Meeting called to order at 3:51 p.m. Monday, October 26, 2015

I. Roll – The following senators were absent: Denis, Franczak, Kun, and Mellyn. McCrone was excused. David Richman, Joel Seligman, Mica Stark, P.T. Vasudevan, and Barbara White were guests.

II. Remarks by and questions to the interim provost – P.T. Vasudevan announced that a tenure-track line in Chinese (Languages, Literatures, and Cultures Department) has been approved by the administration, noting the urging of the senate Academic Affairs Committee last spring to provide funds for such a position. The senators offered their approval with applause.

The provost then said that the university is looking at renting space in Goss, seeking perhaps as much as 50K square feet. A senator asked what the space would be used for. Vasu replied that it will be mostly support services, perhaps including the Academic Affairs Business Services Center. The university maintains transportation to and from that area, but no students will be required to travel there for classes.

A senator asked if the administration is exploring additional connections with Chinese universities. The provost said that there have been discussions of further collaboration with Chengdu University and Chengdu University for Information Technology. He noted that Chinese students who do not do well enough on their college entrance exams are not allowed to complete a BA in any subject, rather they are directed to Associate’s degrees and not allowed to continue beyond that. He said that many of these students are good students, and UNH would like to provide a way for them to advance in their degrees. The programs here may be 2+2, but most likely would be 2+3. There is also some discussion of having graduate students and faculty go to Chengdu to teach English and perhaps Discovery courses. The dean of the School of Law is interested in developing some kind of related program in connection with their Intellectual Property Law studies.

Another senator asked about the status of the Confucius Institute at UNH, and the provost replied that that is a conversation he needs to have in the future with Dean Fuld.

The senate chair thanked the provost for his comments.

III. Remarks by and questions to the senate chair – Senate chair Kinghorn advised the senators to be watching for announcements on the site visits for the candidates for the provost’s position. The visits will happen in November.
IV. Minutes – It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the last senate meeting, October 12, 2015. A duplication was noted in Item VIII, and a senator asked that the minutes reflect more clearly in Item VIII that the Host Checker changes impact only staff and not faculty. Thus corrected, the minutes were unanimously approved with one abstention.

Action Items:

V. Conversation with Joel Seligman and Mica Stark – Joel Seligman, Chief Communications Officer and leader of the Communications and Public Affairs team, introduced himself to the senate, saying his goal is to transform the way UNH presents itself to the outside community. He introduced his colleague Mica Stark, Assistant Vice President for Public Affairs, responsible for media relations and public communications.

Joel noted three areas of importance to President Huddleston in regards to public affairs and UNH: 1) building a distinctive, authentic, timeless, relevant UNH brand, 2) creating a best-in-class branding team to help articulate that using channels and vehicles that stakeholders are currently using, and 3) aligning communications across the institution.

Joel said that each institution has their own method of building communications, varying according to the needs and functions of that institution. For UNH, the top priorities are recruiting students, engaging alumni and donors, projecting the world-class research portfolio, and demonstrating our engagement and impact with the state of New Hampshire.

Seligman noted upcoming opportunities at UNH, including developing new markets in undergraduate admissions to address the issue of declining population of high school seniors in the northeast, the upcoming Sesquicentennial celebration, the public phase of the fundraising campaign, and increasing national visibility for UNH during the upcoming presidential primary.

He also noted the decreasing influence of traditional media, and said his office would be increasing the use of digital and social media platforms. He noted that 3.7 million distinct users visit the UNH homepage each year, and the site is used about 5.5 million times per year, most of whom are not already part of the UNH community.

His office is focused on amplifying their messaging around the successes of faculty, students, and alumni, who sometimes maintain a low profile and who the university would like to celebrate.

Finally, in discussing the integration of the previously separated public affairs functions at UNH, Joel turned the time over to Mica Stark, who said that the new public affairs model has joined communications and public affairs into a single unit, working closely with the Chancellor’s office regarding what is being said in Concord and to the media regarding budget requests.

Joel noted that there are five departments in their organization: a creative team, public affairs team, marketing team, communication leaders for four academic units, and client services team. He invited the senators to visit the website – www.unh.edu/cpa They have developed,
in collaboration across all three USNH campuses and with the cooperation of all the deans, a
communications plan that will help us recruit students, engage alumni, and demonstrate that
we’re a world-class institution, as well as tell the story about the impact and engagement that
exists at UNH.

He noted that in order to amplify the success stories of faculty, students and alumni at UNH,
news releases are not always the most effective way to get that information out. The
university homepage has been expanded to include five stories every week, providing an
opportunity to share the stories of community members and show the breadth of academic
opportunities, research portfolios, and the engagement between students and faculty.

The UNH Magazine is also undergoing some changes to make it more interesting in general
while amplifying favorite features. Mica said that a new version of UNH Today will be out
soon. Currently UNH Today is an outbound email that goes out each Thursday to about
70,000 people to share the great things going on in the university community. The new
version will include a richer experience on the website, and a unified branded set of focused
e-mails to include UNH Today, as well as UNH Today-News for news on prominent hires and
other newsworthy events, UNH Today-Alerts to keep community members up-to-date on
emergency alerts, and UNH Tomorrow to showcase future plans for things like campus
renovations and construction. These emails will reflect the content of the updated website,
and his office has been working closely with central IT to develop an extensive tagging
system that will allow easy searching on the website.

A senator suggested that it is important that we emphasize in our communications just how
close we are to Boston, particularly in promotional maps of the campus. Joel said that it is
also important to remind prospective students and hires how close we are to the ocean and
other amenities here in the Seacoast Area. The senator from the School of Law says that
Concord seems to be too far from Boston for the geography to be a meaningful draw. Another
senator said that with the Amtrak service here in Durham, we are closer to Boston than ever.

Another senator asked about using the draw of the presidential primaries here. Mica noted
that the Massive Open Online Course (MOOC) with Dante Scala and Andy Smith gets a lot of
national and international attention. The Rutman Lectures in COLA, Chuck Todd’s lectures
and both his and Andrew Mitchell’s recent shows from the T-Hall lawn have been
opportunities to garner more exposure for UNH.

The new space at UNH-Manchester is a wonderful resource for community space. Dean
Hickey has been running a National Security Forum, among other events. With three locations
(Durham, Manchester, and Concord), and multiple venues, UNH provides even more
engaging opportunities for community connections.

A senator asked if the UNH Speakers Bureau is under the jurisdiction of the
communications/public relations office. Mica said that it is, but that there are modifications
coming to that entity, saying that the new UNH Today website will have a revamped access to
the Speakers Bureau.
A senator asked about the controversial “Bias-free language guide” that was briefly posted on a UNH-related website this past summer, then removed by the administration. He asked what the effect of this nationally-noted controversy was on the image of the university. Joel said that the issue was perhaps more damaging locally, and in the political arena in Concord, than elsewhere, but that we had many supporters as well.

Another senator asked about the 3.7 million hits on the UNH website and how that compares to other websites. Joel responded that the website is the most visible asset that we have, and is the prime spot to put information we want to share. He said that comparing ourselves to other institutions of our size, we are in the middle of the pack in web traffic. To continue to keep that traffic high is a lot of outbound advertising particularly for undergraduate admissions, although recent advertising for graduate programs has begun. It is possible to see directly how many people follow those ads right into the UNH website, and also possible for us to identify the most effective locations for our advertising.

A senator asked about international advertising strategy for UNH. Joel responded that there is very little work done outside of the USA; most of our advertising is in the Mid-Atlantic states and adjacent states.

The senate chair thanked Joel and Mica for this conversation, and encouraged the senators to email them with any questions or comments.

Discussion/Report Items:

VI. Discussion and vote on motion from the TEVC on wording for online course teaching evaluations – Alberto Manalo, chair of the Teaching Evaluation Form Implementation Committee, reminded the group of the revisions to questions 4, 6, and 10 on the teaching evaluation form for online courses. The committee reviewed the recommendations of the senate from the last meeting regarding Question 4, and propose the following revision to their original motion:

Motion

The ad hoc teaching evaluation form implementation committee moves that the following changes be implemented for Questions 4, 6, and 10 in the student evaluation of teaching for UNH online courses:

Question 4: Presented the course content in an organized manner
Question 6: Encouraged the sharing of ideas among course participants
Question 10: Remained available to students via telephone or electronic communication

There was no discussion. The motion was put to a vote, and passed unanimously with 1 abstention.

VII. Report from senate Academic Affairs Committee on academic calendar/eTerms – Scott Smith, chair of the senate AAC. He reported that his committee was contacted by Registrar
Andy Colby to review the calendar for current eTerms which are the exclusive purview of two masters programs (Masters in Education (MEd) and Masters in Social Work (MSW)). The committee reviewed the dates and saw nothing that was immediately problematic, and would like to propose that the following motion be voted on today, as it is not substantive enough to warrant holding over to the next meeting.

**Rationale:** Two online masters programs (Master of Education, Master of Social Work) already follow a calendar that features five online terms. This calendar has, to our knowledge, never been approved by the Senate, and we have been asked to provide our imprimatur. The Academic Affairs Committee have discussed the proposed calendar, and do not think there is any reason to object to such a calendar. Yet, we believe that this is a matter that ought to be taken up by the ad hoc committee that is reviewing the current two-semester calendar and considering alternatives to the calendar. Thus, we believe it prudent for the senate to approve only the 2016–17 calendar until this matter can be considered in greater detail.

We’ll also note here that the Paul School follows its own irregular online calendar. The result is that: 1) we have a J-Term online term; 2) we have two regular Summer terms that can and usually do involve online classes; 3) a regular series of five “online” eTerms which do not coincide at all with numbers 1 and 2; 4) the Paul School calendar, which from all appearances is asynchronous; 5) irregularly offered online classes that do not fall into any of the above categories. It may simply be that online offerings do not need to brought into any kind of consistency, but it is worth discussing further.

**Motion:** To approve the UNH online calendar of five online terms set forth below (for Academic Year 2016–17 only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016 - 2020 University Holidays not set</th>
<th>Revised July 17, 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-Term 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes Begin</td>
<td>August 17, Monday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Day; University Holiday</td>
<td>September 7, Monday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes End</td>
<td>October 9, Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-Term 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes open on Blackboard</td>
<td>October 19, Monday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election Day; no exams scheduled</td>
<td>November 3, Tuesday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran’s Day; University Holiday</td>
<td>November 11, Wednesday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanksgiving holidays</td>
<td>Nov 26 - 27, Thur – Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes End</td>
<td>December 15, Tuesday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-Term 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLK, JR Day; University Holiday</td>
<td>January 18, Monday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes Begin</td>
<td>January 19, Tuesday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes End</td>
<td>March 11, Friday</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **E-Term 4** |                      |                      |                      |
| Classes Begin | March 21, Monday     | March 20, Monday     | March 19, Monday     |
| Classes End   | May 12, Thursday     | May 11, Thursday     | May 10, Thursday     |

| **E-Term 5** |                      |                      |                      |
| Classes Begin | May 23, Monday       | May 22, Monday       | May 21, Monday       |
| Memorial Day; University Holiday | May 30, Monday | May 29, Monday | May 28, Monday |
| 4th of July; University Holiday | July 4, Monday | July 4, Tuesday | July 4, Wednesday |
| Classes End   | July 15, Friday      | July 14, Friday      | July 13, Friday      |

The calendar is subject to change.

A senator asked if this calendar would now serve as a template for other online Masters programs. Scott said that this calendar was set up with faculty and administrative input, but suggested that it would be a matter for the ad hoc Committee on Calendar Options to take up.

Another senator asked how many online courses are being taught in these programs. The senator from Social Work said that there are two online courses taught in the MSW.

**It was moved and seconded to suspend the rules in order to vote on this motion today. That motion passed unanimously.**

The AAC motion above was then put to a vote and passed unanimously with 1 abstention.

VIII. Report from senate AAC on Discovery Review Committee report – Barbara White, chair of the Discovery Committee, and David Richman, chair of the Discovery Review Committee (DRC) attended today’s meeting as visitors to answer questions regarding the report from the DRC reviewing the first five years of the Discovery program.

Scott Smith, chair of the senate AAC, offered a brief history of the Discovery program. In 1999 the senate passed a motion to establish a general education study committee, which recommended that UNH shift from a general education program to a Discovery program, aimed at a more holistic approach to college education, seeking to energize first-year students
through smaller Inquiry courses, and to integrate core courses. In April 2002, the senate voted to accept the overall parameters of Discovery, and over the next six years, various motions were passed to implement certain areas of Discovery until full implementation was achieved in 2009, with a recommendation for a five-year review, which is what we are discussing review. The Discovery Committee had responsibility for approving Discovery courses and other related features. The DRC was established and charged by the senate Agenda Committee last year to carry out the five-year review of Discovery.

That charge focused on two areas:

1) implementation and process (Did the implementation of Discovery follow the processes outlined in the 2009 Discovery Implementation Document?), and

2) review of conceptual/theoretical foundation (Suggested areas of review include an analysis of the structure of program; suggestions for improvement (e.g. room for "themes"; re-clustering categories, etc.); an analysis of student outcomes related to Discovery Program exposure, etc.)

Eight other questions were appended to the two above, allowing the DRC to consider the efficiency of the program and outline possibilities where the program might change to better serve the needs of the university. Scott informed the senators that they could be added to the area in Box where these reports are stored to have full access to the documents of the DRCR, and encouraged them to take the time to do that:

1. Assess the overall effectiveness of Discovery.
2. Assess the level of awareness/compliance of the faculty with disseminating the tenets of Discovery to students
3. How well do we map Discovery to UNH research strengths?
4. How many courses do we have that effectively cross-disciplinary lines and make that evident to the students (INQ--any others?) Check BU model and the Stanford article on how to re-imagine college education.
5. Are we effectively (in terms of pedagogy) using small and large classes and using classrooms that have technology?
6. Are there places where we could adjust to allow for students to develop depth as well as breadth, and what would be the implications of that?
7. Can we adjust to enhance flexibility for students, so that they can engage in research, study away, internships, etc. – the original idea of wildcards, now so as to encourage cognates?
8. How effective is the Discovery Dialogue program?

Scott thanked the DRC and specifically Barb and David for their efforts and turned the time over to them for answering questions.

A senator asked if the perception of Discovery by students that these courses are not effective nor applicable to their degrees is addressed in the report. David replied that these sentiments are reflected in the surveys included in their review. These surveys were completed by students and parents. He said that the committee attempted to place language in the report to
encourage faculty who are teaching Discovery classes to make it clear to their students what the significance and purpose of their course. Barb said that the faculty who own the curriculum need to make the connection clear to students, and that it is the responsibility of the departments to make this clear to the faculty. Deb also noted that the senate passed a motion strongly recommending that faculty teaching Discovery courses speak clearly to their students at the beginning of the class about the function and purpose of those classes.

A senator asked how many departments have Inquiry courses that are not just first-year courses. Barb responded that there are a handful, but said that the influx of upper-division students taking these first-year courses occurs once open enrollment is over; when there are still slots available in an Inquiry course, they are sometimes selected by juniors and seniors, which can sometimes be problematic for a course designed specifically for first-year students. She noted that there is pressure to fill the classes and add those upper division students, which changes the dynamic of the course. A senator asked if these under-filled courses are serving their value. Barb replied that there is an assessment process, somewhat subjective, which includes five additional questions added to the student evaluation of teaching for Inquiry courses.

Another senator asked, regarding seniors and juniors in these classes, if it were not possible to control enrollments with reserved spots for first-year students only. Barb said that this plan is already in place, but that such reservations and control of enrollments must happen in the departments, with departmental communication with the registrar’s office to do just that.

A senator asked about the two alternatives for revised categories, asking what the two competing visions are. David responded that most of the DRC’s work came in discussing this matter. There was near unanimity that the existing requirements should change, as there are currently too many required courses with eight categories.

The two recommendations regarding re-structuring are:

1. Cut the number of categories to four, requiring two courses in each of four categories. This choice sacrifices breadth for depth in a particular area.

2. Cut the number of categories to six, which asks students to take one course in each of six categories, plus taking two additional courses outside the area of the student’s major.

Barb noted that model 1 was one of the first proposals brought forward to the senate originally, and at that time the senate AAC suggested the current model of eight categories.

A senator asked how these two options solves the problem of students who don’t want to take any courses at all outside of their major. David replied that the committee’s concern was not about accommodating students who don’t want to study anything beyond their majors, but rather to give students the opportunity to expand their understanding. These two options do not require students to take a Discovery course in their own major, which is also a change.

A senator suggested that there is no such thing as generic critical thinking, and said that the proposed models would serve to erode student exposure to a wide range of concepts and
ideas, as well as contributing to competition between departments. He said these are consumer models, allowing students to select from a smorgasbord of courses.

Barb responded that the quality of these courses should not decrease, but that these options should strengthen some courses. She suggested that there is always competition between departments with RCM, but these options allow students to take more courses in the sciences, learning those scientific thinking skills in areas more relevant to their interests. The senator acknowledged the need for increased rigor in all areas, but asserted that it seems to reflect an erosion of student understanding across a vast range of subjects very relevant today. Deb said that this very idea will likely shape the senate’s ongoing discussion of Discovery this year.

A senator asked if the Discovery program is any better than the former General Education program at providing breadth to the students’ educational experience. David responded that there will likely always be a student cohort that is unhappy with being required to take any set of courses. He noted that in all colleges, there are some courses and instructors who are accomplishing the desired result, and some who are not, and that may not change. The point is taken that breadth must be sacrificed for depth. Barb said that we have no real assessment for the old General Education program. The Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) is one metric used.

A senator asked about the Category Seat Dispersion Recommendation. David responded that there are a number of courses that are so large (over 400 students) that they drain students from taking other courses in the same area. If these largest course enrollments are capped, it should encourage students to take other courses in the same area.

A senator said that one thought on the large courses is that these classes are popular because of the structure of the system. Barb said that the DRC maintained their investigation at the theoretical pedagogical level and didn’t examine this. She suggested that this might be something for departments to address. David said they understand that it is a big problem. A member of the agenda committee said that the charge to the DRC deliberately did not include the questions she raises.

The senator from Communications asked about the five extra questions on the student evaluations of teaching for Inquiry courses, and how faculty can access the responses to those questions. Barb said that the chair receives those evaluation forms. The senator noted that her department straddles both Humanities and Social Sciences, and asked how Discovery courses in her department would be categorized. Barb replied that that would be a matter for her department to work out.

A senator commented that the language of the recommendation in the report regarding the caps on student enrollments in the largest classes is ambiguous. She then asked if there is any sense from the DRC that different departments might benefit differently from either of the two options suggested, wondering if there were any data on the advantages or disadvantages of either option to specific departments involving the effects on staff and enrollments, for example.
Barb responded that it there is a delicate infrastructure within Discovery which allows interdisciplinary crossover, opening up opportunities but also inviting competition. The DRC was not charged to watch over this issue. That would be up to the deans. It would be a conversation to have with the provost, who then might direct the associate deans to be mindful not to put departments in jeopardy.

A senator who served on the original Discovery Committee asserted that the proposed changes demonstrate a great disservice to the difference between the Biological and Physical Sciences. He pointed out that the proposed models preserve the distinctions in the Humanities, but not in the Sciences, and said he sees this as a familiar failure to recognize the distinction between Physical and Biological Sciences. David replied that professors from Biology and from Physics served on the DRC that came up with these proposals.

A senator noted that the limit of 400 students is per course, not per department, and asked what actual class sizes are at UNH. Barb responded that there are a couple of classes with between 500-800 students enrolled. There are several with around 400 students. She suggested that a small number can impact other courses.

A senator said that the report didn’t address the issues of specific groups. Expanding or contracting the number of courses required doesn’t help. These courses need to be modularized to appeal to various groups of students. There are students with an aversion to quantitative courses, or to writing long papers, and the challenge for departments is to design offerings that overcome students’ resistance to those courses. He noted that sometimes Discovery courses aren’t taught by the faculty with the most experience and skills in creating a welcoming atmosphere. Barb agreed, referring to her initial comment on making sure that faculty make a concerted effort to creating a classroom experience that is positive.

Scott then summed up his committee’s recommendations, dividing them into categories:

A) Recommendations to increase oversight on the part of the Discovery Committee. Into this fall recommendations #6 (ensure DC meet academic standards), #8 (Disc. Comm. track Inquiry 444 and INQ attribute courses), #10 (track DC that have not been taught for 3 years), #12 (Disc. Comm. conducts category description review).

B) Recommendations concerning categories: #1 & 2 (Writing requirement and QR remain unchanged); #4 (re-clustering categories). The AAC expects this category may require the most discussion.

C) Miscellaneous: #3 (Discovery Dialogue discontinued), #5 (all discovery courses count toward discovery credit), #7 (cap number of seats in large discovery courses), #9, (inquiry courses remain for first year or first year equivalent), #11 (stop using “decommission”).

The AAC would like to give the senators ample time to take this information to their departments and bring back comments. In order to provide a month-long time period for senators to act as clearinghouses for information, sending feedback to the AAC through Scott, his committee requests that responses be submitted by November 29th, or even before Thanksgiving if possible. The AAC will go over comments and suggestions, and will speak
with the provost, with Ted Kirkpatrick, with Barbara and David, and hopefully will have a report back to the senate by early spring.

IX. **New business** – There was no new business.

X. **Adjournment** - It was moved and seconded to adjourn the meeting at 5:30 p.m.