MINUTES SUMMARY

Meeting called to order at 3:10 p.m. on May 6, 2019

I. Roll - The following senators were absent: Ballestero, Conroy, Gass, Guerdat, Innis, Khanlari, Kim, Knezevic, Knowles, Magnusson, Merenda, Miller, Neefus, Puccilli, Reardon, Scherr, Simos, Swift, Tucker, Whistler. The following senators were excused: Bedker and Berst. The following guests attended: Wayne Jones.

II. Remarks by and questions to the Provost - Provost Wayne Jones shared that, as of the May 1 deposit deadline, the undergraduate enrollment numbers are under budget by a couple of hundred students. Undergraduate transfer student numbers and international student numbers are up. The brightest spot is UNH Manchester where the numbers are up at every level. Wayne shared that there are a few pilot projects in place to help drive transfer enrollment. On the international side, UNH is looking at the Navitas contract again and is also negotiating with a company called Shorelight which recruits international students for 19 US schools including UCLA, Standard, Kansas, and UMass. There is no up-front cost in working with Shorelight as the company pays for all of the marketing costs in recruiting international students. Wayne explained that to grow our international numbers we need to diversity the number of possibilities and where international students come in from. If those possibilities can grow our marketing dollars that is a win. As well, we have to have support structures in place. The nice thing about Shorelight is that it is not a bridge program. Students coming in from Shorelight are already qualified for direct entry at a bar that is set by UNH.

The provost offered to take questions:

Q: What is the difference between Shorelight and direct entry admissions? Why do we need that third party?

A: The difference is the amount of marketing that they do. If a student comes in through Shorelight the company keeps a part of the tuition. If a student sees UNH through Shorelight’s marketing but comes in directly through our pipeline, we get all of the tuition.

Q: Do you know where those [Shorelight] students come from?

A: Shorelight has amazing numbers. China and India were high, about 60% of the student body. At UMass, as an example, about 1/3 of the Shorelight students were not from India and China. They came from a nice mix of countries.

Q: On Shorelight, why are we considering this now rather than in previous years?

A: It had been recommended [in the past] but not pursued.
Q: How do UMass and other schools compare with the assistance they provide?

A: There is no quantitative data on this. Anecdotally, campuses that already have a large number of international students, for example, 2000 to 4000, already have robust support systems. Campuses that have smaller enrollments as we do often need that additional support that Shorelight will provide. They will put one to three support people on campus. That is the only distinction I saw.

Q: My question was more financially based. How do schools that offer financial assistance to international students do vs. schools that rely on federal financial aid and private loads that international students can’t use? Are we losing students that could potentially come here because they can’t get financial assistance?

A: In our current environment we do offer scholarship money to international students, but it is at a lower level than for domestic students. For Shorelight they build into their cost financial aid, particularly for the first year but also continuing. It is not at the same level as the discount rate that UNH is at, but it is competitive.

Q: How did Cinco de Mayo go?

A: I think it went very very well. I was personally walking around town yesterday and had lunch in town. There didn’t seem to be signs of cultural misappropriation. The businesses in town were awesome. There wasn’t a single advertisement that promoted it. Yesterday’s police stats were no worse than last year. Overall, we had 5 more arrests than last year, but similar. More than half of those arrests were off-campus folks.

Thank you to all of you that held the line for class participation.

Big kudos for our partners downtown, university police and town police. Thanks to the students – Unity Day was a success and there was a delightful musical event at Paul Creative Arts Center.

III. Approval of the minutes from April 29 - It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the April 29 meeting of the Senate. There were no corrections. The minutes were unanimously approved with 1 abstention.

IV. Discussion and vote on SAC Motion on Universal Expectations for Syllabi - Harriet Fertik explained that there were some changes made to the motion in response to comments at the April 29 meeting. The changes were in the section about distribution through electronic means and the changes to the motion make it clear that the text of the policies do not need to be included in full, but that references to the policies can be used. The changes are underlined in the text of the final motion below.

An education professor asked for a friendly amendment to change “grading policy” to “assessment policy” since there are other ways to do assessment than letter grades. Harriet pointed out that if there were no grades involved this wouldn’t apply. The chair pointed out that this motion is designed to reflect best practices and we try to draw on the language included in the Student Senate’s motion on this topic.
The motion as follows was put to a vote:

**Student Affairs Committee Motion**

on **Universal expectations for Syllabi**

**Rationale:**
In April 2018, the Student Senate passed a motion “to recommend the addition of a policy to the Student Rights, Rules, and Responsibilities that mandates that all academic courses are accompanied with a syllabus within the first two weeks of the semester” and “to urge that the mandate states that all syllabi must include as least the following: the grading policy, professor and teaching assistant contact information and office hours, semester requirements, the Academic Honesty Policy, and the Disability Statement” (Student Senate Resolution XXXIX – 43). Although there are very limited mechanisms to enforce a mandate that faculty provide syllabi, a syllabus that outlines required assessments and assignments for the course, grading policy, instructor contact information, and office hours is crucial for students’ success and will make courses more accessible to all students. The courses taught at the University of New Hampshire are enormously diverse in content and format, and syllabi will necessarily be similarly diverse, but all instructors should be able to provide basic information about the expectations and requirements for their courses. Many units at UNH already request that faculty submit copies of their syllabi at the beginning of each term.

**Motion:**
The Faculty Senate moves that all department chairs and/or program coordinators request that all instructors distribute syllabi to all students enrolled in their courses and submit copies of the syllabi to department or program staff within the first two weeks of each semester. Syllabi should include information on required assessments and assignments, grading policy, instructor contact information, and office hours, as well as references to policies on Academic Honesty, Disabilities, Mental Health, Classroom-Behavior Expectations, and Confidentiality and Mandatory Reporting, for which sample language is distributed by the Dean of Students. Such information may be distributed through electronic means (such as Canvas) or in hard copy.

The motion was put to a vote. The motion passed unanimously with 52 in favor, none opposed, and 1 abstention.

V. Discussion and vote on Professional Name issue - Jim Connell from the Agenda Committee explained that some changes were made to the Motion and the associated report on the Professional Name issue that was presented to the Senate on April 29 with the major change being the removal of Item 8 in the motion. Most of the other changes were fairly minor and were made mostly for the sake for clarity. The revised version was emailed to all senators this morning.

Item 4 in the motion now excludes the specificity of the warning notices. Jim pointed out that the Agenda Committee has had conversations with Terri Winters and she has now presented a temporary solution that might mitigate the need for the warning notice altogether. If the name issue is fixed before the deadline the warning won’t need to go up at all.
John Gibson from the IT Committee responded that he hasn’t had time to review all of the changes as he only received the revised report and motion this morning. He said that he finds that the discussions on this issue have been unnecessarily confrontational. He has a hard time approving of the motion. He is perplexed by the way the motion was brought about and the way it circumvented the productive working relationship that the Senate’s IT committee had with Academic Technology.

Another senator said that she doesn’t understand how the warning notice will help to accomplish the goal of dealing with a professional name. As well, she said that she doesn’t think that the Senate needs to apologize, as is indicated in the motion.

Lori Hopkins from the Agenda Committee responded to John Gibson’s comments pointing out that while things are moving forward, there has been a history of administrative leadership dragging their feet on things and that the Senate needs to keep nudging and making clear that we want things addressed in a timely manner. She pointed out that the motion has been toned down from the original version.

Jim Connell explained that the warning notice is important for faculty going through the promotion and tenure process in that it would be an explanation to outside reviewers who can’t find the faculty name on the department website when their professional name is different than their name on the website.

Erin Sharp of the Agenda Committee said that there was a lot of good communication with Academic Technology and the administration about this issue. The value of pushing forward is that even with people reading the motion today there were changes from Academic Technology that had not been suggested previously. She said that she thinks the Senate should pass this motion.

Another senator asked about the language in the motion about disabling FindScholars should the issue not be resolved and asked about the implications of this and who would be harmed by this. Jim responded that the difficulty we face here is that when FindScholars was put in place many of the department websites were removed. If FindScholars is disabled it would leave a vacuum. Therefore, the warning is a compromise – a band aid – until the issue can be properly solved. This has gone on for over 4 years and we could not give an open-ended check to fix it. We have been told it will be fixed by the end of the year. At that point we will figure out what to do if we need to take the websites down. But, we can’t allow the faculty who are disadvantaged to have it go on forever. Scott Smith pointed out that we have a good relationship with the provost office and we can revisit this part of the motion. It is designed to be an encouragement to move to the timeline.

A faculty member from the Communication Department asked how many faculty are affected by this issue. She said that she is concerned about the polemic language style in the motion and that the motion seems to assign motive while it is not clear that we know the motive. The motion reads like a threat and an attack on staff who we need to be our working allies.

Jim Connell responded that for some of us it is an ethical issue that you don’t treat some faculty differently than others and that, in his definition, this is discrimination. He said that if, when setting up FindScholars, the name issue was not known and recognized as a problem, he would have had more tolerance. Scott Smith responded that, in terms of the number of faculty affected, the estimate is between 6 and 20. The motion does include a requirement for a survey to be conducted to determine this number.
John Gibson stated that “FindScholars and its associated software” is an extremely vague term and asked what “associated software” meant.

The motion as it appears here was put to a vote:

*Agenda Committee Motion on Professional Names issue*

**Rationale:**
See the Faculty Senate Agenda Committee Report dated May 6, 2019. (see Appendix V.1)

**Motion:**
1. The Faculty Senate repudiates discrimination of any kind for reasons of technical expediency, including taking FindScholars@UNH and its associated software and websites on-line prior to resolving the long-standing professional names issue, and further is concerned about the lack of urgency in finding a resolution thereto.

2. The Faculty Senate apologizes to those faculty members with professional names who have been publicly misrepresented by UNH’s adoption of FindScholars@UNH and its associated software and websites to the detriment of their professional standing and careers;

3. The Faculty Senate calls for FindScholars@UNH and its associated software and websites to be disabled if, by 31 December 2019, any faculty are not represented under their chosen professional names, until such time as they are so represented; we recognize that USNH HR has agreed to meet this deadline and urge them to do so;

4. To mitigate the disadvantagements pending this correction, the Faculty Senate calls for the following warning to be displayed prominently on all webpages that do not accurately list a faculty member's professional name, including webpages with faculty lists (e.g. college or department faculty lists) where they should appear

   **WARNING**

   Mandated by UNH Faculty Senate

   Faculty with professional names owning to marital status, ethnic or cultural naming conventions or other reasons, are misrepresented here or missing entirely. When present, their information may be incomplete or in error. Please contact their departments directly for further information.

   said warning to be placed above any such data on any websites in a font size no smaller than the largest displayed information on the site

5. The Faculty Senate calls for FindScholars@UNH and its associated software and websites to be disabled if, by 1 July 2019, the aforesaid warning is not in place, until such time as they are represented as per section 3;

6. The Faculty Senate further calls upon the administration to provide guidance to all departments with affected faculty going up for tenure in the fall semester of 2019 that letters to outside readers should include information regarding the gaps in FindScholars@UNH
and other affiliated websites, and should encourage these outside readers to consult directly with the department concerning the faculty under external review;

7. The Faculty Senate calls for the UNH Administration to conduct a survey within two months of passage of this motion designed to reach all UNH faculty and staff in order to identify all UNH employees whose name currently published on UNH websites does not match their professional name; identifying all of those affected now is crucial for ensuring that USNH addresses the full range of concerns (e.g., marital status name changes, ethnic or cultural naming conventions, and gender identity) when developing and fixing the system.

The motion passed with 37 in favor, 13 opposed, and 5 abstentions.

VI. Report from Finance and Admin Committee (FAC) - Stephan Shipe, the current chair of the FAC, presented a report (see appendix VI.1)

A senator from the Thompson School asked why there was a charge to the Finance and Admin committee related to accounting of the financial cost and benefits of reducing the scope of the Thompson School of Applied Sciences (TSAS). She said that it is a done deal and that any information that comes out of this charge will not change the decision. Scott Smith explained that at the beginning of the year there was a request from the Thompson School senators who were concerned about whether the Thompson School decision was financially positive or not. Scott said that if there is a desire to not explore this we can remove it from the charges.

Scott asked about the list of contracts that were shown in the presentation and whether the FAC was able to evaluate any of these. Stephan responded that some of the questions that the FAC can explore next year are what kind of questions should be asked in connection with contracts. For example, are all contracts sent out for bid and for contracts ongoing year after year, is there a purpose to the recurring nature of them? Stephan said that it would be useful to have a central place for publishing contracts and, at least, announcing them.

Scott thanked the committee for their work and thanked Stephan for stepping in to lead the committee this past semester.

VII. Report from the Library Committee - Daniel Chavez, chair of the Library Committee shared the following information:

- The library has changed the search engines that are used when searching. It should be faster and will be integrated in a seamless way. It won’t affect user experience.

- The Library has been looking for efficiencies. They have negotiated some of the journal costs with a bundle package companies. There have been changes to service hours with adjustments made during the busy period directly and during exam weeks. There have been some retirements or positions lost and these have not been replaced.

The Library budget has stayed flat. The problem is that the costs for most of the collections and journal bundles are going up and this impacts the library budget.
The current storage facilities were never intended for long term use.

In the next 5 to 7 years some sections of the air conditioning system in Dimond Library are expected to have serious problems.

Most of these concerns are included in a letter draft to the provost that is being reviewed by the Agenda Committee.

- The Library committee is studying the need for an ad hoc committee on open source publications. One of the reasons that the subscription package costs are so high is that we don’t have a recourse. So, it is important to promote or implement open source options, if possible, and try to place our publications in the university depository so that we can promote the idea that we don’t have to pay twice for the information we use. Many people have to pay to place articles in journals and then we have to pay to see the publication.

Scott Smith asked when the Open Source Ad Hoc committee will be formed. Daniel responded that the discussion about this has begun and that faculty from different colleges are welcome on this committee.

A senator asked about the recent news about the University of California refusing to make a contact with Elsevier Publishing company and whether there is any way that UNH can participate in that. Daniel responded that we are already trying to do this in working with other universities. But, there are limits. But, trying to break the stronghold is the first step. Another senator shared that the Univ of California system has much bigger buying power than UNH. As a result, they were somewhat successful because of their size and buying power.

VIII. Discussion and vote on SAC Motion in support of the efforts the Transgender Policy and Climate Committee on gender question on Student evaluations - Nena Stracuzzi provided an update on the SAC motion that was presented at the April 29 meeting in connection with the gender question on student evaluations of teaching:

Motion on Self-Identification of Gender on Student Evaluations
Student Affairs Committee

Presenter: Nena Stracuzzi

Rationale: The Student Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate was charged with reviewing Student Senate Resolution 39.17 (Dec. 10, 2017) requesting that the binary question regarding sex (male/female) be changed to a gender-based question with non-binary answers included on students' course evaluations. In reviewing current best practices as outlined by national organizations (e.g. The Consortium of Higher Education LGBT Resource Professionals’ Trans Policy Working Group) and the university’s Transgender Policy and Climate Committee, we agree that students should be able to self identify in terms of their gender, not only on student course evaluations, but on all campus records and documents. The Faculty Senate realizes that it has no authority to speak on this matter beyond student evaluations, but for the sake of consistency, it urges university administrative leadership to adopt a consistent set of categories across the board.

Furthermore, we found that in some cases these changes are already being made, for instance on the Graduate Student Application Form, a change that is supported by Monica Chiu.
Interim Associate Vice President of Community, Equity, and Diversity, as well as Ted Kirkpatrick, Dean of Students, and Donna Marie Sorrentino, Affirmative Action. In fact, it is already being implemented. Plans are also in place to do the same for Undergraduate Student Applications.

Given the above, two things are clear: 1) the University should follow best practices and allow for self identification of gender, and 2) the University should adopt a consistent set of categories for all of its forms, documents, and student evaluations so that data collection is consistent. The categories in the motion itself are, therefore, those found in the Graduate Student Application Form, which is already being revised.

Motion: That student evaluations offer, instead of a binary choice of sex (male/female), the following categories based on self-identified gender: Man, Woman, Transman, Transwoman, Nonbinary/Genderqueer/Gender non-conforming, Something else, Decline to answer. In the interest of consistency, we further urge the university to adopt a consistent set of gender categories for all forms and documents.

In response to a question raised at the April 29 meeting about whether faculty would be able to see individual evaluation data and comments with the indicated gender, the committee has learned that it is, indeed, possible to view the data in this way. Therefore, there is a concern that by expanding the gender choices in the evaluation form there is a greater chance that faculty will be able to connect evaluation data and comments back to individual students. Therefore, the committee recommends that further study needs to be taken on this issue and that this motion should be indefinitely postponed.

Scott Smith explained that this would result in a new charge being assigned to the SAC next year.

A motion was made to indefinitely postpone the discussion on the Motion. The motion was seconded. The motion to indefinitely postpone passed unanimously with 55 in favor and no abstentions.

IX. Report from the Academic Program Committee on Student Success - Allison Wilder shared a PowerPoint summary of the Academic Program Committee Report AY 18-19. Both the PowerPoint presentation and the full report are attached as Appendices IX.1 and IX.2.

David Bachrach asked whether the committee had looked at the charge related to exploring a 5 course/3 credit system at UNH. Allison explained that the committee felt unprepared to address this and that this could be done next year. Scott pointed out that the NECHE (New England Commission of Higher Education) has some issues with UNH credit hours compared to contact hours. Therefore, this topic is something to anticipate.

Another senator asked if the APC was looking at possible oversight of the Discovery Program as a way to accomplish some of the things in their presentation. Allison said that Discovery was a possible avenue. However, there is a separate Discovery Review committee to look at that.

The Senate chair thanked Allison and her committee for their work during the past year.

X. New Business: Radim Bartos, serving as proxy for Senator Phil Hatcher, introduced a motion to amend the previously passed Concurrent Credit Motion. He explained that there is a concern about this pilot program growing to something that was not intended. He presented the following amended language with the new text underlined:
The Faculty Senate supports the implementation of the proposed UNH concurrent credit pilot program for offering students from select high schools the opportunity to take UNH courses for credit in a limited set of courses that provide entry into UNH Manchester computing and communication arts programs, and CEPS programs in Computer Science that are taught within the high school curriculum, and by high school teachers supported by UNH faculty (See Appendix) provided that…:

There was a motion to suspend the rules to allow for the Senate to vote, without the usual one-meeting wait, on this motion to amend after adoption. The vote was taken and the motion to suspend the rules passed unanimously with 52 in favor and 1 abstention.

There was discussion about the motion.

Scott Smith shared that he had spoken to Mike Decelle, Dean of UNH Manchester, and central administration leadership about this and they have no concerns about the proposed change to the original motion.

One senator stated that the clarification is fine but she is concerned about any changes that would put limits on the next step on this program. Scott explained that there is a required 2-year review as part of the original motion.

In response to a request to clarify the phrase “provide entry” there was a discussion and agreement for a friendly amendment with the resulting Motion to amend the previously passed Concurrent Credit Motion as follows:

The motion to amend previously adopted Motion # XXIII-M19 regarding approval for the UNH Concurrent Credit Pilot Program was put to a vote and passed unanimously with 51 in favor and 2 abstentions.

XI. Reflections by the Chair

The Senate chair, Scott Smith, shared some words of thanks:

Scott thanked President James Dean and Provost Wayne Jones, remarking that both of them have been the most “shared governance oriented” administrators that he has ever worked with. Scott said that it is up to the faculty to continue to give our service time to ensure that we have conversations and that the faculty have a voice in what we do.

Scott also thanked all senators who served this year. Based on his calculation, faculty senators gave approximately 8000 hours of time in service, in total. Thanks was given to the Student Senate and the Graduate Student Senate members. Scott recognized the Agenda Committee members and asked them to stand and be recognized. He thanked the Senate committee chairs for their time and energy. Scott
also said that he was thankful to his wife because during the past year she has always wondered where he was.

Scott recognized the Senate work student assistant, Faith Thompson, for her work with the Senate during the year and presented a small gift. He also thanked the Administrative Assistant, Kathy Brunet, and presented her with a gift.

The Vice Chair, David Bachrach, asked to be recognized. David extended a thank you to all the senators and to the agenda committee and he thanked Scott Smith for his leadership during the past year, presenting him with a gift of an engraved gavel.

XII. Upon a motion and second to adjourn *sine die*, the meeting was adjourned at 4:35 pm

**List of common UNH Acronyms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAC</td>
<td>Academic Affairs Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Agenda Committee of the Faculty Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASAC</td>
<td>Academic Standards &amp; Advising Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APC</td>
<td>Academic Program Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>Academic Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAC</td>
<td>Budget Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaPS</td>
<td>Career and Professional Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&amp;PA</td>
<td>Communications &amp; Public Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCLEAR</td>
<td>Clinical, Contract, Lecturer, Extension, Alternative Security, Research faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEITL</td>
<td>Center for Excellence &amp; Innovation in Teaching &amp; Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPC</td>
<td>Campus Planning Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>Finance &amp; Administration Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>Faculty Activity Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRA</td>
<td>Institutional Research and Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITC</td>
<td>Information Technology Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSMB</td>
<td>Joint Strategic Management Board (Navitas review)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Library Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OISS</td>
<td>Office for International Students &amp; Scholars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>Operating Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACS</td>
<td>Psychological and Counseling Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAT</td>
<td>Professional and Technical Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC</td>
<td>Professional Standards Committee (FS permanent committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPSC</td>
<td>Research &amp; Public Service Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAARC</td>
<td>Space Allocation, Adaption and Renewal Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC</td>
<td>Student Affairs Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHARPP</td>
<td>Sexual Harassment and Rape Prevention Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVPAA</td>
<td>Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCAPC</td>
<td>University Curriculum &amp; Academic Policies Committee (FS permanent committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPFA</td>
<td>Vice President for Finance and Administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX V.1

On the Treatment of Faculty with Professional Names by the University of New Hampshire and the University System of New Hampshire, Particularly by Academic Technology, Information Technology and Human Resources

A Report To
The University of New Hampshire Faculty Senate
By Its
Agenda Committee
May 6 2019 (amended)

1. Introduction

The subject of this report relates to UNH faculty who use professional names different from their legal names, in particular, differing surnames. The use of the term “legal name” is misleading, in that it implies that any other name is less legal. Under common law, a person may use any name so long as there is no fraudulent intent. Indeed, when a person changes their surname upon marriage, the new last name is (barring the highly unusual step of going to court) a common-law name. If the new name is incorporated into documents, it becomes, effectively, the “legal” name. This report uses “W-2 name” to avoid any false implications.

The majority of the information presented herein was gathered by the Faculty Senate Agenda Committee (AC), though some was known earlier to the Faculty Senate Information Technology Committee (ITC), whom we thank for their input in creating this document. We do not speak for the ITC, whose members do not always agree with our conclusions.

Shared governance is primarily within the purview of the AC. This has included issues of equity, inclusion, discrimination and intolerance as witnessed by the many motions on these issues the AC has brought to the Senate [1]. While this report, in part, involves information technology, it is concerned principally with equity, fairness, inclusion and discrimination as it pertains to faculty.

Faculty choose to use professional names for a range of reasons. The two most common appear to be 1) marital status (name changes associated with marriage and/or divorce), and 2) ethnic or cultural naming conventions which differ from Anglo-American conventions. There may be other motivations (e.g., gender identity) which may apply. In any case, such motivations are typically deeply personal, often private, and should never be questioned nor trivialized, but rather respected.

While recognizing the foregoing diversity, for purposes of clarity, we use an imaginary Dr. Jane Doe with W-2 name Jane Jones to exhibit aspects and impacts of the issues herein. Dr. Doe may or may not be tenure-track faculty. This is in no way intended to confine the scope of the issues, particularly as to gender, but only to offer anonymous examples, not all of which may apply to a single person. The motivation is brevity and clarity [2]. The disadvantagements described should not be regarded as complete: there likely exist additional impacts.
It is unclear to the Agenda Committee the respective roles of the University of New Hampshire (UNH) Information Technology and Human Resources departments and their respective counterparts at the University System of New Hampshire (USNH) as it relates to their actions and inactions in this report. We therefore use IT and HR to refer to them collective unless a distinction is clear, in which case UNH or USNH is specified. AT refers to UNH Academic Technology.

2. Long-Standing Manifestations of the Issues

The University System of New Hampshire (USNH) Human Resources (HR) recognizes only a faculty member’s W-2 name. A number of University of New Hampshire (UNH) systems draw on this information, in some cases through the Banner system. Payroll is one example. The AC is not aware of any problems arising from this case.

Another example is the telephone directory, whether paper, or on-line. Here, anyone seeking our hypothetical Dr. Doe is unable to find her phone number or E-mail since she is listed under Jones. This may well harm Dr. Doe by preventing her from getting important calls or E-mails. It certainly frustrates the person trying to reach her, and when the reason is learned, puts UNH in a poor light. (Interestingly, the telephone system’s Automated Voice Recognition system can include “alternates,” so Dr. Doe could be listed as both Doe and Jones.)

UNH course listings, both paper and on-line, use W-2 names. This has a number of implications for Dr. Doe. First, she is forced to explain on the first day of her classes why she is listed under Jones. Dr. Doe may well regard the necessity of explaining herself to 10s or 100s of students, many of whom she may be seeing for the very first time, as an invasion of her privacy. Revealing personal detail in this way may undermine the professionalism she wishes to project and maintain.

Another disadvantage is students, liking Dr. Doe’s teaching, may advise others to take her classes. These students are then disappointed to find the class they want to take with Dr. Doe is, instead, taught by “Dr. Jones,” and choose not to take it. This harms Dr. Doe’s teaching opportunities as well as the students’ learning opportunities.

Canvas (myCourses) also uses, exclusively, W-2 names. Since the introduction of Canvas, this has demonstrably created further problems for some faculty, and we conclude that AT (at least) has been aware of the professional names issue for at least four years now. The AC learned that it is possible to temporarily correct this, but Canvas defaults back to the W-2 name when updated by Banner. This means, for Dr. Doe to be represented as she prefers, repeated calls to correct the name are required, taking her away from her core duties.

Teaching evaluations play a role in retention decisions, promotion and tenure of faculty. Here again, only W-2 names are used. Dr. Doe must, again, near the end of each semester, remind her classes that she is listed as Jones. Since some of her students may not have been present on the first day of classes, this must be a full repeat of that explanation. Any students who are confused, and thus fail to complete the forms, reduce the data available on Dr. Doe’s teaching. This may have implications for retention decisions, tenure and promotion.

These are long-standing issues and have been known to AT and other university officials for at least four years with no resolution. Although the AC recognizes that the university is a complex organization with multiple moving parts, we are concerned that this known issue has remained unaddressed for so long. As we will see in the next section, with the move to a public-facing website, this issue has become more urgent.

3. MyElements, FindScholars and the Faculty Activity Report
MyElements, FindScholars and the new (since 2017) Faculty Activity Report (FAR), which is populated by MyElements, fall directly under AT purview but rely, in part, on data fed by Banner. AT has been the public face of this software and has spearheaded its expansion (e.g., using myElements as the basis for FAR).

The problem of professional names was fully known and understood by IT, HR and AT prior to the adoption of myElements and associated software. AT places all responsibility on IT and HR, which have failed to provide for professional names in their databases, despite repeated representations from AT.

The AC has learned that the problem of professional names had been raised during meetings of the myElements Governance Board [3] before FindScholars was to go live. It is an unavoidable conclusion, then, that the stakeholders who made the decision to go live with FindScholars, did so in the knowledge that some faculty would suffer disadvantages from that decision. Yet, even before that decision, myElements presented problems because of the W-2 name issue, especially since websites also now draw on myElements. A brief review of this is in order.

As the AC understands the history, UNH, specifically the Research Office, originally adopted myElements to compile scholarly and research products by UNH faculty in the aggregate and to promote UNH scholarship publicly. A critical requirement for myElements was for all UNH faculty, or at least a critical mass thereof, to engage with the system and “claim” their papers, etc. Dr. Doe has nothing under the name Jones, since one reason she has a professional name (in common with most faculty with a professional name) was to have only one name in the literature. Dr. Doe thus had no papers to claim, since myElements presented papers only under the name Jones. MyElements does include a means to import papers under other names — one added task for Dr. Doe. This was a deterrent to Dr. Doe, who may have joined the vast majority of UNH faculty who did not, initially, claim their papers.

MyElements was then extended to encompass the Faculty Annual Report (FAR) [4]. This was done, in part, with the goal of forcing faculty to claim their scholarly and research products in myElements; to that point, only a small fraction of faculty (<5%) had used myElements. The disadvantages above applied to Dr. Doe, who is now forced to use myElements, and is aggravated by whatever extent the FAR is used for retention decisions, promotion and tenure.

AT promoted and implemented FindScholars, which draws on myElements, with the goal of automating and standardizing all Faculty webpages. This is intended to reduce the workload on faculty maintaining their webpages, albeit with a substantial loss of content control. It is also intended to make sure faculty have up-to-date webpages to promote UNH’s reputation. All such webpages at the college and department level were, and are, to be replaced by pages derived in the same fashion as FindScholars.

Dr. Doe appears as Dr. Jones, and any old websites listing her as Dr. Doe were to be replaced with ones drawing from FindScholars. (At least one department has refused to disable its webpages for faculty so they appear under their professional names.)

FindScholars is a major escalation in the disadvantages imposed on Dr. Doe. Aside from the long-standing difficulties in outsiders finding her phone number and E-mail — not to be minimized — previous aspects have been internal to UNH. Now she faces a very public problem.

Suppose Dr. Doe goes to a meeting or conference and presents a paper and meets others in her field: researchers or scholars, students, vendors, editors, program officers from funding agencies, etc. Probably she gives many her card — knowing full well they cannot find her phone number or E-mail under Doe in the UNH system, she uses a lot of cards — but those who only know her through her paper never see her card. Inevitably, people’s impulse is to look for her on UNH websites, such as FindScholars. Perhaps they are only curious, perhaps they
are considering collaborating, or hoping to study with Dr. Doe, or perhaps (particularly in the case of vendors, editors or program officers) they want to verify her *bona fides*. Business card or no, they cannot find her; they do not know to look under Jones. Dr. Doe’s reputation (one of any academic’s most valuable assets) is harmed and opportunities are lost.

Dr. Doe submits a research proposal and funding is declined. Did a reviewer look for her on FindScholars and, thus, not find her? Did this affect their recommendation? The confidential nature of the peer review process offers no answers. A similar concern that arises in our internet-driven world is that external reviewers in Promotion and Tenure cases may naturally turn to a faculty member’s webpage.

AT attempted to address the problem in some of the software by introducing manual corrections. This proved too burdensome, both to AT and the faculty members, as the correction were repeatedly overwritten by the software. Thus, Dr. Doe had to check regularly to see if she were correctly named, then ask AT to re-make correction when it reverted. The AC commends AT for its good faith efforts in this.

AT has also allowed faculty with professional names to opt out of FindScholars. Thus, if Dr. Doe views having a webpages under Dr. Jones as more harmful than having no webpages at all, she has that option. AT has made it clear this was a major and burdensome concession they did not have to make, and that it substantially mitigates the problem and its responsibility. The AC does not agree that the option to have no presence at all mitigates the problems that could have been anticipated.

It must be noted that, while hoping to have this issue addressed, at least one Faculty member was advised by HR to change their W-2 name. This, in the AC’s view, was an inexcusable response to the problem.

4. Conclusions

The Agenda Committee concludes that key decision-makers—we unfortunately do not have any clarity as to who made what decision when—consciously made knowing decisions to move forward with software that resulted in discrimination against a number of faculty. This discrimination was, and is, based on marital status and ethnic/cultural naming convention, and potentially other factors. In any case, the discrimination is totally unrelated to their work or professional merit.

The discrimination appears to be the result of technical expediency rather than prejudice. The decision to use myElements and to take FindScholars live was predicated on a need to create a public presence for UNH research; this goal is laudable. But it is clear that this desire was judged more important than ensuring that our faculty be represented as they wish. This includes the W-2 naming issue which is the centerpiece of this report, but it also includes other concerns that were voiced by faculty, who had lost control of how their faculty profiles were to be presented. We commend AT for working to address these concerns after the fact, but the AC wonders why these issues, which were known and thus could have been anticipated, were not addressed before going live.

The AC apologizes to those faculty who have been affected by these changes, and wishes that the Faculty Senate had been fully cognizant of the full extent of these concerns sooner.

[1] Senate passes Motion XXIII-M20 on Shared Governance 04-17-2019
Senate passes Motion XXII-M1 on model for mutual respect 9-11-17
Senate passes Motion XXI-M5 on inclusion, civil discourse, free speech 12-5-16
Senate passes Motion XVI-M15 on shared governance, 4/16/2012
Senate passes Motion XVI-M13 on the senate's response to the Inclusive excellence Report, 4/2/2012
Senate passes Motion XV-M2 on diversity reaffirmation, 11/1/2010
Senate passes Motion XIV-M5 on president's call for civic engagement, 11/16/2009
Senate passes Motion XIII-M15 on a shared governance document, 4/20/09
Senate passes Motion XIII-M18 on diversity in strategic planning, 4/20/09
Senate passes Motion XII-M5 on shared governance for study abroad, 11/5/07
Senate passes Motion XII-M4 on a guide for shared governance, 11/5/07
Senate passes Motion X-M7 on shared governance and resources, 4-17-06
Senate passes Motion X-M6 on civil speech, 4-17-06
Senate passes Motion X-M2 on shared governance, 12-12-05
Senate passes Motion IX-M17 on diversity, 4-18-05
Senate passes Motion IX-M10 on shared governance, 3-7-05
Senate passes Motion VIII-M8 on the Statement on Diversity, 3-8-04
Senate passes Motion VI-M2 on international respect, September 24, 2001

[2] Replacing Dr. Doe by “faculty with professional names” and Dr. Jones by “the faculty member’s W-2 name” throughout would certainly adversely affect both brevity and clarity.

[3] The “myElements Governance Board” appears in quotes herein because, first, it has no authority over myElements or its offspring (e.g., Faculty Activity Reports and FindScholars), nor did it ever vote on any aspect thereof, and therefore governed nothing. Second, given the above, and the fact that it was formed solely by AT outside of the elected Faculty Senate, the use of “Governance” appears to be a deliberate attempt to evade legitimate faculty governance norms. That said, we are deeply thankful to the members of the board for serving and, doubtless, substantially improving the ultimate software products when their advice was taken.

[4] This is regarded by the Senate as a clear violation of shared governance as per Motion XXIII-M18, adopted 18 March 2019.
Annual Review

AY 2018/2019
Finance and Administration Committee

Recurring Charges

1. Continue to ask the administration to provide “timely and complete budgetary proposals for new academic initiatives and opportunities” (Motion # XVI-M17). Either the chair of designated member of the committee should serve on the Budget Advisory Committee and report back to the Faculty Senate.

Budget Advisory Committee has not been meeting. We look forward to attending when the meetings restart.
Academic Year Charges

3. Gather information about college-level timelines and processes of budget construction, as well as faculty contributions to the process. Produce a report with recommendations of “best practices” to ensure faculty input on budget decisions that impact academic programs. Year-long study.

   Plan to work on this alongside the new CFO since these processes will likely change under new leadership.

Academic Year Charges

4. Monitor and report to the Senate on the past Capital campaign, specifically how that money is being used, and provide updates of any new initiatives in the area of fundraising. Ask Debbie Dutton, VP of Advancement, to meet with committee in the late fall or early spring.

   Most recent capital campaign just ended. We will be able to discuss full details of plans for money and future fundraising in fall.
Academic Year Charges

5. In light of the continued financial challenges facing UNH and the financial scrutiny faced by academic units on campus, analyze and report on the measures taken to control and reduce costs in non-academic units.

Combined with #6

Academic Year Charges

6. Work with the Vice President of Finance and Administration, Chris Clement, to identify UNH-specific reasons for increases in tuition and compare it to national trends. In particular, review the rise in administrative positions, especially in new areas of focus, such as student-support staff. If appropriate, make recommendations based on this data.

In progress. Closely related to charges 2, 3, and 5.
Academic Year Charges

7. Request from the Dean of COLSA, Jon Wraith, and Interim Provost Wayne Jones an accounting of the financial cost and benefits of reducing the scope of TSAS, with supporting documentation.

Recommend that this be pushed to next year so that we have a full fiscal year of data to evaluate.

Academic Year Charges

8. Identify and list the outside contracts made to meta-educational companies, both single-use and ongoing contracts, and calculate the amount that UNH pays to outside consultants each year for the last 5 years. Provide details about the purpose these consultations served and whether there are in-house organizations and professionals who could have accomplished the work of an outside consultant for less money. Explore the possibility of creating a policy that mandates seeking faculty with the required expertise before contracting with an outside entity.

List has been collected and reviewed. Committee is putting together questions for administration about the contracts as well as discussing a motion for Fall 2019 related to faculty awareness of open contracts and the contacting process.
Academic Year Charges

9. Enrollment Management: report on the budget expenditures from this office and, if possible, assess the return on investment.

- Met with Victoria Dutcher in the fall.
- Discussed the process for working with international recruiting agents
- Contracts are non exclusive, but started in Spring 2018 so no outcomes yet.
- All contracted agents/agencies are paid the same rate.
- There is no incentive to send unqualified students, since agents are not paid, if student(s) are not enrolled (NOT simply if students are accepted) and tuition/etc bill is paid in full.
- International students qualify for merit-based financial assistance (scholarship, graduate assistantships) – but not need-based assistance so discount is lower than that for US students.
APPENDIX IX.1
Presentation by the Academic Program Committee

APC Primary Charge Report to Faculty Senate
May 6, 2019

“We recommend that America’s colleges and universities embrace a culture of continuous innovation and quality improvement. We urge these institutions to develop new pedagogies, curricula and technologies to improve learning, particularly in the areas of science and mathematics. At the same time, we recommend the development of a national strategy for lifelong learning designed to keep our citizens and our nation at the forefront of the knowledge revolution”.

Report Framework

Context
Rationale
Metrics
Recommendations

Context

- New FS committee – broad directive to address “student success” and/or the concomitant issues that impact student success.

- Multiple initiatives underway at UNH to quantify and qualify what constitutes “student success.”

- **What constitutes a “successful education” at UNH per the faculty view?**

- Measuring success is complicated.
Rationale

- Endeavoring to answer: Why do we believe the faculty vantage point is crucial?
  - 9 metrics identified by Administration - not all inclusive...
  - Faculty must define and advocate for their critical role in promoting student success

Metrics

Endeavoring to answer: What additional metrics/experiences/data points should be included in measuring student success at UNH, from the faculty vantage point?
Recommendations

- Endeavoring to answer: What do we recommend for future action?
  - We call for specific actions on the part of the Administration, Faculty, and the University community as whole.

Caveats & Considerations

- High impact educational practices require equally high levels of faculty effort to develop, implement, coordinate, and evaluate.

- Given our current status as an R-1 institution, if UNH is truly committed to implementing high impact teaching practices, the Administration must provide the necessary resources to engage in this high-touch pedagogy.

- Faculty who utilize high impact practices in their teaching should be duly recognized for this extended effort.
APPENDIX IX.2

Faculty Senate – Academic Program Committee Report AY 18-19

Presented 5-6-19 to Faculty Senate

APC Committee – this is a newly formed committee for AY 18-19

Chair: Allison Wilder
Membership: Joe Onosko, Cris Beemer, Chris Neefus, Andrew Seal, Regina Smick-Attisano, Jim Ramsay, Niva Gupta (spring only), Lu Yan (spring only), Lucy Salyer (fall only), Xiaowei Teng (fall only)

Part 1- Recommended APC Charges sent by the FS Chair, Scott Smith in fall of AY’18

1. Define “Student Success” from an academic point of view, and compare it to the definition set forth by administrative leadership. Initial Report in October, follow-up as needed.

2. Consulting with President Dean, Interim Provost Jones, and other key stakeholders (e.g. Dean of Students, Head Registrar, Associate Deans) where appropriate, create a long-term strategy to increase the centrality of the academic mission of the university. Among possible outcomes are:

   a. Establish a mechanism(s) for promoting collaboration, mutual understanding, and shared decision-making across key stakeholders in shaping the future academic direction for the University.
   b. Identify areas that can improve the academic climate on campus (including better use of classroom space in mornings and Fridays, attention to the problem of alcohol on campus, rigor of classes [see self-reported number of hours in classes], and so on).
   c. Analyze grade inflation and/or plot grade distributions among units on campus.
   d. Examine Discovery as the economic driver of curriculum—is it accomplishing its goals? Should professional colleges (e.g., PAUL, HHS) be delivering Discovery, or ought that reside in COLA and hard sciences?
   e. Consider moving from 4 x 4-credit classes a semester to a 5 x 3-credit system.
   f. Identify, and make recommendations if appropriate and possible, other issues that pertain to increasing the academic rigor on campus.

Part 2- Context for Action:

The APC committee discussed the proposed charges and identified item 1 as a priority and item 2, letters a, b, d, and f either informed our work on item 1 or we acted directly upon that charge (e.g. FS Motion to Expanding Academic Offerings throughout the week).
Our committee strongly believes that the health and wellness of our students are essential to a successful education and to their professional development. However, as Faculty Senate is the legislative body that reviews and develops policies concerned with the academic mission of the University, the APC focused on academic indicators of student success here at the University of New Hampshire. We acknowledge that a “successful education” is often defined using measurable indices such as graduation rates and time to degree, and our findings call for a more nuanced definition of student success.

As of the writing of this report, there are multiple initiatives underway at UNH to quantify and qualify what constitutes “student success.” The APC noted that none of the initiatives were centered on what faculty consider to be the hallmarks of success for a UNH graduate. Therefore, the majority of our efforts focused on attempting to frame student success through the faculty lens.

We examined the question: **What constitutes a ‘successful education’ at UNH per the faculty view?**

In endeavoring to answer this question we researched various manuscripts and reports pertaining to success (we note some of these in our framing statements below). We also met with several stakeholders, including but not limited to: Scott Smith, Senate Chair; Anne Shattuck, Director of Institutional Research and Assessment; Nate Hastings, Coordinator of Leadership and Student Organizations; and Dave Zamansky, Assistant Director for Student Leadership.

**Our Framing of the Issue**

- The primary purpose of higher education is learning: students collaborating with faculty in teaching, research, creative expression, and service.
- Implied in President Dean’s Strategic Priorities is the charge to all of us at UNH to facilitate “cultivating the public citizen.” This concept can be tied to (a) the idea of a liberal arts education reflected in the Discovery core program at UNH and (b) the domain-specific understandings and ethical considerations that students will gain in every major at UNH. In short, UNH is more than an entry point to personal professional and financial success. Students at UNH are asked to consider public issues related to their major, as well as the cultural awareness and intellectual breadth available through the Discovery Program.
- The faculty consider it important to improve the academic climate on campus by encouraging students, faculty, and administration to renew their focus on the educational mission of the university (from “White Paper on Friday Classes”).
- “The education our future demands depends on intellectual experiences that are enriched and augmented by travel, research, engagement, technology, professional experience, and integrating general education with areas of specialization” (p12 NSSE report).
- “Students thrive at all three campuses, reflecting UNH’s mission and our deep commitment to high quality undergraduate and graduate instruction, to serving the public good, and to being a place dedicated to both significant research and the liberal arts” (p38 NEASC/CIHE Interim Report, November 2018).
- Beyond obvious metrics currently in use by UNH, there are many facets to successful education in terms of rigor, academic outcomes that are measurable, and the very nature of how students engage in their academic work. Measuring success is complicated.

**Part 3- Rationale:** Endeavoring to answer: Why do we believe the faculty vantage point is crucial?
• The nine academic performance metrics cited in President Dean’s Strategic Plan for UNH do not encapsulate the entirety of critical learning metrics, indicative of student success (https://www.unh.edu/main/future-of-unh).

• Data points that are readily accessed and referenced should remain; however, additional data can capture a more personally relevant factors that explicate matters beyond numbers, yet are critically impactful on student success and should be measured (this is a specific call for additional qualitative inquiry into student success).

• It is important for faculty to establish their indispensability to defining in student success:
  o Through classroom and advising contact with students, faculty members have first-hand knowledge of student strengths and weaknesses.
  o With recognized expertise in each of their fields, faculty members have the ability to provide proper guidance to students to enhance their opportunities for success.
  o With accumulated teaching experiences in the classroom and up-to-date knowledge in their fields of research, faculty members have the toolkit to transform today's students to tomorrow's "producers" ready for the needs of a broadly defined labor market.

**Part 4- Metrics of interest/value to faculty:** Endeavoring to answer: What additional metrics/experiences/data points should be included in measuring student success at UNH, from the faculty vantage point?

*Academic Challenge*

All UNH students should be able to engage in:

1) **Higher-Order Learning:** The ability to evaluate the data (facts, theories, decisions, or points of view) available, to form an understanding of all parts of the data, to propose and analyze a new idea, and to apply it to real world situations and problems. For faculty, the ideal is to keep assignments in the upper layers of Bloom’s Taxonomy as much as possible once the foundation has been formed.

2) **Reflective and Integrative Learning:** The ability to see connections between various courses and to apply their existing and prior learning to societal problems and issues. The ability to critically examine their point of view of an issue or concept, consider and understand different perspectives (ethical, political, religious, racial/ethnic, gender, and so on) that help to develop their understanding of the issue as well as to exercise their creative processes to formulate solutions.

3) **Developing Learning Strategies:** The ability to read, identify, review, and summarize the key ideas presented in reading assignments, course material, and in class. Additionally, being able to transfer knowledge from one discipline to another and to see the relationships between the content of the courses they are taking within their major and without. Ultimately, to become a systems thinker.

4) **Quantitative Reasoning:** The ability to analyze and interpret numerical data to examine contemporary global, political, economic, environmental, and societal issues and draw their own conclusions. Additionally, the ability and/or knowledge of the value of resources utilized in determining the solutions to these issues.

5) **High-Impact practices:** The ability to engage in high-impact experiences such as community-based projects, learning communities, undergraduate research, internships/fieldwork/practica, study abroad, and capstone project/thesis along with engaged practices in classrooms.

*Learning with Peers*

All UNH students should be able to identify the opportunities for and impact of:

1) **Collaborative Learning:** The ability to work in groups or interdisciplinary teams to understand and explain course material to solve assignments, prepare for exams, or complete course projects.
2) **Discussions with Diverse Others**: The ability to discuss and to gain an understanding of the perspectives of peers of diverse backgrounds such as political, religious, racial/ethnic, and economic among others.

*Experiences with faculty*

All UNH students should be able to engage in

1) **Research and Service Learning Projects**: Project based learning will become commonplace within the majority of the coursework students engage in over the course of their undergraduate experience.

2) **Teaching and Learning Opportunities**: As much as possible, students will engage with members of the faculty in determining and in facilitating opportunities for students to teach others in the class via a group project or presenting at a conference or a workshop. (some of this can be done departmentally or college wide: i.e. – a first year colloquia on what I learned in my first semester).

3) **Advising**: Each student will meet with their advisor within the first month of the semester and then again during the course registration time frame. Faculty advising should address major, Discovery & credit requirements, study abroad and away opportunities, lectures and events related to one’s major, career possibilities, and capstone options.

*Campus Environment*

All UNH students should avail themselves of opportunities to:

1) Develop an awareness of the numerous occasions for engagement throughout the campus and surrounding communities to fulfill their teaching and learning opportunities each semester.

2) Interact with the broad array of services/staff/fellow students/faculty and administration (at all levels) to enhance their educational experience on the campus as well as to improve the campus environment for all who work and learn here through
   - Student services
   - Student services
   - Campus recreation
   - Student clubs
   - Career & advising services

*metrics from the NSSE Report 2018*  
([file:///C:/Users/awb27/Documents/3%20SERVICE/SENATE/NSSE_2018_Annual_Results.pdf](file:///C:/Users/awb27/Documents/3%20SERVICE/SENATE/NSSE_2018_Annual_Results.pdf))

**Part 5- Recommendations**: Endeavoring to answer: What do we recommend for future action?

We have organized our recommendations for future action into three categories: A) steps the Administration should take or should consider taking; B) steps the Faculty Senate should take or consider taking; and C) goals that we should set as a university community.

In the first category, we believe that the Administration should:
1) Survey USNH faculty to ascertain the breadth and depth of our current efforts related to a variety of pedagogical practices that promote student success, especially those practices identified as “high impact” earlier in this report;

2) Create an online resource making available the results of this survey and numerous specific examples of these pedagogical practices already in place at UNH;

3) Continue to improve data collection on student performance in order to provide a robust and consistent quantitative basis for future initiatives to both consolidate gains already made and extend the frontier of student excellence;

4) Incorporate additional efforts to capture qualitative data on student success. Students’ stories of their success are very impactful and provide invaluable insight into potential best practices for promoting student success.

5) Actively and positively implement the principle of shared governance by including faculty representation on all future committees formed to define and/or operationalize student success, metrics and programs designed to accomplish such.

In the second category, we believe that the Faculty Senate should:

1) Maintain the existence of a committee or task force dedicated to consistent interaction with the persons responsible for the administration’s data collection and analysis on the topic of student success;

2) Incorporate discussion of high-impact practices into future revisions of the Discovery Program, and how such pedagogical tools can both enhance Discovery courses and provide a meaningfully unified experience at the core of a UNH education.

In the third category, we believe that the university should:

1) Affirm that the intellectual mission of the university is paramount, that it is the purpose of the University of New Hampshire to enable students to participate and engage in the discovery of knowledge and the pursuit of truth;

2) Affirm that students’ participation in these scholarly endeavors is essential to the preservation of an active, informed, and democratically committed citizenry for our state, our nation, and our world;

3) Affirm that the discovery of knowledge and the pursuit of truth is integral to individual development and personal growth; and

4) Commit ourselves to the cultivation of an intellectually inclusive, pedagogically supportive, and civically committed community in which we all exist as thinkers, learners, and citizens.

A closing thought: High impact educational practices require equally high levels of faculty effort to develop, implement, coordinate, and evaluate. These practices often lie well beyond traditional classroom pedagogy and evaluation rubrics. Given our current status as an R-1 institution, if UNH is truly committed to implementing high impact teaching practices, the Administration must provide the necessary resources to engage in this high-touch pedagogy. Additionally, faculty who utilize high impact practices in their teaching should be duly recognized for this extended effort.

Respectfully Submitted by

The Academic Program Committee AY ‘18–’19