

University of New Hampshire

## University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository

---

Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes

Faculty Senate Documents

---

10-15-2018

### 2018-19 FACULTY SENATE XXIII - October 15, 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 - October 15, 2018 Minutes Summary" (2018). *Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes*. 149.

[https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty\\_senate\\_agendas\\_minutes/149](https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty_senate_agendas_minutes/149)

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 October 15, 2018

MINUTES SUMMARY

I. Roll – The following senators were absent: Akiyama, Gass, Guerdat, Innis, Kim, Knezevic, Rigg, Ross, Scherr, Seal, Shipe, Simos, Theimer, and Tucker. The following senators were excused: Golomski, Onosko, and Smick Attisano.

II. Remarks by and Questions to the Interim Provost, Wayne Jones

a. Wayne shared that the R + 30 (the census fix date) has passed and the administration can now assess where we are with student enrollment. Comparing the results to the aggressive June budget:

- Freshmen enrollment was up about 30 (students) from what had been projected.
- Average SAT score was up by about 5 points
- Percentage of students from the top 10% of their class was also up by a couple of points
- UNH Law numbers were way up. The number of JD admissions was way over what was projected. The Master's Degree enrollment was a little lower.
- UNH Manchester enrollment was up. But since the discount rate increased a little bit the financial result was flat.

Wayne explained that the weakest point in the budget was in Durham as the retention numbers were not as good as was hoped. He said that the work we are doing with the retention teams is well timed. He did point out that the Durham downside was offset by strong graduate program numbers. In particular, the professional Master's efforts which were started last spring is continuing. They were up by approximately 100 students. Right now, we are at our second highest number of graduate students ever at UNH and by January we expect to have the largest graduate class ever.

Wayne shared that, overall, UNH is a little bit negative relative to our June projection but not by a lot and that the results are good news overall.

b. Wayne shared that there are two dean searches kicking off, one for COLA and the other for the Graduate School. Wayne has asked Scott for suggestions for faculty senate representation on the two search committees. Both positions will involve a national search. However, the Graduate School search will use an internal UNH process to save some money. For that search we are also able to take advantage of the council of graduate schools, of which UNH is a member.

c. Wayne expressed his thanks to everyone who came to the convocation and the inauguration ceremonies for the President. He shared that it was a wonderful event and he thought that everyone who was there or who watched it streaming came away with a very positive energy focusing forward. He shared that members of the Board of Trustees were very impressed with the turnout of faculty, with more than 120 participating. Wayne is grateful for the support and he thinks it sends a great message to President Dean.

d. Wayne offered to take questions:

*Erin Sharp:* I am on the sophomore retention committee. Every conversation comes back to drinking and conduct and someone on the committee was saying that the arrest records are sky-high this semester for undergrad students. What are your thoughts on the issue of drinking and conduct? I also serve on conduct hearing panels. What are your thoughts on trying to curb some of that?

*Wayne:* Drinking on campus is not a new issue and has been an issue at UNH for a long time. To be honest, the trends that I see are actually better. You referred to a recent report that said that UNH was in the top 10 for number of arrests. That caught my eye too. I was confused because 6 months ago we were the second safest campus in the country. So, where did that come from? Let me give you an answer to that. The Cleary act requires that we report all arrests and all of our adjudications of student situations. UNH has taken a very hard line on that. So, if there is any question, we take a hard line on enforcement of the law. Which means that the Durham police and the UNH police numbers all roll up together. In this case, yes, we did tick up in terms of numbers of arrests. But, the number of those arrests that turn into a student violation if they go on to something else are actually very, very small. But that is because we are holding the line. If you are stepping a little bit over that line you are going to get arrested here. What we discovered is that there are two levels of data that get reported, some of it is raw data that goes into the system. The raw data doesn't correct for the fact that some of the things you will get arrested for on Main Street in Durham you will not get arrested for in other states. There are some things that we arrest for and other campuses just put the student in the student conduct policy. So, if you take that raw data and, not correcting for state, and not correcting for how the situation is managed by that campus, that is how we wind up being the safest campus. Because when you scrub the data and correct for those things, we look really good. In fact, I think that the arrest numbers that we see are consistent with the size of our campus and what I am very pleased about is that we are sending the message to our students that it is not going to be tolerated.

*Danielle -* Given some of the positive numbers you shared about graduate student enrollment, I was wondering if you might take a moment to share your thoughts on the future of, I dare say, non-professional graduate students here at UNH. I don't like calling them that since they are professional. But I mean MA, MS, and Ph.D. graduate students.

*Wayne:* I'm very interested in the shape of our graduate program, Master's students vs. Ph.D. students vs. MA students vs. special certificate programs, which is a growing market for us. What we see is that the non-thesis Masters' are growing. When I discuss this with the deans one of our goals in growing those program is that we will be able to invest more in our thesis-based Ph.D. and Master's programs. Because frankly, our numbers there are not what they could be or should be to be competitive. So, what I have been trying to focus on - and as deans and I have talked about - is that, for a university of our size and being a Research I university, we should be about 5 master's students to every 1 Ph.D. student. We are closer to 3 to 1 and we have colleges that barely make it to 1 to 1. So, I was excited about that. We have actually doubled down on marketing a little bit. There are some programs that we really want to make a push on because we know there is a market there and we are strong in those areas. Once we have done that we want to move on next year or the year after and target some other programs. So, we are being very purposeful since we don't have enough money to market every program at all times. But we do have enough to be strategic in this

*Lori:* There used to be a push to support programs that had the highest degree possible instead of just an M.A. Are we still continuing with that policy? In other words, if your department had an M.A. and your field had a Ph.D. possible the M.A. was not going to get funding anymore.

*Wayne:* I'm not familiar with that policy. If it existed, ok. But I haven't read it. My own opinion is that I wouldn't see the need for that kind of policy. Instead, I would rather see us making a very strategic decision based on the market and what the demand is. And, the demand in different areas today is different than it was 20 years ago. So, for example, I would want us to do the market analysis and say no, there is a market for the MA and we want to go there. Then, as a department or college we want to reinvest those resources into X.

*Allison:* The professional certificate programs. Are they the same tuition rate as our regular classes? If so, has there been any thought to packaging those or making them more attractive because it is really hard to get professionals in the door at the standard tuition dollar.

*Wayne:* That is a wonderful question. Certificate programs are traditionally not marketed at the same flat rate as the typical graduate course would be. They have different market pressures to bear on them. And, when you are in that domain you are talking about certificates, professional master's degrees without a thesis, you are also competing with a broader range of institutions. At the graduate level, the last time I counted we had 18 different rates, which at the graduate level is ok. But, I think what we need to do is pay attention to each one and make sure we are setting it so that a) it covers our cost and b) it is competitive in the market. And, if we can hit those two things and apply a little bit of marketing to the program to grow it I think that is where we are going to find our opportunities.

e. Wayne shared an explanation about the new Amorous Relationship Policy approved by the Board of Trustees (BOT) that is now USNH policy. He shared that UNH had an amorous relationship policy when he first arrived. But, none of the other campuses in the system had a policy. Although a UNH committee was put together last year to review and tighten up the UNH policy, at some point in the spring the BOTs made a decision that they were going to establish their own policy. The process did include a review of the UNH policy and the draft that was being worked on by the UNH committee. The new policy has some clarifications in that it specifies that relationships between faculty and staff and volunteers with undergraduates is forbidden. This is different since in the past there was a requirement to disclose the conflict if there was a power differential. That still exists that you have to disclose the conflict. There was also some clarification regarding who is involved to declare a power differential.

Scott pointed out that the UNH committee that was looking at the policy last year had only a single faculty member on it, Jim Connell.

Jim Connell pointed out that the difference between what has been approved now and what was discussed in the UNH is that the new policy is extremely broad. Jim said that a 22-year-old groundskeeper or someone working in the kitchen or anything like that can't date an undergraduate and he feels that this is absurd. He also pointed out that there are learning assistants who are undergraduates, some paid and some volunteer, and this would mean that they can't date another undergraduate.

Wayne said that he would agree with that interpretation. But he said that there is the power differential point in the policy. He also said that if the night cleaner that happens to be 22-year-old wants to date a 23-year-old undergraduate, there is no comment in the policy on the age. He agreed that the policy could be cleaned up further. But the core principle is not for that distinct minority.

Jim said, further, that it leaves us now in the position that we have to talk to our learning assistants to find out if any of them are dating other undergraduates and advise them that they can't do that. He said, the way it is written, it is a total ban. Wayne explained that it is a ban on dating and the expectation is that, if that were to occur, they would have to declare it and that it is important to remember that it is not just current relationships but past relationships.

Scott asked if there is a way for concerns to filter their way up to give input as there are some very specific concerns about the policy. Wayne said that, for the record, we would have had the same thing in the last policy. The only difference is that it would have been dealt with as a conflict of interest and the person would have to bring it to our attention.

In closing, Wayne said that he would not be surprised to see another refinement or two as time progresses. But he would be happy to take a list of questions to John Wallin or others and get back to the senate.

## II. Remarks by and questions to the chair

a. Scott shared that he and the vice chair met shortly before the meeting with an IT consultant who has been hired by USNH to interview various employees and groups on all USNH campuses in an effort to identify synergies that will help reduce the cost of providing IT services. The consultant is seeking feedback from UNH faculty about delivery of IT services. Scott proposed that another Qualtrics survey be used for gathering this feedback and asked senators to be on the lookout for this survey. Scott shared that the consultant seemed very experienced and responsive to questions.

In response to a question about why the study was being done, Wayne shared that in the course of the Board of Trustees (BOT) working through budget issues they identified that UNH spends approximately \$6 million for IT services. This sum is approximately 15% higher than what the benchmark would be for an organization with similar revenue. The BOT believes that there is money to be saved. It appears that there may be an opportunity for extensive savings across the university system.

Chris Reardon suggested that it would be useful to have the questions in this survey in advance of the survey distribution to the senators. Jim Connell pointed out that there is an incredible range of computing requirements on this campus, running from word processing to a Cray supercomputer.

David Bachrach pointed out that this USNH effort to study IT services along with the recently approved USNH Amorous Relationship policy, raise the broader issue of shared governance in connection with system decisions. He pointed out that our model of shared governance predates the expansion of the system administration and that we don't actually have a mechanism, as far as he knows, for dealing with issues of shared governance with the administration for the university system. He said that this is something we need to figure out moving forward if the central administration is going to be imposing mandates from above.

b. Scott said that he was very pleased with the number of donations for Cornucopia that were brought to today's meeting. These will be delivered tonight or tomorrow to the pantry at Waysmeet. There will be another collection at the next meeting on November 5th and each meeting afterward.

c. Scott said that he has heard from some faculty that there has been an increase in abusive emails sent to faculty, either internally, from outside, or via an anonymous email service. He would like to hear from the senators if they are receiving abusive emails in an effort to identify whether there is a problem

or not. Scott asked that faculty senators ask their colleagues about this and let him know if they are hearing any concerns.

d. Scott also asked for feedback in connection with the issue that was raised during the “Academics First” discussion about structural obstacles for getting new and innovative things done at UNH. He asked that any specific examples from senators or their colleagues be shared with him so that we can think about addressing this.

III. Approval of the Senate minutes from September 17, Session XXIII - It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the September 17 meeting of Senate Session XXIII. Corrections were offered in Items VI and XI. Thus adjusted, the minutes were unanimously approved with 4 abstentions.

IV. Discussion and vote on Resolution from the Agenda Committee on the Recruitment of International Students - Scott reviewed the motion that was brought before the Senate at the September 17 meeting and invited discussion on it:

*Resolution from Agenda Committee on the Recruitment of International Students*

*WHEREAS, UNH continues to engage new initiatives designed to recruit international students to the University, such as the recent efforts to recruit Chinese Students post-Gaokao exam through a relationship with WholeRen Education Group;*

*WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate is the legislative body that reviews and develops policies concerned with the academic mission of the University, and has a responsibility for shared governance, and must therefore be concerned with any actions that impact the academic mission;*

*THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate reinforces its endorsement of the support structures, outlined by the Agenda Committee in Motion XXIII-M1 Conditional Admission of Post-Gaokao Students, needed to provide for the academic success of international undergraduate students admitted to UNH;*

*BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate urges the UNH Administration to place the academic mission of the University and student success at the forefront of all efforts aimed at increasing international student enrollment;*

*BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate encourages the UNH Administration to seek faculty insight and rely on their expertise early and often in all efforts to increase international student enrollment.*

There were no questions and there was no discussion about the motion.

**The motion was put to a vote and passed, with 60 in favor, 1 opposed, and 1 abstention.**

After the vote, Scott shared that he and David Bacharach have been talking with Victoria Dutcher and Rob McGann about how faculty can have a stronger role in internationalization efforts. She is very interested in bringing us on board. As well, they have gotten information about where they are targeting internationalization efforts. Scott said that a committee will probably be able to look into this and offer further insights. Scott is happy with the response so far and hopes that we can increase our internationalization efforts going forward in the right way.

V. Discussion on Academic Affairs to approve the 2023/2024 calendar. Scott reminded the group that the motion to approve the five-year calendar was presented at the last senate meeting by Shelley Mulligan, chair of the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC):

***Rationale:** In order to maintain an approved five-year Academic Calendar, the AY 23/24 must be reviewed and included as the last year of the five-year Academic calendar.*

***Motion:** The Faculty Senate approves the proposed 2023/24 Academic calendar as provided by the Office of the Registrar (see attachment provided). 2023/34 will be added as the last year of the five-year year calendar which includes the start and end dates for each of 5 terms throughout the calendar years starting from AY 2019/20 through AY 2023/24.*

Scott shared that at the last senate meeting there was concern expressed about St. Patrick's Day falling on the Sunday when students return from Spring Break. In response, Shelley reported that there is no change to the calendar presented. Scott suggested that the senate could vote in the calendar now and revisit the question again based on observations this upcoming spring semester when St. Patrick's Day falls on the schedule in the same way.

Shelley pointed out there was also a discussion in the AAC about Jewish holidays and whether there were other potential holidays to consider. She also shared that the committee might consider making a statement in the form of a motion about faculty not scheduling exams on important Jewish holidays, the two days of Rosh Hashanah and one day of Yom Kippur. The committee felt that this did not prevent the current motion about approving the calendar from being brought forward. She said that the AAC may want to bring forward a recommendation that certain dates be recognized or put on the time/room schedule so that instructors are aware of those important dates. Scott pointed out that he thinks this was done this year and that a statement of support would be valuable. Chris Reardon pointed out that there are other religions to consider as well and that if we do come up with a list it would be good to come up with a list of other celebrations that we are sensitive to. Wayne shared that the [Academic Calendar](#) has been updated to identify significant holidays for other religions across the whole academic year. But, a motion from this group that we continue to do that is a great idea.

Allison asked about Senior Day and members of the senate pointed out that this is the day before graduation and that honors convocation and other graduation events are held on that day.

**The motion was put to a vote, passing with 52 votes in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions**

VI. Discussion of the SWOT Survey Results - Scott reviewed the SWOT survey results that came out of a survey taken by faculty senators, following polling their departments, to identify Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats. There were between 70 and 90 individual responses for each category of the SWOT and these came from 38% of the senators who responded, and this is historically high response rate. Some of the responses were submitted via email and those responses were included in the summary as well. Scott suggested that the agenda committee would submit a final executive summary, along with the raw data, to administrative leadership.

Scott remarked that, fortunately, the strengths, weaknesses and threats fell into categories that were easily defined. The responses about opportunities were a bit more diffuse. He presented the results of a preliminary executive summary (see Appendix 7.1) and then opened the floor for a discussion

### After the discussion about strengths:

*Elsa* - I have a question about RCM. Last year I thought someone said that it was going to be introduced as a measure that it might be revisited. Or, is it something that we have to live with forever?

*Wayne*: There are no changes in RCM at this moment. What we are doing right now is unpacking it. The RCM model has built into it that every 5 years we will do a revisit of different depths. It has two deep dives, one in 2005 and one in 2010. In 2015 they did something on the surface. In 2020 we will probably do another deep dive.

### After discussion of Weaknesses:

*David Finkelhor*: This isn't something that faculty have direct influence over. But, it does seem that we have a reputation as a party school that may inhibit the interest that more serious students will have in this coming year. I'm surprised that it didn't show up in the results.

*Scott*: We were too. Again, I think that some things have risen to the surface. We only allowed three comments and if there were 10 or 12 there would probably be much more common.

*Andrew Coppens*: Around the diversity point, I was a little bit troubled. In particular, in the context of concerns in the motion that we just passed on internationalization, for example, and then events that happened near the end of 2016. So, I guess I will make a little bit of a methodological point here that it would be one thing if all of us were surveyed with the question "Is Diversity sort of a weakness or not?" If only 4 people said it was, I think it would reflect that it wasn't an issue. An argument could be made that the fact that it didn't come up spontaneously perhaps reflects the diversity of the senate. I want to raise the suggestion that we don't want to give the impression that this is a small issue for the senate based on that it was only mentioned 4 times.

*Scott*: I do think that having it come up several times in "opportunities" reflects that it was on people's mind. But, they thought of it in a very different way. This is an opportunity. This is something that we value – extremely and highly.

### After discussion of Opportunities:

*David Bachrach*: It seems to me that the bottom opportunity jibes very well with # 2 and # 3 on strengths. Particularly, the ability of UNH to establish a new branding opportunity around our various strengths, that we are a research institution that gives a great deal of effort and time to good undergraduate teaching. So, rather than being betwixt and between, liberal arts schools and major state universities like Michigan, we are, in fact, the best of both worlds and that may be one of our best opportunities.

*Harriet Fertik*: This is about competition. I got several comments about this more oriented toward an internal issue from colleagues who noted that, in their experience, there is a sense of competition between units, colleges, and so forth at UNH that could ideally lead to some sort of productive creative work. But, that often it doesn't do that and has a negative effect. I got that comment from several people. It wasn't necessarily sure where to put it in the SWOT survey. But, I thought it was something worth keeping in mind.

*Allison Wilder*: I don't mean to be facetious. But, is there any circumstance under which we would not be a public university? I'm just putting that out there as a potential idea. How low would we have to go



to - at the current funding level – how low would you go but still be considered a state sponsored entity?

*Scott:* I don't have an answer. And, I don't want to contemplate.

*Erin Sharp:* I want to put forward a motion for the faculty senate to endorse the executive summary of the SWOT results. (This was seconded by Rosemary Taylor.)

*Scott:* There is an urgency. Administrative leadership would like our information quickly, by the end of October. If we are to vote on this in the normal circumstances we would have to wait till November 5<sup>th</sup>.

*Jim Connell:* I move to suspend the rules and vote on this. Although it is a bit of a grey area because it is an endorsement of a report which is usually more procedural. But, let's be safe. I move to suspend the rules and vote on this today.

*Scott:* We now have to have debate on whether to suspend the rules which requires a 2/3 majority. Any discussion about this?

*Erin:* I do have one comment to follow up on Andrew's very important comment that we should add some caveat language into the report about the limitations of the way the data was collected and the response rate.

*Scott:* I do want to keep to the discussion [about suspending the rules.]

*Cristy Beemer:* One other thing. We only mentioned our lecturers in one small spot and sort of pitted them against the tenure track faculty as a consequence. And, I hate the way that sounds, and it doesn't sound respectful to our lecturer faculty. If we could add something to the first section under strengths that we include, just a word to include our lecturers in addition to our tenure track faculty. So, that they are specifically named with all of our faculty. That will just fix that.

*Scott:* I think CCLEAR in general. I think you are right. Let's return. Are there any objections to suspending the rules to vote?

**The motion to suspend the rules to allow for voting on the SWOT summary report today was put to a vote. The motion passed with 56 in favor, 2 opposed, and 2 abstained.**

*Scott:* Now, let's return the debate to the nature of the report. There have been two friendly amendments which were 1) to add a statement about the limitations. Do we need to craft that language? Or, can we leave it? Erin, will you please offer some additional language?

*Erin:* Right this minute?

*Scott:* I'm asking the parliamentarian if we have to have this. I feel strongly that we have to have the language that we go on the report rather than leaving it in my hands to craft as I wish with my incredible power. So, I'm trying to avoid giving myself too much power.

*Jim:* If the friendly amendment is to instruct the agenda committee to do the change. Then, we don't have to come up with the wording now.

*Scott:* So, the amendment is to instruct the agenda committee to create a statement about the limitations of the nature of the data collection since it is informal and non-scientific, also including mention of the CCLEAR faculty.

*Lori Hopkins:* The reason that I think that the mention of the limitations was to also bring out and highlight the idea that most of us do feel very strongly about the question of diversity. So, I would also want that tweaked and worked in.

*Scott:* I will say that, having seen, some insides [of the Administrative Leaderships' SWOT results] , I didn't want to taint the process for the faculty senate. I wanted an independent discussion of what we thought was important. Diversity is A #1 with the administrative leadership. So, I think by adding this it will be giving further impetus to do that. So, I don't think we are going to miss something because of the way we have the data.

*Subrena Smith:* I am a little confused. There seems to be some questions/concerns about the way that the diversity question and answers – what they look like and what will be displayed. And, it sounds as if that, after the fact, the suggestion is that we do some kind of finessing so that it is transparent to the administrators that the senators actually do care about diversity. And, I am wondering if that would lead to - forgive me – to screw with the methodology in a way that is inappropriate. If the fix is going to be applied only to the diversity question this seems to me to be problematic. The methodological question is an important one. But if something is wrong with the methodology with respect to the diversity question. Then, we ought to redo this rather than finesse it afterwards.

*Scott:* My own view, if I can respond to that, is that we need to be honest about the fact that this is an unscientific thought process that doesn't reflect every aspect. I think it would be important to say that the method by which we pursued this was limited. And, it is. The scientific methodology wasn't established ahead of time. So, I think that is important idea.

*Subrena:* I guess my point is that it was limited for all the questions. My discomfort is - leave it as it is rather than, after the fact, address specifically the diversity question.

*Scott:* Would a reasonable compromise be to have a general statement about the limitations about the methodology and leave it at that? Wayne has heard loud and clear that we are interested in diversity. We have had multiple people state that. I don't think it would be a problem if we simply left it as is.

*Drew Conroy -* So, my comment is about the survey itself. The only kind of research I have done is surveys with, mostly, farmers. But, if we did what we are doing here - it is completely inappropriate to say "yea, we all agree that this." But we didn't really take a vote that we all agree. I took the survey and I may well have mentioned diversity in there. But I really feel like we are making a statement and we are assuming a lot of things and we are rushing to make this vote. I really think it would have more weight if – and I realize we are up against November 5<sup>th</sup> – But, we are faculty at a university and calling ourselves a major research university. I just feel like to say that we all agree when we didn't even raise our hands that we agree is really troubling.

*Erin:* I just wanted to say that right now that your report on the survey reflects that data that was collected. I don't think we should change anything about the outcomes. I do think that the way we - diversity was mentioned 3 times – that is data. We don't need to say that this was surprising or seemed low. This is what the data showed. And we will put a caveat about the method of research. I agree that we shouldn't alter the findings to say something that they don't.

*Lucy Saylor:* I share some of the reservations just mentioned about how we are reporting these results. I think that this is really valuable, and it gives us all kinds of helpful guidelines and feedback. It seems like the next best step is to use this to construct a survey that can be distributed to the faculty. The one comment here: “too much emphasis on research” I would be more interested to ask faculty “do we have too much emphasis on research?” I don’t agree. I think that is one of our primary missions. So, that is why I abstained from voting on the rule change. Because I really feel like – even though I feel like this is really useful – I don’t know as we are going forward to report it to the administration it is saying about what we all actually believe and agree to. I don’t know if we have time to go back and make into a proper survey that lists options. Like, how important is diversity to you, how important is research?

*Marc Hiller:* One quick comment and then a question. The comment is that increasingly in the health care sector, of which I am part of, SWOT analysis is almost disappearing as a methodology in favor of different analytics. Given the numbers, given that while 38% is among the largest of response rates, in my frame of reference, given the significance about what is being reported, it is less than ideal. And, I am in agreement with some of the other faculty, I am also feeling more and more that we are being pushed too rapidly into making a decision which may carry a significant amount of weight. I don’t know how much weight is going to be afforded to it. But that is my comment/concern.

My question is whether you can describe a little more or whether it is stated somewhere in the 3 other comments that are made in the weakness section. I appreciate actually agreeing with all three of them. But, I’m not sure how that fits in the context of the overall report? How do other comments that have some other support get interpreted as by whoever is reading the report? If there is some way of putting those comments – or the gist of those comments – into any of the other points that were made rather than having them out there on a limb.

*Scott:* I tried to capture elements that had more than one comment and that might have been implicit in others. So, it was hard for me to define. If those seem outliers, I can certainly omit them from the report if that seems cleaner.

*Elsa Upham:* Just a comment on what you just said about eliminating outliers. If the point is to look at the specific idea and to take them as points of focus – and if we are not taking into account the amount of people who mentioned those ideas - I think that outliers are as important as something someone would have mentioned 21 times and I think that is the debate we are having right now. My question is, what is the expectation of what the administration is going to do with this? Because the concern is that – this is, as far as I’m concerned, we are working off of everything that has ideas that I have to keep in mind and work on. But, if the administration is taking it and saying, “hey look, this is what the faculty says is happening” Then we are going to run into a whole lot of trouble. What is the goal? What are we trying to do by sharing this with the administration? I’m sure they have their own list.

*Scott:* To respond to that, the university leadership is doing a SWOT analysis and there are two additional questions I will share at the end of this process. And, we will talk about whether we want to contribute as well. The thought was that they were going to send us their SWOT results and we would then responds to those SWOT results. And, I thought it was far better to have a faculty generated independent idea of what we felt as a whole as closely as possible within the time constraints. They would like to have this information by the end of October. In the middle of December there is a strategic meeting that is taking place into which faculty senate leadership is being brought. So, we need

to have the information to them so that they can see where they are aligned and where they are not. So, my own view is that this represents, generally speaking, what the faculty senate feels are the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats. It allows us to give input. It allows us to give a general idea of what the faculty feels, realizing that it is imperfect. But it will also be one data point among many. So, we are going to have to close this discussion after one or two more comments and take a vote.

*Lori:* One quick thought was that when they presented this to us and I felt that they had said we are going to move forward on the strengths. We will get the weaknesses next and then we won't be touching these other things for a while. So, I'm wondering if we as a faculty can decide to not do the whole part. But, maybe just the strengths and weaknesses. Or, strengths and opportunities. I wonder if we can just have part of it done. If that is what they are doing right now. Maybe...

*Scott:* What they meant was that they hadn't quite gotten there. But, every two weeks they had a new part. So, they are done. So, in some ways, they are waiting on us. We have tried to be as quick as possible without being overly quick.

*David Bachrach:* I just want to reiterate Scott's point. We either participate in this process or we don't. And, Scott and I are able to share with the administrative leadership some vision of the faculty's view or we don't. And, if we don't it will just be the views that Scott and I share, and it will be better and more representative, I believe, if this body can endorse some version of this document so that we have a broad representation of faculty views, and not simply our two opinions.

*Scott:* Any other debate? Let's be clear, what we are voting on....

Erin and Scott put forth **a motion that the faculty senate endorses the executive summary of the Faculty Senate SWOT results with the agenda committee instructed to add a statement of limitations of the process - not specifically with regard to diversity - plus inclusion of CCLEAR faculty.**

**The motion was put to a vote and passed with 48 in favor, 6 votes opposed, and 2 abstentions.**

*Scott:* I think that this vote will reflect the concerns we have about the document, but it will still reflect what we feel as a senate as a whole. Thank you for the discussion.

VII. - Information Technology Committee report on FindScholars@UNH by Patti Puccilli - Patti indicated that she will be showing the test version of an application that was formerly called VIVO and has now been renamed FindScholars@UNH. Patti explained that we have talked about this before and that faculty should have received emails about it. The site is set to go live on October 29<sup>th</sup>. FindScholars@UNH is a public website where internal and external users can discover UNH research and scholarship across disciplines. This initiative started in the research field with faculty there who wanted to get their research out to the public so that the public could find them as the lead researcher on topics. The site will now be available for all faculty. Patti explained that FindScholars is based on an open source platform that is still called VIVO. It supports searching, browsing, and visualizing scholarly activity and connections among scholars in research. It showcases scholarly records, research, discovery, expert findings, and assessment impact.

The data comes from myElements which contains information from faculty as well as from Banner and HR and other sources. FindScholars@UNH has a faculty member's profile, any publications, whether

they have had any research grants, the courses they have taught, and any education or training background they have.

Patti showed what a faculty member would look like on a faculty webpage and then showed what the faculty member would look like in VIVO and explained that senators could follow along with the demonstration on their own computers, as well, at the test site: <https://vivo-test.unh.edu>

Using a sample faculty member in the test version of FindScholars, Patti showed their publications, and this presented a list of how many times that person's article was cited. She explained that one can look up where the recent citations were, and a score that it is given to it. Patti also demonstrated how to look up information under each of the sections: grants, teaching and background and co-author network.

Patti reviewed again that this platform is set to launch October 29<sup>th</sup> and that emails went out or should have gone out from departments asking faculty to review their background and bio and to go to the site to see how things look. There was a timeframe to get feedback to Terri Winters and her department if things weren't correct or if things needed to be changed. That deadline was September 15<sup>th</sup> and now this is set to launch.

Patti offered to take questions:

### **Questions:**

*David Bachrach* - This is less about VIVO and more about the shared governance issue that VIVO raises. I had an opportunity to go back and read the minutes of the faculty senate meeting minutes from 2010 and 2011 when the initial proposals was brought to the senate to have electronic reporting of which myElements is the most recent version and then the faculty senate expressed considerable reservations about electronic format for faculty reporting and, in particular, many in the senate felt then that posting publicly any information from electronic reporting required approval from the faculty senate. Now I don't know if that was the view of the current faculty senate but that may be an issue that we discuss before VIVO goes live.

*Drew Conroy* - My question is a little more direct. I was wondering about the overview. Like David (the example shown) has an overview and that comes from myElements. I played around with it a few weeks ago. Is it not there because I didn't do it by the September deadline? I did put a weblink in there. I have been trying to play around with this to see.

Another question: I was just looking at citations. In Google Scholar they are cited more than what is there [in Vivo] in the case of a couple of articles that I just looked at. In Google Scholar one of mine has 8 and is showing 0 in VIVO. Another one up there has 1 in VIVO and it has 10 in Google Scholar.

*Terri Winters Responds:*

The first answer is that if you put something into myElements, it should appear the next day. The 09/15 deadline Patti mentioned was when we were going to push the current information from MyElements into FindScholars Test. What we have been doing now though is incremental updates, nightly. When FindScholars is live we will have daily updates. So, I will check on your records and see why that is not happening. So, right now if you went into your myElements profile it should pick that up and it should be visible the next day.

The second answer is about citations. Google Scholar is not a source for citations we are using in the VIVO platform. The reason for that is that it isn't integrated into myElements because Google Scholar is really a black box and we have no way to understand how it works. So, you could, however, put in your Google Scholar link. It would appear right below your picture where the email address is. Or, you can add LinkedIn or other links. Citations that are showing now are coming from MyElements and they are from the sources: [Web of science](#) and [European PubMed Central](#). We will also be using Dimensions. We think that Dimensions has a broader reach and the other thing that we want to be able to do is we want to show what you see in MyElements in terms of citations and this will be matched to Dimensions citations on FindScholars as well as the college website. So that is something that we are working with the MyElements vendor now and we will be getting feeds to be able to cross link these citations with MyElements.

*Faculty member:* What about books?

*Terri:* Good point. The bias in MyElements is for journal articles; however, you should be able to harvest your books. If you can't then you can manually enter them. What we will be doing is, under publications, there will be a heading that will say "Books." We are also investigating - it won't happen by October 29th - if we could have - for example, for the College of Liberal Arts, have books appear first. We are going to see if we can do that by college- to reflect that.

*Scott:* The issue with the Altmetric method citations is that if it is not going to represent what is real and true, the question is then: Is there a danger of this becoming normative for promotion cases and that kind of issue? I'm curious about whether the administration has recognized publicly that these are not to be used in any shape or form in promotion cases, and in other kinds of assessments. Because if they are not accurate we can't trust them, and I think that is a very big consideration.

*George Roth:* Can you display the Map of Science [for the example on the screen]?

*Patti:* This shows that the majority of his (the sample faculty member) articles published are in the field of Biology. Because that circle is the biggest.

I don't know if that is accurate. I checked my publications and they seem reasonably accurate. But, when I go to the Map of Science I am also publishing in Chemistry and Anatomy and other fields which are clearly not me. So, I'm just worried about that link being there and being totally inaccurate and whether we have that button live.

*Patti:* Yes, that button is live.

*Terri:* We are checking whether - for example, some folks don't have anything that matches. So, could we remove the button for that faculty listing. She will check to see why publications under the Chemistry discipline are appearing for George Roth's map.

*Rosemarie Came:* I want to express a little bit of concern. The newish standard in my discipline is for people to look at Google Scholar and we all know that Google Scholar isn't perfect. It certainly duplicates some things and it is a little bit messy. But, nevertheless, it is the new standard and if I were to look at that and see what my citations are and then look at Web of Science, or myElements, or whatever, the one on Web of Science would be much less than Google Scholar, which is fine. I know that these are different. My concern - not for me since I am post-tenure - but for junior faculty in my field, when their potential letter-writers look at their webpage or they come to the UNH site that lists

the citations that those people have and they might stop there and say this person doesn't have enough citations because the standard they are using in their head is what they see on Google Scholar. So, I think we might be short-changing some people.

*Andrew Coppens:* Let me follow on that as a junior scholar. I want to frame the issue in a little bit of a different way. My goals in reporting academic activity to my college from a sort of personnel and promotion and tenure stand point are very different than the kind of data that I would want to have culled and automated into a public profile. And, I am concerned that lines get crossed in that process. For example, I may change a focus of my research and want certain publications to be selected and presented publicly in a way that wouldn't happen in an automated way and I totally agree with the citation ... What number of citations mean from one field to the next really differs and it seems to me that this is a perfect issue for the senate to get behind is faculty having autonomy and control over their public facing image on an individual basis and department basis, etc.

*Scott:* Can we have Terri respond to that?

*Terri:* I just wanted to say that the college website - there are 4 colleges that have a public website at present - These college websites display the 5 most recent and the 5 most cited publications. This was a decision that was made with input from the Deans' Council and the myElements Governance Board. I just wanted to point out that getting feedback like yours, that there is a way that we could in myElements give you the opportunity to favorite the publications that you wanted to publish that represent you best. That is something that I am working on. But, I just need to include these governance groups again to make that decision. And, so that is something that is under consideration. In contrast, FindScholars is really listing all of your publications. It isn't allowing you to curate them. There is a difference between the college website and how you are represented there and FindScholars which is really listing everything.

*Scott:* Terri, just as a procedural question, is it possible to go live with a very basic list of publications without the Altmetric, and without the other buttons, to give us time to work this out? This is a very important item, especially for junior faculty, as Rose mentioned. There is a possibility that someone is going to look at this and use that as a way to judge. I think that is a very important thing for us to work at. Is it possible or are we past the point of no return?

*Terri:* We are specifically looking at that - for example not having a Map of Science button or a co-author network button if you don't author things with other people. I need to investigate the technical details. But, it may be that listing the Altmetric in the citations is a flag, an on/off flag. So, I just want to go and make sure of that. The other thing I want to highlight is that I will be meeting with the Provost and the Sr. Vice Provost for Research on Monday, the 22nd. Because, again, this is a standard IT practice to say whether we are ready to go live, or we are not ready to go live. So, I will have that conversation with them.

*Scott Ollinger:* When I look at my profile I notice problems with the course listed. There are a number of courses that I teach that are not listed and instead that were courses for a different department that were listed. My understanding is that is because when courses are co-listed the system pulls the first occurrence of the co-listed number and there is a course that I teach - there are a couple of course that are offered on a one-time basis as a special topics course in a different department and because that department appears earlier in the alphabet than my department those special topics courses for those

other departments are what are shown in my teaching profile and I was just wondering if that is something that would be fixed before this goes live?

*Terri:* This will definitely not be fixed before this goes live. But what we are doing with that, is we will look at the data. We want to look at cross-listed courses as well as instances where, for example, someone is listed as the instructor for 12 lab sections or people are coordinating it and FindScholars is showing all of those.

*Jim Connell:* I have to say that I share David's concern with governance here. All of the comments that I have heard just reinforce that. The reason we want to control this, the reason why we should be going live without faculty senate approval is just because of all that we have heard today. I would prefer that this not go public until the senate has had a chance to vote on it.

*Scott:* Maybe Terri and I can meet separately to talk about this. I appreciate all of your comments. Do you mind staying for the online Writing Intensive discussion?

VIII. - Presentation of the motion on Online Writing courses - Shelley shared that this motion is a response to a proposal or statement made by Ed Mueller, the head of the UNH Writing Program, around the idea of getting rid or revisiting the moratorium on online writing intensive courses. It is a statement that the AAC looked at carefully and discussed and felt that they were in support of the statement that provides some conditions around allowing for courses to be online that are Writing Intensive (WI).

Scott asked if there was any background about why there was a moratorium placed on online WI courses. Shelley said that she didn't know the background. Shelley presented the motion:

*UNH FACULTY SENATE MOTION  
to support the offering of online courses designated as Writing Intensive*

***Motion Presenter:*** *Shelley Mulligan, representing the Academic Affairs Committee*

***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 Homeland Security. 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.*

***Motion:*** *The Faculty Senate moves that the moratorium on new on-line Writing Intensive (WI) 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 be 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.*

It was agreed that the debate on this motion be postponed to the next meeting due to time.

IX. New Business – There was no new business.

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

**ACRONYM LIST**

<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)