

University of New Hampshire

University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository

Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes

Faculty Senate Documents

4-12-2021

2020-2021 FACULTY SENATE XXV - April 12, 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 - April 12, 2021 Minutes Summary" (2021). *Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes*. 101.

https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty_senate_agendas_minutes/101

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 April 12, 2021 via ZOOM MINUTES SUMMARY

I. Roll: The following senator was absent: Haines, Herold, and Innis. The following senators were excused: Khanlari, Mitchell. The following were guests: Wayne Jones, Kate Ziemer, Nicky Gullace, and Scott Smith.

II. Call to order: The Senate chair, Erin Sharp, reminded the Senate about the following protocols:

- Meetings of the Faculty Senate are recorded to aid in the preparation of meeting minutes.
- If you wish to ask a question or make a comment, please use the "Raise Hand" feature in Zoom. The chair or the vice chair will recognize you to speak.
- Guests may be recognized to speak. However, only senators may vote or propose motions.
- All participants are asked to refrain from using the Chat feature. Chat can be used to share useful links and documents that are mentioned in the discussion. However, any questions or comments should be addressed out loud after you have been recognized to speak.

III. Remarks by and questions to the provost: *Provost Wayne Jones shared the following updates*:

- This Friday is the second mental health day of this semester. The Student Senate passed a motion last night asking that faculty be reminded that the scheduled days off are supposed to be mental health days and are not supposed to be used to assign additional exams, homework, etc. during the 3-day weekend. The provost said that he will ask the deans to send a note to their faculty reminding them about the plan for mental health days.
- Regarding commencement, the decision has been made to allow guests. However, they will be required to show evidence of full vaccination or the results of a negative COVID-19 test taken within 72 hours of the event. The ceremony will be limited to two hours and only two guests per graduate will be allowed. Instead of one large ceremony there will be 11 ceremonies total between Manchester, Concord, and Durham. The main part of campus will be shut down with no parking allowed on campus except for those participating in the ceremony, students, faculty, and staff. Guests will all be coming in through the west side of campus where they will park. Shuttle buses will be used to transport them to campus. This decision was made in order to control the flow and limit spontaneous gatherings for photos.

There will be a processional, but only for the platform party. It will be very small with only nine people on the main platform. The side platforms where faculty would typically sit will have room for

15-20 faculty on each side given the socially distanced seating. Faculty who want to participate in commencement should let their dean's office know. As well, there is a link available for faculty to register.

- In the area of vaccines, the governor has found a path forward to allow out-of-state students to register for the vaccine beginning on April 19. UNH began its own point of distribution delivery of vaccines on Thursday and Friday of last week and 3500 vaccines were administered. Another distribution date will be announced shortly. UNH has also been trying to find some ways to partner with other vaccine distributors, Walgreens in particular, for additional distribution.

Kate Ziemer, Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, shared some additional updates.

The committee charged with both spring and fall 2021 planning has been working. For summer terms there are no universal changes in course modality. However, instructors who wish to switch their course to face-to-face or to consolidate sections should work with your dean's office on an individual basis.

For the fall, the communication with students and advisors is setting the expectation that instruction will be predominantly face-to-face. However, the schedule is not being changed now because to go to three-foot spacing from the six-foot spacing doesn't really get us anything. As we get closer to the time to make the call, the hope is to be able to go to full density of the classrooms.

Kate said that between the planning committee, the Registrar's Office, and Academic Technology, it is relatively straightforward for us to go back to a normal density and classroom schedule with masks and responsible cleaning. The decisions to be made will, of course, be based on data and looking at the environment around us including vaccines.

The provost offered to take questions.

A CEPS senator asked about the parking restrictions during the multiple days of graduation. He is concerned about graduate students who need to come to campus for research. This kind of parking restriction may require that they plan their experiments around this shutdown.

Wayne responded with a clarification that parking will not be restricted for anyone who has a campus parking pass. However, there will be very close monitoring on the two days when the main commencements take place, Friday and Saturday, May 21 and 22. He suggested that it might be useful to encourage research groups to work remotely on that Friday.

A COLSA senator commented that the 3500 vaccines that were administered represent a small fraction of our student body. He asked if there was any sense of the expected uptake of the vaccine at the end of all of the vaccination clinics.

Wayne said that he isn't able to give an answer to that question right now. The vast majority of people participating in the vaccine distribution event were students, but it also included faculty and staff. The leftover doses are currently being stored in a minus 80-degree freezer where they will be good for 28 days. They will be used at the next distribution event.

UNH is not able to require students to be vaccinated since the vaccines were approved under an EUA (Emergency Use Authorization) status and we can't mandate a vaccine with this kind of approval status. Wayne said that the administration is getting ready to put out an announcement to current

students and to admitted students strongly recommending that they be vaccinated and to say that we are doing everything we can to provide vaccines to all our students. If the vaccines become FDA approved UNH will be working with USNH and the NH Department of Health and Human Services to determine if we can make it required. In any case, New Hampshire state law will not allow us to require the vaccine for our faculty and staff, but we can work on it as a requirement for our students as we do for the MMR vaccines.

An HHS senator asked what travel will look like going forward, student travel in particular.

Wayne said that there have been active conversations about this and that researchers, in particular, have been discussing this. There are two components to the current “essential only” travel policy. One aspect is the virus and the other is financial. Wayne said that he believes we will be back to normal operations for travel by January. It will be a bit restricted in the fall.

The hope is that if the vaccine comes on very strong, we will be able to offer some study abroad in the fall, but no decisions have been made on this yet. There is also hope that we will be able to include travel to conferences in the fall. However, it will depend on how the data plays out.

There is work going on to set up a system to identify who has been vaccinated. This would give us a sense of what the population looks like on campus.

Wayne closed out his visit with some final remarks:

Wayne said that he knows that the Senate will be taking up an important conversation about the Discovery Program and he thanked everyone for the thoughtful conversations that have been going into this debate. General education is important to give our students breadth regardless of what their major is and the conversations we are having are a critical component of that. He also reminded the Senate about what the Discovery Review Committee was asked to do. We wanted them to look at new ways where we could make general education and the Discovery Program more manageable for pre-professional programs that have many requirements that are set by their accreditation bodies. We also wanted to look at ways where we could take advantage of and promote high impact practices and internships. And we also wanted them to look at other ethical attributes about diversity and civic education and sustainability. He said that he thinks that they have done those things and the debates in the Senate about those things are an attempt to get us to a good place.

Wayne said that he encourages everybody to make these decisions based on what's best for our students. We shouldn't be thinking about it in the context of how we are going to game RCM or about a worry in connection with finances. He said that he will make sure that that general education is not going to drive changes in this new budget model. He worries that if we get too far away from what is best for the students, we could inadvertently create great challenges there.

Wayne said that the debate has been good and everything he has said is consistent with the things the Senate has been discussing. He thanked the Senate for the great work being done and for the thoughtful attention on behalf of the students.

IV. Remarks by and questions to the chair: The chair, Erin Sharp, shared some updates:

- A change has been made to the Senate calendar so that April 19 will now be scheduled as a full Senate meeting instead of a committee day. The calendar for the rest of the year looks like this:

April 19 – Faculty Senate [changed from committee day]

April 26 – Senate committees meet

May 3 – Faculty Senate

May 10 – Faculty Senate

Erin said that based on her check-ins with committee chairs most work is wrapping up or is ready to come forward. She suggested that senators should ask for assistance if they need help finishing up their work.

- Erin shared some slides that highlighted some recently passed Student Senate resolutions:

Vaccine Distribution

- ***To Strongly Urge***, that the State of New Hampshire provide COVID-19 vaccinations to out-of-state students, and
- ***To Thank***, the State for providing vaccine doses to the University of New Hampshire for its closed point-of-distribution system.
- **Syllabi distribution:**
 - **To URGE**, all faculty members to include a detailed course timeline on their syllabi for students to consult, and be it further resolved,
 - **To URGE**, all faculty members to include tentative dates for projects, assignments, and exams, and be it further resolved,
 - **To URGE**, all faculty to include information regarding required books or textbooks in their syllabi, including whether the required books or textbooks are available at the UNH Library or would need to be purchased from the bookstore, and be it further resolved,
 - **To URGE**, all faculty members to place their syllabi in the appropriate “syllabus” tab on canvas for students to easily access and distinguish from other documents.
- **On Discovery Review Committee Recommendations**
 - ***To Strongly Urge***, The Faculty Senate, to implement a course with a focus on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion into the Discovery Program, and be it further resolved.
 - ***To Urge***, the Faculty Senate to include student representatives from the University Commission on Community, Equity, and Diversity, The Beauregard Center, the Diversity Support Coalition, and Student Senate when developing standards for such a requirement, and be it further resolved.
 - ***To Urge***, The Faculty Senate to create more flexible general education requirements for students, and be it further resolved.

- **To Recommend**, The Faculty Senate pass and implement the new Discovery Program requirements proposed by the Discovery Review Committee.
- **Online Course Restrictions:**
 - **To Commend**, the Faculty Senate's motion to extend online Discovery, Honors, and Writing Intensive course deliveries for the coming semesters, and be it further resolved.
 - **To Support**, the Faculty Senate's reconsideration of previous motions and their impact on the efficiency and accessibility of certain courses, and be it further resolved
 - **To Urge**, the Faculty Senate and respective departments to permanently remove restrictions surrounding online Discovery, Honors, and Writing Intensive courses for greater instructional flexibility in the future.
- **On Leniency related to "Wildcat Wellness Weekend"**
 - **To Strongly Urge**, The Faculty Senate to instruct professors to reduce the amount of assignments they give out for the weekend days of April 16th, 17th, 18th, and 19th, and be it further resolved
 - **To Strongly Urge**, faculty members to not assign time-intensive work that would prevent students from partaking in stress-relieving activities, and be it further resolved
 - **To Encourage**, faculty members to remain lenient on assignments and understanding of students' struggles for the remainder of the Spring 2021 Semester.

A COLA senator asked, in connection with the request for leniency related to Wildcat Wellness weekend, whether having an assignment due on Friday at Midnight was appropriate.

Jenny Hargenrader from the Student Senate explained that students are asking for that weekend to not have any large assignments due so they can take that time to practice some self-care and take a little bit of time away from their academics and get back on track as they prepare to head into finals. She said that it is really a case-by-case decision based on the class.

Another senator pointed out that he was questioned in the past for giving a deadline for a paper the day after finals. He said that just because the deadline is Friday at midnight it doesn't mean that students have to work until midnight. He suggested that we be very careful in looking at the reasons and the language.

V. Approval of the minutes from March 29, 2021 - It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of March 29. Corrections were offered in sections III and VIII. Thus adjusted, the minutes were unanimously approved with 3 abstentions.

VI. Discussion of Discovery Review Committee (DRC) motion - Erin Sharp, the chair, reviewed that the following motion is currently on 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.

She also provided the following background:

- A Motion to close discussion and call the question for a vote on this motion failed on 3/15
- A Motion to indefinitely postpone consideration of the DRC recommendations failed on 3/29

Erin asked David Bachrach of the Agenda Committee to describe some possible next steps:

David Bachrach explained that the Agenda Committee shared at the last meeting some motions that senators might consider offering. The agenda committee doesn't necessarily support these motions. Instead, the goal is simply to facilitate discussion given that there appears to be a substantial number of faculty interested in these four possible amendments:

- 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.

David offered to take questions

CEPS Senator 1: Point of clarification, are these four motions or four amendments to the motion?

Jim Connell, parliamentarian: Technically they are motions.

David: None of them have actually been moved. And if no one wants to move any, there's no real need to discuss any of them.

COLA senator 1: My question is about the motion itself, not the amendments to the motion. I have discussed this with some colleagues, and we couldn't figure out the answer to this question. Has anyone considered the diversity requirement as a stackable attribute instead of a knowledge category? And if that was considered, what was the outcome of that? I looked through the Discovery report and I couldn't find that discussion.

Erin: Thank you for that question. I think I have the appropriate answer for that, and I will call on Nicky [Gullace] to correct me. But my understanding is that Scott [Smith] and Nicky spent time talking with the Student Senate and talking with other student representatives and the goal was really

to have it as a standalone requirement that fits into what is considered the core requirements. It is not considered a knowledge category or an attribute, but stands alone independently with the writing requirement, the quantitative reasoning requirement - and then this diversity requirement. So there have been discussions about where best to place it. That was the decision of the Discovery Review Committee. They brought the recommendations forward.

Nicky Gullace: Yes. We have thought about it as stackable, but the Student Senate was quite adamant that they wanted it to be an independent ethical requirement, just as we have an independent writing requirement and an independent quantitative requirement. And that was one of the conditions for Student Senate support. And we thought that if the students felt that strongly about it, we understood their reasoning or we thought it was reasonable, so we endorsed it.

Scott Smith: I'll simply add that our original proposal featured two race and diversity requirements. And if we were to reduce it to one, I think that the standalone was a reasonable compromise for that. And as Nicky said, it fit with what the students were interested in.

Erin: I'll just mention that at this point, we are open for general questions, comments, deliberation. Also, if any senators want to propose any amendments they can do so now. David, is that correct?

David: Yes. It is my sense that someone could move that we vote on the Discovery Review Committee motion now or someone could make a motion to amend the Discovery Review Committee report motion.

CEPS Senator 2, Rosemarie Came: I have two things that I wanted to say. The first is to follow up on the last question/comment about the structure of adding DEI (diversity, inclusion, and equity) to the curriculum. I just wanted to mention for anyone who might be on the fence that we could very well add DEI to the existing Discovery program as it currently is, as an attribute, just as Writing Intensive is. I could envision a course that currently meets Inquiry, World Cultures, Writing Intensive, and DEI. I just want to throw that out there for those sitting on the fence.

The second thing that I wanted to mention is that I **move to amend the motion to include the lab requirement to put it back in**. And the reason for that is that science is an activity just like learning a foreign language or doing art. You have to do that activity to learn it. And if we take that activity of science out, then that is a move towards science illiteracy, not science literacy. So, I move to put it back.

The motion was seconded.

Kevin Healey, vice chair: So now that we have a motion on the table, am I correct that all discussion must focus on the motion that was just put on the table?

Jim: Yes, that is correct. Any discussion has to be germane to the amendment.

Kevin Healey: Do we have any comments on the motion that was just put on the table about reintroducing the labs?

COLA Senator 1: This is something that my department talked about at length and there are multiple reasons that we actually support reinstating this [lab] requirement. The first reason being that the proposed changes to laboratory instruction are not in line with what we have with our competitive

institutions. So, if we look at University of Maine, University of Vermont, University of Connecticut, University of Massachusetts, three out of the four of those institutions require students to take at least one laboratory in the sciences as part of their Bachelor of Science degree. And this would kind of directly kick us out of that sort of norm. And while the University of Rhode Island doesn't have it, it requires a single dedicated course in the sciences. They require additional courses in mathematics, statistical and computational literacy, information literacy, and a category they call “integrate and apply.” If you look at those categories, many of them are science courses with laboratories.

In addition, my department was very concerned with the idea that eliminating the laboratory that is required in the Discovery Program eliminates the only mandatory active learning component of the science curriculum for general education. And when you look at the way our general education program is currently set up the writing-intensive requirement is considered a very important component of it. We require students to write in disciplines that are in the humanities, the social sciences, and the arts. They generally benefit from that experience. And they benefit from it because there are some skills that they just simply do not learn by sitting in a classroom and taking exams. They are learned by doing. The laboratory is vital to science education because students are actually learning by doing.

While I appreciate the Discovery Review Committee's comments on lab education and their concern about lab education at the introductory level, I am a little troubled by some of the things that were said in the report. One of the things in the report and that was said to me by some members of the committee is that the laboratories that we operate for introductory science courses focus on cookbook lessons where students get frustrated when things don't work and that this detracts from teaching science. And I would like to stress to all of you that that is simply not the case.

Number one, I can tell you that there are multiple introductory lab courses in COLSA right now that do not teach cookbook lessons, where students simply follow directions and get expected results. That is not the case. Our Biology 411 lab is completely open-ended. It is a lab where students design experiments, they develop hypotheses, and they test those hypotheses. And I understand that there is some concern with lab education not teaching students hypothesis-driven science, but the way to address that is to not eliminate lab altogether. The way to address that is to look at introductory lab curriculum in these departments within these colleges and address the curriculum, not the requirement.

The other thing I'll say is that having things not work is part of science. I cannot tell you the number of students that I have talked to over the past six months about the COVID vaccine. All of them think that the COVID vaccine was developed overnight. And I can tell you right now that the COVID vaccine was not developed overnight. It was developed over a process of seven to ten years back when the original SARS virus hit us, SARS-CoV-1. Then MERS hit us, and academic science began researching vaccines for these particular agents. The work that Pfizer, Moderna, and Johnson & Johnson have done is built off of that academic research. And part of learning science is learning that science is not simple. Science is not you follow the instructions, and it works. Science is you follow the instructions, and it works 10 to 25 % of the time. Then the rest of the time you are trying to figure out why it didn't work and address why it didn't work. So, I would just hope that people take this into account. This is an active learning process that is super important for people to learn science. Whether they are going to be scientists or not, they need to understand that this how science is done. It is not simple. It is hard and for people to understand and appreciate science we need to enforce that.

Kevin: Thank you. We do have a number of other hands up. I'm assuming everyone who has their hands up is still speaking directly to the motion about labs. I'm sure some of you might want to follow up on what was just said.

CEPS senator 3 from Computer Science: Many of our introductory classes all have labs associated with them. We never qualified for Discovery. However, one of the goals that I view for Discovery is critical thinking and critical thinking does not mean that you're memorizing material in order to do it on a test. I just really strongly support the putting back of the lab requirement to the Discovery requirement for the sciences. Thank you.

COLSA Senator 2: I'd just like to ask for clarification. In my perspective, this question is intertwined with the other science-related change which is to no longer require a physical science and a life science Discovery course. At the end of our last meeting that had been discussed a little bit and I wanted to know is that still the proposal? And I'm not bringing up a new question because as I say in my mind, these two things are intertwined and they both relate to the way that non-scientists see what is happening with these science discovery categories. Just as the lab is very important, so I think it's very important for our students to see that even within science there are different frameworks and the biological versus physical sciences illustrate that very well. I think these two things are intertwined and should somehow be discussed in relation to each other. Is that still part of the proposal to eliminate that distinction?

Erin: I can reply to that quickly. Yes, one of the Discovery Review Committee recommendations is to allow students to take two sciences but to let students make a choice of those. So, that has not changed. I also wanted to mention that Nicky has her hand raised, but one of the things that I think she wants to make sure to communicate is that the DRC would be supportive of adding the lab back, but this is something that we really need to discuss and vote on it. So, if we can move to next question.

COLA Senator 2: My question is that we really only heard, to my knowledge, about student comments about the diversity requirement. I'd be interested in hearing from the DRC about students who participated in that process, what their thoughts were on the lab requirement?

Erin: I think that's a great question. I will say that the student senate resolution is to support all of the recommendations made by the Discovery Review Committee. Scott and Nicky, do you want to speak to that in terms of your interactions with students during this process. And we also have student senators. If you would like to speak, please raise your hands.

Nicky: I would give Jenny the opportunity to speak here.

Erin: Jenny, it is tough because we do have this lab component on the floor right now as an amendment. But if you could speak generally to the student perspective on the lab requirement.

Jenny Hargenrader, Student Senate: I think the best person is probably to pass this off to Nick as the Student Body president and him being the overall student opinion voice. For everyone's knowledge, Nick Fitzgerald and I both participated on the Discovery Review Committee, so we were there for all of these discussions. I am a CEPS major, so I think that coming from that angle I have a little bit of a different view than a lot of students on campus. I think the goal of eliminating this lab requirement was really to provide students the opportunity for more flexibility within the program. Someone brought up the difference between biological and physical sciences and this was an attempt to allow students to

really follow what they are interested in and to not limit them so much as to what they're able to take to complete those requirements, but allow them to have more options for what they might be interested in.

Nick Fitzgerald, Student Body President: I don't think I have any more to add. I mean, yes, Jenny is right, I am the voice of the students. But Jenny has done an excellent job representing the students on my behalf and all things academic. And she's much more versed in all of this than I am, and she has been speaking much more directly to students on this matter than I am. I think Jenny's covered most of the student opinion is on that matter.

COLA Senator 3: You tell me if it's not germane enough to the lab requirement, but since we talked to Jenny and Nick now about the student input, I'm curious if you could reflect a little or share with us how you gathered student input as the Student Senate? How did you gather input from students that are outside of the Senate because I've talked with a lot of my students about how much they've heard from the Student Senate on this discussion? This is anecdotal. There seems to be, at least from my students, a bit of a disconnect. I'm curious how the Student Senate went about gathering substantive feedback on these really meticulous curricular changes we're discussing here.

Jenny: The first thing is that last year under the previous student body president, we actually sent out a survey and got about 600 responses back on that survey on the entire Discovery Program. In that feedback, what students are really concerned with is the struggle to fit in the amount of Discovery requirements that were required of students to graduate. Another one of the things that we asked them about was the diversity requirement and a large majority – 70 % or something, I don't remember the exact number – were in favor of the diversity requirement. I could try to find the exact survey if that is something you would like to see.

Also, the way the Student Senate works is that we have senators from all of the residence halls as well as off-campus senators, and they each represent 150 students. So, when we vote on a resolution, it really is a full student opinion because each of those representatives actually goes back and speaks to all of the students that they represent, or as many of them as they possibly can. So, we are represented all across campus from all different colleges, all different grades. We try to get a balanced opinion as much as possible. There are some students I think that would prefer to have certain requirements, but the majority of students were really in favor of the Discovery Program proposal.

Erin: Can I just ask you to clarify something about the resolution that the Student Senate passed that was forwarded to us? Am I correct that it endorses not only the diversity requirement, but all of that recommendations of the Discovery Review Committee?

Jenny: Yes. The proposal as a whole as well. Yes.

CEPS senator 4: I want to speak in favor of the amendment. Looking at the current Discovery, if you include writing, first year writing, we have six of what I call liberal arts courses. If you include quantitative reasoning and ETS we have four math, science and technology courses. Under the new proposal, we lose World Cultures, but we add diversity and inequity, which is far more of a liberal arts side to this. Then we look at the math, science, technology, we go down to three. We de-emphasize the differences between sciences, and we eliminate the math course. So just for some overall perspective, this proposal certainly de-emphasizes science at a time when we have a pandemic, when we have climate change deniers, when we have anti-vaccine people, when we have people who deny evolution,

and when I see sustainability experts, so-called, who ignore the laws of thermodynamics. So, it's not just all on one side by any means. And I think maintaining the lab is just one way we can begin to redress this de-emphasis.

CEPS senator 5: I just want to start by saying I really appreciate [COLA Senator 1]. I always enjoy his engagement and his comments on this. I'm just going to give one small, I guess, devil's advocate statement against the amendment though. The first thing I agree is that Inquiry laboratories is where we need to be. I have heard incredible things about Bio 411. We just required Bio 411 for our bioengineering students. Now that's the course to go to because they are inquiry-based learning, but not all lab courses are like that.

What I hear, especially about climate deniers, about vaccine deniers, and all that is that what it really comes down to is people being able to interpret the science literacy. And sometimes the interpretation of science literacy is not the same as engagement with actual laboratory practices. Where I really come back to on the earlier comment on curriculum issues and how it is best to communicate the issues that we're seeing in society and how that will parallel into curriculum. In discussions, at least with my department, we think that might be better with more inquiry-based courses in sciences. We think that's where it needs to be. But it's about how do we embed those inquiry-based courses and that doesn't always need to be in a laboratory setting. I teach an inquiry-based course in the sciences that has no lab component, and it can be done.

The last thing I want to say is that critical thinking happens across the curriculum. Critical thinking isn't just happening in CEPS and sciences. I expect that every Discovery course is having some kind of critical thinking. And so, to think that only critical thinking is occurring within these science courses is an incorrect notion that I don't support.

Kevin: Maybe I can ask Scott. There is a chat happening in the chat box that has to do with the statement that the math requirement or quantitative requirement was eliminated. I don't know if you want to address that because people are discussing it in the chat, and you are aware of that debate. Can you just address that and clear that up before you make your point?

Scott: Sure. I think that [CEPS Senator 4] mentioned that he meant ETS. There is a quantitative reasoning requirement that is not going away. ETS is moving from a standalone to an attribute. I think that is pretty clear from the proposal that that is what we are trying to do.

Again, I just want to back up a step and say that one of our major goals was to allow for the higher subscribed majors to be able to do a Discovery requirement that includes diversity and other things that we want. So, something has to be reshaped. Now, going back to the labs, I want to point out that neither Nicky or I feel that the proposal ought to stand or fall on the lab issue. We proposed what the committee voted on, but we think that this would simply be the way in which science is delivered, not changing the number. So, if there's any amendment that we can see as being unobjectionable, adding back the labs would be the least objectionable that we have. The others would add more to the actual program and that is what we are very concerned about at this point. And that's all I just want to say – that I don't think that this proposal stands or falls on the lab issue for the committee.

COLA Senator 4: I have an honest question. I really want this to be perceived as an honest question. I don't want to perpetuate any sense that there is a disciplinary turf war going but I really don't understand the implication that in order for active learning or inquiry-based learning to be advanced, it

needs to happen in the lab. So, I teach inquiry and project-based learning and students go out into communities and they interview parents and other kinds of folks. And I don't add a lab in order to have that be possible. I just change the assignments within my course to allow that to be possible. So, to me, it seems okay, let's change the course without adding additional requirements so that we can, yes, pursue active learning, inquiry-based learning, hands-on learning in courses, and not have to add additional requirements to students' Discovery load. If anybody has a good answer for me, I'd love to hear that as we consider this amendment.

Kevin: Anyone want to respond directly to Andrew? I don't remember who exactly brought up that initial point.

COLSA Senator 1: No, I didn't say it. What I'm not saying at all is that active learning requires a lab. And that's certainly not the case in my department or in COLSA or CEPS. There is plenty of active learning that goes on in those other courses. But if you want to understand how science is done, it's very difficult to understand how scientific research is done without actually being in a lab and doing lab work at some point in your career. And I understand that lots of people have no interest in doing science as a career. I completely understand that. But what we are talking about is essentially pushing students through a new general education requirement where the highest exposure that they had to laboratory science has essentially been a high-school lab that they may or may not have taken. And I just don't think that that speaks well to a UNH education. So, I think that learning what goes on in the lab is a really important process for understanding what is going on in science. And it doesn't matter what that lab may be, whether it be a biology lab, a chemistry lab, or a physics lab, or in epidemiology lab where you're not actually doing bench work but actually doing statistical work and working on surveys. Those are all lab-based courses. I think those are really important to teach students how science is done and give them at least the understanding that science is not something that's immediate. And that there's a lot of work that goes into this.

CEPS Senator 4: All I wanted to do was apologize for misspeaking [about the quantitative requirement]. Yes, I meant ETS. I am so sorry.

Kevin: Apology accepted.

Erin: What I would like to do is take the three hands that are up and then ask if everybody is ready to vote on this amendment. If there are any objections, of course, we will take them. Definitely. Let's proceed with the three hands are currently raised.

CEPS Senator 6: I think lab mostly means there's time in the schedule for the students to meet to work on a project. So, for us [in Earth Science] the lab is outside looking at materials often. You don't have to be inside doing something called a lab. That's the point I wanted to make.

COLSA Senator 3: First of all, I agree, I think the lab is an important component of this for the learning aspect. But one of the complaints we have for some of our larger science classes is that the students feel they don't get a chance to show how much they understand that is not reflected in exams. And lab is one of the avenues that students, by their participation, can say I'm learning, I'm gaining, I'm gathering new knowledge and new skills by being here. I think there are other ways to do that, but the lab is a really nice way to do that. And in the classes I have taught in over 30 years of teaching, students appreciate the lab component of the class. They sometimes complain about the way the lab is

constructed. But for the most part, they like the lab a lot better than tests and projects and reading and other things that we did.

COLSA Senator 4: I just wanted to reiterate what one person said about the labs in COLSA about the labs not necessarily being in a lab. In Natural Resources we teach a lot of labs outside. We go visit streams, rivers, lakes, soils, and forests. That is an important part for many of our students, especially related to sustainability, to try to actually understand what's going on out in the environment. And they love going out there. And I think it's important for some. They don't even realize what they're missing until they do it. So, I strongly urge people to vote for the amendment for keeping a lab.

Kevin: Are there any objections to calling the vote on this amendment?

Erin shared the motion to amend the main motion as follows:

- ***The Discovery Program should continue its current requirement for students to take a science course that includes a laboratory component.***

Erin asked if there are any objections to moving forward with a vote on this amendment.

Paul College senator 1: I was just looking at the Discovery program as it currently exists online, and I just was wondering if there may need to be a little bit more precision in terms of the motion. It stipulates that it must be a biological science or physical science course that has this lab component. I guess that could be construed as a little bit more narrow than to take a science course. I don't know if that matters or not.

Erin: So, Rose, if you want, I can insert here to **take a biological or physical science course that includes a laboratory component?**

Rose: Sounds good to me, Erin. I guess I hadn't really thought that through. I don't know what the other possibilities are outside of that more narrow description.

CEPS senator 3: I guess for me, I like the fact that it was not specific to a biological or physical science. In Computer science we do a lot of labs and a lot of critical thinking, and we've been excluded from all of this for a really long time. I don't think we are doing any favors to our students saying that you can't take a computer literacy class because it's not a biological or physical science based on what we've done.

Rose: Wow, Thank you for that perspective.

David Bachrach: This is going to be important for this amendment or any other potential amendments. When it says that it continues the current requirement for the students, that means it is whatever the current Discovery says so we don't need to specify that because it already exists.

CEPS Senator 6: So, suppose that I agree with CEPS Senator 3 that the laboratory requirements should be construed more broadly, but don't support eliminating them all together how would I vote?

Jim Connell, parliamentarian: If there's a strong sentiment on this, I would suggest that you move to amend the amendment to broaden it.

CEPS Senator 6: Then, I so do.

Jim: Okay do you want to put in some wording other than taking out the biological or physical science,

CEPS Senator 6: I think some work would have to go into defining laboratory experience in a sufficiently general way. And I would be an amateur to try to do that work in two minutes.

I just wanted to say I could imagine say somebody teaching ethnomusicology where there was a field work component and saying that is a laboratory experience. I'm having the students go and record musicians in C2. Well, why does it even have to be science to be a laboratory?

CEPS Senator 5 made a proposed amendment to the amendment so that it reads “The Discovery Program should require students to take a science course that includes a laboratory.”

CEPS Senator 6: Well, I'm not even sure that it has to be a science course. I was trying to say, you know, honestly, I mean, there are other ways to discover knowledge from experience outside of a particular college. I don't know what laboratory means once it's not a particular room in a particular building, as somebody else said. So, I think that we have to have a conversation about that to come up with a meaningful and fair requirement.

Kevin: Okay, so we don't yet have an amendment to the amendment, but we have a discussion about a possible amendment to the amendment.

CEPS Senator 5: I think I'm next on the floor. I move to amend this amendment as such.

CEPS Senator 6: But just strike the word science and that's my proposed amendment to the amendment to take on the course that includes a laboratory component. Then, if that passes, we can discuss what that means.

Rose Came: I don't consider that to be a friendly amendment because it completely changes the meaning.

Kevin: Okay. Erin, how you want to proceed here?

Erin: What David is suggesting is actually to change the existing Discovery program, I guess, and the Discovery Review Committee recommendations. And certainly, he can offer an amendment to do that, and we can vote on that amendment. As Rose commented, that is not the amendment that she's making. Currently, the general education requirements have a lab, and that lab requirement has to be at this point, associated with biological or physical science and the recommended changes are related to that existing requirement. So, if [CEPS Senator 6] would like to introduce a different motion related to the current Discovery program, he would need to write that and provide that.

COLA Senator 5: I'm feeling confused about a similar question. It seems to me that this resolution is fairly vague in a sense that what are we requiring? What are we continuing the requirement for? Because if the current requirement is a lab that fits into one of two Discovery categories, physical or biological science, those categories don't exist anymore after the DRC, right? What are we requiring? Under the new proposal could you fulfill this by taking some whatever course that has a laboratory requirement outside of your two science discoveries? Or is the intention this be a stackable attribute that has to be stacked on top of one of the science discoveries? I think we need to clarify that, and it might help address the other issues were discussing.

Erin: I think I understand the answer to this but let me ask Nicky or Scott to speak to this.

Nicky: Yes. I think that we should go with [CEPS Senator 5]'s suggestion because the DRC is recommending that students get to choose what science courses they would like to have. And it's clear that the faculty members, most of them who spoke on behalf of the lab want it to be a science lab. I think if we continue to use science as a modifier for lab and take out biological and physical that should achieve everything.

What [CEPS senator 6] has proposed is just quite different. That would allow something like the civil discourse lab to count as a lab and that is a liberal arts civics course. I don't think that was the intention of the science faculty who want to reintroduce the lab. I would simply go with [CEPS Senator 5]'s friendly amendment and say students take a science course that includes a laboratory proposal and move to the vote on that.

Erin: I just want to make sure because this is Rose's amendment, and it was seconded. Rose, are you comfortable with the amendment going back to its original form of take a science course that includes a laboratory component?

Rose: I am personally comfortable with that. I see that as friendly though I have not discussed that with anybody. So that's just me. I guess I see it as friendly.

Erin: At this point as I understand it, the amendment for the lab is what we are still discussing. There are now multiple hands up. I'm seeing chats. Please don't put it in chat. I can't focus on that while I'm also running the meetings. Raise your hand, please. And Kevin, if you can call on people who haven't spoken yet.

CEPS Senator 7: I have a point of clarification and a suggestion potentially that may be a motion. My point of clarification is currently we have the text in bold on top, which basically says that we approve the recommendations with this exception. So, is that part of the motion that's on the floor or is the motion on the floor that we just include the bullet point that's underneath that?

Erin: We are just handling amendments right now. So, what would happen is once we have covered amendments we would go back and vote on the full motion.

CEPS Senator 7: The motion right now for the amendment is the bullet point underneath only? Because if the amendment is the entire text on the slide suggests that we approve basically the current document for from the discovery committee with that one exception.

Erin: Just the bullet point.

Jim: The amendment is to add to it with the following exception, singular at this point, and then the bullet point. So that is what we would be voting on unless there is an amendment to it and then ultimately, we would vote on the entire motion.

CEPS Senator 7: Thank you. Yes. That clarifies it for me. And then the suggestion that I have, which I can put into motion if there is enough interest is to change the language to take a biological, physical, or computer science course that includes a laboratory component. And if there's enough interest for that version of the text, I'll make a motion for a friendly amendment if it seems to be a friendly amendment. I'm not sure how that works.

Erin: If Rose does not see that as a friendly amendment, then what we would need is an amendment to the amendment, and you would need propose to everybody to get a second. And then we need to move all discussion to the amendment to the amendment. So Rose, do you consider the change of the motion to say a biological, physical or computer science course.

Rose: I didn't have computer science on my radar initially. And now that it's been brought up, I see we've been overlooking that. And now I'm concerned that there might be something else out there that is overlooked and if we start listing things, we could overlook something. So that makes me concerned.

Erin: What I would suggest at this point, if people are comfortable, is to simply let people ask the questions that they have or make the comments that they have without trying to amend the amendment right away right now. And then people can offer those amendments after we hear from other folks. Is that okay for me to do?

Jim: There is no amendment to the amendment yet because it hasn't been moved and seconded. You can't force the Senate to do it that way, but you have the moral authority to suggest that this is a good idea before we move on to an amendment to the amendment.

Erin: On my wonderful moral authority, I'd like to hear people's comments and questions more broadly about labs. And then I also just want to note that we are going to end this discussion with 10 minutes remaining on the agenda because we have two motions for which I want to give committees an opportunity to, at least, get on the floor. And so, Kevin, please take the hands in order for comments and questions.

COLSA Senator 2: I mentioned that I was a member of the original Discovery Committee. On this requirement of biological and physical science course, these are natural sciences and that's a very important distinction to make here. The word science is used in a lot of ways. And the natural sciences study the natural world. And that's what this requirement is about whether it's the physical or the biological world. The fact that the word science appears in something called computer science or library science for instance does not make those areas natural sciences. And so, in my view, to bring in those types of courses as acceptable alternatives to a natural science course is completely in opposition to the intent of those two categories.

Kevin: Thanks for that clarification,

Paul College Senator 1: I apologize for throwing a spanner in the works here and kicking off this other philosophical discussion about the meaning of science. But I do think that it is important. Science appears in a large number of our disciplines. I think that having the squishiness in the motion is a kind of open door that will lead to debates and arguments later that could be resolved now. And I think that that's a good idea to do it at this point rather than in a way that is less transparent.

I guess I would say that when I mentioned it, I assumed that we could define it by terms of the colleges in which these courses appear. I think that we have a general sense of which colleges would be included under a common sense meaning of a natural science or science. But I do think that we need to nail down what is meant by science in this motion. Thank you.

Erin: Can we get clarification on that from Scott Smith.

Scott: Yes. I'm listening to this conversation and recognizing that there are a lot of issues about this, and I think that they're all worth thinking about. I think the question is whether this is the time to have this discussion about the breadth of the lab requirement? And I think that the Discovery Review Committee would probably instruct Nicky and me to say that if we're going to revert to the laboratory requirement under this Discovery Review, it would go back to the current requirement which would locate it in the natural sciences as originally intended.

I believe therefore that this amendment probably ought to be resolved and then return to that at another time to discuss it. That would be my recommendation. Nicky, do you have anything else to add to that?

Nicky: I don't see any necessity really for that. I would love to vote on [CEPS Senator 5]'s amendment saying it should be a science course. I don't think anybody is going to usurp that. I personally think computer science has been a bit screwed in all of this. None of their courses count for science and I think it would be very helpful for them if their labs counted. So, I think the modification that it needs to be science is very valid. But I think it can be broad and include all our science colleague's courses in CEPS. I don't think we need to continue to debate it.

Paul College Senator 1: What about Political Science?

Nicky: Well, alright...

Erin: I have to interrupt. Those are different things. So right now, the amendment that is on the floor is that that Discovery Program should continue its current requirement for students to take a science course that includes the laboratory component. And so, the current requirement is a natural science - It has to be within a biological or physical science. If that is not the amendment a different wording needs to be introduced and I don't believe that Rose would see that as a friendly amendment. So, the amendment that is on the floor is not to change our meaning of science right now, but to revert to the current requirement.

If there's an amendment to this to be introduced that does open a different discussion that amendment would need to be presented and seconded. So, Kevin, I think we can move to the next hand in the queue.

COLA Senator 5: I think the fundamental problem here is that we don't know what science means. There's nowhere in the new proposal that science is defined. I don't see the current requirement language as being meaningful in any obvious way. It seems to me we need to incorporate a category that we already have and the only category that I see in the new proposal that would fit is science and science literacy and there already has to be a discussion about what falls in there. It seems to me that a friendly amendment would be to get rid of the "current requirement" language which just introduces confusion and perhaps say a science and science literacy course. And then we can have a separate discussion which is already going to have to happen about what falls in that category if I'm right about that. The DRC already requires discussions about what will be in that category but that avoids proliferating two categories we have to define and argue about right now.

I don't know if that will be considered a friendly amendment. That would be my suggestion for how to avoid the confusion that is arising as we try to figure out what it means to continue a current requirement with a category that hasn't actually been defined.

Scott: I want address this directly. Our current program has one biological and one physical science required. From those two categories the lab has to emerge. The new proposal is that students can take two science courses, either splitting them between biological and physical sciences. Those are not going away. Or two-in-one and none of the other. If we keep this language, “continue its current requirement” it would assume that whatever two courses a student takes whether it is in biological or physical, they will hit the lab in those categories. That's how I read what this is doing. And so, I don't think it's adding confusion because science literacy, you'll probably remember from the proposal is a replacement or a motivation for replacing the lab because there was an interest in getting students to think about the literacy of science and not the hands-on experience of science. I understand where you're coming from, I don't know if I see the same confusion. Maybe I'm misreading something.

Kevin: Do want to say whether you are in fact introducing the amendment that you just suggested or whether you no longer see that as necessary after Scott's comment?

COLA Senator 5: I may be remembering the proposal wrong, so I think I would like to look, I had forgotten that these categories are kept underneath the general umbrella of science. I feel uncomfortable passing language when we are still disagreeing about what it actually means but I will withdraw my suggestion for a friendly amendment at this point. However, I do think we have some confusion that is not good to keep in language we are going to vote on.

CHHS Senator 1: I do think we need to be clear. When I think of “current requirement,” I think of the requirement of you need to take one biological, one physical. I think it's confusing. I also think that, opening up the idea of science - we've got political science, we've got social science with psychology and a lot of experiments in labs there. We have occupational science, and we do a lot of clinical lab work there. It's going to get really messy. I think that we want to be clear with the motion that takes out the “current requirement” language and just say that we're going to require a laboratory course in either the physical or the biological sciences. I mean, that would be the simplest. If we go further than that, then I think we do have to consider all different kinds of courses, some might already meet Discovery requirements and some not. What if somebody takes a lab course that is not part of an approved Discovery class, but oh, yeah, [they will say] I got my lab. We have got to be able to define it much clearer.

So, I would say the simplest way is just take out “current requirement” and say **that Discovery program should require students to take a physical or a biological science course that includes a laboratory component.** If people really want to start thinking about other lab courses, I think you make amendments or you make a new motion for that.

It is a big can of worms with a really important discussion. Do we care that the students get hands-on inquiry experience in Discovery? If so, then the labs shouldn't have to be a physical or biological. There are a lot of other classes that do that hands-on learning inquiry experience, but we just have to decide what the purpose of the lab requirement is and then go from there.

Rose: I see Shelley's amendment to the amendment as friendly.

Erin: Yes. So that **the Discovery program should require students to take a laboratory component in either the physical or biological sciences.**

Rose: I think that's clear. Thank you.

Erin: What I'd like to do, so I see three remaining hands. It would be great if we could this voted on in this meeting. So, if we could take those three hands and then I would like to see if there's any objections to voting.

COLSA Senator 5: I'll be quick. This is a real nail biter. This is one of the most exciting projects in my brief experience on faculty senate. So, I'm happy to be part of this. In my role, or at least the way I view my role as senator, I solicit advice from my department and then bring it back to the table. I'd say going into this that [COLSA Senator 1]'s very detailed explanation about the labs really resonates with me. And it would have been the way I expected my department, Biological Sciences, to also weigh in. It did not, however. So, I just felt obliged to share that of all the folks who responded to my inquiry specifically about this topic, it was unanimous and to my surprise, all the faculty from DBS (Department of Biological Sciences) who gave me their thoughts about Discovery thought that the lab requirement should be eliminated. Their rationale in as briefly as possible is that they felt there is many ways to learn and impart scientific literacy that didn't necessarily have to be limited to a lab setting. And the more they explained that the more I saw some virtues there for different learning styles. And I did hear that echo from a lot of senators today. While that doesn't seem to be the unanimous sentiment of this group, I just wanted to share it.

CEPS Senator 3: So just one thing about the amendment to turn it back into biological and physical. Quite honestly, I think that almost any class that you would take out of CEPS, regardless of whether it says science or not, is a science class. And the fact that focusing on the idea that something has science in it, that magically makes it a science course, I strongly disagree with that and the skills that take place behind that. So, while I understand that Rose felt that this was a friendly amendment, I actually don't view this as a friendly amendment. And it changes my support for the lab component.

COLSA Senator 2 requested to see the language of the current amendment. The following text was displayed:

Discovery program should require students to take a laboratory component in either the physical or biological sciences.

I think that this implies that any laboratory course in the physical or biological sciences could fulfill the requirement, but the current requirement stipulates that courses have to be approved to be appropriate for fulfilling that requirement. And so, I don't see the benefit of having taken out that phrase that says that this is returning to the "current requirement" because I think that takes into account some of the things that we're not building into the statement. And one of those I think is that these are courses that have been approved as Discovery labs, not just any lab.

Kevin: Now, that was the last comment that we were planning to take but should we get a response to what Tom just said?

Erin: Let me ask Nicky to reply to that. And the notion that the biological and physical science labs that are currently approved by the Discovery Committee would be the biological labs and physical science labs that would be covered under this amendment.

Nicky: That is correct. And if other people wanted to put in a new biological science or a new physical science lab, they could. If we keep the words biological and physical science, it'll pretty much stay the

same. Nobody needs to reapply. If your lab is already a Dlab, your lab will still be a Dlab after this if it is passed.

On the other hand, if we take out the words biological or physical science than computer science will be permitted to submit a lab for discovery approval. And long as it is a lab that meets all the specifications and quality control that we apply when we evaluate something, it will get approved. I would be surprised if it didn't because Computer Science has very high-quality scientific work that they are doing.

So, this is really a decision about whether this body wants to vote on an amendment that specifies it must be in the natural sciences, physical or biological, or whether this body wants it to be in the sciences more broadly speaking, that would include computer sciences.

Currently, we have Discovery defined science as usually the science courses from physical science in CEPS or biological science in COLSA and some HHS courses. And I wouldn't imagine that we would move to considering political science or anything under that because these are science categories that we generally consider to be scientific.

Erin: Yes. Just to clarify, the amendment that is on the floor is for a lab attached to a specific biological or physical science. That is the amendment that is on the floor.

Jim: Yeah. I was just going to say first of all that we are running out of time. Second, that people may want to cogitate on that so that if we basically carry this over to the next meeting which we are planning to do anyhow, we would be required to come back to right where we are now and maybe people will have better idea what they wanted to do by the next meeting, and we can vote on the amendment then. That is my suggestion.

Erin: I think that's a good suggestion. And one of the reasons why we have added the April 19 meeting. And I'll have to say that the sense that we have some time pressure to figure this out should not be driving us here. The faculty senate has been presented with a set of recommendations and it is our job as representatives of the faculty to debate these issues and to make sure that our votes are well-informed. And so, we will take the time that we need to have this deliberation.

Does anybody object to us putting a timeout on this discussion of the amendment regarding labs?

There were no objections to laying over the motion until the next meeting.

VII. RPSC Motion on Engaged Scholarship - Ivo Nedyalkov, chair of the Research and Public Service Committee (RPSC), presented the following motion:

The Faculty Senate approves the 2021 Report on Engaged Scholarship written by the Research and Public Service Committee and endorses the six (6) recommendations presented in it.

- **UNH adopt, and disseminate, a clear definition of engaged scholarship. The following definition is proposed: “Engaged scholarship is the mutually beneficial collaboration between UNH and external partners (local, state, regional, national, global) for the purpose of creating and applying knowledge to address societal problems, and to enrich student learning.”**

- **UNH Promotion & Tenure (P&T) Guidelines for Tenure-track (and equally the Promotion Guidelines for Research, Clinical, and Extension) faculty be modified to include engaged scholarship explicitly under pertinent sections. For Tenure-track, this includes section V. Description of Scholarly Activities, number 7, “Professional Organizations in which the Candidate is Particularly Active,” and number 8, “Additional Areas of Scholarship and Work with Persons in Other Departments, in Centers, or with Groups Off Campus.” Modifications to include engaged scholarship should also be made to section VI. Evaluation of Scholarship.**
- **College P&T Documents be modified to include in their guidelines for promotion and tenure a definition of engaged scholarship, expectations, and methods of evaluating engaged scholarship. It is understood that methods of evaluating the quality, quantity, and impact of engaged scholarship will vary across colleges and departments. Note that engaged scholarship is not a required activity but is highly valued.**
- **Department P&T Documents be modified to include in their guidelines for promotion and tenure a definition of engaged scholarship, and expectations for engaged scholarship.**
- **Faculty Activity Reports for all faculty (including non-Tenure-track faculty) be modified to encourage faculty to report their engaged scholarship activities (if any). Such activities will not be required but will be considered as a formal component of the evaluation for those who choose to include it.**
- **UNH establish an annual Presidential Award for Engaged Scholarship.**

Ivo explained that this motion was developed in response to the Engaged Scholarship report that was previously shared with the Faculty Senate and includes the six recommendations that were included in the report. However, one minor modification was made based on feedback from senators about the differentiation between engaged scholarship and consulting work. The intent of the language in the report was to ensure that people don't double dip when submitting their promotion and tenure (P & T) documents. However, since the language was more confusing than helpful this element was removed from the recommendations.

Ivo said that he has received an email from a faculty member about the motion. He will contact him to discuss and will bring any possible modifications to the next meeting of the Senate.

The Senate chair clarified that no second is needed for the motion since it is coming from a committee and she reminded the Senate that the full report has been provided in the agenda for the past several meetings. She asked senators to discuss the report and motion with their colleagues and to come to the next meeting with questions and comments. In the meantime, she encouraged all to contact Ivo directly with any questions.

A CEPS senator asked which P&T documents the motion refers to. She said that there is one set for the chairs and deans and one that faculty have. Ivo responded that the goal is to have all P&T documents updated. He suggested that the senator contact him with any further questions about this.

VIII. APC motion on Evaluations of Teaching - Alex Holzniekemper, a member of the Academic Program Committee (APC), presented the following motion:

Motion: Given the ongoing COVID pandemic and its impact on course offerings and teaching environments, the Faculty Senate moves to continue Motion XXV-M12 (passed 11/2/20) for Summer and Fall 2021 and until the Senate passes a new course survey protocol, following the recommendations of the newly created Ad Hoc Teaching Evaluation Committee. The Senate also moves to continue the use of specific survey questions outlined in Motion XXV-M14 (passed on 11/16/20).

Erin reviewed that the student evaluation of teaching process has been handled in a different way this year. As well, an ad hoc committee was recently formed to focus on revising the way evaluations from students are conducted. Robin Hackett and Kate Ziemer are co-chairing this task force.

Alex explained that this motion is to maintain the new status quo on student evaluations to ensure that the Senate approved questions [from November 2020] will continue to be used in the Blue evaluation system through Canvas. Faculty can choose to administer the traditional Student Evaluation of Teaching questions if they choose to do that individually. The goal of this motion is to continue to use the Senate approved questions through Fall 2021 and until the ad hoc committee brings forward their suggestions and begins to implement the new student evaluations that come out of the ad hoc committee.

The motion will lay over until the next meeting.

IX. Adjournment – The meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:05 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