Meeting called to order at 3:12 p.m. on September 11, 2017

I. Roll – The following senators were absent: Baldwin, Burger, Chu, Herold, Lockwood, Simos, and Wake. Berst and Thurston were excused. Andy Colby, Mark Huddleston, Deb Kinghorn, Nathan Schwadron, and Nancy Targett were guests.

II. Remarks by and questions to the provost – Provost Nancy Targett announced the upcoming UNH Systems Board retreat, which will cover facilities, budget items, and initiative planning.

She next announced the launch of the President’s Task Force on Campus Climate, which happened last Friday. There are twenty-five members of the task force, including faculty and student representatives. She said the president did a very thoughtful charging of the committee, talking about the intersection of free speech and hate speech. During the first meeting, it came to light that some of our students are still being subjected to slurs and other forms of discrimination on our campus, which is not the environment we’re seeking. The task force will begin its work by embarking on a listening tour of campus, seeking out the stories of community members regarding what they are experiencing, talk about those experiences, and then as a group determine ways to address the issues raised. This will be a process that will unfold through the course of the fall semester. A senator asked how faculty might bring ideas to the task force. Nancy said that faculty are welcome to contact her or Jaime Nolan (co-chairs of the task force) with ideas or concerns. She said they are particularly interested in identifying sectors of the community who should be part of the larger conversation. A senator asked if this task force will also address issues of religious discrimination, and the provost replied that all forms of discrimination will be addressed. She said that students and faculty need to feel safe, valued, respected, and able to exchange ideas in a civil way, no matter on which side of an issue they stand. The task force membership will be posted on the task force website, and the provost will share the interim report, to be linked on the Senate website for reference by Senate members.

President’s Task Force on Campus Climate Membership

- Nancy Targett (Co-chair, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs)
- Jaime Nolan (Co-chair, Associate Vice President for Community, Equity and Diversity)
- Vicki Banyard (Professor of Psychology and Consultant at UNH Prevention Innovations Research Center)
- Cristy Beemer (Faculty Senator, Associate Professor of English)
- Darnelle Bosquet-Fleurival (Assistant Director of Residential Life)
- Dennis Britton (Associate Professor of English)
• Anne Broussard (Associate Dean, College of Health and Human Services)
• Paul Dean (Chief, UNH Police Department)
• Kathy Fletcher (Librarian, UNH Law School)
• Sarah Jacobs (Director of Strategic Initiatives, Manchester)
• Rogers Johnson (President, Seacoast NAACP)
• Annie Jones (Senior Administrative Assistant, Office of the President)
• J. Ted Kirkpatrick (Dean of Students/Sr. Vice Provost for Student Life)
• Debora McCann (Director, Education Talent Search)
• Deborah Merrill-Sands (Dean, Paul College of Business and Economics)
• Marty Scarano (Director, Intercollegiate Athletics)
• Mike Shuttic (Director, Accessibility Services)
• Andrew Smith (Independent Human Resources Management Consultant)
• Donna Marie Sorrentino (Director, Affirmative Action and Equity)
• Selina Taylor (Associate Director, McNair Scholars Program; co-chair, President’s Commission on Status of People of Color)
• Keith Timmerman (Human Resources Partner)
• P.T. Vasudevan (Sr. Vice Provost for Academic Affairs)
• Alexandra Padilla (Graduate Student, Ocean Engineering)

Undergraduate Students
• Black Student Union (Co-chairs’ designee is Elysa Caisey)
• Diversity Support Coalition (Chair, Jhenneffer Marcal)
• Interfraternity Council (VP of Scholarship, David Wright)
• Panhellenic Council (President, Meghan Linehan)
• Student Government (Elena Ryan, Community Development Chair)
• Student Athletes
  o Treyvon Bryant (Football)
  o Peyton Booth (Women’s Basketball)
  o Mimi Troare (Women’s Gymnastics)

Committee Staff
• Susan Chalifoux (Assistant to the Provost, Office of the Provost)
• Mica Stark (Assistant Vice President for Public Affairs)

The chair thanked the provost for her time.

III. Remarks by and questions to the chair – The chair announced that there are no other suitable rooms available to us for these meetings, and so we will continue to meet in this room for the fall semester.

Dan then announced the membership of the Faculty Senate’s University Curriculum and Academic Policies Committee, one of the permanent Senate committees. The committee met last week for the first time in order to elect their chair and vice chair for this year. The membership follows:

University Curriculum and Academic Policies Committee

  Clayton Barrows, Hospitality Management, PCBE to 7/1/19 (chair)
  Michael Carter, Electrical Engineering, CEPS, to 7/1/20 (vice chair)
Sajay Arthanat, Occupational Therapy, CHHS, to 7/1/20
Semra Aytur, Health Management & Policy, CHHS, to 7/1/20
Jessica Bolker, Biological Sciences, COLSA, to 7/1/18
Dennis Britton, English, COLA, to 7/1/20 (on leave F17)
Jen Carroll, Library to 7/1/19
Melvin Dubnick, Political Science, COLA to 7/1/18
Estelle Hrabak, Molecular, Cellular, & Biomedical Sciences, COLSA, to 7/1/20
Marcus Hurn, School of Law, to 7/1/18
James Krasner, English, COLA (proxy Britton for F17)
Robert Macieski, UNH-M to 7/1/18
Sean Moore, English, COLA, to 7/1/19
Sterling Tomellini, Chemistry, CEPS, to 7/1/18
Kim Babbitt, Chair of the Academic Standards and Advising Committee
P.T. Vasudevan, VPAA's designee
Audrey Getman, Student Senate Representative
Jovana Milosavljevic-Ardeljan, Graduate Student Senate representative

The chair then reminded the group about the upcoming listening sessions for the presidential search on September 12 (12:30 and 3:15 p.m.) and September 13 (8 a.m.). These meetings will be held in the Strafford Room of the Memorial Union Building (MUB). Dan strongly encouraged faculty to attend, noting that these meetings are the place where our voices can be heard. The search itself will remain confidential until the Board of Trustees announces our new president. Any questions can be directed to the Senate chair (dan.innis@unh.edu)

Cristy Beemer, a faculty representative on the Presidential Task Force on Campus Climate, said that members of that task force have been asked to gather input from groups who might want to participate in the community dialogues. She invited anyone interested to contact her at c.beemer@unh.edu with input.

IV. Approval of the Senate minutes from August 28, 2017 – It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the August 28, 2017 meeting of the Senate. Four corrections were offered, in Items II, V, VI, and IX. Thus adjusted, the minutes were approved unanimously with 3 abstentions.

V. Motion on creating a policy for curtailed operations make-up day – The chair turned time over to past Senate chair Dante Scala, who presented a motion to create a policy for setting make up days for courses missed due to curtailed operations. Dante reminded the group of the attempt last spring by the administration to convert one of the reading days into a make up class day, noting that while the Senate liked the idea, the time frame in which the change was proposed was impractical, and the Senate voted the measure down. At that time, Dante and the chair of the Senate Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) met with the registrar and the senior vice provost for academic affairs to determine if a process could be established by which a decision could be made automatically to convert the first reading day in the spring semester into a make up class day, if needed to provide more certainty earlier in the semester for faculty and students. These four worked together to create the following motion, which has been reviewed by the Senate Agenda Committee:
Rationale: The Faculty Senate wishes to create a formal, routine process by which makeup class days are added to the academic calendar during spring semesters in which there are frequent full class day curtailments. Such a process would reduce uncertainty about the academic calendar, and provide faculty and students with sufficient advance notice of a change to the calendar.

Motion: The Faculty Senate approves the following process for converting the first Reading Day of the spring semester into a make-up class day:

1) This process would commence when either (a) two full Tuesday/Thursday class days or (b) two full Monday/Wednesday class days or c) two full Monday/Wednesday/Friday class days, have been curtailed during the spring semester.

2) The Academic Standards and Advising Committee (ASAC), in conjunction with the Faculty Senate’s Agenda Committee, would jointly make the decision as to what day of the class week will be made up (i.e. a Monday, a Tuesday, etc.).

3) These committees would make the decision on how to convert the Reading Day as soon as possible after Spring Break, so that faculty and students would have the maximum amount of advance notice of the change.

4) The announcement of the makeup day would be issued by the Office of the Provost.

5) The Office of the Registrar is charged with prioritizing class scheduling over special event scheduling on the Reading Day in case of class make-up.

It was noted that this policy will only apply to the UNH-Durham campus, as the School of Law and UNH-Manchester have their own schedules. A senator from the School of Law suggested the motion be amended to state that fact explicitly. The suggestion was accepted as a friendly amendment.

A senator asked why the motion could not specify which class day would be made up. Dante said that the group had struggled to come up with a single-day rule, and noted that one day-a-week classes may require a judgment call by the registrar regarding the need for a make-up class. The registrar said that allowing some discussion regarding which day will be made up prevents confusion and miscommunication that could occur with a fully automated system. Another senator agreed that too much automation muddies the context.

Another senator asked why both 1.b and 1.c were necessary, suggesting that the two be collapsed into a single point. Scott Smith said that this wording was preferred by the committee. Andy Colby, the registrar, said that such a change is acceptable to him. There was some discussion, with several senators in favor of the change and other preferring the clarity of the existing language.
A senator asked if fractional curtailments would be added together towards this rule and Dante said that they would not. A senator from the music department noted that reading days are used in that department for jury examinations and asked that any decision to make such a change be announced as soon as possible in order to adjust schedules. The registrar said that his office takes note of potential scheduling conflicts, and would work immediately to resolve them.

Another senator noted that graduate classes generally meet only once per week, making a single curtailed class the loss of an entire week.

A senator asked how many full days of class were curtailed last year. The registrar said that this proposed policy would have been triggered one time in the past three years, meaning last year for curtailed classes on a Tuesday. The registrar noted that his office will now keep a log of all curtailed operation days.

The chair invited faculty to send any comments or suggestions on this topic to the Senate admin, Dante, Dan, or any member of the Agenda Committee.

The motion will lay over until the next meeting.

VI. Remarks by and questions to the university president – The chair welcomed President Mark Huddleston and turned the time over to him. The president invited faculty to attend the presidential search firm’s listening sessions and to express their opinions there.

He said that we have gotten off to a good start this fall, and noted that last spring ended on a difficult note. As we watched events unfold both here and in other areas of the country, the president said that it is hard not to be concerned about these issues. He suggested that what we’re seeing here is the function of a national dynamic that seems to have everybody on edge. However, he asserted that we will do everything we can to keep the campus safe and hold to our principles of open and free discussion. At the same time, he suggested that we need to redouble our efforts to create an environment on campus where all members of our community can feel included. These are tough things to bring into alignment, but essential if we’re to create a climate that is safe and welcoming.

He asked faculty to try to avoid pushing things to extremes, noting that it is useful to remember that the university is not the public square, where anything can be said and the feelings of others have little importance. As a public institution, we have an obligation to educate, and not to be neutral, nor view unrestrained discourse without offering direction. The president quoted our dean of students, who has said, “we have a responsibility for developing character,” and noted that this includes teaching methods of conversing with one another that are both civil and engaging about the issues that are very present in our environment.

A senator said that as he teaches a course on music and social change, he is aware of his own personal belief system, but that he finds himself seeking guidance from the university for core values beyond his personal perspective. He asked if the university has any statement regarding mutual respect that could serve as a guidepost. The president said that he is not aware of any single statement from the administration, beyond the AAUP’s statement on academic freedom.
Other statements represent a sort of accumulated wisdom regarding the way we expect to treat one another. The president said that he routinely refers to our UNH community as the “Wildcat family,” and asserted that he believes that we should treat one another like family members in our regard for one another. He said he would like to work with the faculty and others to come up with some sort of guideline, without creating a set of speech codes.

A senator from the School of Law asserted that there is a tremendous lack of understanding regarding what the First Amendment allows regarding free speech, and suggested it might be helpful to have input from UNH counsel on that. The president agreed, saying that there are alarming statistics which reveal that some students today actually reject the principles of the First Amendment, not realizing what actually is contained in the Bill of Rights. He suggested there is need for more thorough education in this area.

A senator thanked the president for taking a stand on behalf of the university in support the extension of DACA (Deferred Action for Children Arrivals). The president said that his practice is to stay out of politics in his position, but that he does make exceptions for policy issues that directly impact on higher education. In such a case, he feels he has a responsibility to take a stand. The bylaws of the university system encourage faculty to participate in the political system, but such faculty may not use university resources to advocate for a particular political position or candidate.

A senator asked what constitutes the use of university resources in support of a political party, noting that the university invited President Obama to campus the night before the last presidential election, but that the other candidate was not offered equal time. She noted that this seems to be a use of university resources in support of a party, and asserted that she and other colleagues in Women’s Studies are under scrutiny for emails that do no more than discuss women’s rights in the current political climate. Mark said he is unable to speak to the situation in Women’s Studies, but said that all major parties were extended invitations according to our open door policy. Obama’s visit, he said, just happened to work out. The Senate chair noted that in his campaigns for the NH State Senate, he is very careful not to use any university resources, choosing personal email accounts and a separate phone. The chair said that he appreciates the senator’s concern about the distinction between using university resources to provide educational experiences for our students and using those resources for political support to a party or a cause.

Another senator said that from the view of the administration, choosing a politically impartial position may be preferable, but asked how much room we can allow for debate, as an institution of higher education. She suggested that an open and genuine debate often becomes timid if our partiality for one side or the other becomes evident, and those who hold a different opinion often remain quiet rather than speak out against authority or the majority.

The president agreed, saying that active debate is essential, but challenging in the current atmosphere. He asserted that we are hurting ourselves as an institution and as a society if we censor ourselves out of fear of offense. Another senator said that many faculty are feeling afraid to express their opinions in the classroom or even on social media, suggesting that a statement from the administration that faculty are allowed to have their own opinions would be helpful. She noted that tenured faculty enjoy a security in this area that non-tenured and
non-tenure track faculty do not enjoy. The president agreed, but noted that the administration is unable to protect faculty from the mire of social media.

The chair thanked the president for his time.

VII. Discussion and vote on motion on model of mutual respect – The chair welcomed Deb Kinghorn and Nathan Schwadron back for a discussion on the proposed motion on a model of mutual respect. That motion was presented by Scott Smith and seconded by Dante Scala at our last meeting. Deb said that she and Nathan received a lot of feedback after the last meeting’s discussion, and presented the following revised motion:

The subject of civil discourse, and mutual respect, has been discussed frequently in 2017. However, the meaning of mutual respect has not been clarified. A model of mutual respect communicates its spirit through simple, straightforward language and actions that would help to identify and create conditions in which mutual respect can flourish. To identify something is to note its importance; to define it is to provide a marker for its use.

The Faculty Senate is not only a deliberative body, it is a normative body identifying important and central values and actions that guide the academic mission of the university. The Senate sends a strong message to our community when the faculty unites behind the principles it upholds.

**Motion**

The Faculty Senate endorses the following model of mutual respect in transactions between faculty, students, staff, and administrators.

**A Model of Mutual Respect**

An environment of mutual trust and respect is necessary if an institution seeks to act with integrity. They are prerequisites for open communication and honest dialogue about the values, goals and expectations held by the institution and its members. Trust and respect require freedom of expression without fear of retribution, institutional or otherwise. Respect for the diversity of persons, ideas and choices differing from one's own strengthen the culture of the university. Establishing and supporting a diverse community encourages discovery and creativity. If trust should break down, we need to explore the reasons for the breakdown and identify ways for the community to rebuild trust among its members.

The principles of mutual respect are simple and straightforward to write, but are challenging to put into practice in a consistent manner. The spirit of mutual respect supersedes its definition. The following questions are suggested to establish conditions for mutual respect:

*Do I hear you?*

- Did I allow you to finish your thought?
• Did I hear what you have to say?
• Do I understand where you are coming from?

What is my frame of mind?
• Are my actions motivated by fear or anger?
• What am I communicating non-verbally?
• Am I putting you into a category and acting on the ascribed characteristics of that category?
• Can I pause, breathe and think before reacting?

How can I help?
• What is your frame of mind (If I were in your shoes, how would I feel)?
• Will my actions reduce hostility?
• Will my response escalate or deescalate the situation and humanize or dehumanize the person?
• How are we relating to one another?
• Am I in danger?
• Are you in danger?

A senator suggested a change to the wording in the third bullet point in the first section, saying that “…where you are coming from” doesn’t seem to fit the formal language of a motion. Deb said she could accept that as a friendly amendment. Another senator suggested that the original language is appropriate and speaks to the history of the issue.

A member of the Agenda Committee suggested that it is important to endorse the spirit of this motion and that we should be careful not to spend too much time trying to wordsmith.

A senator from the History department said that the proposed motion has been circulated in her department, inspiring lively discussion. Her department understands the spirit of the motion and agrees that a call for civility and respect is needed. The department would like more time to discuss the motion in terms of academic freedoms and the AAUP statement on those freedoms. She moved, on behalf of her department, that the Senate postpone voting on this motion until the next Senate meeting in two weeks. That motion was seconded by her departmental senate colleague.

The chair asked for discussion on the motion to postpone the vote. A senator asked the senator from the History department if there was concern that this document errs too much on one side or the other. The History senator said that there were concerns from both sides of the issue; some felt that a call for “civil discourse” would only serve to shut down academic freedoms, while others believed that a call for “mutual respect” would allow hate speech in the classroom. Some History faculty were concerned that the motion is too vague. Others wanted to know if this applies only to students or to the larger community.
A senator called this motion urgent, asserting that if we continue to postpone the vote for more discussion, we lose the chance to put forward a statement early in the semester. She said she saw nothing dangerous about this motion. The chair noted that the provost would like to see a statement made early. Deb said she can’t see how this motion could be used to suppress free speech, and asserted that these are innocuous guidelines. She reminded the group that in December 2016 the Senate passed a motion in support of diversity, inclusion, and free speech (Senate Motion #XXI-M5), and said that this new motion does nothing to contradicts the principles of that motion.

A senator asked if the History department faculty concerns were with the first draft of this motion or if they had seen the second draft. The senator from History clarified that the faculty have seen both drafts, although with less time to review the second draft. Her colleague asserted that the issue is too important for any vagueness of language.

Several senators expressed appreciation for the concerns of the History faculty, but urged that the vote not be delayed. It was pointed out that this motion carries no legislation and no penalties.

The motion to postpone voting on the original motion was put to a vote and failed, with 7 votes in favor of postponement, 53 votes against, and 4 abstentions.

The group returned to the original motion for more discussion. A senator called the first bullet point in the third section problematic, saying that it assumes too much:

- What is your frame of mind (If I were in your shoes, how would I feel)?

Nathan said that the first two sections are areas under our own control and the third section refers to our efforts towards thoughtful actions to help others. He noted that he would prefer to remove any unclear statement rather than add additional language.

A senator asked why there is no definition of mutual respect in the motion. Deb and Nathan pointed out that the rationale of the motion states that this document does not attempt to define mutual respect but rather to provide a model to demonstrate what acting and speaking with mutual respect might look like. There was some debate as to the value of a definition, or if it is possible to select a single definition that would satisfy the majority. Nathan noted that many historical documents have been created without such definitions. It was noted that the attempt to include a definition would be a sufficiently substantial change to postpone the vote on this motion until the next Senate meeting, which we have voted not to do. It was suggested to change the wording of the second sentence of the rationale to read

“However, the meaning of mutual respect has not been clarified is difficult to clarify,”

Deb and Nathan accepted that as a friendly amendment.
A senator suggested removing the first bullet point in the third section altogether, which Deb said was acceptable as a friendly amendment.

Another senator said he is uncomfortable telling people how to respect others, and suggested changing the term “mutual respect” to “constructive communication,” which concept he said is more transparent and less profound. After brief discussion, Deb said that such a change would be too substantial, requiring a great deal of re-wording.

A senator suggested dividing the third bullet point in the third section into separate points. This was accepted as a friendly amendment. The senator also suggested combining the last two points of this section, but Nathan said he would prefer to not make that change. Another senator asked that the first sentence of the motion be changed to read

“The Faculty Senate endorses the following model of mutual respect in transactions between among faculty, students, staff, and administrators.”

That change was accepted as a friendly amendment. The chair asked that the motion be read as adjusted by friendly amendments. The revised motion follows:

**Rationale:** The subject of civil discourse, and mutual respect, has been discussed frequently in 2017. However, the meaning of mutual respect is difficult to clarify. A model of mutual respect communicates its spirit through simple, straightforward language and actions that would help to identify and create conditions in which mutual respect can flourish. To identify something is to note its importance; to define it is to provide a marker for its use.

The Faculty Senate is not only a deliberative body, it is a normative body identifying important and central values and actions that guide the academic mission of the university. The Senate sends a strong message to our community when the faculty unites behind the principles it upholds.

**Motion:** The Faculty Senate endorses the following model of mutual respect among faculty, students, staff, and administrators.

**A Model of Mutual Respect**

An environment of mutual trust and respect is necessary if an institution seeks to act with integrity. They are prerequisites for open communication and honest dialogue about the values, goals and expectations held by the institution and its members. Trust and respect require freedom of expression without fear of retribution, institutional or otherwise. Respect for the diversity of persons, ideas and choices differing from one's own strengthen the culture of the university. Establishing and supporting a diverse community encourages discovery and creativity. If trust should break down, we need to explore the reasons for the breakdown and identify ways for the community to rebuild trust among its members.
The principles of mutual respect are simple and straightforward to write, but are challenging to put into practice in a consistent manner. The spirit of mutual respect supersedes its definition. The following questions are suggested to establish conditions for mutual respect:

_Do I hear you?
- Did I allow you to finish your thought?
- Did I hear what you have to say?
- Do I understand your point of view?

_What is my frame of mind?
- Are my actions motivated by fear or anger?
- What am I communicating non-verbally?
- Am I putting you into a category and acting on the ascribed characteristics of that category?
- Can I pause, breathe and think before reacting?

_How can I help?
- Can you help me understand your frame of mind?
- Will my actions reduce hostility?
- Will my response escalate or deescalate the situation?
- Will my response humanize or dehumanize the person?
- How are we relating to one another?
- Am I in danger?
- Are you in danger?

The motion, thus adjusted, was put to a vote and passed with 58 votes in favor, 4 votes opposed, and 4 abstentions.

VIII. New Business – There was no new business.

IX. Adjournment – Upon a motion and second to adjourn, the meeting was adjourned at 4:58 p.m.