BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE

Meeting of the 2013-14 Faculty Senate

This meeting was held on November 01, 2013 from 12:00-2:00 in the Shapiro Student Center Room 313.

Present: Aliyyah Abdur-Rahman, Ulka Anjaria, Daniel Bergstresser, Eric Chasalow, Elif Sisli Ciamarra, Joseph Cunningham, Charles Golden, Matthew Headrick, Carol Osler Ellen Schattschneider, Cindy Thomas, Jeffrey Prottas, Harleen Singh, Joseph Wardwell,

Absent: William Flesch, Thomas Pocahpsky, Liuba Shriria, Susan Parish

Guests: Bernadette Brooten and Steve Goldstein

Reports from Professor Bernadette Brooten

➢ Interim report of the UAC Subcommittee on Sexual Violence

Under previous Senate Chair Tim Hickey, the Faculty Senate suggested that a committee be formed to look at sexual violence on campus. While harassment and racial harassment were not part of the charge of this committee, under Title IX, sexual violence is a subcategory of sexual harassment, and therefore the committee cannot propose alterations to our policies on sexual violence, without also addressing sexual harassment. Professor Bernadette Brooten discussed the work performed by this committee. She stressed that there is an impression on campus, and elsewhere, that any type of harassment must be “quid pro quo” (demonstrated harm to the victim of the harassment) if it is to be a case that requires punishment of the offender. Legally, however, there are two types of harassment. One is quid pro quo, while the other is harassment that creates a hostile environment.

There is a standing policy on harassment at Brandeis, but it cannot be located through a Google search or search of the Brandeis site, as it is password protected. Title IX officer Linda Shinomoto is interested in doing trainings on harassment for faculty, and Brooten proposed that the Faculty Senate to collaborate in the creation of these trainings.

➢ Sexual Violence

The first major question posed regarding the policy on Sexual Harassment was whether or not it was clear that this policy also applies to sexual violence, thereby designating faculty as mandated reporters of a complaint
by a student of sexual assault by another student. One member of the Senate felt this was clear in the policy, but others did not. Since there was no consensus on this, it was agreed that this should be addressed in a revision of the policy.

The second question was whether faculty wish to be required to report complaints of student-on-student sexual violence, even when the complainant requests confidentiality. Faculty are not legally required to be so designated, but Associate General Counsel Steve Locke sees faculty as already mandated to do so by Brandeis policy and strongly prefers that faculty be mandated reporters, noting that the Office for Civil Rights expressed its strong preference for this in May of this year. Some members of the Senate felt strongly that employees should be required to report as representatives of the University and also in the interest of public safety, while others felt that this should be handled on a case-by-case basis to allow for the safety and security of the survivor/victim. There seemed to be an agreement, however, that there needed to be a clear contact person and procedure to follow in these cases to assist the survivor/victim and to enable the faculty to feel that they had placed the subject in a position to receive counseling, support, etc.

One suggestion was that a mandate to report be decoupled from the punitive tone of “reporting,” so that the action of reporting could be seen more as an assistant in the therapeutic movement that needs to take place for the survivor/victim, rather than as pursuing punishment for the accused. For example, could the reporting structure be guided toward the counseling center as opposed to public safety?

➢ Faculty discussions with corporate representatives from Sodexo

Faculty discussions with Sodexo facilitated by the Faculty Senate resulted in Sodexo’s adoption of the full Aramark contract, rather than in the contract initially proposed by Sodexo, which would have been a step down from the previous Aramark contract. In addition, faculty involvement helped to persuade Sodexo to carry over the workers’ sick hours, which Sodexo initially refused to do. The wage provided to Sodexo workers on campus, however, remains a concern. The current contract allows for an hourly rate as low as $12.51 for new hires. The Crittenton Women’s Unions calculates the living wage for a single person in Middlesex County as $15.00 per hour, assuming year-round employment. The question of whether or not Brandeis would like to institute a campus minimum wage was raised. This would require that any outside organizations on campus would have to meet the campus minimum wage. It was mentioned that Clark University was able to provide Sodexo workers a wage based on the campus minimum, but only because Clark agreed to make up the difference between what Sodexo provided and the campus minimum.
was suggested that the Faculty Senate sponsor a public forum on the issue of the living wage, especially as it relates to our campus. It was also suggested that the Senate inquire as to what the actual cost would be to Brandeis should the University want to provide the additional wages to Sodexo employees and any others now earning below $15.00 per hour.

* Prof. Brooten's reports to the Faculty Senate on the issues of sexual and racial harassment, sexual violence, and the discussions with Sodexo can be found as a document on the Faculty Senate page as a sub link titled Bernadette Brooten's Memos to the Faculty Senate (October 29, 2013).

**Provost’s Report on the Implementation of the Strategic Plan**

Provost Steve Goldstein met with the Senate to update the group on the progress of the Strategic Plan. The plan was endorsed by the Board of Trustees in the same session as the approval of the FY 13 budget. Partnering these discussion enabled the university to shift funds based on needs and priorities. The next phase of implementation has involved breaking the goals of the plan into specific objectives and creating groups who will write specific actions, timelines and metrics for these objectives. This document will set actions for implementation into eighteen month and thirty-six month objectives and outcomes and those that will take longer will be standing groups consisting of administration and faculty at Brandeis that will be supplemented by community experts.

The question was raised as to how members of the university, who are not directly assigned to one of these committees, might be asked to participate in this process. There are many ways. For example, if a group has a charge to look for ways for students to more easily complete dual degrees in five years, this might mean that the group members will need to reach out to standing university committees, departments and the registrar to discuss adjustment in schedules, prerequisites and requirements that could make this possible. Also for the initiatives that require fundraising or the capital campaign to implement, such as building a new library, building an arts campus, etc., will need creative minds to take lofty ideas and turn them into fundable goals to share with donors. There is also going to be a strong push toward including faculty in these types of fundraising/development initiatives. The members of the Senate felt that there should be a Faculty Senate representative on each of these groups and/or invite members to a Faculty Senate meeting to report on and discuss the work of the groups and Steve indicated this was the plan.

**The meeting adjourned at 2:00 pm.**