

University of New Hampshire

University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository

Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes

Faculty Senate Documents

4-27-2015

2014-15 FACULTY SENATE XIX - April 27, 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 - April 27, 2015 Minutes Summary" (2015). *Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes*. 203.

https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty_senate_agendas_minutes/203

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 April 27, 2015

MINUTES SUMMARY

I. Roll – The following senators were absent: Dowd, Gingras, Morgan, Smith, and Thompson. Carroll and Minocha were excused. Whistler and Jamison served as proxies for Denis and Kazura, respectively. Lisa MacFarlane and Barb White were guests.

II. Remarks by and questions to the provost – The provost was asked by the senate chair to discuss issues regarding the library. She began by referencing the de-selection process and said that she hopes the library faculty will be able to move forward on this issue, having addressed faculty concerns sufficiently for the library faculty to begin working this summer on necessary de-selection.

Next, the provost shared her thoughts on space issues in the library and branch libraries across campus, including the potential integrated library science center. She expressed her personal interest in discovering the best way to use space on campus, calling this an ongoing challenge for members of the campus community. She said that, in principle, wherever space exists on our campus, it is incumbent to use it in the best way possible. She pointed to the current Information Access Policy Working Group (IAPWG) as the committee reviewing space needs for the libraries. She said that this committee is composed of the senate Library Committee chair, the chair of the Physics department, and faculty from COLSA, EOS, as well as the science librarian. This group is assessing the use of space in the branch libraries, and asking questions about other possible ways to use these spaces. The provost asserted that the subsequent questions of “what would happen if...” become separate issues.

She said that she looks forward to the committee’s recommendations, as well as to the senate’s comments on those recommendations. She wants to see data on use, and impact statements, saying there is nothing mysterious about this process; it is simply a research project to determine the best use of space, which she leaves to the committee, the senate representatives, and the library staff to make a recommendation to the provost.

The provost then said that if an integrated science center were to become one of the recommendations of the committee, that becomes a second step in the process. At that point, advantages and problems related to the creation of such a center would be investigated, along with how the project might take shape. She pointed to the changes in Kendall and Parsons as examples of the process and result of such investigations.

She said that there are many needs to be addressed when examining space needs, usage, and allocation, and asked for as fulsome a response as possible by the next senate meeting. The provost said she would like to separate out all the conjecture about uses for space into three

distinct paths: 1) What are the best uses that can be recommended for our available space, 2) How would it be possible to carry out such recommendations? and 3) What is the best way to move forward from that point? The provost's desire is to look at each of these items separately.

A senator from the Physics department said that he doesn't disagree with the provost's comments, but that his concern is about timing. With only one more meeting of the senate before the summer break, his concern is that there is not sufficient time to review the IAPWG's recommendations, particularly since their final meeting is scheduled two days after the last senate meeting next Monday. He suggested that putting off a decision about this until next year provides more time.

The provost replied that if we put it off too long, we may end up having to start all over again with the process. She asked that the senate offer some sort of recommendation to provide an endpoint to pass on to the next provost. She also suggested that the senate can ask for a draft of the IAPWG's report to review. Responses can be sent back to the committee, who may be able to incorporate some items, or simply appendicize senate remarks, if necessary. The senate chair said that he does have a copy of that draft. A member of the IAPWG said that feedback from the senate would be useful by May 1. The provost encouraged even an earlier turn around in order to move things forward.

The provost concluded her remarks by asserting her strong belief in shared governance and desire for the senate to be a strong presence in the life of the university and a respected partner in shared governance. The strength and credibility of the senate has to do with the very good work that is done here. She appreciates that we continually ask ourselves how we can do better.

III. Remarks by and questions to the senate chair – The senate chair shared a proposal from the provost's office which clarifies the distinctions between external and internal affiliate faculty appointments. The appointments are defined as follows:

Affiliate with Rank: External – Persons whose primary occupations are normally nonacademic and who contribute to the University's education, research and/or service activities on a limited-time basis. They are from outside the University. This appointment involves no compensation. Persons hold academic rank but are not eligible for tenure, fringe benefits, sabbatical leaves, or election to the faculty seats in the Faculty Senate. Appointment is one to three years; renewable.”

Internal - An Affiliated title may be given to a faculty or professional staff member as a means of formalizing an association with a department other than that of the primary appointment. The affiliation must be recommended by the department to the dean. A person who has an affiliate appointment may receive adjunct compensation from the affiliate department. Appointment is one to three years; renewable. Termination of the primary appointment shall automatically terminate the affiliate appointment.

The chair noted that External Affiliate Faculty positions are generally non-academic positions which contribute to the university's mission, filled from outside the university. Internal Affiliate Faculty is a formalization of an appointment of a faculty member within the community to a secondary department.

The chair then turned the time over to the senate vice chair, who reported on the search for a new provost. The vice chair informed the senate that the search committee has been conducting telephone interviews with candidates and that the onsite interviews are about to begin. Hopefully, there will be two or three candidates coming to campus shortly. Emails will be going out to faculty with times, dates, and locations of open forums with these candidates, whose names will be forthcoming on May 1. Their CVs and letters of interest will be posted on the provost's hiring website for interested faculty to review. She strongly encouraged faculty involvement in the open forums, and added that all open forums will be videotaped and those recordings will be uploaded to the website. There will also be a Qualtrics survey for feedback from faculty and staff on the candidates.

IV. Minutes – It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the last senate meeting, April 13, 2015. The chair of the CLER Faculty Involvement Committee had noted an error in Item V, paragraph seven, and asked that the words “that is a contract issue” be changed to “that is a departmental issue.” A senator asked that a line be included in the AAC chair's comments about the Confucius Institute (Item VII) to indicate that only one faculty senate member was included in the COLA committee to review the CI. The minutes, thus amended, were then approved unanimously, with 3 abstentions.

Discussion/Report Items:

VI. Discussion and vote on motions from Academic Affairs Committee on the Confucius Institute – Michael Ferber, chair of the AAC, presented the following six motions regarding the COLA committee report on the Confucius Institute to the senate for approval:

Motions

(1) The Faculty Senate thanks the COLA Committee for its report, which contains much useful information. We also welcome President Huddleston's forthright statement in his letter of March 16 concerning academic freedom at UNH and the consequences of possible violations of it by the Confucius Institute staff.

(2) We call on the Department of Languages, Literatures, and Cultures and the Dean of COLA to make the hiring of a tenure-track professor of Chinese language and literature a priority, and that the Dean report each April to the Senate on progress made toward that end. We ask the President to take leadership in seeking funding that would forward such a hiring.

(3) We call for the termination of the new contract with the CI in its third year if by the end of the second year UNH has not seen fit to invest in the hiring of a professor of Chinese language and literature who is not beholden to the Chinese government, as UNH

will have demonstrated it does not sufficiently value the teaching of Chinese and the exchanges that have begun with China.

(4) We recommend to COLA that it not institute a Chinese minor until a professor is hired.

(5) We deem it a violation of shared governance that the Senate was not consulted about the establishment of the Confucius Institute in 2008-10, and we regret that the Dean of Liberal Arts refused to establish a joint committee to review the CI in 2014. We stated in 2014 that we “assert the authority of the Senate to review and develop policies concerned with the academic mission of the university as a whole, and we believe the contract with the CI affects that mission.” We reassert that authority here.

(6) We charge the Academic Affairs Committee to continue to monitor the CI and to report to the Senate when it seems appropriate.

Michael related a brief history of the Confucius Institute, which was founded in 2004 as a wholly controlled subsidiary of the Chinese government in order to promote the teaching of Mandarin Chinese and Chinese culture around the world. There are about 1,200 institutes or classrooms around the world. He reported that there have been a handful of incidents globally with the institute. Three such incidents in Canada have led the Canadian Association of University Teachers to urge all school systems and universities in that country to sever ties with educational institutes subsidized by China. He said that the American Association of University Professors has made a slightly milder statement expressing certain concerns about the CI.

After reading an article last year about these controversies, the AAC chair brought the matter to the attention of his committee, and that committee brought forward a motion recommending a joint review of the CI by COLA and the faculty senate. The dean of COLA chose to form his own committee, and the senate, regretting the dean's decision, requested that two senators be placed on that committee. Only one senator was placed on the committee. The AAC was then charged by the senate Agenda Committee to review the report of the COLA committee regarding the CI. In the interim, more incidents involving the CI have come to light. Michael reported that a news reporter contacted him regarding a letter sent by President Huddleston regarding the CI, in which Michael reports that the president concluded that there was no evidence of misdeeds by the CI at UNH.

Michael reported that the COLA committee did briefly acknowledge that there were controversial issues nationwide regarding CI, but that the committee did not address those concerns, which the AAC wishes it had. The AAC also sent a list of questions to the COLA committee, including questions about how much money the university made through the courses taught by CI, but those questions have not been answered.

The AAC agrees with the COLA committee that there have been no problems on this campus with the CI and their staff at UNH. The AAC also agrees with the COLA committee's recommendation to renew the CI contract, but with a serious proviso, outlined in the third motion above. Michael reported that he met with President Huddleston regarding the CI, and

said that the president expressed discomfort with the CI, but said that there is no money to hire a tenure track professor in Chinese. He also said that the deans feel their hands are tied if the department of Languages, Literatures, and Cultures (LLC) will not support the hiring of such a professor. The AAC asked if money could be raised for tenure-track line, and the administration said no. The AAC agreed that with a tenure-track faculty in place in Chinese, there would be fewer concerns about the direction of the CI.

Michael closed his comments by stating that the senate was not consulted seven years ago when the CI was brought to UNH, and that the AAC believe the senate should have been consulted. He asserted that it seems that on several campuses across the nation, it seems that a small number of administrators have been able to bring the CI to their universities without much prior review.

A senator asked Michael if, in the second motion above, the senate AAC is directing a department to take a specific course of action. He asked if this is an appropriate senate action. Michael affirmed that the senate cannot direct a department to a specific course of action, but he believes that the senate can urge a department to such.

The senator from the LLC asserted that the implication of unwillingness on the part of his department to hire a Chinese professor is inaccurate. He reminded the senate that his department is struggling at the moment with difficult staffing issues, and said that the recent tenure-track hires approved for his department would be filling much-needed positions in German and Spanish. He said that there is no frivolity in the department's decision.

Michael said he had meant no offense, but that he sees it as a matter of setting priorities. He said that it seems that LLC and the Dean are each saying that it is the other's responsibility to find the funding to make a position in Chinese possible. He expressed concern that if such a position is not created and this issue handled within the university community, there may be political repercussions which might end the CI abruptly and outside of our control.

A senator said that a five-year contract seems too long. She talked about the association that the Art and Art History department has had with the CI, and spoke of a visiting scholar whose appearance was announced to the department last year. She also shared that scheduled art exhibit was ordered by the administration to be removed in order to display Chinese propaganda art. She found this very strange.

A senator from the English department said that the university can't offer everything, and asked why it was so important to offer Chinese. Michael responded that it has to do with comparator institutions, and said that the program, if properly supported with a tenure-track position, could become robust.

Another senator said that the second and third motions above call on UNH to continue with the CI only if we see progress towards establishing a tenure-track position in Chinese. If UNH is not willing to offer this support, the senate can recommend that ties with CI be severed.

A senator said that he disagreed with the discussion, but that he would have liked to have heard from the provost why the CI was brought here, what was its perceived value to UNH, and has it lived up to its expected value?

The Student Senate representative asked to speak on this matter. He said that this topic has been discussed in the student senate with much interest from the student body. He declared that a two-year waiting period is not enough time to see real results, and said that the student senate's biggest concern is that without the CI, there is no funding for the Chinese language program, and no academic resources in the library. He asked why state couldn't help with funding. Michael replied that the state does not fund the salaries of professors. The SS representative also asserted that it is nonsense to say that the CI instructors are promoting communism. He emphasized how strongly the students value this program and asked the senate to allow more time before recommending discontinuing the program.

A senator who is a member of the COLA committee reviewing the CI said that there was no evidence in their investigation of any problems in the CI program at UNH, and that the only concern the COLA committee has with the CI is its dependence on funding from Hanban. He suggested that if the university is going to invest in this program, then clearly it's important enough to invest in one tenure-track positions. With about 109 seats filled in the program, there are sufficient tuition revenues to fund such a position.

The motions were each then put to a vote in the following order:

Motion 2 passed with 32 in favor, 4 opposed, and 6 abstentions.

Motion 3 passed with 25 in favor, 9 opposed, and 7 abstentions.

Motion 5 passed with 35 in favor, none opposed, and 7 abstentions.

Michael mentioned that the motion to not create a minor in Chinese (Motion 4) was brought up in COLA, and that it had been tabled. He recommended that it remain tabled until more information comes forward. A senator asked if such a motion wasn't overstepping the senate purview in regards to COLA. Another senator said that he supported motion 4 because the establishment of a minor without a residential UNH faculty member is an issue. It was asked if this isn't a CAPC issue, and it was noted that CAPC doesn't deal with minors. The senator serving on the COLA committee pointed out that the financing of a minor is dependent on money from Hanban, which seems a messy arrangement if we don't provide our own funding.

Motion 4 passed with 32 in favor, 2 opposed, and 6 abstentions.

Motion 6 passed with 40 in favor, none opposed, and 2 abstentions.

Michael noted that Motion 1 is proposed as thanks to the COLA committee and the president for the letter which he wrote regarding the CI. This letter spoke in defense of the academic freedom of the CI staff, which Michael felt was a ringing statement.

Motion 1 passed with 39 in favor, none opposed, and four abstentions.

A senator asked what teeth these motions have, asking if COLA is obligated in any way to follow these recommendations. Michael responded that we are advisory, and that we can object should COLA act against the recommendations.

VII. Report and motion from ad hoc Committee on Teaching Evaluation Form

Implementation – Barb White, a member of the TEV committee, was introduced to answer questions regarding the implementation of the teaching evaluation forms, representing the committee and its chair, David Kaye. She reported that the committee reviewed the work of the previous committee, received advice from Andy Smith from the UNH Survey Center, and consulted Victor Benassi from the Psychology department for his expertise and research with the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning on this tool, and reviewed data from the survey sent to faculty on this tool, as well as looking at comparator institutions and the tools they use. The committee’s conclusion is that the tool we use is robust and comparable to other institutions’ evaluation tools.

In evaluating responses to the surveys, the committee found no single problem, but did select two items on the evaluation that presented the weakest responses. These were questions #8 (professor is enthusiastic about subject) and #14 (overall opinion of professor). It was determined that reducing the number of total questions would be useful, as there are other programs (Honors, Discovery, etc.) that need to add additional questions for evaluation of their own programs on the student evaluation. She suggested that the twelve remaining questions would form the core of the evaluation, leaving room for perhaps twenty questions altogether. The motion follows:

UNH FACULTY SENATE MOTION

1. Motion presenter: The Senate ad hoc committee on teaching evaluations

2. Date of Faculty Senate discussion: 4/13/15, 4/27/15

3. Motion: The committee recommends that the majority of the teacher/course evaluation question set currently utilized by the University continue to be used for all UNH courses, with the following alterations;

1. Question 8: “Was the Instructor enthusiastic about the subject matter” be eliminated.

2. Question 4: “Was well Prepared for Class”; Question 6: “Encouraged discussion/and or questions” and Question 10: “Was available to students outside of class” each remain unchanged for all face to face and hybrid classes, but that the language be altered as needed for eUNH courses.

3. Question 14 “Overall, how would you rate this instructor” be replaced by an average of all 12 questions asked, if and only if, all 12 questions on the form have been answered.

4. Rationale: After reviewing the survey undertaken by the 2011/12 Ad Hoc Committee on Teacher Evaluations, and the feedback gathering efforts by the 2012/13 Ad Hoc Committee on Teacher Evaluation Implementation, the current committee made the following conclusions;

1. The survey conducted in 2012 did not reveal a conclusive direction concerning satisfaction with the overall evaluation. However, the survey's section addressing the satisfaction of each individual question showed clear satisfaction with each question.

2. After reviewing each question with Institutional Research, the committee concluded that each individual question succinctly addresses a unique aspect of course/instructor quality, with the exception of Q 14, which seems to be highly correlated with the entire question set and thus is reflective of the sum and not in and of itself unique. Further, a historical review of 20 years of data on the current question set demonstrates that the set offers a reasonable method (when combined with additional assessment methods like class observation) of teacher and course assessment.

3. Because one of the most powerful attributes of the web-based tool is the ability for "entities" (Discovery Program, Writing Intensive Courses, Capstones, etc) to be able to ask questions, as well as a greatly enhanced ability for individual faculty and departments to also ask questions, the committee sought to eliminate any of the questions thought to be less essential than others. The committee found only one question to be of limited help to the instructor; Question 8, concerning the "enthusiasm" of the instructor. The committee determined that this may be perceived as more of a "personality," question, a common complaint of faculty concerning the overall idea of Teacher evaluations. Further, analyses of the data showed this question to have the weakest correlation to other questions and to be less robust in showing change over time in response to teaching development strategies. However, it is important to note that the survey found strong support for this question. On a scale of 1-6 (6 being extremely useful and 1 being not useful at all) the spread was: 1: 6.4%, 2: 4.4%, 3: 10.5%, 4: 16.9%, 5: 27.1% 6: 34.9%

4. There are certain questions that are not directly applicable for online courses in their current form. The committee would seek to have these questions reviewed and altered as needed by eUNH in such a way to remain reasonably consistent with the question set asked of all UNH students.

5. The committee wishes the Senate to consider the elimination of question #14; "Overall, how would you rate this instructor." The rationale being that an average of the individual questions offers a more concrete view of the overall effectiveness of the instructor. That being said, one problem exists with this proposal; if students only answer a portion of the individual questions, the average could skew these results. There is also a concern that students may object to not having the opportunity to have this all-encompassing question asked.

The senate chair suggested that the senate vote on each item (1-3) separately for clarity.

A senator expressed that his department is concerned about eliminating question #8, expressing that there is a difference between a lackluster delivery of material and an enthusiastic one.

Barbara said that her committee is happy to receive friendly amendments, and that if the senate votes to keep these questions, the committee is willing to retain them. She noted that #8 has been considered, over time, less reliable and the most ambiguous. Another senator said that #8 is not a fruitful tool for improving. Yet another senator said she would prefer to retain #8 because it reflects the affect of the classroom as perceived by the students. Other senators agreed. The Student Senate representative said that there is some variation in how students respond to this question, noting that sometimes enthusiasm for the topic can lead to dreaded tangents in class. Barbara said that all questions correlate highly, but that this question had the weakest correlation (at .7).

This item, called Motion 1, was put to a vote, failing with 5 votes in favor of elimination, 33 votes opposed to elimination, and 3 abstentions.

The senate then discussed the second item, now called Motion 2. The senator from the School of Law offered a friendly amendment to change the wording to include other online courses beyond the eUNH courses, as the School of Law does not use eUNH. Barbara accepted that friendly amendment, meaning that Item 2 would now read:

*“2. **Question 4:** “Was well Prepared for Class”; **Question 6:** “Encouraged discussion/and or questions” and **Question 10:** “Was available to students outside of class” each remain unchanged for all face to face and hybrid classes, but that the language be altered as needed for eUNH and other online courses.”*

The senator from UNH-M asked what “...the language be altered as needed...” means. Barbara said that the wording may need to be adjusted depending on the type of online course to include items such as blogging, chatrooms, and other online environments. The senator asked if the senate members will be able to see that wording before it is put in place, and Barbara responded that that would be possible. Barbara asked if the senator is requesting that the modifications be brought back for another senate vote, and the senator responded that simply having the information from the committee would be sufficient, and the senate chair affirmed that.

This item, now called Motion 2, was put to a vote, passing with 39 votes in favor, none opposed, and 3 abstentions.

The final item required more lengthy senate discussion. A senator asked about the eUNH course evaluations, and the reduced response rate. Barbara said that the rate is down, but that the rating trends are the same.

A senator pointed out that the third motion is not a suggestion to replace Item 14 with the average of the other questions, but to eliminate #14 altogether. The average of the other questions is already indicated on the evaluations (as per the senate motion last year). He said it might take some time for departments to acclimate to using both pieces of information

together, and suggested that it is too early to remove question 14 for this reason, saying he is not convinced that question 14 simply reflects popularity. He would like to see this item revisited in three or four years.

Barbara said that her committee found robust data showing that these two items (#14 and the average of the other 13 questions) are tightly linked. There was a discussion about the issue of what happens if #14 is dropped, but a student doesn't fill out all of the other questions. A senator suggested that throwing out evaluations in which not all questions are answered means losing valuable information. Another senator agreed that partial responses should not be ignored.

The Lecturer Council Representative brought up the heavy weight of question #14 on lecturers in their annual evaluations, saying she favors eliminating #14 and using the average only. It was noted that sometimes #14 is a place where students act out. Another senator suggested that if the correlation between the average and #14 is tight, then #14 is superfluous. He said that the response to #14 is abused in COLA in regards to lecturers' evaluations, noting that lecturers who receive 4.5 or lower on #14 can be reprimanded or let go. Barbara responded that the abuse of #14 is a cultural matter, not a statistical matter, saying that #13's average could also be abused in a similar way. She said this change needs to happen in colleges and departments, and that changing the evaluation won't change the bar for re-hires. Another senator suggested that a tight correlation between two items doesn't mean that one of them is superfluous.

Another senator offered a friendly amendment to Motion 3, asking that the phrase, "...*be replaced by an average of all 12 questions asked, if and only if, all 12 questions on the form have been answered.*" be replaced with "...*be replaced by an average of all questions answered.*"

A senator said that he has no problem throwing out an evaluation on which not all questions are answered, saying that such data is tainted and that there are likely not very many such evaluations. Another senator asked what percentage of students don't answer all the questions. If there are few, it will make little difference. If there are many, it will be significant.

The senate vice chair asked if this motion could be postponed until the next meeting in order to gather such data. The senator from the School of Law moved to thus postpone the vote and, being seconded, then **by voice vote, the senate voted to postpone the vote on Motion 3.**

VIII. Motion from ad hoc Committee on CLER Faculty Involvement in the Senate – Bill Berndtson, a member of the CLER committee said that the motion before the senate on CCLEAR faculty involvement in the senate is intended to be a mechanism to provide CCLEAR representation on the senate while maintaining balance.

Overview of Motion for CCLEAR faculty involvement in the Senate

Number of voting faculty (TT + CCLEAR)	Number of Senators	Classification of Senators
---	--------------------	----------------------------

15 or less	1	TT
16 to 40	2	TT or CCLEAR
More than 40	3	TT or CCLEAR

1. CCLEAR faculty must have a 75% or greater UNH appointment to vote and serve.
2. CCLEAR faculty just like TT faculty will represent their department.
3. The faculty senate will grow from 51 senators to approximately 83 senators.
4. Ten departments would not be able to send a CCLEAR faculty member to the senate:

A senator from UNH-M expressed concern about the CCLEAR faculty in small departments who will not be eligible to be elected to senate service, calling that inherently unfair. He asserted that any new small departments will face the same pitfall. **He suggested altering the motion to allow for either TT or CCLEAR representation of these few small departments.** The proxy attending for the absent chair of the CLER committee said that the intent of having only tenure-track serve in those small departments was to maintain a majority of tenure-track faculty on the senate. Another senator said he thought it highly unlikely that there would ever be a majority of CCLEAR faculty serving in the senate, and that he liked the suggested amendment to the motion. **It was moved to amend the CLER motion, and seconded.**

Another senator said that his department was not happy with this motion because it means expanding the size of the senate. A senator from the History department said that the unevenness in representation across the university creates an incompatible situation with the motion. Some department faculty meetings are limited to tenure-track faculty, and if their departmental representative to the senate is not tenure-track, they will not be able to do their duty to report to their colleagues regarding the work of the senate. Particularly in the case of senate discussions which touch on hiring, there are inconsistencies with those departments. She also said that three senators representing any department is excessive. Another senator pointed out that election to the senate is conducted by the senate office, not by any department.

In the interest of time, Jim Connell of the Agenda Committee moved to postpone the motion, and the motion to amend the motion, until the next senate meeting. **By voice vote, the senate voted to postpone the votes on these motions.**

IX. Report and motion from the Library Committee – Carolyn Mebert, chair of the senate Library Committee, briefly presented her committee’s motion to accept the library’s de-selection policy.

***Report and Motion from the Library Committee
April 27, 2015***

A few weeks ago, the library committee reported that we had, last fall, sent to all faculty (via senators) the draft library collection maintenance policy, written by the librarians in response to the deselection episode of last spring. We asked for feedback and received

none, except that the history department had some issues and were working with the librarians. The history department achieved resolution of their issues in December and we were all set to go and that's what I came to the senate with.

*Subsequent to that report, the history department realized that they were really not satisfied with the policy and so went back into negotiations with the library faculty. A new resolution was achieved last week (see below) and so **the library committee is now making the motion that the senate approve the revised library collection maintenance policy.***

The motion will lay over until the next meeting.

X. Report and motion from SAC on Student Senate resolution re:advising – Jo Laird, chair of the SAC, briefly presented her committee's motion to add the following statements to the faculty advising handbook and the Students' Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct handbook: MOTION from the Student Affairs Committee (20 April 2015):

1. *Add the following statement to the general Faculty Advising Handbook (www.unh.edu/uacc/advising-handbook).*

Faculty advisors

- *Help students plan their course schedules and provide information pertinent to the major*
- *Help students monitor their progress in the major and toward graduation*
- *Provide guidance on opportunities (e.g. internships, post- graduation employment, and graduate studies) and direct students to relevant support services when appropriate*
- *Establish clear communication guidelines with each advisee, respond to their questions in a timely manner, and direct students to relevant support services when appropriate*

2. *Add the following to section 06.1 of the Student Rights, Rules, and Responsibilities*

06.1.1 Sources of information

Students can find information concerning each department and college on their web sites and can go to the university advising and career center web site (www.unh.edu/uacc<<http://www.unh.edu/uacc>>) to get answers to many questions pertaining to course selection, graduation requirements etc.

Either faculty or staff members may serve as academic advisors depending on departmental procedures. Academic advisors typically help students both schedule classes that meet university and departmental requirements and monitor their progress throughout their academic career. Either academic advisors or other staff of the associated department/college may assist students in various ways, for example to

learn of internships and post-graduation opportunities, and they may direct students to relevant support services when appropriate.

06.1.2 Student responsibility for effective advising

Students are ultimately responsible for their academic careers. Students should meet with the appropriate advisers early and throughout their university careers to devise strategies suitable to meet their specific needs and goals.

To help maximize the effectiveness of academic advising, students should schedule appointments so as to discuss the advising question(s) before forms need to be signed or letters of recommendation are due and follow up on plans and suggestions made during meetings with their advisors.

This motion will lay over until the next meeting.

XI. Report and motion from the Information Technology Committee – Maria Basterra, chair of the senate IT committee, briefly presented **her committee’s motion to approve the revised password policy, which changes are indicated below.**

8.4 General Password Requirements

8.4.1 All passwords (e.g., email, web, ~~desktop computer,~~ etc.) must be changed at least every 180 days.

8.5 Technical Password Requirements.

8.5.2.3 not contain any ~~significant~~ portion of the username

8.5.2.4 not contain any ~~significant~~ portion of the user’s name

~~*8.8 Enforcement. Any user found to have violated this policy will be referred to the appropriate officials and may be subject to disciplinary action. The user may seek redress using the appropriate process*~~

She also handed out Terri Winter’s response regarding lock-outs on accounts over the weekends, found below. The senate admin will forward these handouts to all senators by email.

<http://www.usnh.edu/olpm/USY/VI.Prop/F.htm#4>

5.7 System Access Control

5.7.1 Control Access to Information. *Computer systems and resources used for the transaction of USNH business shall be protected from theft, malicious destruction, unauthorized alteration or exposure, or other potential compromise resulting from inappropriate or negligent acts or omissions.*

5.7.1.1 *Computer systems shall require utilization of employee-specific passwords for access. Passwords for access to USNH systems shall comply with industry standards as established by the*

institutional Chief Information Officers within the technological capabilities of each system.

5.7.1.2 Password change schedules will be established and communicated to password holders at timely intervals.

5.7.1.3 Employee-specific passwords shall be treated as sensitive, confidential information and shall not be shared. Employee-specific passwords also shall not be stored on-line or written down unless adequately secured from unauthorized viewing.

5.7.1.4 Authorized users of computer systems will take reasonable and appropriate measures to prevent access to systems by unauthorized persons.

Good Practice and Procedures:

<http://it.unh.edu/index.cfm?id=F5DA0F56-0B36-FFA4-B49FC297A0B9F828>

Passwords

University policy requires you to change your passwords at least every six months, use strong passwords and separate passwords for each account. You should not use the same or similar passwords on your personal accounts, for example an online banking account. While the minimum length for university passwords is seven characters, longer, strong passwords are significantly more difficult for attackers to break.

Regarding locking of accounts:

AD Account holders are notified via their Exchange email of the requirement to change their password 30 days, 14 days, 3 days, and 1 day before their account is disabled. Once the user changes his/her password the notifications stop.

*Failure to change a password within the six months timeframe will result in the account getting locked. **Accounts are NOT locked Friday through Monday, UNH Holidays, and during winter holiday shutdown.***

Reasons to have experienced a locked out account over the weekend could be due to the following:

- Changing a password on a Friday or during the weekend and missing a device (e.g. cell phone, iPad) that syncs with AD resulting in multiple failures*
- Changing a password and not re-booting computer*
- Entering a wrong password multiple times (15 times in 15 minutes)*
- Suspecting that a username/account has been compromised based on abnormal activity*

On the weekend during Fall and Spring semesters, those with account issues can call 862-4242 or stop by AT Support Center in Dimond Library. Weekend hours are:

Saturday 10:00am to 4:00pm

Sunday 10:00am to 6:00pm

This motion will lay over until the next meeting.

XII. New business – There was no new business

XIII. Adjournment- The meeting was adjourned at 5:04 p.m.