

2-25-2019

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, February 25, 2019

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©2019 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

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



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate., "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, February 25, 2019" (2019). *Documents - Faculty Senate*. 1248.

https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/1248

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.

Regular Meeting
UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING
2/25/19 (3:30 – 4:14)
Mtg. #1820
SUMMARY MINUTES
Scholar Space (301) Rod Library

Call for Press Identification: No members of the Press were present.

Guests: Cyndi Dunn, Wes Dunn, Lily Schwarz, Marybeth Stalp.

Courtesy Announcements:

UNI President **Nook** explained about the purpose of the Future Visioning Committee and answered questions regarding senior leadership decisions made in regard to the recent Waka Flocka concert. (See pages 4-13.)

Faculty Chair **Cutter** asked faculty for feedback in a brief Qualtrics survey on voting rights for faculty members who are not tenure or tenure-track. This will be a voting issue at the September Fall Faculty meeting. (See pages 12-13.)

United Faculty President **Hawbaker** announced the faculty contract ratification and further explained the procedures by which Merit pay will be distributed this year and next year. (See pages 13-15.)

NISG Vice President **Ahart** pronounced the recent visit to the Capitol “a great success,” and thanked faculty including Dr. **Hesse** for the support for students running for elected student government offices. (See pages 15-17.)

Consideration of Calendar Items for Docketing

1320 [Proposed Revisions to the Curriculum Handbook](#)
** (O’Kane/Zeitz) Motion to docket in regular order. Passed.

[1321 Emeritus request for Dennis Schmidt](#)

[1322 Emeritus request for Angeleita Floyd](#)

[1323 GERC Consultation](#)

** (Zeitz/Neibert) Motion to bundle 1321, 1322, 1323 for **March 11** docket. Passed.

Consideration of Docket Items

- 1438 1317 [Emeritus request for Deborah Giarusso](#)
** (Burnight/Strauss) Motion passed. (See pages 22-23.)
- 1439 1318 [Emeritus request for Cynthia Dunn](#)
** (Burnight/Gould) Motion passed. (See pages 23-24.)
- 1440 1319 [Emeritus request for Anne Myles](#)
** (Mattingly/Burnight) Motion passed. (See pages 24-25.)

Adjournment: (Strauss/Zeitz) 4:14

Next Meeting:

3:30 p.m. Monday March 11, 2019
Scholar Space (301) Rod Library
University of Northern Iowa

A complete transcript of 26 pages and 0 addendum follows.

**FULL TRANSCRIPT of the
UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING**

February 11th, 2019

Present: Senators Imam **Alam**, John **Burnight**, Faculty Senate Secretary Gretchen **Gould**, Senators Kenneth **Hall**, Tom **Hesse**, Bill **Koch**, Faculty Senate Vice-Chair Jim **Mattingly**, Senators Justin **Mertz**, Peter **Neibert**, Steve **O’Kane**, Faculty Senate Chair Amy **Petersen**, Senators Mark **Sherrad**, Gloria **Stafford**, Andrew **Stollenwerk**, Shahram **Varzavand**, and Leigh **Zeitz**. **Also Present:** NISG Vice President Kristin **Ahart**, UNI Faculty Chair Barbara **Cutter**, United Faculty Chair Becky **Hawbaker**, UNI President Mark **Nook**, Associate Provost Patrick **Pease**, Associate Provost John **Vallentine**, and Provost Jim **Wohlpert**.

Not Present: Senators Seong-in **Choi**, Nicole **Skaar**.

Guests: Cyndi **Dunn**, Wes **Dunn**, Lily **Schwarz**, Marybeth **Stalp**.

CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Petersen: Alright, should we go ahead and get started? Welcome. Let’s begin by asking our guests to introduce themselves, if you would please? You’re back—you didn’t get enough.

Schwarz: My name is Lily **Schwarz**, and I’m just here to do research and affirm. If you have any questions, I’d be glad to answer them afterwards.

Petersen: Thank you, Lily (**Schwarz**).

Stalp: I'm Marybeth **Stalp**. I'm Department Head for Sociology, Anthropology and Criminology.

Dunn: I'm Cyndi **Dunn**, and I'm on your agenda today, and I'm responsibly for sticking Lily (**Schwarz**) on you. [Laughter] If you have questions, please come talk to me.

Dunn: West **Dunn**, and I'm here to support Cyndi **Dunn**.

Petersen: I don't see any press, so we will go ahead and move on to our announcements. President **Nook**?

Nook: Thanks. Amy (**Petersen**) actually asked me to talk a little bit about the Future Visioning Committee, because there's a request for some people to serve on that Committee, so I want to provide a little background and information about where the Committee is going and what they're attempting to do, because they're interviewing a lot of people—talking to a lot of people. So, the Future Visioning Committee grew out of a leadership retreat that occurred in May of 2017. At that time, it was sort of a University Council meeting, which is 130-some odd people. We used to call it the Cabinet. That's a pretty big cabinet. But we got them together in May and spent the day really looking at what is the future of Higher Education, and what might this University look like, not next year—not in three or four or five years, but 35 years out. So it was a big, big task, and we sent out ahead of time some reading material on the state of Higher Education, sort of future—what's going on in the future; some things about artificial intelligence;

where others things are going as well, and asked them to sort of roll around and play with some ideas of where our University and where Higher Education might be when we reach our 175th anniversary, instead of our 150th, right? And so this wasn't about creating a vision statement. It was really about thinking about our future and what it might look like with a real idea of figuring out what that might be, so that between now and our 150th anniversary in 2026, we actually are laying the foundation for that. We're not just trying to get to and envision what our 150th looks like, but what they 25 years that follow look like, so that we lay the right foundation for that. From that, there were a lot of good ideas churned, but there wasn't enough time to do anything with it. So, we put together a committee to start to pull on those and to test them, and they've been out meeting with faculty, staff—others: students, community members about these ideas and gathering others. So the idea really is to come up with this concept for what the University might look like 35 years from now—something like that. It's a big task, and yet it's been kind of fun for the Committee and for the University to play with, because it's not a task we take on very often. But, I think a university needs to do it every so often, because if you just keep thinking in strategic five-year plan cycles, you don't make the kinds of efforts towards what do we really need to be doing long-range; you keep working on what really is five years—short range on a university. So that's what the Committee's about and where they're headed, but they do want to talk to a lot of people and run some of these ideas by them; gather some more yet. So that's what they're looking at.

Petersen: Thank you.

Nook: I've got a few other things I'd like to talk about—one other thing. But, I'd take questions first.

Zeitz: You said you were going to be looking for more people for the committee?

Nook: I think the committee is actually looking to meet with some different groups. I think we've got everybody, right?

Petersen: Yes. So, I'm on the committee. Tim **Kidd** is on the committee because he was Chair last year, and what we would like to do is we are starting to consult with more faculty in an attempt to try to get some more feedback from around campus. And so we'd like to have a small number of Senators take a look at the work that we have done so far; give us some detailed feedback so that we can continue to make some revisions, and then of course bring it back to the Senate as a whole for a consultation. This group will also be working on trying to put together perhaps some listening sessions or some other opportunities, so that the faculty across campus have an opportunity. But we don't feel as though the documents we have just yet are quite ready, so we're looking for some more targeted feedback from a small group of people. And thank you Leigh (**Zeitz**) for volunteering.

Wohlpart: And you don't have to join the Committee.

Petersen: No.

Zeitz: Well I could if you want.

Nook: Other questions about what this Committee is about? If you really want to know how it's working, ask Amy (**Petersen**). Randy (**Pilkington**) comes and talks to

me every once in a while, but the Committee is out pulling it all together and doing a great job from the updates that I've gotten so far. I think having a lot of fun exploring these ideas.

Petersen: We have. We started work really over the course of the summer and we identified various groups that we wanted to talk with, and so we've been out in the community talking to different employers. We've talked to students on campus; just had an opportunity to explore a lot of different ideas such as artificial intelligence, to try to get a sense of what a future might look like.

Nook: I think it's really important that we do this at this time. One, because of where we're at in our history: We're coming up on really a monumental milestone at 150 years, so it's time to step back and do that. I think the other reasons I was really intrigued with this is I think we're in a pretty unprecedented time of change in Higher Ed. Things are happening pretty fast. Some of that's technology-driven. Some of it's ideology-driven, and so I think it's worth our while to spend a little time looking a little further down the road, and saying 'Where is Higher Education going? Where might it be out there in the future? Are we set up the way we need to be to still be relevant in that future? What are the things we need to be thinking about as we move towards our 150th, so that we still are a relevant institution—still serving the needs of Iowa; the entire State through the education, that we deliver to our students—however those get defined in the future, right? Because that may well change too. So, I think it's really an important thing for us to be involved in right now because of where we're at in the history of Higher Education, but also where we're at in the history of this institution. So, thank you. Thank you. I said there was one other topic. I talked

with Amy (**Petersen**) ahead of time that I might take up a little extra time, but she can cut me off at any time, and you guys can cut me off as well. I wanted to give the Senate an opportunity to ask any question about things around the Waka Flocka concert. It got in the papers an awful lot. There has been a level of controversy around that, and this body in particular I wanted to make sure had an opportunity to ask me—Jim's (**Wohlpart**) here who was involved in many of those meetings as well, but especially me; give you an opportunity to ask any questions you'd like. If you want some background, I can provide that as well. But it has been something that has been in the paper quite a little bit. I did an interview today, so there's likely to be one more story on it as well. I'd be happy to answer any questions or provide any information that you'd like.

O'Kane: What is it?

Nook: Okay.

Wohlpart: The less you know the better. [Laughter]

Nook: There was a--we held a concert on campus. It was held by—put on by the Campus Activity Board, what's known as CAB Live. They bring in an entertainment act about once a year, maybe twice a year, but one bigger one a year, and this was it. Waka Flocka Flame is a rapper that they had decided to bring in, and it was public-announced that there would be a...that he would be performing, that tickets were open to students, and then tickets open to the general public. Concerns were raised and were brought to senior leadership, in particular to my office about safety and security issues around that, and that there was likelihood to have violence, either during that event or in one of our parking lots somewhere

on campus. So, we investigated that. We made the decision to limit ticket sales to just students, because of the information that we had. And it was later determined that might we might also need to move to event over to Nielsen Field House, on the advice that that was an easier place to protect the security. Then we ended up moving it back to Maucker. But those are sort of the key events. There's an awful lot of detail that lies behind those. The decision to limit ticket sales was really based on a concern for safety of our students and then moving it was also along those lines. I'd be happy to answer questions and provide more detail if anybody would like that.

Strauss: The little bit I know, in reading the school paper and hearing my wife talk about what she's read in the paper, one of the mysteries is that where these concerns come from, and how legitimate they were. If you can speak to that.

Nook: Yeah, I can and that was part of the interview I gave today. The original concerns kinda came up—a member of our police department raised them to a member of the senior staff and said, "We've got an issue. Here's what we're hearing." The information that we were getting is that it came from area police. Our police department works closely with both Cedar Falls, Waterloo, as well as the County Sherriff. They'd identified that there was a significant possibility that there would be people from—I hate using this term—the term that they were using is 'gangs.' I don't like that term because in this particular community, it is often taken as code for African-Americans. One of the reasons I hate that term is just after I got here, that first summer I was here, there was a shooting on the Hill and it was reported as "Waterloo gangs." Right? Like they aren't here. And everybody I talked to was talking about African Americans. The shooter and

everybody involved was white. That was never really reported. And so, I'm a little careful with that term. But the way it was reported, they had strong evidence that people from rival gangs were going to be attending, and when they're together, there is always an issue with the safety of the people around them.

Strauss: As a follow-up question, it's my understanding that the officials from the two police departments denied purveying that information. Is that true?

Nook: So one of the things that's really interesting is and that will come out in the article tomorrow if it's printed the way it should be, that's the information we had somewhere around the 20th of January when we made the call to limit ticket sales. As this thing continued to go and develop, there were questions about the veracity of that information. So, on Friday, February 8th, I asked Helen **Haire** [UNI Director of Public Safety and Chief of Police] to connect me with someone at the agency that could provide background. And so I spoke to with a police officer at Waterloo PD, and they said exactly what we had been hearing. Exactly. I asked him a series of questions. One of them was, "Is there a direct threat to the artist," and they said no. "Is there a direct threat that people are targeting this event for violent activity," and he said no. So, it was what we had heard before. You're going to have people from rival gangs there. If you open the ticket sales back up. You're going to have people from rival gangs there and when that happens you end up with the issues that are going to be difficult to control. So, the other question I asked him then was, "Since we've limited community ticket sales, what are you hearing." He said, "It's all gone quiet. No one's planning on being there. We don't expect any issues." And he said, "But if you open ticket sales back up, you have a 70-80% chance of problems on your campus."

So we decided not to open ticket sales back up. We did decide at that point—really after I talked to students on Sunday, to move the event back to the Maucker Union. The other question I asked him was, “Can I release this information? Can I tell students about it,” because we had treated it as confidential. And he said yes, and he was willing to come and talk to the students. At that point, I talked to the students about it on Sunday, and asked them if they’d like to move it back to Maucker. They said yes. We did let them know we weren’t willing to open it up to outside ticket sales. So the concert went ahead and came off fine. Afterwards, in some of the interviews, our statement was exactly that. From local police, we didn’t name anybody. We don’t like to do that. But then in a direct question, I answered the question and said it was Waterloo police. One of the problems is the person I was talking to was not in sort of senior leadership there, and so senior leadership wasn’t aware of that conversation, is the way I’m reading it. So, we’ve sort of worked through some of that as well. But our statement was always concise and accurate, and it was one that I fact-checked personally because it was a major decision to do this, and we had people that were engaged in this conversation that were wondering whether or not we should even allow the concert to occur. Was the threat high enough to do that? And we decided that we needed to check and make sure that we understood the information well. And so that’s where we ended up. I wish the reporting had come out differently, but you don’t get to control that very often. Other questions? Thank you for the opportunity, and if you have other questions or comments by all means feel free to contact me. I’ll be happy to answer them and address them.

Hawbaker: Just one follow-up. So, moving forward, I know that one thing I heard from students was that this situation was treated differently from every other performer we've had on campus. Is there any change in the procedure that you'll go through with CAB, or with looking into security concerns so that it's not just when we happen to have an African-American rapper to perform?

Nook: That's exactly right. We're going to work with CAB and figure out how to handle this a little bit better. One of the issues—this got down the road and announced before anybody really had an idea it was coming out. Some of the sensitivity around this is as it was reported in the paper, the gang shooting on the Hill on the 1st of January, right? So this announcement comes out two weeks after that. So there is a heightened sensitivity to things going on right around our community at that time, which did make this a little bit different than any other performer. I think whether this rapper had been white or black wouldn't have mattered much in that if they have sort of the gang ties and things—that was one of the things that became an issue. So, what we're hoping to do, and what we want to do is make sure that as these are coming through, there is an opportunity even now for security to look at these and say what we need for security, but to ask some deeper questions. Is there more here that we need to pay attention to? These things should never rise to the President's level. Right? It's not that I don't want to deal with them. I don't but I shouldn't. They shouldn't get here. They should be handled before the public announcement is made, and that's the thing we've really got to think through is how do we do this so we know everybody's in the right place with bringing this person in. We've got the security questions answered ahead of time, and we don't have to back up either with students or

with on our own or in any way, right? And so that's one thing we're really trying to work at is how do we get this set up that we don't have this public announcement that now raises concerns with whomever, and then we have to figure out how we're going to handle the safety concerns around it. So, we're working. We'll have to work through those a little bit. We've got a little bit of time, but it's sort of putting these practices and policies into place.

Petersen: Any other questions?

Nook: That's more than enough time for me, so thank you very much for this opportunity.

Petersen: Provost **Wohlpert**?

Wohlpert: I cede my time to the President.

Cutter: So I just wanted to give everyone a quick update on the ad hoc Committee for Faculty Voting Rights. If you recall, which you may not at this point—we sent out an informational email about where voting rights stand, and our concerns about the fact that only tenured and tenure-track faculty currently have voting rights, and the effects that's had. And I sent this informational email out around the end of January, and this Wednesday you'll be getting--everyone will be getting a Qualtrics survey to ask you about a preliminary proposal the Committee has created. And basically, we want your feedback on that. A proposal to expand voting rights. What do you think? Would you be likely to support this or not? And what your reasons are. So, it's short. It shouldn't take too long to answer. So again, you should be getting this on Wednesday and please respond to the survey, mention it to people in your department that it's important because we're

going to have a final proposal of some sort at the Fall Faculty Meeting next September and we want to know that we've got something that's workable before then. So, do you have any questions about that? That's it for me then.

Petersen: Alright. United Faculty President **Hawbaker**?

Hawbaker: At our last meeting I announced that we had a tentative agreement on our new contract and since then, we have ratified that agreement. I did want to talk about the little flurry of emails we sent out last week to clarify how the Merit portion would be distributed. Part of that was struck by questions we talked about here. Senator **O'Kane** was raising those questions, and as we thought a little bit deeper about how that would happen, we found a lot of concerns. And I really want to thank Jim (**Wohlpart**) and John (**Vallentine**) for working with us so expeditiously, and for my cohorts in faculty leadership for helping us to come to consensus on the fairest way to distribute Merit [pay] for next year, absent clear evaluation standards and criteria that have been approved. So, for next year—for this coming year Merit you've earned this year will be added for next year will be distributed equally after the promotions have been awarded out of that 40%. And then the following year—I don't think we included this in our email John, (**Vallentine**) the following year the new standards and criteria will be approved and there will be a Merit calculation that will be part of that. So after that it will go back to the—not back to the way it was, but you'll earn individual Merit according to your actual performance. So, thank you everyone for your great teamwork. It's not a perfect solution, but under the circumstances we felt it was the fairest to everyone.

Zeitz: Will this criterion for the Merit, is it going to be attached to the evaluation system that we're putting together right now, or is there going to be one for a whole University?

Hawbaker: We're all working on our Department Standards and Criteria, but my understanding is that there will be a Merit calculation or formula that will be in Chapter 3 of the Handbook that will cover the University as a whole. So, your department head will say, "Yes, you've met this criterion. Or, you've exceeded the criteria. There will be a numerical value that they'll assign to that, and that will also get factored into your individual portfolio, and that will determine your Merit.

Zeitz: Okay. Thank you.

Petersen: Alright. I'm going to give my time to Kristin (**Ahart**). Do you have updates for us?

Ahart: Thank you. Yes.

Petersen: Did you make it to Des Moines?

Ahart: Briefly. We did make it to Des Moines. Thank goodness--finally. First off, I want to start with NISG elections. This is the last announcement I have about that. They will be soon over on Wednesday, but continue to thank your students and encourage them, the ones that have stepped up to run. It is no small undertaking. It is very emotionally challenging, and so reach out to them. Tell them that you're proud of them for the work that they're putting into representing their fellow students. I just wanted to take a moment as well to thank Dr. **Hesse** for taking

time out of his Humanities classes to allow candidates to speak. I know it's something that the candidates are really thankful for. So I wanted to thank you for that as well. Remind your students that voting is open on Tuesday at 8 a.m. through Wednesday at 7 p.m., so continue to urge them to vote, and to be an active participant in their student governance here on campus, and that polling is located in MyUNiverse and is easily accessible on whatever device they have, and only takes a few quick moments. NISG just recently released a "How to Vote" video, so you can direct them towards that as well. We released an NISG awareness survey that we spread out across campus. It was something that our Director of Public Relations put a lot of time and effort into. It's something that we haven't undertaken as an organization since 2002, so we wanted some updated results on what the student body in general—what their perception was of us, as well as what they need from their student government. And so we've been reviewing those results. And if that's something that you all would be interested in seeing, the end report—I'd be happy to provide that to Chair **Petersen** to distribute. We are really proud of our public relations folks on our team who put a lot of effort into reaching out to students, and we had over 10% of our student population participate in the survey, which we were really excited about. And then also, if you all have any feedback in general about student government and how you all see that we could best represent students, please don't hesitate to reach out as well. We'd love to hear your voice, even though that wasn't incorporated into our survey. Lastly, we had UNI Day at the Capitol on Monday and it went phenomenally well. It is always great to see a broad range of students, outside of our legislative liaison team interacting with legislators and engaging in important conversations about the future of Higher Education,

particularly for our University down on the Hill. So, that was a great success and thank you to all of you, if any of you were able to join with your departments or colleges. That was a fun event and thank you for the role that you all play in advocating for UNI as well.

Petersen: Thank you.

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Petersen: The minutes for February 11th have been distributed. Is there a motion to approve these minutes?

Mattingly: So moved.

Petersen: Thank you, Senator **Mattingly**. Is there a second? Thank you, Senator **Stollenwerk**. And is there any discussion needed? All in favor of approving the minutes from February 11th, please indicate by saying 'aye.' And opposed? Any abstentions? The motion passes. We have no Committee Reports today.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Petersen: We have four items for consideration for the docket. I am going to bundle the emeritus items, but I'll take the other two separately in case we would like to discuss either of those items. So the first item is a Proposed Revisions to the Curriculum Handbook. This is Item 1320. Is there a motion to move this item to the docket?

O'Kane: So moved.

Petersen: Thank you, Senator **O’Kane**. And is there a second? Thank you, Senator **Zeitz**. Is there any discussion around if this item should be moved to the docket? I’ve provided the full Curriculum Handbooks so that you can check out these revisions, and I also requested just a short summary of what those revisions are, and I expect I’ll have this information and I’ll provide that to you later this week. Any other discussion? All in favor of moving the Proposed Revisions to the Curriculum Handbook to the docket, please indicate by saying ‘aye.’ Any opposed? Any abstentions? Excellent. The motion passes. Then, I would like to bundle the Emeritus Request for Dennis **Schmidt** and the Emeritus Request for Angeleita **Floyd** as a bundle to move to the docket. Is there a motion to do so? Thank you, Senator **Smith**. Is there a second? Thank you, Senator **Strauss**. Any discussion as to if we should move these items—these requests—to the docket?

Mattingly: I notice there are not letters for either one of these people, **Schmidt** or **Floyd**, just the application.

Petersen: We typically, we get the letters at varying times. We always do a follow-up, so I load the letters as they come. So I would expect that those letters will be here yet this week.

Mattingly: Gotcha.

Petersen: Good question. All in favor of moving both emeritus requests for Dennis **Schmidt** and Angeleita **Floyd** to the docket, please indicate by saying ‘aye.’ Any opposed? And any abstentions? Alright, the motion passes. The next item that we need to consider to move to the docket is the General Education Revision Committee’s work. And if you recall, they were here at our last Senate meeting.

They shared with us what was almost a final draft of their Mission and Learning Outcomes that they've been working on for quite some time, and they have now petitioned that we take a vote on the Mission and the Learning Outcomes. And so, if we choose to move this to the docket, I would expect that on March 11 we will be voting to accept the Mission and the Learning Outcomes. And so I wanted as we consider moving this to the docket, I wanted to make sure we all felt as though we had enough information to take this vote, and I did upload what are the final documents and provided those documents to you. So let me first ask is there a motion to move the General Education Revision Committee's work to the docket for March 11? Thank you, Senator **Zeitz**. And is there a second? Thank you, Senator **Neibert**. Now, is there any discussion as to if we feel we have enough information to take this vote on March 11?

Hesse: What if we support the overall framework, but we have some grammar suggestions to clean it up a little bit?

Petersen: That's great. So if you send those to me, that would be excellent, and I will pass those on. I think Dean **Bass** suggested to us that we are largely thinking about are we confident around the concepts in the Mission and the Learning Outcomes, but it's not necessarily our job to wordsmith at this point. And please, correct me if I'm wrong.

O'Kane: You're fine.

Cutter: My concerns are not huge, but they're a little bit more than wordsmithing, so that's what I wanted to bring up. It's really Item B on the Learning Areas and Outcomes, which I guess is still The Human World although it's not titled

anymore. So I would be worried if we couldn't have a substantive conversation about the Outcomes if it were coming up for example. The third Outcome, which I guess is Outcome 5 in Item B. It used to say, "in a range of historical and cultural contexts," and that's out. I know I'm a historian, but when you're talking about diversity, I think historical context is extremely important for understanding diversity. And Outcome 4, 'working with others across differences,' I think that's still a little bit confusing in the way it was last time, where it almost seems like group work.

Petersen: And so Chair **Cutter**, are you requesting that the Committee take this feedback and potentially incorporate it, prior to a vote on March 11?

Cutter: Yes, unless they're willing to have a conversation about it when they come, rather than just do a vote. I think other people I can see have issues.

O'Kane: We can certainly bring this up at our next meeting or two.

Petersen: Are you meeting on Friday?

O'Kane: Right. This Friday. I might request that these comments get to us immediately.

Burnight: Through you?

Petersen: Through me is fine, and we'll forward them on.

Burnight: I have a similar issue with Item D. I did a little homework on the quantitative versus formal there, that I brought up at the last meeting, and it looks like that wording—depends on which discipline you are part of, and so sort

of splitting the difference, I looked at how other universities framed it as part of their Gen Ed Core, and it looked like they use both quantitative and/or formal reasoning, and so I'd like to request that as a potential change just for clarity. So, those types of issues going through you?

Petersen: That would be excellent.

O'Kane: I can hear the committee talking about this now. We have tried our very, very hardest to strip out 'ors and ands,' because if you make that 'quantitative and formal reasoning,' it's no longer one outcome. It's two. So, I can hear the committee saying that.

Petersen: I would imagine if we feel that we have enough information to docket today, given the ability to send me that specific feedback so that I can provide it to the committee, I would anticipate then that we would go ahead and vote on March 11, and if we were to turn down this work, we would need to likely form potentially a special committee to provide very specific feedback to the General Education Committee in order to continue to move this work forward. I think our aim is not to allow this work to be stalled. That's one of the reasons at the very beginning we created a process where it couldn't get hung up in a particular college or department, but rather is here in our Senate, so that we can gather consensus, gather feedback, and move this work forward. We have a motion to docket this. Any other discussion before I call the question?

Wohlpart: If I may. I know I'm risking the administration making a comment about curriculum, but I've actually done this process several times, so one of the things that I've been very impressed with, with this Committee is the amount of

listening they have done. And they have a wealth of knowledge, background and wisdom about this. I would urge you all to trust your colleagues. This isn't the end of this process. This is a new process for this campus, and it really needs to be the beginning of continuing to look at what we're doing and refine it: Does it work? Let's try it. Does it work? Let's come back to it. That's my encouragement—is to trust your colleagues who have done an enormous amount of work, and thought about all of the questions you have raised very deeply.

Petersen: Then let me call the question. All in favor of docketing the General Education Revision Committee request for a vote, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Any opposed? Any abstentions? Alright the motion passes. Again, I would take all of that feedback and I will send it to your committee, Senator **O'Kane**. Thank you.

O'Kane: Great. Thanks.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKET ITEMS

Petersen: That brings us to consideration of our docket items. The first is an emeritus request for Deborah **Giarusso**. Is there a motion to approve the Emeritus Request for Deborah **Giarusso**? Thank you, Senator **Burnight**. Thank you, second by Senator **Strauss**. And I do have a letter that was provided by the department head, and so I will just share this letter, and then if there is anyone who would like to speak on her behalf, that would be wonderful. Deborah (**Giarusso**) has provided over ten years of meritorious service at the University of Northern Iowa. During her tenure, she has developed and taught advanced level courses in finance. Over and above her teaching, her service record also includes several terms on the department search committee and Assurances of Learning

committee core curriculum committee. She also has served as coordinator of Financial Analyst's program and personal wealth emphasis designation. Deborah was the faculty for the financial management Association for two years." Is there anyone that would like to offer any additional? Okay. All in favor of approving the Emeritus Request for Deborah **Giarusso**, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Any opposed? Any abstentions. Alright, the motion passes.

Petersen: The second item on our docket this afternoon is the Emeritus Request for Cynthia **Dunn**. Is there a motion to approve this request? Thank you, Senator **Burnight**. And is there a second? Thank you, Senator **Gould**. Great. I would like to now invite Dr. **Stalp** to speak.

Stalp: Thank you. Cynthia Dickel **Dunn** joined the faculty of the Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Criminology in 2000 and is retiring from UNI on June 30th of 2019. Dr. **Dunn** earned tenure in 2006, and full professor in 2015. Dr. **Dunn** unites linguistic anthropology, (exploring linguistic variation in politeness systems, speech styles and genre) in psychological anthropology, (examining cultural models of the self and social relationships). Dr. **Dunn** has served UNI in many capacities, including serving on the CSBS Faculty Senate, the Dorothy Jean Ray Anthropology Scholarship Committee. She's been involved in the Women & Gender Studies Program, and most recently served the SAC department as PAC Chair. She has also received the CSBS Outstanding Teaching Award, and contributes to both the LAC and anthropology major regularly through her teaching. We on the staff wish Dr. **Dunn** well as she moves on to the next adventures in her life, where she will be moving with her family to Colorado

Springs where they can enjoy hiking, wine tasting, and reasonable amounts of snow. [Laughter]

Wes **Dunn**: That goes away.

Petersen: I am selfishly disappointed because they are my neighbors, and so I always hate to lose good neighbors. Is there anyone else that would like to offer? Alright. All in favor of approving the Emeritus Request for Cynthia **Dunn**, please indicate by saying 'aye.' And any opposed? And abstentions? Excellent, the motion passes. The last item on our docket for this afternoon is the Emeritus Request for Anne **Myles**. Is there a motion to approve this emeritus request? Thank you, Senator **Mattingly**. Is there a second? Thank you, Senator **Burnight**. I have a letter here from Jennifer **Cooley**. She had planned to be here, but I think she is stuck in Des Moines, so I will just share what she has written:

“Dr. **Myles** joined the faculty at UNI in 1999. Although my time as her department chair has been relatively brief, I also conferred with Dr. Jeff **Copeland** and Dr. Julie **Husband** in my preparation of these comments. Dr. **Myles** has admirably served as a teacher and researcher throughout her tenure at UNI. She has also performed demanding service roles, such as chairing the PAC Committee in our department and coordinating the graduate program in English. She proved a steadfast supporter of her peers as PAC Chair and guided numerous students to success in their graduate studies as coordinator of M.A. program in English, with careful attention to each student’s particular needs. I also salute her renewed passion for her creative work as a poet, which leads her to pursue graduate work toward a second advanced degree, this time an MFA. In short, I highly

recommend bestowing the honor of Emeritus Status on Dr. Anne **Myles**, and I appreciate her investment in the success of her peers and her students, as well as to the university as a whole. She will be missed!

Petersen: Are there any other comments?

Ahart: I've had the pleasure of having Dr. **Myles** in class multiple times. I'd have to say that there are few people who are so truly passionate and inspiring about the work that they do like Dr. **Myles** has been to me. She has been so clearly passionate about American literature and has been able to spark that in every student in their own unique way and help them pursue their own term papers in a way that provides you support that is so unique and individualized that she makes you excited to do it. It's been a pleasure to be in her courses and I know that many other students have been honored as well.

Petersen: Thank you.

Strauss: Did I understand that properly, that she is going to earn an MFA after she retires?

Petersen: Yes.

Strauss: How exciting.

Petersen: Yes. Sounds exciting. All in favor of approving Dr. Anne **Myles'** emeritus request, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Any opposed? Any abstentions? Great. The motion passes. I have no New Business for us. Is there any other business I am missing? Is there a motion to adjourn? Thank you Senator **Strauss**, and a second by Senator **Zeitz**. We are adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy Sundstedt
Transcriptionist & Administrative Assistant
Faculty Senate
University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa 50614

Next Meeting:

3:30 p.m. Monday, March 11, 2019
Scholar Space (301) Rod Library
University of Northern Iowa