

University of New Hampshire

## University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository

---

Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes

Faculty Senate Documents

---

5-1-2017

### 2016-17 FACULTY SENATE XXI - May 1, 2017 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, "2016-17 FACULTY SENATE XXI - May 1, 2017 Minutes Summary" (2017). *Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes*. 170.

[https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty\\_senate\\_agendas\\_minutes/170](https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty_senate_agendas_minutes/170)

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  
2016-17 FACULTY SENATE XXI

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 3:40 p.m. on May 1, 2017**

**MINUTES SUMMARY**

I. Roll – The following senators were absent: Carr, Celikkol, Gardner, Graham, Herold, Mellyn, Puccilli, Sample, Senier, and Taylor. Barnett, Bstieler, Krzanowski, Ramsay, and Scherr were excused. Hiller, Brower-Berg, Hollen, and Hurn served as proxies for Bonica, Brewer, Connell, and Kowalski respectively. Ted Kirkpatrick, and Nancy Targett were guests.

II. Remarks by and questions to the Senate chair – The Senate chair reminded the senators that the next and final meeting of Senate Session XXI will be one week from today, and that the first meeting of Senate Session XXII will begin immediately following it. He noted that with today's very full agenda, the Senate will be following regular order, with only one item up for a Senate vote today. All other motions presented today will lay over until the next meeting.

III. Minutes – It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes from the April 17, 2017 meeting. One correction was offered in Item VII. Thus adjusted, the minutes were approved unanimously, with no abstentions.

IV. Remarks by and questions to the provost – Provost Nancy Targett continued the presentation she began two weeks ago, sharing a high level view of her goals and vision for the university. She reminded the senators that these PowerPoints will be available on the Senate website for those who are interested.

She began by saying that the broad goals of the provost's office include student success, student health and safety, how UNH impacts on New Hampshire and beyond, and ways that we can measure the outcomes. Today's conversation will be on student success. She said that a lot has been written on the evolution of student success, and said it is important that we look at that success holistically, from recruitment through retention to preparation for post-college success. She noted that for some disciplines, the career choices may be more clear than others, such as the law or business school, but that in other disciplines we can still be teaching them how to present themselves, communicate, work as a team, and how to enter the workplace and be successful.

She asked what the UNH differentiators might be; the external drivers that propel enrollments. She said that the brand is real, as it reflects who we are and who our students are across the institution, and suggested that it is important that visitors to our website have a positive and coherent experience. She said we have work to do in this area, emphasizing the importance of having all of our individual websites tied together.

The provost noted philanthropy as another of our differentiators, and praised the Celebrate 150 campaign.

A dynamic curriculum is another differentiator. She said that as she meets with the deans, she is heartened by the ongoing and dynamic process of curriculum development she sees in programs across the university. She said that the access to Open Educational Resources will be an important benefit to our students, and asked faculty to look for ways to incorporate them. She also suggested reframing majors for a new constituency.

Co-curricular support is another important way we can help students find success. The FIRE program in the Paul College has had tremendous success, and perhaps the principles could be modified for success in other colleges. The Career and Professional Success program (CAPS) has been adopted as a program to help students engage with internships.

Student engagement is more important than ever, as our students seek for ways to get involved in their communities through internships and service opportunities. Nancy noted that UNH used to carry the Carnegie Engaged University designation, and she would like to get that designation back again. She said that the engagement is happening, and we just need to recognize, record, and report the wonderful things going on in our community, such as the 190,000 volunteer hours by the cooperative extension, the 170,000 hours of student volunteering, and over 300,000 volunteer hours being performed by CHHS. We are giving back to the state, and she said that it's time our efforts were recognized.

As far as measuring outcomes, Nancy noted that our retention rate is over 80% of students over six year, which is good, but she would like to see that number rise above 90%. She said that over 68% of the thousand students polled self-report that they are participating in internships, which is markedly higher than the national average of 29%. She said she would like to see an independent data base established to track our students internships, perhaps through the CAPS program.

She asserted that the same principles apply to graduate students as well as undergraduates.

She said that a Gallup student of about thirty thousand undergraduates nationally, who talked about the fact that when they felt that their institution was diverse an inclusive, and they were getting exposure to that diversity point, that was when they felt their education was particularly valuable.

A senator asked about the statistics on students who go on to graduate school after completing their degree at UNH. Nancy said that of the 80% of UNH students who complete their degree within six years, 91% either get a job leaving UNH or pursue an additional degree. Of that 91%, 72% go on to get a job or continue further with their education.

A senator asked how an internship is defined in the poll cited above. Nancy said that the next survey that goes out needs to include more clear language on that very issue. Another senator pressed the question of the quality of internships, and Nancy said that this needs to be part of the discussion. Some are simple placements outside of the institution with corporate, business, or not-for-profit partners, while others require much more intense supervision, and those difference need to be discussed. This is why she is bringing these ideas to the Senate now, to spark future conversations about these important issues.

The chair thanked the provost for her time.

V. Academic Affairs Committee discussion and vote on the proposed five-year calendar – AAC chair Scott Smith returned with an updated version of the proposed five-year calendar. He said that he took the Senate members’ concerns about the make up day in AY 2020-2021 to the registrar, who agreed to build into the exam period some blocks toward the end of the semester which can be used as make up days in an emergency, but he cautions the Senate that UNH is the only land-grant university without a snow-emergency policy, whether using online exams or scheduling exams after the break. Scott recommends revisiting this issue and coming up with such a policy next year.

Scott said that he consulted with the Student Senate, who report that they would prefer to have the fall break as long such a break does not push the semester schedule beyond December 22. He also said that there is an established Faculty Senate rule stating that no final exams may be scheduled after that date. The calendar has therefore been adjusted accordingly.

**The motion to approve the proposed calendar was put to a vote, and passed with 55 in favor, 0 opposed, and 2 abstentions.**

VI. Academic Affairs Committee report and discussion on proposed changes to the withdrawal policy – Scott next addressed proposed changes to the Students Rights, Rules, and Responsibilities handbook regarding the existing withdrawal policy. Dean of Students Ted Kirkpatrick attended today’s meeting to answer potential questions.

The existing withdrawal policy forces students to re-apply for admission to the university when they are ready to return. It has been suggested that creating a leave of absence policy would allow students to take time away for healthy, financial, or other reasons as needed without discouraging them from returning. Code 3.32 and 3.33 would be replaced with a single article 3.33 outlining the leave of absence policy. He reported that his committee supports this change wholeheartedly, and that the motion also has support of the administration. The motion states:

***Rationale:** It is timely to consider a change in our “leave of absence” and “withdrawal” policies. At present, we have separate policies and criteria for a “medical withdrawal/leave,” which requires reapplication and readmission to the university, and “leave of absence,” which does not. The college deans and the office of Student Life, in consultation with the Faculty Senate and the Office of the Registrar, propose to simplify the policy and to have all semester or longer absences be referred to as leaves of absence rather than withdrawals that require later readmission. It is very difficult for advisors and other members of the university community to encourage students in crisis to take time away voluntarily when we only have the rather crude tool of “withdrawal.” The change in policy, and the language below, simplifies advising and also favors the mental and physical health of our students.*

*The following policy has been reviewed by ASAC, the Registrar's Office, and the Academic Affairs Committee, the last of which presents the following motion:*

***Motion:** that UNH change its policy and have all semester or longer absences be referred to as leaves of absence, and that the following language replace the current language under Student Rights, Rules and Responsibilities 3.3.*

**3.31 General rule.** *A student may withdraw from the University in any semester by obtaining, completing, and submitting a withdrawal form from the Registrar's Office. Until mid-semester, students may withdraw from the University without academic liability, receiving a grade of W in all courses. Students withdrawing from the University after mid-semester must be assigned a WP or WF by their instructors. The WF will be computed into the student's grade-point averages. Failure to register in any regular semester or to formally withdraw is considered a lapse in a student's degree status and a transcript notation is recorded "degree status discontinued." The student must subsequently apply for readmission. (For tuition rebate, see 11.241; for housing rebate, see 11.243; for dining rebate, see 14.5. For withdrawal grades, see 7.132(fs). For withdrawal for reasons of health, see 22.)*

**3.32 Leave of Absence.** *Any student not subject to any academic or conduct action wishing to seek a leave of absence from their degree program may consult with their respective college dean's office or the Office of the University Registrar. Reasons for requesting a leave of absence may include financial, academic, personal, or health reasons. Students who request a leave that begins while they are matriculated in a given semester will be subject to the rules governing refunds and the award of W, WP, and WF as noted in section 3.31. In most instances, however, leaves that are not health related begin after the completion of a semester.*

*Any student wishing to leave UNH for health reasons should go first to Health and Wellness to begin the process. Note that students who are granted a leave of absence for health reasons are prohibited from study away program participation during the duration of the leave, must remain on leave for one complete semester following the granting of the leave, and must be cleared by Health and Wellness before returning from a leave for health reasons.*

*Students returning from a leave for a Fall semester must notify the Registrar by June 1 of their intent to return and by November 1 when returning for Spring semester. Students will be reinstated into the same major at the point of their leave's start. Normally, leaves of absence may not exceed three academic years or six semesters, exclusive of J-Term and Summer Session. Exceptions to the leave of absence policy will be granted by the University Academic Standards and Advising Committee and only in unusual circumstances.*

*Until mid-semester, students may take a Leave of Absence from the University without academic liability, receiving a grade of W in all courses. Students taking a Leave of Absence from the University after mid-semester must be assigned a WP or WF by their instructors. The WF will be computed into the student's grade-point averages. Failure to return from a leave of absence or to formally withdraw is considered a lapse in a student's degree status in the next semester after three academic years have elapsed and a transcript notation is recorded "degree status discontinued." The student must subsequently apply for readmission. (For tuition rebate, see 11.241; for housing rebate, see 11.243; for dining rebate, see 14.5. For withdrawal grades, see 7.132(fs). For withdrawal for reasons of health, see 22.)*

A senator asked if a student could leave at any point in the semester. Ted replied that the answer is yes, but that they would still be responsible for their work, as per university policy. Any student

withdrawing after mid-semester does so “with grade,” with a WP or WF (withdraw/pass or withdraw/fail). He said that there may be exceptions for medical leaves which have been vetted by a clinician, but that the idea is to help students step away when they need to. A senator asked if there has been a documented increase in medical and psychological withdrawal requests, based on the first clause of the motion’s rationale. He recommended removing that first phrase, as no data is provided to support the statement. Scott replied that there has been an increase in the number of appointments in psychological services, but that he and the committee would willingly remove the clause as a friendly amendment.

Ted added that what we’re seeing is that students are doing what we’ve been trying to encourage them to do; that is, seek help when they need it. Dean Kirkpatrick said that the number of true mental health incidents may not be greater, but students are asking for help. He also noted that our diagnostic tools have improved. The question of whether this is a real increase or a fake epidemic is less important than the fact that we’re dealing with more students and their families, and that some students simply need to step away from the university setting for a time. The ease of re-entry with a leave of absence makes it easier for students to return to campus when they’re ready. He said that UNH is using the Princeton model, which has had some success there.

A senator asserted that in his personal experience, leaves have not improved student performance, and noted that the current withdrawal policy provides a mechanism to re-evaluate a returning student. Ted replied that the new policy does require a clinician’s evaluation before re-entry for physical and mental health leaves. He said that, overall, the data is persuasive that, even for academic suspensions, it is a helpful intervention tool to re-write a program that is spinning in a bad direction, and empower students to take control of their own program. Ted explained that a student would initiate the leave by filling out the appropriate form, which goes around to the appropriate department and college administrators so that everyone is aware of the leave. If the leave involves a medical or psychological health issue, then it is not only up to the student, as clinicians would be involved. Currently, the leave policy is seldom used because it is so restrictive. The senator asked about the accountability for students who are doing poorly in their classes and choose to withdraw at the last minute and walk away with WP on their transcript. Ted said that that scenario is possible under the current policy as well, so there is no change with the new policy.

Another senator asked how often students have been prevented in the past from coming back after a withdrawal, and why the university’s position on their return seems to have changed. Ted replied that he isn’t sure why there has been a shift in position, but reported that the decision to come back after a withdrawal or suspension has always been made by the dean’s office in which the student resides. The readmission decision was always in the hands of the college, whether for a leave or a withdrawal.

Another senator asked about the admission time frame for returning students, noting that she had a readmission in February. Ted replied that a mid-semester readmission is an anomaly, and added there are specific deadlines in the proposed wording for students to submit their request for readmission before each semester to prevent just such anomalies.

This motion will lay over until the next Senate meeting.

VII. Agenda Committee report and motion on changes to the SRRR regarding MISA violation – The chair, representing the Agenda Committee, shared the following motion to update the Students Rights, Rules, & Responsibilities handbook to clarify the jurisdiction of disciplinary actions for undergraduates who falsify or fabricate data on federally funded research projects. He welcomed Dean Kirkpatrick to answer any questions. The proposed new wording clarifies the protocol:

***Rationale:*** *The Faculty Senate revised the University’s Misconduct in Scholarly Activity (MISA) policy in January 2017 with specific acknowledgement that undergraduates could be subject to MISA if the misconduct was related to their work on federally-funded research. To provide additional clarity and avoid any possible confusion that the student conduct process (rather than the MISA process) would be the primary mechanism to adjudicate allegations of misconduct in connection with federally-funded research, we would amend SRRR as follows. SRRR already notes the precedence of academic misconduct policies over Code of Conduct, and the Faculty Senate has already approved the MISA process that explicitly notes jurisdiction over any misconduct involving federally-funded research (even if undergrads are involved).*

***Motion:*** *The Agenda Committee moves that the Faculty Senate requests the Dean of Students to make the following addition to SRRR:*

***“The procedures and standards of the University’s Misconduct in Scholarly Activity (MISA) Policy will take precedence over the Code of Conduct and the 09.7 “Procedures for Dealing with Academic Misconduct,” for purposes of determining whether misconduct was perpetrated in connection with federally-funded research that falls within the purview of the MISA Policy. If a MISA proceeding concludes that a student violated the MISA Policy, the student will be referred for disciplinary action under SRRR Academic Misconduct protocols.”***

Julie Simpson, director of Research Integrity Services, would first review any alleged misconduct and, if appropriate, make a recommendation to the dean of the college, who would follow the protocols in the SRRR handbook.

A senator asked if this is a separate conduct procedure. Dante replied that if there is an academic violation, the professor would coordinate with the appropriate dean’s office. In this case, it is a separate path, through the MISA office first rather than the professor, and on to the college.

Dean Kirkpatrick said that the UNH Academic Honesty Policy is the envy of other institutions, and added that the proposed update will carry that policy through the MISA office rather than through regular channels for conduct violations. He said it would be very rare for this policy to be enacted, but that it is important for it to be in place. These changes will codify the policy per federal regulations. Until now, we have had no policy to manage such misconduct.

This motion will lay over until the next Senate meeting.

VIII. Teaching Evaluation Standards Committee report and motion – The chair introduced Chris Bauer, the chair of the Senate ad hoc Teaching Evaluation Standards Committee. This committee was formed last year by last year’s Senate to take a closer look at teaching evaluation standards.

Chris reported that charge given to his committee states, “The Faculty Senate shall undertake a study of best practices utilizing methodologies for assessing teaching quality,” and his committee has done that. What emerges is this motion which, in general terms, intends to to guide the direction of the next steps. He said his committee had four objectives:

- Regarding teaching and teaching evaluations, the committee wants to UNH to be a place where educators cultivate one another rather than gather data to use punitively against one another
- The committee wants to see UNH step forward in the area of peer review, not in the sense of evaluation, but in the sense of formative assessment. An example is the current use of end of semester evaluations (or surveys, as the motion recommends they be identified), which doesn’t exercise the level of professional insight they would like to see
- The committee would like to increase the students’ voice by involving them earlier in the semester. He noted a national move to engage students earlier in a conversation about course goals and student perspectives
- There is much talk of teaching quality, without much articulation of what that actually is. He noted that this seems to be a national tendency

The motion states:

***Rationale** - Faculty in higher education across the country are seeking improved processes for assessment of teaching with primary focus on the purpose of professional development. In particular, there is movement away from using student end-of-semester ratings as the sole metric. This movement is due to dissatisfaction with the utility of the rating information for improving one’s teaching. Furthermore, emerging experimental evidence demonstrates that student ratings fail to measure teaching effectiveness and are subject to substantial implicit bias. Early-course assessment (similar to the UNH Midcourse Assessment Program), peer observation, and portfolio-based documentation are practices that are gaining substantial traction, and which give more voice for students and more insight for instructors. There is no uniformly accepted ideal model, and reports indicate that faculty at other institutions are engaged in similar introspective activity.*

***Motion** - That the Faculty Senate support development of a teaching assessment process that embodies the goal of continual improvement for all faculty, and which provides earlier and more productive engagement of students in this process within each course. That process should include the recommended actions that follow.*

*1) That a faculty senate committee, working with the Center for Excellence and Innovation in Teaching and Learning, develop specific recommendations and guidance for instructors regarding early-semester course assessment including professional development on engaging students in that process.*

*2) That the Center for Excellence and Innovation in Teaching and Learning develop instructional recommendations for students on how to provide constructive professional feedback. Report of Committee on Teaching Evaluation Standards, April 2017*



*3) That a faculty senate committee, working with the Center for Excellence and Innovation in Teaching and Learning, develop specific recommendations and guidance regarding peer- assessment practices, and what documentation may or may not become part of P&T or employment decisions.*

*4) That a faculty senate committee, working with the Center for Excellence and Innovation in Teaching and Learning and the Provost's office, develop specific recommendations and guidance regarding documentation of teaching activity and effectiveness by portfolio, for inclusion in the normal evaluative process for faculty promotion, tenure, and continued employment .*

*5) That a faculty senate committee, working with the Center for Excellence and Innovation in Teaching and Learning and the Provost's office, articulate a set of components of quality teaching, building on the work of the Study Committee 2016-2017.*

*6) That end-of-course student input be called surveys and not evaluations.*

*7) That a faculty senate committee take an entirely fresh look at student end-of-course survey prompts to develop a set (numerical and narrative) that provides more insight regarding student perceptions of learning, instructor behaviors, and course learning conditions. In other words, engage students in commenting on what may have affected their learning.*

*8) That the Center for Excellence and Innovation in Teaching and Learning, working with faculty senate representatives, develop a workshop and set of resources regarding the literature on the validity, bias, and reliability of numerical course surveys, including use of historical UNH data. This workshop may be deployed for Deans, Chairs, and all faculty.*

Chris referred the senators to the committee's report, which was attached to today's agenda. He noted that other institutions are applying these principles, and also stressed the value of administrators and faculty working together.

Regarding the portfolio-based documentation, Chris said that the learning objectives and course syllabi, one-third semester student input, and mid-semester peer review all become components that the instructor has as data to look at, including the end of semester surveys to pull together into a portfolio as a reflection on what has happened in that course for that semester. He said that how these components are implemented are specifics that need to be worked out by faculty and administrators. The motion is not attempting to dictate how these elements would be utilized.

A senator asked Chris how to distinguish between evaluative and formative assessments, suggesting that any kind of peer review could hamper earning power. Chris replied that there is much talk about this without any real specifics about consequences for such assessments. He said that institutions such as Cornell and Stanford have elaborate teaching assessment reports and handbooks, but that the committee did not draw on those because they did not want to make assumptions about how we might choose to manage this.

Another senator thanked the TESC for their thoughtful and objective report, and asked what the role of technology might be in facilitating the evaluation process. He noted that Canvas does not seem to simplify the evaluation process, and also suggested that peer evaluation could be facilitated by recording an instructor's class. Chris replied that his committee looked at some possibilities, but did not examine specific products.

A senator asked if the mid-semester peer review recommendation would be mandatory, and if that is in line with the faculty contracts in place. A senator noted that end of semester reviews are already mandated for lecturers. Chris said that such a decision would be part of the discussion, adding that the current system is primarily evaluative, while there is strength in formative assessment. Another senator asserted that although the committee says it wants to cultivate the faculty, what he currently perceives is a system with the overall objective to gather information about professors, using computerized methods to provide easy access to that information and then rank professors by those numbers. He said that the purpose of the evaluation should be to help a professor understand his or her students and see how to improve their course, and that the computerization of the evaluations does not lead us in that direction. Chris said that his committee has no recommendations regarding computerization of evaluations. The idea is to support discussion, narrative, a positive developmental approach in terms of what is put into practice in the classroom, all for the benefit of student outcomes. The committee had no interest in rating people, but rather to improve the teaching and learning environment on campus.

Another senator said he is curious about the meaning of "components of quality teaching," noting that teaching methods vary widely from instructor to instructor. Chris referred the senator to the report, in which the committee examines what needs to be improved, going beyond just a list of teaching techniques.

A senator commended the committee for providing a new framework, and noting the large amount of work ahead to carry out the objectives of this motion. He asked if it seems practical to accomplish so much within a single Faculty Senate committee. Chris said that the committee's objective was to begin the conversation. Some recommendations may be relatively easy to implement, while others will take substantial planning, resources, and effort. A member of the TESC said that this proposal is part of a larger culture change, and encouraged the senators to review the report.

The chair said that this motion will lay over until the next Senate meeting.

IX. AAC report on the Writing Committee – Scott Smith returned to represent the Academic Affairs Committee in its report on the Writing Program and Committee. He said that an external review has been performed of the UNH Writing Program, and that the AAC has reviewed that report. The external reviewers had high praise for the structural aspects of the program, and to UNH's commitment to writing. Problems were also identified, such as inconsistency in familiarity with the writing intensive requirements, the max capacity for writing intensive courses, the process to create writing intensive courses, and particularly a lack of training for instructors teaching writing intensive courses. The external reviewers were also concerned with the proliferation of writing intensive courses at the upper levels, but the AAC didn't see this as a problem.

The reviewers also found that the Writing Committee, which meets in an advisory capacity, lacks the power to enact change or monitor the quality of the writing courses, and the AAC agrees that this may be an issue to address. The senior vice provost for academic affairs asked that the Senate address the concerns raised by the external reviewers. Scott spoke with Ed Mueller, chair of the Writing Committee, about possible solutions to the concerns raised. The AAC proposes the following motion:

***Rationale:** A self-study of the UNH Writing Program was submitted on March 3, 2016. An external review of the writing program was submitted on June 28, 2016. In it, the reviewers praised UNH's "enviable commitment to writing," but also noted tension as to who owned the Writing Program and what body would have the rights and responsibility to enact change. In particular, the external review noted:*

- *an inconsistency in familiarity with the Writing Intensive requirement, the max capacity for WI courses, and the process to create WI courses.*
- *a proliferation of WI courses, especially at the upper level*
- *a lack of training for instructors teaching WI; some faculty "did not even know the course that they were assigned to teach had previously been approved as a WI course."*
- *the Writing Committee's (hereafter WC) lack of power to enact change or monitor the quality of writing courses; the reviewers implicitly suggest that this concern came from members of the WC, whether past or present, a fact that will become important below.*
- *A lack of "ownership" of WI courses at the college or departmental level; specifically, the reviewers note a lack of coherence or consistency across WI courses, and further detect a tension between WI courses and the larger goals of the university.*

*The Academic Affairs Committee was charged with studying the reports and making recommendations, which follow below; a contextualized discussion that led to them can be found in the accompanying AAC report dated April 27, 2017.*

*1. Under the new NEASC accreditation standards, departments will be required to address "educational effectiveness" (Standard 8, pp. 24-25). Each department will therefore be prompted to review its effectiveness in implementing the goals of the Writing Program. We charge the shepherds of the NEASC process with communicating with departments the need to reflect on their approaches to WI and Writing across the Curriculum in their program reports.*

*2. The CEITL organizational structure, under which the Writing Program is planned to reside, must provide adequate resources to provide faculty to assistance and guidance to ensure a smoother and more effective implementation of our writing goals. Whether it should remain in this structure is to be reconsidered next year (see below, #5).*

*3. Even with the above recommendations, there must be a method to ensure accountability and a mechanism to eliminate WI courses that do not meet the requirements. As for the latter, we recommend a mandated sunset period, whereby every five years a department has to review and resubmit courses, with syllabi, that are to maintain the WI designation. Both the colleges and the WC would thus act in an advisory capacity to ensure that WI courses continue to meet the high standards of UNH's writing*

*program. Courses not resubmitted would lose the WI designation.<sup>1</sup> We feel that the original language of the charter (AAC Report p. 4) indicates such a review is warranted. A year of preparation will be warranted to ensure a smooth process; we therefore propose to begin in AY18–19.*

*4. Training for new faculty should include a segment on the Writing Program, its goals, Writing across the Curriculum, and Writing Intensive courses. Faculty teaching a WI intensive course for the first time should undergo mandatory WI training, whether in the form of the many workshops offered by the Writing Program but unexploited by most faculty, or in an online training video.*

*5. The Faculty Senate should consider bringing the Writing Committee under its purview by making the Writing Committee a Faculty Senate Committee, similar to the Discovery Committee. Because this report comes at year's end, we believe it would be in the best interest of all to charge the Agenda Committee next year (AY17–18) with the task of examining the possibility.*

***4. Motion: The Faculty Senate endorses the above recommendations and authorizes the Chair to forward them to the appropriate administrators for consideration.***

A typographical error in Item 2 was corrected as a friendly amendment. A senator noted that the wording in Item 4 calling for “mandated training” should be revised. After some discussion, the AAC accepted as a friendly amendment the change from “*Faculty teaching a WI intensive course for the first time should undergo mandatory WI training*” to “*Faculty teaching a WI intensive course for the first time should be strongly encouraged to undergo WI training.*”

Another senator noted that programs are reviewed every ten years, and that it would be natural to incorporate the review of writing intensive courses at the same time. Scott agreed.

A senator said that these changes are needed, reporting that her department was not clear on how to make a course a writing intensive course. She suggested including wording about including training in the new faculty orientation.

A senator who used to chair the Writing Committee asked why that committee does not enjoy the same kind of authority as the Senate Discovery Committee. Scott said that is one of the questions his committee raised as well, noting that, regarding writing intensive courses that are also Discovery courses, the Writing Committee currently does not have the authority to reject a course as writing intensive, but that the Discovery Committee does have that authority.

Scott said that his committee has the mandate to review the Writing Program and Committee again in three years, and they would like to see if the suggested changes solve some of the problems noted. He said it has been suggested to give the Writing Committee more authority, but the members of the current committee do not seem to want that change, asserting that they are not set up to act as proxies for departments and colleges in making decisions about courses. Scott said that there is a lack of clarity about the issue.

Dante said that this motion will lay over until the next Senate meeting.

---

<sup>1</sup> So as not to overwhelm either colleges or the Writing Program, a review of courses will somehow have to be staggered somehow so that 1/5 of courses would be subject to resubmission each year.

X. AAC report and resolution on the Honors College – Next, Scott presented a brief report on the Honors Program. Two years ago, the Senate endorsed a slight change to the curriculum of the Honors Program, introducing the symposium idea of four courses centering around a single topic, taught by four different disciplines. Last year, Jerry Marx, the director of the Honors Program, proposed the formation of an Honors College with two components. A residential center would be established in Hubbard Hall, including space for an administrative section with some class space for Honors courses, and a change in name to the Honors College, without any real change to the curriculum. The AAC felt very strongly that the change of the name to Honors College with no curriculum change would not truly reflect what is going on with the program, and found the proposal premature. However, they did find a lot of merit in the residential center as well as a slight uptick in the administrative support for the Honors Program itself. Last year at the end of the Senate session, the Finance and Administration Committee reviewed the proposed financials for the Honors College, and found them to be sound. The increase in administrative costs would be shared by a small student fee to cover that cost, which is what other programs do. The AAC recommended that a feasibility study into the cost of renovating Hubbard Hall be undertaken. The administration also had additional plans for upgrading Hubbard Hall to create more bed space, and ran the feasibility study, with three possible recommendations: 1) an extensive renovation of the hall, adding fifty beds, at the cost of \$50 million, 2) maintain the current footprint of the building with a minor upgrade at just under \$1 million, and 3) add a small, one-story wing to the building at the cost of \$1.2 million. The third option is the plan that the administration would like to pursue. The AAC feels that this option would be beneficial, particularly if no university funds are used on the project, seeking instead outside donors for the funds. While there is some debate of the value of the Honors Program itself, Scott said that that is something worth consideration in the future. His committee promotes the following resolution:

***Resolution: The Faculty Senate supports, in principle, the creation of a residential and administrative center for the Honors Program in Hubbard Hall, and urges the administration to seek out alumni and donor support to fund the project.***

A senator asked about the difference between the Honors Program and honors in the major, asking which students are in the Honors Program, particularly if there are many engineering students in the program. Scott said that the university Honors Program follows a first two years plus the second two years model. He said that the second two years are essentially the regular honors in major programs found in any department. These honors in major programs do not require anything extraordinary from a student's first two years. The university Honors Program requires four Discovery classes in various disciplines, taken with other honors students, after which the students move into the regular honors in major programs. After the initial four Discovery courses, these honors students take their remaining courses with all other UNH students, and are not isolated. The Honors Program dormitory would be mostly first and second year students. The senator said that such segregation of students seems counter to the university's goal to increase diversity. He acknowledged the Honors Program as a recruitment tool, but asked if the isolation of our students is worth it. Scott pointed out that Hubbard Hall is already identified as the Honors Program building. The suggested renovations would make it easier to show off that space and our program

A senator asked if the renovations to Hubbard Hall would make it accessible, and Scott said he believe that that is the plan. He asked that the Senate admin post the feasibility study on the Senate website for the senators to review. Another senator asked what the rationale is for the

residential model, and if it is worth the cost. Scott said that this is the model of other institutions, to have residential space for honors students with on-site administrative support. He said that if a donor can be found to fund the project, his committee finds it a worthwhile project.

The resolution will lay over until the next Senate meeting.

**XI. CPC report and motion on a tobacco-free campus** – Marc Hiller, from the Health Management & Policy Department, addressed the Senate, representing the Campus Planning Committee. He noted that the motion before the Senate was brought to the CPC in an effort to update a fifteen year old policy on tobacco use on UNH campuses. He declared tobacco use to be the number one leading cause of preventable death in our nation. He said that the 18-25 year-old cohort is the least successful in addressing tobacco use. He noted the 60,000 annual deaths in our country from second hand tobacco smoke exposure.

The current policy on UNH campuses, established in 2002, is that there must be a twenty foot barrier between any smoking area and our buildings. At the time this policy was put into place, the understanding of that committee was that the smoke-free areas would increase in size over the years until there would be no smoking on campus. At that time, UNH was among the leaders in the United States in adopting this policy. Now over 1,750 college campuses have declared themselves to be tobacco-free, including the University of Maine, University of Vermont, University of Southern Maine, UMass-Boston, and UMass-Dartmouth. The full list of these institutions can be found online.

There are efforts to advance such proposals by the American Cancer Society, the American Lung Association, the American Heart Association, and the American College Health Association, among others. The motion presented today is supported here on campus by Healthy UNH, by CHHS Dean Mike Ferrara, by Kevin Charles, Assistant Vice-President of Student Life and Executive Director of Health Services. Marc has also provided as an appendix to today's agenda a letter of support from Cynthia Hallett, MPH President and CEO of Americans for Non-smokers' Rights Foundation. Marc asked the group to review these letters of support, providing what he called compelling arguments in support of this motion, which states:

***Rationale:*** *The American College Health Association (ACHA) has acknowledged the findings of the U.S. Surgeon General that tobacco use in any form, active and/or passive, is a significant health hazard. Recognizing that environmental tobacco smoke is classified as a Class-A carcinogen, the ACHA has adopted a "No Tobacco Use" policy and encourages colleges and universities to be diligent in their efforts to achieve a 100% indoor and outdoor campus-wide tobacco-free environment.*

*As of January 2, 2017 there were at least 1,757 100% smoke-free college campuses across America.<sup>1</sup> Of these, 1,468 are also tobacco-free, 1,331 prohibit e-cigarette use, and 652 prohibit hookah use. Public New England universities that have already adopted tobacco-free policies include the University of Maine, University of Southern Maine, University of Massachusetts-Dartmouth, the University of Vermont, and Plymouth State University (NH).*

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://no-smoke.org/goingsmokefree.php?id=447>

*Therefore,*

***4. Motion: Given the impact of tobacco and smoking on health, regardless of whether it is inhaled by choice or unintentionally, and given the absence of any real progress toward establishing tobacco-free campuses for UNH since 2002, the Faculty Senate requests that the University adopt a tobacco-free and smoke-free policy for all UNH campuses by 2020, consistent with the “Healthy UNH” tobacco-free campus initiative.***

*At a minimum, any such policy should:*

- *retain the elements of the existing University tobacco policy (not specifically addressed by this revised policy);*
- *continue to provide effective health promotion and education, making smoking cessation programs available to any University individual who wishes to quit smoking;*
- *ensure a wide dissemination of the new policy to all faculty, staff, students and visitors, including consistent signage across campus;*
- *develop a mechanism to monitor impact and effectiveness over time.*

Marc noted that neither the original 2002 policy, nor this one include any type of mandatory enforcement, relying instead on an anticipated cultural shift as reported on the 1,750 campuses employing this kind of policy. He said that other institutions have found that social norming and peer pressure often provide sufficient support without mandated enforcement. He noted that the Graduate Student Senate has reported to him that if they were to support such a policy, they would prefer to see enforcement of that policy, but he asserted that data does not support the need to use of enforcement. He said it is the intent of the CPC to leave the method of implementation to the administration. It was noted that all buildings on all campuses are currently smoke-free.

A senator asked if the committee has had any conversation with the Navitas administrators, noting the popularity of cigarette use among our Navitas students, and the fact that many of these students currently do not abide by the twenty-foot rule when smoking near buildings on campus. Marc suggested that perhaps the administration would choose to establish some method of enforcement. He noted that the director of UNH Health Services firm endorses this motion, with a recommendation to develop a targeted program for students such as the Navitas students.

Another senator suggested that the opening sentence of the motion has some language issues which make it unclear whether the motion is about all tobacco products or just smoking products. Marc said he would look at changing that.

A senator asked if the undergraduate Student Senate has weighed in on this matter yet, noting the potential impact on that group. Marc said that the undergraduate Student Senate has expressed a desire to see more study on the matter, as well as being opposed to any kind of enforcement of such a policy. The undergraduate Student Senate representative, that group’s Health and Wellness Representative, said that their main concern is with our international students. She asked how the university would help students quit using tobacco products, and noted that even among the students who don’t use tobacco, and dislike being around it do not want to prohibit their peers from using if they want to.

A senator asked if there are documented negative health impacts for second hand chewing tobacco. Marc replied that there is data on negative health consequences for smokeless tobacco, e-cigarettes, and hookas, although those consequences are often not as severe as those resulting from second-hand tobacco smoke or actually smoking cigarettes.

Another senator asked about the impact on faculty and staff who use tobacco, and asked about cessation programs for those members of our community. The Senate chair noted that he sent the proposed motion and report to staff organizations, and the head of Human Resources in an effort to disseminate the information as broadly as possible. Marc responded that smoking cessation programs are covered by the UNH faculty and staff health benefit and student health insurance.

A senator from the School of Law asked if this policy would apply to all UNH campuses, and noted that it would be particularly difficult to enforce such a policy on the Concord campus. He said that four of the Law School building entrances are within a few feet of a public sidewalk, and that a policy like this would make things much worse there, even with kiosks and weather shelters in place. He also noted that with the widespread popularity of smoking among Eastern Asians, even a marginal discouragement such as this policy could have a significant impact on recruitment for the graduate program at the School of Law.

The Graduate Student Senate representative asked if there is specific data for second hand smoke impact on the UNH campus. Marc replied that the impact of smoking or second-hand exposure doesn't generally show up for ten to twenty years, making it difficult to get substantial local data. He noted a popular trend for college students to take up smoking for their college years, only to discover at the end of four or six years that it is not as easy to quit as they imagined it might be. He said that progress is being made in the battle against tobacco use in this country, but that in the meanwhile, people are suffering, citing health issues addressed in our health center, such as asthma and other diseases associated with smoking.

The senator from Anthropology said that her department has data showing that quitting smoking is harder for economically challenged groups, making this policy somewhat discriminatory. She asked about plans for smoking cessation options, and then asked what can be done about students who chew tobacco in class. Another senator agreed that he would like to see a policy to eliminate its use in class. Hiller said that the policy currently in place says nothing about chewing tobacco, but that the proposed new policy does. He stressed again that the CPC is not telling the administration how to carry this out, and noted that the national average to implement such a program is three to six months. He said he would like to see UNH back in the lead in this cause. He also noted that any policy approved here would also have to first be approved by President Huddleston.

This motion will lay over until the next Senate meeting.

XII. CPC report and motion on private ventures – Bill Berndtson, representing the Campus Planning Committee, presented the following motion on private ventures at UNH:



***Rationale:*** In 2012 the Faculty Senate approved Motion #XVII-M6 on guidelines for public/private ventures,<sup>2</sup> requesting that the University administration create a set of guidelines and criteria, under which such a partnership would be considered. Such guidelines and criteria have yet to be created or adopted.

Therefore,

**4. Motion:** *Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate calls on the University administration to adopt the following guidelines for UNH/private ventures:*

- 1. *The consideration of any potential UNH/private venture shall occur in compliance with the principles of shared governance. Opportunities for such ventures may arise and require negotiation and/or the execution of agreements during periods when the Faculty Senate is not meeting. The university shall not be constrained from proceeding during such periods. However, the administration should strive to update the Faculty Senate in a timely manner about such activities and should allow the senate an opportunity to provide comment or input when circumstances permit.***
- 2. *Such ventures should clearly and directly enhance the mission and core values of UNH.***
- 3. *Ventures that involve collaborative research agreements should include terms to prevent conflict of interest while respecting the importance of communicating research findings for the public good. Precautions should also be implemented to ensure the integrity of such research, particularly where the private company, University and/or its researchers have a financial interest in the outcome of that research.***
- 4. *Potential benefits and adverse impacts of the partnership on the Town of Durham must be addressed.***
- 5. *The goal of UNH-private ventures should be to partner with the private sector in ventures aimed at catalyzing economic innovation for New Hampshire.***

Bill gave a brief history of the issues with public/private ventures at UNH in past years, speaking of a proposal some time ago to possibly rent land to a big-box store on the far end of the UNH properties. While that plan did not go forward, UNH still has some land that could be used for private ventures, and the CPC would like to provide some guidance regarding the use of that land in such ventures. He reported that the provost has reviewed the proposed motion and had no problem with items 2-4. However, she has said that items 1 and 5 cross the line between governance and management. Bill said that those items were revised and sent back to the provost, who still has an issue with them. He said he is open to suggestions to make those items more palatable to the administration.

---

<sup>2</sup> UNH campus sites designated for potential UNH/private ventures are identified on page 13 of the Campus Master Plan: <https://www.unh.edu/facilities/cmp>

Bill said that the main goal of this motion is to keep the faculty in the loop regarding uses being considered for our land resources. He noted that choices about the use of UNH lands impact the environment, but that some of those lands are critical to our academic programs, as well. Once land has been developed, it puts strain on the remaining undeveloped spaces. He said that the university seems to be asserting now that our goal is to partner with private entities in research and ways that benefit the state. Bill asserted that being a landlord to a retail complex doesn't seem to fit the university's mission for teaching, research, and service.

Dante said that this motion will get the full period of discussion at the next Senate meeting, and thanked the committee for its efforts.

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 5:36 p.m.