

University of New Hampshire

University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository

Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes

Faculty Senate Documents

5-2-2022

2021-2022 FACULTY SENATE XXVI - May 2, 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 - May 2, 2022 Minutes Summary" (2022). *Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes*. 68.

https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty_senate_agendas_minutes/68

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 4:00 PM on May 2, 2022, via ZOOM

MINUTES SUMMARY

- I. Discussion on the motion of the Ad Hoc Committee on Diversity Requirement in GE (AHCDRGE) Committee chair Anna Wainwright thanked everyone for their comments and thoughts regarding the motion that was put forth by the AHCDRGE. Anna shared based on everyone's feedback and the dissatisfaction with the university's diversity statements, the best course of action is to withdraw the motion. The committee can revisit the motion when they put forth their initial learning objectives. The committee is committed to a continued and transparent conversation with their work continuing in the Fall.

Chair Kevin Healey asked Jim Connell a parliamentary question regarding whether Anna would need to ask leave of Senate to withdraw the motion. If yes, can we do that by unanimous consent? Answer: Jim Connell answered, yes that is correct. Anna then asked leave to withdrawal the motion.

Kevin offered thoughts regarding the process of crafting a motion and presenting it to Senate. The benefit is not in the passage, but instead in the process. Introducing a motion and opening it up for conversation provides clarity. In this instance, Senate has significant concerns about the university's public facing statements about DEI. Most important, is that last year the students demanded a change to the gen ed curriculum at UNH that specifically addresses issues of DEI. That is why the AHCDRGE was formed. Kevin recommends next year's leadership recharge Anna's committee with recommending potential changes or updates to the university's diversity statements so there is coherence between the public statements and student learning outcomes that the committee is planning to develop.

Statements from the floor: A Senator shared she does not think there was any disagreement with the charge of the AHCDRGE, but in fact welcomes changes to the Discovery program. Instead, the issue is Senate was unprepared to deal with this motion as it came as a surprise.

A Senator thanked the committee and suggested that perhaps their work was not given a fair shake. The Senate body sometimes allows the perfect to be the enemy of good. It would be wonderful if Senate could accept something in response to what our students are requesting. It would be unfortunate to allow this to carry into next year.

Another Senator noted that Senate has been talking about this Discovery change for a long time but has done nothing. Senate should agree that we are in agreement with the university's DEI goals. Senate unanimously agreed, with the exception of this Senator, on the university's Land Acknowledgement Statement despite potentially problematic language in the motion. Here all Senate is saying is we are committed to the DEI goals the university has laid out. This provides a rationale going forward for

making DEI curricular changes. Additionally, the Senate does not have to act as a unified body. There are times when Senators will disagree. That is acceptable.

Kevin shared he feels some responsibility for this conversation given he was part of the Agenda Committee that developed the ad hoc committee. The work of the committee thus far, goes far past the language in this motion. The motion does not reflect the hours of research and outreach the committee has engaged in, and in many ways, the work and mission of the committee is not captured in the motion. In addition, the Senate already approved the charges of this committee in the same way it approved the GERC. These two committees in and of themselves are a measure of Senate's commitment to issues of DEI. Nadine Petty was deeply involved in the formation of this committee.

Anna agreed. This motion was reflective of the initial charge given to the committee but is a small percentage of what the committee has been talking about and working on within the committee.

Kevin shared that he is hearing lots of discussion, but no objections to withdraw the motion. Without objections to Anna's request to withdraw, the motion will be withdrawn.

A senator did share an objection to the withdrawal. The Senator suggested the Senate vote on the amendment and see what the vote yields. The Senate parliamentarian was asked for procedural guidance on the suggestion.

The Senator who had originally been opposed to the statement "you belong" asked if she were the reason the motion was being withdrawn. She did not oppose the motion, just the last sentence in the university's diversity statement. She agreed the motion should be put to a vote and would be voting in favor.

Given the objection to withdrawal, the motion remained active. A clarifying procedural question was asked as to whether the motion could still be put on next Monday's agenda. The answer was, first Senate needs to vote on the withdrawal of the motion, then there can be a vote to put it on Monday's agenda.

The chair called for a vote regarding the request to withdraw. The vote count was 11 votes in favor of withdrawing the motion, 39 opposed to withdrawal, 2 abstentions.

The motion stands. A discussion ensued whether or not a vote should be taken now regarding passage of the motion.

The chair called for a vote on the motion. The motion passed with 51 in favor, 1 opposed and 2 abstentions.

II. Senate Rule for floor nomination to Agenda Committee

On behalf of the Agenda Committee Vice-Chair Matthew MacManes introduced a rule pertaining to nominations from the floor for members of Agenda Committee. There are constitutional rules with regards to who can be nominated to a given position on the Agenda Committee. Matt read the language of the proposed rule. The newly added language reads, "no Senator shall be nominated more than once for the same office, i.e. Chair, Vice-Chair or at-large members." In other words, one person can't be repeatedly nominated for an at-large seat. Doing so would give that person an unfair advantage. Language was clarified stating this rule pertains to any given Senate meeting.

A question was asked with regards to the at-large members of the AC and if a nomination is made from the floor, is that nomination against all three at-large nominees on the slate, or just one of the nominees. Would there be an election where all 4 (or more) names are put on a ballot and the top three names are the winners? If it's a specific nominee is that person named? Matt suggested numbering the at-large positions 1, 2 and 3. Jim Connell shared this assignment of numbers would need to be random. Kevin reminded the group that the concern with the AC slate as presented revolved around college and gender representation, so it stands to reason the floor nomination would be to address this issue. There was talk of a Zoom vote. Both Vidya Sundar and Kevin encouraged those planning to nominate either themselves or another to please make Senate aware. The AC wants the votes to be fair, but efficient as well.

III. Introduction and discussion of RPSC motion on DEI inclusion in P and T

RPSC chair Ivo Nedyalkov shared he recently followed up with Provost Jones on previous motions passed by Faculty Senate related to Engaged Scholarship and outreach to high schools as they relate to activities valued by administration for promotion and tenure. It was further brought to Ivo's attention that CDO Nadine Petty was interested in DEI being valued by administration for the purposes of promotion and tenure. Currently, there is no Senate motion that explicitly states DEI should be a valued part of the faculty review process.

The RPSC put together a motion recommending faculty efforts related to Diversity, Equity, Inclusion and Access (DEIA) be recognized as a valued element of faculty portfolios. Secondly, the motion instructs the RPSC to make recommendations for appropriate modifications to Faculty Activity Reports, P and T guidelines, instructions and criteria statements to explicitly include language related to DEIA.

A Senator asked if this would count towards the community outreach portion of a faculty portfolio? Adding this component would not fit in the teaching or research component. Where would it go? Answer: Originally the committee agreed adding this element would best fit in the service component, but upon further discussion the group determined there may be times when these concepts could be incorporated into both the research and teaching component of a faculty portfolio. Keeping the element broad leaves room for greater interpretation.

A friendly amendment was offered to change the language from "Promotion and Tenure guidelines,..." to "Promotion and Tenure guidelines, retention decisions..."

A Senator sought clarity on the purpose of the motion. Is the purpose to advise departments on what they should value in their faculty? How are those activities that faculty might be doing not captured already? Most departments already place a high value on service. The Senator felt unsure about making a university-wide recommendation about what departments ought to be looking for in their respective faculty members. Answer: The motion has two parts. The first ensures the DEI work being done by faculty is recognized as a valuable contribution to their faculty portfolio. Secondly the motion instructs the RPSC to incorporate DEI language into the documents noted.

IV. Introduction and discussion on Faculty Senate Resolution on Academic Freedom

Kevin introduced the resolution and shared it was developed by using the AAUP-UNH sample template. The sample language was revised to reflect the needs of those UNH individuals meeting regularly with members of the New Hampshire state legislature. This resolution is crafted specifically with that audience in mind and is intended to be a leveraging tool for individuals such as Tom Cronin in his lobbying work on behalf of the university system. Had the target audience for this piece been different, the language may

have been different too. This is a collaborative effort between Kevin on behalf of Senate, Tom Cronin and Provost Jones.

A Senator suggested removing the term “undue” with regards to political interference. Kevin agreed. Senators were encouraged to review prior to the discussion at the Monday, May 9 meeting.

The meeting was adjourned.