

3-9-2015

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, March 9, 2015

University of Northern Iowa

Copyright © 2015 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

Follow this and additional works at: http://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, "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, March 9, 2015" (2015). *Faculty Senate Documents*. 19.

http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/19

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.

Summary Minutes
Regular Meeting #1764
UNI Faculty Senate
March 9, 2015
University Room, Maucker Union
(3:34-4:56 p.m.)

Courtesy Announcements

1. Press Identification: Amber **Rouse** & Alex **Kehrli**, *Northern Iowa*;
Christina **Crippes**, *Waterloo Courier*

2. Comments from Interim Provost Licari

Dr. **Licari** expressed thanks for the well wishes received on his new appointment at Indiana State, saying there will be about one month of overlap between his exit and the entry of the new provost, allowing for a smooth transition for the provost who will pick up the work begun on the BAS proposal, TIER and the Academic Master Plan. He thanked the Senate for all their “good hard work,” especially on the BAS proposal and encouraged faculty to participate and ask questions as these processes continue to move forward.

3. Comments from Faculty Chair Peters

Chair Peters spoke on four issues: The first was that the committee formed to look at faculty voting rights will present their draft report by the end of the school year. He explained that during New Business he would ask for an Executive Session to recommend winners of the Regents Award for Faculty Excellence. Further on awards, he explained that he is working with Associate Provost **Cobb** and College Senate Chairs to revise and “make less onerous” the faculty awards process. Lastly, he commented on the press reports of forecast savings from the TIER process. While those forecast savings have been reported at \$80 million, he stated that UNI’s savings are forecast at \$3 million over the next three to five years, and that the cost of consultants at UNI has been \$500,000, not including person-hours spent by UNI faculty and staff. Chair **Peters** will pass along dates and locations of meetings with the newly hired Pappas Consulting group, which will handle the academic portion of TIER.

4. Comments from Senate Chair Kidd

Chair **Kidd** thanked Interim Provost **Licari** for his service to UNI. Since the last meeting, he has spoken with Department Chairs who are moving forward with BAS degrees, asking if they might need any further Faculty Senate assistance. Those departments have assured him that they will continue to work through the regular curriculum process on their own.

Minutes for Approval

Feb. 23, 2015

(Nelson/Walter) All aye

Consideration of Calendar Items for Docketing

1270 Changes to Scheduling of Classes

<http://www.uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/changes-scheduling-classes>

**Docketed in regular order. (Zeitz/Strauss) All aye

1271 Honorary Degree Policy Change

<http://www.uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/honorary-degree-policychange>

**Docketed. (McNeal/Dunn) All aye

1272 & 1273 Request for Emeritus Status, C. David Christensen & Marilyn Drury

**Docketed and approved. (Gould/Walter) All aye.

<http://www.uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/request-emeritus-status-c-david-christensen-dept-curriculu>

<http://www.uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-status-request-marilyn-drury-director-its-educati>

1274 Request for Consultation with Foundation

** Docketed for April 13 meeting. (Dolgener/McNeal) All aye.

<http://www.uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/request-consultation-uni-advancement-division>

New Business

Awards Committee Selection

** Motion that discussion be held in Executive Session (Peters/Nelson) All aye.

Consideration of Docketed Items

1249/1154 BAS Degree Structure

<http://www.uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/bas-degree-program-structure>

(Continued discussion on foreign language exit requirement)

**Motion to receive report (Dunn/Zeitz)

1265/1160 Consultative Session on new Discrimination, Harassment and Sexual Misconduct Policy 13.02 (Report from Senators Cutter and Dunn)

<http://www.uni.edu/policies/1302>

**Discussion tabled. (O'Kane/Gould)

Follows is Complete Transcript of 43 pages with 0 Addenda.

Full Transcript
Regular Meeting #1764
UNI Faculty Senate Minutes
March 9, 2015
University Room, Maucker Union
(3:34 – 4:56 p.m.)

Present: Senators Karen **Couch Breitbach**, Jennifer **Cooley**, Barbara **Cutter**, Forrest **Dolgener**, Cyndi **Dunn**, Todd **Evans**, Gretchen **Gould**, David **Hakes**, Randall **Harlow**, Melissa **Heston**, Chair Tim **Kidd**, Ramona **McNeal**, Vice Chair Lauren **Nelson**, Gary **Shontz**, Gerald **Smith**, Mitchell **Strauss**, Jesse **Swan**, Secretary Laura **Terlip**, Michael **Walter**, Leigh **Zeitz**.

Not Present: Senators Steve **O’Kane**, Marilyn **Shaw**

Guests: Renae **Beard**, Sarah **Murray**

Call to Order at 3:34

Kidd: We should call to order. Are there any press present?

Crippes: Christina **Crippes**, *Waterloo Courier*

Rouse: Amber Rouse, *Northern Iowan*.

Kehrli: Alex **Kehrli**, *Northern Iowan*.

Kidd: Alex Kehrli, thank you. Perhaps we have comments from Interim Provost Licari.

Licari: Thanks, Tim. I do want to say thank you to everybody who’s sent me emails about my new position that I’ll be starting in July. It is a great opportunity, but I was just telling Laura (**Nelson**) that it’s a bit, I don’t know...stunning...to wrap my brain around leaving UNI because I’ve enjoyed my time here, but I’m very excited to jump and try something new at a new place. It’s very exciting. Indiana State is a great school and I

think there's lots of opportunities for me, so I'm very excited. In terms of wrapping things up here, the new provost will start right at the end of May, so the two of us will overlap a little bit, which is useful, because I can hand things off and essentially explain to him where we're at with a lot of things. I'll try my best to kind of clean up some loose ends so that there aren't a whole bunch of things hanging that he needs to take care of when he gets here. Obviously, I won't be making huge decisions between now and the end of June. I'll leave that for him. But I will try to make sure that the place that he finds is in good shape, if not better than when I found it, and that's how I try to live life: try to leave things better than I found them. So that's my goal between now and the end of June. We do have a few items obviously that are still going to be moving forward regardless of who is sitting in this chair here. Things like TIER on the various fronts. So the things that intersect with academics are obviously the academic component of it, but that's very early in the stages of getting going. But other things like IT and even the HR stuff will touch Academic Affairs and so I won't be here, but I do encourage you all, as the University moves through all of these processes to participate, to pay attention and ask questions when you think something is unclear or maybe not wise. So that's my encouragement there. The BAS proposals-- whatever you want to call them, those two I think the Senate has done some good hard work lately in investigating what the University wants to do there, so I thank you for your diligence and care on that topic. It's very important that we don't circumvent the processes. So I think the Senate has done some good hard work, and then of course, the Academic Master

Plan as well, and the development of that. All of these projects that got going that I don't get to see finished, but that's how it is with universities. Most of the time, the job is simply to keep pushing the ball rather than being there at the finish line. So, you know, I think that is going well. I know that the University has--the Steering Committee has gotten some good feedback in terms of the kinds of things that will allow us to stand apart and make us distinct in the state, particularly from the University of Iowa and Iowa State University. I just wanted to say thank you for everybody's hard work on these really large projects. I really appreciate all the time and effort that everybody's spent.

Kidd: Thank you. Comments from Chair **Peters**?

Peters: I have a few things. First, the email--remember at the beginning of the year I mentioned that I'd formed a committee to look at faculty voting rights, answering the questions of whether the...currently we have some units on campus that enforce different standards; different definitions of voting faculty. So whether there should be a common definition that adheres only to the faculty constitution, but also whether that definition should be changed given the 2013 AAUP report. That committee has met. There is a draft within that committee of our report circulating. You might get that nailed down by that committee and have it at such a place where I can talk to the Senate about it, at least briefly by the end of the year and have it entered into the Senate Minutes, since there's really no official way for the Chair of the Faculty to circulate something around the faculty in a way that it sticks and stays in the records. In the mean time, I have asked the Committee on Committees and the College Senate Chairs to

ensure that when they come up with nominees for people on the ballot in upcoming elections that they will be people who are qualified as voting members of the faculty, under the Faculty Constitution.

Secondly, I'm going to be asking the Senate in New Business to docket a discussion of the Regents Award for Faculty Excellence. The Awards Committee met last Friday and made our recommendations. Those are then reported on to the Senate. I'll simply ask for it to be docketed in New Business. For those of you who are new on the Senate, this is done in Executive Session. The names are not printed in the minutes. The names are not put forward until they're actually finalized and given the award. I don't foresee an issue with asking for that to be done in, as it's something that's done in Executive Session, and it's not something that the campus has an interest in attending anyway. But again, I'm merely asking for it to be docketed in regular order.

Also regarding awards, Associate Provost **Cobb** has put together a committee with me and College Senate Chairs talking about ways to make applying for awards slightly less onerous than it is right now.

Finally, on TIER, there have been various press reports about the estimated savings of TIER. The Deloitte's Report at the end of Phase I seems to be the number that is often referred to and those numbers can be pretty high: ranging from... some of the estimates go as high as \$80 million that will be saved across three universities. I simply want to point out to faculty that when we look at the DeLoitte reports and when you look at the savings that might be estimated from it at UNI, those savings amount to about \$3 million, give or take. If I'm way off base, I suspect that

Gary (**Shontz** nodded in agreement) might correct me. Those savings amount to around \$3 million at UNI, and those savings would not be realized until three to five years out. In the meantime, we have spent at least \$500,000 so far at UNI on TIER on consultants and that doesn't count all the person-hours on campus that have been spent on TIER. So, I would ask that everyone on campus realize, and I'll certainly do my best to communicate when given the chance, that these large-scale savings that are being forecasted for TIER, if they are actually going to happen, are not going to happen, the large scale savings are not going to happen at UNI's campus, they're happening in other parts of the Regents system. As far as academic programs go, I sent you an email a couple of weeks ago detailing the choice of Pappas Consulting for the academic component of TIER, and I still haven't heard anything about when they're going to be on campus or when that's all going to start. So I'll let you know when I know.

Kidd: Thank you. For my comments, I'd like to thank Mike **Licari** for his service and also for the fact that he makes Board of Regents meetings much more bearable. I very much worry that he will not be replaced properly (laughter). The other thing is that after the meeting last week I reached out to the departments who...the people who showed up from the departments who were working on BAS degrees, and they don't seem to be needing anymore guidance from the Senate itself as to formulate programs, with regards to the foreign language exit requirement, or the LACC requirement. That basically, working with the curriculum process, they should be able to deal with these things on their own. I think that's it

for me. So I guess we should start with...We have minutes for approval. We need to approve the minutes from February 23rd.

Nelson: So moved.

Kidd: So moved by Senator **Nelson**. Seconded by Senator **Walter**. All in favor? Any opposed? Abstain? Minutes are approved. Next to: Consideration of Calendar Items for Docketing. The first one is Calendar Item 1270, Changes to Scheduling of Classes. This was something that was brought to my and other people's attention last fall. I've had some communication with Senators and the faculty and department heads; a lot of people actually over email and there seems to be a strong desire to return the dates at which classes are scheduled to their original time. At the moment, basically classes for the fall semester have to be ready to go, what class you're going to teach, when you're going to teach them, by the first week of class in the spring semester which seems kind of early. It's not a very good time. You know, Christmas break. Do I have a motion to docket Calendar Item 1270?

Zeitz: So moved.

Kidd: So moved by Senator **Zeitz**. Seconded by Senator **Strauss**. All in favor? Any opposed? Abstain? Okay, Calendar Item 1270 is docketed.

Kidd: The next one is Calendar Item 1271, Honorary Degree Change. I wasn't sure if we had to have a new calendar item for this. This was a proposed change from the Honorary Degree that was proposed by...April (**Chatham-Carpenter**) presented this and the changes were rejected by the Senate. I wasn't at that meeting, so I think it needed a new calendar item.

Nelson: Yes, I think it does because it was voted on and rejected.

Kidd: So these changes have been revised and would like the Senate to reconsider them. Could I have a motion to docket this item? Moved by Senator **McNeal**, second by Senator **Dunn**. Thank you much. All in favor? Any opposed? Abstain? Motion passes to docket it. Next we have two Emeritus Status requests. One for C. David **Christensen**, and one for Marilyn **Drury**. I was a little late in getting out requests for letters of recommendation for these two, but I feel that we'll be getting some to add to the Senate Minutes. Would the Senate wish to docket and pass these motions simultaneously or is that impossible?

Gould: So moved.

Kidd: So moved to docket and pass these motions simultaneously. Seconded by Senator **Walter**. All in favor? Any opposed? Okay. So we'll consider that C. David **Christensen** and Marilyn **Drury** have been approved from the Senate's point of view for Emeritus Status, and I will get the letters and attach them to the minutes of this meeting. Last item for docketing is a Request for Consultation with the UNI Foundation. This was a request sent to me, and it looks like I forgot to include the paragraph link. Basically, they want to come talk to us about some...their plan for fund-raising for next year. So...

Nelson: Is this to be docketed for a particular time, or is it docketed in regular order?

Kidd: Actually, I believe they would prefer April 13th.

Nelson: So we need a motion to docket.

Kidd: Let me make sure I got that date right. Yes, April 13th. Bill's been ill, so I'm not sure if he was going to be coming anyway, so yes. Could we have a motion to have a consultation on April 13th with the UNI Foundation?

Dolgener: So moved.

Kidd: So moved by Senator **Dolgener**. Second?

McNeal: Second.

Kidd: Second by **McNeal**. Thank you Senator **McNeal**. All in favor? Any opposed? Abstain? Okay, we'll have a consultation with representatives of the UNI Foundation on April 13th. Under New Business, I had one question for Scott (**Peters**). I've noticed, and this is not limited to the Senate, that we've had trouble filling up some committee slots that are supposed to have Senate representatives; the UCC maybe, LACC for sure, Awards, Planning, and so I just wanted to ask real quick what can we do to make that better, because I don't know what to do to make that better. Are there just too many committees? Do we have not enough Senators? Do we have not enough bodies for these kinds of requests? Does anyone have any ideas? If not, it's okay.

Nelson: I think that we need to decide that we don't need Senators representing the Senate in all instances. Maybe like former Senators, who've just rotated off the Senate would make good representatives as long as they come back and report to us about what's happening, I think they can fulfill the role. My opinion would be that there are too many committees to have a Senator in all the places that a Senator is supposed to fill.

Kidd: I would agree with you, given how many committees I'm currently on. So, I guess in the future, and this will be more for you than for me, we could look to, if we cannot find a Senate representative, the Senate could ask for volunteers from beyond the Senate, as long as they report to us, unless there's something...I don't know, preventing that.

Smith: If the difficulty is just in getting sufficient volunteers, I would suggest that some of you who are in the know as to where Senate voices might influence a decision, it would be important to have a representative. Just to have a Senator or two or three there so it can be stated truthfully that the Senate participated, but we would have no influence, I don't think we need to be there, personally. We are all busy people and have many things to do, so I would like the leadership to maybe identify those areas where faculty considerations as expressed by the Faculty Senate has the possibility at least, of influencing decision-making. There are clearly some (committees) that what the Faculty Senators say have, truthfully less than zero. Facilities, for example: Well, there are people over the in Facilities area that have all the data, all of the facts and anything anyone says is basically shot down because they're arguing from a strict...Or they might be from an academic standpoint. Do we really want to ask people just to attend so we can say 'A Senator was present?' I don't think so, personally. So, I just wanted to express that.

Kidd: Thank you.

Heston: I think it might be very useful, since many of us are on so many committees, to sit down and look, ask the Committee on Committees to do a thorough review and decide which of the committees they have to

find new membership for, might be dissolved, not useful, combined, reorganized or something along those lines. I'll point out one that I find very strange but it's historical: That there's a Graduate Curriculum Committee and then there's the Graduate Council and it seems to me that, I don't know why you have to have a Graduate Curriculum Committee that's going then to report to the Graduate Council. We don't have anything, I guess, but they always report to the Senate. I think that we have a lot of committees. The other issue is often that as we find ourselves falling in numbers, in terms of the number of faculty, we can't ask adjuncts to serve on these committees, and the fewer of us there are, and the more we're involved with teaching and research, the less interest there's going to be in doing service because it doesn't really carry much value.

Kidd: Thank you. Senator **Cutter**?

Cutter: I wanted to add to what Melissa (**Heston**) said, that maybe the Committee on Committees could also look at the committees that they decide we need and see which ones you would want a Senator on, and which ones that maybe the Senate could designate another faculty member, because there might be some that are so directly connected to the Senate we want a Senator on them. And then there are others where we can have another faculty.

Kidd: Okay. I guess my only question to that would be is the Committee on Committee the proper body for doing that, for assessing that?

Cutter: That's a good question. Should we decide? Maybe we should assess it as a Senate.

Swan: We have done this before: created an ad hoc committee to examine this and these sorts of things and we have made changes, some very good changes. Scott's (**Peters**) been involved in that. What I wanted to say, too about what we currently have. One feeling that's been expressed to me is what a huge waste of time, so many of the meetings seem to be. I've been thinking about that in relation to what's important and we always come back around to saying, "Well, I guess we really do need somebody on that committee," and that is when that committee is doing something substantive. So if we could have the committee have to report to the Chair of Faculty, the Chair of the Faculty Senate, on everything that's before the committee, and that those two officers of the faculty alert us to, "Oh this is important to the faculty," and then we would be able to appoint, send someone to be on the committee for the duration of that important matter, I think then we could continue on the way we have been organized, understanding that there won't be probably somebody appointed or on the committee when nothing's happening, or when routine matters are happening. But when something substantive arises, then we probably would be notified, we would definitely be notified, and then we would find someone to participate for the duration of that matter. I think that could solve our problem without creating systemic problems when you try to make a systemic change.

Kidd: As a chair stepping down, I would find that to be less bad, than as if I were starting. A quick comment: Wouldn't that set up something where the Senate Chair and the Faculty Chair have a big deciding role in what's important?

Swan: Yes.

Kidd: I don't really want that responsibility; to be deciding what's important and what's not by myself.

Zeitz: What is the essence that having a Senator on your committee, or Committee of Committees or whatever committee it's going to be, that we're contributing to that?

Kidd: That they can report to the Senate if something substantive is happening.

Zeitz: If something substantive is happening, ultimately don't they end up reporting to the Senate anyway?

Kidd: True. But this could be kind of...if someone is actually on the committee, they know the background, the Senate will be better prepared for discussion, and we'll basically know more of what's going on campus, I believe, if we have proper representation. Again, the LACC proposal springs to mind. We had no one representing the Senate there and so we didn't really get communication from between the start and end of that process, when it might have been useful.

Nelson: I was just going to comment that when you look at the committees, not all of these are committees of the Senate. Some of them are committees that answer to other persons, so we can't unilaterally accomplish the review, and then it always seems to me that you mention this has been done before, whenever you think a committee should be disbanded, someone else comes up with a good reason why they shouldn't. Probably Committee Membership, as Senator **Zeitz** has

discussed would be an easier thing to deal with than the whole committee structure.

Peters: I would add that the other thing that happens is that during the course of the year, something major happens that no one anticipates at the beginning of the year, like for example, the development of a Facilities Master Plan. Faculty are widely represented in all these different task forces... six different task forces, I think, are faculty. And so when the Vice President or Assistant Vice President of Facilities comes to the Senate and says, "One of these task forces deals with the academic component of the Facilities Master Plan. We'd like someone from the Faculty Senate on it." When you already have all these other faculty members at different places, that suggests that they would like the input of a Senator; they will have a little bit more of an overview on University-level things. Some of them you can predict at the beginning of the year—we know we're going to need someone for the Awards Committee, for example, even if that doesn't happen until February or March, we know that we need it, but sometimes you can't even predict going in.

Kidd: Okay. Thank you. I'll use your input and think if there's something better that we can try out, without making another committee. But that would be for another meeting. Scott, you had some New Business?

Peters: I did. I would simply ask, and I guess I can do this as a motion. I can't vote but I can do motions: I would ask that the... I move that the recommendations of the Awards Committee be docketed in regular order, and further that discussion take place in Executive Session.

Kidd: That's in regular order?

Peters: Yes.

Kidd: Do we have a second?

Nelson: I'll second it just to move it along.

Kidd: Thank you. Seconded by Senator Nelson. All in favor? Any opposed? Abstain? Okay motion passes.

Nelson: Do you have a deadline?

Peters: I don't think we do. Nancy?

Cobb: I haven't gotten anything on that. I don't think there is.

Peters: As far as we know, we don't have a deadline. It's the end of the year, as far as we can tell.

Kidd: Thank you. So as far as I know, we have not closed discussion on the BAS Degree Structure, so I don't know if we wish to continue discussion, or if we wish to accept the report and be done with this. The only thing we haven't discussed I believe is the foreign language exit requirement, but that's also come up in various external discussions. I guess I would ask for a motion to continue discussion unless April, do you have more you want to...

Chatham-Carpenter: I don't think that the UCC report on foreign language exit requirement has ever been discussed. I think at least I need to present the report. What you all decide to do with it is up to you.

Kidd: Okay. Sure. Thank you. Let's do that.

Chatham-Carpenter: On October 13th, the Faculty Senate asked the University Curriculum Committee to look at the possible...to look at the current, existing exit requirement from foreign languages to see if that would be something we would recommend for the BAS degree students

to have to complete or to continue completing. If we don't do anything, they will be required to have that exit requirement, so that's the one end of the spectrum here. We talked about this at three different meetings: One of which was before the Faculty Senate meeting that looked at the structure, that received our initial report about the structure, and that was because this was an issue that came out of the ad hoc committee discussions that had been looking at the BAS structure in the spring of 2014 and so we were trying to deal with, and look at specific concerns that that committee had yet to figure out at the UCC level. So that when we first initially discussed it at that meeting, at the 9/24 meeting, we didn't come up with any suggestions. We didn't know what the Faculty Senate would want us to do. So after the 10/13 meeting of the Faculty Senate, we did discuss at a November 12th meeting and December 3rd meeting of the UCC, both of which were primarily looking at the BAS degree (although we had some other things going on at those meetings as well). At the November 12th meeting, I brought up that there were at least four issues that I had been aware of, and I had been in conversation with Jennifer **Cooley**, from Languages and Literatures, to find out their concerns because there would be strong implications for waiving or doing something different with the exit requirement for that department. We talked about that the AAS students that would be coming in for a BAS degree may not have met, although we have no data on this... they may not have met the foreign language requirement in high school, because they were not necessarily on a college track when they were in high school. So there is some assumption that they may not, that they'd be less

likely to come in with that met through high school credit, than maybe our traditional students would have. There was also recognition that these, the BAS students in their current workplaces, especially if they are going to be or going into, we're assuming, wanting to obtain management-level positions, that they would be facing a diverse workplace, and especially as Iowa ends up moving towards more of that diversity in its population. So I presented data on that to the UCC as well, that Jennifer (**Cooley**) had provided for us. At the same time, we recognized that we didn't want to be adding additional hours on to the requirements because we didn't want to do things that would make the degree itself less attractive to them. So we have that as an issue. The fourth kind of issue that we talked about was that we don't currently have, although they are moving in this direction in at least one of the languages, we don't currently offer at UNI, foreign language courses online, which because of the nature of the population of these students being place-bound, we would need to have to have some kind of alternative way of offering the foreign language requirement, if it's continued to be an exit requirement here for them. So those were the kind of four issues that we were looking at. We've looked at some potential options. One of them was to keep the foreign language requirement as an exit requirement, knowing that at least one of the languages that we offer would need to be put into an online format. Or, we would have to find an institution that would offer it online; we could tell BAS students to go take the courses there, elsewhere, outside of UNI. A second possible option that we considered was to keep the

requirement, but to include the foreign language as part of the requirement, as part of the BAS Core; somehow to weave it into those 21-30 hours of the core, so that it's not any extra hours provided. A third option that we considered was to keep the requirement, but provide some alternative options that would be less language-based and more intercultural competency-based, or intercultural-outcomes based; options that would meet the overall goal and perhaps purpose of foreign language requirement, realizing we have a multiple kinds of things...multiple languages, and the way we're defining languages, including sign language, that does meet that requirement. So that was another option. A fourth option is to completely waive the foreign language requirement for students. A fifth option was to let each program to decide if they wanted to waive it or not, each of the programs, the BAS programs. A sixth option, obviously there's multiple things that are possible, was to incorporate (and that really kind of five and six relate together) the foreign language requirement into the major, those 21-30 hours, so if a department thought that it was important to go ahead and include that as part of their major requirements. And then I asked for other suggestions. Basically, I originally had four possible options, and they came up with those additional two. So we discussed this. We, at the December 3rd meeting I invited in Julie **Husband** and Jennifer **Cooley** to come to the University Curriculum Committee. I also invited the departments or department representative from the areas that are preparing a major in this area. At that point, I think there were three or four departments represented, so that they could also give feedback to

the UCC. None of us really liked any of the ideas particularly well. We talked about advantages and disadvantages of each one of them, and although we talked about the importance of foreign language requirements, we were concerned that two semesters of a foreign language, which is less than what our comparable institutions at the Iowa Regents level require, is adequate to give anyone a good working knowledge of a language first of all, but also we're concerned about, "Is that really the best way of getting these folks who are in the BAS track to be better competent in terms of intercultural relationships?" and we didn't have an answer to that, but we struggled with that. So, we ended up coming up with a motion, which I think is what the Faculty Senate originally asked us to do, which is to come up with a recommendation. You all can decide what you do with this recommendation, but the UCC passed the motion on December 3rd. They recommend waiving the foreign language requirement as an exit requirement for students in the BAS degree program. That was the actual motion itself. In the discussion, they also wanted it to read that the UCC encouraged departments to consider including foreign language as a required option within their 21-30 major hours and/or the LACC could also consider if foreign language could be included within the required 21-30 hours of core competencies. So, I am presenting this report to you, for you to do with what you would like.

Kidd: Thank you April. (**Chatham-Carpenter**) So I guess, what shall we do with this report? We could have a motion to accept the report and have this go through the curriculum process, which I'm not sure exactly how it

goes, but that seems reasonable, or we could make a motion to endorse this, although we cannot supersede the curriculum process.

Cutter: I'd guess I have a question. I'd like to know what Languages and Literatures' take on this was.

Chatham-Carpenter: I would defer to Jennifer **Cooley** to answer that question.

Cooley: If I remember correctly, we were asked to make our own proposal, but we didn't, because our proposal is that we think we should maintain the exit requirement. I don't know if we could really package that as a new proposal. Our proposal wasn't really a proposal: Our proposal was to maintain the current curricular structure, and we disagreed with any other variation on that theme.

Kidd: Did you have a follow-up?

Dunn: Yes. Would you folks be interested in, would you feel ready to do an online year or more foreign languages?

Cooley: There will be an online Chinese course offered this summer. That will be the first time it's ever been delivered wholly online. Since it hasn't been delivered, and since I'm not the instructor, I don't want to say that Penny (**Wang**) will be continuing to offer it 100% online from that time forward, but she has taught online at other institutions. She's done Ph.D research on teaching online. She's prepared to teach online. She will offer the course online this summer and from there I guess if there's demand or interest, she probably plans to continue. Spanish is currently going through the curricular process to permit it to do a hybrid course, so that it would only have a certain number of hours face-to-face and a certain

number of hours in an online setting. So that's also a change since we had a discussion in December. So there are some points we could continue to discuss, with the online format for classes, yes.

Smith: When this...when the BAS program was initially being discussed, as I understood, it was to provide opportunities for individuals who were characterized as being place-bound, the opportunity to earn a baccalaureate degree. And one example that was provided was someone who had earned their associate's in applied...whatever, the proper abbreviation from the community college, prerequisite to this degree. And so I thought we were trying to meet a need that was present in Iowa and the example that was often used was police officers who had a community college degree, but they could not be a chief without having earned a baccalaureate degree. So, I we were trying to help our fellow citizens, strengthen their preparation to be the police chief in the community they lived in and you can apply that all over different areas. Then I believe it was two weeks ago we had a special meeting of the Faculty Senate. At that meeting, I understood the head of Criminology, Sociology and Anthropology to say that there should have no experience requirement. That if we had even so much as two-year experience required, that it would depress enrollment too much, and she was making a strong plea, as I understand it—not have any experience required. That meeting caused me to reflect on what I had heard, and I would like to ask the question that is often the reason, often, I'm sure UNI is an exception to this, but often times, we don't know what the problem is we're trying to solve, and we get off on a track and we study and investigate and have

tentative solutions, but until we know the problem we're trying to solve, we don't have a possibility of solving what needs to be solved. So I would like, if there's anyone in the room who can tell me, what is the purpose of the BAS program and what problem more importantly for the University, what problem is it trying to solve? If we're wanting to increase enrollment, then I think we can probably design a program if that's the sole goal, to increase enrollment. If it's to help people prepare themselves to move into managerial positions, I know that we're capable of doing that. But until we identify the problem we're trying to solve, which I thought was to help place-bound Iowans get a four-year degree. But when you hear the chair of the area that police officers would study or in order to become chief, saying, "no, no, no experience requirement, that would lower our enrollment too much, it just wouldn't be practical," then I don't know what we're accomplishing to spend the time on the BSA (BAS) if they want to have zero experience requirement. I don't know about any of the other areas; it was just that one chairperson who was there speaking. Now, if I misunderstood, I apologize, but is there someone in the room that can tell me the problem that UNI's trying to solve, and then we'd have a better likelihood, once we've clearly identified the problem, of coming up with a solution that will meet that problem.

Chatham-Carpenter: Mike (**Licari**) may want to answer this as well, but accessibility is the problem that we're trying to solve; that I've been told that we're trying to solve-- Accessibility to the state of Iowa to students who have not gotten a bachelor's degree. I was under the assumption, as was the LACC, in fact, I'm not sure what I said at that 10/13 meeting, but I

was pretty sure that I said exactly what you indicated, was that these students would have work experience of some kind. I know that in the LACC proposal there was that assumption as well. The UCC was going on the same kind of assumptions that the ad hoc committee had brought to us in the spring of 2104, which that report I think now is in the archives of the Faculty Senate. I think Tim (**Kidd**) has put that there, and that report indicated that the primary population that the BAS degree would be for is a non-traditional-aged population that has work experience. Now, “non-traditional-aged” can be defined in many different ways, but I never have personally in working on this, have assumed that it would be a traditional 18-22 year-old who would be getting this degree. Mike, (**Licari**) you have been involved in this a lot sooner than I was, so...

Licari: April, your summary is accurate. I think the report that we put together last spring was basically silent on this because we made a conscious decision not to put constraints on the parameters of a discussion. However, the operating expectation or assumption was in fact that these degrees would be useful for those people in the workforce already. That these degree programs would be useful to people in the workforce already

Smith: I’m sorry there was a cough and I didn’t hear what you said.

Licari: ...that these degree programs would be useful to folks who were already in the workforce with enough work experience so that they were ready to move into a position of responsibility or leadership within their organization; their private company—whatever it might be. But who needed a four-year degree in order to make that move, and so it’s

essentially a way for the University to hit on a number of things that I think a comprehensive public university ought to be doing: One is reaching students across the state; providing support for them in terms of access to get a four-year degree. These are students who would never otherwise get a four-year degree, but who are ready to take on additional challenges in their work but who need an additional set of educational experiences in order to take advantage of those opportunities. So really, this is hitting on our mission to provide accessible education. It's also service to the state, it's economic and workforce development. It's all sorts of these things that we can do here at a public comprehensive university that a small, private liberal arts college would not be able to do or wouldn't do, or a large public university would just ignore. So frankly, I think we hitting a... or have the potential to hit and address a need out there in the state. That's the problem we're trying to solve and so by definition this would almost automatically mean that these would be students who are already employed, and if the Senate chooses to build that in, as an admissions criteria, for one of the Bachelor's of Applied Sciences programs, that's fine.

Kidd: Remember this is to discuss the foreign language exit requirement also, so let's not get too far off the topic.

Zeitz: Let me ask for clarification if I could. You (**Cooley**) were talking about how there's going to be a hybrid class. When you said face-to-face, was it going to be face-to-face online or was it face-to-face in the same room?

Cooley: What we've asked for in the curricular process is to change the number of credit hours. Currently, the majority of our first and second semester language courses are at five credit hours each. We've asked for the liberty to be able to be a little bit more flexible with that: to go from four to five hours, and become a four-hour class. Our initial intention was to have three 50-minute class meetings on campus and then that extra fourth hour to be offered online. But, I don't think that we're at the pedagogical discussion point at this point. I think that we're just looking for a little more flexibility in the mode of delivery and the number of credit hours of delivery, so we're really just starting these discussions before Spanish. Chinese is much farther along in that process. The woman whose going to be delivering the course this summer will offer it fully online.

Zeitz: Completely on line, so it will be face-to-face?

Cooley: Completely on line; I don't know if it will be asynchronous or not, but it will be fully online.

Terlip: I would be taking us in a different direction, so before I...I would just like to ask a question. In your remarks, Chair **Kidd**, you said that all the programs who are currently interested in developing BAS programs said that they really didn't need any further guidance.

Kidd: I didn't say all. I said the general consensus.

Terlip: ...that they didn't need further guidance from the Senate, but that they could take it through the regular curricular process. So I'm wondering if maybe we just ought to receive the report and let them take it through the regular curricular process and deal with it then.

Cooley: I'd like to offer a little bit of guidance, if I may. For one thing, I think it's interesting that this example of the police chief has come up, because police forces offer a bonus if people have language skills, or a higher pay grade if you have language skills. So I don't think this is a skill that is completely off target to include in a BAS degree. It's interesting in that note. The other guidance that I'd like to offer, I guess on record is that as we're contemplating the creation of a new degree, a 21st century degree, that's going to take advantage of new sorts of delivery modes; new areas of inquiry perhaps --to me it seems backwards-looking to NOT be thinking of it as a degree that prepares us for a global marketplace. That preparation for a global marketplace involves at least-- at the very least, a tolerance for languages other than English. The workplace is populated by folks from all around the world. It's a global workplace. Language is a part of that picture. Whether you speak it or not, if you have a tolerance for it; if you've heard it, if you've gone through the steps of trying to acquire a new language, the challenge of trying to acquire a language, I think continues to be an important asset in a 21st century workplace, and we're a forward-looking institution. I'd hate to see us create a new degree that's backwards looking. That's my comments.

Strauss: Following up on Senator **Smith's** concern, as I sit here listening to this session and the previous session, and the one before that, it seems to me that one of the biggest problems we have as a faculty is that we grant degrees, and there seems to be great discomfort, at least it's my observation, with this new type of degree, and the discomfort that I sense is an erosion of the baccalaureate degree, for this new type of degree that

we're going to give to people in the workplace. There's also great discomfort too, and I don't know if it's a valid discomfort or not, but it's a discomfort about the erosion of the LAC as it exists. There seems to be people in my college at least, there's a lot of concern about LAC being eroded by this new BAS degree, that's going to require less LAC and if we don't address those problems, in terms of faculty, how we feel about this and rationalize this, then there's always going to be a resistance.

Smith: Did you point to me or point to someone else? Okay. I just wanted to say is what April (**Chatham-Carpenter**) and Michael (**Licari**) said is my understanding of exactly what the BAS was intended for. Then my question is very simple: Why are some of the programs, namely criminology, sociology and anthropology saying that if there's a work requirement it would drive down the enrollment so that it would be unacceptable. I think we need to figure out what we're trying to do, and then not have certain programs saying, "No work experience," and if we're trying to benefit people who are place-bound because of jobs and so forth, but I didn't hear anything April said, nor Michael, that I didn't understand before. That's exactly my understanding. But the confusion for me was introduced two weeks ago today when that department said "We really can't tolerate any work experience requirement, or this won't be beneficial to our prospective students." Thank you.

Evans: April, (**Chatham-Carpenter**) I don't know if this is considered an option. Sorry if I'm repeating myself, for something you said, but is an elective block, was it thrown out there as an option?

Chatham-Carpenter: Zero to 18 hour elective block: Here's the issue: I'm imagining, but I could be wrong, that most of the majors are going to take it up to 30 hours, and that now the LAC is still up in the air, we don't know, but originally, the proposal that was presented here for feedback was for 21 hours. Then you would have some time in that 0-18 hours to take an exit requirement, which I think is what you're getting at there.

Evans: Because if we're doing this for people who are out in the working world already, they probably know what they want to do and they might have a strong need for another language or they may have absolutely no need whatsoever for what they're going to do ever, and that might make this degree not as palatable, not as sought, rather than something that if they have an option or two, they might be much more likely to take if they are looking at choices that they have to do this. So somebody might need a foreign language, and then it would be beneficial to have there or some kind of option for them to do it. If they don't, then they might need something else. Options are always good, but if the credits get tied so tight, that could be problematic.

Cutter: I just wanted to say something about availability of language classes because I want to make sure that everybody's aware that there are some other options, say for Spanish, if it's not as far along in the process. Even with place-bound people, they got their AAS degree somewhere, so they may live near a community college and they all offer Spanish to fill this requirement. So there are some short-term options that could deal with this right away. The University of Iowa generally offers online Spanish classes. I mean they have for years. I don't know

what they're doing now, but I assume they're still doing that, so you do have another Regent's school doing it. It wouldn't...I don't see why having that kind of requirement and only having one language online at UNI would make it too difficult for students to do at this point.

Peters: Regarding Senator **Smith's** comments about work experience, I think there's a difference in terminology, but I think it reflects a difference in understanding maybe. There's a difference between saying there's a work requirement, and saying that the expectation is that students who would take this degree have work experience. What I heard the Interim Provost and the Associate Provost saying is when we look at the prospective student population for these degrees, we expect that they'll be a little older, that they'll have some work experience. That's not the same as saying we're going to require them to have that experience to be admitted. But maybe I'm parsing things too much there.

Licari: As I said, we were intentionally silent on the setting of parameters for admissions requirements because we didn't feel that it was anything that we could even come up with when we working on this last year, because it was so early and none of these discussions had happened and so we left that open. I guess my own personal expectation, for whatever that's worth, would be that there would be a requirement for work experience. You didn't hear necessarily wrong, I'm just offering my own editorial comment there.

Peters: More broadly, to Senator **Strauss's** comments, I would frame Mitch's (**Strauss's**) comments a little bit differently. I would say that what we're seeing is such concern about the creation of the first...This is the

first time in a long time that we've created a new bachelor's program on campus. I emailed Phil **Patton** a while back and asked, "When's the last time we created a new degree? It's not a new program, but a brand new degree?" Here's what he came up with: A Professional Science Master's in 2006, a Master's of Accounting and Master's of Social Work in 2002 and then before that a Master's of Science in 1994. So, none of those are undergraduate degrees, and they're all very program-specific. So the challenge that we're facing here, as a faculty is we're trying to create a new undergraduate degree and create an umbrella for it that can operate for multiple programs that may want to pursue these degrees. As is happening, I think to put a slightly different spin on it from what Mitch (**Strauss**) said, that everyone involved wants to make sure we get it right, so that in fact, it does have academic integrity, and it does have standards and value to the degree. So, I think that's what we're seeing here, is because we have no manual or guidebook about how to create a brand new degree, because we haven't done it in anybody's memory, at least, for undergraduate programs. And so, I think that's part of what we're facing here.

As to language in particular, I would simply say, and keep in mind that I'm saying this as an undergraduate French major and someone who greatly values language skills, a lot of campuses do language differently than we do, right? So there might be ways, even beyond the BAS discussion; there might be ways that we could change our own language requirements, including strengthening them in some ways or creating more options for students. There are a lot of campuses, at my Alma mater, most programs

had a BA or BS choice. And the choice of a BA meant that you had to take at least 12 college credits hours of foreign language. The choice of a BS meant basically you took more math and science, and so I could have gotten a BA in political science. I could have gotten a BS in political science, and almost every program carried that option, depending upon what kind of skills you wanted to develop. There are different models out there for doing this with the BAS. That hasn't been the way we do it on this campus, but there might be programs where language is a particularly important skill, and they want to include more language hours. There might be other programs where they want to emphasize other options. For what that's worth, that's my two cents.

Kidd: Alright. Thank you.

Heston: I have concerns about the BAS. I do understand that it's been a long time since we've created a degree and they weren't at the undergraduate level. My question is, how long or do we need to be concerned at all about that this is a push towards creating a credentialing system, rather than an educational system? One in which what matters is and I'll use the phrase that I got from someone else, the badge that you put on your little belt, that you acquire a series of courses, without getting an education. From my perspective, the LAC is critical to a well-educated person and I can think of no one more in need of being well educated than someone who is in the workplace and making executive decisions, but who because we have allowed the truncating of the LAC to become far more narrow, because that's what they want, and that's what made the degree marketable. We have in fact narrowed their perspective and

made them less able to engage in broad thinking and problem solving involving and considering serious issues that face all of us. I think about the issue of sustainability. Are these people...we have a nation that does not believe that there's—at least half of us don't believe that there's any need to worry about climate change. We have a nation that half of us don't get media literacy or more. I think we have some serious situations here when we think about really educating people for their roles as citizens, not just as employees, and what that really means, and giving people what they want, is really back to the market mentality that (a) they know what they want, they know their best interests, and that matters is what they want, not what society as a whole might well need them to understand and know. It's not that I'm opposed to change in any way, shape or form. I'm no a lover of our current LAC as some magnificent creation of people 40 years ago, but I'm very concerned that we are moving towards more of a business model that is based on being for profit and serving a market, rather than on the core mission of a university, which is to educate, and that means people learn things they don't necessarily want to learn.

Cooley: Very briefly, Melissa (**Heston**) my comments to “Do we need to worry about this?” My answer is that not only do we need to worry about this, but other institutions who have built comparable degrees have worried about it to such a degree that they have established a separate entity, such as an extension: There's a UW Extension, there's a University College at the University of Maryland, there's a University College at the University of Iowa. So that they're housing these degrees under the

umbrella of a large institution with the same brand name, but within a different entity for reasons of cash flow; for reasons of accreditation I suspect, and also for reasons of admission. Right? You can get different people into these other entities. There are lots of points that we haven't quite come to discuss yet, but at some point, we would want to look at that, the big picture. What are we getting ourselves into?

Zeit: I wanted to support something that Senator **Cutter** said a while ago and that has to do with the idea of having the two semesters of language. An important thing that we have in here is that we're talking about competency, and I think competency-based equivalency would be something that would fit in here as well. I think that the way in which it needs to be tested is not a written, multiple-choice test. It needs to be something where the competency is identified through both verbal and written. That's a way that we need to take a look at that; that would be a way in which we could approach it.

Kidd: Because there is another report, I'd like to end discussion in the next three minutes.

Swan: That's what I wanted to do, too. It's plain that faculty have many thoughts and many of which are very supportive, actually of the new degree, the BAS degree and wants more opportunities to contribute to the development of the degree itself. And so with that in mind, we should, so I'll ask the Chair what's the best way to do this? Either now just move on and continue the University-wide discussion of the degree, and the degree separate from any major that might be attached to the degree, because that's what the whole campus is concerned about: the

degree, not necessarily a specific major, that may be attached to it. Chair **Peters** made some good points, and this might explain some of the confusion that's occurred that I've heard. The degrees that have been created, most recently are entirely specific to one major. So Master's of Social Work: No one can come along and say, "I want to have a Social Work in English Renaissance Literature, right? But a degree does, you can say, "We want to have all these majors doing a degree, and we haven't created that sort of degree within memory, right? So that's the confusion. The people who are proposing majors for the degree, they're really just worrying about their major—they need to worry about their major. The whole university faculty needs to worry about the degree because we do want different majors over time to be able to be attached to it. That's why I think we should continue the discussion and not have any sense going out that anything is decided about the degree yet. If that means moving to receive this report at this time and continue discussing, or it means that we just stop and put this away, and then move on, I'm fine. If it means a motion, the motion I mentioned, I'm willing to make that. I ask the Chair...

Peters: Just a very quick follow-up and that's just to remind people that at 11:30 tomorrow and 3:30 Wednesday there are forums sponsored by the LACC about the BAS degree and you'll have to check your email for locations on those. The emails just came out last week.

Nelson: This is in follow-up to Senator **Swan's** comments. If we receive the report, it goes into the Senate Minutes and is then more widely available for people to refer to and in perhaps, future discussions.

Swan: Is it not in the minutes already?

Kidd: It's in the minutes.

Swan: I think it's in the minutes already. So we could just keep going. I don't think we have to do anything.

Dunn: I was going to move that the Senate receive the report. Maybe that's not necessary, that we at least do that. Is that a second?

Zeitz: That's a second. We got in trouble last time we didn't do that.

Kidd: Senator **Zeitz** seconded. All in favor of receiving the report? Any opposed? Abstain? Motion passed. We received the report. Also I believe there's supposed to be a committee being formed about this, a BAS Degree Committee. If I get more information on this, I'll send it back, I'll distribute it. Our next item for discussion is a report back on the Consultative Session on Discrimination and Harassment Policy, so I'd like to let Senator Dunn speak.

Dunn: More than a month or so ago we had a long session with Leah **Gutknecht** and Leslie **Williams**, talking about the new policy on discrimination, harassment and so on. So, walking out of the meeting, I was trying to think about how to move this forward in a productive way. So I suggested to Chair **Kidd** that perhaps we could form a committee of several of us together with the Title IX officer and the Dean of Students to look again at that reporting requirement and see if we could address some of the issues that people had raised. I guess Tim and President **Gorton** of United Faculty took the idea to President **Ruud**, who basically said, "Sure. Go ahead," or words to that effect, so we have a committee. It consists of me, Senator **Cutter**, who is also the Vice President of United

Faculty, Katherine **McGillivray**, who is the Director of Women's and Gender Studies, Leah **Gutknecht**, the Title IX Officer, Leslie **Williams**, the Dean of Students. We've met several times and we've been batting around a number of different ideas, a number of different approaches. One thing that came out at one of our meetings is that the current policy does permit anonymous reporting. It's not in Section 3. You have to read through a few more pages, but it does say that they will accept anonymous reports. What it means is that if a student came and told a faculty member something but said, "Please don't tell anyone." The faculty member could use the anonymous report and withhold both their name and the name of the victim. So that would be one way that they would have the information for reporting purposes. They could look for patterns and that kind of thing. On the other hand, we also had some issues with that option. One of them is that it doesn't deal with the issue the union brought up, of faculty being able to talk among themselves about potential discrimination or harassment without having to report to the Title IX officer. Second, we have some concern that if we push anonymous reporting, that may also increase malicious or false reports. We know that people are often not responsible when they're doing things anonymously. If that's an option, do we really want to push that? Other possibilities we considered would be rather than saying, "All employees are required to report," we could divide it, and say, "All employees are encouraged to report," but "only some employees are required to report." It looks like the Title IX language allows that, but it's somewhat ambiguous because it includes anyone that a student could reasonably

believe is responsible for misconduct and that opens a can of worms. Currently, the University of Iowa, they have a list, these are the categories of employees that are required to report. Apparently, the Title IX office that's trying to administer that finds it really unworkable. It's too vague. They keep running into borderline cases. "Does this person belong in Category 3d or not?" So they want to change their policy from the Title IX office's perspective, it's much easier to just make everyone report. We're looking into those possibilities to cut it at supervisory personnel, so that if you're supervising another employee, then you're a mandatory reporter. If you don't supervise someone, you're not. But we're still sort of, "What could actually work from the Title IX office's perspective?" Another thing we talked about is maybe we separate discrimination and harassment and misconduct involving students and those involving employees. Title IX is really concerned with protecting students, and so we can say, okay, everyone must report anything that a student reports to them, which raises the same ethical issues that we've already discussed. But, it would mean that if faculty feel that harassment or discrimination is going on that doesn't involve students, faculty would be able to talk about that freely and not be forced to again report it. The current policy if you read it strictly says that if you're an employee and you are a victim of discrimination or harassment, you **must** report it to the Title IX Officer. If the victim chose, for whatever reason that it was in their best interest not to report, they would technically be in violation of this policy, and we didn't think that was a good outcome. So we're thinking about it. If people have other ideas or suggestions, I've made up a document that

outlines these options if you'd like me to send it to you I'd be happy to do that. I also wanted to follow up with Paul (**Anderson**). My understanding is that a few weeks ago NISG voted unanimously to support the current policy. Is that correct?

Anderson: They did.

Dunn: And was there a prolonged discussion? Was it pretty pro forma?

Anderson: They got into a lot of the same issues that were discussed here. But ultimately, it was decided that the positives of having faculty and staff be mandatory reporters outweighed what they felt was the negative.

Dunn: Okay.

Anderson: That's was kind of what the gist of the whole discussion came to and that's why it was a unanimous decision.

Dunn: And that's important to know.

Anderson: I could get Tim (**Kidd**) a copy of that resolution if he doesn't already have one.

Dunn: That would be good. Thanks.

Cutter: Can I follow-up? I just wanted to add a couple of things to what Cyndi said (**Dunn**) Thanks so much to Cyndi for taking the lead on this. The anonymous reporting thing, in our meeting, Leah (**Gutknecht**) said that faculty could fulfill their obligation through anonymous reporting. But when you look at current policy, it actually suggests that would not be an option. That would have to be a policy change I think. Because if you look at the reporting responsibilities it specifically says that, "the initial contacts will be treated with maximum possible privacy, however," they

might have to use a name. So if the anonymous reporting in that section, from the current policy, it suggests that that the anonymous reporting would be for voluntary reporters, not for required reporters. That's just something that Leah (**Gutknecht**) suggested we might be able to tweak. And I wanted to just give you a couple of examples of what University of Iowa did. The one that the Title IX reporters don't particularly like but is within the law just so we know. There's nothing legally considered wrong with this. They list academic or administrative officers as required reporters and I'll give the short version of the list with all the categories, but not all the details: Deans, faculty members with administrative responsibilities at the level of department head or above, any staff member whose primary job responsibility is to provide advice for the students, academic or pursuant to other university-related activities, any faculty/staff member serving as director or coordinator of undergraduate or graduate studies, or director or coordinator of an academic program including abroad, the president, director of Equal Opportunity and Diversity, sexual misconduct coordinator, vice presidents and those person's designees, direct supervisors in an employment context, including faculty and staff who supervise student employees in relation to matters involving the employees they supervise, and Human Resource representatives. So, that's an example of how they do it, which is not to say that's the only way it can be done. There is a listing option. Some schools just say, "people with supervisory responsibilities." And the last thing that I was going to say that came up that Cyndi (**Dunn**) mentioned, just to give you an example of the kinds of things that are covered that we

didn't think of is. Some faculty members were talking about pay discrimination. I'm sure there are some taking about it today; talking about possible pay discrimination. Last semester it became clear in our meeting that actually faculty member felt that they were receiving---on the receiving end---of pay discrimination on the basis of say, gender or another protected category. Technically, they're required to report under this. So one can't have a conversation with a colleague about possible pay discrimination under this current policy without being required to report it to the Title IX officer. That's one of the issues in this policy. It's not just about things like harassment and assault. Parts of it get to the heart of workplace activities.

Kidd: Thank you. There's time for discussion on this.

Peters: Have you talked at all about the possibility of the University ombudsman or what role any position like that might play? This could be someone who can keep things confidential and can be a resource for an employee or a student who is interested in reporting something. They can point a person to the appropriate resource who is trained in counseling them.

Dunn: No, we haven't. That's a good idea that we can bring up. The thing is, there are people on campus that can do this, but students and faculty may not know it. There's a Victim's Advocate--anything that's told to that person is confidential and they can then contact the Dean of Students or whoever on behalf of the victim. Anything that someone in the Counseling Center said to a counselor is confidential by law. So those exist, but I can't, for example, go to the victim advocate and say that a

student discussed something with me because I'm required to go to the Title IX. That's a good thought that we can bring up. Thanks.

Kidd: Any other comments or questions?

Swan: From what Senator **Dunn** just said, so the victim advocate isn't required to report to the Title IX officer? So even under the current Draconian massive-all-encompassing proposal or policy, there is an exception. That you mentioned another one, that the counselors in the Student Health Center, is that right? They're not required. I could ask another question if I could to Senator **Cutter**. So we heard that the bureaucrats at Iowa don't like their policy, how did the faculty and the victims of assault like their policy, or do we know?

Cutter: We don't know, we just heard from two Title IX coordinator conversations that it gets complicated for them, and we do want to talk-- Cyndi's working on this—to the victim's advocate person to get a better sense of this from a victim's advocate perspective.

Swan: Good. Thank you.

Dunn: So we're working.

Kidd: Thank you. I guess whenever you have anything you want to tell us, let us know. I think we could table discussion for now. Do we need a motion to table or just let it go? Are there any objections to tabling discussion for now? Awesome. Do we have a motion to adjourn? Moved by Senator **Zeitz**, seconded by Senator **Walter** and approved by all the people leaving.

Respectfully submitted,
Kathy Sundstedt

Transcriptionist and Administrative Assistant
Faculty Senate
University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa 50614