

University of New Hampshire

University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository

Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes

Faculty Senate Documents

11-26-2018

2018-19 FACULTY SENATE XXIII - November 26, 2018 Minutes Summary

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "2018-19 FACULTY SENATE XXIII - November 26, 2018 Minutes Summary" (2018). *Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes*. 147.

https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty_senate_agendas_minutes/147

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
2018-19 FACULTY SENATE XXIII

The fundamental function of the approved minutes of the Faculty Senate is to accurately document actions taken by that body. Additionally, the minutes traditionally seek to provide context by capturing some statements of Senators, faculty in attendance, and guests. The minutes do not verify the veracity, authenticity, and/or accuracy of those statements.

Meeting called to order at 3:10 p.m. on November 26, 2018

MINUTES SUMMARY

I. Roll – The following senators were absent: Innis, Kim, Minocha, Reardon, Rigg, Seal, Shipe, Simos, and Teng. The following senators were excused: Hiller, Knezevic, and Tenczar. Wayne Jones and Police Chief Paul Dean were guests.

II. Remarks by and questions to Provost Wayne Jones - There will be an announcement coming out this week related to the COLA Dean and the Graduate School Dean search committees. Wayne explained that because of the announcement of his being named Provost, there is now a CEPS Dean position to fill. There will be three other searches, not counting the Vice President for Enrollment Management be running in the spring. Depending on the how the conversation goes with the executive committee, it is possible that the CEPS search may be put off till next year.

- Wayne shared that he will be coming to the Senate in the next semester with Chris Clement to do a presentation about the budget. One of the significant headwinds that we faced is that the state about 4 years ago the state decided it was no longer putting in capital dollars to the campus even though it has an obligation by state law to do so. As a result, for the last four years we have been putting more and more UNH money into renovation, repairs, and new construction. We made a heavy play starting in June and working through the summer with President Dean's arrival to try to get additional support for capital construction. The first two projects are the Spaulding renovation for COLSA and a project around health sciences involving nursing professionals in HHS. The governor has come out very strongly in support of those projects. If these come to pass it will be the first time we have had capital construction dollars in four years. It will be an enormous help for fiscal year 2020.

Wayne said that after there are some more opportunities now that we are past the elections. Wayne, President Dean, and Chris Clement are meeting with the governor's budget director on Wednesday about how we do state allocations and state support and how 7% state support seems a little odd for a flagship research university.

- Wayne thanked the senators for participating in the SWOT plus two analysis. He said that more than a dozen different groups on campus – faculty, students, and staff - have participated in the SWOT process and we have rolled that all into one data set. Tomorrow, an email survey will be sent out and this will provide an opportunity for every individual member of campus to put in their own thoughts and their ideas and prioritizations. Please reply even if you have participated in the Faculty Senate SWOT. Wayne explained that there will be a day and half retreat with senior leadership plus three faculty from the Faculty Senate to review all the data. We are going to try to collate all that data into the top 3 or 4 goals for the campus going forward and maybe 3 or 4 strategies under each goal that we think we will want to work on in the next 2 to 3 years. We want to have a very focused plan and we want to focus on the next 24 to 36 months. The goal is that President Dean will roll that out at the State of the University address on January 24.

- David Finkelhor asked about the new pre-law minor and asked for more background, how that decisions was made, and what the current status is. Wayne explained that the Law minor was approved last spring, going through the normal process within the college and then rolling up. Minors don't typically come to the body as a whole, they are typically handled at the college level. When the minor showed up in the catalog questions came up, including questions from COLA about overlap with Political Science. Wayne said that he has had

conversations on this with the faculty senate leadership and thinks it is important to get the faculty together to talk about it. He had a meeting on the Tuesday before Thanksgiving with the two deans involved and he suggested that they get folks together. Right now, interested chairs in COLA are putting together a list of courses that they think build a Law minor and might be relevant and the Law School will get together their course list - a different set of courses. There was some overlap that needs to get cleaned up. Ultimately, this comes down to the idea that we have a lot of power in many of our courses that packaged differently might be attractive. Wayne said that when he was dean of CEPS and heard about it at a meeting with all the other deans, he was excited about it. Because if you can get a minor in Law while you are getting a major in science or engineering that is a powerful combination for looking for a job or going to graduate school. But we want to do it in a manner where we aren't just moving around of the deck chairs. We really want to create something value added so we can get more students here. At the moment, the deans are working on it and pushing it down to the faculty and chairs.

Buzz Scherr explained that it is definitely not a "Pre-law" minor. It is not designed to be the primary vehicle for people who want to go to law school to get into a law school. It was designed as a minor to educate students in a particular subject matter area about how the law works for that particular area in an "on the ground way." It is different than many course we already see in COLA that might be considered "law and society" courses. We expect more people who are never going to law school to do the Law Minor than those that think they will.

Lucy Salyer noted that the courses may not overlap in some cases and in some cases they might. But what we are concerned about is that we have a vibrant well-established Justice Studies major and minor. The courses that the UNH Law wants to offer are not duplicates of what we offer necessarily. But we do have a limited number of students that are going to be taking law related classes. So, what we would love to see is a collaboration with UNH Law to bring their courses into a Justice Studies major or minor rather than having a parallel program that might affect our program.

Wayne responded that you both Lucy and Buzz are making great points. From his perspective the key is that we have to believe in and design around a growth environment that says that we are going to be adding more students. If this can pull more students into Engineering because they can learn more about contract law and intellectual property it is a win. If we can pull more students into COLA because they see the opportunity to take Justice Studies and get additional law courses that is great. We have to be looking for those opportunities to grow. If we are convinced that we are just going to continue to shrink, then we aren't going to get anywhere. We have to more aspirational. But I know that getting the faculty in the room and talking through it is the best way to decide how to do that growth and design for that growth. Wayne said thank you for the work you are doing on that.

III. Remarks by and questions to the Senate chair

- Scott shared that he also wanted to thank everyone who participated in the senate's SWOT plus two question process. He has spent time reviewing the results of the recent "two question" survey that asked, "What are your top aspirations for UNH?" and "What are your top goals for UNH?" A summary of the results for the first question were included in the agenda attachment sent out earlier today. The responses for the second question didn't easily fall into categories. The summary and the raw data of all responses will be sent to the president and provost. Scott encourages all to participate in the university wide survey that is being sent by email concerning strategic planning. To that end, at the next full faculty senate meeting, we are going to reserve some time for the faculty senators to have a listening session with the three faculty members who will be part of that strategic planning retreat, David Bachrach, Erin Sharp, and Scott Smith.

The FAR (Faculty Activity Reporting) Survey is ongoing. Please consult with your constituents and provide feedback on the positive and negatives of FAR. Elsa asked about individual faculty completing

the survey. Scott advised that senators should poll faculty in their department and then put a summary of the results in the Qualtrics survey. Senators can also submit responses to the survey questions by email to Kathy and himself. Scott explained that a separate survey about FAR was sent out to the chairs and deans and their vice-deans, and he has asked central administration leadership to comment as well.

- The Agenda Committee is continuing to look into the Amorous Relationship Policy. Scott has reached out to faculty leadership at the other USNH campuses to try to get a sense of what is going on. Jim Connell and Scott are working to create a list of concerns and we are hopeful that we can provide a list of concerns to the Board of Trustees before their January meeting in January. If you have specific concerns, the agenda committee would appreciate hearing from you.

- Scott reminded senators to speak into the microphone and to introduce yourself for the benefit of other senators; it is also useful for the minutes.

- Scott reminded senators that there is only one vote allowed per person at Faculty Senate meetings. Senators should not vote on behalf of an absent senator. Senators who cannot attend are welcome to send a proxy who can vote in their place. Any proxies should identify themselves to Kathy before the meeting.

- Scott shared his thanks for senators who participated in the recent caucus meetings with the deans. Anita Tucker participated in the HHS caucus and thought it was great but that there was not enough time. Two out of eight agenda items were covered in an hour. Scott said that COLA got through one item. Scott said that, going in, this was an ambitious program, but he wanted to see if this experiment would work. He asked if it should be continued and there appeared to be agreement that it should. Allison Wilder said that her dean in HHS was quite interested in the Faculty Senate process. He wanted to know how does information flow from the faculty to the senate and back and forth.

Regina Smick-Attisano from COLSA said that it would be great if the caucus meeting could be held with the dean directly since it is uncertain what information is passed on and what the filter is. She said it was a good conversation. But they also ran out of time.

Scott suggested that future meetings be held outside of the senate meeting time window and that a more flexible schedule be available.

David Finkelhor said that he has never been a department chair but that his sense is that the institution is set up for communication from the faculty to the dean via the department chairs and that, to the extent that we want to continue to do this, and institutionalize this, we need to probably consult the department chairs as well. If they begin to feel like they are being bypassed or that this is a commentary on the job that they are doing in terms of communication with the dean, then it seems to me that we have created some problems.

Jim Connell shared that he invited his dean to attend a senate meeting since his dean was interested and deans are faculty and they are welcome to come. Jim said that his dean was appreciative of the invitation and we might make that more official and invite all the deans to come and see how the senate works. Scott said that any way that we can increase communication is a good thing.

Harriet Fertik said that she appreciated the opportunity to hear from the dean but found it frustrating that we got through so little and that if we do these again there needs to be some mechanism for keeping the conversation moving forward, not just cutting down on the items.

IV. Approval of the minutes from November 5, 2018 - It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the November 5, 2018 meeting of the Senate. Corrections were suggested in Items I, III, VI, VII, IX, and XII. Thus adjusted, the minutes were unanimously approved, with 10 abstentions.

V. Discussion and vote on motions 1) on need for a test proctoring facility and other resources and 2) on developing a strategy to address needs of students with executive function challenges.

Scott opened the floor for discussion on the first motion which had been presented at the November 5 meeting.

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

1. *Motion Presenter: Harriet Fertik on behalf of the Student Affairs Committee*

2. *Dates of Faculty Senate Discussion: November 5, 2018*

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

4. Motion

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

Scott pointed out that administrative leadership have already been successful in getting some space for a testing center in the basement of Thompson Hall. Wayne shared that this space has been approved and is being renovated in the spring. Scott explained that this motion is really to reinforce that effort.

There was no discussion, and motion was put to a vote, passing with 64 votes in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions.

Scott shared the next motion that was presented by the Student Affairs Committee at the November 5 faculty senate meeting and opened the floor for discussion:

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

1. *Motion Presenter: Harriet Fertik on behalf of the Student Affairs Committee*

2. *Dates of Faculty Senate Discussion: November 5, 2018*

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

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

Donna Schaeffer asked for clarification about the last sentence of the motion regarding developing relationships with the families of students. What would this contact with families look like and what would the parameters of this contact be? Would the families get in contact before the student is accepted or when they arrive on campus?

David Bachrach replied that when discussing the needs of these students with folks in SAS and CFAR one of the major problems that students with executive functioning difficulties face is the move from a situation in which they receive enormous support, particularly from their families and their high schools, to a situation where they are asked to largely fend for themselves. These students, in particular, do not have the developmental skills to fend for themselves. CFAR, in particular, has found that involving parents of this particular subset of students in helping them cope with the numerous challenges in their first year of school has been very effective. But we have a culture on campus, as is true across many universities, of trying to keep families at arm's length and for very good reasons since we don't want helicopter parenting. But we are much more likely to see success for these students if there is a legal possibility of involving families before they matriculate on campus and having the families involved at least during the first year. In connection with the level of involvement, this is something that university leadership is going to have to figure out and is not something that the senate can adjudicate for them.

John Gibson suggested that in the rationale for the motion the word "autism" be added to the first sentence so that it reads "...and those who are on the autism spectrum, ..." Scott asked if there was any objection to this from the committee and no objections were raised.

David Finkelhor asked if there is a clear definition of “Executive Function Challenges” and how that is defined and diagnosed. He said that there is a definition for ADHD and autism spectrum, but, is it at all of concern that we have a category that could have a very poor definition? Andrew Coppens from Education explained that it is a very broad category and that the definitional problem is that it spans an enormous range of cognitive ability and disability. The definition is quite fuzzy.

Bachrach said that one of the things this motion asks is that the administrative leadership bring on board, not only the stakeholders, but the people with expertise on campus who can help define what we are looking at much better than the senate can unless the senate has members here who are experts in this field.

Harriet explained that the idea of presenting these motions together is that in the committee’s conversations with Mike Shuttic (SAS) and Dani Adler (CFAR) there was some concern that the test center not be the end-all and be-all of the initiatives. It is just a starting point and a specific example of something that we could do to address these issues. So, this motion is thinking more broadly and more flexibly and taking the concerns into account that Mike and Dani raised and is not focused on the specific tactics, but on the broader issue.

Allision Wilder shared that, as a disability advocate, she doesn’t see in the motion anything that ties into the notion of “nothing about us without us.” She said that we, as a faculty senate, are making a stand relative to the support of people that receive services, but she doesn’t hear the voice of the people at the receiving end in this motion. She clarified that she isn’t sure if it belongs there or not, but it is just a thought to consider. Asked to explain, Allison said that the phrase “nothing about us without us” refers to individuals within the disabilities community and those of us who have grand ideas about policy and how things should be structured. But we often fail to get their input. So, when we make recommendations about policies to adapt there should be the voice of the individuals being served by the policies. Scott said that we could ask Dani and Mike if they are receiving that kind of input from their constituents. Scott asked if this is what happened. David Bachrach responded, “Very much so.”

There was discussion about what the EFC umbrella covers. Cristy Beemer suggested that some students with ADHD and some on the autism spectrum have executive functioning challenges. So, it is not a blanket umbrella for both of these situations. Instead, it is one possible manifestation for students with these issues.

Shelley Mulligan commented that we are dealing with a group of students who have a learning challenges and it might be because they have EFC or it might be because they have other kind of symptoms associated with an autism spectrum disorder. Shelley said that it appears we are not addressing all of the needs of students with learning challenges and that “learning challenges” might be a better term. EFC is a narrower term and that she would argue that all students who have ADHD have executive functioning challenges and, by its nature, that is part of the disorder. Perhaps a broader term would be useful since we are dealing with students who have learning challenges and we need to be able to support them. Shelley also said that she is not comfortable with the last sentence of the motion as she doesn’t know how she feels about bringing families into discussions with students who aren’t matriculated yet. Are these students who have been admitted but haven’t started yet? Or, is this for students who are thinking about coming to UNH and we are having a conversation about how we would best support them at UNH?

Bachrach responded that the specialists in SAS and CFAR report that the greatest challenge they face is students who present EFC. This particular matrix of learning disabilities is the most prominent. This motion is intended to deal with that particular group of students. There is no reason why we can’t pass other motions that deal with other sets of learning disabilities but that wasn’t the purpose of this motion. Secondly, UNH is far from being on the cutting edge of this kind of program. There are many other

universities, both public and private, which already have these programs in place that are designed to bridge the gap between high school and university or college and many of those programs do involve families and it is for students who have been admitted. Many universities, including Boston University and some public universities in North Carolina, have these programs in place which they advertise for families with students who have EFC as a place where these students can come and be supported whereas, in other universities, they wouldn't be.

Coppens offered to link some of the tone of the motion to some broader currents in American public education vis-à-vis special education and disability. A gross oversimplification here is that initially it was about pulling special education students out of classrooms followed by an approach focused on things that are missing and identifying the need and trying to fill those needs so that students can be integrated into mainstream classrooms. A more contemporary view that might be linked to UDL (Universal Design for Learning) is that we locate disability not on disabled students or on learning disabled students, but as an effect of students in classrooms. In other words, classrooms disable students as much as students disable students. He said that one thing he would love to see in the language of this motion is a recognition that we have a more comprehensive approach that includes that the design of classrooms, in addition to the support services that are available to students, are both on the table for revision and for addressing this issue with regard to transition but addressing the more comprehensive issue about academic achievement.

Erin Sharp said that she is also confused by this motion because based on the presentation from CFAR and SAS there are a large number of students whose needs are not being supported. She said that she would like to see a motion that is much broader, one that deals with the fact that current student support services recognizes that there are student needs that, institutionally, we are not addressing well and that we are calling upon the administrative leadership, stakeholders, and experts to make a more comprehensive plan to help those students. Maybe we need to be thinking more comprehensively about meeting our students' needs and not be so specific about the disability.

Scott asked if it would be a course of action to consider this motion now and then to ask the committee to consider a second motion to expand. We do have some broad language that is calling on the university to develop a comprehensive strategy with the key stakeholders. We are asking the university to bring experts to do this. So, is that a reasonable procedure or table this motion?

Erin Sharp shared that there is a enough concern among the senators about the motion that it would probably get voted down and rather than do that the committee should take the feedback and consider making changes to the motion.

Cristy Beemer said that she agrees strongly that we don't need a diagnosis in the motion. She suggested, instead, that it be worded to say that we are seeing a substantial number of students that face EFC and to please pay attention to this issue and come up with a plan.

Elsa asked if it is the general view of the senators to make this motion more specific or more broad. She said that she doesn't feel that she has the knowledge to make it more specific. But we can find people that do. Or, on the contrary, if we want to get the ball rolling, we can make it broader.

Adele Marone asked if this motion was about students with EFC that are not identified and, therefore, are not getting services from SAS. Bachrach said that, according to Dani Adler, a very large number of students getting services from CFAR are not identified with SAS. So, they self-identify, but only after they are on the brink of failure.

Erin Sharp made a motion that this be sent back to the committee. Cristy Beemer seconded the motion. There was additional discussion.

Coppens said that, looking at the rationale, he wanted to highlight the second to last sentence “and the internal obstacles faced by students with EFC in organizing their behavior to seek support on campus.” Embedded in that is a claim about the location of the problem and that is the kind of language that should be revised in order to broaden it out. If we are seeking a comprehensive strategy, that language is contradictory to a comprehensive strategy.

Bachrach said that what he has heard in discussions with CFAR and SAS that students with EFC have difficulties in seeking help because they cannot organize their behavior and that this is the primary stumbling block for getting the services that they need. So, if we don't recognize they are unable on their own in many cases to reach out and get the services that they need, then we are going to fail to serve their needs.

John Gibson asked if it is the case that the vast majority of students who face EFCs are students with ADHD and on the autism spectrum. If so, this motion adequately reflects what is happening at the university and addresses a real need. Bachrach agreed. John said that he would vote against sending this back to committee for further revision.

Nena Stracuzzi said that, further to Bachrach's comments, the idea that some students are unable to take advantage of the support systems in place - they do not or are unable to - the suggestion made by Mike and Dani for more consistency and some central location would make it easier for these students.

The motion to send the motion back to the Student Affairs Committee was put to a vote and passed with 37 voting in favor, 22 opposed, and 5 abstentions.

Scott said that we will re-present this motion when the committee is ready. Elsa Upham asked that anyone who spoke on the subject and has strong opinions to email the committee so that we can take suggestions into consideration.

VI. Active Shooter Training by UNH Police Chief Paul Dean - Chief Dean was invited at the suggestion of the chair of the Campus Planning Committee, Danielle Pillet-Shore. Chief Dean said he was glad to be talking to the senate again, this time about Active Shooter situations. He explained that as he travels across the country to talk about these things, he rarely finds that the faculty want to be involved in this conversation. He is thankful to be here today to talk about this. Faculty are a critically important part of the public safety here at UNH. He said that his experience with UNH faculty has been that you are have been engaged about safety and you care about safety.

The Chief shared that the topic of active shooter is probably on everybody's mind. So far in 2018 there have been over 300 incidents of what we classify as “mass shooting” - that is 3 or more people that have been shot in one incident. In 2017 there were 345 or 346 incidents. So, the increase in these kind of issues is clearly on the rise. What is more disturbing is the locations where they are happening. We are learning that these are not just in schools. They are pretty much everywhere. He explained that the video you will be seeing is college-based but the information is meant for you to take anyplace and anywhere you go. If you can remember 3 things when you leave today – RUN, HIDE FIGHT – you will have an edge. Nothing that will be covered today is the solution to the problem. Instead, this is about providing you with an edge, the edge that could save your life and the lives of those students in your classroom because “Run, Hide, Fight” works. It has saved lives. We know that almost 45% of these shootings take place in schools, and the term is used broadly to include college campuses. Another 20 to 29% happen in government buildings and other 10% in other facilities. So, if you look at this campus as a community, we fit in every one of those categories depending on the building you are in. Statistically, we are in the category of being a potential place for these things to happen.

Chief Dean played a video prepared by the [Center for Personal Protection and Safety](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9O-vSQgVR5I). [The video can be seen online at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9O-vSQgVR5I>]

At the end of the video Chief Dean asked for thoughts and some faculty said that in most classrooms at UNH they would be sitting ducks since there is only one doorway. He responded that, with the exception of really modern buildings, most buildings on campuses were not designed with an active shooter in mind. One of the issues is that faculty can't lock their classroom doors. Part of the problem is that ADA requirements provide that we can't lock down the door because of accessibility issues. The laws haven't caught up to what is going on. There are companies trying to develop devices along these lines and UNH is looking into them. But, most of the devices that have been developed are not ADA compliant.

David Bachrach asked about social media and pointed out that in almost every case where there has been a large-scale shooting, they have identified, after the fact, that there was substantial social media presence that showed that the person had been planning this for a long time. Does UNH have policies for monitoring social media or any capacity to examine social media to look for threats? Chief Dean responded that, as far as intelligence goes, he has two officers that are assigned full time to the state intelligence center. Their sole job is there on a federal grant and their job is to represent higher education in NH. So, any of the intelligence that comes into the state of NH from within the state or outside the state that has anything to do with schools gets funneled through them and then down to him every morning in a briefing. This is a high-level view. UNH also has a behavioral intervention team and this is where the faculty have been immensely successful in helping. Faculty see, well before others, people in their classrooms who are acting strange, who are acting different and just not within the norms of the classroom. Since 2007 when we built this relationship with faculty there has been a great improvement in built-up trust for getting information to us and in knowing that we are taking action. We also have the same team that deals with faculty and staff that might be of issue. We have been very successful in deterring serious issues. As far as that intelligence base between what faculty do and what RAs and Hall Directors do in the dorms and the training that we are giving them, we are averaging almost every single day getting some information about something. That doesn't mean that everyone that comes to the attention of the behavioral intervention team gets in trouble. In fact, it is the exact opposite. It is about surrounding them with help – a kind of “conspiracy of care.” The second a student comes up on the radar screen they are surrounded with services and there is no place better than the state of New Hampshire and UNH - the Durham Campus, Manchester campus, and the Law school – for responding with an immense amount of resources to surround that student with support. Nine out of ten times they are able to help that student lead a productive academic career for 4 years. The other times they simply have to go, not that they are getting kicked out of school. It may be a leave of absence because we are not a therapeutic campus. We have the services, but we are not long-term care, or we do not have significant care that can possibly solve all the things that are going on. But we do know that we can connect them with the community where they come from and we engage their parents and get them involved and they come back and are successful. .

Chief Dean said that his department monitors social media the same way that you monitor social media. He explained that he doesn't have a special way to monitor because the companies shut it down. But kids still put things out there that help us identify things and get to them. UNH BarStool is a great place to look that guide the UNH police to some very interesting things. We are monitoring that. But there are more and more companies developing social media apps that are encrypted and you can't follow them unless you are there or if you have a warrant for something like that.

A senator shared a story about a situation involving a student who turned in a writing assignment of a story about shooting people. She also found some disturbing images on the student's Facebook page. When she brought the situation to her dean the dean talked to the student and asked him to apologize even though the faculty member didn't want to be identified. The student did apologize. Six months later the

student was no longer on campus but, she didn't feel any safer. The question raised was whether she should have gone directly to the police. Chief Dean answered – Yes! He said that if you bring information to me even if it doesn't belong to me, we will know where to put that information. In the situation described, I would have given the information instantly to a detective who would have taken ownership of it and he would engage Dean Kirkpatrick who would initially take care of it. There would have been a threat assessment and we would simply deal with it and it wouldn't be the first time we would have done that.

Chief Dean said that he wants the faculty to reach out to him and his office. We are here 24/7. He offered to come back as often as we need to get it right and answer questions. He will meet personally, he will come to departments, whatever you want.

Another senator asked, based on that story, can he meet with the deans and come up with procedural points and suggestions on how to handle matters like this. The fact that someone from leadership didn't understand this is frightening. Chief Dean responded that he will absolutely do that. I will speak with Provost Jones. I have been in front of the deans. I have talked about these things and we will bring it again. Your safety is paramount to me. But, please let me come back as many times as you need over anything and before you leave, take my cell # 603-834-1393. If I don't answer right away leave a message and I'll call you back. That is my relationship with you. I can't do this without you. I need to have a partnership with you and I want you to have access to me whenever you need it, not going through the dispatch center, but directly to me.

VII. Presentation of motion on recognition of religious holidays in the academic and campus calendar - Shelley Mulligan presented the following motion, explaining that this came about during discussions about the academic schedule and it is an attempt to address ways to accommodate for religious observances.

FACULTY SENATE MOTION

on recognition of religious holidays in academic and campus calendar

Rationale: To create a fully inclusive campus community that is respectful of the needs of all students.

Motion: The faculty senate recommends the following actions to acknowledge major holidays and observances, and to increase awareness of needs for accommodations:

1. The faculty senate recommends that significant religious holidays and observances, such as Yom Kippur and both days of Rosh Hashanah, be identified on each year's academic calendar.
2. The faculty senate recommends that course instructors include the following statement in their syllabi to address the needs of students of all faiths, "In the event that a student needs accommodation for a religious or cultural holiday/observance, that student is encouraged to make that request as early in the semester as possible so that the instructor can make appropriate arrangements."
3. The faculty senate recommends that the university not schedule significant campus events on major religious holidays and/observances.

Shelley pointed out that the Jewish holidays in the motion and other religious holidays are already listed on the academic calendar this year. So, this motion would support the continuation of this practice.

Buzz Scherr suggested taking out the phrase “such as Yom Kippur and both days of Rosh Hashanah.” He said that he thinks it, unintendedly, privileges those holidays and might suggest to some who read this that those are the ones that have to be identified to be covered by the policy. Lori Hopkins responded that they would never ever schedule anything on a Christian holiday. So, there isn’t a privileging of Jewish holidays because it is never done and that mentioning these doesn’t put the Jewish religion above any other. She also shared that calendar issues with Yom Kippur and Rosh Hashanah have been repeatedly a problem here on campus and for that reason should be mentioned specifically. She said that, personally, it is really bothersome that those first weeks of class there are always events and meetings scheduled as if these holidays don’t exist. Shelley explained that this was the reason the committee included those holidays in the language of the motion. Those were the days that came up the most and were most problematic.

Buzz said that he understand that perspective and pointed out that there are other non-Christian religious holidays in addition to Yom Kippur and Rosh Shanna. John Gibson suggested that the Islamic holidays Eid al-Adha and Eid al-Fitr be added to the list of examples in the motion. Scott asked for any objection to that suggestion and none were stated.

Allison Wilder suggested that, in an effort to take the onus off the instructor, the last sentence of the motion end after the word “possible” and to remove “so that the instructor can make appropriate arrangements.”

Rosemary Taylor said that a problem came up at another session about the phrase “...as early in the semester...” because that is very subjective. As an alternative, she suggested “During the first weeks or when an assignment is given or when an activity is scheduled to please notify your instructor that this is a conflict.”

This motion will lay over until the next meeting, at which time the discussion may continue.

VIII. Presentation of motion on how to respond to curtailed operations during the December final exam period - Shelley next presented a motion about the need for a plan to respond to curtailed operations during the December final exam period as follows:

FACULTY SENATE MOTION
on how to respond to curtailed operations
during December final exam period

Rationale: *A need for a plan to respond to curtailed operations during the December final exam period.*

Motion: *In the event of a curtailed exam day make up exam time blocks will be made available by the Office of the Registrar, Wednesday and Friday 6pm-8pm, and 8pm-10pm during the exam week if instructors would like to reschedule. For curtailments on days following the last final make up day during the exam period such as the last day of exams, exams will be not be rescheduled, and it will be up to instructors to make other arrangements such as an on-line exam.*

There was a question about the phrase “...on days following the last final make up day during the exam period such as the last day of exams, ...” Shelley suggested that perhaps it would be clearer if it read as follows: “For curtailments on the last day of exams, exams will not be rescheduled, and it will be up to instructors...” There were no objections to this suggestion.

This motion will lay over until the next meeting, at which time the discussion may continue

VIII. Discussion about the response to the Academic Affairs Committee on Test Optional Admissions Memo - Shelley Mulligan explained that the Academic Affairs Committee received a response from the Office of Admissions about test optional admissions and this was shared in the supplemental attachments to the agenda sent out by email today. A senate motion was passed last April that set some guidelines and conditions that the senate felt were important for Admissions to address in any kind of proposal for test optional admissions. Victoria Dutcher and Rob McGann came and talked to the committee as well. They have some pretty compelling evidence and reasons for going test optional. Shelley said that the AAC was feeling fairly comfortable with moving forward to create a motion to accept the proposal to go test optional, but she wanted to get a pulse from the faculty about the level of support for this kind of motion before it is drafted. This is an opportunity to check with your colleagues to see what they about the issue.

Shelley explained that there are some departments, like Nursing, that have very competitive admissions and they strongly depend on SAT scores, perhaps more than other departments. She said she didn't know if Admissions would allow for some exceptions to a test optional policy for situations like that.

Scott suggested that this topic be added to the agenda for the December 10 meeting to allow time for senators to review the material and more time on the agenda for discussion.

IX. New Business: Patti Puccilli shared that, as chair of the IT Committee, she has received numerous emails since Thanksgiving about the announcement of the Computer Store closing and the new policies about computer purchasing and repairs that is being put in place. She said that UNH will now be buying computers from Lenovo instead of Dell and that they will not be supporting Macs. Your departments can buy Mac products outside – possibly with an arrangement with Best Buy. You would have to bring it there for service as it would not be supported here. Patti said that she has heard from chairs and deans who want her to bring this to the senate to see if we want to do something to stop this or do something about this. But the changes go into effect on January 1 so there is urgency.

Scott responded that the Agenda committee will add this to their agenda on Monday and he asked Patti to send specific issues and questions to him. As well, if anyone else has a strong view they should contact Scott. Scott said that he will try to arrange a meeting with Wayne, Vasu, or Stan to get to the bottom of this.

X. Adjournment - The meeting was adjourned at 5:05pm

ACRONYMS

AAC	Academic Affairs Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)
AC	Agenda Committee of the Faculty Senate
ASAC	Academic Standards & Advising Committee
APC	Academic Program Committee
AT	Academic Technology
BAC	Budget Advisory Committee
C&PA	Communications & Public Affairs
CCLEAR	Clinical, Contract, Lecturer, Extension, Alternative Security, Research faculty
CEITL	Center for Excellence & Innovation in Teaching & Learning
CPC	Campus Planning Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)
FAC	Finance & Administration Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)
FAR	Faculty Activity Reporting
IRA	Institutional Research and Assessment
IT	Information Technology

ITC	Information Technology Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)
JSMB	Joint Strategic Management Board (Navitas review)
LC	Library Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)
OISS	Office for International Students & Scholars
OS	Operating Staff
PAT	Professional and Technical Staff
PSC	Professional Standards Committee (FS permanent committee)
RPSC	Research & Public Service Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)
SAARC	Space Allocation, Adaption and Renewal Committee
SAC	Student Affairs Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)
SHARPP	Sexual Harassment and Rape Prevention Program
SVPAA	Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
UCAPC	University Curriculum & Academic Policies Committee (FS permanent committee)
VPFA	Vice President for Finance and Administration
Discovery	(Faculty Senate permanent committee)