

Regular Meeting #1786
UNI Faculty Senate
Jan. 9, 2017 (3:29 - 4:19 p.m.)
Scholar Space (Room 301), Rod Library
SUMMARY MINUTES

1. Courtesy Announcements

No members of the Press were present.

Interim Provost **Bass** reminded faculty that February 1 is the date when the President **Nook** and Provost **Wohlpert** will assume their duties, though President Nook and his wife will move be on campus the last week of January. Bass had no solid information about budget changes at this time.

Faculty Chair **Kidd** had no comments at this time.

Senate Chair **Gould** reminded Senators to consider action today on the first two docketed items.

2. Minutes for Approval: November 28th, 2016

**** (Campbell/McNeal)** Motion passed.

3. Consideration of Calendar Items for Docketing

1315 Emeritus Request for **Leonard Curtis**, Theatre Department; **Jay Edelnant**, Theatre Department; and **Robert Seager**, Biology Department .

**** (Campbell/Walter)** Passed. Docketed at head of today's order.

<https://uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-request-leonard-curtis-theatre-department-jay>

1316 Diversity and Inclusion Resolution

**** (Walter/Campbell)** Passed. One nay. <https://uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/diversity-and-inclusion-resolution>

1317 Revisions to Curriculum Handbook - Fall 2016

**** (O’Kane/Cooley)** Passed. Docketed in regular order for January 23rd meeting. [https://u](https://uconsultative-session-with-president-mark-nook-on-february-27-at-330-to-be-followed-immediately-by-regular-senate-meeting) Consultative Session with President Mark **Nook** on February 27 at 3:30 to be followed immediately by regular Senate meeting. <https://uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/consultative-session-president-mark-nook>

4. Consideration of Docketed Items Adjournment

1315/1207 Emeritus Request for Leonard **Curtis**, Theatre Department; Jay **Edelnant**, Theatre Department; and Robert **Seager**, Biology Department.

<https://uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-request-leonard-curtis-theatre-department-jay>

**** Emeritus Request for Leonard Curtis (Fenech/Schraffenberger).** Passed.

**** Emeritus Request for Jay Edelnant (Schraffenberger/Walter).** Passed.

**** Emeritus Request for Robert Seager (O’Kane/Walter).** Passed.

1316/1208 Diversity and Inclusion Resolution

**** (Walter/Campbell)** Motion to withdraw resolution from today’s docket and to create an ad hoc committee including Senators **Fenech, Schraffenberger, Choi,** and Vice-Chair **Walter** to study the resolution and return it to the Senate.

<https://uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/diversity-and-inclusion-resolution>

Full transcript of 28 pages with 0 addendum follows.

**FULL TRANSCRIPT of the
UNI Faculty Senate Meeting #1786
January 9, 2017 (3:29 - 4:19 p.m.)
Scholar Space (Room 301), Rod Library**

Present: Senators Ann **Bradfield**, Russ **Campbell**, Seong-in **Choi**, Kerri **Clopton**, Jennifer **Cooley**, Lou **Fenech**, Chair Gretchen **Gould**, David **Hakes**, Tom **Hesse**, Bill **Koch**, Ramona **McNeal**, Steve **O’Kane**, Amy **Petersen**, Joel **Pike**, Jeremy **Schraffenberger**, Secretary Jesse **Swan**, Vice-Chair Michael **Walter**. Also: Interim Provost Brenda **Bass**, Associate Provosts Nancy **Cobb** and Kavita **Dhanwada**, Faculty Chair Tim **Kidd**, NISG Representative Maggie **Miller**.

Not Present: John **Burnight**, Gloria **Stafford**, Leigh **Zeitz**.

Gould: I’m going to go ahead and call this meeting to order. Happy New Year. Welcome back. Thank you for coming to Senate on the first day of class. I know it’s not ideal, but oh well. I want to start off with Courtesy Announcements. Do we have any press present? No, not seeing any press, I am moving on to comments from Interim Provost **Bass**.

Bass: I want to say Happy New Year as well and welcome back to Spring 2017 semester. I hope things are going well so far, for those of you who had classes already today. I’ve just got a couple of updates I wanted to, similar to the email I sent out, I just wanted to update people on the transition with the President and the Provost positions. Again, the official date when everyone shifts into their roles is February 1st, but President **Nook** will most likely be here on campus the last week in January, moving into the house and moving into his office, so don’t be surprised if you see him and/or his wife wandering around campus getting a little more familiar with it. And then, I also wanted to mention budget, as you have probably seen in the news, the Governor has announced that for the current fiscal

year, that the State is roughly around a hundred million short of where the budget had been estimated to be, and so he's announced that there's going to be de-appropriations. He's going to be announcing that tomorrow at his annual address along with his recommendations for the next year's fiscal budget. With the de-appropriations, it will be his recommendation and then the legislature will have to act on it. It takes legislative action to make a de-appropriation, and we really don't know what to expect at this point. It could be something small. It could be something big. They could hold UNI harmless. But the Governor has already indicated that he's going to keep PK-12 and Medicare harmless, and those are big chunks of the State budget, so it doesn't leave that many other areas to take money from and so one would expect that the Regents system will see part of the de-appropriations but at this point we just don't have any details. And even tomorrow after the Governor makes his recommendations, we probably still won't have all the necessary details, because again it will take legislative action. But the President's office plans to be communicating as soon as possible with any of the details as they unfold. If people have questions, I don't necessarily have answers, but I can give you context for things if you wanted to ask questions.

Gould: Thank you. Comments from Faculty Chair **Kidd**?

Kidd: After that cheery news, Happy New Year. [Laughter] That's good.

Gould: Is that it?

Kidd: That's it.

Gould: The only comments I'm going to make are that I know I suggested that the Senate should maybe consider taking action on first two calendar items today,

once we docket them. I will leave it up to you guys to decide whether or not you want to take action on those items today, or wait until January 23rd. That's it for me.

Next up we have Minutes for Approval from our November 28th, 2016 meeting. Do we have any corrections, changes, anything? Okay. I need a motion to approve the minutes from November 28th. Moved by Senator **Campbell**, seconded by Senator **McNeal**. All in favor, say 'aye,' all opposed 'nay,' abstain, 'aye.' Motion passes.

Gould: Next up, we have Consideration of Calendar Items for Docketing. Calendar Item 1315 we have the Emeritus Request for Leonard **Curtis** from the Theatre Department, Jay **Edelnant** from the Theatre Department, and Robert **Seager** from the Biology Department. Can I have a motion to docket this emeritus request in regular order? So moved by Senator **Fenech**, seconded by Senator **Campbell**. So moved and docketed as Item 1207. Next up, we have Calendar Item 1316, the Diversity and Inclusion Resolution. Is there any discussion before taking a vote?

O'Kane: Are we going to vote?

Gould: On docketing it? Yes. Is there any discussion before taking a vote?

Swan: So that motion seems to me that it answered your question in your comments---that we're docketing it in regular order...

Gould: Yes.

Swan: And so, regular order is, if I have the docket correct in my mind, is for the first item at our next meeting in the docket.

Gould: Behind the emeritus requests, unless we take up these.

Swan: I thought we were discussing these emeritus requests.

Campbell: I thought that we discussed earlier this year, that docketing in regular order meant the next item on the docket, which would include this meeting unless someone moves to adjourn before we got to it. So when we docket it in regular order, it's at this meeting, not the next meeting.

Swan: No, because the faculty would have no time to see what's on the docket if we did that. That's docketing at the head of the order, what you just described, which we could do. That motion could be "docket this at the head of the order and for immediate action at this meeting," but that's not what we've docketed. The motion is to docket in regular order, which in our docket is the first item at the next meeting.

Gould: Any other discussion?

Swan: If we don't want that, we should change the motion. That's why I mentioned this.

Gould: Do you want to docket it at the head of the order?

Swan: For action today?

Campbell: Yes. We're still on the emeritus. So I would move for consideration today, docketing for consideration today, the emeritus motion.

Gould: Senator **Campbell** moved to docket for today the emeritus requests Calendar Item 1315, Docket Item 1207 and Vice-Chair **Walter** seconded. Senator **Fenech** withdrew the original motion. Senator **Campbell** replaced the motion. Vice-Chair **Walter** seconded. All in favor say 'aye,' opposed, 'nay,' abstain, 'aye.' Motion passes.

So, back to Calendar Item 1316, the Diversity and Inclusion Resolution. Do we want to docket that today or do we want to docket it in regular order for the January 23rd meeting?

Walter: I move that we docket it for today.

Gould: Vice-Chair **Walter** has moved to docket it for today. Does anybody want to second? Senator **Campbell**, second. All in favor of docketing Calendar Item 1316, Docket Number 1208? Discussion?

O'Kane: Is there a reason that we want to docket this early?

Swan: Why do you want to docket this early? You made the motion.

Walter: I feel like that if we read it, and get it out for discussion in this body, the better off we are.

Swan: We could discuss it right now if you like.

Campbell: We could also decline to vote on it when it comes up on the docket and I would just like to clear our docket as much as possible in case that next point takes a lot of time or something. I would like to have come here for some reason today.

Swan: We're docketing. That's one thing we're doing today.

Gould: So should I ask for a vote now? Any other discussion? All in favor of docketing Item 1316, Calendar Item 1316, Docket 1208 for consideration at today's meeting say 'aye,' all opposed, 'nay,' abstain 'aye.' Motion passes [One nay].

Next up, we have Calendar Item 1317 which is on the Revisions to the Curriculum Handbook for the Fall of 2016. Do we have any discussion, questions?

Dhanwada: Can I just say what it is?

Gould: Yes.

Dhanwada: Because we are on an annual cycle, we take a look at the end of each cycle after we finish---the University Curriculum Committee as well as the Graduate College Curriculum Committee---takes a look at the procedures that are in place where we had some issues as we were going through the process and try to update. So we're doing an annual update, and so these revisions are just some of the ideas that were generated---some of the roadblocks that we faced, to help make the process much easier for the next cycle. So these would include some of these revisions.

Gould: Any other discussion or questions?

Pike: Just a quick question of clarification: The way that this is presented it is as if we were revising back to last fall, or are we revising...

Dhanwada: We're revising the last curriculum handbook, which was revised that year. So we're looking at the handbook that was in place that we used in Fall of '16 as we went through it.

Pike: So we want to revise that handbook for future use?

Dhanwada: Right.

Pike: I thought that's what that was. I just wanted to be really clear. Thank you.

Gould: Any other questions or comments? Can I have a motion to docket Calendar Item 1316, [1317] Docket Number 1209, Revisions to the Curriculum Handbook in regular order for consideration at the January 23rd Senate meeting?

O'Kane: So moved.

Gould: Who moved? Moved by Senator **O'Kane**, seconded by Senator **Cooley**. All in favor, please say 'aye,' opposed, 'nay,' abstain, 'aye.' Calendar Item is docketed. Motion passes.

The last calendar item we have is Calendar Item 1318, which is a Consultative Session with the incoming president, Mark **Nook**. I was able to arrange for him to come to Senate on February 27. I'll have him briefly talk about his plans for UNI and answer any questions we may have for him, and address any concerns we may have. Is there any discussion on this item?

Swan: So why don't we just have this as a scheduled Consultative Session from 3:30 to 4:30, and commence the regular meeting at 4:30?

Gould: Can we do that?

Swan: Yes. That's what you're supposed to do. But we can do any number of other things including docketing it and pretending that it's part of a regular meeting, which it's not.

Gould: I consulted the by-laws, and I thought...

Swan: A Consultative Session is a kind of meeting that the by-laws gives us to have.

Gould: Right, but I understood we had to docket it, which is why I had it up there.

Swan: No. You can call a Consultative Meeting. But people often want to consult. Do we want to have such a meeting? Will we come to such a meeting? I think we're saying we will come at 3:30 for a Consultative Session, and that you'll call a regular session at 4:30.

Gould: Okay. So do I need to leave this on the calendar?

Swan: Do we all agree that we want to a Consultative Session? Is anyone opposing it? So now you're calling a Consultative Session at 3:30 at that time with President **Nook**.

Gould: Okay. We will have a Consultative Session with President Mark **Nook** on February 27th from 3:30 to 4:30, after which a regular meeting will commence.

Swan: It's Monday. The same meeting day. A consultative session and a regular session to follow.

Gould: It's the normal time. So for that, do I need a vote?

Pike: Could we, instead of 3:30-4:30, and then the regular faculty senate at 4:30, couldn't we just say a Consultative Session at 3:30, immediately followed by the Faculty Senate?

Gould: Yes.

Pike: I was just thinking that allows a little more flexibility.

Gould: Okay. Yes. I can say that.

Pike: Just a thought. Not my motion so I can't change the wording on it.

Swan: So you could say then you're announcing to people, it sounds like, we have a Consultative Session at 3:30 and a regular session afterwards if there is time, because we typically end at 5:00, and so if it goes until 5:00, you won't be calling a regular session.

Gould: Okay.

Swan: And you announce that to the faculty at large, so that they understand what's going on.

Gould: Okay. Now we have Consideration of Docketed Items. So, first item, Docket Number 1207, the Emeritus Requests for Leonard **Curtis** from Theatre, Jay **Edelnant** from Theatre, and Robert **Seager** from Biology. Does anybody wish to speak on behalf of any of these faculty?

O’Kane: I’d like to speak on behalf of Bob **Seager** who has been here amongst the very longest of anybody at the University. Bob’s (**Seager**) always been a very good myself as well as to the department. He has taken it upon himself to take care of most of curriculum for many, many years, which is a huge relief. Bob is also very often the Chair of the PAC subcommittee, and has done a remarkably good job with that. He has been an excellent elder statesman in our department and I for one will sincerely miss him.

Gould: Thank you, Senator **O’Kane**. Would anybody else...

Walter: Along the same lines, Bob’s (**Seager**) is also a colleague of mine and fellow U.C. Santa Barbara alum as it turns out.

O’Kane: We don’t hold that against him. [Laughter]

Walter: Anyway, Bob has been a really good friend, free with advice when asked, kind of a guiding light, depending on how you look at it, at Biology faculty meetings, or a silverback with the loudest voice, which often really helps you know, honestly, and an excellent geneticist: taught a lot of very basic genetics courses, and it was generally admired by the faculty, almost without exception in biology.

O’Kane: I also would like to add--- I didn’t mention this, but students...

Walter: Absolutely.

O’Kane: Students loved this man. They absolutely loved Bob **Seager**.

Walter: He was very approachable.

O'Kane: Very approachable. He's a fruit of a very different kind of tree, I'll say. The students loved that. They just loved the man, and he's a real loss for us.

Walter: Definitely.

Kidd: During my first year I was stationed in the BRC, and everybody there made me feel very welcome. Physics was kind of splintered among the campus while the building was being renovated and Steve (**O'Kane**) was there too, of course, but Bob (**Seager**) let me have his research lab and I proceeded to blow circuits left and right.

O'Kane: Yes, you did.

Kidd: Because it was made for a biologist, not a physicist, and I don't think I took out the dean's stuff too often. But anyway, he made me feel very welcome. He had lots of advice for an incoming professor, and I've lost touch with him the last couple of years of course because physics...but he was a great institution at the University.

Gould: Thank you.

Campbell: I can just say that when I came here to interview, Bob **Seager** was one of the people they scheduled me to meet with, to show me...

O'Kane: I'll be darned. That's cool.

Campbell: ...To show me that there is some research that I can sort of relate to if I come to UNI, and since I've been here about 34 years or so, that indicates that he's a couple of years beyond that.

Gould: Thank you. Does anyone else wish to speak on behalf of these three faculty? Can I entertain a motion to approve the emeritus request for Leonard **Curtis**?

Campbell: I want to request that you separate the question. I think we should vote on them independently.

Gould: Okay. First, can have a motion to approve the emeritus request for Leonard **Curtis** from the Theatre Department? So moved by Senator **Fenech**, seconded by Senator **Schraffenberger**. All in favor of approving emeritus status to Leonard **Curtis**, please say 'aye,' all opposed, 'nay,' abstain, 'aye.' Motion passes.

Next up we have Jay **Edelnant** from the Theatre Department. Can I have a motion to approve emeritus status for Jay **Edelnant** of the Theatre Department? Moved by Senator **Schraffenberger**, seconded by Vice-Chair **Walter**. All in favor, say 'aye,' all opposed, 'nay,' abstain, 'aye.' Motion passes.

And last, but not least, can I have a motion to approve emeritus status for Robert **Seager** of the Biology Department? So moved by Senator **O'Kane**, seconded by Vice-Chair **Walter**. All in favor say 'aye,' opposed, 'nay,' abstain, 'aye.' Motion passes. Okay.

Last item on the docket for today's meeting is the Diversity & Inclusion Resolution. As you remember, I mentioned to you late last fall that the Senate Chair from Iowa State had contacted UNI and Iowa and asked us all to bring

forward a diversity and inclusion resolution. So I took our original diversity statement that was passed on December 14, 2015, and I added a little bit. I added another section at the bottom so that students would know that they are welcome, and we want them to be able to learn on all of their campuses in a positive environment. So, open for discussion.

Campbell: What does 'these ideals' refer to in the paragraph that was added?

Gould: I kind of tried to follow Iowa State. I took that to mean that we uphold the ideals of students being able to study on the campus in an environment free of racism, sexism, bigotry, harassment, and oppression.

Campbell: But as I read that, and as I try to parse it, and of course my English colleagues could counter this, that would be an ideal of students being free to study, and if you're looking for ideals, I can only read it as referring to racism, sexism, bigotry, and harassment if I look at the grammatical structure.

Gould: True. I will tweak that, and remove 'oppression.'

Pike: If you're going to tweak it, maybe it might be useful to just say "We uphold the ideals of" and list them there, so there's no confusion.

Campbell: But the ideals of what? Of opposing racism? I would almost look at it as 'We oppose these mindsets' or something, instead of 'we uphold these ideals.'

Peterson: Gretchen, could we add 'ableism' to the list?

Gould: Ableism, yes we can add that.

Pike: Again, if I was going to list the ideals that we're trying to uphold here, 'respect for all members of the community, embracing diversity, respectful dialogs, promoting inclusion.' I mean think those are all ideals, as well as learning in an environment that's free. I think those are all ideals that we want to uphold. I'd just like to say, I'm just thinking that it might be really useful to just articulate them.

Gould: Yes.

Schraffenberger: I actually read these ideals not strictly grammatically. I read the ideals as the ideals of this resolution, but it's probably a good idea to clarify that --to specify the ideals of this diversity and inclusion resolution. That way, we could add twenty things to that right now, and I've written things by committee in the past, and it's not the most exciting thing in the world, so I think that's all we're saying, that this statement is representative of these ideals. You wouldn't have to fill in the blanks

Pike: Part of the reason I like articulating it is then when in talks in the next phrase of upholding these ideals, and then in the next about teaching them, it's very specific about what it is that we're encouraging to be upheld, and what it is we're encouraging to be taught.

Gould: Okay. Any other comments?

O'Kane: I'm wondering if you might want to take comments via email, and redo this and then we'll vote on this next time. There's no rush, right? I agree with Joel that...

Walter: I second that motion even though...wordsmithing.

O’Kane: Doing it by committee---oh boy!

Schraffenberger: I think one of the reasons Jesse (**Swan**) may have not wanted to discuss this today is that we should also have some feedback from other people on campus, and that might be a good way. If we’re holding off on the vote we can get some ideas that can be added or inserted.

Gould: Okay.

Walter: I think most people have already read this but still, it does need some work.

Schraffenberger: And are we simply voting to affirm the new language or reaffirm the old language? Would revising the old language be something that we’re being asked to do as well?

Gould: Senator **O’Kane** was Chair when we passed the original statement. I wasn’t...I mean we could revise it, but I took it from the original minutes.

Campbell: I would rather not revise the original, because that would be a statement that we have problems with the original and we’re busy trying to decide what we’re doing about that. I would say this is a good foundation and we want to clarify it, which is what you are trying to do.

Gould: Yes.

Schraffenberger: I asked because I would add ‘non-belief’ to religious beliefs, because I think that’s just as important.

Gould: Yes.

Schraffenberger: But that’s revising the old language, and so I don’t know what exactly we’re being asked to do.

Pike: Maybe when we articulate the ideals we could throw it in.

O’Kane: Question: This originated at Iowa?

Gould: Iowa State. It originated at Iowa State.

O’Kane: And Iowa is on board for the three universities?

Gould: Yes. Iowa—I don’t know when exactly they’re bringing it up at their Senate, but they are also bringing it up at their Senate. I can touch base with the Senate Chair after the meeting and find out.

O’Kane: I’m still left wondering a little bit, I think somebody over here mentioned it, we already had a statement. Why are we doing another one?

Gould: I think to send the message, I mean, we had the statement for UNI last year, but this is kind of sending the message to the students that all the Regents universities are on board and have the same ideas.

O’Kane: So perhaps the newspaper headline should read, “Iowa and Iowa State Follow UNI’s Lead” on this. [Laughter] Seriously.

Gould: True. We could not take this up, and we could reaffirm the original statement.

Swan: This seems like very good discussion for the calendar stage, but you all have put this in the docket to be decided. But we can just go on and do whatever we want, and do things that are appropriate to the calendar stage as well, which it seems like we're moving towards doing. I'm with Senator **O'Kane**, I think. I'm trying to understand why Iowa State wants us to do this, and it seems to me, and I could be wrong, and that's why I'm mentioning it and asking, that they were concerned with immigrant students and wanting to make sure that we welcome immigrant students in a new political environment. But perhaps that's not part of Iowa State's impulse.

Gould: Right. I think part of the reason they did not specify but...

Swan: So they didn't specify in their proposed language? Didn't they send us something that they wanted us to endorse?

Walter: I'm not going to read it but right off the page: "Welcome to study on our campus without fear of harassment, racism, sexism, et cetera, especially in light of the elections." We're all dancing around the fact that this has been a really ugly episode, and we know freedom has to be fought for constantly. If we happen to make a redundant statement about something we already believe, fine. Let's do it, but we have to get the wording right.

Swan: I think the wording does need to be right, so it doesn't sound like just a restatement of something from the past that had nothing to do with the impulse

for a statement now, which was Iowa State's purpose. I do think it's better that this faculty say nothing, than not to support the impetus of Iowa State faculty's statement. That's my view.

Gould: I think the reason behind it was if all three universities came together, the Board of Regents would also support the statement and issue their own statement.

Pike: Regardless of...I personally, despite my own personal feelings, don't think it's appropriate to have a reference to your motive in a statement like this. So I'm happy to not have that. I do however think that the additional portion is an important piece. That as a community of scholars, we support programs, policies...what I like about the second piece is that we are articulating that we welcome all students AND that we uphold the ideals and encourage colleagues across to encourage. And then the last part is also pretty important. Also part of this is teaching those. None of those things is included in the original statement. I think they're useful, important things to add. I don't care what the motivation is. Even if there's no motivation other than to just have a nice statement of ideals.

Swan: That would be revising the statement that we formulated earlier, and that's a very different activity, function, motivation for us to change a statement or make a statement than we were presented with. We were presented, from the Iowa State faculty with a statement that they just wanted us to endorse, for us to say something about it, and make specific reference to phenomena that we're currently facing. And we, if we don't want to do that, then we just don't do that it seems, and not reiterate another statement that's impertinent to what we're

being asked to do. But this could be the motivation for getting us to revise a previous statement if we want to put in teaching. I'm sure we did talk about why we didn't want to put that in to the statement that we passed, that did serve certain functions, and it's to serve a wide function in the past. But that's another discussion, another purpose, and so I do think we should continue to address the issue at hand, and that's Iowa State University's faculty promotion of a safe place for immigrants to study and other phenomena in relationship to the November election, or decline to endorse or say anything about it.

Gould: NISG's representative...I don't know your name.

Miller: I'm Maggie **Miller**. I just wanted to mention that all of the student senates and student governments have all passed resolutions on the diversity inclusion.

Gould: At all three?

Miller: Yup.

Gould: Thank you.

Campbell: Do we, or can we have a copy of your resolution?

Miller: Yes. I can send one to you.

Hakes: Is it common across the three, or do you each have your own?

Miller: We each wrote our own.

Gould: Any further discussion?

Cooley: It might be interesting to point out that there was some proposed legislation called, “Suck It Up Buttercup,” and it wouldn’t surprise me if this was a timely move to make something of a response to that idea.

Swan: I actually do think that if the Senate think this is an important matter to continue with, that it should go a committee, and that it should be composed by a committee that gives it back to the Senate, complete, with feedback from everybody who wants to provide feedback. And I suppose that might be an ad hoc committee of Senators who are interested and anybody else who might be interested to compose our statement to go with Iowa State University’s faculty statement.

Gould: Any?

Choi: While this is one is affected to everybody, but personally, I am delighted to look at this kind of issue. I was watching this conversation without knowing whether I really wanted to join in this discussion, which actually shows my discomfort about this topic personally. It actually shows that the...my discomfort shows this is an important topic, right, because it means that I don’t really feel comfortable, and I don’t really feel that this is a safe environment. After the election I had a chance to talk with many students of different cultures and different countries, and they share those fears. And also I had a chance to talk with my friends and colleagues who are working in other universities, and they shared some instances about some hate crimes, or hate paintings on walls, that kind of thing. It is quite a significant issue, and many people feel personal fears, so I think this is the right timing to revisit this resolution and discuss about it. The

reason why I was hesitating to say something about this one is because I felt kind of helpless because this statement from my perspective, the statement was quite neutral, or not enough...I think it could be more proactive. It's kind of passive to me, "Yeah, we welcome..." I know I'm welcomed, but I want more reassurance that the institution will fight for me for the social justice when it happens.

Pike: If it said something...I'm just trying to clarify. So if it said something more along the lines of "We commit to the goal of all students feeling welcome," would that be more active? More of what you're looking for, as opposed to "We welcome all students?"

Choi: One thing is to be more proactive. I would like to see more reassurance that our institution will fight for social justice. Something like "this kind of thing will not be tolerated." Something like that. "If this kind of thing happened, we will do something."

Schraffenberger: It's tricky because if we're going to write a resolution about diversity and inclusion, Senator **Pike** expressed his reservation that we not include motive, but we're fooling ourselves, as you've said that there is no motive. This is a response directly, not just to legislation, but to violent events in our communities: hate crimes, as you would describe them. To not include whether we call it motive or what I would prefer---context---is to sever it from the historical record. We don't know why this is being affirmed, and I think the more proactive it is, the better. But I also think the more context provided the better also. There may be like a shorter version of it that we affirm as being on board with Iowa and Iowa State, but I think that for our own purposes, we should

probably be honest with ourselves, and include whether it's motive or rationale, at the very least, context.

Campbell: Two comments: One, I almost heard Senator **Choi** saying, I mean she didn't say it, but she felt a little unease being here, and somehow wanted, "We welcome all students, faculty and staff" to be proactive. Instead of we uphold these ideals ourselves we will strive to provide this environment, striving to provide the environment being a stronger thing than just upholding the ideals, and again, your committee of three or whatever that gets formed is going to wordsmith it. So that's just one possible thought.

Choi: I like that. Thank you very much. Let's strive for rather than just welcome. Welcome sounds more like a bystander, like "You're welcome. You can be here," something like that---just an observer. But "We will strive for something. We will promote something," that kind of wording.

Gould: I think based on our discussion, I'm going to recommend an ad hoc committee of the Senate to work on this resolution and come back with something. Can I have two or three volunteers? Okay, Senator **Fenech**, Senator **Schraffenberger**, Vice-Chair **Walter**.

Walter: I nominate Senator **Choi**.

Schraffenberger: If you just prefer to have three, I'm perfectly happy also to withdraw my name.

Walter: If we post it, everyone will be able to comment on it.

Swan: So is this what you want to do? We should then vote 'no,' as this is in the docket. So we're supposed to take care of this. So we can just say no to this, as you've formed this ad hoc committee...

Campbell: Wouldn't it be easier to ...

Swan: It would be easier to in the calendar stage, to do what we're doing now.

Campbell: We can amend the motion.

Swan: It's easiest to handle what's in the docket, and you can approve or reject what's in the docket. At the calendar stage, you do what we're doing now, and that's very clear and easy. It would be very easy to vote this down and then have the committee that you're forming now present the resolution that's addressing Iowa State faculty's resolution. That's the other thing that this committee should be clear on: We don't want the committee, I don't want the committee, to revise a previous statement that we've done for other purposes. We want them to come up with another statement that is to attach with Iowa State University's faculty statement, that they sent to us and asked us to endorse. For whatever reason we don't want to endorse their statement. We want to come up with another statement. This ad hoc committee is now coming up with that statement. That's what they're to do.

Gould: Okay.

Swan: So I think we should vote this down and do that committee, and then that will be introduced into the calendar stage as a new resolution from that ad hoc committee.

Gould: Okay. So first, can I have a motion not to approve...

Swan: It's already in the docket.

O'Kane: We just need to vote on it.

Swan: It's there to approve, so we vote to approve it, 'yes,' or not to approve it, 'no.'

Pike: I have a question: Is it an option to table it rather than approve or disapprove, but to table it pending the revisions and committee report?

Kidd: I normally would agree with that, but it's nice to have it, I guess on the calendar stage and on the agenda, so that people from the campus, if they wanted to, could see it before it comes up before the Senate to make comments. So if we didn't have it on the calendar...

Campbell: Well, it's going to be on the calendar. It's going to be on the agenda as tabled until it's taken off the table.

Swan: That gets very confusing. That's making it very confusing. We want to make it as simple and straightforward for everybody around. So when it comes on the calendar stage again, it's very clear.

Kidd: Yeah. I mean the entire point I think is, I don't know how many people do it, but the point is to let people from campus know what's coming up on the agenda and make comments or come to discuss things that they wish. So, if there's not a rush, then it's just another meeting, so.

Campbell: I think I'm not the only one who doesn't want to vote against this which is why, what is the motion on the floor?

Swan: To accept this.

Campbell: It was docketed in regular...

Swan: No, at the head of the calendar for this meeting, to rush it through.

Campbell: We should be able to just put forward a motion to refer it committee at this stage.

Swan: That's what you do at the calendar stage.

Campbell: But you can amend the motion.

Swan: This body can do anything it wants at any time. So we could be confused and be confusing to the campus at large, or we could very simple and clear and straightforward with what we're doing. We can just say no to this iteration. We have another committee coming up with another iteration, that when it's ready will present it to us, and that will appear on the calendar. What's wrong with voting 'no' on it? There's nothing wrong with voting 'no' on this.

Kidd: So are you worried about the perception?

Campbell: Yes.

Kidd: It's kind of like voting against puppies. [Laughter] It doesn't look right. So what I think he's doing is looking for a way to withdraw the current form without

having to vote against a resolution on this. He doesn't want to take it out of context, for example.

Swan: **Walter**, did you make the motion? We can let you withdraw it, and allow it to come up when it's ready to come up, is what you really want to do.

Walter: I would like to withdraw the motion.

Swan: And if there's no objection--Is there an objection to it being withdrawn by the sponsor, then the Chair declares it withdrawn.

Gould: So, the Diversity and Inclusion Resolution item has been withdrawn and will be removed from the docket, and an ad hoc committee has been formed of Senator **Fenech**, Senator **Schraffenberger**, Senator **Choi**, and Vice-Chair **Walter** will work on a diversity and inclusion resolution and bring something back to Senate when they are ready.

Walter: I want to be clear that some form of this is still posted so that the campus can read it.

Gould: Yes. Yes. I'll leave all this up on the website. Can I have a motion to adjourn? So moved by Senator **Cooley**. Seconded by Senator **Hakes**. All in favor, say 'aye,' opposed 'nay,' abstain, 'aye.' Meeting adjourned.