Meeting called to order at 3:42 p.m. Monday, April 11, 2016  

MINUTES SUMMARY

I. Roll – The following senators were absent: Dowd and Orovich. Emison, Erickson, Jamison, and Senier were excused. P.T. Vasudevan was a guest.

II. Remarks by and questions to the interim provost – Interim provost Vasudevan said his office is preparing next year’s budget, and noted the potential impact of the upcoming vote on the Teaching Evaluation Form Implementation Committee (TEVC) motion on using online student evaluations of teaching, saying that if the motion does not pass and the online evaluation forms are not implemented, the cost of using paper evaluations instead will be $87,000 more than using the online evaluations. He also said that a breach in the paper evaluations for a department on campus has been discovered in the last two weeks, and pointed to the greater securing of the online evaluations. He said that he is happy to work to make sure the faculty’s concerns about the online evaluations are heard. He said that a solution has been found to align the qualitative and quantitative responses on the evaluations. A senator asked if there was a commitment to when that adjustment would be made, and Vasu said it should happen over the summer.

It was noted that at this late date, there is no way to fully implement online evaluations for the Spring semester, as the original TEVC motion had suggested. Alberto Manalo, chair of the TEVC, said that today’s motion has been updated and suggests Fall 2016 as the new date for full implementation. Vasu said that there will be both paper and online evaluations this semester, as in recent semesters.

A senator asked if the shift from paper to online evaluations will be included in the provost’s office’s release of the Promotion & Tenure guidelines for Fall 2016. Vasu replied that the deans have committed to recalibrating the ratings if necessary, and that putting such wording into those guidelines would be the next step. He said he is willing to take that suggestion to the deans council.

Another senator asked if there were any way for faculty to see the actual online evaluation of teaching that the students will be using, suggesting that it would be helpful to have a clear understanding of how they are being evaluated. The provost said that he can find out how that might be done, and that he will get back to the senators with that information.

A senator asked if the administration has looked into the actual risk of security breaches in using the online evaluations, referencing identity theft and hijacking of social security numbers as potential issues, and asking that the online evaluations be made truly secure. Vasu responded that breaches within the online evaluation system are unlikely, since the turnaround
time is very short between the time the evaluations are submitted and the actual reports are compiled and printed/stored. He said that the university Chief Information Officer has assured him that identity theft is not a serious problem at UNH at the current time.

III. Remarks by and questions to the senate chair – The senate chair asked for a straw poll among the senators as to how many of them would be accepting of a policy on campus to allow dogs (or pets) on campus. About fifteen senators out of the attending 46 indicated they would be accepting of such a policy. The remaining senators indicated they might have some reservations. Deb said that a resolution will be coming from the Student Senate regarding the establishment of a policy on campus to allow pets, particularly Emotional Support Animals (ESA), inside buildings. She noted that there is no such policy on the UNH campuses.

There was discussion regarding the wide ranges of policies that seem to be accepted across campus, varying from building to building and from department to department. While many senators recalled long-standing traditions in some buildings to either allow or disallow animals/pets, Deb reiterated that there appears to be no written and established policy on this matter. She said that this information should be taken back to all departments for conversation and thought there. The subject will not be addressed this year by the senate, but may well come up next year.

It was noted that ESAs are not the same as Service Animals, which are currently allowed by policy in campus buildings, and that ESAs can be a wide range of animals, not just dogs. It was also noted that while some staff and faculty already support this idea, there are some who have a fear of animals who may have other opinions, which is why it is important for departments to discuss the Student Senate’s upcoming resolution. A senator asked if this is a Senate matter or an administrative matter. Another senator pointed out that it is an environmental health and safety issue. Deb said that the senate may not have any deciding power in this matter, but that we should weigh in on it. A senator noted that dogs are allowed in the library during testing, and the senator from the Library said that those are trained service dogs, and that she personally has no complaints or concerns about them.

IV. Minutes – It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the last senate meeting, March 21, 2016. A correction was suggested in Item VI. Thus adjusted, the minutes were unanimously approved with no abstentions.

Action Items:

V. Discussion and vote on TEVC motion on implementation of online evaluations – Alberto Manalo, chair of the Teaching Evaluation Form Implementation Committee (TEVC), shared his committee’s updated motion with the group, noting that it is impossible now to implement the forms for all faculty for the current semester. He also pointed out that the committee is asking that the senate continue to evaluate and report to the deans regarding the teaching evaluations. The new motion reads:

*The ad hoc Teaching Evaluation Form Implementation Committee moves the following:*

a. Student evaluation of teaching by untenured and non-tenure-track faculty, and
graduate students should be administered online no later than Fall Semester 2016.

b. The Faculty Senate should continue analyzing the distribution and means of ratings for the questions in the teaching evaluations, and compare such results with those obtained for the paper evaluation in past years. Based on the analysis, the Faculty Senate will provide to the deans, department chairs, and provost the appropriate adjustments.

Alberto said that the benefits of moving to online evaluations for untenured faculty, non-tenure track faculty, and graduate students include the faster release of results to faculty and department chairs, and better safeguards for data integrity.

The faculty concerns include the possibility that the ratings from online administration of the evaluations may be lower than ratings from the paper evaluations. He pointed out that the deans have committed to recalibrate or make adjustments in their use of the teaching evaluation data. He also shared the following data from research conducted on the evaluations by Victor Benassi from the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning:

**Means for Item 14 and avg for Items 1-13, Online and Paper Evals, Sp ‘15 and F ‘15**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean, Item 14</th>
<th>Mean, Items 1 to 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2015 (Online)</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2015 (Paper)</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015 (Online)</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015 (Paper)</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data for tenured associate professors and professors:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean, Item 14</th>
<th>Mean, Items 1 to 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014 (Paper)</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2015 (Online)</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015 (Online)</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dr. Benassi said the explanation for the difference could lie in the actual response rate, shown here:

**Mean for Item 14 by response rate, online evaluations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Below 65%</th>
<th>75% or Higher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(sd = 0.70)</td>
<td>(sd = 0.57)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(sd = 0.65)</td>
<td>(sd = 0.53)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 247</td>
<td>n = 242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The committee’s recommendation is that we continue efforts to increase the response rate of online evaluations. Alberto pointed out that if the revised motion (below) fails, tenured faculty
will continue to be evaluated online, and non-tenured faculty and instructors will continue to be evaluated with a paper evaluation. If the motion passes, all faculty and instructors will be evaluated with a single online instrument. He also noted that with the online evaluation, it will be easier for individual departments to add specialized questions to their departments’ evaluations.

Referencing the concern addressed during the provost’s comments earlier, regarding the format of the report, Alberto said that Provost Vasudevan and Vice President Dutcher have indicated that Institutional Research & Assessment will support the development of a report showing students’ ratings together with their comments. He said that a committee has been formed to work on this development and that their first meeting will be next Monday.

Another faculty concern with the shift to online evaluations is that the online evaluation period is too short. Alberto reported that the online evaluation period will be extended to begin two full weeks before classes end.

In conclusion, he noted that using online evaluations will increase efficiency in preparing the evaluations, lower the cost to manage the evaluation process, free up resources to improve response rates and make online evaluations work better for departments, create a unified data set for teaching evaluations, and simplify the creation of reports required by programs (e.g., Honors, Discovery, etc.) needing data from different colleges and departments.

The senate chair opened the floor for discussion, noting the importance to complete this discussion today. She said she would ask for comments in favor of the motion, and then comments opposed to the motion, and asked that the comments be kept succinct.

A senator asked if he could offer a friendly amendment to make the implementation contingent upon the integration of qualitative and quantitative components being put into place, saying that if the administration does not add those components, the faculty concern has not been addressed, and such wording would then hold up the implementation until it has been addressed. Another senator approved this suggestion, and Alberto said he believed his committee would be in favor of such an amendment, as he is sure this will happen. The senator also added a second amendment that there be a commitment to an analysis of evaluations for faculty from under-represented groups under the two systems in the coming academic year. Another Senator proposed changing “underrepresented groups” to “underrepresented groups and women” to make explicit that women were included. After discussion, these were also accepted as friendly.

A senator asked when the online evaluation period would end, recommending that it end as late as possible in order for students to be able to evaluate the entire course experience. He also suggested waiting a year from instituting the online evaluations before making a decision about their value going forward. He recommended using the words “...in the following year” as opposed to “...in the coming year” in the amended motion.

The senator from the School of Law said that they have been using only online evaluations for some time now, and that the time period to complete the evaluations begins two weeks before the end of classes and ends with the end of exams. They also have a notation on the
evaluation report to indicate when each evaluation was completed, as well as including the response rate for each class so that faculty have that information as well.

Another senator commented that the evaluations are quite subjective, especially when there are faculty who offer treats or enticements to the students on the day that they complete the evaluations in class. He also noted that the UNH-Manchester and UNH-Durham calendars do not line up well, so that the time frame for online evaluations on the two campuses may need to be different. He asked if UNH has ever done an analysis on evaluation bias based on gender or under-represented status, noting that the University of Texas has. Alberto said he was not aware of any such studies.

A senator spoke strongly against the use of online evaluations, saying that the anonymity of completing an online evaluation outside of a classroom is likely to contribute to negative bias of instructors. He said he is not confident that the response rates will rise if students are to complete the evaluations on their devices, and asserted that the only control that faculty have to increase the response rates is to hand out paper copies. He advocated a complete return to paper evaluations. Another senator expressed agreement with this sentiment. She does not like the cross-department comparisons that will happen with the analysis of online evaluations, asserting that such comparisons create a false sense of security regarding the meaning of the evaluation results. She said there is much concern about the online evaluations in her department, and pointed to current research against an over-reliance on data in such evaluations. She also expressed a desire to serve on the new senate ad-hoc committee charged to look at the use of teaching evaluations. The chair said she would contact her.

A member of the Agenda Committee commented that he had voted against the move to online evaluations when it was first suggested. He reminded the senate that the use of two separate systems (paper and online) was implemented in order to protect untenured faculty during the trial phase of the online evaluations. He then noted that since the senate voted last year to make that move, he feels it is important to move forward and get all faculty on the same evaluation system as soon as possible. He asserted that the important question to ask is if the current motion by the TEVC provides reasonable protection for vulnerable faculty, which he feels it does. He also is pleased with the implicit acceptance by the deans of the idea that judging teaching is something in which faculty should have a part. This is a precedent he is not willing to waste. He called both the paper and the online evaluations imperfect tools, and said the new ad hoc committee has been formed to examine those problems. He will vote in favor of the motion.

A senator asked what the cost to administer the online evaluations will be, noting the provost’s account of the cost of administering the paper evaluations. Alberto said he didn’t know; only that the online evaluations cost less, as the provost noted in his comments.

Another senator said that her department faculty have had positive responses to the online evaluation, with 65-80% response rates for online evaluations, and about 80% for paper evaluations. Her colleagues are not concerned by the small discrepancies in the ratings. She pointed out that the current motion from the TEVC, and the current conversation in the senate, is not about the effectiveness of evaluations, but whether or not the university should move to
online evaluations from paper ones. She said she is happy for the increased efficiency of the online option.

A senator expressed concern about where students will choose to complete the evaluations, and suggested that students be encouraged to fill out the evaluations online while in the classroom. He said that completing the forms elsewhere may lead to bias in their completion. The senate chair said that many faculty have had their students complete the evaluations during class time. Alberto noted that in those cases, the response rate is significantly higher than for classes in which the students filled out the forms outside of class.

The chair called for a vote on the motion, with the friendly amendment as noted here:

*The ad hoc Teaching Evaluation Form Implementation Committee moves the following:*

  a. Student evaluation of teaching by untenured and non-tenure-track faculty, and graduate students should be administered online no later than Fall Semester 2016, contingent upon the integration of qualitative and quantitative components for Fall 2016, and a commitment to an analysis of evaluations for faculty from under-represented groups and women under the two systems in the coming academic year.

  b. The Faculty Senate should continue analyzing the distribution and means of ratings for the questions in the teaching evaluations, and compare such results with those obtained for the paper evaluation in past years. Based on the analysis, the Faculty Senate will provide to the deans, department chairs, and provost the appropriate adjustments.

The motion passed with 35 votes in favor, 7 votes opposed, and 3 abstentions.

VI. Discussion and vote on Academic Affairs Committee motion on changes to the add/drop policy – Scott Smith, chair of the senate AAC, reminded the group of the proposed motion, which has three parts:

1) That UNH move from a three-week add period to a two-week add period. The period that students may drop courses is to remain at 5 weeks.

2) That the current practice of online add/drops for the first week of classes continue, followed by a week during which students may add and drop only through the paper add/drop process.

We also urge the Registrar's Office to consider the following, if at all practical and possible:

1. When a student adds a class electronically, they receive a confirmation that states something to the effect of “It is critical that you contact the instructor immediately to discuss course prerequisites, missed work or other important information.”
2. When a student adds a class electronically, the instructor receives an e-mail alerting them to this fact.

3. Once a course is full, the Registrar creates a “wait list” of students who want to add the course. The first person on the wait list should be automatically added as soon as someone drops the class. This would circumvent the issue that we raised above about timing.

A senator asked what the response has been from students. Scott said that he asked for a response from the students and received none. A senator said her colleagues have asked if there is any way to kindly ask students who are registered but not attending to move more quickly to drop the class in order to make room for students who would like to enroll. Scott said that he would speak with Andy Colby to see if there is something that could be done, although it seems a somewhat extraneous request. A senator said she had polled her students, and they were in favor of the longer time period. The senate chair said that she took this motion back to her colleagues in her department, and they were all firmly in favor of the proposition.

Alberto mentioned that the Registrar’s office had initially wanted a two-week period in which students could add/drop online without consultation with faculty members, and the AAC determined that certain provisions needed to be in place before the senate should consider a fully online add/drop process.

There was a suggestion to use the wording “late adds” rather than just “adds” for clarification in Items 1 and 2 under the section of recommendations to the Registrar’s Office, i.e., “When a student late-adds a class electronically…” In Item 3, the suggestion was to insert the words “instructor controlled” as referencing the wait list, i.e., “…the Registrar creates an instructor controlled ‘wait list’ of students ….”

In Items 1 and 2, concordance was corrected by using the wording “When students add…” and in Item 2 “…the instructors receive an e-mail alerting them to this fact.” The AAC accepted these as friendly amendments.

A senator asked if instructors are required to allow a student to add a class during the second week of class. Scott replied the proposal is that as of Tuesday at 4 p.m. during the second week of class, the student must add using a paper add/drop form, or go through an administrative assistant to add a class, which should require faculty approval. Scott noted that there could be potential problems for students who are waiting to add the class, and attending all class sessions in anticipation of an opening becoming available, losing their place on the waiting list to someone who happens to find the slot open online.

A senator asked about the phrase “The first person on the wait list should be automatically added as soon as someone drops the class” in Item 3, wondering who makes that decision. Scott suggested that the second and third sentences in Item 3 be struck, since the friendly amendments suggested above make them moot.

Another senator suggested that allowing the Registrar to back-fill classes eliminates the potential for criticism of a faculty member for their method of filling their class; if there is
bias shown. The chair asserted that faculty should have the right to make choices about who adds their courses.

A senator asked if this policy might enable faculty who want to under-enroll their courses. It was noted that, as a wait-list policy, this only take effect once the class is already filled.

The motion, amended as below, was put to a vote.

1) That UNH move from a three-week add period to a two-week add period. The period that students may drop courses is to remain at 5 weeks.

2) That the current practice of online add/drops for the first week of classes continue, followed by a week during which students may add and drop only through the paper add/drop process.

We also urge the Registrar's Office to consider the following, if at all practical and possible:

1. When students late-add a class electronically, they receive a confirmation that states something to the effect of “It is critical that you contact the instructor immediately to discuss course prerequisites, missed work or other important information.”

2. When students late-add a class electronically, the instructors receive an e-mail alerting them to this fact.

3. Once a course is full, the Registrar creates an instructor controlled “wait list” of students who want to add the course.

The motion passed with 43 in favor, 1 opposed, and 1 abstention.

VII. Discussion and vote on motions from the Agenda Committee to amend the senate constitution and bylaws - Jim Connell, of the Senate Agenda Committee reviewed the proposed changes to the Faculty Senate constitution and bylaws in the five motions proposed at the last senate meeting.

The first motion regards the permanent committees of the senate, with wording to clarify the status of the Professional Standards Committee in its relationship with the AAUP contract, and the addition of the Discovery Committee to the senate’s permanent committees, under Item 6.c of the constitution:

6.c. Permanent Committees. The Faculty Senate has permanent committees that include non-senators as members.

1. The Professional Standards Committee. The Professional Standards Committee will concern itself with matters affecting the welfare of the faculty including academic freedom, promotion, tenure, workload assignments, faculty personnel policy, and professional ethics. This committee has a role established by a collective bargaining agreement relating to termination or severe sanctions placed on faculty members. The Professional Standards Committee will be elected by tenure-track
faculty in the AAUP-UNH bargaining-unit by approval ballots in CEPS, COLSA, COLA, CHHS, PCBE, UNH-Manchester, and the Library. All tenured faculty members will automatically be the nominees on their respective ballots. The Faculty Senate will supervise this election. The Professional Standards Committee will have seven directly elected members, one from each of the following: CEPS, COLSA, COLA, CHHS, PCBE, UNH-Manchester, and the Library. In addition the vice chair of the Faculty Senate will be the eighth member and the chair of the committee.

2. The University Curriculum and Academic Policies Committee (“UCAPC”) shall function under its Senate Charter.
3. The Discovery Committee.
4. The Faculty Senate may establish other permanent committees by charter.

The motion was put to a vote, requiring a two-thirds majority, and passed with 44 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

The second motion amends the charter for UCAPC (Section 1.c) to extend that franchise to all senate-eligible faculty, as follows in the second motion:

1.c. The faculty representatives from each college will be elected by written ballot by the members of the faculty in that college eligible to vote for faculty senators. If fewer than two members elected by the colleges are also members of the Faculty Senate, the senate will elect from among its members one or two additional representatives to the committee as necessary to meet the requirements of 1.b. above. If the senate elects two members, they will not be from the same college.

A simple majority is required for this motion to pass. Put to a voice vote, the motion carried with a majority in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions.

The third motion would add a new item to the bylaws to allow for the creation of subcommittees within the senate standing committees.

The current Section 5 shall be renumbered as Section 6 and a new Section 5 inserted:

5. Standing Committee Operations
Based upon the anticipated work-load, the Agenda Committee may appoint a larger number of senators to one or more standing committees in the expectation that these larger committee form sub-committees. The chair of the standing committee shall appoint sub-committee chairs and appoint committee members to each sub-committee with due regard to balance among colleges. All committee members shall be a member of one sub-committee except the committee chair who shall be ex-officio a member of all sub-committees. With committee approval, the chair will apportion committee charges to each sub-committee or to the committee as a whole. The sub-committees will report to the committee, though the committee may specify that a sub-committee report directly to the Senate. In that case, it may be appropriate for the sub-committee chair to present the report.
A suggestion was made to reword the third sentence in the paragraph to read "no committee member shall be a member of more than one sub-committee, except the chair, who shall be ex-officio a member of all sub-committees." A correction was suggested an in the first sentence to read “…that these larger committees form…. ” These were accepted as friendly amendments.

A senator asked if the committee chairs will have discretion to decide whether forming a subcommittee would be necessary, and Jim said that the committee as a whole would decide whether they could fulfill their charge(s) with or without creating subcommittees. The chair of the Senate AAC voiced his support for the agility that this amendment to the bylaws provides.

The motion was put to voice vote and carried with the majority in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions.

The fourth motion amends Article 5 of the Senate Constitution to provide wording for the first time regarding the status of faculty serving on the Agenda Committee, adding the stipulation that AC members should be tenured faculty. This is in an effort to protect vulnerable faculty from undue pressure. It was noted that the senate vice chair serves as the chair of the Professional Standards Committee, which is comprised of only tenured faculty according to the senate constitution and in accordance with the AAUP contract.

1. Officers of the Faculty Senate. In May of each year, the outgoing Faculty Senate chair will conduct an election, by the members of the Faculty Senate for the following academic year, for a chair, a vice-chair, and three at-large members of the Agenda Committee for one-year terms. Members of the Agenda Committee must be tenured faculty. A slate of candidates will be presented by the out-going Agenda Committee two weeks before the election. Additional candidates may be nominated from the floor.

The representative to the senate from the Research Faculty Council suggested that the research faculty would agree that the senate chair and vice chair should be tenured, but the group would like to see some non-tenured faculty serving in other positions on the Agenda Committee. Their opinion is that the argument of pressure from the administration does not greatly affect the research faculty.

The chair of the AAC countered that junior tenure-track faculty would be vulnerable to such pressures, and spoke in favor of this motion. Another senator called the motion paternalistic. A senator asserted that, having served on the AC as a junior faculty member at the time that the faculty voted to unionize, he felt tremendous pressure from the administration as well as from tenured faculty. He said that tenure provides faculty in such positions with a freedom of speech that is necessary for Agenda Committee members in their work with faculty and administration. A senator asked if tenured faculty up for full professorship might be equally vulnerable, and the former senator said that all faculty are vulnerable, but particularly untenured faculty.

The motion was put to a vote. As an amendment to the constitution, a two-thirds majority is required. The motion passed with 38 votes in favor, 6 opposed, and 1 abstentions.
The fifth motion expands the constitution, Article 6, Section a., expanding it to explicitly state the responsibility of the Agenda Committee to charge the senate committees, as well as providing some authority for the AC to act, only in exigent circumstances, on behalf of the senate during the summer, when university business is still being conducted, but the senate is not in session.

a. **Agenda Committee.** The Agenda Committee shall set the Faculty Senate agenda and be responsible for the operations of the Faculty Senate. In addition to committee charges by the Senate itself, the Agenda Committee shall have the authority to charge all Senate committees consistent with the will of the Senate. The Agenda Committee shall consist of the Faculty Senate chair, vice chair and three at-large members. In addition to these five members, the previous senate chair shall serve as an ex-officio voting member of the Agenda Committee if possible. In the event that the previous senate chair cannot serve, the Agenda Committee may select a replacement.

In exigent circumstances, when the Faculty Senate is between meetings, and cannot be called into emergency session, the Agenda Committee is authorized to act on behalf of the Senate. This power should only be exercised as a last resort. Such actions require a 2/3 majority of the Agenda Committee members present and voting. Where practical, the Agenda Committee should consult with cognizant Senate committee chairs before acting. The members of the Faculty Senate shall be notified (electronic means are acceptable) of such actions within one week, and the Chair of the Faculty Senate shall report on the action at the next Senate meeting. The Faculty Senate retains the authority to reverse any such action by majority vote.

A senator asked what “exigent circumstances” might mean. Jim replied that that would be in the judgement of the Agenda Committee, but that any business that can wait until the next senate meeting would not be exigent. Another senator suggested that all senators should be notified before any decision is made, rather than being informed after the fact. This would allow faculty to offer feedback on the issue. Jim suggested amending the motion, to read:

“… the Agenda Committee should consult with cognizant Senate committee chairs and inform Faculty Senate members before acting.”

The AC members accepted this as a friendly amendment. It was noted that the AC does have a quorum requirement for its meetings; four of the six members are required for a quorum, and a two-thirds vote of members present would be required to take action on any such business as indicated in the amendment, meaning at least three AC members would have to vote in favor of taking action.

The motion was put to a vote, requiring a two-thirds majority to pass, and carried with 42 votes in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

VIII. **Discussion and vote on motion from Campus Planning Committee on university lands** – John Carroll, chair of the Senate CPC said that the university lands have value beyond academics, but that as the faculty senate’s purpose is to watch over the academic mission of the university, the following motion is offered:
**Motion:** Let it be resolved that the Faculty Senate goes on record to protect these valuable academic assets, UNH’s farms and woodlands in Durham, Lee and Madbury, and asks university administration to take such measures as necessary to protect these lands as outdoor academic assets in perpetuity.

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

IX. Motion from Campus Planning Committee regarding lactation facilities on campus – Danielle Pillet-Shore, from the Senate Campus Planning Committee, offered the committee’s report on the need for more lactation facilities on campus for use by faculty, staff, and students. In part, that report states:

“In compliance with New Hampshire State law, RSA 132:10-d: Breastfeeding in New Hampshire, and in support of the University of New Hampshire’s family friendly initiatives, the university understands the importance and benefits of breastfeeding, and recognizes and respects the need to accommodate lactating mothers – be they faculty, staff, and/or students – who choose to nurse or express breast milk upon their return to work or school, without discrimination. To support and accommodate lactating mothers, and to prevent discrimination and harassment of breastfeeding employees and students who exercise their rights under this policy, the UNH-Durham campus has designated two lactation rooms. The University’s Human Resources website, however, currently states: ‘Please NOTE: As other rooms become available on campus, we will add that location and access information to this page.’”

She explained that there are only two suitable rooms currently available on campus, 354 Dimond Library, and 341 in the MUB, both in the heart of campus and a significant distance for many women who need these facilities to travel between classes or on breaks. The statement above indicates that Human Resources assumes that more rooms will be made available, and the committee calls for such accommodations.

Danielle shared maps of the campus to give perspective to the distance issue, and also shared data gathered that indicates that the existing facility in Dimond Library is only able to serve four women at capacity, leaving unmet demand. She said that the University of Vermont has seven such facilities available, as compared to the two facilities at UNH-Durham. UNH-Manchester has a single wellness room that can be used for this purpose. The School of Law has no such facility as far as the CPC is aware.

She offered the following motion on behalf of the CPC:

“Let it be resolved that the Faculty Senate urges the University Administration to designate additional lactation rooms evenly distributed across each UNH campus to minimize transit time and maximize scheduling/booking access.”

A member of the Agenda Committee suggested that the lengthy report be separated from the motion, and a brief rationale created for that motion. The senate chair thanked the CPC for their detailed work on this report and motion.
The senate chair said that the remaining items of business on today’s agenda would be postponed due to time constraints.

X. New Business – There was no new business

XI. Adjournment- It was moved and seconded to adjourn the meeting at 5:30 p.m.