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Meeting called to order at 3:10 PM on May 3, 2021, via ZOOM

MINUTES SUMMARY

I. Roll: The following senator was absent: Ballestero, Colleran, Herold, Innis, Kirsch, Knowles, Minocha, and Woodward. The following senators were excused: Minocha, and Mitchell. The following were guests: Wayne Jones, Kate Ziemer, and Ken La Valley.

II. Call to order: The Senate chair, Erin Sharp, reminded the members that Senate meetings are recorded to aid in the preparation of meeting minutes. Senators should use the Raise hand feature in Zoom to ask to speak. All participants are asked to refrain from using the chat feature.

III. Remarks by and questions to the provost – Provost Wayne Jones shared the following updates:

- The COVID-19 infection numbers have continued to trend downward. There are currently only 29 active cases on campus. A vaccine clinic for second shots is scheduled for Thursday and there will be another distribution in a week. With that, it is estimated that about 75% of students will be fully vaccinated before the end of the semester,

- A goal had been set to document student learning outcomes for all 228 academic programs at UNH by the end of the semester. Getting these completed has been a problem over the years and NECHE noted it. At this time, all but 14 programs have uploaded their student learning objectives and the remaining ones are expected by the end of the month.

- The housing deposit deadline has passed. Wayne shared that 2,728 housing deposits have been received. This means that the housing numbers will be flat or up a few percentage points against last year’s number. However, this does mean that housing for the fall is undersubscribed. Because housing density was reduced this past year due to COVID, the number of carryovers is also reduced because the carry-over percentages (which didn’t change) were applied to the lower base. As a result, some housing is being opened up to graduate students. At least one full dorm, Babcock, will be designated 100% for graduate students and there may be some other availability. Wayne encouraged faculty to get the word out to graduate students about this.

Wayne offered to take questions:

A COLSA senator pointed out that on April 27 the CDC changed its guidelines for routine screening of populations. He asked if UNH will follow the CDC guidelines and discontinue testing for those people who have been fully vaccinated. He also asked how faculty and students should go about demonstrating to the university that they are fully vaccinated and, therefore, don't need to be tested any further.

Wayne responded that communication should come out this week from the management team that will lay out the plan as we move into summer. Although the decisions aren’t finalized yet it looks like we will
continue to require testing over the summer and will reassess for the fall. During the summer, students who are not vaccinated will test twice a week. Vaccinated students will test once a week. Faculty and staff, vaccinated or not, will continue to test once a week.

In connection with providing evidence of vaccination, Health and Wellness has a website that will allow people to upload their vaccine documentation. There will also be a fax number for faxing a copy of one’s vaccine card. There should be communication out about this soon.

The COLSA senator followed up to ask again why the university is going beyond the CDC guidelines for screening. He pointed out the tremendous cost associated with testing supplies and with the pandemic ramping up in Southeast Asia, testing supplies are needed in other parts of the world. He also pointed out that one of the incentives that the federal government is trying to put forth is that vaccinated individuals don’t have to go through routine COVID-19 screening. He said that there is a lot of vaccine hesitancy on campus and that one way to promote vaccination is to reduce testing requirements for vaccinated individuals.

Wayne said that these are great points, and he will share this sentiment with the leadership team. He also said that for the fall semester this is exactly where we are headed. For the summer we don’t have everyone's vaccination information yet and the university is taking a more conservative approach than we need to. In terms of supplies, UNH is not purchasing any more supplies at this point as it has more than enough supplies. Wayne pointed out that summer testing supplies are available now for anyone that wants to pick them up at the MUB. No appointment is necessary.

A CEPS senator asked about exiting and re-entering the testing protocols without being marked as delinquent now that we are approaching summer, and people will be away from campus. Kate Ziemer clarified that the university is not requiring a form or anything for summer. You are just required to have a valid Wildcat Pass to be on campus. So, if you leave the testing program you are expected to drop off a test kit and get a negative result before you come back to campus during summer. The test can be done upon return without worrying about a particular testing day schedule because the lab is expected to have more flexibility due to a lower number of tests. Kate shared that there is much more confidence now that the valid wildcat passes are tied to the mag stripe on ID cards.

A COLA senator asked Wayne to comment on the status of the tenure-track union contract. Wayne responded that he hasn’t received an update in a week or two but the last status he received indicated that things will probably be moving towards mediation. There have been some really good questions coming out of the discussions and the administration is providing more data. The projections on revenue six months ago are not consistent with the current projections.

III. Remarks by and questions to Ken LaValley, Vice Provost of Outreach and Engagement and Director, UNH Extension - Ken shared a high-level overview of some of the efforts that his group has been involved with along with faculty, staff, and administrators. (See Appendix III for slides from the presentation.)

Ken offered to take questions after his presentation.

A CEPS senator explained that he conducts research that involves NSF (National Science Foundation) funding and is engaged with the NSF definition of broader impacts at the K-12 level and a lot of other professional development activities. He said he isn’t quite sure how to connect to Ken’s office and how to advise his peers to do that. He has reached out a few times, but he isn’t sure how to partner together and
whether this is the best place to partner. Ken responded that his office is a good place to start since his office is part of the research economic engagement and outreach office of the university. He encouraged the senator to send him an email. He pointed out that there have been efforts in the past year to get all these folks together that are doing this work. The intake process is really critical to ensure that faculty can get plugged into the right units on campus and the folks doing that work can help faculty to be successful with NSF. Ken reviewed that the role of his group is to bring the intellectual capacity of the university out into communities. So, it is important that the work is being done to develop the engagement pathways between faculty, his office, and the rest of the university.

A COLA senator asked about faculty who participate in this intake process and whether it would count as engaged scholarship within the framework of the engaged scholarship motion that the Senate has been discussing. Ivo Nedyalkov, chair of the Senate’s Research and Public Service Committee, responded that he thinks this would be the case given the definition in the proposed motion on engaged scholarship. Engaged scholarship is defined as the mutually beneficial collaboration between UNH and external partners for the purpose of creating and applying knowledge to address societal problems and to enrich student learning. It sounds like working with Ken’s group would fit into that definition. Ken shared that Ivo is the faculty senate representative on K-12 Engagement Council.

A COLA senator said that he admits to having a bit of skepticism about micro-credentialing in the past. However, today’s presentation really checked a lot of boxes around his priorities in education. A focus on competencies is one example. The senator asked if there is any kind of a conversation, maybe a pilot program, to give students access to this kind of articulation of what they can do, what they're competent in, within the general population of students enrolled at UNH. For example, is there an effort to work with the Registrar to have these kinds of things included on a transcript? Ken responded that he would love to have that conversation. He has enjoyed his conversations with Kate Ziemer about things like this and she is on the same page when it comes to the holistic view of student learning and outcomes. UNH Professional Development and Training have been piloting with graduate students and with COLA undergraduates, offering free access to specific programs. He said that they have learned a lot about what undergraduates wanted in addition to their traditional academic curriculum.

The Senate chair thanked Ken for his time and encouraged faculty to reach out to Ken with any further questions and comments.

IV. Remarks by and questions to the chair

- Erin explained that the Senate has a lot of work to get through in the final two meetings and she reviewed the motions that are scheduled. She also explained that the final meeting of the Senate on May 10 will end early, and the new session of the senate will meet directly afterward to elect members of the Agenda Committee. Erin shared the Agenda Committee slate for the 2021-22 Senate, Kevin Healey, Matt MacManes, Jim Connell, Harriet Fertik, and Vidya Sundar.

- Erin shared that the Student Senate recently voted unanimously on a resolution to condemn the Faculty Senate for not passing the DRC recommendations, to demand that the Faculty Senate pass and implement diversity requirements in its work, and to urge the Senate to act quickly on the new charges. Erin said that she has given her assurance of the Faculty Senate’s commitment to working toward changes to the Discovery Program. (See Appendix IV for the full Student Senate resolution regarding an updated Discovery Program.)
- Erin explained that in connection with the reassessment of the Discovery Review Committee’s recommendations, the Agenda Committee has sent the following charge to the Discovery Committee to consider recommendations that could be brought incrementally to the Senate to provide some additional flexibility for students.

The Faculty Senate charges the Discovery Committee to review recommendations (e.g., allowing upper-division courses for Discovery, eliminating the inquiry requirements, etc.) from the report of the ad hoc Discovery Review Committee, and consider whether any should be brought to the Senate as independent motions similar to those adopted to allow Discovery credit for transferred 2.5 credit courses (MOTION # XX.III-M26) and to award transfer and study abroad Discovery credit based on student learning outcomes (MOTION # XXIII-M25) that help to better support our students within the current Discovery program, and if so, to offer such motions.

- The Research and Sponsored Programs office is implementing Cayuse, a risk management and grant management system. Erin explained that Louise Griffin, Senior Director of Research and Sponsored Programs Administration, shared that they are seeking users who are willing to test Cayuse. Please reach out to Louise if interested.

- UNH’s Enterprise Technology and Services (ETS) is exploring a change in file storage systems, a possible move from Box to Microsoft 365. ETS will be holding some open forum sessions to gather feedback, the first one is Thursday. It is important that everyone keep this on their radar. An email was sent out to all faculty and staff about this.

- The Agenda Committee met recently with representatives from Human Resources and from USNH HRIS to get an update on Kronos concerns, particularly in connection with tracking research hours. Work is being done to improve the user experience based on input from the Faculty Senate and from particular senate representatives who have helped to document concerns. Erin suggested that faculty should contact the Agenda Committee if they continue to have concerns so that the Agenda Committee can share these with the working group.

V. Approval of the minutes from April 12, 2021 - It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of April 12. Corrections were offered in sections VI and VII. Thus adjusted, the minutes were unanimously approved with 2 abstentions.

VI. Discuss and vote on RPSC Motion on Engaged Scholarship - Ivo Nedyalkov, chair of the Research and Public Service Committee, shared the following motion on behalf of the committee. This motion was presented to the Senate previously in the April 12 meeting.

Rationale:

Based on the 2021 Faculty Senate Report on Engaged Scholarship, it is important to define engaged scholarship in the context of UNH and encourage (but not require) faculty to be involved in engaged scholarship activities.

Motion:

The Faculty Senate approves the 2021 Report on Engaged Scholarship [see appendix] (Appendix VI in these minutes) written by the Research and Public Service Committee and endorses the six (6) recommendations presented in it.
1. UNH adopt, and disseminate, a clear definition of engaged scholarship. The following definition is proposed: “Engaged scholarship is the mutually beneficial collaboration between UNH and external partners (local, state, regional, national, global) for the purpose of creating and applying knowledge to address societal problems, and to enrich student learning.”

2. UNH Promotion & Tenure guidelines, instructions, and criteria statements be modified to explicitly include engaged scholarship.

   The document titled "Instructions for Preparing the Promotion and Tenure Statement" for Tenure-track (and equally for Research, Clinical, and Extension) faculty for example, be modified to include engaged scholarship explicitly under pertinent sections. For Tenure-track, this includes section V. Description of Scholarly Activities, number 7, “Professional Organizations in which the Candidate is Particularly Active,” and number 8, “Additional Areas of Scholarship and Work with Persons in Other Departments, in Centers, or with Groups Off Campus.” Modifications to include engaged scholarship should also be made to Section VI. Evaluation of Scholarship.

   For the document titled, "Procedures and Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure: Guidelines for Deans, Department Chairpersons and Faculty Members of School and College Promotion and Tenure Committees" the description of scholarship on page 3 should make reference to engaged scholarship such as adding it as a manifestation: e.g. "Manifestations of scholarship vary widely in form from one discipline to another, from publications that report original discoveries in a field of knowledge, to artistic performances or products, to engaged scholarship resulting in policy or practice change within outside organizations and programs, to new applications of knowledge. Indeed, there are many examples of significant variations among specialized areas within an academic department."

3. College P&T Documents be modified to include in their guidelines for promotion and tenure a definition of engaged scholarship, expectations, and methods of evaluating engaged scholarship. It is understood that methods of evaluating the quality, quantity, and impact of engaged scholarship will vary across colleges and departments. Note that engaged scholarship is not a required activity but is highly valued.

4. Department P&T Documents be modified to include in their guidelines for promotion and tenure a definition of engaged scholarship, and expectations for engaged scholarship.

5. Faculty Activity Reports for all faculty (including non-Tenure-track faculty) be modified to encourage faculty to report their engaged scholarship activities (if any). Such activities will not be required but will be considered as a formal component of the evaluation for those who choose to include it.

6. UNH establish an annual Presidential Award for Engaged Scholarship.
Ivo explained that there have been some slight changes to recommendation 2 in the motion, including that it now includes more specific detail about the P&T documents involved.

The Senate chair thanked Ivo and the committee for their report, and she commented that the report was an excellent example of providing data to support a motion.

A CEPS senator asked how this motion applies to contract faculty. Ivo responded that recommendations 2, 3, and 4 address tenure track faculty. Recommendation 5 addresses other faculty as well. He explained that generally any research activities are not used in the evaluations of lecturers, as far as he knows, but these activities can be considered as something positive when looking at promotion and these activities can still be included in FAR (faculty activity reporting) discussed in 5. The way the motion is worded here, all faculty, including non-tenure-track faculty, can report engaged scholarship activities in their FAR and that's something that should be recognized. Ivo emphasized again that no faculty member is required to perform engaged scholarship. Instead, it is something that can be reported in the FAR.

Shelley Mulligan, a member of the RPSC, clarified that for 2, 3, and 4, the committee looked at the UNH promotion and tenure guidelines and that is what is being referred to. She said that the committee didn’t see any specific documents for contract faculty. The committee was looking at the type of faculty who are eligible for promotion and that includes clinical faculty, research faculty, and tenure track faculty. Extension faculty were added as well. She explained that contract faculty are usually not eligible for promotion.

Kevin Healey pointed out that some lecturers do conduct research and publish, even though they are not hired to do this kind of work.

Gregg Moore, a member of the RPSC said that he is a member of the Research Faculty Council and has shared this motion among the research faculty. They were equally pleased by this document and many felt that it represents their interest well.

The motion was put to a vote. **The motion passed with 58 in favor, none opposed, and 2 abstentions.**

**VII. Academic Program Committee Motion to continue Motion XXV-M12 on Student Evaluations of teaching -** Tom Haines presented the following motion on behalf of the Academic Programming Committee (APC). The motion was previously presented to the Senate on April 12.

**Rationale:**

Course modalities and teaching environments remain in flux as we enter this second year of the COVID-19 pandemic. In Fall 2020, the Faculty Senate approved by a vote of 52-1 a temporary system for student evaluations of teaching that more accurately serves the goals of assessing and improving teaching during these uncertain conditions. Academic technology and others in the University have worked hard to implement this new system fully for Spring 2021. Meanwhile, a newly appointed Ad Hoc Teaching Evaluation Committee aims to propose a new system for the assessment of teaching to be ready for Spring 2022. In the interim, therefore, it is wise to continue the use of the temporary system in Summer and Fall 2021 and until the Ad Hoc Committee creates the new protocol for the assessment of teaching.
Motion: Given the ongoing COVID pandemic and its impact on course offerings and teaching environments, the Faculty Senate moves to continue Motion XXV-M12 (passed 11/2/20) for Summer and Fall 2021 and until the Senate passes a new course survey protocol, following the recommendations of the newly created Ad Hoc Teaching Evaluation Committee. The Senate also moves to continue the use of specific survey questions outlined in Motion XXV-M14 (passed on 11/16/20).

The effect of this continuation is that the Senate-approved survey questions (from Motion XXV-M14) will be automatically used in the Blue Teaching Evaluation system, as is the case for the Spring 2021 evaluations, for all courses until a new course survey protocol is approved. Faculty who wish to also gather feedback using the pre-2020 Student Evaluation of Teaching questions may independently administer their own survey with these pre-2020 questions.

Tom explained that the Academic Program Committee (APC) was asked to propose a plan for student evaluations of teaching for this coming summer and fall semester that would continue the previously passed motions about evaluations until a new approach to the evaluation of teaching is put in place through the work of the ad hoc committee. That proposal is expected in the fall for implementation in the spring of 2022.

A CEPS senator said that he thinks it is important to get this right and to change our previous system. However, he has some concerns about making the previous system, not an option but an add-on that requires faculty to manage through a Qualtrics Survey themselves. The Senate chair pointed out that when the APC initially brought forward changes to manage teaching evaluations during COVID, the committee goal was to stop using the standard evaluation of teaching (SET) questions and to use the Senate-approved items instead. There was not enough time during the first semester of implementation to get the (SET) out of the Blue system and to add the Senate-approved items. That is why the Qualtrics process was put in place for Fall 2020. It took another semester (spring 2021) to put the Senate-approved items into Blue. A Qualtrics option is also available for faculty who want to use the traditional SET questions.

Lisa MacFarlane, chair of the APC, explained that Academic Technology is not able to have both types of evaluation questions in Blue at the same time. Faculty who want to use the traditional questions can do so but they have to do it on their own, with Qualtrics.

A COLSA senator shared that one of his concerns with this motion is that the initial set of evaluation questions was presented in the context of working through COVID and the need to have teaching evaluations to maintain our accreditation. He is concerned that the questions did not get a lot of input. He said that his department is very concerned that the new evaluations are not going to fit with what is needed for teaching assistants and large classes and that some questions were problematic for science courses in general. He said that his concern is that this motion is essentially making the new evaluation questions the default questions moving forward until a new evaluation system is utilized or developed and he is not sure that the new questions address the shortcomings of the old system, which was a bias towards male faculty members over female faculty members and low rates of completion. He said that until we have data back on the usage of the new set of evaluations, it's unclear why the new evaluations are better than our previous evaluations, especially when we are supposed to be returning to “normal” operations in the fall. He stated that he isn’t sure that he can support this motion for these reasons.
Erin clarified that if the senate voted in favor of this motion, the Senate-approved questions would be in Blue for the summer and fall semesters. If the Senate votes no on this motion, the evaluation questions in Blue for the summer and fall would return to the traditional SET questions until a new process is approved and implemented.

Lisa MacFarlane pointed out that we have approximately 20 years of data from the traditional SET questions. We don’t yet have even one semester’s worth of data on the new questions. The proposal is to use these new questions for one more semester while the ad hoc committee is working. Kate Ziemer and Robin Hackett are the co-chairs of that committee. Lisa said that in the spirit of wanting to get data it is useful to get a couple of terms and then compare that to the many, many years of data we have on the SET before the new system is set up for Spring 2022. She believes this was the intent when the Senate passed that motion earlier this year.

A Paul College senator said that he agreed with some of the statements of reservation that have been raised. He also pointed out that some assistant professors will eventually be compiling their tenure packages based on three different systems of questions, the traditional, the interim (Senate-approved questions), and presumably the new system proposed by the ad hoc committee. That presents a challenge for these professors because they lose the ability to compare. The senator also asked if faculty would have the option to not have these surveys used for formal evaluation even if the university returns to green in the fall. Tom responded that the option to not have the surveys used for formal evaluation is part of the current motion as it was with the 11/2/20 motion.

A CEPS senator said that she is looking at this from a student’s perspective. She would prefer not to bounce back to the old way and then introduce yet another system when it is approved. So, while it might not be where we want to be or necessarily as good as it could be without studying other things, she is concerned that returning to the traditional questions might not be in the best interests of students. Tom agreed that this was part of the committee’s thinking. It is about maneuvering through this interim period with relatively little logistical change for the students as well as for faculty.

A COLSA Senator asked why we can’t wait to see what the data is for completion rate using a new evaluation this semester and combine that with the fall semester before we make this decision. Erin responded that the decision needs to be made today because Academic Technology needs a long lead time, months in advance, to make changes to the Blue system.

The motion was put to a vote. The motion passed with 49 in favor, 10 opposed, and 4 abstentions.

VIII. Agenda Committee Motion to endorse a diversity requirement and to form a new Ad Hoc Committee on Diversity Requirement - Erin Sharp, Senate chair, shared the motion. This motion was initially presented at the April 19 meeting.

Agenda Committee Motion to endorse a diversity requirement and to form a new Ad Hoc Committee on Diversity Requirement

The Faculty Senate endorses the concept of adding a Diversity requirement to UNH’s general education curriculum; therefore, the Faculty Senate instructs the Agenda Committee to form an ad hoc committee to develop the framework, objectives, and student learning outcomes for this requirement. The Agenda Committee will draft the parameters for committee membership with the goal of being representative across colleges and will prioritize involvement of faculty with interest and expertise in the areas of diversity, equity,
and inclusion, and the specific committee charges, which will include collaborating with the new ad hoc committee formed to reassess the DRC recommendations, and timeline and share these with the Senate for approval.

Erin provided some background about the Senate’s past work in the area of diversity explaining that the Senate has approved several motions over the years that call for the university to address the issue of diversity and to spend more time conversing about ways to implement the values endorsed in the motions, as follows:

2001 Motion on diversity reaffirmation
2009 Motion on diversity in strategic planning
2005 motion on Diversity
2004 Motion – statement on diversity

Erin also shared that the Senate considered a motion on adding a diversity requirement to the curriculum as far back as 1991. As well, UNH leadership has articulated in their strategic plan a goal to prepare all students to function effectively in diverse settings. Last year, the Academic Program Committee in the Senate passed a motion to define student success, which included a statement that students should “…be prepared to be engaged citizens and be able to flourish in a global society.”

Erin clarified that the motion on the table today is to endorse diversity as a requirement in the general education curriculum, but the “where” and “how” of it is for the ad hoc committee to work on.

Kevin Healey, Senate vice chair, reminded senators that a list of comparator institutions with information about the diversity requirements in their general education programs was sent with the agenda. (See Appendix VIII.) Kevin remarked that diversity requirements are included in the curriculum at other universities in many different ways. Some have a requirement that is specifically about race in the US. Others have a requirement from a global perspective. And then others have a requirement that deals with both race in the US and also diversity from a global perspective. Kevin suggested that part of what this new ad hoc committee would do is to look at these comparator institutions to see how other people are doing it and then discuss how we want to do this, what are UNH’s priorities, and how can we fit this into an existing general education program until the Discovery program ad-hoc committee gets its work done. Kevin said that he is going to support this motion. He believes there is ample precedent for support at the university level and among faculty.

The floor was open for discussion:

COLA Senator 1: I'm excited about this motion. I'm going to vote in favor of it. I don't know if this is an actual change or just an issue that I'd like to raise at the risk of raising the “What is science?” conversation. There is a “What is diversity?” conversation here that I think is important to have. The word diversity itself is really abstract and really can go in any direction in the literal definition of the word. But it's the way that it's used in discourse, refers to specific categories of experience, often race, ability, gender, things like that. So, I just wonder if it's worth us having the courage to be more specific about what we mean about diversity. Maybe that's a conversation that's more appropriate for the committee. It could go in a lot of different directions, but I don't think are directions, for example, that the student Senate is calling for or directions that are represented by our comparators.

Erin: I think a really important point and I will say that as the Agenda Committee forms its charges for this group, similar to the way we did with the ad hoc teaching evaluation committee, the charges will need
to include that the committee defines what diversity will mean in terms of this requirement. Or, potentially to use a different term or a different defining feature. That's going to be the first charge for this committee. And each step will be coming to the Senate to get action related to their work.

**COLA Senator 2:** This is related to the comment by [COLA Senator 1]. I would hope that we would consider that important question to be one that would be part of this committee's charge simply because I know there is a committee in COLA and others around the university working seriously on this very question who can frame it in a useful way for the Senate in order to make any deliberation more valuable. And so, I would say that being broadly in favor of this proposal, I will vote for it and will hope for conversations that can be guided in some way by those who have been committed to thinking through these issues for an extended period of time.

**Kevin:** This committee would be comprised of people as least one of which would have a specific background in thinking about this concept as it relates to curriculum. Is that correct?

**Erin:** Yes, it’s going to be the role of the new Agenda Committee to form the committee membership recommendations, parameters, and the charges.

**COLA Senator 3:** I just want to clarify that this ad hoc committee will come up with the learning outcomes, the learning goals of this requirement, but not to be making recommendations as to how it's implemented into some future Discovery program. I would love to see whatever ad hoc discovery committee exists to have as much freedom and space to be able to create something flexible that works for everybody. And I'm concerned that if we have a recommendation as to how something could be implemented, that will already start to box in the other larger committee.

**Erin:** The charges haven't been written yet for this committee, but we have acknowledged the importance of working collaboratively with the ad hoc committee to reassess the Discovery Review Committee recommendations. The goal of this committee is to form what this requirement would look like, but not to make the recommendation of how it will fit in with Discovery.

**Paul College Senator:** First, I was wondering if I could get a little bit more clarification about the procedure. Erin, you mentioned recommendations from the Agenda Committee. I would assume that if the ad hoc committee wanted to do some work over the summer it would be important to have the membership filled out relatively soon. So how does the process go of filling out that membership and how quickly could it be done?

And then the second question was, I was wondering if you could go over some of the language in the student motion that you read earlier about their concern over our failure to pass the diversity requirement. And maybe we can use that to guide us a little bit for some more concrete language regarding what they think the diversity requirement is supposed to do.

**Erin:** The Agenda Committee that will get put in place on May 10th will have to decide on how quickly to write the charges and to develop the committee membership. We are also working on the broader ad hoc committee. I don't know that I have an answer for that, although I think the goal is to be expedient about this process.

The second thing that I would say about the Student Senate resolution is that it will be part of the materials and resources provided to this committee as it does its work. Unless there's a motion to do so or
an amendment, I think we should keep this motion broad right now and not try to change the language based on any actions of another group.

Kevin: I think it is important to underscore that there is an urgency behind this, especially given the concerns raised by the Student Senate. There is support for this requirement from the administrative level. There has already been support from the students. The Student Senate reiterated their support in the motion that we looked at earlier. I agree with Erin. So, in my perspective as the incoming chair, this is one of the most important, if not the most important, issue to address. And so, it depends on who is willing to raise their hand and volunteer and be part of an ad hoc committee over the summer. I certainly think it's important to be working on it over the summer and that will be my headspace to the extent that I can rally people to get working on it sooner rather than later.

CEPS Senator 1: It would seem logical to me to ask the administration to invest in developing courses, appropriate courses and let them run as electives, gather some experience, and then formulate a requirement around that experience rather than beginning with imposing a requirement and then having departments respond to that opportunity or mandate in an ad hoc way. I think the important thing - I'm not a student, I'm not in the Student Senate - would seem to me that that investment of resources in the development of those learning opportunities would be the thrust of what the students are asking for and we could do that right away without changing the graduation requirements.

CEPS Senator 2: Just two comments. The first is, no matter what the Students Senate may think, this was never going to start next year. And so, the goal of this is to maintain the momentum that it will start the year after as if the Discovery Review Committee recommendations had passed. The second is just to remind everyone, the new Agenda Committee will be meeting over the summer, so there'll be an opportunity for them to come up with charges and get this committee together. It is not as if it is going to wait until the fall as far as the new Agenda Committee is concerned.

Erin: As we mentioned last time, and as a senator from Sociology mentioned, there are a number of courses, a wide range of courses, on UNH campuses that address diversity, equity, inclusion, and culture. I know a list has been collected of those courses that are already in existence. Certainly, I think part of understanding what has worked well in that area and who has expertise in that area will be informative.

Kevin: I can piggyback on that and underscore that in my informal conversations when I raised this idea with people in Philosophy and Anthropology I found people who have been teaching courses, the content of which is directly related to this, where their pedagogy and their curriculum is tried and tested. They are itching to participate in this conversation. So, I think the momentum is there.

Erin: We will go ahead with a vote since this motion was presented in our last meeting. The motion is to both endorse the concept of adding this requirement and to instruct the Agenda Committee to do the work forming the committee.

The motion was put to a vote. The motion passed with 60 in favor, 4 opposed, and no abstentions.
IX. Academic Affairs Committee Motion on Making Permanent the Fully Online ADD DROP Procedures
- Joe Dwyer, chair of the Academic Affairs Committee presented the following motion, on behalf of the committee:

Rationale: The Registrar’s Office has successfully implemented a fully online process where students use their Registration Access Code (RAC) to make changes to their schedules for the ADD/DROP process. The Registrar’s Office seeks to make the online ADD/DROP process permanent.

Motion: The Faculty Senate approves making permanent the fully online ADD/DROP process. Furthermore, the Senate recommends removing the requirement that students request and receive permission to add from instructors during the last three days of the add period. In addition, the Senate recommends incorporating a process by which the Registrar’s Office notifies instructors of students who have added and dropped their courses both at the end of the add period and again at the end of the drop period.

Joe explained that due to COVID the Senate had approved a fully online Add/Drop system for the 2020-21 academic year. This change was very successful. The Registrar has requested that we make the change permanent.

Joe explained that in discussions with the Undergraduate Advising Center, they pointed out that the requirement to request instructor permissions to add a course during the last 3 days of the add/drop period has caused a lot of confusion. The recommendation is to remove that requirement for instructor permission during the last 3 days of add/drop. As well, the motion includes a recommendation for a notification system to let instructors know when a student has added or dropped.

In response to a question, Joe clarified that the add/drop period is two weeks long.

Two COLA senators expressed concern about dropping the instructor permission requirement during the final 3 days because in some cases students will have already missed significant assignments or quizzes. The requirement to get the instructor’s permission allows instructors to advise students that it may be very difficult for them to be able to keep pace, especially in a class where things build.

A COLSA senator proposed that one way to deal with this could be to include a statement on the Add/Drop form that urges students to contact the instructor. Or a warning statement could be included on the form that late additions are done at a student’s own risk.

There was a request to hold a straw poll to see how many senators agree with the portion of the motion that removes instructor permission during the last three days of the add period. The chair agreed to run a quick straw poll using the “raise hand” feature and it showed that there were a significant number of senators who had concerns about this. It was agreed that the AAC would discuss this issue before the next meeting.
X. Academic Affairs Committee Motion to Endorse the University Diversity Statement - Joe Dwyer, chair of the Academic Affairs Committee, presented the following motion on behalf of the committee:

**Rationale:** Dr. Nadine Petty, Chief Diversity Officer provided the Senate with the final updated UNH diversity statement. The goal is to have community members align their individual statements with this one and/or point to or link to this statement on their webpages.

**Motion:** The Faculty Senate endorses the University of New Hampshire Diversity Statement:

*The University of New Hampshire is committed to building and nurturing an environment of inclusive excellence where all students, faculty, and staff can thrive. We also are committed to providing open and inclusive access for all alumni, volunteers, learners, employees, and visitors seeking to participate in our programs and activities. We venture to sustain a campus environment that fosters mutual respect and understanding. We believe diversity, equity, accessibility, and inclusion are foundational values inextricably linked to achieving our core educational mission; and we embrace the many characteristics of our community members that make them uniquely themselves. Here, you belong, and all are welcome.*

Joe explained that this statement was produced by the office of Nadine Petty, the Chief Diversity Officer, and was vetted and approved by the President's Leadership Council as well as by President Dean.

In response to a question about whether statements by comparator universities were reviewed as part of the process, Joe said that his committee was not involved in the process of crafting this. The committee was given the final product. So, he doesn’t know the answer to this. Erin shared that she has had a chance to clarify the origins of the statement with Nadine Petty. Nadine’s work on the statement included engagement and consultations with chief diversity officers across the country.

Joe shared that the AAC made some minor grammatical corrections that made the statement easier to read. There was no serious disagreement about the statement within the committee.

A COLA senator stated that he first wants to be clear that he is in support of the diversity requirement. He said that this diversity statement was sent out at the same time we were discussing the diversity requirement in the DRC proposal. This statement uses some of the same language that was used in the DRC proposal with references to foundational courses and core courses and that language is also included on the Discovery webpage. He said that in voting on this we may find ourselves in a position where we are committing, at least verbally, in a vote to a structure of a diversity requirement before we’ve ever really had that discussion. Although the Discovery proposal isn’t on the table anymore in the same way this statement is tapping into structures that already exist. He worries that this would then be something that future committees who come up with a new Discovery Program would feel that they're beholden to as far as structure, not necessarily learning outcomes. Erin responded that this is a good point. This statement is thought to go beyond curriculum, but the point is important. It is going to be on the President's website and the UNH website. The question is whether the Senate wants to provide an endorsement of it as well.

A Paul College Senator said that she is confused. She said that this reminds her of when the business school created a mission statement in a rush and now it is seen as something that is a truth. She said that this diversity statement is a wonderful aspiration, but she just doesn’t believe that it is true, and it is not at all true in her own experience. She explained that she studies organizational dynamics, and she goes into organizations to find out what their diversity climates are like. She said that if the committee believes that
this is something we should support, she will support it, but she wants to go on record saying that she doesn’t believe this is true at UNH.

Erin suggested that we could discuss with Nadine Petty these concerns and ask her to make a statement and share some background about it in a future Senate meeting if that would be helpful. There was a suggestion that the feedback could be shared with Nadine outside of the Senate meeting.

Another question was raised about what this statement is intended to do. That part is not clear. Is it a statement of value? Or is it performing some function?

A CHHS senator said that she wonders about the last sentence, “Here, you belong, and all are welcome.” For example, are we going to welcome all unvaccinated students in the fall? She said that she likes the whole statement but isn’t sure if the last sentence is true in all cases.

A COLSA senator said that when he read this statement initially when it was sent to the committee, he viewed it as aspirational but in re-reading it the sentence that troubles him is “We venture to sustain a campus environment that fosters mutual respect and understanding.” He suggested that possibly the word “sustain” should be changed to “create” because then we are not trying to say that we are already there but that we are trying to move towards that. There may some other verbiage here that we can change to make this explicitly aspirational.

Erin shared that these comments are really meaningful. She suggested that she will work with Joe and the committee and Nadine Petty to see if we can get more information and to understand what our parameters are for making suggestions at this point.

XI. Adjournment - Erin explained that there were additional motions on the agenda that did not get to the floor and these will be presented at the May 10 meeting. Andrew Coppens, chair of the Student Affairs Committee, encouraged senators to read the motions and the background material that was provided for these motions. He said that the committee does plan to ask that the rules be suspended to allow a vote on these motions at the May 10 meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:00 PM

Some UNH Acronyms

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

UNH Futureskilling and K12 Engagement

FutureSkilling Workforce Considerations

• How might college students, educators and administrators improve student success and employability?

• How do we ensure that students can better identify, define, acquire and communicate skills that employer’s value?

• How can we help students understand how their skills can translate into predictable long-term career opportunities?

*Students — Matriculated and non-matriculated learners
Upskilling Advisory Council: Landscape Analysis

- Analyzed current regional workforce development initiatives.
- Researched what efforts have already been completed/are underway to identify skills gaps.
- Identified what skill gaps exist between the current and projected workforce needs for the next 5-10 years.
- Identified the primary industries and occupations requiring upskilling
- Identified current approaches upskilling initiatives by both the state and major employers.

Essential Skills of the Future

Skills & competencies of the future -

- Analytical thinking and innovation
- Active learning and learning strategy
- Communication strategy
- Creativity, originality and initiative
- Technology design and programming
- Critical thinking and analysis
- Complex problem-solving
- Leadership and social influence
- Emotional intelligence
- Reasoning, problem-solving and ideation
- Resource & operations management
- Systems analysis and evaluation
Empower Learning to Communicate Earned Essential Skills: Micro Credential Definition

"UNH defines a micro-credential as evidence that reflects attainment of specific skills or competencies. Micro-credentials can be issued for formal and informal academic or professional learning experiences. A digital badge is one example of a micro-credential."

UNH Micro-Credentials are:

- Competency-based
- Approved through faculty/staff governance
- Meaningful and of high quality
- Digital Badge is one example of a micro-credential

UNH BADGING TAXONOMY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Association</th>
<th>Learning</th>
<th>Competence and Validation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Participation Badge</td>
<td>Contribution/Recognition Badge</td>
<td>Grade-Based Badge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Badge earner participates in an event (i.e., professional development, classroom or online learning, etc.) but has not taken an assessment.</td>
<td>Badge earner has made a non-trivial contribution as part of a team or project. Can serve as recognition of accomplishment; i.e., an award.</td>
<td>Badge earner has earned recognition for successfully completing a learning event. Examples of formal recognition might include college credit, CEUs or other measures for non-collegiate credits learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of Evidence (not exhaustive)

- Statement describing event, activities, or participation; link to event.
- Statement of contribution: artifact or link to artifact of contribution. Statement of accomplishment or award; supplementary link to justification for recognition.
- Statement of learning gain, type of assessment, and score with cut score indicated. Link to artifact of learning. If cut score is inappropriate or unavailable, additional description of the assessment and outcome are needed.
- Statement indicating structure/style of levels; context given to explain how badge fits within larger picture of curriculum. Statement of learning gain, type of assessment, and score with cut score indicated. Link to artifact of learning. If used as encouragement, contains evidence of learning gains and details of progression to other badges.
- Statement of learning gain and performance demonstration, type of assessment, and score with cut score indicated. Link to artifact of learning. Description, artifact, or other data needed to justify claims of successful performance.
- Statement of context for professional certification or licensure with links to descriptions or awarding body. Type of assessment is indicated, along with score and cut score.
University of New Hampshire Franklin Pierce School of Law Certificate in Blockchain, Cryptocurrency & Law
Issued by University of New Hampshire

This badge is awarded to individuals who have completed the Blockchain, Cryptocurrency & Law coursework. The earner of this badge has learned core and advanced characteristics of blockchains, distributed ledger systems, and cryptographic assets. Industry-specific applications.

SKILLS
- Blockchain for Social Impact
- Cryptoeconomics and Blockchain Governance
- Data Privacy & Security
- Ethics of Distributed Systems in Healthcare
- Smart Government
- Tokenomics & Cryptocurrency Regulation

WHAT IT TAKES TO EARN THIS BADGE
This 20-week program requires 4-6 hours a week of online class time. Weekly coursework required includes viewing pre-recorded video lectures (approx. 60-75 minutes each), completing reading and class preparation materials (approx. 1-2 chapters or the equivalent), participating in live chats with guest speakers (approx. 1 hour), engaging in optional discussion board conversations (approx. 1-2 hours), and completing a quiz. A student’s final grade for each course is determined entirely by quiz scores. Students MUST complete 60% of the quizzes with a passing grade to complete each of the 2 semesters.

K12 Engagement
Enhance youth experience & pathway to UNH

- Every child deserves an education that allows the opportunity to achieve his or her dreams. UNH sees the need for developing a "multiple pathways" approach that recognizes the diversity of student interests and abilities.

- Student success is dependent on highly-effective teachers. By supporting the ongoing learning of primary and secondary teachers through professional development, UNH can engrain itself deeply into our local communities while potentially increasing revenue streams to build financial strength, one of the University’s four strategic priorities.
K12 Engagement Council: Outcomes & Recommendations

- Compiled & distributed spring & fall UNH resources for educators and families during the COVID-19 pandemic
- Performed UNH website inventory & investigation for youth & educator outreach activities. Compiled website recommendations
- Currently developing a “Tool Kit” for faculty/staff engaged in outreach activities
- Identified the primary industries and occupations requiring upskilling
- Held in-person (Zoom) follow up meetings w/8 UNH departments to gather more information and ideas for items such as Tool Kit, student recruitment and communication

K12 Engagement Council

Recommendations

1. OUTREACH & ENGAGEMENT VISIBILITY

Develop a coordinated & comprehensive outreach & engagement website presence and communication channels that will provide:

- Increased UNH faculty/staff awareness of all activities
- Increased K-12 family, educator, and school administrator awareness of activities
- Easy and efficient access to view UNH Outreach activities (i.e. ‘Engagement Hub’), esp. from unh.edu
- Ability to cultivate relationships and sustain communication with outreach audiences
- Ability for UNH to demonstrate its outreach impact to key stakeholders
K12 Engagement Council

Recommendations

2. INTAKE PORTAL

Determine a technical mechanism & process for intake of all outreach activities:

- Accessible and efficient for staff – not a repetitive input task
- Integrate with service-oriented UNH departments (i.e. Housing, Dining, Transportation, UNH Police)
- Allow for review and education of risk management protocols (i.e. UNH Policy & Procedures for the Protection of Minors)
- Identify/support activity inclusion in ‘Engagement Hub,’ learning pathways, resource sharing, collaborations

---

K12 Engagement Council

Recommendations

3. STUDENT RECRUITMENT

Develop recommendations for faculty/staff to maintain engagement with youth participants for potential UNH student recruitment. This may include:

- Broadened yet defined use of Salesforce w/governance on usage; or an alternate plan if Salesforce is not the preferred platform
- Identify existing and future required resources (i.e. support & training for users)
- Understand current recruiting strategies w/youth
- Create a recommended recruitment/communication plan for faculty/staff in the hopes of having a unified, coordinated approach
K12 Engagement Council

Recommendations
4. LEARNING PATHWAYS
Develop learning pathways for K12 students and educators in order for:
• Youth/Family and Educators to progress through a logical selection of activities/courses
• Keeping these audiences engaged in UNH offerings with increased awareness and an organized path
• Assisting in identifying gaps or duplication of activities
Student Senate resolution regarding an updated Discovery Program

Student Senate of the University of New Hampshire

Student Body President Nicholas Fitzgerald (for himself), Student Body Vice President Tyler Silverwood (for himself), Academic Affairs Chair Jennifer Hargenrader (for herself), Community Development Chair Hannah Falcone (for herself), Student Senator Christian Zepeda-Lipovsky (for himself), Student Senator Bryce Gauthier (for himself), Student Senator Kylene Rock (for herself), Student Senator Niko Dishaw (for himself), and Student Senator Jillian Cookingh (for herself) submitted the following resolution for the consideration of the Student Senate:

RESOLUTION

R.42.35 – REGARDING AN UPDATED DISCOVERY PROGRAM

25TH OF APRIL 2021

WHEREAS, the current Discovery Program requirements were implemented in 2018 (1), and

WHEREAS, several surveys conducted by the Discovery Review Committee (DRC) between 2015 and 2020 revealed university wide “dissatisfaction with the program in its current form” from students and faculty alike [2], and

WHEREAS, these surveys found that the current discovery program places undue pressure on students, imposes discrete course requirements commonly overlooked, and presents obstacles for students trying to enrich their curriculum with additional majors, minors, and courses of interest [2], and

WHEREAS, in February 2021, the DRC of the Faculty Senate presented a proposal for an updated Discovery Program [3], and

WHEREAS, this updated proposal streamlines the current Discovery Program and “incorporates some of the ‘values’ education, Internship opportunities, and Cultural Competencies” students and faculty are looking for [2], and

WHEREAS, this proposal would also allow for students to potentially complete their Discovery Requirements in as few as 9 courses [2], compared to the current 11 courses [4], and

WHEREAS, the updated DRC proposal eliminates mandatory labs, allowing greater flexibility in courses to fulfill a science requirement, and

WHEREAS, in 2018, members of the Black Student Union and Diversity Support Coalition demanded the creation of “a mandatory 4-credit social justice course requirement, that must be intersectional in nature, to the discovery program,” [5], and
Whereas, also in 2018, the Presidential Task Force on Campus Climate [5] addressed this demand by listing the incorporation of a social justice course into the curriculum, as one of their recommendations on how to build a “safe, more inclusive and respectful campus climate at UNH,” and

Whereas, the DRC proposal includes a diversity course requirement, which focuses on Diversity & Inequality in the United States and would fulfill the requests of many student groups, and

Whereas, this requirement would fulfill President Dean’s and many other administrators advocatory statements for the inclusion of a discovery course that will ensure UNH students are “exposed to the elements of U.S. history most important to understanding our current situation with regard to race,” [6], and

Whereas, The Faculty Senate passed a motion at their meeting on April 19th, 2021 to recommit the DRC proposal to a new Ad Hoc committee to reassess the DRC recommendations to the Discovery Program with 36 in favor and 19 opposed

Therefore Be It Resolved By The Student Senate Of The University Of New Hampshire

To Condemn, the Faculty Senate for not passing the Discovery Review Committee proposal, and be it further resolved

To Demand, the Faculty Senate to pass and implement the diversity requirement of the Discovery Review Committee proposal, and be it further resolved

To Strongly Urge, the Faculty Senate to act expeditiously in creating charges for the new Ad Hoc committee on revising the Discovery Program, and be it further resolved

To Demand, the Faculty Senate to pass a revised Discovery Program proposal by the end of Fall 2021 and begin implementation of the new program by Fall 2022, and be it further resolved

To Strongly Encourage, all academic departments to implement some form of equity and inclusion curriculum and initiatives into their respective programs, and be it further resolved

To Strongly Encourage, the creation of seminars available to Faculty to learn how to incorporate education of equity and inclusion into their classroom

[1] https://www.unh.edu/discovery/discovery-program-student-learning-outcomes

Senate Actions: Passes Unanimously
Speaker Verification: Igor Garcia
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UNH Faculty Senate Research and Public Service Committee (RPSC) Report on Engaged Scholarship
February 22, 2021

Prepared by:

Ivaylo Nedyalkov, Chair (Mechanical Engineering, CEPS)
Vanessa Druskat (Management, PAUL)
Robin Hackett (English, COLA)
John McClain (Mathematics & Statistics, CEPS)
Gregg Moore (Biological Sciences, COLSA)
Sharyn Potter (Women's and Gender Studies, COLA)
Shelley Mulligan (Occupational Therapy, CHHS)
Igor Tsukrov (Mechanical Engineering, CEPS)

Introduction

In Fall of 2020, the Research and Public Service Committee (RSPC) of Faculty Senate was charged to build upon the work initiated by prior members of this committee from the 2018-2019 Senate Session to formulate a precise and practical definition of Engaged Scholarship in the context of the diverse and varied faculty contributions to engaged scholarship at UNH. Towards this important goal, the RSPC has researched concepts, definitions, and opinions regarding engaged scholarship, its definition, role, and valuation at universities throughout the US (including UNH) and developed recommendations for how this type of faculty activity should be viewed, approached, and addressed in Promotion and Tenure documents at the university, college, and departmental levels. Review of the 2019 RSPC Faculty Survey on Engaged Scholarship (see Appendix II) was central to tailoring recommendations that are inclusive and aligned with UNH faculty experience and perspectives on the topic.

Relevant Background Information

Historically, as a Land, Sea, and Space Grant public research university, UNH produces, conveys, and applies knowledge to address challenges of global scale and consequence alongside New Hampshire citizens, businesses, institutions, and organizations as important constituencies. UNH has a long history of placing high value on the engaged scholarship activity of its faculty. Julie Williams and Eleanor Abrams initiated the Engaged Scholars Academy at UNH in 2004, which evolved into the Research and Engagement Academy which is still actively training faculty today. In 2008, UNH was recognized as a community engaged university by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. A UNH advisory board affirmed UNH’s commitment to engaged scholarship in 2009. In the university’s strategic plan from 2010, an intention was set to become “a national leader in the emerging effort to create a genuinely seamless understanding of scholarship, one that affirms the essential interconnectedness of teaching, research and engagement” (UNH in 2020). A report on the importance of engaged scholarship was developed by the Faculty Senate in 2014. UNH’s 2020 Vision Strategic Plan includes as one of six vision and value statements, the goal to achieve “a broadened definition of scholarship.” One of its five core strategic academic initiatives is “Partner for Life: Expanding and Deepening UNH’s Strategic Partnerships.” Understanding that our continued vitality
depends on the good will and support of the people of NH and their elected officials, UNH aims to strengthen existing outreach initiatives including the engaged scholarship of its faculty.

However, despite the value that has been placed on engaged scholarship over the last 20 years at UNH, the subject remains a considerable concern among the tenure track, clinical, research and extension faculty because of a lack of clear definition and inconsistent perceptions on whether such activities are considered within the realm of their service obligations, scholarship activities, or some combination of the two. Additional questions have also been raised regarding the ways in which departments and colleges view and evaluate engaged scholarship in annual reviews and promotion cases which may have potentially discouraged faculty to participate in this type of scholarship.

Overview of Aims, Assumptions, and Data Sources

This objective of this report is to propose a common definition of engaged scholarship and to attempt to clarify its role (i.e., contribution, value, perception) in promotion and tenure decisions. Data sources used by the committee members included a review of relevant UNH reports and documents, external literature related to engaged scholarship, and definitions and methods of evaluating engaged scholarship employed by other research universities, including documentation for reclassification of universities as “engaged universities” by the Carnegie Foundation. Appendices I-IV contain relevant quotes, data, tables, and examples curated from these sources. Summaries of and links to specific documents are provided in Appendix V.

Herein, we attempt to define engaged scholarship based on the following four assumptions: 1) engaged scholarship is an ongoing value of the university; 2) faculty participation in engaged scholarship can vary individually and over time; 3) engaged scholarship may include pedagogical, practical, applied, or public-facing scholarship; and 4) formal recognition of engaged scholarship has equity implications. The basis, implications, and resulting recommendations that stem from these assumptions follows below.

Adapted from Howard (2007).

Definitions at UNH and Beyond

Before recommendations can be developed, we must first provide context for the proposed definition of engaged scholarship at UNH. The Carnegie Foundation defines community engagement as the “collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity,” and the same body explains the purpose of community engagement is “to enrich scholarship, research and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic
responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good” (Carnegie Foundation). Former president of the Carnegie Academy for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning, Ernest Boyer, promoted the ‘scholarship of engagement’ as a means of broadening the definition of scholarship (Boyer 1990, Boyer 1996). The Hanover Research report on Publicly Engaged Scholarship Frameworks reviews several universities’ and organizations’ attempts at and processes for defining publicly engaged scholarship. The authors find that while there is no universally accepted definition, there are three traits common to many definitions. “First, the publicly engaged scholarship generally includes activities in all three traditional land-grant university missions (instruction, research, and service); second, it is both informed by and generative of scholarship; and third, it is for the public good.”

Examples of engaged scholarship might include carrying out original research in collaboration with community partners and applying disciplinary-specific knowledge to address research needs in the local, regional, national or international community [Appendix IV]. Barker (2004) articulated that scholarly engagement consists of “research, teaching, integration, and application scholarship that incorporate reciprocal practices of civic engagement into the production of knowledge. It tends to be used inclusively to describe a host of practices cutting across disciplinary boundaries and teaching, research, and outreach functions in which scholars communicate to and work both for and with communities” (Barker 2004, p. 124).

A 2002 UNH NEASC self-study defined engaged scholarship at UNH as “a mutually beneficial collaboration between the University of New Hampshire (New Hampshire’s land, sea and space grant institution) and community partners for the purpose of generating and applying relevant knowledge to directly benefit the public” (NEASC 2002). Specifically, engaged scholarship is scholarship that “breaks new ground in the discipline and has direct application to broader issues, answers significant questions in the discipline which have relevance to public or community issues [and] is reviewed and validated by qualified peers in the discipline and by members of the community” (Sandman 2010).

While we are aware that different units within the university will need to develop discipline specific ways to understand and evaluate engaged scholarship, this committee recommends that UNH explicitly adopt the following broad and useful definition endorsed by the Engagement and Outreach Scholarship Advisory Board Statement on May 1, 2009):

Engaged scholarship is the mutually beneficial collaboration between UNH and external partners (local, state, regional, national, global) for the purpose of creating and applying knowledge to address societal problems, and to enrich student learning.

With a working definition established, examples from the literature often list examples to designate activities that are typically considered engaged scholarship. Far from an exhaustive list, some examples of faculty activity that may be considered as engaged scholarship include:

- Collaborative efforts with those within an organization resulting in the design and implementation of modified or new practices or policies;
- Providing consultation, education and technical support within an organization to assist in the translation of knowledge to practice within the faculty’s area of expertise;
- Collaborative research activities that result in the generation of knowledge that is of benefit to the faculty and organization; or
- Collaborative efforts to create and disseminate knowledge and practices through various forms of media, publications, and professional presentations.

In an opinion piece in Inside Higher Ed, McNeill (2020) articulates as in interesting counter perspective, suggesting that to understand engaged scholarship in its truest form, one must first understand what it isn’t. He writes “Engagement is not synonymous with simple volunteerism. It is not using a community to recruit participants for a pre-existing research study or imposing an academic agenda onto a group. And, although public dissemination of research is important, engagement is not a one-way transfer of information. In fact, engaged scholarship actively counters each of these oversimplifications.” Similarly, scholars from Michigan State University detail bulleted lists of activities that are not engaged scholarship to efficiently increase clarity of what is [see Appendix IV].

**Equity and Justice Implications**

Among the benefits of recognizing engaged scholarship institutionally is an opportunity to enhance equity and justice initiatives on campus. Kabria Baumgartner, Faculty Fellow for Equity and Inclusion in COLA, notes that faculty of color tend to conduct research that is both scholarly and public-facing, a testament to their versatility and interdisciplinary training. Valuing engaged scholarship can then motivate faculty of color by facilitating the integration of public-facing work with research identities, thus strengthening recruitment and retention. Moreover, recognizing and supporting engaged scholarship will help connect faculty of color to local communities, bring attention to public-facing work, and perhaps improve town-gown relations. Finally, increased recognition of public-facing work may enhance recognition of knowledge created outside of the university. Scholars well-trained in conducting public-facing work are uniquely positioned to recognize these knowledge systems.

**Valuation vs. Evaluation**

There is no question that engaged scholarship is valued at UNH. From the Engaged Scholars Academy in 2004 to the Research and Engagement Academy that continues today, acknowledgement of the importance and value of engaged scholarship is prevalent and echoed by UNH’s leadership, exemplified by the two examples below:

Senior Vice Provost for Research, Economic Engagement, and Outreach Marian McCord writes: “Engaged scholarship is a hallmark of a public land-grant institution, and a means by which we build a deeper connection with our constituents and work collaboratively to generate societal impact. Recognition of faculty excellence and effort in this critical aspect of our mission will promote and reward this essential activity.”

Vice Provost of Outreach and Engagement Kenneth La Valley adds: “In my role as Vice Provost of Outreach and Engagement, I believe that providing incentives for faculty to participate in engaged scholarship will be necessary to strengthen the culture of engagement at UNH. One barrier has been the value placed on engaged scholarship as part of promotion and tenure. By embracing UNH’s responsibility as a land-grant university to teaching, research, service, and extension, we acknowledge the importance of interdisciplinary collaboration between the university and our stakeholders. If
engage scholarship is a valued, but not required, contribution to a faculty members scholarly works, there may be more opportunities for pre- and post-tenured faculty to participate. In so doing, we as a university community will increase our relationships with external partners, the societal impact of our basic and applied research, and reinforce our role as a partner in solving societal issues and contributor of new knowledge.”

Yet there remains a disparity between valuing and evaluating engaged scholarship. Even with the above-referenced evidence of broad institutional support, encouraging engaged scholarship at UNH will require departments and colleges develop a clear and consistent rubric to evaluate such work for retention, appointment, promotion, and tenure. A common concern noted by faculty regarding the evaluation of engaged scholarship is that it less often results in high-impact peer reviewed publications than comparable efforts in basic and applied research in their respective fields (see Survey Results Summary). Additionally, not all departments or university units have an abundance of faculty who are experienced in the practice, or evaluation, of engaged scholarship. The Hanover Research Report notes that it is important to build an understanding between administrators and faculty regarding the definition of engaged scholarship and outline a process for evaluations. They also discuss mechanisms for supporting publicly engaged scholarship, including financial and non-financial awards and the incorporation of relevant language and processes in tenure and promotion criteria. They point to publicly available resources for definitions and evaluation rubrics to assist in the development of such processes. The report includes a table of “Eight Key Characteristics of Quality Community-Engaged Scholarship” from the University of South Florida’s toolkit, which provides these key characteristics of engaged scholarship along with example activities and work products that act as evidence of these characteristics [Appendix III].

Conclusions and Recommendations

As a Land, Sea, and Space Grant public research university, UNH produces, conveys and applies knowledge to address challenges of global scale and consequence, with New Hampshire citizens, businesses, institutions and organizations and UNH has a long history of placing high value on the engaged scholarship activity of its faculty. As noted earlier, one of its five core strategic academic initiatives is “Partner for Life: Expanding and Deepening UNH’s Strategic Partnerships.” UNH aims to strengthen existing outreach initiatives including the engaged scholarship of its faculty.

Despite the high value placed on engaged scholarship, it remains evident that steps remain to be taken to increase understanding, recognition, and consistent evaluation of engaged scholarship at UNH. The RSPC views this as an opportunity, and not a burden, for UNH Leadership to develop transparent policies and/or guidelines to acknowledge, evaluate, and value the contribution our faculty make through innovative, engaged scholarship initiatives tightly linked to their research and expertise. Therefore, the Committee offers the following recommendations to the Faculty Senate for discussion and consideration:

1. UNH adopt, and disseminate, a clear definition of engaged scholarship. The following definition is proposed: “Engaged scholarship is the mutually beneficial collaboration between UNH and external partners (local, state, regional, national, global) for the purpose
of creating and applying knowledge to address societal problems, and to enrich student learning.”

2. UNH Promotion & Tenure (P&T) Guidelines for Tenure-track (and equally the Promotion Guidelines for Research, Clinical, and Extension) faculty be modified to include engaged scholarship explicitly under pertinent sections. For Tenure-track, this includes section V. Description of Scholarly Activities, number 7, “Professional Organizations in which the Candidate is Particularly Active,” and number 8, “Additional Areas of Scholarship and Work with Persons in Other Departments, in Centers, or with Groups Off Campus.” Modifications to include engaged scholarship should also be made to section VI. Evaluation of Scholarship.

3. College P&T Documents be modified to include in their guidelines for promotion and tenure a definition of engaged scholarship, expectations, and methods of evaluating engaged scholarship. It is important that engaged scholarship be distinguished from paid or unpaid consultative work, and service activities. It is understood that methods of evaluating the quality, quantity, and impact of engaged scholarship will vary across colleges and departments. Note that engaged scholarship is not a required activity but is highly valued.

4. Department P&T Documents be modified to include in their guidelines for promotion and tenure a definition of engaged scholarship, and expectations for engaged scholarship.

5. Faculty Activity Reports for all faculty (including non-Tenure-track faculty) be modified to encourage faculty to report their engaged scholarship activities (if any). Such activities will not be required but will be considered as a formal component of the evaluation for those who choose to include.

6. UNH establish an annual Presidential Award for Engaged Scholarship.

Appendix I. Engagement and Outreach Scholarship Advisory Board Statement, May 2009

In his seminal work, Ernest Boyer (1996) set the national context for the critical role higher education must play in society when he stated: “...the academy must become a more vigorous partner in the search for answers to our most pressing societal, civic, economic, and moral problems and must reaffirm its historic commitment to what I call the scholarship of engagement.”

In 2008, the University of New Hampshire (UNH) was designated as a community engaged university by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in recognition of its excellence and commitment to the scholarship of engagement. Engaged scholarship is the mutually beneficial collaboration between UNH and external partners (local, state, regional, national, global) for the purpose of creating and applying knowledge to address societal problems, and to enrich student learning.

The University of New Hampshire’s engaged scholarship and outreach includes the work of faculty collaborating with external partners, Cooperative Extension programs and student engagement and

---

learning opportunities. Engaged scholarship at UNH enhances the quality of life for citizens across New Hampshire, the nation, and throughout the world. These initiatives and the value that UNH places on engagement align specifically with results from the recent national survey by the Higher Education Research Institute’s national survey of faculty. This survey, based on the responses of 22,562 full time faculty at 372 institutions, reveals that the majority of faculty believe it is “very important” or “critical” to instill in students a commitment to community engagement/service. The value that UNH places on engagement is also well aligned with national initiatives to undertake the largest investment in innovation and scientific research in American history to solve societal problems.

[While UNH is not currently designated as an engaged university by the Carnegie foundation, it is committed to regaining the designation in the next cycle. Having a university-wide definition of engaged scholarship and encouraging such activities will be essential in meeting the criteria the university needs to meet.]

Appendix II. Summary of Results of the RPSC 2019 Faculty Survey on Engaged Scholarship

The UNH Faculty Senate RPSC Committee administered a survey about engaged scholarship to the UNH faculty in November 2019. Below is a summary of the quantitative and qualitative responses received from the 125 faculty who responded.

Survey Prompt
“As the UNH Faculty Senate RPSC Committee ... we are conducting a survey to solicit information from UNH departments regarding definitions, prevalence, and value regarding engaged scholarship.

To prompt deeper thinking in this area, we provide a recent definition of engaged scholarship based on a review of two decades of publications that were characterized as “engaged scholarship” (Beaulieu, Breton, & Brouselle, 2018), but do not seek to restrict our solicitation to these parameters. We are also not necessarily endorsing Beaulieu et al.’s view. It is open to critique, praise, appropriation, etc.

Beaulieu et al. (2018)[1] define engaged scholarship to include two core values (social justice; citizenship) and five principles (high-quality scholarship; reciprocity; identified community needs; boundary-crossing; and democratization of knowledge) (pp. 5-6).”

---


We, the undersigned members of the University of New Hampshire’s Advisory Board for Engagement and Outreach Scholarship, strongly endorse a continued emphasis on and commitment to community engagement, community engaged scholarship and academic outreach as a central focus of the University of New Hampshire’s strategic plan and fund-raising priorities.
Responses to Quantitative Questions

N = 125

Q2: Has your department or College had a formal conversation about "engaged scholarship"?
   - No = 85.6%
   - Yes = 14.4%

Q4: Is "engaged scholarship" specifically accounted for in your department or College P&T policies?
   - No = 88.5%
   - Yes = 11.5%

Q6: Whether or not a part of your department or College’s P&T policy, is “engaged scholarship” formally or informally evaluated in any other way in your department or College?
   - No = 64.2%
   - Yes = 35.8%

Responses to Quantitative Questions about the relevance at UNH of the values and principles emphasized in Beaulieu’s conceptualization of engaged scholarship

N = 125

Value 1: Social justice – Scholarship that develops “complementary relationships between scholarly achievement and the public good and to study public issues”
   - 76.5% of respondents rated this as either “somewhat relevant” or “highly relevant” for UNH

Value 2: Citizenship – Scholarship that “integrates [researcher] role as expert with their role as citizen”
   - 70.2% of respondents rated this as either “somewhat relevant” or “highly relevant” for UNH

Principle 1: High-quality scholarship – Scholarship that “ensure[s] the value and relevance of research on both the social and academic levels”
   - 86.3% of respondents rated this as either “somewhat relevant” or “highly relevant” for UNH

Principle 2: Reciprocity -- Scholarship characterized by partnership and collaboration “between the academy and civil society during not only the production of knowledge, but also its dissemination”
   - 71.8% of respondents rated this as either “somewhat relevant” or “highly relevant” for UNH

Principle 3: Identified community needs -- Scholarship that “address[es] important civic issues or real societal problems”
· 81.5% of respondents rated this as either “somewhat relevant” or “highly relevant” for UNH

Principle 4: Boundary crossing -- Scholarship that “fundamentally involves a multi-intertransdisciplinary approach... [also] integrating teaching, research, and service” ·
76.5% of respondents rated this as either “somewhat relevant” or “highly relevant” for UNH

Principle 5: Democratization of knowledge -- Scholarship that exemplifies “the democratization of scientific knowledge and its accessibility for all... also questions the assumption that the academy holds a monopoly over knowledge production” ·
72.4% of respondents rated this as either “somewhat relevant” or “highly relevant” for UNH

Thematic Analysis of the Qualitative Comments of Respondents
N = 125

Four prominent themes emerged from faculty comments in the survey. Themes are listed below with representative comments under each.

1. The need to clarify how UNH defines “engaged scholarship” and how much UNH values it

   a. I would suggest first, having an articulate conversation defining "engaged scholarship". How does this get interpreted through different activities, priorities, and values, and what are various ways that engaged scholarship looks like.

   b. Engaged scholarship is still a vague concept so I cannot say it aligns with any principles or values

   c. While I appreciate the difficulty in distilling 'engaged scholarship' across multiple disciplines is difficult, there doesn't seem to be much discussion about what is meant by "community"

   d. I would say that 75% of the faculty in my college would have no idea what the words mean and would need to Google them

   e. I don't think there is formal or structural support or even respect for "engaged scholarship". My feeling is that all research and publication that is valued at UNH revolves around traditional sources of highly esteemed editorials and/or journals.

   f. My concern is that in some cases the scholarly element of work claiming to be "engaged scholarship" is minimal... The word "engaged" also implies that scholarship that doesn't do this kind of work is "disengaged" - that's an assumption that might be strongly interrogated.
2. The desirability and evaluation of engaged scholarship varies between and within colleges, departments, and disciplines.

a. We are in an applied field. Without support for engaged scholarship, it is challenging to complete engaged scholarship while fulfilling other research requirements for P&T. As we move further away from engaged scholarship, the practitioners and researchers are feeling disconnected. It would be helpful for faculty members' engaged scholarship and contributions to community development be recognized.

b. It is difficult to keep it [engaged scholarship] in such broad terms when a specific discipline becomes involved

c. [These ill-defined terms perhaps] make sense to someone in the sociology department but are not generally used in all sciences...you would do far better to consider how what you are asking is relevant to different scientific and scholarly disciplines.

d. The values and principles here do align with my priorities, but it's not necessarily how they are valued in my field.

e. [Engaged Scholarship has been] Openly discussed at a faculty meeting and added to our Dept. P and T Policies.

f. [Engaged scholarship] has been discussed in our faculty meetings although not for a few years

g. The blend between scholarship and service in my particular work, as a professional musician, (singer) is virtually constant.

h. Our P&T committee views this as important and considers a faculty member's engaged scholarship both as part of formal P&T deliberations, and in our regular pre- and post-tenure reviews. This is mentioned in our evaluation letters and documents. It also frequently gets mentioned by outside reviewers commenting on a promotion case.

i. Unless we get a peer-reviewed publication out of it in some way, it counts as service.

j. Engaged scholarship seems to be viewed favorably in both my department and college... Yet, when it comes to actually rewarding these activities in promotion and tenure processes, the same [old power] structures continue to rule the roost.

k. Engaged scholarship is looked upon favorably within our department as it creates connections with practitioners in our field, thereby serving various needs such as securing advisory board members, providing internships, etc. It is also considered good in terms of "gestalt" of the P&T case.
I. [Engaged Scholarship] is recognized at some level by the college, but not really appreciated.

3. Respondents’ desire to separate engaged scholarship from service or general outreach

a. Discussions of "engaged scholarship" should focus first and foremost on quality of scholarship...that is of high quality (sound methodology, interesting theoretical propositions, well written, etc.) gets published in top journals..."Engaged scholarship" is *fundamentally* different from "engagement as outreach" or "engaged teaching".

b. I consider outreach a very important part of our mission as faculty. I also feel we must maintain standards for true scholarship.

c. "Engaged scholarship" can be a "slippery slope". We consider scholarship to result in refereed publications in a respected journal. Otherwise, we consider it service- certainly valued as such in the P&T process.

d. If peer reviewed, it is scholarship/research. If not, it is considered service.

e. [We evaluate engaged scholarship] as a type of service

f. Scholarship entails scholarly publication; engaged scholarship requires both engagement and scholarship.

g. If there isn't high quality peer-reviewed (or reviewable) research behind the outreach, then it isn't engaged scholarship.

h. The department of communication certainly supports engaged scholarship (e.g. the critical discourse lab), but output from these initiatives would be unlikely to be considered as a form of scholarly output unless it took a traditional scholarly form (e.g. conference presentation or peer-reviewed journal article).

4. Respondents’ desire for increased acknowledgement of the value and time-commitment involved in engaged scholarship

a. I would encourage this committee to include in their discussions the relationship between engaged scholarship and the strategic pillar of embracing NH. Local and statewide work should be prioritized so long as this is a pillar.

b. ...acknowledgement of the time and effort involved in bringing them to fruition in more than a tokenistic way. Even laying the groundwork for mutually productive partnerships can take considerable time. Plus what counts as useful and high quality work in an academic context may not correspond at all with the on-the-ground work of "engagement" before, during, or after some kind of collaboration.
c. Engaged scholarship - from my understanding - is more relevant to the engaged the party with whom the scholar is working than to the academic community. It may not pass muster in top tier journals but it is research nonetheless.

d. In particular, we have not discussed scholarship built on these foundations, the time commitment it takes, and particularly how much it bleeds into what may appear to be the much less valued "service" dimension of our academic profile (or, in some cases, teaching).

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.019320
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTERISTIC</th>
<th>SAMPLE EVIDENCE (RESEARCH-RELATED)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear Academic and Community Change Goals</td>
<td>• Clearly stating the basic purpose of the work and its value for public good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Defining goals and objectives that are realistic and achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identifying intellectual and significant questions in the discipline/community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Articulating one’s program of research and objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Preparation in Content Area Grounding in the Community</td>
<td>• Investing time and effort in developing community partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participating in training and professional development that builds skills and competencies in engaged scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Demonstrating an understanding of relevant existing scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate Methods: Rigor and Community Engagement</td>
<td>• Refining a research question through co-generation with community partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Involving the community to improve accountability, study design, collection of data, and/or enhance plans for recruitment and retention of study participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Developing policy recommendations and application or intervention ideas based on study’s findings through brainstorming with community partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Disseminating findings more broadly through community partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improving ethical credibility by addressing specific concerns with the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Results: Impact on the Field and the Community</td>
<td>• The community contributing to as well as benefiting from the research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Making progress toward social equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Securing increased funding for community partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increasing the capacity of the community to advocate for themselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Utilizing the work to add consequentialy to the discipline and the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Presentation/Dissemination to Academic and Community Audiences</td>
<td>• Publishing research results in peer-reviews, practitioner, or professional journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Disseminating information through media used/read by community members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Producing documents directed towards service providers, policymakers, or legislators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective Critique: Lessons Learned to Improve the Scholarship and Community Engagement</td>
<td>• Conducting debriefing sessions with community members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Seeking evaluations from community members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Changing project design based on feedback and lessons learned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Engaging in personal reflection concerning, for example, issues of privilege or racism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership and Personal Contribution</td>
<td>• Receiving invitations to present to professional society meetings, conferences, to present to community audiences, to testify before legislative bodies, to appear in the media, or to serve on advisory or policymaking committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mentoring students, junior faculty, and community partners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix IV. Examples of What Is (and Is Not) Engaged Scholarship

Common Types of Engaged Scholarship (from Michigan State University)

- Community Engaged Research
  - Community-based, participatory research
  - Applied research
  - Contractual research (funded by government, non-governmental organizations, or businesses)
  - Demonstration projects
  - Needs and assets assessments
  - Program evaluations

- Community Engaged Creative Activity
  - Collaboratively created, produced, or performed
  - Film
  - Theater
  - Music
  - Performance
  - Sculpture
  - Writing
  - Spoken words
  - Multi-media
  - Exhibitions

Engaged Scholarship is Not (from Michigan State University)

- Serving on a departmental committee
- Serving on a university-wide committee
- Serving on a disciplinary committee
- Volunteering not related to your discipline or not associated with community partnerships in your academic field
- Conducting outside work for pay, with no connection or benefit to your departmental/unit missions

Selected Examples of Engaged Scholarship Projects at UNH

- NH Violence Against Women (& Men) Project
  - The purpose of the partnership is to assess the prevalence of violence against women and men in New Hampshire. The results are intended to inform public health practice
by state and local health departments, and the network of related non-profit service organizations linked by the NH Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence.

○ The violence against women survey results have been presented at the state and national levels, and several manuscripts are in development. The team continues to work together on analyzing the more recent violence against men survey.

● Recycled Materials Resource Center
  ○ The RMRC works to promote the appropriate use of recycled materials in the highway environment. This is done by engaging all of the different stakeholders and bringing them together so that trust and partnerships are developed between the different stakeholders, allowing the collective group to move forward.
  ○ The RMRC has brought three full time research faculty to UNH who have contributed significantly to the educational mission of the University. The Center has funded approximately 15 graduate students, both Masters and Ph.D., who have received graduate degrees from UNH. The center has purchased infrastructure and instrumentation that have provided research capabilities and led to advancement of the research enterprise at UNH.

● Northeast Consortium
  ○ The Northeast Consortium encourages and funds cooperative research and monitoring projects in the Gulf of Maine and Georges Bank that have effective, equal partnerships among fishermen, scientists, educators, and marine resource managers.
  ○ Opportunity for researchers and faculty to conduct fisheries and oceanographic research partnering with commercial fishermen and fisheries managers.

● Project 54
  ○ Project 54 at the University of New Hampshire, in partnership with the New Hampshire Department of Safety, is a nationally recognized law enforcement technology program. Ongoing research is focused on improving the safety, effectiveness and efficiency of officers in the field through improvements in human computer interfaces and data.
  ○ Many students have received MSEE degrees supported by Research Assistantships funded by Project54 and involving MS thesis research support from Project54. The project has produced 35 publications and 79 technical reports (most involving a combination of faculty and student authors).

Selected Examples Engaged Scholarship Projects Outside UNH

● The Research University Civic Engagement Network (TRUCEN) keeps a list of exemplars of Engaged Scholarship at https://compact.org/trucen/research-university-engagedscholarship-toolkit/section-a-what-is-engaged-scholarship/exemplars-of-engagedscholarship/

● ‘Publishing and the Publicly-Engaged Humanities: Articles and book chapters selected by the National Humanities Alliance in partnership with Routledge,’ Taylor & Francis https://think.taylorandfrancis.com/publicly-engaged/
Public Humanities and Publication; Publishing and the Public Humanities Working Group


This essay is rich with examples of the importance and variety of engaged scholarship. It notes, as well, the relationship between publicly engaged scholarship and public humanities. The importance of the essay for our purposes is that it clarifies that there is no one way to publish, evaluate, or credit faculty for engaged scholarship. Rather, it is essential for P and T committees at every level to learn how to recognize and value engaged scholarship in their disciplines, and to bring that knowledge to bear in their work on individual P and T cases.

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching Elective Community Engagement Classification Re-classification Documentation Framework


Includes the documentation for re-classification of the university as an engaged university by the Carnegie Foundation. These metrics/requirements may change when we apply. We will be submitting as a new first-time application for the 2024 cycle. The cycle was delayed due to COVID but UNH intends to submit an application.

Publicly Engaged Scholarship Frameworks


The Hanover Research report on “Publicly Engaged Scholarship Frameworks” reviews several universities’ and organizations’ attempts at and processes for defining publicly engaged scholarship. The authors find that while there is no universally accepted definition, there are three traits common to many definitions. “First, the publicly engaged scholarship generally includes activities in all three traditional land-grant university missions (instruction, research, and service); Second, it is both informed by and generative of scholarship; and Third, it is for the public good.” They also find that it is important to build an understanding between administrators and faculty regarding the definition and outline a process for doing so. Finally, they discuss mechanisms for supporting publicly engaged scholarship, including financial and non-financial awards and the incorporation of relevant language and processes in tenure and promotion criteria. They point to publicly available resources for definitions and evaluation rubrics to assist in the development of such processes.

Works Cited (section will be updated for final version of the report)


NEASC self-study (2002)


UNH in 2020


Please enter the complete references


https://engage.msu.edu/about/overview/common-types-of-community-engaged-scholarshipreported-by-faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Requirement Details</th>
<th>Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UMass Amherst</td>
<td>Two courses within the Social World curriculum area (out of 4 courses required) are needed to fulfill the Social &amp; Cultural Diversity requirement. 1 course focuses on US diversity and 1 course focusing on Global diversity</td>
<td><a href="https://www.umass.edu/gened/students/fulfilling-requirements">https://www.umass.edu/gened/students/fulfilling-requirements</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Connecticut</td>
<td>6 credits required in Content area &quot;Diversity and Multiculturalism&quot; 3 out of the 6 credits must address issues of diversity and/or multiculturalism outside of the United States.</td>
<td><a href="https://catalog.uconn.edu/general-education/">https://catalog.uconn.edu/general-education/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Rhode Island</td>
<td>Requires courses to fulfill 12 outcomes but a single course may meet more than one outcome. One of the outcomes is &quot;Develop and exercise diversity and inclusion responsibilities&quot;</td>
<td><a href="https://web.uri.edu/general-education/students/learning-outcomes/">https://web.uri.edu/general-education/students/learning-outcomes/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Vermont</td>
<td>All UVM undergraduate students must successfully complete the following two requirements prior to graduation: 1. One 3-credit course from Diversity Category One (D1) (Race and Racism in the U.S.), to be taken as early as possible after matriculation to UVM - preferably no later than the sophomore year); and 2. A second 3-credit course from either Diversity Category One (D1) or Diversity Category Two, the Diversity of Human experience (includes global and international issues)</td>
<td><a href="https://www.uvm.edu/generaleducation/diversity-requirement">https://www.uvm.edu/generaleducation/diversity-requirement</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maine</td>
<td>Must complete 18 credits in <em>Human Values and Social Contexts</em> to satisfy 5 subcategories, including &quot;Cultural diversity and international perspectives&quot;. The SLO for this includes the primary goal to encourage students to become aware of the diversity of American culture and to discover their roles within that diversity.</td>
<td><a href="https://umaine.edu/oira/wp-content/uploads/sites/502/2019/10/Human-Values-and-Social-Contexts-Cultural-Diversity-or-International-Perspectives-1.pdf">https://umaine.edu/oira/wp-content/uploads/sites/502/2019/10/Human-Values-and-Social-Contexts-Cultural-Diversity-or-International-Perspectives-1.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Delaware</td>
<td>All students, regardless of major, are required to take one 3-credit multicultural course, which may be taken any time before graduation (US And international).</td>
<td><a href="https://sites.udel.edu/gened/sample-page/multicultural-course-requirement/">https://sites.udel.edu/gened/sample-page/multicultural-course-requirement/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University at Buffalo, SUNY</td>
<td>Required to complete one course on Diversity in the United States. This course can be used to also complete another gen ed requirement. Focus is not limited to race.</td>
<td><a href="https://catalog.buffalo.edu/policies/ubcurriculum.html#diversity">https://catalog.buffalo.edu/policies/ubcurriculum.html#diversity</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ of North Carolina, Chapel Hill</td>
<td>One course required in Diversity (US). Description: Courses in U.S. diversity help students develop a greater understanding of diverse peoples and cultures within the United States and thereby enhance their ability to fulfill the obligations of Unites States citizenship. These courses address in systematic fashion one or more aspects of diversity in the United States, whether arising from ethnic, generational, class, gender, sexual, regional, or religious differences. This requirement can be met while meeting other gen ed or major/minor requirements.</td>
<td><a href="https://catalog.unc.edu/undergraduate/general-education-curriculum-degree-requirements/">https://catalog.unc.edu/undergraduate/general-education-curriculum-degree-requirements/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern</td>
<td>Includes 11 requirements including &quot;Engaging Differences and Diversity&quot; (local and international) and &quot;Understanding Societies and Institutions&quot;</td>
<td><a href="https://www.northeastern.edu/core/requirements/">https://www.northeastern.edu/core/requirements/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Requirement Description</td>
<td>URL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinnipiac</td>
<td>As students progress through the Breadth part of the curriculum (31 credits), students are required to take at least 3 credits in classes marked as “I” (Intercultural Understanding). The classes with “I” designation can be chosen from any area in Disciplinary and/or Personal Inquiry. (includes US and international focus)</td>
<td><a href="https://catalog.qu.edu/academics/university-curriculum/">https://catalog.qu.edu/academics/university-curriculum/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth State University</td>
<td>Students take a three or four-credit Diversity (DICO) course (either within the major or not) designed to broaden and deepen awareness and appreciation of differences and commonalities of sub-cultural groups in the US society defined by differences in race, ethnicity, ability, social class, religion, politics, gender, or sexual orientation. International courses do not address diversity in US society so DICO credit is omitted from international courses. Diversity courses do this by exposing students to the life stories and the voices of members of different groups and by exploring issues of equity, opportunity, and justice.</td>
<td><a href="https://coursecatalog.plymouth.edu/general-education/">https://coursecatalog.plymouth.edu/general-education/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keene State College</td>
<td>No diversity requirement in their general education program (Integrative Studies Program)</td>
<td><a href="https://www.keene.edu/catalog/resources/programs/bachelors/">https://www.keene.edu/catalog/resources/programs/bachelors/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartmouth</td>
<td>Not labeled as a diversity requirement. All Dartmouth undergraduates must satisfactorily complete one course from each of the three areas, 1) Western Cultures (W). 2) Non-Western Cultures  and 3) Culture and Identity</td>
<td><a href="http://dartmouth.smartcatalogiq.com/current/orc/Regulations/Undergraduate-Study/Requirements-for-the-Degree-of-Bachelor-of-Arts/General-Education-Requirements-Categories">http://dartmouth.smartcatalogiq.com/current/orc/Regulations/Undergraduate-Study/Requirements-for-the-Degree-of-Bachelor-of-Arts/General-Education-Requirements-Categories</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Anselm</td>
<td>Saint Anselm College has identified 10 core learning outcomes that are considered essential for the education of each student. One of these is &quot;Global engagement&quot; which is defined as Global engagement means active interest in a world where all peoples, being rooted locally, share the responsibilities of belonging to a common humanity. As members of the human family, students should respect the inherent dignity of all peoples and their universal human rights. Courses should provide students with an understanding of global structures, processes, and conditions. Students should be able to identify commonalities and diversity in an interconnected world; they should have the capacity to be responsible and effective participants in global society; and they should appreciate their relationship with the greater world.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.anselm.edu/academics/core-curriculum/college-learning-outcomes">https://www.anselm.edu/academics/core-curriculum/college-learning-outcomes</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern New Hampshire University (SNHU)</td>
<td>Program outcomes include &quot;A graduate of SNHU is expected to demonstrate the ability to learn and work collaboratively with individuals of diverse cultures and perspectives in order to reach common goals.&quot; Notes: There is nothing specifically labeled as a diversity requirement.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.snhu.edu/admission/academic-catalogs/uc-catalog#/programs/view/5c9cda2872228825005689d8">https://www.snhu.edu/admission/academic-catalogs/uc-catalog#/programs/view/5c9cda2872228825005689d8</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>