Meeting called to order at 3:13 on March 2, 2015

MINUTES SUMMARY

I. Roll – The following senators were absent: Aytur, Denis, Dowd-Solorzano, Hight, Kun, Morgan, Ware, and C. White. Benoit, Berglund, Berndtson, Minocha, Prescott, and Seitz were excused. Kevin Gardner, Lisa MacFarlane, Paula Salvio, and P.T. Vasudevan were guests.

II. Remarks by and questions to the provost – The provost had no comments other than to remind senators to close their office windows at the end of each day, noting potential issues with freezing pipes and saying that if faculty do not close their windows, the facilities staff has to take time to do so when they have many other tasks drawing on their time. There were no questions for the provost.

III. Remarks by and questions to the chair – The senate chair shared a presentation on the Green Zone program, which is run by a small group on campus to provide support and services to students who are serving or have served in the military. Green Zones are areas of safety for these students to come to talk about issues they are dealing with and get support. Faculty and staff who go through the approximately one to two hour training are invited to post a sticker on their office door indicating that area as a Green (or safe) Zone. Such volunteers offer support and help these student veterans navigate campus resources. Volunteers are not expected to be experts, counselors, or problem solvers themselves, but rather help to connect students in need with the help available. Karen Gilbert (2-3480) and Denny Byrne (2-0911) run the program and are available to answer questions. The program email is unh.veterans@unh.edu if faculty have additional questions. Senators are encouraged to share this information with their departmental colleagues.

IV. Minutes – It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the last senate meeting, February 23, 2015. The senate vice chair offered a clarification of Item VI in the minutes: It was stated in the meeting that the UCAPC vote to approve the DMS proposal passed with a vote of 6-3. However, the UCAPC minutes from the January 30, 2015 minutes state that the final vote was 6-2. The minutes will not be corrected, as they reflect the statement made at the time, but this clarification will be noted in those minutes as well as in this record. Thus clarified, the minutes were approved unanimously, with two abstentions.

Discussion/Report Items:

V. Discussion and vote on UCAPC recommendation to approve Dual Major in Sustainability (DMS) – Paula Salvio and Kevin Gardner, two of the drafters of the DMS, were in attendance at today’s meeting, as well as senior vice provost Vasudevan, to answer questions regarding the DMS proposal. A senator asked again about the term “dual major,” which some feel implies a double major, but it was again clarified that “dual major” is the term used at UNH for this kind of additional emphasis. The idea is that a student will have a primary major, which provides depth of
study, while the secondary or dual major provides a breadth of experience. Paula Salvio described it as an imaginative approach to provide that depth and that the dual major provides greater depth in the topic than simply a second concentration. The senior vice provost compared this dual major to the one student-designed major in sustainability that was developed four years ago, calling this dual major more rigorous than that.

The senior vice provost shared a brief presentation about the history of this proposal, which began its first review in 2011 and has been through six versions. He shared data from a Qualtrics survey on student interest in enrolling in the DMS. Noting that of the 623 freshmen and sophomores (students most likely to take advantage of the program, should it be approved) who responded to the survey, a 10% return rate, 215 (about one-third) reported that they were likely to enroll in the DMS in 2015. Currently there are three other dual majors on campus: International Affairs, Justice Studies, and Ecogastronomy. Vice provost Vasudevan also referenced UNH’s strong reputation for support of sustainability as a good foundation for this program, which he believes will give our students important tools they will need as they enter the work force.

A senator asked where the advisors from the program will come from. Paula responded that their primary major advisor will advise them, and that the director of the DMS program will also serve as a resource for advising questions.

The senator from the Music Department commented that this is a different usage of the term “major,” almost as if the majors are attributes. He called this proposal a strong idea with no limitations, as the dual major can be conjoined with any major in any discipline.

A senator expressed concern about the disproportionately large number of courses listed in the program that are at the 400 level. Kevin responded that while that may be the case at the moment, the actual number of 400-level courses students may take in the program is limited to two. The three required courses are one 400-level, one 500-level, and one 700-level. The other courses will be from various levels, with the capstone course at the 700-level. Vasu invited faculty, particularly from CEPS, to submit additional courses at the 600/700 level for inclusion in the program.

Two senators asked about the approval process for faculty who would like their course to be included in the DMS. Paula responded that the deans will appoint faculty to sit on a board for a two-year cycle to review and approve courses submitted for inclusion. Approved courses would be taught within their home departments. She pointed out how this approach recognizes that the principles of sustainability education are not owned solely by the sciences. The senator from Classics, Humanities and Italian Studies, who also serves in the Sustainability Institute said that that organization is impressed with the breadth of sustainability at UNH, highlighting the strong cultural component here, and said that UNH is becoming a leader in sustainability.

A senator asked about the review schedule for the program, and the senior vice provost responded that, like other new majors, the program will be reviewed every ten years, with the first review after five years.

Speaking as the senator from Natural Sciences and the Environment, the senate chair said he believes this dual major will attract students to UNH, and added that the senate agenda committee supports the proposal.
The motion to approve the DMS was put to a vote, and the measure passed with 30 ayes, 1 nays, and 3 abstentions.

VI. Report from the Research and Public Services Committee on the update to the proposed policy on data management – Wayne Fagerberg, chair of the RPSC, directed the senators’ attention to the revised wording in the proposed policy on data management, noting that the new wording resolves the concerns expressed by senate members about administrators serving as Principal Investigators on research proposal, while still enabling UNH to retain ownership of the data for internal investigations.

Proposed change to 5.3 (bolded) and additional sentence (5.3.1) (bolded) to the UNH policy on Ownership and Management of Research Data:

5.3 Custody. Through this policy, except as stipulated in 5.3.1, the University automatically assigns custody of all University-owned research data to the PI, Other Investigator, or Sponsoring PI (for students), as applicable, who carries out her/his custodial responsibilities in accordance with this policy.

5.3.1 For research studies initiated by UNH where data about the institution are collected for purposes of institutional decision making, the University assigns custody of the research data to an UNH Academic Administrator who carries out her/his custodial responsibilities in accordance with this policy.

Rationale: The committee finds that:

1. The institution wants to ensure that the custodianship of research data collected by a faculty, staff, or student in response to a request from the institution (e.g., at the request of an administrator or a department) on behalf of the institution and which are about some aspect of the institution (e.g., employee experiences, attitudes towards an issue, status of physical infrastructure) remain at and under the control of the institution in the event of the departure from UNH by the person collecting the data.

2. This proposed addition is in response to a recent situation where UNH employee committees/councils asked an employee on their behalf to conduct a study that involved surveying UNH faculty and staff. The information collected was considered sensitive in nature and particularly had there been a breach of confidentiality, potentially harmful to certain individuals. Shortly after the study was conducted and the results shared with the employee committees/councils, the employee who conducted the study left UNH. According to the current UNH policy on Ownership and Management of Research Data, that employee could as the principal investigator take the original data as the employee was the custodian of the data. The employee wanted to use the data in subsequent research and the university was worried that the data may be used in such a manner that would negatively impact the respondents and/or the University.

Clarifications:
1. The sentence applies to all studies, regardless of funding, where initiated by the institution involving the collection of institutional data for institutional decision making purposes.

2. The sentence does not apply to studies initiated by faculty, staff, or students (rather than at the request of the institution) in pursuit of their own research projects. For example, it would not apply to the following:
   - A student designs a research project funded by a SURF grant that involves conducting a survey of students about their experiences with weight and health issues during their first year at UNH.
   - A faculty member as part of his research agenda designs a study that involves, in part, assessing UNH’s technological infrastructure and applies for federal funds.
   - A staff member conducts a study that assesses the spiritually of students as part of a master’s degree.

3. The term “principal investigator” is used as this is the term used throughout the policy to refer to the faculty or staff member who is charge of the project and who is custodian of the data (2.1.1 “Faculty or Staff Principal Investigator (PI): A faculty or staff employee of the University who holds primary responsibility for the research project/activity for which data will be collected.”)

4. The additional sentence does not change the ownership of any research data as, with few exceptions, research data are owned by UNH. Rather, it places the custodianship of data collected at the request of the institution about the institution for institutional decision making with an Academic Administrator rather than faculty or staff principal investigators. An Academic Administrator has certain fiduciary obligations, which would mean that the data would remain at the institution if that person left UNH.

5. As the UNH policy on Ownership and Management of Research Data does not address authorship issues, the additional sentence does not have any implications on authorship decisions. The additional sentence is purely to address custodianship of data.

A member of the agenda committee said that this revision is a huge improvement over the previous proposed policy, and simple and clear in its language. The RPSC recommended that the senate endorse this change to the existing policy.

**The motion was put to a voice vote and the measure passed unanimously with 3 abstentions.**

VII. Vote on motion from Information Technology Committee to approve the password policy – Maria Basterra, chair of the ITC, directed the senators’ attention to the email response from Brian Gaon, UNH Information Security Officer. The wording of the original proposed change to the password policy contained much stronger language regarding password length and the consequences for not complying with the policy, and the senate ITC requested changes, which resulted in the current document. Many senators expressed great concern about the practicality and enforceability of such a policy. The policy is intended to apply to faculty, staff and students.
Many senators expressed the opinion that the current policy to lock account owners out of their account if they do not update their password appropriately should be the only discipline necessary. Maria pointed out that the discipline statement refers to account owners who share their password with others, and reiterated the ISO’s response that this kind of language is standard in the industry and that it would be irresponsible to not include such language in the university’s policy on passwords. One senator noted that any willful and repeated violation of the policy of an institution is a violation of the terms of employment, and that additional language about disciplinary actions for such violations is superfluous and gratuitous.

After lengthy discussion of ways that the policy might be adjusted to the satisfaction of senate members, it was determined that such suggestions are not within the senate’s authority at this time, and the matter was put to a vote.

**The motion to endorse the proposed password policy change failed, with 1 vote in favor, 26 opposed, and 3 abstentions.**

The ITC chair then asked for recommendations from the senate to take back to the ISO. The sections found to be most concerning to senate members were sections:

8.4.1 All passwords (e.g., email, web, desktop computer, etc.) must be changed at least every 180 days.  
8.4.2. All passwords must conform to the Technical Password Requirement (reference Section 8.5).  
8.4.5. Passwords shall not be written down or stored on-line in clear text.  
8.4.6. Passwords shall not be shared in email, chat, or other electronic communication  
8.4.7. Passwords shall not be spoken in front of others.  
8.4.2.3. Passwords shall not contain any significant portion of the username  
8.4.2.4. Passwords shall not contain any significant portion of the user’s name  
8.4.2.5. Passwords shall not be re-used within 2 years’ time

Also recommended was the removal of any reference to personal computers, and the need for more than 8 characters in a password. It was also recommended that the policy wording could encourage account owners to follow such guidelines, but not require adherence. It was requested that all language regarding discipline be removed. The senate admin will share these notes with Maria, who will take these recommendations back to the ISO. The senate chair thanked Maria and her committee for the time they have invested in this charge.

VIII. Report from Student Affairs Committee on advisor-student expectations – Jo Laird, chair of the SAC, reported that her committee was charged to review Student Senate Resolution XXXV-20 Advisor-Student Expectations and develop a suitable response to the resolution’s request that the faculty senate consider these expectations and disseminate the goals of the resolution to departments. She noted that last year the student senate passed this resolution asking academic advisors of students to meet seven expectations:

**Student Senate Resolution XXXV-20 dated 6 April 2014**

Students ask that all academic advisers meet the following expectations:

1. Maintain a constructive relationship with the student advisee
2. Communicate with students regularly by email to give them information relevant to their major
3. Promptly reply to questions or concerns that the student advisee may have
4. Be knowledgeable about graduation, major, and minor (when it relates to the department of major), and discovery requirements
5. Advise students on how their degree is relevant to potential careers
6. Understand and communicate the expectations and application process for graduate school when students request information
7. Take into consideration the welfare of students beyond their classes

She noted that much data is included in advising handbooks, but not much is included in the Students Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct handbook. The committee recommends to:

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 (e.g. the order to take courses in the major)
- Monitor student progress in the major and toward graduation
- Provide guidance on internships, post graduation employment opportunities, and graduate studies
- Establish clear communication guidelines with each advisee, respond to their questions in a timely manner, and direct students to relevant support services when appropriate

She also asked for additional time, as this motion lays over for a later vote, in order for feedback from the Student Senate to be received.

Questions from senate members included a definition of what it means to monitor student progress, and how faculty are supposed to be able to provide employment opportunity information to their advisees. It was noted that students are also responsible for some of these items, as noted in the SRRC. The motion will lay over to a later meeting for further review and discussion.

IX. New business – The senator from the Philosophy department said that from the vigorous discussion regarding the inclusion of CLER faculty in the work of the senate, it is clear that there is more work to be done. He had prepared a motion to allow CLER faculty to vote in their departments for the tenure-track colleagues who will serve on the senate, but expressed his opinion that the formation of the new committee on CLER faculty inclusion would better address the issue.

The senate chair asked all senators to please communicate to their CLER faculty departmental colleagues that the senate is seeking the most effective way to establish representation and inclusion of CLER faculty in the work of this body. He urged faculty with input on this topic to please reach out to senate members to share ideas and perspectives relevant to the issue, and expressed hope that before the end of the semester, the senate might have a workable solution to present.
In other new business, a senator asked who sets the policy for the Discovery course requirements, and asked if a college may make policy regarding Discovery requirements. He referred to some lack of consistency between departments in regards to Discovery courses. Todd DeMitchell, who serves on the Discovery committee, stated that students may provide their transcripts and petition for Discovery credit, which request would be reviewed by the Discovery committee. He said that the Discovery committee controls the policy, but does not control when a course is offered.

A discussion followed regarding the standard practice for Discovery courses that a new course cannot be promoted without demoting another course in that discipline. While it is understandable that infinite courses cannot be offered, it was asserted that the current policy is stifling to creativity in course development. It was suggested that a pool of courses could be designed and rotated in and out according to the teaching schedules of the correlating faculty, allowing for more innovation in course design. The senate chair reminded the senators of the current review of the Discovery program. A member of the agenda committee encouraged all faculty to share ideas and concerns by participating in the online survey that is part of this review. Another member of the agenda committee pointed out that the associate deans were the ones who made the decision to utilize the one-up, one-down course implementation plan. A senator noted that these courses are not taught as often as might be believed, and that most of the Discovery approved courses in a department are not actually competing with one another.

X. Adjournment- The meeting was adjourned at 4:46 p.m.