

University of New Hampshire

University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository

Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes

Faculty Senate Documents

3-15-2021

2020-2021 FACULTY SENATE XXV - March 15, 2021 Minutes Summary

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "2020-2021 FACULTY SENATE XXV - March 15, 2021 Minutes Summary" (2021). *Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes*. 97.

https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty_senate_agendas_minutes/97

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
2020-2021 FACULTY SENATE XXV

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 March 15, 2021, via ZOOM MINUTES SUMMARY

I. Roll: The following senator was absent: Innis and Knowles. The following were guests: Wayne Jones, Kate Ziemer, Scott Smith, Nicky Gullace, and Nick Fitzgerald.

II. Remarks by and questions to the provost – Provost Wayne Jones provided the following updates:

- The COVID infection numbers are holding in the mid-teens as can be seen on the university's COVID-19 Dashboard. The off-campus numbers have gotten better. The data is being tracked closely.
- Commencement planning is taking place. The current plan is to do a face-to-face ceremony with people that are in the testing program. UNH Manchester and UNH Law are planning ceremonies outside in a parking lot or a field, possibly with some guests.
- More than 21,000 completed applications have been submitted for undergraduate admission. This is 8% ahead of applications last year. Out of state applications are particularly strong, particularly with applicants from Massachusetts, New York, and New Jersey which are all up by double-digit percentages.
- Wayne shared thanks to all faculty serving on search committees. The diversity of the pools is significantly better than in the past and offers have been made to a number of diverse candidates.

Another way to diversify the faculty is through the new Opportunity Hiring Program. The program framework is now officially approved and is being distributed to departments by deans. The framework was built with longevity in mind. There is an opportunity for departments to identify if they have an opportunity to help diversify their faculty, either from within a current search or from a new search through an expedited process. It is anticipated that there will be between one and four lines under the program that could start as early as the fall semester. For fall hires, information needs to be submitted to deans by April 2.

The provost offered to take questions.

A Paul College senator asked if there was any progress in pushing the state to include higher ed in the education prioritization phase for the vaccine. Currently, that phase only includes K-12 educators.

Wayne responded that he continues to advocate whenever he has a window to do so. As well, Marian McCord and Chief Paul Dean go to two DHHS meetings a week and they continue to advocate for the same.

The Biden administration's release of more vaccines, and its projection that everyone will be eligible by May 1, has kind of shifted the state's mindset in terms of opening things up.

UNH was approved as a point of distribution for vaccines. Now it's just a matter of the supply. The state is also aware that UNH is happy to distribute any extra vaccines that become available.

A COLA senator asked about COVID Recovery Act funds and asked if UNH will be compensated for every shot that it administers. Also, are we just getting any other monies from the recovery act?

Wayne shared that there are three components to the funding that will come to UNH.

One piece is flow-thru money amounting to between \$11 and \$14 million. Fifty percent of that money has to go directly to students but not in the form of financial aid. Instead, it literally has to go to help students in their day-to-day living. Fifty percent is for us to use however we like. The other component of the stimulus funds is to support the testing program and to support the state in various ways, including small business development and things like that. That amount of funding has to go through the state process, so there is no estimate for that yet.

These funds don't go all the way to covering the \$60 million shortfall, but it helps, and we are thankful for it. The state has been a great partner. While we are not delivering any vaccine doses right now, the state has been very supportive of our testing and sequencing program.

A COLA senator asked about USNH's proposal for dramatically cutting parental leave for tenure track faculty. She said that given the university's ongoing promotion of our improved research status and the research output of our faculty, this move would, in practice, really undermine the research and careers particularly of younger women faculty, as well as others. Why is the university considering a move like this?

Wayne responded that there are many components to this issue. This is a collective bargaining issue and so our position has been that we do those negotiations in private, so we don't put out public statements about them. The changes and the benefits are getting pushed by many different sources. It is certainly not unilateral from UNH. Our healthcare providers have been changing the way that they've been structuring things for us. Also, the size of our benefit pool has been changing because of the different numbers of people in different plans across the system.

Wayne said that he remains committed to making sure that everyone has access, that young female faculty have access to the same level of benefits that we've talked about in terms of number of weeks of parental leave, for example. However, because of our health care benefit changes, some of those benefits have taken different forms. He said that he is going to leave that to the union folks to continue negotiations in private but that he would like to see us provide more ways to provide different types of support to all faculty. And we certainly would not want to disadvantage our female research faculty and our junior faculty that might need it.

Erin Sharp, the Faculty Senate chair, pointed out that the Senate will be discussing the Discovery Review Committee recommendations today. She asked Wayne if he wanted to say anything about this.

Wayne thanked the Senate for the work it is doing on the Discovery Program and said that it is critical that we keep our students at the center. The Discovery program was designed to support our students by supporting the breadth of education that we all know is so important.

Wayne shared that we did work with Erin and with folks in the administration to put up an FAQ about this, including a statement that Discovery program should not be designed around how it can generate more or less revenue. He said that he is making the commitment that with the Discovery program that is proposed, there would be no direct financial impact on colleges. We want to shift the new budget model so that it's really being driven not by revenue of colleges and partners, but rather by and where the students need their support. He encouraged the Senate to focus on what is going to be the best for our students and their education, and that he will remain focused on making sure that there's no direct impact on the colleges as a result of this as part of the new budget model.

The new budget model will go into effect for fiscal year 23. It hasn't been refreshed since 1999 and is overdue. It isn't clear yet what the new model will look like, but there is a commitment that it will be designed in a manner where Discovery is not going to be a driver of revenue.

Erin added that Stephen Trzaskoma is serving as the Faculty Senate representative on the budget planning committee. He is on leave this semester so she will follow up on this. Wayne said that there will be two faculty representatives on that group. Right now, the energy is on getting the fiscal year 22 budget uploaded and that will happen within the next three weeks. At that point, the energy will pivot to looking at the new budget model with the goal that the committee will deliver a rough draft of a model to the campus community by September for feedback. It can then be tweaked for implementation in the January/February timeframe.

III. Remarks by and questions to the chair - Erin Sharp, the Senate chair, shared the following remarks:

- The Student Senate passed a resolution asking faculty to check student Wildcat Passes during face-to-face classes.

-The Agenda Committee did receive a letter of dissent from Andrew Coppens in connection with the procedural motion to suspend the rules at our last Senate meeting on the motion about extending the fully online add/drop process.

Erin reviewed the Senate's procedural rule on substantive main motions which says that the Senate will hold motions over and not vote on them until the next meeting in order for Senate representatives to talk with their colleagues about a proposed motion. Although "substantive" is not fully defined in the rule, the assumption is any decision to suspend the rule should be done very conservatively and generally only in cases where there is a time related urgency.

Erin thanked Andrew for submitting the letter and she thanked the Senate for thinking about these issues and taking service seriously.

- Erin shared that the Agenda Committee also recognized that when meetings were in-person, there was an opportunity for the chair to consult privately with the parliamentarian if questions about procedure came up. In an effort to have a similar opportunity, we will be using a Zoom breakout room for the chair and the parliamentarian to discuss procedural questions, if needed.

IV. Approval of the minutes from February 22, 2021 - It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of February 22. Corrections were offered in sections III, VII, VIII, IX. Thus adjusted, the minutes were unanimously approved with 3 abstentions.

V. Finance and Administration (FAC) report on Headcount - Jeffrey Halpern, chair of the FAC, presented a faculty headcount report that tracks trends from 2005 to 2021. The full report was sent with the meeting agenda. He made the following points:

- The report is based on the number of faculty. So, if one faculty is only working quarter time for whatever reason, they're counted as a single digit here.
- FTE data is included in a separate Excel file that he can make available upon request. It will also be shared in the Senate newsletter.
- There are some slight discrepancies between headcount and FTE, but we decided as a community that head count would be better represented.
- For tenure-track faculty, we see a 6.2% reduction in all tenure-track faculty over the past five years (624 to 585 total headcount). Separating it out by rank is more in the area of associate professors, less in the others.
- A 16 percent reduction in lecturer faculty in the past five years (218 to 183 total headcount).
- Undergraduate enrollment is down about 7.8% over the past five years. Graduate student enrollment is up 7.2%. UNH Law enrollment is up 71.8%.
- The reductions in faculty could lead to workload and imbalances. The committee has discussed this but not sure how to look at this.
- The committee has been talking in greater depth about changes in FTE and workload. There is a downward trend in faculty, a downward trend in undergraduate enrollment, but there is an upward trend and graduate students there is an upward trend, at least in stem field of research output, as well as possible other fields.
- The largest changes in the past five years are to Lecturers and Associate Professors.

Usually, this data would be looked at in terms of credit hour generation, however, Provost Jones commented that the way that credit hour is calculated now is not the same way as it was calculated five years ago.

- Adjuncts are not captured in this data.

- A remaining big question that the committee wants to look at is a breakdown by lecturer rank because we do have a breakdown of rank within tenure track faculty.

Jeffrey offered to take questions.

The chair asked if the data takes into account the retirements we have seen this year?

Jeffrey responded that the data is as of October 2020 and does not include CERP retirements taken at the beginning of 2020. We do not know what the data will look like after this. We are interested in seeing that data, but we're probably not going to see that till next year.

A COLA senator asked if the headcount data can be disaggregated by college and/or department. He said that in his department tenure track positions are down 50% since 2015. The desegregation might really help in looking at questions about workload.

Jeffrey responded that the breakdown of data is available by college and he displayed a spreadsheet showing that in COLA, the number of associate professors between 2017 and 2021 went from 91 to 76. For lecturers, the number went from 120 to 83 in the same time period.

The FAC made a strong point that it does not know what this college data means. We cannot draw conclusions on why one college may have a downward trend versus another. We do not have a breakdown by department. The committee didn't ask for that and we aren't sure if that is necessarily going to be helpful at this time.

A COLSA senator asked for some clarification as to why “credit hours” is not something that the university can provide. The FTE information is not really that informative with regards to headcount because many lecturers are employed at 88% almost automatically when they're brought to campus. He said that he would like to see credit hours just because that would seem to affect tenure. For tenure track faculty, the growth in lecturers teaching courses on campus would be something to be concerned about. The question is why credit hours are no longer available to look at for lecturers and tenure-track faculty and clinical faculty as well.

Jeffrey said that he can't speak on behalf of Provost Jones or the administration, but he understands from information shared with the committee is that the way credit hour generation was shared with the community in the past was wrong and is being reassessed. Apparently, the calculations behind this were incorrect.

Erin suggested that it might be useful to ask Provost Jones to address this question at the next Senate meeting and also to discuss recent retirements and where faculty hiring is happening.

Jeffrey said that he wants to clarify that the issue with credit hour generation is due to the way it was calculated compared to how it is calculated now. The provost is hoping to get back into that starting next year. And so, it's not that he's against calculating it, but he would have to go into more detail of that discrepancy and what that means.

A COLA senator encouraged the committee to get the data on adjuncts. She said that as part of collective bargaining there has been advocacy for this but was told that there was no way for the System to produce this information because of the way that the codes are linked. She was told that if someone is doing a short-term contract in dining services, they're considered an adjunct and that there is no way of teasing those people out from adjunct faculty. This seems to be deeply problematic for a number of reasons so if there is any way that Senate can aggressively and vociferously advocate that those codes be changed so that we actually have the ability to account for adjuncts, that would be amazing.

Jeffrey suggested that the committee might pursue this issue through the use of a motion. The request for adjunct data is something that the committee aggressively pursued in the last meeting with Provost Jones, and he gave a similar answer and he also pointed out that when some administrators teach, they get coded as an adjunct or we have some other things that get coded, and it seems very confusing. But we should be able to track who is having classroom instructorship, who is given to the research mission, and how that's being coded. This is part of what the committee is going to be discussing and how we might be able to provide recommendations to the administration. There seems like there's a disconnect because the administration does not see that as a concern, but the committee does see it as a concern.

The same COLA senator said that she thinks that FTE is an important consideration. Most lecturers are hired at 88%. But an FTE look would be really quite important when you're looking at the overall lecturer numbers. Because as a result of collective bargaining and workload issues that have been considered through grievances, a number of lecturers had been changed to 1.0 FTE. So that might be something that is contextualizing. Certainly, there are college differences, and we know that the big hit in COLA a few years ago is in part responsible for the dip in our numbers. But it might be worth looking at FTE and how that's changed over time.

Jeffrey shared a spreadsheet with FTE data broken down by rank as well as by College. Jeffrey provided the Box link to the data in Chat and indicated that he is also willing to send it by email upon request.

The same COLA senator asked if it is known when Provost Jones is providing the credit hour data and if that will be a retrospective look or is that just going to be in the last couple of years or perhaps even worse, prospective from the time that the change in consideration of the data happens.

Jeffrey asked others on the committee if they had information on this and Stephen Pimpare said that his memory is that the provost offered that he could provide prospective data but was not willing to commit to doing any retrospective data because of the concerns about how those have been calculated across multiple systems in the past.

Erin thanked the FAC for their work and suggested that there will be follow ups. She offered that the Excel data sheet will be sent out in the Senate's newsletter this week. She suggested that senators contact Jeffrey and her by email with questions or things that they want to see.

Erin also shared that several years ago another Senate FAC did a similar report that did include the nuances of adjuncts. It also included a look at administration changes in relationship to faculty changes.

She offered to share that earlier report as well. At that time, the committee felt that it was important for colleges and administration to be talking about what the right mix of faculty type on campus and that is really central to decision-making. There may be some good motions to come out of this work.

VI. Research and Public Service Committee (RPSC) report on Engaged Scholarship – Ivo Nedyalkov, chair of the RPSC, shared the committee’s report that has been previously shared with the Senate. He said that the essence of the report includes a definition for engaged scholarship, which is based on a lot of items that the committee reviewed, including literature and the survey that was presented last year by the committee. The definition is: “The mutually-beneficial collaboration between UNH and external partners for the purpose of creating and applying knowledge to address societal problems and to enrich student learning.”

The report also includes a suggestion for updating promotion and tenure documents to include engaged scholarship as part of the process. He said that the report indicates that this is not required and is not a requirement for promotion and tenure. But for people who perform engaged scholarship, this is something that should be included in the evaluation and count towards their work.

In addition, there is a suggestion that this kind of activity should be included in the Faculty Activity Reports (FAR) regardless of faculty rank. Again, this is not something that has to be included in every faculty member’s work. But, if one performs such activity, it should be pointed out and in some form be appreciated by the department, the college, and the university.

Another important essence of the report is a proposal to establish an annual Presidential award for engaged scholarship. This seems to be supported by some faculty and hopefully most, if not all, faculty. It is something that the administration is interested in having to promote engaged scholarship since this is an important aspect of having a successful university.

Ivo offered to take questions.

A COLA senator thanked Ivo for the report. He said that one concern from a colleague was about the distinction between engaged scholarship and consultancy work since the proposal is to exclude from engaged scholarship anything that is compensated in monetary terms. He said that her worry was that she has experience working with community groups and receiving a very small nominal honorarium payments, which really doesn't amount to anything that you could really call a consultancy fee. He asked wouldn't it be right for that kind of activity is still to be regarded as engaged scholarship, even though it does provide nominal compensation.

After some discussion about where this is included in the report, page 6, Ivo and another member of the committee agreed to neaten up the language that excludes compensated work.

Ivo said that the committee will be working to identify any motions about implementing the recommendations in the report and will bring those to the Senate.

VII. Discussion on Agenda Committee motion on the Discovery Review Committee Proposal -

Erin Sharp, Senate chair, reviewed that at the end of the February 22 meeting the Agenda Committee moved the following motion onto the floor:

The Faculty Senate endorses the Discovery Review Committee's recommended changes to the UNH general education program as presented to the Faculty Senate on February 8, 2021.

Erin thanked Scott Smith, co-chair of the Discovery Review Committee (DRC), for continuing to be available even though his service on the DRC ended in September. She shared that Scott and Nicky Gullace have met with several departments independently. They have tried to respond to every question, and they have helped to develop some FAQs that were recently sent out to the Senate.

Erin invited Scott to share any comments before discussion on the motion begins:

Scott Smith, co-chair, DRC: I just want to just thank everyone on the Senate and the Agenda committee for the process. I'm quite sure that Nicky and I have not allayed every concern that has been voiced, but we have taken in everything and we have tried to hear everyone's views. I just want to make three very brief comments.

The first point is I would say that the proposed changes are fearful for some people. I'm coming from a department that will likely also lose some enrollments if this is voted in. I share some of those concerns. But I've come to believe that, in toto, this proposal is good for the students and good for the university despite the apparent risk to an individual department. The committee really worked hard to come up with changes that move us forward, but that do not disrupt the whole.

Second, I would just remind senators that the process has been thus far faculty- driven and there has not even been a scintilla of pressure from central administration. This proposal has the backing of university leadership, nonetheless. The students have consistently supported it, including and especially the diversity requirement, the attention to sustainability, and the addition of a democratic governance attribute.

And third point is this. This is the rub. We really can't do everything; especially as major requirements have risen dramatically. The proposal under consideration allows us to introduce some important components in a 20th century general education program, while not abandoning the core commitments that we think are indispensable.

It is for the Senate to deliberate on this proposal and vote. I only ask you to consider the overall benefits to students who support the changes and to the university whose strategic priorities are reflected in part in this proposal. I'm happy to stay for further deliberation and comments. I'm also happy to step off so that the deliberations can be completely honest without any fear of offending the person who chaired this thing. I want you not to fear that I'm happy to take any further criticism or comments as well.

Erin: Thank you, Scott. I actually think having you here for questions and clarifications would be great. I have no problem with that.

Before we go to questions, I wanted to just give Nick Fitzgerald, the student body president, just a moment to say anything about the DRC recommendation.

Nick Fitzgerald, Student Body President: I popped in on the process over the summer and I'm glad to see all the progress that's been made on it. It follows the platform that got me elected to this office. In conversations with various student organizations including the diversity support coalition, they have all been extremely in support of this proposal as has the Student Senate in general. To me, it seems like the vast majority of students are going to be in support for multiple reasons, one being the diversity element. Also, the fact that it does take off and free up some credit space to allow students to take that and not be so stressed out about their major requirements or take that and maybe take it towards fulfilling a minor. Overall, I've been seeing a lot of positive feedback on the student side of things in support of this.

Erin: Thank you, Nick. As we go to questions, I just want to remind everybody of a few things. Even though the Agenda Committee put this motion forward, this is based on findings from another group, so there are not going to be the friendly amendments. So, if there are changes, they'll have to come as motions.

Please focus on the comments that are germane to the discussion and be concise so as many voices can be heard. We have heard a lot of the same voices. We would also like to make sure to hear new voices, including voices of support and voices of concern today. I will turn it over to Kevin [Senate vice chair] to moderate the discussion.

UNH Manchester senator: I would like to speak in opposition to the motion as it stands, making sure to bracket my appreciation to Scott and the committee for extraordinary work on an absolutely, completely, and totally impossible task.

That said, the clear direction from Manchester faculty is that if our only option is to vote up or down on this proposal in its current form, they would have us vote "no." There are a range of concerns that our faculty have expressed. Many of those have been shared broadly across the university and reporting into the Qualtrics survey. I won't touch on those. . Others we have heard articulated here previously by our colleagues in this forum. I won't repeat those. I do want to share two concerns that I think have not been brought up and then I want to offer a suggestion.

We have particular concerns about the impact of this on our transfer students. More than 60 percent of all Manchester students are transfers, and that number is actually higher in some of our programs. We have 44 existing pathway agreement programs with New Hampshire and Massachusetts community colleges that would be affected by this? There are a lot of aspects to that, but here's the big one. We are concerned, particularly, about the stackable attributes approach. We worry about confusion and complexity. Others have articulated that, but we also particularly worry about how hard they will be to transfer, what that means for our enrollments and what that means for our students. Programs and departments across the university are going to act strategically and try to make as many courses as possible stackable knowledge attribute courses and we have, in fact, been told that this is an expectation of this proposal. Students presumably will also be seeking out those stacked courses because that's one of the ways in which they can reduce their Discovery obligations. This is going to put our transfer students at a disadvantage. I do just want to highlight that one of the original charges to the Discovery Review Committee was "to investigate ways the Discovery program can develop the

flexibility to allow transfer students to achieve their degrees in a timely fashion.” It is our judgment that the proposal before us makes this problem worse than it does better and we think that with the recently announced merger, this is likely to become a problem for other programs and departments as well.

The second concern is about the transition program itself and the implications across the university for workload. We will all need to teach out the current Discovery Program for any student who enters under a catalog year with it. So that means we're going to be offering two curricula for six years, for seven years, maybe for eight years. And that problem is made more acute in some departments because of CERP requirements and the lack of clarity of which of those lines they are going to articulate.

So, a question that a number of us have asked from the beginning of this process has been, can we achieve our core goals while creating less disruption, less confusion, and less work for chairs, program coordinators, and others? In that vein, I want to quickly offer an alternate way of thinking about the task before us.

Can we separate out the pieces of this proposal and think about voting on each separately instead of the entire thing as a package? For example, there seems to be minimal opposition to eliminating Inquiry given the ways in which it has not functioned the way that it was originally envisioned. There also appears to be widespread support for a new diversity category. So, can we create a standalone motion to replace Inquiry with diversity? That achieves one of our core goals with minimal disruption. Then we could separately evaluate ways to reduce Discovery credits from among the options that are currently on the table. For example, a motion to eliminate the ETS, a motion to eliminate the lab requirement, a motion to reduce the number of science requirements, a motion to reduce required Discovery courses from 7 to 6, etc.

Lastly, we want more civic ed or sustainability. We could charge the Discovery Committee with, for example, altering the criteria for existing Discovery categories so that over a time a certain percentage of those courses foreground civic education content or create a civic engagement minor or digital badges or certificates. Again, with sustainability.

Here's the point - If we take an approach such as this alternate one, does that achieve most of what the proposal before us does with less disruption, lower transition costs, and less complexity?

I do have a proposed substitute motion on that question.

Erin: Yes. We have talked about the process and procedure quite a bit in the Agenda Committee and our recommendation is if you have an amendment to bring to the floor, bring it to the floor. That is what this deliberative process is for. You have that that option to bring a motion and a motion in an amendment to the floor for consideration?

Manchester senator: Do we put the motion on the table before we have discussion about the motion?

Jim Connell, parliamentarian: You are making a motion to replace the motion that's on the floor. So, it is an amendment by substitution. That will require a second.

Before you do that, I just want to remark, based on one of your points, that the Discovery Review Committee has presented its report, so it no longer exists as such. So, if your goal is to send this to a committee or an ad hoc committee, you're going to have to create one.

Manchester senator: the motion does not do that.

Jim: I wanted you to be aware. So, if you have a motion to amend by substitution and it gets seconded, then we have to discuss the motion to amend by substitution. That becomes the germane topic unless there are additional motions related to it.

Erin: With Nicky here and wanting to response to the questions, is there an order in which that should happen?

Jim: The first thing to do is determine whether it is seconded.

COLSA senator: Ok. I'll second the motion for discussion.

Jim: Then the discussion has to be germane to the motion to amend and it may well be.

The **Manchester senator** shared his screen with the full text of the motion and read the motion, as follows:

MOTION DRAFT

PURPOSE: To Substitute the current Motion to Endorse DRC Recommendations (2/8/2021) with this directive to articulate a plan for separate motions on discrete elements of that proposal in an effort to achieve comparable goals with less disruption.

MOTION: In response to the DRC's recommended changes to the UNH general education program as presented to the Faculty Senate on February 8, 2021, the Faculty Senate directs that there be created:

A stand-alone Motion to replace the current Inquiry requirement with a Diversity category.

Stand-alone Motions on approaches to reducing Discovery credit requirements, to include:

- **eliminate ETS category**
- **eliminate lab requirement**
- **of X Discovery categories, students only need to take X-1 [X-2]**
- **allow either/or option for Discovery science categories (or only 1 of 2)**
- **others as they see fit**

Stand-alone Motion to allow upper-division courses to carry Discovery credit

Stand-alone Motions to charge Discovery Committee with developing a plan to incorporate Civic Education content into relevant Discovery Knowledge categories (SS, HIST, HUMA, FPA?) AND/OR to charge the appropriate standing Committee with exploring options for Civic Ed content (such as Minors, Digital Badges, and Certificates)

Stand-alone Motions to charge Discovery Committee with developing a plan to incorporate Sustainability content into relevant Discovery Knowledge categories AND/OR to charge the appropriate standing Committee with exploring options for Sustainability content (such as Minors, Digital Badges, and Certificates)

And other such stand-alone Motions as they deem relevant and in furtherance of the DRC charge of 2019

Erin: We can have discussion that is only germane to this substitute motion and we will focus that conversation now.

Nicky Gullace, Faculty Director, Discovery: The suggestion of replacing Inquiry with diversity is not a one-to-one substitution. Only 15% of our students take Inquiry as a standalone category. And most of the highly structured ABET majors take Inquiry as an attribute of a laboratory course. So, removing that requirement will not mean much to most students. It will only mean something to a very small number of students who take that. Whereas we're proposing a diversity requirement that every student would take. So, it would still end up being an additional requirement for the ABET programs.

It would be workable if we reduce the number of categories. If students were allowed to choose to take a certain number of categories, then students in the ABET programs could choose to not take something instead. But unless we also incorporate bullet point number three, the ABET heavy programs incorporate both the ETS and Inquiry.

Kevin: I wonder if the best order to go here. Is there anyone on the Agenda Committee who can respond to Nicky's comment?

COLA Senator 1: I was going to comment on this motion to replace the motion and point out a couple of concerns that I have about this motion. They are related to what Nicky said, but not directly on the same point.

So, the current proposal takes the number of required Discovery categories from 10 to 9. This one does not do that. The ETS categories, one of those eliminated by the current proposal, but the current proposal also eliminates the World Cultures requirement as a standalone. So, this motion to replace the motion would maintain the same burden on current students as the current Discovery program and that burden is particularly heavy on students in high requirement majors such as those that are in Engineering. So, this fails one of the primary goals of the Discovery review, which was to make the Discovery program more flexible for students.

Also, we're actually not voting on anything specific in category 3 because it says of ten Discovery category students, students need only take ten minus one or ten minus two. We would have to pick. So, there is no specific vote on that.

And then it says “allow either/or option for Discovery science categories (or only 1 of 2)”
Again, this is a suggestion about a variety of options, but it doesn't give us a specific option. So, like Nicky's objection about a not one-to-one correlation, this replacement motion doesn't give specific choices. It lists a whole bunch of possibilities. And so, each one of those possibilities would have to be hashed out before we could even begin to vote on this motion.

Manchester Senator: In the interest of not dominating, why don't we collect all of the comments and if it feels useful for me to respond I'll do that.

CEPS Senator 1: As a faculty member who has just recently gone through an ABET review, I'll just say this will negatively impact anybody in an ABET program and would add courses in a very negative and unpredictable way - possibly even delaying graduation. I respect and look forward to more comments on how the main motion affects transfer students. But I don't think this is the answer.

Jim: I would say that I would prefer to maintain the current motion, but then introduce amendments to modify the proposal rather than attempt this sort of large-scale replacement because it would be much easier for us to vote on individual amendments that accomplish somewhat, but not all, of what is proposed and it potentially could address all of them by saying we endorsed the motion, but we want this change or that change and vote on those. So that would be my preferred approach. I think it would be more orderly and easier to follow. But that's just an opinion.

Manchester senator: In funny ways, I actually agree with a lot of what was said. I absolutely can see that this may not be the answer.

Going back to your observation, Jim, here is here is my trouble. You suggested that the answer is to amend the motion, but the only motion before us is to accept the recommendations of the committee. So, I don't see an opportunity for actually amending it because the motion does not include any of the detail that presumably we are all going to have to live with which is why, in my mind... Is there an option other than the “all or nothing” that as I understand it, is what is before us?

Jim: If there's a motion on the floor, you can certainly amend it. You can offer an amendment to, for example, to not eliminate the lab requirement. You could offer an amendment that we endorse the report except for eliminating the lab requirement, or whatever.

The motion is put forward by the Agenda Committee is intended as a vehicle to move us forward. After all, we have voted on nothing related to this yet. So, it's intended as a tool. It is a starting point. Then amendments can be added to make changes if people don't like something or want to add something. That is the procedure we tried to put in place so that we can move forward in an orderly fashion. No motion, unless a rule has been adopted by the Senate, is unchangeable.

Paul College senator: The procedure that was undertaken in Congress in 1850 as part of the build-up to the Civil War, as an effort to diffuse some of the tensions, was precisely to take this avenue of breaking up a number of things that had overlapping but distinct interest groups or oppositional groups into five separate bills and to pass them individually rather than trying to use an omnibus bill.

I think that that has its attractions as there are clearly overlapping but distinct interest groups in the Senate, each of which would prioritize tussling over one or other of the provisions. And I think that one of the advantages that I definitely see in this [motion on the floor] is to try to add some order to

this process of the many different provisions and take care of some of the least controversial or the most broadly supported elements first, before proceeding to some of the more difficult aspects.

I don't know if substituting things all at once is the best way to move forward or to go through a process of amendment to the original motion. But I just wanted to acknowledge that this is a truly intractable problem of trying to break up what is a very complex document into things that are more or less widely supported.

Scott Smith: I want to point out that the original Discovery program was implemented in the same way that is being proposed - piecemeal - and there were some issues with that. What I'm worried about with this particular document, having been the author and part of the whole discussion, is that it is like when you pull a thread on one side, it can completely unravel the other part. What I'm worried about in this piecemeal standalone process would be that something that we vote on early would have unintended consequences on other parts. And that's what I'm really worried about. I think that Nicky's point that replacing Inquiry with diversity actually increases the burden and then that will make us change to a different opinion about it later on. Maybe that is the right call. I just think that this document as a coherent whole was thought through as a coherent whole. And I think that that might be part of what we should think about and I'll leave it at that.

Manchester senator: I am persuaded as I was coming into this conversation that this was not necessarily the correct approach but did want to sort of articulate my concerns about the package as a whole. So as a consequence of that, I am happy to withdraw the motion.

Erin: based on this conversation, is there another motion that you would like to put forward in its place or just withdraw?

Manchester Senator: That's a good question. Unfortunately, I have not thought that far ahead. I don't know the answer to that question on top of my head. I would just sort of – and this is not a motion - sort of encourage us to think about the important observations that have been made and that we think about as we move toward trying to amend the proposal in front of us, how are we going to do that in a coherent, systematic kind of way. As Scott said, there are lots of interlocking pieces there, some of which enjoy more support than others. Is there an alternative other than yay or nay to in its entirety? And if not, then what is the process that makes that rational?

And as a political scientist, I would like to just give a shout out about [the Paul College Senator] on the observation that was uncomfortably in the back of my own head as I was putting this together.

Erin: We might have some possibilities for thinking that through. One thing that would be incredibly helpful, in my opinion, is to hear from senators who would like to support the Discovery Review Committee recommendations as they have been presented. If there are senators who could speak to their support of the recommendations and of the motion to endorse the recommendations so we can get a sense.

Kevin Healey, Senate vice chair: Steven has offered to withdraw the motion. I'm just wondering procedurally; can we accept that withdrawal immediately?

Jim: He is asking leave of the Senate to withdraw the motion. So, you can ask if there's an objection, particularly from the person who seconded it.

Erin: Is there an objection to withdraw the motion - and that would be specific to the person who seconded it?

COLSA senator: I'm fine with the withdraw. The main motion has been withdrawn by the proponent. So, I have no issues with that.

Kevin: I believe [COLA senator 2] was going to speak on the subject.

CEPS senator 2: Erin, as a point of order, I don't think it is completely fair to get the opinions in favor of the motion first and run out of time and not give a chance to people who want to speak against it.

Erin: I totally agree but we have a potential backup motion that we could think about, but I would just want to get some sense. We have no sense at this point of the overall feelings of the Senate. We have heard a lot of concerns. And so, if you want to go ahead and speak first because you were in the queue to speak and that motion has been withdrawn.

CEPS senator 2: I'd be happy to and because I really want to be done with this. Quite frankly, I've had enough of this discussion. When we started the discussion over a year ago, we were told this was all about marketable skills. It was about critical thinking. It was about oral and written communication, about technology literacy, all those great things.

Okay, then we fast-forward a few months, and we find ourselves with all this gone. It's been replaced with African American art, gay and lesbian literature, and George Floyd. We fast-forward a little more. We find ourselves at the last senate meeting seriously discussing gangs of white supremacists killing black folks in their beds or something like that. That doesn't make any sense to me. I don't know what the Senate is debating at this point, but to me, this is not a general education program. Whatever it is, I am not interested - have had enough. I am sure that the Senate can design its own hagiography of George Floyd without my help and congratulate themselves on how diverse they are. I just want out. I want to be done with this. I am ready to vote against this thing and I'm not going to participate in discussion anymore.

Kevin: If I could just respond. I would say one of the ground rules was to make sure our comments are germane to the substance of the Discovery proposal, and I'm not sure that that it is.

CEPS senator 2: It is. I am not the one that brought George Floyd's names several times during the discussion. I am not the one who invited Mr. Thomas to make his speech last time. This is germane to the proposal, which includes a big diversity component.

COLA senator 2: Well, I do want to speak in favor of the proposal, and I also do think that if we are discussing concerns about it, we ought to be clear about whether we actually think that it has nothing to do with general education or whether our concerns, are more narrowly, that we don't think question of contemporary racial politics should be part of general education. Those seem to me to be two entirely different potential avenues to go down.

I think that while there might be concerns about keeping track of the complexity of this proposal which I do share on some level, I do think that the concept of attributes that a given course can have seems to me to be much more intellectually coherent compared to our current categories, that in practice

encompass an enormous range of courses that a given category can fulfill. And I say this as a person who personally benefits in terms of having to recruit less for categories that I teach that are in demand. But I do think that this will be a more intellectually coherent approach.

The possibility of teaching Discovery courses at upper level seems to me to be really essential both for programs that teach a tremendous amount as my entire department does at the Discovery level in order to be able to offer at an upper level and to encourage all members of our community to take the general education program seriously, seems to me to be really essential.

I also want to note that I've heard very strong support from my colleagues for the US diversity equality course. We did want to note that we have tremendous resources at this university for considering questions of race and diversity and inequality in a global and broad historical context and to ask what mechanism might exist to encourage the Discovery Review or the Discovery Committee in general to support or look out for courses that we currently do teach that might take a global perspective on these issues and that could be encouraged to be marked as fulfilling whatever additional attributes might exist under this program.

COLA senator 3: I'm looking at our time. We have 15 minutes left and I'm just wondering if there's a way for us to assess how much support this has in the next 15 minutes. Just from talking to other people - my colleagues and people in other departments - my impression is that as it stands, this is not supported. There are too many parts of it that don't seem to be very well supported, even though there are some parts of it I think that, that many people would be very enthusiastic about. So, I'm not sure how we could even vote this up or down further. It's going to go down if we vote on it today. That's my guess. And so why don't we work towards coming up with something that would garner more support?

Jim: You can always offer a motion to postpone indefinitely. And then we can discuss that if it gets a second.

COLA senator 3: And then what does that motion get me exactly?

Jim: It means we are done with it until something new is brought up. In fact, there are possibilities within that motion if that helps. In a sense, it's a straw vote - If this thing's not going to pass, period.

Erin: I appreciate this conversation. I guess what I think if I listen to this, is that it might make sense to have a motion to recommit, which would take the [Manchester senator's] request at the beginning to consider bringing forward individual motions that have maybe a higher degree of support or an easier possible route to implementation. Jim, is that acceptable for me to do at this point?

Jim: In a sense, yes, except we need a committee you want to recommit it to. In a sense maybe the draft motion we did is the way forward because at least it moves things forward in a positive way.

The meeting was paused at the request of the chair to allow a private procedural discussion with the parliamentarian.

Erin: [COLA senator 3], you have the floor at this point so you can finish your comments. We will talk with those in the queue and hear their questions and comments.

COLA senator 3: In general, my department wanted me to table this motion. We don't like it for couple of reasons. The first one is that as philosophers we are all very much in favor of critical thinking and that just dropped out of this and is replaced with a very specific requirement for diversity and inclusion. In fact, the way it was described both in the PowerPoint but also by the student who spoke in favor of it, is that it's a history course, a US history course. And that is a boon for History, but it doesn't help with critical thinking and it doesn't address issues of diversity and inclusion across the board. So not that we couldn't work it in. I already do a lot of this in my social and political philosophy class. But, to me, it seemed extremely specific.

We had two crises going on at the same time. One was an epistemic crisis where you have America divided into two factions who listened to different trusted authorities and can't seem to have a rational conversation. And then you have racial injustice. And when this was before the committee, George Floyd happened. And so, it seemed like, well George Floyd it is. It is not that students don't need to have some way of thinking about these kinds of events but that just gave pride of place, I thought, to a very narrow issue that really would not be able to have a platform in many different departments for one thing. So that was one of our concerns. We really think critical thinking is important, if perhaps futile, but it is important.

And then we thought it was overly complex. We like the idea of reducing the number of requirements. We know how hard it is for some of our engineering and science majors. But then the stackable attributes just seem to add a level of confusion.

And then I've heard other people concerned about the sort of lowering the status of world cultures, not taking world cultures seriously by eliminating it as a knowledge category. So, in general, no one in my departments is in favor of it, as is.

Kevin: There are probably too many people in the queue to take everyone and wrap up the meeting on time.

Erin: I would like to hear from Allison. Let's think about people we haven't heard from.

CHHS senator: I want to get clarification because we're having conversations and because we had a guest speaker that seemed to emphasize that the nature of the course on diversity was focused on issues of racism. I was operating under the understanding that course, by its design, was to encompass all manner of "isms", if you will. And I just wanted to get clarification on that.

Nicky: I think Scott mentioned that the Philosophy Department was dealing, I think, with an older draft that we had already amended. We had already taken into consideration that people did not want this to be specifically a US history focused requirement. So, the requirement is it has now been posed, would be to look at diversity and inequality in the United States as a category. And some of the examples we suggested were, for instance, diversity and inequality in health sciences, in economics, in civics planning, in a variety of capacities that would be teachable in multiplicity of departments and across all colleges. That seemed to make sense. Our committee actually voted on that change.

So yes, it does deal with racial inequality in the United States. Yes. It was formulated in part in response to George Floyd. I'd like to remind everyone that George Floyd's murder also inspired President Dean to the speak to the press, saying that the University of New Hampshire was going to address that event by implementing a diversity requirement. So, we did come together to try and fulfill that promise. We

worked with students including Nelson Thomas to make that requirement. And we have a statement from the Beauregard Center from Cache Owens-Velazquez and Lu Butterfield-Ferrell which I won't read at this point, which also supports a US diversity requirement that looks in part at structural inequality in the United States. But this is not a history requirement. This is a requirement that could be taught in any department.

CHHS senator: I don't think I have my clarification. Is the course required to focus primarily on issues of systemic racism?

Nicky: Yeah. That's a central part of it. I mean, other inequalities obviously addressed - LGBTQ issues, feminism, and all the rest. But there is, there was a strong stance, particularly among the student diversity advocates, that racial inequality in the United States should be one of the central foci of this course.

Erin: I will just mention quickly that we are the only campus in our comparators that that does not offer a specific requirement on issues of systemic racism and diversity.

Scott: I want to be absolutely clear. The diversity requirement has taken on its final form in part because of the George Floyd events of the past summer. But the students have been calling for diversity. They've been calling for US diversity for years. We did have a diversity requirement in the original proposal. So, it's not as if we came out of left field with this. The final form has been changed a little bit. I want to be clear that the students have been calling for this. It was literally the number one request that they had for us. The second one would be sustainability. So, we've been trying to incorporate the student needs and student desires in it.

Just as a point. If there is widespread rejection of this - I'm not on the Senate anymore - it might be cleaner to have a vote at the next meeting in which the wishes of the Senate are fulfilled. And therefore, we can go back to the drawing board and figure out what it is we want. So, I just want to say that we can continue to talk about this for quite a long time.

Erin: So, if we could take two more comments quickly, I would like to present an alternative motion for us to consider.

COLA Senator 1: My concern is that we are rushing to cut short a discussion. We've had a total of seven people talk about this motion. And the idea that we're going to cut short conversation about probably the most important thing we'll vote on for the next three or four years on the basis of seven people with a couple for and a couple against, and people saying their colleagues do or do not like this. We are the Senate. We should vote on this motion now or at the next meeting. Then we'll know where the Senate stands. And if it fails, then we can move forward and if it passes, we can move forward. And if people have substantive motions to make to change this motion, they can put forward those motions. But right now, we're just spinning our wheels talking about things we could be doing when we should be voting on this motion.

Erin: Actually, do you want to call a vote on this motion?

COLA Senator 1: I'm very happy to call for a vote on this motion.

The motion was seconded.

Paul College Senator 1: Point of order. Can we hear Erin's motion?

Erin: The first thing we have to do is have a two-thirds vote to close our discussion and move forward with the vote on the motion. And given that we are at five o'clock, I'm going to cut that off. We don't have time. Jim, is that ok that we hold this over until the next meeting?

Jim: We should vote on the motion for the previous question because it is not debatable. If it passes, vote on the overall motion.

Erin: What we will do is vote right now. First, we will vote on whether we are going to close discussion in order to vote on the original motion.

A vote was taken to on the motion to close discussion on the motion. A 2/3 majority is needed for the motion to pass.

The motion to close discussion on the motion failed because a 2/3 majority was not met. There were 30 in favor, 26 opposed, and 4 abstentions.

Erin: Jim, am I correct that the discussion moves to the next meeting and we will take up the original motion again at the start of that meeting?

Jim: Unless somebody objects, I think you have unanimous consent to carry on to the next meeting. Otherwise, we need a formal motion.

Erin: If there is anybody that disagrees with us carrying this to the next meeting, please speak up. Now.

CEPS Senator 1: Though I hate to keep people here, Erin, are you planning on providing an amendment to replace or an entirely parallel motion? If it is an entirely different motion. I think we should get that on the table.

COLA Senator 3: It is way after 5:00. We shouldn't be putting any motions on the floor at this point.

Erin: I agree with that. let's carry this discussion to the next meeting. . First of all, I just want to respectfully say how much I appreciate people's input on this. This is really important. This affects us and affects our students. So please continue with the discussion. If you have specific things that you would like for the Agenda Committee to consider, please email me.

VIII. New Business - There was no new business.

IX. Adjournment - The meeting adjourned at approximately 5:07 PM

Some UNH Acronyms

AAC	Academic Affairs Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)
AC	Agenda Committee of the Faculty Senate
ASAC	Academic Standards & Advising Committee
APC	Academic Program Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)
AT	Academic Technology
BAC	Budget Advisory Committee
CaPS	Career and Professional Services
C&PA	Communications & Public Affairs
CCLEAR	Clinical, Contract, Lecturer, Extension, Alternative Security, Research faculty
CEITL	Center for Excellence & Innovation in Teaching & Learning
CORPAD	University Committee on Real Property Acquisition and Disposal
CPC	Campus Planning Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)
DRC	Discovery Review Committee
FAC	Finance & Administration Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)
FAR	Faculty Activity Reporting
IRA	Institutional Research and Assessment
IT	Information Technology
ITC	Information Technology Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)
JSMB	Joint Strategic Management Board (Navitas review)
LC	Library Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)
OISS	Office for International Students & Scholars
OS	Operating Staff
PACS	Psychological and Counseling Services
PAT	Professional and Technical Staff
PSC	Professional Standards Committee (FS permanent committee)
RPSC	Research & Public Service Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)
SAARC	Space Allocation, Adaption and Renewal Committee
SAC	Student Affairs Committee (Faculty Senate standing committee)
SHARPP	Sexual Harassment and Rape Prevention Program
SSSC	Student Success Steering Committee
SVPAA	Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
UCAPC	University Curriculum & Academic Policies Committee (FS permanent committee)
VPFA	Vice President for Finance and Administration