

2-11-2008

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, February 11, 2008

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Copyright ©2008 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate., "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, February 11, 2008" (2008). *Documents - Faculty Senate*. 894.

https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/894

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Documents - Faculty Senate by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

SUMMARY OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING

02/11/08

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Licari called the meeting to order at 3:20 P.M.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes of the 01/28/08 meeting by Senator Bruess; second by Senator Gray. Motion passed with one abstention.

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

No press present.

COMMENTS FROM INTERIM PROVOST LUBKER

Interim Provost Lubker reported that the Board of Regents (BOR) met last week and there was nothing remarkable to report.

Interim Provost Lubker also commented on the recent email he sent out to the campus community on the student textbook issue, asking faculty to get their booklists, including ISBN number, to their department secretaries as soon as possible for the following semester so this information could be posted on the Northern Iowa Student Government's (NISG) website so that students will have ample time to search the internet for the lowest possible book prices. He noted that there is legislation being introduced both at the state and national level addressing this problem. A lengthy discussion followed.

COMMENTS FROM CHAIR, MICHAEL LICARI

Chair Licari reminded the Senate that there is still money available in the Faculty Senate Speaker's Fund for departments and colleges to use.

NEW BUSINESS

Chair Licari reminded the Senate that they need to select two Faculty Senate representatives to serve on the Provost's

Research and Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion Committee. Discussion followed with Interim Provost Lubker noting that he is hoping for feedback from this committee by the first of April.

Self-nomination to serve on the Provost's Research and Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion Committee by Senator VanWormer; second by Senator Gray.

Self-nomination to serve on the Provost's Research and Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion Committee by Senator Soneson; second by Senator Gray.

The motions passed.

ONGOING BUSINESS

Calendar Item #951 CHFA Faculty Senate Resolution - Liberal Arts Core Committee

Chair Licari noted that this resolution came forward from the CHFA Faculty Senate to direct the UNI Faculty Senate to have the Liberal Arts Core Committee (LACC) work on a process for revising the Liberal Arts Core (LAC). Members of that LACC subcommittee to consider the processes for reviewing curricular proposals regarding the LAC, Ken Baughman, Department of English Language and Literature, and Frank Thompson, Finance, were present to discuss this with the Senate. Dr. Baughman also noted that today's report is a brief interim report, not a final report.

Dr. Baughman stated that clarification of the curricular procedures in general, with respect to consideration to proposals or changes in the LAC, were needed, noting that the General Curriculum review process diagram is relatively straightforward to add or drop a course to a category, or to make a change in a course. However, there is very little explicit provision for consideration of changes in the LAC requirements, such as changes in categories. The University Curriculum Committee (UCC) has extended an invitation to the LACC for consultation and they feel that this will be very useful. A lengthy discussion followed, with comments and suggestions from senators being heard.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

862 Emeritus Status request, Juergen Koppensteiner, Department of Modern Languages, effective 12/07

Motion to approve by Senator Basom; second by Senator Soneson.

Motion passed.

ADJOURNMENT

DRAFT FOR SENATOR'S REVIEW

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
02/11/08
1657

PRESENT: Maria Basom, Gregory Bruess, Phil East, Paul Gray, Bev Kopper, Michael Licari, James Lubker, David Marchesani, Steve O'Kane, Phil Patton, Jerry Smith, Jerry Soneson, Katherine van Wormer, Susan Wurtz

Absent: David Christensen, Jeffrey Funderburk, Mary Guenther, Pierre-Damien Mvuyekure, Donna Schumacher-Douglas, Ira Simet, Michele Yehieli

Jerilyn Marshall was attending for Chris Neuhaus

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Licari called the meeting to order at 3:20 P.M.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes of the 01/28/08 meeting by Senator Bruess; second by Senator Gray. Motion passed with one abstention.

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

No press present.

COMMENTS FROM INTERIM PROVOST LUBKER

Interim Provost Lubker reported that the Board of Regents (BOR) met last week and there was nothing remarkable to report.

Interim Provost Lubker commented on the email he recently sent out to the campus community on the student textbook issue, asking faculty to get their booklists, including ISBN number, to their department secretaries as soon as possible for the next semester. The department secretaries will then send the book lists to Northern Iowa Student Government (NISG) via e-mail so they can be posted on the NISG's website and students will have ample time to search the internet for the lowest possible prices. He has been getting favorable responses that this is something we should do to help student. The problem is the price of the textbooks which we can't control, nor is it an issue of the bookstores dealing in textbooks making too much profit. All faculty can do is help students shop for the cheapest price possible. If we don't do something it looks like the legislature in Iowa will. There is a bill that has passed in the House Education Committee but is currently a very weak bill that doesn't specify any deadlines. There is a much more detailed bill being put forth in Washington which carries more weight that might cause us more trouble and will require publishing houses to make public how much it costs the bookstores to get the book.

Senator Wurtz asked if this is something the Senate should have a discussion about, the idea that faculty are being asked to participate in "sticking a band aid" on a problem? She doesn't want to participate in the "band aid" unless we're also going to take on what could turn into a book war, and noted we should be vocal about it.

Interim Provost Lubker said that he would be glad to see a book war with the publishers happen but right now all he can think of is the "band aid." Several faculty have asked if a letter to book editors would be the way to go and this was discussed at the Cabinet meeting. This is a real difficult political issue because some legislators that have been very helpful to universities are supporting this and we don't want to get them angry by publicly going to war with them. President Allen, Pat Geadlemann, Special Assistant Board and Government Relations, and himself meet regularly with legislators and have discussed this, and will again.

Senator Patton stated that the UNI Registrar's Office and Information Technology Systems have been working with NISG for the past year to accomplish what this legislation has proposed.

Interim Provost Lubker noted that NISG has a clever website but unfortunately there is a short list of departments that have submitted books to it. There have also been discussion with Iowa and Iowa State on this but the perception is that faculty won't participate and it won't be successful. He also noted that if the legislature passes this as a state law it would be difficult to police.

Senator Soneson asked Senator Wurtz to explain what she perceives the problem to be.

Senator Wurtz relayed what she has discussed with one publishing representative, and that is that the cost is largely driven by the ancillary materials, the power points, the videos, the canned lectures. So that someone who's a "talking head" can take the materials and deliver the classroom presence, the exams, do the grading with almost no expertise in the area at all, and those materials aren't cheap. Those ancillary materials take the place of the class prep work faculty do, and allow the class to be taught without any prep by the instructor, and the students are paying for it.

Again, Senator Wurtz continued, she only had a conversation with one publishing representative, who noted that a lot of this is driven by community colleges where they are hiring faculty who do sometimes end up teaching in fields that they do not have much expertise in. The more ancillary materials available, the more attractive it is to these faculty, the more sales they make, and as enrollment in community colleges has increased the more pressure there is to put out these fancy textbooks. Our students are paying for faculty to not have to do their work.

Senator Soneson commented that he doesn't even look at the ancillary materials.

Senator Wurtz continued that in looking at those materials, they would be expensive to produce, and if putting a "band aid" on it helps the students a little bit, ok.

Interim Provost Lubker stated that that's all they're asking right now, a "band aid." Students are currently paying \$500-\$600 a semester for books, which is pretty outrageous when you think about it.

Senator Soneson noted that our students are paying for the communication college education.

Senator VanWormer remarked that she tries everything she can to get the price of the textbooks down and publishers tell her she has to have an Instructor's Manual, and she has to do this and that, and it just goes on and on and on. They are trying to think of gimmicks because there is no profit in the sales of used books. They also make authors come out with more current editions even though the book is not out of date and they tell authors that if they don't they'll get other authors who will. Often times in newer editions there is no new materials, just chapters may be switched and such. Amazon is now selling used books and students are going there. It becomes a vicious cycle with the prices getting higher and higher. She had tried to negotiate for lower prices but when the book comes out the prices are already set high. She has been using Oxford University Press because they make their money off their dictionaries and you can do low price books with them. Many of the publishing companies have been buying each other out which gives fewer options to find lower book prices, and there just doesn't seem to be any solution.

COMMENTS FROM CHAIR, MICHAEL LICARI

Chair Licari reminded the Senate that there is still money available in the Faculty Senate Speaker's Fund. Departments or colleges that have an invitation they would like to extend for a speaker and are considering using the Speaker's Fund should apply as there is a lot of the money still available.

NEW BUSINESS

Chair Licari reminded the Senate that they need to select two Faculty Senate representatives to serve on the Provost's Research and Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion Committee.

Interim Provost Lubker added that United Faculty has given him names of representatives to serve from the Library, Alan Asher, and from Chemistry. Joel Haack, Dean, College of Natural Sciences, will be representing the deans. Two department head names have been forwarded to him from deans, and he has also asked John Fritch, Head, Communication Studies, to poll the heads from his vantage point as chair of that group.

Senator Soneson asked how often the committee would meet?

Interim Provost Lubker replied that he didn't know, and he may be unrealistic but he's hoping for feedback by the first of April.

Senator Smith asked if this committee is prepared to look more broadly at the overall picture of evaluating faculty performance or is it strictly to look at the definition of what counts as research and scholarship?

Interim Provost Lubker responded that it's to look mostly at promotion and tenure decisions, and the research and scholarship definition as it applies to promotion and tenure.

Senator Smith asked what is motivating that particular concern, as opposed to a broader concern with how we assess faculty, even post tenure in terms of what their contributions are?

Interim Provost Lubker replied that this is more manageable and something that can be done in a shorter period of time. It doesn't mean it's any more important, it's just that we can probably get it done in less time. Other schools have done it; Iowa State recently did this. People have brought this up to him since he arrived at UNI, wouldn't it be nice if we could broaden the definition to include more things that go on that could be viewed as research or scholarship. It seems a more manageable problem.

Self-nomination to serve on the Provost's Research and Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion Committee by Senator VanWormer; second by Senator Gray.

Self-nomination to serve on the Provost's Research and Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion Committee by Senator Soneson; second by Senator Gray.

The motions passed.

ONGOING BUSINESS

Calendar Item #951 CHFA Faculty Senate Resolution - Liberal Arts Core Committee

Chair Licari noted that this resolution came forward from the CHFA Faculty Senate to direct the UNI Faculty Senate to have the LACC work on a process for revising the LAC.

Ken Baughman, Department of English Language and Literature, and Frank Thompson, Finance, were both present to discuss this with the Senate. Dr. Baughman, noted that Donna Hoffman, Political Science, also served on this LACC subcommittee to consider the processes for reviewing curricular proposals regarding the LAC. One of the things they looked at was the Curriculum Handbook, in particular the flow chart that appears in that handbook, which they distributed to the Senate. Dr. Baughman also noted that today's report is a brief interim report, not a final report.

Dr. Baughman continued, stating that clarification of the curricular procedures in general, with respect to consideration to proposals or changes in the LAC, would be particularly helpful. The General Curriculum review process Diagram is relatively straightforward to add or drop a course to a category, or to make a change in a course. There is, however, very little explicit provision for consideration of changes in the LAC requirements, such as changes in categories. They understand that the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) is reviewing curricular procedures, including procedures for curricular changes, this semester. While their own deliberations are not complete, it seems that it would be useful for there to be some consultation regarding curricular procedures between their subcommittee, the LACC and the UCC. As he understands it, the LAC is "flying a bit under the radar," provisions for considering proposals are not very clear and there is some ambiguity. He indicated on the chart that the LACC reports to the UCC, which reports back to the LACC, and then the LACC reports to the Faculty Senate. There are some things that could be clarified and things that could be spelled out in more detail or more explicitly. He has talked with Associate Provost Kopper, Chair of the UCC, and the UCC has extended an invitation to the LACC to undertake this consultation as they feel that it would be useful.

Senator Soneson asked what consultation Dr. Baughman was talking about.

Dr. Baughman responded that it would be a consultation between the LACC and the UCC regarding procedures for considering proposals for the LAC.

Senator Soneson asked if this is in regard to proposals to change one class here and one class there, or will they also be considering the procedures involved in a major overhaul of the LACC?

Dr. Baughman replied, that yes, they are looking at both, and that proposals regarding changes in individual courses, adding or dropping a course here or there in the LAC, are accommodated by the current procedures reasonably well. In looking at the curricular procedures he saw that there was very little direction for how to proceed when there's a larger proposal for the requirements themselves within the LAC. Several years ago the LAC did bring a proposal to the Faculty Senate, which was accepted in part. There's just not an explicit provision in the procedures which would be followed each time such a proposal might come forward. We need a standing procedure so that all parties, those that are making a proposal, those that are considering it, and those that would be affected by it, all have an understanding and that there's provision for their participation in the process.

Dr. Thompson added they have had several meetings in which they have looked at how they would go about developing such a process. Within that context they thought of what major changes that would be envisioned under this process, as well as minor changes. They then went to the idea that before any change could be made there should be some rationale given as to why the change should be made. There should be some consultation in terms of the individual departments, colleges and faculty that are affected, and they should have an opportunity to find out what's going on and provide input. In the course of that particular discussion they discovered that in looking at what they already have in place for curriculum change processes for courses there is a lengthy form to be filled out. However, there is no form or any type of process for major curriculum changes. In looking at the process diagram there is a line going from the Undergraduate Committee on Curricula to the UNI Faculty Senate, and a line going both ways from the LACC to the UNI Faculty Senate. In reviewing whether there have ever been any major changes to the curriculum which involve the LAC in which they bypass this lengthy form that's filled out for curriculum courses, they noted that Capstone was changed and came to the Faculty senate without going through this separate process.

Associate Provost Kopper responded that the New Capstone model did go to the UCC before coming to the Faculty Senate.

Dr. Thompson noted that that would then appear to provide evidence that there shouldn't be a separate line in which separate proposals would bypass that separate UCC. Before a process can be developed we need an answer to that particular question, would they maintain this existing UCC structure and would large changes also go through that process, or would they go directly from the LACC into the Faculty Senate?

Senator Smith asked if it currently isn't the case that all proposed changes to the LAC have to go through the UCC?

Associate Provost Kopper replied that no, they don't, that it's just certain kinds of changes.

Senator Smith noted that it is important to understand that the LAC doesn't really belong to departments; it belongs to the faculty as a whole. That may have some impact in terms of the process. A consultation with departments is fine but it wouldn't be in a situation where departments could veto changes because it is a university program, not a departmental program.

Associate Provost Kopper noted that the UCC is in the process of revising the Curriculum Handbook, and there are contradictions between what's on the flow chart and what's it says that various bodies will do. For example, in the handbook it talks about the LACC reviewing all college-approved proposals but yet in the text it also states that all departments will forward LAC proposals directly to the LACC. There is confusion and that's what the UCC is trying to clean up, and in that regard invited Dr. Siobhan Morgan, Chair, LACC and other committee members to meet at the next UCC meeting to try to take care of the discrepancies and confusion in the process. This issue came up frequently at the curriculum review where they were reviewing individual Capstone courses.

Dr. Barbara Cutter, UCC member, commented that they tried to talk about broad changes at the last meeting but determined that they needed to talk with the LACC because of the discrepancies.

Dr. Thompson stated that their thinking in terms of the process and the direction that the Faculty Senate has given them on this issue is that if a change in a course goes through a process whereby a form is filled out and there is consultation and faculty are made aware of it and able to give input, then it should also happen if it is a major change of not just one course but several courses. There will be some paperwork and

documentation similar to what there is for one course but the question is what is the process under which that paperwork would go forward, would it go to the UCC or directly to the Faculty Senate?

Senator Soneson noted that this issue was really raised in relation to a major overhaul of the LAC, and it would seem that if there is a major overhaul, something much more complicated than consultation between the UCC and the LACC would be at stake here. The Senate needs to decide if they really want a major overhaul, and if we do, the Senate would direct the LACC subcommittee to return to the Senate with a set of procedures which would involve a vision of how faculty across campus would get involved in thinking about and consenting to that kind of change. Then by the time the program would be passed, and faculty teaching those courses would be on board. If it's a consultation between the LACC and the UCC, interesting proposals might come forward but no one would be on board. It's no problem if it's one course here or one requirement there, but this is the 21st century and we're probably in the position of wanting and needing to change our LAC as a whole. And if that's the case, we need to consider how other schools have gone about this and study what it would take to get everyone on board and to come up with a vision that could be shared.

Senator Basom, LACC member, stated that one of the things the LACC had discussed was, do they want to put into writing that every ten or twelve years they suggest or hold a major reconsideration of the LAC? Because it is so difficult to get any major changes through, do they want to write this in? Problems in the handbook do need to be clarified because anyone should be able to bring a proposal forward but they have to know how to do it. But do we want to also direct the LACC to come up with a mechanism for routine reconsideration of the LAC? They do overlap but they're not identical.

Senator Soneson responded that he hasn't thought about that but what he feels would be worth talking about as a Faculty Senate is whether or not we want to consider a major overhaul now. Whether we want to consider it fifteen years from now is another matter, but are we in a position where we can see that our current LAC program is outdated or isn't preparing our students sufficiently?

Dr. Baughman clarified that here the present suggestion is that the consultation between the LACC and the UCC would focus specifically on what kinds of procedures would be appropriate

for curricular review for proposals for the LAC, to get them defined and thorough and explicit. His expectation is that working this out between the two committees would provide for the kinds of things that Senator Soneson has suggested. Most importantly, those procedures would provide for what Senator Smith reminded us of, that the LAC belongs to the faculty as a whole.

Dr. Thompson added that what is also critical is if the discussion is a one time only separate process. In talking about change it would appear that we want to look at a process that's fairly simple in terms of incremental changes, which can then be reviewed periodically to determine whether they make sense. If they don't, then eliminate them and go back to what was before, but over time develop an improvement of the process whereby everybody's on board. If we wait five or ten years the people on that committee are going to say that's not a committee they want to be on as it's going to involve a lot of time and at then end will we have any change at all?

Senator East stated that he believes procedures are important and they need to allow for changes from a variety of situations. Student Outcomes Assessment procedures are being developed for the LAC and that also needs to be worked into the procedure for change as well. There are two main ways to do a significant revision; the first being the Faculty Senate deciding that it's time it should be looked at. Another way that seems reasonable is that someone comes along with a really good idea, or one that they perceive to be a good idea. That's what this is about, for people to have ideas and to circulate them and to have them evaluated and see what happens. The procedure needs to allow for that even though the LAC may have just been revised. If someone comes along with a really good idea the procedures ought to allow them to put their idea forward. The procedures need to allow all of that to happen. He feels better ideas come from an individual who talks with other people and writes his idea as opposed to a committee developing something that kind of politically stands with everybody. He appreciates having people on board and that's a good idea but to design something that comes about in an effort to get people on board will often times ruin what you're after.

Senator Smith followed up on what Senator East said, noting that it is his understanding that any faculty member can bring forward a proposal for a change in curriculum, force it to the full faculty for review, and that was done several years ago by the English Department with respect to the LAC. He believes it

was not passed, but it was done. Unless you are going to override what he believes is a very fundamental principal, allowing and encouraging our faculty to develop ideas, any process that this group develops has to accommodate that.

Dr. Thompson responded that they have looked at ways to go about doing that. The issue is where would that proposal go initially, how would it be evaluated in terms of assisting that faculty member so that they develop the best possible proposal and one that has a chance of really meeting the needs of students, as well as approval of other faculty? Where is that process to assist with development of proposals so that it's successful?

Senator Smith asked why can't they simply set a process where the proposals are brought to the LACC, the LACC then provides provisions for the full university community to be made aware of and review the proposals, to bring comments back to the LACC who then makes an evaluation proposal, votes on it and sends it to the Faculty Senate? What's wrong with that?

Dr. Thompson replied that the charge they were given from the Faculty Senate in terms of developing a process was the intention within the context Senator Smith what has brought up, to create a process where everybody becomes aware of proposals, can provide input and whereby everyone senses they have ownership of the process, and it leads to a chance for success of some change.

Senator Smith noted that he believes the process he just described meets every one of those criteria.

Dr. Thompson continued that Senator Smith has pointed the best example of why that process doesn't work without developing a support for that proposal; that the proposal brought forward by the English Department did not pass.

Senator Smith asked Dr. Thompson to not over generalize, that one example hardly proves a case.

Dr. Thompson continued, noting that from that one example they haven't seen any other proposals.

Senator Smith responded that's because there's been no other process.

Dr. Baughman commented that these are the issues and the possibilities that could be worked out and explored between the two committees. He especially appreciates Senator East's comments, and he feels personally that there does need to be provision for both proposals generated by committees and individuals or small groups who have strong commitment to the LAC.

Dr. Thompson added that as they continue to work on this they will report back to the Faculty Senate, and ask for their input and take it back for further discussion to try to craft a proposal that is workable for the Faculty Senate as well as faculty involved in the LAC.

Associate Provost Kopper noted that the UCC deals with proposals that have been approved by a department and by the college. The New Capstone courses, which were in the curriculum, were discussed with the UCC because they were specific courses, which is what occurred in the last curriculum cycle. In terms of the big issues such as category changes, those have not always gone to the UCC; they come directly to the Senate. Typically the UCC only discusses proposals that have gone through the departments and the college senates. With the LAC, which is university-wide, that would raise the issue of whether they would all have to go from the LAC to all the colleges before it would come to the UCC, and that's a whole other layer to consider.

Dr. Baughman commented that that's the kind of thing they could think through together. His personal sense is that the current curricular procedures are pretty much designed with major and minor programs in mind, and there's not the kind of explicit intention to changes in the LAC that would be appropriate given the importance of that program.

Senator East stated that it seems to him that because we've always done something isn't necessarily a reason to continue doing it.

Senator Soneson asked if this means that the Dr. Baughman and Dr. Thompson will go back to their committee to try to work out procedures in discussion with the UCC for major overhaul of the LAC.

In response to Dr. Thompson's concern that his committee will be working with either the UCC or the UCC's committee to look at change, Associate Provost Kopper noted that the UCC committee is looking at taking care of the errors and revising the procedures

in the handbook. Because the LAC is referenced in this they have invited Dr. Thompson's group to come and give their recommendations as to what they would like changed in the handbook related to that.

Dr. Thompson stated that as he sees it they would then come forward with a proposal that both groups would find agreement with, and would report to the Senate.

Dr. Baughman asked if the resulting changes in the Curriculum Handbook could be reviewed by the Senate?

Associate Provost Kopper replied that yes they would.

Chair Licari thanked the LACC subcommittee for the update and noted that this will be left as Ongoing Business and will await further reports from the LACC.

Associate Provost Kopper added that this is a curriculum matter and she's unaware of the LACC's timeline, but they will be reviewing the Capstone management issues and within that is embedded the course numbering for the Capstone courses. It is her understanding that will have catalog implications.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

862 Emeritus Status request, Juergen Koppensteiner, Department of Modern Languages, effective 12/07

Motion to approve by Senator Basom; second by Senator Soneson.

Senator Basom stated that Juergen Koppensteiner served 40 years in the Department of Modern Languages at UNI. He's a prolific writer who's published at least six textbooks on Austrian culture and literature, published over 70 articles and book chapters, close to 200 reviews, over 100 articles in leading Austrian newspapers, and he's presented hundreds of conference and invited papers on Austrian literature and culture. He's also had appointments as a visiting faculty member in Austria, New Zealand, China, Russia, Finland and Germany, and she also remembers him going to Iran. He has received numerous awards, including the Officer's Cross of the Order of Merit of the Republic of Austria in 1989, Iowa Outstanding University Foreign Language Educator of the Year in 1994, and the American Association of German Teachers Certificate of Merit in 2001. But the numbers, however impressive, do not reveal the impact he

had on his students. In conclusion, she related a brief story he told her at the end of last semester before he retired. He had just received an email from a former student, a Russian student who completed an M.A. degree in German at UNI and was currently working as an interpreter in Vienna, Austria. The student wrote to tell Dr. Koppensteiner that as he happened to be walking down the main street in Vienna, he passed one of the major bookstores and happened to glance in the window only to see displayed in the window the latest edition of a book by Dr. Koppensteiner and laughed at the thought of that coincidence: a student from Russia who sees the textbook for his German professor from Iowa displayed in a bookstore window in Vienna. This story encapsulates the international scope of Dr. Koppensteiner's work, as well as capturing the personal dimension because he has kept in touch with a lot of his students and really touched a lot of students' lives. Dr. Koppensteiner had a renowned 40 years here, and we wish him well in retirement.

Motion to approve passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Senator Soneson to adjourn; second by Senator O'Kane.
Motion passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Dena Snowden
Faculty Senate Secretary