

University of New Hampshire

University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository

Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes

Faculty Senate Documents

11-21-2016

2016-17 FACULTY SENATE XXI - November 21, 2016 Minutes Summary

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "2016-17 FACULTY SENATE XXI - November 21, 2016 Minutes Summary" (2016). *Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes*. 178.

https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty_senate_agendas_minutes/178

This Text is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate Documents at University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes by an authorized administrator of University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository. For more information, please contact Scholarly.Communication@unh.edu.

UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
2016-17 FACULTY SENATE XXI

<p>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.</p>

Meeting called to order at 3:42 p.m. on November 21, 2016

MINUTES SUMMARY

I. Roll – The following senators were absent: Barnett, Boucher, Carr, Clark, R. Collins, Edwards, Finkelhor, Negron-Gonzales, and Warner. Poworoznek, Reagan, Scherr, and Wake were excused. Robertson and Lyon served as proxies for Friedman and Gibson, respectively. Jim Harter, Mica Stark, Helen Stubbs, and Nancy Targett were guests.

II. Remarks by and questions to the provost – Provost Targett reported that there have been reports in the press recently accusing UNH of demonstrating sharp bias in the recent presidential election season. Women’s Studies and the Carsey Institute of Public Policy have been particularly singled out for public criticism. A newspaper article described posts on the Women’s Studies program Facebook page, and an email leaked by WikiLeaks from the Carsey School Director which indicated support for a particular candidate. In the article, concerns were expressed that university staff, time, and property were being used for overt political activity.

The provost said that she is meeting with university counsel to determine if there was inappropriate action on the part of UNH employees, and just what needs to be done. She said that all faculty and staff are encouraged to be politically active, but that the university itself does not advocate for particular candidates or parties. She said that the goal is to develop some guidelines for faculty and staff to follow, noting that any guidelines would be a starting point for discussion of the issues, based on advice from legal counsel that would outline where things are right now, with some movability going forward.

A senator thanked the provost for addressing this issue, noting that the issue goes beyond partisan politics. Another senator said that a colleague asked him if there is a vehicle to report incidents of hate crimes on campus. Nancy responded that “reportit.unh.edu” is the URL to use for just such reports, and to keep abreast of what is going on in the community in this regard.

A senator said that this becomes a First Amendment issue, and asked if faculty who write op-ed pieces are permitted to include their name and university position on such pieces. Nancy said that is appropriate as she discussed in a previous Senate meeting. She emphasized, however, that it is important to also include a disclaimer stating that the opinion expressed does not necessarily represent the official position of the university, unless the writer is actually authorized to make such statements on behalf of UNH.

The provost said that the other items she was going to share today can wait for another day. The chair thanked her for her time.

III. Remarks by and questions to the Senate chair - Chair Dante Scala reported that the reception for Senate members at the president's home has been re-scheduled to follow the next Senate meeting, on Monday December 5, beginning at 5:30 p.m. He said that the invitations have been sent out by email. Several senators reported that they have not received the invitations yet. The Senate admin will check with the president's office about those invitations.

Next, Dante said that a memo will be going out to college deans and department chairs from the registrar, the Senate chair, and the Academic Affairs Committee chair regarding double-counting of courses for Discovery and major/minor credit. [Senate Motion XX-#M24](#), passed last May stated that the default for double-counting would be to allow the practice, although departments may rule to not allow it if they choose. Dante noted that some colleges are very settled on this issue, while it continues to be more controversial in other colleges. He said that the registrar's role is to implement the Senate's ruling as outlined in Motion XX-#M24.

A senator asked if this rule applies to seniors, or only to incoming first year students. She said that this is an ongoing problem in her department in COLA, and asked how this will impact student advising. Dante replied that the rule will apply going forward, with room to appeal if necessary. Scott noted that because the current catalogue includes a restriction on double-counting, the registrar cannot retroactively change what is there, although petitioning is allowable. Since the Senate voted strongly to allow double-counting, with departmental discretion, the registrar should respect that recommendation. He noted that it may take a few weeks to fully implement the policy and honor those petitions, and he and Dante asked faculty to be patient with the registrar's office during that time. Dante encouraged senators to communicate with their department chairs on this matter to be sure that the memo is received. As far as student advising in the next few weeks, he advise faculty to continue to follow their departments' current rules until an announcement is made that the new policy is fully in force.

IV. Minutes – It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes from the November 7, 2016 meeting. With no corrections suggested, the minutes were approved unanimously as presented, with 1 abstention.

V. Motion from the Teaching Evaluation Implementation Committee – Alberto Manalo, chair of the ad hoc Teaching Evaluation Implementation Committee, presented his committee's report on questions that have been proposed as additions to the student evaluations of teaching for online courses at UNH. The committee was asked to review twenty-six questions proposed for the evaluations. The committee found some of the questions to be of little actual value, and recommended to eliminate those questions (Q24-26). As indicated in the report, concern was expressed about questions which asked students to compare online and face-to-face course experiences. The committee proposed the following motion:

***Rationale:** The set of questions in the student evaluation of UNH online courses includes the sixteen questions asked in the student evaluation of traditional face-to-face classes, with three questions modified to take into account the online nature of the courses. The Faculty Senate has approved the inclusion of those sixteen questions.*

Students in an online course are also asked an additional set of questions related to their experience with the course. These questions originally came from UNH Online, and were meant to obtain information from students that could be used to improve the quality of online courses offered by the University. These questions had not been approved by the Faculty Senate. Some faculty members have also questioned the usefulness and validity of several of those questions.

The Faculty Senate Ad Hoc committee on Teaching Evaluation Form Implementation has reviewed the second set of questions and proposes some changes.

Motion: The set of questions related to the student experience in the online course should be preceded by the following introduction:

The University of New Hampshire is committed to supporting students and faculty members engaged in online teaching and learning. Your responses to the following questions will help us as we strive to offer the best online courses.

The following set of questions related to student experience in the online course should replace the one currently in place:

- 17. The syllabus and other supporting documents clearly outlined what the student should expect of the course.***
- 18. The course material required for this course was easy to locate.***
- 19. The course material required for each module was clearly described.***
- 20. The multimedia (ex. audio/video) materials were effective in communicating course content.***
- 21. The interaction I had with other students online created a stimulating learning environment.***
- 22. How can the quality of interaction with other students throughout this online course be improved?***
- 23. How can the quality of interaction with the instructor throughout this online course be improved?***

Alberto noted that questions 22 and 23 are modified versions of the originally proposed questions. He also said that these questions would be used for 100% online courses, not for hybrid courses. A senator suggested that some kind of introduction might be helpful on the evaluation itself to explain these questions, saying that sometimes the intent of the questions gets lost in context.

Another senator suggested re-numbering the questions in the motion, Q1-7, rather than beginning with Q17. A senator suggested using letters to prevent confusion, and also suggested using quotation marks in the motion itself, around the introduction and then again around the questions themselves, to clarify the wording.

A senator asked if Q17 is intended to be used in the same manner as Q1-14 for promotion and tenure. Alberto said that these questions are not meant for promotion and tenure, but rather are designed to help instructors improve their courses. There may be a need for additional questions,

but developing those questions is not the role of the TEVC; that would be for the Senate and the provost to review together.

A senator asked who will receive the information from these evaluation questions. Alberto replied that the instructor will get the information, and that UNH Online will also have access to the responses. Another senator noted that twenty-three questions are a lot for students to answer and wondered if students will actually complete all of the questions. Alberto said that students seem to have answered all of them in the past.

Another senator asked about the mean for Q1-13 in the original evaluation, which seems to have disappeared from the online evaluation form. Alberto said the Senate chair has been working with the administration in having that reported again. Alberto said that getting the result reported has been complicated with the current vendor. The Senate chair said that that evaluations will have that mean score generated beginning this fall. The senator asked if the new Q17-21 (which are on a rating scale) will have a similar mean figured, and if that average would be included in the 1-13 mean, or would be averaged separately.

A senator asked if it is a general expectation of students to be able to interact with other students during an online course, and asked if we are trying to duplicate the face-to-face classroom experience in our online courses. A senator who reported attending training for online course instruction said that providing student interaction is a major component in that training.

Another senator asked what the motivation is to add these questions to the evaluation form, whether it is about the quality of the program generally, or with the online components of the program. Alberto said that the TEVC thinks that these questions have value in helping instructors develop their courses, and that these are not intended to evaluate the instructor. A senator said that Q17-20 in the motion could equally apply to online or face-to-face courses, and asked why they weren't being used for face-to-face course evaluations. Alberto said his is a good point. Another senator said that these questions, by virtue of being part of the student evaluation of teaching form, will naturally come to be used to evaluate the instructors, regardless of the intent to use the new questions solely for the instructors' information. She also said that these questions do not apply to all online courses, noting that some seminar courses would not have a component for student interaction. A senator said he disagreed; that online students can always be encouraged to collaborate and communicate with each other. He suggested that if there are questions that do not apply in a particular course, students can easily respond "no need" to those questions.

A senator said it seemed important to include some question on the evaluation form to ask if this course is a student's first online course experience, noting that if a student has no frame of reference in their evaluation, it may skew their responses. Another senator asked if these questions for online courses couldn't be separated from the regular evaluation form, since the answers are going to be sent to the instructors separately anyway. Alberto said that that is something to consider.

The chair thanked Alberto and his committee for their work, and said that this motion will lay over until the next Senate meeting. He invited questions and feedback from senators during the next two weeks on the motion.

VI. Gallup report – The chair turned the time over to Mica Stark, UNH Assistant Vice President for Public Affairs. Mica said that this is the second year that UNH has worked with Gallup, and that we’re now finalizing two studies with them; one of our alumni and one of our students. Year 1 data was released at about this time last year. President Huddleston and his cabinet felt that it was important to understand the outcomes and well-being of our students and alumni. As we enter Year 2, the president’s cabinet and the provost thought it might be helpful for the Senate to hear some of the new information coming from the Gallup surveys. He suggested that it will be helpful to use the gathered data internally to improve the long-term outcomes for those populations. The Gallup Purdue index is a large national study used for the alumni data set.

Mica introduced two guests joining us today. Helen Stubbs is a senior consultant for Gallup who has been partnering with UNH on the Year 2 data. Joining us from Nebraska is Jim Harter, who is Gallup’s chief scientist on workplace management and well-being. He turned the time first to Helen. She invited the group to pause for a moment to think about what it was that prompted each of them to choose to pursue their current career. She said that those seminal experiences are part of what will be discussed today.

Jim shared some background to the data results that will be discussed later. He noted that Gallup has been working with UNH on two studies – one for alumni and another for students. The constructs assessed in the alumni instrument include well-being, employee engagement, attachment to institution (UNH), and experiences as students. On the student instrument, the constructs assessed include well-being, student engagement, attachment to institution (UNH), student experiences, hope, and strengths/self-efficacy.

In its decades of global research, Gallup has associated well-being with numerous positive health and employment outcomes, including medical and health expenditures, ER visits, absenteeism, and others. The interrelated and interdependent elements of well-being include purpose, social, financial, community, and physical well-being. A short measure of ten questions is used in larger studies, and a longer measure of fifty questions is used with individuals.

In examining what is important to employees, Gallup has done extensive research on ways to improve outcomes that are important to organizations, such as loyalty, longevity, punctuality, and productivity. A meta-analysis of this information, called the Q12, has now been answered by 31 million people nationwide for Gallup. The employee engagement measure ranges from basic needs to more complex needs. On the UNH alumni survey, all of the questions regarding employee engagement were asked. On the UNH student survey, a smaller set of questions was used.

In measuring attachment to institution, two questions were asked: “UNH was the perfect school for me,” and “I can’t imagine a world without UNH.” Jim noted that the extreme wording of the statements can improve the instrument, as it speaks to high-functioning attitudes that lead to commitment from respondents. Those who strongly agree with both items are considered “emotionally attached” to their institution.

The Gallup-Purdue Index (GPI) used in the alumni survey assess alumni perceptions of their university experiences and how those experiences relate to their well-being and job quality later in life. The index includes the constructs described above, but also a set of experiences that can

predict workplace engagement. Gallup has found six workplace experiences that consistently predict not only workplace engagement and well-being, but also whether alumni feel they got their money's worth from their school.

These six critical experiences in undergraduate life are divided into two areas: emotional support and experiential learning. Under emotional support, the three key experiences are

- Having a professor who cares about you
- Having a professor who makes you excited about learning
- Having a mentor who encourages your goals and dreams

Under experiential learning, the three key experiences are

- Having an internship or job that applies what you're learning in class
- Working on a project that takes a semester or more to complete
- Being extremely active in extracurricular activities and organizations

Nationally, 47% of graduates had zero or one of the six above experiences in college. Only 3% experienced all six. Among graduates who had none of the experiences, 5% strongly agree that their university prepared them well for life outside of college. 85% of graduates who had all six experiences strongly agree their university prepared them well for life outside of college.

A senator asked if there are indicators as to the causal connection to the answers to these questions. Jim responded that there is not yet enough longitudinal data to form exclusive causal connections. He said some work has been done to control for other factors like demographics and personality. He said that in time, causalities will be easier to identify.

Helen then spoke about data specific to the UNH community. On the alumni study, during Year 1, alumni from 1960-2014 were invited to participate in the 2015 study. Those alumni who did not participate in the Year 1 study were invited again to participate in the 2016 study. Those responses were added to those from 2010-2015 alumni from the 2015 (n=1,170) and 2016 (n=639) surveys, for a total of n=1,809. To contact these alumni, they used 9408 undergraduate alumni email records for alumni who graduated between 2010 and 2015. The UNH alumni are compared to the GPI sample, to alumni from the same time period from other public institutions, alumni from private not-for-profit institutions, and alumni from Doctoral Universities (Higher and Moderate Research Activity institutions). Of those who responded, the average age was 25.3, 39% of respondents were male, 94% of the respondents were white, 26% reported they were first-generation college students, and 26% reported postgraduate work or degree.

For the student survey, 12,915 student email records were used to invite students to participate in the Gallup Student Survey, customized for our community. With a 10% participation rate, 1,309 students responded. Those responding reported the average age of 20.9, with 36% of the respondents being male, 88% white, and 29% reported they were first-generation college students.

From the alumni survey, we see that 79% of reporting alumni have full-time employment from an employer, which is above the 71% average for similar institutions, 67% for public institutions, 69% for private not-for-profit institutions, and the 67% national average. UNH alumni report

higher workplace engagement at 49% (versus 39% public, 35% private, and 37% national). The study reports that UNH alumni are on par with comparison groups in thriving in five well-being elements. She said that the drivers of the statement “UNH prepared me well for life outside of college” included the following:

- I had at least one professor at UNH who made me excited about learning (3.2x more likely)
- My professors at UNH cared about me as a person (3x more likely)
- While attending UNH I had an internship or job that allowed me to apply what I was learning in the classroom (2.3x more likely)
- While attending UNH, I had a mentor who encouraged me to pursue my goals and dreams (2.1x more likely)

Those alumni who state that UNH prepared them well for life outside of college are 5.1x more likely to say they would strongly recommend UNH to a potential student or parent, and that each of the four drivers noted above are strong indicators that an alumni would recommend UNH.

Helen pointed out that there is no national representative sampling to use for comparison on our student survey, but said that the results for students at UNH are very close to average, according to what she has seen. Nearly half of reporting students indicate thriving in zero (24%) or only one element (24%) of well-being.

A senator asked if these student responses are broken down by major. Helen said responses could be divided by major, but that currently they do have data on responses by school/college. She said that there are some identifiable patterns in various schools/colleges. She said that the full data set will be provided to UNH and should soon be in the hands of faculty, and asked what questions faculty would like to see included. Jim noted that the data will reside with Institutional Research & Assessment, and that Helen will be speaking to the Deans’ Council tomorrow.

Helen discussed the relationship between engagement and support experiences, noting the strong likelihood of a student reporting feeling engaged when they also indicated that they had professors who cared about them, or a mentor who encouraged their goals and dreams, or professors who made them excited about learning.

Helen continued, discussing the drivers of student engagement. The following responses are, as indicated, more likely to drive the report of a student identifying as “engaged:”

- My professors at UNH make me feel my coursework is important (5.7x more likely)
- In the last seven days, I have received recognition or praise for doing good school work (4.5x more likely)
- While attending UNH, I have had a mentor who encouraged me to pursue my goals and dreams (2.3x more likely)
- I have at least one professor at UNH who made me excited about learning (1.4x more likely)

Looking at student well-being, those students who strongly agree that their professors care about them as a person are those who are thriving in four and five elements of well-being. Students

who reported that UNH is preparing them well for life outside of college also report that their professors cared about them, made them excited about learning, and mentored them, and that experiential learning experiences such as internships and multi-semester projects add to a student's perception that they are being well-prepared for life after college.

Speaking about student perceptions of faculty at UNH:

- 50% strongly agree with “My professors have strong subject matter knowledge”
- 42% strongly agree with “I am treated fairly at UNH”
- 27% strongly agree with “I am challenged to develop myself to my full potential”
- 22% strongly agree with “I receive the help I need to succeed in school”
- 17% strongly agree with “My professors know me as an individual person”
- 35% strongly agree with “I have many positive interactions with my professors”
- 27% strongly agree with “UNH has high academic standards”
- 24% strongly agree with “My professors always reply promptly to emails or calls”
- 20% strongly agree with “I receive useful communication from UNH”

Helen said that the data gathered shows opportunity for growth and change at UNH and speaks to the importance of the human experience, as well as to the importance of academic advising. She acknowledged that there are various models of academic advising being applied across the colleges at UNH. There is data on advising issues that she will be sharing with the Deans' Council tomorrow.

A senator said that the data on employment for UNH graduates is promising, and asked if that high percentage is related specifically to the UNH experience, or if it is evidence of the increased number of job opportunities in the New England region. Helen answered that it is hard to say how UNH compares to other New England institutions, and that ultimately those career opportunities depend heavily on career choices and the available work force.

The graduate student Senate representative asked if there is data for masters and Ph.D. students, and Helen said that these numbers are only for undergraduate students, and the alumni data is only for bachelor's degree holders.

A senator asked if these studies are intended to be used in marketing for the university, or in what other ways the university might use this information. Mica Stark responded that the data is intended for internal use to drive change at UNH and to improve the overall student experience here. He said that some of the data from last year was used in a marketing package to demonstrate positive outcomes for our students.

Another senator asked if there were gender indicators in this data. Helen replied that in the national polls there is a higher response rate from women. Another senator asked how the UNH response rate compares to the response rates from other universities, and asked if the selection of people to respond to these questions might influence their actual responses. Helen said that it is surprising how difficult it is to get to that information. Jim Harter replied that when the response rates are low, there is a slightly more positive response average. The senator said that faculty need to be aware of how to use this information in advising students, and that it is important to ensure that the responses used are representative of actual student populations and not certain select groups.

The Senate chair thanked Mica, Helen, and Jim for sharing this information with the Senate.

VII. Finance & Administration Committee report on four Senate charges – Erin Sharp, chair of the Senate Finance & Administration Committee, offered her committee’s report on several charges. She noted that there is access to a range of reports and financial data through the following UNH SharePoint site: <https://share.unh.edu/sites/finance/Pages/Home.aspx>. She began by saying that the newly formed Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) met for the first time on October 28th. She serves as one of two faculty representatives on that committee. She reported that the BAC is much smaller than the old Central Budget Committee, which is intended to keep the committee nimbler in carrying out its work. The BAC has been charged by President Huddleston to provide feedback from the university community.

Erin then reported on the figures on current fund revenues, saying that revenues have not increased much, that expenses continue to rise, and that we have reached our capacity with undergraduate revenues.

From the FAC report:

*UNH remains in a challenging financial situation (“barely treading water”). Comparing revenue from FY12-16 shows a 1.9% average annual increase, and expenses and transfers from FY12-16 shows an average annual increase of 1.6%. FY12 was when UNH experienced a **50% decrease in state operating appropriation** (\$67.8M to \$35.7M) – FY16 state appropriation was at \$55.3M.*

Continuing from the report:

The FAC met with Vice President Finance & Administration, Chris Clement, Associate Provost for Finance & Academic Administration, Leigh Anne Melanson, and Associate Vice President for Finance, Kerry Scala on October 31, 2016. The FAC is in the process of scheduling a second meeting for early February, 2017.

The FAC sent the following questions to Clement prior to the meeting, and Clement, Melanson, and Scala came to the meeting prepared with data to respond to each of these questions:

- a. *Can you provide data – from the last few years – that will help our committee understand how UNH’s financial situation has changed? Data on both changes in expenses and changes in revenue generation (especially credit hour generation)? Are there any clear areas of spending/expenses that have significantly increased or decreased over the last few years? Are there clear areas of revenue generation that have significantly increased or decreased over the last few years?*
- b. *How have University expenses related to Facility Services, General Administration, and Academic Affairs changed over the last few years?*
- c. *Can you provide the context for the increase in tuition dollars allocated to the central administration from 26.5% to 30.5%? What are the financial needs that motivated this adjustment to RCM?*

- d. *Has RCM been adjusted more often than was anticipated at its inception? Is there a point where RCM doesn't function as well because the numbers are being adjusted too regularly?*

The FAC has received additional information from Melanson and Scala since this meeting in response to questions we had during the meeting. The FAC has found the VP for Finance and Administration and the Staff to be open and transparent in all communications this semester.

The committee reports that the deficit in the Central Administration budget, which it took on with the severe budget cuts in 2012 in an effort to reduce the impact on academic units, is being addressed:

The increase in tuition dollars allocated to central administration from now to FY19 (26.5% to 30.5%) is to support the core operation of the Central Administration. Expenses that account for the increased funding needs of Central Administration include investments in career and professional success, academic Wi-Fi, advancement, marketing, and branding as well as expenses associated with legal, union negotiations, and IT software licenses. There have also been changes in expenses related to registrar-controlled classrooms, which are now paid for by Central Administration. Finally, the Central Administration has a deficit because it absorbed 80% of the 2012 reduction in state appropriations.

Funding for strategic initiatives of the President and Central Administration will not come from the increase in tuition dollars allocated to Central Administration, rather this pot of money will be funded from savings on faculty fringe.

The VP of Finance and Administration reported that once the deficit in Central Administration is paid down, the 30.5% rate will be addressed again.

Charge 4 to the FAC asked the committee to assess the current allocation of teaching positions to lecturers and tenure-track professors, as well as the growth of faculty positions compared to the growth of administrative positions.

Erin reported that the number of tenure and tenure track faculty has rebounded since the SIP and hiring freeze following the 2012 reduction of state allocations. They do not have current data on the number of administrators at UNH. The report indicates that while AAUP faculty compensation has increased by 7% during FY12-FY16, compensation for Academic Administrators increased by almost 50% during the same period. Erin said that her committee intends to ask additional questions of the VP for Finance to better understand this difference.

Erin said that the accessibility and transparency of the administration in finance is much improved this year.

A senator asked about the increase in the number of professional-administration-technology staff (PAT), and there was discussion about the reason for that increase. Another senator noted that revenues equal tuition, and that students pay tuition to receive instruction from a professor. He

said that a large portion of the campus community has nothing to do with classroom teaching. Erin said that in examining the Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) numbers, she can report that most faculty do teach. We have seen a rise in the number of lecturers at UNH, and decline in the teaching load for tenure-track faculty since 2009. She suggested it would be helpful to examine how those items impact the budget. A senator suggested it might be useful to break down the numbers by instructional salaries, noting that there is apparent stability in tenure-track faculty numbers across the university, but that individual colleges, such as COLA, have seen a marked decrease in tenure-track faculty recently. Erin said that the FAC looked at these numbers by college last year, and that she can re-share that report.

Another senator said that last year the Senate examined academic bloat at UNH, and noted that the provost at the time made the comment that we have a smaller administration than our comparator institutions. The senator wondered if these PAT-level, intermediate administrative positions might be having an effect on those numbers overall. These PAT staff members are sometimes brought in to do tasks under the offices of the vice presidents, sometimes taking over administrative duties of faculty members, and other para-educational work. He said that knowing who these staff members are and what they are being paid might shed light on where the increases are coming from. Erin concurred, especially with the very large number of staff who took separation incentive packages last year.

VIII. CPC report on campus memorials/statues – The Senate chair suggested postponing this report until the next Senate meeting, as there are some items of new business that need to be addressed today. The CPC chair agreed to report at the next meeting.

IX. New Business – Alberto Manalo, representing the department of Natural Resources & the Environment, brought forward the following motion from that department regarding the upcoming return to the previous common exam time. His department asks the Senate Agenda Committee to consider this motion:

Motion from Department of Natural Resources & the Environment

The Department of Natural Resources and the Environment would like to submit to the Agenda Committee the following proposal related to the common exam period reverting to Tuesday and Thursday, 12:40 -2:00 once the Hamilton-Smith Hall classrooms are back in use. We assume that several lecture classes and laboratory classes and field courses will be offered at UNH during that period. We propose that,

- 1) Upper level classes be exempted from Common Exam rules (i.e., students in upper level class must be accommodated to prevent missing their lecture)**
- 2) Classes with laboratories be exempted from Common Exam rules (e.g., a scheduled biology/ecology lab trumps Common Exam)**

The foundational arguments are that 1) upper level classes typically demand attendance and do not have multiple sections, and 2) in classes with multiple lab sections, many (if not all) labs are at capacity (preventing choice and/or options other than exceeding capacity); others are held outdoors which negates the ability to

actually attend that week's lab. Certainly faculty cannot be expected to double-teach labs to accommodate common exams.

A senator from the Thompson School of Applied Sciences said that she would like to see the upper-level students from her unit included this policy for the reasons given. Dante said that the Agenda Committee will review the motion and consider it.

Dante then noted that a senator has prepared a motion for Senate consideration, but since he could not attend today's meeting, this motion will be postponed until such time as the senator can come forward to present it.

The past Senate chair said that, given the provost's comments today about diversity and building a united community, she believes it would be wise for the Senate to create a statement supporting inclusion and diversity. The group applauded her suggestion. It was suggested that she could compose such a statement herself, or that the Senate could charge the Agenda Committee to take up the task.

Academic Affairs Committee chair Scott Smith reminded the group that this is Thanksgiving week, and that his committee is looking for input from faculty on how the cancellation of classes this Wednesday may be affecting them, for better or for worse. He is looking for written feedback and specifics. He noted that some students left campus after classes last Thursday, and pointed out that when this schedule was proposed, the Senate spoke clearly that faculty needed to hold the line on attendance for the Monday and Tuesday beforehand. It was noted that Tuesday this week is a Friday schedule, and Scott asserted that that decision is part of the problem, and that it should not be so. He also asserted that the closing of the dormitories on Tuesday evening is not helpful to the students and should be changed in the future, if we are to continue canceling classes on the Wednesday before Thanksgiving. He said that the Senate needs to make a strong statement on this matter. He will collate all the information he receives and share it with the Senate at a later date.

X. Adjournment - Upon a motion and second to adjourn, the group voted to adjourn the meeting at 5:25 p.m.