

University of New Hampshire

## University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository

---

Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes

Faculty Senate Documents

---

3-19-2018

### 2017-18 FACULTY SENATE XXII - March 19, 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, "2017-18 FACULTY SENATE XXII - March 19, 2018 Minutes Summary" (2018). *Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes*. 157.

[https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty\\_senate\\_agendas\\_minutes/157](https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty_senate_agendas_minutes/157)

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  
2017-18 FACULTY SENATE XXII

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 3:11 p.m. on March 19, 2018

MINUTES SUMMARY

I. Roll – The following senators were absent: Baldwin, Ballestero, Barnett, Gass, Herold, Mathieson, Miller, Onosko, Ross, Simos, and Whistler. Golomski, Laird, Ramsay, Subrena Smith, Tenczar, Tucker, and Wilder were excused. P.T. Vasudevan, Nancy Targett, and Jon Wraith were guests.

II. Remarks by and questions to the provost – The provost told the Senate about the upcoming changes planned for the Thompson School of Applied Sciences. She invited Dean Jon Wraith from the College of Life Sciences and Agriculture to join her and help present this information. The Thompson School of Applied Science provides a two-year degree program at UNH. The Thompson School has been a part of our legislative mandate for 125 years as a land-grant institution, and part of our history in agriculture and forestry. Graduates from that program emerge job-ready. Since 2004, the Thompson School has been facing serious headwinds in terms of enrollments in nearly all majors. The provost shared a PowerPoint that included data from 2004 up to 2017.

She cited the report delivered to the university system in 2013 from [the Huron Education group](#), which made certain recommendations that began a process of re-imagining the Thompson School. The administration engaged with stakeholders both within and outside the university to examine the competitiveness of our programs in the T-School relative to community colleges in the region. We can see that the short-term certifications provided by the T-School in professional development and training (PD&T) have grown dramatically, while other programs have not. One question raised in this process is whether we are fully meeting the needs of the state in this applied program, under the mandate of the existing legislation.

Ultimately, the path forward is to re-focus the core mission of the Thompson School, which currently provides seven programs serving 187 students. That mission involves agriculture, forestry, and animal science. The plan is to integrate courses from the Thompson School more closely with other programs in the College of Life Sciences & Agriculture (COLSA). We also want to incorporate more short-term professional certificate and development training to further meet the needs of the state.

Three of the T-School associate degree programs will continue forward, and four will be eliminated after June 2019. The transition will take about twelve to fourteen months, and there are no changes anticipated to faculty and staff through May 2019. The provost said she is very committed to helping all faculty and staff affected by these changes to find a soft landing.

Students who are already involved in the programs being sunsetted will be fully served until they have completed their degrees. New students for Fall 2018 have been contacted by the

university, and we are working with any of those students who had enrolled in the sunsetted programs to help them find landing spots in other regional programs.

The associate degree programs will continue to be aligned with COLSA, and the PD&T certifications will be taken over by UNH PD&T, which is part of the UNH Cooperative Extension.

Dean Jon Wraith said that this has been a four year-long investigation and process, and the present outcome is not what he had anticipated at the outset. He added that, given the demographics that we're looking at for our baccalaureate and associate degree programs, there has been an unanticipated increase in attention to our Agriculture and Food program. Some years ago, we felt that our strategic advantage in this region had to do with our farms and dairies, but our competitors now have similar resources, and we cannot compete in the two-year sector with these institutions at our cost point. He noted that the market, the demographic, and the popularity of two-year programs have all shifted markedly, combining to make our offerings less attractive.

A senator noted that eliminating some of these programs will make it problematic for students with interest in combining degrees. Dean Wraith replied that COLSA, a leader in sustainability, holds agriculture and natural resources as vital programs. The three programs being brought over from the T-School will work into existing curricula.

Dean Wraith said that the administration continues to be in touch with stake holders as part of our mission. The Thompson School has a leadership council made up of five individuals. He reiterated that no one thought that this would be the outcome, but said that all of the stakeholders understand and are excited about the opportunities going forward. He believes that we can maintain the two-year programs being brought over into COLSA, as well as the PD&T certification programs. He said that these programs will appeal to young people as well as non-traditional students who need credentials but whose jobs and other obligations won't allow them to enroll full time for two or four years.

The provost noted that the other option to this plan was to simply sunset the Thompson School altogether, but that the administration didn't want to do that. She said that this move is about positioning the Thompson School for the next twenty-five years. She said that the T-School started out in a single narrow sector 125 years ago, and has grown out, and now we're simply repositioning it to represent the needs that our stakeholders are telling us will align with the changes going on around us.

A senator asked how many faculty and staff will be affected by this change. Dean Wraith said that currently the T-School has 18 full-time faculty (7 tenured, 9 lecturers, and 1 clinical), plus the equivalent of about six full-time adjuncts. Some of them will be moving with their programs. He said that he is committed to helping faculty find leads on employment here at UNH or UNH-Manchester, or elsewhere. There are three full-time PAT (Professional and Technical Staff) currently at the T-School.

The four programs being eliminated are Integrated Agricultural Management, Culinary Arts, Civil Tech, and Horticultural Tech. The three programs that will continue will be Forest Tech,

Veterinary Tech, and Animal Science. The dean said that this is a conversation within relevant departments in COLSA, so there will be no separate administrative structure. Within the Thompson School there will be two lobes: the credit/degree space and the non-credit space. He said he expects that some programs will continue to be physically located in Cole, Barton and Putnam Halls, some may move over to buildings housing relevant COLSA departments.

A senator asked about the dean's expectations regarding Professional Development & Training (PD&T). Dean Wraith replied that UNH PD&T is a branch of the UNH Cooperative Extension, and Chris LaBelle (Assistant Director, Engagement & Extension Relations) is in charge of that. This partnership is not within COLSA. There is great interest in aspects of the Thompson School such as Culinary Arts, Surveying and Civil Tech. This is where some of the opportunities may exist for our faculty and staff whose programs are being sunsetted. Cooperative Extension Dean and Director Ken LaValley intends to partner in broader areas, including the Storm Water Center. UNH PD&T's upsurge (151% increase in the last decade) reflects a national trend.

A senator asked about financial aid opportunities for non-degree PD&T students. The provost said that this is one of the things that will be fleshed out in the next twelve to fourteen months as these changes are implemented.

The chair thanked the dean and the provost for their comments.

III. Presentation by SVPAA Vasudevan – The provost welcomed Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (SVPAA) P.T. Vasudevan, here to speak to the Senate about the Student Success Collaborative platform, and what we can learn from this new tool regarding retention rates at UNH. The provost said that a great deal of work has gone into importing UNH historical data into the platform, and in validating that data. The SVPAA has begun to roll this out, and has received a positive response from those who have seen these results.

Vasu noted two aspects to the study he has prepared: graduation rates and retention rates. He began with data for six-year graduation rates based on students who entered UNH in 2007. UNH's four- and six-year graduation rates are 65% and 76%, respectively. Vasu asserted that we can do better, and can make education more affordable for our students.

He then showed numbers on UNH retention for second- and third-year students, and also four- and six-year graduation rates. He cited the Complete College America pathways strategy campaign called "15 to Finish," which refers to the number of credits students need to take each semester to complete their degree in the 4-6 year window.

From an academic standpoint, retention impact factors include, from an academic standpoint, advising (using SSC), research opportunities, identification of gateway courses, number of incomplete courses, registration, course mapping, internships, and summer and J-terms. From a non-academic standpoint, things like campus life, housing, parking, financial aid, and support for diversity and gender issues impact retention rates.

The Student Success Collaborative platform provides tools to help us enhance our enrollments, retention, and graduation rates. Graduation rates can be determined by gender, ethnicity, first generation status, veteran status, high school region, high school name, international status,

first-year credits, and first term GPA. Vasu showed results for each college using 2012-2017 graduation data for non-transfer students. It provides total graduation rates by college, which data indicates that CHHS and the Paul College have higher rates, and COLA has a lower rate.

The ethnicity breakdown by college did not show a wide variation from college to college. Vasu pointed out that graduation rates seem strongly tied to GPA. The numbers for international students and for veterans show somewhat lower rates.

Vasu mentioned the UNH Center for Academic Resources (CFAR), which caters to the needs of students in their TRIO program. TRIO refers to federal outreach programs like Upward Bound, Talent Search, and Student Support Service. These programs are designed to identify and provide services for individuals from disadvantaged backgrounds and are administered, funded and implemented by the U.S. Department of Education. CFAR data indicate that students who avail these services do well. However, Vasu said that the problem is that we don't have the resources to continue supporting these students. We are trying to address this problem.

The Student Success Collaborative advising portion of the software has been running as pilot programs in various departments across campus, with 49 faculty advisors participating in the pilot. Vasu shared an image of the SSC website, and reported that those who have been using the platform in CEPS have reported positive experiences.

A senator asked if Vasu might consider running graphs on financial aid as it relates to graduation rates. Vasu said that he could try to do that, noting that the average student debt load upon graduation is about \$32,000 and climbing.

A senator asked if this presentation could be made available to the senators for reference. Vasu said that he is currently in the process of sharing this with each college, and that once he has completed that task he will make the presentation available to everyone.

The chair thanked Vasu and the provost for their time today.

IV. Remarks by and questions to the chair – The chair offered an update on the double counting issue in COLA. He said that he has been in contact with Dean Bostic by email, and shared portions of some of those emails. On February 23, the Agenda Committee met with the dean and the SVPAA regarding this topic. On February 27, the dean distributed to COLA chairs by email a summary of all departments' most recent recommendations regarding double counting (from March 2017). On March 6, the dean and the SVPAA met with the COLA chairs to discuss double counting, among other topics. She reported a lively and productive conversations. On March 20, her intent is to meet with the COLA chairs again, and to discuss double counting if the chairs wish to. By March 23, the dean has asked the chairs to email the associate dean of COLA regarding their perspective departments' recommendations regarding double counting. The associate dean will communicate any recommended changes in double counting to the provost's office and to the registrar.

The chair said that he asked the dean if she would abide by the chairs' wishes regarding the use of double counting of Discovery courses for major credit in their own departments. The dean responded that she will support whatever recommendation each department makes regarding

double counting. Each department has their own take on the matter, she said, based upon their particular needs and circumstances.

The dean went on to tell the chair in this email that final resolution on this matter may take a little time, perhaps somewhat beyond March 23, but that the college should have things wrapped up well before the suggested target of April 30. Dan noted that these communications indicate that the Senate has been heard on this matter, and that our task now is to watch for the implementation of this policy, calling this excellent news.

A member of the Agenda Committee noted that in the conversation with the dean and the SVPAA, the SVPAA made argument against double counting of Discovery classes for major credit, noting that fewer courses are required for majors in COLA than in other colleges. The senator pointed out that COLA students need 128 credits to graduate, like every other student on campus. She added that COLA is the only college that has a language requirement for all majors. She noted that this unique element of academic rigor is found in no other college, but has not been acknowledged as such by the SVPAA.

The senator who proposed the motion of censure against the COLA dean said that if the described actions are taken as laid out by the dean in these emails in a timely fashion, he will move to withdraw his motion of censure at a future Senate meeting.

V. Approval of the Senate minutes from February 26, 2018 – It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the February 26, 2018 meeting of the Senate. The minutes were unanimously approved as presented, with 4 abstentions.

VI. ITC report – John Gibson, chair of the Senate Information Technology Committee, resumed his report from the last Senate meeting. The ITC was charged to:

*9. Research and make recommendations regarding the lack of automated checks for prerequisites in the online system used by students for adding and dropping courses in the first two weeks of the semester.*

His committee discussed this issue with the registrar and, unfortunately, there is no near-term solution to the problem. There is no way to automate prerequisite checks in the online registration because in the Banner data base used to generate registrations, prerequisites are stored in the text of the course description. In order to automate prerequisite checks, a new field would need to be added to the data base, and that field would need to be populated course by course by someone in each department, with communication with the registrar's office. This is a labor-intensive process that could take up to two years to complete, according to the registrar, due to other ongoing projects and limited man power in that office. The ITC will take no further action on this charge.

The ITC has also been charged to:

*3. Work with the Senior Vice Provost on a review of the Student Success collaborative pilot program.*

John noted that ITC filed a report on its progress on this charge prior to the last Senate meeting (stored on the Senate SharePoint site), and that some changes have occurred since then. Two weeks ago, the SVPAA and Terri Winters (head of UNH Academic Technology) came to the ITC meeting and demonstrated the advising portion of the Student Success Collaborative. He said that all members of the ITC found that the software they saw two weeks ago was very different from the demonstration given to the full Senate in September 2016 by the Educational Advisory Board representatives, and was far less objectionable than what we saw in 2016.

The 2016 presentation showed black box algorithms assessing individual students, generating emails in the voice of the faculty members, and inserting software between the students and their advisors. What the ITC saw two weeks ago was entirely different, and John said he cannot account for the difference. Two weeks ago, the ITC saw that the advising portion of SSC is merely an interface to the UNH Banner database of student transcripts, plus the relevant admissions information from students' high schools and GPA/SAT scores. Additionally, software is included for coordinating and scheduling advising meetings between students and faculty. There is a facility for entering notes from those advising meetings and sharing them between advisors. Finally, one facility was for departments to determine important success markers for their majors, watching to see if students meet those markers and keeping track of which markers have been met and which have not been.

An important difference between this presentation and what the Senate saw in 2016 is that the department is the entity that determines what those success markers are. John said that what was presented to the ITC was pretty unobjectionable, and alleviated most of his own prior concerns regarding SSC.

John also noted that this platform will be labeled "My WildCat Success" at UNH, rather than calling it Student Success Collaborative.

A senator asked how SSC will work with DegreeWorks, and John said that the programs do not work together. DegreeWorks is a separate system for auditing students' fulfillment of degree requirements. SSC has no such capability. The senator asked if the success points are different from minimum grade requirements in each major, and John replied that that would be up to each department to determine.

A senator from the ITC added that the administration is planning to put a link inside SSC to link to DegreeWorks to make it easier to move between programs. He added that an advantage of the SSC software is that faculty can see groups of students, based on grades in current or past semesters, to quickly identify which student(s) might be at risk, simplifying the data mining aspect for faculty and/or advisors.

Another senator said that a purported advantage to SSC is the data mining that would help establish correlations for departments to help them set their trigger points. John said that this capability does not seem to be immediately available. While this function seemed to be the essence of the package, it appears that the data analysis functionality of SSC is currently more at the aggregate level across the university, as we saw from Vasu's presentation. John noted that the data analysis in the SVPAA's presentation resulted from Vasu's own exploration of statistical relationships in student data, rather than discovery of those relationships by the SSC software.

VII. Discussion and vote on AAC motion on use of common exam time – The Academic Affairs Committee’s motion on the use of the common exam time was re-introduced to the Senate, with some modifications to the text, as suggested in the last meeting:

***Motion: The Faculty Senate supports the resolution passed by the Student Senate of the University of New Hampshire (Student Senate XXXIX – R1 – Disallowing Classes During Common Exam Blocks, October 1, 2017). We urge the Registrar’s Office to minimize the scheduling of undergraduate classes, including labs, during common exam time so that this time can be used as time blocks for instructors to hold exams and make-up classes as stated in section 04.16 of the Student Rights, Rules, and Responsibilities handbook. The regular scheduling of classes during common hour times should only be made by the Registrar’s office after discussions with the college deans’ offices, and then only when it is determined that there are no other feasible scheduling options in consideration of classroom space availability, or faculty or student scheduling conflicts.***

A senator expressed concern that the Student Senate motion, which this motion supports, is loosely worded. He pointed out that passing this motion will not cause the registrar to do anything differently than he currently does in these cases. A policy is already in place, and the real issue has to do with faculty who refuse to follow that policy. Students are the ones who suffer. The chair pointed out that the registrar is usually accommodating to the wishes of the Senate, and that this statement provides that office with a reason to go back to departments that are abusing the common exam time and remind them of the original policy. He emphasized that it is important for all senators to take this statement back to their own departments and urge their colleagues to follow the university’s policy on this.

A senator from the Thompson School of Applied Science reminded the group of his statement from the last Senate meeting outlining the concerns of the T-School in this regard. The chair of the AAC said that that is why she included “section 04.16 of the SRR&R” in the motion. That section of the SRR&R specifically names the Thompson School as an exception to this policy. The senator said he would prefer to see such wording in the motion itself. Another senator pointed out that the Faculty Senate does have say in the SRR&R in regards to academic matters.

A senator said that the real problem with the use of the common exam time is when faculty do not allow students to make up work, from a lab for example, when a conflict exists between a scheduled exam and that lab. A student who tries to work with the two faculty members often is told by each instructor that the other instructor must acquiesce, and the student is left without recourse. Another senator called this a valid point, and suggested sending this motion back to the AAC for additional wordsmithing. He moved to recommit the motion to the committee and instruct the committee to supply appropriate language to address the need to allow make-up work for non-exam periods. That motion was seconded.

The AAC chair asked what changes need to be made, saying that her committee is reluctant to make such changes.



The first senator above asked for wording to indicate that if a lab is scheduled during a common exam period, faculty must allow the student to make up that work. Another senator said that the focus of the students is on the class. This motion would discourage the scheduling of any lab during the common exam period in the first place. A senator pointed out that the problem is not with the registrar's office at all, but rather with the departments who schedule these conflicts. The chair asserted that this motion puts the weight of the Senate behind the registrar in attempting to adhere to the original policy which, if followed, would greatly reduce these conflicts. The petitioning senator said that scheduling is very difficult, and a better solution would be to reduce the number of make-up exams.

Another senator pointed out that leaving large blocks of time untouchable (for common exam time on Thursday afternoons, and again on Thursday evenings) makes scheduling once-per-week seminars difficult.

The senator who moved to recommit the motion said it is untenable to put students between two faculty who refuse to budge, and that there is value in clarifying which event (exam or lab) has priority.

The chair asked for a vote on the motion to recommit the motion. The AAC chair reiterated that this motion is a reminder to reduce the use of the common hour, and perhaps the use of this time slot for scheduling labs is a separate issue. She noted that the Student Senate's motion is just an effort to minimize the use of the common exam time for things other than common exams, and asserted that this motion supports that.

The chair said that he is amenable to a separate motion to deal with the issues of scheduling labs. The senator who moved to recommit the motion said that he is agreeable to amending his motion to let the committee bring forward a separate motion to deal with the scheduling of labs during the common exam time, bringing forward the other motion in a future meeting.

A senator pointed out that in the SRR&R, it states clearly that if a class or lab is scheduled during a common exam time, the exam takes priority. Another senator said that just because a class/lab is scheduled during the common exam time, it does not mean that that is actually a "common exam class," which class has priority over other classes/labs for scheduling exams during that time. There is no way for students to resolve these conflicts when faculty will not cooperate.

The senator who moved to recommit the motion amended his original motion, and moved to instruct the AAC to **"investigate the problem of conflicts between courses in the common exam time in terms of exams, etc., and bring forth an appropriate motion."** This amended motion was seconded.

**The amended motion to charge the AAC was put to a vote, and passed with 37 in favor, 14 opposed, and 4 abstentions**

**The original motion, as above, was put to a vote and passed with 51 votes in favor, 4 opposed, and 0 abstentions.**

The chair thanked the AAC for their work.

VIII. Discussion and vote on CPC motion on AED units on campus – The Campus Planning Committee’s motion follows:

*Motion: The Faculty Senate moves (1) to encourage the University to provide and maintain a minimum of one AED unit in each campus building; (2) increase awareness of the location of AED units on the campus by broadly disseminating the URL showing buildings with AEDs and their location within those buildings; (3) each University building should post adequate public signage that would direct one to where the AED is located in that building in case of an emergency; and (4) to promote and provide training in CPR and the use of AEDs to the campus community.*

A senator asked how many buildings are on campus, noting that the motion asks that an AED be placed in each campus building. He pointed out that some buildings on campus are not regularly occupied. Bill Berndtson, the CPC chair, answered that there are 231 buildings, and acknowledged that some buildings, like garages and sheds, may not actually need AED units. The senator suggested amending the motion to include the words “regularly occupied,” and the committee considered that as a friendly amendment.

Another senator pointed out that there are currently no AED units in the dormitories and asked if the intent of this motion is to include dormitories for placement of AEDs, and the CPC chair said that is the intent.

A senator asked about the overall cost of implementing this motion. At \$1,500 each, this would entail an investment of about \$350,000, plus the cost of replacing batteries every 5 years and pads every eighteen months. The chair pointed out that the motion only encourages the administration to provide and maintain the units. Bill said that there may be other funding sources such as grants that might finance the effort rather than using tuition dollars. He then told of a student who collapsed last month in the Equine Center. When 911 was called, the dispatcher instructed the caller to secure an AED. No one there knew where the closest one was, and the dispatcher told them to stop looking because the EMT would arrive before they might find one. The incident turned out not to be a cardiac event, but it was a stark reminder of the importance of having these units easily accessible. Bill added that item (1) in the motion is not the most important element, but that items (2) – (4) are very important for the safety of our campus community.

**The motion, as amended, was put to a vote and passed, with 52 in favor, 1 vote opposed, and 3 abstentions.**

IX. New Business – Shelley Mulligan, chair of the Senate Academic Affairs Committee, offered a brief update on the subject of a test-optional admissions policy, as discussed by Victoria Dutcher in her meeting with the Senate on January 29. She said that the AAC is forming a motion to ask the admissions office to present a proposal regarding test-optional admissions. She asked all senators to speak with their department colleagues about the idea and gather their opinions. A senator asked if this policy would apply to international students, and Shelley said that is not yet clear.

A senator from the Thompson School noted the recent announcement from the provost about the “reimagining” of the Thompson School of Applied Science. He expressed his colleagues’ concerns at this turn of events, which he called unexpected. T-School faculty were told about this decision just minutes before formal announcement went out to the university. He cited the sharp decline in faculty and staff positions in the T-School, and noted that the staff member dedicated to admissions for the Thompson School was removed from that position.

He said that the T-School faculty have received mixed messages from the provost’s office over the past few years, and added that there seems to be no help coming from either of the faculty unions.

A senator asked about the role of faculty in making this decision regarding the changes at the Thompson School. The senator replied that there was no faculty input. Three faculty were involved in the Huron report cited by the provost, but he said that none of the ideas suggested by those faculty members were implemented in this final decision by the administration.

The other Thompson School senator said that the faculty worked with a strategic planner who was hired to find solutions to problems facing the school, but that none of those suggestions were included in the final decision either. A member of the Agenda Committee asked the senators to send a timeline of these events to the Agenda Committee.

X. Adjournment – Upon a motion and second to adjourn, the meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.