



The University of Vermont  
FACULTY SENATE

**Minutes**

Monday, May 20, 2021

Online via Microsoft Teams 3:00 – 4:30 p.m.

Recording of this meeting is available on Microsoftstream:

<https://web.microsoftstream.com/video/8b1a17a3-81a5-4c0f-a4e0-3cad43d3c753>

---

The meeting was called to order by Faculty Senate President, Chris Burns, at 3:00 PM

**Senators in Attendance: 71**

**Absent:** Senators Cepeda-Benit (Psychological Science), Callahan (Extension), Weinstein (Family Medicine), Terrien (Medicine), Moore (Pediatrics), Maruti (Psychiatry), Calkins (Family Medicine), Dubief (Mechanical Engineering)

---

**1. Board of Trustees Chair, Ron Lumbra**

Chris Burns welcomed Chair Lumbra, who was invited to address the Faculty Senate before opening the floor for discussion and conversation. On behalf of the Board of Trustees, Chair Lumbra acknowledged the challenges faced by the faculty during the last year, and expressed appreciation for the faculty's agility, resilience, and caring for students. Despite all the challenge, UVM has a lot to be proud of, and has been able to maintain focus on important mission-oriented issues, such as support for students, and our impact on Vermont. Highlights include an 40% increase in research funding, a commitment to divest from fossil fuels, the opening of the Office of Engagement, increased diversity on the BOT, and an impressive list of faculty awards. The Board is very empathetic and understanding of the personal toll and stress that the pandemic has caused for faculty and their families. Chair Lumbra made a personal plea for faculty to take care of themselves for their own mental health and wellbeing. Chair Lumbra addressed issues from the board perspective, including academic reorganization, low enrollment majors, the concept of no-confidence, and resource allocation in a resource availability challenge.

Recording of this meeting is available on Microsoftstream:

<https://web.microsoftstream.com/video/8b1a17a3-81a5-4c0f-a4e0-3cad43d3c753>

**2. Faculty Senate President's Welcome Remarks** – Christopher Burns made the following remarks:

- Committee Reports – Year-end reports from the six Senate standing committees are posted with the agenda. As there is little overlap between Senators and Senate Committee members, Senators are often unaware of what is happening in the standing committees. Senators are strongly encouraged to read the committee reports to get a better sense of the full breadth and depth of work that is occurring in the Senate and reach out to our committee chairs with any questions or suggested topics to address in the 2021/2022 academic year.
- Appreciation of Senators and Committee members – President Burns thanked the Senators and Committee members for their service and engagement in the work of the Senate during this

difficult year. In addition to the normal Senate and Committee duties, faculty served on UVM Strong committees, the Academic Reorganization Working Group, the Bylaws revision committee, a joint General Education committee, the Childcare Working Group, and more. President Burns offered special thanks to departing Executive Council members, Michael Giangreco Chair of the Professional Standards Committee, Laura Almstead Chair of the Curricular Affairs Committee, and two departing members-at-large, Brian Beckage and Thomas Ahern.

3. **Presentation of Degrees** – Chris Burns stated that due to unusual nature of this semester's academic calendar, the bulk of degree conferrals will take place at a special Faculty Senate Executive Council meeting on May 27, 2021. Dean Richard Page of the Larner College of Medicine presented 110 candidates who successfully completed their requirements for the degree Doctor of Medicine as of April 30, 2021.

It was moved, seconded and voted that the 110 LCOM graduates be recommended by the Senate to the President for the awarding of the appropriate degrees or certificates as authorized by the Board of Trustees. Individual names of the graduates are recorded with the Minutes of this meeting in the permanent Senate records.

**Vote: 100% Approve, 0% Oppose.**

4. **Consent Agenda** - The following items were voted as a consent agenda:

- Minutes of the 4/19/21 Faculty Senate Meetings
- Student Affairs
  - a. Inclusive Data Practices Resolution
- Curricular Affairs
  - a. New micro-Certificate of Graduate Study in Agroecology (CALs)
  - b. No-Contest Deactivation of the Master of Science in Engineering Management (CEMS/GC)
  - c. Name Change of the Health Sciences program and major to Public Health Sciences (CNHS) New concentrations in the existing Nutrition & Food Sciences major (CALs)

**Motion:** President Burns stated that the Consent Agenda came to the Senate moved and seconded by the Curricular Affairs Committee. A call was made for requests to pull any item off the consent agenda before the vote. No requests were received, and the vote opened.

**Vote: 99% approve, 0% oppose, 1% abstain. The motion carried.**

5. **Review Process for Proposals to Restructure within an Academic Unit** -

**Motion:** President Burns stated that the three processes attached to the agenda came to the Senate moved and seconded by the Senate Executive Council. Discussion began with a reminder from President Burns that these are processes regarding **academic unit structure** (department, school, college), and are meant to provide a process for considering proposals on academic unit structure as no process currently exists. Curricular questions are still handled by our Curricular Affairs processes, and any related curricular questions must be handled before questions regarding academic structure. President Burns recognized Senator Louis deRosset.

**Motion:** Louis deRosset moved to amend sections 4(d) of each Procedures Relates to Academic Unit Structure to increase the depth of the review as follows (strike through and bold text reflect the proposed changes):

At the time of circulation, an ad hoc committee (membership described above) will be appointed to ~~review~~ **manage a process of comment on the proposal and to make a report and recommendation to the Senate.** All feedback collected ~~during the comment period~~ **from the electronic survey described above** will be made available to the ad hoc committee. **The ad hoc committee will also invite faculty comment on the proposal either in writing or in person.** During their review, the ad hoc committee may ask the [Provost/proposers] to respond to specific comments. Additionally, the ad hoc committee will meet with the [Provost/dean of the responsible unit] and program faculty, and may request additional information ~~as part of their review.~~ **The comment period will last for 60 days from the time the ad hoc committee is constituted. It must fall wholly during the normal appointment period for 9-month faculty, and no more than five days of that period may occur between fall semester grade submission and the start of spring semester classes.**

Upon completion of ~~their review~~ **the comment period**, the ad hoc committee will write a report summarizing **commentary received and** any additional information gathered during the ~~review process~~ **comment period.** ~~provide a rationale for their recommendation, and propose to~~ **The committee will also recommend to the Senate one of the following actions:**

- **That** the (proposed action) be implemented as described in the proposal;
- **That** the (proposed action) be implemented with ~~the following~~ adjustments or conditions;
- **That** the (proposed action) be implemented only if ~~the following~~ **certain** concerns ~~can be~~ **are** resolved;
- **That** the (proposed action) not be implemented at the present time, or in the present form, ~~in view of the following perceived difficulties;~~
- **That** ~~We do not yet have adequate~~ information **pertinent to the** evaluation of the (proposed action) **is not available** and ~~therefore~~ **that the Senate** request the following clarification ~~before completing our evaluation.~~

**The report will provide a justification for the ad hoc committee's recommendation and specify any relevant adjustments, conditions, concerns, or matters still requiring clarification.**

The ad hoc committee will complete its work within ~~14~~ **30** days of the end of the comment period, unless significant issues arise that require additional time for the ad hoc committee to complete its review.

The motion was seconded. Discussion included the intent and potential impacts of increasing the timeframe for the process.

**Motion:** Mary Cushman moved to amend the proposed amendment to change the 60 days in the first paragraph to 40 days, and the 30 days in the last sentence to 20 days. The motion was seconded. The question was called and seconded.

**Vote: 98% approve, 2% opposed. The motion carried, ending debate.**

Chris Burns called the vote to amend the proposed amendment.

**Vote: 84% approve, 14% oppose, 2% abstain. The motion carried.**

Debate on the motion to amend section 4(d) continued. The question was called and seconded.

**Vote: 96% approve, 4% oppose. The motion carried, ending debate**

Chris Burns called the vote on the motion to amend section 4(d) to increase the depth of review as amended.

**Vote: 79% approve, 16% oppose, 5% abstain. The motion carried.**

**Motion:** Louis deRosset moved to amend sections 4(d) of each Procedures Related to Academic Unit Structure to include a process of revisions and resubmission as follows (strike through and bold text reflect the proposed changes):

At the time of circulation, an ad hoc committee (membership described above) will be appointed to manage a process of comment on the proposal and to make a report and recommendation to the Senate. All feedback collected from the electronic survey described above will be made available to the ad hoc committee. The ad hoc committee will also invite faculty comment on the proposal either in writing or in person. **The ad hoc committee will summarize faculty comment to the [Provost's Office/proposers] for the purpose of responding to commentary and/or revising the proposal.** ~~During their review,~~ Additionally, the ad hoc committee may ask the [Provost/proposers] to respond to specific comments. Additionally, the ad hoc committee will meet with the [Provost/dean of the responsible unit] and program faculty, and may request additional information. The comment **and revision** period will last for 40 days from the time the ad hoc committee is constituted, **though the committee will extend the period for comment and revision if members judge that revisions to the original proposal are significant enough to warrant another round of commentary.** The **comment and revision period** must fall wholly during the normal appointment period for 9-month faculty, and no more than five days of that period may occur between fall semester grade submission and the start of spring semester classes.

Upon completion of the comment **and revision** period, the ad hoc committee will write a report summarizing commentary received, ~~and~~ any additional information gathered during the comment period, **and the revisions (if any) made to the proposal on the basis of the commentary.** The committee will also recommend to the Senate one of the following:

- That the (proposed action) be implemented as described in the proposal;
- That the (proposed action) be implemented with adjustments or conditions;
- That the (proposed action) be implemented only if certain concerns are resolved;
- That the (proposed action) not be implemented at the present time, or in the present form;
- That information pertinent to the evaluation of the (proposed action) is not available and that the Senate request clarification.

The report will provide a justification for the ad hoc committee's recommendation and specify any relevant adjustments, conditions, concerns, or matters still requiring clarification.

The ad hoc committee will complete its work within 20 days of the end of the comment **and revision** period, unless significant issues arise that require additional time for the ad hoc committee to complete its review.

The motion was seconded. Discussion included requests for clarification regarding the ad hoc committee's recommendations and if they are meant to be advice only or a backstop that would force a revision. Concerns were expressed over the Senate's jurisdiction over lower-level review processes, and the potential for a proposal to get stuck in a commentary loop.

The question was called, and seconded.

**Vote: 96% approve, 4% oppose. The motion carried, ending debate.**

Chris Burns called the vote on the motion to amend sections 4(d) to include a process of revision and resubmission.

**Vote: 91% approve, 7% oppose, 2% abstain. The motion carried.**

**Motion:** Louis deRosset moved to amend the Procedures Related to Academic Unit Structure sections 2(h) College and Schools, 2(j) Department, 2(i) School within a College to require election for members of the ad hoc review committee as follows:

**Replace the two sentences:**

An ad hoc committee of nine members, to include representatives from the Faculty Senate, the Faculty Senate Executive Council (FSEC), the Senate Curricular Affairs Committee, the Senate Financial and Physical Planning Committee, the Senate Student Affairs Committee, the Senate Educational and Research Technologies Committee, and the Senate Research, Scholarship, and Creative Arts Committee, will review the proposal. The members of the ad hoc review committee and a Chair of the committee will be appointed by the Faculty Senate President in consultation with the Faculty Senate Executive Council.

**With:**

An ad hoc committee of nine members will review the proposal. The ad hoc committee will include 3 faculty senators **elected by the Faculty Senate**, and one member each of the Faculty Senate Executive Council (FSEC), the Senate Curricular Affairs Committee, the Senate Financial and Physical Planning Committee, the Senate Student Affairs Committee, the Senate Educational and Research Technologies Committee, and the Senate Research, Scholarship, and Creative Arts Committee, **selected by those bodies**.

The motion was seconded. There was no discussion.

**Vote: 91% approve, 6% oppose, 4% abstain. The motion carried.**

**Motion:** Louis deRosset moved to amend the Procedures Related to Academic Unit Structure sections 2(h) College and Schools, 2(j) Department, 2(i) School within a College to allow faculty members in the affected units to serve on the ad hoc committee as follows:

**Delete the sentence:**

The committee members may not hold primary or secondary appointments in academic unit(s) that are the subject of the proposal.

The motion was seconded. There was no discussion.

**Vote: 83% approve, 13% oppose, 4% abstain. The motion carried.**

Chris Burns re-opened discussion on the Procedures Related to Academic Unit Structure as amended. There was no discussion.

**Motion:** To approve the Procedures Related to Academic Unit Structure as amended.

**Vote: 92% Approve, 4% Oppose, 4% Abstain. The motion carried.**

6. **(4:42 PM) Resolution Concerning the Faculty Senate's Authority** – Chris Burns recognized Jacques Bailly to present a resolution brought to the Senate by petition of 19 Faculty Senators.

**A Resolution Concerning the Faculty Senate's Authority**

**Whereas** the Faculty Senate has been empowered to “review and establish policy with respect to... All curricular matters, including establishment, dissolution, and substantial changes of degree programs” (CBL 1.1.b); and

**Whereas** the Faculty Senate is also empowered to “review, to recommend, and to participate in the formulation of policy with regard to institutional priorities; the allocation and utilization of the University's human, fiscal, and physical resources; academic organization, including the establishment or elimination of colleges and departments and the reorganization of the general university and college academic structure; [and] administrative procedures and organizational structure,” among other matters (CBL 1.2.a-c, h); and

**Whereas** in recent years, but particularly in the current academic year, administrative proposals, including substantial cuts to programs, have been brought forward publicly without clear consultation with the faculty; and

**Whereas** those proposals require changes to curricula, which is a clear violation of the faculty's, including the Faculty Senate's, authority; and

**Whereas** the current effort to reorganize the university originally lacked substantial faculty presence on the reorganizational working group (which was a clear case of ignoring the Faculty Senate's authority to participate in formulation of policy) and this was only corrected in response to Faculty Senate demands; and

**Whereas** the principle of shared governance stipulates that Faculty and Administration collaborate in the long term planning of the University; and

**Whereas** Faculty Senate and Administration collaboration in long term planning has generally occurred only on an ad hoc basis;

**Therefore** be it resolved that the Faculty Senate design regular procedures whereby the Faculty Senate's authority, as cited above, may be fulfilled in a robust, meaningful, and mandatory way; and

**Therefore** be it resolved that the Faculty Senate charge an ad hoc committee\* to 1) determine those areas where new procedures for assertion of the Faculty Senate's authority under 1.2 of the Constitution and Bylaws are needed; 2) formulate, and circulate among the faculty for comment, proposals creating regular and mandatory procedures, bodies, and roles to exercise the Faculty Senate's authority in these area; and 3) bring final proposals designed to create regular and mandatory procedures and/or bodies and/or roles that lead to assertion of the Faculty Senate's authority to the Senate for adoption.

Said committee shall be formed and charged before the second Faculty Senate meeting of the Fall of 2021, and be comprised of 2 faculty senators each from CAS and LCOM, 1 faculty senator each from the other major academic units; the President of the Faculty Senate will also be a member of said committee (ex officio); members shall be elected by the faculty senators of their respective units. Said committee shall report back to the Faculty Senate regularly during the 2021-22 academic year with the intent to present their proposals for review and adoption by the Senate as a whole.

Sarah Alexander

Jacques Bailly

Pablo Bose

Suzy Comerford

Jessica DeMink-Carthew

Louis deRosset

Bogac Ergene

David Feurzeig

Kyle Ikeda

Adrian Ivakhiv  
Dale Jaffe  
Anthony Julianelle  
Mary Lou Kete  
Ignacio Lopez-Vicuna  
Katherine Merrill  
William Mierse  
Severin Schneebeli  
Peter VonDoepp  
Laura Webb

---

\*7.3 Ad Hoc Committees. Select committees may be created by the Senate, the Executive Council, or the Senate President for the purpose of studying specific problems and preparing proposals relating thereto. These committees will ordinarily be appointed by the Senate President, after consultation with the Executive Council, but may also be appointed by a majority vote of the Executive Council or of the Faculty Senate. They will terminate when their assignment is complete or within one year of the date of appointment, whichever is shortest. They may be reappointed. An ad hoc committee is directly responsible to the entity appointing it, to which it shall report.

The resolution was seconded. Discussion included the desire for increased communication and meaningful consultation, and the need to have a process that is more engaging of the President and Provost and their teams to improve shared governance.

**Vote: 83% approve, 13% oppose, 4% abstain. The resolution carried.**

**4:57 PM Academic Reorganization Update – David Jenemann and Academic Reorganization Working Group members.** The presentation slides were attached to the agenda and to these minutes. After his presentation, Dean Jenemann opened the floor for questions. Discussion included:

- the tentative plan for analysis of the qualitative data,
- a request to update the website feedback form,
- clarification that the academic reorganization process is looking at academic alignment, and the reputation of our programs, etc., to ensure that the University is set up for success going forward,
- The Reorg working group is not yet at the point to make recommendations. Questions anticipated to arise after the data is analyzed include: How the reorg will enhance student experience, enable better collaboration, and identify things that need to be nourished?

Recording of this meeting is available on Microsoftstream:

<https://web.microsoftstream.com/video/8b1a17a3-81a5-4c0f-a4e0-3cad43d3c753>

7. **5:25 PM University Finances (follow-up to April conversation) – Jane Knodell, FPPC Chair –** Jane Knodell, Chair of the Senate Financial and Physical Planning Committee (FPPC), reported that the May meeting of the FPPC included a follow-up conversation with VP Cate to discuss the apparent disconnect between the structural deficit problem in the General Fund. The FPPC asked, and VP Cate agreed to provide the FPPC with year-end actuals on the General Fund budget. The

Provost also agreed to be part of the conversation. The FPPC plans to study the information and produce a report to bring back to the full Senate.

**8. 5:31 PM New Business**

- Jeanne Shea reported that the UVM Faculty Women’s Caucus has produced a report of the results of an April 2021 survey on campus climate, working conditions, and equity for women, LGBTQ+, and BIPOC faculty.
- Meaghan Emery reported a list of concerns from the group UVM United Against the Cuts.
- Luis Duffaut-Espinosa spoke on behalf of the Department of Electrical and Biomedical Engineering regarding the limitation on how much UVM can pay students through sponsored programs, and its impact on hiring and retaining undergraduate students.

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 PM