Meeting called to order at 3:46 p.m. Monday, December 7, 2015  

I. Roll – The following senators were absent: Dowd, Pilet-Shore, Rodriguez, and Scherr were excused. Tomellini, Dorsey, and Harper served as proxy for Greenslade, Mellyn, and Poworoznek, respectively.

II. Remarks by and questions to the senate chair – Senate chair Deb Kinghorn said that Provost Vasudevan was unable to attend today’s meeting. She announced that there is a third candidate in the search for a new provost; a late entry that the committee feels is worth seeing. Again, there will be video posted on Blackboard so that faculty can see the candidate and then offer feedback through the Qualtrics survey.

A senator asked when the first senate meeting will be next semester, and the chair replied that it will be on February 1, as the first day of classes will be Tuesday, January 26. She reminded the group that committee meetings may be scheduled next week, in December, or before classes start, as committees may choose.

III. Minutes – It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the last senate meeting, November 23, 2015. A spelling correction was offered in Item II and, thus adjusted, the minutes were unanimously approved with three abstentions.

Action Items:

IV. Discussion and vote on motion from Senate Finance and Administration Committee regarding the Central Budget Committee – Dan Innis, co-chair of the FAC, reviewed the motion presented last week to reinstate the university’s Central Budget Committee. He noted a few changes made by the committee in response to input from the previous senate discussion. The revised motion follows:

Let it be resolved that the Faculty Senate calls on the Central Administration to (1) ensure that the Central Budget Committee convenes a meeting before January 31, 2016 and continues to meet on a monthly basis throughout the calendar year and (2) ensure that the Faculty Senate has representation on any other committee or committees where UNH’s financial affairs and budget matters are being discussed and decided and that this membership occurs immediately. If the CBC fails to reconvene, the Faculty Senate asks that faculty have representation on any other relevant financial affairs committees at a similar proportion to what has been historically provided on the CBC (approximately 25% of the CBC are members of the faculty). Faculty Senate membership on financial affairs and budget committees is required under the shared governance structure of the University.
Being that the motion was not substantially changed from the original, this motion was presented to the senate for discussion. Dan noted that the Central Budget Committee was a good model, and the only university-wide committee that included faculty in budgetary decisions. A senator asked what decisions might have already been made without faculty input while the CBC has not been meeting. Dan replied that some of the RCM changes might fall in that category, but emphasized the need to go forward from here by reinstating the CBC.

The motion was put to a vote and passed unanimously with no abstentions.

V. Motion from RPSC on policy for Start-up Companies — David Finkelhor, chair of the senate Research and Public Service Committee, reported to the senate regarding a new policy proposed by Jan Nisbet regarding start-up companies. Jan has asked for a senate response by December 15, indicating that no response would indicate acceptability of the policy to the senate. The RPSC, upon review the policy and noting the complicated legal implications, feels it cannot offer appropriate feedback by the December 15th deadline and submits the following motion and response:

Motion from Senate Research and Public Service Committee

The Faculty Senate is not prepared at this time to endorse the “Policy on Conflicts of Interest in Start-Up Companies” or “Management of Equity Interests in Start-Up Companies (Revised)” and would like to gather more information and have more discussion about the context for and consequences of putting these policies in place.

Explanation

Key elements of proposed revision

1. Limit faculty management involvement in a start-up to 2 years.
2. Changes some procedures for handling conflicts of interest.
3. Changes some issues related to University and faculty members’ equity holdings in the start-up.
4. VP for Research wanted comment by December 16.

Concerns

1. It is not clear what the specific goals these revisions are trying to achieve.
2. At least one faculty member believes it will have serious negative impact on his current research activities.
3. There appear to be possible collective bargaining implications that need to be worked out.

Conclusion

We need more time to discuss and negotiate about these policies.

It was moved and seconded to suspend the rules so that this item could be voted on today so that the senate’s response could be shared with Jan Nisbet in a timely manner. A senator asked if there are faculty who are trying to start-up a company who might be impacted
by a time delay on the senate’s response to this policy. There are faculty directly affected by the policy, but not by the time schedule at this point. The motion to suspend the rules passed unanimously with no abstentions.

The RPSC motion was then put to a vote and passed unanimously with no abstentions.

VI. Motion from AAC on cancellation of classes on the Wednesday before Thanksgiving – Scott Smith, senate AAC chair thanked the senators for faculty feedback on this motion. The overwhelming response was to continue the cancellation of the Wednesday before Thanksgiving, which also includes the elimination of the fall break in October. The committee suggested an extended trial period for another three years.

Motion for Thanksgiving Break
Motion Presenter: R. Scott Smith, Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee

Rationale: Last year the Faculty Senate voted (XIX–M8) to cancel classes on the Wednesday before Thanksgiving (hereafter WBT) for one year, but mandated a review by the Academic Affairs Committee to determine whether this change should be continued beyond the one-year trial period. The AAC solicited feedback from Faculty Senators concerning the week before Thanksgiving. The committee received over twenty responses, and the prevailing opinion (over 90%) was in favor of cancelling classes on WBT for a number of reasons, including the safety of students.

When the motion was presented last year, there was some concern about students taking advantage of the cancellation of Wednesday classes to take the whole week off. Some students indeed left early, but there was no clarity—nor any way to find out—whether more did so than in previous years when WBT was a de facto day off because of numerous cancellations by faculty. Responses from Faculty Senators were mixed: some reported abnormal absences; others expressed surprise at high attendance; still others found no appreciable difference in attendance.

A particularly worrisome phenomenon arose, however, to wit, the fact that a substantial number of faculty cancelled classes on the Tuesday before Thanksgiving. It stands to reason if a student has less to lose, that student will see less need to stay on campus. Therefore, if the Faculty Senate votes in favor of the motion, we strenuously urge department chairs and senators to remind their faculty that classes are expected to run as scheduled on the Tuesday before Thanksgiving. Faculty must take a united stand.

The Academic Affairs Committee has worked with the University Registrar on a provisional calendar should this motion be passed, and is ready to act quickly to establish the calendar for the next academic year.

Motion: The Senate Academic Affairs Committee moves that the Faculty Senate adjust the calendar such that classes are cancelled on the Wednesday before Thanksgiving and Fall Break is eliminated for a period of three years (to AY 18–19). It also recommends that the Academic Affairs Committee review the effects of this change before voting on a new five-year calendar.
Scott also reported the Student Senate’s motion, requesting that the fall break not be eliminated. The SS representative reported that the student senate motion was not voted on in their last meeting, and that the student body would prefer to keep the fall break as well as eliminating the Wednesday before Thanksgiving.

A friendly amendment was offered to continue the trial for one year instead of three years. A senator noted the discrepancy between the Durham and UNH-Manchester campus calendars when the calendar was adjusted to change a Tuesday schedule to Wednesday’s schedule in order to balance the number of lost classes. This adjustment, made on the Durham campus, but not at UNH-M, caused some conflicts for faculty teaching on both campuses.

There was some discussion regarding the tendency for students, and even faculty, to try to stretch the break. Scott said that his committee’s intent is to protect the Tuesday classes from being cancelled. It was suggested that these concerns should be clearly articulated to all faculty. The student senator was asked to report back on the SS vote on their motion. A senator asked if the calendar can only include one of the two breaks, or if students could agitate for both days. Scott responded that the senate sets the calendar, but in order to have a fall break and eliminate the Wednesday before Thanksgiving, classes would have to start earlier. The student senator said that the SS discussion of their motion centered around student burnout when there are no breaks (long weekends) in the fall semester until November, and said that the SS prefers both breaks, even if it means starting the semester earlier.

Scott asked if the senate preferred a 3-year trial of the Wednesday cancellation, or the proposed 1-year trial. A senator expressed preference for the 1-year trial. Another senator asked if there had been a substantial reason for only one or the other break, and suggested that there is some merit to a mid-semester (fall) break for students. The senate chair said that this motion will lay over until the February 1 meeting, and asked senators to bring colleagues’ responses back to that meeting. Scott said he has received about twenty-five faculty responses, and that the AAC seeks more responses, particularly if any faculty have attendance numbers to share.

This motion will lay over until the next senate meeting on February 1, 2016.

VII. Motion from TEVC regarding implementation of online evaluations – Alberto Manalo, chair of the Teaching Evaluation Form Implementation Committee, said that the pilot of online student evaluations of teaching began in the fall of 2014, with only tenured faculty in the College of Health and Human Services and the Paul College being thus evaluated. The rates of completion on these evaluation were 69% for CHHS and 76% for the Paul College. The School of Law does all of their evaluations on line, and their current rate of completion is 82%. In Fall 2015, the pilot was expanded to include all tenured faculty. The average response rate was 61% for online evaluations and 75% for paper evaluations.

In comparing online responses to the paper evaluation responses, the average response for Question 14 is lower online than on paper. The TEVC asked Victor Benassi (Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning director) to conduct an analysis of these results, and he found no difference in the ultimate behavior of the results. For example, Q5 receives the
lowest average ratings on the paper evaluations, and also receives the lowest average ratings in the online version. Q7 receives the second lowest ratings on paper, and also online. The average of Q1-13 are typically higher than Q14 on paper, and also online. Thus the online evaluation responses, regardless of the rate of return, are consistent with the paper evaluation responses.

The greatest concern of the TEVC is the low response rate, and yet the committee noted that the School of Law, which has been using online evaluations for several years now, has a much higher response rate. The committee observed that there were not many incentives for students to complete the online evaluations, other than a series of email reminders. A senator reported anecdotal responses of students’ irritation at the reminders.

The administration would like to expand the online evaluations to all faculty, Institutional Research and Assessment is currently running two systems (paper and online), which is taxing to IR&A’s limited resources. The online evaluations provide an easier method for programs and departments to customize their evaluations, noting that departments currently adding their own questions will be able to maintain those through arrangements with IR&A. A quicker turnaround in evaluation reports will be an advantage particularly to Lecturers. With additional effort, it would be possible to generate from the evaluations data a report that links the qualitative and quantitative responses of the students to the person reporting; such linking is not generated by the software currently used in online student evaluations of teaching. The administration has expressed its commitment to raising the response rate.

The ad hoc TEVC committee, stipulating their concerns that should the online evaluations result in lower scores for faculty, the administration must take that into account, and receiving confirmation from the provost that that is a reasonable concern, offers the following motion:

UNH Faculty Senate XX Motion
on Online Administration of Student Evaluation of Teaching for all Faculty Members in Spring Semester 2016

1. Motion Presenter: Alberto Manalo, Chair of the Ad Hoc Teaching Evaluation Form Implementation Committee

2. Dates of Faculty Senate Discussion: December 7, 2015, February 1, 2016

3. Rationale

The analysis of the results of the online evaluations has revealed that they behave similarly as the results of the paper evaluations. The University is also committed to continue striving to improve the response rates of the online evaluations. There are also several potential advantages from online over paper evaluations that the faculty can benefit from once university resources are focused toward administering evaluations through the Web exclusively. Such potential benefits include the following: It will make it easier to include supplemental evaluation questions from departments and programs, and to incorporate the alternative evaluations that today some departments and programs operate under exemption and under their own process. Online evaluations for untenured
faculty, especially lecturers, will generate a faster turnaround of results than paper evaluations. Furthermore, IR&A will be able to address the reporting needs that it, with its small staff, is unable to meet today as it tries to manage the two different processes involved in administering paper and online evaluations.

4. Motion

The ad hoc teaching evaluation form implementation committee moves that:

- All student evaluations of teaching be administered online beginning Spring Semester 2016.
- If the mean values for the evaluation questions are lower than the norm for the paper evaluations in preceding years, then such differences must be reported to department chairs, deans and the provost, and the Faculty Senate must call on them to make the appropriate adjustments in their evaluation criteria.
- The Faculty Senate should continue monitoring the teaching-evaluation results until new norms for the averages for the various items or questions have been established.
- The Faculty Senate should call on the IR&A to generate as soon as possible the reports that the faculty wants, such as the link between quantitative and qualitative responses and the mean of the average ratings for questions 1 to 13.

There was a discussion about the method and manner by which the students complete the evaluations. As it is, there is little oversight over where and how the students complete the evaluations. It was suggested that completing the evaluations, online or on paper, in the classroom at the end of the semester offers meaningful closure to the students. A senator who does not support the use of online evaluations noted that his evaluation numbers were much lower with the online evaluation, and that very few students completed the evaluations at all. He suggested that comparing the rate of response at the School of Law and the rest of the system is comparing apples to oranges. A senator said he thinks that the online evaluation is another administration tactic to gather data from faculty, reducing the human factor. He questioned the purpose of the online evaluation, asserting that the value of the evaluation is for the professor first, and for the administration next.

A senator said that the faculty from Women’s Studies will speak strongly for paper evaluations, and asserted that there should be other forms of evaluation. She pointed out that unhappy students are more likely to fill out evaluations online, providing results skewed to the negative. She said that this tool is not useful as some may believe, providing at a high cost the appearance of scientific analysis without providing a truly valuable benefit, and said that she supported allowing departments to choose their form of evaluation.

A senator asked if the written (qualitative) responses were lower on the online evaluations, and Alberto did not know the answer to that. The online evaluations do include qualitative questions.
A senator asked just how much lower the average of the online evaluations is. Alberto responded that it is about .15 on average. The senator expressed concern that despite the provost’s reassurance regarding consideration of this potential drop in faculty evaluation rates, it is important to get such assurances from the deans themselves, who make the hiring and promotion decisions. Alberto said that the provost will be an advocate with the deans for the faculty.

A senator asked if faculty can choose to use either paper or online, and Alberto said that IR&A is seeking a single form of evaluation. Another senator pointed out that problems do exist with the paper evaluations, such as cancellations due to weather that make it impossible for students to fill out the evaluations at all.

This motion will lay over until the next senate meeting on February 1, 2016. The senate chair strongly urged the faculty to take this issue back to their departments for discussion and input.

Discussion Items:

VIII. FAC report on graduation student tuition – Erin Sharp, co-chair of the senate Finance and Administration Committee, reported to the senate on its charge to examine the policy for crediting programs for graduate student tuition and report. The FAC reviewed the 2014-15 expedited RCM review report, met with Jan Nesbit, Senior Vice Provost for Research, and talked with Leigh Anne Melanson, Associate Provost for Academic Administration. They learned that during the most recent expedited review of RCM completed in May, 2015, the decision was made to continue the RCM model that flows graduate tuition dollars to the unit in which the graduate student is enrolled rather than to the unit in which a graduate course is offered. Although there is concern that this RCM model may hinder interest in the creation of interdisciplinary, cross-unit graduate programs and collaboration, the Deans expressed concern that changing the model may encourage programs to require students to take courses only within the enrolling unit, potentially limiting graduate students’ educational experience.

This RCM model is not an issue for interdisciplinary graduate program opportunities within a College, because the Dean can filter tuition dollars easily between departments within the College. Cross-college graduate programs and course offerings can find workarounds to support equitable collaboration. For example, the tuition dollars for the Natural Resources and Earth Systems Sciences cross-college graduate program are filtered first to the Graduate School and then divided among units. In another example, the COLA/CHHS PhD option in Children and Youth in Communities uses a memorandum of understanding between the units and a registrar-assigned ‘option’ coding to filter graduate tuition dollars between the Colleges.

Erin noted that the policy doesn’t hold true for online (J-term and summer) courses for reasons that are currently unclear. The FAC is not recommending any action be taken.

The senator from the Nursing program said that there would be a benefit to students in that program to go out to other colleges, but as it is, they have to create courses within the program in order to keep the funds because other colleges don’t want the students if they can’t have the funds. Erin reported that some confusion about anticipated changes in this policy still exist,
and said that the FAC will continue to monitor the situation. Erin clarified that the college is the RCM unit, not the department or program.

A senator asked if this is a senate issue or a deans’ issue. Erin responded that the policy creates issues for interdisciplinary program faculty. A senator asked why these tuition dollars should be dispersed differently for graduate students and undergraduate students; what is the rationale and the impact? The senate chair pointed out that these kinds of questions indicate the value of bringing back the Central Budget Committee so that faculty have a better idea of where the tuition dollars are going, and thanked the FAC for their continuing review of this policy and any changes to it.

IX. FAC report on hiring trends and the academic mission – The FAC co-chair then reported to the senate about the committee’s work regarding UNH hiring trends and its impact on the academic mission of the university. She said that the Associate Provost for Academic Administration had provided information to the FAC regarding those trends. Erin reported that concerns about hiring trends at UNH are not new. Faculty Senate passed a motion (XVII-M18) in 2013 that called on the Central Administration to make it a top priority to halt the substitution of lecturers for departing tenured professors. This motion was passed after the presentation of data indicating sharp increases in lecturers at UNH from 2005 to 2013 at the same time that tenure-track positions decreased. While the Faculty Senate acknowledged that UNH has been under financial stress, faculty concerns about hiring decisions and the impact on the Academic Mission grew stronger because of evidence that spending and hiring at the administrative level increased during the same period that tenure-track faculty positions were not being filled.

While personnel data after 2013 are not publically available at this time, the APAA has indicated that the data will be updated and available by the end of the calendar year (2015), and the FAC will update reporting on hiring trends at that time. The following information comes directly from the FAC report, with some charts abbreviated:

> For this report, the FAC relied on several data files compiled by or for previous Faculty Senate committees (Nonacademic FTEs and salary with graphs; Faculty FTE {TT and non-TT} Senate 10 2012; Faculty FTEs FY 05-12; Historical FTE and Headcount FY05-FY14). The FAC also explored publically available data on UNH personnel from the USNH Annual Financial Reports, the UNH Fact Book archives, and the Common Data Set and HR headcount data provided by the Office of Institutional Research.

> **FINDINGS – HIRING TRENDS: TENURE TRACK, NON-TENURE TRACK AND ADMINISTRATION POSITIONS:**

This table summarizes hiring counts data and presents full time tenured and tenure track faculty at UNH Durham by total numbers and by College from 2005 – 2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>COLSA</th>
<th>COLA</th>
<th>CEPS</th>
<th>WSBE</th>
<th>CHHS</th>
<th>TSAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>551 (-17)</td>
<td>72 (-9)</td>
<td>213 (-27)</td>
<td>125 (+1)</td>
<td>55 (+8)</td>
<td>67 (+11)</td>
<td>19 (-1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This table summarizes data from the archived Common Data sets available on the Institutional Research website for student enrollment and ‘Full-time Instructional Faculty’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full-time Instructional Faculty</th>
<th>Undergrad enrollment</th>
<th>Grad enrollment</th>
<th>Total Student Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>11,971</td>
<td>2,877</td>
<td>14,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>610 (−71)</td>
<td>12,840 (+869)</td>
<td>2,329 (−548)</td>
<td>15,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,398</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data regarding trends in Central Administration positions is more difficult to untangle because of variability in data categories and reporting formats. Leigh Anne Melanson and Interim Provost Vasudevan are working together to compile data on administrative positions at UNH over time. They plan to present this data to the Faculty Senate in January or February, 2016.

The FAC did want to present some initial data for the Faculty Senate to consider. UNH’s Office of Institutional Research provides personnel data / staff counts from 2009 – 2013 and there is also a link from Institutional Research to UNH Fact Book archives that include personnel data.

Personnel data from 2009 – 2012 on the employee category “executive, administrative, and managerial employees” are provided here and show an increase in personnel in this category:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N = 189</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>208 (+ 19)</td>
<td>212 (+23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>208 (+ 19)</td>
<td>212 (+23)</td>
<td>224 (+ 35)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2013, the personnel data categories changed and there is no longer a category of “executive, administrative, and managerial,” instead there is a category labeled “management occupations” and in 2013 that category listed 371 employees.

Here are the data on full-time tenure and tenure-track faculty numbers (UNH Durham and Thompson School) added together from the by college-level data for this same time frame.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N = 574</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>574 (+ 0)</td>
<td>578 (+4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>574 (+ 0)</td>
<td>578 (+4)</td>
<td>551 (- 23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2012, the Faculty Senate collected data on FTE and Annual Salary spending for UNH Non-Academic RC Units from 2005 – 2012. The following figure illustrates changes in the percentages of total personnel spending at UNH for faculty compared to administrative (non-academic RC units) positions.
**CONCLUSION AND ACTION:**
*At this point, our committee is recommending that the Faculty Senate continue discussions about hiring trends at UNH with a focus on impacts of the Academic Mission. FAC will make sure to update this report once personnel data are available for 2014-15 and 2015-16. Data suggest that the UNH Central Administration views limiting the number of tenured and tenure-track faculty at UNH as a means of costs saving. At the same time, though, data suggest that the UNH Central Administration is dedicating more money to administrative and managerial positions. It is critical that the Faculty Senate examine how this policy impacts the Academic Mission at UNH and to develop a strategy for communicating concerns about hiring practices.*

It was noted that UNH-Manchester is included in these numbers, but not the School of Law. A senator asked if staff positions are included in the administration positions above. Erin replied that some archived reports did list staff positions. Another senator noted that some of the data may be skewed when staff positions are eliminated and some of those duties placed on faculty members, some of whom are at a breaking point in terms of work assigned. Erin noted that at a recent Board of Trustees meeting, the president asked for approval for a SIP for PAT staff, anticipating some significant retirements from those incentive offerings. She said that any new hires for those positions will now go through the provost’s office. A senator said that the new contract for the lecturers could move some lecturers to 100% status, which might off-load some responsibilities.

A senator asked if the Separation Incentive Packages have been more aggressive lately, noting a sharp drop in TT positions in the Thompson School of Applied Science. Erin said that the last faculty SIP was last year. Another senator asked what has caused the drop in graduate student enrollments, and asked if it is expected to continue. Erin responded that this is a national trend and is likely related to the recession. Another senator spoke about faculty-administrators who have reduced teaching loads while functioning as associate deans, assistants to directors, etc., and asked if the numbers might be misleading regarding the actual number of administrative positions.
Erin said that she can ask Vasu and Leigh Anne to include this information in their report. The senate chair said that this topic will require more discussion in the future. She asked the senators to email Erin with any questions their departments might have on the subject.

X. ITC report on the Canvas rollout – Siobhan Senier, chair of the senate Information Technology Committee, reported to the senate on the committee’s meeting on November 23 with Alicia Medros for an update on the Canvas rollout. She reported that all appears to be going smoothly. Faculty and staff are attending the trainings in large numbers (including 50 % of J-term faculty so far); 90 faculty have already published 165 courses, with 82% reporting they are having a “good” or “very good” experience. The 24x7 support is getting a good deal of use (70% via online chat, and 36% outside regular business hours).

AT will soon announce an open forum on Canvas, possibly December 13. That might be a good time to discuss concerns. The Committee has been communicating with Terri Winters about a loss in coverage of plagiarism-detection software. SafeAssign will disappear with Blackboard at the end of May, and the University has not yet decided on a replacement package. Terri is well aware of faculty concerns over this and is putting together a working group to address it as soon as possible.

A senator said that Canvas seems to be best suited for teaching rather than for advising or other functions served to this point by Blackboard. The senate chair thanked the ITC for their report.

XI. Summary report of Senate Session XIX – Past senate chair Alberto Manalo presented a summary of the accomplishments of the last senate session. This report is posted on the senate website at [http://www.unh.edu/fac-senate/annual-summary-report](http://www.unh.edu/fac-senate/annual-summary-report). The senate thanked Alberto for his report.

XII. Summary report of motions from Senate Session XIX – Senate vice chair Dante Scala presented a status report on the implementation of the motions passed in the last senate session. This status report may be found on the senate website with this link. Dante reported that it seems that all senate motions are being implemented, or are in the process of being implemented, with one exception.

One of the changes to the Students Rules, Rights, & Responsibilities suggested in Senate Motion XIX-M16 needs some editing. Associate Dean of COLA Kirkpatrick submitted the following request to the Agenda Committee:

“In 06.1.1, the Senate must clarify the first sentence in the second paragraph. OS staff may not serve as academic advisors. No HR OS classification has academic advising as an assigned duty and OS are not generally expected to possess the educational degrees necessary to discharge those duties at the college level. I suggest that the Senate consider a revised language: ‘ Faculty and PAT staff members may serve........ ’”

Dante, representing the Agenda Committee, offered the following:
Senate Motion XIX-M16 suggests that the SRR&R item 06.1.1 read:

“...Either faculty or staff members may serve as academic advisors depending on departmental procedures...”

A new motion will be drafted to suggest that 06.1.1 read:

“...Either faculty or PAT staff members may serve as academic advisors depending on departmental procedures...”

This matter will be addressed in a future meeting. The chair thanked Dante for his report.

The senate chair thanked all the committee chairs and members for the work accomplished already during this semester.

XIII. New Business – A senator thanked past chair Alberto Manalo for his impressive leadership during the past senate session. The group indicated acclamation by applause.

XIV. Adjournment- It was moved and seconded to adjourn the meeting at 5:28 p.m.