

3-11-2019

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, March 11, 2019

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

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](#)

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, March 11, 2019" (2019).
Faculty Senate Documents. 1250.

https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/1250

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 Faculty Senate Documents by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

Regular Meeting
UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING
3/11/19 (3:30 – 4:20)
Mtg. #1821
SUMMARY MINUTES
Scholar Space (301) Rod Library

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

Guests: Brenda Bass, John Fritch, Ana Kogl, Eric O'Brien, Doug Shaw, Michael Zwanziger.

Courtesy Announcements:

President **Nook** shared information from the Bookstore about how faculty provide financial benefit to students when textbook orders are placed on time. **(See pages 5-6)**

Provost **Wohlpert** yielded his comment period to Eric **O'Brien** for comment on future changes to UNI's recycling program due to global changes affecting single-stream recycling. **(See pages 6-12)**

United Faculty President **Hawbaker** reminded staff to congratulate colleagues who have earned tenure or promotion and to tell those who have not to seek support and advice from United Faculty. UF hosts Faculty Appreciation Dinner on Saturday, April 13. **(See pages 13-14)**

NISG Vice President Kristin **Ahart** announced the election of Jacob **Levang** and Jacob **Stites** to NISG leadership. A few leadership and service positions remain available. Students who vote in the Special Election in Cedar Falls will need proof of address and can find it at My UNiverse. **(See pages 27-29)**

Minutes for Approval

February 25, 2018 (**Gould/Stafford**) One abstention: **Stollenwerk**.

Consideration of Calendar Items for Docketing

** (Zeitz/Skaar) Motion to docket as a bundle for **March 25** meeting with Regents Award chosen in Executive Session. Passed.

[1446 Regents Award](#)

[1447 Emeritus Request for Gerald Smith](#)

[1448 Writing Committee Update](#)

Consideration of Docket Items

1441 1320

[Proposed Revisions to the Curriculum Handbook](#)

** (O’Kane/Strauss) Motion passed. All aye.

1442 1321

[Emeritus request for Dennis Schmidt](#)

** (Mattingly/Skaar) Motion passed. All aye. **(See pages 15-16)**

1443 1322

[Emeritus request for Angeleita Floyd](#)

** (McCandless/Strauss) Motion passed. All aye. **(See pages 16-18)**

1444 1323

[GERC Consultation](#)

** (Skaar/Strauss) Motion passed. One abstention: O’Kane.
(See pages 19-27)

Adjournment: (Strauss/Neibert) 4:20 p.m.

Next Meeting:

3:30 p.m. Monday March 25, 2019

Scholar Space (301) Rod Library

University of Northern Iowa

A complete transcript of 30 pages and 0 addendum follows.

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

March 11th, 2019

Present: Senators Imam **Alam**, John **Burnight**, Cathy **DeSoto**, Faculty Senate Secretary Gretchen **Gould**, Tom **Hesse**, Bill **Koch**, Faculty Senate Vice-Chair Jim **Mattingly**, Senators Amanda **McCandless**, Peter **Neibert**, Steve **O’Kane**, Faculty Senate Chair Amy **Petersen**, Senators Mark **Sherrad**, Nicole **Skaar**, Gloria **Stafford**, Sara **Smith**, 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: Kenneth **Hall**.

Guests: Brenda **Bass**, John **Fritch**, Ana **Kogl**, Eric **O’Brien**, Doug **Shaw**, Michael **Zwanziger**.

CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Petersen: Alright, let me call our meeting to order. Do we have any press? I don’t believe so, but I know we have a number of guests with us this afternoon. So, let me ask our guests if they would introduce themselves and just share briefly why you are joining us today.

O'Brien: I'm Eric **O'Brien**. I'm the Director of Sustainability here at UNI. I've been asked to give a brief update on our recycling program and some potential changes that are on the horizon for that.

Zwanziger: Mike **Zwangziger**. I'm here for the same reason.

Shaw: Doug **Shaw**, Gen Ed Reform Committee.

Kogl: Ana **Kogl**, also Gen Ed Reform.

Bass: Brenda **Bass**, also with the Gen Ed Reform Committee.

Fritch: John **Fritch**, also with the Gen Ed.

Petersen: Okay. So let us start with our Announcements, and I will start with President **Nook**.

Nook: First of all, everybody should be getting ready for break. I think this is the last meeting before Spring Break. I know that's a big event for everybody on a campus, especially with the winter we've had. I'm looking forward to that as well. We focus a lot here on the success of our students, and I want to pass on some good news that on a lot of campuses wouldn't necessarily be associated with student success, but we spend a lot of time talking about what we've done to drop the average student debt that students leave with on this campus; the way we focus on helping students control their costs—what that means to their long-term financial health, professional health; those sorts of things. This will seem sort of small, but it's really a shout-out to the faculty. I've got some numbers from the Bookstore, just as a way of an update. This past spring, new text average price

is down 18.8%. The used textbook average price is down 3.7%, and the rental titles available—these are all sorts of rental ways which really save, are up 12%. Talking with Michael (**Hager**) the reason for that is faculty getting book orders in early. The earlier you can get these in as faculty, the easier it is to get some of these major gains in cost and purchase price that they have, and to be able to get multiple people to engage in rental agreements, and not just have to turn to one rental vendor. So, people this is all on you. Right? And so thank you and congratulations. These savings to our students are because faculty committed to making sure that their textbook orders are in on time. So please spread that around the University. As we continue to get everybody engaged in this, these will keep coming down. It's a win for our students. It's a win for our Bookstore. It's just a win all the way around. The other one that's on here, our inclusive access, which is when a student can get both the electronic access on the first day and then get back out if it if they drop the class—that sort of thing. But inclusive access: That's up 144%. Again, all of these are really driven by faculty getting textbook orders in on time. I think this is one of the advantages we have in now owning the Bookstore: This kind of information is a little easier to flow. It's a little easier for faculty to see how things can make a difference. So thanks very much. That's the end of my report.

Petersen: Questions?

O'Kane: Yes, **President Nook**, I'm wondering if the costs at the Bookstore have gone down just for the pure reason that we purchased it?

Wohlpart: Partly, because they're paying no sales tax. So that is a large piece of it, but we're also working much more closely with faculty. And there are several faculty in several departments that have been spearheading things, that has percolated out to other possibilities. So, those relationships I think have been happening.

Nook: All of these things have nothing to do with the purchase per se. Right? It is this relationship with faculty, and faculty textbooks coming in earlier. The sales tax—we weren't charging sales tax before on books. We were on some other things. I'm not sure if we were on other things either. It hasn't really...the sales tax isn't part of this. The sales tax is not part of this. Thank you.

Petersen: Provost **Wohlpart**?

Wohlpart: I know that we're pressed for time, so I'm going to hand my time over to Eric (**O'Brien**) and Mike (**Zwanziger**) to talk about recycling. I know that sustainability is a really important piece of this campus community. There are some very big changes happening with recycling globally that hopefully you are all aware of that is making recycling less and less viable. And I didn't want the faculty and the Faculty Senate to be caught off guard by the changes that we have been dealing with as the cost of recycling is going way, way up. But before I turn it over to them, I only have one comment: This has been a hard semester. A really, really hard semester with the weather, three student deaths, so thank you all for

persevering. The Spring Break that we having coming up is an opportunity at least to breathe. I know everybody will continue working, but it's an opportunity to breathe. Sunshine yesterday and today, and then rain starts tomorrow. Sorry for that, but all the snow will go away.

Nook: It is rain. [Laughter]

Wohlpart: Eric (**O'Brien**) and Mike (**Zwanziger**), if you'll take less than five minutes; three-ish minutes.

Petersen: And you're welcome to come to the front.

O'Brien: Thank you very much for allowing us to come here to give a brief update on recycling. I just want to reinforce that we do have an institutional commitment to sustainability here that's been one of our values at UNI since before I ever arrived here. It's noted in a lot of different things. We save hundreds of thousands of dollars every year in energy reductions on campus. We've got local food purchasing that dramatically impacts our local economy, reduces our carbon footprint for transportation to campus. All of these kinds of things led to us being the first Gold Star Campus for sustainability in the entire Midwest. Briefly on the history of recycling here: We were one of the early adopters of a lot of recycling initiatives in the late 80's, early 90's. We started with some cardboard initiatives on to some office paper in the late 90's, early 2000's. Then we started seeing a lot of incremental improvements that really, dramatically jumped about five years ago when we started going to single stream recycling, which is what most of you are probably very familiar with. In every open space here on campus we've got

the black containers that say 'landfill' and 'waste' on one side, with the recycling blue containers attached on the other side. And that was a very—we did that intentionally, trying to make sure that every place people went, they were given the choice of recycling or sending things to the landfill. All of this resulted in some pretty substantial jumps in our recycling numbers. When I started here about ten years ago, we were diverting about mid-teens in the percentage of our waste going away from the landfill. In 2016, that increased to 37%. And our most recent numbers were all the way up to 44.18% just last year. Our goal is to be the 46% waste diversion by 2022, as outlined in our Strategic Plan. So now to the changes that we're seeing related to recycling across the world right now. Over the last 18 months, China has made some massive changes into what they are accepting and not accepting for recycling. Almost all of our single stream recycling was going to China previous to this. Now, I want to say this really coincided with the uptick of single-stream recycling across the country. When that happened, everyone was incentivized to divert as much material from the landfill as they could, and it resulted in what I like to call "Wish Cycling," where people hoped something could be recycled, so they threw it in the recycling side. Or, they know that it could be recycled if some work was done to it, so they threw it in the recycling side. We have a fairly clean recycling stream here on campus. Other places didn't have as clean a stream, which is what's led to a lot of these impacts and ripples that we're seeing that have resulted in really an economic correction related to recycling. Five years ago when we started this, we were paying zero for recycling. So, every ton that we were sending away from the landfill—there was a big incentive for us. We were saving a lot of money. Now, it costs us four times the amount that it does to send material to the landfill. So, there's major changes,

and those are being seen across the country. The vendor—or excuse me—the service provider that handles this material has just now announced some changes in how they're operating, which are not going to allow us to send material the same way that we currently do. We're going to be working with them very closely over the next number of months to be able to identify what they are going to accept, what they aren't going to accept as they move forward. So, overall what does that mean for us? Really, a lot of that's going to depend on that service provider, as far as what they decide they will and will not accept going forward. We're going to be working with them, and we anticipate between now and the end of this academic year there's going to be little to no visual change out of our academic buildings for faculty and students that are entering. There will be some behind the scenes changes that our custodial staffs are going to be taking and putting on their backs. We do anticipate over the course of the summer there will be changes based on what is considered recyclable, and what is not considered recyclable anymore. So when you come back from summer break, when students come back, expect that there will be some changes. We don't know what those changes are going to be yet however. What I will say is we do plan on recycling going forward. We're going to maintain office paper, cardboard for certain, but there is going to be changes in some of the other things that are happening on campus. In addition to this, I know it's difficult for me to sit here and talk about massive changes for recycling. That isn't fun for anybody, because I know most people would like to see it happen. But there is changes in how recycling is happening. Hopefully, this leads to bigger campus conversations about our waste stream here on campus. What is going into our waste stream, whether it's from campus, whether it's coming in from the outside. I know that we have a lot of

people--employees that bring stuff and just throw it in our recycling containers. This is going to have to be the start of bigger conversations that we have, if recycling is truly important for our campus community.

Wohlpart: Thank you. Including for instance the packaging that we have in all of our stores. Can we reduce that? And so there's more intentional work we will now need to do to eliminate plastic for instance—containers, extra containers and things like that. Questions anybody has?

Strauss: I have one question. You said there was zero cost, and now it's four times more. So I don't understand the math there. [Laughter]

O'Brien: Four times more than recycling—than the landfill costs.

Wohlpart: In other words, it was free, so everything we diverted we were saving money. It's now four times more than sending it to the landfill. It's cheaper for us to send it to the landfill now.

O'Brien: By four times.

Wohlpart: But we're not, because of the ethical obligation.

Strauss: Thank you.

Cutter: Does this mean with the new vendor in the future, are we going to move away from single-stream, or are we just going to have a different single stream?

O'Brien: That's yet to be determined. I think both options are on the table. I think if you look at multiple streams, that would be very difficult to put on to our

custodial staff to try to move out of the buildings. They're stretched very thin there as it is, so whatever we end up landing on, we can't be adding a lot of labor on any group. We can't be asking a lot more, whether it's custodial staff, faculty, staff—anything like that. So we're trying to work within the structure of what we have, and seeing if there's programs that fit there, and that would be budgetarily feasible for us.

Koch: Is there a specific recycling item that's been problematic, that's a surprise, like greasy paper or something is my understanding is one of the problems?

O'Brien: That wouldn't be as big a problem as you might expect. The biggest problem around the world is plastic containment. The plastic that we might have on this campus is the lowest grade plastic possible. It's the last life of plastic. So it still has the little recyclable sign on it, but there's not much that they can do. I would say nationwide, there's groups like Waste Management; other recycling organizations that are asking permission from their board of directors to send a lot of that to the landfill. So what we want to get away from--If a change has to be made, we don't want the people to have the impression that they're doing the right thing by putting it in the recycling, and then find out later that it's going into the landfill. It would make a lot more sense if we know that's the direction that it's going to go. We do some work and education on this side to remove it from, and maybe it gets into what the Provost is talking about as far as the conversations that maybe we shouldn't be having that as the primary packaging.

Petersen: *Sixty Minutes* aired a special on recycling just a few weeks ago and it was intriguing to me because essentially the argument they were putting forth is

that this notion of recycling has been largely a myth in the United States. That we as consumers want to feel as though we are recycling, but in fact much of what we send or think we send to the recycling wherever--never makes it there for various reasons, and often it's shipped to China and China just puts it in the landfill or stores it. For example, [points to plastic water bottle] this bottle cannot be recycled unless it has its cap attached when it goes into the recycling bin.

Wohlpart: And you've been told to remove the cap. Yes, you have.

Zeitz: I never heard that before.

Petersen: It happens to be a little—I like to get up on my high horse about it, but yes. I know this. My husband used to work at International Paper, which is a recycled paper company in Cedar Rapids. They recycle cardboard, but much of what they receive, they also have to just throw out because it doesn't come in the right condition. And so really the best thing we can do is to become minimalists and use less. But...

Wohlpart: I know this is a really important issue for this campus. If you want more information, or want to be involved in some way, send me an email and I'll connect you with Eric (**O'Brien**) and Mike (**Zwanziger**) who are really—they're all over this. They've been spending an enormous amount of their time trying to figure out how we can do the right thing; getting educated—figure out what's going on. So if you're interested, send me an email. Thank you both very much.

Petersen: Faculty Chair **Cutter**?

Cutter: I don't have any comments in the interest of time.

Petersen: United Faculty President?

Hawbaker: I just want to reiterate the email I sent out to all faculty last week. If you can assist us with helping to get the word out to congratulate people who have earned tenure or promotion, and to encourage those that may have got less positive news, that United Faculty is there to support and advise them. So please help us get that word out. Then, to remind you that the Faculty Appreciation Dinner will be Saturday, April 13th and all of you and a guest are invited. More details to come about speaker and all of those things, but just want you to have the date. That's it.

Petersen: I want to welcome Senator Cathy **DeSoto**. She will be here the remainder of the semester as Senator **Choi** is on leave. So welcome.

Petersen: The minutes have been disseminated. Is there a motion to approve the minutes for February 25th? Thank you, Senator **Gould**. Thank you Senator **Stafford**. Any discussion needed? All in favor of approving the minutes for February 25th, please indicate by saying 'aye.' And any opposed? Any abstentions? Senator **Stollenwerk**. Alright. Thank you. The motion passes.

Petersen: We do not have any committee reports this afternoon. We have three Calendar Items for docketing. The first is the Regents Award, which we will do in Executive Session the Monday after Spring Break. We also have an emeritus request for Gerald **Smith**, and the Writing Committee would like to come back and provide some additional updates. Is there a motion to bundle and docket these calendar items? Thank you, Senator **Zeitz**, and a second from Senator **Skaar**.

Is there any discussion needed? Alright all in favor then of bundling and docketing the Regents Award, the Emeritus Request for Gerald **Smith**, and the Writing Committee update, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Any opposed? Any abstentions? The motion passes.

Petersen: The first item on our docket this afternoon is the Revisions to the Curriculum Handbook. Is there a motion to approve these revisions? Thank you Senator **O'Kane**. Is there a second? Thank you, Senator **Strauss**. Now we can have some discussion on these revisions. Thank you Provost **Pease**, for sending us a summary of the changes. Do you wish to speak to any of these changes?

Pease: I can. Most of this is relatively minor. The biggest part was the—here it says 'removed,' but it's really a paragraph was merged in with a larger section. The University Curriculum Committee had wanted to add in what is basically Page 3 of the document now, which outlines the big picture of all of the steps that you go through. The document's long enough now—it's a little cumbersome to work through, so they wanted a summary snapshot at the very beginning of the document saying, "These are the steps you go through if you want new curriculum." So we took some language that was already in there, added some other language, and created the very first page, an introduction: This is what you need to do. The other change we made was a timeline. That's Page 5 of this. We added this timeline in which really walks programs through when they would expect to make, what changes they would make, and when they would be expected to do those things. Again, it's really coming up with a list of the things that you need to do to be successful; to successfully move through the curricular cycle. So it's information. It's summarizing information to make it easier to flow.

Otherwise, the changes were largely just editorial. Just shuffling a couple things around; cleaning up a little language. One line for example we strengthened up the 'What College Senates can do.' One of the things we discovered this past year was the College Senates, even for very, very minor edits to a curricular package, they were sending it back to the department. The department didn't necessarily know that they had it back in their work flow, and it was getting bogged down. And so there's some language in here reminding Senates that they can actually make those changes in committee, and keep it moving forward rather than having to send it back to the department. As long as the department and the Senate are there together anyway, they can just make the changes and keep moving it on. So, a few little clean-ups to make this flow a little bit more easily. No changes to policy or regulation. It really is more about cleaning up and clearing up the language to make it easier to understand the document.

Petersen: Questions or discussion? Hearing none then, all in favor of approving the Revisions to the Curriculum Handbook, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Any opposed? Any abstentions? The motion passes. The next item on our docket is the Emeritus Request for Dennis **Schmidt**. Is there a motion to approve this emeritus request?

Mattingly: So moved.

Petersen: Thank you, Senator **Mattingly**. Is there a second? Thank you, Senator **Skaar**. I do have a letter on his behalf. I have two. One from the Department Head of Accounting, as well as the Chair of the College of Business's Senate. They are somewhat similar. Let me read the letter from Mary **Christ**, the Department Head of Accounting:

Dennis **Schmidt**, the Deloitte Professor of Accounting, first came to UNI in 1993, left briefly in 2005 to teach at Montana State University, and returned to UNI in 2008. Prior to that, he taught at the University of Wyoming for seven years. During his career, he has taught a variety of tax and accounting information systems courses at both the undergraduate and graduate level. He is the recipient of six teaching awards and ten educational development grants. Dennis (**Schmidt**) is an active researcher with more than 40 published journal articles and 25 conference papers or presentations. He has won four research awards and received nine research grants. He was one of the first academic accountants to research and work extensively with electronic tax databases and was the creator of taxsites.com, one of the first of such sites and one still used today by academics and practitioners. He has regularly served UNI at the Department, College, and University level. He has also served on a number of American Accounting Association and American Taxation Association national committees and served as webmaster for the American Taxation Association. In 2011, Dennis was named the Deloitte Faculty Fellow in 2015, he became the Deloitte Endowed Professor of Accounting. In 2014, he received a UNI Regents Award for Faculty Excellence for his sustained record of excellence in teaching, research and service.”

Petersen: Is there anyone who would like to add some additional? Hearing none then, all in favor of approving the Emeritus Request for Dennis **Schmidt**, please indicate by saying ‘aye.’ Any opposed? Any abstentions? The motion passes.

Petersen: The next item on the docket is the Emeritus Request for Angeleita **Floyd**. Is there a motion to approve this request? Thank you, Senator **McCandless**. Is there a second? Thank you Senator **Strauss**. Is there anyone who would like to speak on Angeleita **Floyd**’s behalf?

McCandless: I’m delighted to speak about my colleague, Dr. Angeleita **Floyd**, and if I [says with emotion] –sorry—I’m going to miss her, and she has been a consummate colleague and mentor to all of us in the School of Music, particularly

those of us who are women. Sorry. I've been sitting here telling myself not to do this. [tears up] She blazed the trail for us. She really, really did, and so now I'm sitting in a division of all women, and knowing that when Angeleita started, she was the only one in her division. She really made it possible for us. And I'm not just saying that because she was on the committee that hired a lot of us. She really was an example to all of us. She was a fine mentor; internationally known. We've made jokes before: Not that many people are known by their first name: There's Cher. There's Prince, and there's Angeleita. [Laughter] I'm telling you, I go to conferences; I go to other universities and if they ask where I teach, I tell them. "Oh, you work with Angeleita." They don't say her last name, just Angeleita. She's known. She's a huge international star in the flute world. She wrote a book on the British School of flute playing that is on everybody's shelf, and actually she's planning to write a second book which is going to be an enormous contribution to the field. So we are going to miss her. Why don't you talk now, Dr. **Vallentine**?

Vallentine: It's great emotions, and I think that's the way everyone in the School of Music, and anyone that's worked with Angeleita (**Floyd**) feels. I've been Angeleita's colleague. I've been Angeleita's colleague for 26 years, and if you took everyone's most positive day here at UNI and multiplied it times 100, that's Angeleita. Her enthusiasm for teaching, for her performing early on, and then conducting and her service work to the University was really, really quite amazing. Amanda (**McCandless**) mentioned the National Flute Association. Angeleita served as president of the National Flute Association, which is 5,000 members worldwide, and very, very well respected with that organization, and she received the Distinguished Service Award from that group. What's great about Angeleita,

in her role as a flute professor here, she's traveled the world. She's given over 50 international presentations as a musician, and her role as a teacher: In Iowa, if you were a flute player, this was the place to come. And not only in Iowa, but nationally students were auditioning to come study with Angeleita, and then worldwide students started coming here. So she's really built not only a reputation for herself, but the School of Music at UNI, and is just a fabulous colleague, so I really recommend the status to you, along with Amanda **(McCandless)**.

Petersen: Thank you both.

Ahart: I didn't personally know her, but I chair the committee that oversees the nominations for Outstanding Faculty and Staff around campus that the students give out every single spring called the Above and Beyond Awards, and there was an enormous outcry from students that nominated her for this award. So through the submissions, I can fully understand the emotion and passion that she is able to emit and then inspire in other people. Students adore her as well.

Petersen: Alright. All in favor of approving the Emeritus Request for Angeleita **Floyd**, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Any opposed? Any abstentions? The motion passes.

Petersen: The last item on our docket for consideration today comes to us from the General Education Revision Committee. They are requesting that we vote to approve the Mission and the Learning Outcomes. Is there a motion to do so? Thank you, Senator **Skaar**. Is there a second? Thank you Senator **Strauss**. I know that Ana **(Kogl)** and Doug **(Shaw)** have joined us to provide us with a bit of

feedback, so I will let them begin our discussion; share with us a bit about the discussion you had after receiving some of our comments.

Shaw: A couple of comments first, for people here—You all have access to Google Docs? [Murmurs of assent]

Cutter: Not right now.

Shaw: Not right now, but you have access to it in general? Yeah. How are you able to—where did you find time to read the ULA—the end user license agreement? [Laughter] Is there anybody here using Google Docs who did not read that document? See, that's ties into this. We want this to be something that we can be proud of, that people can understand and show off. So one of the tensions in our committee is we don't want it to read like that ULA, which all of you skipped. Because if it reads like that, then nobody's going to read it, and then there's no way we're going to be able to make this some shining gem that people really come here for if it's unreadable. So that was one of our constraints, is that we want this thing to be readable. Academics love to put long lists of things with an Oxford comma between them. We didn't do that. So, that was one of our constraints going forward. The twelve objectives that we are voting on are meant to be inclusive. The idea is every department; every department—every single department who want to be part of the Core should have that opportunity to do so and find a home somewhere within the Gen Ed. Similarly, every single professor on this campus who wants to be involved with the Gen Ed should have that opportunity teaching a course they're passionate about, as opposed to just making this a chore that somebody has to do it; find the least senior person and

load them up with the Gen Ed stuff. We don't want that to be the case. So in our language on these twelve objections, we had to make sure not to exclude or imply exclusion. That's one of the reasons we made many of the choices we have. Now, for your update, in addition to the feedback we've received all over campus, we have received feedback from four Senators. We discussed this feedback for over an hour. We took every single word we got very seriously, which is why it took over an hour to have that conversation. We did not wind up making any changes. We can go into some detail later if you like, but we want you to keep in mind that this is a living document. You are not voting today on what we will have for the next 50 years. It's probably going to be revised and tweaked much more frequently than it has been in the past. So, assuming that you pass this vote, the next thing on our docket is of course, we have to talk about the structure of the Gen Ed Core. Currently, we're in the process: We have 16 completely different ideas on the table right now. There are some commonalities, but we haven't gone through all 16 in detail yet. So, that's where we are in the process. Our goal is to take these 16 ideas and wind up when the smoke clears to have two or three that we can submit into the entire campus for review. During that process, we'd be happy to come back and give you updates. Do you have any questions at this time? Okay, hearing none...[Laughter]

Cutter: I guess I would like to hear a little bit more about Outcome Four because one of my comments on that was that I—from our conversation a couple times ago, it still seemed very unclear to me. Here, I remember being told that it wasn't about having group work. So, it still seems unclear to me if that's not what it's about.

Shaw: It's meant to be inclusive, so certainly group work can be part of it, but that would not be the whole thing. We're getting into structure stuff, but if for example, a student does a service-learning component or travels abroad, that would certainly fit that outcome, even if no group work was involved.

Kogl: Also, we want to remind folks that one course does not have to fulfill Outcomes 3,4 & 5. So Outcome 4, I think we conceived of it, and I recall when we were here last time that we said something about, that this is about becoming a person with the social skills that enables them to work whether in a political setting or a professional setting or any other setting--a person who can work across differences of culture, differences of ideology (I'm a political person, it's showing), but who has those skills. And I don't think it requires a particular category, and it certainly doesn't require that somebody teaching a history class has to do group work. That's not our intention. I don't even remember what the language was in the earlier version of it, but I think that we changed it based on our last meeting with this body.

Shaw: And the feedback we got from faculty.

Kogl: And also, I'll speak for myself. When Doug (**Shaw**) says we have 16 different structure proposals—I think there's 16 different faculty members of the committee, so that's what he's referring to. We've all kind of proposed our own ideas. I'll speak for myself...

Shaw: One of us proposed two. [Laughter]

Kogl: Overachievers. I know for me, I see Outcome Four kind of in a category with Outcomes One and Two, that it's sort of a foundational skill. I guess we will leave that up to a rubric committee to figure out what exactly do you need to do to demonstrate that you're capable of doing that.

Shaw: Now I'm speaking for myself, the College of Business did a study trying to see the alignment between College of Business graduates and what the people who hired them want. And they found out that content knowledge was not really a big thing that businesses were concerned about. They wanted students to graduate here being able to collaborate, and so for me the collaboration is a very important thing that people are able to do. But, that doesn't necessarily mean putting them in groups to solve a math problem.

Cutter: Can I follow up?

Petersen: Sure.

Cutter: I get what you're saying, and I think part of the confusion is its presence in 'B' where it looks like it's supposed to be related to that because of the way you're describing it, it does seem much more like the other category.

Shaw: Point taken. We put the letters in as a way of organizing things so when we showed it to people here just as an organization thing.

Kogl: This goes to Senator **Burnight's** question too about the letters; the numbered Outcomes. The letters were sort of just to help us organize and narrow down the areas that we wanted to focus on. But then, because we were charged as a committee with coming up with measurable outcomes, we tried to then be

more careful in the wording of the outcomes. So A, B, C, the lettered categories are more general. They're not in outcome-language.

Shaw: So they are not grouped. We could have distributed this, and we actually talked about distributing this with just a list of 12, and it was a judgement call. Just looking at a list of 12 is kind of...we thought it would be easier to parse it if we put them like that.

Cutter: I do have a follow-up question based on that, because it seems to me if you just had the list of 12, you would lose some of the stuff that you have in the A, B, and C, so couldn't that change the meaning of?...

Shaw: That's why we ultimately decided to go with having sentences, to kind of do that.

Kog: And one thing that I know, I don't think—I don't think anybody has decided yet who will come up with the rubrics for measuring the Outcomes. Our committee I think was charged with coming up with Mission, Outcomes and Structure. That's my understanding. And to actually come up with rubrics for measuring outcomes, it probably needs to be a different body and that body it seems like might want some guidance, but might want some independence from us. So I see that as kind of a 'down the pike' kind of conversation that maybe you all will have to figure out a charge for this whatever this imaginary next committee is. People are looking at me with deep confusion. I'm not...Is it the cold medicine? [Laughter]

Petersen: Just to interject. Your committee did have an interest in coming back on the 25th to begin to really talk about the next steps; what that process might look like, and so we can certainly vote today and also table the discussion so you can come back on the 25th to have some more follow-up about next steps: Process and structure.

Stafford: I may have missed something, but can you speak to the decision to take the labels—Communication, The Human World, Critical Thinking off of..? In other words, when you came in, I had a copy from February 1st and it had A: Communication, B: The Human World, C: Critical Thinking, and I note that those titles have been taken off.

Shaw: It's because a lot of this is going to be taken care of when we have a structure. So, the thing we are asking you to vote on is those 12 Outcomes.

Stafford: Okay. Thank you for clarifying that.

Burnight: The issue I've raised before, and I want to preface it by saying I think the Committee has done an excellent job in terms of formulating these. So this is really more for a clarification than anything else, because it looks like there's some discipline-specific or discipline-specific difference in terms of how quantitative versus formal are used, and I've raised that before. And so I think I can probably solve this—or ask for a clarification pretty quick: You mentioned before Doug (**Shaw**) that as you and the committee understand it, quantitative is the broader category that includes formal, and so a lot of places where I've looked it seems to go the other way, and so I've spent way more time looking at various Gen Ed programs and how they...

Shaw: Right. Thank you for doing that research, by the way.

Burnight: But I did find a couple places where quantitative was used as the sort of the more inclusive, broad category including USC and Michigan, which is pretty good company to be in. I think so. I would say if that's the case, that you're viewing quantitative as the larger category including formal, then I would be totally comfortable with this. Is that basically reiterating what you said about a month ago I think? That understanding of the terms, because not all disciplines understand the terms that way.

Shaw: Correct. And then also...I guess the short answer is 'yes.' I'll keep it at the short answer.

Burnight: Thank you.

Petersen: Are there questions, points of discussion?

Shaw: And also, Critical Thinking will also include some of that –if you're talking about logic and stuff like that. It would go there as well.

Petersen: All in favor then of approving the ...Was that a hand Barbara? (**Cutter**) I'm sorry. Was that a hand?

Cutter: It was, but...

Petersen: Okay, I'm not going to rush it. Go ahead, Senator.

Cutter: I did want to ask about, I brought up the idea of time as a relevant category, and I'm wondering like what was the discussion about the problem with addressing...

Kogl: I wasn't present at the meeting where that was discussed, and I would say that I agree with you that the historical and the geographical, and the ways in which different groups of humans answer different important questions in very, very divergent ways is really important. We thought that the language that we had—we tried to not flag specific disciplines too much. So we're hoping that the language we have can imply and inclusion of historical perspectives, because we think it should. But it should imply so many different things. So, we struggled a little bit with coming up with inclusive lists of things like identities, communities, cultures, ideas, works, institutions. So Ideas, works, institutions in particular—we didn't think any of those were very discipline-specific, and that's what we were aiming for. But, Doug (**Shaw**) can say more to the actual conversation and what the committee talked about. Maybe Steve (**O'Kane**) can too.

Shaw: I think you hit it.

O'Kane: Yes.

Shaw: It was just...because as we were playing around during that conversation, we started to get really close to making a huge list of adjectives.

Kogl: Which would point to specific disciplines, and so the more specific you get, the more you have to be specifically inclusive of every discipline. Is that what happened?

Shaw: That was exactly what happened, so that's the call on that. Believe me, it was talked about.

Cutter: I'm sure. Thanks.

Petersen: Any other discussion? All in favor of approving the Mission and the Learning Areas and Outcomes, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Any opposed? Any abstentions? Senator **O'Kane** abstained. The motion passes. And let me first thank our committee, because I can only imagine the conversation and the time and energy and thoughtfulness that you've dedicated to this thus far this year. And I know there is much more to come and so I appreciate your work, and I also am incredibly appreciative of all of you as Senators, because you have had a lot of homework to do, and you've been very careful about that homework, and you've paid attention, and you've done the reading and you've asked good questions. And so I also appreciate the discussion that have led to us passing the Mission and the Learning Outcomes, and I look forward to hearing about the next steps in the structure and in the process as we continue to move forward. So thank you all.

Petersen: Is there any New Business? I realize I did not give you any time Kristin (**Ahart**). Would you like to take a moment and update us on students?

Ahart: Sure. I'd love to. Starting off, most importantly, we have a special election coming up and our teams have been working really hard with the election date,

which was chosen to be over our Spring Break, when a lot of our students who are able to vote in this district won't be present. So luckily, we've been very fortunate to arrange two satellite voting dates on campus, which will be the 12th and 13th from 10 a.m. to 7 p.m. in Maucker Union. So please encourage your students and peers to get to Maucker Union and get engaged and vote before they head off for Spring Break. We're really hoping to have a high student turnout. We're really proud of the engagement we've had on the national level with student voting numbers and so we want to keep that up and keep our students engaged in this process, and so we've been doing a lot of outreach in the last couple of weeks to make sure that we can get everything set up and ready to go. So continue to plug that for your students and then lastly we had our NISG elections last week. Right? Time goes by so quickly. It was last Wednesday we had our NISG elections, so our incoming administration will be the **Levang** and **Stites** administration. Both of their first names are Jacob, so we conveniently refer to them by their last names for ease. It will be Jacob **Levang** and **Jacob Stites**. They're now taking applicants for their Executive Boards, so we have positions for all the directors as well as our Chief of Staff, and then we also have a couple of seats in our legislative branch for our senate in the College of Education, the Graduate College, and Undecided/General Studies. And so if you have any students that are interested in that, send them to anyone at NISG and we'd love to talk about what being a Senator entails, and what being a representative for that specific college would look like. So again, that was the College of Education, the Graduate College, and Undecided & General Studies that we need one more seat for in each of those areas. We're also taking applications for four associate justices. That's a really cool opportunity to be a part of our judicial branch and

work with the election commission especially when elections come around. So if you have anyone who's interested in policy or law, that's a really cool opportunity to get them engaged at a campus level. They do a lot of important work. I'd be happy to also send that over to Chair **Petersen**, if you'd like links to the applications and some information about the positions to send on to individuals. And other than that, we had breakfast with the Board of Regents last week, which is always a great honor and good opportunity. We talked about student fees. The Board has requested that we compile a student response to all of the fee proposals each year and moving forward. That's something that they would like from the student side, and so we're looking forward to preparing our statements and our opinions on all of the recommendations.

O'Kane: Speaking of satellite voting, there's currently a bill being discussed in the Iowa Congress. I don't remember if it's House or Senate, that one of the outcomes of the bill is to ban satellite voting in public buildings, and it specifically mentions the schools. I don't know if NISG is going to do anything about that.

Vallentine: Not public, but state-owned buildings. They could still be at County Courthouses.

O'Kane: State-owned. Sure.

Ahart: That's something that we've had our attention on, and so once we get our special election finished up, that's something we're going to be taking a stronger lead on. Our governmental relations team is on already, looking over that bill and what it entails, so we can release a comment on how that will affect student participation. And also, don't forget to remind your students that they need

proof of address, and it is still available in their My UNlverse. So I know that's a large barrier for students going to the polls—finding pieces of mail that have their address on it, proving that they live in this district, and so we've secured a really great program through My UNlverse that they can just click on a button and be able to show proof of address for Cedar Falls. So don't forget to remind them that that is still available on My UNlverse.

Petersen: Are there any other announcements? All right. Is there a motion to adjourn? Thank you Senator **Strauss**. And a second? Senator **Neibert**, thank you.