Meeting called to order at 3:10 on November 3, 2014

I. Roll – The following senators were absent: Dowd, Franczak, Mebert, Murphy, Onosko, and Scherr. Wu was excused. Willem deVries, Kate Gaudet, and Jerry Marx were guests.

II. Remarks by and questions to the provost – The provost and senior vice-provost for academic affairs were unable to attend today’s meeting.

III. Remarks by and questions to the chair – The senate chair acknowledged and welcomed representatives from the undergraduate and graduate student senates. He reminded the senators of the report and motion from the Student Affairs Committee regarding the cost of course materials and referred the senators to today’s agenda and the email they recently received reminding them to share the suggestions from that motion with their departmental colleagues. The chair noted that for some students, the cost of course materials is a grave concern.

IV. Minutes – It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the last senate meeting, October 20, 2014. One typographical error was corrected, and the corrected minutes were then approved unanimously, with four abstentions.

Discussion/Report Items:

V. Vote on motion from the senate Academic Affairs Committee regarding the new Honors program - The AAC chair reminded the senate of the committee’s support for the general plan introduced by Jerry Marx, Director of the UNH Honors program, and Kate Gaudet, Assistant Director of the program, at the last senate meeting. He suggested that while some adjustments may need to be made, the best way to test the plan is to implement it. He opened the floor to questions to the director of the Honors program.

A senator asked why there was a limit of four units for each symposia module, suggesting the establishment of more categories. Jerry replied that this is a good place to begin, referring to space issues and recruitment of faculty as natural initial limitations. Kate pointed out that there may be a natural expansion of the symposia categories with time. There was a discussion of the possibility of interdepartmental team-teaching, which Jerry said could be determined by faculty interest and the willingness of departments to support such collaboration.

A question was raised about the selection of themes for the symposia and if the themes will respond to or reflect student interest. The Honors program will take feedback from students regarding future themes. Each semester, four faculty will choose their own sub-themes under an umbrella topic which will be relevant and timely. It was noted that there will be two themes per term, with three options to begin with.
A senator noted that the current honors program deepens the Discovery experience and raised the concern of dilution with the new program, asking if this program will compete with departmental honors programs. Jerry described two parts of the new honors curriculum; honors in Discovery for first- and second-year students, and upper division honors, which encourages more students to take advantages of higher-level experiences already available on campus through the Hamel Center or the Hood House programs. Another senator agreed that a feature of this design is that the symposia will be taught by experts in the discipline, reducing the danger of superficial coverage of topics. A senator asked if “high impact experiences” refer to existing courses or if faculty will need to develop new curricula. Jerry said that this program is not an add-on, and that students may choose to do an honors in major or they can do a thesis in their major and three high-impact activities beyond the classroom, taking advantage of existing programs on campus and not adding further burden to faculty. The hope is that this program will add flexibility and choice for students, noting that only about a third of students who enter the university in Honors actually graduate in Honors.

The motion was then put to a vote, passing with 38 in favor, none opposed, and 3 abstentions.

VI. Report and motion from Student Affairs Committee on revision of UNH policy on scheduling games and practices – Jo Laird, chair of the SAC reported that the committee had reviewed some minor changes made to the UNH policy on scheduling games and practices, last approved by the senate in 1998. Noting that the only significant change was the addition of wording to restrict student-athletes from missing classes in accordance with NCAA bylaw 17.1.6.6.1,

NCAA Bylaw 17.1.6.6.1 indicates that no class time shall be missed for practice activities except when a team is traveling to an away-from-home contest and the practice is in conjunction with the contest.

the committee recommends approval of the revisions. The matter will lay over to the next meeting for a senate vote.

VII. Report from Research and Public Service Committee on the proposed change to the UNH Policy on Ownership of Research Data – Wayne Fagerberg, chair of the RPSC reported that the committee has reviewed a revision of the UNH policy on ownership, management and sharing of research data. He informed the senate that the premise of these revisions is based in the administration’s desire to protect sensitive information gathered in university-commissioned studies as a way to maintain some custody of the data itself. He noted that this policy does not impact research of individual faculty members.

There was a hearty discussion of the potential problems and far-reaching effects of this policy, including concern about administrators acting as PI (Principal Investigator) over research that they are not conducting themselves, or over which topic they are not themselves experts in the field. There was concern about the effect that such a policy would have on the acceptability of proposals before review panels who might have issues with such an arrangement.

It was suggested that the same goal of providing the administration with custody of data could be accomplished with simple agreements between the PI and the administration. Another senator suggested that re-wording a research proposal to include protection of the data and prevent the
unwanted sharing of that data would accomplish the same thing. Another senator asked about the potential for corruption of conduct of research.

The RSPC chair asserted that this change is relevant mostly to internal grants requested by the university, although there might be some external funding. The past senate chair pointed to the ADVANCE grant as an example of this kind of grant and research, where the provost is the PI, data is generated, and the administration wants to control the use of that data. He suggested that broadening this definition to include faculty and their own research projects would not be appropriate. Another senator noted that for some large institutional grants, an administrator is needed as a PI.

The discussion was interrupted for Debbie Dutton’s presentation, and upon resuming the discussion, a senator asked what the powers of a PI are. Wayne responded that control of the data is part of that power. Concerns over returns of overhead expenses and the generic wording of the policy were also raised, with a senator asking for clarification from the administration. The senate chair said he would take the concerns raised to the administration.

VIII. Presentation from Deborah Dutton, Vice-President for Advancement at UNH – The senate chair introduced Deborah Dutton, who offered an update on the current fund-raising campaign. She said that such campaigns are designed to gather people and galvanize support. She said that we are in year four of the current campaign, with $50 million raised in financial aid, $50 million in program support ($20 million of which is the donation for the Carsey Institute), and $25 million for the Paul College of Business and Economics. The campaign will be announced, or launched, in September 2016, to coincide with the university’s sesquicentennial. The campaign began in 2011, and has shown 274% growth in the past four years, which is evidence of the focus of the campaign towards visible results.

She explained that donations can be spread over several years, ideally 3-5 years, but in rare instances for 7 figure and above gifts, that timeframe is extended. A senator asked who decides what the priorities for spending this money should be, pointing to the sharp decline in tenure-track positions in COLA. Debbie replied that the goals of the current campaign were selected before her appointment, but that each dean presents a list of needs and wants. These lists are gathered and narrowed to find key projects for fundraising. She said that she could email information to the senate members regarding the breakdown of monies to be spent. She told the senate that her office shares these goals with donors and works to match donor interests with college needs. The Graduate Student Senate representative asked if there is an effort to offer more financial support to graduate students. Debbie responded that she works closely with Harry Richards and Cari Moorhead, and that the gift officers are watching for donors who have an interest in this area.

A senator asked if the recent recession has had an impact on donations. Debbie replied that there was some increase in deferred gifts and one-year gifts, but that the multi-year gifts are seeing an increase again. She said that all members of the Advancement team are working to engage donors who have been neglected in the past. The senate chair thanked her for her presentation.

IX. Discussion and possible vote on motion to amend the senate constitution regarding non-tenure track faculty representation on the faculty senate – The senate chair shared four points with the senate which the agenda committee thought might be topics for possible amendments to the
motion presented by the ad hoc Committee on the Representation of Non-Tenure Track Faculty. Based on the senate discussions to date, the four points are:

1) Provide a unit for eligible voting faculty who have no primary or secondary departmental affiliation so they too have representation.

2) Faculty with 75% or more appointments would be eligible to vote and count towards additional Senators. (Replaces the proposed 50%. Two years at the University would still be required to sit in the Senate.)

3) Any department that is eligible to elect more than one Senator would be required to have at least one tenure-track Senator.

4) Raise the number of faculty required for additional Senators from 20 to 25 or 30 to limit the increase in the size of the Senate.

The Agenda Committee has no position on these amendments, but provides them in hopes of facilitating discussions. Any Senator can move one or more of these changes (or any other amendment they feel desirable) and, should it be seconded, discussion and a vote will ensue.

A discussion ensued regarding the possible change in size of the senate based on the motion and item #4 above.

The senators from the History department expressed the opinion that the faculty senate is not the place for non-tenure track faculty (NTTF), who might be better served with a separate body more tailored to their particular needs and conditions of employment. A more clear definition of who the NTTF actually are was requested. Another senator asked if lecturers understand what service on the senate entails, asserting that if this is what they want, they would be welcome. He suggested that item #3 above helps to prevent the potential exploitation that has been a concern to many. The AAC chair suggested that segregating the NTTF from this body removes them from the power (be that as it is) of the senate, and asked if the NTTF have any power in their own councils.

The chair of the NTTF Committee said that the senate is a place to carry out the academic mission of the university and asserted that NTTF have a meaningful role in that mission, offering great experience and expertise. He agreed that the conditions of work may cause some conflict of interest, but that no such conflict exists in the formulation of academic policy.

A discussion followed regarding the differences between tenure-track (TT) and NTTF, referencing the three-fold responsibilities of teaching, research, and service required as conditions of employment for TT. It was noted that while lecturers do not generally do research or service, some clinical faculty have service responsibilities, and research faculty may or may not be teaching. A senator asked how we can weigh asymmetry of these positions against the right to voice that each faculty should have. A senator asked what initiated the committee’s recommendation, and the response was that the committee was formed last year to review the status of non-tenure track faculty in regards to governance.

A member of the agenda committee pointed out the distinction between service on the senate, as outlined in the motion and the four potential amendments above, and the opportunity to vote for
who will serve on the senate from each department. The NTTF Committee chair agreed that there is a difference between voting for senate representatives and actually serving on the senate. The opportunity to vote provides a sense of representation, even if they cannot or choose not to serve, and lessens the sense that NTTF are somehow second-class citizens in the campus community.

A senator asked if NTTF would have the power to say no to service on the senate without recrimination. Another senator said he supports inclusion and appreciates the valuable input of the NTTF, but that he sees problems with NTTF serving on the senate in instances when the senate is defending shared governance. He asked if that might be an uncomfortable position in which to place these NTTF.

A member of the agenda committee commented on the quality of today’s debate and moved that the discussion be continued, and the vote postponed, for at least one more senate meeting to allow for a full examination of these issues. His motion was seconded, senators voiced support for the motion, and the senate chair thanked the senators for the discussion.

X. New business – There was no new business.

XI. Adjournment – The meeting was adjourned at 5:02 p.m.