

University of New Hampshire

## University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository

---

Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes

Faculty Senate Documents

---

11-5-2018

### 2018-19 FACULTY SENATE XXIII - November 5, 2018 Minutes Summary

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty\\_senate\\_agendas\\_minutes](https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty_senate_agendas_minutes)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "2018-19 FACULTY SENATE XXIII - November 5, 2018 Minutes Summary" (2018). *Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes*. 148.

[https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty\\_senate\\_agendas\\_minutes/148](https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty_senate_agendas_minutes/148)

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](mailto: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 3:10 p.m. on November 5, 2018

MINUTES SUMMARY

I. Roll – The following senators were absent: Bauer, Chavez, Coppens, Gass, Innis, Kim, Knezevic, Merenda, Shipe, Subrena Smith, Rigg, Simos, Stracuzzi, Terry, Tucker, Tenczar. Beemer was excused. Poworoznek served as proxy for Ross. P.T. Vasudevan, Daniela Adler, and Michael Shuttic were guests.

II. Remarks by and Questions to Vasu - Vasu shared that he participated in a meeting last week with Mike Shuttic, several associate deans, and Ted Kirkpatrick, the Dean of Students, about the need for testing space for students who have an approved accommodation for taking a supervised exam in a space that is less distracting. Vasu reported that the total number of students enrolled in Student Accessibility Services, as of October 27, is 1327. Students who need extra time or less distraction when taking exams is about 702 students. 11 students require a separate testing environment with individual space.

The first part of a plan for creating testing space is to convert some of the space in the basement of Thompson Hall. This space is already set up with cubicles. Vasu said that there is a SAARC meeting next week and, hopefully, the money will be approved to modify that space for this purpose. The goal is to have the new testing space available at the beginning of the spring semester.

Vasu said that there is also the question about how to accommodate students who need extra time for an exam. He said that there are classrooms available. This will involve a conversation with the Dean of Students and he hopes that they will have something in place soon. The discussions will also address the issue of staffing for these additional testing areas.

Vasu summarized by saying that these conversations are ongoing, and our goal is to find a solution that addresses all of these challenges and problems. He opened the floor to questions:

*Senator:* Is the number of 700 students needing extra time or less distraction up or is it the same?

*Vasu:* That is a good question. I don't know the answer and will need to find out.

*Erin Sharp:* Did your comments suggest that the main work is around those that need quiet environment? Because I am having to schedule the students who need extended time just like those that need a quiet environment.

*Vasu:* That is where the problem is, trying to find these spaces. The whole question then is if we can find classrooms that would be dedicated just for this purpose (for example, additional time needed).

*Jim Connell:* This is a question from my department. Signing up for health insurance – the whole range of items – we are required to do it every year now and a lot of people have been having a horrible time with it. It has been causing a great deal of difficulty, at least for the people in Physics.

*Vasu:* It certainly caused me difficulty. I think this is a new software. I shared my concerns with HR and I would recommend that you and your colleagues do the same. It has been a bit of a challenge.

*Jim -* It has been a challenge and a big time sink and, from what you say, it is not just the Physics Department.

Scott shared a reminder that the deadline for enrollment is November 9th and the enrollment requires the employee to actively enroll. If you miss the enrollment deadline you will be uninsured.

### III. Comments and Questions from the chair

- Scott urged faculty senators to send a message to their colleagues asking them to hold fast on holding scheduled classes during the week of Thanksgiving. He explained that we have created a calendar which gives students and faculty the Wednesday before Thanksgiving off. But in past years we have heard anecdotal evidence that many faculty members and students are taking Monday and Tuesday classes off as well. It would also be helpful to understand how many faculty are cancelling their classes on Monday and Tuesday. We can revisit the topic of giving Wednesday before Thanksgiving off as it is something that the senate has been long studying.

- On November 19th, Scott has scheduled a **day for senators to caucus with their respective deans**. He has asked the deans of all colleges to set aside one hour to meet with the faculty senators from their college to talk about college matters. Detailed information will be sent out when it is available.

- Scott pointed out that next Monday is Veteran's Day so, for some committees, this may result in no meeting between now and the next senate meeting on November 26th. Therefore, if there is a matter that needs to be taken up, especially if it will be on the docket for the next meeting, you may have to work offline or find another meeting time. Scott said that he thinks the college caucus day is an important day and he wants to see if we should continue to hold such meetings in the future.

-There has been a lot of discussion at the Agenda Committee about the new Amorous Relationship Policy. Scott pointed out that one element of the policy results in some undergraduates not being allowed to date other undergraduates. This seems to be a mistake that should have not been left in the policy. There are other issues as well. Wayne Jones has been responsive and has advised that we can take concerns to the USNH Board of Trustees. Scott asked senators to send any specific concerns about the policy to Kathy and him.

- Scott commented that the discussion at the October 15 senate meeting about **Find Scholars @UNH** was exceptionally productive. Terri Winters and Wayne Jones met and agreed to push off the rollout of FindScholars for a month and they agreed to take off some of the problematic metrics that the faculty had issues with. We are going to continue to charge the IT Committee to continue to

look at it. Scott said that he is excited that the collective wisdom of the faculty senate was shared, and that Terri and Wayne were responsive to it.

- Scott reminded all about the “**Two Questions**” survey, the results of which will be used in the administration’s strategic planning session in December. This survey asks for feedback on the goals and aspirations for NH. The survey ends on November 7.

- Scott reviewed that a statement distributed to the university community about the recent shootings in Pittsburgh and Kentucky was signed by President Dean and Provost Jones, along with David and himself, as representatives of the Faculty Senate. The letter was sent out to all parents as well. Scott asked for thoughts about whether the full senate should consider endorsing the statement as well.

Lori responded that she heard a comment from a fellow faculty member that they were upset that nothing was said about the rally for transgender rights that was held at UNH in October. She asked if the faculty want to put out a statement about it.

Chris Reardon remarked that the senate should somehow express to President Dean our thanks for sending a communication to all the students encouraging them to vote in the recent mid-term election. Chris shared that it was a very nice letter that the president did on his own and that we need to support him. Scott said that we can certainly communicate that to the president and the provost in the next meeting.

Erin Sharp shared that since the letter from the president about the violent incidents was signed by Scott and David, there seems to be an implied endorsement by the faculty senate. Scott said that he appreciates that, but he doesn’t want to speak on behalf of the entire senate. He asked for feedback offline if anyone has any strong thoughts about endorsing it or not

IV. Approval of the minutes from October 15, 2018 - It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the October 15, 2018 meeting of the Senate. Corrections were suggested in Items II and VI. Thus adjusted, the minutes were unanimously approved, with 2 abstentions.

V. Update on conditions in the Start-Up Policy motion being met - Scott presented information about *Motion # XXII-M16 on Policies on Start-Up Companies* that was passed in May 2018. The motion provides that the senate agrees in principle to two polices on Start-Up companies but cannot approve them for two reasons.

Scott explained that one of the concerns regarding grandfathering has now been met and satisfies the Agenda Committee.

David Bachrach and Jim Connell explained that the other concern with the policies concerned the composition of the advisory committee for making decisions about start-ups. The senate motion states that the majority of the committee must be faculty. The Provost office is agreeable to this. However, because the committee has a fiduciary responsibility, the role of the faculty can only be advisory. Jim explained that the Agenda committee considers this a reasonable implementation of the terms of the motion. He explained that, procedurally, Marc Sedam is basically waiting for us to get back to him to say that this meets the intent of the motion. If there are no objections today from the senate the

Agenda Committee will ask Marc Sedam to send the actual language of the policy for review. If the Agenda Committee is satisfied, they will bring it back to the senate and ask the senate if it meets the requirements of the motion. This would be a procedural motion. If that motion passes, we can finally, after 3 years, lay this subject to rest.

There were no concerns voiced. Scott advised that we will vote on this at a meeting after we see the policy with the changes.

VI. Discussion and vote on Writing Intensive (WI) designation for online courses - A motion to support the offering of online courses designated as Writing Intensive was introduced at the October 15 meeting. But, due time constraints, the discussion was postponed. . Scott reviewed the background on the moratorium on online WI courses and pointed out that this moratorium prevents any online undergraduate degree program, and this may hamper, for example, UNH Manchester from putting forward an online program. Shelley Mulligan further added that the spirit of WI courses is still there even if it is taught online. The main requirements still must happen, and the discussions are about how much feedback can you give, in terms of passing writing back and forth, and if there are opportunities for reviews. She said that the technology allows us to do these things adequately. The Academic Affairs committee didn't have too much problem with lifting the moratorium.

Jim Connell asked if language could be added that says that this should be revisited in 3 years, specifically to ask the Writing Committee to review it in 3 years and come back to the senate.

Briggs Bailey responded that she understands from Ed Mueller, the director of the Writing Center, that there is a plan in the works for the WC to have a regular process of reviewing WI courses- both online and in person courses. She said that in the past few years practices for online writing intensive teaching have firmed up and gotten better.

Jim Ramsay said that, more generally speaking, our obligations to our regionals accreditors is to assess our general education requirements anyway. Therefore, by virtue of program review and our ongoing assessment obligations, he sees no reason to be redundant with respect to revisiting online WI courses. We should be having this assessment concept with our general education requirements anyway. He remarked that, speaking in favor of the motion, he teaches WI classes right now in his major, and from a practical perspective, the students submit the writing online, he submits the writing to verification check, and he provides the feedback with typing, not on paper and pencil. He shared that he was trained in 1995 at Madison to be a WI instructor and the big take away there was to cap our classes at 17 students. So, he thinks that the cap is a much bigger issue than the format of whether the writing is submitted digitally or in class. He closed his remarks by saying that it is really kind of interesting that, if we don't vote in favor of something like this, we are essentially saying that in 2018 t we don't have any aspirations to have an online undergraduate degree program.

Scott shared that when the moratorium was in place there was a concern that UNH would go fully online and try to compete with SNHU and other larger institutions. He doesn't want this moratorium to be used as an artificial check on online education. But, we need to be very strategic and careful about where we go with online education.

Jim Connell explained that all the ongoing review is great, but, unless we put something in now, the senate is not going to review it again in 3 years. This is more for the senate than for accreditation processes and that sort of thing. We have done it in the past with Discovery.

Marc Hiller suggested that it might more effective or efficient to add that we ask the WC to do a review in X amount of time. Scott expanded on the suggestion with the idea that the WC would do the review and then bring it to the Faculty Senate.

Chris Reardon said that he doesn't have a problem lifting the moratorium. However, he has a problem with the fact that WI courses are not evaluated again after they have been approved. Scott responded that the WC is working to put a review process in place based on a senate motion that passed last year and specifics for this are being worked out.

Jim Connell made a motion for an amendment to the end of the original motion as follows: This policy will be subject to a 3-year review, conducted by the Writing Committee and submitted to the Faculty Senate. The motion was seconded by Marc Hiller and discussion was opened about the amendment.

Jim Ramsay asked what would constitute a review. What sort of things would we be looking for given how we are currently executing and sustaining WI policies and courses? Jim Connell said that this would be similar to how review of the Writing Program as a whole is done but the focus would be on this new area. He explained that it would increase the confidence of some of us if this review were required.

Briggs Bailey expressed concern that this 3 year review requirement is redundant if the WC is, indeed, launching a regular review every 5 year of all WI courses, on and offline. If we were doing something really new it would be good to review it. But, there have been online WI courses taught and grandfathered in and there is a lot of research out there about how it should work.

Scott presented the motion to add this statement to the original motion:

*This policy will be subject to a 3-year review conducted by the Writing Committee and submitted to the Faculty Senate.*

**The motion was then put to a vote. There were 18 votes in favor, 35 votes opposed, and 3 abstentions. The motion to amend, therefore, failed.**

Discussion resumed about the original motion. David Bachrach commented that the university's position is that 3- and 5-week online courses are the exact equivalent of a semester long course. And, by passing this motion we are implicitly calling into question the quality of those January term courses and first and second term summer school courses as equivalent to 8 week long online course and regular semester length courses. He asked if this is the position that the senate wants to take?

Briggs responded that the AAC did discuss this and that there are differences in the kind of skills that can be picked up in 3 weeks. Writing is not one of those skills. It really does take longer to settle in. So, we are not implicitly calling into question the university's support for J-term courses. We simply supported Ed Mueller's research that you really need the 8 weeks to learn how to write better.

Scott presented the motion for a vote:

**3. Rationale:** *In light of the establishment of the 8-week on-line E-UNH calendar, the Writing Committee discussed lifting the moratorium that Writing Intensive (WI) courses not be offered on-line, and only face to face, at the December 2017 meeting. A position statement was then presented March 29, 2018 that would allow WI designated courses to be taught on-line under a set of parameters. The Academic Affairs Committee has reviewed this statement and are in support of the position statement.*

*A primary motivation for lifting the moratorium is to allow for the creation of specifically online degrees, such as Cybersecurity. Whether the university should heavily invest in online degrees is considered a separate matter worth deliberating, but not within the scope of this specific motion.*

**4. Motion:** *The Faculty Senate moves that the moratorium on new on-line Writing Intensive courses be lifted as long as new on-line courses designated as Writing Intensive meet all conditions as described in the attached position statement from Ed Mueller, Director, UNH Writing Programs, March 29, 2018. These conditions are summarized as follows:*

- *Undergraduate online WI courses should primarily offered in an 8-week eUNH semester. They could also be full Fall or Spring semester courses, or 8 and 10 week Summer Session courses. UNH transfer policy allows for 6-week WI courses to address accelerated quarters, which would be the shortest allowable duration for WI online courses.*
- *Class size be capped at 24 students*
- *Courses must conform to established UNH WI courses guidelines which are valid regardless of mode*
- *WI proposals should be generated for new online courses in accordance with established course proposal processes, as well as for existing conventional courses that are migrating to online modes or changing timeframes, per Faculty Senate Motion #XVII-M12.*

**The motion was put to a vote and passed unanimously with 7 abstentions.**

Scott said that he will communicate to Ed Mueller that we would like to see continuous review of all WI courses. Scott also shared that we will have other discussions in the senate about online course.

VII. Conversation with Dani Adler, Director of Center for Academic Resources (CFAR) and Mike Shuttic, Director of Student Accessibility Services (SAS) - Dani shared that she and Mike work on the 2nd floor of Smith Hall and they work with students together. She explained that CFAR works with all undergraduate students at UNH and their work is all about student academic success. CFAR works with students in a wholistic manner taking into account who they are, what their experience is at UNH, what their learning style is, the design of the courses that students are in, what resources

are embedded in the courses, and what faculty expectations are. She explained that they try to help students critically analyze information and not just memorize. Students bring a lot of high school skills with them that don't necessarily work. She said that CFAR is the expert in the most effective and efficient ways to study, including the best ways to take notes in class, how to read that textbook or whatever reader they have, and how to prepare for exams. There is a lot of focus on time management and organization skills.

CFAR uses a peer mentoring model. There are 16 students who work with Dani and they work one on one with students once a week for an hour. The complexity of student needs is much different than what it used to be and thus, the wholistic model they are trying to use with students allows them to better understand what is going on in students' lives. The complexity of what it means to be a student has also changed. It is no longer going to class, taking notes, and doing your reading. Now there are many more resources that students are expected to use. There are over 200 portals on MyUnh.edu. Some faculty use PowerPoint slides, some post them before class, others during class, some post them after class and some don't use them at all. We have Canvas and there are a lot of different places where faculty can populate things into Canvas. Some faculty are using Canvas, and some are not. Some are putting things in places where other faculty are choosing a different way to post. here is no longer the static syllabus environment. There are many portals for homework. Some students must go to 2 or 3 different portals to do their homework. So, there are a lot of moving parts for students.

In connection with executive functioning weaknesses, Dani explained that this deals with the command center of the brain – like the air traffic controller in the airport. You have to be aware of everything that is going on around you. You have to understand that bigger picture and how to enter into that picture. You have to be able to see all of the individual parts and you have to be able to take that whole and break it down. The person with executive functioning weaknesses has problems in the areas of time management and organizational skills. It is about attention, focus, impulsivity, distraction, planning, and sequencing. It is a performance deficit, not necessarily a skill deficit. It is about the ability to enter this kind of environment and keep all the balls in the air to be successful.

Dani explained that many students don't recognize that they have a problem until they get here since teachers and parents are very good at structuring and providing lots of feedback and support and time management for these students. Or, they thought that they had overcome these weaknesses. So, what CFAR is trying to do is work with these students, through an academic coaching model, is better understand and break down these processes with them. Students meet once a week with a peer mentor for one hour. For many this is not enough.

Dani said that some students self-identify to the CFAR office. CFAR works with students that need accommodations to help them register with the Student Accessibility Services. That office then takes over for any accommodations needed.

Mike Shuttic explained that the Student Accessibility Services (SAS) focuses on how we can work to create access. He said that there is a distinction between accessibility and accommodation. Accessibility is what we do to invite as many people as possible to show up unannounced and have their needs met. For example, we don't monitor who uses the curb cuts or the automatic doors. If we did, most of the people here would be restricted from using those things. In the same way – when we start talking about classroom access or policies, practices, and procedures it gets a little



more difficult. We make accommodations because access doesn't exist. And that always puts us in the "chasing after" or retrofitting, doing something outside of what is already established.

Mike pointed out that when we talk about executive function the more we can create consistency, familiarity, and minimizing complexity then the more we are doing to address those issues. This campus, especially for new students, is like going to a different culture, like going to a different country. You don't know what you don't know and what you are accustomed to is different than what the expectations and requirements are here. So, even though we may have the expectation that students come and can figure those things out – they need to advocate for themselves, they need to be inquiring about how to find information, - when the landscape is complex and there is nobody to shepherd or teach then we just compound the impact of the executive function issues.

Mike shared an analogy about driving from state to state. Every state has the same idea of stop signs, shape and color and location. You don't have to think about it. It doesn't require time and energy to think about. If we can create that sense of consistency and familiarity in how Canvas is used, in how we provide accommodations for exams, in captioning of videos, in creating syllabi, and when and where that is available then we take away some of that critical thinking difficulty or confusion that exists for students with executive function issues. Mike explained that this is not just about disability. It also affects first generation students, students who were home-schooled, and students from another culture. This is an issue that impacts everybody to a greater or lesser degree. He said that when we do something due to disability and accommodation the impact is for everybody.

Mike shared that with the motions that will be presented, the things that Dani and he are working on a daily basis, are about how can we make it different. Some things one can do just as a person – the language that one uses, how inviting or not inviting one is, and how one can create the classroom, those are things that a person can do just on their own.

There are some things that are more administrative. For example, if we want all videos captioned, how is that going to happen? Who is going to do it? What is the process? Who is going to pay for it?

We want to make sure that everyone uses Canvas in a similar way. For example, all syllabi go here, all announcements go there. Where students go to find what week to week looks like is consistent so that they don't have to worry about 4 different systems in 4 different classes.

Mike suggested we look at what we can control. What is going to be a more of a meeting of needs from a faculty perspective before getting to an administrative stage where we need a better system to help students and minimize the need for accommodations.

Regarding captioning, Mike pointed out that the questions to think about are: What videos are being used? Why are they being used? What is the intent? Can they be found somewhere where they are already captioned? If not, then we need to caption them. Are we going to only do this for students with hearing disabilities or are we going to do it for all students? If the answer is that we don't know, this is a tough situation when you have a student who does need the videos captioned. For example, with enrollment in November and a semester break there is only a short time before classes begin to arrange captioning. Students also can add/drop, and this adds uncertainty. Mike

said that, on the other hand, if we say that any video that is being used, no matter what, has to be captioned, there is a cost involved. Who is going to do it and what is the process? So, at some level we need to decide how we are going to manage this and just be aware of what the differences are.

Mike said that other technologies to consider are lecture capture and the posting of PowerPoint slides. He said that he recognizes this is tough because sometimes there is abuse and we are caught between mis-uses of technology and effective use of technology. But, as soon as we say in the syllabus “no technology in my class” and there is a student who uses an app on her phone to check her diabetes, or a student who uses a laptop or an iPad to record notes because they can manage it better, then we are either outing the student because we are allowing them to use it or we are restricting a student from being more self-sufficient – which is what we are trying to do. As a result, we create conflict.

Mike explained that when we talk about legal obligations that is the ground floor. Then there is a moral obligation that is outside of the legal obligation. So, institutionally, what is it that we would like to do? What can we do and how do we approach it? He pointed out that what we do creates a culture and certainly makes a difference in what happens and then is pervasive across campus.

Mike and Dani opened the floor to questions:

*Erin Sharp:* I really appreciate the information about CFAR because, I am going to be honest, I didn't realize that I could refer students to CFAR for those kinds of things. So, I am going to make sure that I have some flyers to give out to my students. The other thing is that faculty and instructors are feeling very overburdened at this point. We are teaching larger classes, we have more students to grade, we have less support, and I really try to accommodate and be accessible to my students. But, I think that there is also a question of when it becomes faculty's responsibility to provide those additional resources vs. student service staff. That is a major issue in terms of the amount of responsibility that faculty have now.

*Dani -* I think that your motion has to do with trying to work with students – particularly in connection with students with executive function weaknesses – much earlier on. So, having support in the summer, maybe seeing the Connect program for underrepresented students that come in for a week or 2 weeks before the semester, as well as what would be a more structured support for that first year for students, that is again, not put on you, but is put on the service providers that is supported by faculty, that would be beneficial for students to get more support than what exists. I think when you get into what Mike is talking about there are some much smaller things that faculty can do that probably don't take a lot of time that would be beneficial and there are much bigger things that he is talking about.

*Mike:* Again, I always work on the “what happens if we get sued” perspective. So, what is it that we need to be doing? What are legal obligations and, at the same time, what we can do to minimize the need for accommodations and still maintain the integrity of the course, to the degree, to the institution?

Ultimately, it is an institutional responsibility, how we determine to manage that is internal. The Office of Civil Rights doesn't care. We just need to figure out how to get it done. And the testing center is a big piece of that. I have been here, going on my 4th year, and it has been on my list as

long as I have been here. It isn't faculty responsibility and it is not SAS responsibility. It is UNH responsibility. But, how are we going to manage that because neither of us have the resources independently to make it work efficiently or effectively?

*Scott Smith:* The way I read this consistency issue, for example, Canvas looking similar to help students with executive functioning challenges, so, let's say that I'm a teacher who thinks that the old-fashioned piece of paper syllabus is dominant and I want to use Canvas to not look like anybody else's Canvas and I don't want to use Canvas except for one or two classes and so on. So, in terms of academic freedom if I choose a certain way for my class isn't it going to create some kind of inconsistency and when I think about my large 230 person class - I have a no electronics policy for the very fact that it creates many distractions for people around them - so there are these tensions and I wonder if supporting the executive function challenges motion where we are marshalling all of these resources to try to do a better job at helping students, is there is a risk that our academic freedom might be infringed where we are forced to do things that we were not anticipating. I wonder if you have any thoughts about how that might play out? And, I'll let you answer off line.

*Dani -* I love Syllabi and one of the first things that we do with students is we make them print out and go through it with us. I think there is a need for consistency if you are going to use Canvas, that things are in consistent places, not that you have to use Canvas over a syllabus, but that there is consistent use.

*Scott Smith -* Do you find students who expect Canvas and when you don't do Canvas their brain starts to go a little haywire? I sometimes see that. I'll leave that hanging for a moment.

*Marc Hiller -* I was going to comment—without going into detail—that one of the issues is how there might be more or greater communication between your offices and the faculty wherever there is a course that the student has issues with. One of the experiences that I encountered was a few days before a course was to begin, I noticed that the classroom was changed and the classroom that it was being changed to disengaged or didn't do for the course what the original classroom was going to do. I learned at that point that the classroom may have been changed because of one student needing accommodations. As the course got started and I met with that student extensively I learned that the student did not want the classroom to be changed and there was no need for the classroom to be changed. And things could have gone on as they were originally designed to do. If there had simply been more communication as to what the situation was or what the needs were a lot of that uneasiness could have been alleviated. So, it goes back to more communication. We are all struggling to find extra minutes in the day but if there are issues that involve changing things around, to interact with the faculty member we can figure out what works best for the student, but also not disrupt the class.

*Mike:* I think I remember what the situation is. The biggest part of our difficulty is that there are multiple factors going on. A student's schedule got changed. He didn't request that and I'm not sure why that happens. But, whatever schedule that the student created, when classes started it was different and so things like "I need a certain time and distance to get between classes or a time for a break because of medication or eating food," the student tried to manage that by creating a schedule that worked for them. But, the schedule got changed. And there was a ripple effect. So, we are dealing with housing, with dining, with the bursar, the registrar, and we are dealing with the folks who are in the classrooms. The other thing that I am always cautious about is that students may,

because they don't want to create a problem, will do what they can do to make it work, the best students especially might say, "you don't need to caption it, I can get by." But, we are not asking them. We are creating access. We don't do it any differently than we say who is going to use this building? Should we put an elevator in the building? Or automatic doors on it? Because the student isn't necessarily a good gauge of what they should be doing or could be doing when we are talking about simply access.

*Chris Reardon:* Every time I get a student with an accommodation, obviously, I am extremely concerned and very flexible. Whatever the student needs and whatever the letter is saying, I do it – plus. The question I have is the times that the student gets the accommodation but then starts running into problems. I don't know who to go to because of privacy issues and I don't want to be calling up your office and saying "look, this student is having a problem." But, I just had somebody who just popped up again and I was having constant problems and I didn't know who I should be talking to. Now, in the past, I have one person with multiple personalities and I was constantly going back to one of the offices here. With this student I felt that nobody was there, and I didn't know if I could have a problem legally if I reported that this person is having a problem. Or, is this an issue of privacy? So, often I am passive waiting for the student to come to me and say, "I need help with this." Can you make a comment about this?

*Mike:* Please spread the word. There is no privacy issue in effect when we are talking about a student that we share. The letter came from us. You are coming back to us about those with issues – even under FERPA – our information is FERPA, not HIPAA. So, if there is a need to know, and we are talking about the well-being of the student, then it is appropriate. The amount of information – or the level of information – may be restricted in terms of the level of the disability or the treatment. But, when we are talking about accommodations in the classroom and student's impact and the student is struggling or asking for more than they should be getting, then that is an open conversation. We rely on faculty being in touch with us. Because the letter – you may not have read it as minutely as intended with this particular point – explains that the accommodations are created with respect to the student, which may or may not impact your class. We don't create an accommodation letter for every student for every class for every semester.

*Danielle Pillet-Shore:* Just to clarify, if I have a student or two who have accommodation letters on file with me this semester and then the students are independently are not using that accommodation – because I have been waiting for them to come see me – I am aware and willing to provide it – but if they choose not to activate it or use it for a quiz, for example, is that fine or do I now need to circle back with you? At what point do we shepherd and kind of nanny-state this versus let them lead the charge.

*Mike:* I'll go back to what Dani said at the onset, this is a group of students who oftentimes are coming from a setting where a lot of things are assumed, or other folks do to and for them. So, the idea that "I've done my part and sent the letter and everyone else will gather round to make it go" is not the way it works. So, we say in the information on our website and when we meet with students and when we send the accommodation letters, it is a two-step process. The student initiates sending a letter at whatever point they decide to do that. There is no expectation with regard to accommodation, but there is no deadline. And, then they need to initiate contact to talk about the accommodations. Simply notifying you says "Here I am." But, if we are talking about extended time for an exam, it can't be done until there is that conversation. I don't need to know. But, it is

helpful to know because if I see a pattern - that same student who is sending the letter but not using the accommodations then I am going to call the student and say, "Why do we have this set up? What is it about these courses that this isn't necessary, or you are not following through?"

*Bill Woodward:* I have a large class – over 200 – and about 10% have problems with every quiz – they don't show up for the quiz and they have good reasons. I have been pursuing them because of the retention policies that I heard about – the importance of faculty to reach out. It is a lot of work. I am impressed that they have reasons and I am also astounded that they don't think of contacting me when they miss a quiz. Related to this, my syllabus says that they can drop their lowest quiz. But, I heard from a faculty member recently that Canvas can't do that for us, that you have to go through Excel. I haven't found out the answer to this. Do you have any general thoughts?

*Elsa Upham:* Canvas can be set up so that you can drop the lowest grade that you want.

*Bill Woodward:* Great. Made my day!

VIII. Present motions on student support initiatives: 1) support strategies for students with executive function challenges and 2) support for a test proctoring facility - Harriet Fertik presented the following motions on behalf of the Student Affairs Committee (SAC):

***Student Affairs Committee Motion  
on developing a strategy to address needs of students with executive function challenges***

***Rationale***

*Currently, the University of New Hampshire has a substantial number of students, including those who have ADHD and those who are on the spectrum, who face executive function challenges (EFC). At present, many of these students either do not, or are unable to take advantage of the support systems that are in place at UNH. There are a number of factors that play a role in this disconnect between students in need, and the support services. These include a lack of information about available services, difficulties in transitioning medical support from the home and high school environments to UNH, particularly with respect to medications that help treat EFC, and the internal obstacles faced by students with EFC in organizing their behavior to seek support on campus. Obstacles to student access to necessary support also include a lack of coordination among UNH units, and a cultural barrier at UNH to developing relationships with the families of students with EFC in order to establish cooperative partnerships.*

***Motion***

***The faculty senate urges the administrative leadership to develop a comprehensive strategy to address the academic and social needs of students with executive function challenges that draws upon the expertise all of the relevant stake-holders, including SAS, CFAR, Health and Wellness, and faculty with expertise in these matters. We encourage the administration to think as broadly as possible about this strategy, and to include both incoming students and their families in the period before they matriculate at UNH***

***Student Affairs Committee Motion  
on need for a test proctoring facility and other resources***

***Rationale***

*UNH is currently not fully meeting the needs of the 1300–1400 students who require accommodations in order to progress and excel in their academic work. One pressing need includes better facilities and staff support for students who require specific conditions to complete exams, such as extra time, extra equipment, or freedom from distraction. Faculty members, especially in large courses, routinely encounter difficulties in securing space or administering and proctoring exams outside of class time. Dean Kirkpatrick has been tasked with addressing these challenges. Creating a test proctoring center is a sustainable way to do so. Peer institutions of comparable size (University of Vermont, University of Delaware, etc.) support test proctoring centers and staff to accommodate students who require specific conditions, equipment, and extra time for exams. It will be imperative that this space be designed with a nuanced understanding of the unique challenges confronted by this student population.*

***Motion***

***The faculty senate urges the administrative leadership to address the growing needs for a test proctoring facility, as well as the associated resources needed for all students requiring accommodations. We strongly recommend drawing upon the expertise of the relevant stake-holders, including SAS, CFAR, Health and Wellness, as well as faculty, in meeting the needs of these students.***

Harriet explained that SAC was charged with analyzing and assessing the growing issues around student accommodations and accessibility and that this work has involved discussions with Mike Shuttic and Dani Adler, as well as with Dean of Students, Ted Kirkpatrick.

The first motion addresses the issues from a more wholistic perspective and taking into account the variety of challenges faced by students and the different stakeholders involved. The second motion is more straightforward, advocating for a test proctoring facility. This is not meant to be the end-all and be-all of addressing issues around how faculty are being tasked with meeting the growing needs for accommodations. But, it is one piece of the puzzle.

Discussion followed about the motions. Drew Conroy asked about the phrase in the first motion about a “cultural barrier at UNH.” David Bachrach explained that one of the things that came up clearly in discussions with Ted, Dani, and Mike was about that some students with executive functioning difficulties, up to the time that they arrive at UNH, have relied very much on family support and once they come to UNH we have a culture, appropriately so, that they are adults and they should be on their own and should work out their own needs without advocates. However, for students with executive functioning difficulties that is the equivalent of asking someone without legs to run – without any training or prosthetics - because they have no experience, training, or developmental structure to allow them to do so. So, one of the questions we have as a university is the extent to which we want to use the structure that students used before they came to UNH in helping them to adapt to the culture at UNH.

The motion was laid over until the next meeting.

IX. Present and vote on superseding motion # XX-M33 with the Academic Program Committee added to the list of committees that invites student representatives from the UGS and GSS

Scott presented and explained that the following motion is an update to a 2016 motion. Passing this motion will allow the faculty senate to invite Undergraduate Student Senate and the Graduate Student Senate to each appoint one student to participate in the newly formed Academic Program Committee.

**UNH FACULTY SENATE MOTION**

*on including student representatives on some standing senate committees*

**1. Motion presenters: Scott Smith on behalf of the Agenda Committee**

**2. Dates of Faculty Senate discussion:**

**3. Rationale:** *Committees whose work involves issues which can directly affect students' lives, including Academic Affairs, Academic Program, Student Affairs, and Campus Planning, could benefit from more timely feedback from both undergraduate and graduate students on those issues. The Undergraduate Student Senate, the Graduate Student Senate and the Faculty Senate would all benefit from more fruitful communication between the three governmental bodies. Although students have occasionally had representation on the Student Affairs committee in the past, the practice has not been codified.*

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

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

*This motion supersedes Motion # XX-M33 (May 10, 2016).*

Scott opened the discussion on the motion. There was a short discussion to clarify that this motion was necessary because of the recent creation of the Academic Program Committee.

Because this motion is not substantive it is not necessary to lay it over to the next meeting.

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

X. Campus Planning Committee presentation on SAARC - Danielle Pillet-Shore explained that she was presenting information on behalf of the Campus Planning Committee (CPC) about the Space Allocation, Adaptation and Renewal Committee (SAARC). This is a standing advisory committee to the president of UNH and it oversees the development, assignment, naming and stewardship of all university buildings, grounds, road, and related infrastructure. SAARC voting members during this current year are Chris Clement, Megan Davis, Wayne Jones, Jan Nisbet, Deborah Dutton, Marty

Scarano, and Victoria Dutcher. Danielle shared that she attends the SAARC meetings as a faculty representative, but she does not vote. She is trying to provide communication between what is going on in the SAARC meeting and the Faculty Senate at a critical juncture. She can bring concerns and questions on priorities to the voting members the next time she sees them. The priorities are being sent for campus construction, renovation, repair and maintenance projects in the next fiscal year. SAARC met twice in October and will meet again twice in November to discuss and vote on the funding priorities for the upcoming fiscal year.

She explained that there are three areas of focus for SAARC: Capital Projects Priorities which are funding requests greater than \$3 Million. A copy of this list was sent out with the agenda. But, these are being tabled for discussion until President Dean makes his State of the University address in January. The second item is the Institutional Repairs and Asset Management Priority List. This is handled by Mike Mason, Director of Asset Management, and these are things related to infrastructure, HVAC, building failures, etc. The Asset Management group decides on the priorities.

The third area is the annual space needs and campus improvement requests that was sent out with the agenda. This is where the faculty seem to have the most voice. The current list, sent out with the agenda, is a draft compilation of projects that have been identified by all RCM units across the university. This list is carried over from year to year. But, each year some new items come on and other items are taken off. Over the course of the next 2 SAARC meetings the voting members will be discussing how to rank order this list. Right now, it is listed in order of the unit that made the request and then it will have the priority ranking by that unit. Each year there is funding for approximately \$4 million in expenditures. The decisions are not made based on the number of items, but a dollar amount that they are going to fund. The next SAARC meeting is on November 13th. Daniele asked for faculty to contact her with any requests or information by email about items that should have high priority so that she can try to advocate for those items.

David Finkelhor asked if installing electrical vehicle charging stations on campus is being considered. Danielle said that this would fall under the purview of the Transportation and Policy Committee and that she will bring it up. Tod Guerdat shared that when he first started working here he had an electric car and he spent a lot of time talking to the director of parking and transportation about this. He said that they felt it more fiscally responsible to donate money to the town of Durham for funding several charging places at the public library and didn't feel the need to go further in putting charging stations on campus. Scott suggested that we could consider a motion in connection with this issue if the senate feels that this a good idea.

David Bachrach pointed out that there are a number of buildings on campus without central air and some of the rooms become unbearably hot in the early fall and late spring. He asked if there is any attention in the SAARC meetings for student health and wellness when they are making allocations for retrofitting for fans or air conditioning? Danielle pointed out that the list does contain some specific classroom retrofits and adjustments, including fans. She said that she is happy to ask for these to be prioritized. She explained that she and the undergraduate and graduate student reps on SAARC have been advocating for anything that is common space, specifically classrooms to get funded and, in terms of the dollar amount, those tend to be more modest financial asks. So, she is definitely prioritizing those. Danielle asked that faculty notify her if any of the members have specific experience with hot temperatures in specific classrooms at the beginning of the fall or end of spring.



XI. Introduce request received for resolution on the IPCC report – Scott explained that he is moving this item to the agenda for the November 26th meeting because he has received information that some faculty senators may wish to make a more formal proposal on this topic.

XII. Shared Governance regarding online faculty activity reporting (FAR) - David Bachrach shared that he has done some research on the origins of online faculty reporting. He said that in the fall of 2010 and spring of 2011 there was intensive discussion on the senate floor about online faculty reporting. At that point three colleges already had the system in place – CEPS and CHHS and COLSA. WSBE (now Paul College) was also looking to introduce it at that point. There were many objections raised about online reporting particularly by senators from COLA who were worried about a number of concerns with online reporting not representing their disciplines very well. The upshot was that a number of faculty on the floor made the point that the implementation of online reporting without a formal faculty vote on this issue would constitute a significant breach of faculty governance. When Terri Winters and Dan Innis made their presentations to the faculty senate the online FAR was presented as a pilot project which would be implemented on a minimal basis and then evaluated before being fully implemented. But, there was never a faculty vote to implement online faculty reporting. There are no motions going back to 2011 on this. In 2012 the online FAR with Digital Measures was implemented systematically throughout all the colleges. David explained that, unless he missed something in his research, online FAR represents a breach of shared governance between faculty and administration. Therefore, FindScholar@UNH and all of the fruits of online faculty reporting represent, metaphorically, poisonous fruit from a poisonous tree.

Scott asked whether we should pursue whether or not online FAR has been done without faculty approval even though it has become standard practice. He explained that senator feedback will drive whether we take this up in the Agenda Committee to take it further.

John Gibson said that it is imperfect, although it represents him well. As a member of the IT Committee, he has seen that the Academic Technology group has been responsive about the concerns with it and have improved it in places where the technology does not jibe with the faculty. But, he said that it is another question whether we, as faculty, want the data published to the world online via FindScholars. He said it isn't perfect for everyone. But, let's work to improve it. The ability of FindScholar to present his scholarship to the world is something he has wanted from UNH. The rationale behind the project is to promote the scholarship of the university to elevate public awareness of the research that happens at the university and this is a laudable goal.

Lori pointed out that in presentations about the online faculty reporting there are statements made that it is very popular with faculty. But, she would like to know what other colleges love about it. Is it just a problem with COLA?

Briggs Bailey said that if the faculty had anything to do with approving this we would not have approved the uniform system that covers all these different disciplines. She gave an example of how MyElements frames her work. One year she published a 2-page book review. But, because it was a review of 3 books, the system listed it as three publications. When she published a 300-page

monograph that involved years of research and writing it was listed as one publication. For who is this useful? If faculty had been part of the discussion, there would be different systems of reporting.

Lucy Saylor said that it sounds like this is a particular problem for COLA. She said it has been a nightmare for people in the History Department trying to use the system. The report is so topsy-turvy in the way that it reflects scholarship. She just put together her case to be promotion and what she really loved in the old days where the narratives that showed clearly, very accurately, and fully what had been done. When, in putting together her case, she got to the time period of online reporting the information was not very helpful in capturing her work and scholarship. She said that it is hard to begin to even make a list of the how to fix it.

Scott suggested that we could simply ask the university leadership what the FAR is used for and what are the benefits.

Rose Came from CEPS said that she echoed the concerns expressed. Erin Sharp said that CHHS had an online evaluation form that worked nicely. But, MyElements is not user-friendly and it causes more work to use it. She said that the department chairs are not able to get the kind of reports that they need out of the system. She is not opposed to online reporting. But, we need something that works for us as faculty.

John LaCourse from CEPS said that he agrees with COLA. When he came in 1980 he was able to prepare a reporting in a narrative form and talk about the classes he taught and the changes he wanted to make. The next person that read that report could follow through and make their changes. The new reporting system is very much a bean counting more than trying to get the information. He would suggest that it should be looked at.

Scott suggested that the senators go back to their constituents to get feedback so that the senate can have some data to work with.

The final comment was from Jim Connell. He said that CEPS was one of the first to implement online reporting. We are in the 4th version now. Jim said that each successive version it has been worse.

XIII. New Business – There was no new business.

XIV. Adjournment - Upon a motion and second to adjourn, the group voted to adjourn the meeting at 4:58 p.m.

#### ACRONYMS

<b>AAC</b>	Academic Affairs Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)
<b>AC</b>	Agenda Committee of the Faculty Senate
<b>ASAC</b>	Academic Standards & Advising Committee
<b>APC</b>	Academic Program Committee
<b>AT</b>	Academic Technology
<b>BAC</b>	Budget Advisory Committee
<b>C&amp;PA</b>	Communications & Public Affairs

<b>CCLEAR</b>	Clinical, Contract, Lecturer, Extension, Alternative Security, Research faculty
<b>CEITL</b>	Center for Excellence & Innovation in Teaching & Learning
<b>CPC</b>	Campus Planning Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)
<b>FAC</b>	Finance & Administration Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)
<b>FAR</b>	Faculty Activity Reporting
<b>IRA</b>	Institutional Research and Assessment
<b>IT</b>	Information Technology
<b>ITC</b>	Information Technology Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)
<b>JSMB</b>	Joint Strategic Management Board (Navitas review)
<b>LC</b>	Library Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)
<b>OISS</b>	Office for International Students & Scholars
<b>OS</b>	Operating Staff
<b>PAT</b>	Professional and Technical Staff
<b>PSC</b>	Professional Standards Committee (FS permanent committee)
<b>RPSC</b>	Research & Public Service Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)
<b>SAARC</b>	Space Allocation, Adaption and Renewal Committee
<b>SAC</b>	Student Affairs Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)
<b>SHARPP</b>	Sexual Harassment and Rape Prevention Program
<b>SVPA</b>	Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
<b>UCAPC</b>	University Curriculum & Academic Policies Committee (FS permanent committee)
<b>VPFA</b>	Vice President for Finance and Administration
<b>Discovery</b>	(Faculty Senate permanent committee)