

University of New Hampshire

University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository

Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes

Faculty Senate Documents

8-26-2019

2019-2020 FACULTY SENATE XXIV - August 26, 2019 Minutes Summary

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty_senate_agendas_minutes

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "2019-2020 FACULTY SENATE XXIV - August 26, 2019 Minutes Summary" (2019). *Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes*. 111.

https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty_senate_agendas_minutes/111

This Text is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate Documents at University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes by an authorized administrator of University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository. For more information, please contact Scholarly.Communication@unh.edu.

UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
2019-2020 FACULTY SENATE XXIV

The fundamental function of the approved minutes of the Faculty Senate is to accurately document actions taken by that body. Additionally, the minutes traditionally seek to provide context by capturing some statements of Senators, faculty in attendance, and guests. The minutes do not verify the veracity, authenticity, and/or accuracy of those statements.

Meeting called to order at 3:12 p.m. on August 26, 2019 MINUTES SUMMARY

I. Roll – The following senators were absent: Ballestero, Charpentier, Kies, Kim, Knezevic, and Miller. The following senators were excused: Bedker, Berda, Hiller, Khanlari, Magnusson, Mitchell, Moran, and Seaman. The following guests attended: President James Dean and Senior Vice Provost PT Vasu Vasudevan.

II. Remarks by and questions to President Jim Dean – President James Dean opened the meeting with remarks about the importance of the Faculty Senate. He explained that in his recent book about how universities work, intended for people on university boards, one of the chapters involves a pretty deep dive into university governance. He said that he is convinced of the importance of the faculty representative body as a key partner of the president’s leadership team. President Dean gave credit to Scott (Smith), David (Bachrach), and Erin (Sharp), and other members on the agenda committee, pointing out that we have formed a good collaboration that has really paid off in putting together the strategic priorities. He has not seen shared governance work better than he has seen it work at UNH so far. He also thanked all the faculty senators for the sacrifice they make to be part of this body. It makes a big difference.

In connection with the strategic priorities, President Dean explained that there was a really elaborate process for coming up with the strategic priorities and this process included all university constituencies, about 10 different groups, in one way or another, contributing to forming the plan. The core meeting at the end of the process where we set the priorities and the measures, was one in which there was a high level of involvement and influence from the Faculty Senate. Based on representation from the Faculty Senate these are your priorities as well.

The aspiration is for UNH to be among the top 25 public universities in a number of important areas and academic accomplishments. We are actually there or not far from there in a number of areas already. We are certainly very near the top of public universities in sustainability and US News and World Report rank us as 10th in “best value” which measures the value of the degree against the cost of the degree. This may be a little surprising since we hear so much about the cost. On the measure of (6-year) graduation rate for all students we rank 29th and for Pell-eligible students we rank 34th. So, we are within shouting distance of the top 25 on a number of elements already. There are a few areas where we are not in the top 100 and there is a lot of work to do. This includes the measure for attracting the top 10% of high school graduates. It also includes the ratio of administrative expense to educational expense. This is somewhat surprising because, by other measures, we are very very lean administratively and our costs are actually quite low. That measure may be telling us that we just don’t spend that much money on education. In any case, we

are working on all of them. That is the aspiration and there are two messages there: 1) We aspire to be among the top public universities in the country and 2) we are actually not that far off on the most important elements associated with academic performance.

The president talked through a set of slides (see Appendix I.1) associated with the strategic priorities and some examples of strategic initiatives that are being worked on. The president then opened the floor asking, “What do you want to tell me or what do you want to know from me?”

Erin Sharp: Jim Connell and I had a chance to attend the chairs’ meeting that you and the provost recently held. I have heard many people say how much they value that meeting and that they appreciate your openness to discussion and shared governance. It has been making a difference. People are saying in 10 years there has never been a chairs’ meeting with all the chairs in the same room.

President Dean: Thank you and I appreciate it. That was Provost Jones’ idea. I am happy to support it. As the chief academic officer, he is a tremendous champion. I am really very happy that he joined us in that capacity.

Scott Smith: Last year we learned that there will be a chief financial officer. Is there any movement on that and do we have an expected timeline for that? Is there anything else you can share about that?

President Dean: We have been doing a search for a chief financial officer (CFO) for the last several months and that involved changing some positions within the university in separating the position of chief operating officer from chief financial officer. We got to a point of making an offer to someone for the CFO position. But the individual decided he wanted to do something different than work with us, which I regret. There will be an announcement out in a few days that we are going to have an interim CFO for, probably, the next 6 months or so and we are going to reinitiate the search. I wish that were concluded but it just didn’t work out. It is such an important area that we want to be sure to get the right person in there.

We, as the leaders of the UNH community, make presentations to the board of trustees, which includes all four universities in the system. So, we need to make sure we have the best advocate possible talking on our behalf to, especially, the financial people on the system board. That is an important part of the job to tell our story as well as we can. Also, frankly, it is also important to have someone who can talk to the legislature to make sure that people understand that we are managing our finances as adeptly as possible.

Tu Lan - I have heard that UNH is in the process of renegotiation with the GSSP (Global Student Success Program) for international enrollment for this popular program. I was wondering if you have an update on the process and I was wondering if UNH has any kind of future plan for international enrollments.

President Dean: Yes, we have been working with one organization for quite some time trying to help us with international enrollment. And here we are talking about undergraduate level. Graduate enrollment is quite a bit diverse, and people come from around the world. Undergraduate international enrollment has declined in the last couple of years for a variety of reasons, not the least of which is that students are having a hard time getting visas. And I think that goes back to some of our government policies and this is very unfortunate. We are now in the process of signing or preparing to sign an agreement with a new organization to help us do some additional recruiting of international students. It is important for us to be within the world and to provide education for people who are interested in coming to New Hampshire. It is also important for students who are American and students from New Hampshire, as we think it is good that they are exposed to people from around the world as well.

This summer, you may know that I spent a week in China. One reason I went was to try to reinforce our presence there and we had receptions in both Beijing and Shanghai with alumni, with some of our current students who were back home for the summer, and also with a number of representatives of various agencies that help to recruit our students. I had my picture taken with about 100 different agents who are trying to recruit students for us. For many of them, they said it was the first time they had met any university president. Our largest group of undergraduate international students is from China. So, I thought that it made sense to spend a lot of time there and try to change that relationship. Also, I want to make sure that our stewardship of the students that we have now is going well. With the collaboration of Yige Wang, head of the Confucius institute here, we are having a reception for some of our Chinese students in September in connection with the Moon Festival. I have, perhaps mistakenly, agreed to perform one of the Chinese musical instruments during that event. It sounded like a good idea at the time.

We are very much of a mind to continue opening the university and welcoming international students at all levels and certainly faculty as well. It is unfortunate that we are in a national climate now where it is harder than it should be. We are trying to do everything we can.

Senator: What is the current situation for the collective bargaining agreement with lecturers in terms of the approach from the administration?

President Dean: I can't say very much about that. The administration has put an offer on the table some time ago and the last I heard is that we have not heard anything back.

Stephen Pimpare: The counters on all of those dimensions are sitting on John Wallin's desk and have been there for 3 weeks or so.

President Dean: Thank you for pointing that out.

Senator: I want to follow up on the previous question about the GSSP Navitas. Is that going to be renewed? Also, are you referring to Shorelight as well?

Vasu (Senior Vice Provost): GSSP is Navitas. They were taken over by another company. Our contract expires next year, and Wayne and I are going to be meeting with the CEO sometime soon. That is an active program. The other program that the president referred to is a contract with Shorelight for direct admission students. The negotiations with Navitas has not taken place yet but they will start soon.

President Dean thanked the Senators and said he looks forward to coming back whenever he is invited.

III. Remarks by and questions to the chair - Senate chair, David Bachrach, welcomed everyone back for the new semester and introduced himself. He also echoed President Dean's thank you to the senators for doing this hard but necessary work saying that it is the work of this body that makes the academic mission of teaching, research and service go much more smoothly for us than it might otherwise go.

It is expected that this will be a very busy year for the Senate with work to be presented by the Discovery Review and work associated with the RCM review. Also, we will be helping the administrative leadership roll out the strategic initiatives.

In addition to the specific initiatives and charges we also have an opportunity to solidify the culture of transparency which has developed over the past year. President Dean and Provost Jones have done a very good job of being open and transparent with the faculty over the past year. A good working relationship

has developed with the administration, which is based on regular communication, expectations of good will, and also the common goal of strengthening academic mission at UNH. These are essential for the success of the faculty and for the university.

David shared some best practices and suggestions that will contribute to a success year for the Senate:

- i. It is very important that the individual committees meet in all the weeks that the Senate does not meet.
- ii. It is also important to get as many of the charges to the floor as a motion, a recommendation, or a report in the fall. In the spring the work of the Discovery Review Committee is expected to take up significant time during Senate meetings.
- iii. We have scheduled several extra meetings for the committees over the course of the fall and members of the agenda committee will be fanning out to the individual committees during some of these dates to help answer questions and facilitate your work.
- iv. We have all experienced meetings where conversation tends to go around in circles. David shared a favorite saying of his rabbi, "Meetings take a long time when everything has been said but has not been said by everybody." If someone has made your point substantively already you may want to consider allowing that comment to stand for your comment. Of course, if you have other information or another perspective to share, you should do so. But, the fewer repetitions of a particular idea that we have, the more discussion we can have on more topics.
- v. The Agenda Committee will be setting provisional allocations of time for the discussion of individual motions and reports. We are going to try to stick with those timelines unless there are exigent circumstances to break them.
- vi. This is a big room. It is important to use the microphone to speak so that you can be heard.
- vii. Wordsmithing on the floor is not an effective use of the Senate's time. If a motion, as written, does not meet the needs of the majority of the senate members then we will ask the committee to reconsider the motion and anyone that has suggestions for alternative ways of saying things can direct those comments to the chair of the committee.

David introduced Kathy Brunet, the administrative assistant for the Senate, and Faith Thompson, the Senate's work study assistant. He introduced the Agenda Committee and asked them to stand. David invited the student representatives at the meeting to introduce themselves. Present were Casey O'Hearn, Graduate Student Senate president; Allie MacPhee, Student Body President; Kelsey Crowley, Student Body Vice President; and Nick LaCourse, Speaker, Student Senate.

David reminded the senators about the upcoming Academic Convocation, scheduled for Friday, August 30. This is an important event co-sponsored by the Faculty Senate and Provost Office, intended to be the kickoff for a year-long discussion about our general education and the Discovery program. David asked that senators encourage their colleagues to attend.

David recognized Senator Joe Dwyer, Professor of Physics. He has been named a fellow of the American Geophysical Union (AGU). This is an honor bestowed on fewer than 1/10th of 1% of AGU members each year. The group gave a round of applause.

David opened the floor for comments or questions:

Scott Smith, former chair, reminded the senators to say their name and department when speaking. Scott also expressed his thanks to David for taking on the role of Senate chair and to Erin for agreeing to take on this charge the following year. He said that faculty governance depends on our willingness to participate in the process. Scott encourages everyone to do their job and do it well and we will get important things done.

Sterling Tomellini pointed out, in response to the earlier comments by President Dean, that the representatives of the collective bargaining unit are not having the same experience as the Senate leadership in working with the president and provost. He encouraged David to ask the president about the lecturer's contract.

David responded that although the various union groups on campus and the Senate have overlapping membership, we have different responsibilities and different lanes. But, at this point, he hopes to keep the Senate lane to the Senate and the negotiation lane to the appropriate faculty represents on the negotiation side. David said that he can only speak to the relationship that we have had on the academic side and the Senate side. It may come to a point where these two lanes necessarily cross over.

Sterling pointed out that there is no question that the negotiation side is always going to be part of the union side. Working conditions are always going to fall under the negotiating side of the CBA. However, faculty relations are not. There are questions about basic faculty relations and the Senate does have an interest in that. There are issues like teaching evaluations that do overlap. Sterling pointed out a situation over the summer where the provost refused to meet with the union representatives without the contract administrator being present, even though the representatives included faculty with many years of teaching.

David shared that two of our committees this year have teaching evaluations as part of their charges and that this topic straddles the lanes between the union and the Senate. We will do our thorough duty on that issue and others as well.

Erin Sharp added that because of the role of the agenda committee, David as chair, and herself as co-chair, do meet with the president and provost on a regular basis. She said that they do plan to talk about some of these overlapping issues, especially the negotiations about the lecturer's union. We can talk about staying in our lane, but we can make sure that there is transparency in getting at what faculty concerns are.

IV. Approval of the Senate minutes from May 6, 2019, Sessions XXIII and Session XXIV – It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the May 6, 2019 (Session XXIII) meeting. Changes were suggested in Items V, IX, X. Thus adjusted, the minutes were unanimously approved, with 11 abstentions.

It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the May 6, 2019 (Session XXIV) meeting. The minutes were unanimously approved with 11 abstentions.

V. Review the Faculty Calendar - David reviewed the Senate calendar for the academic year, available at <https://www.unh.edu/fac-senate/current-faculty-senate-calendar>, pointing out:

- Tuesday, October 15 (this day follows a Monday schedule) has been set aside for senators to caucus with their respective deans instead of meeting as a body or in committees. The Deans have already been asked to set aside the time from 3:10 to 5:00 pm on this date to meet with senators from their college. The feedback from last year's caucus meetings was that these meetings were fruitful and that senators indicated they would like more of them.
- Members of the Agenda Committee will be offering to join the individual committees on September 16 and 30, to answer any questions about the charges, to help facilitate the writing of motions and, in general, to serve as conduit of information between the committees and the Agenda Committee.
- During the spring semester the Senate and committee meetings alternate every week except for the last two Senate meetings of the year which are held back to back.

VI. Committee Chairs - David thanked the chairs for taking on the work of leading the Senate committees and offered to work diligently to have regular communication between the Agenda Committee and committee chairs. He introduced a new practice at Senate meetings that will involve each committee chair giving a 1-minute description of the work being done by their committee. The goal is to help all senators understand what each committee is working on and to provide an opportunity to identify overlapping efforts. The 1-minute presentations by the committee chairs will begin at the next Senate meeting on September 23.

The final charges for each committee will be sent out by email tomorrow. David asked that senators to review their own committee charges as well as the charges for the other committees. The charges will also be published on the Faculty Senate website.

VII. Update on Motion # XXIII-M18 on using MyElements as a platform for Faculty Activity Reporting
David gave an overview of the motion that was passed last spring giving MyElements one last chance as the vehicle for which the faculty must submit their faculty activity report (FAR). The motion calls upon the agenda committee to conduct a survey of all department chairs, deans, and senators asking for their feedback on the success of the MyElements platform as platform for submitting FAR. David asked that senators discuss the survey questions with their colleagues and submit a synthesized summary of these views in the survey. (Note: the decision was made at a later date to distribute the survey to each individual faculty member.)

The Agenda Committee and the Information Technology Committee will review the results and, if warranted, will bring a motion to the floor about whether MyElements is the appropriate platform for faculty activity reporting.

Scott Smith shared some additional background on this topic. MyElements was purchased by the Research Office many years ago in order to promote what we do as a public facing operation. It is where FindScholars and our website information comes from. It started as publication and research platform with only 4% use by faculty. It was a good option for publicizing the work of UNH faculty, but faculty were not using it. On the faculty activity reporting side, we were using a different system which was not as cumbersome but was problematic. In order to ensure that MyElements was used by as many faculty as possible, the decision was made to overlay the FAR on to MyElements. So, in summary, MyElements is

useful, but whether this is what we should be using to talk about our careers year after year, that is a different question.

Erin Sharp added that one of the concerns when UNH was working toward the Research I indicator was that faculty research information was not in one place. As a result, it was hurting UNH's efforts in being classified as a Research I university. We need to be careful about the two separate goals. Using MyElements without the purpose of faculty activity reporting will still require that faculty log in to MyElements to verify and confirm their publications.

In connection with the goal of collecting survey responses, Jim Connell pointed out that we are a representative body and that it is important for senators to have conversations with their departments. Jim shared that in his department "news from the senate" is an item on every faculty meeting agenda.

David added that one of the traditional weaknesses of the Senate has been the sense of disassociation among the faculty members from the Senate, but he thinks this has changed significantly over the past 5 or 10 years. Do consider that you are representing your colleagues and it is important to have regular and continuous communication with your colleagues to learn what their concerns are. These concerns can often lead to the assignment of an issue for a committee to undertake.

David explained that the results of the MyElements FAR survey will be reviewed by the ITC and the Agenda Committee, followed by a shared report to the Senate.

VIII. Conversation with Scott Smith, Chair, Discovery Review Committee - Scott explained that in 2009 the university shifted, after many years of discussion and debate, from a general education requirement to the Discovery Program. The Discovery Program added several elements to our general education requirements including a very short-lived desire to have freshmen seminars of a certain size as well as a capstone and a university dialogue. The 2009 Discovery Program was approved by the Faculty Senate and the provost implemented it in various stages. The program came with a mandatory 5-year review which arrived in 2014 and a Discovery Review Committee (DRC) was formed. The DRC was given charges by the provost and the chair of the senate at the time. The Academic Affairs Committee in 2015 spent the year discussing the recommendations of the DRC report. Although we are not mandated to have a second 5-year review, the provost and the Agenda Committee agreed that it made sense for us to take a look at the Discovery Program again. The Agenda Committee, the provost, and Vasu jointly created the charges for the current DRC (See Appendix VIII.1)

Scott explained that one of the main questions he faces as he shepherds this process is whether the faculty has the will to make substantive changes to a program that took 10 years to talk about and get implemented. If we do want to make some changes, do we have the will to do it, realizing that there might be repercussions in certain programs and departments because of the decisions that we make?

The upcoming convocation allows us to open a discussion about what general education means and what is the reason for having a core set of requirements at a modern university. National and university narratives are emphasizing the professional and vocational aspects and return on investments is a very large part of the discussion about what it is we do here and why we are doing it. So, how does that relate to the strategic priority about increasing academic excellence? What does the general education program mean in today's educational climate?

Scott shared that during the last review of the Discovery Program he read 6,842 responses by students and faculty which were gathered about the program. One of the continuous themes was that the general education program is too burdensome for our students. Many students made the claim that it was another

way for administration to get a year's tuition out of them and they were angry about it. What they are saying and what is stated repeatedly is that it is the major that matters. As well, the name "Discovery" created confusion because we haven't really communicated what it is. In some cases, we as faculty don't necessarily agree on what our core education should be. So, it is exciting to be able to have a faculty-wide conversation at the convocation and here in the Faculty Senate and maybe in your departments about what it is we are doing and why we are doing it.

Scott wondered about the cases of students having difficulty fulfilling their general education requirements. Is it not the case that the majors are overprescribed and that we ought to think about ways to give students more flexibility from that aspect? Maybe it is more about how the core and majors align with each other. Scott offered that he would love to have input from the senators on this question.

Other concerns in reviewing Discovery involve accounting for Discovery seats as it is trickier than it seems. If you take a Psych 401 there is no way for us to separate those people who are taking Psych 401 for a major and those that are taking it as a Discovery requirement. They are mixed together.

In the last Discovery review one of the recommendations was to lower the number of categories that students must take for their general education breadth requirement, but still have them take the same total courses from a reduced number of categories. That was rejected by the AAC and the full senate because, in part, a lot of departments were probably afraid that if we reduce the number of categories, they would lose FTEs or even disappear during difficult times. There was a lot of fear. Scott said that, whatever we decide to do, there will be a need for a lot of faculty buy-in. The most important thing is that we need to have agreement about, at least philosophically, what we are trying to do with any kind of core general education requirement.

Scott explained that the DRC has a representative from each college, except for UNH Law because they do not have undergraduates. (See Appendix VIII.2) Because of the need for some administrative insights the following were invited to be part of the committee: Vasu, Senior Vice Provost; Kim Babbitt, Associate Dean of COLSA and the chair of ASAC; Chuck Zercher, Interim Dean of CEPS; and Andy Colby, Registrar. The administrative burden is going to fall on Amy Oliva of the Discovery Office, and we are grateful for her help

The DRC will be meeting every other Friday during the fall semester, beginning September 6. The hopeful goal is to deliver a report in February.

Scott opened the floor for comments and questions:

Allison Wilder: I wonder about charge # 7 which is related to turf battles. Is there going to be a discussion about what appears to be departments being locked down from offering new discovery courses, particularly in the social sciences? Will that be part of the discussion? How can we get new courses into the mix? At this point unless something is archived nothing is going in.

Scott: One of the things you are referencing is the desire not to have a proliferation of Discovery categories with a lot of empty seats. I know there is a lot of contention about this. I also think that stymieing innovation in cool courses is a bad idea. We ought to be embracing them. To back up, # 7 is controversial but it remains on there because of the difficulty of negotiating this whole process. There were people who said don't put # 7 in. But the Agenda Committee and the provost felt it should stay. I don't want this to dominate and to be a primary consideration. No matter what general education program is considered it should not be based on practicalities. Instead, it should be based on what we believe is best for our students at our university. So, [charge #7] is a subsidiary or even tertiary concern for the

committee. But there is a lot to be discussed about who owns Discovery. Is it arts and sciences because that is the way we frame it? Are there ways for other colleges to contribute? I think we have to say yes. How much that is I don't know. I won't speak for the committee. There is nothing more controversial on this campus than Discovery seats – except maybe the scoreboard when it came out.

Erin Sharp - Have you thought about how you can really address core curriculum that works well for our students vs. RCM? Is the goal to keep all the practical pieces out of it and come up with a plan that is most meaningful to our current students?

Scott: RCM is also controversial. Provost Jones has said specifically that he does not want RCM practicalities to be at all a consideration. I hope this is true, having seen the last implementation of Discovery that ran into fiscal problems with the first-year seminar. But I don't think we ought to, as a unit, think differently about what we want because of what we can get. I think we ought to at least first fill out the ideal and then accept what is possible out of the ideal.

Jim Connell: Just a comment from being on the previous DRC. The Agenda Committee at the time specifically outlawed the discussion of the practicalities. As soon as the report came out everyone blamed the committee for ignoring that. It is important that it, at least, be on their agenda.

My other comment is that the idea of RCM is to provide incentives. When we are providing incentives that are opposite of our goals, RCM has a problem.

Stephen Pimpare - One of my critiques of the president's strategic plan is that it looks like the kind of plan you would see from any incoming president coming into any university at any time in the last 20, 30, 40, 50 years. We are in an unusual moment in American higher education and the tumult that we are seeing. I think we are at the cutting edge of it. We are going to see landscapes shifting. So, I am worried that when we talk about "our students" we are operating under a presumption that our students today are going to be our students tomorrow, our students in 10 years, and our students in 20 years. From my viewpoint, part of the challenge that I'm not sure the university is confronting is where are our students going to be coming from now, 10 or 20 years from now and how are we putting together that long term strategic thinking. Does that make it different when we think about: What does an education look like? what are those students? Why are they coming here? Why are they coming here rather than of other places? How can we anticipate those shifts and create an educational experience that is responsible for that while keeping in mind the practical considerations? It would be foolish not to.

Scott - 20 years ago would you have predicted where we are today? If we are trying to predict what is happening in 20 years, we may miss the mark.

Stephen Pimpare - Sort of. I was just out of graduate school and confronting an entirely different job market than my advisor had confronted. And I am still here 20 years later in a non-tenure track line. Some of that I could sort of see coming down the pike. Can we anticipate, can we look at different rapid changes that we know are taking place? I know that SNHU has all kinds of internal data and they spend a boat load of money trying to project what is happening to American higher education. Whatever they are, they are good at data collection and good at thinking about what their market is going to look like in the future. It feels like we need to do some of that.

David Bachrach - I know that the provost and Vasu are heavily involved in looking at that. Everything you said would not be a surprise to them. Insofar as SNHU, we have this kind of this research as well. The broader question we must ask is: Is it the students who determine what a university education should be or is it we who determine what a university education should be and we who decide what our students

should know? That is part of the conversation that we as a faculty will have over the course of the year. I don't want to prejudice the discussion but before we say that we can't plan a university education in a core curriculum we need to have that conversation about what we as a faculty think that a university education and a core curriculum are.

Scott: In terms of # 8, I have continually bristled at the notion that the only thing we should care about is what other institutions are doing and finding out what they are doing and implementing it. The Discovery Program was kind of the rage in the late 90s. There is no other university that has a full discovery program except the University of Illinois which has vestiges of it now. I am not concerned about looking elsewhere for what to do at UNH.

Erin Sharp: I am not an expert in higher education, but I do study adolescent development and transition to adulthood. I would say that Victoria Dutcher, our former enrollment manager, felt that UNH was not appreciating how higher education was changing. I would push back and still push back. It is something I value about our current administration. Yes, there are students who want to go online and there are a growing number of non-traditional students. But there is also going to be a need forever for traditional higher education. Young people are not transitioning to adulthood until their mid-to-late 20s. If they don't come to an institution of higher education with a residential campus, then some of them are in their parents' basement from ages 18 to 28. The transition to adulthood is taking much longer and young people are building in gap years before they even go to college so there is a lot of desire to extend the time that they are exploring and learning. I think that there are plenty of people that SNHU captures. They also don't graduate their students. I appreciate that our university has pushed back against that goal to say American higher education is no longer going to look like it does now. That is my opinion. But UNH has to know who it is and who it serves.

Alex Holznienkemper - Do you think the committee will be able to upload a couple of documents for those of us who are newer to UNH to allow us to look at the history from 10 years ago to get an idea of where we are coming from?

Scott: We can work towards that. There are a lot of documents. One place you might start is to read the 1999 to 2009 Faculty Senate minutes. Almost every single meeting during that time frame had mention of Discovery. I will work with Nicky Gullace and Amy Oliva to come up with a primer to Discovery. I think that is important. What I find difficult to navigate is the fact that we spend a lot of time on the Discovery program and in 10 years that is something to consider. I ask all of you when you go back to your departments to talk to your colleagues. To what degree do we have the stamina to do something more substantial? We can tweak and it probably won't affect the water. But if we do something substantial, we may find the boat listing about in a way that we aren't expecting. We need to take stock of how much will we have to do this, what it means, and what are we willing to compromise.

I did a study of the majors on campus. I understand that the engineering programs have ABET standards that have to be met. But, upwards of 98 out of 128 credits for a major seems to me a little bit excessive. So, we have surveyed the deans and the chairs to ask them whether their students would be somehow disadvantaged if the major requirements were reduced by a couple of classes. It is worth looking at the relationship between the core education and the actual major classes that students are taking. RCM has the poisonous result of incentivizing more and more classes in the same college. I want to make sure that that is for a good reason, so students aren't being disadvantaged and that they have more chances to take a weird class in some other college. I think that is something beneficial.

Adele Marone - There are some separately accredited programs in the university that have requirements that have to be met with their accreditors. And those are the programs that have the most difficulty in meeting the Discovery requirements. Any additional requirements would overburden those students.

Scott - I agree and this is one of the questions we had for the deans and chairs. Very few people want to increase the number of discovery classes. I suspect that there will be a recommendation for the number to go down. We are looking at innovative ways for combining classes in creative ways to make it less problematic. That still doesn't solve the problem of whether we want our students to do things that are not in their major or general education and just take electives. I want to think about those.

Jim Ramsay: Last year the Academic Program Committee we talked a lot about this because one of our charges was to figure out what it means to be a UNH student. And we figured that the Discovery program was a primary mechanism by which we could instill what it means to be UNH, to the degree that there is some sustainability or even commonality across Discovery so that everyone who graduates from UNH has some sort of stamp on them in terms of how they think, and their knowledge skills and abilities and their world view or something. I am curious when you go through the review this year, it might be helpful to address the question, "What do we think we are giving students?" The responses you got are generated because, I think, students don't know what they get out of this and they have massively disparate experiences because we have so many classes attending to the same general education categories. One solution, I am thinking, is that it might be interesting if we assess our Discovery program and we have a common set of student learning outcomes. Across each of the categories we can look at the degree to which the student learning outcomes are actually being accomplished. If those outcomes operationalize what we want a UNH education to be then we can assess the degree to which they are occurring. This might make it easier for us to address whether and to what degree we are actually doing what we need to be doing.

Scott: The learning outcomes expected by each category have just been published on the Discovery website. Also, I know that Nicky Gullace reviews every syllabus for appropriateness. But I take your comment, in general, to heart, to think about "Are we delivering what we are saying we are delivering and how are we delivering it?"

David Feldman: I want to say that the only Discovery course I know intimately is the course I teach myself, but from advising I worry about academic standards in Discovery courses. There is a combination of turf battles and RCM that may incentivize professors to offer the easiest course to get the biggest enrollment. I don't think you can police something on the basis of the syllabus I think you need to talk to the students. I don't know what the mechanism would be.

Scott: This is a known problem. There are departments that are rightfully scared for their existence and to a certain extent there is an arms race to get more students. If we want to change Discovery, we must realize that we are fundamentally changing enrollment patterns and that is a frightful thing. I do think that addressing that problem carries with it a very great risk of intervention into the academic freedom of a classroom. So, I am reluctant to go and look at evaluations for rigor and so on. I don't know how you measure that. That is something that we need to address. There needs to be a lot of conversation about how to address this without destroying academic freedom. I'm looking forward to having a lot more conversations.

David - This is a topic worthy of a year long discussion and one in which the faculty senate must play a leading role along with the DRC.

IX. New Business - There was no new business

X. Adjournment - The meeting was adjourned at 4:46 PM.

Common UNH acronyms

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

Continue for Appendices

APPENDIX I.1
Slides from President Dean's remarks



University of
New Hampshire

Faculty Senate Presentation

James W. Dean, Jr.
UNH President
August 26, 2019


Session
Overview

- Importance of Faculty Senate
- Update on strategic priorities and initiatives
- Discussion



Faculty
Senate

- An important component of university governance
- Key partner of the president's leadership team
 - Very strong collaboration
- Plays a crucial role in pursuing our strategic priorities
- THANK YOU!



Strategic
Priorities:
Background

- All university constituencies contributed to the plan
- Faculty Senate leadership played a central role in deliberations
- Priorities announced January 2019
- *Our aspiration is to be among the top 25 public universities on the most important indicators of academic performance*








Strategic Priorities

- Enhance student success and well-being
- Expand academic excellence
- Embrace New Hampshire
- Build financial strength

<https://www.unh.edu/main/future-of-unh>



Sample of Current Strategic Initiatives

- Extensive efforts toward student retention and graduation 
- Redesign of core curriculum 
- Re-envisioning the Honors Program as an Honors College 
- Extensive engagement in NH high schools 
- Deep dive on revenue and cost structure of university 
- Strategic funding pool and investments



Discussion

- What do you want me to know?
- What do you want to know from me?



APPENDIX VIII.1

Discovery Review Committee Charges

- 1) Investigate ways the Discovery Program can become more manageable for students in highly structured pre-Professional majors.
- 2) Investigate ways the Discovery Program can develop the flexibility to allow Transfer Students to achieve their degrees in a timely fashion.
- 3) Investigate the First Year experience at UNH to achieve academic and community engagement through interdisciplinary Discovery offerings.

- 4) Investigate ways to encourage High Impact practices (such as Study Abroad and Internships) by aligning the transfer and assessment of credits with the goal of encouraging, rather than deterring, students who wish to take advantage of these enriching opportunities.
- 5) Investigate ways Discovery can accommodate qualified students who wish to fulfill distributive requirements in upper division courses, possibly as part of a Minor or Cognate cluster and/or through a deeper understanding of a content area or category (depth).
- 6) Investigate the possibility of incorporating Ethical Attributes (such as Diversity, Civic Education, and Sustainability) that are politically, socially, and culturally inclusive.
- 7) Review the concerns about Discovery delivery by colleges and “turf” battles over Discovery courses.
- 8) Tasks 1–7 should be carried out in concert with a review of the best practices and successful strategies adopted by other universities, especially our comparators.

APPENDIX VIII.2

Discovery Review Committee Members

Scott Smith, Chair: COLA
William Stine (PSYC): COLA (Social Sciences)
Sajay Arthanat (OT): HHS
Devkamal Dutta (Bus. Admin): PAUL
Melinda Negron Gonzales (Poli Sci): UNH-M
Jesse Morrell (ANFS): COLSA
Nicoletta Gullace (Hist): COLA
Kathrine Aydelott: Library
Arthur Greenberg (Chem.): CEPS

Members, Non-Voting

Vasu (Sr. VP Academic Affairs)
Kim Babbitt (Associate Dean, COLSA)
Chuck Zercher (Interim Dean, CEPS)
Andrew Colby (Registrar’s Office)

Administrative Support:

Amy Oliva (Discovery Program Office)