Meeting called to order at 3:51 p.m. Monday, April 25, 2016

MINUTES SUMMARY

I. Roll – The following senators were absent: Davis, Denis, Dowd, and Kun. Berglund was excused. Bill Hersman was a guest.

II. Remarks by and questions to the senate chair – Senate chair Deb Kinghorn had no comments, and there were no questions.

III. Minutes – It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the last senate meeting, April 11, 2016. The senator from the library offered a correction to her comments in Item III. Two senators offered clarification of their comments from Item V, asking that some wording be added and edited. Another clarification was requested in Item VI. Thus adjusted, the minutes were unanimously approved with 3 abstentions.

IV. Discussion and vote on CPC motion on adding campus lactation rooms – Danielle Pillet-Shore, representing the Campus Planning Committee, restated the motion presented last week urging the designation of additional lactation facilities across campus.

“Let it be resolved that the Faculty Senate urges the University Administration to designate additional lactation rooms evenly distributed across each UNH campus to minimize transit time and maximize scheduling/booking access.”

A senator suggested deleting a definitional paragraph from the original motion’s rationale, as the information is more informative and dilutes the impact of the motion, and the committee accepted this as a friendly amendment. The senator from the Recreation Management and Policy Department said that some faculty in her department have experienced the challenge of traveling to and from the current lactation rooms, and that they are appreciative of this initiative.

The motion was put to a voice vote, and passed unanimously with no abstentions.

V. AAC report and motions on the Discovery Review Committee Report – Scott Smith, chair of the Senate Academic Affairs Committee, offered eight motions on behalf of the AAC, based on the recommendations made in the Discovery Review Committee Report, which can be found on the senate website, on the home page under “What’s News,” or here.

Scott said that the AAC believes that the following motions reflect the will of the faculty at large, or at least those who were polled in the committee’s work on this report over the past seven months as they have conversed with faculty and administrators, and gathered
approximately 35 pages of feedback from faculty. He reminded the group that Barb White and David Richman from the Discovery Review Committee spoke with the senate last fall regarding their report. Some of the motions may be more controversial than others, but in general, the AAC does not feel that any substantial change should be made to the Discovery program only six years into its course.

Thus, the Academic Affairs Committee moves each of the following eight items, all of which will lay over until the next senate meeting:

1) that the writing requirement and quantitative reasoning requirement remain unchanged

This recommendation is based on the DRCR recommendations #1, 2.

2) that the Discovery Dialogue be discontinued

The Discovery Dialogue, the overarching, university-wide theme that was to unify undergraduate education, has suffered several budget cuts and is not functioning as was intended. The Discovery Review Committee (DRC) recommends it be discontinued, and the AAC concurs, although the AAC believes that the idea of the Discovery Dialogue should be supported in principle, and there is hope that at some point in the future, the idea can be resurrected in some other form. At this point, the program lacks financial support. Scott asked how many senators have used Discovery Dialogue this year, and none responded that they had.

The next motion seems to be the most controversial:

3) that the Discovery Categories remain unchanged, despite the strong recommendation by the DRCR (recommendation #4) to reduce the number of categories (to six [6] or four [4]) but keep the number of required classes the same (eight [8]);

The AAC, after consultation with faculty, felt strongly that the Discovery categories should remain unchanged. A senator asked why, and Scott replied that the responses they gathered indicate that breadth is still remarkably important to all departments. He noted that the proposed changes to the categories seemed inconsistent and without an overarching rationale. A senator who served on the DCR said that evidence was offered in support of the change as an attempt to increase flexibility in order to be responsive to students’ preferences.

Scott asked if there were serious concerns about this motion. Another senator who served on the DRC said that he disagrees with the AAC motion. He asserted that there seemed to be a strong sense from students and faculty advisors that Discovery was micromanaging this process, which is what drove the committee to recommend the change. To clarify, more flexibility was desired, particularly for the better students who would like to pursue more depth in their studies, or to be able to choose Discovery courses that interest them more.

A senator said that it is important to be responsive to the recommendations of the DCR, suggesting that students feel limited by the current system. Her department is leaning toward
the six category option with two wild cards, to maintain the spirit of diversity. Another senator recalled that the university’s former General Education program offered 500- and 600-level courses, while most Discovery courses are 400-level. She asserted that students get a better feel for what a discipline is about when they’re taking courses above the 400-level. She asserted that more 400-level courses have been created in order to fit the Discovery model, and suggested that the idea of introducing students to a field by way of general education or Discovery courses is being lost. She suggested that six categories with a wild card might offer more flexibility.

Scott pointed out that enrollment management is directly tied to the categories, which may be part of the source of the resistance of the departments to the change. The AAC determined that Discovery can’t be fully dealt with without an overall review of enrollment management.

Another senator asked if part of the concern about students’ desire for flexibility in their course selections had to do with the difficulty of getting courses approved for Discovery. Scott said that the vast majority of student comments he reviewed said essentially that the students didn’t want to take any courses outside their course of study. The other 10% of responses were seeking some kind of flexibility in the program. He said it was difficult to piece together just what students mean by flexibility. A member of the DRC said that their committee was not moved by that majority call from students to only take courses in their field, but that all responses seemed to indicate an opinion that Discovery is too restrictive as it is. He noted that the original Discovery proposal was for four categories, but then was changed.

A senator said that the AAC discussed the fact that students who desire more flexibility always have the right to petition, and that those petitions are taken seriously by the Discovery Committee, which means that students have alternatives when they truly need them. She suggested that allowing more than two courses to overlap might be appropriate, and then pointed out that there are 600-level courses in Discovery, including study abroad options. These variations within the program must be taken case-by-case, but they do provide more flexibility.

A senator asked if there has been any evaluative research on the consequences of the distribution schemes. The senate chair said that initially there was a great deal of research being examined and circulated, but she is unsure of what is available now. The senator expressed disappointment in the lack of research, saying that assumptions are being made without sufficient evidence. He asked if we know that it is true that if students are required to take more STEM courses, they will begin to like STEM subjects more. One of the DRC members said that the greater concern in maintaining three requirements for the sciences is that if students only have to take two sciences, they will miss out on the third. He suggested that research on this is complicated. It seems that the things that separated Discovery from the old General Education program are gone: the Discovery Dialogue and the small class size are both gone due to financial constraints, with the result that the new program strongly resembles the old one.

The senate chair reminded the group that at the next meeting when these motions will be voted on, any motion that does not carry will be moved forward to the next year for further
review by the AAC, meaning that if we don’t feel we have all the answers we need now, there will be time next year to address those issues more fully, and determine what more needs to be done.

A senator said that the conversation seems a little one-sided. He said that what we’re talking about is the purpose of a Liberal Arts education, which is to provide that breadth. He asserted that critical thinking is not a general set of skills; it is understanding a wide swath of ideas.

Scott noted that the Writing and Quantitative Reasoning requirements do not change, but that some of the other categories do change. A member of the DRC noted that a physicist and a biologist were each on the DRC, and said that there have been so many changes in biological and life sciences in the last decade that the distinction between the fields is much less than it used to be. However, it was noted that there is opposition from some faculty in the Biological Sciences, with strong opinions to maintain the separation of the sciences in Discovery.

The next motion has to do with double counting of courses; for both a student’s major as well as for Discovery credit. He said that some departments restrict the courses that can count for both Discovery and towards the major, and that in some colleges, students cannot fulfill a Discovery requirement with a course that also fulfills a major requirement. If the Discovery program is meant to be anti-insular, the AAC recommends that departments not be given carte blanche in regards to double-counting, particularly those departments who offer Discovery courses in as many as five separate categories.

4) that a Discovery course satisfy a Discovery category regardless of whether it also counts as a major requirement (that is, “double counting” is allowable); departments and programs are, however, free to place restrictions on double counting, and are encouraged to limit the number of Discovery courses taken within the major rubric itself (DRCR recommendation #5);

A senator offered a minor amendment, as follows:

4) that a Discovery course can satisfy a Discovery category regardless of whether it also counts as a major requirement (that is, “double counting” is allowable); departments and programs as well as colleges by agreement of their chairs are, however, free to place restrictions on double counting, and are encouraged to limit the number of Discovery courses taken within the major rubric itself (DRCR recommendation #5);

He suggested that there shouldn’t be a one-size-fits-all constraint on double counting, nor an administrative, top-down constraint, but that if chairs should find some kind of agreement together, they might work out appropriate guidelines. The committee found the amendment friendly, and it was accepted.

Another senator expressed concern that a department might attempt to take away a student’s ability to count a course for Discovery. He asserted that departments can certainly add any additional requirements they might desire for their major, and can determine which courses can count for their major, but that they should not be able to determine whether or not a course
would count for Discovery credit. He asserted that departments cannot declare what courses can be accepted for Discovery credit; they may only control what is accepted for major credit.

A senator from the English Department reported that her department had received instructions from the dean’s office that their students could not receive Humanities category Discovery credit for courses in their department. Her concern was that this restriction didn’t come from the department, but from without the department. Another senator asked if a department can dictate to students which Discovery courses they can take. A member of the DRC replied that a department can require students to take a specific course from one of the six Discovery categories as part of their major requirements, but that the department should not prohibit a student from taking another course in that category.

Scott asked if the amendment to the above motion covers the concern regarding the control over Discovery credits, and the concerned senator above replied that for him it did; it protects Discovery, and it protects departments in their control of their majors. A member of the DRC said that the intent of the committee was that departments should not be forced to double count or not double count courses, even by other department chairs. The amended wording covers that.

Another member of the DRC said that the purpose of Discovery is to get students to explore other fields besides their major, and that departments should be careful to encourage their students to look outside their major to fill their Discovery category requirements. A senator said that in her department, they offer courses fulfilling five different Discovery categories, and that it concerns her that their majors could potentially fulfill so many Discovery courses without branching out into other disciplines. The senator from the Languages, Literatures, and Cultures Department noted just the opposite; that their students are prohibited from receiving Discovery credit for World Cultures for courses taken within their language, including study abroad courses. This means that while they’re studying world cultures in their major, or in a study abroad setting, they must then go to another department to get Discovery credit for that category, which seems absurd. Scott said that hopefully this change will press the Registrar to change the policy that allows a computer to make determinations about what courses can be counted to fulfill the categories.

The fifth motion gives the DRC the power to discuss issues with departments. The senate vice chair asked if the committee members have the capacity to take on such work, and Scott replied that the members of the committee with whom he spoke said that they felt they had the time to devote to this.

5) that the Discovery Committee be empowered to:
   a) review all discovery courses for academic standards and inform departments should it judge any to have fallen below reasonable university standards (DRCR recommendation #6),
   b) track and report to, and discuss with, departments any changes in syllabi and personnel for Inquiry 444 and Inquiry Attribute courses (DRCR recommendation #8),
   c) track discovery courses that have not been taught during the past three years (DRCR recommendation #10), and
d) conduct a category description review of the current eight categories (unchanged; see above, #3) and make recommendations to the Faculty Senate for possible changes to the language in order to clarify the parameters of the categories (DRCR recommendation #12);

The sixth motion aims to stop the practice of decommissioning courses, and seeks to find new policies that will allow the creation of new courses.

6) that colleges stop the practice of forcing departments to “decommission” a Discovery course in order to create a new one since such practice stifles innovation (DRCR recommendation #11);

It was noted that having a policy to set limits on the number of courses is necessary, but that there are ways to rotate courses or follow other practices that don’t require re-submission of courses that have been decommissioned. Some of the deans are looking for new language and new practices to facilitate this. If the decommissioning is done on a college level, a senator asked if there is any way for the Faculty Senate to stop the practice. Is this within the senate’s purview, or do we only control the Discovery Committee and its processes? He suggested that the Discovery Committee only looks at courses that have already been passed by the college, and said he’s not convinced that the senate can control this. A member of the DRC said that while the college can decommission a course, the decommissioning should not be driven by the creation of a new course, which is the current practice. He said a different mechanism is needed to control the number of seats offered. Another member of the DRC noted that the creation of a new course might also mean that an older course could still be offered, just not as a Discovery course. There was then some discussion about whether the college determines if a course should be classified as Discovery, or if it is Discovery Committee that makes that decision. Scott asked if a college has ever taken that step. The senate chair said that this is a good point to consider. A member of the DRC said that the motion simply says that a course can’t be decommissioned to make room for another course.

The seventh motion discusses enrollment caps. Scott said that there has been some pushback from departments who already have courses with enrollments over 400. He suggested that this is something that the AAC should look at next year:

7) that the Discovery Committee work with Deans and Chairs to ensure that Discovery seats are equitably distributed and that certain large classes do not unfairly dominate the market (DRCR recommendation #7, modified away from instituting a “hard cap” of 400 students per course in aggregate); and

A senator asked why, if there are no caps, decommissioning should occur. She pointed to the value of small classes, particularly in fulfilling the purpose of Discovery. Scott noted that the original plans for Discovery courses to have 35 students or less has proven to be financially unfeasible to maintain here at UNH. A member of the DRC pointed out that 400 is an arbitrary number, and that it could mean the number of students in several sections of a single course.

The final motion promotes stronger advocacy for the Discovery Program by faculty, advisors, staff and administration:
8) that the administration, faculty advisers, and university staff advocate positively for the Discovery Program and that they advise students of the rationale behind the program; and, furthermore, that all syllabi from courses taught within the Discovery Program clearly state what category and/or attribute the course fulfills and describe how the course fits the language of the category (DRCR “additional comments,” p. 13; see further Student Senate Resolution XXXVII–32, Feb. 28, 2015; category descriptions may be found at http://www.unh.edu/discovery/discovery-categories)

Scott said that responses from students revealed that they often do not have a clear understanding of why they are being required to step outside their discipline. He suggested that if students are better informed, they may have a better experience.

A senator suggested a wording change:

8) that the administration, faculty advisers, and university staff advocate positively for the Discovery Program and that they advise students of the rationale behind the program; and, furthermore, that all syllabi associated with a category…..

He suggested that a paragraph be included to state the purpose of each category in the syllabi, to give the students a better sense of what purpose that category might serve in the course.

The senate chair closed this discussion and urged the senators to review the documentation on these motions in preparation for voting on these motions next week. If the senators are not satisfied with a motion, they may vote it down, in which case the senate can choose to send the matter forward to the next session for further review and discussion. The motions will lay over until the next meeting.

VI. Discussion and vote on motion from RPSC on proposed policy on Start-Ups – David Finkelhor, chair of the Senate Research and Public Service Committee, shared the committee’s motion regarding the university’s proposed policy on Start-Up companies:

Rationale: The need for such policies seems reasonable, but the committee was also persuaded that it could be unfair to change the rules on someone who made decisions on the basis of a previous set of guidelines. The RPSC therefore moves:

Motion: That the Faculty Senate approve the university "policy on conflicts of interest in Start-Up companies" (attached) and the "revisions to the UNH policy on the management of equity interests in Start-Up companies”(attached), with the proviso that they apply only to Start-Up companies formed after the date of their formal adoption.

He reminded the group of eight key provisions of the proposed policy:

- Full disclosure of the roles of those faculty involved in Start-Ups
- The limit of two years for faculty in such Start-Ups to serve in fiduciary role
- The specification that there would be an oversight committee to review Start-Ups and their activities
The specification that a founder may not receive a share of university equity if the founder is an equity holder themselves

The specification that no voting shares for the university part of the Start-Up

UNH will liquidate its equity on acquisition of the Start-Up by some other entity or by the public offering of the shares of that Start-Up

The specification that the faculty member involved in a Start-Up may not supervise employees who are students

That the oversight committee is empowered to investigate conflicts and employ sanctions

David said that the administration is very keen to have this policy enacted. He acknowledged the issues raised by Professor Bill Hersman in a prior senate meeting regarding his experience as the founder of such a company while teaching at UNH, and suggested that the RPSC’s recommendation to modify the policy so that the rules apply only to companies going forward from this time might offer an appropriate solution. He said he has heard no objections to the policy from anyone besides Professor Hersman. He also said he is unaware of the number of Start-Ups that may currently exist at UNH, although he suspects there are not very many.

David reported that the Interim Provost, Marc Sedam, and Jan Nisbet all objected to the committee’s recommendation that the new guidelines apply only to Start-Ups formed after the date of implementation of those guidelines. He then shared a letter from UNH counsel Ron Rogers, who writes:

“In my view the only time the university can legally justify such an exemption [as excluding a specific person from a university policy such as the proposed policy on Start-Ups] is 1) when it has an articulated rational for distinguishing that individual from the remainder of the covered population, and 2) there are no other individuals in that population to whom the rational basis would apply.”

David asserted that he believes there is an articulated rational basis for excluding this class of people, as individuals who started their companies under a different set of assumptions, and for whom those assumptions should still apply. He continued reading from Ron Rogers’ email:

“A better practice is to create some form of exemption/grandfather/safe harbor provision (perhaps including an expiration date) that would apply to all similarly situated individuals without singling out any one individual. Of course the exemption/grandfather/safe harbor provision and any temporal limitation on its application should be supported by an articulated rational basis.

“In the context currently under consideration, the above principles suggest, for example, adding a limited exemption for corporations in existence as of the effective date of the policy by starting the two year grace period on that effective date, regardless of how long the corporation has been in existence.”

David said that in his mind, this suggestion is not a grandfathering at all. A senator noted that the Oversight Committee proposed in the revised policy includes no faculty, which is not acceptable in the spirit of shared governance. The Oversight Committee for Start-Up
Companies, as proposed in the revised policy document includes the Provost, the Vice President for Finance and Administration, the Sr. Vice Provost for Research, and the UNH Innovation Managing Director, (or their designees), with representatives of the USNH General Counsel serving in advisory roles. David said that there is a committee with faculty on it, on which he serves. Deb said that faculty must be included as voting members on any such committee as the Oversight Committee for Start-Up Companies.

A senator expressed concern regarding the prohibition on faculty serving as supervisors of employees who are students, saying that this defeats the purpose of having start-ups at the university in the first place. David said that the administration’s concern is that the incentives present in the start-up company might override the kinds of typical mentoring or advising judgements that might be made for a student if no such dual role existed. The senator agreed that no faculty should be a thesis advisor in such a position. A senator asked if the policy prohibits all officers of the start-up from supervising students, or if it’s only the fiduciary positions that would be prevented; would Chief Technology Officer or Chief Scientific Advisor. David said he believed it would only be faculty in fiduciary positions. The senate chair said that this is an issue that should be resolved.

A senator said that having two sets of rules for different Start-Ups seems messy. He said that Ron Rogers’ solution of an expiration date for older Start-Ups should be considered. He said it seems reasonable to give older Start-Up companies a period of time in which to make adjustments, but then at some point it is only fair that all companies should be playing by the same rules, and there was some agreement. David asked the senator if he then approved of the grandfather clause, and the senator replied that such a clause with an expiration date would be acceptable to him. David asked if there were a suggestion for a length of time for that clause, and Deb suggested that the committee should review the information and make a suggestion to that end.

Bill Hersman was a guest in the meeting, and thanked the group for its consideration of this matter. He said that the technology his company has created is a drug, which must be approved by the FDA. Such approval usually takes more than fifteen years, happening after the patents have expired. He expressed concern about the language in the policy that states that faculty must choose, after a two-year period, either the company or the university. He says that the way it is written makes it sound like a tenured professor could lose his or her job at UNH if they want to continue working as CEO of their company. He noted that in the previous section, other language is used to encourage such faculty to take a leave of absence rather than being forced to quit. He encouraged the senate to support the use of such wording in the policy. Regarding the advising of students, he noted that he has given up advising UNH students in order to comply with the rules, but that he does advise students from other universities. He suggested that the issue of faculty in fiduciary roles in such companies is a null set; most faculty creating such a company would do so with some equity interest or ownership in the company. The language that the university has inserted regarding founders who are not equity holders misrepresents the intent; that no such founders are likely to exist. He suggested that what the real object of this wording is that faculty should relinquish their company, and that the more likely outcome is that faculty will simply not license their technology from the university.
Deb said that when this motion comes to a vote next week, a yes vote means that the senate supports this policy with the committee’s caveat. A no vote means that the senate does not support the policy. She urged the senators to review the documents on this matter in order to be well informed for the vote. **The motion will lay over until the next senate meeting.**

VII. Report from Senate Finance and Administration Committee – Dan Innis, co-chair of the Senate FAC, presented his committee’s report on their charges for this year. He said that it has been difficult to get information regarding the committee’s ongoing charge to ask the administration for “timely and complete budgetary proposals for new academic initiatives and opportunities” noting that sometimes the answer received has been that academic initiatives and opportunities live at the college level, not the university level. Dan would assert that anything that affects funding for academic units is an academic issue. He said that the VP for Finance and Administration has been helpful.

The committee’s charges and responses follow:

1. **Examine the newest RCM policy and report on changes...**
   - CEPS and Paul are adversely impacted, moderated by differential tuition increases
   - All units affected by new Revenue Retention rates
     - Increases from the current rate of 26.5% to 30.5% over the next five years
     - Cumulative net revenue gain to central administration of $20 million over the five year period in addition to tuition increases

2. **Explore what input faculty have or can have to initiate changes or to voice concerns with RCM.**

   Several conversations have taken place with the Provost and/or VP for Finance and Administration over the course of the academic year. An earlier motion to reinstate the Central Budget Committee, or some similar vehicle for budget discussions and input, was passed with overwhelming support from the Faculty Senate. That motion requested that the university reestablish the committee by the end of the last calendar year. This has not yet happened and there has been little information regarding efforts to reconstitute the CBC.

3. **Examine the policy for crediting programs for graduate student tuition and report.**

   This work was completed in the fall semester. The finding was that graduate tuition revenue do not follow the generation of graduate credit hours, rather money remains with the academic unit in which the student has matriculated. From the UNH RCM Manual: “Graduate Gross Tuition & Financial Aid flows directly to unit of matriculation.” Unlike undergraduate credit hour revenues, there is no lag period between the generation of credit hours and the realization of revenue to the unit.
4. Update the statistics on the number of tenure-track faculty lines versus non-tenure track lines according to Senate Motion # XVII-M18 on hiring practices and report on the hiring trends.

   This was reported to the Faculty Senate at the end of the fall semester.

5. Determine and assess the financial/budget implications of the following UNH themes and goals.

   a. Grow and enhance STEM education and pedagogy
      The recent changes to RCM, which adversely impact several of the subject areas that are a part of the STEM initiative, must be studied and understood in more detail. Further work is needed here.

   b. Enrollment management
      There was a preliminary conversation with the new VP of Enrollment Management, Victoria Dutcher, last fall. This marked the beginning of a dialog on enrollment. VP Dutcher was new to campus and was still defining her position and direction. Further work is needed in this area.

   c. Deepen research and strengthen commercialization
      Work remains to be done in this area.

6. What is the role of faculty in capital campaigns?

   Debbie Dutton visited with the Senate to present an update on the campaign and to discuss the possible role of faculty members. She encouraged faculty to work with their chairs, deans, and development officers to get engaged and to help to draw attention to the strengths of UNH.

7. How can the university keep the costs of a UNH degree affordable?

   This was not pursued during the current academic year.

**Honors College**

Budget information has been shared with the FAC. In summary, the Honors College budget will be built on a $100/semester fee for Honors College students. The University estimates that there will be 800 students enrolled, generating $160,000 annually. This covers the ongoing incremental costs of establishing a college structure for the program. There is a $7.5 million startup cost associated with renovating Hubbard Hall, and the University intends to fund that through funds acquired from donors. The proposed budget for a UNH Honors College seems appropriate given comparisons to several similar institutions. However, the Senate Finance Committee has two concerns.

First, the creation of the Honors College depends on securing a large gift to fund the renovation of Hubbard Hall. Without this living-learning community, an Honors College
may not be able to attract sufficient students to cover its costs. Second, the budget is rather top-heavy. Most of the operating money is allocated to the Faculty Director and Assistant Director positions and there is money allocated for only one Academic Counselor. It seems that a strong Honors College would emphasize student support and, therefore, should reflect a focus on advising in the proposed budget.

The FAC recommends monitoring the budget situation as efforts to raise money for Hubbard Hall progress and as the development of the Honors College moves forward.

A senator asked if we have discussed or approved the Honors College before in the senate. The chair said that it has been discussed, and that the SAC, AAC, and FAC have all been charged to look at elements of the proposal.

The University of New Hampshire has recently revised the Responsibility Centered Management (RCM) budget model.

- Shared governance used to be through the CBC, whose responsibility was to
  - Establish institutional funding priorities and budgetary guidelines consistent with the overall institutional strategic plan
  - Finalize the institutional budget and RCM rates
  - Submit an annual report at the end of each fiscal year, highlighting major recommendations to the UNH President and the status of the recommendation.
- Credit hour weighting changes and Revenue Retention are major changes made absent shared governance
- Revenue Retention redirects revenues from the academic units to central administration
- This affects all units at an equal rate (currently 26.5% increasing to 30.5%)

The general purpose of RCM is to allow revenues to follow activity, and to provide flexibility to units in terms of how they apply resources to academic initiatives. During the 2015-2016 academic year, the RCM model was reviewed by the institution, and a new model has been released. Past revisions of the model were handled through the use of collaborative processes involving administration and faculty. This was often through the former Central Budget Committee, a body that was representative of most areas on campus and served the President in an advisory capacity.

Importantly, the new budget model changes the credit hour weightings significantly, resulting in budget reductions for CEPS and Paul, with increases for COLA and COLSA. Notable is a change in the assessment rate, increasing by one percentage point each year from the current rate of 26.5% to 30.5%. In year one this represents a diversion of more than $2 million from the academic units to central administration (this figure is based on 2015 net tuition revenue of $206 million). By year five, the diversion is $8.2 million each year. The cumulative effect over five years is approximately $20.5 million moved from the academic units to the central administration. These are funds that were previously sent to the academic units that will now be managed centrally. The UNH RCM website clearly states the following:
The budget model should centralize only those activities where institutional consistency is imperative or where there are material economies of scale. The budget model should provide for formal input from users into the service levels and costs of central services.

The process for adjusting RCM this year was essentially a “black box.” There was little input from the colleges, faculty, or other stakeholders. The changes were handled in a manner inconsistent with the principles of RCM.

Dan said that without the CBC, there is no faculty voice in financial decisions at the university level, nor do faculty have the information they should have regarding these decisions.

It is abundantly clear that the spirit of RCM at UNH has been ignored in the current revision. Further, there has been a lack of shared governance with respect to the budget process and the dissolution of the Central Budget Committee is indicative of the degradation of financial communications and transparency. The role of the CBC should not be understated, and its absence from campus has created a void in the planning process that has given the Administration free reign to modify RCM. The UNH Website notes that the CBC is the governing group on budget policy and financial planning for the campus community and that it is comprised of President, Vice Presidents, 2 Deans, 4 Faculty, 2 RC Unit Directors, Student, and Treasurer.

The duties of the CBC, from the UNH website are as follows:

The Central Budget Committee advises the President on budget policy and financial planning for the campus community and in that capacity will:

- Establish institutional funding priorities and budgetary guidelines consistent with the overall institutional strategic plan
- Review the performance of service units, through the periodic use of the ad hoc Service Unit Advisory Board
- Regularly update the institutional financial plan, consistent with strategic academic plan updates
- Finalize the institutional budget and RCM rates
- Review requests for internal fee increases above inflation or new internal fees
- Serve as the steward for RCM
- Submit an annual report at the end of each fiscal year, highlighting major recommendations to the UNH President and the status of the recommendation.

It is important that the administration present a full description of the new RCM model to the Senate. The recent changes are too important to be covered in a handful of slides reviewed quickly at the beginning of a Senate meeting. Further, the actual financial impact on each college is not entirely clear and that should be presented for consideration and input.

Given the complete lack of community input into the new RCM revision, as well as the lack of shared governance during the planning process, and the new model’s siphoning of
millions of dollars in funds from the academic units to the central administration, it is imperative that the CBC be reconstituted. This matter was addressed by the Senate last fall and supported with Motion XX-M6.

Further, the University should immediately suspend implementation of the revised RCM model until such time as the Provost and the Vice President for Finance and Administration present a comprehensive plan to the Faculty Senate and the campus community detailing the use of the diverted funds.

The faculty object strongly to the clear lack of shared governance in the reformulation of Responsibility Centered Management and call for a frank and open discussion about the issue prior to its implementation. The increasing assessment imposed on the operating units diverts funds from academics and the university must provide a written explanation regarding the use of the funds and how they will support the academic mission of the university.

On behalf of the FAC, Dan offered two motions. The first regards RCM and the CBC:

Finance and Administration Committee Motion
Regarding the Implementation of the Revised Responsibility Centered Management Budget Model
April 25, 2016

Motion: The Finance and Administration Committee moves that the Provost and Vice President of Finance and Administration immediately suspend the implementation of the revised Responsibility Centered Management Revenue Retention formula until a comprehensive description of the new model and a clear plan for the use of such monies has been presented to the Faculty Senate and to the UNH community.

The faculty restates its position that the CBC or similar budget committee be reinstated immediately.

The FAC believes it is important to make a strong statement on this matter, even if the administration does not provide everything that the senate wants. A senator asked what the response has been from the administration on the CBC, and Dan said there has essentially been no response. A senator asked if a vote of no confidence has been considered regarding the VP for Finance and Administration. Dan said that has not been considered. Another senator said that this motion could be a first step in that direction, should there continue to be sluggish response from the administration in answering senate questions regarding RCM and the CBC. Dan pointed out that the CBC had already stopped meeting by the time the interim provost and the VP for Finance stepped into their current positions.

A senator asked if the deans support the shift of funds to central administration through RCM, and Dan replied that at least one dean does not. Another senator said that many strategic initiatives are justified, but that the important piece is the need for shared governance in these matters as well. A member of the FAC noted that there may be other ways to get at this issue,
and that RCM may or may not be the place to draw the line regarding the transparency that faculty are hoping for in financial information.

A senator said that RCM looks at the symptoms rather than dealing with the real problems in a “backward looking” pattern, looking back at the past year to adjust for the next year. He spoke about the history of the student surcharge, which was approved by the Board of Trustees to provide funds for technology and faculty development. If these funds are being diverted from college to college, he feels that this is deceptive to parents and students.

The second FAC motion urges the administration specifically to meet twice yearly with the Senate FAC, regardless of whether the CBC is reinstated or not. Dan noted that revenue retention affects everyone equally.

**Finance and Administration Committee Motion**

**Regarding the Increased Communications on Budget Matters**

*April 25, 2016*

**Motion:** The Finance and Administration Committee moves that the University of New Hampshire administration, specifically the Office of the Provost and the Vice President for Finance and Administration, meet with the Faculty Senate Finance Committee no less than twice each semester to provide budgetary updates and other relevant financial information that affects academic programming on campus. This information should not be limited to new programs and opportunities, and should include information on budget actions that directly or indirectly affect any and all academic programming, including the implementation of RCM.

The senate chair thanked Dan for his committee’s report and said that these motions will lay over until the next meeting.

VIII. Report and motion from the AAC on Community College transfer credits – Scott Smith, chair of the AAC, said the senate received a request from the administration to review the policy on the number of transfer credits accepted at UNH from two-year institutions. He said:

“Current UNH policy on transfer credit from all two-year schools limits the number of credits accepted to 64. The logic behind this limit seems to be that, because Community Colleges are two-year schools, the University should accept no more credits than would be earned by the end of the sophomore year. However, some New Hampshire Community College programs require more than 64 credits to complete. For example, the Criminal Justice program at River Valley Community College requires 72 credits. As UNH currently develops dual admission agreements with the Community Colleges, it proposes that all credits for college-level courses required for completion of the Associate Degree program be accepted in transfer – hence the rise from 64 to 72. Despite the increase, certain standards will remain in place:

- The University will continue not to accept courses considered not to be college-level (Algebra, for example)
- The University would retain the minimum performance standard for transfer
credit—that the student must earn a C or better in each transfer course.

- The University would not accept courses in transfer that are not part of the Associate Degree program.

Scott noted that Southern New Hampshire University allows up to 92 transfer credits. This change is not a sacrifice of standards, but allows dual admission agreements to go forward. The Senate Academic Affairs Committee thus moves that:

**UNH change its policy on transfer credit and allow up to 72 credits from two-year schools in transfer.**

A senator asked if this policy includes the Thompson School. Scott said that the AAC would like to examine the Thompson School in this regard next year, but that it was not addressed this year. The senator from the TSAS said that the current policy is that students who go to Community Colleges have all of their credits transfer. She said that TSAS students pay the same tuition as four-year students and that their credits should all transfer. A senator asked if there is a minimum number of credits a student must earn at UNH. Scott said that 56 credits would be required.

IX. Report and motion from CPC on support for child care – Emily Poworoznek, on behalf of the Senate Campus Planning Committee, presented a report on the need for more accessible child care for faculty and staff who need it, and the following motion:

**Rationale:** Almost 10 years ago, a comprehensive study conducted by the UNH President’s Commission on the Status of Women thoroughly documented the need for high-quality, affordable childcare. Childcare is essential to most working people with young children, and the quality of childcare is widely recognized as a key dynamic in child development. UNH seeks to provide a family-friendly environment, yet there is less nearby accredited childcare for infants and toddlers than 15 years ago. Meanwhile, academic expectations for employees have increased. It is time for the University to set a high priority on and actively support the expansion of child care options for the UNH community.

**Motion:** Let it be resolved that the Faculty Senate urges the University Administration to support high-quality, affordable childcare for the UNH community by actively encouraging and creatively leveraging resources toward childcare expansion on and in the immediate vicinity of the UNH Durham campus, in a collaborative manner with in-kind and other available means of support and cooperation.

She noted that “immediate distance” means within walking distance of campus, as parking and moving vehicles are problematic. She noted that the President’s Commission on the Status of Women spent forty years trying to move the administration forward on this matter, but that now this is no longer a women’s issue only, and thus it is not within the purview of that commission. She also noted that without accessible childcare, faculty with children are severely limited in the times when they can teach courses.
Emily said that Growing Places, a non-profit childcare organization that used to accommodate infants and toddlers near campus, had to move their infant/toddler care out of Durham because they couldn’t find space here. The university offered a twenty year lease on university land for them to build a center. As a non-profit, a twenty-year lease was not feasible. In addition, Growing Places has an on-campus preschool facility at Woodside, but the annual rent increase is so high that we may lose this facility in the near future. Capacity would need to double to accommodate the waiting lists at these sites. The Child Study and Development Center (CSDC), which has begun plans for a hoped-for new building, will not be increasing their enrollments. The need is great, particularly for infants and toddlers under the age of 18 months.

She said that the CPC is not asking the university to be in the business of childcare, but rather to leverage their resources and influence to support affordable childcare for members of the university community. In-kind support would be helpful—such as the 99-year lease that was offered to a developer in Durham recently—such an offer would be very helpful.

A senator asked if a deadline should be added to the motion to create some pressure. The senate chair encouraged the committee to discuss the idea of such a deadline and possibly bring back an amended motion. The senator said that there are also no line items for sponsored research on childcare as an allowable expense, or release time for parents. Emily said that would be an interesting topic to address next year.

A senator suggested expressing in the motion that there is interest in expansion of available childcare beyond the planned building for the CSDC, which is not expanding its capacity. Emily said she would look at putting that into the motion.

Another senator suggested that wording be added to the motion “…and that the administration report back to the senate next year on their intentions and plans in this regard.” The chair suggested that a more specific date might be more motivating. A senator asked how many children are served by childcare for the UNH community. Emily said that if we could accommodate the waiting lists, we would need about 100-120 slots, but that includes only nine spots for infants up to 18 months.

The senate chair said that this motion will lay over until the next meeting. She urged the senators to review all of the documents and minutes in preparation for the vote at the next senate meeting.

X. Motion from AC on student inclusion in some standing senate committees – The senate chair represented the Agenda Committee to bring forward a motion to include one undergraduate and graduate student representatives on three of the senate’s standing committees. The Agenda Committee believes that such inclusion will facilitate communication with the students as well as dissemination of information. She noted that final line of the motion, which provides committee chairs with the option to hold more private sessions, should sensitive topics need to be addressed. There is some precedence for this, as there have been student representatives on the Student Affairs Committee for several years. The motion follows:
Rationale: Committees whose work involves issues which can directly affect students’ lives, including Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Campus Planning, could benefit from more timely feedback from both undergraduate and graduate students on those issues. The Undergraduate Student Senate, the Graduate Student Senate and the Faculty Senate would all benefit from more fulsome communication between the three governmental bodies. Although students have occasionally had representation on the Student Affairs committee in the past, the practice has not been codified.

Motion: The Agenda Committee moves that the Undergraduate Student Senate and the Graduate Student Senate be invited annually to appoint one student from each body as representative to the Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Campus Planning Committees of the Faculty Senate. Students will have no voting privileges, and are welcome to report the proceedings of the committees to their respective Senates.

The chairs of each committee are empowered to request the committees to enter executive session from which non-voting representatives are excluded.

A member of the SAC said it has been very helpful to have a Graduate Student Senate representative on their committee. The chairs of both the AAC and CPC said they would welcome students to their committees. A senator asked if the committee would consider a suggestion for wording. The chair asked him to send that suggestion to the senate admin.

This motion will lay over until the next senate meeting.

XI. New Business – Deb reminded the group that they have received the proposed slate for next year’s Agenda Committee, and urged everyone to review it before the next meeting.

XII. Adjournment- It was moved and seconded to adjourn the meeting at 5:55 p.m.