will UNH IT still offer onsite computer repairs?**

No. However, UNH IT will be opening the IT Depot in the MUB. The IT Depot will provide guidance on computer purchases, liaison and depot repair services, a laptop loaner program, referrals for repairs, basic diagnostics, and fee-based software services.

**Will there still be a loaner laptop program?**

UNH IT will continue to offer a limited number of loaner computers to those who purchased from the UNH Computer Store whose machines are under warranty on a first-come, first-served basis. UNH IT will also provide loaner computers to those who purchase through the new online system if their computer needs repairs and is under warranty.

**Services and Support**

**Will the SAFEWARE service I purchased be honored?**

Yes. UNH IT will provide guidance on how to use your SAFEWARE service and will be coordinated through the UNH IT Depot service, MUB 213.

**I purchased Out of Box for my computer. Will this be honored?**

Yes. This service will be handled by the IT Depot located in the MUB room 213.

**What about SEEDED (Safe Equipment Electronic Disposal)? Is this program going away?**

No. UNH IT has engaged with a new vendor. We are currently reviewing our model for this program, but for the time being, collection scheduled for November 29 will proceed as scheduled.

_Last update: Tuesday, November 13, 2018_