Meeting called to order at 3:53 p.m. on May 2, 2016

MINUTES SUMMARY

I. Roll – The following senators were absent: Denis, Dowd, and Kun. Wilder was excused. Hatcher and Taylor served as proxies for Ruml and Samuels, respectively.

II. Remarks by and questions to the senate chair – The senate chair welcomed members of the 2016-17 faculty senate, session XXI to today’s meeting, and reminded the new senators that all votes during this meeting would be for members of the 2015-16 senate, session XX only.

III. Minutes – It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the last senate meeting, April 25, 2016. Emily Poworoznek, the member of the Senate Campus Planning Committee who presented the motion on child care at the last meeting had shared several clarifying revisions to Item IX in the minutes with the senate admin after the agenda had been sent out. Those revisions were accepted and included. Another senator asked that a note be included in Item V, just before the fourth motion proposed, that the amendment he made to change the wording of that motion be indicated as friendly and acceptable to the committee. That revision was also accepted, and thus amended, the minutes were then unanimously approved with two abstentions.

Action Items:

IV. Vote on AAC motions on Discovery Review Committee recommendations – Scott Smith, chair of the Senate Academic Affairs Committee, stepped forward to lead the discussion and votes on the eight motions presented at the last senate meeting regarding the AAC’s recommendations regarding the Discovery Review Committee Report (DRCR) recommendations. Motion 1 states:

Motion: Based on DRCR recommendations #1, 2, the Academic Affairs Committee moves that the writing requirement and quantitative reasoning requirement remain unchanged.

There was no discussion. The motion was put to a vote and passed unanimously with no abstentions.

Motion 2 states:

Motion: Based on DRCR recommendation #3, The Academic Affairs Committee moves that the Discovery Dialogue be discontinued.
There was no discussion. The motion was put to a vote and passed unanimously with no abstentions.

There was some discussion regarding Motion 3:

*Motion: The Academic Affairs Committee moves that the Discovery Categories remain unchanged, despite the strong recommendation by the DRCR to reduce the number of categories (to six [6] or four [4]) but keep the number of required classes the same (eight [8]);*

A senator from the Biological Sciences Department noted that both the 6+2 and the 4+2 models enable non-science majors to take less science courses than they do now, and said that these options are broadly rejected in the College of Life Sciences and Agriculture. He said he would advocate for this motion to leave the categories unchanged. A senator from the College of Liberal Arts noted that similar problems exist for Arts and Humanities students, and suggested reducing the requirements in the categories marginalizes each one as a general education requirement, and promotes a moving away from general education in the name of flexibility. The senate chair suggested that flexibility is really not the result, from the perspective of the students, because the same number of courses is being required. A member of the DRCR noted that all of the students on the committee saw this recommendation as a flexibility issue. He will vote against the motion. Another senator asked for the opinion of the Student Senate Representative to the Faculty Senate, who was not in attendance today. The AAC chair said that in his committee’s discussion with students, two things became clear:

1. Students don’t understand the need for Discovery; they don’t believe they should have to take any courses outside their major.
2. There does seem to be a flexibility issue, but student concerns over flexibility are not of a single category.

He asserted that there is no reduction in the total number of courses required by Discovery, which means that students really are not any more free to take non-Discovery courses instead, limiting the flexibility they have. In answer to the question of what the students truly want, Scott responded that they want six or four Discovery courses in total, with fewer forced classes, which they interpret as Discovery courses. They want to take whatever they want, with no mandated courses beyond their majors.

The motion was then put to a vote, and passed with 41 votes in favor, 4 votes opposed, and 1 abstention.

Motion 4 discusses the practice of “double counting” courses for both Discovery credit and towards a student’s major.

*Motion: Based on DRCR recommendation #5, 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.

A senator asked if, up until this point, there have been any limitations allowing students to double count other than limitations imposed by college deans or associate deans. Scott said that the limitations seem to be negotiated between college deans and certain departments. A senator who also serves as a department chair said that the limitations are top-down negotiations, and that it is difficult in COLA to make a case for allowing the double-counting.

A senator said that she is strongly in favor of allowing one Discovery course to be double-counted, but that she fears an “arms race” of sorts should the practice become parochialized. The AAC chair said that his committee strongly recommended against creating any such specific rule, viewing it as too restrictive, as well as being its own sort of top-down rule from Discovery. Instead, the AAC hopes to promote departmental policies better suited to each program.

A senator noted that the wording in the motion, added at the last meeting by friendly amendment, “…departments and programs as well as colleges by agreement of their chairs are, however, free to place restrictions on double counting…” was well added in alleviate the need for specific rules about the number of courses that can be double counted. He suggested that if there is agreement at the college level, it’s not really top-down, but rather is something agreed upon by the chairs, which allows for some constraint to prevent the very real possibility of such an “arms race” as described earlier. Scott noted that a later motion recommends that the AAC meet with the Discovery Committee to come up with a holistic approach to problems with enrollment strategies, which might help put this in perspective.

Another senator expressed appreciation for the spirit of this motion, saying it that it signals responsiveness to the students’ desire for more flexibility. She said she supports avoiding a rigid approach to the number of possible courses allowed for double-counting. She also pointed the number of faculty being hired who are truly interdisciplinary as another reason for flexibility in this area.

A senator said that it is her understanding that in COLA there are agreements between the deans and the department chairs regarding double-counting of Discovery courses. Scott said that is correct, and that this motion would allow the chairs some ability to go to their deans and have some rationale for revisiting the topic. He said the motion may not erase such agreements between the deans and the chairs, but it allows the chairs some decision-making power. He said that an individual department can make some decisions, but that chairs meeting collectively in the college can also decide whether they want to make a college-level restriction on double-counting.

There was some more discussion on whether the motion should be re-worded to allow only one double-counted course. A senator moved that the limitation of one double-counted Discovery course be allowed. It was noted that in some departments, it is conceivable that up to five courses could be double-counted for Discovery if there were no restrictions whatsoever, which seems obviously unwise, but Scott said that the AAC was reluctant to mandate limitations, rather leaving it to departments (individually or collectively by college)
to set their own guidelines. He said that the AAC had discussed and rejected limiting the number to two double-counted courses, and said he doubted that the committee would consider one double-counted courses as an appropriate restriction. The committee concurred that they could not accept this as a friendly amendment. Instead, their intent was to offer guidelines and allow departments determine what is appropriate.

A senator said he appreciated the spirit of the motion, but feared that the recommended practice could be used to shift student populations to certain courses down the road. Scott agreed that enrollment management is an issue.

The senate chair asked if there were a second to the senator’s moved amendment to the motion to change the wording of the motion as follows:

“Our motion: Based on DRCR recommendation #5, 4) that one a Discovery course can satisfy a Discovery category regardless of whether it also counts as a major requirement (that is, “double counting” is allowable)....”

There was a second. The senate voted on the amendment, with 3 voting in favor, 39 opposed, and 2 abstentions. The motion to amend failed.

A member of the AAC noted that this policy only applies to courses required by the major.

The original motion was put to a vote and passed with 46 votes in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention.

The fifth motion is intended to give the Discovery Committee authority to monitor, review, and make recommendations to departments regarding Discovery courses, and to do a category description review to ensure that the language fits the parameters of each category.

Motion: Based on DRCR recommendations #6, 8, 10, and 12, the Academic Affairs Committee moves 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,
b) track and report to, and discuss with, departments any changes in syllabi and personnel for Inquiry 444 and Inquiry Attribute courses,
c) track discovery courses that have not been taught during the past three years, and
d) conduct a category description review of the current eight categories (unchanged; see Faculty Senate Motion #XX-M23) and make recommendations to the Faculty Senate for possible changes to the language in order to clarify the parameters of the categories

A senator asked if the committee would consider adding the word “substantive” to Item b to avoid requiring the Discovery Committee to review every possible change (name, date, textbook, etc.) to a course. The AAC found this to be a friendly amendment, and the motion, thus adjusted, would read:
“Motion: Based on DRCR recommendations #6, 8, 10, and 12, the Academic Affairs Committee moves 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,
b) track and report to, and discuss with, departments any substantive changes in syllabi and personnel for Inquiry 444 and Inquiry Attribute courses,…”

The motion, thus amended, was put to vote and passed unanimously with 1 abstention.

Motion 6 from the AAC urges an end to the practice of the decommissioning of Discovery courses. Based on the senate discussion during the last senate meeting, the AAC chose to add some clarifying language to this motion, and it now reads as follows:

Motion: Based on DRCR recommendation #11, the Academic Affairs Committee moves 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; by “decommission” we mean the process whereby a department, if it wishes to create a new Discovery Course, must eliminate all offerings of, or remove the Discovery designation from, another course in the same category as the new course. Pursuant to this and the next motion, we recommend a policy that, if a department wishes to offer a new Discovery Course and there is not enough room college-wide in the category to do so, the college try to negotiate with the department a deal whereby the department “vaults”—but does not eliminate—a course (or its Discovery status) for the semester or year that the new course is offered, so that a rotation instead of course or category elimination is adopted.

A senator asked if “vaulted” courses are no longer offered. Scott replied that this is a term that the administration is using, and that such courses retain their approval as Discovery courses, but are set aside temporarily. There was some discussion about the most appropriate terminology to be used for such a course, and it was determined that “temporarily suspends” is most satisfactory to the senate members, which wording was acceptable to the AAC as a friendly amendment. The motion thus reads:

Motion: Based on DRCR recommendation #11, the Academic Affairs Committee moves 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; by “decommission” we mean the process whereby a department, if it wishes to create a new Discovery Course, must eliminate all offerings of, or remove the Discovery designation from, another course in the same category as the new course. Pursuant to this and the next motion, we recommend a policy that, if a department wishes to offer a new Discovery Course and there is not enough room college-wide in the category to do so, the college try to negotiate with the department a deal whereby the department temporarily suspends—but does not eliminate—a course (or its Discovery status) for the semester or year that the new course is offered, so that a rotation instead of course or category elimination is adopted.
The motion, thus amended, was put to a vote and passed unanimously with no abstentions.
The seventh motion from the AAC seeks to establish a policy to, where possible, seek equal distribution of Discovery seats across departments and colleges.

**Motion:** Based on DRCR recommendation #7, modified away from instituting a “hard cap” of 400 students per course in aggregate, the Academic Affairs Committee moves 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.

A senator suggested removing the first phrase, as unnecessary, from the motion. The AAC accepted the senator’s suggestion as a friendly amendment, resulting in the following version:

**Motion:** The Academic Affairs Committee moves 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.

Several senators said that they liked the idea of a hard cap. Scott said that the object of the motion is to move away from a hard cap, noting that currently there is no cap. He said that the AAC could examine the possibility of a cap next year. He said that there could be instances where the Discovery Committee could recommend that a class could exceed such enrollments, but the AAC saw this as creating unfair advantages for some courses, departments, and colleges. The senate chair asked if it is within the purview of the senate to impose caps, or if that is the duty of the deans.

Another senator asked how many courses might reach a cap of 400 enrolled in a given year. A member of the DRCR said that he was not sure, although Dean Kirkpatrick had those numbers; he imagined it to be six or seven. Another senator noted that the cap is the number enrolled across all sections of a given course. He asked on what the cap would be based, suggesting that good faith, working together, would provide an equal chance for all departments. He said he would vote in favor of this motion. Another senator called the discussion distorted for colleges such as COLSA, which only has three departments.

The senate chair said that the issue of caps could certainly use more discussion, but that at this time we need to vote the motion up or down, or recommit it to next year’s senate. A member of the Agenda Committee said that we could pass this motion and still send a charge to the AAC next year to review the option of a hard cap. A senator noted that this motion is quite general, not requiring the Discovery Committee to work with deans and chairs of any specific college.

Another senator asked if the DRCR has completed their work. The chair responded that they have. The Discovery Committee is a permanent committee of the faculty senate, and its work goes forward. If they feel that this is not working, the Discovery Committee can bring an issue to the senate. Scott said that the intent of this motion is that the Discovery Committee should not have to make broad rules across colleges.
The senate chair asked for a vote on this motion, and it passed, with 45 votes in favor, 0 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

The final motion from the AAC follows:

_Motion: The Academic Affairs Committee moves 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._

Scott said that the students need a better understanding of the function of Discovery courses, and the AAC wishes to urge faculty, staff, and administrators alike to advocate positively for Discovery. A senator asked how the senate can move that people do something, and suggested replacing “moves that” with “urges,” or something like it. There followed a discussion regarding the senate’s power to mandate behavior to faculty, as well as the need for the senate to speak out firmly on matters of academic importance. The senate chair reminded the group that if the administration finds the wording too strong, they will let us know, and that this topic is well within the senate’s scope in oversight of the academic mission of the university.

Another senator pointed out that the motion is not just telling the administration, but also telling faculty what to put in their syllabi, with which he is not comfortable. He also said that the administration spoke strongly for Discovery in the first place, and that it would be good to remind them to speak strongly for it now. A senator said that he thinks it is less important how this motion is worded than with what action we propose to take next year in the senate; that we should create a list of things to review on our agenda for next year. A third senator then suggested using the words “calls upon” rather than “moves that,” and add the word “to,” as below. This wording was accepted as a friendly amendment by the AAC, and the motion thus reads:

_Motion: The Academic Affairs Committee moves that calls upon the administration, faculty advisers, and university staff to 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._

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

The chair thanked the AAC for their hard work on the DRCR.

_V. Vote on AAC motion on transfer credit policy for two-year institutions –_ The AAC chair remained before the senate to discuss the committee’s motion on the policy regarding transfer credits for two-year institutions. Scott noted that this is a move in the right direction, especially noting that Southern New Hampshire University allows 92 credits in transfer. The motion reads:
Motion: UNH change its policy on transfer credit and allow up to 72 credits from two-year schools in transfer.

A senator noted with pleasure that specifying two-year schools in the motion means that this policy also applies to the Thompson School of Applied Science.

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

VI. Vote on RPSC motion on Start-Ups – David Finkelhor, chair of the Senate Research and Public Service Committee, shared a slightly revised version of the motion proposed at the last senate meeting, regarding the proposed new policy on Start-Up Companies at UNH. He answered a question from the last meeting regarding the total number of Start-Ups at UNH, saying that there are no more than four. David noted that the provisos in the motion are intended to 1) allow already existing start-ups that began under a different regulatory framework to be grandfathered out of the new requirements and, 2) implement the principle of shared governance.

Motion: That the Faculty Senate approve the university "policy on conflicts of interest in start-ups companies” and the "revisions to the UNH policy on the management of equity interests in start-up companies,” with the proviso that they apply only to start-up companies formed after the date of their formal adoption, and the proviso that the envisioned “Oversight Committee for Start-Up Companies” be expanded to include faculty representatives in a voting capacity.

The topic was opened for discussion. A senator suggested amending the motion to include not only faculty in the Oversight Committee, but specifically a faculty senate representative. The RPSC accepted this amendment as friendly, resulting in the following modification:

Motion: That the Faculty Senate approve the university "policy on conflicts of interest in start-ups companies” and the "revisions to the UNH policy on the management of equity interests in start-up companies,” with the proviso that they apply only to start-up companies formed after the date of their formal adoption, and the proviso that the envisioned “Oversight Committee for Start-Up Companies” be expanded to include faculty representatives, including a faculty senate representative, in a voting capacity.

The senator expressed continuing concern about the language in the proposed policy outlining the termination of faculty if they choose to remain affiliated with the Start-Up in a C-level fiduciary position in the company. He noted that not only tenured faculty, but research and other faculty are also subject to this part of the policy, and those who are not protected by tenure are particularly vulnerable. The senate vice chair agreed that the use of the language “must step down if he or she wishes to retain university employment” in section 7.2 of the policy is concerning, and said he would like to hear more discussion on the matter.

Another senator asked for clarification of the restrictions on supervision of students by faculty in C-level positions in such companies. David said he checked with Marc Sedam, and that the administration’s concern regards conflict of interest for faculty in such positions. There is a
fear of interference with students’ progress because of some interest that the company might have, but David said that he believes there are ways to resolve this concern and does not think it is something that should hold up passage of the policy. A senator asked if there have been egregious cases of such interference in the past. David said there have not been such cases at UNH, but there have been in other institutions. It was asked why the deans cannot deal with such problems as they arise rather than establishing such a broad policy. Another senator pointed out that Jan Nisbet and Marc Sedam have expressed that this policy is intended to align our policies with federal regulations. Concern was expressed about a one-size-fits-all policy rather than something that is specific to the needs of this institution. David pointed out that the wording in the RPSC’s motion to recommend a grandfathering clause was not considered a friendly amendment by Jan Nisbet’s office.

Another senator mentioned that the faculty union (AAUP) has asserted that these are not senate issues but bargaining issues. Several senators asserted that there are academic implications in this policy, both regarding promotion and the experience gained in such endeavors. Another senator expressed concern that to allow a grandfathering in perpetuity might be unwise, and recommended a finite timeline for such grandfathering.

The senate chair reminded that group that our task today is to vote this motion up or down; that voting in favor of the motion means that the policy is approved with the revisions suggested by the RPSC, and that voting against the motion means that the policy is not approved by the senate, and that the current policy would remain in effect.

A senator said that two years is too short of a time for faculty who have begun a Start-Up Company to retain their place in C-level fiduciary positions; he suggested that the proposed policy may discourage some faculty from taking the risks necessary, and called the new policy counter-productive. The senate vice chair recommended delaying the vote and sending this issue on to the next year’s senate to discuss further, as there seem to be many concerns regarding the proposed policy. His motion to recommit this to next year’s senate was seconded.

David said that if the senate is not comfortable with the motion on the proposed policy as it stands, he would rather the senate vote down the motion. He suggested that perhaps the administration doesn’t have a true sense of what the senate’s opinion is. A negative vote on the motion would send a clear message to the administration. The senate vice chair then withdrew his motion. Another senator suggested that what is missing from the proposed policy are the specifics or background on the companies involved. He suggested that, should this be voted down and come before the senate again, the committee focus on developing a context so that the senate can make a knowledgeable decision.

The senate chair asked that the motion be put to a vote. The motion failed with 3 votes in favor, 41 opposed, and 3 abstentions.

David said that he has good information to take back to the administration now. Deb thanked the RPSC for their work on this subject.
VII. Vote on CPC motion regarding child care – Emily Poworoznek, representing the Senate Campus Planning Committee, excused her co-presenter, Kang Wu, who could not stay through the end of today’s meeting because of child care issues. She presents the following motion in its entirety, to clarify the inclusion of certain passages that had been eliminated from the motion in last week’s iteration, and adding a new sentence at the end of the motion to clarify the timeline for the administration’s response (in red below):

**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. The UNH Child Study & Development Center (CSDC) is part of the Department of Human Development & Family Studies, and its capacity is set to fulfill its academic mission, not to meet university community needs for childcare. Waiting lists indicate that capacity would need to double to accommodate existing need. The environment is stressful for families as well as for faculty and staff parents’ departmental colleagues. 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.

Given the clear need, academic climate, and the range of possibilities for cooperation and in-kind support that exist, it is time for the University to play an active role and wholeheartedly embrace its opportunities to encourage the expansion of high-quality, affordable childcare in the immediate vicinity.

As the Executive Summary of the Women's Commission Child Care Study concluded:

“The University of New Hampshire, in its development of a family leave policy for faculty, is beginning a courageous journey towards developing a comprehensive family-friendly campus climate. The development of more extensive child care services and programs to meet the needs of faculty, staff and students would be a reasonable and sound next step in the process. As the Flagship University in the University System of New Hampshire, we can use this opportunity to provide an example of leadership not only to the other members of the system, but to the other Land Grant Universities in the New England states.”

**Therefore,**

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. We request that the administration report back to the Senate next year by October 17th on their intentions and plans in this regard.
A senator asked if the committee had considered how many within the UNH community who have child care needs and might use the Child Study & Development Center (CSDC), are staff rather than faculty, and how many actually live locally and would use the service. If the majority using the service would be staff, does the senate have purview over that? The senate chair said that if only one faculty member is affected, it is part of the senate’s mission.

The Graduate Student Senate Representative asked if this child care would be available for grad students as well, and the chair responded that it would extend to them. Emily also noted that on the international student website for UNH, there is wording to discourage families from bringing children because of the high cost of child care in this area. The CPC’s aim is to encourage more affordable child care for all of the UNH community.

The senator from Human Development and Family Studies expressed some concern about the timing of this motion, saying that the CSDC is hoping for a new facility to be built, and that the appearance of competition for business might be detrimental to the CSDC’s cause. She moved that the vote on the motion be postponed until next fall, when plans for the proposed new CSDC facility might be more stabilized. Her motion was seconded.

Another senator asked why this motion would impede the plans for the new CSDC facility. The motion states that the administration should strategize to increase available services. She does not see how it would impede the CSDC’s plan. The chair of the CPC agreed that the work of his committee leads to support more child care on campus in a very positive way. The HDFS senator said that it is really a matter of tricky wording and of timing, and suggested that the administration might view this differently than the faculty do. A senator suggested that the sooner we make the case, the better, or we might miss out on space opportunities. The senate chair asked the HDFS senator if, should more amenable wording be included, she would withdraw her motion to delay the vote? The HDFS senator said that she would.

After some discussion, the following wording was suggested and accepted as a friendly amendment to the original motion.

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, including updated facilities for the Child Study & Development Center, in a collaborative manner with in-kind and other available means of support and cooperation.

The HDFS senator withdrew her motion to delay the vote, and the senate chair called for a vote on the original motion, as amended.

The motion passed unanimously with no abstentions.

VIII. Vote on FAC motions on RCM and budget issues – Dan Innis, co-chair of the Senate Finance and Administration Committee, opened discussion on the two motions presented last week regarding the RCM and communication issues between the administration and the FAC. Regarding the first motion, he said that the new Responsibility Center Management plan was
instituted with no faculty input and that even the deans were left out of the planning. His committee believes that a strong statement is needed from the Faculty Senate to reinforce the need for the reinstatement of the Central Budget Committee or some other vehicle for transparent communication between the administration and the faculty on budget matters. The motion follows:

**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.

A senator noted that the new RCM is already in place and monies have been redistributed between colleges. He asked if this motion passes, would those monies be re-allocated. Dan replied that he did not know, and could not say, as neither the provost nor the Vice President for Finance met with his committee in person at any time during the semester. Another senator offered support for the motion, saying it sends a clear message. Dan agreed, saying that that message will be sent to the new provost, as well. It was asked if the VP for Finance would be speaking with the senate today. Deb said he had been scheduled to come today, but the amount of work needing to be completed by the senate today made it impossible to fit him into the schedule. She and Dan have both spoken with the VP for Finance on this topic. Deb said that President Huddleston has indicated that he would take up the subject with next year’s senate chair.

The motion was then put to a vote and passed unanimously with no abstentions

The FAC’s second motion is intended to encourage more consistent and clear conversation between the senate and the administration regarding budget actions. The motion follows:

**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.

Dan said that the meetings proposed in this motion are to act as a complement to the reinstated Central Budget Committee. He asserted that it is essential to have an ongoing dialogue about these matters, without having to regularly petition the administration for an audience.

The chair asked that the motion be put to a vote, and it passed unanimously with no abstentions.
Deb thanked the FAC for their work on this issue.

IX. Vote on AC motion on including students on senate committees – Representing the Senate Agenda Committee, Senate Chair Deb Kinghorn reminded the senate of the motion presented last week to allow one undergraduate and one graduate student representative to serve on each of three of the standing committees of the senate: the Academic Affairs Committee, the Student Affairs Committee, and the Campus Planning Committee. She noted that the motion clarifies the committee chairs’ authority to move to executive session, in which only voting members are included, to discuss any particularly sensitive matters. The motion follows:

**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 a non-voting 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.

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

X. AAC/FAC report on proposed Honors College – Deb invited Scott Smith, representing both the AAC and the FAC in their joint efforts on this report, to speak to the senate regarding the proposed Honors College. She apologized to the group for saying last week that the senate had been informed this year about the proposal for this new college; it had been mentioned last year in a senate discussion with Jerry Marx, Director of the UNH Honors Program. She said that the Agenda Committee sent the proposal for the new Honors College to the AAC, the FAC, and the SAC to review various elements of the proposal.

Scott said that the AAC and the FAC worked together to review the proposal to establish a distinct residential Honors College at UNH. He said that such a unit is intended to increase the connectivity for students within the program. He also said that the senate committees have reviewed the proposal in an effort to slow down the process and preclude major steps from being taken without faculty review of the implications of such a development.

The AAC and FAC together feel that it is acceptable for the university to do a feasibility study over the summer for the renovations needed to Hubbard Hall, where the proposed college would be housed. This facility would provide living, classroom, and administrative space for the proposed college. The feasibility study will need to be done regardless of the Honors College, to determine costs for renovation of Hubbard Hall, and so the AAC and FAC felt there is no harm in supporting the study, with the stipulation that the senate be consulted before the administration moves forward with any plans for an Honors College. A senator said this is a good idea even if the Honors College does not materialize. He said that he has spoken with Honors students who have spoken in favor of the renovations, even if they remain an Honors Program only. Deb recommended that the senate take up the proposed college in the fall. She recommended that the AAC/FAC report be accepted. The senate voted
unanimously with one abstention to accept the report.

XI. SAC report on proposed GPA increase for Honors Program – Jo Laird, the Senate Student Affairs Committee chair, referred the group to Appendix 10.2 in today’s agenda, which is the proposal from Jerry Marx and Kate Gaudet in the Honors Program to increase the minimum GPA for students graduating with University Honors from 3.4 to 3.5, effective for students entering in the fall of 2017. The SAC offers the following motion:

**Rationale:** The Student Affairs Committee (SAC) was asked to review a proposal from Jerry Marx and Kate Gaudet, dated 2/26/2016, for the University Honors Program (UHP) “... to raise the minimum GPA for students graduating with University Honors from 3.4 to 3.5 effective for students graduating in May 2017 and beyond”. The reasons given for the change proposed are: 1) “as of May 2016 only students with a 3.5 or above are recognized as University Scholars or Presidential Scholars, or awarded cum laude designations” and 2) the UHP’s belief that “recognizing students for University Honors who have a 3.4 GPA creates confusion ... and conflicts with the UHP’s reputation for rigor and high expectations.”

After reviewing this proposal, the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) met with the director of the Honors program and was assured that any student graduating with a 3.4 – 3.5 GPA in the next two years will be granted Honors through petition. Subsequently, the SAC told the AAC (via Scott Smith) and the Agenda Committee (via Deb Kinghorn) that it should not be up to students currently in the UHP to petition for Honors if their GPA falls below 3.5 but is above 3.4 because they are bound by the catalog under which they entered UNH, and it says 3.4 is the minimum GPA for students graduating with University Honors. The most recent proposal of the UHP states that “Until current students graduate, [the UHP] will work with the Advancement office to ensure students graduating with University Honors but whose GPA's fall below the new standard are recognized at Convocation.” The AAC accepted this new proposal 4/28/2016, and the SAC now makes the following motion:

**Motion:** To raise the minimum GPA for University Honors Program students with University Honors from 3.4 to 3.5 for students entering in the Fall, 2017, provided that the UHP: 1) announces this change in the next UNH undergraduate catalog published and 2) ensures that students who entered UNH before the change in minimum GPA will receive University Honors if their cumulative GPA is 3.4 or above.

The SAC is willing to support the change, with the two provisos included in the motion. They also recommend that the administration announce this change and clear the path to facilitate the process for students who entered the university under the prior requirement, rather than forcing those students to go through a difficult petition process to graduate with honors.

Scott Smith said that Jerry Marx informed him that this change has passed through the Academic Standards and Advising Committee (ASAC). Deb noted that the ASAC did not pass it with any provisions for students entering UNH before the change.
A member of the Agenda Committee moved to suspend the rules for laying over a motion to the next senate meeting so that this motion might be voted on today. That motion was seconded. **The senate voted unanimously to suspend the rules, with no abstentions.**

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

XII. **ITC reports on charges and other items** – Siobhan Senier, chair of the Senate Information Technology Committee, offered the following report on the final four charges to their committee.

**A. Faculty Activity Reporting System.** IT/AT—along with Jan Nisbet’s Research group—is currently evaluating a “new and improved” version of our current platform, Activity Insight, and considering extending the use of Symplectic Elements (already in use by some research scientists) for annual reporting.

**B. SafeAssign has been replaced with something called Vericite.** There is a trial version available until 7/10 in myCourses. It’s a trial only, not applicable to any current Blackboard assignments or yet able to work with MyCourses’ Speed Grader. But you can take a look at [https://www.unh.edu/it/kb/article/mycourses-vericite-guide.html](https://www.unh.edu/it/kb/article/mycourses-vericite-guide.html)

**C. Portal Project.** The BB portal will be sunsetted over the course of the next year, and IT/AT seems to be down to three finalists. There seems to be strong support for ModoLabs among people who think that students and staff want increasing mobile access; and for OneCampus, which allows us to customize the portal to our own needs. If you want to see product overview videos, fill out a ticket at [https://tdforms.unh.edu/wmd/](https://tdforms.unh.edu/wmd/) Product survey results are here:

- **ModoLabs:** [https://unh.az1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_9H0ei9LSMkCjgMB](https://unh.az1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_9H0ei9LSMkCjgMB)
- **OneCampus:** [https://unh.az1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_eLi4AhMeUEZZCR](https://unh.az1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_eLi4AhMeUEZZCR)
- **LookingGlass:** [https://unh.az1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_0DvAyvzRkmGPhfOR](https://unh.az1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_0DvAyvzRkmGPhfOR)

**D. Faculty Survey (see attached summary).** We were charged with “polling the faculty to find out current satisfaction/dissatisfaction with IT/AT and making recommendations to Agenda Committee for further study.” In our brief survey, we observed four main trends:

1. Widespread dissatisfaction with redesign and roll-out of departmental websites.
2. Frustration with password change requirements, frequency and cumbersome rules.
3. Frustration with classroom technology: wireless coverage, cables, lack of HDMI, software installation, touchscreen projector controls, etc.
4. Frustration with software churn, i.e. endless cycle of IT-mandated changes of software packages and versions.

These four items fulfill our charge for this year. We recommend that next year’s ITC make web governance a top priority. The Senate should request copies of the USNH Internal Audit Office’s review of unh.edu as well as Terri Winters’s response to that report, and insist on Senate representation in any web governance process going forward. We do not recommend that the Senate spend any more time on the password issue.
The senate chair thanked Siobhan and the ITC for their work this year and moved to accept the committee’s report. **The senate voted unanimously to do so, with no abstentions.**

XIII. **CPC report on senate charges** – John Carroll, chair of the Senate Campus Planning Committee, offered the following report on charges to their committee.

_Senate Charges to the Campus Planning Committee:_

1. **Review changes to the Campus Master Plan, if any, and assess the likely effects of those changes on the academic mission of the university.**

2. **Based on the 2015 Campus Planning Committee's Report (UNH Construction/Renovation Project Status Report, March, 2015), update status of construction projects and report any new projects.**

   **Committee Response:** (Each response represents a unanimous vote of the Committee.)

   1. The overall concepts and direction of the 2012 Campus Master Plan are intact, but what has evolved are the priority projects as we move forward. Some of this is due to the fact that we have or are accomplishing some of the significant projects (McConnell Hall, Hamilton Smith Hall, Campus Rec, and Stadium). Other project priorities have grown out of ongoing input from each of the Deans as well as from campus leaders in other areas. The Integrated Science project for the College of Life Sciences and Agriculture (COLSA) and Psychology is a good example. Others include Chase Ocean Engineering expansion, the possibility of an enhanced Career Center, and making Hubbard Hall the home of the Honors Program.

   2. All of the current projects in construction are on schedule. (Hamilton Smith will be completed Spring, 2017.) While UNH has updated its priority projects and overall space needs, funding for specific projects is very limited at this time. It is expected that the Chase Ocean Engineering expansion will be funded by the College of Engineering and Physical Science (CEPS) and to move forward with construction starting next Spring. The university is moving forward with a small but important project in Paul Creative Arts Center (PCAC) to install elevators that will dramatically improve accessibility to the Art Museum, the art studios, and the music practice rooms (using the small amount of state funding received this biennium). A new Water Treatment Plant is anticipated to start construction in 2018. The Child Study and Development Center (CSDC), Integrated Science, Kingsbury Courtyard infill, MUB expansion, and Health
Services expansion have all completed planning studies, but there has been no authorization of funding or scheduling for this.

3. The Committee believes that a further facilities challenge may be anticipated in the future in the re-purposing of the Stadium, as the role of football declines in our nation and in our society due to the prevalence of chronic brain disease (Chronic Traumatic Encephalopathy or CTE) in active and former football players.

4. We note that town/gown relations can be enhanced by focusing attention on two elements of the current Campus Master Plan which have received little attention in the past year: the proposed Concert Hall/Art Museum to be located on a site adjacent to C-Lot; and continued effort to construct a new UNH/Durham Fire Station.

5. The Committee further believes, with respect to the subject of parking, that the UNH Parking Authority/Campus Planning should take into consideration the parking needs of staff and faculty during normal business hours on Monday to Friday when making decisions to close parking lots on campus.

6. The Committee further concludes that SAARC should prioritize the maintenance and renovation of space that directly serves and supports UNH’s academic mission (classrooms, faculty offices). Examples include prioritizing funding for planned renovations to Horton Hall – 1st floor to, among other things, facilitate wheelchair access to faculty/staff offices. (Horton – 1st floor is the home to the Department of Communication, with 550 undergraduate majors, houses two key classrooms, both of which are deteriorating with frequent A/V technology failures, broken light fixtures and loose ceiling tiles.)

7. The Committee this year has introduced to the Senate three formal Resolutions: to protect the academic integrity of university lands for research and teaching; to provide more child day-care facilities for the faculty and the broader university community; and to provide additional lactation facilities for university personnel.

8. As major capital projects have not been state-funded for the biennium, the Senate Campus Planning Committee recommends that the charge for next year include a report on UNH planning for campus stewardship, including maintenance and renovation priorities and the methods and/or policies that influence decisions on them and on space allocation. In this context, some
elucidation of the role of the Space Allocation, Adaption and Renewal Committee (SAARC), formerly known as the Space Allocation, Repair and Renovation Committee (SARRC) – http://www.unh.edu/vpfa/saarc – could be helpful.

The chair thanked John and the committee for their work this year, and moved to accept the committee’s report. **The senate unanimously voted to accept the CPC’s report, with no abstentions.**

XIV. Committee on Calendar Options report – Christine Shea, chair of the Senate ad hoc Committee on Calendar Options, presented her committee’s findings regarding possible options to the current two semester system at UNH. She said the committee had representation from every college, the Library, UNH-Manchester, and the School of Law, and began their work last November. She said that in general, the faculty and students surveyed asserted their preference for the current schedule, and that alternatives to that schedule were not well received.

The committee was charged to:

- Determine the internal need for more flexibility in the calendar and define problem areas with respect to the academic mission.
- Explore and document the options that are currently in practice, including short terms, online terms, master's degree terms, etc.
- Evaluate other universities where flexible calendar options are present. Dartmouth is one such place.

Christine said that the committee fulfilled the first two of these charges, but that it did not extensively examine other universities utilizing other calendar options, other than to read some reports from Hanover Research Council and the Boise State University Faculty Senate.

The four calendar options reviewed were:

1. Trimester: three 15-week terms; three 2-week breaks
2. Trimester plus J-term: three 1-week breaks
3. Quarter System: four 12-week quarters; four 1-week breaks
4. Current Calendar: two 14-week terms; J-term; winter break; spring break; various summer sessions

The committee’s overarching findings were that:
- 68% of faculty and 71% of students prefer the current calendar
- 58% of faculty would not be willing to teach and 49% of students would not be willing to take courses in the summer

The reasons given by faculty for these opinions were the effect of any change on their own teaching mission, on their work/life balance, on their research, and on faculty governance. For students, their objections to any change fell in the order of the impact on work schedules, on cost, on their own research, and on their work/life balance.
The committee noted department-level differences between the objections to any schedule that impacted the current two-semester schedule. For some science departments, the current schedule provides essential opportunities to teach classes and conduct fieldwork in a more appropriate season and under better weather conditions in ornithology, ecology, marine biology, and forestry. On the other hand, programs such as Music and Dance rely on faculty collaboration in creating theater productions and ensembles, and a change to the schedule would negatively impact those programs.

The report itself, which shall be posted on the Faculty Senate website, includes

- Review of current calendars in use at UNH
- Full quantitative and qualitative evaluation of each calendar option
- Spreadsheets containing the full list of faculty and student comments organized by topic can be provided to the senate

The senate chair thanked Christine and her committee for their extensive work on this, and moved to accept the committee’s report.

The senate voted unanimously to accept the report with no abstentions.

XV. AAC report on online courses – Scott Smith addressed the senate again to present a brief report on online courses at UNH. Their report follows:

_The Academic Affairs Committee has a standing charge to monitor online courses, including J-Term. Below we provide a snapshot of the number of courses and online enrollment patterns for all regular terms (Fall, J-Term, Spring and Summer) for the past three years. Briefly:_

- **UNH-Durham**’s online presence continues to grow for all terms, but there has been a marked increase in the number of online-only offerings in the past three years for Fall and Spring semesters.
- **Despite the fact that the total number of eCourses (defined as all online offerings, including hybrids) offered at UNH-Durham during the Fall and Spring semesters remains low (1.48% in calendar year 2013, 2.3% in calendar year 2015), the number of students taking advantage of online courses is disproportionately high (8% and 10.5%, respectively).**
- **UNH-Manchester**’s online numbers have also ticked slightly upward over the past three years.

_Given that the number of online courses (and students taking those courses) continues to rise, we believe that it is in the best interest of the Faculty Senate to renew the Academic Affairs Committee’s charge to monitor online courses. It also deems it wise for the Faculty Senate to work with the administration to devise a sound policy that allows the university to maintain its flexibility without becoming overly reliant on online courses to deliver its world-class education._
The Academic Affairs Committee also has a standing charge to report on enrollments in the January term. The number of students enrolled in J-term at UNH-Durham over the past 7 years is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After a 41% increase from 2013 to 2014, the enrollment numbers have plateaued. UNH-Manchester does not have a significance presence, online or otherwise, during the January term.

Deb thanked Scott and the AAC for their report and moved to accept it.

The senate voted unanimously to accept the report, with no abstentions.

XII. New business – Vice chair Dante Scala offered a gift to outgoing senate chair Deb Kinghorn on behalf of the senate. He thanked her for her tremendous service to this institution, for her steady hand in guiding us and communicating with the administration, her forward-looking vision for this institution, and for her joie de vivre in running these meetings and wielding the gavel. The senate offered their thanks by applause. Deb thanked the group, particularly the committees and their chairs for their service throughout the year. She also offered a gift to senate admin Linda Chaston, and thanked her for her support on behalf of the senate.

Deb then asked all new senate members to stay, and invited all retiring senate members to leave their name signs and clickers at their tables to be collected at the conclusion of the following meeting.

XIII. Adjournment- It was moved and seconded to adjourn this final meeting of the XX senate session sine die at 5:25 p.m.