Meeting called to order at 3:44 p.m. on December 5, 2016

I. Roll – The following senators were absent: Barnett and Warner. Boucher, Chiu, Finkelhor, Hopkins, Krzanowski, and Mellyn were excused. Tracy Birmingham, Nancy Targett, and Julie Simpson were guests.

II. Remarks by and questions to the provost – Provost Targett began by alerting the Senate to an initiative on campus to help support students with food insecurity (http://www.unh.edu/unhtoday/2016/11/swipe-it-forward). She urged the Senate to look into the initiative, suggesting it as a worthy cause and something we can do to help our community.

She also said that the development campaign has had its launch in Boston and New York and has had tremendous success in the reengagement of alumni. She said that the development office has approached her about ways to help the faculty feel engaged in the “Hear Us Roar” project. To that end, there will be a seminar on February 7th, a Rudman Lecture put on by the Carsey School, at which an external speaker will come to discuss the Morrill Act’s outline of the responsibilities of a land-grant institution. The Carsey School will put together a panel to discuss what being a land-grant university means to UNH. The provost hopes for good faculty participation in highlighting our commitments to the land-grant mission.

She said in the last semi-annual board meeting for Navitas, the recent self-study and external review of the joint UNH Navitas partnership were discussed. The senior vice provost for academic affairs, P.T. Vasudevan, is chairing a committee which includes representatives from the Faculty Senate. This committee is looking at ways to expeditiously address some of the issues raised in the self-study and review. Vasu is also working with the Senate Academic Affairs Committee, seeking possible solutions to concerns raised. She said that the senior vice provost is seeking ways to develop a more intentional strategy in our collaboration with Navitas, including recruitment of students.

The provost announced that the communications and public affairs group is working to enhance the social media guidelines for the campus community, developing scenarios to be shared around aspects of political activity. Hopefully these examples will be helpful to students, faculty, and staff.

A senator asked about the progress of the Navitas pre-master’s program. The provost said that the program is still in the early stages but that she will get the numbers to share. She believes that the program is hitting the benchmarks set.

The chair thanked the provost for her time.
III. Remarks by and questions to the Senate chair - Chair Dante Scala reminded the group of the reception at President Huddleston’s home immediately following this meeting.

He announced that the next meeting of the Senate will be on January 30th, the first Monday of the new semester.

He reminded all Senate committee chairs that the spring schedule for Senate meetings is being planned, and that while we will have some visitors come to speak with the Senate, more of the time should be spent in the spring bringing forward reports and motions to spread the Senate’s work over the entire semester. He invited committee chairs to respond to him by email regarding their projections for reporting on their committees’ charges, including possible schedules for reporting dates.

Dante asked the senators to pass along information to department chairs regarding a report that comprehensive exams are being given in Discovery courses this week, which is forbidden by university rules that state that no exams of any kind may be given during the week before final exams. He said that the deans’ offices have sent out a reminder on this, and asked the senators to alert their department chairs of the issue.

IV. Minutes – It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes from the November 21, 2016 meeting. A correction was suggested in Item VI. Thus adjusted, the minutes were approved unanimously, with 9 abstentions.

V. Report from Senate Campus Planning Committee on statues and memorials on campus – Danielle Pillet-Shore, chair of the CPC, reported that Charge 4 to her committee was to identify those in charge of “the placement and selection of sculptures and the like on campus, and who has input into decision-making.”

She said that there is a Committee for Campus Aesthetics (CCA), which deals with public art on campus, including sculptures, bike racks, memorials, tributes, and both permanent and temporary signage on campus. The director of the Museum of Art, currently Kristina Durocher, chairs this committee. She works closely with the university architect and director of campus planning. Kristina reports that the committee does not meet regularly, but rather when occasion requires. Danielle said she was unsure what might have sparked this charge, but said that if there are concerns about any public art on campus, Kristina welcomes questions, and offered to come and speak to the Senate about the committee’s process for selecting public art on campus.

According to the website, this committee is staffed with representatives from the Museum of Art, UNH campus planning, the Sustainability Academy, facilities services, the president’s office, the UNH Foundation, UNH communications, operating and PAT staff, the Student Senate, and the faculty (six faculty representatives, including one from the library and two from the department of Art & Art History).

A senator asked if the CCA weighed in on the cardinal sculpture, which is situated near the student health center, and Danielle said that it did. Another senator mentioned that several years ago, he was sufficiently impressed with a presentation of one student’s artwork that he attempted to convince his dean to purchase some of the items to be displayed in Rudman Hall. He was told at that time that it would not be appropriate to use college funds for such purchases. The senator
said he would encourage departments to explore the purchase and display of student art. Danielle said that she agrees that such a request would need to go through individual deans’ offices. She said that Kristina informed her that displaying art that does not belong to the university can become complicated when it comes to building renovations or even cleaning, which might require moving the art. A senator suggested that the Parents’ Fund might be a good source for funding for the purchase of student art by a department or college.

A member of the Agenda Committee suggested that the Faculty Senate should be represented on the CCA, and recommended that a member of the Senate Campus Planning Committee should be one of the faculty representatives, reporting back to the Senate whenever the committee does meet.

Dante thanked Danielle for the Campus Planning Committee’s report.

VI. Report from Senate Information Technology Committee on web design change – John Gibson and Wheeler Ruml, co-chairs of the Senate ITC, reported that last year, Academic Technology’s web and mobile development set up a re-design of college and department web pages which was designed by UNH Communication and Public Affairs. He reported that there has been some measure of dissatisfaction with this new design, and the method by which it was implemented, as indicated by last year’s ITC faculty survey. The first four charges to the current ITC are relevant to the changes in university web site design.

1. Review Faculty Senate Information Technology Survey from 2015-16 with Academic Technology (AT), Information Technology (IT), and Communications and Public Affairs (C & PA). Identify and resolve the most pressing issues, including 2, 3, 4 below.

2. Review recently restructured departmental and college websites, develop a set of recommended revisions, and cooperate with AT, IT, and C & PA to implement these revisions.

3. Work with AT, IT, and C&PA to formulate policy on control of web presence, ensuring faculty involvement and protecting academic freedom.

4. Work with AT, IT, and C&PA to develop or choose an appropriate system for faculty and research-group webpages.

The ITC has submitted a report documenting in detail some of the design issues identified in the survey. From that report, some concerns raised are about the menus and tabs on the standardized websites:
A. Even though a given page appears to be primarily about a department, each of the menus at the top pertains only to the college-level; departmental links are relegated to a less-prominent side-menu. Thus, a “People → Faculty” link lists all the staff in the entire college, rather than just the department. An “Academics → Undergraduate Programs” link lists all the programs in the college, rather than just those offered by the department.

B. The amount of screen space taken up by the UNH banner and the college-level banner is large, especially on smaller screens (such as mobile devices). Even more, the department’s side menu takes up significant horizontal space, making it difficult to present a visually compelling page.

C. It is not clear who makes the rules for what can/should be posted where on a departmental site, such as supplementary advising documents or departmental calendars.

Of greater concern is that this new design was implemented with little or no faculty input or oversight. The process is an expensive one, done on a cost recovery basis by each college, and changes will not be made easily. The responsibility for the design of the departmental web pages comes down to a transaction between each college’s dean’s office and Academic Technology. The ITC is continuing its investigation of options presented to colleges by Academic Technology in the hope of ensuring that faculty/department needs are more effectively considered in future re-designs.

John recommended that senators ask their department chairs to compile a list of the most pressing complaints about their website to forward to their college dean. He urged that including the impact on departmental productivity, and communication with current or prospective students and faculty in order to provide solid evidence for the need for a re-design of the sites. He said that the best way to communication with deans on this would be through the respective college communications managers, as below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEPS</td>
<td>Communications Manager</td>
<td>Brooks Payette</td>
<td><a href="mailto:brooks.payette@unh.edu">brooks.payette@unh.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLA</td>
<td>Communications Manager</td>
<td>Susan Dumais</td>
<td><a href="mailto:susan.dumais@unh.edu">susan.dumais@unh.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLSA</td>
<td>Web Communications Specialist</td>
<td>Tanya Hakala</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tfhakala@unh.edu">tfhakala@unh.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHHS</td>
<td>Communications Manager</td>
<td>Callie Carr</td>
<td><a href="mailto:callie.carr@unh.edu">callie.carr@unh.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Communications Manager</td>
<td>Keith Testa</td>
<td><a href="mailto:keith.testa@law.unh.edu">keith.testa@law.unh.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul College</td>
<td>Director of Communications &amp; Marketing</td>
<td>Sharon Keeler</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sharon.keeler@unh.edu">sharon.keeler@unh.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ITC will also ask Academic Technology to “..put together best practices for how they engage with colleges and departments to develop their web sites. The goal is to ensure appropriate involvement of key stakeholders (such as faculty, staff, and students) in future web design activities.”
It was also noted that the Physics department has created its own web design, investing their own resources in the project, maintaining the required UNH branding elements while providing opportunities for a more intuitive and compelling web page. John suggested that AT could incorporate these design elements in the future if there is sufficient demand and funding for the changes. He said that the schedule is about an eighteen-month scale. A senator from the Physics department said that departments in CEPS have been relaying concerns about the standardized web design to Academic Technology without any response for a year now, and expressed concern that other departments and colleges may not find AT responsive to their requests. John said that he has secured a seat on the Academic Standards and Advising Committee (ASAC), which is one of the places where decisions for academic technology on campus are made. His hope is that this will provide a stronger faculty voice in those decisions. He said that at the last ASAC meeting, the AT director spoke about faculty concerns raised about the web design. He expressed hope that AT will be more responsive going forward. He noted that since the deans are the ones paying for these web designs, departments need to be persistent in expressing their concerns to the deans, as there is no other way to effect change in the web designs.

A senator from Theatre & Dance said that her department fought the web design change in their college, and that they were told by their college dean that there was no way to make any change. She expressed hope that the new dean will be more responsive to concerns.

A senator expressed concern about the aesthetics of the orange fields on the standardized web pages, and asked who determines color choice, and why decisions are being made by others on behalf of departments. John said that color schemes come from the UNH Communications and Public Affairs office. The senator also noted that his college’s communication manager urged the administration to secure the “UNH” acronym on Twitter, but the administration did not act, and that now the acronym has been taken by the University of New Haven. Another senator asked about the uploading of content to departmental websites, and whether that content needs to be approved at some administrative level.

Wheeler Ruml responded that there is an ongoing effort to formalize a policy on who controls the content of UNH web pages. Academic Technology has hired a full-time Web Governance Steward to manage the formulation of that policy. The ITC has forwarded a statement-of-principles document in an effort to open a conversation with Heather and Terri around these issues, including three main principles around this issue:

1. Preserve and support academic freedom – web pages are a publishing forum for faculty and students
2. Preserve decentralized administration as much as feasible
3. Ensure faculty input in the process of forming the policy

Wheeler said that a promise has been made to include a Faculty Senate representative on the committee that will recommend the official policy. The ITC is hoping for continued conversations through the rest of this year, and he believes that the plan is for the formulation of this policy by the end of the academic year.

He noted that there are many parts to the web presence for UNH. Beyond the core university administrative entities, the departments and colleges represent a wide variety of entities, and Communications & Public Affairs would like to see all departments and colleges branded in the
same way to provide a unified face to the public. C&PA has hired an official web curator to oversee all websites to make sure that no inappropriate content is posted on university-sponsored sites. Wheeler offered to forward the ITC document on web governance to those who would like to see it.

Next, John reported on the Student Success Collaborative software, which was presented to the Senate by the Educational Advisory Board earlier this semester. UNH has committed to a nine-month trial of the SSC program, funded by the university system. The Senate Academic Affairs Committee and the ITC have been charged with providing input to the evaluation of the system. The university is proposing that student advising and student assessment be monitored through the new software. These are two stewardships that have always belonged to faculty, and the ITC has some concerns about those tasks being turned over to a software program. The committee feels that SSC requires careful scrutiny by the Senate, in what appears to be a very short time frame. The ITC has prepared a list of about twenty questions for the senior vice provost for academic affairs regarding the SSC evaluation project. They will happily forward those questions to anyone interested.

Some of those questions include:

What metrics does this system actually compute?
Who gets to see those metrics?
Are the algorithms producing those metrics transparent – will students get to know how they are being evaluated?
What data goes into the computations?
When does the nine-month pilot program begin?
Who is involved in the pilot program?

A senator asked if faculty are going to have an opportunity to see what the software really does. John said that this is what he believes the nine-month pilot will involve, although he does not know if the pilot will be small- or broad-scale. He said that the software has been rolled out at Plymouth State, so it will be helpful to speak with faculty there about it.

A member of the ITC identified this software as a data analytic pool that may be drawing its data from Canvas, and that it will be important for people to know what data will be used, how it will be used, and who will see it. He noted that this software is being promoted as a way to improve student retention, and asked what the role of faculty will be in the new advising process.

VII. Motion from the Teaching Evaluation Form Implementation Committee – Alberto Manalo, chair of the ad hoc Teaching Evaluation Form Implementation Committee, presented an updated version of the motion presented at the last Senate meeting. The new motion reads as follows:

Motion: The set of questions related to the student experience in the online course should be preceded by the following introduction:

“The University of New Hampshire is committed to supporting students and faculty members engaged in online teaching and learning. Your responses to the following questions will help us as we strive to offer the best online courses.”
The following set of questions* related to student experience in the online course should replace the one currently in place:

A. The syllabus and other supporting documents clearly outlined what the student should expect of the course.
B. The course material required for this course was easy to locate.
C. The course material required for each module was clearly described.
D. The multimedia (ex. audio/video) materials were effective in communicating course content.
E. The interaction I had with other students online created a stimulating learning environment.
F. The interaction I had with the instructor online created a stimulating learning environment.
G. How can the quality of interaction with other students throughout this online course be improved?
H. How can the quality of interaction with the instructor throughout this online course be improved?

These questions are designed to help instructors improve the students’ experience in online courses. They are not intended for use in the student evaluation of teaching.

* For Questions A-F, students may respond by selecting one from the following choices: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neither Agree nor Disagree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree, Does Not Apply, Do Not Know. Questions G and H are open-ended.

He said that this motion is keenly focused on a subset of questions to be asked of students in the student evaluation of online classes. There are twenty-six questions being asked, with the first sixteen having already been approved by the Faculty Senate. The last ten questions ask students about their experience in their online classes, and need approval by the Senate. The Teaching Evaluation Form Implementation Committee was asked to review these last ten questions.

After reviewing the Senate discussion from two weeks ago, the committee determined that it is important to make a distinction between the original sixteen questions evaluating the teaching of the course from the final ten questions, which evaluate the online course experience. The revised motion reflects this by using letters rather than numbers for the final ten questions, and emphasizing the introduction to the questions. Concern was expressed that administrators may choose to use the responses to the final ten questions in evaluating the teaching of the course, which is not their express purpose. To that end, the revised motion includes wording specifying the intent of the questions.

The committee believe that it is a good idea for administrators to see the results of the original questions, and believes that improving the quality of teaching is a shared mission of the faculty and the administration. Administrators should know the faculty’s efforts to improve their courses, and in that way, administrators can provide the appropriate support needed by faculty to improve the quality of their courses.
The committee believes that since online teaching is a relatively new approach for us as educators, it is important to ask students for feedback that can be used to improve the experience in online classes.

Alberto noted that a member of his committee, Barbara White, also has responsibility for New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC) accreditation. She has reminded him that our institution is obligated to provide evidence that we are trying to improve the quality of our courses. This set of additional questions is consistent with that kind of effort.

Alberto said that if the motion fails, the current set of evaluation questions will continue to be used.

A senator asked if Question A is also asked in the first set of sixteen questions. Alberto responded that the first sixteen questions are asked from the perspective of the instructor, and that the final ten questions are intended to focus on the student experience in the online class. Another senator asked if there might be additional options for presenting these sets of questions, perhaps in two separate evaluations. Alberto responded that his committee was tasked with reviewing and improving the additional questions in an effort to get useful information to the faculty.

Another senator asked if these ten questions might not also be useful to ask of students in face-to-face courses. Alberto said that his committee was not tasked with evaluating questions for face-to-face courses. He said that such an investigation might be taken up in the future.

The senate past chair called the previous question. The group voted unanimously to call the question, with no dissenting votes and no abstentions.

The motion was then put to a vote, passing with 59 votes in favor, 5 votes opposed, and 2 abstentions.

The chair thanked Alberto and his committee for their extended service. He added the following statement to the minutes:

Dear committee members,

On behalf of the Faculty Senate, I want to thank you for all your work on faculty course evaluations. We appreciated your attention to detail, and your willingness to take on multiple related tasks.

I’m pleased to report, now that your committee’s motion regarding online course evaluation has passed the Senate, I have no new business for you. Your committee is now dissolved, with our thanks for a job well done.

Sincerely,

Dante Scala
Chair, Faculty Senate
VIII. Conversation with Julie Simpson and Tracy Birmingham – Dante introduced Julie Simpson, director of UNH Research Integrity Services, and Tracy Birmingham, UNH Special Counsel, who came to discuss the proposed changes to the UNH misconduct in scholarly activity (MISA) policy.

Julie said that the current policy has been in effect since 1998, and that the policy is needed in order for UNH to qualify for federal funding, primarily for research. She said that about half of the externally sponsored programs last year received federal funds. The policy applies to all members of the UNH community, and does not distinguish between funded and unfunded scholarly activity, except when a sponsor has special requirements. This policy was last revised in 2009, when there were some changes to the federal misconduct policy.

The federal definition of misconduct is extremely narrow, and comes in two parts. First, it is fabrication, falsification or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing scholarly activities, or in reporting of the results. Second, it is retaliation against anyone who makes a report of misconduct. This definition was issued by the Federal Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP). The UNH MISA policy does not include the full definition as above, and one of the proposed changes is to update the wording to align with the federal definitions.

Julie said that misconduct does not include authorship disputes, except for those that involve plagiarism, noncompliance with any university policy (such as data management or intellectual property policies), misuse of sponsored program funds, or noncompliance with sponsor requirements.

She said that the OSTP took ten years to come up with a federal policy, which unifies definitions for all agencies and recipients. The federal agencies have ultimate oversight, but the institutions are responsible for preventing, detecting, and investigating allegations of misconduct. The requirements of the policy are written into the federal regulations.

The UNH policy needs changing in order to clarify the definitions. The senior vice provost for research (SVPR) has decided to move responsibility for the day-to-day oversight of the MISA policy to the UNH Research Integrity Officer, which is Julie’s position, although the SVPR will remain the deciding official. Bringing the UNH policy into line with the federal policy will keep UNH eligible to receive funds from the U.S. Public Health Service.

The significant proposed changes to the policy involve:

1. Changing the SVPR’s role to deciding official, and assigning the integrity officer to manage the day-to-day aspects
2. Defining key terms, such as plagiarism, fabrication, and falsification
3. Articulating the rights and responsibilities of parties within the process
4. Clarifying that the policy applies to graduate student research, including theses and dissertations
5. Changing the term “inquiry” to “stage 1 investigation” and “investigation to “stage 2 investigation”
6. Delineating more thoroughly the procedures for stage 1 and stage 2 investigation.
The Responsible Conduct of Research Committee has approved these changes. The changes were sent to the various faculty and staff councils, and the AAUP in January 2014, and no changes were requested. The AAUP gave its approval in May 2016, and approval from the Faculty Senate would finalize approval of the policy. At the beginning of this semester, these changes were shared with the Senate Research & Public Service Committee, who will be presenting their report today.

A senator asked about the state of misconduct investigations here at UNH. Julie replied that in nearly sixteen years, she has seen one case investigated, and two allegations that went to inquiry but were deemed not to be misconduct. Another senator asked about students copying one another’s work, and she said that that would fall under the Students Rights, Rules, & Responsibilities (SRRR)/Academic Honesty.

A senator asked if undergraduate research should be included in the policy. Julie said that currently it does apply, but that proposed changes to the SRRR, passed in the May 5, 2014 Faculty Senate meeting, were intended to include all instances of undergraduate misconduct in that document so that they would not be included in this one. We are waiting for those changes to be made official in the SRRR. Until that change is made, the wording needs to remain in this document so that there is not a void. When the change is made, the undergraduate reference will be removed. A senator suggested that undergraduate misconduct should be covered by default in the SRRR.

A senator asked about the definition of falsification, and Julie said that the committee would need to look at the charge itself to make any determination. A senator asked for clarification about the conflict of interest definition, and Julie said that the definition applies primarily to members of the Stage 1 or 2 committee.

Another senator noted that some of the definitions may be field specific, and asked how the policy deals with that issue; would experts on campus be utilized to clarify standards within specific fields? Julie said that the Stage 1 committee would consult experts to see if an accusation fits within disciplinary standards of that field. Tracy Birmingham said that the MISA policy has been in place for a long time. The changes being made now to create Stage 1 and Stage 2 teams provide semantic clarity to the process.

The Senate chair thanked Julie and Tracy for the information they shared today.

IX. Report from Research and Public Service Committee on the proposed MISA policy changes – Kevin Gardner, representing the RPSC, said that their committee has met with Julie and others to discuss the changes just discussed, some of which were partially shaped by suggestions from the RPSC. As a result, the committee unanimously proposes the following motion:

**Motion from RPSC on Revised UNH Misconduct Policy**

**Rationale:** this revised policy improves and makes more specific the process of investigating and adjudicating research misconduct cases, by placing more responsibility in the hands of a Research Integrity Officer and delineating a two-stage process for identifying cases in need of more thorough investigation. The revised policy has been
Motion: The Senate Committee on Research and Public Service Committee moves that the full Faculty Senate approve the Revised UNH Misconduct Policy that has been developed by the Director of Research Integrity Services and reviewed by our committee.

Two small edits were offered and accepted as friendly amendments as indicated above. The chair said that this motion will lay over until the next Senate meeting. He instructed the senators to review the proposed changes to the MISA policy, to share that information with their departmental colleagues, and to gather input to bring back to the January 30 Senate meeting. Questions may be passed along to Dante, who will share them with Julie and Tracy.

X. Motion from Agenda Committee on inclusion – Deb Kinghorn, past Senate chair, represented the Agenda Committee in proposing a motion urging unity and inclusion within our university community. In light of acts of hatred and prejudice on our campus in recent weeks sparked by political discord and the effect of such behavior on our students and their academic experience, the committee feels it is important that the Senate make a statement reaffirming the faculty’s position on tolerance and inclusion on our campuses.

**Rationale:** The University of New Hampshire website contains several important statements on the necessity and desirability of an inclusive and diverse community. (See addendum). Indeed, it is one of the values of our Strategic Plan. Yet recently incidents of racist and sexist aggression have increased on our campus. The President and Provost have begun addressing this, but it is imperative that faculty, administration, staff, and students alike stand together and as one in repudiating such behavior. Our ideals will mean nothing if we tolerate any instance of bias, prejudice, hatred, or intolerance towards anyone of different racial, ethnic, cultural, or religious background, or of different sexual orientation or gender identity. In addition, one of the hallmarks of academic life is a commitment to civil discourse and free speech, in which we honor varying opinions and points of view. We must continue to uphold and value a civil, respectful climate on our campus and in our discussions.

**Motion:** 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 or intolerance against any person or group on our campus. We do this because we respect these ideals and believe that our students are best taught by our example.

Attached to the motion is an addendum including four statements drawn from the Six Visions and Values of the Strategic Plan 2020, clearly defining the university’s position on diversity, tolerance, and inclusion. Deb said that her intention with this motion is to urge the university community to uphold the values we have proclaimed.

There was some discussion on possible re-wording of the motion in the highlighted areas above. Some senators believed that applying this motion to only “on campus” incidents was too limiting, while others felt that the Senate’s influence falls primarily within the UNH community and on its
A senator suggested replacing the word “instance” with “act” in the rationale. There were requests to add additional categories of potentially targeted individuals, with attention to appropriate wording.

A senator moved to suspend the rules in order to vote on this resolution today, after whatever wordsmithing might be agreed upon. There was a second to that motion. A senator said he would prefer to not suspend the rules, but to allow time for discussion of the motion. Another senator said that this is a time-sensitive issue, and that a current response from the Senate would be helpful to the community. Another senator asked if this motion implies that the university should be careful about inviting speakers to campus based on their philosophies and levels of tolerance. Deb said that this motion is not intended to limit freedom of speech, but rather is a call to faculty to speak out against speech and actions which violate the standards to which we have agreed as a community, as indicated in the four statements within the addendum to the motion.

The motion to suspend the rules was put to a vote and passed, with 59 voting in favor, 4 voting against, and 3 abstentions.

After additional discussion and friendly amendments, the following amended motion, with the amended portions in bold, was ready for a vote by the Senate.

Rationale: The University of New Hampshire website contains several important statements on the necessity and desirability of an inclusive and diverse community. (See addendum). Indeed, it is one of the values of our Strategic Plan. Yet recently incidents of racist and sexist aggression have increased on our campus. The President and Provost have begun addressing this, but it is imperative that faculty, administration, staff, and students alike stand together and as one in repudiating such behavior: Our ideals will mean nothing if we tolerate any act of bias, prejudice, hatred, or intolerance towards anyone on the basis of race, ethnicity, culture, religion, sexual orientation, gender, gender identity, or physical or mental ability. In addition, one of the hallmarks of academic life is a commitment to civil discourse and free speech, in which we honor varying opinions and points of view. We must continue to uphold and value a civil, respectful climate on our campus and in our discussions.

Motion: 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 or intolerance within the UNH community. We do this because we respect these ideals and believe that our students are best taught by our example.

The graduate student senate representative thanked the Senate for this statement, and asked if there might be a way to promote this message multiple times to the university community. She said that the impact of this motion goes beyond political issues. Deb said that, if approved, this motion could be something that is presented in every class in order to initiate conversation and understanding. A senator noted that this resolution reflects a commitment to tolerance of all opinions, including those with which we may disagree, as well as our stance against acts of bias.

A senator moved the previous question in order to vote on the amended motion. The request was put to a voice vote, with the majority in favor, 2 votes opposed, and 2 abstentions.
The motion on inclusion was then put to a vote and passed with 59 votes in favor, 2 against, and 3 abstentions.

XI. New Business – The chair of the Academic Affairs Committee once again reminded the senators that his committee would like written feedback on the cancellation of classes on the Wednesday before Thanksgiving.

XII. Adjournment - Upon a motion and second to adjourn, the group voted to adjourn the meeting at 5:31 p.m.