

UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
02/28/11 (3:17 p.m. – 4:50 p.m.)

SUMMARY

Summary of main points

1. Recognition plaques for past Senate service were presented by Chair **Wurtz** to Senator Pierre-Damier **Mvuyekure** and Senator Donna **Schumacher-Douglas**. Senators Maria **Basom** and Michele **Devlin** were unable to attend. A special recognition plaque was presented to the outgoing Senate Secretary, Dena **Snowden**, for her 10 years of service to the Senate.
2. Courtesy announcements included no press present. Provost **Gibson** reported on President **Allen**'s current health condition. She also discussed upcoming budget decisions briefly and requested a closed Senate session at the March 28, 2011, meeting. No comments from Faculty Chair **Jurgenson**. Chair **Wurtz**'s commented on her recent ankle injury.
3. NEW BUSINESS—Motion made to move into Executive Session at 4:15 p.m. on 03/28/11 and to invite Provost **Gibson** to be a part of that Executive Session (**Deberg/Funderburk**). Passed.
4. Minutes approved for: 02/14/11 (**Neuhaus/Roth**)
5. Docketed from the calendar:
 - 1072 970 New Undergraduate Academic Standing Policy (Academic Alert, Probation, and Suspension) for the 2011-2012 Academic Year (**Neuhaus/DeBerg**), regular order
 - 1073 971 Resolution from NISG regarding Professional Development Assignments (**DeBerg/East**), regular order
 - 1074 972 Expedited Review of Program Changes for the Elementary Education and Middle Level Education Majors (**Neuhaus/East**), pended until information available

1075 973 Resolution from NISG regarding proposed Dead Days
(**Soneson/Bruess**), regular order

6. Consideration of docketed items:

1070 968 Name for the Merged College (**Soneson/Hotek**). Motion failed;
alternative name passed: College of Humanities, Fine Arts, and
Natural Sciences (**Soneson/Funderburk**)

1071 969 Department Name Change (**Soneson/Gallagher**). Motion
failed; alternative name passed: Department of Languages and
Literatures (**Smith/Terlip**)

7. Adjournment at 4:50 p.m.

**MINUTES OF THE
UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
02/28/11
Mtg. #1693**

PRESENT: Megan Balong, Karen Breitbach, Gregory Bruess, Betty DeBerg,
Forrest Dolgener, Phil East, Jeffrey Funderburk, Deborah Gallagher, Gloria
Gibson, James Jurgenson, Michael Licari, Julie Lowell, Chris Neuhaus,
Michael Roth, Jerry Smith, Jerry Soneson, Laura Terlip, Katherine Van
Wormer, Susan Wurtz

Absent: Doug Hotek, Marilyn Shaw

CALL TO ORDER

Chair **Wurtz** called the meeting to order at 3:17 p.m.

RECOGNITIONS

Chair **Wurtz** made apologies for the belatedness of these recognitions.
Senators **Basom** and **Devlin** were unable to attend. Senator Pierre-Damier
Mvuyekure and Senator Donna **Schumacher-Douglas** each received
plaques for their Senate service to rounds of applause. Former Senate

Secretary Dena **Snowden** received her plaque to a hearty round of applause with many cheers and a standing ovation for her 10 years of service to the Senate.

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

No press were in attendance.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GLORIA GIBSON

Provost **Gibson** stated that President **Allen** is doing fine and that a statement will appear in UNI On-Line tomorrow. He surprised her office on Friday with a visit looking good. He is to be released by the doctor tomorrow, and sometime in March he will return to work.

Gibson continued by noting that there should be additional information in March pertaining to the Budget. By the end of March, two important pieces of information will be ready. First, the arbitration session was held last week, and the arbiter will give a decision on March 15 regarding faculty salaries and other negotiated items. Second, information on tuition increase will be available. The Board of Regents will vote on that increase after Spring Break. However, the Provost said the allocation from the State will not be ready by then. At present, the Governor has made a suggested cut, the House has suggested deeper cuts, and the Senate will make their suggestion perhaps this week or next. She does not expect the Senate to propose any cut. All will need to compromise on this issue, and it could be late April or May before UNI receives the State Budget, so things are on hold right now. She anticipates some cut, perhaps between \$3 million to \$9 million.

Academic Affairs' percentage of the UNI Budget is approximately 72%. So even a modest budget cut will have a significant impact on Academic Affairs. She has heard from the Senate that they want continued information from her as it becomes available with clear process communicated. Therefore, she is requesting to have a closed session of the Faculty Senate at the end of March to discuss this new information and its

implications on the overall Budget. The basic information will be available in the newspapers, and she wants to clearly communicate the implications of that information.

Chair **Wurtz** outlined how that Executive Session can be planned for and will take it up under New Business. Discussion and questions for the Provost included Senator **Roth** who noted that his colleagues in Physics are sufficiently concerned as to want to contact their elected officials and asked about restrictions that may be in place for using UNI e-mail or UNI phones. **Gibson** replied that no one should use UNI e-mail or phones to communicate with legislators. Use home e-mail and home or cell phones for such communication and please share this information with colleagues.

Senator **DeBerg** stated that the Senate likely would support the Provost's not allowing 70% of any budget cuts to come from academics. She felt other areas (perhaps Athletics and Price Lab School) could sustain more of the cuts than their budget percentages would suggest. She does not want to see academic programs weakened by the assumption that across-the-board cuts are required. **Gibson** replied that she understands this point and stated that the last time there were budget cuts, the percentage was reduced for Academic Affairs. She acknowledged that it was not very much but feels that every cent counts. She will be sure to make that argument when the time comes. She also noted that each UNI unit will say that their area is vital and that "others" can cope with cuts better than they.

Senator **Soneson** agreed with **DeBerg** and said that it does not hurt to remind everyone that this is, first of all, an academic institution and that the academic side of the institution must not be hurt when there are other areas that could take shortfalls in order to preserve the academic integrity of UNI. **Gibson** agreed. **Soneson** also had a question about tuition increases, that UNI's proposal is 5% and the University of Iowa's is 7%. He wondered about this disparity. **Gibson** said she understands that the 3 Regent's Universities are the same at the undergraduate level (5%, she thinks) but that the differences come at the graduate level.

Senator **Funderburk** asked about open searches. Is there any talk about suspending or halting searches as yet? **Gibson** replied that no searches have been suspended, and she does not want to have to do that.

Wurtz asked the Provost to convey the Senate's best wishes for continued recovery to President **Allen**. She also asked the Provost to be sure to ask the Senate if there is anything they need to take action on as all involved work to keep the budget healthy. **Gibson** asked for ideas, as a way of assisting her, because ultimately there will be difficult decisions made. No matter what, Academic Affairs will be faced with some cuts. She needs assistance with process and decision-making. It is not as simple as saying, "Cut this and cut that" and expecting all the problems to be solved.

Senator **East** asked if it was reasonable to presume that, just as there may not be across-the-board cuts across campus, that there also will not be across-the-board cuts within Academic Affairs? He encouraged her to consider this, and for her to encourage her Deans to consider this, as they all go through the process of applying budget cuts. **Gibson** replied that the Deans and all of her direct reports have already been asked to start thinking about what they would cut if asked to do so. Both **East** and **Gibson** agreed that this means not across-the-board.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JAMES JURGENSON

Faculty Chair James **Jurgenson** had no comments today.

COMMENTS FROM CHAIR SUSAN WURTZ

Comments from Chair **Wurtz** included the story of her recent ankle injury on campus when attempting to be helpful to students playing Four Square but which only served to cause major damage to her dignity and illusions of youth. She will be in a lovely purple Panther cast until March 31. She also now has new appreciation for those with disabilities and those with short-term conditions requiring crutches/wheelchairs. UNI infrastructure could be improved to facilitate their movement.

NEW BUSINESS

Chair **Wurtz** called for a motion to approve an Executive Session for March 28, 2011, the next scheduled Senate Faculty meeting. **DeBerg** moved that the Senate docket for March 28th an Executive Session with the Provost on the topic of the Budget. **Funderburk** seconded. Discussion included **East** asking that a specific time be noted, perhaps at the end of the meeting in order to expedite necessary business prior to that time. Senator **Neuhaus** noted that any business not completed could then be tabled until the following meeting. After the Chair briefed the Senate on upcoming likely items for consideration at that meeting, **DeBerg** restated her motion to docket an Executive Session on the Budget with the Provost on the next meeting date at 4:15. **Funderburk** agreed. Vote passed with no opposition or abstentions.

BUSINESS

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

The Minutes for 02/14/11 were distributed to senators electronically. Nuss received no additions or corrections prior to the meeting. Motion was made to approve the minutes as distributed (**Neuhaus/Roth**). No senators today had additions or corrections or discussion. Passed.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Consideration of Calendar Item 1072 for Docket #970, New Undergraduate Academic Standing Policy (Academic Alert, Probation, and Suspension) for 2011-2012 Academic Year

Neuhaus moved to docket in regular order; **DeBerg** seconded. Passed with no discussion.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1073 for Docket #971, Resolution from NISG regarding Professional Development Assignments

DeBerg moved to docket in regular order; **East** seconded. Passed with no discussion.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1074 for Docket #972, Expedited Review of Program Changes for the Elementary Education and Middle Level Education Majors

East stated that the documentation looked like a warning that this would be coming, that the Senate was asked to examine their curriculum proposals after the Curriculum Committee has finished an expedited review. **Wurtz** acknowledged that she might have jumped the gun in putting this on the agenda, so perhaps it should not be docketed yet. Associate Provost **Licari** agreed with **East**, stating that he received a call today from that group who said the expediting had been concluded but that the University Curriculum Committee next needed to consider the matter, and that they would meet mid-March. **East** felt it could be docketed if it is available, but that nothing seems certain. The Senate body decided to let the matter pend until further word arrives of its readiness for docketing.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1075 for Docket #973, Resolution from NISG regarding proposed Dead Days

Soneson moved to docket in regular order; **Bruess** seconded. Passed with no discussion.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

DOCKET 968, NAME FOR THE MERGED COLLEGE (**Soneson/Hotek**)

Soneson began discussion stating that the College of Humanities and Fine Arts Senate did not resoundingly endorse this proposed name of College of Arts and Natural Sciences and passed it along to the Faculty Senate. There is some contention with this proposed name, and there is the possibility that another title might be more appropriate. He encourages this body to talk about the pros and cons of this title as well as other titles before a vote is taken. Provost **Gibson** asked if Senator **DeBerg** might give some history so that everyone understands the process by which the name came about.

DeBerg detailed the process for as far as she was involved, stating that a steering committee of 5 faculty from each College was asked to discuss some issues dealing with the College merger, including the name of the new College. In a manner that will not hold up to social science research

methods, they had multiple names offered—some of which were funny, but those did not make the final ballot. They provided a long list of proposed names on a ballot on the web on which faculty from the two Colleges could vote. She recently sent a memo to all Senators in which she gave the tallies from both Colleges. The steering committee met once about the name of the College. She did not attend that meeting, so she cannot speak for the group's decision to send up the 3 choices that they did. They sent pros and cons for each name along with the list of 3 choices to Dean **Haack** and Provost **Gibson**. Those three names were: 1) College of Arts and Sciences; 2) College of Arts and Natural Sciences; and 3) College of Humanities, Arts, and Natural Sciences. That is the process as far as she knows it.

Dean **Haack**, from the audience, asked if Senators would like to have the history from there. Chair **Wurtz** asked him to join Senators at the table. He stated that he knew the history of that point on, but he began by stating that before it came out of the College Merger Steering Committee, an open forum was held to which faculty from across both Colleges were invited to come and speak. Every Department was given the opportunity to comment on proposed names. That data were also collected. When the steering committee forwarded the three proposed names, they also included the information they had gathered from each of the Departments. He looked over the data in lots of ways because he understands that faculty opinion on this is absolutely critical. In looking it over, any one of the three names could have been chosen to move on through the process. He discussed it with the Academic Affairs Council, with the Council of Department Heads which includes the Department Heads of both Colleges, with the Deans of the Colleges of Liberal Arts and Sciences at UNI's sister Regent's institutions. He ultimately decided that in the interest of moving the process along, he would move along the name of the College of Arts and Natural Sciences. That was submitted to the two College Senates, who are meeting together actually, and both had a chance to discuss the proposed name. They learned that whatever happened there, the decision would be made ultimately by the Faculty Senate. So they chose, rather than to endorse the name, to endorse the fact that he should forward the name to the Faculty Senate. So what has come before the Senate is a proposed name for the merged College, fully recognizing that this body will decide

the name for the new College. He noted that his favorite was not even on the list, so he has no personal stake in this. He hears very good arguments for adding Humanities to the name. He has heard good arguments for adding Technology to the name. He understands that it is very difficult to fully represent all the areas that are in the merged College. He tried that today, and it would come out as: College of Humanities, Communication Science, Fine Arts, Mathematical Sciences, Technology, and Natural Sciences. That would be a real challenge. He is glad that this body has the chance to figure out what would make the most sense. The data collected so far have been primarily from within the two merged Colleges. On the other hand, the name of a College in a University is also of critical importance to people outside that College. So the Senate really is the appropriate body to ultimately decide this matter.

Provost **Gibson** made a point of clarification saying that it is her understanding that the Senate makes a recommendation to the Provost, who then makes a recommendation to the Council of Provosts, who then makes a recommendation to the Board of Regents for consideration.

Wurtz replied that she understands that the Faculty Senate has 3 choices: 1) The Senate can endorse this name submitted; 2) The Senate can choose not to endorse the name without offering another name; and 3) The Senate can choose not to endorse the name and offer an alternative name instead. And, yes, it is an endorsement and not a decision.

DeBerg spoke against the idea that Humanities is co-equal with Math or with Comm. Sciences or with Technology, because Humanities is an entire sector of what a university does. The others names are simply Departments. It is comparing apples to oranges to use this as an argument for leaving Humanities out of the name for the merged College, she stated. She has yet to hear a good reason for leaving Humanities out. At UNI there are 4 Humanities departments, which is more than Fine Arts departments in the current College of Humanities and Fine Arts. She says after non-consultation before the merger took place, leaving Humanities out of the new name just adds insult to injury. She feels there is no overwhelming faculty support for leaving Humanities out of the name; in fact, it is just the opposite.

Wurtz reminded those present that this discussion will be on the merits of the name submitted for Senate endorsement or non-endorsement, with or without an alternative name suggested. **Soneson** added that the use of the word Humanities is historical at UNI as a part of a college name. It is one thing to take away a part of an historical name and quite another to add other names. If the Senate endorses the named proposed, they would be taking away something historical.

Wurtz called for more discussion summarizing that if they choose not to endorse the proposed name they do not necessarily have to propose an alternative. They could send a list of terms they would like to see included. **Soneson** continued saying that he agreed with **Haack** that this is very much a faculty issue and that they need to listen to faculty opinion on this. Senators are the faculty representatives and need to think seriously about the outcome of this. If there are objections to the name College of Humanities, Arts, and Sciences, now is the time to be heard. **East** stated that the motion is about approving the name College of Arts and Natural Sciences, to which **Wurtz** agreed. So a discussion about changing it to something else he feels is out of order. The Senate should vote on the motion as presented and then, if another name is suggested, another motion is needed for that vote. **Wurtz** agreed that it will be accomplished in this way but that she is trying to be efficient in the discussion by allowing talk of both at the same time.

Senator **Terlip** stated she made a concerted effort to talk with colleagues and most could live with the name offered but would prefer to have Humanities reflected in it. As a side note, she had some who were uncomfortable with the obvious abbreviation of CANS (College of Arts and Natural Sciences) for the merged College. College abbreviations often appear in publicity materials.

DeBerg noted that an argument has been made that the term Arts can also include Humanities. But the term Humanities can include the Arts as well. The Federal Government has had both the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities, so there are precedents for neither encompassing the other. If Arts can include Humanities and therefore leave it out. Then Humanities can include Arts,

leaving it out. Also, with Natural Science in the proposed name, then that leaves Arts and Sciences as the catchall for everything that is not a professional school. That is common. But after the term Science is modified to Natural Science, then Arts is left as everything it is not supposed to be either. Therefore, Arts and Sciences is very different than Arts and Natural Sciences. The only other public use of the word Arts used at UNI is the Center for the Arts, the Performing Arts Center, so here at UNI Arts seems to mean the Fine Arts and does not really encompass Humanities in any kind of meaningful and practical way.

Wurtz asked if anyone wishes to speak for endorsing this proposed name. So far it seems the discussion has been entirely for not endorsing it.

Neuhaus wondered if the Senate were to reject this name and send it back, could there be any expectation that any other name might be agreed upon among the constituents of these two large and diverse Colleges? **Wurtz** agreed that another option could be to send it back for further consideration.

Funderburk noted that he was contacted quite often after the final name was proposed, mainly because the word Humanities was not included. Also, many did not take part in the surveys because they assumed it would ultimately be College of Humanities, Fine Arts, and Natural Sciences and the many random surveys seemed unnecessary. He has recently been named to the Humanities Board and has heard from many. He would say it is 100% against having a name without Humanities included.

Dean **Haack** suggested that someone could amend the current motion and noted that sending it back would be the least preferable outcome for him. Deciding on a name today, whatever it is, is quite acceptable. (End of Side A of Tape 1)

East said that this is mostly a faculty concern. Mostly other people do not care. People off campus do not care. Students do not care, perhaps do not even keep track of what College they are in. So it is faculty egos and whatever they think is important about communicating whatever they think they communicate with a college name. **Terlip** said she would like it decided today because she would like to be with a college with a name.

Gibson reminded the group that it will not actually be resolved today. **Terlip** agreed but at least the Senate's part in it could be.

DeBerg called the question on the motion. Two-thirds agreed. **Wurtz** asked for a vote on endorsing the proposal that the new name be College of Arts and Natural Sciences. Ayes = 0; Nays = 9; Abstentions = 5. Motion failed to pass. **Wurtz** called for a motion on what they would like to send forward as an endorsed name. **Soneson** moved that the Senate endorse the name College of Humanities, Fine Arts, and Natural Sciences.

Funderburk seconded. Senator **VanWormer** asked for a definition of Fine Arts because she has always thought of it as art and music. She wonders about English Literature and where that would fit in here. **Soneson** responded that he chose Fine Arts because that is the historical title of the College of Humanities and Fine Arts today. Because of the history, he does not think they need to be too specific about the meaning of Fine Arts and what it includes. It includes literature today.

Wurtz hearing no further discussion asked for a vote of sending forward and endorsing the name for the merged college in the Senate's opinion be College of Humanities, Fine Arts, and Natural Sciences. Passed with 0 nays and 3 abstentions.

DOCKET 969, DEPARTMENT NAME CHANGE (**Soneson/Gallagher**)

Soneson stated that this is the merger of two major Departments on campus. This has been a complex process and has taken a considerable amount of time. The two Departments have chosen the name Department of Languages, Literatures, and Cultures. Those Departments need to have a strong voice in the name that will identify the merged Department; therefore, he endorses the proposed name.

Guest Jeffrey **Copeland**, Head of the Department of English, Language, and Literature moved to the table and greeted all. He thanked everyone for the opportunity to provide a little background. He noted that both the Department of English, Language, and Literature and the Department of Modern Languages chose to follow the model and procedure basically used

by the College is trying to establish its name. That is, committee discussion on the issue moved to transition team discussion with transition teams from both Departments which led to public forum which led to voting which then led to additional forums and discussions which led to a final vote ultimately with the Department of Languages, Literatures, and Cultures being the favored choice. At that point, he met with **Licari**. They went over the UNI Policies and Procedures Manual to find out which steps were then in order. It went first to the College Senate which gave its approval. The College Senate then also recommended consultation with other Departments that might be influenced or affected by the new name. Only one of those Departments had a concern. An electronic glitch occurred when he transmitted this information prior to today's meeting, and therefore he read one sentence to the group. This is from the Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Criminology. It says: "In our view, your Department's proposal to change its name to Department of Languages, Literatures, and Cultures has an impact on our Department, and we respectfully object to this proposed change." **Copeland** also offered that it was the feeling of the two Departments that language cannot be taught without its attending culture. There was never an intention that they, as a combined Department, would be teaching separate courses just in the area of culture. It was to be included with the study of the languages. It was felt most strongly by those in both Departments that this is what has been done since time immemorial. They realized that Anthropology was sensitive to the inclusion of *cultures* in the title, that syntax and semantics can be multiplied 10-fold, as Shakespeare said, so they do not see a terrible conflict here. Respecting the views of their colleagues in Anthropology, they would still request that the Senate give consideration to the proposed name for the new combined Department. He then offered to answer any questions.

Vice Chair **Lowell** noted that she is the only anthropologist in the room, so she feels that she needs to talk about their view as anthropologists. For anthropologists, culture is the center of what they do. To define anthropology, it is the study of culture, and it is the study of culture in all its aspects. She supports what her fellow anthropologists have argued, which is not to say that in languages and literature they do not teach culture. She personally has had courses in Russian literature where she has learned a lot

about Russian culture, but it is not a systematic study of culture in the same way that anthropology would teach it. This is not to take away from teaching language in the context of culture and the arts and so forth, at all, but that is their objection. They do not feel they own *culture* or that word, but that is the objection. **Wurtz** clarified with **Lowell** that she and her colleagues would prefer simply Department of Languages and Literature.

DeBerg noted that the word *culture* is like the word *technology*. A lot of different people use and study technology, and that word is not the domain of one Department. She also feels that what distinguishes the study of anthropology from the study of art, which is a central part of culture, from the study of literature and languages as a central part of culture, from the study of international business culture, and religion culture is that anthropology uses specific methods that are different from other parts of the University that study culture. Anthropology is distinguished by ethnography, by participant observation, and other kinds of methods that anthropology uses. So she feels anthropology's claim to the word *culture* is methodological. It is not subject matter. A lot of people at the University study culture and should study culture. It is part of what they do.

Soneson recognized that the argument that was made in the letter sent forward by Kent **Sandstrom** is strong, explaining that what they do is look systematically at culture. He would like to hear **Copeland's** response to that particular argument. **Copeland** said that he respects fully **Sandstrom's** arguments, and yet he goes back to what the faculty members said en masse that no one can separate teaching a language from its attending culture, and that is what they intended by this wording.

VanWormer said she reacted in the same way, that her reaction as a sociologist was the same. She has always thought of culture and sociology together and, of course, anthropology. She would argue just for Languages and Literature. She feels otherwise it would be confusing to students and others. Perhaps some other term such as *cultural arts* or some such could be used.

Smith agreed that *culture* is very general and relates to many different Departments and that then it should not be included in the name of any

Department. That is an argument against the proposed name. He also understands that faculty in the Modern Language Department have said that you cannot teach language without teaching culture, but in fact they have been doing it for decades and doing it just fine without having *culture* in the title. He does not see the necessity of adding it now nor of the real benefits of adding it now. It could be viewed as somewhat capturing of turf that does not belong there when it belongs to everybody. That is his objection to the proposed name change.

Funderburk reluctantly admitted to mostly agreeing with **Smith**, which makes them both nervous and brought laughter to the group. He thinks that the argument being made of the inclusion of *culture* in the study of language would be identical with the argument they could make with the study of music, because one cannot fully get involved in music without knowing culture. When he saw the name, he assumed that it would include the kind of classes that are traditionally in the Anthropology Department. So adding the word *culture* in the title would seem to point toward something that is not true about what the offerings are and states a reality that everyone already expects in a languages-based area.

Lowell wished to reiterate that she does know that they teach language in the context of cultures, and she has learned lots about other cultures from language courses and literature courses but never in a way that she has learned about culture from anthropology, because they look at all aspects of cultures, including linguistics as one of the subfields. They study language and religion and politics and the arts within the context of culture --everything that is connected to the culture in a package and how it all works together. She just does not think that that is done in a language or literature course.

DeBerg spoke to **Smith's** comment saying it was exactly wrong. She knows of no Modern Language or Foreign Language Department that teaches only the language. If there is a Business French course, most of the learning is about how business is conducted in France, because they already have the language skills when they go into it. She noted that they added World Religions to their name because there was so much misunderstanding about what happens in the academic study of religion. Literatures and

Cultures is to counteract so much misunderstanding about what goes on in a university-level Modern Languages Department. Their basic language courses is just part of what they do. She also sees the stiffer language requirement at UNI as getting toward their goal in global education. She sees it as essential to understanding other cultures. She wants to defend Modern Languages changing their name in order to avoid this kind of misunderstanding about what happens at a university-level language program.

Balong agrees with **DeBerg** and added that obviously other universities have gone through this process of trying to decide names because ISU and U. Iowa, in the notes sent, report that they chose *languages, literatures,* and *cultures* as terminology. Both those institutions have Anthropology and all of the other things that would claim *culture* as part of theirs. So other institutions have had this dialogue. ISU chose Languages and Culture, and U. Iowa chose Languages, Literature, and Culture. Choosing the proposed name would bring UNI parallel with the other Regent's Universities in Iowa.

Copeland wished to comment on some of the discussion so far. Because this group is advisory and will be making the recommendation to the Provost, in re-identifying themselves, the faculty as a whole from ELL and DML were basically taking upon the task of not only who they are but also where they are going in the future. As far as them deciding what the new merged Department would look like and reflect in a name—their goals, their missions, their objectives, their outcomes—this was the favored name. It is also germane perhaps to mention that the second place name in the discussions and in the voting was Department of Languages and Literatures. However, the Department of Languages, Literatures, and Cultures was the favored name by faculty in both Departments becoming one.

Soneson stated that the merging of these two Departments really is lifting up in a new way an emphasis on global education. It is not just English here in the United States and maybe a little bit in Britain, but it is English around the world. It is French around the world. Spanish around the world, and so on. Learning Spanish is not just learning what goes on in Spain. It is

learning what goes on in other countries that speak Spanish. He wondered what difference it might make if they were to choose Department of Languages and Literatures in Global Cultures. Would that perhaps bring out some of the emphasis that is rightly there and ought to be there that is signaled by *cultures* but might be misleading without the use of the word *global*.

Wurtz reminded the body that they will ultimately vote on the motion in front on them and that if they vote against endorsing, then she would like a motion for a recommendation instead.

Samuel **Gladden**, Acting Head of the Department of Modern Languages, joined the table from the audience and responded to **Soneson**. He stated that discussion occurred of moving for a name change of his Department to World Languages and Cultures. That name change was not made, but the Department's majors are now collectively categorized under a World Languages and Cultures heading in the University Catalogue. Part of what can be seen in this vote is a reflection of the desire of faculty in Modern Languages to make very clear just exactly what two senators were discussing—that they do not study language in isolation. It is part of a larger cultural experience. This is reflecting that long-term discussion that occurred prior to his becoming Acting Head. He arrived there from English last January.

East brought up that in 1-2 years a curriculum package may come up for approval with *culture* in the title rather than a language in the title, and the Senate saying, "Yes, they have the name *culture* in their Department name, so they should be teaching culture." He can also imagine that if a Computer Science Department were to say, "I teach technology within the context of modern culture and the impact of technology on that," that the Senate might wholeheartedly disagree. He feels they all teach culture. He thinks it is useful to have names as simple as possible, and it only matters to faculty, that the students do not care what the department is called. He is frustrated by all this naming stuff and wishes the Senate did not have to do it. He remembers feeling opposition to a new "school" that was created a year or so ago that involved just two Departments. The Senate is expected to just approve what is asked. He does not see a principled way

to deal with this. He thinks that simplicity is best, rather than trying to list everything done within a curriculum. Therefore, he opposes the motion and encourages other senators to also

DeBerg reminded everyone that Modern Languages changed the name of their Major and not the name of their Department. So that clears up the confusion. Also, she noted that she thinks completely differently from **East** about the importance of naming, because naming is an occasion to reflect on the mission. As mission changes, naming highlights that or reaffirms it. It lets the University know that there has been a change in identity and mission in many cases. She thinks that the discussion of naming is really important, and she likes that it has come to the Senate to reflect on the issues here. She wanted her comments to be a counterweight to those of **East**.

Lowell commented on a **Gladden** point that they want it to be known and understood that they do not teach these things outside the cultures. That is absolutely valid and correct. She liked **Soneson's** suggestion of Department of Languages and Literatures in Global Cultures. This sets it in that context rather than saying that they are teaching cultures.

Gladden noted that the renewed focus of culture in modern languages came in part from the last program review where reviewers recognized that there was a different and more extensive focus on culture in many of their classes than there had been in previous years. That spurred the conversation about renaming the Major collectively. The importance of culture also appears very strongly in their SOA documents in the Department. This is not simply meant to be an announcement that they do things in a larger context. That is part of what it is. But it is also emerging from a series of internal steps that have been made to improve and make more visible the work that they do. So part of the title here would be consistency with changing mission and so forth that derives from those kinds of processes.

Soneson responded to **East's** scenario of the Department of Modern Languages coming in the future and saying, "We want to teach a course called *German Language and Culture*." It turns out that they already have

that course. In fact, they have *German Language and Culture I, II, III, and IV*. They have others also. He thinks that the combined Department is asking that the Senate recognize what they are already doing.

East said that **DeBerg** said it exactly right, that people change their names because of what they want to do and when what they want to do conflicts with what other people already do. UNI is not an interdisciplinary university yet, but there will be duplication—culture courses here, culture courses there, culture courses somewhere else, and they are going to duplicate. Everyone will want to make sure that no one is fired nor any program limited. What we are doing here is expanding programs in name so that in the future programs can expand in actuality. He can foresee the upcoming need for hiring a specialist in culture for the language department which another department will disagree with. It is a turf war, he stated. When one Department expands to do things that another Department already does, resources become diluted. Instead of allowing this, they need to figure out how to do things interdisciplinarily. He thinks these overly-expanded names encourages this turf war.

Gladden reiterated that the desire here is not to expand. The desire is to clarify what it is that they are doing, and the desire is to clarify the kinds of attention that they place outside of the traditional way that language has been taught in isolation and literature has been taught in isolation. He humorously noted that he really liked the idea of hiring a culture specialist, something they had not thought of yet.

Bruess stated that he shares the position of **Lowell** and the others speaking against the inclusion of *culture* in the title. He has studied a number of different non-English languages and cultures. It is simply embedded in it. His Department's name could be quite long if the history of everything they teach were named. He stated that **Soneson's** response was a miscommunication. That adding a modifier simply explains more clearly what it is, such as Russian Language and Culture. Extending a name for something that is simply a part of the discipline is unnecessary.

VanWormer had two suggestions. 1) Languages and Literatures in Cultural Context; or 2) Literatures, Language and Culture without the second

comma. Two items rather than 3 which makes it sound like anthropology. **Lowell** noted that they have an actual course named that, Language and Culture.

Gallagher asked if there is a problem at the curricular level, should it be dealt with at that level? If there is a concern about overlap, would the curriculum process be a better place to deal with it? **Smith** disagreed with this saying that they all teach culture and that no one Department should have the possession of the word *culture* as this naming does.

Wurtz reminded senators not to repeat arguments that have already been made. **Neuhaus**, coming from the Library, has a more neutral view on this naming process and can appreciate all different disciplines. These arguments are perhaps more emotive due to financial strains that make the discussions more than theoretical. That said, he does favor simplicity. The argument could be made that adding the word *science* to *social science* might have been a mistake. He feels that college and department names should be more simple and then become descriptive when naming courses. He can appreciate the arguments for and against and thinks that the current financial concerns drive a lot of the emotion.

Wurtz asked for added depth to arguments already made or new arguments. **Soneson** stated that one of the great drawbacks to education in the U.S. is that we have deemphasized learning alternative languages. In European countries, they put great emphasis on learning another language from kindergarten on up and that that makes a difference in how people relate to each other in European context. Learning somebody else's language is learning to look at oneself and your own culture quite differently. It is one thing to look at matters intellectually in academic categories. It is another thing to learn how to speak in another language. There is a different grammar and a different way of putting the world together that you become familiar with, and then you begin to see your own world as also being put together rather than some kind of absolute. Placing the learning of languages in a global context he thinks really helps signal the importance at this University of learning how to get outside of ourselves and studying the world and lets us understand personally how others actually see us.

Funderburk called the question. **DeBerg** seconded. Two-thirds vote passed on calling the question. Vote on the motion to endorse the proposal that the new name be the Department of Languages, Literatures, and Cultures had 5 ayes, 8 nays, and 2 abstentions. Motion fails.

The Chair next entertained new business of proposing an alternative name for the merged Departments. **Soneson** moved that the Senate recommend the name for the new merged Department as the Department of Languages and Literatures in Global Cultures. Second by **Lowell**. **Soneson** said that based on the significant comments others have made on using just the word *cultures* seems to make some sort of claim on the study of cultures. He thinks that worry is lost when using *in Global Cultures*. It makes it clearer how this is cultural studies.

Balong asked that **Copeland** offer some views on this. He respectfully spoke against this idea. In the process there was a second choice for a name that was Department of Languages and Literatures. If it were to go to another name, that was the one clearly favored second. **Gladden** added that although faculty do not share this view universally, many faculty would resist the word *global* in the title because it is viewed as a buzz word. Something like *world* would be preferable, although he is not suggesting that at all. He is suggesting that this body listen to what **Copeland** just said about the 2nd place vote. He thinks that *global* brings a number of concerns for the Department from a P.R. standpoint. **Copeland** wished to clarify that this was a lengthy process and that in that process the earlier noted second choice was favored, and he hoped that that would be kept in mind.

VanWormer stated that she feels this new recommendation seems awkward. She offered Languages and Literatures in Cultural Context. **Copeland** disagreed with her thinking that faculty in the two Departments would like that.

East stated that he cannot imagine the Senate creating a name for a Department without the Department bringing the name before the Senate. **Soneson** agreed and withdrew his motion. **Lowell** withdrew also. **Smith**

moved that they approve the 2nd choice of the faculty of the two Departments, Department of Languages and Literatures. **Terlip** seconded this new motion. **Soneson** called the question, which passed. Vote for the motion to endorse the second choice brought forward passed with 1 opposed and 2 abstentions.

ADJOURNMENT

The business for the day being accomplished, **Soneson** moved to adjourn, and the Chair declared the meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Submitted by,

Sherry Nuss,
Administrative Assistant
UNI Faculty Senate