

University of New Hampshire

University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository

Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes

Faculty Senate Documents

10-6-2014

2014-15 FACULTY SENATE XIX - October 6, 2014 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 - October 6, 2014 Minutes Summary" (2014). *Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes*. 214.

https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty_senate_agendas_minutes/214

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 3:12 on October 6, 2014

MINUTES SUMMARY

I. Roll – The following senators were absent: Dowd-Solorzano, Scherr, and Ware. Mellyn, Minocha, Tenczar, B.White, and Wu were excused. David Cross, Lisa MacFarlane, Sean Moundas, and Denise Nelson were visitors.

II. Remarks by and questions to the provost – The provost opened her remarks by addressing a question posed at the last meeting by a senator regarding the number of students who were arrested last year. Having done some research on the matter, the provost reported that 8% of last year's first-year class was arrested at some point, a great deal lower than the number suggested by the senator two weeks ago. For the most part, these arrests were alcohol and/or noise related events which occurred in off-campus housing. She noted that it is difficult to proactively police student behavior off campus, but said that there are standards of behavior which are clearly outlined on the university's [Community Standards](#) page, with a wide range of consequences, depending on the severity of the infraction.

The provost announced that the next Board of Trustees meeting would be at the end of October, and that she would share information from that meeting at the first senate meeting in November.

She also spoke about the appropriations request to the state for funding in the amount of \$38 million for an integrated science center. The state appropriations board has asked that the university be funded at the same level it was before the 2010 budget cuts. She noted that the university will be funding the renovations of the Hamilton-Smith building internally. She encouraged the senators to vote in the upcoming elections and to encourage their colleagues and students to engage in the process as well.

A senator from the History department asked why the Hamilton-Smith renovations were not considered for state funding, and the provost suggested that with the pressures from the state to increase support for the sciences, the choice was made to focus the request on Bio-Science space, which is also a critical need. Lisa noted that a positive result of internally funding the Ham-Smith project is that such internal funding allows the university to begin the Ham-Smith renovations sooner.

The senator from the Chemistry department asked about a request to his department to assess the impact of a 10% increase in present enrollments. The provost stated that this request is part of an impact study on the carrying capacity study being conducted in order to respond to questions from the Board of Trustees regarding future growth of the university. In response to questions from the board about whether the university might ever anticipate enrollments as high as 16,000-18,000 in the future, the university president informed the board that such a question would require serious

and detailed examination to determine if those kinds of enrollment figures could be supported in any measure at any time in the future. A capacity study has been initiated to examine the consequences of such an existential proposition, beginning with creating a model of four successive years of enrollment increases like what we have seen in this academic year. All aspects of the university must be considered, from housing and dining to student services and athletics, to counseling and security services, beyond classroom space and faculty hires.

The provost asserted that UNH's success as an institution is a function of being a "high-touch" campus where students get hands-on training with strong interactions with their professors. She noted that UNH has a low faculty to student ratio of 19/1, and first- and second-year retention rates of 86%. Our graduation rates are nearly 70% for four-year graduation and 80% for six-year graduation. She commented on the impressive numbers of students who participate in the Undergraduate Research Conference, and asked if greatly increasing our enrollments would have a negative impact on the very qualities that make UNH a unique place to receive a quality education. The impact study is a way to do a thorough analysis of these very questions, and the provost called it an exercise to provide data that will inform this discussion in the future. By asking for solid data from the departments, the administration will have solid data to build the capacity study.

A senator asked how the current increase in enrollments came about; through good fortune or increase recruiting? The provost said that the increase is the result of a number of separate efforts. Certain high schools were targeted in areas where there is a higher concentration of UNH alumni, such as California, Colorado, New York, DC, and Chicago, for heavy recruitment. It was noted that there was a dip in in-state enrollments after the 2010 state budget cuts, which saw some reversal as UNH continued to prosper despite the state cuts. The provost also noted that a leveling of price differences between system schools may have provided some students to choose UNH over other in-state institutions. Relaying the story of one student's decision to attend UNH over other universities, the provost emphasized the value students receive here for the tuition money they spend.

III. Remarks by and questions to the chair – The senate chair reported that David Richman, from the department of Theatre and Dance, has agreed to chair the Discovery Program Review Committee.

IV. Minutes – It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the last senate meeting, September 22, 2014. Jim Connell noted that those minutes cited the senate parliamentarian as proposing a motion, but that only a senator can bring a motion forward. While in this case the parliamentarian is also a senator, he requested a rewording of that portion of the minutes, in Item V, paragraph 7, and also in item VIII, paragraph 1. The senate admin agreed to make those changes.

The senator from the library pointed out that in Item III, paragraph 1 of the minutes, the "comprehensive science lab" should have been identified as a "library" rather than a "lab." The senate admin noted the typographical error, and made that correction. The library senator then offered some clarification of information in the provost's remarks (Item II, paragraph 9), "*The dean of the Library asked that a comprehensive plan of an integrated science library be developed no later than the end of 2016, at which time the move of the physics library will be re-examined.*"

The senator stated that the library faculty have not yet been asked by the dean to do this. As the senate minutes are a reflection of what was actually said in the meeting, no adjustment was made to the senate record, but the senate admin agreed to include the senator's clarifying statement in today's minutes. Thus adjusted, the minutes were unanimously approved, with two abstentions.

Discussion/Report Items:

V. Presentation from David Cross on identifying at-risk students and the Kognito program – David Cross, the director of the UNH Counseling Center came to share a [powerpoint presentation](#) on at-risk students with the senate. He was joined by Sean Moundas, the assistant director of outreach, and Denise Nelson, the adjunct assistant dean of students, who chairs the behavioral intervention team that helps identify students of concern on campus. They are asking for help from faculty senate members to take their message out to the faculty and spread the word about help that is available to students who are dealing with mental health issues. The counseling center has purchased a Gatekeeping training program for faculty, staff and students to help them identify at-risk individuals, and know who to contact or where to refer such students for additional help.

David reported that suicide is the second leading cause of death for 18-24 year olds nationally; accidents (usually auto accidents involving alcohol) are the leading cause. He said that almost 7% of college students in the country have seriously considered suicide in the past twelve months. Almost 80% of students who commit suicide have not been seen by a counselor. These programs are designed to help at-risk students get the help that is available to them.

He discussed the rising issues with student veterans. As more veterans enter higher education, there is a greater need to offer assistance to those who are in need of counseling. Drop-out rates for student veterans are 70% nationwide, nearly 3 times the national average. Nearly half of all student veterans have reported considering suicide.

LGBTQ students are three to four times more likely than heterosexual students to experience discrimination that affected their academic performance, and are at higher risk for self-harm, or suicidal thoughts or attempts.

In his presentation, David revealed that seven of the top ten impediments to academic success reported by students are related to emotional and social issues. He noted that anxiety disorders are presenting more prevalently this year.

This Gatekeeper training is a research based approach which teaches techniques for identifying and approaching distressed students in order to take appropriate action to help them receive the help they need. It demonstrates obstacles that veteran and LGBTQ students may experience on campus and shows effective methods for managing discussions in and out of the classroom. A Gatekeeper is someone who has significant contact with students and is thus well situated to identify warning signs of students in emotional distress. Gatekeepers include faculty, staff, and campus safety personnel.

There are three sets of trainings: the LGBTQ and Veterans training each take about 30 minutes, and the training for Faculty and Staff takes about 45 minutes. This is an online program that can be done all at once or in bits and pieces. Participants interact with emotionally responsive avatars to respond to various situations. A virtual coach is available to instruct and guide participants in

the process. There are nine conditions portrayed, all of which exist on the UNH campus. Results from these trainings show significant increases in awareness, and participants rated the program as easy to use and highly informative. David suggested that the faculty begin with the program for faculty and staff, but recommended that they also review the other programs as well, as time permits.

The senator from Mechanical Engineering suggested that participation in the program be required by departments, similar to the academic honesty quiz administered in his department. He noted that such requirements in individual classes could become redundant. David said that some faculty in the Paul College are offering extra credit for participating in this program.

The senator from Health Management and Policy said that students in her department are very interested in this program and in building a culture around it, hoping to create some kind of event involving other departments, and David asked her to forward names of highly motivated students to him. The senator from Family Studies noted that this is Mental Health Awareness Week, with a Mental Health Panel being held on October 8th.

A senator asked about the operating hours of the Counseling Center. David responded that the center is open 8 a.m. – 5 p.m. Monday-Friday, but that after hours there is a hotline (603-862-2090) for emergency services and referrals available 24/7.

Another senator suggested creating an area on Blackboard to promote these programs, as well as looking for ways to create incentives for participation. A senator asked which online program Teaching Assistants might use, as they are both students and teachers. David suggested that they take both, and noted that the Kognito/Gatekeeper program is available to anyone at all, not just to university students and faculty members. He said that educators at Oyster River High School have utilized this program, and said that all anyone needs is the enrollment key to participate. That key is unh624 for faculty, and unh603 for students, at the site <http://kognitocampus.com/login>

A senator asked if there is any way for faculty to follow up on students they may refer to the counseling center. David responded that unless the student signs a release, there is no way to report back to the faculty. He suggested that the most effective way to be sure that the student actually goes to the counseling center is for the faculty member to actually walk with them to the center, pointing out the value in the relationship of trust between the faculty member and the student, which then transfers to the counseling staff. He said that if the student wishes, the faculty member is permitted to join the student in the counseling session.

A senator suggested that this program might be presented in college faculty meetings. David said that the Thompson School faculty did the training during the January break.

David informed the senators that Denise Nelson, as head of the Behavioral Intervention Team, has authority to require students to meet with her and mandate that they receive counseling. If faculty have concerns about a student, they can contact Denise directly. She handed out cards to the senators with her contact information. She is available 365 days a year, 24/7. She works with students at-risk of harm to themselves, or at-risk of harm to others, with violence interventions, and with homeless students. Any student behaviors that are of concern should be reported to her: denise.nelson@unh.edu Phone: 862-2498.

A senator asked about faculty or staff behavior that is of concern, and who one should call with those issues. David reported that CAST (Collegiality and Safety Team) is the organization for such concerns for faculty and staff. The group is headed up by Jim Varn, and meets about once per semester. He said that concerned faculty could use the same contact information as above to report issues, and the counseling center will make sure they are referred to the appropriate place. He also noted that FERPA and HIPAA regulations do protect the privacy of students, but they do not preclude faculty reporting student behavior.

VI. Report from senate Academic Affairs Committee on the proposed change to the common exam time – Michael Ferber, chair of the AAC, presented the committee's report (*FS agenda 10-16-14, Appendix 6.1*) regarding the proposed change to the common exam time. He noted that the renovations to Hamilton-Smith next year will remove seventeen classrooms from use, which space must be found someplace else on campus. He said that the senior vice-provost for academic affairs has suggested that adjusting the schedule of classes and common exams is the most effective way to find this space, avoiding rental of space elsewhere or temporary trailers being placed on campus. In the end, the AAC moves to support the vice-provost's proposal in the absence of any other workable solution. Michael noted that Vasu will be in attendance at our next senate meeting for discussion on this matter. The AAC wants to make it clear that their intent is to support the change in the common exam time only during the time of renovations to Ham-Smith, and not as a permanent change at this point in time. Their motion follows:

Rationale: In the summer of 2015 the renovation of Hamilton Smith Hall will begin, and it is expected to take two years. During Academic Years 2015 and 2016, therefore, all of its classrooms will be unavailable: seventeen of them, many of them large, with seats for about a thousand students in all. Courses from many departments are given there concurrently, and most of the classrooms are reserved for tests given during the common Exam (CE) time, the main ones now Tuesday and Thursday 12:40 to 2:00. Somehow, and somewhere, classrooms must be found to replace those seventeen. Therefore:

Motion: The Academic Affairs Committee moves that the Senate, pursuant to its power to set the calendar, stipulate that for Academic Years 2015 and 2016 the Common Exam time currently set at Tuesday and Thursday 12:40 to 2:00 PM be moved to Friday 2:10 to 5:00 PM.

This change will obtain for two years only. If the renovation of Hamilton Smith takes longer than that, the Senate will extend the new schedule or modify as it sees fit. Otherwise the Common Exam time will revert to its current slot for AY 2017 unless the Senate explicitly acts otherwise.

We call upon the Deans to convene a meeting soon of department Chairs and administrators to explain the change and its consequences and to adjudicate such questions as what departments will be allowed to preserve the current Common Exam time for their members' meetings.

Needing no second, the motion was opened up for discussion.

A senator asked why, if the change does not work well, the senate would need to wait two years to recommend modifications. Michael said the intent was to allow the change for the duration of the construction, but that an earlier evaluation could be done if deemed necessary. A senator from Physics suggested that alternatives to this plan had been offered, such as using the existing class schedule more effectively, including more classes on Friday afternoons and in the early morning. Michael responded that such measures currently seem to represent the worst case scenario to the registrar's office. The senator asserted those changes would be less disruptive than the plan supported by this motion. Michael referred to conversations with the former registrar, who maintained that the proposed changes were the least disruptive solution, and freed up prime hours. There is a dramatic domino effect to any scheduling change.

A senator pointed out that Parsons Hall had been renovated wing by wing and asked if there were some way to do the Ham-Smith renovations in such a way as to use part of the building while renovating the other part. Michael replied that the back of the building will be torn down, making that difficult.

The senator from the Music department quoted the senior vice-provost in calling the program a pilot program. That word concerned this senator, as his department does not support this plan becoming permanent. Michael assured the senator that the intent is for the plan to be temporary and thoroughly evaluated after the construction is complete. Another senator reminded the group about the effort last year to enact such a change, and reiterated the sentiment that the change should be a short term solution to an immediate problem.

Senators offered suggestions of alternate solutions that have been utilized at other institutions: using gymnasiums, dining halls or the New England Center for common exam space. A senator asked if two common exam times (2:10-3:30 and 3:40-5:00) were necessary, or if only one time slot could serve the purpose. Another senator replied that large classes needed two time slots for all students to take the exam, particularly as students must spread out during exam time. Michael replied that the AAC relied on data given to them from the registrar's office regarding what space was actually available on campus. The Graduate Student Senate representative said that at other institutions, space is sometimes rented in hotels, or that the common space in residence halls is used to administer common exams. Michael noted the expense of renting space.

Another senator commented about many empty classrooms on campus at night and asked about using those time slots. Senators from Physics and Chemistry pointed out that their students use those times for labs. It was also noted that this issue is not particular to any department, as majors in all fields are required to take classes in the departments most seriously impacted by this proposed change.

VII. Report from the Research and Public Services Committee on proposed changes to the UNH Intellectual Property Policy – The chair of the RPSC reported that his committee was charged last year to review the revisions to the [university's policy on intellectual property](#). The previous version of this document was reviewed by the faculty senate in 1998. He noted that the revised document has been vetted by the AAUP. The RPSC reported that the committee found no issues with the document's revisions.

However, in reviewing the document, there were other issues that raised questions to the committee that might warrant further review by members or committees of the senate. Some items that the committee felt might be of particular interest to members of the senate were:

Item 4.1– the policy applies not only to faculty, but to staff, administrators and students, which may come as a surprise to some members of the university community.

Item 5.1 – policies on copyrightable material, including class notes, and classroom and research instruction, broadly defined. There was concern particularly about the inclusion of the work of graduate and undergraduate students in these policies.

Item 7. – The rights to student intellectual property becomes a complicated issue, as students may attend several institutions over the course of their education; which institution has claim to that material? There were also concerns about the university's claim to the right to use such materials however the university sees fit, without having to gain permission to use it.

Item 12.1 - Wayne reported the standard financial breakdown royalties and other net income received from the licensing of Intellectual Property: 30% to the creator/innovator, 30% to the college associated with the innovator, 30% to a university-wide research and development fund, and 10% to UNH Innovations (UNHI).

Wayne pointed out that in the sciences, many of these policies are standard, but he suggested that in the arts, there may be a need for further discussion on the effect of these policies on the work of those faculty. He added that despite some wording in the document to include the arts, this policy has clearly been written for the sciences.

The Lecturer's Council Representative pointed out that lecturers currently receive no compensation for research they do, and asked how these policies apply to them. Wayne suggested that this question is one of those to be discussed. Another senator asked if the AAUP had raised any concerns in their vetting of the document, and Wayne replied that the AAUP lawyers felt that this was the same document as the one approved in 1998; that the minor wording changes did not change the overall intent of the document.

A senator from the English department said that in more than twenty years at UNH, she had not been aware that her students, undergraduate and graduate, were subject to this document. She recently polled colleagues and students and found little awareness of the language in this policy. She pointed out that some universities are pushing back on intellectual property policies.

The senator from the Health Management and Policy department asked if there had been input on this policy from the human subjects and ethics side of research. In doing research with human subjects, it is required that researchers make their subjects aware of how their data might be used in the future. She raised the question of whether the use of data provided by other people is subject to these policies.

A senator asked if this policy is standard at land-grant institutions in the U.S.A. Wayne was unable to answer that question in regards to land-grant institutions, but said that similar documents are

widely distributed across the country. The senator suggested that such uniformity would seem apropos.

The senator from Family Studies said that when applying for external funding, there is a requirement to examine this document before completing the application. A senator from the Education department suggested that the book “Common as Air” by Lewis Hyde offers great insight on this topic.

The senate chair accepted the RPSC’s report and thanked the committee for their work.

VIII. Discussion on amendments to the senate constitution regarding non-tenure track faculty representation on the faculty senate – Todd DeMitchell, senate past chair, offered the following procedural motion on behalf of the senate Agenda Committee:

The Agenda Committee moves that the Faculty Senate adopt the following procedure as a guideline for deliberation and final action on the pending motion introduced on September 22, 2014, to adopt the constitutional amendments recommended by the Ad Hoc Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty:

- 1. On October 6, 2014 there will be a brief, time limited consideration of the motion. The Senate will request that all senators bring to their departments the pending motion on the inclusion of non-tenure track faculty in the Faculty Senate. The motion would be laid over.**
- 2. The Agenda Committee will include an item on the Faculty Senate agenda for further consideration of the motion for the October 20, 2014 and the November 3, 2014 meetings. The motion shall be laid over for final action at these meetings unless a motion to modify these procedures is adopted or another action (e.g. recommitting the motion to a committee) is taken that entails additional delay.**
- 3. Final consideration and a vote on motion would be scheduled for November 17, 2014 unless the Senate votes for a further delay or other action is taken that entails an additional delay.**

This procedure supersedes (though it is consistent with) the motion adopted on September 22, 2014 to lay over the motion for at least two Senate meetings.

A senator from the English department said that while his department seems in favor of the inclusion of non-tenure track faculty to senate service, there was concern about the burden of serving on senate committees and, noting that NTTF are not compensated for service responsibilities, the department suggested that NTTF be allowed to serve on the senate without serving on any senate committees.

A member of the senate Agenda Committee asserted that the experts on the language of this motion are the members of the ad hoc committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty, and said that suggestions could be made to that committee which would then be able to create the appropriate wording to include in the motion.

The procedural motion was put to a voice vote, and the motion passed unanimously.

IX. New business –There was no new business.

X. Adjournment- The meeting was adjourned at 4:59 p.m.