

University of New Hampshire

University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository

Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes

Faculty Senate Documents

4-25-2022

2021-2022 FACULTY SENATE XXVI - April 25, 2022 Minutes Summary

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty_senate_agendas_minutes

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "2021-2022 FACULTY SENATE XXVI - April 25, 2022 Minutes Summary" (2022). *Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes*. 66.

https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty_senate_agendas_minutes/66

This Text is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate Documents at University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes by an authorized administrator of University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository. For more information, please contact Scholarly.Communication@unh.edu.

UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
2021-2022 FACULTY SENATE XXVI

The fundamental function of the approved minutes of the Faculty Senate is to accurately document actions taken by that body. Additionally, the minutes traditionally seek to provide context by capturing some statements of Senators, faculty in attendance, and guests. The minutes do not verify the veracity, authenticity, and/or accuracy of those statements.

Meeting called to order at 3:10 PM on April 25, 2022, via ZOOM

MINUTES SUMMARY

- I. Remarks and questions to the Provost
Provost Jones shared the following:
 1. The campus COVID numbers dipped below 1%. Despite this being good news, COVID remains within the campus community.
 2. NECHE has approved the UNHM/GSC merger Substantive Change document. This document can be found on the Faculty Senate teams site under the 4/11 Senate meeting. Provost Jones thanked the faculty and staff working on the merger committees. The majority of the academic questions are getting resolved in a collaborative way. There will be a few challenging issues that may require the assistance of the deans and department chairs. The state legislature has approved the merger. The legislation is awaiting the governor's signature.
 3. Commencement is coming up. There will be graduation ceremonies on all 3 campuses as well as through all of the colleges. The PhD students will be hooded on Friday and then have the opportunity to sit with their respective colleges on Saturday or Sunday.
 4. The fall enrollment dashboard is up by approximately 10% in deposits. May 1 is the enrollment deadline and the university is approximately two-thirds of way towards full enrollment. There is always an expected surge of deposits as the deadline nears. The concern is with incoming students making deposits at multiple schools. Despite the expense, many students make deposits at multiple institutions. This is why outreach to accepted students is so important. Having a flexible number of incoming students makes hiring new faculty challenging.
 5. Collective bargaining continues. The AAUP for TT faculty is awaiting the fact finders report. Provost Jones is expecting the report as early as Friday though it's more likely to be received at the end of next week. The lecturers' union and administration are actively engaged in bargaining. There have been a couple of meetings and the two have begun to exchange proposals back and forth. There are two full days of bargaining scheduled at the end of May. The NEA, which represents the law school faculty, are meeting regularly and going back and forth with proposals.

Questions for Provost Jones

- A Senator from Paul College acted on behalf of her committee colleague, Ivo Nedyalkov who was not able to attend the meeting. She read a statement/question regarding faculty retention at UNH especially in light of the union negotiations. The Senator was unable to attend today's meeting as he was in the final rounds of interviews for a tenure track position at an institution that is one of the top ten mechanical engineering programs in the country. In speaking with the chair of this respective institution, the Senator learned no one has left the department since the department current chair arrived. This is not true of the mechanical engineering department at UNH. At UNH tenured, tenure track and CCLEAR faculty have left the university. If the UNH

administration considers contract negotiations as related to the financial health of the university, how do you account for the loss of faculty talent and subsequently the potential loss of students? If this is not a goal of negotiations, then what is the goal?

Answer: This is an important question. The university has more than half a dozen faculty where retention may be an issue. This is the nature of higher education and is particularly true with regards to the faculty diversity within the university. With regards to negotiations, the intent is to pay faculty above the median in our competitive sphere. This is challenging due to the dramatic increase in benefit costs and inflation. This had gotten much worse in the last 18-24 months. There is an effort to not increase tuition. There was a time when UNH was increasing its tuition by 3% every year and this hurt enrollment. With regards to faculty leaving the university, it's also a mark of the excellent caliber of faculty at UNH. Faculty should be coveted and sought after. The questioner asked for clarity regarding the goal of negotiations. The answer was both the administration, and the unions, have multiple goals including finances, faculty development, processes, parking, support for faculty outside of financial support among other issues. It's about supporting and respecting the faculty as a core entity of the university. Money is part of the equation and in particular this year as finances have changed so dramatically over the past few years.

Question: A COLA senator asked about what appear to be security cameras on the president's residence. Why? Are these surveillance cameras? Has there been a credible threat to the university? Is this a move towards greater surveillance on campus? Answer: Provost Jones was not aware of the cameras, but suspects they are related to a few instances of vandalism both in front of and behind the president's house. There is not an effort for greater surveillance around campus.

Question: Are there changes in the works with regards to COVID testing and summer? Answer: Not yet. This discussion is in the works. There is hope a message will come out the first week of May. There will be some testing protocol and testing will remain available to anyone who wants a test.

Question: Faculty Senate Chair Kevin Healey asked to revisit comments Provost Jones made related to the merger. There are two Senate committees providing oversight of the policy integration work. Thus far, there has been only one batch of policies for review. Senate is nearing its end for this academic year and the concern is decisions will be made over the summer that lack Senate review and input. Can you confirm those decisions that would fall within the purview of Senate will not be made over the summer when Senate is not in session? The NECHE document that was just approved said many of the final decisions will not be made until the summer of 2023. Correct? Answer: Yes, this is correct. The primary goal is to have decisions coming through the established merger working groups. Faculty Senate is recognized as a merger working group. This process is a bottom-up process. The governor's signature will establish July 1, 2023 as the official merger date. There will not be a full class of students under the new merger until the fall of 2023. The current goal is to have the bulk of the decisions made this Fall (2022) so class recruitment is reflective of what will be the newly merged UNH. The merger committees will be meeting over the summer and if there are items that meet the need for Senate review, those will be placed on hold until Senate is back in session. Provost Jones and the AC meet a few times over the summer, and this would also be an opportunity to share updates, review, etc.

Kevin went on to share that the 2 standing committees currently reviewing the merger documents have not yet completed their work, however, the issue generating the biggest concerns has to do with the 120 vs 128 minimum graduation credits. Provost Jones was asked to address the question of why in order to accommodate GSC students the university is considering an across the board change from 128 credits for UNH to 120 which is the current graduation requirement for GSC students. Answer: In the online education space or non-traditional market, 120 credit hours is the default. This is also NECHE's default. The merger is not interested in lowering the credit hours for any established programs. There will not be an effort to lower the required credit hours in existing UNH programs. In closing Provost Jones shared any sensitive information will be brought to Senate leadership. In addition, a summer schedule for meetings between the chair and vice chair along with Provost Jones will be established. Agenda Committee meetings too.

Provost Jones left the meeting.

- II. Approval of minutes from the 4/11 meeting. After a few edits the minutes were approved by unanimous consent.
- III. Remarks by and questions for the Chair
 - Elections Update: There are 4 under represented departments on Faculty Senate. Several winners and runner-ups have declined the appointment. The vacancies are understandable as everyone is overwhelmed, however, these vacancies are also important in that FS represents the faculty and absent of faculty representation there becomes a question around the integrity of the work of Faculty Senate.

Question: A Senator asked if the motion that was introduced at the 4/11 meeting allowing CCLEAR faculty to be elected in departments with 15 or fewer faculty members would have alleviated this issue? Answer: Vice Chair Matthew MacManes answered, "We don't know." Kevin shared that though this may have helped in filling seats, conversely it may have placed undue pressure on CCLEAR faculty. Amanda shared that in some departments this is true, but in other departments lacking full representation both TT and CCLEAR faculty were on the ballot.

Question: Is this lack of Senate representation a new problem or one that has been ongoing? In a recent committee meeting the committee membership were discussing how Senate participation is almost the same as teaching in terms of the work and time commitment. Faculty may feel Senate is too much work. Would it be possible for smaller departments to share a Senator? Answer: Senate already has two departments that share a Senator, Anthropology and Geography.

Jim Connell went on to clarify that securing Senate representation is not a new problem. In the past, there have been departments that have opted out of Senate representation. Jim continued to share the level of importance university faculty place on the Senate has risen over the past several years. The level to which everyone is overburdened right now may be causing faculty to feel Senate is too much time to add to their existing work load. The questioner reflected on the history of UNH Faculty Senate and talked of how historically Senate has not always been seen as an effective entity. Over the past several years Senate has become a more respected institution. Perhaps for some, there remains a negative impression of Senate. To this end, Senate may need to do some work in conveying a message regarding the important work of Faculty Senate and its

commitment to shared governance. Jim Connell shared the most effective way to convey this message is via department meetings. Members of Senate need to bring their Senate work back to their respective departments via a standing agenda item at department meetings.

Question: A Senator from the English department shared their department has 2 Senators that attend every meeting. Could they alternate and take turns? Answer: Chair Kevin answered no, if you elect two Senators both need to attend or appoint a proxy. Vice Chair Matt reminded the questioner if only one Senator from that department attends the meeting than they get one vote. One Senator cannot represent a department and vote for all Senators from that department. One person, one vote. The questioner asked about the two departments that share a Senator. If they can share a Senator, why can't a department do the same within their department. Answer: Matt clarified the two departments that share a Senator get one vote, not two.

Kevin asked if there is any precedent where Senators are given a course release due to their work on Senate. The Chair is given a course release, but what about sitting Senators? Jim Connell answered he had never heard of that being done, but in his department, there is a spreadsheet of faculty service projects and Senate is one that carries weight, being on the Agenda Committee even more so.

- Update to Honors Program: The honors program is now allowing students to petition to allow upper division honors courses to be used for discovery credit. The example given was an honors student using an honors level history course to meet the history discovery requirement. There is not an expectation there will be a significant number of students taking advantage of this new opportunity, but by allowing students to petition for this option, the honors programs can begin to track the number of students seeking this option. Secondly, in 2014, Faculty Senate passed a motion that allows the honors program to create special courses that fulfill two discovery requirements. The honors program is planning to create a few more of these kinds of courses.

Question: The question was asked if a student petitions to have an upper level course meet a discovery requirement, is that course now considered a discovery course for others? Answer: No. The process will be to send this student's course work to the registrar so that the course can be noted as a discovery course requirement for this student only.

- IV. Amendment After Adoption language on the motion re Student Evaluation of Learning
This motion already passed. Amended language to the motion was left off the motion that was passed. The change in language was to replace "student evaluation of teaching to student evaluations of learning". The amendment after adoption passed by unanimous consent.
- V. Discussion and Vote on AC Constitutional Amendment re AC membership
The amendment would allow any sitting senator to serve on the Agenda Committee. Vice-Chair Matthew MacManes read the proposed language change. The change acknowledged the AC chair and vice chair would remain tenured faculty but would allow any sitting senator to be elected to the three at-large Agenda Committee seats.

The floor was opened to questions and comments. It was noted to pass this amendment, the change requires a 2/3 vote of those present and voting.

No one offered comments or questions. The amendment was put to a vote. The motion passed with 50 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstention.

Kevin asked, what's the implications of this vote? Matt answered the implications are any sitting Senator can be a member of the Agenda Committee in an at-large position. Matt introduced the slate for next year. He shared he had reached out across the university and asked a large number of individuals representing all colleges and both genders to join the AC. He was turned down many times.

Questions: What is the deadline for nominating Senators for any of these positions? Answer: The nominations are from the floor during the May 9 meeting. The newly seated Senate will be voting on these members, not the current Senate. Should there be nominations from the floor, those being nominated must have already agreed to serve.

Question: What is the process for selecting the chair? Answer: The culture or custom is the vice-chair assumes the role of chair. This is not required nor written in the constitution. It's the responsibility of the Agenda Committee to propose the leadership slate for the next year.

A Senator shared she would be interested in serving on the AC as an at-large position member but is in a strange position due to her appointment as a permanent proxy. She comes from a small department which worked around the TT role for the first Senator by electing a tenured faculty member who then appointed her as his permanent proxy. She shared that it is strange that she can serve as a committee chair but is not able to serve in another capacity.

Matt shared this is a difficult situation and they he and this Senator have discussed this issue. In addition, the AC discussed it for weeks. In discussing this particular Senator's participation, the group segued to the other constitutional amendment that was introduced at the 4/11 meeting addressing the provision in the constitution that requires the first Senator from each department be tenured or tenure-track. The amendment in question would allow smaller departments of 15 or fewer to elect a CCLEAR faculty member as its only Senate representative. This amendment has been withdrawn for this year. Even if this amendment was passed now, it would not have any effect until next year's elections.

Question: Is there a tradition or culture on the Agenda Committee that there be representation from all of the colleges? Answer: Yes, this representation is taken into consideration and great effort was made to secure AC participation from across the university. At least 7 individuals that were approached declined to serve.

Comment: A Senator pointed out the gender inequity on the slate and a lack of CCLEAR faculty. How are these positions voted for? Is the vote for a slate or is the election for each individual? Answer: Matt shared that the first 5 individuals he approached for AC were women and all declined. Also, Andrew Seal is a lecturer. With regards to the procedural question regarding how votes are taken, Jim Connell shared that if there are not nominations from the floor, the slate is presented and voted on as one. If there is a nomination from the floor for a specific role, say chair or vice-chair, then there is a vote to determine the winner of that particular position. The more difficult issue is when there is a nomination from the floor for an at-large member. Is this nomination an attempt to block a nominated at-large member from serving or is the nomination

simply a general nomination because the nominator thinks the individual would make a good AC member. There currently is not a procedure in the constitution for handling this situation. If it were to happen, Senate would need to adopt a rule in the moment for handling the situation.

A Senator asked a procedural question regarding the other AC constitutional amendment that has been withdrawn. Jim Connell the parliamentarian clarified that the AC would need to ask permission to withdraw the amendment as it has already been brought to the floor. This issue was set aside for a moment to continue the discussion on the AC slate. The motion was revisited about 10 minutes later, and Kevin asked for a vote by unanimous consent that the AC motion regarding the first Senator rule be withdrawn at this time. There were no objections. The motion was officially withdrawn.

A Senator wanted it noted that the AC is the most important committee of the Senate and the current slate is not equitable. This includes gender, college and experience representation. Matt said he agrees and a few weeks ago, Chair Kevin Healey sent out an email to the Senate and committee chairs and no one stepped up to serve on the AC. No volunteers have stepped forward. The Senator asked what does it mean to table the motion regarding the first Senator being TT? Does this mean it goes away for good or can it be brought back next year? Matt answered he is committing to everyone on Senate that this motion and the need for equity are at the top of his agenda and he assures the group this issue not going away. He will bring the motion back to the Senate in the Fall. This motion will be considered prior to the next round of FS elections happening in the Spring of 2023.

Kevin reiterated that anyone can self nominate or nominate another Senator for a role on AC. This nomination can be given ahead of time or during the meeting on the 9th. The person being nominated must agree ahead of time to accept the position should s/he win. The slate is presented two weeks prior to the vote for this very reason: to ensure the slate meets your satisfaction. A point of clarity, any nomination needs to be for a Senator who is serving next year, not this year.

VI. Discussion and Vote on motion from the Ad Hoc Committee on the Diversity Requirement for GE

Chair Anna Wainwright shared the committee membership with the group. She continued to share the work of the group including:

- The group met with the chair of Senate and appointed a committee chair
- The committee has held 4 full meetings and several subcommittee meetings
- Gathered research on diversity pedagogy and curricula including courses and initiatives already in progress at UNH and comparable institutions.
- Met with the AC and the AAC
- Sent a survey to COLA faculty in collaboration with the COLA committee. Surveys to other faculty are in the preparation.
- The committee began conversations with many stakeholders across campus
- Put forward the motion currently before Senate
- There have been continued conversation with university administrators
- After presenting the motion at the 4/11 meeting, the committee regrouped and tweaked it to reflect Senate feedback. Anna reminded the group that this motion was put forth as part of the charge given to the committee by Senate. The committee will be getting into deeper efforts around what to suggest for diversity requirements in general education and how to create or

suggest ideas for a more inclusive curriculum. The purpose of this motion is to create a foundation for the committee's on-going work. Anna revisited the concern from the 4/11 Senate meeting that the UNH diversity statement does not necessarily reflect individual reality. This sentiment was shared with Nadine Petty who responded the diversity statement is intended to be an aspirational statement and not a reflection of what the university has accomplished.

A Senator asked what do these statements stand for? Where is this defined? Is this coded language? Answer: Anna acknowledged this is the language generally used in higher education. These statements are public university statements available on university web pages which she shared with the group. In addition, Anna shared the diversity requirement statements from other universities. Anna continued to share that in exploring ways to incorporate these concepts into curriculum does not necessarily require traditional learning methods but should give UNH students a vocabulary for talking about race, gender and power relationships.

Anna reiterated the point of the motion is to acknowledge the universities statements regarding DEI and respond with curricular reform.

Following a clarification from the Senator who asked what these words mean, Anna responded the COLA survey that was distributed specifically asked respondents to identify what the different subjects are that respondents would want to see in a diversity requirement. This kind of questioning will be distributed to all the colleges as the committee doesn't want to be vague about how to best meet DEI curriculum inclusion.

A Senator asked how this motion and subsequent Senate action might align with the bills pending in the state legislature? Answer: Anna referred to Kevin and Matt and the academic freedom statement the AC has been working on. When the committee first met, the members asked similar questions and wanted to better understand the parameters around the committee's charge. Many faculty on campus are currently teaching what might be labeled as divisive concepts, but have been assured their academic freedom is intact. Anna referenced a Senator's comments from an earlier meeting noting that these bills could potentially create a scenario where students are arriving on campus less informed and educated on these issues than s/he may have been only a few years prior.

Kevin reminded Senate that prior to issuing charges to the Ad Hoc Committee on Diversity Requirement in GE, the AC asked Nadine Petty to meet with the AC because there was concern about moving forward with this work given potential legislation coming out of the state legislature. This issue has definitely been at the forefront of concerns. Senate has had nothing but support from Nadine Petty, Provost Jones and Tom Cronin.

A Senator reiterated her point from a prior meeting that the committee's work is excellent, important and timely, with the exception of endorsing the UNH Diversity Statement. She remains opposed to the last sentence, "here you belong". This has not been her experience.

Anna appreciated this concern and asked if this Senator would come and speak with the committee as her input and experience is critical to their work. Again, the committee did not write the UNH Diversity Statement, but are endorsing the university's aspirational goal within the statement.

Kevin pointed out that the aspirational statement gives Senate a tool of accountability. By endorsing the statement, Senate acknowledges that it's aspirational and as such Senate intends to hold itself and the university accountable to its stated aspiration.

A Senator appreciated Kevin statements but reiterated aspirational or not, there are those who simply do not feel as though they have been treated as if "they belong". The statement "you are welcome" is perhaps less of a sticking point, but "you belong" is a hallow statement for some. By endorsing the statement, it would diminish the feeling and survey feedback from many who have felt unwelcome.

Another Senator thanked Anna for the work of her committee but shared she is more inclined to agree with the sentiments of the previous Senator's comments and less inclined to agree with Kevin. She took issue with the idea of by "endorsing an aspiration", Senate will hold itself accountable. The two ideas mean different things. What is the purpose of this motion? Is our role as Senate to endorse aspirations? If this aspiration is endorsed, then why not another? This feels like a lot of walk without a lot of talk. Endorsing an aspiration feels hallow.

Chair Kevin responded that the reason the AC encouraged the committee to offer this motion as a first step is to give credence to future work of the committee which is to develop a set of learning outcomes for changing the university's general education curriculum. If the university has these statements, but there is not an adjustment or revision to the gen ed curriculum in such a way that every UNH student encounters these principles in a purposeful way in the classroom then there is no integrity to these statements or our curriculum. Although this might be a performative gesture Senate has appointed this ad hoc committee to explore changes to the curriculum. The first step is to identify the university's statements related to these issues and then figure out how to integrate these principles into our curriculum in a way that has not yet been done. Doing so not only gives integrity to the statements but also to the commitment we have made to our students.

Anna shared she has zero interest in participating in empty gestures and if endorsing these statements was the purpose for the committee, this would be a silly committee. Anna shared a slide of the original charges given to the committee at last year's Faculty Senate meeting.

A Senator asked what would be the pragmatic tool or enabling motion that will ensure Senate remains accountable to their endorsement of an aspirational statement? Rather than address this question directly, Kevin shared he and Matt felt this discussion needed more time than was available at today's meeting. He suggested there not be a vote today and the motion and conversation be revisited at the next Faculty Senate meeting. Anna shared she agreed and reiterated the action behind the motion is for the committee to put forth actual changes to the curriculum that reflect the sentiment of these university statements. Kevin said the AC will ensure this motion is on the agenda for the next FS meeting and encouraged Senators with thoughts or comments to reach out to Anna directly.

A conversation ensued regarding the procedural requirements of postponing the discussion. The decision was to postpone by unanimous consent to revisit the motion at the May 9 meeting of Faculty Senate. The chair asked for unanimous consent without objection to postpone a discussion and vote until the May 9 meeting.

There was one objection. This objection required Senate discuss the objection. Vice Chair Matt MacManes stated, "I would argue that we need more time to allow for more voices to be heard and as a

result I would respectfully request that we postpone this discussion until the next meeting when we can have a more full discussion.”

A vote was called on the Chair’s request to postpone the discussion and vote until the May 9 meeting. The vote count was 42 in favor, 1 opposed and no abstentions.

The meeting was adjourned.