

Regular Meeting # 1770  
**UNI FACULTY SENATE**  
**Oct. 12th, 2015 (3:30 p.m. – 4:47 p.m.)**  
**Oak Room, Maucker Union**

**SUMMARY MINUTES**

1. Courtesy Announcements: **Summary of Main Points**

A. No members of the press were present

B. Faculty Chair **Peters** announced the first of a series of meetings about leadership at UNI to be held Friday, Oct. 30 at 3:30 with refreshments and wine served. Speakers include Dan **Power**, Kerri **Clopton**, John **Fritch** and Donna **Hoffman**. While working on voting rights for term and adjunct faculty last year, **Peters** learned that UNI has no stated policy regarding academic freedom and will work to address that this year. Peters briefly discussed the confidential early draft of the Pappas Report on the academic portion of the TIER study.

C. Faculty Senate Chair **O’Kane** said that faculty Chair **Peters** and he wrote a response to the Pappas Report, which has called for an increase in Distance Learning. He added that research about additional clientele for Distance Learning has not been done.

D. Provost **Wohlpart** had no comments.

2. Minutes/Transcript

Sept. 14, 2015 Approved **Walter/McNeal** All aye.

Sept. 28, 2015 Approved **McNeal/Kidd** All aye.

3. Consideration of Calendar Items for Docketing: No items.

4. New Business

\*Motion **Peters/Fenech** to schedule a 3:30 Consultative Session with the Emeritus Policy committee to review the policy and possible changes to how emeritus petitions are handled. All aye.

## 5. Consideration of Docketed Items

1283/1177

\*\* Motion to approve the offering of BAS degrees passes by roll call vote with amendment by **Kidd/Terlip** of Number Six under 'Liberal Arts Core' to say, 'Capstone course or one course from Category Three, Four or Five.'  
(For roll call vote, see full transcript pages 36-38)

\*\* Motion passes to approve the particular BAS programs (BAS LAC, Criminal Justice, Tactical Emergency Services with Vulnerable Populations)  
**Kidd/Terlip.**

1279/1174 Consideration of Changes to the Student Cod of Conduct.

\*\* Motion passes to support **Swan/Terlip.**

1284/1178 Emeritus Request for Rebecca Edmiaston and Carlin Hageman.

\* Motion passes to grant emeritus status. **Fenech/Cooley.**

6. Adjournment                   **Hakes/Kidd.**

### **Next Meeting:**

**Monday, October 26, 2015**

**Oak Room, Maucker Union**

**3:30 p.m.**

**Full Transcript follows of 47 pages, including 0 Addendum.**

**Regular Meeting**  
**FULL TRANSCRIPT of the**  
**UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING**  
**Oct.12th, 2015 (3:30 p.m. - 4:47 p.m.)**  
**Oak Room, Maucker Union**  
**Mtg. # 1770**

**Present:** Ann **Bradfield**, John **Burnight**, Jennifer **Cooley**, Forrest **Dolgener**, Todd **Evans**, Xavier **Escandell**, Lou **Fenech**, Gretchen **Gould**, David **Hakes**, Tim **Kidd**, Bill **Koch**, Ramona **McNeal**, Joel **Pike**, Nicole **Skaar**, Jesse **Swan**, Michael **Walter**.

**Not Present:** Aricia **Beckman**, Leigh **Zeitz**.

**Guests:** Parker **Bennett**, Aaron **Friel**, Mark **Gray**, Sarah **Hofmeyer**, Lisa **Jepsen**, Gayle **Rhineberger-Dunn**, Diane **Wallace**.

**O’Kane:** Good afternoon everybody. It is 3:30 pm on a lovely Monday afternoon. Welcome everybody back. Do we have any press here today? No press here today. Provost **Wohlpert** will be a little bit late, so Faculty Chair **Peters**, if you don’t mind giving us your comments now.

**Peters:** Sure an announcement went out today for the first meeting in that Leadership series that the Provost’s Office and Steve (**O’Kane**) and I have been working on. That’s going to be Friday the 30<sup>th</sup>, October 30<sup>th</sup> at 3:30. Some form of refreshments will be provided. Wine will be provided. I’ll say that again. Wine will be provided. So the hope is at the end of a week we can get together and talk a little bit about leadership at the University; what makes for a good leader. I forgot to bring the list of speakers: Dan **Power**...

**Cobb:** Dan **Power**, Kerri **Clopton**, John **Fritch** and Donna **Hoffman**. So it's a panel presentation-discussion.

**Peters:** Another thing I'm working on this year if you'll recall from last year, the issue of voting rights for term and adjunct faculty members who, particularly those who have been here for a long time and are part of the life of the University, last year a committee that I put together endorsed the idea of granting those rights, provided that some sort of protection for them could be built in to the shared governance process and as I've been thinking about ways to do that, I realized that we really on campus, we don't have any sort of policy, unlike many—maybe most universities—we don't have any sort of the policy that affirms our commitment to academic freedom, or has protections built in for shared governance. And so, I'm going to be working with other groups on campus to try to develop such a policy. Obviously that would come before the Senate for discussion at some point, but I'm starting out. Next week I believe, I'm going to talk to the NISG Senate about academic freedom on campus and shared governance and the importance of developing some kind of policy there. And finally, I don't know, I forgot to check with Steve (**O'Kane**) if he was going to mention this: There was a draft report of the Pappas Report. That's the TIER Efficiency Study report on academic programs. The Regents asked that that draft be held confidential, and with some reservations, I agreed not to send it out. Steve (**O'Kane**) and I agreed not to send it out to people. We do expect that there will be some changes to the recommendations they made, but the good news is for UNI is that we come out looking very well on the reports,

particularly on the enrollment management side of the report. We at one time thought might involve a review of academic programs in terms of how well each academic program is doing in terms of time to graduation and things like that. It doesn't cover anything like that. It basically identifies; it compares each university to its peers and we come out looking very good compared to our peer institutions. In terms of online education, the Regents are likely to, I think based on the draft report, recommend more online programs be adopted. But I'll say that one thing that I thought was notable from the report is that statewide, the three universities already educate more students online than Arizona State University, which is held up as an exemplar of online education. So, if the Regents, it seems to me if the Regents want to promote online education, one place we can start is by saying 'We're already a leader in online education,' and they can promote that message. We'll see how that goes, and obviously we'll pay close attention to that.

**O'Kane:** Thanks, Scott. The Provost isn't here yet, so I'll just give my very brief comments. My comments again refer to the Pappas Report. Both Scott (**Peters**) and I wrote...together wrote a response to that. Just to second what Scott said about the Distance Education, the report is asking for a huge influx or a huge increase in the amount of Distance Education. No one has really done the research to see if the clientele exists for that. So, we need to stay tuned on that. Given that the Provost isn't here, I think we can move ahead briefly to approve the past minutes. Finally the website is 100% functional. 100%! So can I have a motion that we approve the

minutes from September 14<sup>th</sup>? So moved my Senator **Walter**, seconded by Senator **McNeal**. Is there any discussion concerning those minutes?

Therefore there's none. All in favor of approval say 'aye,' against, 'nay.' Any abstentions? Okay, can I have a motion to approve the minutes for September 28<sup>th</sup> 2015? So moved by Senator **McNeal**, second by Senator **Kidd**. Any discussion of those minutes? Seeing none, all in favor of approving the minutes from September 28<sup>th</sup> say 'aye,' against say 'nay.' Any abstentions? Okay. Motion passes. Thank you. We don't have any docket items to consider today for docketing. Faculty Chair **Peters**, do you have some New Business?

**Peters:** Yes. I'd like to ask the Senate to docket...I guess the best way to do this would be to do a Consultative Session with the Emeritus Faculty Policy Review Committee. (I don't really know what that's called.)

**Cobb:** We didn't call ourselves any kind of committee.

**Peters:** A consultative session to discuss changes to the policy on emeritus faculty. So that's the motion.

**O'Kane:** Is there a second for that motion? Seconded by Senator **Fenech**.

**Peters:** Senator **Fenech** and I were on this committee together with Associate Provost **Cobb** and...

**Cobb:** Michelle **Byers** and Tolif **Hunt**.

**Peters:** Michelle **Byers** and Tolif **Hunt** and the policy...the State Auditor has gone through our policies and is required ...sorry—Not the State Auditor, the auditors who work for the Board of Regents.

**Cobb:** Internal auditors.

**Peters:** ...has gone through our policies and is requiring us to update certain policies, and this is one that is being updated. It sounds like his office...the auditor wants this done sooner rather than later, and the Provost's Office has already held them off over the summer until faculty could get back on campus. Is that accurate?

**Cobb:** That's accurate.

**Peters:** And so that's going to enter into the policy process. The change to policy is not that significant at this point, but I think it's a good time to have a brief discussion before the Senate about whether, since we're going through the policy process anyway, whether we want to keep handling emeritus petitions in the way we traditionally have. It's come up in my time sitting with the Senate. It's come up twice about whether we want to keep doing it this way. Let's have a brief discussion about it. I think particularly some universities automatically give people emeritus status. There might be other options. So that would be the motion: Reviewing the policy and then have a brief discussion of how we handle emeritus petitions.

**O'Kane:** I'm a little unclear about how to proceed on that to get it docketed. Does anybody know? Senator **Swan**?

**Swan:** With whom do you want a consultative session? From what you just said it sounds like a committee of the whole or a quasi-committee of the whole where this body discusses? In either case, the motion would be to schedule a meeting where that takes place. So you would schedule a meeting of the whole to discuss this topic and come up with anything we might want to do and then that would be calendared and then docketed. But we could have a consultative session. You mentioned a group, or maybe an appropriate administrative officer who knows about this or the auditor, to have the consultative session with him or them, and then make a proposal that would be calendared and docketed. Those people could also come to a meeting where we're in the quasi-committee of the whole. So it doesn't have to be a consultative session.

**Peters:** Either one would work for me. And I honestly don't envision it being a lengthy discussion. The policy itself is very simple and the suggested changes are very short, so it's mostly a chance to get the Senate's feedback on whether we want to keep doing things the way that we've been doing things. Whatever is easiest and simplest: I'll defer to the Chair.

**O'Kane:** Any further discussion?

**Swan:** So it sounds like we just want to talk among ourselves. We wouldn't want to have a committee talk about it and propose something to us? If everybody here wants to talk about it, we should do that it seems to me.



**O’Kane:** I suggest that we add a consultative session to New Business for next time.

**Swan:** With whom?

**O’Kane:** With your committee, correct?

**Peters:** Sure.

**O’Kane:** With the committee here.

**Swan:** So then your motion is to have a consultative session with the committee first thing at the next meeting, and then after the session, we’ll move into our regular meeting.

**O’Kane:** We can certainly do it that way.

**Swan:** Is that the motion?

**Peters:** Yes.

**O’Kane:** Is there a second to that motion?

**Swan:** There is a second?

**Peters:** It was already seconded.

**O’Kane:** Further discussion? All in favor say ‘aye,’ opposed, ‘nay.’ Abstentions? Motion passes. If I heard it correctly, we’ll be having this prior to the regular meeting.

**Swan:** But at 3:30 we’ll have the consultative session. When that’s closed, then the regular meeting will open.

**O’Kane:** Very good. Provost **Wohlpart**’s here.

**Wohlpart:** My apologies for being late.

**O’Kane:** That’s very okay. Your comments?

**Wohlpart:** I have none. [laughter]

**O’Kane:** We’ve got stuff to talk about, gang. We’ve got number 1177, which is the curriculum proposal for new degrees et cetera. We left off last time talking about whether or not we would as the Senate body, approve of the BAS degree here at UNI. And several of you agreed that we needed a little bit further discussion on that so, now’s the time to jump in on that discussion. Anybody have anything they wish to add? [Pause] Wow. I’m amazed. Yes, Senator **Hakes**.

**Hakes:** Didn’t we have concerns about a firewall between undergraduate courses and BS and BA courses and the BAS courses, and then some suggestion that there never was a firewall? It makes it appear as if there’s no firewall, that this is just a movement of BA and BS courses to being online, and the leftover space is used by regular BA and BS students, and if some BAS students take those classes, that would be great. Now, it seems originally it seems we wanted a firewall that was one direction. There’s no problem with a BAS student that’s enrolled taking a BA or BS class, but not the other way around. That seems to have been broken down. Senator **Swan** and I discussed this after the last meeting. Am I summarizing roughly our conversation?

**Swan:** Yes. Yes that's right.

**Kidd:** It's my understanding that if the course would be acceptable for a major in the BA and BS major, that would be true. However, a lot of the courses and the BAS degrees are different than courses which are acceptable for a BA or BS major. So at most they'd be used as electives except if the course is the same for the shared Liberal Arts Core. I don't understand the concern, I guess if BAS courses don't count for the degree.

**Swan:** Chair, could you repeat what Senator **Kidd** said?

**Kidd:** I'm sorry, I've got a little cold here.

**O'Kane:** Could you give us that again?

**Kidd:** Basically, I don't understand the concern because as far as I understand it, there are select BAS courses, which only apply to BAS degrees. And then there are shared courses, which could be applied to either degree. And then there are some shared Liberal Arts courses, which could be used for anyone. And so as far as I understand, any student could be able to take a BAS course per se, but it would not apply to their major. At most it would be a University elective, I guess.

**Swan:** Can I note that the Associate Provost is nodding her head? Saying that that appears to be correct, and you are saying that's correct?

**Dhanwada:** What Senator **Kidd** said.

**Swan:** That those are the regulations that just don't appear in the proposal, but that those are the regulations.

**Dhanwada:** The way that the programs are structured, because there were several proposals put forth, it is really is up to the department as to whether it will only be BAS students taking these courses, or that they will open it up to their other students, but not necessarily counting toward their major, but, being part of the coursework. So it would be an elective. They would have the opportunity to take these courses.

**Pike:** I'll tell you about where my confusion about that came in: The two proposals we were looking at, if I recall, basically took existing classes that were BA/BS classes and said, 'Well first, we're going to put up the classes only open for BAS students and if they don't fill up, we'll open them up.' Again, the way this was first proposed, at least in the College of Business; the way the proposal was presented to us, was this idea that we were trying to do was construct for a different population, a new degree program, not adapting existing courses and thus that was the argument for the firewall. Right? They're coming in with a different background and a different skill set and we're trying to develop a program that would get them somewhere where we're comfortable giving a bachelor's degree. That's my confusion. That doesn't seem to be what's actually taking place.

**Dhanwada:** You're right. That's what I was saying. It's a department's own choice on what they're going to allow. So yes, the College of Business-- that proposal that was put forward, basically they said all of their courses-- they

would not allow the students on campus to take those courses. Okay? Whereas, the courses from the Criminology or Criminal Justice BAS and the Tactical Emergency Services—both of those said ‘No.’ Criminal Justice actually has four new courses that are part of their BAS that they developed for it. But they said, ‘Yes. We’re going to allow our BAS students to take it first, but we’re also going to open it up to other majors if possible.’ Am I correct?

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** Gayle **Rhineberger-Dunn**, Criminology; one of the BAS programs under discussion. In all of the meetings I have been to about the BAS, I never once heard the word ‘firewall’ for keeping these classes separate, ever, in any discussion that started last year, and I went to a number of meetings. It was never discussed that we couldn’t, or they couldn’t, and I frankly don’t know why we would want to. We have graduate students in this University who are taking undergraduate classes for graduate credit. I’m not sure if we allow that, why wouldn’t we want BAS students in with our BA students? They might have some different – they’re going to have some different needs, but that’s up to the faculty to build in some additional... deficiencies if they have it. If they have it-- we’re presuming they have it—because some of them may not. It would be a mistake to separate, at least in our major, to separate these students into different categories and treat them as second-class citizens. It’s just not appropriate. This is a different degree, with a different title and most people will understand that this is not a BA. It’s a BAS. There are some different criteria that come with that. We’re comfortable with that. Some

of the courses do count in both of our programs. Some of them don't. Our students have at least 36 credit hours beyond the major in the LAC that they need to take. If they choose not to double major, then they have a lot of extra credits to take, and they can certainly take these other classes as part of their University electives.

**O'Kane:** Thank you. Senator **Pike**?

**Pike:** I wasn't saying 'second-class citizen.' Because again, it kind of comes back from my question: This was presented: that what we want to do is to develop a program--I'm just telling you how this was presented to us and we spent a lot of time discussing how to put that together. This was presented: We have a group of students that have a different skill set: a professional background and an applied degree, but not necessarily an academic background—so build a program that would bring them to a level where we'd be comfortable giving them a bachelor's degree. My question would be: If we're not doing that, then why do we need a new degree?

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** But we are doing that in some ways by adding new courses. Courses that we are adding a very new and are very specific for people who are working in the field or will want to go into the field, because some of the people that will take our degree are not currently working. They can't get a job in the field until they get that BA, or they can't get promoted until they get that BAS.

**Peters:** Just to put point on the question of preferring BAS students to enroll in certain classes, it's not like this is new on campus. A lot of

programs already do this in existing courses or programs, right? They allow majors first and only then open them up to others? This happens routinely across campus, so that's nothing new. That's something that doesn't have to be approved by the Faculty Senate or doesn't get written in the catalog anywhere. It just happens.

**Swan:** So what's new, is that we're creating courses for a place-bound population with no academic background, is the point of the AAS degree, is that it's not an academic degree like the AA degree is. Laura wants to talk after I...

**Terlip:** No.

**Swan:** They're technical degrees and we're designing something for them, and we want them to take BA classes. The firewall is to say that the BA student can't take those classes. We've always said last year that yes, the BAS, we want them to take BA classes. That's always what we want. Once they're taking the BAS classes, once they're taking the Liberal Arts Core, they're going to want to move over to a BA and that can be a possibility. But what we've always understood is that we won't have our BA students filling up the classes of the specific classes of the BAS and right now, today we've heard, 'Oh if a program in this degree wants that to happen, that will be okay.' And we're saying, 'No, that's not okay. That's a difference between the degrees.' If you want to take a BA degree, then you enroll in a BA degree program. If you're taking the BAS, it's specially designed for you coming with an AAS background. If you don't have the AAS, you can't get

into the BAS degree program. And so that is new. That is different. That's what the faculty I represent say they don't want: They don't want the BA students taking BAS classes.

**Gray:** Mark **Gray** from Anthropology. I don't know where this whole concept comes from. I'm like Gayle, I've been doing this for a year and I've not heard 'firewall' even once in that entire process. I have never heard any discussion whatsoever, that the BAS classes are going to be in any way different. All the classes that we are going to offer in our degree are regular classes. Generally speaking, taught by regular UNI faculty and only one is relatively new and it's being converted from an independent study course. The rest of them are taught by regular faculty. A couple of the introductory courses might be taught by adjuncts. No one has said that throughout this entire process that these are going to be different courses. Frankly, I find it's elitist to suggest that these people are coming in with an AAS degree are somehow intellectually inferior and now we're supposed to respond to them by not giving them the best courses that we have to offer.

**Terlip:** I would just second what Professor **Gray** has just said. In addition, we've talked a lot about the fact that most of things that are going to be shared are going to be general education courses and Jesse actually last year I remember you saying, 'Well why can't they take our Gen Ed courses?' And that's what we're letting them do now.

**Swan:** That's what we want them to do.

**Terlip:** Right.



**Swan:** That's why I said it. That's why I say it now. I don't think Laura's finished.

**Terlip:** Just because they restrict enrollment to one major first, that's done all the time. We have a priority for our majors in our own courses before we open it up to electives.

**Pike:** Again, that's the second time my remarks have been mischaracterized. I do **not** think these are second-class citizens, or that somehow they are inferior. What I was told that was that...again, I asked this the last time, then why don't we just transfer the AAS? Well they're not academic—and yet we're trying to put together a program to get them to a bachelor's equivalent. Again, that's how we designed it. I'm just going from what we did: We put together a program saying, 'Okay, people are coming in with a certain skill set, and here's where we want to get them to.' Our normal students are not coming in at that same place, and don't need to get to that same place in that period of time. And so I'm not saying 'second class' or anything else. It's just that the whole point that was presented to us of having a new degree was we are dealing with a specific population that we can't accommodate through the current BA and BS, and if that's true, then the programs should be different.

**O'Kane:** Senator **Kidd**.

**Kidd:** A comment on 'why are there different degrees?' 'Why is there a BA degree?' It's because they have different requirements. This is a BAS

degree. It has to be a different degree because it has different requirements. The reason it has different requirements is because they have an Associate's, an AAS degree, or whatever it's called—AAS—and if they were to try to get a BA degree it would take them close to four years to get a BA degree. So the idea is to create a different form of degree with different requirements in which they can complete in two years. That's the purpose.

**Pike:** That goes back to my point of last time. So why would it take them nearly four years? Because we do not allow those credits to transfer in, and if we do not allow those credits to transfer in—there's got to be a reason for that. So if what we're trying to do is construct, again, a program designed to take somebody with that skill set and background and get them to a bachelor's level in two years, then it's hard for me to see how either (a) we should be transferring credits in a way that would more accurately reflect the skill sets they bring, or we need to cram more into that two years to get that to that level. It's hard for me to see why...

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** One of the things that we talk about is that the different requirements, right? These courses do transfer in, from AAS programs, but they transfer in as elective credit. Just as our military students transfer in some of their military that's not actually an academic setting credits to come in, they count as University electives. They're counting toward their degree. So do these AAS classes. The problem is that they're slightly more technical, and so they don't count in the Liberal Arts Core. They don't count in the major. So this is a different path. We need to

have a different program with--we wouldn't have to, but I don't know why we wouldn't want to-- that allows our students—our students can learn so much from each other in this process: our BAS students and BA students and you know, our own students transfer in all kinds —sixty-some credit hours from a community college. I guess I'm still a little bit flabbergasted that we're not on board with the idea that we have a real opportunity to advance higher education in Iowa; that there is a body of students who need this degree. We are well situated to provide such a degree, for a specific group of students who can then learn more from our existing BA students, if they're allowed to have classes together. Our own students can benefit from some of those courses, but they're not part of their degree program.

**Peters:** Building on that, there are people out there, influential people, people with money who are trying to tear down four-year college degrees. If you read the *Chronicle* or *Inside Higher Ed*, you'll see a story on this every day-- people promoting badges and alternative credentialing systems and what have you. There are people who want to get rid of higher education and want to credential people for very specific skills and who do not see the value of the liberal arts or a four-year degree. I guess, when I look at the BAS, I see...and I'll admit like a lot of you around the table, I have...Is it a new thing? Yes. Am I a little unsure of it? Yes. But, when I look at it in that context of where we are in higher ed today, I see us saying that we see the value in the liberal arts; that we can demonstrate to students and prospective employers that they can get these types of degrees and

increase their prospects and become better and more fully engaged and more fully informed citizens in their communities. So I kind of like the idea that in response to people who are trying to tear down four-year degrees, that we respond to this by saying, 'No. We think there is a place for a four-year degree in this atmosphere. That we still see value in liberal arts education and coupling it in a new way with kind of more technical, field-specific education that people want.'

**Evans:** To clarify the issue: It's not that your students would be taking these for their... replacing their required courses, that the traditional students might be taking, BAS students would be taking these as University electives.

**Hakes:** Yeah, but never as a major?

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** We have a couple of classes that might overlap because they wouldn't be taught any differently. We would not reduce the quality or the kind of stuff in the class. If anything we would add—if--depending on the needs of the students, there was some--they may or may not, we have no idea, have not as good writing skills—but I'm telling you, some of my BA students can barely write. So it's... We've got issues in our own body of students that these AAS students will have. But the content of the classes that do overlap wouldn't change. Why would we not even think to dumb it down, make it differently, make it more technical. That's not our purpose: This is a liberal arts education, and our courses are going to be that way...

**Evans:** Well if the issue ...Couldn't the compromise then be, for a traditional student, you can't take more than 'X' number of credits of a BAS program

to count for your degree or something along those lines--if you're looking for a firewall, or something like that?

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** I'm not in favor of such firewalls. I will defer.

**Terlip:** I guess my perception is that we don't tell Bachelor of Science students which University electives they can't take as many Bachelor of Arts courses as they want, so why would we reverse it and discriminate against people?

**Evans:** I was merely making a suggestion to get past this issue, but...

**Swan:** That's because the difference between the Bachelor of Science and the Bachelor of Arts is that you have to have more requirements for the Bachelor of Science, but otherwise they're both academic degrees with the same academic requirements coming into it. So that's why there can be a lot of sharing. It's easy to go back and forth between the BA and the BS degrees. But this is an entirely different student population that we're trying to serve here, and we want to be able to serve them and the best way to serve them is to provide them what they need, but what they need is sometimes not what the BA students need. That's what we're talking about. We're not talking about the degree. Most of us last year said, 'Of course we need this degree and we need to then set up the standards so we know what kinds of programs will be generated for this degree, that's not just cannibalizing—that's what some people say-- a BA program. Right? They are supposed to be distinct; attracting a distinct population, right? And that's why there's this discussion and always has been, of this one-way

firewall that you can't have already-present BA students choosing to take certain classes for their degree at all, even as electives, because that's then for their degree-- anything that's for them. You can have the BAS student in certainly take the Liberal Arts Core courses. We can also have special ones made up for them. But we don't have to, we've been talking about, but we can. And if we do make up one special for that degree, then BA students couldn't take that one. But if we don't and it's just the regular Liberal Arts Core course, then of course then everybody can take them. But then you were talking about having cohorts. And so it would be the same Liberal Arts Core, but it would only be the BAS students because it's in a cohort. That's fine too, because you're administratively excluding BA and BS students, but we're talking now about the degree and the requirements that make this degree distinct and appropriate for the population that we're seeking, and making sure that it's not itself contaminated by students that it's not made for. That can actually radically change the dynamic in there. The elitism can go that way: That we're actually providing them an elite education for themselves. This red herring of thinking that the BA is somehow the elitist program: it's not. We're talking about two very different kinds of degrees. Why we creating a BAS degree and stick with it, and not make it so it's so amorphous that almost anything can happen, and in effect we're supporting academic programs through BAS students that wouldn't maybe be able to stand on their own. Or otherwise, the BAS student's programs cannibalize the BA programs. So those are some issues that are operating here, when people are talking about having a distinct firewall, a one-way firewall from BA into BAS. When they don't have the --the BA students--

don't have the requirements to be in the BAS programs. They don't have the background in work background or credentialing background that AAS degree. So it's another reason to say we don't—they shouldn't be, in a specialized course for the BAS. They actually don't qualify to be in those. So I actually don't know why it's not a good thing. You could think of it that way, for BAS students to say, 'No. These other students can't take these classes.'

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** Another point on the classes. Some of the classes that we're teaching in the BAS program are content-specific courses that any student who graduates with a degree should have. Any person working in the criminal justice system should take a course on victimology, because too often frankly, police officers and probation/parole officers do not understand victims, and we want them to graduate with that. We cannot physically even, the number of--we have a high number of students and a low number of faculty in criminology, we couldn't possibly create a whole new program without adding two more faculty, which we're not going to get any time soon. But beyond that, the courses that do overlap, are from our judgment as Ph.Ds. that these courses are content specific and needed in those degree programs. We want to produce in our case, the best possible police officers, the best possible probation-parole, residential juvenile treatment officers--that they should have that content. Why would we change it for AAS students?

**Swan:** You wouldn't.

**Kidd:** We've had a discussion on this firewall business. I was wondering if we could take a quick opinion on if we should worry about this as in if we could ask to say raise their hands if they want to have a firewall, which blocks BA or BS students from taking BAS courses.

**O'Kane:** We could certainly do that or we could just move on the motion.

**Kidd:** I have other questions about that motion that I'd like to discuss. But I think this part of the discussion has seen ample time, I guess.

**O'Kane:** Let us then take a sense of the Senate vote. Senator **Kidd** if you would phrase it the way you'd like?

**Kidd:** Sure. Who would be in favor of establishing some kind of firewall which would prevent BA or BS students from taking courses designated for BAS—absolutely prevent it?

**O'Kane:** I see four hands raised and one maybe; five hands raised.

**Kidd:** And then, who would not be in favor of such a firewall?

**O'Kane:** Ten hands are up.

**Kidd:** It seems that that would pass the Senate. I would like to move if we could, to other aspects of the proposal.

**O'Kane:** That's fine with me.

**Kidd:** Of course I can't eliminate discussion, but it seems that we've heard both sides. One thing I've noticed is that in the description it says that '60



semester hours applicable transcript from coursework completed as part'...It doesn't specifically say that you must have an AAS degree. At least to my mind it seems vague. Maybe I'm wrong and just reading it incorrectly.

**Swan:** That's the first sentence. It says you must have an AAS.

**Kidd:** It's not under "Requirements for the BAS." I would like it specific. It doesn't say you have completed an AAS degree, and I don't know if we need to be specific about that.

**Dhanwada:** In that first line?

**Kidd:** Sure. Yeah. Like 'Must complete an AAS degree which includes at least 60 credits.' That's all.

**O'Kane:** Thank you.

**Kidd:** The second thing is, I have a question about whether we can actually exclude other Liberal Arts Core classes, because the legislature said that we must accept transfer credit from community colleges. So, in the first line under "Liberal Arts Core Requirements, it says 'BA students are permitted transfer courses...No other non-UNI classes can be applied to fulfill the LAC portion of the BAS degree.' I'm not sure we're allowed to do that, because the legislature says we have to accept these classes, and they have to be accepted verbatim. We have transfer agreements from all the two-year colleges.

**Dhanwada:** So many of those courses, the reason why we have nine hours is because those are the ones that usually transfer over.

**Kidd:** I understand that.

**Dhanwada:** There's not other courses that necessarily transfer over.

**Kidd:** What I'm saying is let's say they start their BAS degree. In the summer they take Western Civ. at Hawkeye. Why couldn't they transfer that?

**Dhanwada:** If they've started the BAS degree, sure.

**Kidd:** It says here that 'no non-UNI classes could be used for the LAC degree. I don't think we are allowed to do that.

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** In part it's because if they have an AAS degree, we're already agreeing to transfer in the maximum number of credit hours. You can transfer in 65 hours total from a community college. You can transfer as many credits as you want from four-year institutions, but you can only transfer in...

**Dhanwada:** And it won't count towards your 120 hours.

**Kidd:** But you can still transfer 65, right?

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** You can transfer in 65 and make it count for university electives. That often happens.

**Kidd:** What I'm saying is that, by agreement, we must take these courses from two-year colleges. They must count for our courses in the Liberal Arts

Core. I don't see how we can prevent that from happening. It's just a matter of the agreements we have in place. Maybe I'm interpreting this wrong, but...Yes. I understand that you can stop it at 65, but...

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** I think that the issue there is that from these AAS programs, a lot of those ...

**Kidd:** It doesn't say that. It says 'non-UNI courses.'

**Dhanwada:** That was the part of the proposal from the LACC...

**Kidd:** I'm just saying that I don't think that our agreements allow us to do that. I'm not positive about this. I have a question that should be looked into.

**Dhanwada:** I will surely look into this.

**Kidd:** The thing would be like you could take a class at Iowa, and have that transfer-- these kind of things.

**O'Kane:** We will continue with the understanding that the language might subtly be changed for clarity.

**Kidd:** Sure.

**Swan:** Along those lines though, the point of that was, when this was presented, as an entirely online degree, was that whatever we put in the BAS, was to be taken from UNI online. You register for the classes here and pay for the classes here, and it would be in part a student enrollment issue.

That's one of the reasons it's in here: You must take these hours—register and pay for these hours, through UNI. It was held to be in accordance and appropriate with all applicable state laws last year and at the time and I think we should continue to do that—which is to continue to have students—we can have. That's why it's in here, to have the students enroll at UNI—not enroll in the BAS and then take courses at Hawkeye and transfer them in, as part of the BAS. It's very hard to manage a cohort that way if you let people in and then they can take several of these other courses elsewhere. All of this is of a piece. And that's part of the piece.

**Terlip:** When we talk about those transfer credits if they have an AAS they come in they've fulfilled the program. If they go to Hawkeye, they can't transfer in any more hours. They're done, so they would have to take courses at UNI. If its a four-year institution, we would accept those. If the University of Iowa wants to do it, are we going to say, 'No, your class isn't as good as ours'? I mean, we don't do that with anybody else. So I don't understand why this is an issue, honestly.

**Swan:** It's because it's a new degree. It was another feature of this degree. You're right. We're not making another BA degree. We're not making another BS degree. We're making a BAS degree with certain goals attached to it, and one of them was to create groups who would take whole classes and programs mostly or –it was originally--entirely online. This desire to promote online education, this is part of that. That's why we didn't want them to do what some BA students do: enroll here, but take a course from Hawkeye and transfer it in or at Iowa in the summer and transfer it in.

Those are options in the BA and BS, but we were making it not an option in the BAS for all of these other reasons that I can't remember all of them, but I've remembered a few and said a few.

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** I understand that, but the reality is that our BA students can transfer in a lot of classes from four-year institutions and only take 30-some credit hours—32 credit hours is all you have to take, and you get a degree from UNI. So if they take those classes at The University of Iowa or Iowa State, their liberal arts will transfer in. They still have to take 32 credit hours here. That's all our BA students technically have to take. So...I understand we want them to take classes here, but if they're taking them at four-year institutions, and transferring them in because they're not going to take them at Hawkeye after they transfer in the AAS. It's only going to be from four-year institutions, which is also what we allow for our BA students.

**Pike:** I just want to try to clarify what I heard from Senator **Kidd**, which was that you transfer in the credits from your AAS, which don't include some of the liberal arts classes. That we have agreements with community colleges that if they take those courses, that they would transfer in. So again, if I'm understanding your question correctly, that ...and I'm not sure that we want to not allow that. But again, we're looking at place-bound students. So you could have students from southern Iowa who have a local community college who might prefer to take a writing class there, and do it in person and transfer it in. And we have agreements that say that when you take those credits at community colleges, those credits transfer. Is that

the point you were making? I wanted to make sure I understood that correctly. That's the question really.

**Kidd:** You say it's 65 hours when you transfer from community colleges, that would be 60 from the AAS, then you would have five more you could transfer from community college. Is that correct?

**Dhanwada:** You could actually have, of the Liberal Arts Core, there could be nine transferred in.

**Kidd:** I'm saying that ...

**Dhanwada:** Into the LAC.

**Kidd:** My question is this: We have to allow those classes to transfer in as credit, for those classes here. And so I don't understand how you can tell that student, 'Yes, you've taken this class. Now you have to take it again, because you have taken the exact same class by our agreement.'

**Dhanwada:** They don't have to take the exact same class because within the LAC, the category, there's multiple choices that they can take.

**Kidd:** Depends, but okay.

**Dhanwada:** So if they took a Psychology course, then they could take a Sociology course. They don't have to take the same course in the Category Five. So there's choice among those categories, so they don't have to take the same class. What we're allowing though, is within those Core Competencies, that we are saying that of your AAS degree, if you did take

math, if you did take oral com; those are the things that we will let you bring in. So then the number of electives goes up, because the LAC goes down.

**Terlip:** Just a couple of things. One, I think those articulation agreements are specific for the BAS degree, so we wouldn't have to accept them. Secondly, and this may be premature, I don't know. It seems like we've spent a lot of time on this already, and I don't know if anybody else has any questions that haven't specifically been addressed. If they do not, I would like to call the question.

**Kidd:** I have one more from Senator **Swan** at the last meeting. Senator **Swan** had a proposal I believe to modify the Liberal Arts Core requirement of the BAS degree to say that Category Six could be Capstone and/or one of the Category Two through Five class. Is that correct?

**Swan:** Yes.

**Kidd:** So I think that would be something that we should consider before we vote on the whole proposal. How would do we consider that?

**Swan:** We can keep talking about it, and have a sense. We're not doing the firewall thing because of what you just did, right? So if we have a sense that we want to do this, then we make a motion to amend.

**Kidd:** Yeah. Okay.

**Dhanwada:** One of the reasons the Capstone course was put in, again, this is part of a Liberal Arts Core requirement. The Capstone is supposed to be a Capstone class: it's supposed to entail a discussion. It is a smaller class kind of synthesizing all of that. That's part of their degree and that's why they included that specific course. They left the Capstone requirement in.

**O'Kane:** There would have to be a motion...

**Kidd:** In response to that, I would say the Capstone in practice is probably one of the least respected liberal arts classes by my students. The class is sometimes incredible and often it doesn't have any standards, to put it mildly. So I guess I'm not personally offended if we allow that to be changed for a different class, because too often it seems that the Capstone class is not up to what I would say, par. That's a personal opinion.

**Swan:** So and for that, it makes all the points I made from my constituents, and one that came from me, that one was again, thinking about the students that we said we were trying to serve—reach and serve—with this degree, which were place-bound students, who were going to do the degree here entirely online. (That's always been the original concept, the thought was.) It's very hard to imagine the ideal Capstone being made into an online environment class whereas these other categories which they're not getting as much as the BA/BS students to begin with, if they elected to do one of those, that would be good for them. Those constituents, my colleagues who talked to me about it, offer very fine online classes relative to, I imagine what Capstone could be in part maybe because their



experiences match what Senator **Kidd** talked about in face-to-face classes; that it doesn't improve in an online environment. That's why the proposal was to just make that an option; not change it. They could still take the Capstone. It's just another option. All of the proposals were just adding options to the degree. Again, I think that's a good idea.

**O'Kane:** Could I ask for a sense of the Senate on this suggestion?

**Dhanwada:** I'm hesitant. I understand where Senator **Kidd** is coming from because I've heard similar comments. I think that before you take a sense, I think that's fine, as long as there's an 'or,' and not removing it.

**O'Kane:** So the suggestion is to add an 'or.'

**Dhanwada:** Or.

**Terlip:** Could you repeat which options were talking about here?

**Swan:** So for Number Six, under 'Liberal Arts Core' Category Six: Capstone—so right now it says 'Required: Capstone experience. One course,' and it would say, 'Capstone experience or one course from Category Two, Three, Four or Five.'

**Terlip:** Since Capstone is an upper division course. I would like if we're going to do that, it should be an upper division course.

**Swan:** Those categories typically don't have division courses.

**Terlip:** That's my concern because it's supposed to be at a higher level.

**O’Kane:** Okay. Let’s get a sense of the Senate. How many of you would wish to amend the proposal as stated? Raise your hands, please. [counts] Twelve ayes. And those opposed? One opposed.

**Swan:** So I guess Senator **Kidd** is making a motion to amend.

**Kidd:** I’d like to make a motion to amend the proposal to say instead saying, ‘Capstone Experience, one course of three hours OR an additional course from Categories Two through Five would be accepted for LAC.’

**Swan:** Second.

**O’Kane:** Second by Senator **Swan**. Any further discussion on that? All in favor, please say, ‘aye,’ against, ‘nay.’ Abstentions? Motion passes. We are once again running up against a time deadline.

**Peters:** I have a question that I think will be a quick one. This is...we don’t offer a lot of online or primarily online undergraduate programs, and one thing that I understand to be important in online programs is active support in order to ensure persistence and retention. Do we have a plan for that either centrally, or is that something that’s handled by individual departments?

**Dhanwada:** In terms of continuing through the programs?

**Peters:** Yes. In terms of continuing through the programs.

**Dhanwada:** You’re right. I don’t think that we have too many, but we do have some specifically at the graduate level. We have several programs

that are purely online programs, and I think that we can certainly...the programs that have come forward, they have not mentioned; there was no discussion, but I'm sure that those kind of practices that we do put in place for the cohort programs at the graduate level could be definitely instituted, could be discussed at the undergraduate level as well.

**Terlip:** I think also, at least my understanding was, that those folks would go through the Quality Training through Continuing Ed. and they talk a lot about putting in discussion and engagement into the course before it's approved.

**Dhanwada:** Right.

**O'Kane:** Senator **Terlip**, it's unclear if you have a motion on the floor.

**Terlip:** Yes. I would like to call the question.

**O'Kane:** How do we proceed on that?

**Swan:** As long as there is a second you can vote on closing down discussion.

**O'Kane:** Is that a second, Senator **Cooley**?

**Cooley:** No, it's not. I think there's another question on the table left from two weeks ago.

**Swan:** I need a second for the motion at hand. We'll have to table the question. I'm sorry to close discussion.

**Kidd:** I'll second it.

**O’Kane:** Second by Senator **Kidd**. All in favor that we call the question, say ‘aye.’ Those opposed, ‘nay.’ We’re going to have to have a hand vote. So all in favor please raise your hand. [Counting] Nine in favor of the motion. Those against? [Counting] Six. Motion passes. So, it seems to me we’re at a spot where we need to vote on the motion.

**Swan:** I’d like a roll call vote.

**O’Kane:** That’s fine. We’re asking for a roll call vote and the motion is that we pass the BAS degree. So would you like to start, Senator **Swan**?

**Swan:** The Secretary usually calls the roll and we respond. Are you ready? Is somebody ready to record if we start with me?

**Terlip:** I’ll take it. She’s got it recorded too. Yes, I’m ready.

**Swan:** Should we start here and go around?

**Terlip:** Senator **Swan**?

**Swan:** Is Laura going to call a roll?

**Terlip:** That’s what you asked for, correct?

**Swan:** And is that what you’re going to do? So you’re starting? Senator **Swan**, no.

**Cooley:** Could you clarify what we’re voting on at this point?

**Terlip:** Passing the motion: The BAS degree.

**O’Kane:** The BAS degree with the amendments. We need to get this read into the record. We’re going that way. We need the names in the record.

**Cooley:** My name is Jennifer **Cooley** and my vote is no.

**O’Kane:** Senator **Fenech**?

**Fenech:** I’m Senator **Fenech** and my vote is aye.

**Escandell:** Aye.

**Walter:** Nay.

**O’Kane:** Senator **Koch**?

**Koch:** I don’t believe I can.

**Swan:** He’s non-voting.

**O’Kane:** Senator **Pike**?

**Pike:** Aye.

**O’Kane:** Senator **McNeal**?

**McNeal:** Aye

**O’Kane:** Senator **Bradfield**?

**Bradfield:** Aye.

**O’Kane:** Senator **Skaar**?

**Skaar:** Aye.

**O’Kane:** Senator **Evans**?

**Evans:** Aye.

**O’Kane:** Senator **Dolgener**?

**Dolgener:** Aye

**O’Kane:** Senator **Hakes**?

**Hakes:** Aye.

**O’Kane:** Senator **Burnight**?

**Burnight:** Abstain.

**O’Kane:** Senator **Kidd**?

**Kidd:** Aye.

**O’Kane:** Motion passes.

**Terlip:** I get a vote. I vote aye.

**O’Kane:** Senator **Terlip**?

**Terlip:** Aye.

**O’Kane:** Senator **Gould**?

**Gould:** Aye.

**O’Kane:** Sorry about that you two. Motion passes. We need to move on and the next thing on our agenda is to talk about the two specific BAS programs, whether or not those will be approved our not, so we need a motion I think to that effect.

**Kidd:** So moved.

**O’Kane:** So moved by Senator **Kidd**, seconded by...that we’re approving the two programs.

**Terlip:** I’ll second.

**O’Kane:** Seconded by Senator **Terlip**. Discussion? Hearing none, those in favor of the motion, please say ‘aye,’ those against, ‘nay.’ Those abstaining? Motion passes. Thank you all very much. That was a long, drawn out process. We’re moving on to Docket Item 1172 which I was able to get posted. It was given to me and is now posted on the website. That only just went up today, so that will remain on our docket for next week. Moving on to Docket Number 1174, I’ve asked some of the representatives of Student Government to talk to us about their changes to the Student Code of Conduct, kind of a consultative session. So if you guys have the floor. You can come right up here if you like.

**Hofmeyer:** Hi everyone. I’m Sarah **Hofmeyer**. I’m the Chair of Campus Relations, which is a committee in Northern Iowan Student Government. So basically we deal with issues facing the students. If you’ll recall at the end of last year, the Conduct Code was being reworked and Policy 3.02 specifically was being reworked. They were going to take away panels so when someone was charged or accused of sexual assault or something of that nature, it used to be that they would go before a panel of five people and then those people would render a decision based on that. It was going to change to just having one person, Leslie **Williams**, or the Dean of

Students, if that ever changed, rendering the decision. And so Campus Relations stepped in and talked with them, because we saw that as something we didn't want to happen. As student's voice wouldn't be heard if the panel wouldn't exist, and we thought a panel would be a really great idea. Having only one person make that decision, it's a very big concentration of power, and we didn't want it to rest in their hands solely, basically, no matter how competent they may be. So we met with Leslie **Williams** and a bunch of other people in April last year. And it has since changed to three people, one of which is a student and one of which is faculty and staff, I believe, and Leslie **Williams**, or the Dean of Students is still is the person who makes the decision in the very end, but she then also hears the panel out, so you still get that everyone's voice is heard. So currently that's what's basically in place, and we are still facing issues with that as it's getting pretty difficult to find a student and faculty and staff to be on that panel as it requires a lot of training. So that's what we're going through right now. We just wanted to come and talk to you guys about what that's changed to and answer any questions.

**O'Kane:** Questions for our guests?

**Terlip:** I have a question about the policy, because I'm not sure that I read it correctly. Did I read it correctly that the Dean of Student's decision is final and that the only other appeal would be to the Board of Regents, or did I misread that?



**Bennett:** Our understanding was that it goes to the President first, and then from there it can also be appealed to the Board of Regents.

**Terlip:** We may want to look at the language of it then, because when I read it--may be it's changed, it still said there wasn't any other appeal. I just wanted to check on that. I'll pull it up.

**O'Kane:** Students please check that out.

**Hofmeyer:** Yeah. Absolutely.

**Evans:** Does anybody know the justification for removing the panel and changing the policy?

**Hofmeyer:** Yes. There was a recommendation that came out under—I'm really sorry, it was under some sort of Title IX higher up, and it was a recommendation to get rid of panels, but it had wording that suggested that panels might make things more difficult, or legalities issues of the panel—something like that. So that's why they wanted to get ride of them entirely in making a decision. So that's why Leslie (**Williams**) is still the person that renders the final decision but panels still get to be part of the process.

**Bennett:** So there was a federal recommendation to get rid of the panels. It wasn't a mandate, so there was a recommendation. They took that as something they wanted to do and then we heard of it and decided that's not something we necessarily agreed with.

**Terlip:** I just have one other question, and this may be explained by federal law or state law; I'm not sure. But one of the things that the policy said, was they would continue to keep records of alleged sexual harassment and those kinds of sexual misconduct. What if the person is found innocent? Why would we keep track of those charges? Shouldn't those go away, just like other violations?

**Friel:** My understanding is, and this actually goes...and strikes a deeper problem in the process of University officials, faculty and students adjudicated these issues, which is, especially in cases of sexual assault, collecting evidence and obtaining a final verdict of these that is at the criminal level, is very difficult. Adding to this problem of sexual assault on college campuses is some growing body of research that suggests that the majority of sexual assaults are perpetrated by a small number of individuals who perpetrate the act multiple times. So I think the idea is that it's highly unlikely that someone would be accused of sexual assault times by multiple...survivors, but that is a factor that may be taken into account in future cases, where 'Wow. This person has received four such complaints. That is astoundingly unlikely.' And I think that without keeping those records, it can be very difficult for the panel in that process to determine whether or not someone may be perpetrating those acts on campus. And just to clarify, the terminology that the panel uses is not 'innocent' or 'guilty'—they have a different terminology. But it's not a criminal trial.

**Terlip:** I don't have any problems in those kinds of instances, but after a person leaves, the way I've read it, is you can graduate and we would still

have that history. And so if that's the case, somebody could have had an alleged thing and the committee said, 'No, everything's fine.' But the allegation would still be maintained on the record. Keeping a record of what the people decided, or something like that is fine, but allegations—it's like in job interviews. You can't ask if they've been arrested, you can only ask them if they've been convicted of a crime. That's where I'm coming from.

**Friel:** That is something worth looking into actually. Thank you for that comment.

**Swan:** Thank you. Thank you for bringing this to our attention and your fine presentation, so I'd like to move that we support the students, the Student Senate, in their resolution, and that's what they're asking us for-- to support their resolution, SSR 2015-20, A Petition For Student Conduct Hearing Panels. My motion is to support that.

**Terlip:** Second.

**O'Kane:** Second by Senator **Terlip**. More discussion?

**Peters:** I have just a related issue. The Provost's Office did send Steve (**O'Kane**) and me an email asking for faculty names of people who might be willing to serve on these panels. One of the reasons that the initial draft of the policy that the students sent to us last year got rid of panels altogether, was because they were afraid that it would be hard to train people under the old model, because the Office for Civil Rights, of the Department of

Education has put significant requirements in for training. I'm looking for the document now and can't find it. But the number of things that people have to be trained in to meet the federal requirements is quite substantial. I mean I'm talking about reliability of forensic evidence, the ability to look at witnesses and know if they're lying or not, the ability to deal with the victims and deal with the psychological problems they might be having... I think the estimates are that training involves about 30 hours of training for this. So faculty, students said they still wanted students on the conduct panel. Faculty have generally been supportive of students so far in their desire to do that, but that's kind of meaningless if we can't find a faculty member, or students for that matter, who are willing to actually sit on those panels.

**Evans:** Were there other reasons given for removing the panel?

**Peters:** My understanding is the main reason was the training requirements. I had a footnote here. There's a document. It's called, "Questions and Answers on Title IX and Sexual Violence." It was put out by the Office for Civil Rights in April 2014; Office for Civil Rights for the Department of Education. Somewhere in here there's a footnote where they describe...Here it is. It says, "Title IX (it's Footnote 30) "Although Title IX does not dictate the membership of the hearing board, the Office for Civil Rights discourages schools from allowing students to serve on hearing boards in cases involving allegations of sexual violence." And the reasoning seems to be mostly because of the training requirements that the put in place.

**Friel:** I didn't want to just add. So that was something the committee considered. And it was actually the previous chair Blake Findley, who fort of led the charge on this last year. But Blake Findley brought to the attention of the NISG committee that in a similar report published by the Department of Education's Office, Civil Rights, that the vast majority of students, after they've gone through a panel, were in support of having that panel. That was something that they highly valued. Based on that, we didn't want to take away the option. Currently, I think the policy we have is sort of a system whereby either student may request that the panel may be done as part of the process. That's something they can request but that isn't required.

**Evans:** From a victim's standpoint, the victim doesn't have to attend or appear before the panel. Is that correct?

**Friel:** I don't think I can answer that question. I think if either party requests that the panel review the case, then both parties do have to attend panel hearings. But the panel has to be present.

**Evans:** I'm not sure if that's true. For example, I could think of a reason not to have a panel. It might make victims shy away from coming forward with something. But I don't know if that's true or not. That's why I've asked a couple of times: What's the justification? There might be other reasons from a panel's standpoint that we haven't considered. I'm not just saying yes or no.

**Peters:** I think, and I'll admit that I didn't go back and reread this before the meeting so I don't know offhand. I think there might be ways that the Title IX Officer can interview the victim. I'm not sure if the victim has to appear before the panel or not.

**Gould:** I served on the Student Conduct Committee for two years, and we did have cases where the victims didn't attend. There was the Title IX Officer, Scott, the Faculty Chair **Peters** would go over all of the facts and there was one where neither the victim nor the offender came. We've had people call in, instead of come in person. And so, I've seen it several different ways—handled several different ways.

**Evans:** I've seen at least one situation where the victim did not have to appear. The victim could step away and not be present at the hearing so to speak.

**O'Kane:** Further discussion? Our motion is that we support the student document. Yes? Senator **Pike**.

**Pike:** Do we need a second to the motion?

**O'Kane:** Laura seconded.

**Pike:** Never mind.

**O'Kane:** So all in favor, 'aye' please. All those against, 'nay.' Any abstentions? Very well. Thank you very much for coming and speaking with us. We have one more happy item on the docket for today and that is

Docket Number 1178, and that is for two emeritus requests. One is for Rebecca **Edmiaston**, and the other for Carlin **Hageman**. Let's focus on Rebecca **Edmiaston** first. Is there anything anyone wishes to say about Dr. **Edmiaston**? I believe there is a support letter on the website.

**Swan**: So there is a support letter?

**O'Kane**: I believe there is for that one.

**Swan**: And don't we typically get something from the head?

**O'Kane**: We typically do. I will contact those people, but there are times when I don't get a letter back.

**Swan**: And certainly if there were to be an objection, that would already have come up some other way? Okay.

**O'Kane**: The second person we're considering is Carlin Hageman--any comments about Carlin? Yes, **Edmiaston** does have a letter. There it is. No comments. Okay, seeing none, let us then have a motion that we grant emeritus status to these folks. So moved by Senator **Fenech**, seconded by Senator **Cooley**. Any further discussion? All in favor, 'aye.' All those opposed, 'nay.' Any abstentions? Thank you very much folks. We'll see you in a couple of weeks. I need a motion to adjourn. So moved by Senator **Hakes**. Seconded by Senator **Kidd**. All in favor?

Submitted by,  
Kathy Sundstedt  
Administrative Assistant/Transcriptionist  
UNI Faculty Senate

**Next meeting**: 3:30 p.m. Monday, Oct. 26, 2015  
Oak Room, Maucker Union

Follows are 0 Addendum to the minutes