

9-24-2018

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, September 24, 2018

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Copyright ©2018 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

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

 Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate., "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, September 24, 2018" (2018). *Faculty Senate Documents*. 1228.

https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/1228

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Documents by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

Regular Meeting
UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING
09/24/18 (3:30 – 4:43)
Mtg. #1811
SUMMARY MINUTES

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

Introduction of Guests: Anita **Gordon**, Joyce **Morrow**, Chris **Neuhaus**, Terri **Lasswell**, Scott **Peters**.

Courtesy Announcements

Provost **Wohlpert** explained that according to best practice, the only student information available to the public will be a student's UNI email address. Faculty may access other information using CAT IDs. Additionally, faculty will see Phase One of the Gen Ed Revision, which is sharing of Student Learning Outcomes. He stressed that these are not content area. Phase Two, coming later, will include structures. (See pages 4-5)

Minutes for Approval Sept. 10, 2018 – Summary Minutes & Transcript

**** (Stafford/Mattingly) All aye.**

Consideration of Docketed Items

**** (Choi/O'Kane) Motion to reorder docketed items in order below. Passed.**

1403 1282 [Request for emeritus status for Kathy Oakland, Department of Teaching](#)
**** (Strauss/Choi) All aye. (See pages 7-8)**

1404 1283 [Request for emeritus status for Lee Weber, Department of Teaching](#)
**** (Mattingly/Skaar) All aye. (See pages 8-9)**

1409 1288 [Request for emeritus status for Dianna Briggs, Department of Teaching](#)
**** (Gould/O'Kane) All aye. (See pages 9-10)**

1405 1284 [Request for emeritus status for Ardith Meier, Department of Language & Literatures](#)
**** (O'Kane/Koch) All aye. (See pages 10-11)**

1408 1287 [Request for emeritus status for Thomas Davis, Health, Recreation & Community Services](#)
**** (Strauss/Skaar) All aye. (See pages 11-12)**

- 1411 1290 [Graduate and Undergraduate Curricular Changes](#)
** (Mattingly/Stafford) All aye. (See pages 12-13)
- 1400 1279 [Consideration of revisions to Policy 6.10 Academic Freedom](#)
** (O'Kane/Burnight) All aye as amended. (See pages 13-19)
- 1401 1280 [Consideration of revisions to Policy 13.13 Research Misconduct](#)
** (Burnight/Gould) To refer back to EPC for further revision. All aye.
(See pages 19-27)
- 1406 1285 [Consultation on Phishing Education](#)
(Ken Connelly's PowerPoint Presentation is available using the link
above) (See pages 27-37)

Adjournment (Skaar/Gould) 4:43 p.m.

Next Meeting: 3:30 p.m. Monday, **Oct. 8, 2018**
Elm Room, Maucker Union
University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, Iowa

A complete transcript of 37 pages and 0 addendum follows.

Regular Meeting
FULL TRANSCRIPT of the
UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING
September 24th, 2018

All Present: Senators Imam **Alam**, John **Burnight**, Seong-in **Choi**, Faculty Senate Secretary Gretchen **Gould**, Senators Tom **Hesse**, Bill **Koch**, Faculty Senate Vice-Chair James **Mattingly**, Senate Alternate Heather **Peyton**, Senators Steve **O’Kane**, Faculty Senate Chair Amy **Petersen**, Senators Mark **Sherrad**, Nicole **Skaar**, Gloria **Stafford**, Andrew **Stollenwerk**, Mitchell **Strauss**, and Shahram **Varzavand**. Also: Faculty Chair Barbara **Cutter**, Associate Provost Patrick **Pease**, Associate Provost John **Vallentine**, Provost Jim **Wohlpert** and NISG Vice President Kristin **Ahart**.

Not Present: Peter **Neibert**, Sara **Smith**, and Senator Leigh **Zeitz**, United Faculty President Becky **Hawbaker**, UNI President Mark **Nook**.

Guests: Ken **Connelly**, Anita **Gordon**, Joyce **Morrow**, Chris **Neuhaus**, Terri **Lasswell**, Scott **Peters**.

CALL TO ORDER, PRESS IDENTIFICATION, & INTRODUCTION of GUESTS

Petersen: Alright, I think let’s go ahead and begin our meeting that I will call to order. I do not see any press, but I would like to give our guests an opportunity to introduce themselves. Anita, (Gordon) would you begin?

Gordon: I'm Anita **Gordon**. I'm the Director of Research Ethics in the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs.

Peters: I'm Scott **Peters**. I'm a professor in the Department of Ed and Political Science, and I'm here today to talk about last year when I chaired the EPC.

Morrow: Joyce **Morrow**, Registrar. I'm not here to talk, just to visit.

Lasswell: My name is Terri **Lasswell**, Department of Teaching. I'm here to talk about some of the Emeritus Requests.

Petersen: Thank you all for joining us. We will begin with announcements and I did ask that we keep our announcements brief because we have a full agenda. President **Nook** I hear is still on the road, so I'll move to Provost **Wohlpert**.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST WOHLPART

Wohlpert: Just two quick things to let you all know: In our directory online you used to be able to get personal information about our students: their home address for instance, unless they chose to suppress it. That's not best practice, so we're changing that. So online now, all you can get is their UNI email I think is the only thing. If you have a CAT ID, you can go in and get other information as a faculty member if you need to. But, that is a major change. For faculty, the only information you can get is their professional information, UNI email, phone number, office location. That's it. This is a pretty major change in terms of what we would put out there for students, and a necessary one. And just a reminder about what's coming for Gen Ed revision, because this is really, really important that you have this framed correctly in your minds. What you're going to see, I

assume, I hope—are a list of student learning outcomes. You're not going to see content area. You're not going to see structure. You're not going to see what looks like a Gen Ed Program: You're going to see student learning outcomes, which was the Senate's charge to that committee, which is best practice. That's Phase One—is Student Learning Outcomes. I just want to make sure that you all are kind of prepared mentally for what's coming your way, and you don't stop and say, "Well we need to see structure for this. That's Phase Two. Steve (**O'Kane**) if you would want to add anything?"

O'Kane: I think you've got it.

Wohlpart: It's really important that everybody understands this is best practice. You all went to a conference. This is how it is done.

O'Kane: Let me emphasize the idea of when you see these outcomes, do not be thinking, "This is that class. This is that class. "

Wohlpart: ...This is that area.

O'Kane: There is no implied structure at all; simply learning outcomes.

Wohlpart: Questions you have of me about that? Because that's really important that that is what you are going to see. And I know that the committee has gotten a lot of feedback, so it's very helpful feedback, and it's moving along. I just wanted to make sure that everybody knew that. That's all I have.

Petersen: Chair Cutter?

Cutter: I don't have any comments.

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Petersen: Let's begin then with consideration of our September 10th meeting minutes. They've been distributed. Is there a motion to approve the minutes? Thank you. Seconded by Vice-Chair **Mattingly**. All in favor of approving the minutes say 'aye.' Any abstentions? Any opposition? The motion passes.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

Petersen: We have no items for docketing today, so we will move right into our Consideration of our Docketed Items. What I would like to do is to request a motion to re-order our docket based on the guests that we have here today, as well as some of our items need to be considered first because of the timeframe. So, what I would like to do--there is a revised agenda and I would like to request a motion to consider the emeritus status first, so Docketed Items 1403, for Kathy **Oakland**, 1404 for Lee **Weber**, 1409 for Diana **Briggs**, 1405 for Ardith **Meier**, and 1408 for Thomas **Davis**. Following, I would like to request that we consider 1411, which includes the graduate and undergrad curricular changes, and then we can move into the consideration of 1400 and 1401, which include the Policy on Academic Freedom and the Research Misconduct Policy. And then I would like to do the Phishing Consultation, and we will be having a guest coming to share that information with us. If we have time, we could then move into 1410, which is the Request for New Membership in Voting Faculty. Is there a motion to re-order the docket in this manner? Thank you Senator **Choi** and seconded by Senator **O'Kane**. Any discussion? All in favor of re-ordering the docket, please indicate by saying,

“aye.” Any opposition? And abstentions? Alright, the motion passes. So first we will consider the emeritus status for Kathy **Oakland** and we have from the Department of Teaching, Dr. Terri **Lasswell** here to speak a bit on behalf of Kathy **Oakland**.

Lasswell: First of all, thank you for the opportunity to talk with you today. I appreciate the communication with Dr. **Petersen** to make this happen. I understand I am only addressing Ms. **Oakland** right now, correct?

Petersen: Yes. We’ll go one at a time.

Lasswell: Okay. Thank you. First of all, Ms. **Oakland** dedicated 31 years to the University of Northern Iowa. And please note that I didn’t say she worked here. She dedicated 31 years to the University of Northern Iowa. She was both at the Lab School and at worked in the Department of Teaching. Probably the thing that describes and defines her is in her career as a classroom teacher at Union High School and at Price Lab she was very creative. There were a lot of things that high school speech classes had not done or considered before, and Ms. **Oakland** was responsible for that. Another kind of unique piece was when she started pairing her Human Relations students here at the University of Northern Iowa with New Aldaya and then with Western Home, mainly with retired teachers who really gave a lot of insight, and received a lot in return from our students. Her passion was placing students in the various schools in the Cedar Valley as she coordinated various field experiences and she moved on from that in recent years, but she did that for a while. I remember when I wasn’t even working here—I was working in a different university, she called me and wanted me to do a ride-along, and it was

part of the building block of where we are now, to place nearly 900 students per semester in buildings in the Cedar Valley. So she built that foundation today.

Research was not a requirement for Kathy (**Oakland**) but she was very involved in what you may remember was the Teacher Work Sample, and later learned more about the education of teacher performance assessment, but really involved with Teacher Work Sample, training of faculty at UNI, and at other institutions around the Midwest. With that, I would like to recommend her nomination.

Petersen: Is there a motion to approve the Emeritus Status Request for Kathy **Oakland**? Thank you, Senator **Strauss**. Is there a second? Thank you, Senator **Choi**. Any additional discussion? All in favor of approving the Emeritus Request for Kathy **Oakland**, please indicate by saying, “Aye.” And any in opposition? And abstentions? Excellent. The motion passes. The second emeritus request that we have for consideration is for Lee **Weber**, also in the Department of Teaching. So I will ask Dr. **Lasswell** again to speak on his behalf.

Lasswell: I needed that break. Mr. Lee **Weber** dedicated 27 years to the University of Northern Iowa at the Lab School and in the Department of Teaching. He was passionate—and if any of you knew him—you kind of couldn’t miss him, because he was tall—about all things History and American government—very, very passionate. But beyond the content, Lee (**Weber**) had dedicated himself to helping preservice and in-service teachers master the art of collaborative group work as a chosen pedagogy in those content areas. He was an admitted ‘Stand and Deliver’ teacher who transformed himself into understanding how he could bring that coursework and that content to life with a different kind of pedagogy. The transformation that he made personally was amazing, and then the fact that

he was able to go out and into schools where there were people who were teaching that content in that way, work with him one-on-one whether they were preservice or in-service teachers, and then with other universities in the region. He set a high bar for expectations. He was very student-focused and I would support his nomination to emeritus status as well.

Petersen: Thank you Dr. **Lasswell**. Is there a motion to approve the emeritus status for Lee **Weber**? Thank you. Motion by Senator **Mattingly**. Is there a second? Seconded by Senator **Skaar**. All in favor of approving the Emeritus Request for Lee **Weber**, please indicate by saying "Aye." Any in opposition? And any abstentions? Excellent. The motion passes. Our third request for emeritus status is for Diana **Briggs**, also in the Department of Teaching, and Dr. **Lasswell** is here to speak on her behalf as well.

Lasswell: Dr. Diana **Briggs** dedicated 40 years to the University of Northern Iowa. So if you add all those up, that's 98 years between those three people alone. She was also in the Lab School and Department of Teaching. She served as an Instructor. She earned her doctorate while doing that. She served in several leadership roles. She trained many of the Student Teaching Coordinators for the Department that are still working, including myself. In many ways, Diana (**Briggs**) set the standard for the coordinators and the Department of Teaching, and I will say to others in other universities, because they looked up to her in that way. Her main goal was to support students, but not at the expense of other students, so she was very wise about seeing if someone was headed down a path where maybe we needed to pull them back in and do some re-tooling and then put them in a different classroom. She was highly respected by her colleagues and the

schools; K-12 schools statewide. Diana (**Briggs**) continued to author and co-author until her final year at UNI, even though it wasn't a requirement. She saw it as a way to support and involve others, whether it was in the Department, in the College, or across campus. She was also very active, serving as President of the Iowa Business Educator Association. She served as Department Head for a while. She also served as the Student Teaching Head Coordinator for a bit. If something needed to be done, Diana many times was the person who did it. Again, I would support the nomination to emeritus status for Diana **Briggs**.

Petersen: Thank you Dr. **Lasswell**. Is there a motion to approve the Emeritus Status Request for Diana **Briggs**? Thank you Senator **Gould**, and a second by Senator **O'Kane**. All in favor of approving this emeritus request, please indicate by saying "Aye." Any in opposition? Abstentions? The emeritus request is approved. Our next emeritus request is for Ardith **Meier**. And these materials are posted on the website. Is there anyone who would like to speak to this request? Does anyone know Dr. **Meier**?

Koch: I know her a little bit, being in the Department of Languages and Literatures. I didn't have a lot of contact, but she's always very serious and professional. She seemed to be very involved with her students, so I would recommend that she would get this.

Ahart: I took my Capstone course with Dr. **Meier** and it was one of the most challenging courses I've taken here at UNI, but I learned the most from it. She's very involved with her students in classes and you could tell that she was very dedicated to our success as well as her research.

Petersen: Her letter comes from Dr. **Cooley** and it indicates she was a professor in TESOL. She was a dynamic and highly effective professor who taught a broad range of courses. She published in the *Journal of Pragmatics*, *Multilingua*, *Language Sciences*, *English Language Teaching Journal*, *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *American Speech* and *The Modern Language Journal*. She's also "worked as a volunteer, serving refugee and immigrant populations in Europe. These accomplishments are the mark of a seasoned and dedicated teacher and a lifelong learner, and clearly qualify her for the distinction of Professor Emeritus." Any other discussion? All in favor of approving the emeritus request for Dr. Ardith **Meier**, please indicate by saying "Aye." Any in opposition? Any abstentions? Excellent. The request is approved.

Petersen: The last emeritus request that we have for consideration is Dr. Thomas **Davis** from Health, Recreation, and Community Services. Is there a motion to approve this emeritus request? Thank you, Senator **Strauss**. Is there a second? Thank you, Senator **Skaar**. Would anyone be willing to speak on his behalf? Does anyone know Dr. **Davis**?

(**Petersen:** I don't know if you noticed, but I put Gretchen (**Gould**) in charge of the computer after my inability to multi-task last week, so thank you so much Gretchen.)

Gould: I'll get these working next time—all these displays.

Petersen: I've just highlighted a few of his accomplishments. He has published more than 35 manuscripts and professional journals; 17 externally funded grants,

including 16 as primary investigator. He has made approximately 200 professional presentations, including 45 international presentations in Europe, Asia, and Africa and he's delivered 37 national and 40 regional presentations in 27 U.S. states. For 11 years, beginning in 2006, he served as the sponsor and faculty advisor for student teams participating in the National Health Education Case Study Competition, and they had won that competition in 2006, 2007, 2008, 2013 and 2016. He is also active in the service of his profession, serving in a variety of capacities for the Society for Public Health Education, and the American Association for Health. He's received the College of Education Excellence in Service Award, the Excellence in Teaching Award, and the Indiana University Distinguished Alumnus Award. He has served here at UNI for over 40 years. Any additional discussion? All in favor of approving Dr. **Davis's** emeritus request, please indicate by saying "Aye." Any in opposition? And any abstentions? Excellent. The request is approved.

Petersen: The next item on our docket is the Consideration of the Graduate and Undergraduate Curricular Changes. I'm going to ask Associate Provost **Pease** if he might be willing to provide us with an overview summary of these changes.

Pease: Yes. Thank you very much. I come to you this time of year each year to talk about curricular packages that have to be approved through the Board of Regents. You'll see another, much larger curriculum package later in the year with other more routine changes that come through. But each year, just because of the schedule of the Board of Regents and trying to get things approved in order to make the next catalog year, we bring some of the larger changes through to you early. This year, it's a fairly small packet. There's just three program name

changes that are in place. There's one from Health, Recreation, and Community Services where they would like to change their program name from a Public Health to Public Health in Education, so they want to make a small edit to the name of their program. Again just adding a couple of words. There's one from Technology for their B.A. in Graphic Technology, where they're changing the name from Graphic Technologies to Graphic Technology—changing from a plural to a singular. And from Math, changing Mathematics for Middle Grades 4-8 to Math for Elementary and Middle Grades K-8. This is a name change, but it's also merging two tracks together for efficiency sake. So, fairly straight-forward programs. I'd be happy to answer any questions about those three if anyone has any. [Pause] I see no questions.

Petersen: Okay. Is there a motion to approve these curricular changes? Thank you Senator **Mattingly**. Is there a second? Thank you, Senator **Stafford**. All in favor of approving these curricular changes, please indicate by saying, "Aye." Any in opposition? Any abstentions? Excellent. The motion passes. Thank you all for doing your homework around these changes.

Petersen: The next item on our docket is consideration of the Academic Freedom Policy, which is Policy 6.10, and we also have consideration of Policy 13.13, the Research Misconduct Policy, and our guests are from the EPC (Educational Policy) Committee, and they are here to share a bit about these revisions. I think we should start with the Academic Freedom Policy, but I do understand there may be some overlap in having this discussion as well. So, let me ask if Scott (**Peters**) might be willing to get us started.

Peters: Sure. Thank you for having me here. I chaired the EPC last year and we worked on these two policies that we'll talk to you about today. First, about a year ago the University finalized some changes to 6.10 that strengthened language protecting academic freedom and shared governance, and at that time the we—the EPC, promised we would continue looking at that policy and take a look at the Academic Responsibility part of that policy, which we did last year. So you'll notice that there is—the changes here are in the Academic Responsibility part of the policy, and as we looked at that policy, we looked at the policies of our sister institutions, keeping in mind that Iowa and Iowa State have, as we do now, have a Faculty Handbook, which takes the place of a lot of policies. Some things that we put in policy, they put in their Handbook. We updated language, we looked at model statements from AAUP, we looked at the policies of our peer institutions, and so what you see here are suggested changes to update some of the policies here on faculty responsibility. We did feel like, given that policy is harder to change than the Handbook, we did not want to print a level of detail into policy of things that are more properly addressed today through the Faculty Handbook. So, we did for example have a discussion about communication with students. A lot of institutions will have a policy that has some sort of—that says something about how faculty will respond in a helpful and timely way to student inquiries, or something like that. But, as we talked about that, we ultimately decided that that was something that seemed more appropriate for a Faculty Handbook than for University policies, so we didn't include that. So, those were some of the issues we faced as we revisited this, and I'd be happy to answer any questions anybody has about any of this.

Cutter: I really like these changes, but I do have a couple of questions. I guess it's on Page 3 at the bottom: This isn't actually—I don't think you added this, but I was just reading that, "students are entitled to the same intellectual freedom that faculty members enjoy." Which, is of course true, but in the context of this paragraph, it seems that it's blurring intellectual freedom and academic freedom, which are two different things. So, maybe that...because it goes on to talk about not introducing controversial matter—which is the whole academic freedom part. So, I'm wondering if that might be clarified?

Peters: Sure. If you have language that could help clarify it, I would encourage the Senate to make any amendments it sees fit.

Neuhaus: Just a thought. This is Chris **Neuhaus**, who's going to be the chair this year. Some of our students do teach classes here. So you could view that as I suppose covering those cases, and maybe that would have to be specified, that you will have some of our students—some of our grad students who will be conducting classes themselves. At least a few of them would be in professorial mode from time-to-time. I'm not sure what the intent was when that was originally penned, but this would supposedly cover those instances.

Cutter: My only thought was maybe just cutting the first sentence there.

Petersen: "The students are entitled to the same intellectual freedom." That sentence?

Cutter: Or moving it elsewhere.

Wohlpart: Barb (**Cutter**) could I ask why? I'm just trying to clarify. This is not about academic freedom. It is about intellectual freedom, and it's not about students who teach. It's about students in the classroom and it's talking about the way in which students enjoy this intellectual freedom, different from academic freedom, but they can't go rogue. Right?

Cutter: Right.

Wohlpart: So the first one says they have this broad umbrella of freedom, however, here is how it can be constrained.

Cutter: No. I agree with that. I just think that the following sentences tend to make it almost seem like intellectual freedom and academic freedom are the same thing, because it shifts into talking about what faculty should do, which seems to me to be an academic freedom issue. Right? What they should teach and not teach. That's my only concern—is that the two sentences are next to each other.

Wohlpart: Just a suggestion: I would take the part about faculty out in the second sentence, and focus on students. "Following AAUP guidelines, the faculty should limit introduction by students of controversial matter," so that this whole section here focuses on the students.

Cutter: I think that's a great idea.

Wohlpart: I see the concern: It jumps to a limitation on faculty.

Peters: That does somewhat change the meaning of it though, because the AAUP guidelines about academic freedom do say that ‘Yes, of course faculty have academic freedom, but they should not unnecessarily introduce controversial matters into their teaching.’ Right? Not related to the class.

Wohlpart: Is that anywhere else in here Scott (**Peters**)? That limitation on faculty?

Peters: I don’t think so. Oh, it does say that actually. Yes. Never mind. It’s in the definition of academic freedom, it does include that quote from the 1940 statement.

Mattingly: Not related to the course.

Wohlpart: Is that anywhere else in here?

Gould: What page is that on?

Peters: It’s the very first section—Section 1 of the Policy Statement. Page 2 of my copy. Keep going up further under academic freedom. There. You’re there now.

Mattingly: So, its redundant in the second one.

Peters: It actually is. That’s a good point.

Koch: This is under “Faculty Responsibility to Students,” and Number C1 starts with “Faculty members have responsibility.’ And then Number 2 starts with reference to the students. Maybe, it would be clearer to say again that ‘faculty must ensure student intellectual freedom, and then that would clear up that kind of sequence. And then Number 3 also starts with ‘student’s freedom to learn must be protected.’ I noticed Number 4 starts again with faculty members, so

perhaps clarifying it that these are faculty responsibilities. Start Number 3 also with 'Faculty should also ensure student freedom to learn must be protected.' Along those lines, and then in Number 2, 'Students are entitled to the same intellectual freedom that faculty members enjoy.' The main point of that sentence could be included in the second sentence. Something along the lines of 'Faculty should respect and foster the intellectual freedom that students are entitled to,' and I think that would still say the same thing.

Wohlpart: And this is at the very end of this, 'That faculty have a responsibility to limit introduction by students of controversial matter which has no relation to the subject.' That's the limitation. That can't be lost, since the statement about faculty is already included above, I think you could take the statement out about faculty. And then you have a coherent Number 2.

Gould: Can you repeat that?

Wohlpart: Absolutely. I would say, 'Following AAUP guidelines, faculty should limit introduction by students of controversial matter which has no relation to the subject.' So what you would take out is at the very bottom of 3, 'Should avoid introducing into their teaching.' That doesn't need to be there because that's already above in the definition. So that would be struck.

Petersen: So we have the suggested revision of editing Number 2 in the following way: 'Following AAUP guidelines, faculty should limit introduction of controversial material into their teaching.'

Wohlpart: No. ‘Should limit introduction by students of controversial matter which has no relation to the subject.’ The faculty part is already covered above. The limitation on faculty is already covered above.

Petersen: Is there other discussion, questions, suggestions on this policy? Can we make such a revision? So, I’m a bit unclear: Do we need to—can we make such a revision and then vote to approve the policy?

Gould: Yes.

Mattingly: As amended, yes.

Petersen: As amended.

Gould: Yes.

O’Kane: I move that we approve this policy as amended.

Petersen: Thank you, Senator **O’Kane**. Is there a second? Thank you, Senator **Burnight**. Any additional discussion? Alright, all in favor of Policy 6.10 Academic Freedom, Shared Governance, and Academic Responsibility as amended, please indicate by saying “Aye.” Any in opposition? Any abstentions? Excellent the motion passes.

Petersen: The next item for consideration is the Policy 13.13 Research Misconduct, docketed 1401.

Peters: Before I start on this one, I will say something I probably should have said before discussing the previous policy, is that it’s important I think for Senators to realize that this is just the beginning of a process. EPC brings forward a proposal

to the Senate. But what the Senate's actually doing is formally proposing it from the faculty to enter into the University's policy process. And that really begins the process. It will get put up for public comment. People will have the opportunity to submit comments on it. Those comments will come back to the Senate. The Senate can revise it. And only after all of that does it then go forward for consideration to the President to finalize it into policy. The reason I want to make sure we understand this is that this is a pretty substantial revision of policy and what made it challenging was that really to revise the policy, we actually had to revise all the procedures first. So that's why you have this big, revised procedures before you. Now we didn't have to do it that way. I mean, you could revise the policy and then leave it up to Anita (**Gordon**) here to just revise the procedures on her own, but Anita (**Gordon**) rightly came to the committee and said that really the important details are in the procedures, and that we needed to go through those carefully because that lays out what happens when a faculty member is accused of scholarly misconduct. So, we worked on this a lot last semester and did our best. I'll describe to you the overall thrust, and then see if Anita has anything to add. This policy was initially put into place it looks like 2010, largely because—and Anita (**Gordon**) correct me if I'm wrong—largely because we were either out of compliance, or in danger of being out of compliance with federal regulations requiring us to have these policies in place to govern grants. So at that time it was sort of 'Uh-oh, we need a policy in place.' And we pretty much put in a policy without too many changes, a model policy—is that correct? And so since that time the policy has been used a few times in ways that it may not have originally intended to be used, and if I think—that there was overall recognition that this policy needed to be revisited, and so what we tried to do here is to build

in a process that if this is going to be the default policy about scholarly integrity on campus, to make the policy reflect that. And also to try to provide additional safeguards to faculty in that process. So, try to more clearly define the different types of misconduct, try to more clearly define the standards that have to be met for an allegation to move along to the next step of the process, and then try to clearly define what the options of the decision-makers are after decisions have been made by peer-review committees.

Gordon: I'm not sure what else to add. Scott's (**Peters**) correct that this got put together fairly quickly when I realized that we've been promising the federal government that we have this policy and we couldn't find it. So the Senate passed it last time, largely based on the federal model policy for research misconduct. So, most research universities across the country have a policy that looks a lot like this, but we have some room I think in how we proceed, and I'll keep an eye on whether or not the final policy is consistent with federal requirements. But for the most part we have some room to decide what is the best way to approach this, and I think we're overdue to have that conversation in more depth. I'm not actually sure that we're ready to be done with this at this at this point. I'm looking forward to hearing your input, but you might—I think Amy's (**Petersen**) going to say this in a minute—you might choose to refer back to EPC for more work, especially if you think there are particular areas that do require some more discussion, or maybe a broader campus discussion, for that matter. I'm not sure what the best approach is.

Petersen: As Anita (**Gordon**) alluded to, we have the option again of approving these recommended changes or we can send this policy back to the EPC

Committee with some specific questions, or suggestions, or task areas for them to look at.

Mattingly: I was going to ask if –it’s my understanding that the EPC would like to see this back because there are things that they would like to change about the policy before it moves forward?

Gordon: That’s my opinion.

Neuhaus: At our last meeting, a couple of members expressed some concern about protection of those who have been accused, that odd or unfortunate possibility where they are wrongly accused, is there enough protection in there for those situations? I think they thought that we’re going to work on this thing to make sure it’s doing its job in all directions there. At least one member was concerned that perhaps this didn’t cover that situation of how fair are we being in this policy to someone who might be accused when they shouldn’t have been.

Petersen: I sat in on that meeting, and I think the concern was that if a faculty member can perhaps violate this policy, we should also assume that an accuser could perhaps fabricate an accusation, and within this policy, it’s not strong enough to consider that possibility. Did I capture that?

Peters: I know that the Senate is busy, and the Senate has a lot of business, and I’m not on EPC anymore so it won’t be my problem to deal with, but having served on EPC and having served on the Senate, one of the awkward things about our governance system is that in this case, Senator **Imam** is on EPC—that will be helpful---but often, there is no overlap there between EPC and Senate, so EPC is

off in its own world doing its work, and it thinks it's done a great job and then it comes to the Senate and the Senate says, 'No, we didn't want anything like this at all.' That can be pretty frustrating. And so if you do at this point, since it's here and we're here, and we can pass the notes along, even if you think it should be sent back, any particular things that you think need work in addition to what Chair **Petersen** was talking about would probably be helpful to EPC's work.

Hesse: I had a question about Point Number 7. It says, 'All employees or individuals associated with UNI must report.' I'm a little unclear about that 'must.' Do we want mandatory reporting? Or do we want a 'should' there? It comes up again further down. 'Observe, suspected or apparent scholarly misconduct by UNI students must be reported.' I personally would prefer 'should.'

Wohlpert: Anita (Gordon) does this have anything to do with federal regulations?

Gordon: I would have to check on 'must' versus 'should' just in case. If the Senate feels it would be important to go in that direction, I'll definitely make sure. I'm pretty sure that we don't have to worry about too many small—that's significant but small. I think the most important thing is that we have to clarify the process and due process and that it covers everybody that it should, and that it covers the amount of misconduct that it should et cetera. I suspect it's fine. I will definitely check it before we finalize it.

Hesse: I'm a little concerned because 'must' implies you have to, so that implies there would be a penalty if you didn't. So if I see someone doing something shady and I don't report it, I could get in trouble, and that's why I prefer the 'should' or 'strongly encouraged to,' or some language like that.

Pease: I would question how that section also intersects with Policy 3.01, because most of what goes on in that comes at the discretion—the lower level violations 1 & 2, are currently largely at the discretion of how faculty wish to handle them, and this takes it out and moves it to your office.

Several Voices: No.

Pease: It requires reporting to your office.

Gordon: But more to your point Patrick (**Pease**), people may not realize that originally this policy included faculty, staff, and students. We did intend to pull the students out of this entirely. So I'm finding myself kind of thinking...

Peters: If you scroll up to Number 2.

Hesse: Patrick's (**Pease**) question is answered by Number 2.

Gordon: But mostly students misconduct. There were some EPC members who wanted to consider the possibility that there are times when this would be more appropriate. We can discuss this further.

Petersen: To summarize, I'm hearing that there may be more need to discuss the intersection of the student policy with this policy. Is that correct?

Pease: I think it could be much more clear where one ends and the other takes over.

Peters: I'm not sure that's possible to make a clear line, because there very well could be instances where both could apply, but the intent of Number 2 there is to govern the entire policy to say that under normal circumstances, student

complaints; complaints against students would be handled under the 3.01 or 3.02, whichever is appropriate. And there would be rare instances where it would be appropriate to handle it this way. But, if we do have a student for example who has published a paper in a journal somewhere, do we—is there a larger issue than what can be handled by 3.01? Does it become more than just a student disciplinary matter at that point? And does it become something the University has to investigate under broader scholarly misconduct? So, we did talk about where the cutoff should be, and we weren't sure if it would be easy to ever find a clear cutoff, except to say that typical student violations don't fall under this. And certainly if people have ideas of better ways to do that, please suggest them.

Petersen: Are there other questions?

Cutter: I guess I just have a question about the committees. Did you not specify who they would be made up of because of what you said earlier Scott (**Peters**), about this being policy, rather than the Faculty Handbook?

Peters: The Inquiry and Investigation Committees? I think we kept the composition of those committees—I think we kept them the same as they are in current policy, if I remember correctly. So, the—there is a requirement that if it is a faculty member who is accused, that a certain number of people on the committee be comprised of faculty members. But we have to remember that it's not necessarily a faculty member who's accused. It could be a P & S employee who does research, or something like that. We could say, "It's got to be all faculty." We could make that decision.

Cutter: I was just asking because it didn't say anything about the composition of the committees in this document.

Peters: Oh, Policy. Sorry. It's in Procedures. It is specified in the Procedures.

Cutter: And you just want to keep it in the Procedures?

Peters: Right. Yes. I'm sorry. Yes.

Cutter: Okay.

Petersen: Am I correct, Scott (**Peters**) in understanding that it's the Research Integrity Officer who is selecting that committee?

Peters: That is correct.

Petersen: So, one of the concerns—and again, correct me if I'm wrong, of some of the new members who were looking at this document with fresh eyes is that the Research Integrity Officer potentially would have too much power in this process?

Neuhaus: I think that's right, although I think they felt pretty good about the current one, but they were always wondering about the future. Perhaps a higher ratio of faculty—not necessarily all faculty, but there was a concern that you could end up with something that had very few faculty on there, and they thought there should be a little more peer participation in that.

Gordon: Although it says a 'majority.' If it's a faculty member, a majority—and if you're appointing three or five that makes it...I missed that conversation, which is why I'm asking the question.

Neuhaus: It's perhaps that's just something that the committee would like to discuss a little bit more themselves.

Petersen: We have the option of approving these suggested changes and moving them forward, or we can also refer this back to the committee with our comments and this discussion to guide them in some further revision. Is there a motion for either of those? Yes. Senator **Burnight**. We have a motion to refer this back to the committee. Is there a second? Thank you Senator **Gould**. Any additional discussion? All in favor of referring this policy back to the Educational Policy Committee for further revision, please indicate by saying "Aye." Any opposition? And any abstentions? Excellent. The motion then passes to refer it back to the committee. Thank you all for coming and sharing with us. I appreciate your time.

Petersen: Alright, this brings us to our next item on the docket, which is the consultation by Ken **Connelly**. I'm going to give Gretchen (**Gould**) just a moment to load the PowerPoint.

Gould: Can you tell me what number?

Petersen: Yes. The number is 1406.

Gould: There we go. Would you like to take over the keyboard during the PowerPoint?

Connelly: I can.

Gould: If it would be easier for you.

Connelly: Sure. I'm Ken **Connelly**. I'm the Director of Information Security for Information Technology here at UNI. I presume that you are aware of what phishing is—an attempt by a criminal to steal your information by either a webform or simply a reply to an email message. We propose to provide some phishing education to the campus by contracting with a vendor to send phishing messages to faculty and staff. The goal of this is to educate; to show people that do fall for these messages what clues they may have seen in the message that would have indicated that it was phishing and not a legitimate message. Our goal is education. It's never anything punitive. Why would we do this? Well it's happening all the time. The bad guys are doing it for fun and profit. They send messages that look like this. The text is a rather rambling request to participate in a survey, but they included a banner that looks like our banner. They included a photo of President **Nook**, and this actually showed up in people's in-boxes here. So we should do it to ourselves to provide education and training for the community. Here is another sample that came as a part of a penetration testing exercise that we did against our power plant this past spring. It is verbatim, except for one thing: What gets sent to people whose CAT ID passphrases are going to expire.

Wohlpart: What would be the clue? You all look at this.

Gould: It says '.org' instead of '.edu.'

Connelly: The link is not a uni.edu link. It is an access.uni.org link. This was sent to seven people, and four of those seven responded to it. So, this is what kind of tipped the scales and said we really need to make sure that people understand what to look for, and help them identify things that—whoops, this is not real. This

is no longer breaking news, but an indication of how pervasive this can be. We have had volunteers from selected departments on campus that said, “Yes, you should phish us because we have important information that we protect.” But, all it takes is one person to fall for a phish, and then Google doesn’t pay nearly as much attention to messages that come from uni.edu to other uni.edu addresses. Things that come in from the outside—they have a level of scrutiny that they apply. Once it’s coming from the inside, it’s far less than that. At another university roughly the size of UNI here in the States, one person fell for a phishing message and they ended up with 200 compromised accounts because the additional messages came from the inside, so we need to educate everybody, not just HR, not just OBO, but everyone on campus. What we are going to do is to send a series of messages throughout this academic year. We’re going to start next month. October is national cyber security awareness month, so it gets a lot of press and a lot of attention on the IT front. We’re going to finish by April. Roughly monthly, but not every month absolutely, but kind of that perspective. And there will be messages sent to all in the campus community—not students, but faculty and staff. And if someone does respond, they will get a rather immediate little bit of training about ‘Here was the message, here are one, two, three different things in this message that could have told you that it was not real. Look for those the next time.’

O’Kane: Why aren’t the students included?

Connelly: The numbers of people that are involved. When we talk about our employees, it’s a couple thousand, and if we include students, that gets multiplied

by six or so. So, it's the quantity. Students are certainly susceptible to this as well, but we'll see what else we can come up with to educate students.

Wohlpart: They also wouldn't have access to as much sensitive information as other folks.

Connelly: Yes. That's true.

Wohlpart: They couldn't get into the accounts.

Connelly: So we're going to finish up by April, because I know May is the tag-end of the year, and people are anxious to do other things: travel and other activities. On campus, this has a lot of support. The Security Working Group was a group that was set by President **Ruud** and continues yet today. It came to be as a result of the income tax issues that we had several years ago, and it was designed and encourage to promote advances in security for the campus in terms of IT things. They're responsible for the multi-factor authentication. They're responsible for the hardening of systems to make them more secure in everyday use; a variety of activities and things have come about because of the Security Working Group. There are a lot of universities across the States that do self-phishing; phishing education of people. So far, Iowa and Iowa State don't do that, but they tend to follow our lead sometimes on IT things. So we'll show them that this is a good thing to do. This is a very routine thing in the private sector. John Deere, hospitals, those insurance companies: They do this all the time to their employees. As I said, we had several directors and department heads that volunteered and said, "Yeah. I want to participate." But we thought we should go wider, because all it takes is one or two people to fall for this and then you have a

much greater chance of others getting messages that they will react to. So we're going to do all P & S. We're going to do all Merit, We're going to do all faculty. Any other questions? I should have said to chime in as you...

Stafford: So I'm not sure exactly how this will work. So, you're going to send out a fake phish...

Connelly: Yes.

Stafford: And if somebody responds and clicks on whatever they shouldn't be clicking on, they'll be taken to a place where they get the message, "You shouldn't have done that, and here's why, and here's what you need to know." Or, will they get an email back saying, "You shouldn't have done that."

Wohlpart: No. We will take them to a special place. [Laughter]

Stafford: What exactly will happen?

Connelly: It will be all in the web session. If you click on the link, you'll go to a page that might look like our CAT login page and you put in your CAT ID and your passphrase, and you click 'submit' and it will come back and say, "Here was the message you saw," and maybe some circles around, "Here was one clue. Here was Clue Number Two that you should not have followed this link and this message."

Stafford: This will be very clear this is coming from UNI Security, so that...? I can understand how somebody might go, "Oh my God. Now what have I done?"

Unless it's very clear that this is internal and from the people who are trying to protect us.

Connelly: The vendor will not collect any information that gets submitted. They will simply make note of who it was, and send them on to a page that is our page and we say okay.

Stafford: That you've designed that says, "Just so you know, here's what you did, and here's why you shouldn't have done that. And just for the future, be very clear..."

Wohlpart: What we hope people will do when they get a message like that is to forward that Ken Connelly or to the working group. That's what you're supposed to do. If you get a phishing message, you need to forward it to the folks at IT so they're aware of it. So that they can take action. That's what we hope people will do.

Stafford: It is. Okay.

Connelly: This--I've started the process of explaining this in an "Inside UNI" item that's coming out tomorrow I hope, and it's going to talk about the basics of what we're trying to do. What we're trying to accomplish. It's a learning experience for me as well. So if the first responsive page isn't what people expected to see, I absolutely welcome feedback about...

Stafford: You designed it so it doesn't evoke fear that, "Oh, wow. What have I done now? Is this all a joke? What is going on?"

Connelly: That's correct.

Stafford: I think it needs to be really clear that this was just a test, and "We're just here to educate you. What you did was this. What you should have done was this."

Connelly: Right. Exactly.

Mattingly: In the past, when I would get a message that was obviously phishing, I would forward it to CBA Tech, which was our College tech people. Now would that go to Service Hub?

Connelly: You can send it to Service Hub. You can send it to Security@uni.edu. You can send it to Phishing@uni.edu. We've got a variety of potential targets. Security is my team. Phishing is the Postmaster, Nick **Frerichs** and his crew. Service Desk is the Service Desk people that work and help to answer questions people have, and all of those are certainly potential targets for sending—forwarding things that you think are a problem and that should be addressed. It's kind of a game of Whack-a-mole. When you see something and you send it to the right people, by then it's really probably too late because it's probably come to everyone who's going to get it. But, we can take steps to take down websites. We can take steps to try to identify key phrases in the messages that will filter on this and maybe the next time somebody uses that same phrase it will go to Spam or it will just get rejected automatically. It's beneficial for us to see what you see, because they don't always send it to us to say, "Hey Security, is this going to pass your muster or not?" Having that forwarded is great for us.

Wohlpart: And you all also alert other institutions, right, when we get something that's coming? We'll forward it to Iowa and Iowa State and say that this is something that's happening on our campus—you might look for this. So it's helpful.

Gould: This is more of a comment than a question. You guys sent out the message about the fake phishing messages from President **Nook:** I think the subject line said: IT Security. And I was like, 'That seems a little generic,' and I hovered over it and saw it said Security@uni.edu. So I don't know if that's something the Security Group wants to consider, that they're the same. Like Uni@ITsecurity or something like that. Just a comment.

Petersen: So you're saying it gave it away?

Gould: It was suspicious to me because it was generic. It said like "IT Security."

Connelly: We discussed who that message should come from. Whether it should come from Marty **Mark** our CIO, or whether it should come from me, and we kind of thought it should be not quite like it's coming from one individual but from IT. I understand your...

Gould: The generic-ness.

O'Kane: I'm wondering what happens if recipients of the fake phish click Spam, will that break it from working?

Connelly: No.

O’Kane: You know what I’m saying? If I alert Google that this is Spam, will it not shut it down for other people?

Connelly: If enough people did that, it might have that effect on that particular round. If—and that’s okay. If that happens, we’ll adjust on our end for the next time around, and vary things enough that it will hopefully—20 people saying, “This is Spam,” for Google, won’t cause them to sideline the next 500 that come out.

Wohlpart: That might be considered a success.

Choi: I guess that the fake phish will be sent from an email account outside of UNI?

Connelly: We’re not going to tell you that. [Laughter]

Choi: Oh, so even UNI senders can be phished? Because so far for me, when I got suspicious email, I determine based on the sender: If the sender is uni.edu, then I trusted it more than other emails.

Connelly: It’s very easy to forge email messages; to say it’s from Joe when it’s from Jim. Who it says it’s from, you can’t necessarily put a lot of faith in that. If it’s somebody that you communicate with a lot, then does this look like their email messages? But if it’s a name that’s at UNI, you don’t necessarily—you aren’t necessarily able to believe that at face value.

Vallentine: I just wanted to mention that I serve on the Security Working Group and now there is a Faculty Senate representative that’s serving on that body as

well. And after this did presentation when Ken (**Connelly**) did it in the Security Working Group, I was really scrutinizing my email because I was sure he was going to send me one. I identified one. I sent one to him. I thought, “Ah, I found one,” and he said, “John, that’s just a blind copy.” Someone had sent me a blind copy of a message, so it is interesting. You look at your email differently.

Wohlpart: Is that why you’ve been deleting all my emails? [Laughter]

Vallentine: Maybe I won’t have to answer 20 messages from the Provost. [Laughter]

Ahart: You touched briefly on including students in this process maybe in the future integrating with a new program for students. Could you elaborate on what that may look like? I know that as a student, I receive—I know my email may be more accessible, or on the website more than a regular student’s email, but I know that I receive at least five a week—that I know are phishing emails, and that is quite annoying personally, and I know that someone may not know how to perceive whether that’s a phishing email or not.

Connelly: I get a number of forwards from students, not necessarily every day, but routinely that says, “This is a scam. This isn’t right,” and I always respond, “Thank you for sending this. You’re right. It’s too good to be true. You make \$500 for working two hours and that just doesn’t happen.” We haven’t really thought through yet about what this might look like for a student version someday.

Wohlpart: You actually know, we are way ahead of the curve. Iowa and Iowa State are not doing this yet. So we are way ahead of the curve, and I will say that

that is not uncommon for IT practice for our IT staff to be way ahead of the curve. So this is something that is fairly new and we're really trying to get ahead of it. And students will come.

Ahart: Okay. I think even the group of students that I hear this happening more frequently to are individuals on the Organization Leadership Pages. That may be a smaller portion of students to start with to include them in a process like this.

Petersen: Any other questions or comments for Ken (**Connelly**)? Great. Thank you so much for joining us today.

Connelly: Thank you.

Petersen: We have just about 15 minutes. We have two options. We certainly could move on and consider the Request for New Membership in Voting Faculty that was put forth by Senator **Hesse**. However, I know in my email to all of you I didn't anticipate we would get this far. So you might not be prepared to have that conversation. So we could also adjourn early, and that would mean the following meeting we would consider that request, as well as we have on the docket a Consultation for the General Education Revision Committee.

Skaar: Move to adjourn.

Petersen: And a second. Thank you. Then we are calling it a day. Thank you for doing your homework. It was a very productive meeting today.

Respectfully submitted,
Kathy Sundstedt

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

Next Meeting: 3:30 p.m. Monday, Sept.24, 2018
301 Rod Library (Scholar Space)
University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, Iowa