FACULTY SENATE - 13 April 1998 Minutes Summary

Faculty Senate

I. Roll - The following Faculty Senate members were absent: Afolayan, Balling, Barkey, Burger, Evans, Fink, Greenlaw, Guidry, Halstead, Henke, Herold, Lugalla, Morgan, and Sohl.   Excused were DeMitchell, Hinson and Walsh.

II. Communications from the Chair - The chair said that she wrote an article on the subject of adequate education, which was published by Foster's Daily Democrat and has been distributed to the senate.   A tabloid is being prepared which reflects national and regional coverage of faculty in the news.   This is part of an effort to demonstrate the broad impact of faculty at UNH.   A cover letter for that tabloid has been distributed, and your input on the project is requested.   Planning is continuing for the Distinguished Alumni Recognition, which will be held in February.   Please give your ideas regarding this also.   There was some confusion in an article in The New Hampshire regarding Thompson School credit transfer.   Most Thompson School credits will transfer fully to UNH, but only as elective credits and not as general education or major credits.   Therefore transferring credits may not substantially reduce the time to degree.

III. Minutes - The minutes of the previous senate meeting were approved unanimously.

IV. Scholarly Misconduct Motion - The Professional Standards Committee has revised the motion on scholarly misconduct.   A previous draft had been presented to the Faculty Senate prior to its February 9 meeting and discussed and tabled at that meeting, with a request for input from all faculty.   A revised version was distributed to the faculty prior to today's senate meeting. Today a motion to reconsider the matter was made, seconded and unanimously passed. **John Seavey moved and Dennis Bobilya seconded that the Faculty Senate endorse the policy on misconduct in scholarly activity.**

Concern had been expressed about the standard of proof being a preponderance of the evidence, but that standard is consistent with the federal guidelines.   Professor Seavey stated that, if we were to establish a higher standard of proof, there would then be two different standards, one for federal and one for non-federal, which the committee decided would be inappropriate.   However, the committee added a footnote to clarify what "preponderance of the evidence" means.   Also, the phrase "serious deviations from accepted practices" is part of the standard federal definition of misconduct.   The Professional Standards Committee added wording to specify that misconduct does not include honest differences or judgments with respect to scholarly issues, nor should it be interpreted to stifle academic freedom.   Anonymous complaints are allowed under federal policy and must be kept confidential.

A phrase was deleted regarding choosing members of the Peer Investigating Committee in consideration of their generational, racial and gender characteristics.   Regarding overlap of the inquiry stage with the designation of the Peer Investigating Committee, the Professional Standards Committee decided to retain the original process since, if there were a different group involved in the selection of the investigating committee, this new group would have to review extensively the whole situation.   This would not only be time consuming but also would involve too many people in these confidential matters.   The whole document has been reviewed to make sure that the use of words such as "may", "must", "should" and "will" is consistent with the intent. Non-substantive wording changes were made in the definition section and the sanctions section. A definition of conflict of interest has been added in footnote six.

In peer institutions, there is a wide range of policy on scholarly misconduct, but almost all of them use the National Science Foundation's guidelines. In this document, the Peer Investigating Committee has an odd number of members; but the other committees do not, due to administrative structures. As a standard practice, members of the committees on scholarly misconduct would be held harmless. Jim Farrell made and Paul McNamara seconded an **amendment that no member of the inquiry team shall serve as a member of the Peer Investigation Committee**. The amendment passed with one nay.

Pointing out that the document specifies that the university will have legal counsel, John Farrell made and John Miller seconded an **amendment that** the subject of the investigation has the right to legal counsel. Todd Gross made a friendly amendment, which was accepted, to change the wording to **"The subject of the investigation shall be informed that he or she has the right to legal counsel."** After discussion, the vote on this amendment passed with nineteen ayes, fourteen nays, and no abstentions. **The motion to endorse the policy on misconduct in scholarly activity passed unanimously, with the two amendments.**

V. <u>Report from the Library Committee</u> - Robert Stibler, the chair of the Faculty Senate's Library Committee, reported that the committee had participated in the budget process and had urged the university librarian to be more forceful in asking for increased library funding. That effort was well received, and the library is in line for increased funding. The committee met with a library consultant and also monitored the library construction project, which is still on schedule. The library will be closed for a short time in August and will reopen one week before the start of the fall semester. The committee presented a request for access through the back door of the library, but this was refused. New programs should contact the librarian to discuss their needs in advance. The Library Committee will give a written report for carryover to next year's committee.

VI. <u>Transportation Policy</u> - The Transportation Policy Committee which began two years ago is advisory to the president and has representatives from all constituencies. In 1996/97, the committee proposed reducing the number of cars on campus and using remote parking. The traffic at the corner of Main Street and College Road delays the shuttle bus. Adding a lane in that area would be expensive because of the steam lines under the road. The loop road has been proposed to prevent traffic other than the shuttle from using this road and others in the central campus. The loop road plan would also include two underpasses under the railroad, as well as sidewalks from the Field House to the West Edge Lot. The university is withdrawing from participation in the Coast bus and will start its own service after Memorial Day. This bus service is expected to go from Durham to and from Newmarket, Dover and Portsmouth. The bus will stop near the Dover train station to connect with Amtrak passenger trains. Later, if there are any funds left over, bus routes might be added to Lee or other places.

Main Street is a busy road, and pedestrians should keep in mind that they should check for traffic even when they are in crosswalks. Noise from motorcycles is disturbing to classes, when windows are open in warm weather. Now we have more students with cars and more part-time faculty, which increases traffic. Freshmen and sophomores should not have cars on campus, but exceptions are granted for both medical and employment reasons. Teaching assistant and research assistant graduate students have faculty/staff parking permits.

VII. <u>Academic Computing</u> - Jeffry Diefendorf chairs a standing committee to examine policies and priorities on academic and research computing. The committee has oversight, liaison and communication functions. The committee has discussed email privacy policy and budget plans. The capital campaign is expected to facilitate the electronic campus, desktop computing, computing support staff, distance learning, and enhanced student computing. There has been

great concern that administrative computing was much better off than academic computing. The committee did a survey of faculty and student computing needs. More mid-sized super-technology classrooms and more portable computer equipment are needed, along with more support staff.

For tenure-track faculty, the committee would like to recommend a three-to-four-year computer replacement cycle. The cost of this initiative would increase by 10% to 25% if all instructional faculty were included. Would these computers be purchased centrally or through the colleges? A faculty member asked that the university not standardize computing too much, saying that faculty need to spend their computer dollars according to their individual needs. The committee will report to the president by the end of this semester. A faculty member said that software on mainframe computers should be distributed to faculty computers, adding that site licenses are available for most statistical packages and should be for broad use, not just for the mainframes.

Students have proposed a new computing general education requirement, which could be fulfilled through passing a test or taking an introductory course. A professor suggested that computer skills should instead be made an admission requirement, with remedial courses available. The university will encourage students to have their own computer on campus and may soon require this. The committee is considering this issue.

A professor raised questions about recycling old computers from the university to public schools and about ownership rights of electronic material developed by faculty. The committee chair said that there are serious problems about intellectual property rights that will have to be addressed. Courts have ruled that, if university facilities are used, then the material produced, whether electronically or on paper, belongs to the university. The committee plans to recommend a non-intervention policy. For example, the university could monitor the number of hits on a server but would not read personal electronic mail unless the president authorized that because there was cause to believe that a violation of law or university policy had occurred.

VIII.   Budget and Responsibility-Centered Management - A professor said that responsibility-centered management is a big issue which could change the character of the university. Faculty are concerned that this type of management would still leave decisions in the hands of the administration but would require local departments to generate their own funds and fight for funding. A few programs could be funded beyond the income they generate. Also, in the near term, one-time monies would be used to overcome some budget deficits. What support and training would chairs be given for implementing responsibility-centered management? Criteria for choosing a department chair might change. Would there be sufficient uniform decision making and cohesive planning?

IX.   Adjournment - The meeting was adjourned.