

University of New Hampshire

University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository

Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes

Faculty Senate Documents

3-30-2015

2014-15 FACULTY SENATE XIX - March 30, 2015 Minutes Summary

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "2014-15 FACULTY SENATE XIX - March 30, 2015 Minutes Summary" (2015). *Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes*. 205.

https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty_senate_agendas_minutes/205

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
2014-15 FACULTY SENATE XIX

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 3:13 on March 30, 2015

MINUTES SUMMARY

I. Roll – The following senators were absent: Berglund, Dowd, Fagerberg, Franczak, Hight, Kun, Murphy, Potter, Prescott, and Tenczar. Carroll, Denis, Minocha, Scherr, Thompson, and Urquhart were excused. Emily Poworoznek served as proxy for Christina Bellinger. Brian Gaon, Mica Stark, and Terri Winters were guests.

II. Remarks by and questions to the chair – The senate chair announced the newly formed ad hoc Committee on CLER Faculty Involvement in the Faculty Senate, organized to address the issues of Clinical, Lecturer, Extension, and Research (CLER) faculty in the senate. This committee will be chaired by Kerry Kazura (CHHS), with Nelson Barber (PCBE), William Berndtson (COLSA), and Michael Ferber (COLA) serving as tenure-track faculty representatives, and Trish Cox (Clinical-CHHS), Noe Lugaz (Research-CEPS), Jesse Morrell (Lecturer-COLSA), and Sarah Smith (Extension-COLSA) serving as CLER representatives. The committee will report to the senate later this semester.

The chair then reminded the senate of the online teaching evaluation program that the ad hoc Teaching Evaluation Form Implementation Committee has been working on. The pilot program is currently going on, with tenured faculty being evaluated this spring with an online form at both UNH-Durham and UNH-Manchester. By summer, this evaluation form will be available for all courses. David Kaye, one of the co-chairs of the committee, will attend the next senate meeting to answer questions about the implementation of this new evaluation form. A senator asked how online evaluations are to be implemented in some departments where the objective of the teaching evaluation is to get the students to write out their evaluation. She asked if such departments or programs might be grandfathered in to retain the older form of evaluation. The chair responded that the committee is reviewing some situations that may require special attention.

III. Minutes – It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the last senate meeting, March 9, 2015. A senator questioned some wording regarding the provost's response regarding the selection of the university's commencement speaker. The senate admin confirmed the accuracy of that portion of the minutes. The minutes were then approved unanimously with two abstentions.

Discussion/Report Items:

IV. Presentation by the Assistant Vice President for Public Affairs – The senate chair introduced Mica Stark, Assistant VP for Public Affairs, who came to discuss state budget requests. Mica expressed gratitude for the opportunity to speak to the senate about the

university's efforts in Concord to secure state appropriations for education, and to shed some light on the process by which such requests are submitted. He took a few moments to introduce himself as a NH native and a UNH alumn in Political Science. He then went on to explain that the Board of Trustees, the governing board of the university system, is charged by statute to submit their appropriation requests to the state every two years, in the fall. The Trustees focused their requests last fall on three things: 1) to continue the tuition freeze for two more years for NH resident students, 2) some new scholarships for resident students in STEM fields, and 3) scholarships for community college students entering into the USNH institutions. The dollar request was \$100 million in FY16 and \$105 in FY17. The former request would put our funding back to the same level we were at in 2009.

He said that the House Finance Committee concluded its work on the budget last week, and the full House of Representatives will vote on that committee's recommendation. There were significant cuts and Education and Renewable Energy took some serious cuts. Although there are some reports that this funding is level-funding higher education, but the actual budget, taken year-to-year, shows that in FY15 we are receiving \$84 million from the state, and the proposed FY16 budget would send \$76.5 million to higher education, or a 9% cut to funding for UNH, Keene, Plymouth, and Granite State. The budget will now go to the Senate Finance Committee and then the full Senate before being finalized by a joint House-Senate conference committee in June, when it will be presented to the Governor for her signature.

Besides the core operating budget, there is also a capital budget, which is for capital projects. The Trustees put forward a request for only one project last fall, which was for \$38 million (with the university putting forward \$12 million towards a \$50 million project) for a significant renovation of Spaulding Science Center. In the governor's capital budget proposal, she has offered \$5 million, with the House standing by her proposal. He said that with Kingsbury Hall as an example of the results of a cooperative effort between the state and the university in capital projects, he believes it is time to make a strong case for the positive return on such a capital investment.

In next addressing the university's advocacy efforts, Mica said that when the devastating budget cuts hit in 2013, the university realized we needed to build a base of third party advocates to speak for the needs of the university. Since then, the university has been reaching out to students, parents, alumni, and the business community to build a base of, now, about 4,000 advocates through the UNH Works program.

A senator asked if, in the face of so many competing interests for state monies, the advocates for investing in higher education have made a strong case for the fact that higher education is an essential part of all of the "competing interests" in the state. Mica responded that some legislators understand this principle while others do not. Another senator asked about finding ways to draw in the advocates for some of these competing groups into alliances so we can advocate for one another in our common causes. Mica responded that in our approach to Concord, it is important to unearth and map out where the university has connections with other groups in order to reframe the work of the future of the state. The challenge in the budget, he said, is to educate and engage the lawmakers in the "off season," discovering what they really know about us, and finding their interests in order to help them see the value of higher education beyond the numbers.

There was some conversation about negative press about the university system, and about ways to educate the public about the context of the state budget. One senator referred to a town administrator who sends out a weekly email to keep citizens informed and suggested that UNH could send out a regular “state of the university” report to inform not just our advocate base, but the general population.

Next there was a discussion about the percent of the university’s operating budget that comes from the state, which portion is about 9%, the lowest in the nation. The national average for state funding of higher education is about 51%. Mica said it’s important that we alert both our advocates and our alumni to this issue.

Another senator asked, with such low funding from the state for education, why the university spends so much money on non-educational capital projects such as the expansion of Holloway Commons or the new football stadium.

A senator suggested that the university, or the faculty, could make our own news about the realities of state funding of higher education by taking out ads in newspapers to expose the inequities. Mica pointed out that there have been such efforts in the past which created undesirable backlash. One local paper recently attacked the university for its budget requests, and the chancellor has written a response, but it is to be seen if his letter will be published, or receive meaningful exposure in the public eye.

The senate chair thanked Mica for his presentation.

V. Report by the Academic Affairs Committee on proposal for a social identity attribute to the Discovery program – Michael Ferber, chair of the AAC reminded the senate that six years ago there was a proposal to add a social identity attribute to the Discovery Program, but that the AAC reviewed the proposal and recommended to the senate to not support the proposal. The Discovery Committee and the university have created a new proposal for a social identity attribute in the Discovery Program. The AAC has reviewed and discussed the proposal, and found some value in the idea, particularly since the proposal shows that there has been widespread adoption of such requirements at other universities. The committee was concerned that some tightly scheduled programs might find it challenging to add another Discovery requirement. The Discovery Committee has suggested tabling the proposal for a time, as the Discovery Program itself is currently under a five-year review. The changes that may come out of this review for the program may increase the flexibility of the program, and make it easier to add a new attribute to the program. The AAC agrees to the suggestion to table the consideration of the proposal until it is recast in line with the revised Discovery Program as a whole.

A senator pointed out that, six years ago, the AAC did not vote against the social identity attribute, but simply did not vote in support of that proposal.

VI. Discussion with Terri Winters about questions on the proposed IT password policy – The senate chair introduced Terri Winters, UNH Director of IT Academic Technology, and Brian Gaon, the USNH IT Security Officer, who came to answer questions from the senators regarding the proposed password policy discussed earlier this semester.

To begin, Terri said that the changes proposed to the USNH password policy were sparked by the Identity Management Project, which has been divided into two phases. The password policy is a way to work toward a single sign-on for faculty and staff who are currently working on various systems that the project is trying to bring together. Brian and his colleagues at other institutions in the system have been working together to mitigate security risks as much as possible. They are aware that areas like WISE are not in line, but the goal is to bring all of these areas together.

In the process of making the university system as secure as possible, Terri says that she welcomes input from faculty, including the feedback of raised concerns over the inclusion of personal devices in this policy. She agreed that this item will be changed in the next iteration of the proposed policy.

A senator said that in his research regarding the need for frequent changing or rotating of passwords, he found little empirical research to support the effectiveness of changing passwords every six months, and asserted that such a practice of frequently changing passwords actually encourages phishing as it provides a way for non-university entities to pretend to be UNH IT, requesting users to change passwords.

Terri responded that while there is no way to be 100% secure, there are professional criminals trying to do malicious things, and that the university IT group is trying to mitigate that risk and stay ahead of such invasions. She reminded the senate that UNH IT will never send any message asking for a user's password, and asserted that having a strong password is a first line of defense.

Brian added that the research referenced by the senator applies to forward facing (user-side) attacks, but that malware and bots direct their attacks to the back-door vector, where longer and stronger passwords provide protection. A visiting faculty member from CEPS cited his own lengthy experience in IT and said that there are two possible security threats. The first is phishing, and that against this method, an RSA token is the only way, albeit an expensive way, to truly protect a system. The other threat is a brute force attack. He noted that his bank hasn't asked him to change his password in over ten years, and suggested that there is a greater risk of security breaches when people are required to frequently change their password, and then can't remember what they are. Another senator agreed that changing passwords every six months is burdensome, saying it is unacceptable when accounts are blocked for non-compliance, particularly on weekends when there is no one at the IT Help Desk to resolve the problem.

Terri replied that banks have more security resources than the university, and that one of the tasks of IT Academic Technology is to blend security with the openness of the university. She said that it is helpful to her to know that one of the issues for concerned faculty is the six-month requirement for changing passwords. She also said that the issue of blocking accounts over the weekend is a valid concern, noting that adjustments on this could be made at the service desk.

A senator also said that payroll approval is a nightmarish process. Terri said this is not her department, but that she will look into it.

Another senator suggested that security questions for re-setting passwords could be automated. Brian responded that under the current system, all users in the USNH system rely on the USNH Identity Management Infrastructure for security. He agreed that it would be great to offer a self-service option to change passwords for all application, but said that our ability to do that depends on outside vendors to facilitate such an option. He asked what a reasonable number of security questions would be to securely establish the identity of the user. There were several responses, including offering an option for an email confirmation to which the user must respond.

A senator expressed frustration with the Pulse VPN (UNH's Virtual Private Network), used to access the university network remotely, which she says refreshes too often, requiring multiple sign-ins which are made more difficult due to the fact that the typing is blacked out so that the user can't see what she is typing or if she has made a mistake, causing lock-outs. One senator noted that not all faculty are IT-minded, and that it's important for the IT planners to remember their audience.

Another senator said that he appreciated the university's desire for security, but that he is very concerned about the punitive measures suggested in the proposed policy change. He suggested the need for specificity, not vagueness. It was also noted that the terms of employment at UNH offer sufficient consequences for failure to follow institutional policies, and that this document does not need to be reprimanding in tone.

Finally, several in attendance suggested more positive solutions to the password security problem, including education and tips for faculty and staff to help them learn how to create more secure and memorable passwords, perhaps with helpful instruction areas on the website to educate users.

The senate chair thanked Terri and Brian for discussing these matters with the senate.

VII. Report from Campus Planning Committee - Bill Berndtson, chair of the senate Campus Planning Committee (CPC) reported to the senate about the status of current UNH construction and renovation projects. Focusing primarily on the scope of each project, anticipated dates for initiation and/or completion, and individual project costs and sources of funding, this report does not describe the need or justification for individual projects, or how the projects were prioritized. Bill noted that many of these projects are in progress, and his attempt is to provide the most current information available, despite rapid changes.

He said that there are several ways that projects are funded at UNH, and discussed the following six:

1. The State of New Hampshire provides some funding, typically for major projects serving academic purposes, but never for auxiliary enterprises. Those projects may be funded by loans from the Higher Education Finance Authority and repaid with student fees.

2. SAARC (Space Allocation, Adaptation and Renewal Committee) – these funds are derived from RCM square footage charges to all units for the space used for the various programs. These funds are used to take care of what we already have, addressing maintenance and life safety issues. These funds are also used as project planning funds, and sometimes used to cover part of the cost of other projects, if those projects are related to SAARC’s intended purpose.
3. Strategic Initiative Funds – Usually these funds are allocated by the Board of Trustees and used to enhance academic programs.
4. Internal borrowing – The Board of Trustees requires UNH to have financial reserves, and specifies the maximum amount that the university can borrow. The funds must be repaid with interest within a specific time frame.
5. Private donations – When private donors offer funds, the university is not at liberty to mandate where those funds are to be spent; rather the donor’s wishes direct where the money will go.
6. Fundraising

Regardless of the source of funding, the university must get approval from the Board of Trustees for any capital project costing more than \$3.5 million. This approval feeds into the timeline of when projects go forward.

Bill then discussed several of the upcoming projects. The Hamilton-Smith building renovation is budgeted at \$37 million. Ground has been broken for the NH Veterinarian Diagnostic Lab, budgeted at \$2.75 million. The expansion of Holloway Commons will provide additional needed seating for students dining there, and will cost about \$10.5 million. The renovations in Kendall Hall should be about \$1 million, and that building will provide swing space during the Ham-Smith renovation. The ATO fraternity, purchased downtown by the university as a cooperative project between the university and the community, is budgeted at \$2.1 million. The Spaulding Life Science Building will undergo a couple of million dollars in renovations taking place there this summer to provide additional lab space to support teaching programs in that building. The Field House and Academic Commons is about a \$2 million dollar project. The stadium has been approved for \$25 million, and the outdoor pool for \$5 million. The water treatment plant needs to be replaced, at about \$20 million. Last week \$2.1 million was approved to renovate the Horton Science Building.

Future initiatives include the Integrated Biologic Science Program, with \$7 million from the university and about \$37 million requested from the state. The Hamel Recreation Center is planned at \$35.5 million. The CPC asked Doug Bencks about the plans for the New England Center, for which there are no current plans, although there is some thought of using that building for the Advancement Office. Potential renovations to the Paul Creative Arts Center are in the very early stages of planning, with an estimate of about \$30 million. He directed the senators to the website – www.unh.edu/facilities/unh-capital-projects-fy-2015-2020 - for more information about upcoming projects.

Bill then shared how the CPC asked questions of the University Campus Planning Committee about how expenditures of the university on non-academic items, such as the stadium and the Hamel Recreation, are viewed by the public and state legislature. There was some concern of senate CPC members that asking the state for money for a science center when we’re

spending money on a stadium might be a concern. They also asked how these projects impact the cost to attend UNH. They feel these are questions that the senate ought to consider to determine if we should take a position on them.

A senator asked why the Paul Creative Arts Center is so far down the list, suggesting it should be a much higher priority. Bill responded that this is a difficult question, referring to last year when it seemed that the PCAC was a very high priority for the university president, but does not seem to be high on the list this year. He said that there is input from deans, faculty from various colleges, and all of these things go together to set the priorities for these projects. The senate CPC believes that the university CPC has a good system of establishing priorities.

A senator suggested that it may be easier to request money from the state for a project like a science center, but that a PCAC project might be something that might more likely be funded by an outside donor. The senate vice chair reminded the senate that there was an outside donor who might have donated to a PCAC project but chose to donate to another area on campus instead, at which point the PCAC project fell to the bottom of the list. Bill asserted that there is no way to predict when and where donors will come forward, and no way to dictate to donors where their donations might be spent. He said that he hopes that by understanding the diversity of funding sources, and how the university has discretion over some sources but almost none over others, the members of the senate may have a better idea of the processes by which these decisions are made.

A senator asked about the practice of internal borrowing, asking if we are borrowing against our future. Bill responded that the money is real money which is in reserves. Another senator asked why we need to pay ourselves back at high interest rates. Bill replied that there is a going rate for internal borrowing. Another senator asked why there is not more free access to SAARC money for departments, based on the square footage fees paid. Bill responded that all of the SAARC money is in a single pot, not differentiated by college or program, and not being invested to earn interest. The campus planners go down the list of projects and spend what is there, not carrying over a balance other than some reserve accounts, but exhausting the funds annually. A senator responded to the question on interest rate, saying that the idea is to charge in interest what the university could get on those funds if they were invested in order to create a revenue neutral status.

A senator from the History said it had been her understanding that the renovations to Horton would happen this summer. Bill responded that in the last SAARC meeting, there seemed to be some funding for the project, but that the estimates and planning still seemed a ways away. The senator then asked if there has been any talk of a faculty dining hall in a future project. Bill said that he has not heard of any such project. The senator asked if such a project could be suggested, saying that the faculty used to have one, and that it would be a good resource for faculty collaboration and for entertaining visiting candidates for positions. She suggested the New England Center or the recently purchased fraternity house as possibilities. Another senator agreed, calling the faculty lounge an intangible but valuable resource.

A member of the senate CPC, his impression of the entire experience of discussing these projects with Doug Bencks was very difficult to understand, particularly in determining where money is actually coming from. He said there is a lack of transparency and that it was difficult

to get a straight answer. He feels this is a problem, and that the senate CPC should continue to focus on these issues. Bill clarified that many of the questions of the CPC were directed to Doug Bencks, who sometimes simply did not have all the answers the CPC wanted. Bill suggested asking these same questions of the Provost, the Vice Provost, or the Vice President for Finance. A senator asked if the senate has conversed with the administrators who make these decisions. Alberto said that we can invite these administrators to our meeting. It was noted that some of the budget decisions are made by the Board of Trustees and not by the administration.

The senate chair thanked the senate CPC for their work and their report.

VIII. New business – A senator suggested that, in an effort to minimize the number of administrative positions at the university, as there frequently seem to be new positions added, the senate might advise that the positions of Provost and Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs be reduced to a single position.

IX. Adjournment- The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.