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Meeting called to order at 3:10 PM on March 29, 2021, via ZOOM

MINUTES SUMMARY

I. Roll: The following senator was absent: Ballestero, Herold, Innis, Karaivanova, Knowles, and Vannette. The following senators were excused: Barnett, Lockwood, Mitchell, and Ramsay. The following were guests: Wayne Jones, Kate Ziemer, Marian McCord, and Nicky Gullace.

II. Call to order: The Senate chair, Erin Sharp, reviewed that meetings of the Faculty Senate are recorded to aid in the preparation of meeting minutes. She also shared that since the March 15 meeting, there were several requests for the recording of that meeting, and requesters were told that the Senate does not share the recordings. The Agenda Committee has consulted with the UNH/USNH general counsel about this and has learned that our meeting recordings do fall under the state’s “Right to Know” act. If someone asks for our records using language associated with “Right to Know” we have to provide them. The Agenda Committee will bring to the full senate a discussion about the practice of recording and saving recordings.

Erin also reminded the Senate that Zoom Chat should not be used for deliberations. The Senate uses procedures to ensure that everyone has a chance to speak and that everyone has a chance to hear that speech. The use of Chat excludes some people from the discussion. However, we do want to leave the Chat feature turned on so that we can take advantage of sharing links and documents, if necessary.

III. Remarks by and questions to the provost - Provost Wayne Jones shared the following remarks:

- Concerning merger discussions between the Community College System of New Hampshire and the University System of New Hampshire, this is very much a political debate. However, there have been conversations going on for years about how the two systems can work more closely together. Last week the State House of Representatives came out with a revision to the governor’s original proposal. The new proposal postpones the merger date and creates a commission to study the issue. It is not clear who will be on the commission, but it will likely involve both boards of trustees.

Nonetheless, this issue is not going away and UNH wants to stay engaged. Wayne said that he and Kate Ziemer are going to be actively involved in synergies meetings as we look for new ways to come together to facilitate transfer pathways so that we don't have to have 7 community colleges times 4 different research institutions, totaling 28 “degree pathways” for each of our 200 majors. Discussions are happening about inviting some faculty to come together this summer to work on a few target areas. Those plans are being set by the president and the Senate will be informed as soon as we know what those areas are. It is important that faculty come together to figure out how to do this together rather than administrators telling the faculty how we ought to do this together.
The NH House also restored our funding levels, and this added between $4 and $5 million per year for the biennium to the UNH budget.

- In connection with the COVID-19 vaccine, Wayne shared that the governor is opening vaccine eligibility for all phases by the end of the week – on April 2. However, out-of-state students will not be eligible at that time. Wayne said that within an hour of the governor announcing that out-of-state students would not be eligible, he and President Dean were active with the networks in the state and were advocating with the governor’s office and DHHS. A letter was sent to the governor, signed by the presidents of every university and college in the state. There is also advocacy taking place from private high schools that are also affected by the decision. Wayne said that he has personally communicated with the provosts of all the flagships in New England. We are the only New England state that has a policy restricting out-of-state students. Wayne said that the governor did state that when more vaccines are available, he will deploy them. So, there is hope that the policy will change.

Wayne also shared that UNH has been notified that the state is planning to use us as a point of distribution for the vaccine. This is very helpful.

- Wayne provided information in response to a question that came up at the last senate meeting about how to break down credit hours by faculty type. The question was raised during a report from the Finance and Administration Committee (FAC). Wayne shared his screen to show a new version of a report that is being developed. He said that the final version of this will be provided to the FAC as soon as it's finalized, possibly by the end of the week. Wayne said it is important that we keep track of faculty by rank and type; lecturers vs. tenure-track vs. clinical, and how many credit hours are being generated. In the past, UNH has done this tracking in a manual manner and an employee was spending a percentage of their time doing nothing but keeping this data up to date. That person has now retired. The Institutional Research Team has developed an automated way to create a report twice a year. This will make it easier for faculty, department chairs, and deans to have access to the information.

- Wayne shared that UNH is planning an in-person commencement by college. At this time, it is an open question about whether guests will be allowed. Decisions are being made about requirements that guests be tested. More information will be forthcoming when decisions are made.

There will be much lower density for faculty on the stage for each of the colleges. The center stage will have only 9 people. The two side stages will have room for only 15. However, since the ceremonies will be held by the college, there is plenty of room for 30, maybe even as many as 40, faculty to participate beyond the stage.

*Wayne offered to take questions:*

**Erin Sharp** asked if some documentation such as paycheck stubs could be used by students to qualify for the vaccine. Wayne said that anyone over the age of 16 can go to the NH vaccine registration website and click the “Am I eligible” button to walk through the requirements. For eligible people, they will be taken to the registration form.
A CEPS senator asked how extra vaccines are being handled if they come to UNH. Wayne said that UNH will begin delivering vaccines once they are given to us, next week at the soonest. But for any extra vaccines, the priority is those who are living on campus. Our next priority will be those that are coming to campus every day. And then we'll go from there.

Another CEPS senator asked about the availability of the vaccine for faculty who live outside of NH. Wayne said that he didn’t know the answer to this, but it was raised in discussion with the System office during the drafting of the letter to the governor. There is a significant portion, 20% of faculty and staff, who live outside the state of NH but regularly commute to campus. When we deliver the vaccine here, we want to be able to vaccinate them. However, we don't have any ruling on that yet.

A COLSA senator asked if UNH will be a vaccine site that is open to the public through the state’s registration system. Wayne said that he didn’t know the answer to this yet. One possibility is that the state will give us doses and tell us to do our community as fast as we can. The other possibility is that they're going to set it up more like a super distribution site for anyone in the state to come to. We will have to wait to find out.

IV. Remarks by and questions to Dr. Marian McCord, Senior Vice Provost of Research, Economic Engagement and Outreach - The senate chair welcomed Marian McCord and explained that it is traditional for the Senate to welcome new administrative leaders. However, given COVID disruptions and the very important work that Marian has been doing with COVID testing on campus, we have not had an opportunity for her to speak to the senate until now about research, engagement, and outreach initiatives.

Marian pointed out that it has been an incredibly challenging year for all and that while it was not the onboarding that she imagined when she began at UNH last year it has been a great challenge with a lot of reward.

Marian explained that shortly before she arrived at UNH there was a reorganization that brought Extension and Outreach into the Research unit. During the coming year there will be a high level of engagement in the strategic planning process for the unit. She said that as she reflects on the unit she is very committed to the land-grant mission and to our public impact/public service mission. We partner to generate new knowledge, technology, and creative works. And then we leverage the resources of UNH for societal and economic impact in New Hampshire and beyond.

Marian provided an overview of the different groups within her unit and their accomplishments through a series of slides. The slides are available in Appendix IV.

In the last portion of the presentation, Marian explained that faculty will be hearing about some public forums or town halls that will be held to collect input for the upcoming strategic planning process. The goal is to decide where we should be investing our resources over the coming few years in ways that align with the mission of the university. She said that they are thinking about a deep dive into centers and institutes just to understand what constitutes something like a university center or institute versus a college-focus center or institute and what are the things that differentiate those. As well, how should they be supported, and what are the opportunities for support that we can improve on?
She said that they are also thinking about a five-year comprehensive research plan and a possible survey related to the future of research. We want to look across disciplines for multidisciplinary opportunities that fit UNH and start thinking about a few of those where we really want to put our efforts into growing.

There is also a goal to increase funding for DEI initiatives. There have been a few commitments made through President Dean’s plan for DEI here at UNH. One idea being developed is a seed grant program that would fund research and community engagement in DEI initiatives. It would work with both existing initiatives and new initiatives. Work is being done with Dartmouth to explore ways to partner on that program.

Marian closed her remarks with recognition for the Senate’s Research and Public Service Committee. She said that she has had some excellent meetings with the committee. She applauded their report on engaged scholarship and their recommendations and she is looking forward to working together over the next year.

Marian offered to take questions.

A Senator from COLSA pointed out that one of the most important things in academia over the last 10 to 15 years is the open access, open science movement. He asked Marian if her office has an official position on open access and how her office is supporting researchers in using open access options, particularly as it relates to publication.

Marian responded that she has had a meeting with the library about open access and her office is very supportive of this and will continue to work with the library on how to increase the use of open access. She clarified that her office doesn’t necessarily have a policy on open access, but it is something that we definitely support and would like to see more of.

The COLSA senator said that it would be fantastic to work on a policy to explicitly support faculty in their engagement with the open access, open science movement and, in particular, the financial support of this which would greatly benefit faculty and the scientific community broadly.

Marian responded that she thought there were some funds available to support faculty who want to participate in open access. Wayne Jones added that most of our publisher arrangements right now are coming up to be renewed and we are trying to build into those contracts the idea of an offset charge so that if we buy into a journal, they give us a certain credit to publish open access with that journal and we could pass that on to the authors. Wayne said that Tara Fulton, the UNH Library dean, is working on this.

A COLA senator shared that he took a tour of UNH Innovation Lab (UNH-I) several months ago and he encourages others to take a tour of the lab. He said the space is impressive and the people are very helpful. He was excited that the folks working in the Innovation Lab are reaching out to people in the humanities who are seeking a platform for some of their work. He encouraged all to visit. If your work is relevant in any way to their work, they will help you to get your ideas out there.

Marian agreed that it UNH-I is a great place. She said that if you have creative works contact the Lab to find out what they can do to make these more available. Also, she asked that if you have
technological innovations, do an invention disclosure. UNH-I is a place to help make things more public and available.

Erin thanked Marian for her remarks to the Senate and suggested that the discussion about open access may be a good initiative for one of the Senate’s committees to work on next year.

V. Remarks by and questions to the chair - Erin announced that she has accepted a position as the next Associate Dean in the College of Health and Human Services [beginning June 1]. Erin said that she doesn’t see that there is a conflict of interest or that this will have any impact on her role as senate chair for the remainder of this semester. However, she asked that senators with any concerns about this should address them to the Agenda Committee. She also pointed out that, because of her new position, she will no longer be able to fill the ex officio role of former chair on the Agenda Committee next year.

About the ongoing Senate deliberations about the recommendation to add a diversity requirement to the general education curriculum, Erin reminded senators that the proposed requirement, currently named “Diversity and Inequality, the US experience”, has not yet been designed. With an endorsement of the DRC proposal by the Senate, the next step would be an implementation process. The learning outcomes of that course have not been designed. The goal would be that that work is done through an ad hoc representative committee of people with expertise and interest in those areas.

Erin pointed out that during some of the discussions last week about diversity some comments suggested that a diversity requirement would actually take away from important goals like critical thinking and skill development. She offered that for anyone who has spent any time engaging with students or colleagues around race, diversity, inequality, there is no doubt that these subjects are really rich for expanding critical thinking. They are also rich for expanding marketable skills like communication, collaboration, and leadership. She said that she thinks we need to appreciate what students are asking for, that their general education be more relevant to their lived experiences.

Erin shared that the Student Senate passed a resolution last night that was just distributed today regarding the diversity requirement for Discovery. The resolution urges the Faculty Senate to implement a course focused on diversity, equity, and inclusion into the Discovery program. The resolution also urges the Faculty Senate to include student representatives from the University Commission on Community, Equity, and Diversity, the Beauregard center, the Diversity Support Coalition, and the Student Senate when developing the standards for that requirement. And they further urge the Faculty Senate to create more flexible general education requirements for students and recommend that the Faculty Senate pass and implement the new Discovery Program requirements proposed by the Discovery Review Committee.

Erin shared that there were comments made in the March 15th Senate meeting that included language and emotion regarding the diversity requirement that were upsetting to some senators and guests. Erin said that, in response, she consulted with appropriate UNH administrators and with the Agenda Committee. She also talked with Dr. Nadine Petty and the UNH General Counsel and she has had some consultation with the Affirmative Action and Equity Office. Erin said that our words do matter, and our senate has previously expressed some core values around this. She presented the text of two motions that were previously passed by the Senate.
Erin explained that the first was a resolution on inclusion passed in 2016. And the motion states that the Faculty Senate pledges to do all within its power to uphold the values of tolerance, inclusion, diversity, civil discourse, and free speech, and to speak out forcefully against any and all acts of prejudice and intolerance within the UNH community. We do this because we respect ideas and believe that our students are taught by our example. That motion passed in 2016 with 59 votes in favor.

The second is motion was passed in 2017 and is a model for mutual respect. It says that the Faculty Senate endorses a model of mutual respect among faculty, students, staff, and administrators. The questions that this motion asks us all to consider are, have we set up an environment where mutual trust and respect is present, freedom of expression without fear of retribution, respect for the diversity of person's ideas and choices different from our own, and support for a diverse community. That motion was passed with 58 votes in favor.

Erin explained that, in response to some emails to her about the last meeting, she has explored Robert's Rules of Order further and has learned that there is an option for any senator to call for a “point of order.” If there is any time where there is a concern about how procedure is being followed or a concern about language on the floor, any senator has the right to call for a point of order. You can interrupt the speaker to do that.

Erin pointed out that if we are going to realize our goals of having a climate at UNH that not only supports but elevates inclusion and diversity, we have to commit to facing hard conversations. Erin said that in her 11 years at UNH she has personally faced backlash from colleagues when pressing conversations about diversity, race and inequity and she has also faced concerns for appearing to back away from these critical issues. We just can't let that fear stop us from doing the work that we need to do. She said that standing up against racism is one of her core values and that is not going to change. She said that she does think we have to protect free speech and that includes speech that we disagree with and she thinks that includes speech that represents a minority perspective. But we're also a representative body of the faculty. We are elected to serve and to represent our department. We have an obligation to work to support the values of our institution. The newly released UNH diversity statement asks us to commit to building a nurturing environment of inclusive excellence where all students, faculty, and staff can thrive. Senate has a special obligation to deliberate thoughtfully and carefully when discussing anything, but especially something as important as race, diversity, and inequality and within a body that, at least on the surface, lacks much racial and ethnic diversity. Erin said that this is especially important at this time in history. We all should have at the forefront of our minds the negative impact of discrimination, bias, and intolerance on BIPOC and LGBTQ+ students, faculty, and staff in our community.

In closing, Erin shared that the Women and Gender Studies faculty has been engaging in a workshop around P.E. Moskowitz's book, The Case Against Free Speech. There is an upcoming discussion led by Women and Gender Studies faculty on April 9th about how we take the ideas of that book and think about it as we teach and manage what happens in our classroom.

*Erin opened the floor for any comments or questions.*
A CEPS senator commented that there is often talk that CEPS students, because they are analytical students, think outside of the idea of race and gender issues; however, he said this is a very wrong old mindset and that, in fact, our students are falling behind with this requirement. They need it. Many companies are now requiring diversity statements or are asking questions about diversity in interviews, and our students are underprepared. Further, there is a lot of data out there that shows that there are racial and gender issues systemic in engineering fields. The senator said that he appreciated Erin’s comments.

VI. Update from the Transportation Policy Committee - Moein Khanlari, chair of the Campus Planning Committee, and a Senate representative on the UNH Transportation Policy Committee (TPC) provided a report on some changes that have been proposed by the TPC to the UNH transit system for the next academic year. The slides from this presentation are attached as Appendix VI.1.

The TPC report shows that ridership on all transit has been on a downward trajectory for several years and this has been exacerbated by COVID-19. In a study of ridership, if a run has an average ridership of fewer than 14 passengers per run for a particular route, there is consideration given to eliminating the run or tying it into other routes, to make it cost-effective.

Moein shared that in the spring of 2020, Dover ridership went up, Portsmouth remained almost unchanged, and Newmarket went down. Newmarket has been a pain point in terms of ridership over the past few years and the TPC has always considered doing something about it. Lower demand is expected to continue even in the return to a green mode of operations because it is expected that some people are going to continue to operate remotely.

The current proposal for the Newmarket run in AY 21-22 is to reduce service to three runs per day during the weekdays and offer no service on the weekends. The plan is to then discontinue the run altogether beginning in May 2022. There are minor changes proposed for the other runs, but those changes are negligible.

The Town of Newmarket has been notified of this. Students are also being notified. The financial impact of the changes would be a reduction in cost of approximately 19% to the $1.3 million transportation budget. UNH public hearings about this will be held on April 5 and 6. Moein pointed out that it is important that stakeholders among the faculty attend and weigh in on this proposal.

A CEPS senator pointed out that some graduate students choose to live in Newmarket because it has a much cheaper cost of living compared to other places. He wondered how many graduate students would be affected. Moein said that the TPC doesn’t have the exact numbers on how many students live in these different cities partly because the database is not updated all the time and they don't have direct access to the database of student addresses. He said that there is a Graduate Student Senate representative on the CPC.

VII. Approval of the minutes from March 15, 2021 - It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of March 15. Corrections were offered in sections II, III, V, VI, and VII. Thus adjusted, the minutes were unanimously approved with 7 abstentions.
VIII. Discussion on Agenda Committee motion on the Discovery Review Committee Proposal -
The chair, Erin Sharp, shared that the Agenda Committee has met several times since the last meeting of the Senate. Based on what we have learned from the senate discussions and feedback, the Agenda Committee is proposing a structured way to move the Senate forward in deliberations about the Discovery Review Committee recommendations. Erin introduced Jim Connell to present the structure and pointed out that there will be time for questions and comments about this.

Erin displayed a copy of the motion that is currently on the table:

**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.**

Jim Connell, member of the Agenda Committee and Senate parliamentarian: We learned a great deal at the last meeting, which was very helpful. We think we have a path forward that would be the least disorderly and messy, which is not to suggest it will be perfectly orderly and clean. One part of this is that David [Bachrach] has developed, based on all of your comments, a series of potential amendments to the pending motion to put the DRC recommendations into effect. It was always imagined that would be part of the path forward, that we would start with a motion so that we can have amendments and vote on those amendments and move forward, either adopt them or drop them. One example would be to keep the lab requirement, just to give some idea.

We expect each will be moved and seconded by someone since we've heard from more than one person on each of them. Each, in turn, will be discussed and voted on. And David's list is not exhaustive. So, when we get to the end of that process, we'd like to see if there are other amendments put forward.

Once the current main motion, which is basically to adopt the DRC changes, has been finished in terms of amendments it will be further debated and voted on. I think that's important because if we wind up with a real Frankenstein from all of these amendments, we can still vote it down, which is an advantage over voting on each aspect in getting it officially approved and then more which pass and fail, which is what happened the last time.

This will be a rather long and perhaps arduous process. It is certainly going to go beyond today in my opinion, and quite possibly beyond the next meeting. So, we don't want to expend this time if there is no chance of the final amended, perfected if you like, motion to support the DRC proposal passing. I have been approached by a couple of people about tabling the motion and hence the proposal. In each case, I said that what they really should do is move to postpone indefinitely instead of table. The effects of these two motions are very similar but they differ in one really important way, which is that a motion to table is not debatable. A motion to postpone indefinitely is open to discussion. And I think that's a very important distinction.

Jim displayed a possible motion, as follows:

**[possible] MOTION: postpone indefinitely**
The Faculty Senate thanks the ad hoc Discovery Review Committee for its hard work, extensive report and thoughtful recommendations; however, due to current circumstances, the motion to endorse the DRC recommendations is postponed indefinitely.

Jim: So, I think we all agree that the ad hoc Discovery committee deserves enormous thanks for all of their hard work. So that's a part of the motion. And the second part really in effect says that we are going to kill this motion. That's really what it is. We don't think it has any chance of passing, or at least a majority does not think it has any chance of passing.

If that motion to postpone indefinitely passes I will offer two follow-up motions to save aspects which we think the majority of senators support independent of all the other aspects of the Discovery proposal.

[possible] Motion: move on Diversity

The Faculty Senate endorses the concept of a required diversity course and instructs the Agenda Committee to facilitate development of a detailed proposal and means to incorporate it into the Discovery program; the Agenda Committee is authorized to form and charge one or more ad hoc committees, if judged helpful.

Jim: On the DEI course, we believe it has that kind of support. Remember, it was never going to happen next year. We're going to have an implementation committee and further senate approval as Erin has already pointed out in her remarks. So, what we would like is a vote of support from the Senate to move forward on that - to give the Agenda Committee the authority to set up an ad hoc committee to do whatever it is that we think is necessary to facilitate that process.

We were also asked about sustainability to help there as well. That's why it's in the DRC proposal, although it's received less attention.

[possible] Motion: move on Sustainability

The Faculty Senate instructs the Agenda Committee to facilitate development of proposals for a sustainability component added to the Discovery program and means to incorporate it into the Discovery program; the Agenda Committee is authorized to form and charge an ad hoc committee, if judged helpful.

Jim: Again, we would like to be in a position to move that forward because we think it has wide support. We don't see that as terribly controversial. And we would like to see our rating in terms of sustainability stay high. So, again, I will only offer these two motions if the motion to postpone indefinitely passes.

Just to be clear- to give some idea - if you like the DRC proposal as it is, you should definitely vote no on the motion to postpone indefinitely. If you think with some reasonable amendments to the
proposal, say restoring World Culture requirement, or ETS, you might vote for the DRC proposal, you should probably vote no on the motion to postpone indefinitely.

If you cannot see a way you would vote for the DRC proposal, much short of starting from scratch, you should probably vote yes, to postpone indefinitely. If, and this is where my department stands, you think we should not even be considering this right now with the pandemic, with all the challenges that we will face over the next few years even if COVID is controlled, including the system-wide reorganization, you should also vote yes, to postpone indefinitely.

So, if Erin is willing, I suggest that before I actually make the motion and we discuss its merits, if people have questions as to procedure or technical questions I can try and answer them.

**CEPS Senator 1:** Just a quick procedural question. Can you go back to the original motion? I was talking about this with a couple of senators and our concern is based on this motion as it stands. We accept the work that the Discovery program did, yet we might have issues with one or two of the specific programs. So, if we want to make adjustments, as in we are okay with the whole, but we want to make some minor adjustments, how can we go about doing that with the way this motion currently stands?

**Jim:** Again, this was originally intended as a starting point and there is no reason that the motion can't be amended. Any motion can be amended, pretty much, unless the Senate adopts a rule otherwise. So, you could have a motion to approve this, except as regards to eliminating the lab requirement. That's an easy one that comes to my mind and probably is in your mind. And there's a number of them that David has prepared.

**Erin:** So, procedurally, one of the things we have talked about is trying to take a straw poll to find out if the DRC recommendations have any chance of passing with some amendments to the original recommendations. And, we have some amendments prepared, but don't want to go down that trajectory of looking at the amendments if it seems clear from this motion that the majority of the Senate would not support a vote to endorse recommendations even with amendments. So given your description of your perspective, it would probably make sense to NOT vote “yes” on the motion to postpone indefinitely.

**CEPS Senator 1:** Thank you for the clarification.

**Paul College Senator 1:** Just about the math involved. So, is this a simple majority, is it a plurality? How do abstentions count? Are they part of the denominator? What is the setup here?

**Jim:** It is a simple majority of those present and voting which means that if the number of people who vote in favor exceeds the number of people who vote against, then it carries. If it's a tie, it fails. Normally the chair holds off on voting unless it will make a difference one way or another - either it will be defeated or move it forward. It is not quite the same as the US Senate and the vice president, because he/she only votes in the case of a tie. But it is what's called a simple majority. And abstentions mean you're present and you count towards the quorum. But it is totally neutral.
COLA Senator 1: I have a question about the motions on diversity and sustainability and the point about the means to incorporate it into the Discovery program. I'm wondering if that is meant to encompass something like adjusting other requirements or if we are imagining if we vote to approve these additional requirements, that these would simply be added to the existing slate?

Jim: Yes. The idea is for these committees to come up with a way to fit them in because there's no way with the ABET requirements, if nothing else, that we can simply add something. I mean, you can think of various options where there's an existence proof. For example, you could say, whatever the diversity course is, it's going to be in some category that means that we don't add another category. I'm not saying that's what we should do. I'm not saying that that's what the committee should do. I'm only saying there's at least one way forward and I suspect there are plenty which I haven't thought of.

There were no additional questions or comments.

Jim: I move that the Faculty Senate thanks the ad hoc Discovery Review Committee for its hard work, extensive report and thoughtful recommendations. However, due to current circumstances, the motion to endorse the DRC recommendations is postponed indefinitely.

The motion was seconded.

CEPS senator 2: Point of information. Does the previous Discovery Program have a sunset or does tabling mean then the old requirements will go on indefinitely?

Jim: The old requirements will go on until the senate changes them. There is no sunset in the old Discovery program. The Senate, of course, is responsible primarily for the curriculum and so, if we change Discovery, that is when it will change.

CEPS Senator 2: So, if I can follow, has the Senate already committed to some form of Discovery or general education with only the details debatable now, or is the concept itself still subject to debate?

Jim: The current Discovery, of course, was approved years ago by the Senate. The Senate has not approved any changes to the Discovery program since the last review, which was five years ago - six at this point.

CEPS Senator 2: I'm asking whether Discovery itself is debatable now.

Jim: Could you be more specific?

CEPS Senator 2: Suppose someone said we should move to a core curriculum. Would that be out of order at this time?

Jim: To the extent that it would lead one to vote one way or another on the motion to postpone indefinitely, it would be germane. For example, if you want to say, I really want to go to a core curriculum and the new Discovery proposal doesn't do that, so I want to vote for this, that’s certainly in order but it is up to the chair. That's just my opinion.
Nicky Gullace, faculty director of the Discovery Program: The Discovery program was developed in 2008/2009. It took a huge amount of work and input on the part of faculty, the faculty senate, and the administration to create it. It has caused sources of dissatisfaction among students because there are too many discrete requirements. It is too prescriptive, and it lacks flexibility. What the DRC proposal that Scott and I and our committee prepared was an attempt to edit and recreate the Discovery program in a way that meets the needs of students, the advice of the Admissions office, the desires of Career Placement, and others. And I think to simply come up with a new program on the Senate floor would be unwise because I think the knock-on effects could be very harmful. In fact, I know that not these motions in particular, but some of the motions in the back pocket are going to increase the requirements in highly structured majors in ways that we reduced them in order to fit in diversity and sustainability.

And as Jim said, it's all about the math. Diversity plus x equals a program with fewer rather than more requirements. X is a variable.

COLA Senator 2: I just wanted to address the hypothetical that Jim raised about this not being the time to address general education. And I would just like to say that this is absolutely the time to address general education. There are always reasons that make something that is difficult to do, difficult to do. If it's not COVID, it will be something else. If it's not a potential merger, it will be something else for us to delay. Because something looks like it's out there on the horizon, is always to say that we will indefinitely delay and never do anything.

I would also like to argue affirmatively that it's the best time to be doing this because we don't know what's going to happen. COVID has laid bare a lot of inequities that this particular proposal seeks to address. And if, when, and however, a potential merger with the community college system comes into effect, we as a faculty, want to be on the record as affirming proactively the principles of our education, the values that we have as a community of educators and what our university seeks to do. So, I would say that there is some imperative for us as a faculty to take a stand sooner rather than later.

COLA Senator 3: Like [the last speaker], I am very much opposed to a motion to postpone indefinitely. I agree that there is never going to be a good time to undertake such a major project as overhauling all of our general education program. There are certainly parts of this proposal that I do not like. But as a whole, I think this proposal markedly improves the general education program that we do have and that if we were to simply stick with the status quo we are going to continue to alienate our students. We're going to continue to have a general education program that no one really understands. And I think this proposal has gone a long way to making life easier for students in highly circumscribed majors. I think it goes a long way to making our general education program more robust by allowing upper-division courses to count. And so, I'm going to oppose this motion.

COLA Senator 4: I am also supportive of what [the last speaker] said, I think there's no good time. There is no easy time to do any reform of this kind. But I don't see that the present circumstances are prohibitive for us enacting this. I also think that the alternative route that's suggested here, an indefinite postponement is something of an illusion, a mirage. I'm not clear how you can incorporate a diversity requirement into the current Discovery program. So, we are either going to find a way, I don't know what it'll be, to squeeze a diversity requirement into the current Discovery program or the
committee that we charged to do this is going to come back with some other reform proposal that will amount to a large part of what the proposal that we have before us is. So, I don't really see a reasonable alternative path forward if you want to save the diversity requirement. I think the committee has done extraordinary work to figure out how to incorporate that requirement. And it has involved other elements of restructuring of the Discovery program, but they have managed it. I think we should grasp the nettle and we should move to consider the original motion to support the Discovery Review Committee’s recommendations and we can then debate amendments to that.

**CEPS Senator 2:** I would like to speak broadly against general education.

**Erin:** I don't think that that's going to be relevant to this current motion.

**CEPS Senator 2:** That's why I asked you whether it was the time to speak, and I was told that it would be relevant. If I'm out of order, I'm out of order.

**Erin:** I'm going to rule that out of order right now so that we can move forward with the proposal that is currently on the table. Jim, what can we do to move this motion toward a vote?

**Jim:** if there's no one else who wants to speak against or in favor of it we just proceed to a vote as we normally would. It sounds like the debate has run down.

**Erin:** I'll just give a minute to see if there's going to be any additional hands raised.

We are voting on the motion to postpone indefinitely. The motion in favor of postponing indefinitely is going to basically table this proposal and a motion not to postpone indefinitely will move us to further work on the Discovery Review Committee recommendations.

*The decision was made to take votes using the “raise hand” feature counting those in favor first, then those opposed, and then abstentions.*

**The motion was put to a vote and failed with 19 in favor, 39 opposed, and 1 abstention.**

*The chair asked David Bachrach to discuss the next steps in considering the main motion.*

**David Bachrach, member of the Agenda Committee:** The Agenda Committee went through all of the comments that we received from all of the senators and solicited from all over campus. And we identified a whole series of potential sticking points for folks who generally like the DRC proposal but suggested that they wanted to have certain things revised back to the original model. And so, the way this is set up is that if someone were to make a motion that they would like to have the laboratory requirement put back in and that were to get a second, then we would vote on that motion and that would change the Discovery Review Committee proposal to put back in the lab requirement, as Jim mentioned earlier.

There are a series of these proposed motions, as displayed:
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 with the following exception(s):

- The Discovery Program should continue its current requirement for students to take a science course that includes a laboratory component.
- The Discovery Program should continue its current requirement for students to take one Biological Science and one Physical Science.
- The Discovery Program should restore ETS as a stand-alone requirement.
- The Discovery Program should restore World Cultures as a stand-alone requirement.

Now, there are different stakes involved in each of these motions. The first motion basically has no stakes in terms of increasing the burden on students as overall Discovery.

The second motion on biological and physical science will likely make life more difficult for students in CEPS, in particular, but also for some nursing students.

The third motion will increase the burden, again on students in higher circumscribed majors.

And if we were to pass both the third and fourth motions, we would have a higher burden on students than we have now and would make it impossible for students, particularly in ABET-accredited programs, to graduate on time. So, there are stakes involved in motions 2, 3, and 4 that we have here. And as Erin pointed out, this doesn't exhaust all the motions, but these were the ones that received the most attention in the comments that we had.

CEPS Senator 1: Point of clarification, David, on the way you presented this as four separate motions.

David: These are all 4 possibilities that we identified. And we structured them in this order in terms of the increasing impact on students and decreasing their flexibility.

Nicky Gullace: I am absolutely fine with the motion to reintroduce the lab. This was something that had been proposed by the administrators of CEPS and COLSA and I think it's not been popular with the faculty. But I do really want to strongly advise against motions number 2 and 3 and 4. The number one charge of the Discovery Review Committee was to increase flexibility for students and to reduce the number of discrete requirements. If we move to have separate biological and physical requirements again, all of the savings of the one course that we managed to squeeze out for nursing and engineering students will be gone because where they're getting their savings in our proposal is by being able to take both their sciences in major.

Erin: Nicky, I really hate to interrupt again because you have done such a great job of providing the rationale and information and frequently asked questions and I think that your comments are well
known. We really have to let the Senate go through this process. So, I really do think that your willingness to answer questions along the way has really been a benefit to us, but we really have to let senators move forward on this process.

CEPS Senator 3: For me, I voted to continue with the discussion and not to postpone indefinitely. However, my concern with doing this is that it is sort of the line-item veto, right? If everybody doesn't sort of feel a little bit of pain in how things are structured there isn't necessarily a compromise that is willing to be taken. And so, taking these as separate items and not holistically looking at all of them, someone might say, well, this got voted and so we changed it down here and that now I want to change my vote. So, I'm concerned about doing these piecemeal in a line-item fashion. That I just think it needs to be a holistic either thumbs up for what we agree to or a thumbs down and not each individual item because, the way it's structured, I don't think you can say yay on one without essentially unraveling the thread of the entire proposal.

David: I mean, this is something that the Agenda Committee discussed in great detail. And we are certainly not interested in pulling threads on every aspect of the Discovery Review Committee report. We don't think it is a good idea necessarily to put every aspect of the report up for a vote. What we did is pull out the four issues that received the most attention from senators and from the community at large that pose the greatest obstacles to passing this plan. Now it may be that if we pass any one or two of these, there will not be a sufficient number of votes to pass it. It may also be the case that there are not a sufficient number of votes to pass it in its current form. We don't know because we've never voted on it. And so, this was the method we thought that best got at most people's concerns. There is still the option for other people to bring motions and other issues, but to either ignore all of those points raised by senators or to list 100 changes seems to us not the best way forward.

CEPS Senator 3: So, if a department wanted to continue to require World Cultures in their program, they're certainly entitled to do that. Yes?

David: The Discovery Program has nothing to do with departmental requirements, it has nothing to do with college requirements. So, for example, removing that the World Culture requirement as a standalone course has nothing to do with, for example, the COLA language requirement.

CEPS Senator 3: I understand that but what we're saying is if people who had a strong feeling that World Cultures should be in there, their department, their program could certainly make that a requirement for their program and not necessarily have the rest of us have to live with it. That is my point.

David: Certainly, that's not it. That is a departmental issue. That's not a senate issue.

Erin: Just a procedural note. None of these amendments may come forward. What it would require is a senator to move an amendment forward, to be seconded, and then voted on. These are just options for senators to move forward with amendments. It does not mean any of these will be moved forward. It doesn't mean any of them will get a second. It doesn't mean any of them will get support in a vote.
COLSA Senator 1: I'm a little concerned because I went back to my faculty group and developed motions for this, and it feels like a lot of our work was done in vain. One of the things that I would like to see is that the 2 first motions of this go forward. However, we're at a point where it is 4:56 right now, and trying to be respectful of everyone's time, I don't feel like there's adequate time to discuss or vote on any of these motions. So, while I would hope that we can give these motions, including the ETS and the World Cultures motion some consideration, I don't think that it's really appropriate to do it at this time, I would suggest that we postpone this discussion until next time. How that motion goes forward I will leave to other folks that are more skilled in Robert's Rules than I am.

CEPS Senator 4: Thank you. My question is very much related to the two that just came before. I have spoken with my department about their wishes in terms of the existing proposal, but I have not spoken with people in my department about an amended one. And so, if one or two or several amendments, such as the ones proposed or put up on the screen here, now were to move forward, I would want to speak with people in my department before voting.

Kevin Healey, Senate vice chair: Erin, let me ask a follow-up question on that. Now that we know what some possible motions might be to amend the original motion, could we take these potential motions back to our departments and see if there's any support for any of these individual motions so that when we come back, we can consider them in earnest?

Erin: I think that's very fair. It is important that we all have an opportunity as senators to deliberate, to share, to ask these questions. All senators also have the right to bring forth a different amendment. This was just a way to try to organize the discussion. But you still have the autonomy as senators to do that. And certainly, given the time, I was not expecting that we would move anywhere past our five o'clock timeline for this discussion.

COLA Senator 2: I would just say that since we're going to go over until the next meeting and I'm looking at Nicky’s comment in the chat about the World Cultures requirement, I think it would be really helpful if we all had the most recent, most up-to-date, version of the plan and also the supporting materials demonstrating flexibility in those sorts of things that Nicky prepared because I just think there's been confusion out there about which version is the most current one. And it's hard for our colleagues in the departments who aren't in the Senate to keep track of this. So, if that could be made super easy for us, that's really helpful.

Erin: I totally agree and, just so you know, all of those materials are in today's agenda. All of those materials are on the Faculty Senate website page dedicated to the Discovery Review conversation.

COLA Senator 2: If there are specific questions that senators had, could Nicky be given an opportunity to respond to them so that it's super clear?

Erin: Absolutely.

COLSA Senator 2: I would just like to ask the senators to think about the distinction between the biological and physical sciences. And the fact in proposing to remove that distinction by taking one of each, that they are not recognizing how substantively different those two areas of science are. Yes,
they're both sciences, but they're substantively different. And that difference is reflected, I think, in the
gender breakdown of the students who are in those two areas. If you take a look at that, I'd be surprised
if you have two other academic units or departments where gender breakdown is so distinct and
opposite to another one. I was a member of the original Discovery Committee and we thought long and
hard about the distinction between the physical and biological sciences. And within those sciences, the
perspective was, well, look at all the distinctions that are being made among liberal arts categories. Are
not the biological and physical sciences as different as any two existing liberal arts categories? And I
would certainly argue that they are. So, I would ask you to think about that carefully before removing
that component of the program.

Erin: I think this was a super productive conversation and anything that we can do to make sure you
have the most recent information, let me know. Nicky and Scott have been nothing but generous
with their time and I know that they would answer any questions that anyone has. I did get a request to
put the motions back on the screen. I will do that.

IX. New Business: There was no new business.

X. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 5:04 PM

Some UNH Acronyms

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

Continue to next page for appendices.
The Office of Research, Economic Engagement and Outreach partners in the generation of new knowledge, technology, and creative works, and leverages the resources of UNH for societal and economic impact in NH and beyond.
Research

Accomplishments

• Secured a record $130M in new grants and contracts in FY20
• Built state-of-the-art, CLIA-certified COVID-19 test lab on campus; tested all students twice per week
• Faculty honors included a DIVERSE Issues in Higher Education Scholar, and new fellows of the Carnegie Foundation, American Geophysical Union, Ecological Society of America, and AAAS
Economic Engagement

Extending Research
Engaging Youth
Providing Lifelong Learning
UNH Outreach & Engagement

UNH Extension
- Offices in all 10 NH counties
- 160 educators
- 5,400+ volunteers
- 150,000 program participants
- > 2000 businesses served

UNH Outreach & Engagement

UNH Professional Development & Training
- 4,000 enrolled each year
- 13 Staff
- Offices in Portsmouth, Manchester and Durham
- > 250 one-day in-person and online workshops, certificate programs, conferences & boot camps
UNH Outreach & Engagement

Engaging youth & Preparing Teachers
- 60K youth in camps, college readiness programs & 4-H
- Leaders in inquiry-based STEM teaching pedagogy through the Leitzel Center
- Providing civic and community engagement opportunities to UNH students

UNH Innovation

- Ranked 6th in US for Innovation Impact amongst mid-size universities
- Oversight/management for new COVID Lab
- International leader in licensing of creative works
- IOL has over 180 industry relationships
- Over $1MM in royalty income 4 years running
- Grants and training to support industry engagement
- Award-winning entrepreneurship center
Goals for next year

- Strategic planning process for the unit
- Deep dive into centers and institutes
- Work on a five-year comprehensive research plan
- Increase funding for DEI initiatives
APPENDIX VI.1
Slides from Moein Khanlari Update from the Transportation Policy Committee

Wildcat Transit Changes
UNH Transit

PROPOSED BY THE TRANSPORTATION POLICY COMMITTEE (TPC)

PRESENTED BY:
MOEIN KHANLARI, CHAIR, CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE
SOURCES: TPC MEETING AND TPC PROJECT UPDATES – FEBRUARY 2021

UNH Transit trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit Service</th>
<th>AY 17-19 3 Year Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Route 3 - Dover</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 4 - Portsmouth</td>
<td>-30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 5 - Newmarket</td>
<td>-44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildcat Transit</td>
<td>-26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Connector</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL TRANSIT</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart showing transit trends.
TPC Transit Reviews and Recommendations

TPC recommends upcoming year transit service levels following fall ridership productivity review.

Four years ago, a benchmark of 14 passengers per run as threshold for Service was established.

If a run (i.e., round trip in a route) falls below that level for more than a semester, it is adjusted, or merged with adjacent route, or the run is cut.

Previous Service Levels and Proposed Transit changes

Wildcat Transit Service Summary: 24% system-wide service reduction from '19-20 base; Newmarket Route 5 sunsets May 2022 and a Campus Connector evening service reduction of about 5%
Cost Impact of Proposed Changes

Wildcat Transit
AF 19-20 base, current COVID-19-21 Yellow and recommended '21-22 service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Operating Expense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72-22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-21</td>
<td>COVID Yellow Service</td>
<td>$22,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-20</td>
<td></td>
<td>$22,444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Campus Connector
AF 19-20 base, current COVID-19-21 and recommended service for '21-22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Operating Expense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72-22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-21</td>
<td>COVID Yellow Service</td>
<td>$22,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-20</td>
<td></td>
<td>$22,444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combined Transit System Operating Expense*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Operating Expense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72-22</td>
<td>$22,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Revised based on current fuel costs and rates per cost share agreements

UNH Transit (Wildcat & Campus Connector): 19% overall operating cost reduction from '19-20 base year