

University of New Hampshire

University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository

Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes

Faculty Senate Documents

1-28-2019

2018-19 FACULTY SENATE XXIII - January 28, 2019 Minutes Summary

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "2018-19 FACULTY SENATE XXIII - January 28, 2019 Minutes Summary" (2019). *Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes*. 143.

https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty_senate_agendas_minutes/143

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
2018-19 FACULTY SENATE XXIII

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 January 28, 2019

MINUTES SUMMARY

I. Roll – The following senators were absent: Bedker, Gass, Guerdat, Hemstock, Innis, Khanlari, Knowles, Merenda, Neefus, Reardon, Schefer, Simos, Subrena Smith, Tucker. The following senators were excused: Akiyama, Finkelhor, Scherr. The following guests attended: Wayne Jones, Nicky Gullace, Tom Kelly, and Shari Robinson

II. Remarks by and questions to the provost: Provost Wayne Jones shared that two dean searches (COLA and Graduate School) are up and running. A new search will kick off this week for the position of Senior Vice Provost for Research and this will be run by a national search firm. The search committee has not been built yet.

Financial overview:

The provost apologized that Chris Clement, the Vice President for Finance and Administration, was not able to join him in this presentation on UNH Finances. Chris is working with the Board of Trustees on an issue that has come up.

The provost began his presentation by explaining that when he took on the interim provost position, he faced an imminent financial challenge. He recognized that to survive, he needed to go back to figure out what happened to be sure that it doesn't happen again. The presentation is a little bit of history of UNH finances over the past 5 years, including lessons learned and how we plan to operate going forward.

The following are highlights from the presentation:

Budget problems since 2017

UNH generally budgets conservatively with the result that budgeted revenue is usually below actual and the budgeted expenses are usually above actual. This was true until 2017 when the following factors affected UNH's operating margin (the percentage of net revenue that is in excess of expense):

- The state stopped giving any capital dollars to UNH. For a long time – 20 years prior – the state put in capital dollars, one-time money to help with buildings and renovation. As a result, in the past few years, UNH has paid for the cost of renovations without these state dollars. This created a debt problem because of the System's restriction on debt to reserves ratio.
- UNH faced the beginning of a significant decline in in-state enrollments.
- Tuition discount rates were going up across the nation (more on this later.)
- Pressures from the System to hit a 3% operating margin during the prior two years while Plymouth (PSU) and Keene (KSU) were facing a negative operating margin resulted in a fudge factor being built

into budgets for UNH to hit the operating margin. But the hard work was not done until after those budgets were set. Note: UNH did not and has never transferred money to KSU and PSU. Instead, those schools drew down on their reserves when they were operating in a negative operating margin.

Challenges in accounting for operating margin:

- The System was looking at operating margin across all categories of monies combined. These include a) *E&G, Aux & Int*, which includes tuition, residence hall revenue, Whit Arena revenue, etc. b) *Gifts* c) *Grants* d) *Plant/Capital* and e) *All Other*.
- Normally, in managing a budget, you break these categories apart and deal with them separately. But the System said that they wanted to see it all together.
- The BOT has now accepted that the categories would be looked at separately. This is a big win, especially in looking at Gifts and Grants separately.
- If we only look *E&G, Aux & Int* we have an operating margin of 14.1% for FY 2018.

Headwinds from Fiscal Year 2018:

- The growth in expenses exceeded revenue growth. Revenues grew by \$13.1 million due to growth in undergraduate and graduate net tuition and other student fees as well as an increase in non-capital gifts and other sources. But, the growth in operating expenses rose by \$3 or 4 million more than revenue growth. So, this put us in a negative position.
- Why are expenses going up faster?
 - The bulk is due to employee compensation
 - Supplies and services went up a little bit
 - Energy costs went up a little bit.
 - The biggest factor is the undergraduate discount rate. Last year we had a net increase in financial aid of \$10 million which translates to a 29.7% discount rate. This year it is 30.5% and it is projected to hit 31% next year. Our peers in public higher education are close to 40% and the private sector is 50 to 60%. This is the most significant headwind.

About Fiscal Year 2019:

- Provost Jones faced a FY 2019 budget in his first days on the job that had a \$32 million shortfall to reach a 3% operating margin. He had had 4 days to fix it.
- How did this happen? The System office asked for 11 budget projections last year. Every projection consumes the time of Deans, BSC and other directors, and uses hundreds of hours of people time in the financial affairs office. As a result, there was no time to work on FY 19.
- There was a threat that if the budget wasn't fixed the BOT was going to come in, as they did at KSC two years ago, and tell UNH which departments or colleges to close.

- How did it get fixed?

- The deans and the BSCs had already done much work on the issue. They reviewed their estimates to give more likely numbers instead of very conservative numbers.
- The estimates were changed to reflect an increase in undergraduate net tuition to be achieved through retention efforts and by changing the discount rate to reflect one that was better than expected.
- Revenue estimates were increased for professional master's programs
- The goal for non-capital gifts was increased by \$1 million.
- Supplies and employee compensation were looked at.
- All open positions were frozen. But Deans and RCM directors were given more latitude to work with their budgets as they wanted to work toward their mission. For example, they could move supply dollars to personnel or personnel dollars to travel money.
- In working to resolve this budget issue there was an agreement to these core ideas: 1) Try to protect raises so that our PAT and other non-unionized employees have the same raises that unionized employees had. 2) Try to put decision making back in the hands of the folks who are involved. 3) Try not to furlough anybody.

Where are we now with Fiscal year 19?

- We are still working toward a 3% operating margin.
- We have to keep watching all those extra revenues that were added to the budget.
- We have to continually watch our expenses and be cautious in terms of hiring.
- At this time, we are behind in meeting our operating margin by approx. \$8 million. Some explanations for this are:
 - Transfer student enrollment numbers are way down.
 - Undergraduate enrollment for the first-time/full-time freshman is about flat.
 - International student enrollment was much lower than expected. The forecast was for 200 and we had no more than 20.
 - Graduate school revenue is up, almost exactly what we predicted it would be.
 - Our research numbers are good.
 - We are seeing lower costs than expected for post-retirement benefits.
 - We are not out of the woods and we don't suddenly have extra money to invest.

What did we learn?

1) We have to start planning earlier in the process. The process of building projections for FY 20 began in August and there are revenue projections in place now. We are going out to talk to your units about where, if we made some investments, could we generate more revenue, whether it be programmatic or in some other way?

- 2) We need to get better at revenue projections. We have to get better at projecting based on the number of students we have and based on what we are seeing in terms of yield to identify realistic numbers.
- 3) We have to get out and do these conversations so that the community knows what we are doing so that they recognize that we are in this together and we welcome ideas as to how we might be able to engage.
- 4) We have to build trust with the BOT so that they will accept real numbers, not budget plugs.
- 5) We need to look at ways to coordinate and adjust the way we are doing business so that it matches the model we are in today. Like every other higher education institution, we are very good at creating new things but not very good at stopping things.
- 6) We want to try to spend more of our restricted gift dollars for financial aid where we can instead of unrestricted funds. This doesn't affect our operating margin and it positively affects our debt ratio and provides more flexibility.

Questions:

Erin: I really appreciate this, and I say thank you for treating the faculty like adults in the room and giving us all his info.

Drew Conroy: I saw this presentation in the COLSA Dean's executive meeting. You mentioned the borrowing money that was done a number of years ago to upgrade buildings and facilities. Was that initiated by the last president or had that been the history of UNH for capital projects paid for with solid dollars from the state. Was the borrowing thing a one-time thing, a thing under the last president, and does that continue?

Wayne: That is a wonderful question. I don't know of any flagship university in the country that doesn't do borrowing against their reserves in a similar capacity. There are 3 different types of borrowing that occurs 1) In NH there is one group called HEFA bonds which are mostly for residence halls and things like that. This kind of bond is linked to a revenue stream, the students that are paying rent for that space. 2) bonded dollars where the state backs the bonds. They did that for many years and 3) borrowing against ourselves internally. We are directly saying to a lender we have \$100 million reserves and we need \$30 million to do this building. Will you give us the 30 and we will secure it with our reserves. That gives us a really good interest rate.

The difference in the last one or two biennia is that we have not had from the state legislature anything to offset it so 100% of those costs were coming from us. A couple of buildings make my point. If you go back to look at the renovations of Kingsbury and Parsons, 80% of that was state dollars and 20% was from borrowing internally or gifts from alums. If you look forward at Gregg Hall and the Chase Ocean Engineering lab - for Gregg, there was only about 20% state money and the rest was borrowing or gift. The Chase renovation is 100% gift and then Ham Smith which was supposed to have some state support, but it didn't materialize, and we did it 100% as a loan. So, the shift has been how much has been borrowing and how much from the state. And this year we are being exceptionally proactive with the state and we are getting very positive feedback. There have been some announcements from the governor about the biosciences and the health sciences initiatives and we are hearing from friends in the state legislature and talking to them a lot more and that helps. We are hearing positive things. So, I'm hopeful that we will

have a good biennium this year and that we will continue to do those things, but we won't have to borrow as much of our own dollars. Instead, leverage the state's resources.

Allison Wilder (RMP) – You spoke last semester about students with accommodation needs were going to be served in a particular area on campus and this was going to be ready by this spring. I received an email saying that I'm still on the hook. Can you speak to that?

Wayne - The space is taking a little longer than we thought. At the moment, we hope to have it done by the first day of class. But it is not. They are telling me it is going to be around 5 more weeks. It will be before the end of the semester. But it is taking 5 to 8 weeks longer than we had hoped. It is merely a construction delay and there is no change in policy or what I said we were going to do. It is just taking longer than expected.

III. Remarks by and questions to the chair

- The chair, Scott Smith, welcomed senators back from break for the first meeting of the new semester. He also welcomed new proxies for senators on leave this semester, Art Greenberg, Rosemary Caron, and Lu Yan. In a review of best practices for Senate meetings, the chair reminded senators to use the microphone when speaking and to be wary of excessive wordsmithing as this can sometimes lead to excruciating delays.

- Scott reminded senators that President Dean gave his state of the university address last week which focused on a strategic plan for the coming years. Scott, along with David Bachrach and Erin Sharp participated in the president's strategic planning retreat in December, spending approximately 12 hours in a pretty intense process. Scott shared that he was pleased that faculty voices were heard and listened to and he feels that they got a very fair shake in every way shape or form. An important theme, of "academics first" came through in the President's talk on Thursday.

- Many senators have expressed concern about the Amorous Relationship Policy - The Agenda Committee has been working with the provost and president to ensure that our concerns have been sent to the Board of Trustees (BOT). As well, Scott met with the chancellor, Todd Leach, on Friday and he assured Scott that the board is going to take this up again in February or March. The Agenda Committee will be monitoring that very closely. The Agenda Committee is also working to prepare a motion so that we might encourage them to go in the direction that we think they ought to go. Any further concerns about the policy should be shared with Scott.

- Unlike last semester, we will not be collecting donations for Cornucopia food pantry this semester due to logistical issues with senators carrying food to the meetings in winter weather. However, Scott encouraged senators to continue to donate on their own.

- In conjunction with administrative leadership, two different sessions of *Diversity and Inclusion Training* will be offered for faculty on February 21. There is a 30-person cap for each session. An invitation to register will be sent out to faculty senators tomorrow. If seats are available after the registration deadline the training will be opened to all faculty. Scott encouraged senators to attend this training, if possible.

- Scott introduced a new process for improving communication between Senate committees and the Agenda committee. This will also be put in place for Senate representatives on university-wide

committees. A request to complete a brief update form will be sent to all committee chairs. The responses will be shared with the Agenda Committee.

- Office hours for the Senate to meet with the chair will be on Tuesdays from 1 to 3 pm this semester. Drop-ins are welcome. But, making an appointment is a good idea.

IV. Approval of the minutes from December 10, 2018 - It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the December 10, 2018 meeting of the Senate. Corrections were offered in Section I (attendance) and II. The minutes were unanimously approved with 5 abstentions.

V. Update on Start-up Policy - David Bachrach gave an update on the start-up policy but reminded the group that this information has also been shared previously. He explained that for several years, the faculty senate and the office of the provost have worked together to identify an equitable treatment of the question of faculty having a fiduciary role in companies that were based upon patents that were developed by faculty during their service at UNH. After considerable discussion and debate, the faculty senate provisionally accepted a set of rules developed by the provost's office under the leadership of Jan Nisbet, under two conditions.

In a motion passed by the faculty senate on May 7th, 2018, the faculty senate agreed in principle with the proposed policy on conflicts of interest in start-up companies and the policy on management of equity interests in start-up companies but stated that:

1. any such policies must have a majority of faculty as voting members for their committee(s) relating to faculty actions.
2. any such policy must have clear and adequate provisions to protect the interests of existing start-up companies and the faculty and/or staff involved in those companies.

After further discussion with the provost's office, it became clear that the first of these conditions would present a violation of the fiduciary responsibility of the university unless the votes of these committees were to be understood as recommendations rather than have the force of policy themselves. The university accepted the second of these conditions, although did not use the language of "grandfathering"

The agenda committee recommends therefore that the faculty senate affirm the motion made by the Senate in May 2018 taking into account the response of the administrative leadership regarding these two issues.

Jim Connell explained that normally for this type of situation the Senate would endorse the report of the Agenda Committee. But, in this case, the May 2018 motion is posted. Therefore, we are going to handle this in a more formal way with a procedural motion that can be voted on today instead of carried over to the next meeting as follows:

The Faculty Senate endorses the January 28, 2019 report of the Agenda Committee that the *Policy on Management of Equity Interests (11/7/18)* and the *Policy on Conflicts of Interest in Start-Up Companies (11/7/18)* complies with Motion # XXII-M16 on Policies on Start-Up Companies (May 22, 2018) and is therefore accepted under that motion.

Jim noted that the motion reflects two policy documents because the start-up committee of concern is referenced in both of these documents.

The procedural motion was put to a vote and passed with 56 in favor, none opposed, and 2 abstentions.

VI. Discovery Committee motion to remove the moratorium prohibiting Inquiry 444 and Inquiry Attribute courses for online delivery – Nicky Gullace, Discovery Faculty Director, explained that the Discovery Committee is proposing a motion to remove the Faculty Senate moratorium on online inquiry courses. She explained that Inquiry courses, as most know, are small 444 seminars and they were envisioned as something that would be a high-touch format where students and faculty would be face to face. The reason for this motion is that UNH Manchester is planning to launch a very promising new online cybersecurity major. And, because they hope to have an international clientele for this major, they would like to be able to offer Inquiry online. In coming to this decision, the Discovery Committee has had an extensive discussion about this with the committee's Academic Technology representative, Daniel Carchidi. Based on much research, Daniel believes that using best practices, it is possible to create a community online. Facebook, Reddit, and other online communities are becoming more and more prevalent and, increasingly, our students are comfortable communicating in this way. Nicky shared that our most successful online teachers believe that they create more participation in some of their online classes than they do in some of the face-to-face classes where the shyer students recede. For the moment this motion does not extend to Inquiry lab courses because Daniel has not yet done enough research to ensure that a lab course could be delivered online.

Nicky shared the motion as follows:

To remove the 3/18/2013 moratorium (Motion XVII-M12) prohibiting Inquiry 444 and Inquiry Attribute courses from being delivered in an online format, with the exclusion of Inquiry Labs, which must be offered in a classroom format pending further investigation of best practices for delivering Inquiry labs online.”

Lori Hopkins shared a concern about class size and suggested that the motion include a class size cap of 25. Nicky responded that the rules for Inquiry 444 courses already have a 25-student cap. This motion does not change that. If we were to extend this to Inquiry attribute courses, it would have the same rules as attribute courses.

Nicky explained that the Discovery Committee requests that any instructor interested in teaching an online inquiry course must work with Academic Technology. Apparently, there are quite interesting pedagogical ways to create discussion boards and things where there is more interaction than you might expect. We don't, however, expect is that these courses will include Zoom simultaneous meetings. The expectation is that students for many of these 444 courses will be across time zones from one another. But there are devices to have these discussions even if they are not done in a simultaneous manner.

Cristy Beemer asked if these are writing intensive (WI) courses which have a cap of 15 students. She also expressed concern about the amount of work is involved in teaching an online course. Nicky responded that the inquiry 444 would not have to be WI. However, if an Inquiry course is submitted as a WI it would have to be approved by the Discovery committee and it would also have to follow the all the strictures for the online WI where the cap is 15 students.

She explained that UNHM has faculty who are eager to try this. Hopefully, if we get proposals for an online Inquiry course it will come from a faculty member making a case for why they want to do this and

how they will do this. They will be telling us what their technological device for inspiring conversation will be and presumably they will be aware of the amount of work it is going to take.

Harriet Fertik asked if there was a reason for lifting the blanket moratorium across the board for Inquiry courses instead of narrowing it to just programs that anticipate a high number of international remote students. Nicky explained that she doesn't anticipate a flood of people wanting to do online 444s but if the cybersecurity online major is a success it is possible that other departments and programs may decide to try international online courses. If we lift this now and other people want to innovate in that way, they will be allowed to do so. We don't anticipate UNH turning into a primarily online institution or anything like that. But we do see some opportunities in particular programs that the Discovery committee thought were compelling enough that it would be reasonable to lift this prohibition.

Andrew Coppens asked about the language in the memo that accompanied the motion that says, "it is essential that the faculty consult with AT and Faculty must work with AT to foster an online community." He explained that there are promises around online education and that a community can be fostered. He said that he doesn't question that. But, simply lifting the moratorium doesn't guarantee that it happens. He asked if this language is precise as it could be. Nicky responded that this language is fairly binding because any change of mode as in face to face to online has to come back to the Discovery Committee and the committee includes an Academic Technology representative and this person weighs in anytime that there is a proposal for an online course to make sure that the proposal is consistent with best practices and online pedagogy. So, by putting that language in there we are ensuring that we are not going to offer a 444 online course without any knowledge of how the instructor will change techniques pedagogically. Much of what the Discovery Committee does is enforce rules presented by the Faculty Senate, the Registrar, etc., and this would be a rule that we would enforce to ensure that the pedagogical best practices are in place.

Allison Wilder asked about the statement in the memo associated with the motion about the requirement for a fully compliant online program. She said she doesn't know what they are, and it sounds as if we have directed that decision to the provost's office. She asked how that would be handled. Nicky said that Andy Colby from the Registrar's office also sits on the Discovery Committee and he is very concerned that we could approve something without realizing that there are accreditation implications. The provost explained that his office is trying to anticipate desires by departments that want to come forward to offer online courses, we do need to make sure that we are meeting our accreditation requirements. Usually, this is done by ensuring that all of the courses have the same contact hours. We don't achieve that, necessarily, by default in J-term courses. We actually get very close in most cases in summer courses. But we have to be aware of that for every course that is offered in J-term. Every J-term course gets looked at the same way to see if it will meet that requirement or not.

Jim Connell offered a reminder that the Senate will be voting on the highlighted motion only, not the text below it. The text outside the motion doesn't have inherently the weight of the Faculty Senate behind it.

Jim also said that he understands why you would want to offer this motion for Inquiry attribute courses. But he is a little uncomfortable with the Inquiry 444 courses being taught online. His understanding is that it is not absolutely required for the major to have an Inquiry 444 course. He asked if the committee had considered moving a little more slowly and just dealing with the Inquiry Attribute courses to see how it works before tampering with what he thinks of as the crown jewel of the place. Nicky answered that she had made the suggestion to the committee to just authorize Inquiry Attribute courses rather than the 444.

But, after a great deal of discussion, the committee thought is that if we are going to lift it the Inquiry 444 is actually a smaller student number and perhaps that it would work even be better than the Inquiry Attribute courses. She suggested that Jim could offer a friendly amendment to limit this motion to Inquiry Attribute courses only.

Rose Came asked how a fully online course would work if the lab course, a requirement, could not be taught online. Nicky explained that the lab course could be taught online as long as it is not an Inquiry lab. UNH is already offering online lab courses. But the decision was made to prohibit Inquiry labs because they are different from regular labs in that they have to deliver the four attributes of an Inquiry course.

Erin Sharp shared that she teaches online and that she has found amazing engagement in her online classes. She thinks it is great that the Discovery Committee evaluates all of these. She expressed concern that a faculty member who doesn't personally like the idea of teaching online might assume that it can't be done really well. Nicky said that she agrees with this and that her own skepticism about online teaching was reduced greatly after looking at the work of some colleagues in the Education Department who specialize in online pedagogy. There are people who can share their resources with those of us who aren't sure how we would deliver an online course successfully. In fact, the reason we are asking people to reach out to Academic Technology is so that we can share the best knowledge we have on campus about how to run an online course.

This motion will lay over until the next meeting, at which time the discussion may continue.

VII. Student Learning Objectives for Discovery Categories - Nicky Gullace, Discovery Faculty Director, explained that last semester the Discovery Committee approved Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) for the various Discovery categories and these were shared with the Agenda Committee. These SLOs were created because NECHE, the accreditation body, wants to see a demonstrated movement toward creating SLOs for every single course. As well, many other accrediting bodies require SLOs and many of our colleagues use them. A few years ago, Barb White created a set of overarching SLOS for the Discovery Program and we simply broke these down to the most basic SLOs we thought were appropriate for each category. Nicky suggested that the senators share these with their colleagues. They are available on the Discovery Program website. When the time comes sometime in the future when an accrediting body insists that SLOs be included on every syllabus, these may be useful with an instructor adding or deleting as they see fit for their own personal course

Nicky ended her remarks by sharing that the Discovery Committee will be coming forward to the Faculty Senate in the near future about small tweaks in an effort to create a more user-friendly Discovery Program. Right now, we are throwing up all kinds of rules in the way of transfer students and study abroad students, in particular, who are having a very hard time getting courses approved for Discovery because their courses aren't directly similar to or identical to courses we have at UNH. In order to change these rules, we need for the Faculty Senate to create the rules for the Discovery Committee to be a little more lenient. Nicky explained that she will be also be consulting with the Student Senate about this soon.

David Bachrach commented that the provost had just shared earlier in this meeting that a big part of our income gap this past year was related to a decrease in the number of transfer students coming to UNH and that we are putting roadblocks in the way of transfer students coming to UNH by denying them Discovery credits for classes which are Discovery-worthy. David suggested that when Discovery Committee makes

its proposals the Senate should very strongly consider approving them and let the Registrar's Office know that that the faculty welcomes transfer students and doesn't want to keep them out. Nicky said that she agreed.

VIII. RPSC motion on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Special Report

Scott Ollinger (Scott O) explained that the background of this motion goes back to the 2016 Paris Accord. At the time the scientific thinking from the IPCC and a number of other groups was that the worst consequences of climate change could be averted if greenhouse gas emissions were reduced to a level that limited mean global warming to 2 degrees Celsius (2° C). Since that time there have been a number of other assessments and the most recent is the IPCC 2018 report that found that at 2° C there would still be a number of consequences that would be deemed unacceptable by many of us, really catastrophic consequences, some of them, include things like a near total loss of the world's coral reefs. That level of warming would cause a degree of bleaching and ocean acidification that basically, from what we know about coral is that it would cease to exist in the way that we know it without some evolutionary leap that we can't yet foresee. It would also lead to a rise in sea level globally between .3 and .8 meters which would cause near total inundation of some inhabited low-lying islands as well as loss of life among a number of societies that don't have the financial resources to deal with that. These are consequences that are hard for us to get our heads around.

As a result of that assessment, the IPCC has revised its recommendation on a tolerable - not acceptable – level of warming and they think that the worst of these consequences could be averted if we could limit warming for the globe on average to 1.5 ° C. That wouldn't avert those consequences if we just minimize them and reduce them by a marginal degree. For example, the estimate of the amount of coral that would be remaining at 1.5 ° C would be about 20% of the current distribution of coral reef, an 80% decline instead of a 100% decline.

What the IPCC also recommended as part of that report was that it would be possible to limit global warming to a 1.5 °C cap if, globally, greenhouse gas emissions were reduced by a level of 45% using 2010 as a baseline by the year 2030. And, that by the year 2050 the world effectively becomes carbon neutral in that carbon emissions – or greenhouse gas emissions - would either hit zero or be offset by sinks that would offset those emissions. So, we would achieve carbon neutrality at that time.

The UNH Student Senate, it turns out, is aware of this and they have taken this up and are working on a motion that would urge UNH to address this and to make a formal statement that UNH is really committed to taking steps to appreciate the magnitude of this problem and show a real substantial commitment to its part to solve this problem.

Scott O. explained that the subcommittee on Research and Public Service recently met to discuss a draft resolution that was initiated by Tom Kelly, the director of UNH Sustainability Institute, and Tom put together a small group, including himself, Matt Davis, Rose Came, a number of other people from the Sustainability Institute, and a few others.

Scott O. presented the resolution and explained that this allows the Faculty Senate to make a collective statement to the university that we think that this is important enough and we urge the University community to address this:

**DRAFT Faculty Senate Resolution
on the IPCC Special Report**

Whereas, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has issued a Special Report on the impacts of global warming and finds that adverse impacts on human and natural systems are already occurring at the current 1°C of warming and that risks will be much more severe and destructive at 2°C than previously projected and beyond the capacity of our societies to adapt, and

Whereas, the IPCC report recommends limiting global warming to 1.5°C and finds that this goal can be achieved if global greenhouse gas emissions are reduced to a target of 45% below 2010 levels over the next twelve years, and to carbon neutrality by 2050, and

Whereas, UNH has become a national leader in climate action and sustainability and has already developed an aggressive Climate Action Plan (WildCAP) that is on track with near term goals and seeks carbon neutrality by 2100.

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

To urge the community of the University of New Hampshire, including faculty, staff, students and university leadership to collectively commit to adopting the IPCC goals of 45% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions from the 2010 baseline, by 2030, and net-zero emissions by 2050 as part of a revised UNH Climate Action Plan.

To urge the University of New Hampshire to develop and implement a plan to meet these goals through continued coordinated actions among students, staff, faculty, administration and community partners and in a manner that ensures that all members of the university community understand the urgency and importance of the issue, and

To urge the University of New Hampshire community to commit to providing its students with an education that prepares them to respond creatively and effectively to the unprecedented challenges outlined in the report, insuring that they have the skills to contribute to solutions in their professional and civic lives.

Scott O. displayed a slide that showed UNH CO₂ emissions over time and explained that, fortunately, UNH has been a leader in taking action on things like this and we have been tremendously fortunate to have innovative people who have been committed to this all along/ We already have a very aggressive climate action plan. The slide doesn't specifically address the targets that the IPCC has recommended. But it does address different targets at different dates. The current UNH climate action plan is called WildCAP, Wild Climate Action Plan, and it uses 2001 as a baseline instead of 2010 and its plan set a reduction of 50% by 2020 By 2017, we have already achieved a substantial reduction in greenhouse gas emissions since the 2001 baseline. Although we didn't have 2030 as the target date, at the current rate we are actually set to at least meet that or exceed it. But it would be nice to really anchor that and make that statement that we will stay on track at the pace we are going

Where the UNH Climate Action Plan differs from what the IPCC is recommending is that the Climate Action Plan seeks carbon neutrality by 2100. The IPCC now says that we really need to hit that by 2050. And, so the two things that this resolution would do is to urge the university community as a whole, not

just the administration, to agree to form a wise climate action plan that would take these new recommendations by the IPCC into consideration and come up with some way to meet that challenge and make a new set of commitments going forward. UNH is in very good shape to do this.

George Roth asked about whether the measurements include inbounds and outbounds and wondered how faculty travel and other things that are part of the university business are included. Scott O. said those are the most challenging things to hit. One of the reasons we have made such great headway at UNH is because of the facility and infrastructure energy savings and the EcoLine project - which many faculty on campus don't know about. UNH gets approximately 70 or 80% of our electricity power for campus met by methane that is pumped by a nearby landfill. For the on-campus facilities, we are as close to off-the-grid than maybe any other university in the country. Those are big-ticket items that can take a big chunk out of our emissions. The behavioral issues are much more difficult. How we get to work, and how we travel.

David Bachrach asked about the methane transfer. He said that, as he understands it, the vast majority of the state's greenhouse gas emissions was due to the replacement of coal burning technology with methane so the question then becomes, for a further reduction in terms of behavior, what do we look at in terms of lifestyle changes? Are we going to ask our students to not use air conditioning in the summer, not to have heat in the winter, ask our faculty to not use AC in their offices or classrooms, are we going to encourage our faculty to move to Durham so that they don't have to drive? Are we going to encourage faculty to move to smaller homes? These are the lifestyle questions that we have to ask and while we are making sweeping efforts to reduce greenhouse emissions, we have to realize that there is a real human impact for each of us individually involved in these things. Scott O. answer that the best answer he can give is that we don't know yet and this is why we need to stay on this and have a discussion about what are the questions we are going to ask. Currently, it is probably impossible to meet those goals at the moment. We don't know what new technologies will come along. We don't what carbon sequestration options might come along that might allow us to kind of maintain some of the activities. Also, it is important to remember that it is net emissions, not the gross emissions, that are in play.

Tom Kelly, Director of the UNH Sustainability Institute, was invited to come forward to help answer questions. Tom said that, on that particular question, all of the work we have done to both set targets and achieve targets has been done within a framework of sustainability. So, it would never compromise, for example, public health, including AC and heating. He explained that the idea isn't to pit greenhouse gas reductions against environmental conditions that allow us to thrive as a university. Instead, we have to find a way to get over those binary kinds of framings, those dichotomous framings, and that is where we need the whole community coming together to help figure that out. He added that the pathways that the IPCC identifies don't include credit capture and carbon storage that are used. So, there is a whole technological frontier that is opening up that we are going to pursue. We'd love to do it as an entire community. We think we will find ways to make those cuts through some of those technologies.

Jim Connell said that with the fact that if methane is not burned and converted to CO₂ it would be 30 times worse than CO₂. Therefore, burning it for energy is a huge positive and he is surprised that with the EcoLine project UNH is not carbon negative at this point.

Scott O. clarified that he is not an expert on how landfills manage methane. But if you do have a methane emission from a point source like a landfill you can flare it off. If you are not going to turn it into energy you can at least burn it and convert it to CO₂ right away. This can be viewed when driving by a landfill when you see a pipe with flames coming out of it and that is being done to convert it to CO₂ to mitigate

the emissions. But, what UNH is doing is much better because we are burning it and harvesting the energy to offset additional emissions. Tom agreed that this is a huge positive and that is why UNH is so far ahead in terms of our reductions, but it is just not enough.

Drew Conroy said that he appreciates the work that has been done all this time. When students have asked him to calculate his carbon footprint, he found that two trips to Africa offset everything else he does in his life, including his house and car. He pointed out that faculty do a lot of travel. Scott O. pointed out that, for many of us, air travel is a big component of our life and work. Fortunately, at the moment we are not saying that our target is zero net emissions by next year. Tom pointed out that ultimately this is not about individual calculations. It is about systemic calculations so therefore it is about systemic infrastructure and it is about collective norms and practices. But, in fact, UNH has already reduced its emissions from travel during the current cycle we are in. So, it can be done.

This motion will lay over until the next meeting, at which time the discussion may continue.

IX. Conversation with Dr. Shari Robinson from the UNH Psychological Counseling Services (PACS) -

The chair welcomed Shari Robinson to the Senate. In the course of a guessing game, Shari shared information about PACS, and the services offered, as follows:

- PACS is located in Smith Hall, along with other student service groups including CFAR, SAS, and TRIO.
- PACS offer evening hours on Tuesdays and Wednesdays until 7 pm. Initially, hours were offered till 8 pm but due to underutilization, they were cut back to 7 pm.
- PACS offers both individual and group counseling They have grown their group counseling offers quite a bit this year, offering 10 counseling groups. These include an ADHD educational drop-in group, a Walk and Talk group that is a partnership with the Rec Center. As well, there is a partnership with Northeast Passage to offer an experiential group. There is an anxiety management group that is very popular.
- Stress and anxiety is the number one presenting issue at PACS. Shari shared that she has worked at four different counseling centers over 20 years and that trend doesn't change by institution or part of the country.
- Depression is a top 4 issue.
- Sleep hygiene issues present as a top 3 issue.
- Alcohol is a top 10 issue.
- Over 50% of UNH students who seek counseling are relatively new to mental health. Yet, 1/3 of the students who enter our college enter with ongoing mental health issues. The latest data from NCHA (National Collegiate Health Association) shows that 46% of students entering college have stress or anxiety related issues that are coming from high school or beyond.
- PACS is transitioning to a stepped care model where there might be 9 levels of care. The highest level is psychiatry. But everyone walking in the door will not need to work with a psychiatrist or even with individual counseling or group counseling. Lower levels of care might include self-help

online digital resources. This generation likes digital resources. So, it is easy to refer them to different apps to help them deal with stress management, time management, and sleep hygiene. One of the apps she uses is called CALM.com They have the best bedtime stories!!

- PACS does not have a waitlist! Shari explained that this is a misconception that is important for her to debunk. Since the name change about three years ago, the organization has completely overhauled its clinical services model. When she was hired, she was specifically charged to NOT have a waitlist. But there is a difference between waitlist and wait time. During this past fall semester, the wait time was under 5 business days during the highest peak period. That is 8 days counting the weekend.

PACS is really trying to match the clinical demand day to day and week to week and to make adjustments in real time and in the moment. As a director, Shari emphasizes timely accessibility. If a student has to wait 2 or 3 weeks to access services, we have probably lost that student academically. So, the goal is to get them in quickly within a week for clinical evaluation by a mental health counselor.

Shari made a plea for faculty to invite her to their departments saying that she likes to engage with faculty and to have an opportunity to share information about PACS and debunk some misconceptions about PACS.

Shari spent the last part of her visit talking about the new [UNH Faculty and Staff Helping Students in Distress Guide Fall 2018](#). 1800 copies of this guide were printed a few weeks ago on orange paper in a folder format. As well, digital copies were sent out by email. This guide was designed to be a quick handy reference guide for faculty and staff to refer students to the appropriate resource.

Shari also explained that the office of the Dean of Students is considered a central hub. So, if you still don't know where to refer a student, reach out to Dean Ted Kirkpatrick, or if you think it is a mental health issue, reach out to PACS. There is an on-call clinician available every day, Monday through Friday. Faculty are encouraged to call. If you are observing something with a student, that doesn't seem right, encourage the student to call PACS or you can consult with the on-call clinician to troubleshoot the issue.

When a faculty or staff member calls into PACS about a student the clinician will be able to cross-check the name with client information, formerly or current. Shari also serves on the UNH Behavioral Intervention Team so she can cross-reference with their list as well. The clinician will not be able to share any information back with the faculty or staff member. But it is important to know that some appropriate follow up will be done. In some cases, after troubleshooting, the clinician may ask your help to get the student to PACS. There are urgent same-day appointments every day from 1 to 5 pm. So, if a faculty member walks a student over, they will receive help to get them seen.

Shari asked for questions or suggestions in connection with the guide. Susan Endrizzi remarked that the guide does not address mandatory reporting for sexual assault situations. Shari said that the guide went through many people for review including the office of Donna Marie Sorrentino. There was some language changed in response to feedback. Shari encouraged faculty to report if they are concerned that a student is a survivor of sexual abuse since the most important piece is getting the student connected to the appropriate service. PACS is not a mandatory reporter as it is a confidential setting. Shari also shared that

mandatory reporting seems to create more confusion. Some people don't understand what it means to be "responsible employees." She explained that this wasn't within the scope of this guide. But she suggested that it be kept in mind for the next version.

David Bachrach shared that representatives from CFAR and SAS came to the Senate last semester and explained that one of the big challenges at UNH is the gap when students come from high school to UNH and they leave their support system. He asked what does PACS need to help students bridge that gap so that when they get here, they are not falling into a ditch and they are getting the services they need when they need them. Shari said that she just came from a meeting with the first year retention group at Paul College and they were talking about a way to develop a wellness profile or mental health screening that would be a requirement for all incoming freshmen and transfer students in an effort to identify someone that may have been in counseling previously to help them make referrals or help them with continuity of care so that there is not a disruption to their care. Shari said that right now we don't have the staffing power to accommodate something like this, but she is aware that some of the smaller private schools have every incoming freshman complete a health screening, including a mental health component. A mental health person would then screen those questions. She also shared that the NCAA is now mandating this kind of process for all student-athletes as an early alert system to catch students before they need the services, although it is always left to the student to make the decision about services. Again, this comes back to resources. The PACS staff, with the exception of three people, are 10-month employees because we don't have the summer enrollment to justify staff.

Maryann Clark asked if there was a limit to the number of individual counseling appointments? Shari explained that there is a limit of 8 individual counseling sessions per academic year. But there is no limit to group sessions. Exceptions are made if there are extenuating circumstances like financial or cultural considerations where additional services are granted. But this is done on a case by case basis. Shari explained that If we did not limit our services, we would bottleneck the access and her charge is to keep access open. She said that there is a commitment from the institution to continue to grow our staff. According to our accreditation standards, we have 12 permanent full-time staff. But, for a campus institution of this size, it should really have 15. With 15 permanent staff, the limit for individual counseling could be lifted from 8 to 12 easily. However, it is important to know that, on average, students use only two or three sessions.

X. New business – There was no new business.

XI. Adjournment - The meeting was adjourned at 3:05 p.m.