# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF IOWA EASTERN DIVISION 

BUSINESS LEADERS IN CHRIST, an unincorporated association,

Civil Action No. 17-cv-00080-SMR-SBJ

## Plaintiff,

v.

THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA; LYN REDINGTON, in her official capacity as Dean of Students and in her individual capacity; THOMAS R. BAKER, in his official capacity as Assistant Dean of Students and in his individual capacity; and

## APPENDIX VOLUME I-B

## OF PLAINTIFF'S STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

WILLIAM R. NELSON, in his official capacity as Executive Director, Iowa Memorial Union, and in his individual capacity,

## Defendants.

Christopher C. Hagenow
Hagenow \& Gustoff, LLP 600 Oakland Rd. NE Cedar Rapids, IA 52402 (319) 849-8390 phone (888) 689-1995 fax chagenow@whgllp.com

Eric S. Baxter*
Lead Counsel
Daniel H. Blomberg*
The Becket Fund for Religious Liberty
1200 New Hampshire Ave. NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC, 20036
(202) 955-0095 phone
(202) 955-0090 fax
ebaxter@becketlaw.org
dblomberg@becketlaw.org

## Counsel for Plaintiff

*Admitted pro hac vice

## APPENDIX INDEX

Volume I-B
Tab 31 - Nelson Deposition Volume \#1 ..... 256
Tab 32 - Nelson Deposition Volume \#2 ..... 349
Tab 33 - Exhibit 2 ..... 361
Tab 34 - Exhibit 14 ..... 366
Tab 35 - Exhibit 18 ..... 374
Tab 36 - Exhibit 20 ..... 376
Tab 37 - Exhibit 21 ..... 383
Tab 38 - Exhibit 102 ..... 384
Tab 39 - Exhibit 114 ..... 388
Tab 40 - Exhibit 115 ..... 390
Tab 41 - Exhibit 116 ..... 393
Tab 42 - Exhibit 118 ..... 400
Tab 43 - Exhibit 119 ..... 402
Tab 44 - Exhibit 125 ..... 404
Tab 45 - Exhibit 126 ..... 407
Tab 46 - Exhibit 127 ..... 408
Tab 47 - Exhibit 131 ..... 411
Tab 48 - Exhibit 132 ..... 418
Tab 49 - Exhibit 133 ..... 419
Tab 50 - Exhibit 150 ..... 421
Tab 51 - Exhibit 167 ..... 422
Tab 52 - Exhibit 4 (July 16, 2018) ..... 428



Memorial Union, I became the Executive Director of the Iowa Memorial Union, and just recently named Associate Dean of Students and Director of -- Executive Director of the Iowa Memorial Union.
Q. And can you briefly just tell me what was involved in each of those responsibilities?
A. Um-hum. So as the Director of Student Life, I was responsible for the Office of Student Life, which is now the Center for Student Involvement and Leadership. The name just changed. So that was providing administrative oversight to Fraternity/Sorority Life, our campus programs and student activities area, our major annual events area. Student Legal Services reported up through me. Our multi cultural programs and cultural centers program reported up through me. I -- I maintained that, those responsibilities.

Then, as I referenced, I just received some additional responsibilities when I was named Associate Director for the Iowa Memorial Union and just assumed additional responsibilities in the area of assessments for the Iowa Memorial Union, and sharing some of the administrative oversight with the then-Director.

Then, the -- again, continued to maintain my responsibilities for the Center for Student Involvement and Leadership, but then became solely responsible for

11
BY MR. BAXTER:
Q. And as the Associate Dean of Students, who were you replacing?
A. I'm not replacing anyone. There was a
restructuring of the Division of Student Life, and the Vice President for Student Life, Melissa Shivers, named two Associate Deans: Dr. Angie Reams, who will be primarily doing Student Care and Assistance, and then me.
Q. And is the position that was previously held by Lyn Redington still open?
A. Correct.
Q. And so now you will report directly to Melissa Shivers?
A. In the interim I am reporting to Melissa, and then we are in the process of searching for a replacement for Dr. Redington, and then I will, upon their hire, report to that person. So in the interim, to Melissa.
Q. And have you ever been deposed before?
A. I have not.
Q. And do you understand, generally, the purpose of why we're here today?
A. I believe so.
Q. Okay. And you understand that you're here both
the functions, programs, and services from the Iowa Memorial Union. So I retained those original responsibilities and then just kept adding more.

So in the Executive Director of the Iowa Memorial Union capacity, again, I have provided administrative oversight for that operation, which consists of a book store, the University Club, facilities, operations, guest and events services. We have a hotel, and the Center for Student Involvement and Leadership is a part of that operation. We have a welcome center.

And then again continuing to maintain those responsibilities, and then just recently named Associate Dean of Students in the reorganization of the Division of Student Life, and so I'll have some larger responsibilities with the Dean of Students operation. MR. CARROLL: I'm sorry to interrupt. Two things: Will you speak up a little bit and slow down just a little bit?

THE WITNESS: I certainly -- certainly. MR. CARROLL: I mean, I know you're -you're not used to being deposed, but she's the only one that's important in here today. So if you can please speak up a little bit.

THE WITNESS: I'm happy to do that.
(A discussion was held off the record.)
to testify on your own behalf and on behalf of the University; you understand that?
A. Yes.
Q. And your counsel just mentioned a few of these, that it's important as far as ground rules that you try to give verbal responses. The reporter can't take a head shake or a nod.
A. Okay.
Q. Let's try not to talk over each other, so that
she can get everything down that we say. And if you need any breaks, let me know. We'll try to take a break every hour or 90 minutes, but if you need a break, we'll be happy to accommodate that.

I'm gonna ask you now to look at the binder in front of you, the exhibit behind Tab Number 2, and do you recognize this document?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you reviewed it?
A. Yes.
Q. And you are prepared today to testify on topics one, two, nine, ten, and 11, and parts of four and five; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And have you read all of these topics previous to coming to this deposition?


```
MR. BLOMBERG: It was corrected.
MR. BAXTER: Oh, it was corrected?
MR. BLOMBERG: Yeah.
MR. BAXTER: That one's corrected. You're
right.
BY MR. BAXTER:
    Q. Okay. Do you recognize that document?
    A. Yes.
    Q. What is it?
    A. It's a Confidential Inquiry Complaint Form.
    Q. Concerning what?
    A. Complainant Marcus Miller filing a violation
against Business Leaders in Christ.
    Q. And have you seen this document previously?
    A. Yes.
    Q. And when did it first come to your attention?
    A. The case or the document?
    Q. The document.
    A. When I received the materials.
    Q. From?
    A. From -- the University.
    Q. Okay. So the University -- someone at the
University would have sent you this complaint form?
A. It was a -- well, it was in the -- an exhibit, I
believe, that I received from you all.
```
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## A. Notifying the organization, specifically Miss

Thompson, that a complaint had been filed against Business Leaders in Christ.
Q. And when you received that document, the
complaint that we just looked at under Tab 91 was not with that letter, as far as you recall?
A. I don't recall.
Q. Okay.

MR. CARROLL: Eric, just so the record's
clear, can you read off the page numbers, the Bates
stamps, so that later we're not debating what we were
talking about?
BY MR. BAXTER:
Q. So the document that's labeled as Exhibit 92 is Plaintiff's Production Number 27 and 28. Do you see the second highlighted language there? Could you read that?
A. The second highlighted --
Q. Yes.
A. "Failure to maintain confidentiality may be regarded --" excuse me.
(The reporter requested that the witness speak more slowly.)
THE WITNESS: I apologize. I apologize.

## A. (Continuing) "Failure to maintain

confidentiality may be regarded as a form of retaliation
Q. Okay.
A. There was a document that had several -- Exhibit

## A, Exhibit B, Exhibit C. I believe this was one of the

 exhibits which was the first time I saw that.Q. So prior to commencing this lawsuit, you never saw this document?
A. Correct. This actual document.
Q. Okay. I'm gonna ask you to turn to the exhibit behind Document Number -- behind Tab 92.
A. I don't have a Tab 92, unless they're out of sequence.
Q. I'm gonna ask you to take a look at this document.

> MR. CARROLL: Yeah, no -- no, you're
correct. You're missing tabs
A. (Pause.) Okay.
Q. Do you recognize that document?
A. Yes.
Q. And what is it?
A. This was a communication that was sent to Hannah

Thompson from the Office of Equal Opportunity and
Diversity, Constance Shriver Cervantes.
Q. And you were cc'd on that letter?
A. I was.
Q. And what was the purpose of that letter?
in violation of University policy."
Q. Do you know what that language is referring to?
A. The University has an anti-retaliation policy
that issues frequently in judicial cases, so that the
respondent and -- doesn't retaliate in a direct or indirect way.
Q. So do you read that language to mean that if
someone -- a complaint is filed against someone, that
individual cannot speak to anyone about the complaint
that was filed against them?
A. Well, they certainly will need to speak to the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity when they are involved in the investigation and hearing.
Q. Could they speak to a lawyer?
A. I believe they have that right.
Q. Okay. Could they speak to family and friends?
A. I -- I don't know that.
Q. Okay. So you don't know if the University would
take action against them if they spoke to family and
friends about a complaint that was filed against them?
A. I don't know that for certain.
Q. Are you the person who would be responsible for enforcing that?
A. No.
Q. So who is Constance Cervantes?


Q. And then "the below highlighted action," does
that refer to Constance's recommendation that the email -- that BLinC be suspended?
A. Cor -- I believe so.
Q. And then looking back to Tab Number 104, am I correct this is you forwarding -- or at least forwarding the email to Kristi Finger?
A. Kristi -- yeah, communicated with me and then I , in turn, was communicating back to Kristi.
Q. So below that at the bottom you said, "Once the draft is finalized," that would be -- you forwarded -how did you -- she was on the original email, right?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. And then she responded and said, "What are the implications for our other faith-based groups that have Statements of Faith for their student leaders?" Do you see that?
A. Correct.
Q. What -- what's your understanding of what her concern was at that time?
A. I believe Kristi's concern was that there were -were similar situations or could be similar situations. We hadn't received any complaints, but absent the complaint, she, I believe -- as I'm recalling, there should be concern related to other groups.

## 31

Q. Okay. Do you remember what Constance told you about the facts at that time?

## A. I do not remember.

Q. Okay. Was there any other time, prior to
receiving the draft, that you would have learned about the facts of the BLinC situation?
A. I don't know. I can't recall if I had any other communication with Connie. I may have, but I simply can't recall.
Q. Okay. When you -- so prior to receiving the draft, you had no input into what -- did you have any -let me start that again. Prior to receiving the draft, did you have any input in what would have been included in the Findings?
A. I -- I had conversation with Connie again on May 26. I'm not certain I can account for what she would or wouldn't include, based on our conversation.
Q. And beyond that did you have any other input into the draft?
A. I can't recall.
Q. If you look at the email from Constance again at

105 -- well, she's says, "Attached is the final draft."
Do you know if anybody made any comments in response to receiving the draft?
A. I'm not certain who responded to her.
Q. And when you read that email, do you remember what your response was to it before you wrote your response?
A. That could be true.
Q. And what -- did you have any thoughts about what kind of problems might arise -- or what implications might arise?
A. I would -- I'm not certain I understand your question.
Q. Well, at the time you received this email, did it trigger any thoughts, in your mind, about what implications there might be for other faith-based groups if BLinC were to be sanctioned?
A. Yeah. My -- my thought was that there -- if there were groups who were in violation of Human Rights Policy, then -- and there could be, and if we received a complaint for a violation, that we would need to investigate.
Q. And do you recall, did you read the draft that Connie sent -- reasonably promptly after she sent it?
A. I -- I -- I believe I did.
Q. Would that have been the first time you learned anything about the facts of the situation with BLinC?
A. No. I believe some of the facts were in -discussed in that -- May 26th meeting.
Q. So you're not aware of any comments to the draft?
A. I can't recall. I apologize for not recalling --
Q. That's fine.
A. -- but I simply can't.
Q. And did you provide any written comments or oral responses to the draft?
A. I don't recall.
Q. Okay. It's not a trick question.
A. No, I know. I'm not -- my effort is nothing
other than an earnest effort to try to recall.
Q. I appreciate that. Thank you. I'm gonna ask you to look at Document 106. Do you recognize this document?
A. I do.
Q. And what is it?
A. This is the -- the official Finding of the formal complaint of discrimination against BLinc. Excuse me.
Q. And why would you have been -- am I correct that you are cc'd on this document on the last page?
A. Yes, I -- yes.
Q. Okay. And what was the purpose -- what would have been the purpose of you receiving this document?
A. Given her findings that the Human Rights Policy was violated, in my capacity as Executive Director of the Iowa Memorial Union, I am responsible, at the
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Q. Okay. Would they have been sent to you from Ms.

Cervantes, or how did you gain access to them?
A. I have some. I had -- some I have access to on
my own. The constitution, for example, is available on
our student organization database management. Same with our -- constitution and guidelines. I can't recall if Constance provided supplementary documents to me.
Q. So do you have any recollection of having reviewed a copy of Facebook Messenger notes?
A. I -- I don't recall doing that. I may have, but I don't recall.
Q. Okay. Do you have a document -- and just to
explain, we -- FedEx didn't get all of our documents
here on time so we have a more complete binder that's arriving.
A. Okay.
Q. But is there a Tab 88 in that binder?
A. I -- goes from $\mathbf{8 5}$ to 91 .
Q. Okay. You have no recollection at this moment of having reviewed Facebook Messenger notes?
A. (Pause.) I -- I don't recall. I may have, but I simply don't recall.
Q. Okay. Would it be your normal practice in reviewing -- let me ask you this: How often do you receive findings from an investigation conducted by the
Q. And do you have any obligation, under the rules governing -- I assume there are rules governing this process; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And under those rules do you have any obligation to look beyond the Finding to confirm its accuracy?
A. No.
Q. Okay. You noticed on the document behind Tab 106 at the very bottom of the page -- first page --
A. Oh, excuse me. I'm there.
Q. -- it says -- this is the memo from Constance -the Finding from Ms. Cervantes, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And it says, "The following documents were
reviewed: Copy of Facebook Messenger notes of meeting dates, email from Complainant to Student B, email from Student B to Complainant, constitution of Business
Leaders in Christ," and so forth. There's additional documents on the second page, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Would you have reviewed any of these documents in connection with your review of the Findings and decision to make sanctions?
A. Yes, I reviewed some of them, as I recall. For sure, some of them. I can't recall all of them.

## EOD?

MR. CARROLL: Just so we're clear, are you talking about student groups?

MR. BAXTER: Any kind of findings.
A. Right. I would only be the recipient related to the Registered Student Organizations. In -- I can recall in my career at Iowa, three.
Q. And who were those pertaining to?
A. BLinC, 24:7, and UI Feminist Union.
Q. Okay. And in reviewing those three, would it
have been your normal practice to ask the investigator for all the documents that were reviewed in the process of the investigation?
A. I don't believe I did that.
Q. In any of the three instances?
A. I can recall in -- it appeared to me that the relevant -- excerpts from these other -- from social media or other documents were -- would be included in the finding. I remember there being lots of quotes, lots of just a direct -- you know, this particular fact came from this particular document. I don't recall giving a -- the -- kind of the -- the chronology of any form of, like, email communication that, you know -person by person by person by person, but that the relevant opinions were extracted from those -- those

|  | kind of communications and put into the Finding. | 1 | A. Correct. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q. So in making sanctions that's decisions, was your | 2 | Q. What is your understanding of what Ms. Cervantes |
| 3 | practice just to rely on the written document from the | 3 | found in her Findings? |
| 4 | investigator in deciding whether to issue sanctions? | 4 | A. That there was a violation of the University of |
| 5 | A. Primarily, yes. | 5 | Iowa's Human Rights Policy, that the Complainant was |
| 6 | Q. So you have made no independent effort to confirm | 6 | denied a leadership opportunity because he had stated he |
| 7 | whether the Finding accurately reflected the facts? | 7 | was gay. |
| 8 | A. Correct. I accepted the Findings from the Office | 8 | Q. Okay. And in -- on your recollection, was -- |
| 9 | of Equal Opportunity and Diversity. | 9 | were there any other facts that might have called that |
| 10 | Q. And why did you do that? | 10 | into question? |
| 11 | A. Because they are the office charged with doing | 11 | A. The Findings, I know, referenced email -- I |
| 12 | so, and I -- respect their work. | 12 | believe email communication, in which the Res -- |
| 13 | Q. Okay. So if they issue a finding of no probable | 13 | Respondent admitted that -- because the Respondent |
| 14 | cause in an investigation, and you receive that, what | 14 | offered the leadership opportunity to the Complainant. |
| 15 | would you do after that? | 15 | After doing so the Complainant, through his admission |
| 16 | A. If you mean no probable cause, being no policy | 16 | that he was gay -- she said that the student -- the |
| 17 | violation -- | 17 | Respondent said that she would have to get back to him, |
| 18 | Q. Correct. | 18 | nd then a -- a period of time passed and she got back |
| 19 | A. Nothing would move forward. I won't -- I'm not | 19 | to the Complainant and retracted the leadership |
| 20 | involved unless there is a policy violation in terms of | 20 | opportunity offer. |
| 21 | action. | 21 | Q. Okay. I'm gonna ask you to flip to Document 108. |
| 22 | Q. Would you -- would you receive a report even if | 22 | A. I have 106 and then 109. |
| 23 | there were no policy violations? | 23 | MR. BLOMBERG: Look at the bottom. |
| 24 | A. Yes, I would. | 24 | A. Oh, excuse me. I apologize. I have it. |
| 25 | Q. But you would take no action after that? | 25 | Q. And do you recognize that document? |
|  | 39 |  | 40 |
| 1 | A. Yes. | 1 | Q. Do you see in the second paragraph, the second |
| 2 | Q. And what is it? | 2 | entence, says, "Section IV (B) calls upon the Executive |
| 3 | A. May I review it quickly? | 3 | Director of the IMU to schedule a time to meet and |
| 4 | Q. | 4 | scuss the case with the student organization |
| 5 | A. (Pause.) Tom Baker's -- Tom Baker's forwarding | 5 | presentatives before determining whether or not the |
| 6 | of the Human Rights violation being confirmed by Connie, | 6 | tions of BLinC's student leaders violated one or more |
| 7 | his forward | 7 | the established rules for student organizations." |
| 8 | Q. What was Tom Baker's role in this? | 8 | A. Correct. |
| 9 | A. Tom Baker participated in the investigation with | 9 | Q. So one purpose of the meeting was to determine |
| 10 | Connie. He was involved in some part or all of her | 10 | hether there were grounds for a violation; is that |
| 11 | interviews with some or all of the students. | 11 | correct? |
| 12 | Q. Do you know what his employment relationship is | 12 | A. Are you referencing the meeting that occurred on |
| 13 | with respect to Ms. Cervantes? | 13 | September 1st? |
| 14 | A. At the time Tom was the Associate Dean of | 14 | Q. Well, the meeting that's referred to here. It |
| 15 | Students, and Tom had a role in -- a liaison role with | 15 | did happen on September 1st. So when he refers to the |
| 16 | both the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity and a | 16 | meeting, is the purpose of the meeting -- he says you |
| 17 | liaison role with the Office of the General Counsel, and | 17 | have to schedule a meeting before determining whether or |
| 18 | Mr. Baker will need to define that more specifically. | 18 | not the actions violated one of the rules, correct? |
| 19 | Q. Okay. So do you know why he would have been the | 19 | A. Yes. The -- our policy requires that I meet with |
| 20 | person who sent this letter to you? | 20 | the students. |
| 21 | A. I think that's our protocol, as a participant in | 21 | Q. And is one of the purposes -- what is the purpose |
| 22 | the process. Again, this -- as I reference this, this | 22 | of that meeting? |
| 23 | isn't a usual practice over time, so -- again, I | 23 | A. Again, as I referenced earlier, it's not to |
| 24 | reference, I believe, three. So saying a protocol might | 24 | dispute the facts at the meeting, but it is to ask -- |
| 25 | not be appropriate, but he advanced the document to me. | 25 | give the students the opportunity to provide additional |

context, to ask additional questions, for me to then share what the process looks like moving forward.
Q. So you wouldn't make a decision about sanctions until after that meeting; is that correct?
A. Official final sanctions would occur after that meeting.
Q. Did you go -- would you go into that meeting with an assumption of what the sanctions would be?
A. I go into the meeting knowing that the EOD violated -- ruled there -- was a policy violation and sanctions could be warranted, and part of the process of the meeting is, I believe, to get a better idea, based on the conversation with the students, of what is appropriate for a sanction.
Q. Okay. In the last paragraph on that page you say, in the second sentence, it says, "The Human Rights Policy does not require that their creed be modified"; is that correct?
A. That's -- that is how that reads.
Q. Okay. And do you remember what that -- why he would have thought that was important to say?
A. No.
Q. Okay. He then says, two sentences later, "No further discussion took place between the student applicant and the group leaders --" let me start over.

In the very next sentence it says, "In the BLinC case, the student who expressed an interest in the position of vice president self-reported --"
(The reporter requested that the witness speak more slowly.)
Q. (Continuing) I'll reread that. "In the BLinC
case, the student who expressed an interest in the position of vice president, self-reported to the
interviewer that he was gay. No further discussion took place between the student applicant and the group leaders with regard to the student's actual sexual practices."
A. Um-hum.
Q. Do you have any recollection of why Tom would have thought that was significant?

## A. I don't. And I -- based on Connie's Findings,

she references additional communication between the Complainant and the Respondent.
Q. If, in the context that's described in this letter, do you think it would have been important for there to be a discussion between the student applicant and the group leaders with regard to the student's actual sexual practices?
A. Could you repeat that, please?
Q. Is there a difference between -- well, Mr. Baker
Q. Okay. And you were cc'd on this letter, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And the letter's dated July 14th, 2017?
A. Correct.
Q. And the meeting you held with BLinC was on September 1st, 2017; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And so this letter came in before that meeting?
A. Correct.
Q. In the second paragraph, could you read that, please, to yourself?
A. Yes. To myself?
Q. Please.
A. (Pause.) I have read it.
Q. Okay. What's your understanding of what Mr. Estell was trying to express?
A. Frankly, I was a bit confused with that paragraph because I know that the communication between the Complainant and the Respondent did not involve Jacob Estell. It was between -- I don't know if I can say the name or not, but it was -- the Respondent who was named initially, the then-president, and so the communication that occurred that we were talking about earlier between the then-president of the student organization BLinC and then the -- Complainant.
Q. And you see on the second page with Jacob's signature, it says "President, Business Leaders in Christ"?
A. Um-hum.
Q. And you're aware that he became the president after Hannah Thompson, who was the original president, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And that he would have had authority to speak on behalf of BLinC, correct?

## A. Correct.

Q. And what's your understanding then of what he was trying to express in the second paragraph?
A. He was stating that the group did not discriminate against the Complainant based on sexual orientation, but the original communication, involving Hannah Thompson, directly did so.
Q. So the sentence starting, "The student participated in BLinC before asking for a leadership position, and remains welcome to participate, even as a leader, regardless of his orientation."
A. Um-hum.
Q. Correct?
A. Um-hum.
Q. Then the next --

## A. Correct.

Q. But rather that he was denied a leadership
position because he disagreed with BLinC's Christian principles; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. If that statement were true, that Mr. Miller was denied a leadership position only because he refused to live by BLinC's Christian principles, would that have violated the Human Rights Policy?
A. Yes.
Q. Why?
A. Because it would be discriminatory based on his sexual orientation.
Q. So he just -- Mr. -- Mr. Estell just says, right, that he was -- only denied a leadership position because he disagreed with Christian principles. Doesn't say anything about sexual orientation. If he had been denied the position just because he refused to abide by the Christian principles of BLinC, would that alone have been a violation of the Human Rights Policy, as you understood the policy at that time?
A. Yes.
Q. Why?
A. As I -- as I stated, because it references that -- the -- I'm trying to think back to the Business
A. Oh, excuse me. Yes. Correct, I apologize.
Q. "The student was not eligible to be a leader in

BLinC only because he stated that he disagrees with, and would not try to live by, BLinC's Christian principles, which means he would not effectively lead our group," correct?
A. That is what it -- that's what he wrote.
Q. Do you understand the distinction of what Jake was trying to make there?
A. I think he was -- I'm not certain -- but I believe he was trying to state that the Complainant was not categorically denied the opportunity because he admitted to be gay. Rather he was denied the opportunity because he wouldn't live by BLinC's principles.
Q. And if that were true, would that have violated the Human Rights Policy, as you understood it at that time?
A. Repeat that again.
Q. So you said that your understanding was that Jacob was trying to say that Marcus Miller, who was the Complainant, correct?

## A. Correct.

Q. That he was not denied a leadership position because of his sexual orientation?

Leaders in Christ's Statement of Faith, and in the -Doctrine of Personal Integrity, there's a connection between the two.
Q. Now, that statement was submitted to the University after the September 1st meeting, correct?
A. The -- the updated statement that included the Doctrine of Personal Integrity was submitted after, yes.
Q. Okay. And do you recall that that statement did not exist in the constitution prior to the September 1st meeting?

## A. Correct, it was added after.

Q. So on July 14th that statement was not in the constitution, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. So just, hypothetically, if Marcus Miller were not gay but indicated that he did not agree with BLinC's Christian principles and was denied a leadership position for that reason, at that time, as you understood the policy then, would that have violated the Human Rights Policy?

## A. No.

Q. So it was simply because the belief that Marcus

Miller disagreed with -- concerned homosexuality, that you believe there was a violation?
A. I believe there was a violation because he

## admitted to the then-president that he was gay, and the

 offer for the vice president position was retracted after he made the admission.Q. Hypothetically, if Mr. Miller was not gay, but simply disagreed with BLinC's Christian views on homosexuality, and was denied a leadership position for that reason, would that have violated the Human Rights Policy?
A. No. I apologize. That took me a while to -connect.
Q. That's fine. Thank you. Okay. I'm going to ask you -- to look at the document numbered 110. Do you recognize this document?
A. Yes.
Q. And this email is dated the same day as the letter from Jacob Estell, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And that letter from Jacob Estell was sent to you via email; is that correct?
A. I was -- if I'm understanding, it was copied on the letters you sent to Dr. Redington.
Q. Correct. And you would have received that -- if the letter is accurate, you would have received that on July 14, correct?
A. Correct. Yes, I was copied on that

## 51

Q. And then she says, "I can guess how he saw the report which precipitated this letter, but that doesn't really matter." Do you know what she's referring to there?
A. I do not.
Q. And in the appeal to Lyn Redington, as far as you understand the procedures, is there a process there where a student organization could contest the factual findings?
A. I believe -- again, this is probably a more appropriate question for Connie -- but the Findings again are a part of the EOD process, and there -- I believe there's a process to challenge the finding at that level.
Q. So once it gets to you, as far as you know, no one looks beyond the findings?
A. Correct.
Q. Did you have any further discussion with Lyn Redington about Jake's letter?
A. Yeah, we may have talked about the next line. Again, I think part of Lyn's urgency in getting the document to me was, again, knowing that she had a role in the appeals process, that -- wanting to get it to me to begin the resolution process quickly -- or not necessarily quickly -- but just so that we weren't

## communication, yes.

Q. And do you have any reason to think that that email was -- or that the letter was dated incorrectly?
A. No, no.
Q. And at 110 -- Tab 110, what's your -- what's your understanding of what this is?
A. This is a communication from Lyn -- Dr. Lyn

Redington, the then-Dean of Students and Assistant Vice
President for Student Life, sharing that with me. I -frankly, the -- I think this was sent to Lyn in error because the process didn't require the student to send -- I think -- I believe the student was under the understanding that he should communicate with the Dean. And I think that was just a simple -- I'm assuming that was just a simple error on Jacob's part and that the commun -- so she was simply sending that to me as -- a note that this was -- again, the resolution -- I begin the resolution stage. Dr. Redington is involved in the appeal stage, so she's getting it to me because I'm the next step.
Q. Okay. And so she was basically just forwarding

Jacob's letter back to you, and she says, "I believe
BLinC can appeal the sanction, not the Finding." Is that true?
A. Correct.
confusing the resolution stage with the appeal stage.
Q. Okay. I'm gonna ask you to look at Document 111. Do you recognize this document?
A. I don't.
Q. Okay. It's dated the same -- it's also dated

July 14, 2017, correct?
A. Um-hum.
Q. And -- can you answer "yes" or "no"?
A. Excuse me. Yes. I apologize. Yes.
Q. Thank you. It then says, "Lyn, Met on

Wednesday," and then there's a list of people with Bill, Tom, Bill, and so forth, correct?
A. Um-hum.
Q. So this -- if you -- was that a "yes" or "no"?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And on July 14th -- that was a Friday,

July 14, 2017 -- I'll represent to you that was a
Friday. So Wednesday would have been two days before that, correct?

## A. Correct.

Q. And do you recall this meeting? This would have
been two days then before you received the letter --
A. Right.
Q. -- from Jake.
A. I'm not able to place this in any kind of
context. I apologize
Q. It says, "Letter re sanctions will come from

Bill," correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Or J.T. Timmons?
A. Correct.
Q. Who's J.T. Timmons?
A. That's what's confusing. J.T. Timmons is the

Director of Recreational Services, and so J.T. has a role that's parallel with my role when it involves sports clubs. That's why I'm a bit confused on how J.T. is brought into this, because J.T. -- Bill Nelson, I, do resolution related to Registered Student Organizations.
J.T. Timmons does resolution related to sports clubs.
Q. Okay. Do you ever -- do you remember ever being
in a meeting with J.T. Timmons about the BLinC
investigation?
A. I don't.
Q. This refers to sanctions, though, correct? Do
you see where it says, "Letter re sanctions will come
from Bill"?
A. Yeah, I'm making a -- an assumption, that this is somewhat of an explanation to Lyn about our process. Lyn was new. Lyn's -- only served in the role of Dean for less than two years. So this would have been on
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Q. Okay. You have no original recollection -- you
don't know whose handwriting this is?
A. I don't. I -- I don't.
Q. Okay. And it refers to the BLinC appeal. This
was five days after the last note, correct?
A. Um-hum.
Q. And it says, "BLinC appeal," correct?
A. Um-hum. Yes.
Q. Thank you.

MR. CARROLL: I know. It's hard.
A. Yes. I apologize to you.
Q. Then it says, "Drafter: Draft brief email to

Jacob to -- have to outline sanctions. First will come
from Nelson," correct?
A. Um-hum.
Q. Told to -- is that a "yes" or "no"?
A. Yes:
Q. "Told to wait on sending Bill Nelson letter,"
correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Had the sanctions already been decided by this
time?
A. No.
Q. How do you know that?
A. Because $I$ issue the sanctions and the sanctions
the -- I -- a short time -- I can't -- I'm not for certain of the length of time of her tenure, but it was short. I believe that this is some form of an explanation that -- again, that the resolution and sanctions happen from Bill and J.T. and not from her, which could be the reference related to the whole notion why Jake had sent that note to her because he wrote in that note to Lyn, I remember, "That my understanding is you, Dr. Redington, do sanctions," and that's not correct. So I'm not -- I don't know whose handwriting this is. But I'm thinking that this is a cryptic explanation to Lyn that she doesn't manage the resolution and sanctions part, that she manages the appeals process.
Q. Okay. And then you see below that it says, "Waited on sanctions until 24:7." Do you see that?
A. Um-hum.
Q. Is it fair to assume that "Waited on sanctions," that means that you were waiting on sanctions for BLinC until 24:7?
A. I don't know what that means. I apologize.
Q. Okay. I'm gonna ask you to look at Document 112. Do you recognize this document?
A. From -- not from the original -- not from 7/19 but perhaps in the document production process. I -56
weren't communicated to BLinC until after our --
September 1 meeting. I believe September 13.
Q. In your mind, by this time had you already settled on sanctions?
A. No.
Q. How do you know that, or how do you remember that?
A. Because I hadn't spent time with the students yet.
Q. Okay.
A. This -- oh --
Q. Go ahead.
A. Reading this confirms my speculation about the --
previous page -- was again, someone needed to communicate -- someone was instructing Lyn to communicate to Jacob that I'm the next step in the process, not her --
Q. Okay.
A. -- which was what I was stating earlier.
Q. Thank you. I ask you to look at Tab 113.
A. I -- I don't have 113.
Q. I am gonna ask you to take a look at what I am gonna hand you as a document that's behind Tab 113. Do you recognize that document?
A. Yes.
Q. And what is it?
A. It's a communication from Marcus Miller to Lyn

Redington; Marcus asking to schedule a meeting with
Dr. Redington.
Q. And then what does the top half of the email say?
A. Related to -- oh, a communication from Lyn asking me to respond to Marcus' previous request.
Q. And did you respond to Marcus Miller?
A. I don't know if I did or not.
Q. Did you ever have any direct communications with Marcus Miller?
A. No.
Q. You never emailed him?
A. I have never spoken to Marcus. I've never met Marcus. I may have emailed him.
Q. Is there any -- why would you have emailed him? In what circumstances might you have emailed him?
A. I can say I might not have emailed him simply because of his role, and then me needing to meet with the students.
Q. Did you -- when you searched your emails -- did you search your emails in response to document production --
A. Yes.
Q. -- issues? If there were an email to Marcus
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Q. Okay. And you mentioned previously the meeting that took place on September 1st, 2017, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And can you remind me what was the purpose of that meeting?
A. Yes. The purpose of the meeting was to -- I -- I wrote the students. Well, my secretary was -- attempted to schedule meetings through the -- the month of August, several outreaches from my secretary to Jacob. He responded. We met on the -- 1st of September. I believe I communicated both to you and to Jacob about the -- the flow of the meeting. I did so at the end of August related to that, but it was, again, to -- hear the facts of the case, as presented by Mr. Baker, in general, to allow the students to ask questions, make additional comments. Again, I -- I believe I was clear in the August communication that this was not about disputing the findings, and so the meeting happened on September 1st.
Q. Okay. Why was Tom Baker there?
A. To share the Findings on behalf of EOD.
Q. Okay. He was there as a representative of EOD?
A. I didn't -- I don't -- I can't say that. I know that he was the University official that was sharing the information.

Miller, would you have produced it in this case?
A. If there -- if there was an email from me to

Marcus, I would have produced it. I can't recall there, if I did or not.
Q. Okay. Would you -- are you willing to
double-check your email to make sure you haven't emailed Marcus Miller?
A. I can, yes.

MR. BAXTER: Okay. Counsel, I'll follow up with you on that. No further questions on that document.
A. If I were to follow up with him, it was simply to acknowledge Lyn asked me to do so, but -- yeah, I don't recall.
Q. So is there any reason why you wouldn't have reached out to him when she specifically asked you to?
A. I -- again, if I would have reached out to him, I would have just been acknowledging that the case -- the case is still pending and not resolved. I simply don't recall if I did. That's why I -- what I would have said.
Q. Okay. We've been going a little over an hour.

Do you want to take a short break? Are you okay if we go on?
A. I am okay to keep going a little bit.
Q. And had you communicated with Tom before going into the meeting?
A. Yes.
Q. And was that communication via email?
A. I know we had face-to-face communication.
Q. Do you recall if there were any email

## communications?

A. There -- there could have been. Could have been about process and flow. There could have been communication, yes, electronic communication.
Q. Okay. There have been no such emails produced. Will you recheck your email and find me such emails?
A. I will. As I share, I definitely remember
face-to-face communication. Tom's office is directly down the hall, and so a lot of our -- majority of our communication is face-to-face.
Q. And what was the substance of those discussions concerning the September 1 meeting or the -- BLinC finding?
A. Process, his role, finding the appropriate time for the meeting. Yeah, meeting flow, what he would be doing which would be again presenting the facts, so the meeting flow.
Q. Did you have any discussion about Tom's personal views about the findings?

```
A. His personal views, no.
Q. And did you ever express your own personal views
to Tom?
A. No.
Q. Did you have any personal views about the
findings?
A. (No response.)
Q. What were your personal views?
A. Personal views were -- I accepted the Findings from EOD.
Q. Did you have any personal views about the actions that BLinC had taken, that were the subject of the investigation?
A. Any -- personal views, I -- I think about professional views, in my professional context, and my personal views and my professional views align. I -again, based on the Findings from EOD, I believe that there was a -- a violation.
Q. Okay. Did you and Tom have any disagreements about what would happen in the meeting?
A. I don't believe so.
Q. Do you recall the substance of what happened in the meeting?
A. In generalities, yes.
Q. Okay. Do you recall --
```

that need to ask about sexual relationships outside of marriage; do you remember that?
A. I remember the -- the -- the subject being
that -- as long as the requirement is both to those who
identify as homosexual and those who identify as heterosexual.
Q. Okay. Do you recall that Tom took the position that BLinC was distinguishable from the CLS situation because BLinC failed to ask follow-up questions about Marcus Miller's practices or whether he was involved in a sexual relationship?
A. I believe Tom stated something of that general nature.
Q. So you and Tom both agreed that it would be okay for a student group to require its leaders to abstain from sexual relationships outside of marriage, correct?
A. If it applied to both heterosexuals and non-heterosexuals.
Q. Okay. So a religious requirement to abstain from marriage outside -- to abstain from sexual relationships outside of marriage between a man and a woman -- or outside of marriage would be okay?
A. Say that again, please.
Q. A requirement for leaders -- a religious requirement for leaders to abstain from sexual activity

MR. CARROLL: Excuse me. Just so I'm clear, what meeting are we talking about?

MR. BAXTER: This is the September 1st --
MR. CARROLL: Okay. Just so you understand.
THE WITNESS: Yes, yes. This -- yes. Thank you.

BY MR. BAXTER:
Q. The meeting that took place on September 1st,
2017. And who was at that meeting?
A. Tom Baker, myself, two students, and --
Q. Do you remember their names?
A. Yes. Jacob Estell, Brett Eikenberry, and then you, Mr. Baxter, and I believe Mr. Blomberg.
Q. Mr. Blomberg, correct?
A. Blomberg, excuse me.
Q. Um-hum. Do you recall at that meeting that early in the meeting Tom raised that issue, do you recall, that Christian Legal Society, the CLS, had been allowed to maintain registered status even though it had requirements in its constitution that forbade sexual relationships outside of marriage?
A. Yes.
Q. In fact, at that meeting Tom said that groups can require leaders to be abstinent outside of the institution of marriage, that the focus needs to be on
outside of any marriage would be permissible?
A. If applied universally, to all.
Q. Would a religious requirement that leaders abstain from homosexual sexual relationships be acceptable?
A. If it was applicable to all.
Q. Okay. And do you recall Tom saying that the University could not tell an environmental organization that it had to allow a climate denier to be -- I'm sorry. Do you recall Tom saying that the University would not -- could not tell a student group focused on environmental issues to have a climate denier as its leader?
A. I recall Tom using the -- this analogy of that nature.
Q. Okay. So at the time of that meeting it was the University's policy that groups could require their leaders to embrace the group's mission; is that correct?

## A. Say that again.

Q. Is it permissible for a student organization at the University of Iowa to require its leaders to embrace the mission of the organization?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And can that requirement be written into the constitution?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And can the leaders be required to sign a statement affirming that provision of the constitution?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall that -- that Jake and Brett, who were at the meeting, contested the investigators' Findings during the meeting?
A. I don't recall if they did it or you did it. I remember there being a contest.
Q. Okay. And do you remember what the contest was?
A. I -- I think we've -- not specifically. But I
believe it was around what we've discussed earlier, the
notion about the claim of -- the student being given a
leadership opportunity and then it being retracted
because he admitted to being gay versus, I think, some
of the substance that was in the communication he wrote
to Dr. Redington.
Q. So basically BLinC argued, right, that they had denied Mr. Miller a leadership position because he disagreed with religious philosophy, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And that they would have allowed anybody who was
gay to be a leader if they accepted their religious philosophy, correct?
A. That's what they said.
Q. And specifically you were referring to their
beliefs about sexual activity outside of marriage
between a man and a woman, correct?
A. Correct. And -- correct.
Q. Okay. And BLinC agreed that it would make clear that its leaders were expected to hold BLinC's religious beliefs, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And have you ever required any other
student groups to detail their religious beliefs in their constitution?
A. No.
Q. Why did you ask BLinC to do that?
A. Because they had committed a Human Rights

Violation, and I wanted to -- moving forward, prevent that so -- which was one of the reasons I issued my -in my sanction about the clear qualifications for leadership roles, as well as clear interview protocols so that we wouldn't accidently, inadvertently, or perhaps on purpose ask inappropriate questions that could get the group -- in violation.
Q. Okay. Are other -- are other groups expected to meet those same standards?
A. Yes.
Q. And have you followed up with those groups to do
Q. And that that religious philosophy included beliefs that homosexual -- or that sexual conduct outside of marriage between a man and a woman is sinful, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And if they had been correct, if you were
reviewing -- let's say you had authority to review the
findings and you believed what they said, would you have issued sanctions against BLinC?
A. I would not have as long as they didn't violate the University of Iowa's Human Rights Policy.
Q. Okay. And if they were correct, they wouldn't have been violating it up to that point, correct?

## A. Correct.

Q. Okay. And, in fact, at the meeting you asked if those beliefs were expressly written down somewhere; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And then you said it would be helpful to have that in the group's constitution, right?
A. Or in the governing documents, correct.
Q. Okay. So you were asking them to detail their religious beliefs in their constitution or in other governing documents, correct?
A. Correct.
that?
A. If there's a policy violation or a complaint, we will.
Q. So you only require that if there's been a
complaint?
A. Correct.
Q. And what exactly is the heightened requirement
for groups that have received a complaint?
A. Excuse me -- here.
Q. Well, you said that if there's a complaint
against a student group they'd have to -- you know, you
took specific action or request -- requested specific
action from BLinC because they -- received a complaint.
A. Um-hum.
Q. Was that a "yes" or a "no"?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. What were the -- what are the specific
requirements that are imposed on a group that has
received a san -- a complaint?
A. I -- I'm not certain I know what your --
Q. So you --
A. -- question --
Q. At the meeting you asked BLinC to make changes to its constitution and you're saying now that that is because a complaint was filed against them, correct?

## A. I don't think that's exactly correct.

Q. Okay. Explain what you meant to say.
A. So, as I recall, the conversation was around the
notion that the context -- as -- as I'm thinking about
it was -- I was thinking about the notion that students -- I'm sorry, I'm -- your question one more time.
Q. Sure. At the meeting on September 1st, 2017, you
asked BLinC to detail its religious beliefs concerning marriage and sexuality in its constitution, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And you then stated that that was because they -a complaint had been filed against them, correct?

MR. CARROLL: Well, that's a misstatement of the record. His role was after the EOD found the complaint to be valid. So it's not the complaint that drove that meeting. It was the EOD Findings.
Q. Let me correct. You -- you -- you were stating -- as I understand it, you were stating that you required BLinC to detail its religious beliefs concerning marriage and sexuality in its constitution because of the EOD Findings against it, correct?
A. Not necessarily. I think it's because it's really important that all student organizations have very complete, thorough expectations of what they expect
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## A. Correct.

Q. But that they would not categorically discrim -that someone who was gay could still be a leader if they agreed with those beliefs, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. So was there any reason to require BLinC to put that into its constitution?
A. Again, to ensure ongoing compliance.
Q. And have you ever required that of any other group on campus? Just "yes" or "no."
A. No.
Q. Are you aware of groups that have in their names
words that would indicate that the group discriminates on the basis of sex or gender or sexual orientation?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you asked any of those groups to detail
their beliefs in their constitution to ensure ongoing compliance?
A. We had --
Q. Just have you asked any of them to -- to add their detailed beliefs into their constitution to ensure ongoing compliance?
A. We've asked them to insert the University of

Iowa's Human Rights Policy in its entirety.
Q. Okay. I'm gonna ask the question again. Have

## from leaders and members.

Q. What do you say -- when you say all groups have that expectation, what do you -- how -- what are you basing that on?
A. It's just -- I think it's just good practice that if you're going to be a leader or a member of an organization that you be fully aware of what is expected of you and what is expected among the leadership and membership.
Q. So it's good practice, but does the University have any requirement that groups detail certain beliefs in their constitutions?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Why did you ask BLinC to do that?
A. Because I thought it would be useful, moving forward, to ensure ongoing compliance with policy moving forward.
Q. BLinC had already told you, right, that they did not discriminate against anyone because of their sexual orientation, correct?
A. They had told me that, yes.
Q. And they told you that they intended to move
forward with a standard that would require their leaders to abide by their beliefs about sexual activity outside of marriage, correct?
you asked any other groups besides BLinC, including groups whose title indicate that they discriminate on bases listed in the Human Rights Policy, to detail their beliefs or their standards for leaders in their constitution to ensure ongoing compliance with the Human Rights Policy?
A. No.
Q. And that time you agreed that if BLinC would add that additional language into its constitution, that that would resolve -- that would enable it to remain a registered group on campus, correct?
A. I -- in my letter of sanction, I required them to --
Q. I'm just asking: At the meeting -- at the meeting you indicated that if BLinC would add that language into its constitution, that would resolve your concerns about any ongoing violation of the Human Rights Policy, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And BLinC agreed that it would do that, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And then BLinC asked if there was a way to
correct the adverse Finding that they had rejected Marcus Miller solely because of his sexual orientation; do you remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. And Tom explained that there was an opportunity to appeal to correct the Finding, but that -- that if BLinC elected not to appeal, it could submit a statement in the record -- that that didn't mean the University would correct the record, but that the statement would be there; do you recall that?
A. I recall that, correct.
Q. Okay. So at that time it was your understanding
that on the appeal BLinC could contest the factual findings of the investigation; is that correct?
A. They could submit a letter countering that to be part of their file.
Q. Okay. And so you would have expected Lyn Redington to review their -- their allegations and the factual record that was developed by Constance Cervantes; is that correct?
A. Would I have expected that?
Q. Yes.
A. I think Lyn would have -- as my boss, I don't
know if $I$ would have expected that of her. It seemed like that's what she should do.
Q. Okay. So you think there should be a -- you didn't expect to review the factual findings, but you expected that, on appeal, she would; is that correct?
A. In the -- the three occasions over my $\mathbf{1 5}$ years.
Q. So as far as you know, on those three occasions
there was no one above Connie who was reviewing her work before it came to you?
A. I can't speak to that. I don't know for certain.
Q. But in your experience with the three you've received, you've never seen that in the process?
A. What in the process?
Q. That there was a review at EOD of -- of the
investigator's findings?
A. Again, I'm not following that.
Q. Okay. In the -- you said that you had received
three findings from EOD, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Concerning student groups?
A. Correct.
Q. And you haven't received any other findings from them?
A. Correct.
Q. And was Constance the investigator in all three of those?
A. She was in BLinC. She was in 24:7. The UI Feminist Union, I believe there that was -- I think perhaps Wanda -- I can't think of Wanda's last name -was the investigator.
A. That she would have access to their file and their file could have that in there.
Q. Okay.
A. Whether or not -- the merit she gave that, that would be Lyn's --
Q. Why wouldn't you have considered the same thing?
A. Because I accepted the Findings from the EOD.
Q. Okay. Why would you expect the appeal from your sanctions to review the Finding of the EOD, but not your own sanctions decision?
A. Again, I think it's -- what Mr. Baker said, they had the opportunity to submit that. The merit that Lyn Redington would give, that would be up to her.
Q. Okay. In the policies that govern this procedure, is there anything written that would protect the right to the student group to contest the factual finding?
A. Again, $I$ think the context of the factual findings happens at the EOD investigation. That's where the Findings are derived and issued, and so -- again, I -- that's a really good question for Connie, but I -I believe that is an opportunity to appeal the Findings of EOD.
Q. But when you receive findings, they come directly from Connie to you, correct?
Q. But in -- but in all three instances the findings came directly from the investigator to you, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And would you agree that there's a problem if the
findings go directly from the investigator to you, and you impose a sanction without reviewing the underlying facts?
A. My assumption is that if the students are disputing the facts, they will appeal the decision of EOD.
Q. And you think they have a decision within the EOD -- they have an avenue within the EOD to appeal that?
A. I think so.
Q. And you think that they would have received notice of that opportunity?
A. I believe so.
Q. And if that opportunity did not exist, would you agree that that's problematic?
A. Yes.
Q. Because that would deny students of the right to
have their facts and circumstances reviewed, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay.

MR. CARROLL: Why don't we take a break?

MR. BAXTER: This is a great time.
(A recess was held from 10:27 a.m. until
10:35 a.m.)
MR. BAXTER: Okay. Go on the record.
BY MR. BAXTER:
Q. Okay. We were just talking about the meeting
that took place on September 1st, 2017, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. After that meeting did you have any discussion with Tom about it?
A. Yes.
Q. And what was the nature of those discussions?
A. Just talking about appropriate sanctions, asking opinion.
Q. What was Tom's opinion?
A. I think com -- similar to mine; that again, based
on the fact that there was a finding -- a violation that
seemed like there was some appropriate restorative kinds of sanctions related to ongoing compliance.
Q. And by that you're referring to the additions to the constitution that BLinC agreed to make?
A. Referring to the -- what ended up being the three sanctions that were part of my September 13th communication.
Q. Okay. And before I get to that, just to clarify,
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Q. And why not?
A. Because they could in an interview setting ask a question that was not appropriate based on the Human Rights Policy. They --
Q. So interviews would be problematic?
A. If -- if not structured with an appropriate
protocol and line of questioning that would be approved
by the leadership and by the advisor --
Q. Okay.
A. -- to avoid asking questions that could get the group in conflict with the policy.
Q. But if all the student group did was ask students
to sign a statement, if they signed it, they were
eligible; if they didn't, they weren't eligible for the
leadership position; that would be okay?
A. Barring no other problem.
Q. Okay. Let's -- so you -- was there any
disagreement between you and Tom about how to proceed after the meeting?
A. Nothing of substance that I recall.
Q. Okay. Anything minor that you recall?
A. I -- I don't believe so.
Q. Okay. Did you exchange any emails about the meeting with Tom afterwards?
A. I don't -- there was definitely personal
when you were in the meeting you indicated that it would
be okay for BLinC to -- in fact, you asked BLinC to
include its beliefs about marriage in its constitution, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And a statement that all students had to abstain
from marriage out -- abstain from sexual relationships
outside of marriage between a man and a woman, you indicated would be acceptable, correct?
A. I believe so.
Q. Okay. And that's because as long as it applied to everybody, that would not categorically exclude anybody from participating in BLinC because of their status -- their sexual orientation?
A. Correct.
Q. And asking students just to read that and sign that would allow BLinC to avoid asking them directly about their sexual orientation, correct?
A. I suggested or I required in the --
Q. Well, let me -- let me just ask you that
question. Just -- just asking a student leader to sign
a Statement of Faith, that would avoid the potential for presuming something about someone's sexual orientation; isn't that correct?
A. No.
communicate -- face-to-face communication. There could
have been. I think there was -- sorry, an email draft of the -- there wasn't an email draft. It was a hard copy draft, as I recall, of his -- a review of my letter.
Q. Okay. Would you make sure that that's been produced?
A. Okay.
Q. And we'll make a note of that. Then would you --
were there -- did you -- would you have emailed anybody else about the meeting?
A. I may have emailed Lyn to let her know that it occurred. I can't recall exactly.
Q. Okay. And would you make sure that any emails that are relevant were produced?
A. Correct.
Q. Well, you don't go forward -- you do that after this session?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Did you have any conversations with anyone other than Tom about the meeting?
A. Nate Levin.
Q. And who's Nate Levin?
A. In the Office of the General Counsel.
Q. Okay. Anyone else besides Nate?

## A. I referenced Lyn in terms of how the meeting

 went.Q. What did you tell her about how the meeting went?
A. I felt the meeting -- I felt the meeting was a
good meeting.
Q. Okay. And why?
A. Because I felt that the students had agreed to what we had talked about in that setting and that -- I was -- that was the first time I had met those students. I was impressed with them. So --
Q. Okay. When you -- in fact, when you left the meeting you turned around and said something positive to them. Do you remember that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And do you remember what you said?
A. Not exactly, but something to the effect, "You're quality UI students."
Q. Okay.
A. Something of that nature.
Q. Great. Thank you. I'm gonna ask you to look at

Document Number 114. Do you recognize this document?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And what is it?
A. This is my communication to Jacob -- at -- at the conclusion of our meeting on September 1st.
Q. But you made that decision without looking at the evidence directly, correct?
A. I looked at the evidence that was provided by

Constance.
Q. Okay. But you did not look at the -- the -- the original evidence?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. It was just Constance's summary?
A. In her insertion of direct quotations, et cetera.
Q. Then the next paragraph you say, "After
consideration of the investigative report and your remarks, I will permit your organization to function as a Registered Student Organization in good standing provided you comply with the following."

## A. Correct.

Q. "Commit to ongoing compliance with the University of Iowa's Human Rights Policy at all times in the future."
A. Correct.
Q. And BLinC had already agreed to do that, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. "Two. Submit a list of qualifications for
leaders of your organization designed to prevent future disqualifications based on protected categories and to ensure that persons who identify as non-heterosexuals
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1
Q. Okay. I'm gonna point your attention to the first sentence in the second paragraph. It says, "This investigation was conducted under the Discipline of Registered Student Organization Procedures found at --" and then there's a website?
A. Yes.
Q. So the investigation was conducted under those procedures; is that correct?
A. Yes, because investigations of Human Rights Policy violations go directly to the office of EOD.
Q. Okay. Would you expect to find procedures for appealing from the EOD findings in this document?
A. No.
Q. Okay. It would be in a separate document?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And do you know what that document would be?
A. It would be an EOD-related document.
Q. Okay. And you don't know what it is?
A. I don't.
Q. Okay. The second paragraph, you said in the second sentence, "I find there is a preponderance of evidence that BLinC violated the University of Iowa Human Rights Policy." Is that correct?

## A. Correct

are not categorically eliminated from consideration," correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And that refers to the same decision that came out of the meeting, correct?
A. In essence, yes.
Q. Okay. So if BLinC inserted its beliefs in a way
that did not categorically eliminate anyone from consideration --
A. Yes. And -- and I believe that it's important to have all kinds of qualifications that are relevant for leaders in all student organizations to be very clear.
Q. Okay. And that's important for all student groups?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And then the third requirement was, "Submit an acceptable plan for ensuring that group officers who interview leaders will ask questions relevant to the vision statement that are not presumptive of candidates based upon their sexual orientation."
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And then you state that they will return to good standing if they comply with that.
A. Correct.
the Doctrine of Personal Integrity was included. That was a brand-new section, but everything else remained the same --
Q. Okay.
A. -- in that document.
Q. Okay. Any other changes that stood out to you?
A. Again, I remember there being a section that was
included. I can't recall.
Q. Why don't you -- why don't you look at --
A. Okay.
Q. -- Article III, paragraph 1, and read that to yourself?
A. (Pause.) Yes.
Q. Okay. Is this the paragraph that you're referring to?
A. Yes, if that -- if that is the Doctrine of --
Q. This is not the Doctrine of Personal

Responsibility. That's later. I'm just asking if --
you said there was another section you thought maybe was in membership or something. I'm wondering if this is what you --
A. I believe -- I apologize, but I believe so.
Q. Okay. What -- having read this now, is there anything problematic in Article III, Section 1?
A. (Pause.) I don't believe so.
section that -- there was a section that was included that hadn't been there before.
Q. And do you remember -- what was that about?
A. Was it Section 4 on membership?
Q. Well, I'll -- I'll walk you through them. I'm just wondering what you recall --
A. Yeah, I remember that -- I remember there were
some --
MR. CARROLL: Slow down a little bit.
THE WITNESS: Oh. Can't read my hands? I apologize again.
A. Yes, there were -- minor changes, major changes, words that were -- so minor changes, major changes.
Q. Okay. Do you remember what the substance --
the -- the main gist of any of those changes were? Without looking at the document. I'll let you look in a minute.
A. Yeah, yeah.
Q. I just want to know if you remember --
A. Yes, the -- part of the submission also involved the Statement of Faith.
Q. Okay.
A. That was -- that went from a -- it was like a vision statement to an actual -- I believe the title said to a Statement of Faith in which the personal -- or
Q. And then I'm gonna refer you next to the last page of this Exhibit, Exhibit A. Now, is this what you're referring to when you said there was previously a vision statement and now there is a Statement of Faith?
A. Correct.
Q. And the final paragraph was added?
A. Correct.
Q. And as far as you recall, that was the only thing that was changed in this, right?
A. Correct. I know there was a section about signature section --
Q. Okay.
A. -- but -- that's not -- here. That was on the
one that was submitted.
Q. So let's look at Article VI.
A. Excuse me. I believe that signature statement was a part of both.
Q. Okay.
A. Yeah.
Q. I'm gonna turn your attention to -- then go back a couple of pages to Article VI -- it says Article VI in the constitution. Okay. And it says, "All nominees must be interviewed by the President or, at the President's direction [sic], by another Executive Officer. Nominees must affirm that they accept and seek
to live BLinC's religious beliefs as set forth in
Article III, paragraph 1 of this constitution. If elected, a nominee must sign a copy of BLinC's Statement of Faith."
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Was there anything -- this was -- this was in the BLinC constitution before, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. That's your recollection?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Is there anything problematic about this provision?
A. No.
Q. Then I'm going to ask you to look at the

Statement of Faith again. The Doctrine of Personal
Integrity -- and in the first line says that, "All
Christians are under obligation to seek to follow the
example of Christ in their own lives and in human society," correct? Is there anything -- any problem with including that in the student constitution?
A. No.
Q. Okay. The next line says, "In the spirit of

Christ, Christians should oppose racism, every form of greed, selfishness, and vice, and all forms of sexual immorality, including pornography." Is there anything
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## A. Yes.

Q. Why?
A. Because the husband and wife piece it's --
federal law that allows same sex marriage, State of Iowa, same sex marriage.
Q. So it's your belief that it's now illegal to
believe that God's intention for sexual relationship is
to be between a husband and wife?
A. I'm saying it's a protected class in our Human

Rights Policy.
Q. Okay. And does your Human Rights Policy prohibit certain religious beliefs?
(The reporter requested a clarification.) MR. BAXTER: Religious beliefs.
A. Well, religion is -- religion is one of the protections.
Q. Okay. So is it okay, under the Human Rights

Policy, for students to believe that God's intention for
sexual relationship is to be between a husband and a wife in the lifelong covenant of marriage?
A. There is a conflict.
Q. Well -- is it a violation of the Human Rights

Policy for students to believe that?
A. To believe it? No.
Q. Okay. Is it unconsti -- is it a violation of the
problematic in including that statement in a student constitution?
A. No.
Q. The next statement is, "We believe God's
intention for a sexual relationship is to be between a husband and a wife in a lifelong covenant of marriage." Is there anything problematic about including that in a student constitution?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Why?
A. The -- the husband and wife piece is a -- a violation of our Human Rights Policy as it relates to -we allow -- it's not universal for heterosexuals and non-heterosexuals, and it infers a male and a female.
Q. Okay. When we spoke before the break, you stated that including a statement like that in a constitution would not be a violation, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And then during the break did you speak with anyone during the break?
A. I did not.
Q. Did you speak to your counsel?
A. I did not.
Q. Okay. And now you're saying that you think that statement is problematic?

Human Rights Policy for students to express that belief on campus?
A. No.
Q. Is it a violation for students to form groups
with other students who share that belief?
A. No.
Q. Is it a violation for students in that group to express that belief on campus?

## A. No.

Q. So why is it a violation of the Human Rights Policy?
A. Because the notion of -- of the status piece, rather than belief piece.
Q. This says, "We believe God's intention for a sexual relationship is to be between a husband and a wife in a lifelong covenant of marriage."
A. Um-hum.
Q. And you think that violates the Human Rights Policy?
A. Again, the difference between belief and status.
Q. What's the status here?
A. The status related to protected class in the

Human Rights Policy.
Q. But whose status is it --
A. Sexual orientation, meaning that this implies

## heterosexual and --

Q. But you said -- you already indicated that it's okay to state your beliefs about homosexuality or marriage or any of those things on campus, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And so the -- yeah, students have freedom of speech to do that.

## A. Um-hum.

Q. And it would be a violation of the law for the University to suppress that speech? Just students on campus -- if students on campus, expressing their beliefs about homosexuality or God's intent for sexuality to be between a man and a woman, any of those beliefs, if expressed on campus, and the University tried to suppress those speech -- that speech by a student, that would violate federal law?
A. Yes.
Q. And it would violate state law?
A. Yes.
Q. And it would probably violate Iowa City law, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And you indicated that if students get together on campus and express those beliefs as a group, that the University cannot suppress that speech without
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are free to express these views on campus, either alone or in groups, that they're free to form groups around these beliefs --
A. Um-hum.
Q. -- but that they can't express them in their constitution?
A. They should be able to express them in the constitution.
Q. Okay. And if the Human Rights Policy says they can't, then the Human Rights Policy is in violation of the law, correct?

## A. Correct.

MR. CARROLL: I'm gonna object. Just a minute. You're not an attorney, so don't answer legal questions.

THE WITNESS: Okay.
MR. CARROLL: You're a fact witness and you're a corporate designee --

THE WITNESS: Okay.
MR. CARROLL: -- but don't answer questions about what counsel suggests the First Amendment or Title VII for the equal protection clause, right.
BY MR. BAXTER:
Q. But these are -- that's consistent with what you believe, correct?
violating the law?
A. Correct.
Q. And that they can even form a group, right?
A. Right.
Q. And they can express that as a group?
A. (Nodding.)
Q. So if you were to suppress this statement from
the -- the constitution of BLinC, that would violate
federal law, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So your earlier statement that this was a problematic statement was false?

## A. Again, I think it's -- problematic in

 relationship to the Human Rights Policy as it relates to sexual orientation.Q. So your Human Rights Policy is in violation of federal law; is that what you're saying?

## A. No.

Q. How do you -- how do you explain that students can express all of those views on campus individually and in groups and they can form groups and have those views, but they can't express that in their constitution?
A. Say that again, please.
Q. How do you justify your statements that students 96

## A. Say -- what is consistent?

Q. What we've just said -- what you just said. You said, "Correct" at the end because it was your -- the questions I was -- I'm just gonna stop right there. I'll leave it there.

The next sentence says that, "Every other sexual relationship beyond this is outside of God's design and is not in keeping with God's original plan for humanity." Is there any -- I'm sorry.
A. No, correct. That's what that reads.
Q. Okay. Is there any problem with including that provision in the student constitution?
A. No.
Q. Okay. The next sentence says, "We believe that every person should embrace, not reject their God-given sex." Is there any problem with including that in the student group constitution?
A. Well, that statement is in conflict with the gender identity component of the University of Iowa Human --
(The reporter requested a clarification.)
THE WITNESS: Gender identity component of the University of Iowa Human Rights Policy. BY MR. BAXTER:
Q. Okay. Is that because the Human Rights Policy
prohibits certain beliefs about gender identity?
A. Say that again.
Q. Does the Human Rights Policy prohibit certain beliefs about gender identity?
A. Beliefs, no.
Q. Okay. What in the statement goes beyond belief?
A. Nothing.
Q. Okay. So is this statement in violation of the

Human Rights Policy?
A. I think it -- I think it is.
Q. Okay. I'm going to -- okay. I'm gonna ask you to look at document -- well, let me just ask you one more question about that document. You've indicated that -- there's three sentences I want to focus on. The first one starts out, "We believe God's intention." You indicated that that sentence is not problematic. That's what you previously said, correct?
A. Right, right.
Q. Okay. And then you said that the second sentence was not problematic, correct?
A. (No response.)
Q. That's what you said, at least before, correct?
A. Okay. Yes.
Q. Okay. And then -- but the third sentence you think is problematic?
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## A. Yep.

Q. There are a number of groups on campus that are essentially support groups for students in the LGBTQ community, correct?
A. Um-hum.
Q. And those students' constitutions express certain
views about homosexuality or gender identify; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And is their expression of those views in
violation of the Human Rights Policy?
A. No.
Q. But BLinC's expression of those views -- of views is in violation of the Human Rights Policy?
A. The expression of the belief, no.
Q. Okay.
A. The acting on the -- the expression of the
belief, no.
Q. Okay. So all of those three statements that I
read, none of those are -- there's no problem with including those in the student constitutions?
A. As -- as beliefs.
Q. Okay. I'm gonna ask you to look at Document 118 .

Do you recognize this document?

## A. Yes.

Q. What is it?
A. "We believe every person --"
Q. Correct. "Should embrace, not reject their

## God-given sex"?

A. On the face it's a violation of our -- Human Rights Policy because of the gender identity component.
Q. Okay. So is it your position that any reference to gender identity in the student constitution violates the Human Rights Policy?
A. Any reference?
Q. Yeah.
A. I'm sorry. I'm --
Q. Okay. And just to be clear, when we said, "The first sentence," I was referring to the sentence that says, "We believe God's intention for a sexual relationship is to be between a husband and a wife in the lifelong covenant of marriage."
A. Again, I'm -- I'm --
Q. I'm just -- I'm just gonna clarify for the record. On the second sentence -- starts -- - says, "Every other sexual relationship beyond this is outside of God's design and is not in keeping with God's original plan for humanity." And the third sentence says, "We believe that every person should embrace, not reject, their God-given sex." I have a new question for you.
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## A. A letter from me to Jacob.

Q. Okay. And what was the purpose of the --
A. Sorry --

MR. BAXTER: Sorry. What was that?
MR. CARROLL: He looked at me. I said, "I
was just yawning."
MR. BAXTER: Oh, oh, thank you.
BY MR. BAXTER:
Q. What's the purpose of this letter?
A. This was my communication -- to him stating that
they had an additional ten days to respond to my -request in the September 13th communication.
Q. Okay. So this is -- this came after you'd received their revised constitution, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And you state that, "Their constitution does not satisfy the requirements I delineated," correct?
A. Correct.
Q. "That the Statement of Faith on its face does not comply with the University's Human Rights Policy," correct?
A. Correct.
Q. So we've already talked about several provisions in the constitution that you already said were all acceptable. So what in the constitution, on its face,
violates the Human Rights Policy?
A. The sections related to sexual orientation and
gender identity.
Q. And which sections are those? Do you want to flip back to --
A. In the personal -- in the Document of Personal Integrity
Q. Okay. This is doc -- the Document 116. Which --
which sentences on their face violate the Human Rights Policy?
A. The -- the husband and wife and a lifelong covenant of marriage and the God-given sex.
Q. Okay. And a minute ago you said that it was -there was no problem including those in the constitution. This letter says that they are problematic on their face.
A. Um-hum.
Q. How do you -- how do you distinguish that?
A. (No response.)
Q. You can't -- you can't really distinguish those, right, there's no logic in those two positions, correct?
A. Right. I'm -- I am getting myself very confused and I --
Q. I mean, doesn't this really stem from the fact that the University disapproves of BLinC's views?
A. No.
Q. What does it stem from then?
A. A violation of the University of Iowa's Human

Rights Policy.
Q. Okay. You say -- let's see. You say, "You have opportunity to make additional revisions," correct?
A. Correct.
Q. You don't -- do you explain anywhere what those revisions could be?
A. I go -- I go back to my communication of the 13th referencing back that the -- the acceptable plan for ensuring that group officers must -- or who interview -will ask questions relevant to Statement of Faith, but are not presumptive of candidates, so directing them to provide that.
Q. If they deleted those three sentences that we spoke about earlier from their constitution, would they no longer be in violation of the Human Rights Policy?
A. I'm --
Q. Let me -- let me restate this. If they had -- if
they had deleted -- after receiving this letter, if they
had deleted those three sentences --

## A. Could I take a break?

Q. After this question. After this question.
A. 'Cuz my head is so -- getting myself so confused
at this point.
Q. I'll get you -- I'll give you a break. I just
want to hear your question [sic] right now. If they had
responded to this letter by deleting those three
sentences, would you have approved their constitution?
A. At this point I -- I don't want to answer that without taking a break.
Q. Because the truth is you would have accepted
their constitution if they had deleted those three
provisions, correct?
A. Again, I'd like to take a break. I'm --
anxiety --
Q. That's okay. Mr. Nelson, you're under oath, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. That means you have an obligation to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth --
A. Correct.
Q. -- correct?
A. Correct.
Q. If they had deleted those three provisions from
their constitution and sent it back to you, would you
have accepted their constitution?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.

```
Q. When was that?
A. Upon -- receipt of that.
Q. Okay. After -- go ahead.
A. No.
Q. After you received the revised constitution, did
you have any substantive conversations with Constance
about the revised constitution?
A. With Constance, no.
Q. What about with Dr. Redington?
A. Yes, I believe I shared that -- yes, we talked
about it. I -- but it did not -- as I recall, the
conversation was about the fact that it did not -- what
I had requested my position was, what I had received was not sufficient.
Q. Okay. And what was her response?
A. I -- "Thank you."
Q. Do you remember anything else about the
conversation?
A. I don't.
Q. Okay. Then looking at this letter, did you review it before it went out?
A. I can't recall for sure. She may have checked for factual accuracy, but I -- I don't recall.
Q. Do you remember providing any edits to the letter?
```
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I used and she'd received my letter.
Q. And I'm gonna ask you to go ahead and look at Document Number 120.
A. 120?
Q. Yes. Do you have that? Does not have --
A. I don't believe so.
Q. Okay. Okay. We'll pass -- we'll pass on this
next point. Right before we went back on the record, we
took a ten or 15 -minute break, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Did you talk with anyone during that --
A. I -- I did not. I may have mumbled. No.
Q. You mumbled to someone or to yourself?
A. Mumbling, myself.
Q. Okay.
A. Anxiety and sweating and --
Q. Okay. Sorry to make this a difficult experience.

Let's see. (Pause.) I'm gonna ask you to take a
look -- well, let's -- do you have Document Number 81?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Okay. And do you recognize what that is?
A. Yes.
Q. What is it?
A. This was Constance Schriver Cervantes' finding on the investigation of 24:7.
A. I don't recall.
Q. Okay. And then do you see at the end of the
first paragraph where she says, "My review is based upon the written record"?
A. Correct.
Q. So that confirms your earlier suspicion -- or I
guess, that indicates that she wouldn't have -- to
your -- well, I don't need to ask that question. The next sentence says, "Upon my review of the record I affirm the decision of Dr. Nelson," correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And then skipping a sentence, the next sentence
says, "The Statement of Faith on its face does not comply with the University's Human Rights Policy," correct?
A. Correct.
Q. That "on its face," language is the same language you used in your letter, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Did you have any discussion with Lyn about that?
A. No.
Q. Okay.
A. I -- I don't recall.
Q. Okay.
A. I don't believe so. You know, that was language
Q. Okay. And you were cc'd on that document, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. I assume that you had no involvement in the EOD investigation portion of this; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Had you heard about the investigation before you
received this complaint?
A. Yes.
Q. And what had you heard?
A. That it -- again, that the -- there had been a complaint, and again, as I referenced earlier on that May 26th meeting when Kristi Finger and I met with Connie, I believe we talked about both cases.
Q. Okay. And was there any other time when you would have discussed the $24: 7$ situation with anyone?
A. Yeah. I -- I'm certain I would have talked with my supervisor about it. Again, just in normal course of -- supervisor/supervisee communication. Tom Baker, probably given Tom's -- having historical involvement in cases and -- yeah.
Q. Okay. Was -- do you recall the substance of any of those conversations?
A. No.
Q. In the normal course of dealings, what would they
A. Update on -- part of my style in communicating
with my supervisor is just letting them know any issues
of importance, and so I would have definitely
communicated that this is something that would have come
to me. The depth of our discussion, I simply can't
recall. But I absolutely would have notified because
that's how I do my work.
Q. Okay. And what's your understanding of what the result was of the investigation?
A. This investigation resulted in a finding of --
there was not a preponderance of evidence that there was
a violation. I --
Q. Okay. Did -- did you review the -- the Findings?
A. Yes, I've reviewed this, yes.
Q. You would have read the -- at the time, had --
did you -- when you first received it, did you read
the -- read it in its entirety?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And were you surprised about the Finding?
A. I was not, based on the facts that Constance

## presented

Q. Okay. And do you remember what the facts were that --
A. Yes.
Q. -- didn't surprise you?
A. That she -- there was just insufficient
information to -- to determine whether or not -- again, I think we've already, I think, discussed this -- the student's name, right?
Q. Marcus Miller?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. Um-hum.
A. The reason for his -- not being given that leadership opportunity, there was not a preponderance of evidence for her to determine if it was a policy violation or not.
Q. Okay. So I want you to look at the second page
of the -- of the Findings. And I guess it's the
paragraph after allegations. It says -- the fourth
paragraph down, it says, "Complainant was then contacted by Gaskill." Do you see that?
A. Um-hum.
Q. And then the second sentence says, "Complainant met with Gaskill and advised Gaskill that he was struggling with being gay and Christian. Gaskill told Complainant if Complainant was openly gay, he would not be acceptable as a leader in 24:7."
A. Um-hum.
Q. If that were true, would that be a violation of
Q. And then it says, "Complainant's answer provided, in part, 'I am gay and continue to wrestle with the Bible actually -- with what the Bible actually teaches on the subject of homosexuality.'" Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Does having an application that asks those kind of questions violate the Human Rights Policy?
A. (Pause.) Could you repeat that, please?
Q. Do you see the application question?
A. Um-hum.
Q. It's number 2.
A. Yes.
Q. Correct? Is having that question as part of the application for becoming a leader of a student -- of a registered student group -- does that violate the Human Rights Policy?
A. Yes.
Q. But Constance found no -- no probable cause to find a violation, correct?
A. Because there was additional context in terms of student -- one of the students -- I believe a -respondent not following up with the Complainant -- the specifics of this -- really, I think, are -- need to be Constance.
Q. Okay. But you didn't do anything -- the fact
that a student organization had a provision that
violated the Human Rights Policy, you took no action to
correct that, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And you just let it go?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Do you have Exhibit 46?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recognize this document?
A. Yes.
Q. What is it?
A. Communication from Tom Baker to -- regarding the

Christian Legal Society.
(The reporter requested a clarification.)
THE WITNESS: Christian Legal Society.
BY MR. BAXTER:
Q. And do you -- this -- this is dated February

20th, 2004, right?
A. (Nodding.)
Q. And you've said that you've been at the -- is
that correct?
A. Yeah. I arrived -- October of 2003.
Q. Okay. Do you remember what was the gist of this letter?

MR. CARROLL: Excuse me. Just so I'm clear,
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A. Would you like me to continue to --
Q. Why don't you just read the letter?
A. Thank you. (Pause.) Okay.
Q. At the time the -- you've had a chance to read
the entire letter, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And at the time that you received this letter, it
would have been your normal practice to read it
carefully?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And do you remember doing that in this instance?
A. I -- I'm certain I did.
Q. And is there anything in this letter that you disagree with from -- or as -- let me just -- let me ask you this question. Turn to Exhibit 2 quickly. And the -- is that the Exhibit A to the -- Notice of Deposition -- Notice of $30(B)(6)$ Deposition?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. And so you're looking at Exhibit A, correct? This is the list of topics that were noticed for the deposition.
A. Correct.
Q. Correct?
A. Correct.
are you asking at the time of the letter?
2 BY MR. BAXTER:
Q. I'm just asking right now, do you remember what the gist of the letter is?
A. Yeah. There was an issue about whether or not the -- potential violation of Human Rights Policy -- and failure to include part of it in the -- in the documents, as I recall.
Q. Okay. Does it sound correct to remember that BLinC -- or that -- I'm sorry -- that CLS was concerned about including the Human Rights Policy in its constitution?
A. Correct.
Q. And do you remember why it was concerned about that?
A. I'll have to read it and --
Q. Do you want to just take a minute and read the letter?
A. Please. Thank you. (Pause.)
Q. Have you read the letter?
A. I've skimmed the -- the last section. The last
part.
Q. Where -- where did you start skimming?
A. The middle of the second page. Page two.
Q. Okay. After --
Q. And the first one says, "The University of Iowa's policies and/or procedures regarding Registered Student Organizations."
A. Correct.
Q. And you are authorized to speak on that topic today on behalf of the University?
A. Correct.
Q. And then topic number 11 -- well, I won't -- I
don't need to ask for that one. Why are you the person that can speak for the University? I mean, what -- what are your day-to-day responsibilities that qualify you to speak on this topic?

MR. CARROLL: Well, I'm gonna object. That isn't the requirement of the rule. You can certainly ask him what his day-to-day responsibilities are. We can designate anybody we want, as long as they're here properly.

MR. BAXTER: Thank you.
MR. CARROLL: So you can --
MR. BAXTER: Let me --
MR. CARROLL: -- respond.
MR. BAXTER: Well, let me rephrase the
question.
BY MR. BAXTER:
Q. Do you have responsibilities in your job that
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qualify you to speak on these topics?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And did you have any -- did you -- what are those -- what are those responsibilities?
A. The registration of student organizations function as a part of the Center for Student Involvement and Leadership. The Center for Student Involvement and Leadership works up through the Iowa Memorial Union.
Q. And how does that -- what -- what impact does
that have with respect to student organizations in the Human Rights Policy? Do they submit their constitutions to you?
A. They submit the constitutions to the staff who administer that program.
Q. Okay. And -- and so the staff has responsibility to make sure that the Human Rights Policy is complied with?
A. Correct.
Q. And if they have questions, do they go to you or --
A. They can, yes.
Q. Okay.
A. They can, or to General Counsel's Office, or historically Tom Baker has answered some of those questions.
constitution?
A. (No response.)
Q. If you don't remember, that's fine. I just
wanted to know if --
A. Yes.
Q. -- you remember why?
A. I don't.
Q. All right. But at the time you would have read the letter?
A. Yes.
Q. And understood it?
A. I believe so.
Q. And if you disagreed with anything in it, would you have said something?
A. I would not have attempted to overturn the decision of the -- the Vice President, and I think Tom Baker was writing on behalf of the Vice President.
Q. Okay. Are you aware of -- after that of any other situation involving CLS and concerns about whether it was in compliance with the Human Rights Policy?
A. I -- one point of clarification, is at -- at that point in time my role in terms of student organization discipline was different than it is today.
Q. Okay. But do you have any recollection -- during all of your time at the University of Iowa -- do you
Q. Okay. But as far as the Center, you have the final authority at the Center for construing the Human Rights Policy; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And you're authorized to speak for the University on that topic today?

## A. Correct.

Q. Okay. Is there anything in this letter that is inconsistent with the Human Rights Policy?
A. (No response.)
Q. Let me re-ask that question. As you read the letter, was there anything that jumped out to you that violates the Human Rights Policy?
A. The -- the -- the case, as I recall -- and, again, in reading, was that they had not inserted their -- the Human Rights Policy, and then the University directed them to insert it, correct, and then in doing so --
Q. Do you remember why they were concerned about inserting the Human Rights Policy?
A. I'm sorry. Do I -- why --
Q. Do you remember why they were concerned?
A. Why Christian Legal Society?
Q. Correct. Why Christian Legal Society was concerned about putting the Human Rights Policy in their
have any knowledge of the history of CLS and its compliance and concerns about its compliance with the Human Rights Policy?
A. Yes, there have -- there had been.
Q. And what have those concerns been?
A. Related to whether or not they are operating consistent or not consistent with the University of Iowa's Human Rights Policy.
Q. Can you remember any specific incidents that arose?
A. Again, the -- the one related to -- again student -- University of Iowa student government denied them recognition, and then they were to include their Human Rights Policy, and then they would be eligible to receive the -- benefits of Registered Student Organizations.
Q. Okay. And that's the ones referred to in the letter you just read --
A. Correct.
Q. -- which is Document 47? Were there any incidents after that, that you're aware of?
A. I believe so.
Q. Do you remember what they were?
A. There may have been another incident later on in -- I don't know if it was 2008, 2009, related to,
again, student government, I believe, wanting to deny funding.
Q. Okay. And do you remember how that was resolved?
A. The decision was made at the student government
level to allow funding.
Q. Okay. And did you review any of the docu -- in
preparation for your deposition today, did you review
any of the documents about that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Why -- do you remember why anybody wanted to deny CLS either registered student status, registered group status, or funding?
A. There -- the -- the student government leadership was suggesting that they were being discriminatory in their practices.
Q. Well, what was the belief that they were discriminating on?
A. I believe on sexual -- orientation.
Q. Okay. So there was -- and that incident -- I am gonna ask you to look at Document Number 53. Are you familiar with this document?
A. Yes, now. I don't remember it back from 2008.
Q. Okay. I'm gonna ask you to look at Document Number 54. Should be next in the --
A. I have 53. I don't have --
A. -- a massive amount of documents. Incredible to retain all that --
Q. I'm just --
A. -- without getting confused in my own mind, and I apologize for that.
Q. That's okay. I understand. I just want to make sure we end up both understanding where we are in this so -- but you were aware that there was a group called OutLaw on campus, and what was that group's mission?
A. They were -- they were affiliated with the College of Law -- gay, lesbian, bisexual, and allied students affiliated with the College of Law.
Q. And is it fair to say that they were protesting funding going to Christian Legal Society?
A. Yes.
Q. And the University basically wrote a letter saying that it was -- the funding was constitutional and appropriate?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And you're -- there was another issue --
is it correct that -- do you recall another issue where
one of the student -- the student -- I think it's SABACK
[pronouncing]; is that correct?
A. SABAC, yes.
Q. SABAC?
Q. That's okay. Okay. I'm going to move now to Document Number 121. Or no, wait.
A. I don't have Document --
Q. Document 14. (Pause.) Is 220 in your binder?
A. Yes, it is.
(A discussion was held off the record between Mr. Baxter and Mr. Blomberg.)

BY MR. BAXTER:
Q. Okay. Are you familiar with this document?
A. Yes.
Q. And what is this?
A. Communication from then-Vice President Rocklin to

OutLaws student Organization.
Q. And what was the nature of the letter?
A. Again, related to the challenges around student organization registration and possible disconnect with the University of Iowa Human Rights Policy.
Q. Okay. And what -- do you remember what the conclusion of this letter was?
A. (No response.)
Q. I mean, do you have any independent -- without
having to look back at the document, do you have any independent recollection of what these were about?
A. Not without reviewing this because there's --
Q. I understand.
A. Um-hum. Yes.
Q. Had a -- I have that.
A. SABAC is S-A-B-A-C. It's an acronym.

THE REPORTER: Thank you.
Q. And it stands for?
A. The Student Allocation Budgeting Committee.
Q. And do you recall an incident where SABAC had a provision where they were wanting to deny funding to CLS and groups like it?

## A. Correct.

Q. Okay. So you're aware that there's been a history on campus of groups protesting CLS, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Because of its religious beliefs?
A. Yes.
Q. And those beliefs concerning marriage and sexuality?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And did you ever do anything to try to fight that kind of discrimination against CLS?
A. I remember being a part of the -- the discussion with the students at the -- at the student government -student government meeting, talking about the fact that denying funding would be -- not consistent with University policy, and if they chose to do so the

University would, as I recall, as I reflect, reverse that decision.
Q. Okay. So you knew back in 2009 that conditioning
funding based on a group's religious beliefs would be a violation of the law, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And would also violate the Human Rights Policy, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Now, I'm going to ask you to look at

Document 14.
(A discussion was held off the record between Mr. Baxter and Mr. Blomberg.)
BY MR. BAXTER:
Q. Okay. Do you recognize this document?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And what is this?
A. It is one of the three sections of the Code of Student Life that references student organizations.
Q. Okay. And what's the purpose of this document?
A. To talk about the registration of student organizations.
Q. Okay. And has this document -- was -- you know, print -- this copy was printed some time ago, you know, since the start of the BLinC litigation. Is -- has
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been added related to fraternities and sororities, and, again, it has the -- the only difference is the exemption language related to social fraternities and sororities.
Q. Okay. And what is -- what is that? What is -what kind of exemption is there?
A. The -- Title IX exemption that's given to the University allows the University to exempt -- allows them to have the single sex status.
Q. Okay. And you've applied that to fraternities -so is this an exemption from the Human Rights Policy for fraternities or sororities?
A. This is -- this is -- the Title IX, as I
understand it, is an exemption that's given to the institution to comply with social fraternities and sororities to allow them to retain their single sex status.
Q. Okay. So it allows fraternities and sororities to discriminate on the basis of sex?
A. Protected under Title IX.
Q. Okay. And we will talk about that, but what -is there any reason why this policy was not in the documents that were -- the updated policy? Is there any reason why the updated policy was not produced to us in response to the document requests?
there been any change to this document in recent times?
A. Yes, there was clarification to the document regarding fraternities and sororities. There have been -- that's the substantial -- and inclusion into this document -- there's three sections. One is registration, one is administration, so they're in the registration section or administration section. The inclusion of the -- the --
Q. I'm gonna ask you to slow down a little bit.
A. Okay. The adapted -- Human Rights Policy that has in -- in it the exemption related to social fraternities and sororities.
Q. Okay. I want you to explain that to me. When was this amendment made?
A. Within the last month, two.
Q. Okay. So in the last month or two there's been a change to this policy?
A. Correct. And it's -- again, an insertion related to the Human Rights Policy. There's no, like -- when this was printed -- yes, yes, it's a registration section so --
Q. What page are you on?
A. Page -- it would be the second page.
Q. Okay. Then the one labeled 000273 at the bottom?
A. Correct. There's an additional section that has
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A. I don't -- I don't know that for sure, why it wasn't provided. Is it my obligation to provide the question? My obligation to provide it or --
Q. You didn't -- you didn't go look for anything to provide them in this litigation?
A. Well, again, there's been ongoing communication. As I understand it, there's been supplemental communication sent from the University to -- to you related to updates, updates related to this, updates in terms of some of our enforcement practices that are different now than they were then.

MR. BAXTER: Okay. Counsel, will you make sure that gets produced to us?

MR. CARROLL: Yeah, I'm not sure that I've seen it. If I have it, you have it.

MR. BAXTER: Okay. I haven't seen the original old policy or the new policy from you so -- we just --

MR. CARROLL: This is the old policy (indicating).

MR. BAXTER: Well, we printed that and produced it.

MR. CARROLL: Oh, okay.
MR. BAXTER: That's our document. BY MR. BAXTER:
Q. I'm gonna ask you to look at Document Number 11.

Do you have it?
A. I believe so.
Q. Go to the document that's been -- will be in the
binder as Number 11. Do you recognize that document?
It's a screen shot?
A. Um-hum.
Q. Do you recognize what it's a screen shot of?
A. Yeah, it's related to our OrgSync platform, I
believe.
Q. Okay. And do you see the column on the right?

It says something about 6/22/2018 -- can you read that?
A. 6/22/18, um-hum.
Q. What do those two entries say that have that date?
A. Registered Student Organization Constitutional

Standards and Guidelines.
Q. Okay. And what does the second one say?
A. That was the second one. The first one says

Policies Affecting Student Organizations.
Q. Okay. And turn to Document 12.
A. I don't have 12.
Q. Okay. Do you see this breakdown where it says A,
$B$, and $C$ ?
A. Those are the three sections I referred to.
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says "Registered Student Organization Constitution
Standards and Guidelines"?
A. That's -- that's -- we provide student
organizations with a template to use to develop the -the model constitution.
Q. Okay. I'm gonna ask you just to hold onto

Document Number 11, which is labeled P000270. No, I'm
sorry. That is Document Number 12. Document 12 is
labeled P270.
(The reporter requested a clarification.)
MR. BAXTER: Correct.
THE WITNESS: 2-7-0.
BY MR. BAXTER:
Q. Okay. And then turn in the binder to 14. So 14 corresponds with -- what's A on 11, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And you're gonna provide me an updated copy of
that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And then turn to 15. You're familiar with that document?
A. Yes.
Q. And is that what corresponds with B on Document 11?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And these correlate on the Document Number 11 to the policies affecting student organizations, correct?
A. These are the three sections within the policies affecting student --
Q. Okay.
A. Well, policies and regulations affecting
students.
Q. Okay. So if I told you that I clicked on the

6/22/2018 date on Document 11, and it brought down this, that would --
A. Yes.
Q. That would make sense, right?
A. Yes. Some of our -- yes, there has been
substantial work in the last several months about making certain that our policies/procedures are -- are clear, and so that we can be consistent in our enforcement of policies and procedures.
Q. Okay. And which one of those three is the one that has the fraternity -- the exception for
fraternities and sororities?
A. Now? The A.
Q. A? Okay.
A. Registration.
Q. And then what's this second one down here that
Q. I'm sorry -- on Document 12?
A. Yes, yes, yes. Corresponds with B.
Q. Okay. And is this document then revised any time in the recent future?
A. It would have -- by recent future --
Q. I mean -- in recent -- in the recent past?
A. Okay. Yes, if there were -- if -- again, if
there were components of this document that needed
clarification related to policies and -- and
enforcement, there would have been adjustments made to
this?
Q. Okay. And would you have a redlined version of
these policies with the recent changes?
A. The staff would.
Q. Okay. Would you produce those to us?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And --

THE WITNESS: Do I need to write this --
MR. CARROLL: No, I've -- I've got notes.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
BY MR. BAXTER:
Q. Okay. And then I'm asking you to look at

Document 16.
A. Okay.
Q. Does that correspond with Exhibit C on Document

## 12?

A. Yes, it does.
Q. Okay. And do you know if this one's been updated any time recently?
A. I'm just reviewing it to make sure some of the sections -- I don't believe there's been any changes to this.
Q. Okay. And then also for 17 -- on Document 17, do you have a 17 ?
A. Um-hum.
Q. Okay. Is that the document that corresponds with this second entry on Document 12?
A. Correct. And there would be changes to this.
Q. Okay. For all of those documents, will you produce updated copies including redlined with any changes that have been made since 2008 ?
A. 2008 would be challenging.
Q. Okay. Since -- since --
A. Commencement of the --

MR. CARROLL: Well, you don't have to answer discovery requests.

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.
MR. CARROLL: I do.
MR. BAXTER: He'll provide those.
MR. CARROLL: I'll provide --

## 135

MR. BLOMBERG: Can you give me the numbers

## again?

MR. BAXTER: Yeah, it's basically -- or 14 through 22.

MR. CARROLL: Do you want to break for lunch?

MR. BAXTER: Let me just look. I think
we're done. I want to just check and make sure there's
nothing about those documents that I want to ask him
when we all break, if that's okay. Then we'll have a
nice clean break.
BY MR. BAXTER:
Q. I do have one question. On 21 there is a document entitled Nondiscrimination Statement.
A. Um-hum.
Q. Is there a difference between the

Nondiscrimination Statement and the Human Rights Policy?
A. This -- this document is in the University of

Iowa Operations Manual. I'm not -- I'm not responsible
for the University of Iowa's Operations Manual. I
believe there are -- there are -- there are differences.
The Human Rights Policy has some additional language as
related to student organizations than what is written here.
Q. Is it fair to say, though, then the -- this is

MR. BAXTER: Let's do anything before the invest -- before the situation on BLinC arose, so whatever the date is of the complaint. February 20th. Well, no, because -- I would say back to -- well, we'll talk about a time.

MR. CARROLL: Yeah. Yeah.
MR. BAXTER: Okay. We don't have to put this on the record.
(A discussion was held off the record.)
MR. BAXTER: In fact, I'm gonna make that same request because we didn't receive any of the docu -- we didn't receive any of the policies except one copy of the Human Rights Policy. So for documents labeled $18,19,20,21,22$, will the University produce updated versions of those documents?

MR. CARROLL: Yeah. Why don't you put it in writing --

MR. BAXTER: Okay.
MR. CARROLL: -- what you truly want because some of these policies -- it depends on how far back you're going. When you say "redlined versions," they may not exist. Changes exist.

MR. BAXTER: Sure, but any -- any -- okay. We'll put them in writing.

MR. CARROLL: Yeah.
what applies to the University in its own operation --
A. Correct.
Q. -- as far as you know?

MR. BAXTER: And then -- why don't we take a break? We'll do lunch. Meet here again at one.

MR. CARROLL: Okay.
(A discussion was held off the record.)
(A recess was held from 12:04 p.m. until 1:03
p.m.)
(Mr. Blomberg is not present.)
MR. BAXTER: Okay. We're back on the record?

THE REPORTER: Yes.
BY MR. BAXTER:
Q. Okay. Mr. Nelson, we've just returned from our lunch break. Did you speak to anyone about this case while you were at lunch?
A. I did not.
Q. Okay. After -- after Lyn Redington sent her letter affirming the sanctions, did you have any other involvement specifically with regard to BLinC?
A. After Lyn sent her letter to the -- in terms of communication with you, communication with students? Could you clarify, please?
Q. Yeah, did you have any -- well, you didn't have
any -- did you have any communication with me after the Lyn Redington letter?
A. No, I received the -- after -- after Lyn's
nine-day appeal, I know that there was no communication with you and $I$, and then $I$ think our next communication with the students occurred after -- after the judge's decision and it allowed -- getting ahold of them to participate in the student organizations there.
Q. Okay. So you -- and by "you," I assume you mean the center. What do you call the place where you work?
A. I work in the Iowa Memorial Union.
Q. The Memorial Union.
A. And in the Center for Student Involvement and

Leadership. It is a -- kind of a programatic area that works with --
Q. Okay. So when you referred to --
(The reporter requested a clarification as the witness's answer was not audible.) THE WITNESS: Registered Student

Organizations.
BY MR. BAXTER:
Q. So when you refer to where you work, what do you call it? The Memorial Union?
A. The IMU.
Q. The IMU? Okay. I'll just be in -- up with the
prior to Iowa, he was in a professional role at another institution.
Q. Okay. And does Andy have a male partner?
A. No.
Q. Okay.
A. A -- I believe a wife, woman.
Q. Okay. And when did Andy first become aware of the BLinC matter?
A. I would imagine shortly after his hire.
Q. Okay. And was there anything that happened after the Lyn Redington letter that caused the University to reconsider policy or to start conducting a review of the constitutions?
A. Yes, my understanding was that after the -again, we received direction from the Office of the General Counsel.
Q. Okay.
A. I don't know --

MR. CARROLL: You -- you can -- you can
answer that component without getting into what --
BY MR. BAXTER:
Q. Yeah, you don't have to tell me what your lawyer told you, but if you want to tell me, like --
A. Correct. Yeah, we -- yeah, we were in communications with the -- after the judge made the
lingo.
A. No, no, no. That's fine.
Q. Okay. So you -- IMU -- you or the -- someone at the IMU reached out to BLinC to invite them back to the student --
A. Correct. Andy Kutcher, exactly.
Q. Okay. And what exactly is Andy Kutcher's role at the IMU?
A. Andy Kutcher replaced Kristi Finger, Student Organization Development Coordinator.
Q. Okay. And Kristi, you said, went into more of an administrative side?
A. Correct. She's still in the Iowa Memorial Union, works in Event Services, and does scheduling, meeting rooms, events, space, campus -- outdoor campus space.
Q. So do you remember approximately when Andy would have been --
A. When he joined our team?
Q. When he would have joined your team?
A. Yes, it would have been, I believe, the first part of December of 2017.
Q. Okay. And before that, was he at another position at the University, or was he an outsider?
A. He was in a clerical role in our University residence halls, but he trailed his partner and -- but 140
ruling -- is it called an injunction; is that correct?
Q. Correct. Entered an injunction --
A. Yep. Then there was --
(The reporter requested a clarification.) MR. BAXTER: Entered an injunction is what I said.
A. Then there was a communication to us immediately to reinstate BLinC, and I believe that was -- could have been the very same day or the day -- I think the day of because then we immediately -- when I say "we," Andy Kutcher authored the email inviting the students to participate in the student organization fair, which they did that day. I think perhaps January 20 something.
Q. Okay. So you reinstated BLinC. At some point, though, the University started reviewing student constitutions, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And what triggered that?
A. The concern that was -- communicated to me from General Counsel. I don't know. And, again, tell me if I can't say this.
Q. I'll let your counsel stop you.
A. Sure. Because the -- one of the concerns from the judge was -- again, I don't want to quote this -but in -- inconsistent enforcement, and so beginning --

January, February, there would have been a process of -yeah.
Q. So the -- one of the judge's concerns was
inconsistent enforcement. So without telling me what your attorney said, though --
A. Um-hum.
Q. -- what decisions were made to respond to that?
A. The -- we -- needed to review our student
organization -- Registered Student Organization constitutions, to determine, of those constitutions, which of them had the current accurate and complete University of Iowa Human Rights Policy. That review happened late January, early February.
Q. Okay. And the -- who -- who headed up that review?
A. The -- review -- the -- coordinating the effort
was led by -- Anita Cory, which we referenced earlier, Paul Mintner, which I believe we referenced earlier, and they assembled the staff of the Center for -- because of the volume of constitutions involved, they assembled the staff of the Center for Student Involvement and Leadership to review those constitutions.
Q. And just remind me, Anita Cory works where and for whom?
A. Okay. Dr. Cory at the time was the Associate
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Q. So he is between Anita and Andy?
A. Nope.
Q. Because Anita left?
A. Anita left. Anita works in the Office of the

Dean of Students.
Q. What was he at the time that this -- back in

January?
A. Paul was -- there were three Associate Directors.

Anita was one, and Paul was two of the three. The second of the third.
Q. So both Anita and Paul reported directly to you?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And they pulled in more of your staff from CSIL to help review?
A. Correct.
Q. And how many people were pulled in?
A. The majority of the team, which would be -- I
could do a count but probably -- I know there were some that were not available, and, again, it happened over more than one occasion. But -- ten, ten to 12 --
Q. Okay.
A. -- staff members.
Q. And were they given guidance on what to do? What were they told to do?
A. They were -- they were given guidance. The

Director for -- in the Center for Student Involvement and Leadership, and she had administrative oversight over student organization development. So -- just a visual, if you will, Andy Kutcher reporting to Anita Cory, Anita Cory reporting to Bill Nelson. And I said that she is no longer in that role, however, she's still with the University.
Q. And what's her new role?
A. She is -- she is doing student organization conduct.
Q. What does that mean?
A. She works in the Office of Dean of Students, and her primary area of focus is student conduct.
Specifically, student organization conduct.
Q. So this is if they have a drunken party and cause problems, she would deal with that?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Those types of things?
A. And University policy violations.
Q. Okay. Would that also -- but if it were a Human Rights Policy violation, it would go back to the EOD?
A. EOD. Correct.
Q. Okay. And then remind me, Paul Mintner's role?
A. Yes, Paul is -- currently Andy's interim
supervisor.
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guidance was to review the constitutions to see if the University Human Rights Clause -- the updated Human Rights Clause, which was, I think, 2014, was included and was complete and accurate there. They were also to see if there were other perhaps contradictory language that was also to be noted.
Q. Was there something about a financial clause?
A. There's a financial clause that's required as well, and I -- I -- that was part of the review that had been going on over time as well. That wasn't a central piece, but it was -- a Human Rights Clause -- or excuse me -- the Human Rights Policy was.
Q. The Human Rights Policy was? I thought you --
A. Oh.
Q. -- ended in the middle of -- sorry.
A. No, yeah, I -- yeah. The Human Rights -checking to see if the Human Rights Policy, the updated version, complete and full, was included in the student organization's constitution.
Q. Okay. And -- when you said they were looking for language that was conflicting --
A. Um-hum.
Q. -- were they given any guidance on what to look for?
A. Yes. Any language that might be in conflict with

## protected classes in the Human Rights Policy.

Q. Okay. Was it just that general? They weren't
given any examples or --
A. I think they were -- I wasn't in the setting
where they did that.
Q. Okay.
A. I would imagine they did give examples and were
asked questions and provided illustrations.
Q. Do you know if they were given any written
guidance, or was this just oral communication?
A. I think it was oral.
Q. Could you double-check that?
A. Okay.

MR. CARROLL: (Nodding.)
A. I have a procedural question; may I ask?
Q. Sure.
A. Why -- there's been many times that you have
referenced followup, and I certainly want to --
Q. Well, your counsel will keep track of that.

We'll keep track of that.
MR. CARROLL: Yeah, you don't have to worry about it.
A. Okay. I want to make sure that --
Q. Yeah, we --
A. -- don't do anything wrong.
A. Yes, yes.
Q. Okay. What was -- tell me about that.
A. I'm not certain I can. That was when I was
arriving. I can't speak to previous --
Q. Okay.
A. -- versions of the Human Rights Policy. I
apologize.
Q. Okay. Was there a time when the Human Rights

Policy was revised to add religion?
A. Again, I think that issue --
Q. You don't have any independent knowledge of that?
A. No. I know that there was an update in 2014.
Q. Okay. Do you have Document Number -- 33 and 34?
A. I have 33 .
Q. Okay.
A. I do not have 34 .
Q. Okay. Do you recognize this document
(indicating)?
A. As an -- as an original document, no. As a --
no.
Q. But you read it to prepare for this deposition?
A. I had access to it, yes, as the part of the --
(The reporter requested a clarification.)
THE WITNESS: As part of a very large amount of documents.
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Q. She's writing everything -- oh, she's writing everything down and we will --
A. Right.
Q. -- and we're writing everything down.
A. We'll come back eventually because we need to
follow up.
Q. Yeah.
A. Thank you.
Q. I want to go back. Well, I'll just have you look at a document. That was one of the documents pertaining to the Christian Legal Society. And it was the letter that Tom Baker wrote on February 20th, 2004. It's Document Number 46. Do you see in the second or the third paragraph -- actually, the last sentence, it says, "Creed and sexual orientation are specifically listed as examples of categories that deprive a person from consideration as an individual. Religion and religious affiliation are not specifically identified in the policy, although in some instances discrimination on the basis of religion would violate the policy, such as a practice of not permitting Christians to join a student political group."

Do you have -- I mean, was there ever an earlier policy that didn't include religion? Does that sound right?

BY MR. BAXTER:
Q. And what -- what is this document, as best you know?
A. This explains the revisions to the University of Iowa's Human -- Human Rights Policy.
Q. Okay. And it indicates that this is -- the date at the top says fall of 2014, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And that this is when policy changes were expected that summer. Do you see that in the heading?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And it -- it -- does it sound right that
in December 2012, there was an internal audit that made a recommendation to review the policy on human rights? Do you see that at the very top sentence?

## A. I do, I see that.

Q. And then it says their goal is to promote a more complete understanding of the nondiscrimination policy and encourage consistent practices and so forth?

## A. Correct.

Q. Okay. And then down under number 1 it says,
"Combine the Human Rights Policy with the EOD's discrimination complaint procedures."

## A. Correct.

Q. So was it your understanding that the EOD

```
discrimination process and the H -- Human Rights Policy
process are the same process?
    A. I think you'll need to speak to Connie about
that.
    Q. Okay.
    A. Constance.
    Q. Yep. And then under 2 it says, "Added several
new protected categories: Religion, status of the U.S.
veteran, pregnancy, service in the U.S. Military, and
genetic information."
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Were you part of the discussion on how to change the policy?
A. No.
Q. No? And have you talked to anybody who was?
A. No.
Q. Do you have any insight into why these were protected categories?
A. No, not why they were added.
Q. Who would have that knowledge?
A. I believe Constance -- Constance would.
Jennifer -- these were people who would work in the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity. Jennifer Modestou who is the director there, Constance who is one of the team members there, perhaps Mr. Baker.
```

of the student constitutions?
A. At -- at my level or the Vice President's
level -- I'm not certain. So, again, I -- or the office of the President. Again, it was -- it was a
directive --
Q. Okay.
A. -- based on advice to -- that needed to happen.
Q. Okay. But Anita and Paul would have --
A. Report to me.
Q. Report to you?
A. Excuse me. Interrupted.
Q. If you had questions, you would have then reported to who?
A. At -- at the time when the review started, it was -- Lyn Redington was in the process of leaving, and so I, for a period of time, was in the process of reporting to Dr. Shivers, shall we say?
Q. And Dr. Shivers is?
A. The Vice President for Student Life.
Q. So before Lyn Redington left, did she report directly to Ms. Shivers --
A. Correct.
Q. -- Dr. Shivers?
A. Yes. Lyn reported directly to Vice President

Shivers.
Q. Okay. Do you think this came out of EOD more than --
A. I'm not certain of its origin.
Q. Okay. That's fair. Do you know, as the person
who's authorized to speak for -- the person at the deposition about the Human Rights Policy -- do you know why the categories that are included were included, and why other categories aren't included?
A. I do not have that information.
Q. For example, there's nothing in the Human Rights Policy that would protect someone based of their immigration status, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And there's nothing in the Human Rights Policy that would protect someone based on their status as a crime victim?
A. Correct.
Q. Or as an ex-spouse?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. So I want to ask you just a series of hypotheticals.
A. Okay.
Q. And ultimately -- let me ask: Ultimately, you were the person who was responsible -- or were you the person who was responsible for carrying out the review
Q. And so as the process of the reviews began, you were starting to shift over your reporting to Vice President Shivers as well?
A. Correct.
Q. And were there any issues that arose that you passed up to her?
A. Yes. In our -- in our review of -- or when I say "our," the collective "our," our CSIL team in the review. I'm sorry. In the review, I believe they reviewed over 500 student constitutions, and among those 500 constitutions, approximately 160, 150 -- I think it was 157 have the full and complete information. Human Rights Policy Clause.
Q. Okay.
A. The remaining did not. That was passed along.
Q. And so what did you do -- that was passed along to Vice President Shivers?
A. Correct.
Q. And do you know what she did with that information?
A. I believe she passed that along to the Office of the President and the Office of General Counsel.
Q. And what did you do? Beyond -- you've got the first wave of information.
A. Um-hum.
Q. Then what did -- what happened?
A. Um-hum. Then we realized that one of our challenges was that student organizations could upload governing documents into the OrgSync portal -- OrgSync being our student organization data -- database management platform, and that students could go in and do that, and there was no trigger for staff to know that the $A B C$ group went in and made a change.

So in the first part of February we disabled that, so that all con -- all governing documents -uploads or -- would have to go through staff. So that way staff had to review the updated uploaded document -prior to upload.
Q. So how did that -- how did that problem come to your attention?
A. When we realized -- how the problem?
Q. Well, you said that it was a problem -- or it
sounded like you were saying it was a problem that student groups were uploading their revised constitutions, presumably without it going through staff?
A. Correct. Correct. And this was -- as we realized, we needed to do something different related to enforcement. That seemed to be a natural -- point of where we could connect a potential problem.
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was the -- those that were full and complete, accurate, current. So that remaining number, that 300 and some -they were reached out to, to say that, "You need to include the full, complete, updated Human Rights -Policy."
Q. Do you have a list of the 157 that were complete from the beginning?
A. We should have that, absolutely.
Q. And we'll ask that that be provided. Were those 157 also reviewed for conflicting language? Do you know what I am talking about?
A. Yes, yes, yes. Part of -- yeah, part of -- part of that review that happened initially with that 513 -that was -- you know, the other thing they were looking at, was -- potential conflicts in language, yes.
Q. Okay. Then --
A. I don't know how many of that 157 may -- may or may not have had conflicting language off the top of my head.
Q. Would there be a record of that?
A. I -- I believe so.
Q. Okay. And then after the April 14th letter went out to the remaining 300 and some groups, what happened?
A. So that communication, I believe, was sent on April 20th. They had until March [sic] 3rd to respond,
Q. But do you know how it came to your attention that they were being uploaded without getting --
A. That was just the way the system was. That was our practice.
Q. It wasn't -- okay. And so what -- what did you do -- anything besides that? You changed it so they would reroute to staff?
A. Yes. And so -- timing-wise, then the -- that disabling occurred the first part of February, and then -- there were -- in -- April there was a communication that was sent out to the -- Registered Student Organization leadership, the primary representatives, asking that they submit -- or -- new constitution, new governing documents that included the updated full and complete University of Iowa Human Rights Policy.
Q. And did that -- that was April something?
A. Something. Yes.
Q. Did that go to every single student -- Registered

## Student Organization on campus?

A. That went to the groups who -- well, we knew from our initial review that there were 160 that were complete. That communication went out to the remaining. We started the review, I believe I said -- 500 and -513, I think, was the initial starting number; 157
and I believe they received 200 and -- 201 responses.
Q. And why was March 3rd chosen as the date?
A. I think there was a two-week period. I think, ballpark of two weeks from April 20th to --
Q. Okay. And then there were two more letters that went out later. Do you recall that?
A. There was a letter that then went out on -- June 1st.
Q. Okay. What was the purpose of that letter?
A. That letter was a communication to the groups who had not complied or -- complied or responded, saying, "You have until June 15th to submit the revised con -governing documents, constitution in the bylaws," and it said that if they did not, they would be deregistered, but as soon as they did, they would be reregistered, assuming it was full and complete.
Q. And were you -- did you help draft those emails or who would have drafted those emails?
A. They would have come from, I believe, Andy Kutcher. I reviewed -- I have reviewed some of his communications, and I don't know -- I know I reviewed the communication that went out on -- that -- that first communication, was the day April --
Q. 20th?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. I'm gonna show you a document that's been labeled as Document 75. Do you recognize that document?
A. Yes.
Q. And what are those?
A. This is communication from Andy Kutcher to a
student organization leader, and -- referencing the
Human Rights Clause.
Q. Is that the April 20th letter you were referring
to, or one copy of it?
A. Correct, it was a batch.
Q. Okay. And if you flip through that, is that what that -- those are all batches of the same letter?
A. Yeah. Yeah, this -- yes.
Q. Okay. And does that language -- does that email have language in there asking the students to make sure the Human Rights Policy is stated correctly in their constitution?
A. Correct.
Q. Does it have language in there about removing conflicting language?

## A. Not in this communication.

Q. Okay. And does it have information about making sure the financial's policy is stated correctly?
A. Not in this communication.
Q. Okay. So this is the communication that went out
A. Correct.
Q. And are they student employees?
A. No.
Q. Okay. And they were just given oral guidance on how to do that, not written guidance?
A. There were -- no, there was -- there were written -- yes, because there was -- again, in that -in those -- the dates -- the -- the time frame between those dates we've identified, there was follow-up communication, and so there was, for lack of a better description, a script that people could use in those follow-up communications --
Q. Okay.
A. -- to guide the conversation.
Q. Okay. And did that script have examples of types of problems and how to resolve them?
A. I don't believe it was that specific.
Q. Okay. I'm trying to understand what --
A. Sure.
Q. -- "conflicting language" means. Was there anything in writing that would have explained what was meant by conflicting language?
A. I'm trying to -- I -- I'm un -- I'm unclear right now as to the guidance that we provided the groups about the unclear language piece.
to the -- all of the student groups that weren't already
in compliance by April 20th, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Was there any other communication that
went to all of those groups with everything else in it?
A. So -- again, the -- then the June 1st

## communication.

Q. Okay. So it's -- did everybody who got the April

20th -- email also receive the June 1st email?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Why not?
A. Because some of the groups complied in the interim.
Q. Okay. So some of those groups that complied might have failed to remove conflicting language because they didn't know about it?
A. Sorry. I'm just -- I'm collecting in my head then the letters. I -- I can't recall for sure exactly when we addressed the conflicting language piece with them. But we were -- we continued to look at that in -in submissions.
Q. Okay. And the only -- and this -- and the people who were looking at that, the reviewers --
A. Um-hum.
Q. -- are full-time employees of the CSIL?
Q. Okay. That's fine. I think I have that
document, but I'll wait to show it to you later and you can verify if it's what you're thinking of.
A. Okay.
Q. Okay.
A. Which -- which document?
Q. Well, there are some documents that may -- maybe have the script that you referred to or something, and I will show those to you.
A. Yeah. I -- I can see the sample email, I can see the -- some scripts, et cetera, but I can't tell you in which communication, plural, we addressed the conflicting language piece.
Q. Okay. Now, just for clarity of the record, I'm going to state that the document that I showed you that was the samples of the April 20th, 2018, email is Document 175. I'm now going to show you what's Document 173. This is a set of emails dated June 1st, 2018. They appear to be a form email. And can you verify whether this is the email you referred to earlier that was sent on June 1st?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Does that email contain instructions regarding the full -- inclusion of the full Human Rights Policy?

```
A. Yes.
Q. Does it have language in there about removing conflicting language?
A. Yes.
Q. Could you read that?
A. Yes. "Additionally, RSO governing documents --" (The reporter requested that the witness read more slowly.)
MR. CARROLL: Slow down.
THE WITNESS: I apologize.
THE REPORTER: Additionally --
A. Thank you. This is -- yeah. "Additionally, RSO governing documents may not include language that is considered contradictory to the Human Rights Clause. Any language considered contradictory must be removed." I knew this was in a communication. I just didn't know which one.
Q. Okay. And -- but this one would not have gone to all the students. This email at Document 173 would only have gone to students who already hadn't been approved?
A. This would have gone -- this would not have gone to the ones that we had identified as being -- having no problems.
Q. So that's the 157 from before April, plus any who came into compliance between April and June 1st?
```


## communicated with everybody initially.

MR. BAXTER: Okay. I would share with
counsel the documents we received, there are gaps that
suggest that some student organizations received the
first notice on June 1st -- June 1st or June 8th. So if
that's correct, I'd like the rest of the production of those documents.

BY MR. BAXTER:
Q. Do you notice that -- well, I'm gonna show you again Document 173, which was the June 1st email.
A. Um-hum.
Q. In this document the language -- the
contradictory language is just in plain type, no
underlining or emphasis, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And could you read that again?
A. The entire paragraph or just the --
Q. Just the -- the (inaudible) language.
(The reporter requested a clarification.)
MR. BAXTER: I'm sorry. Just the
contradictory language.
A. "Additionally, RSO governing documents may not include the language that is considered contradictory to the Human Rights Clause."
Q. Okay. And I'd like you, while you're looking at
A. Correct.
Q. And then I'm going to show you what's labeled as Document 174, which is an email -- a batch of emails dated June 8, 2018. And what -- would you look at that and tell me if that's --
A. Um-hum.
Q. -- what that is?
A. Yeah, it's an additional communication going out about having the -- Human Rights Clause in there as well as removal of contradictory --
Q. And what was the impetus for this email just one week later?
A. I believe in the previous communication you sent me, they -- we had given them till June 15th --
Q. Correct.
A. -- to respond. I think it was a little bit of a courtesy, a reminder to -- to do so.
Q. Okay. And are you confident that there are no student groups who received the first notice on either June 1st or June 8th?
A. Am I confident --
Q. That all student groups received the April 20th email, and that there are no student groups who heard about this for the first time on June 1st or June 8th?
A. I believe -- to the best of our ability, we
that, look at the document that's labeled 174 and --
is -- do you see there's additional language added?
A. Yes.
Q. And this kind of language is in bold and
underlined, right? And what's the additional language?
A. The part about the -- more clarifications related
to, "Requirements for membership and leadership that are based on one or more protected classifications that are listed above in the Human Rights Clause."
Q. So this tried to explain what contradictory language might be, right?

## A. Correct.

Q. And it states that the contradictory language would be anything that has to do with selecting the years [sic] based on things that might contradict the -or might be implicated by the Human Rights Clause?
A. Correct.
Q. So only the -- only the groups that received this email on June 8th would have received that instruction, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And, again, there's no -- there were no more specific guidance on what it meant to have language contradictory to the Human Rights Policy?
A. Please say again.
Q. And was there -- is there anywhere where I could find more clear guidance on what you meant by language that is -- by contradictory language, that would include requirements for membership or leadership that are based on one or more protected classifications?
A. So is there -- you're asking for -- is there another document that explains that?
Q. Right.
A. I can't recall. There may be.
Q. So did the CSIL employees who were redoing the constitution pretty much act on their own discretion to determine what was a violation of the Human Rights Policy?
A. They --
Q. What was -- excuse me. Let me ask that question again. Did the CSIL employees pretty much act on their -- have final decision making authority on what type of language for selecting leaders would violate the Human Rights Policy?
A. No, that -- if there were questions, those were to be addressed to -- to Andy and, again, Anita at some point, and then Paul more recently.
Q. But questions would never get to them if the reviewers didn't raise them, right?
A. Correct.

## BY MR. BAXTER:

Q. Thank you. If in their constitution they had a provision that excluded nonimmigrants, would that have -- should that have been flagged by the reviewers?
A. The -- whenever there was a conflict of -- of contradictory language, and it couldn't be discerned by Paul, again -- excuse me -- Andy -- and then Anita or Paul, depending on the timeline, then those were sent to the Office of the General Counsel for clar -- or for an interpretation and advice.
Q. So let's say that a group formed around immigration status, is there anything in the Human Rights Policy that would be triggered by that?
A. No.
Q. Okay. So if someone, though -- you know, started a -- you know, build-a-wall club --
A. Um-hum.
Q. -- and they wanted to exclude immigrants --
A. Um-hum.
Q. -- they could do that without violating the Human Rights Policy; is that correct?
A. We allow the groups to assemble around an agreed-upon mission.
(Mr. Blomberg entered.)
Q. Okay. And the same with categories like -- if
Q. So they had the first call whether something was a violation or not?

## A. Correct.

Q. And you were just trusting their judgment to decide if something should be passed up?
A. Or, again, based on instruction, direction that was given to the team assembling. I -- again, I wasn't -- I wasn't in the space at the time with them, but I -- there had to have been a layer of discussion -or discussion and direction, guidance given. There was a -- there was a form. They had a form that -- that had at -- that had protected classes on the form, and protected classes, those included in the Human Rights Policy.
Q. Okay. Well, let me -- I'm just gonna ask you a series of questions to see what you -- what your understanding was of how they would have applied the requirement to remove any contradictory language. Let's say someone started a group to -- for students who are participants in the DACA Program?
A. Um-hum.
Q. Do you know what the DACA Program is?
A. Um-hum.

MR. CARROLL: "Yes"? "Yes"?
THE WITNESS: Yes, I apologize.
you had a group that formed around, you know, protecting victims of sexual assault, and they wanted to exclude anybody who had a criminal record, there's nothing that would trigger the Human Rights Policy or that it would be considered a violation of the Human Rights Policy for that?
A. Could you repeat that?
(Mr. Blomberg left the room.)
BY MR. BAXTER:
Q. Let's say a group formed around -- a group of students wanted to form a club to -- a support group for victims of crime --
A. Um-hum.
Q. -- say, victims of sexual assault.
A. Um-hum.
Q. And in their constitution they excluded any
members who had a criminal record --
A. Um-hum.
Q. -- there's nothing in the Human Rights Policy --
A. My apologies. Yes.
Q. Please say that.
A. Yes, yes.
Q. That would --
A. That's earlier -- yes. Felonies, not --
Q. Okay. What about political parties? If a group
of students wanted to form a group supporting Bernie
Stand -- Stander -- Sanders, they could do that, right?
A. Correct.
Q. And they could limit their leadership to
individuals who supported Bernie Sanders' platform?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And could students form a Republican club and require their leaders to be registered Republicans?
A. Correct.
Q. They could require them to support the Republican party platform?
A. Correct.
Q. What if the Republican Party platform has a
statement that marriage should be between a man and a woman --
A. Um-hum.
Q. -- could they still have that club and exclude people who didn't -- who didn't support that platform?
A. They can have that statement, but they can't -that statement can't categorically unilaterally violate the University of Iowa's Human Rights Policy.
Q. Could that club make people sign a statement saying that they support everything in the Republican Party platform in order to be eligible to be a leader?
A. Yes, we -- we allow groups to sign a statement
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A. Policy and human rights.
Q. What's Tiffini Stevenson Earl's job?
A. She's one of the compliance officers in EOD.
Q. Okay. And do you know what her job
responsibilities are?
A. She's involved in training; I know that. I think, again, Constance can speak specifically to her exact duties.
Q. Okay. This looks like a training document, right, on how to comply with the policy on human rights?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. On the -- on the page within this document
that's numbered 935 -- do you see that?
A. Um-hum.
Q. It defines creed as a formal statement of religious belief, confession of faith, or a system of beliefs, principles, or opinions, and it can be any strongly held philosophical beliefs, even if not a recognized religion; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. So -- and is this an accurate statement of how
the University would interpret creed?
A. Yes.
Q. So when the Human Rights Policy says that you cannot discriminate on the basis of creed --
that -- leaders to sign Statements of Faith.
Q. Okay. So creed is included as a protected category, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And what's your understanding of what creed means?
A. Context of religion.
Q. In the context of religion or other -- what does it mean to you?
A. Umm --
Q. Let me ask you another question?
A. Yes, please.
Q. Will you turn to Document 37? Okay. Do you recognize that document?
A. And it's authored, yes. Works at EOD -Tiffini -- (inaudible).
(The reporter requested a clarification.)
A. Yes. And the person listed on the first page is a staff member in Equal Opportunity and Diversity. Tiffini Stevenson Earl.
Q. Earl. And do you recognize what -- or do you have -- do you recognize what that document is?
A. It's a review, yes.
(Mr. Blomberg returned.)
Q. A review of what?

## A. Um-hum.

Q. -- does that mean that political groups can't exclude people who don't share their political creed?
A. Again, it's -- student organizations can have those statements.
Q. Okay. So the political -- the Republican Party can exclude Democrats?
A. They cannot violate the University of Iowa's Human Rights Policy.
Q. Okay. Can they exclude Democrats as their leaders?
A. (Pause.) As long as their exclusion is not based on a violation of the Human Rights Policy.
Q. Well, how do you -- how would Republicans exclude Democrats without violating the prohibition against discrimination based on creed?
A. I'm -- I'm sorry?
Q. If the Republican Party excluded a Democratic leader --
A. Um-hum.
Q. -- isn't that discrimination on the basis of creed?
A. Yes.
Q. So it violates the Human Rights Policy?
A. Yes.
Q. But you said you make an exception, apparently, because you allow political parties to exclude, as leaders, people who don't share their -- their beliefs or their creed?
A. Yeah.
Q. That's correct?
A. What we -- again, we -- allow the groups to have
these -- their -- their Statements of Beliefs, their
credos, their -- what they believe strongly in. And as long as someone is -- not denied an opportunity, because of our protected classes, we haven't -- we have not acted on that as a violation.
Q. Okay. So creed is a protected class, and do you know that on campus there's lots of groups that exclude leaders who don't share their creed, right?
A. Um-hum. Um-hum.
Q. Is that a "yes" or "no"?
A. Yes.
Q. And have you ever done anything to stop that?
A. We've received no violations, no complaints on
that. Had we, we would have investigated.
Q. But you said earlier that you would allow that to
happen, that if that -- you would allow groups to exclude leaders who didn't share their creed.
A. As a Statement of Faith, but if we received a
Q. Well, I've given you the entire situation.

You're authorized to interpret the Human Rights Policy, correct?
A. For Registered Student Organizations with
guidance from administration, yes.
Q. But for purposes of this deposition, you're
entitled to speak on behalf of the University on that
issue, correct?
A. For student organizations.
Q. That's a "yes" --
A. Yes.
Q. -- for student organization?
A. Excuse me. Yes, yes.
Q. If the pro-Bernie party excludes, as a leader, a pro-Trump individual, that's discrimination on the basis of creed, correct?

## A. Correct.

Q. Technically, that violates the Human Rights

Policy, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. But you've stated that you let student groups do
that because you want student groups to form around common beliefs, correct?
A. Right.
Q. And there's many ways that someone's creed or
complaint from a student that acknowledged that they were -- "I was not given an opportunity because of a protected class," we would investigate -- or EOD would investigate.
Q. And what would EOD's conclusion be?
A. It depends on the specifics of the -- of the

## complaint and --

Q. Well, let me give you a very specific fact pattern.
A. Okay.
Q. Okay. Assume that there's a par -- a group on campus that supports Bernie Sanders, and a -- individual shows up and asks -- has been attending the group for months, and asks if he can be a leader of the party.

And he says, "I'm a huge Trump supporter, and -- I want to become a leader so that I can insert Trump's beliefs into the group," and the group denies him a leadership position for that reason because his political creed is different than the group's political creed.
A. Um-hum.
Q. Does that violate the Human Rights Policy?
A. I got a little bit lost in the analogy there.

But -- does it violate -- is a result of an
investigation that would look at the whole situation to see what all of the variables were.
group philosophy could conflict with the Human Rights -with a -- could touch on a topic in the Human Rights Policy, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Could a sorority, for example, require its members to be single?
A. No.
Q. Why not?
A. There may be actually sororities that do not
allow membership to women to be married.
Q. And why do you think that might be?
A. Because that's a part of their credo, their
belief, their strongly-held system of values.
Q. Right. Possibly, the sorority's purpose, right, is to generate social interaction between men and women, correct?
A. Or students, in general, um-hum.
Q. And they might feel like that feels improper if
they have married members, right?
A. I'm not certain I know -- how they feel.
Q. But it's a possibility?
A. Certainly.
Q. And would you allow them to follow that credo, that creed, if that's what they wanted to do?
A. Again, I think we would allow the group to

## function until we were made aware of there being a

 problem, and then we would look at the entirety of the problem to determine what had happened.Q. Well, I'm giving you very basic scenarios. Let me give you another very simple one, okay? Let's say there's a group organized on campus to support veterans who have served in the United States Military --
A. Um-hum.
Q. -- and they exclude anyone who hasn't served in
the military. That would be discrimination on the basis of service in the U.S. Military, correct?

## A. Correct.

Q. And service in the U.S. Military is a protected status?
A. Correct.
Q. So would you allow that group to exist or not, if someone complained?
A. If they complained and they were found in violation, they would not be allowed to exist. If they -- if the complaint -- if the finding was there was no violation, they would be allowed to exist.
Q. Say that last part again.
A. If there was a -- if the investigation -- you said there was a complaint. If the complaint was investigated, and given all of the variables, all the
mean?
A. I under -- I think you were talking about disassociating them from the institution.
Q. Deregistering them, correct.
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Have you made any effort to deregister -are there groups on campus that form around --
A. Yes.
Q. -- affiliation with the military or service in
the military?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Do they require their leaders to have served in the U.S. Military, or to meet the purposes of the group?
A. The latter.
Q. Okay. They require them to meet the purposes of the group?
A. Correct.
Q. And even -- have you made sure that that -- so some of those groups would exclude members who, for example, have never served in the military or have no affiliations with the military?
A. (Nodding.)
Q. So you're nodding your head "yes" --
A. Meaning --
facts, then, if they were found to be in violation of the University of Iowa's Human Rights Policy, there could be sanctions issued against them. If they're -if the investigation yielded no violation of the University of Iowa's Human Rights Policy --
Q. Okay. You're dodging the question.
A. I --
Q. There's no -- there's no complicating factor
here. There's -- there's one set of facts. A group excludes leaders who don't meet their mission. A U.S. Military group excludes people who haven't served in the U.S. Military. That is a violation of your Human Rights Policy, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So you should disband that group, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Have you made any effort to go to the groups on campus that form around affiliations of the U.S. Military and ask them to disband?

## A. No.

MR. CARROLL: Well, just a minute. I'm gonna object as a misstatement of the record. We deregister groups. We don't disband them.

BY MR. BAXTER:
Q. When I say "disband," do you understand what I 180
Q. -- is that correct?
A. Well, no, I'm saying -- I'm following your line of questioning, and that no, we have not done that. That's why we are changing our enforcement patterns.
Q. Okay. So --
A. Because we operate from a complaint-driven system.
Q. But all you -- you've upgraded from a
complaint-driven system?
A. Correct.
Q. What's the system now?
A. Well, I think we're waiting on guidance from the General Counsel's Office to determine exactly how we should be proceeding. That's why I referenced these cases where there's conflict and the staff can't seem to quite work through the conflict, are -- in the General Counsel's Office or interpretation for us to then receive direction.

MR. BAXTER: Okay. We're gonna -- I'm gonna stop and go off the record for a minute.
(A discussion was held off the record.)
(A recess was held from 2:03 p.m. until 2:11
p.m.)

MR. BAXTER: Let's go on the record.
BY MR. BAXTER:

```
Q. And we'll start with Document 121, which will be
handed to you by Mr. Blomberg.
    (A discussion was held off the record.)
    MR. BAXTER: Here, why don't you give me the
    folder. We'll give one to the reporter and one to you.
    That's 121, and 121 to the reporter.
    MR. CARROLL: Just so I'm clear, how do we
know this is 121?
    MR. BAXTER: Because you're gonna put it in
your folder behind Tab 121, and we're going to put it in
her folder --
    MR. CARROLL: Okay.
    MR. BAXTER: -- behind 121.
    MR. CARROLL: Are these exhibits marked as
exhibits (addressing the reporter)?
    MR. BAXTER: They're marked by the tabs.
    MR. CARROLL: But --
    (A discussion was held off the record.)
BY MR. BAXTER:
    Q. Okay. The exhibit was marked as -- or was
    Document 121, correct? If you'd like, you can write on
    the bottom, "121."
    A. (Writing.)
    Q. And do you recognize this document?
    A. Yes.
```

A. Well, in relation to the context we're discussing, all of our -- like, how do we manage student organizations. I can't remember the exact context, but I believe I prepared a one or two-page -- brief related to -- this is what student organization review committee, benefits that you are given should you be registered as a student organization.
Q. Okay. I'm gonna ask you to look at Document 122.

They're marked here as 122 . We'll add a sticker.
(Marking.) You're not on this document. Do you recognize what it is? Have you seen it before?
A. $\quad$ I -- it could be in -- well, again, in the -- I assume it was in the production of documents, yes.
Q. And you see the documents immediately behind it. Did you prepare this document or have you seen it before preparing for this deposition?
A. I believe I provided some of the contents for this.
Q. Did you provide it in writing or --
A. I think it goes back to some of the
information -- (pause) -- could have been -- I'm
speculating -- could have been information also shared with strategic communications surrounding -- surrounding the case, as well as general information about Registered Student Organizations.
Q. Okay. And it's an email from you to Melissa

Shivers and Pam Krogmeier, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Who is Pam Krogmeier?
A. Pam is Vice President Shivers' Administrative

## Assistant.

Q. Okay. And Dinette Myers is your Administrative

Assistant; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And do you know what this email is about?
A. Yes, I believe she had asked me for some just general information surrounding student organizations, privileges that are afforded to the student organizations. She may have been -- she must have required specifically or -- to include discipline cases, perhaps.
Q. Okay. Do you know -- she says, "I just want to make certain you had something in your hands to start with and to use that something as a gauge for whatever else you need -- you may need." What were you referring to?
A. I believe she was going to have a conversation with either or -- -- the President's office and/or General Counsel.
Q. About what?
Q. Okay. On the page that's marked at the bottom as 3888 --
A. Excuse me.
Q. -- where it says, "Several fraternities have been
deregistered since I've been here, approximately 15
years." Is that something that you submitted?
A. It would have had to have been.
Q. Okay. I'm gonna ask you to take a look at then Document 125.
A. Excuse me.
Q. Would you mark that on the bottom as 125 ?
A. (Marking.)
Q. Do you recognize that document?
A. Yes.
Q. What is it?
A. A document that I provided directly to Vice

President Shivers.
Q. And what was the purpose of this document?
A. It was based on a request that she had made to provide information about how we managed an organization, what the benefits of student organizations are. Just -- basic information for -- for her. Again, Dr. Shivers, I think at this point in time, would have been in her -- fifth or sixth month of employment.
Q. Was this in preparation for a decla -- or
declaration sheet signed and submitted to the Court; do you know?
A. I don't know that.
Q. I'm gonna ask you to look at -- what will be marked as Exhibit 126. (Marking.) Are you familiar with this document?
A. Yeah, this was -- this was information that was
provided in terms of a -- a plan as we -- as I
referenced earlier, when we were -- began the effort to work with student organizations about their documents.
Q. Okay. And do you know when this document would have been printed or created?
A. Probably in advance of that first review, which happened again late January.
Q. Okay. And --
A. Early February, that's when we -- as I --
possibly, you and I discussed earlier, in terms of when we began the -- the review.
Q. And do you know who this went to?
A. I think there were -- I think there were multiple recipients of this.
Q. Do you remember who the author was?
A. A -- Paul -- again, I believe, Andy Kutcher and Dr. Cory would have, with some assistance from Paul Mintner.
A. I believe so.
Q. Do you think there were any other documents like
it?
A. There may have been followup that some of the
staff asked of Paul -- of Andy, and he may have provided some additional followup in writing.
Q. And would you have received copies of that follow-up writing?
A. Probably not. Would have been directly between
the staff members and Paul.
Q. And were you --
A. Excuse me. Andy.
Q. Were you at some point asked to produce documents
for this litigation?
A. Yes.
Q. And was Andy asked to as well?
A. $\quad \mathrm{I}-\mathrm{y}$ yes.
Q. And was everybody on your staff who participated
in this review process asked to produce documents?
A. No.
Q. No?
A. I don't believe so.
Q. Okay. Is there any reason why --
A. Well, I think -- well, I think Paul was -- again,

I think Andy Kutcher and Paul were collecting all the
Q. Okay. Let me hand you what's been marked as

Document Number 127. Do you recognize this document?
A. Yes.
Q. What is it?
A. Some of the -- the guidance that was given to the team of people -- during review.
Q. And do you know who drafted this?
A. I believe it was Paul Mintner and Dr. Cory.
Q. Okay. And did you review and approve this document?
A. I did not.
Q. And why not?
A. I -- it was -- I didn't ask to approve it.
Q. Okay.
A. I -- I can't honestly recall -- I believe it was
at that time managed with -- again, Andy and Dr. Cory.
Perhaps some involvement from Paul Mintner.
Q. Okay. And you see down at the bottom where it
says $1, a, b, c$ ?
A. Correct.
Q. Are these the written instructions that the
reviewers received for reviewing constitutions?
A. Yes.
Q. You referred to a document they might have received earlier; is this that document?
documents on behalf of everyone. I'm not sure -individual people didn't submit anything to the General Counsel's Office. It was funneled through Paul and -- I continue to say Paul -- I meant Andy. And Paul and Dr. Cory, but again Dr. Cory and Paul -- Dr. Cory transitioned out, and Paul transitioned in.
Q. Okay. And so is it possible that there were
communications between the people reviewing the contract -- constitutions that have not been produced?
A. Perhaps. I did -- I -- oral communication or written communication? They were assembled in the room. The majority of the -- of review happened with people in the same room at the same time. So there -- maybe I referenced this earlier, as there were questions, they could be addressed as a team. So all of the communications in that setting probably were mostly oral.
Q. Okay. But when you were asked to provide documents for this deposition, did you ask your entire team to collect documents and send them to someone?
A. Yes.
Q. Including all the reviewers?
A. Yes. And that process was a process that was done by -- by me and by Andy and -- yeah, that team of us worked together on this because of the magnitude of

## the effort.

Q. But everybody that was on the review team was asked to somehow get you any documents they might have?
A. I believe Paul asked everybody to do that. That would be part of the -- what we needed to do.
Q. On the next page over you see -- and then there's Number 2 a, it says, "Once approved please delete the organization from the Student Organization Governance Follow-up --"
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And it says -- and that's a shared Excel spreadsheet, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Was that document gathered for production in this litigation?
A. I -- I can't tell you if it was.

MR. BAXTER: Well, I'm gonna ask counsel to make sure I have that. I don't believe it was in the production.
BY MR. BAXTER:
Q. Okay. On the next page at the top of the page --
A. Okay.
Q. Do you see where it says "Registered Student Organizations RSOs are considered University programs and thus must comply with all policies including the

Human Rights Clause"?
A. Um-hum.
(The reporter requested a clarification.) MR. BAXTER: The Human Rights Clause. BY MR. BAXTER:
Q. And then it says, "The Human Rights Clause is encompassing of all RSO activities, including the selection of membership and/or leadership"; is that correct?
A. Um-hum.
Q. And then it says, "RSOs can still have purposes/mission statements related to specific classes or characteristics of the HR Clause, but attaining -attainment of membership or leadership cannot be contingent on the agreement, disagreement, subscription to, et cetera, of stated beliefs/purposes which are covered in the HR Clause."
A. Um-hum.
Q. So I want to tease out your understanding of this sentence, and I want to propose: One way of looking at a Human Rights Policy is that it prohibits status-based discrimination.
A. Correct.
Q. And you can't discriminate against someone because of their status. There's another way to look at 192
because of their status?
A. Their status.
Q. So it's okay to discriminate on the basis of beliefs?
A. (No response.)
Q. Can the -- student group for transgender students discriminate against people who believe that transgenderism is a figment of the imagination?
A. Discriminate by not allowing them --
Q. To join the group.
A. Can they? We don't allow -- we don't allow violations of our Human Rights Policy, and so the -- so excuse me.
Q. If -- if -- if a transgender -- a transgender support group excludes people who believe that transgenderism is a figment of the imagination -- is that status-based discrimination or is it belief-based discrimination?
A. Belief.
Q. Okay. Can you give me an example of what status-based discrimination would be?
A. Yes, it's a suit -- if -- if -- in this case if

Marcus Miller saying he was gay and then being denied a leadership opportunity.
Q. Just because he was gay?
A. If he -- correct. If the group had categorically
denied him of that opportunity because he had -- he had
said he was gay, and so as a result, they denied him
that leadership opportunity. So gay would be a status in that case.
Q. Okay. So -- is belief-based discrimination okay under the Human Rights Policy?
A. Yes.
Q. So the Human Rights Policy only prohibits
status-based discrimination?
A. At the time, yes.
Q. At what time? Right now?
A. No. I -- again, we are waiting for guidance.
Q. Okay. But at the time that -- up till -- at this moment the Human Rights Policy is the same Human Rights Policy that was in existence at the time of the BLinC investigation?
A. Correct.
Q. There's been no changes?
A. Correct.
Q. And the human policy [sic] in place right now only prohibits status-based discrimination?
A. Correct.
Q. And did you know that at the time of the BLinC investigation?
A. I think that's the belief status thing. That --
Q. This says that you can't -- you can't require
people to subscribe to a belief, though, right?
A. (Pause.) This is -- this is, at the time, an
accurate interpretation of how we were instructed to move forward.
Q. And this came from counsel?
A. We received our direction about how to move forward in consultation with the Office of the General Counsel.
Q. Did anybody that you know of above you approve this statement?
A. I can't -- I can't speak to that. I'm -- I
believe we received direction from the General Counsel's Office on that.
Q. And who did you say you think drafted this?
A. The document itself was put together by Andy Kutcher and Dr. Cory --
Q. Okay.
A. -- I recall, but they were informed along the way
by direction from the Office of the General Counsel.
Q. But this is just Andy and Anita's -- own writing?
A. Correct.
Q. And you never -- you never reviewed it?
A. I did not.
A. Yes.
Q. And did everybody else in the University that you know of know that?
A. I can't attest to that
Q. Okay. Did your staff know that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And is it your understanding the new policy is going to prohibit belief-based discrimination?
A. I'm not -- we are waiting for direction from the Office of the General Counsel about how we will interpret the Human Rights Policy moving forward.
(The reporter requested a clarification due to lawn maintenance occurring outside of the deposition room.)

BY MR. BAXTER:
Q. So this statement in this memo, you think, is wrong?
A. The opening paragraph, that first paragraph?
Q. Well, the last sentence in that opening paragraph says that, "RSOs can have mission statements related to specific classes or characteristics of the HR Clause, but obtainment of membership or leadership cannot be contingent on the agreement, description -- agreement, disagreement, subscription to, et cetera, of stated beliefs/purposes which are covered in the HR clause."
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Q. You never tried to make sure that the guidance they were giving their reviewers was accurate?
A. I made the assumption of what they were getting
from the General Counsel's Office -- is what we needed to do.
Q. Okay. But you don't know if they asked counsel to review this?
A. We've been asking counsel every step of the way. It would be logical to assume that they were asking -as well in this situation. We've been asking every step of the way.
Q. But you agree that this is wrong compared to what you understand the policy to be?
A. I state at -- at the --
Q. At this time, right now, which is the same policy that existed during the BLinC investigation, is this a false statement?
A. I don't think it's false.
Q. But you stated, correct --
A. I'm sorry. I --
Q. You stated the Human Rights Policy only prohibits status-based discrimination?
A. Correct.
Q. Can the University tell students what they have to believe?
A. No.
Q. Can they tell the student groups what they have
to believe?
A. No.
Q. So this statement says that you cannot condition leadership on agreement to a stated belief or purpose. Isn't that trying to tell people what they --
A. Correct.
Q. -- can't believe?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. So this statement, you're -- according to your own views of the Human Rights Policy, this statement is a false statement?
A. We can't -- (pause). I -- I -- wonder if that should say "status."
Q. You wonder or you agree that it should say
"status"?
A. It should.
Q. Okay. So the statement that you can't condition membership or leadership on shared beliefs or purposes is false?
A. Correct.
Q. The Human Rights Policy does allow you to share or to -- require leaders and members to share beliefs or purposes?

## conflicts.

Q. Okay. But they would have been flagging language
based on a false understanding, right?
A. Perhaps.
Q. Because this -- this was the official document they were looking at for guidance?
A. Yes.
Q. And there's nothing in here about status-based discrimination, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. It only flagged belief-based selection of members and leaders --
A. Correct.
Q. -- which this says is -- is a violation of the

Human Rights Policy?
A. Correct.
Q. So you were just relying on legal counsel to
correct that?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Let me ask you to look at Document 128. Do you know who Ken Brown is?
A. Yes. Ken Brown is the Associate Dean of the Tippie College of Business and has oversight of their student -- Student Services functions.
Q. So is he your equivalent at the Tippie school --
A. They are allowed to share similar beliefs and

## purposes.

Q. And that's true for leaders, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And that's true for members?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And that's the official interpretation of the policy by the University?
A. Currently.
Q. Okay. So the entire review of all of these 500 plus constitutions was done based on a false statement; is that correct?
A. No. They were reviewing constitutions, and part of what was being flagged to be set aside for review by General Counsel was any of -- if they had statements, beliefs in there that were counter to the Human Rights Policy, that would be reviewed by General Counsel.
Q. But -- but the -- but did -- everyone who was reviewing the constitutions. Was looking for the wrong kind of language, correct?
A. They were responsible for collecting the data, and then the data would be given to Paul -- Paul -Andy, and then Andy and Paul, and then that information was in direct communication with -- General Counsel's Office in term of whether there may or may not be 200
as far as who relates to student groups at that school?
A. Roughly, yes.
Q. Okay. And do you know who Jacob Gordon is?
A. Jacob Gordon. I'm not recalling off the top of my head who Jacob Gordon is.
Q. Okay. Do you know who Tevin --
A. Yes, Tevin Robbins is a staff member there as well.
Q. At the --
A. In the Tippie College of Business.
Q. Okay. And if you flip over to the second page,
the very first line it says -- notes that Court issued an injunction that BLinC is reinstated as a student organization?
A. Correct.
Q. And then the second paragraph says, "I know that some members of the organization engaged in discrimination and that that act was not only wrong but hurtful." Do you see that?
A. Correct.
Q. And then you see down at the next to the last line in the middle, it says, "We understand how BLinC's activities are not consistent with our beliefs and principles of human rights"?
A. Um-hum.
Q. Did you hear anyone else in the -- in the University administration express these kinds of sentiments?
A. (Nodding.)
Q. You're nodding your head; is that a "yes"?
A. No, I'm just familiarizing myself with the
contents of the communication. And then your question again, please?
Q. Did you hear anyone else in the University express this kind of sentiment?
A. What -- could you ask your question again?
Q. That BLinC had engaged in discrimination. That

BLinC's conduct was wrong, that BLinC's activities were
inconsistent with the University's beliefs and principles of human rights?
A. Yes, that was the Findings from the EOD.
Q. But did you have -- did you ever hear other

University officials express these kinds of feelings either in person or in email?
A. Yes, I -- yes, those that understood the case.

Yes. Like Tom Baker, yes.
Q. Tom Baker was disappointed in BLinC's actions?
A. Tom Baker -- I wouldn't -- I don't know if it's disappointment or not disappointment. I just know that Tom recognized also that it was a violation of the
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about whether the whole event was just based on a misunderstanding of religious beliefs?
A. I don't believe any of my supervisors or
supervisees thought it was a misunderstanding.
Q. Okay. And Kristi Finger had no concerns about --
what was her concern? She never talked to you about any concern about the impact that the BLinC Findings would have on other religious organizations?
A. Yeah, I think -- I think she had concerns about the Finding. I don't think that meant she disagreed with them.
Q. Okay. And it never occurred to you that what
happened -- what BLinC was doing was just requiring members to support its religious beliefs?
A. BLinC wanted -- students to support their religious beliefs. Yes.
Q. And you said that's okay?
A. Yes.
Q. We've established that, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Even if those beliefs concerned homosexuality or other sexual conduct?
A. Correct.
Q. Correct? And was there anybody in the University who spoke up to defend that in this entire process?

## University of Iowa's Human Rights Policy.

Q. Did you hear anyone express a concern or express
a belief that -- that BLinC's actions were evidence of that religious believers are sometimes bigoted?
A. Repeat that again.
Q. Did any -- did you ever hear any University employees or officials --
A. Refer to BLinC's actions as bigoted? No, I wouldn't use -- no, I don't think that was ever --
Q. Did you ever hear them talk about religious groups -- rights in connection with this whole affair; speak about religious groups that opposed homosexuality? I'm sorry. That opposed homosexual activity.
A. Staff members stating that they -- do not support homosexuality?
Q. Did you -- were you aware of any conversations or

University officials -- officials -- among the University officials --
A. That the group had engaged in discrimination?

## Yes.

Q. Okay. Did anybody in the University that you worked with that you know of speak up in defense of BLinC?
A. Not that I'm aware of.
Q. Okay. You never heard anybody express concern

## A. To defend BLinC?

Q. To defend BLinC or the right for religious organizations to have beliefs that are controversial?
A. Oh, yes, I think -- yeah, the -- there were -- if
it's -- now I understand your question, yes. There were -- there may have been a faculty member or two or committee member or two that disagreed with the University's position, yes.
Q. Okay. But nobody within the decision making group --
A. Meaning?
Q. -- discussed that. You, Lyn Redington, Melissa

Shivers, your immediate supervisors or supervisees?
A. I think, there was -- yeah, there was discussion about whether or not this was the right -- you know, course of -- course of action because I think there had been some historical pieces where -- this was philosophically a -- a different approach than the past.
Q. Was that because they were going more after beliefs than just protecting status?
A. That was because -- it was more of a shift from leadership and membership, would be the differentiation.
Q. But really, the policy hasn't changed, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. So there was -- the way it was enforced against

BLinC was different; is that what you're saying?
A. Policy had changed. We've established that, but --
Q. When had the policy --
A. But interpretation of the policy in this case, I believe, had been somewhat different than -- that was part of the discussion. Again, I -- I hadn't been here as long as some of those staff members that were talking about some of the historical -- allowing groups to -the membership versus leadership piece.
Q. Okay. That was a new thing that arose just with the BLinC situation?
A. That was our first opportunity to have the conversation after a long time.
Q. I'm gonna ask you to look at what's labeled

Document 131. (Marking.) Do you recognize this document?
A. Yes. Dr. Cory, I believe, produced this.
Q. Okay.
A. Yes.
Q. And did you review this document?
A. I believe so.
Q. Okay. And who did this -- who was this document written for?
A. I'm gonna have to take a look at it again,
please.
Q. Okay.
A. (Pause.) This was a -- a brief prepared to
update the administrative reporting line for Dr. Cory
about where we were at in our review process and kind of an outcome -- general outcome of what we -- the team -discovered/learned during the review.
Q. So this would have been passed up the chain?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Do you know who -- do you know who it went to?
A. Me -- again, I'm trying to -- Lyn Redington was on an extended leave from the office between when her -when -- it became her last day in the office versus her retirement and day of leaving the institution -- was extended. Like, she was only in the office a couple of days. So I'm not certain whether or not Lyn had access to this, but Dr. Shivers would have -- and I believe it would have been shared with the President's Office and the Office of General Counsel.
Q. Okay. And would there have been an email circulating this?
A. I believe so.
Q. Okay.
A. I -- I'd have to -- I would have to review,
Q. Isn't that true of other groups as well?
A. I believe there's some, yes.
Q. In fact --
A. The other -- excuse me. Go ahead.
Q. The Federalist Society, for example, is a national organization. They have a chapter on campus.
A. Um-hum.
Q. Were they given extra time or not reviewed?
A. I don't believe they were given extra time.
Q. And -- but they were part of the 500 ?
A. Correct.
Q. They were not in the --
A. Correct. Yes.
Q. And do you have any reason -- any explanation for why that would be?
A. No.
Q. Okay.
A. I just know that we -- the decision was made to set aside fraternities and sororities. That was a decision that was confirmed by the Office of General Counsel, and then -- but we did eventually move to working with them in the very same way, starting in June.
Q. Okay. So in June they got emailed, or what did they get?
A. Correct. They got -- they got an email communication.

MR. BAXTER: Okay. I'm gonna note for the record that I don't believe that email's been produced.
BY MR. BAXTER:
Q. Has there just been one communication?
A. There was, I believe, a -- a followup. That communication was from Erin McHale.
Q. Okay.
A. Erin McHale was our Assistant Director for Fraternity and Sorority Life Programs, and so Erin communicated on, I believe, June 1 or June 15th -- I apologize -- in June -- that they would need to adjust their governing documents to include the modified Human Rights Policy that we referenced earlier, that had the exemption related to Fraternity and Sorority Life. I believe that was also part of the delay -- my understanding, from the Office of the General Counsel, was that particular piece, in terms of what the exact language would be used in the Human Rights Policy that would apply to fraternities and sororities because of Title IX.
Q. And were there any other exceptions made for fraternities and sororities?
A. I don't believe so.

Secondly, there was a question posed to General Counsel about how to manage the Title IX exemption.
Q. What's your understanding of what the Title IX exemption is?
A. As I shared earlier, that is an exemption that the institutions have, as relates -- my contact with fraternities and sororities is much broader than that, I understand. But that there's an exemption that the institution can enact to -- so that fraternities and sororities can operate as single sex organizations.
Q. Okay. So your understanding is that the law allows Universities to let fraternities do that?
A. Well, I -- well, the point I'm trying to make is the exemption is for the institution to make that. Fraternities and sororities themselves aren't quote/unquote exempt from Title IX.
Q. Okay. So is there any reason why you had to exempt fraternities and sororities from the sex -nondiscrimination requirement?
A. I --
Q. It sounds like you're saying that you could, under Title IX, but is there any reason why you have to?
A. Again, I -- that's a General Counsel Office direction that we were wanting to receive. I'm not certain.
Q. Okay. So -- and that said -- in this document right here it says in the middle of paragraph three, do you see where it says -- I'm on page that's marked 3981 on the bottom?
(The reporter requested a clarification.) MR. BAXTER: Correct.

BY MR. BAXTER:
Q. In the middle of that paragraph it says,
"Regardless of category, all organizations are expected to adhere to the Human Rights Policy except social fraternities and sororities."
A. Sir, where are you at on that page?
Q. I'm in the middle of the third paragraph.
A. Thank you. (Pause.) Was there a question? I'm sorry.
Q. You've -- you've read that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Is there -- why were the fraternities and sororities given a -- that exception?
A. The -- a couple of -- a couple of issues. The fraternity and sorority constitutions and bylaws were not in the OrgSync portal because fraternities and sororities are -- receive their recognition -- their registration, their recognition to their respective counsels.
Q. Okay. So you're just acting on instruction, you don't have any reason or any personal --
A. Well, it -- it --
Q. -- stake in it?
A. Absolutely, I have a personal stake and I have a professional stake in it, and it's the notion that, as it currently reads, fraternities and sororities, because the exemption piece wasn't in there, it was the opinion that it could give the appearance of not being accurate because we need the -- we thought it was important to draw out the exemption language.
Q. Okay. Do you know that Title IX has a religious exemption in it?
A. I'm not familiar with that part.
Q. Okay. But if there were, would it make sense to you to also give religious organizations a religious exemption?
A. That would make sense.
Q. And -- what about sports teams? Does the University of Iowa's official team -- official teams, are they segregated on the basis of sex?
A. Yes. We have -- yes, sports, yes. Division -NCAA groups, are you talking about?
Q. Yes.
A. NCAA groups. Yes.
Q. And that technically violates the Human Rights Policy, correct?
A. There's a long -- perhaps. A long established NCAA -- that that's been allowed to happen.
Q. Regardless of what the NCAA does, the University could have its own policy, right? It could say, "We're gonna dis -- we're gonna forbid discrimination"?
A. It could.
Q. Okay. And is there any written exception in the

Human Rights Policy or the University's nondiscrimination policy that allows University sports teams to discriminate on the basis of sex?
A. No.
Q. Okay. So technically they're in violation of their own policies?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.
(A discussion was held off the record during which time the reporter requested that the parties speak more slowly.) MR. BAXTER: I will slow down.

BY MR. BAXTER:
Q. Is there any reason then -- so was this exemption for fraternities and sororities extended to student organizations that have sports -- that are

Q. Well, just -- just tell me how you would interpret the Human Rights Policy right now if that question came to you.
A. It would be.
Q. That's status-based discrimination, right?
A. Correct. Correct.
Q. And so the women --
A. It would be.
Q. -- cannot do that?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And would you -- do you think the

University would make an exception?
A. Perhaps.
Q. Okay. And why might they make an exception?
A. Historical reasons.
Q. Okay.
A. Long standing traditions that have been acceptable for extended periods of time.
Q. And would that all be consistent with the spirit of the Human Rights Policy?
A. Would all what be?
Q. With those types of -- making exceptions for those reasons, would that still be consistent with the spirit of the Human Rights Policy?
A. No.
sports-centered?
A. No.
Q. So if you have a women's football team at the University, is it your understanding that they have to admit men to play on their team?
A. Are you referencing sports clubs at this point?
Q. Correct.
A. Yeah, we've long -- long allowed sports clubs to be single sex. The men's volleyball team, the --
Q. So I'm talking about student organizations --
A. Um-hum.
Q. -- Registered Student Organizations.
A. (Nodding.)
Q. If there were a women's football club that had registered status, would it be okay for them to exclude men from membership?
A. No.
Q. So they have to admit men?
A. Umm --
Q. If a man wants to join a women's club that's sole purpose is to get together to pay football, they have to let him come and play?
A. I -- I don't know if we've had that kind of a case come before us to see how -- what we -- how we would respond to that.
Q. Not even with the spirit?
A. No.
Q. Because the University's goal is to stop any kind of status-based discrimination, no matter how much sense it makes?
A. No.
Q. So what's the real purpose of the Human Rights Policy?
A. It is to protect classes that have been decided by law to be protected. Federal law, state law.
Q. Okay. What about --
A. Equal opportunity and access, et cetera.
Q. What about a women's a cappella group? If a man wanted to join, and he couldn't -- and he was a bass, would they be required to join -- let him join?
A. Right. We haven't had that situation so, again, I think it would go back to if we would have looked at -- we would have looked at the situation like that, if a man tried to join, he was denied that opportunity, and we received a complaint, we would look into that.
Q. And if he was denied just because he was a man, you would have to find -- that there was a violation?
A. Correct.
Q. And you would sanction that organization?
A. Correct.
Q. And basically force them to admit him?
A. We would have ruled that you cannot violate the University of Iowa's Human Rights Policy.
Q. And the only way to do that would be to admit
him, right? The only way to not violate the policy is to admit him?
A. Correct.
Q. Is it fair to say that there are lots of
complexities with the Human Rights Policy that you have not thought through?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. And --
A. Me personally, or the University of Iowa?
Q. Well, you personally.
A. Yeah. There's -- there's -- I thought through --
never thinking through these would not be accurate. I
thought through a lot of this. And there are
complexities and there -- to say I've not thought through them is not accurate.
Q. Okay. Is -- would you say that there is a fair bit of discussion, just generally, you know, across the nation about the value of fraternities and sororities?
A. Yes.
Q. And there are some people who think that fraternities contribute to misogyny/homophobia; is that
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Division I teams?
MR. BAXTER: I'm talking about sports -- I'm
talking about the --
MR. CARROLL: Clubs?
MR. BAXTER: -- the clubs.
MR. CARROLL: Registered clubs, because,
obviously, the football team is not a registered group.
MR. BAXTER: Right. It is subject to the
University Civil Rights Policy.
MR. CARROLL: Right. But -- but --
MR. BAXTER: But it's not a Registered
Student Organization.
MR. CARROLL: Yeah.
A. Back to your question now.
Q. So you turned a blind eye to this for all of these years, but now you're going to start requiring student clubs -- student sports clubs that are sex-based to integrate?
A. We are not, that I am aware of at this point in
time. Sports clubs are administered through
Recreational Services.
Q. Okay. So you -- as far as you know, they're
going to continue to be allowed to be single sex clubs?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And you're not going to require them to
correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. So is there any reason why you would give
fraternities an exception to sex nondiscrimination
policy, but not sports teams -- or sports clubs?
A. We allow sports clubs. We do have single gender sports clubs.
Q. But you've admitted that that's in violation of the Human Rights Policy, correct?
A. If that's what was found to be the case -- the outcome of a hearing.
Q. So you'd -- even though there's a club on campus called the men's football team?
A. We've allowed them to be registered.
Q. And you turn a blind eye to that potential violation of the Human Rights Policy?
A. We have.
Q. And that's a -- why have you done that?
A. We have not received a complaint.
Q. You only enforce based on complaints?
A. Correct.
Q. But now you're going to require all men's sports teams to fully integrate? That's --

MR. CARROLL: Just a minute now, you're mixing two things here. Are you talking about
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change their name or anything like that?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. I'm gonna ask you to look at Document

Number 132. Do you recognize that document?
A. That is the spreadsheet that I referenced earlier.
Q. What spreadsheet is that?
A. This was -- this was the compilation of the review that happened. So after the -- after the review
of -- I believe this was in the category Registered Student Organization, then -- it's self-explanatory in terms of whether or not --
Q. So -- continue.
A. Yeah. No. Whether or not the violations --
Q. So you --
A. -- are a potential conflict.
Q. Is it your understanding that this is the
spreadsheet that should have all 500 student
organizations on them?
A. The initial effort involved registered -religious student groups.
Q. Okay. Why did you review religious groups first?
A. That was what we were directed to do by the General Counsel's office, to look at them first.
Q. So before you sent the April 20th emails --
A. Correct.
Q. -- you conducted an internal review?
A. That was what happened in late -- that's what
happened late -- yes, late January and February, and then the review happened for all the groups, but we were asked about this specifically.
Q. Okay. So was this the first group you reviewed, these -- groups on this spreadsheet?
A. They did them -- yes, this was done first.
Q. Okay. And was there any other category that you specifically looked at besides religious groups?
A. This -- these were done first.
Q. Okay.
A. And then shortly thereafter everybody. All of the -- all of the groups.
Q. When you say "all of the groups --"
A. All of the Registered Student Organizations.
Q. Okay. So were all of the constitutions reviewed before the April 20th email?
A. Yes. That -- the review occurred late January and February, and then there was the subsequent dates that we talked about, the -- April 20 -- April 20th and May 3rd, and then the June 1, June 5th -- or 15th. So there was -- the -- reason it occurred before we communicated with all of those groups.
Q. Okay. I'm gonna ask you to look at the first attachment -- the first attachment to Document 131.

## A. Okay.

Q. And I want you to look at the -- on the far right
column. It says "Applicable language from the org's constitution."
(The reporter requested a clarification.) MR. BAXTER: From The org's --
o-r-g-apostrophe-s constitution.
BY MR. BAXTER:
Q. And then the third column down, can you read what that says?
A. "The -- all voting members"?
Q. No, "The selection process."
A. Okay. Excuse me. "Athletes in Action"?
Q. Yes.
A. "Selection process: Only those applicants who can communicate the chapter's message accurately, can provide spiritual leaders for the chapter, and can model the chapter's message in their behavior shall be eligible for a leadership position. Applicants -excuse me -- applicant may be asked about their willingness to model the chapter's core messages through their behaviors so that the messages are communicated with integrity."
Q. Okay. And is there a spreadsheet like this one for all of the other groups?
A. We tracked the information. I don't know if we tracked it in a spreadsheet form or not.
Q. Okay. I think I mentioned to you an Excel spreadsheet earlier that was a missing document, and that document has now been produced to us. I'm entering a request for it to be reproduced.

I'm going to ask you to flip back to Document 131 in front of you.
A. Yes.
Q. In the back of that there's another copy of a similar spreadsheet; do you see that?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And there's actually two copies of it. Do you see that? If you -- if you flip through the
Document 131, there's two copies of this -- of a similar looking spreadsheet.
A. Um-hum.
Q. I think the first of those --

MR. BAXTER: Do you have that copy that I
had?
MR. BLOMBERG: Oh, isn't that in your notebook? BY MR. BAXTER:
Q. Okay. Now, I want you to look at the same column on Document 132.
A. Okay
Q. This is even tinier, but can you see where the last one ended with the -- with the word -- the words "communicated with integrity," there's more after. Can you read what's after that?
A. Yes. "Corinthians, Chapter 6, verses 9-12, explicit statement about homosexuality. Several other bias verses that related to sexual immorality."
Q. And I believe that says "Several other Bible verses --"
A. Oh, excuse me.
Q. "-- that related to sexual immorality."
A. I apologize. I --
Q. Okay. So do you know why there's two different versions of this spreadsheet?
A. Yes, I believe this was an initial review.
Q. When you say "this," what do you mean?
A. Excuse me. The -- I don't remember the numbers.
Q. The document's are on the bottom, on the -- on the front page, at the bottom.
A. Yeah. This here (indicating) being an initial review.
Q. Before you go, just, will you flip to the front
page and tell me what number it is?
A. 131.
Q. Okay
A. This being an initial review (indicating), and
this being a subsequent review (indicating).
Q. And when you say "the subsequent review," that would be Document --
A. 132.
Q. -- 132? Why were there two different reviews?
A. This was an -- I believe --
Q. 130 -- when you say "this," you're referring to

Document --
A. 131 --
Q. -- 131?
A. -- was an initial review.
(The reporter requested that one person speak at a time.)

MR. BAXTER: Sorry. I'm sorry. We'll slow
down.
(A discussion was held off the record.)
THE WITNESS: I apologize.
MR. BAXTER: As do I. As do I.
A. This was an initial review. This was a subsequent review.
Q. I'm sorry. I'm gonna stop you.
A. For -- to gather, like, a double-check and to make certain another set of eyes, et cetera, and I believe this latter one was done -- Andy Kutcher was -again, with help from Paul or Anita, depending on the timing.
Q. So it's your --
A. It was Anita at this point in time, I believe.
Q. So it's your understanding that the second
document was done by Anita and Andy themselves?
A. Correct. I -- I believe so.
Q. And the first document would have been done by whom?
A. The compilation of -- of information from the reviewers and Paul, and this being a second in-depth look. More in-depth look.
Q. I am gonna hand you what is Document 133.
(Marking.) What is this document?
A. A communication to Melissa about the groups that
were -- Dr. -- Vice President Shivers about the Registered Student Organizations that were reviewed.
Q. Okay. And this was just the religious
organizations; is this correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And do you know why she wanted a specific list of religious organizations?
A. Numbers --
Q. When you say that --
A. Excuse me.
Q. -- Number 131 --

MR. CARROLL: She's gonna wear out, and she's gonna kick us out, so you -- you both have to really pay attention to -- let him finish his question and then you can answer. Okay. Because you are talking over each other.

THE WITNESS: I apologize.
MR. CARROLL: Well, that's fine but --
THE WITNESS: I'll try to do it differently.
BY MR. BAXTER:
Q. So just to -- the document in your --
A. 131.
Q. -- left hand is 131 ?
A. Correct. Correct.
Q. Okay. So that one was -- was 131 the initial review or the subsequent review?
A. The initial review.
Q. Okay. And then -- 132 was the subsequent review?
A. Correct.
Q. And why --
A. As I recall.
Q. And why was there a subsequent review?
A. I was providing her an update of our -- of our effort related to religious student organizations, and I was clarifying the 31 versus 32, being that we were asked to not look at BLinC.
Q. As far as you're aware, was the President of the University Bruce Herrald ever consulted or informed about the review of the constitutions?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And do you know -- did you ever have a direct communication with him?
A. I'm trying to remember if we were in the same room together for any conversations. Melissa and I certainly were. I may have been. I apologize for not recalling.
Q. Do you know anybody at Iowa State University name -- whose last name is Braun, B-r-a-u-n?

MR. CARROLL: You said Iowa State.
MR. BAXTER: Yes.
MR. CARROLL: Did you mean that?
MR. BAXTER: Yes.
BY MR. BAXTER:
Q. Iowa State University, not University of Iowa.
A. Mark -- I don't -- I don't --
Q. Please, I'm just asking if you know someone named -- whose last name is Braun at the University --
at Iowa State University?
A. I know someone named Braun, but their affiliation is broader than Iowa State University.
Q. Oh, okay. Would they have an Iowa State address?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Who is that?
A. I believe -- depending on what you have in front
of you --
Q. Well, I'm just asking the person you know.
A. Mark.
Q. I'm not asking you what --
A. Mark Braun.
Q. Don't talk over me.
A. I apologize.

MR. CARROLL: If I may just interject, just
it's a little complicated. It's just Mark Braun is the
Executive Director of the Board of Regents. They just
by -- historically use Iowa State's email address. So
he's not an Iowa State employee. He's an employee of
the Board of Regents.
MR. BAXTER: Okay.
MR. CARROLL: So it's -- it's just
sufficiency whose email server they use.
BY MR. BAXTER:
Q. Okay. And do you know -- do you know if the

Board of Regents was regularly informed about the status of the BLinC lawsuit?
A. I believe they were informed.
Q. And why do you believe that?
A. Because that's the normal course of action for
the Vice President to communicate with the President who, in turn, communicates with the Board, or the Vice President can communicate with the Board when directed.
Q. Okay.
A. I, personally, in my capacity, don't communicate directly with the Board.
Q. Are you aware of any statements or -- of concern or interest that the Board has communicated -- or members of the Board have communicated to --
A. I --
Q. -- someone at the University?
A. I know that one Board -- what I know -- there could be multiple because, again, I'm not privy to all of those communications, but I know one regent did reach out to -- and have concerns to Melissa. Melissa told me.
Q. And which regent was that?
A. I believe Boddicker.
Q. And did Melissa tell you what the regent's
concerns were?
Q. Do you recognize --
A. Yes.
Q. -- this document?
A. Yes. Professor I referenced.
(The reporter requested a clarification.) THE WITNESS: Yes. The professor --
professor I referenced earlier.
BY MR. BAXTER:
Q. Remind me what professor you're referring to
A. Michelene Pesantubbee. It's -- it's the --
that's -- I referenced -- you'd asked a question earlier about concerns. One of the concerns that came in was from a professor, Dr. Michelene Pesantubbee.
Q. Okay. What was the -- have you had a chance to look at this email and refresh your recollection?
A. Yes.
Q. What --
A. She was -- she was concerned about another
situation that was similar, and I -- I was really nebulous in my response because, again, as the litigation was pending, I didn't feel that I could -- I should be talking much.
Q. What was her specific concern?
A. A group and a book -- a booklet had been used as a proselytizing tool, I recall, to lead a group --

## Q. Well --

A. -- and the connection. Oh, please.
Q. Do you see the bottom of the first page where it says "Original Message"? It's under Michelene's name.
A. Yes, yes.
Q. And then that original message was from Imam

Mahdi Org, and that's spelled I-m-a-m, M-a-h-d-i, Org.
Is Imam Mahdi a student group on campus?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Okay. And in the subject line it says,
"NonAcadStudorg."
A. Correct.
Q. Do you know what that refers to?
A. Yes, this would be a mass email that was sent by the sender through the University's mass email process for Registered Student Organizations.
Q. And so Professor Pesantubbee was complaining about the content of the email, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Because she thought it was proselytizing?
A. Correct.
Q. Do all student organizations have access to this email?
A. Correct.
Q. And are there any rules that govern what they can
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Q. Okay. I'm going to show you what's been marked as Document 141. Are you familiar with this document?
A. Yes.
Q. What is it?
A. A communication about some of the -- an update, if you will, about our compliance efforts, our outreach student orgs, our review of constitutions, peppered with specifics related to fraternities and sororities.
Q. And do you know who drafted it?
A. From the outer page, I believe Andy Kutcher. And this, again, is in reference to how we were going to -as we discussed earlier, our subsequent outreach to fraternities and sororities.
Q. Okay. And do you know who drafted this second half? If you turn to the next page it says --
A. Paul and -- Paul -- Andy Kutcher and Erin McHale
had a -- I'm sure, had a level of -- of edit -- writing and editing.
Q. Do you see at the next -- bottom of the next page, number 3713, it says, "Sincerely, Center for Student Involvement and Leadership"?
A. Um-hum. Um-hum.
Q. This was drafted by your office; is that correct?
A. It was constructed by the Center for Student

Involvement and Leadership.
send through the email?
A. There's issues related to -- length. There are issues -- it's a little convoluted, and there's layers of the mass email system. Some go to just students. Some go to students and faculty. Some go to just faculty. There's several layers, and depending on the layers, drives a little bit on how long they can be, who has to approve them, but they're not censored for content.
Q. Okay. So is there any problem with Imam Mahdi having expressed the views that they do in this email?
A. No.
Q. So at the top of that document you say, "At some point this nuance needs to be brought into the discussion." What did you mean by that?
A. Um-hum. That I didn't think it was appropriate at that point in time, but $I$ think what is appropriate is that we perhaps need to have a broader communication to the University campus about what is acceptable and not acceptable mass emails because we often hear concerns from faculty and staff about, "Why are you letting that out? Why are you allowing that statement as such?" And so nuance, being she was complaining about it, and response would be we allow all of our groups to do that.
Q. Okay. And you have supervisory authority over that office?
A. Correct. One of the areas that reports to me.

One of the departments.
Q. Ask you to look at Document 143. (Marking.) Are you familiar with this document?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. And the bottom email in this chain, is that the June 1st email that we've previously discussed?
A. Correct.
Q. And at the top, what were you -- what was Melissa -- or what were you saying to Melissa?
A. This was the communication that again went out, a reference that I had worked with Andy on the first communication, and -- that went on June 15th at -- and was related to due date on June 15th. I shared with her what we had worked on together, and then I was forwarding that to her, and the -- the little joke in here is that I am -- I am the advisor to the University of Iowa Student Government, UISG. So they weren't compliant. Our goal was to get groups compliant. I'm, obviously, very, very involved, and one of the groups I advised directly wasn't compliant. So I referenced myself as being a terrible advisor.
Q. Got it. (Marking.) Ask you to look at Document

## Number 150. Do you recognize this document?

A. Yes.
Q. And what is it?
A. It's a doc -- it's an update about compliance,
sent by Erika Christiansen in Andy Kutcher's absence. I
believe he was on vacation for a period of time, and Erika became a point person.
Q. Okay. And these -- what's on this document?

What are these groups?
A. The groups that weren't compliant in terms of having the current accurate full Human Rights Policy included in this -- in their document.
Q. So is it possible that this list is no longer accurate; that some students, for example, have submitted corrected constitutions?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Did you see the article in the newspaper.

In the Gazette a week or so ago, talking about the University of Iowa had deregistered 39 student groups?
A. Correct.
Q. And did that list come off of this?
A. I'm not certain where they got that number. I
know that number has now changed. It was 39 originally.
It's now 30. The origins, how they got that information, I'm not quite certain.
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MR. BAXTER: -- and the discovery requests
are still ongoing.
BY MR. BAXTER:
Q. Going back to that document, are those the
only groups left that could be deregistered based on this review?
A. No. The Fraternity and Sorority Life, the -- the
chapters are given until September 4th or 5th, the first
part of September, to be compliant. There's a meeting
that's occurring on August 13th to discuss all this.
Q. Okay. Other than the fraternities and
sororities, if a -- if a student group is not on this
list, and they have a constitution on OrgSync, they have been officially approved; is that correct?
A. Yes, with the exception of those that are with the Office of General Counsel for their review.
Q. So there still are some documents that are subject to review?
A. Correct, in the Office of the General Counsel.

We have forwarded them for their -- to provide counsel for us, what to do.
Q. And how many of those documents -- how many groups are still looking for review of the General
Counsel's Office; do you know?
A. Twenty -- 24.
Q. Okay.
A. I would imagine they got it from Strategic

Communications, which is the connection between the University --
(The reporter requested a clarification.)
THE WITNESS: Between the University --
Strategic Communication is the -- kind of portal
through --
(The reporter requested that the witness only finish his sentence.)
MR. CARROLL: Yeah.
THE WITNESS: Media. And media. Yeah,
Media.
BY MR. BAXTER:
Q. Do you know which nine have been reinstated from the 39 ?
A. Off the top of my head, no. I have -- I
have -- a binder full of that information, but I don't have that off the top of my head.
Q. Okay. And that's information you could provide to us?
A. The nine? Absolutely.

MR. BAXTER: Okay. And I understand the request that we get updates --

MR. CARROLL: Um-hum.
Q. And you --
A. Twenty-five; 24, 25.
Q. And do you have a list of which groups those are?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Can you provide that list to us?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Do you know why they're being held
up?
A. They -- yes. They were the ones where we had -that they resubmitted, and based on the resubmission, caused staff not to -- it wasn't clear whether or not it was acceptable, and we wanted General Counsel to give us directions to whether it was acceptable.
Q. And they just haven't gotten back to you yet?
A. Correct.
Q. So there are 24 or 25 groups out there that don't know yet what their status is?
A. Of the 24 and 20 -- of that -- of that number --
they know that -- if they're registered or deregistered.
Q. But they don't know yet --
A. But they --
Q. -- if they will be deregistered as a result of
your review or General Counsel's review?
A. Correct. As I -- as I'm remembering, there's about 17 -- of that 20 -- I can't remember if it's 24 or

```
25 -- there's 17 that are -- registered. Roughly,
seven -- seven or eight that are deregistered.
Q. And they were deregistered because they were already not in compliance?
A. Correct. They missed the submission -- they missed the submission date, and they became deregistered, and then if everything would have been -acceptable based on staff review they worked on automatically to reregister, but because there was questions, they went back to the General Counsel's Office for review.
Q. Okay. So there are 24 or 25 student groups that still could hear word that they've been deregistered for failure to comply with the Human Rights Policy?
A. Correct.
Q. And will they get -- does every student group get
``` a written notification once they've been approved?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So if someone has received no notification, that means their renewed constitution is still in General Counsel's Office?
A. Yes. I want to -- I will need to double-check with Andy to understand exactly what's been communicated.
Q. Okay. I'm gonna show you what's marked as
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Q. Okay. And you could --
A. Whether or not --
Q. Please go ahead.
A. Whether or not they completed this actual form
for all of them, I will need to have to check on that.
Q. Okay. And you can check that for us?
A. Yes.
Q. Flip through the one that's numbered, at the
bottom, 1828.
A. Okay.
Q. This is the U.I. Men's Soccer -- Club Soccer?
A. Oh, 28. Excuse me. Yes.
Q. Okay. And then it says, "Please summarize in
consistent language," and then someone has handwritten "One must be invited." Close quote.
A. Um-hum.
Q. Is a requirement that someone has to be invited
to join a student organization -- is that a problem from
the University's perspective?
A. I think it was a notation from the reviewer to quote/unquote flag it for further review by Andy.
Q. And do you know what the outcome of that review was?
A. I do not.
Q. And based on your understanding of the policy, do

Exhibit 154. (Marking.) Do you recognize these
documents?
A. Yes.
Q. And what are they?
A. A further capturing of -- of -- of potential
problems with alignment of language and the University of Iowa's Human Rights Policy.
Q. Are these documents that would have been created during the review last January and February?
A. And -- and beyond, with subsequent -- because of the followup.
Q. Should there have been a review sheet for every student group on campus?
A. I believe there was a review sheet for every group that was being reviewed.
Q. And every group, except the fraternities and sororities, got reviewed last January or February, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So there should be about 500 of these?
A. Correct.
Q. And I only counted 109. I could be wrong, but your understanding there should be another 400 pages or so out there?
A. They reviewed over 500.
you know what the outcome should be?
A. In terms of invitations?
Q. In terms of whether the requirement that one must be invited to be a part of the student group, whether
that violates the Human Rights Policy or is somehow inconsistent with that policy?
A. One does not have be invited to join.
Q. Well, this suggests, doesn't it, that the U.I.

Men's Club Soccer student organization has a requirement
that one must be invited? Isn't that a fair conclusion
because someone flagged that as language that was inconsistent with the Human Rights Policy?
A. I would imagine what that means is everybody has
the opportunity to try out, and then they select
their -- the team base, but everybody -- but it's open for tryouts for all.
Q. But as far as you know, should that be -- you
know, what if it were an invitation-only student
organization, do you think that would be a problem?
A. For -- membership?
Q. Correct.
A. We have student organizations that have -- you
have to be invited to join.
Q. And that's okay under the Human Rights Policy?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And that's to be invited to be a member?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Will you turn to the -- the document
that's tabbed as -- I mean, labeled 2107 at the bottom?
And then it says "General Members," where it -- where it asks the reviewer to flag inconsistent language, it says, "General members have no requirement. Executive
board members must subscribe to Basis of Faith as outlined in the constitution."
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And are you aware that InterVarsity

Graduate Christian Fellowship was one of the
organizations that was kicked off campus?
A. They were de -- they are deregistered, yes.
Q. Okay. And do you know why they were
deregistered?
A. They didn't complete their -- by the -- I believe
they were one of the groups that didn't meet the deadline.
Q. So theirs was just a deadline issue?
A. No. I think there were issues also that were
flagged based on the executive board members having to subscribe, which again was something that was flagged.
This group was one of the groups that is pending with the Office of the General Counsel.
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Document 167. (Marking.) Why don't you take a minute and familiarize yourself with that email?
A. Thank you. (Pause.)
Q. Have you had a chance to review that email?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Let's start at the back, the bottom of the email chain, and walk through this. Do you see on the bottom of the page marked 7994, the next to last page --
A. Yes.
Q. -- at the very bottom it says "Original message from Laurynn King"?
A. Correct.
Q. And who is Laurynn King?
A. Laurynn King is an Administrative Assistant for the Center for Student Involvement and Leadership.
Q. Okay. And do you see on the next page where she sent an email to Tiffany and Lyubov, L-y-u-b-o-v, indicating that she's following up on several emails and voice mails that she's left?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And then moving up the next email,

Tiffany responds and says, "Hi Laurynn," she's
forwarding it to the new leadership team?
A. Correct.
Q. And then Laurynn says, "Thank you." And then on
Q. Now, InterVarsity Graduate Christian Fellowship is on the list of 39 that the -- well, they've received an email, actually, that they were deregistered.
A. Yes. And as I said earlier. Of the \(\mathbf{2 4}\) that are in the General Counsel's Office, 17 are deregistered. MR. BLOMBERG: I believe it's the other way around.
A. Excuse me, I apologize, yes. Seventeen
registered, and to \(\mathbf{m y}\)-- to the best of my knowledge, 17 registered, seven deregistered.
Q. So is it your understanding that no decision has been made about InterVarsity's religious requirements for leaders?
A. I don't believe there's been a final decision.
Q. And what are you basing that on?
A. The fact that my understanding is it's still pending with the General Counsel's Office.
Q. And are you aware that InterVarsity has filed a lawsuit against the University?
A. Yes.
Q. But you think that's premature?
A. Depending on the outcome of the review from

General Counsel and guidance they provide us, it could be.
Q. Okay. I'm gonna show you what's been marked as
the bottom of the page marked 7993 --
A. Um-hum --
Q. -- there's an email from Katrina, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And it states, "I was under the impression that
the InterVarsity Graduate Christian Fellowship's
constitution had been updated and submitted June 1st or
2nd." Do you see that?
A. Correct.
Q. And then above that, Andy jumped in and asked Katrina if she used the OrgSync form.

\section*{A. Correct.}
Q. And then Katrina says that she's done that now. "Let me know you if you need anything else" --

\section*{A. Correct.}
Q. -- or something to that effect. And then on 7992

Andy says to Katrina, "On my initial review I see several issues."
A. Um-hum.
Q. "As part of compliance with the Human Rights

Clause, organizations cannot have any language deemed contradictory to that clause." And then he cites specific provisions, correct?

\section*{A. Correct.}
Q. And he says that that language is directly
related to the ability to become a member or hold a leadership position, correct?

\section*{A. Correct.}
Q. And then above that Katrina answers -- and
explains why she doesn't think it's a conflict. She says, in the second paragraph, halfway through, "It is also important to have Christian leadership in a Christian organization."
A. Correct.
Q. "We do not in any way discourage those who may not subscribe to the basis of faith in Article II, but we do recognize that having Christian leadership is important."
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And then on 7991 Andy responds, and he says, "I recognize the wish to have leadership requirements based on Christian beliefs. However, Registered Student Organizations are considered University of Iowa programs and thus must follow the Human Rights Clause in its entirety."
A. Um-hum.
Q. "Having a restriction on leadership related to religious beliefs is contradictory to that clause."

\section*{A. Um-hum.}
Q. Is that a correct statement of the Human Rights

Policy?
A. (Pause.) Having -- again, having a belief is not.
Q. Is religious organizations selecting leaders who select -- if a religious organization rejects leaders -let me start over. If a religious organization rejects as leaders students who reject that organization's religious beliefs, that's discrimination on the basis of religion?

\section*{A. Correct.}
Q. And is it your view -- is it the University's view that religious student groups cannot do that?

\section*{A. The religious belief part or --}
Q. Can religious groups exclude individuals because of their religious beliefs?

\section*{A. No.}
Q. So a Muslim group cannot reject a Christian leader?
A. If it's a violation of University rights -- Human Rights Policy, and, again, in all of the context, yes.
Q. Yes what?
A. Yes, they can -- no, they cannot violate the University of Iowa's Human Rights Policy.
Q. So are there Muslim student groups on campus?
A. Yes.
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need to discuss any changes with the rest of the leadership team, but I do have a question. Would changing the language --" do you see where I am?
A. I can --
Q. I'm on 7991 --
A. Yes.
Q. -- in Document 167. She says, "Would changing the language of the constitution from 'must subscribe' to something like 'are requested to subscribe' or 'are strongly encouraged to subscribe' make it so that the constitution is no longer contradictory? Again, I will need to discuss changes, but your input in this matter is greatly appreciated."

And then Andy, at the next page, at 7990, says, "I just received word that we would not approve the change in language you proposed. Student orgs are free to express whatever language they desire in their mission purpose, but the University and the Center for Student Involvement and Leadership must enforce our Human Rights Clause when it comes to leadership and membership."
A. Yes.
Q. Is that the official position of the University?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So a religious group on campus cannot even
encourage its members to have its same religious
beliefs? That's a fair characterization of what Andy
said, right?
A. Right.
Q. And you just said that that's a correct position of the University?
A. Yes, and he said that he received word from the

General Counsel's Office that the language they proposed was not acceptable.
Q. Okay. I'm gonna ask you to look at Document

Number 184. (Marking.) Do you recognize that document?
A. I'm assuming it was part of, again, the
production of documents.
Q. It's titled "Constitution of the Iowa National Lawyers Guild," correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And the number at the bottom is 2409 ?
A. Correct.
Q. And it says "BLinC-Def 002409." Do you see that?
A. Correct.
(The reporter requested a clarification.)
MR. BAXTER: Dash Def, D-e-f, for Defendant,
002409.

BY MR. BAXTER:
Q. Under Article II Membership, do you see that it
staff who agree with the Statement of Purpose in Article I, correct?

\section*{A. Correct.}
Q. So they can exclude people who don't agree with

Article I?
A. As stated in their constitution.
Q. And that is discrimination on the basis of creed?
A. Yes.
Q. So that should violate the Human Rights Policy
under your theory that we just discussed with respect to the InterVarsity email, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. So is it still your position, after
reading the email from Andy, that the InterVarsity constitution is still under review by the lawyer's office?
A. I -- I -- I don't know. I apologize for not
knowing that. It -- it very well may be there. It
might not be. It could -- it's very dynamic -- it could have -- I know this is a month or so ago. It appears
that the -- the General Counsel's Office has given Andy
the direction as it relates in that June 12th -- but if
it's a backup there or something else, I guess, I don't know.
Q. But it's fair to assume that this email from Andy
says, "Membership in the NLG is open to all students, faculty and staff at the University of Iowa College of Law who agree with the statement of purpose in Article I"?
A. Yes, I see that.
Q. Do you know if this organization is one of the 24 or 25 that are still under review?
A. I don't -- I can't recall without looking at the list.
Q. Would you have flagged that language as problematic for review by the General Counsel's Office?
A. (Pause.) I'm sorry.
Q. Take a minute and read the first paragraph that has the Statement of Purpose in it.
A. (Pause.) Okay.
Q. And what you just read in Article I, that's the

Statement of Purpose for the Iowa National Lawyers Guild?
A. That's correct.
Q. And that statement includes political statements about protecting workers and so forth, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And then under Article II, Section 1, the constitution says that membership in the -- in this organization is only open to students, faculty, and
is the final word from the University, correct?
A. Correct, because they received word not to approve the language, and that word came from the Office of General Counsel.
Q. Okay. And they also -- that email -- I'm referring to Document 167 -- also states that a religious organization can't even encourage its leaders to be a certain religion, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And that's the official position of the University?
A. No.
Q. Well, you said that that was the guidance from the legal counsel's office, correct?
A. I'm sorry. I need to -- regroup here. How Andy was advised is the position of the University.
Q. Okay. And Andy was advised to tell her that it was not permissible to have the language that she has on the top of the second page --
A. Correct.
Q. -- that leaders are requested to subscribe or strongly encouraged to subscribe to their beliefs?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. If I go onto OrgSync today and download the constitution of the Iowa National Lawyers Guild,
```

that means that they are currently a Registered Student
Organization, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And unless their constitution is still in the
Office of General Counsel, they've already been
approved?
A. Again, there are }17\mathrm{ with the General Counsel's
Office that are registered and there are seven that are
deregistered.
Q. But if they're not currently in the lawyer's
office, that means they've already been approved?
A. I think under review pending -- there were a section of student organizations that de -- selected to reregister on their own. I don't believe they're part of that, so I believe the answer is yes.
Q. Okay. But today any -- any organization that is currently on OrgSync, their con -- except for the fraternities and sororities, their constitutions have already been reviewed and approved, except for maybe 17 who are currently --
A. Correct.
Q. -- in the University's lawyers' office?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. If you can bear with me a few moments, we're getting very close. I'm going to show you a

```
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individual basis to maintain the purpose of the organization as a space for black queer individuals and/or the support thereof."
A. Correct.
Q. Do you believe this language is in conflict with
the Human Rights Policy. I'm sorry. I'm gonna scratch that question. Is this language in violation of the Human Rights Policy?
A. Yes.
Q. And why?
(Mr. Blomberg entered.)
A. Because of the race piece and -- that space is only open to -- says black.
Q. Black queer individuals, right?
A. Correct.
Q. So that would violate both the race and the
gender identity or sexual orientation perhaps --
A. Yes.
Q. -- provision? And is this constitution --

MR. BAXTER: Excuse me -- can we just go off the record for a minute?
(Mr. Blomberg left the room.)
MR. BAXTER: We'll go back on the record.
BY MR. BAXTER:
Q. So you said it was a problem because the space
document marked 192. (Marking.) This is a copy of the constitution of the House of Lorde that was downloaded from the University's website, from the OrgSync website.
(The reporter requested a spelling.)
MR. BAXTER: L-o-r-d-e.
(Mr. Blomberg left the room.)
BY MR. BAXTER:
Q. I'm gonna ask you to flip four pages in.
A. Okay.
Q. And do you see it says -- where it says "Article

2: Mission"?

\section*{A. Correct.}
Q. And then it says that, "The House of Lorde is an organization founded to advocate for the political interests of Black Lesbian et al GBTQPA+ students at the University of Iowa and metro Iowa City community." Do you see that?

\section*{A. I see that, yes.}
Q. Okay. And then, skipping two more pages over, where it says "General Student Membership --"
A. Yes.
Q. And then the second tab -- the second bullet point, says, "Selection of membership may be based off a general interview by the executive board or open by association. Either option will be discussed on an
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was reserved for black queer individuals. Are you -- as far as you know, is this constitution one of the ones that is in the legal office at the University?

\section*{A. I don't know.}
Q. Okay. Is there any problem with the statement in here that selection and membership may be based off a general interview? Is the interview process alone a problem?
A. No.
Q. Okay. I'm gonna show you two more constitutions. Number -- well, I will just ask you: Do you know if -Multiethnic Undergrad Hawkeye InterVarsity is one of the groups under review in the lawyer's office?
A. I -- I believe that they are. I know that they reached out to Andy yesterday.
Q. How do you know that they reached out to Andy yesterday?

\section*{A. Andy told me}
Q. Is -- do you know if International Neighbors is one of the groups whose constitution is before the lawyers at the University?
A. At this point, without the list in front of me, I feel like I'm not giving -- giving accurate information. I have that list.
Q. And as far as you know, is Christian Legal
```

Society still a Registered Student Organization?
A. They may or may not be with the General Counsel's
Office.
Q. Okay. The University has scheduled a mandatory welcome-back meeting on August 19. Are you aware of that?
A. Yes.
Q. And you've asked one representative from
every -- you said that one representative from every organization will need to be attending -- in attendance; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And what's the purpose of that?
A. We provide this meeting each year. It's to go over policies, regulations, what's coming up for the year. We are changing our student organization database management system, which is significant. They need to be aware of that. Giving two sessions has been the customary -- at the beginning of the semester orientation because many of the student leaders are new.

MR. BAXTER: Okay. That's all I have except for one topic. We haven't talked about the Interrogatories, which he's also noticed for the Interrogatories.

MR. CARROLL: Um-hum.
(A discussion was held off the record.)
(Whereupon, the proceedings adjourned at 4:16 p.m., August 8, 2018.)
(The reporter marked the exhibits listed on pages 2 through 7 for identification.)
now or do it tomorrow?
MR. CARROLL: What are you gonna do; just go through his?

MR. BAXTER: Go through his Interrogatory
Responses and the University's Interrogatory Responses.
MR. CARROLL: Can you come back tomorrow
morning?
THE WITNESS: How long would we go?
MR. BAXTER: I think it would be less than an hour.

THE WITNESS: An additional hour?
MR. BAXTER: It probably will be less. It probably will be a half-hour but --

THE WITNESS: It seems like some of what we talked about relates to those -- to those.

MR. CARROLL: Well, why don't we just take a
break? You've been here all day. If you could come back, we have -- we're starting up at nine. Are you staying?

MR. BAXTER: I'm staying.
(The reporter asked if counsel wanted the record closed.)

Mr. BAXTER: We'll go off the record. I'm sorry.
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|  |  | 268 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 11 12 12 13 14 15 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 24 25 |  | Q. Have you reviewed these recently? <br> A. I reviewed the first supplemental ones recently. <br> Q. Have you seen the second supplemental answers? <br> A. I believe so, yes, in the production. <br> Q. Have you reviewed them at all? <br> A. Yes. <br> Q. When did you last review them? <br> A. I can't tell you. I believe I reviewed these. <br> I know I reviewed the first set. <br> Q. Did you review them when they were first sent out or just in preparation for the deposition? <br> A. I -- Both. <br> Q. And have you talked to anyone about -- Other than your lawyer, have you talked to anyone about what's in the responses to interrogatories? <br> A. I think I attempted to, and I realized I shouldn't. <br> Q. Who did you attempt to talk to? <br> A. Mr. Baker. <br> Q. Okay. <br> A. And realized that we can't do this. <br> Q. So you didn't talk to him. And you didn't talk to any of your employees or anyone on your staff about the answers here? |
| 14 15 16 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 | WILLIAM R. NELSON was recalled as a witness and, being first duly sworn, testified as follows: <br> DIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued) BY MR. BAXTER: <br> Q. Good morning, Mr. Nelson, could you state your name again for the record? <br> A. William R. Nelson. <br> Q. And this is a continuation of the deposition that was taken yesterday; correct? <br> A. Correct. <br> Q. And yesterday you testified under oath just like today; correct? <br> A. Correct. <br> Q. I'm going to ask you to look at Exhibit <br> Number 5. I'm sorry, I'm going to ask you to look first at Exhibit Number 4. Do you recognize this document? <br> A. Yes. <br> Q. And this is the University's second supplemental answers to first set of interrogatories; correct? <br> A. Correct. <br> Q. And you're the witness that has been designated to address these on behalf of the University; correct? <br> A. The ones that I can, yes. | A. The -- Some of my employees were involved in helping me get documents for the interrogatories. <br> Q. Did you help draft the responses to these interrogatories? <br> A. Yes. <br> Q. You wrote the written responses? Let me -Are you familiar with what interrogatories are or should I explain that? <br> A. Yes, please. <br> Q. Interrogatories are -- We sent questions to the University asking them to provide written responses. <br> A. Correct. <br> Q. If you flip through, for example, in Number 1, we asked to identify all the individuals who have knowledge about the case. <br> A. Right. <br> Q. There's all of these names listed in response. <br> A. Right. Right. <br> Q. Were you asked to provide the answers to the interrogatories? <br> A. Yes. <br> Q. Do you know -- <br> A. For my -- For me. <br> Q. There are a separate set of interrogatories that were sent to you individually; correct? |


|  | 270 |  | 272 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | A. Correct. | 1 | for student conduct in the Office of the Dean of |
| 2 | Q. Those are at Exhibit 5; correct? | 2 | students. |
| 3 | A. Correct. | 3 | Q. Who did she report to? |
| 4 | Q. Did you already look at those? | 4 | A. She reported to Lyn Redington. |
| 5 | A. These (indicating)? | 5 | Q. And did you report to Angela or you had a |
| 6 | Q. Those are in Exhibit 5; right? | 6 | direct line to Dean Redington? |
| 7 | A. Correct. | 7 | A. I reported to Lyn Redington when she was here. |
| 8 | Q. And those are interrogatories directed to -- | 8 | Q. Who is Eric Rossow? |
| 9 | A. To me personally. | 9 | A. Eric Rossow is a staff member in the Iowa |
| 10 | Q. Try not to talk over me. | 10 | Memorial Union, assistant director for external |
| 11 | A. I apologize. | 11 | relations, and functions in many ways as an assistant to |
| 12 | Q. I'll try to end my sentences quicker. What | 12 | me. |
| 13 | we're seeing in Exhibit 4 is just a separate set sent | 13 | Q. What was his involvement with the BLinC |
| 14 | just to the University; correct? | 14 | investigation in the review of student org |
| 15 | A. Correct. | 15 | constitutions? |
| 16 | Q. Did you help write the responses to these | 16 | A. Eric did not participate in the review of the |
| 17 | interrogatories? | 17 | student organizations with the CSIL staff. That was the |
| 18 | A. The -- I'm getting confused on the first and | 18 | CSIL staff. |
| 19 | second sets. | 19 | Q. What was his role with the BLinC investigation |
| 20 | Q. So there's -- We sent just one set to the | 20 | or the sanctions decision or anything else regarding |
| 21 | University. The University responded one time. | 21 | this lawsuit? |
| 22 | A. Um-hm. | 22 | A. No involvement in the sanction decision, but |
| 23 | Q. Then they sent a supplemental response, which | 23 | helped me, as I went through my materials, make sure |
| 24 | had all of the original responses, if I remember | 24 | that I provided the appropriate materials. |
| 25 | correctly, and they just added some additional | 25 | Q. So his only knowledge about the case is in his |
|  | 271 |  | 273 |
| 1 | information. Do you recall being involved in that? | 1 | role as your assistant? |
| 2 | A. I believe I was. | 2 | A. Correct. |
| 3 | Q. Do you know who besides you was asked to help | 3 | Q. Who is Stuart Stutzman? |
| 4 | write responses? | 4 | A. Stuart Stutzman is the accountant that works |
| 5 | A. I don't. | 5 | in the student organization business office. |
| 6 | Q. And did you write the responses right into the | 6 | Q. And what's his knowledge relevant to this |
| 7 | document or did you send someone an email with | 7 | case? |
| 8 | information that you had? | 8 | A. Stuart's capacity is to administer all of the |
| 9 | A. I had staff -- some of my staff help me in | 9 | student activity fee dollars through that office. My |
| 10 | compiling this. | 10 | direct communication with Stuart on this was related to |
| 11 | Q. And you wrote the answers yourself? | 11 | their funding. I double checked with Stuart to see when |
| 12 | A. Together. | 12 | BLinC received their first funds. |
| 13 | Q. With your staff? | 13 | Q. Just so I know, the student activity fee, is |
| 14 | A. Yes. | 14 | that something every student at the University has to |
| 15 | Q. And then you sent your answers to your | 15 | pay? |
| 16 | attorneys? | 16 | A. Correct. |
| 17 | A. Correct. | 17 | Q. How much is that? |
| 18 | Q. So let's look at Interrogatory Number 1. | 18 | A. \$72 a year. |
| 19 | MR. CARROLL: Are we on Exhibit 4? | 19 | Q. Per student? |
| 20 | Q. We're still on Exhibit 4. These are the | 20 | A. \$36 per semester per student. |
| 21 | individuals who are identified who have knowledge about | 21 | Q. Do all of these funds go to the student orgs? |
| 22 | the case; correct? | 22 | A. No. All of -- It's $\mathbf{1 . 8}$ million dollars. Not |
| 23 | A. Correct. | 23 | all goes to student orgs. Some of the funds go to |
| 24 | Q. Who is Angela Ibrahim-Olin? | 24 | University services and programs. |
| 25 | A. She is the conduct officer, assistant director | 25 | Q. What percentage goes to the student orgs? |

A. I can't tell you the percentage. I can give you numbers.
Q. What's the number?
A. I'll have to go through the list, if you will. Examples of -- Again, the big number that we start with is $\mathbf{1 . 8 7 2}$ million. Then there are fixed-cost groups that get money off of the top. So that would be like the student organization, the business office, which I believe gets $\mathbf{1 6 0 , 0 0 0}$, student legal services, which I believe gets approximately 250 to $\$ 260,000$. There's those groups that get that. LeaderShape is a program that gets, I believe, $\$ 42,000$.

So there's -- so not all -- Your question was do they all go to registered student organizations. The answer is no, some go to university programs and services.
Q. Do you have the amount that goes to the student orgs generally?
A. The amount that's allocated by -- We talked yesterday about SABAC, and the counterpart to SABAC is GPAC.
Q. And SABAC is spelled S-A-B-A-C?
A. Correct. GPAC is G-P-A-C. It's the parallel organization for the graduate special students. Those two together have an allocation of about 270,000 .
Q. And those funds are distributed -- All student organizations have equal access to those funds?
A. Registered student organizations.
Q. And only registered student organizations; is that correct?
A. Student organizations that aren't registered aren't eligible.
Q. Who is Jacob Simpson?
A. Jacob Simpson was the then president of the University of Iowa Student Government.
Q. Is that a student?
A. That's a student.
Q. What's his knowledge relevant to this case?
A. Student government has a capacity where they -- Again, they administer the funds. SABAC and -That SABAC group is an arm of UISG, and Jacob is the president of UISG.
Q. Who is Lilian Sanchez?
A. Then-vice president of UISG.
Q. So Jacob and Lilian's knowledge is limited to the funds that might have been distributed to BLinC; is that correct?
A. No. I kept them abreast of the generalities of the case given their capacity as the president and vice president.
Q. Did they express any opinion about the matter?
A. I believe they just took the information in. They didn't -- I don't recall them offering me a position or opinion.
Q. Who is Angie Reams?
A. Angie Reams is the current associate dean of students responsible for student care and assistance and then also now student -- in the interim student conduct is reporting through her.
Q. What has been her involvement in the matter?
A. So since Lyn's departure student conduct, again, reports -- So Angela we talked about reports to her, Tom Baker we talked about reports to her. So her involvement is as a supervisor and director of that area.
Q. Was she involved in the review of the student constitutions?
A. No.
Q. And Ellen Link I think you mentioned was an assistant?
A. Yeah. Ellen Hermanson-Link is one of the then-three associate directors of the Center for Student Involvement \& Leadership.
Q. I'll ask you this. Did she participate in the review of the constitution?
A. Yes.
Q. In what capacity?
A. She was a part of -- Again, we talked about Dr. Cory, Nellie and Paul Mintner leading that effort, coordinating that effort among the staff.
Q. Nellie is?
A. Ellen Link is Nellie. She goes by Nellie. I apologize.
Q. Thank you for clarifying. In question 4 on the next page -- or next couple of pages over, do you see where it says to describe the advice or statements made to the University by the persons identified in Interrogatory Number 3, which are the people we just talked about?
A. Correct.
Q. And then there's an objection as to attorney/client privilege; do you see that?
A. Correct.
Q. Are any of the individuals that we just talked about in question 1 and that are referred to in question 3, are any of them attorneys?
A. Can I refer back --
Q. Yeah, looking back to question 1.
A. Tom Baker is an attorney. He doesn't work in the general counsel's office, but he is an attorney.
Q. He doesn't work in a true legal capacity, in a legal capacity, as far as you know; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. So there's no one on the list who is acting as an attorney?
A. Correct.
Q. If you look at question number 6 -MR. CARROLL: Just within the same document.
Q. I'm sorry, we're still in document 4 , and I'm asking you to look at question 6 , which is on page 8 .
A. Okay.
Q. This is a list of all the organizations since 1997 that have been refused registration, deregistered or penalized under University policies. Did you participate in gathering this list?
A. I participated in gathering this list with staff. It involved multiple people.
Q. There's no group or organization that's ever been deregistered for having standards for selecting their leaders; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. BLinC is the first student organization that that's happened to?
A. The UI Feminist Union was found responsible for human rights policy violations, but they were not
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## registered.

Q. And that was because they had removed someone from a chat group on their Facebook page; correct?
A. That is correct, a man who was a member of the group.
Q. Is it the University's position that it has
disciplinary authority over what student groups say on a non-University forum like Facebook?
A. Yes.
Q. So the University can restrict the speech of those students?
A. That information can be used in an investigation in making a finding.
Q. And the penalty that was imposed in that case was requiring the student group to reinstate that member to their chat group; correct?
A. That was one of them, yes.
Q. Did anybody discuss with you that that was a potential First Amendment violation?
A. No.
Q. I ask you to look at Interrogatory Number 9, which is on page 14 within the same document. This is a list of University of Iowa programs since 1997 that employ preference based on race, creed, color, religion, and the other categories in the human rights policy;
correct?
A. I did not provide this information.

MR. BAXTER: And so I -- For the record, I understand that a different witness has been designated to respond to Interrogatory -- I'm sorry, 30(b)(6) topic number 4 , which would also correspond with this Interrogatory Number 9; is that correct? I'm asking counsel.

MR. CARROLL: Yeah, that's -- Yes.
Q. We'll skip that for now then. Did you provide any information in response to Interrogatory Number 9 ?
A. Yes.
Q. What did you provide?
A. I provided the information related to the scholarships that are with the UI Center for Advancement that are connected with the Division of Student Life.
Q. What are those scholarships?
A. Those are approximately 80 scholarships that are donor-based scholarships. The donors give money to the foundation. The foundation then works with the Division of Student Life in the disbursement of those funds.
Q. So that's a list that you compiled and gave to someone else?
A. Correct.

|  | 282 |  | 284 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A. Staff for the Center for Advancement. |  | who are protected by the human rights policy but not |
| 2 | Q. Are you aware of efforts or are you | 2 | religious students? |
| 3 | responsible for efforts on campus to provide resources | 3 | A. Repeat that, please. |
| 4 | to minority groups, provide support centers for minority | 4 | Q. You've indicated that the University provides |
| 5 | groups or LGBTQ individuals and so forth? | 5 | support centers that support students who are protected |
| 6 | A. Yes. Part of my responsibility up until the | 6 | by the human rights policies either because of their |
| 7 | recent restructuring was our multicultural programs or | 7 | race, gender identity or sexual orientation, maybe |
| 8 | units reported through me through the Iowa Memorial | 8 | national origin for the Asian-Pacific group. |
| 9 | Union. | 9 | A. Right. |
| 10 | Q. Is the University recognized as being a | 10 | Q. Is there any reason why the University has |
| 11 | minority-friendly place or has it received any awards | 11 | provided support centers for those students but not for |
| 12 | for that kind of thing? | 12 | religious students? |
| 13 | A. I believe we're recognized as being a | 13 | A. The four centers that I referenced that were |
| 14 | minority-friendly place. | 14 | part of my portfolio were all started by students, |
| 15 | Q. What's that based on? | 15 | student activists, students believing that they needed |
| 16 | A. Comments by students are, I think, a premier | 16 | that kind of space for programs, activities, affinity, |
| 17 | center for diversity enrichment staff and their | 17 | fellowship, et cetera. |
| 18 | programs, the quality of programs that are part of our | 18 | Q. And if religious students wanted a similar |
| 19 | four -- I'm only -- then was only responsible for four | 19 | kind of center, would the University provide the same |
| 20 | of those centers. | 20 | funding and support for those? |
| 21 | Q. Which centers were those? | 21 | A. I believe so, to the best of our ability. We |
| 22 | A. The four at that time were the Asian-Pacific | 22 | do provide space on campus for prayer and meditation. I |
| 23 | American Cultural Center, the LGBTQ Resource Center, the | 23 | wouldn't equate those to a center. |
| 24 | Latino-Native American Cultural Center and the | 24 | Q. You've indicated that the University has a |
| 25 | Afro-American Cultural Center. | 25 | good reputation for being minority-friendly. That |
|  | 283 |  | 285 |
| 1 | Q. How many centers total are there like that? | 1 | extends to being LGBTQ friendly I assume? |
| 2 | A. Those are the four in my purview. There's | 2 | A. Um-hm. |
| 3 | other centers across campus not a part of my purview. | 3 | MR. CARROLL: Yes? |
| 4 | Q. Are you aware of any centers that are focused | 4 | A. Yes. Yes. |
| 5 | on religion? | 5 | Q. Is that a new thing or is this a long |
| 6 | A. There was a Center For Religious Studies on | 6 | tradition at the University of Iowa? |
| 7 | campus at one point, if I recall. There's a Women's | 7 | A. Long tradition. |
| 8 | Resource and Action Center that is not in my portfolio | 8 | Q. How far back would you say that goes? |
| 9 | but is a part of what would be called a center at Iowa. | 9 | A. Since the inception of the -- what began as |
| 10 | Q. Is that a religious support? | 10 | the -- The name has changed over time. We're one of the |
| 11 | A. It is not. | 11 | original LGBTQ student organizations in the country, |
| 12 | Q. So the religious studies one is the only one | 12 | perhaps the first to be recognized by the University. |
| 13 | that you know that pertains to religion? | 13 | The center -- I can't speak to how old the actual |
| 14 | A. Religious studies is, I believe, more of an | 14 | student organization is. I can't remember. |
| 15 | academic program than it is a nonacademic program. The | 15 | Q. I'm going to ask you to look at Exhibit 26A. |
| 16 | other centers I talked about would be considered | 16 | This is an exhibit that was produced by BLinC, and it's |
| 17 | nonacademic programs. | 17 | a printout of a website of the University; is that |
| 18 | Q. They're more like support groups for students; | 18 | correct? |
| 19 | correct? | 19 | A. Correct. |
| 20 | A. Correct. | 20 | Q. Does this web page fall under your |
| 21 | Q. There are no support centers for religious | 21 | responsibility or . . |
| 22 | students? | 22 | A. The -- I-- |
| 23 | A. Correct. | 23 | Q. It looks like it may be under admissions. |
| 24 | Q. Is there a reason why the University focuses | 24 | A. Correct. We don't -- We contribute to it, we |
| 25 | on providing support groups for many of the individuals | 25 | don't administer it. |
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|  | 286 |  | 288 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Q. This indicates that Iowa was given a 4.5 out | 1 | basic requirements set forth in your policy? |
| 2 | of 5 stars for being LGBT-friendly; right? | 2 | A. Correct. |
| 3 | A. Correct. | 3 | Q. And the purpose of that policy is to allow |
| 4 | Q. And I assume you promote the University of | 4 | student organizations to form around areas of interest; |
| 5 | Iowa to members of the LGBTQ community? | 5 | correct? |
| 6 | A. Correct. | 6 | A. Correct. |
| 7 | Q. Then if you'll flip over to Exhibit 27, this | 7 | Q. And the University considers registered |
| 8 | is also a print-off from the University's web page that | 8 | student organizations to be separate legal entities from |
| 9 | has a timeline of LGBTQ milestones indicating that in | 9 | the University; is that correct? |
| 10 | the 1970s the University became the first state | 10 | A. Correct. |
| 11 | university to officially recognize and continuously fund | 11 | Q. And the University does not treat them like |
| 12 | a gay student organization; is that correct? | 12 | other university departments or units? |
| 13 | A. Correct. | 13 | A. Correct. |
| 14 | Q. So there's a long history over nearly 50 years | 14 | Q. And there are student groups that are |
| 15 | actually, right, of the University supporting and | 15 | considered part of the University; correct? |
| 16 | encouraging the LGBTQ community? | 16 | A. Correct. |
| 17 | A. Correct. | 17 | Q. And those are referred to in your registration |
| 18 | Q. And there's no history at the University of | 18 | of student organizations policy as affiliated student |
| 19 | Student group -- other students protesting LGBT student | 19 | organizations; is that correct? |
| 20 | organizations on campus or the support center for LGBTQ | 20 | A. Correct. |
| 21 | students; is that correct? | 21 | Q. Or sponsored -- |
| 22 | A. There's been concerns raised by opposing | 22 | A. Sponsored. |
| 23 | people/organizations over time. | 23 | Q. -- student organizations; is that correct? |
| 24 | Q. Do you remember any of those? | 24 | A. Correct. |
| 25 | A. Not specifically. | 25 | Q. And, in fact, the University has disavowed in |
|  | 287 |  | 289 |
| 1 | Q. Are these things you knew about firsthand or | 1 | that policy that registering a student organization does |
| 2 | just things that you've heard about? | 2 | not constitute an endorsement -- I'm going to restate |
| 3 | A. Things I've known about. | 3 | that question. The University's policy states that |
| 4 | Q. Has SABAC ever threatened to withhold funding | 4 | registration does not constitute an endorsement of the |
| 5 | from any of the LGBTQ groups? | 5 | organization's program or purposes; correct? |
| 6 | MR. CARROLL: Can you clarify threatened as | 6 | A. Correct. |
| 7 | opposed to suggested? If you want to use that term you | 7 | Q. And it's merely a charter to exist? |
| 8 | can, but... | 8 | A. Correct. |
| 9 | A. Again, the group -- the umbrella organization | 9 | Q. So the University has no real responsibility |
| 10 | for the student organization is now called UI Spectrum. | 10 | for what happens within a student organization? |
| 11 | That's the current name of the -- kind of the umbrella | 11 | A. I would disagree with that. |
| 12 | student organization for LGBTQ. They have not | 12 | Q. And how? |
| 13 | threatened to take away their funding. | 13 | A. We are -- Again, in my capacity I'm charged |
| 14 | Q. And the student government, I think you called | 14 | with, if there is a violation and that violation is |
| 15 | it USIG; is that correct? | 15 | found to be, again, proven, that it was an alleged |
| 16 | A. US- -- University of Iowa Student Government, | 16 | violation being proven to be a violation, then I'm |
| 17 | UISG. | 17 | responsible for the resolution phase, which is looking |
| 18 | Q. Thank you. UISG, they're an official arm of | 18 | at the situation and then determining what sanctions, if |
| 19 | the University; is that correct? | 19 | so, are appropriate. |
| 20 | A. Correct. | 20 | Q. But if a student organization speaks on an |
| 21 | Q. Have they ever suggested withholding funds | 21 | issue, the University would disavow ownership of that |
| 22 | from any LGBTQ groups? | 22 | speech; correct? |
| 23 | A. Not to my knowledge. | 23 | A. Correct. |
| 24 | Q. And you would agree, right, that all student | 24 | Q. So no student organization can speak for the |
| 25 | groups are welcome on campus as long as they meet the | 25 | University? |


|  | 290 |  | 292 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | A. There are -- the notion of agency, and the | 1 | other than you and Lyn Redington? |
| 2 | University considers their governance organizations. | 2 | A. Yes, that would be correct. |
| 3 | There are six governance organizations -- excuse me, | 3 | Q. I would ask you to just turn the page over to |
| 4 | seven. | 4 | Interrogatory 14. I'm not asking for a legal opinion |
| 5 | Q. And what about those governance organizations? | 5 | here, but just in your opinion this question asks what |
| 6 | A. That they are considered -- Their leaders are | 6 | interest the University of Iowa has in preventing |
| 7 | considered agents. | 7 | religious student groups from selecting leaders who |
| 8 | Q. And student organizations that are classified | 8 | embrace their mission. Yesterday you indicated that |
| 9 | as general student organizations are not considered | 9 | that isn't really a purpose of the University. But to |
| 10 | agents? | 10 | the extent it may be, are these reasons here, compliance |
| 11 | A. Correct. | 11 | with federal law, the only reasons why the University |
| 12 | Q. And in general is it the University's desire | 12 | would re- -- impose restrictions on which leaders |
| 13 | to encourage a broad diversity of student organizations? | 13 | student groups can select? |
| 14 | A. Yes. | 14 | A. I'm going to ask you to repeat that, please. |
| 15 | Q. Why is that? What value is that to the | 15 | You referenced a position I took yesterday, and I wanted |
| 16 | University? | 16 | to hear that. |
| 17 | A. It adds a richness to the educational | 17 | Q. I'll simplify the question. Does the |
| 18 | experience and campus environment. | 18 | University have any reasons why it would want to |
| 19 | Q. How important are student groups to the | 19 | restrict who student groups can select as their internal |
| 20 | University? | 20 | leaders? |
| 21 | A. They are very important. | 21 | A. We would want to make certain that the process |
| 22 | Q. Why? | 22 | for selecting internal leaders was consistent with |
| 23 | A. Because they provide opportunities for -- | 23 | University policy, specifically the human rights clause |
| 24 | fellowship opportunities for very important learning | 24 | related to student organizations. |
| 25 | outside of the classroom, opportunities to engage the | 25 | Q. But what's the reason behind that policy? |
|  | 291 |  | 293 |
| 1 | curriculum with the co-curriculum in a more practical | 1 | A. So that we provide equal treatment to all |
| 2 | experiential kind of way. | 2 | under the law. |
| 3 | Q. When you say important for students to engage | 3 | Q. But you would agree that whatever student |
| 4 | and learn, what do you mean by that? | 4 | organizations do, whoever student organizations select |
| 5 | A. To participate, to be members, leaders, | 5 | as their leaders, that doesn't implicate the University; |
| 6 | learners within the groups. | 6 | correct? |
| 7 | Q. Do you expect that students would have | 7 | A. If there's a policy violation as a result of |
| 8 | opportunity to confront ideas that they might disagree | 8 | that, it -- yes. |
| 9 | with and learn how to debate and understand and grapple | 9 | Q. Does the University bear any responsibility |
| 10 | with positions that maybe they have never grappled with | 10 | for who student groups select as their leaders? |
| 11 | before? | 11 | A. Yes, I think within the context of ensuring |
| 12 | A. Yes. | 12 | that the process for selecting leaders is one that is |
| 13 | Q. And that's an important part of the | 13 | consistent with our human rights policy. |
| 14 | University's purpose of having student groups; correct? | 14 | Q. If -- But you've already indicated that the |
| 15 | A. Yes. | 15 | student groups are not acting on behalf of the |
| 16 | Q. I'm going to ask you to look in the same | 16 | University when they select leaders; is that correct? |
| 17 | document, Number 4, Interrogatory Number 13. This | 17 | A. Correct. |
| 18 | interrogatory asks who played a role in the decision to | 18 | Q. Did the -- I'm looking at Interrogatory |
| 19 | deregister BLinC, and the answer includes William Nelson | 19 | Number 15 on the next page, just one page over from |
| 20 | and Lyn Redington. Is there a reason why Tom Baker | 20 | where you are. I'm going to skip that. |
| 21 | wasn't included here? | 21 | Turning to the next one on Interrogatory |
| 22 | A. Lyn and $I$ are the actual two people who issue | 22 | Number 16, this says -- asks why the University believes |
| 23 | the decisions. Tom Baker's opinion was sought. | 23 | that BLinC's statement of faith is discriminatory on its |
| 24 | Q. Was there anybody else who -- Is it fair to | 24 | face. The response here says that the University of |
| 25 | say that Tom Baker played a larger role than anyone | 25 | Iowa seeks to enforce its rights under the Iowa |


|  | 294 |  | 296 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Constitution, federal and state law. Do you have any | 1 | Q. Well, the list that was published in the |
| 2 | idea what rights are at stake for the University here? | 2 | Gazette says that one of the groups was Sikh Awareness |
| 3 | A. I didn't write that. | 3 | Club. |
| 4 | Q. But you're the individual who's authorized to | 4 | MR. CARROLL: I'm sorry, is that an acronym or |
| 5 | speak for the University on these interrogatories; | 5 | a word? |
| 6 | correct? | 6 | MR. BAXTER: Sikh is S-i-k-h for the religion. |
| 7 | A. Correct. | 7 | A. Excuse me? |
| 8 | Q. Do you have any idea what rights the | 8 | Q. Sikh religion. |
| 9 | University is trying to defend for itself? | 9 | A. Yes, that group is -- I can't remember the |
| 10 | A. Well, the Code of Iowa Human Rights mirrors | 10 | status for sure -- I believe deregistered and could be |
| 11 | the University of Iowa's policy. | 11 | also among the seven that are deregistered that are with |
| 12 | Q. What rights does that give the University of | 12 | Nate Levin. I may be wrong on that. |
| 13 | Iowa? Does the University of Iowa have special right to | 13 | Q. Do you know about the J. Rueben Clark Law |
| 14 | enforce student groups' leadership selection or speech | 14 | Society or the Latter-day Saints student association? |
| 15 | or anything like that? | 15 | A. Latter-day Saints group is deregistered. The |
| 16 | A. I'm not understanding the question. | 16 | other one I -- without looking at my notes, my list, |
| 17 | Q. I'm just trying to understand what rights for | 17 | what I have access to in my office, I don't want |
| 18 | the University are at risk here. If you don't know, | 18 | misspeak. |
| 19 | that's fine. Do you have any idea what the University | 19 | Q. It's my understanding the Latter-day Saints |
| 20 | is trying to say here? | 20 | student association received an invitation to go to the |
| 21 | A. We have an obligation as an institution to | 21 | student fair. Would that surprise you to hear that? |
| 22 | follow federal, state and our own policy, laws and | 22 | A. Yes, if they're deregistered. |
| 23 | policies. | 23 | Q. And why were they deregistered? |
| 24 | Q. But the federal law doesn't require you to | 24 | A. I don't remember. They could have been one of |
| 25 | control who student organizations select as their | 25 | the groups that didn't meet the June 15th deadline or |
|  | 295 |  | 297 |
| 1 | leaders, does it? | 1 | they could have been a group that submitted and what |
| 2 | A. Correct. | 2 | they submitted was not acceptable. I don't know which. |
| 3 | Q. So do you know what rights are at stake for | 3 | Q. So if it was the latter, then counsel has |
| 4 | the University? | 4 | already reviewed that and rejected their constitution? |
| 5 | A. I would be unclear to state. | 5 | A. There are to my knowledge seven that are |
| 6 | Q. Do you know if the Korean student organization | 6 | pending in the general counsel's office. |
| 7 | or the Feminist Union have been reregistered since these | 7 | Q. Is that one of them or it just could be? |
| 8 | interrogatories were provided? | 8 | A. I can't remember. |
| 9 | A. They have not been. | 9 | Q. Is that the same for the J. Rueben Clark Law |
| 10 | Q. Do you know why not? | 10 | Society? |
| 11 | A. They were deregistered because they didn't | 11 | A. Urban Law? |
| 12 | register in the registration window. So as a result | 12 | Q. J. Rueben Clark Law Society is another LDS |
| 13 | they were immediately deregistered, and they've made no | 13 | association for law students. |
| 14 | attempt to reregister. | 14 | A. I'm not certain of their status. |
| 15 | Q. Do you know if Imam Mahdi has made an attempt | 15 | Q. I'm going to ask you to look at document |
| 16 | to reregister? | 16 | number 6, which is the next document in the binder -- |
| 17 | A. They are one of the groups that, as I believe | 17 | I'm sorry, document number 5. Do you recognize this |
| 18 | I shared yesterday, are deregistered but are pending in | 18 | document? |
| 19 | the office of the general counsel with Nate Levin. | 19 | A. Yes. |
| 20 | Q. And is the Sikh student group that was | 20 | Q. And this is your responses to interrogatories; |
| 21 | deregistered also in the attorney's office? There was a | 21 | correct? |
| 22 | Sikh organization that was among the 39 or so student | 22 | A. Correct. |
| 23 | groups that were purged. | 23 | Q. On page 3 there's a list of individuals who |
| 24 | A. Right. I'm trying to recall which ones. If I | 24 | have knowledge concerning the lawsuit. Can you identify |
| 25 | could see a list I would be able to -- | 25 | just for me here those that were involved in the review |
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|  | 298 |  | 300 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | of the student constitutions? | 1 | correct? |
| 2 | A. Anita Cory, Nellie Hermanson Link, | 2 | A. Correct. |
| 3 | Paul Mintner. I believe that's it. | 3 | Q. And at the time of -- |
| 4 | Q. Would you look opposite page 6 as well? | 4 | A. As leaders? |
| 5 | A. Are you referring to the -- the actual | 5 | Q. Correct. |
| 6 | date that -- we talked about it yesterday, I apologize, | 6 | A. Yes. I mean, all-comers policy is all-comers. |
| 7 | I'm forgetting the date -- where the Center for Student | 7 | Q. And that would mean that the transgender |
| 8 | Involvement team got together to review all of the | 8 | support group would have to support people who think |
| 9 | constitutions; is that what you're referring to? | 9 | that transgenderism is a figment of someone's |
| 10 | Q. Correct. You said there were two stages, one | 10 | imagination; correct? |
| 11 | where religious groups were reviewed and then where | 11 | A. Again, as long as there's not a violation of |
| 12 | everyone else, and there was a team who called all of | 12 | the human rights policy in and among the process of |
| 13 | the student groups in. So are these three the only | 13 | becoming a leader. |
| 14 | members of that team? | 14 | Q. So at the time of the BLinC action and the |
| 15 | A. Correct, to the best of my knowledge. | 15 | decision to deregister BLinC, the University of Iowa did |
| 16 | Q. Those three did all of the work of | 16 | not have an all-comers policy; is that correct? |
| 17 | contacting -- | 17 | A. Yes. |
| 18 | A. No, there were other staff members involved. | 18 | Q. Was that discussed within the University? |
| 19 | Q. Okay. But those staff members aren't listed | 19 | MR. CARROLL: Other than with attorneys? |
| 20 | here? | 20 | Q. Other than within the defense attorneys. |
| 21 | A. That's correct. | 21 | A. Whether or not we should have an all-comers |
| 22 | Q. Is there a reason for that? | 22 | policy? |
| 23 | A. I'm not aware of -- One of them, omission. | 23 | Q. Whether you had an all-comers policy. |
| 24 | Q. Will you update your interrogatories to | 24 | A. There was conversation about the |
| 25 | provide that information? | 25 | interpretation of our policy. |
|  | 299 |  | 301 |
| 1 | A. Yes. | 1 | Q. And was there agreement among the individuals |
| 2 | Q. Have you used any other email addresses to | 2 | responsible for enforcing the policy, yourself, Lynn |
| 3 | discuss the BLinC litigation other than your official | 3 | Shriver [sic] -- and excluding attorneys, was there |
| 4 | University of Iowa -- | 4 | agreement there was no all-comers policy? |
| 5 | A. I have not. | 5 | MR. CARROLL: Excuse me just for a minute. |
| 6 | Q. Have you discussed the issue on Facebook or | 6 | You misspoke. It's not Lynn Shriver. |
| 7 | Twitter or any other platform? | 7 | Q. I'm sorry, Lyn Redington. |
| 8 | A. I'm not on any of those. | 8 | A. Repeat your question, please. |
| 9 | Q. In all the time through the course of the | 9 | Q. So excluding -- Your communications with your |
| 10 | incidents involving BLinC, was there anyone who spoke up | 10 | attorneys are privileged. Do you understand that? |
| 11 | against deregistering or penalizing BLinC? | 11 | A. Correct. |
| 12 | MR. CARROLL: Do you mean within the | 12 | Q. And so you shouldn't disclose to me what your |
| 13 | University? | 13 | attorneys advised you. Do you understand that? |
| 14 | Q. Within the University. | 14 | A. Correct. |
| 15 | A. There may have been. Within my unit, no, my | 15 | Q. With that understanding, was there agreement |
| 16 | department, no. | 16 | that the University does not have an all-comers policy? |
| 17 | Q. A couple of follow-up questions. At the time | 17 | A. Was there agreement we did not? I would say |
| 18 | of the decision to -- Do you know what an all-comers | 18 | there was not agreement. |
| 19 | policy is? | 19 | Q. Who disagreed? |
| 20 | A. (Witness nods head.) | 20 | A. I'm thinking about the discussions that |
| 21 | Q. And what's your understanding of what an | 21 | occurred and kind of the dissenting opinions as we were |
| 22 | all-comers policy is? | 22 | kind of figuring this out. So whether or not everybody |
| 23 | A. That all are welcome. | 23 | all the time agreed always that we have had an |
| 24 | Q. And that means that the Democratic student | 24 | all-comers policy, I can't say that's accurate. |
| 25 | group would have to admit Republicans as leaders; | 25 | Q. Would you say there's general consensus that |


|  | 302 |  | 304 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | the University doesn't have an all-comers policy? | 1 | Q. What did she tell you? |
| 2 | A. Among the people making the decision, no. | 2 | A. That there's discussion -- I don't know if I'm |
| 3 | Q. Who were the ones that disagreed? | 3 | violating the attorney/client privilege related to her |
| 4 | A. Again, I think there were people asking | 4 | discussion. |
| 5 | questions because -- particularly Mr. Baker, because it | 5 | Q. Is she a lawyer? |
| 6 | was different than years and years ago. | 6 | A. No, but I know she's had conversations with |
| 7 | Q. Did Mr. Baker believe the University had an | 7 | attorneys. |
| 8 | all-comers policy? | 8 | Q. Well, were lawyers with you when she told you? |
| 9 | A. I can't say if he actually said that or not. | 9 | A. No. |
| 10 | Q. How would you characterize the position he was | 10 | MR. CARROLL: Well -- |
| 11 | taking? | 11 | Q. I'm asking a question, and you have to answer |
| 12 | A. Historical, trying to figure out our | 12 | unless your attorney instructs you not to answer. |
| 13 | historical pattern based on our current pattern. | 13 | MR. CARROLL: That's right. So I was waiting |
| 14 | Q. And yesterday you mentioned that there is a | 14 | to see what his answer -- where he was headed. So I am |
| 15 | new HR policy being proposed. Again, without disclosing | 15 | going to object to attorney/client privilege. If |
| 16 | communications from your attorneys, when did you first | 16 | Ms. Shiver's only repeated what she learned from counsel |
| 17 | learn about this potential new human rights policy? | 17 | to you, that's privileged. I'm not trying to tell you |
| 18 | A. I referenced the policy update that happened | 18 | what to say, trust me. For example, if she said I |
| 19 | in 2014. | 19 | believe the policy should be X in the future. |
| 20 | Q. Correct. | 20 | THE WITNESS: She did not state that. |
| 21 | A. What I was meaning to reference yesterday was | 21 | Q. So do you believe that everything she told you |
| 22 | the membership -- the human rights clause, that there is | 22 | is just what she heard from the attorneys? |
| 23 | an insertion now that was approved on -- in July that | 23 | A. Yes. |
| 24 | references the Title IX exemption related to | 24 | Q. And have you discussed this with anyone else? |
| 25 | fraternities and sororities. | 25 | A. No. |
|  | 303 |  | 305 |
| 1 | Q. You also referred to a potential new policy | 1 | Q. Do you have any idea of when this might come |
| 2 | that would clarify the leadership selection standards | 2 | out? |
| 3 | for student organizations. Do you recall that? | 3 | A. No. |
| 4 | A. I don't re- - I can't recall if I said that. | 4 | Q. Are you familiar with the organization NORML, |
| 5 | Apparently I did. | 5 | capital N-O-R-M-L? |
| 6 | Q. Are you aware -- Just is there an impending | 6 | A. Yes. But I'll need a little refresher. |
| 7 | policy? Do you know of any further policy changes that | 7 | Q. It's an organization that works for promoting |
| 8 | might be made? | 8 | the legalization of marijuana; is that correct? |
| 9 | A. I don't believe there's policy changes in the | 9 | A. Correct. |
| 10 | works right now. | 10 | Q. Is there a NORML group on campus? |
| 11 | Q. Do you believe there's any new interpretation | 11 | MR. CARROLL: Do you mean a registered group? |
| 12 | that's being considered for the existing -- | 12 | I don't know what the question is. |
| 13 | A. Yeah. | 13 | Q. I'm just going to let him answer, and then |
| 14 | Q. -- human rights -- | 14 | I'll clarify. |
| 15 | A. Yes. | 15 | A. I'm not certain if we have a registered or |
| 16 | Q. -- human rights policy? | 16 | deregistered NORML chapter. |
| 17 | A. Excuse me. Yes. | 17 | Q. Do you know if there's been one in the past? |
| 18 | Q. What do you know about that? | 18 | A. I believe there has been. |
| 19 | A. I think there has been recent discussion about | 19 | Q. Are you aware of any incident involving the |
| 20 | reconsidering our position on that. | 20 | NORML student organization at Iowa State University? |
| 21 | Q. And do you know, is that only in | 21 | MR. CARROLL: I'm going to object as |
| 22 | communications with your lawyers that you know that? | 22 | irrelevant and not leading to discovery of admissible |
| 23 | A. No. | 23 | evidence in this litigation. |
| 24 | Q. Who else has talked to you about that? | 24 | Q. You can go ahead and answer. |
| 25 | A. I heard that from Vice President Shivers. | 25 | MR. CARROLL: You can answer if you know |
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## EXHIBIT A

## List of Topics for Rule 30(b)(6) Witness

1. The University of Iowa's policies and/or procedures regarding registered student organizations, including all funding and benefits made available to such organizations.
2. Student organizations that have been refused registration, deregistered or otherwise penalized since 1997, and the investigations into those student organizations.
3. The adoption, interpretation, and enforcement of the University of Iowa's Human Rights Policy, Nondiscrimination Statement, and Statement of Policy.
4. Official University of Iowa programs existing at any time since 1997 (including but not limited to scholarships, awards, events, admission policies, and educational programs) that employ preference for or against students with regard to their race, creed, color, religion, national origin, age, sex, pregnancy, disability, genetic information, status as a U.S. veteran, service in the U.S. military, sexual orientation, gender identity, political affiliation, or associational preferences.
5. Registered student organizations at the University of Iowa, including but not limited to fraternities, sororities, sports clubs, and sports teams since 1997 that have employed criteria for the selection of leadership positions, membership, or participation involving a preference for or against students with regard to their race, creed, color, religion, national origin, age, sex, pregnancy, disability, genetic information, status as a U.S. veteran, service in the U.S. military, sexual orientation, gender identity, political affiliation, or associational preferences.
6. The University of Iowa's investigation of Business Leaders in Christ and its decision to deregister Business Leaders in Christ.
7. The University of Iowa's investigation of the complaint filed by Marcus Miller against student organization 24:7.
8. The University of Iowa's investigation of any complaints filed against student organization Christian Legal Society.
9. The University of Iowa's responses to Plaintiff's First Set of Interrogatories to Defendant University of Iowa.
10.Any documents produced by the University of Iowa in response to Plaintiff's First Set of Requests for Production of Documents from Defendants.
10. The University of Iowa's efforts since the commencement of this lawsuit to enforce its Human Rights Policy
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George A. Carroll
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# Registration of Student Organizations 

A student organization is a voluntary special interest group organized for educational, social, recreational, and service purposes and comprised of its members. Student organizations are separate legal entities from the University of lowa and legally are not treated the same as University departments or units. Student organizations can exist whether or not the University endorses them pursuant to this policy. Unless otherwise denoted hereafter, the use of the term "student organization" shall include sports clubs registered by Recreational Services.

Student organizations are an important link in the co-curricular activities of the University of lowa. They play an important role in developing student leadership and providing a quality campus environment. As such, the University encourages the formation of student organizations around the areas of interests of its students, within the limits necessary to accommodate academic needs and ensure public safety.

## I. Registration of Student Organizations

The University of lowa, through the Vice President for Student Life (hereinafter, "vice president"), has delegated the responsibilities and obligations of registering student organizations to the Student Organization Review Committee (i.e., on behalf of the Center for Student Involvement \& Leadership and Recreational Services) (SORC) and to deans of academic colleges. The SORC is a team of students and staff that determines the approval or denial of the application for registration. Registration of a student organization by the University does not constitute an endorsement of its program or its purposes, but is merely a charter to exist. The reasons for denying or withdrawing registration of a student organization shall not violate the University Policy on Human Rights.

It is the responsibility of each registered student organization to adhere to the mission of this University, its supporting strategic plan, policies, and procedures. Organizations must abide by all local, state, and federal laws. An organization's goals, objectives, and activities must not deviate from established University policies and procedures. Because participation in student organizations may enhance a student's educational experience and the University deems this important to our students' success, registered organizations are entitled to certain privileges and benefits.
A. Benefits of Registration:

1. Registration as a University organization;
2. Establishment of an account in the Student Organization Business Office (SOBO), Fraternity Business Service, or Recreational Services and appropriate purchasing privileges in accordance with University policies;
3. Eligibility to apply_ for funds from mandatory Student Activity fees (i.e., for student organizations) or Recreational Services fees (i.e., for sports clubs);
4. Inclusion in appropriate University publications;
5. Utilization of the Center for Student Involvement \& Leadership's (CSIL) OrgSync software (funded by UISG \& GPSG)
6. Utilization of the University's trademarks in accordance with the UI Trademark Licensing Department's program and policies;
7. Eligibility for use of campus meeting facilities and outdoor spaces;
8. Eligibility, but not the right, to utilize UI Fleet Services vehicles in accordance with state and University policies, procedures, guidelines, and insurance requirements;
9. Eligibility, but not the right, to utilize University staff and programming resources;
10. Eligibility, but not the right, to utilize Information Technology Services Mass Mail once each semester;
11. Eligibility to apply for awards and honors presented to University registered organizations and members; and
12. Eligibility to apply for Student Organization Office Suite (SOOS) or Student Activity Center (SAC) office space and/or storage space.
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1. In order to exercise the privileges accorded to registered student organizations, students interested in starting a new registered student organization must first write a constitution for the potential student organization and hold a Preregistration meeting with the appropriate CSIL staff, BEFORE filing the New Organization Registration Form online through OrgSync. This form includes organizational information and the organization's Constitution and Bylaws. Upon receiving this information, the CSIL staff will review it and submit it to the Student Organization Review Committee (SORC) for consideration. If approved for registration, the SORC will assign the appropriate registration tier (see below). 2. Eligibility/Registration Requirements
a. Any group or organization which consists of and maintains at least 80 percent University students, whose purposes are consistent with the educational objectives of the University, and do not violate local, state or federal law, is eligible for registration by the University. To start a new registered student organization, the organization must consist of and maintain at least five (5) individuals as members, of which four (4) must be currently enrolled UI students.
b. Membership. It is the policy of the University that all registered student organizations be able to exercise free choice of members on the basis of their merits as individuals without restriction in accordance with the University Policy on Human Rights. The University acknowledges the interests of students to organize and associate with likeminded students, therefore any individual who subscribes to the goals and beliefs of a student organization may participate in and become a member of the organization.

Membership and participation in the organization must be open to all students without regard to race, creed, color, religion, national origin, age, sex, pregnancy, disability, genetic information, status as a U.S. veteran, service in the U.S. military, sexual orientation, gender identity, associational preferences, or any other classification that deprives the person of consideration as an individual. The organization will guarantee that equal opportunity and equal access to membership, programming, facilities, and benefits shall be open to all persons.

Membership in a student organization must be composed primarily of UI students (minimum $80 \%$ student membership) and be controlled and directed by UI students. Members are individuals who self-select to join an organization; "membership" is different from the audience a student organization targets, serves, or represents. The "audience" is not automatically considered a part of the organization's membership. Only UI student members shall have voting rights in a student organization. Membership is not open to persons under the age of 18 who are not enrolled UI students. Non-university community members who are at least 18 years of age may participate in the activities of student organizations but may not be voting members. If the student organization desires to allow persons under the age of 18 who are not UI students to participate in the activities of the student organization, the student organization must follow the requirements contained in the Youth Programs Policy Manual for RSOs, including that the youth participant must have permission to participate from a parent or guardian.

As some University services and benefits require knowledge of a student's membership in the student organization requesting the service or benefit, all organizations are encouraged to have a full membership roster on file with the Center for Student Involvement \& Leadership via OrgSync. For example, if a member of a student organization wants to request approval to drive or ride in a university vehicle for an organization event or activity, that member must be listed on the organization's full membership roster located on OrgSync.

The student organization must be nonprofit in nature; student organizations affiliated with for-profit businesses are not eligible for registration. Student Representatives and student organization members must not profit or benefit financially from student organization membership.
A. Primary and Secondary Student Representatives. Student Representatives are individuals who are authorized by the organization to speak for or represent the organization in its relations with the University and who are authorized to receive for the organization official notices, directives, or information from the University. Every student organization or potential student organization, registered with the Center for Student Involvement \& Leadership/Recreational Services/academic deans via OrgSync must include the names of two student representatives in its Org Profile. Both Representatives must be currently enrolled UI students, and in academic and non-academic good-standing. One name will be designated as the Primary Representative and the other as the Secondary Representative. It is the responsibility of each student organization to update the Org Profile with the current names of Student Representatives. A student organization no longer under the direction of currently enrolled students may lose its registration.
B. Access to University Resources. Registered student organizations are guaranteed an equal opportunity to apply for funds from mandatory Student Activity fees (i.e., for student organizations) or Recreational Services fees.(i.e., for sports clubs) or for any other benefit conferred by the University of lowa Student Government (UISG) or Graduate and Professional Student Government (GPSG) or their constituent bodies, without differentiation for reasons that violate the University Poligy on Human Rights or inhibit the group's exercise of First Amendment rights of free expression and association. Nothing in this
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C. Registration Procedure. Throughout the year on an ongoing basis, the University will consider applications from student organizations that request to be registered. Registration of student organizations is granted by the Student Organization Review Committee (i.e., on behalf of the Center for Student Involvement \& Leadership and Recreational Services) or an academic dean. Registration granted for sports clubs, and fraternities and sororities are subject to additional policies administered by their respective department or student governance organization(s). In order to receive funds from mandatory Student Activity fees (i.e., for student organizations) or Recreational Services fees (i.e., for sports clubs), a student organization must be confirmed by the UISG and/or GPSG or Recreational Services. Greek-letter social organizations are registered by the University of lowa Interfraternity Council, Panhellenic Council, Multicultural Greek Council, or the National Pan-Hellenic Council.

1. To start an organization one must follow the step-by-step process listed on the "Starting an Organization" website.

Registration of student organizations that are residential living units (i.e., residence hall organizations, fraternities, and sororities) is granted by their respective student governance organization (i.e., Associated Residence Halls [ARH], Interfraternity Council [IFC], Multicultural Greek Council [MGC], National Pan-Hellenic Council [NPHC], and Panhellenic Council [PHC]) with the concurrence of the vice president.

The Student Organization Review Committee (SORC) shall review all student organization registration applications. Upon its evaluation, the Committee will register the student organization and forward the organization's application to the appropriate student governance organization or college/department/unit for confirmation; 2) register the organization subject to specific conditions on activities the organization is permitted to sponsor; or 3) reject the application. If an application is rejected the organization may appeal the decision of the SORC within 30 calendar days upon the receipt of their denial of registration letter. Appeals must be submitted in writing to either the Director of the Center for Student Involvement \& Leadership (i.e, for student organizations) or the Director of Recreational Services (i.e., for sport clubs). If an organization appeals and is not satisfied with the decision rendered by the Director of the Center for Student Involvement \& Leadership or the Director of Recreational Services they may then submit a final appeal in writing to the Dean of Students. There is no further appeal after the Dean of Students.
D. Constitution and Bylaws. In order to complete the registration process, all student organizations must have an approved constitution and bylaws. Sponsored and affiliated student organizations (see Section 8, Registration Tiers) must also provide a copy of the charter, constitution, and/or bylaws of any organization external to the University with which such organization may be affiliated. Student organizations are required to include mandatory clauses within their organization constitutions.
E. Registration of Inter/National Chartered Organizations. In addition to observing all University rules, an organization that is chartered by an inter/national organization, such as a Greek-letter social fraternity or sorority, must maintain its affiliation with the inter/national organization in order to retain its University registration. University registration will cease when the inter/national organization no longer recognizes or sponsors the student organization as an active organization. In this situation, the organization is no longer eligible to affiliate with their respective student governance organization, to participate in activities sponsored by the governance organization or its member organizations, or to access the privileges granted to registered student organizations. Once the inter/national organization has officially returned the student organization to affiliation status, the student organization representatives may apply to the University and the respective student governance organization for registration, although re-registration is not guaranteed. When the University removes registration of a student organization for violating University rules but the organization remains affiliated with the inter/national organization, the student organization will not regain their University registration by virtue of their relationship with the inter/national organization.
F. Housing Organizations. Student organizations that provide off-campus housing to their student members are considered Housing Organizations. These include Professional Residence Groups, fraternal organizations with a professional focus that are recognized by an academic college, and Undergraduate Residence Groups, which includes Greek-letter organizations that are affiliated with their respective student governance organization.

1. In addition to all other student organization policies, Housing Organizations must fulfill the following expectations due to the level of responsibility and complexity involved in the service they provide:
a. Manage their housing unit;
b. Enforce internal organization rules;
c. Ensure that relevant national, state, and local laws and regulations are observed;
d. Provide safe and healthful lodging and cooperate with city or state agencies responsible for enforcing applicable health and safety laws; and
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e. Observe relevant University policies in their housing facilities, including the Anti-Hazing Policy and the Sexual Misconduct Policy.
2. Organizations are eligible for the same privileges granted to registered student organizations which do not provide housing.
3. The responsibility for the regulation and governance of professional fraternities that maintain chapter structures shall be with the Dean of the respective college, including professional fraternities registered by the College of Medicine, the College of Dentistry, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, and the Graduate College.
4. The possession or consumption of alcohol is prohibited in recognized undergraduate residence group housing except where explicitly authorized in writing by the vice president.
G. Governance Organizations.

1. Registered student organizations are governed by the University of lowa Student Government (UISG), Graduate and Professional Student Government (GPSG), or Associated Residence Halls (ARH).
2. Undergraduate men's and women's social fraternities are governed by the University of lowa Interfraternity Council, Panhellenic Council, National Pan-Hellenic Council, or the Multicultural Greek Council, which may establish, consistent with the University Policy on Human Rights, additional rules and regulations for recognition of new fraternities, membership selection standards, and standards of conduct.
3. Reviews. In order to determine whether a student organization is in compliance with a student governance organization regulation or policy, University officials may from time to time review the organization's record. Information gathered as part of the review may include, but is not limited to, the following: aggregate grade point averages, membership figures, financial reports, internal rules and policies, insurance coverage schedules, educational programs for members, safety and security precautions, compliance with relevant municipal ordinances and state laws, and complaints to the lowa City police.

## II. Registration Tiers

Each student organization granted registration with the University of lowa is classified as general, affiliated, or sponsored. The registration tier is determined by assessing the student organization's relationship to the University, the purpose and scope of its activities, the University population served, and the perceived potential risk to participants and the University.

The relationship of student organizations to the University is determined by evaluating the student organization's mission, goals, and activities as they relate to the mission, vision, goals and culture identified by the University in its Strategic Plan.

The privileges and responsibilities associated with each type of registered student organization are outlined below.
A. General Student Organizations: The privileges of becoming a registered student organization at the University are not extended without careful consideration. General student organizations are those that are consistent with the mission and culture of the University and engage primarily in activities that benefit their membership. These organizations are primarily interest groups capable of functioning with minimal support. The University registers but does not support or endorse the purposes of these general organizations and may not accept responsibility or liability for the activities undertaken by the student organization.
In addition to the University resources available to all registered student organizations, general student organizations may receive third priority consideration for:

- Student Organization Office Suite (SOOS) or Student Activity Center (SAC) office or storage space; and
- Reservable space for University-wide annual events at the lowa Memorial Union, other University facilities, and outdoor venues through the IMU Event Services process and other University scheduling processes.
B. Affiliated Student Organizations: Affiliated student organizations are those that serve a specific University interest and may provide support to University programs and initiatives. They contribute to the mission, vision, goals, and culture of the University by routinely presenting events for their members, the campus, or their related department's or unit's members and invited guests. A University department or unit must provide oversight and direct responsibility for the organization and its activities. Affiliated student organizations also may be directly associated with an academic course and its requirements.
in addition to the University resources available to all registered student organizations, affiliated student organizations shall comply with any rules, procedures, and expectations established by the responsible University department or unit.

Because of their broad impact, affiliated student organizations may receive second priority consideration for:
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- Student Organization Office Suite (SOOS) or Student Activity Center (SAC) office or storage space; and
- Reservable space for University-wide annual events at the lowa Memorial Union, other University facilities, and outdoor venues through the IMU event services process and other University scheduling processes.

Affiliated student organizations will need to follow appropriate criteria and guidelines from each University department or unit to receive these services and benefits.
C. Sponsored Student Organizations: Sponsored student organizations are those considered critical to the mission and culture of the University and work in partnership with a University department or unit. These organizations are linked to the University because of their role representing the University or in presenting events of broad appeal that are considered an integral part of the institution and its activities. Sponsored students organizations routinely present events for the campus and broader community, and typically work in a collaborative relationship with a University department or unit. The student organization's purpose and effect are to serve a broad segment of the campus community, not just its membership.

Once registered, the events and activities presented by the student organization should accurately and positively reflect the mission, vision, goals and culture of the University, as well as the rules and standards of the institution and its activities. The registration process requires action by both student leaders and University officials. As such, this process creates a mutually beneficial relationship between sponsored student organizations and the University.

In addition to the University resources available to all registered student organizations, sponsored student organizations shall have:

- A full-time professional staff or faculty member whose job description designates them as the primary adviser to the sponsored student organization in accordance with student organization registration requirements. These advisers are considered experts within the respective student organization's area of interest;
- A University department or unit that provides oversight and direct responsibility for the student organization and its activities; and
- Routinely presented events of broad appeal for the campus and community. Student organization operations and event planning are complex, and the majority of the events/programs are University-wide. Sponsored student organizations routinely present events for the campus and broader community, and are expected to work closely with the appropriate University department or unit in the planning of these events.

Because of high complexity, sponsored student organizations may receive first priority consideration for:

- Student Organization Office Suite (SOOS) or Student Activity Center (SAC) office or storage space; and
- Reservable space for University-wide annual events at the lowa Memorial Union, other University facilities, and outdoor venues through the IMU event services process and other University scheduling processes.

Sponsored student organizations must follow appropriate criteria and guidelines from each respective University department or unit to receive these services and benefits.

## III. Tier Appeals

An appeals process exists for those organizations desiring a registration tier different than that into which they were initially placed. Based on additional information, an organization's registration tier or may be modified also by the Student Organization Review Committee (SORC).

1. Appeals - Recognition Tier Decision. A student organization has the right to appeal a tier designation decision of the SORC or the determination by the Center for Student Involvement \& Leadership to change or modify a student organization's recognition tier. An appeal provides a limited review of the original decision. It is not an opportunity to present the evidence again or to re-evaluate credibility. If an error has been made, in most cases the matter will be returned to the SORC so that the error may be corrected.

One of the following two conditions must be used as a basis for appeal:

- Discovery of new information that was not available at the time of the decision; and/or
- The appropriate processes for registering student organizations were not followed.
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Written documentation stating the grounds for appeal must be filed with the appeal administrator within ten (10) business days of receipt of the original SORC decision.

The appeal administrator will decide one of the following:

- Uphold the original decision;
- Remand the case back to the SORC for reconsideration consistent with the findings of the appeal administrator;
- Remand for a new registration process review of the student organization; or
- Modify the registration tier assigned by the SORC.

The appeal administrator will provide a written decision to the SORC Chair within ten (10) business days of the appeal review. An appeal may be taken within ten (10) business days to the Dean of Students.

## IV. Registration Renewal


#### Abstract

A. Each student organization must renew its Profile on OrgSync at or near the beginning of the fall (between Aug. 1-Sept. 15) and spring (Jan. 1-Feb. 15) semesters, even if there are no changes from the previous semester in primary and/or secondary representative and contact information. A student organization that does not update and renew its profile will lose its registration automatically for one semester. Any changes in primary or secondary representative or changes in contact information must be reflected in the profile. Registered student organizations must provide complete and accurate information as requested in the profile. If additional information is needed, student organization representatives must provide information upon request to the Center for Student Involvement \& Leadership or Recreational Services. For those student organizations that are registered by an academic college as well as by a student government, student leaders are advised to check with the college/department/unit regarding registration deadlines. B. From time to time, the Student Organization Review Committee reviews the status of student organizations to ensure the safety and welfare of students who participate in activities sponsored by the organization. Depending upon the results of its evaluation, the Committee will 1) register the student organization; 2) register the student organization subject to specific conditions on activities the organization is permitted to sponsor; or 3) recommend to the Director of the Center for Student Involvement \& Leadership or Director of Recreational Services that registration be denied.


## V. Organizational Registration Changes

A. During the year, registered student organizations must report to the Center for Student Involvement \& Leadership or Recreational Services any amendments to or changes in its student organization name, constitution, by-laws, student representatives, and/or advisers within two weeks of the changes becoming effective. Registered student organizations also must submit any additional information requested from time to time by their respective registering body.

## VI. Advisers

A. Student organization advisers are strongly encouraged for all registered student organizations. Advisers shall be faculty members whenever possible in order to promote student-faculty interaction beyond the classroom. Professional \& Scientific staff with advising experience and/or relevant expertise also may serve as student organization advisers. Merit staff, with advising experience and/or relevant expertise also may serve as student organization advisers upon approval from the Center for Student Involvement \& Leadership, Recreational Services, or academic dean. A non-University affiliated individual may serve as an adviser to a student organization only if they serve as a liaison to a local/regional/national organization with which the registered student organization has an official affiliation.
B. Student organization advisers must be employed at the University on at least a . 5 FTE basis. The Division of Student Life shall have the right not to approve advisers of student organizations who are on disciplinary status as deperniopegtpy the
C. All student organization advisers are strongly encouraged to participate in the adviser training programs sponsored by the Center for Student Involvement \& Leadership. The Center for Student Involvement \& Leadership and Recreational Services will provide specific information to student organizations about these requirements.
D. Graduate assistants, with at least $50 \%$ appointments, may serve as additional advisers in conjunction with student organization advisers who meet the requirements stated above; however, they will not have signatory authority (e.g., financial transactions, contracts, vouchers).

## VII. Space Allocation for Registered Student Organizations

A. Limited office or storage space is available to registered student organizations in the Student Organization Office Suite (SOOS) or Student Activity Center (SAC) in the lowa Memorial Union. Student organizations allocated space in the SOOS or SAC must abide by the policies in regard to use of office or storage space. Application forms for the office and storage space are available online through the Center for Student Involvement \& Leadership website (http://csil.uiowa.edu/). Office and storage space requests are reviewed annually by the CSIL Space Allocation Committee and recommendations for assignment of space are made to the Director of the lowa Memorial Union and Center for Student Involvement \& Leadership. Sport Clubs are required to follow all policies in regard to storage space established by Recreational Services.
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# Statement of Religious Diversity and the University Calendar 

Religious history, religious diversity, and spiritual values have formed a part of The University of lowa's curricular and extracurricular programs since the founding of the University. In order to advance religious diversity on campus, the University makes reasonable accommodations for students, staff, and faculty whose religious holy days coincide with their work schedules and classroom assignments. As a public institution, the University neither promotes any particular form of religion nor discriminates against students, staff, or faculty on the basis of their religious viewpoints.
University holidays are not religious holy days, although a religious holy day may coincide with a University holiday. The University is prepared to make reasonable accommodations in its work assignments, test schedules, and classroom attendance expectations in a manner which is consistent with the University Policy on Human Rights and does not unfairly burden employees and students.

## Students

With regard to classroom attendance, students who notify the faculty (including teaching assistants) of a religious holy day conflict in a timely manner shall be excused from class or other scheduled academic activity to observe a religious holy day of their faith. Where attendance is mandatory, students compelled by their religious convictions to refrain from attending class on specific days must notify their instructors during the first few days of the semester or session, and no later than the third week or one week before the absence if a conflict occurs before that time.

Students who notify their instructors of a religious holy day conflict in a timely manner shall be permitted a reasonable amount of time to make up the material or activities covered in their absence, including tests. Students who receive an exemption on religious grounds cannot be penalized for failing to attend class on the days exempted. The instructor may, however, appropriately respond if the student fails to satisfactorily complete any alternative assignment or examination.

In those cases where a request for an excused absence based upon a religious holy day conflict is denied by the instructor, a student may pursue a grievance under "Student Complaints Concerning Faculty Actions" (posted in Policies \& Requlations Affecting Students, sub-section D). Where a timely request is made but denied by the instructor, the grievance process shall be expedited as much as reasonably possible to ensure that a student pursuing a religious holy day accommodation is not unduly disadvantaged by the passage of time.

Students with attendance conflicts may be required to notify an instructor in writing. An instructor who requires written notice must inform the class of this expectation in the class syllabus. An instructor may deny a student's request for an excused absence on the ground that the request was not made within a reasonable time period, that is, no later than the third week of class or one week before the absence if a conflict occurs before that time.

## Faculty

Faculty members have "the responsibility to meet classes as scheduled and, when circumstances prevent this, to arrange equivalent alternate instruction" (University of Iowa Operations Manual, Section III, Chapter 15.2.b). Faculty members who wish to observe religious holy days must fulfill the above-mentioned policy and satisfy any other responsibilities regatling fff

When scheduling tests, instructors are encouraged to take cognizance of religious holy days which fall on University class days. In addition, faculty should include in their syllabi information regarding the policies for handling conflicts between classroom activities (attendance, tests, etc) and religious holy days. Such policies must be consistent with University policies (see the section for "Students" above).

## Staff

Staff members may request accommodation for religious observances through their immediate supervisor. Accommodation may be in the form of scheduled leave or an alternate work schedule. Approved absences will be recorded as vacation. In cases when vacation is not available or an alternative work schedule is not possible, a leave of absence without pay may be permitted. Departments will attempt to accommodate such requests, balancing the request to accommodate with the particular needs of the work unit.

In order to best meet staff needs in an area, appropriate advance notice is required.
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## Chapter 3 - Human Rights <br> (Amended 9/14)



For related policies, see ॥-14 Anti-Harassment, ॥-4 Sexual Harassment, and Il-11 Anti-Retaliation.
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### 3.7 Protection Against Retaliation

3.8 Protection of the Respondent

### 3.9 Confidentiality

### 3.1 Policy and Rationale

The University of lowa brings together in common pursuit of its educational goals persons of many nations, races, and creeds. The University is guided by the precepts that in no aspect of its programs shall there be differences in the treatment of persons because of race, creed, color, religion, national origin, age, sex, pregnancy, disability, genetic information, status as a U.S. veteran, service in the U.S. military, sexual orientation, gender identity, associational preferences, or any other classification that deprives the person of consideration as an individual, and that equal opportunity and access to facilities shall be available to all. These principles are expected to be observed in the internal policies and practices of the University; specifically in the admission, housing, and education of students; in policies governing programs of extracurricular life and activities; and in the employment of faculty and staff personnel. Consistent with state and federal law, reasonable accommodations will be provided to persons with disabilities and to accommodate religious practices. The University shall work cooperatively with the community in furthering these principles.

### 3.2 Definition of Terms Used in This Policy

a. Alleged victim: a person against whom discrimination has allegedly occurred.
b. Complainant: the person who brings a complaint of violation of this policy, who could be an alleged victim or a third party.
c. Graduate assistant: a graduate student employed by the University as a research assistant or teaching assistant.
d. Instructor: a person engaged in teaching students or in evaluation or supervision, direct or indirect, of a student's academic work.
e. Member of the University community: any University student, or faculty or staff member.
f. Protected interests: University employment, education, on-campus living, or participation in a University activity.
g. Respondent: a person or unit that has been accused of discriminating against one or more individuals.
h. Specific and credible allegations: allegations that provide factual details such as, but not limited to, time, place, actions, participants, and witnesses. Allegations do not necessarily have to be based on firsthand observation of events to be "specific and credible," but direct observation normally results in greater specificity and credibility than indirect knowledge.
i. Supervisor: a person who has authority either: 1) to undertake or recommend tangible employment decisions (those that significantly change an employee's employment status, such as, but not limited to, hiring, firing, promoting, demoting, reviewing performance, reassigning, and compensation decisions) affecting an employee, or 2 ) to direct the employee's daily work activities.
j. Third-party complainant: a person who brings a complaint alleging an act of discrimination against someone else.

### 3.3 Bringing a Complaint

a. Persons who believe they have been subjected to discrimination in violation of the policy are encouraged to report it, even if they are not certain whether a violation of this policy has occurred. A complaint that this policy has been violated may be brought to the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity (EOD), 202 Jessup Hall, through informal or formal channels by any member of the University community, including a third party, or by the University itself. A complaint must state specific and credible allegations of discrimination to warrant an investigation. There is no time limit for bringing a complaint; however, it may be difficult to substantiate the allegations if they are made after significant time has passed. Therefore, prompt reporting of complaints is strongly encouraged.

Anyone (victims or others) who wishes to consult with someone about a specific situation without making a complaint, or who wishes simply to learn more about enforcement of this Human Rights Policy may contact any of the following offices or organizations:
(1) Office of the Ombudsperson (for faculty, staff, students, and persons not affiliated with the University), C108 Seashore Hall;
(2) Employee Assistance Program (for faculty or staff), 121-50 University Services Building;
(3) University Counseling Service (for students), 3223 Westlawn;
(4) Women's Resource and Action Center (for faculty, staff, or students), Bowman House.
b. Informal complaints. An informal complaint is a request that the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity seek to reach an informal resolution of the complainant's concerns. The procedures for such complaints are designed to be flexible so as to enable the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity to address an individual's situation in the most effective and expeditious manner possible. Resolutions of informal
complaints are accomplished with the assistance of other offices or administrators on campus in the area relevant to the complaint.

In the case of an informal complaint, the accused party normally will not be informed of the complainant's action or identity without the consent of the complainant unless circumstances require. When allegations are addressed through an informal resolution process, no disciplinary action may be taken against the respondent, and there will be no record of the allegations in the respondent's personnel file or student disciplinary file, unless the person is notified of the allegations and given an opportunity to respond.
c. Formal complaints. A formal complaint of discrimination involves an impartial investigation of the complainant's allegations by the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity. The investigation begins when the Office provides written notice to the respondent of the filing of the complaint, the identity of the complainant, and the general allegations of the complaint. The respondent is then interviewed regarding the specifics of the allegations and given an opportunity to respond fully to the allegations. The Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity may also interview other persons believed to have factual knowledge relevant to the allegations. The purpose of the investigation is to establish whether the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity finds a reasonable basis to conclude, by the preponderance of the evidence, that the respondent violated the Policy on Human Rights.

The Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity will issue written findings outlining the basis for its conclusions. The written finding normally will be issued within 60 days of when the complaint was filed. When it is not reasonably possible to issue the finding within that time, the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity will notify the alleged victim and the respondent that the finding will be delayed and indicate the reasons for the delay. This report is provided to the administrative officials responsible for the area in which the respondent is involved, the alleged victim, the respondent, and the chief administrative officer in the unit (e.g., the Provost in a complaint filed against a faculty member; the vice president or dean for the unit in the case of a staff member; or the Vice President for Student Life in the case of a student) or his or her designee. Third-party complainants will be notified only that the proceedings are concluded.

### 3.4 Process for Sanctions

a. In the case of formal complaints, the following administrators will review the findings of the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity investigation:
(1) the Office of the Provost, if the respondent is a faculty member or other instructional personnel (except graduate assistants);
(2) the office of the vice president or dean responsible for the unit employing the person charged, if the respondent is a staff member (including a graduate assistant, in which case the Dean of the Graduate College also must be notified in order to determine whether ramifications apply for the student's academic progress);
(3) the Dean of Students, if the respondent is a student (including a graduate student, in which case the Dean of the Graduate College also must be notified in order to determine whether ramifications apply for the student's academic progress).
(4) the appropriate administrator above, if the respondent is a unit.
b. The administrator who receives the report shall:
(1) discuss it with EOD in order to determine, based on EOD's findings and input, appropriate corrective measures and/or sanctions. If the respondent is a staff member, the administrator will also consult with the Senior Human Resources Leadership Representative in the unit. If the respondent is a faculty member, graduate assistant, or unit, the administrator will also consult with the appropriate dean and departmental executive officer. When a respondent staff member, faculty member, or graduate assistant is also a student, the administrator and the Dean of Students will also consult with one another in determining what corrective measures or sanctions should be pursued.
(2) implement appropriate corrective measures and/or sanctions consistent with University procedures. The administrator must inform EOD in writing of the actions that are taken in response to EOD's findings.
(3) insure that the alleged victim is informed when action is taken.
c. Violations of the Human Rights Policy may lead to sanctions up to and including termination or separation from the University. If the respondent is a unit, sanctions may include changes to unit policies or processes, or other appropriate actions. Sanctions for violations of this policy should be commensurate with the nature of the violation and the respondent's disciplinary history. It is the responsibility of the appropriate administrator to follow-up with the parties at a reasonable interval(s) to assess their compliance with the sanctions imposed. More serious sanctions up to and including termination of employment or separation from the University may be imposed in the event that the individual fails to comply with the sanctions initially imposed.

### 3.5 Applicable Procedures

Formal sanctions imposed in response to alleged violations of this policy will be governed for:
a. faculty members by II-29 Faculty Dispute Procedures and that portion of those procedures dealing with faculty ethics (III-29.7).
b. staff members by applicable University policies, including Щ1-16 Ethics and Responsibility Statement for Staff and the applicable discipline and/or grievance procedures (II-28 Conflict Management Resources for University Staff and/or relevant collective bargaining agreement);
c. graduate assistants, when dismissal is sought, by the procedure for dismissal of graduate assistants (III12.4). When sanctions other than dismissal are imposed by the dean of the employing college, a graduate assistant may appeal through any existing contractual grievance procedures;
d. students by the Student Judicial Procedure.

### 3.6 Appeal Procedures

If the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity concludes that the complaint is unfounded, the complainant may appeal the finding on the grounds that the decision was arbitrary and capricious or that the investigating office did not follow procedures resulting in prejudice to the complainant. Appeals must be made electronically or in
writing and submitted together with all supporting documentation to the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity within 10 University business days of the receipt of the finding. Generally within two University business days, the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity will transmit the notice of appeal and the case record to the appropriate appeal officer, as described on the EOD website. The appeal officer, or the appeal officer's designee, will issue a written decision on the appeal to the complainant and the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity within 20 University business days of the receipt of the appeal, although this time frame may be extended due to the complexity of the case or the severity of the allegations.

In cases where the appeal is denied, such action constitutes final University action on the matter, subject to appeal to the Board of Regents. In cases where the appeal is successful, in whole or in part, the appeal officer/designee will advise the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity regarding appropriate measures to address the issues of concern raised in the appeal.

For complaints that conclude in a finding that there is a reasonable basis to believe that a policy violation has occurred and sanctions have been imposed, respondents may appeal such findings through the grievance procedures applicable to them. The respondent may challenge any sanctions imposed as a result of a finding through available grievance procedures.

### 3.7 Protection Against Retaliation

a. Retaliation against alleged victims, complainants, and/or witnesses who provide information during an investigation pursuant to this policy is prohibited by $\|-11$ Anti-Retaliation. Reasonable action will be taken to assure that alleged victims, complainants, and/or witnesses suffer no retaliation as a result of their activities with regard to the process.
b. Any retaliation against alleged victims, complainants or witnesses should be reported pursuant to II11 Anti-Retaliation. Retaliation may result in sanctions against the person committing the retaliatory act(s).

### 3.8 Protection of the Respondent

a. This policy shall not be used to bring knowingly false or malicious allegations. Making such allegations may subject the complaining party to sanctions up to and including termination or separation from the University. Any such action will be initiated by the appropriate administrator overseeing the complainant(s).
b. In the event the allegations are not substantiated, reasonable steps will be taken to restore the reputation of the respondent if it was damaged by the proceeding. The respondent may consult with the investigating office regarding reasonable steps to address such concerns.

### 3.9 Confidentiality

a. In order to empower community members to voice concerns and bring complaints, the confidentiality of all parties will be protected to the greatest extent possible. However, confidentiality cannot be guaranteed.
b. Alleged victims, third-party complainants, and respondents are expected to maintain confidentiality as well. They are not prohibited from discussing the situation outside of the work or educational
environment. However, the matter should not be discussed with individuals who are members of their University work or educational environment.
c. Dissemination of documents relating to complaints of Human Rights Policy violations and/or to the investigation of such complaints, other than as necessary to pursue an appeal, grievance, or other legal or administrative proceeding, is prohibited.
d. Failure to maintain confidentiality by a respondent may be considered to be a form of retaliation in violation of II-3.7 of this policy. Failure to maintain confidentiality by any party (alleged victim, third-party complainant, or respondent) may result in sanctions.
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## Chapter 6 - Nondiscrimination Statement

(Amended 9/98; 6/04; 12/06; 5/15)
The University of lowa prohibits discrimination in employment, educational programs, and activities on the basis of race, creed, color, religion, national origin, age, sex, pregnancy, disability, genetic information, status as a U.S. veteran, service in the U.S. military, sexual orientation, gender identity, associational preferences, or any other classification that deprives the person of consideration as an individual. The university also affirms its commitment to providing equal opportunities and equal access to university facilities. For additional information on nondiscrimination policies, contact the Director, Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity, the University of lowa, 202 Jessup Hall, lowa City, IA 52242-1316, 319-335-0705 (voice), 319-335-0697 (TDD), diversity@uiowa.edu.
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
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SENT VIA ELECTRONICMAHL
September 13, 2017
Jacob Estell, Fresident
Business Leaders in Christ (BLinC)

Dear Jacob:
I am in receipt of the June 30, 2017, communication from Constance Schriver Cervantes regarding the case filed against your registered student organization, BLinC. Ms. Schriver investigated the complaint filed against BLinc on behalf of the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity.

This investigation was conducted under the Discipline of Registered Student Organization (DRSO) procedures found at https://dos.uiowa.edu/policles/discipline-of-registered-studentorganizations/. We met on September 1, 2017, to discuss the case. I listened and considered your comments and questionș. During our discussion, Tom Baker, Assoclate Dean of Students, stated your organization should be allowed to function as a registered student organization in good standing so long as the student leaders operate fully and consistently in accordance with the University of lowa Human Rights Policy and make a sincere commitment to comply with the policy moving forviard. After furtherdiscussion, you stated your organization intended to comply with the University of lowa luman Rights policy at all times in the future.

As explained in DRSO Sectilon IN.D., I have the authority to impose sanctions if I conclude University rules were violated and sanctions are warranted. I find there is a preponderance of evidence that BLinC violated the University of lowa Human Rights Policy.

After consideration of the Investigative Report and your remarks, I will permit your organization to function as a registered student organization in good standing with the University of lowa provided you comply with the following:

1. Commit to ongoing complance with the University of lowa Human Rights Policy at all times in the future;
2. Submit a basic list of qualifications for leaders of your organizatlon designed to prevent future disqualiflcations based on protected categories and to ensure that persons who identify as non-heterosexuals are not çategorically eliminated from consideration; and

3. Submit an acceptable plan for ensuring that group officers who interview leaders will ask questions relevant to the vision statement that are not presumptive of candidates based upon their sexual orientation.

To reiterate, BLinC, as a registered student organization, will return to good standing with the University of fowa following your compliance with the above. Please submit the required information to me directly at

You have the opportunity to appeal this decision. As an organization representative, you have ten (10) business days after receipt of this decision to request an appeal to the Office of the Dean of Students. The deadline for filing an appeal is September 27, 2017. Permissible grounds for appeal are listed at DRSO Section VI. Appeals.

Information related to this incident will be filed in the Office of the Dean of Students. Please be aware Section V. Sanctions of the DRSO states that, "Student organizations that fall to comply with a sanction in a timely manner are subject to additional disciplinary action, which may include loss of registration until compliance is achieved."

If you have any questions, please contact me af $\square$ or H

Sincerely,


Whiliam Nelson, Ph.D. Executive Director lowa Memorial Union
c: Tom Baker Eric Baxter

Christensen, Eetty $[\mathcal{A G ]}$

| From: | Eric Baxter <ebaxter@becketlaw.org\% |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sert: | Wednesday, September 27, 2017 2:29 PM |
| Tot | Nelson, Willam R; Estell, Jacob |
| Cc: | Baker, Thomas R; Daniel Blomberg |
| Subject: | RE: BLinC Decision Letter |
| Attachments: | 201.7.09.27 BLinC Constitution,pd |

Dear Bill,

Attached is a copy of BLinc's revised constitution addressing the issues we discussed at our meeting earfier this month. The main relevant changes are in Article II and the cited Exhibit A. We trust that, with these changes, the University will be able to conclude its investigation.

We look forward to your response.

Sincerely,
Efic.
from: Nelson, William R [mailtowiliam-relson@utowa,edu]
Sent: Monday, September 18, 2017 9:30 AM
To: Eric Baxter <ebaxter臽becketlaw,org>; Estell, Jacob[jacob-esteli@uiowa.edu](mailto:jacob-esteli@uiowa.edu)
Cc: Baker, Thomas R <thomas-baker(ouiowa.edu>; Redington, Lyn [lyn-redington@uiowa.edu](mailto:lyn-redington@uiowa.edu)
Subject: RE: BLinC Decision Letter

Dear Eric,

I was able to visit this moming with Assistant Vice President and Dean of Students, Dr, Lyn Redington, about your request.

She has agreed to grant the extension you requested.

Please let me know if you have questions.
Bill Melson

William R. Nelson, Ph.D.
Executive Director, Iowa Memorial Unlon
145 IMU
The University of lowa
lowa City, IA 52242-1317
319/335-3059
william-nelson@uiowa.edu
imu.uiowa.edu

From: Eric Baxter [malito:ebaxter@becketlaw.org]
Sent: Friday, September 15,2017 3:27 PM


To: Nelson, William R <william-nelson@uiowa, edu>; Estell, Jacob <jacob-estell@uiowa, edu>

Cc: Baker, Thomas R [thomas-baker@uiowaedu](mailto:thomas-baker@uiowaedu)<br>Subject: RE: BLinC Decision Letter

Dear Bill,
Thank you for forwarding the University's decision letter. I write to request an extension of time for the appeal. While We are hopeful that BLinc's response to the three requirements outined in the University's letter will allow for final resolution of this matter, untll the University receives and accepts BLinC's response, it is uncertain whether an appeal is necessary. We thus propose that BLinc be given the 10 business days until September 27 to submit its response. If the University accepts BLinC's response, that of course would resolve the matter. If for some reason the University rejects BLincts response, BLinC would then be given 10 business days from that decision to appeal to the Dean of Students. Thls will allow the parties to reach a final resolution without forcing BLinc to submit an appeal to preserve its rights.

Please conflim whether you agree with this approach.

Sincerely,
Eric

Eric Baxter<br>Senior Connsel<br>Becket - Religious Liberty for All<br>1200 New Hampshire Ave. NW, Suite 700<br>Washington, DC 20036<br>202-349.7221<br>

NOTCE: This e-mall is from a tewtirm, the Aerket fund for Religious therty, and ts intendex sately for the use of the person\{s) to whom it is avdressed. If you balieve your reseiven this e-raill in error, ofease notify the sender mmediately, delete the e-mall from your computer and co nor copy or disclose it to anyone clse. If you tre not an existina chight of Beckec, do nat construe anytuing in this e-mail to make you a cfient unless it contains a specific stotement to that effect and do nat disciose anythitg to necket in reply that you expect or want to hofl in confience. if you properfy received this a-mail as a client, co-counsel or retained expert of Beckec, you


From: Nelson, William R [mallto:willam-nelson@uiowa, edu]
Sent: Wednesday, September 13, 2017 6:19 PM
Tos Estell, Jacob < lacob-estell@uowa.edu>
Ca: Baker, Thomas R [thomas-baker@ulowa.edu](mailto:thomas-baker@ulowa.edu); Fric Baxter [ebaxter@becketiaw.org](mailto:ebaxter@becketiaw.org)
Subject: BLinC Decision Letter
Jacob,
Attached you will find my decision letter regarding the complaint filed against your registered student organization, BLinC.

I apologize for my delay, Please contact me should you have questions.

## Bill Nelson

Willam R. Nelson, Ph.D.
Executive Director, lowa Memorial Union
145 imu
The University of lowa
lowa Clity, 1A 52242-1317
319/335-3059
william-nelson@uiowa.edu
imu.uiowa.edu

Title: The CONstitution of Business Leaders in Christ ("BLinc")
Date: September, 27, 2017

## Article :

## Purpose:

As seekers of Christ, Business Leaders in Christ is a student organization within the Tippie College of Business meant to help students leam about how to continually keep Christ first in the fast-paced business world. Using the Bible as a guide and through prayer, fellowship, group discussions, and service, students will network within the College and with business leaders who walk with Christ on a day-to-day basis.

## Article II

## Hembership:

Section 1) Niembership in BLinC shall be open to all students without regard to race, croed, color, religion, national origin, age, sex, pregnancy, disability, genetic information, status as a U.S. veteran, service in the U.S. miltary, sexual orientation, gender identity, associational preferences, or any other classification that deprives the person of consideration as an individual. The organization will guatantee that equal opportunity and equal access to membership, programming, facilities, and beneffis shall toe open to all persons.

Section 2) There will be no limitations as far as the minimum or maximum number of participants within the student organization.

Section 3) Because BLinC is seeking certification within the Tippie College of Business to become a recognized student organization, its target audience includes students already admitted into the Tippie College of Business, pre-business students, and students strongly considering business as a major/minor. A Member's role or affiliation will not be different based on their class within, or ties to, the Tipple College of Business.

Section 4) A student will be considered a Member after signing in and attending 2 or more meetings in a given acadernic year. However, the President and/or the Faculty Advisor has the right to withdraw membership at any time for misconduct or other extreme circumstances.

## Article ill

## Officers and Duties:

1) All Officers are required to affirm that they accept and seek to live BLinC's reilgious beliefs as set forth in its Statement of Fath attached as Exhibit A. They must be prepared
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to provide spiritual leadership for the organization, including leading prayer and Bible study, explaining the content of BLinC's religious beliefs, and ministering to others. They should have knowledge of, and agreement wth, BLinc's mission and an understanding of how to model the values of the organization for the rest of the membership. All Officers are expected to uphold BLinc's religious beliefs and help ensure that the organization remains true to its religious mission, as described in this paragraph.

## 2) There will be 4 Executive Officer positions within BLinC:

a) President The role of the President is to schedule, organize, and lead executive and large group meetings weekly. It is also the President's responsibility to manage all administrative issues, such as amending the constitution, overseeing the work of the other executives, making any final decisions regarding the well-being of the student organization, and reaching out to form meaningrul relationships with members of the organtzation. To fuffill these responsibilities, the President must work closely with the Faculty advisor, providing updates on a weekly basis, as well as working closely with the other executives of the organization. It is the President's duty to work with the other officers to make sure all administrative work is successfully completed. In order to become President, a candidate should possess strong leadership skills (prior leadership experience is preferred), strong communication skills, and a strong work ethic to be able to complete all of the required duties as President.
b) Vice President: The primary role of the Vice President is to schedula guest speakers to come in and present on how they use their faith on a day-to-day basis in the workforce. Ideally, they wilh start planning and scheduling guest speakers for the following fall semester, as soon as they are elected. Besides engaging in outreach for speakers, the Vice President will assist the President with administrative issues and will assume the role of President whenever the President cannot attend a meeting or fulfill his/her duties. In order to be a successful Vice President, a candidate should possess strong community outreach skills. They should feel comfortable reaching out to potential speakers and asking if they would like to come present to the organization. The Vice President should also have strong administrative and leadership skills as well because they will work hand in hand with the President completing various administrative tasks.
c) Treasurer: The primary role of the Treasurer is to manage the funds, money, and make a budget for the organization. They will work with the other executives and the faculty advisor to decide where to allocate all of the funds. Candidates should have a knowledge of managing money, and someone that is majoring in accounting or finance will be prioritized.
d) Secretary: The main role of the secretary is to market the student organization. They should send out emails to members reminding them of upcoming events, post on the fracebook page, and tweet about what is going on within BLinc. Also, during meetings, the secretary should record minutes. Candidates considering the position of secretary should be organized and good communicators.

## Article IV

## 马uatreaculey Advisor

The responsibility of the Staff/Faculty Advisor is to be a voice for the students with the University and to help the Executve Officers with whatever needs they may have. The advisor should be made aware of everything that is going on within the organization by the Executive Officers. The Advisor is invited to attend leadership and group meetings in order to again lend input for the well-being of the organtzation.

To select a Staff/Faculty Advisor, the Executve Officers will search first in the Tipple College of Business by sending out emails or scheduling meetings, with faculty members to see if anyone would be interested. The Staff/Faculty advisor my serve only by unanimous vote of the Executive Officers. If there is no one interested within the Tipple College of Business, the search may expand outside of the college, but the same process of unanimous vote by the Executive Officers must be followed.

## Article $V$

## Meotings

Section 1) Meetings will be held once a week. Meetings will not be held during finals week or on University breaks and holidays.

Section 2) Members will be nofified by email 48 hours in advance of special meetings.
Section 4) The President or StaffiFaculy Advisor has the authority to call and schedule a meeting.

## Apticle VI

## Election ${ }_{2}$ Removal of Officers

Section 1) Elections for the Executive Officers will be held once a year in March to elect Officers for the following school year.

Section 2) BLinC Members who are regularly enrolled as students at the Universily of lowa, in good standing with the organization, and have attended $75 \%$ or more of the group meetings may be nominated by thernselves or others to run for an executive office. Nominations should be submitted by email or ofher writing to the Executive Officers before March 1 of each year.

Section 3) All nominees must be interviewed by the President of at the President's discretion, by another Executive Officer. Nominees must affirm that they accept and seek
to live BLinc's religious beliefs as set forth in Article III, Paragraph 1 of this consitution. If elected, a nominee must sign a copy of BLinC's Statement of Falth.

Section. 4) At minimum, members will be notified of the upcoming election and the opportunlty to submit nominations in a meeting and by email at least two weeks before March 1 and again by email at least two weeks before the election if held after March 1.

Section 5) Executive Officers will be selected by a majorly vote of the Members present at the duly noticed election meeting.

Section 6) The process for removal of any officer shall be commenced by a written request for removal slgned by at least wo Members and dellvered to the Executive Officers. The challenged officer shall have one week to prepare a written response to the request and shall have the opportunity to meet with the remaining Executive Offlcers to speak with them about the request and response. Should the other Executve Officers find grounds for the challenged officer's removal, the matter will be referred to a vote by the Members. No officer shall be removed without the vote of the majority of the Members present at a duly noticed meeting.

Section 6) Notwithstanding the procedures outlined in the previous paragraph, any misrepresentation in an Executive Officer's leadership applieation or change in an Executive Officer's representations regarding the beliefs and mission of BLinC (and, hence, their ability to communicate the messages of the organzation accurately) shall be grounds for the immediate review of the Executive Officer's position by the remaining Executive Officers. If, after review, the remaining Executive Officers decide that the Executive Officer in question can no longer effectively represent BLinc or further its mission, the remaining Executive Officers may remove the Officer by a majority vote of the remaining Executive Officers.

## Artucle VII

## Finances

Secton 1) There will be no dues required for membershlp within BLinc.
Section 2) All financial decisions must be made by joint agreement between the President and the Treasurer. The President and Treasurer must seek consensus from the other Executive Officers for financial decisions involving more than $\$ 200$.

Section 3) All checks must be signed by both the President and the Treasurer. If the President is unavailable, the Vice-President may sign, but only with the President's permission.

Section 4) BLinC shall give back to the Tippie community at a minimum rate of 10 percent of any grants or giffs received by the organization.

Section 5) At the beginning of each fall semester a budget shall be made by the Treasurer to thoughtfully allocate all funds expected through the end of the spring semester. The budget shall be presented to the Executive Officers and be ratified by a $3 / 4$ vote.

Section 6) it is the duty of the Executive Officers, especially the Treasurer, to thoughffully pray that whatever financing BLinc might recelve would be used as God desires.

Section 7) BLinc is required to deposit all receipts in, and make disbursements through, tha student Organization Eusiness Office, Fraternly Business Services, or Recreational Services. Upon dissolution, state money and mandatory student fees revert back to the granting otganization. Inactive organizations will be considered dissolved after five years of no account activity. Revenue generated dollars or "00 funds" must be divided as stated in this Constitution and earried out by our leadership. Our organization's remaining revenue generated dollars or "00 funds" will be divided or disbured to The University of lowa Studert Government. If this organization has dissolved and revenue generated dollars or "00 funds" have not been divided as stated in this Constitution by five (5) years trom last account activity, funds in our "00 account" will revert to an account speciffed for this purpose within USGFEGPS, These funds will then be available for difsribution through SABAC or GPAC guidelines im accordance with University of lowa policy.

## Article VIII

## Amencments

Section I) In order to amend this document, both a $3 / 4$ vote from the Executive Officers and a \%/s vote by current Members, at a duly noticed meeting is required to overturn or oreate changes to amendments.

Section 2) If an Executive Officer of a Member wishes to amend this constitution, the Executive Officers and Members should be notified at least two weeks in advance by email and by reading the proposed change(s) at one meeting to all Members present.

## Article X

Section 1) This Constitution shall take immediate effect upon a majority vote of all Executive Officers of the organization. The organization shall have all authority necessary to implement this consitution.

## EXHIBIT A

## BLINC STATEMENT OF FAITH

- DOCTRINE OF SCRIPTURE: The Bible is God's unique revelation to mankind, the inspired, infallible Word of God. As such, it is the supreme and final authority and without error in what it teaches and affirms. No other wiltings are vested with such divine authority.
- DOCTRINE OF GOD: There is only one true God. He exists eternally as three persons --Father, Son, and Holy Spift - each fully God yet each personally distinct from the other. God is the creator of everything.
- DOCTRINE OF SIN: Everyone, regardless of race, gender, social class, or intellectual ability, is created in God's image and for communion with God. But because of sin, that communion was broken and all of humanity was separated from God, the source of all life. Because of the fall, everyone deserves God's judgment.
- DOCTRINE OF SALVATION: Jesus Christ is the Way, the Truth, and the Life, and God gives salvation and eternal life to those who trust in him. Salvation cannot be earned through personal goodness or human effort. It is a gift that is received by repontance, faith in Christ, his death on the cross, resurrection from the grave and testifled through baptigm.
- DOGTRINE OF JUDGMENT: At the final judgment, unbelievers will be separated from God inio condemnation. Believers will be received into God's loving presence.
- DOCTRINE OF CHRIST: Jesus Christ, the second Person of the Trinity, was conceived by the Holy Spirtt, born of the Virgin Mary - he was God in human flesh. He llved a simless human lfe, yet willingly took upon himself our sins by dying in our place and on our behalf. He rose bodily, victorious over death. He ascended to Heaven and is at the right hand of the Father as the believer's advocate and mediator. Someday, he will refurn to consurmmate history and to fulfill the eternal plan of God.
- DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT: The Holy Spint, the third Ferson of the Trinity, convicts the work of sin and gives new life to those who trust in Jesus. He Indwells all bellevers and is available to empower them to lead Christ-like lives. The Spirit gives them spiritual gifts with which to serve feliow believers and reach out to a losk and needy world.
- DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH: All believers are members of the body of Christ, the one true church universal. Spiritual unity is to be expressed among Christians by acceptance and love of one another across ethnic, cultural, socio-economic, national, generational, gender, and denomfnational lines. The local church is a group of believers who gather for worship, prayer, instruction, encotragement, mutual accountability, comrunity with each other, and as a witness to the world.
- DOCTRINE OF PERSONAL INTEGRITY: All Christians are under obligation to seek to follow the example of Christ in their own lives and in human society, in the spirit of Christ, Christians should oppose racism, overy form of greed, selfishness, and vice, and all forms of sexual frmorality, including pornography. We believe God's intention for a sexual relationship is to be between ahusband and a wife in the lifelong covenant of marrlage. Every other sexual relationship beyond this is outside of God's design and is not in keeping with God's original plan tor humanity. We believe that every person should embrace, not reject, their God-given sex. Wo should work to provide for the orphaned, the needy, the abused, the aged, the helpless, and the sick. We should speak on behalf of the unborn and contend for the sanctity of all human life from conception to natural death.
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# SENT VIA ELECTRONIC AMAIL 

October 19, 2017

Jacob Estell
Business Leaders in Christ (BLinC)

Eric Baxter

Dear Jacob and Eric:
The revised Constitution and Statement of Faith you submitted in response to my September 13, 2017 letter does not satisfy the requirements I dellneated in order for BLinC to remain as a registered student organization in good standing. The Stztement of Faith, on its face, does not comply with the University's Human Rights policy since its affirmation, as required by the Constitution for leadership positions, would have the effect of disqualifying certain individuals from leadership positions based on sexual orientation or gender identify, both of which are protected classifications under Chapter 216 of the lowa Code (the lowa Clvil Rights Act) and the University of lowa Human Rights Policy.

You have the opportunity to make additional revisions to your Statement of Faith in order to submit a version that complies with the University of lowa Human Rights Policy. Your submission must also finclude a response to the third requirement I set forth in my September 13,2017 letter, which follows: "Submit an acceptable plan for ensuring that group officers who interview candidates for leadership positions will ask questions relevantto the Stafement of Faith that are not presumptive of candidates based upon thelr sexual orientation or gender identity." You have ten (10) business days from the date of this letter to submit your revised response. The deadine for submission is November 2, 2017.

If you choose not to submit a revised response, I will find BlinC not to be in compliance with the University of lowa Human Rights Policy and as a result, will revoke its registration. If BlinC elects not to submit a revised response, you have the opportunity to appeal this decision. As an organization representative, Jacob, you have fen (10) business days from the date of this letter to file an appeal with the Office of the Dean of Students. The deadline for filing an appeal is November 2, 2017. The permissible grounds for appeal are listed at DRSO Section VI. Appeals.
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Information related to this incident will be filed in the Office of the Dean of Students. Please be aware Section V. Sanctions of the DRSO states that, "Student organlzations that fall to comply with a sanction in a timely manner are subject to additional disciplinary action, which may inciude loss of registration until compliance is achieved."

If you have any questions, please contact me at [
Sincerely,


William Nelson, Ph,D.
Executive Director
lowa Memorial Union


November 16, 2017
Business Leaders in Christ Non-Greek Sent electronically

PERSONAZ AND CONEIDENTIAL.
Reganding Case Number: 2017143301
November 16,2017
Jacob Estell
Business Leaders in Christ (BLinC)

Eric Baxter

Dear Jacob and Enic:
Thave received and considered your appeal regarding the decision of Dr. William Nelson, Executive Director of the Yowa Memorial Union, that Business Leaders in Christ (BLinC) more likely than not violated the University of Iowa Human Rights Policy resulting in his decision to revoke BLinC's registration as a UX student organization. My review is based upon the written record.

Upon my review of the record, I affirm the decision of Dr. Nelson that BLinC violated the University's Human Rights Policy. Furthemnore, the revised Constifution and Statement of Faith you subriitted in response to Dr. Nelson's September 13, 2017 letter does not satisfy the requirements delineated in order for $B \operatorname{LinC}$ to remain as a registered student organization in good standing. The Statement of Faith, on lt face, does not comply with the University's Human Rights policy since its affirmation, as required by the Constitution for leadership positions, would have the effect of disqualifying certain individuals from leadership positions based on sexual orientation or gender identity, both of which are protected classifications under Chapter 216 of the Iowa Code (the Iowa Civii Rights Act) and the University of Yowa Human Rights Policy. Therefore, I affirm the sanctioning decision of Dr. Nelson to revoke the registration of BLinC.

Your appeal document states that the university is forcing "... BLinC to revise its Statement of Faith or be kicked off campus." In fact, a student organization is a voluntary special interest group organized for educational, social, recreational, and service purposes and comprised of its members. Student organizations are separate legal entities from the University of Lowa and legally are not treated the same as University departments or units. A student organization can exist on campus whether or not the Universty approves its registration pursuant to the Registration of Student Organtzations policy.

In addition, upon appeal, you now claim for the first time that the Complainant was not allowed to hold a leadership position because he "confirmed that he intended to be sexually active in same-sex relationships." This assertion by BLinC of the complamant's intentions specifically regarding sexual activity outside of marriage was not previously addressed by BLinC and the making of such a statement by the complainant was not validated through the investigation process and finding. In fact, BLinC's Leadership told the investigator, as well as the Complainant in an email, that because of Complainant's "desire to pursue a homosexual lifestyle/relationship" he was denied a leadership position. BLinC"s leadership also told the investigator that Complainant would have become vice-president had he not told
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her he was gay. BLinC leadership also told the investigator that individuals who are gay are welcome to be student members of BlinC, but not leaders of the organization.

My decision is the final University of Iowa action an this matter. Yon have the right to appeal this decision to the Board of Regents, State of Towa. If you choose to appeal, your notice of appeal must be delivered in hand copy or by fax (319)-335-0907 to the President's Office (11 Jessup Hall) within twenty days of this decision. The president is responsible for assembling your notice of appeal and other evidence and forwarding it to the Board Office. Details of the appeals process are available at:
htip:/hww, iowaregents.edu/plans-anduplicieshoardpolicy-manuali17-appeals-to-the-hoard/

Sincerely,


Lyn Redington, Ph.D.
Assistent Vice President and Dean of Students
CC: Eric Baxter
Bill Nelson, Ph.D., Executive Director IMMU
Anita Cory, Ph.D., Associate Director, Student Organizations and Leadership Program
Jenaifer Modeston, Director, Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity, Depury Title DK Coordinator Lena Hill, Interim Chief Diversity Officer and Associate Vice President
Melissa Shivers, Ph,O., Vice President for Student Life
Tom Baker, J.D., Associate Dean of Students, Director of Student Conduct

- 471 Registered Student Organizations (RSOs)
- Categories: Academic...Campus Programming...Environmental...Film/Publications/Media ....Fraternity/Sorority (Social)...Games \& Gaming...Graduate \& Professional... Honors ...Multicultural...Performance...Political...Recreation \& Wellness....Residence Halls ...Service....Special Interest...Spiritual \& Religious....Sports Clubs (Competition) ...Student Governance
- Provide Mandatory Student Organization Training sessions for RSO leaders each semester (on multiple days and times each semester) on relevant UI policies, procedures, protocois, programs, services, resources, et al.
- Provide New Student Organization Orientation Training sessions for RSO leaders as their RSOs become registered, in addition to providing RSOs with ongoing advice and guidance on a regular basis
- Provide access to OrgSync for RSOs to have a portal and to have easy access to resources and information provided by CSIL. CSIL staff utilize OrgSync to communicate with all RSOs as opportunities, programs, services, etc. become available to all RSOs
- Provide access to Student Activity Fee funding from UISG and GPSG (for RSOs) and Recreational Service Fee funding (for Sports Clubs)
- Provide access to the Student Organization Business Office and its staff to assist with planning budgets, managing finances, depositing funds, purchasing equipment, securing vehicles for travel, etc.
- Provide access to request CSIL Grant funding and Late Night funding
- Provide access to request university vehicles for travel to regional or national conferences or competitions
- Provide access to request storage space in and around the Student Activity Center and Student Organization Office Suite
- Provide access to Student Organization Development workshops. Examples of workshops include:
- Securing funding for your RSO
- Working with the Student Organization Business Office
- RSO Event Planning 101
- Provide individual consultations on a variety of topics, by request from RSOs
- Provide individual consultations on formulating and writing constitutions and bylaws
- Provide access to UI mass email services (two emails per RSO per semester), UI listservs, and UI email addresses
- Provide free or discounted room rates (depending on the room) for RSOs in the IMU
- Provide discounted catering rates from University Catering for RSO programs and events
- Provide discounted rates in the lowa House Hotel for RSO-sponsored guests/presenters/ speakers
- Offer event ticketing services for events and programs sponsored by RSOs. There is a nominal charge.
- Provide access to participate in the fall and spring Student Organization Fairs. It is important to note there are capacity issues when the Fair is inside the IMU in the spring; there are no capacity issues when on Hubbard Park in the fall

- CSIL-sponsored leadership development programs and services are available for all RSO leaders to attend OR available for all to RSO leaders to apply for participation. Examples include:
- LeaderShape
- Leadership Library
- Introduction to Leadership courses
- Alternative Break service learning course and Hawkeye Service Teams
- Be Better Forum
- Be Better Theme Thursdays (highlighting a different "Strength" each week)
- See link for Registration of Student Organizations located in the "Polices and Regulations affecting Students"
- https://dos.uiowa.edu/policies/registration-of-student-organizations/ A hard copy is included
- See link for Administration of Registered Student Organizations located in the "Polices and Regulations affecting Students"
- https://dos.uiowa.edu/policies/administration-of-registered-student-organizations/ A hard copy is included
- See link for Discipline of Registered Student Organizations located in the "Polices and Regulations affecting Students"
- https://dos.uiowa.edu/policies/discipline-of-registered-student-organizations/ A hard copy is included
- Below is the verbatim text from the Registration of Student Organizations section of the "Policies and Regulations affecting Students," which details the benefits of registration for RSOs:
A. Benefits of Registration:

1. Registration as a University organization;
2. Establishment of an account in the Student Organization Business Office (SOBO), Fraternity Business Service, or Recreational Services and appropriate purchasing privileges in accordance with University policies;
3. Eligibility to apply for funds from mandatory Student Activity fees (i.e., for student organizations) or Recreational Services fees (i.e., for sports clubs);
4. Inclusion in appropriate University publications;
5. Utilization of the Center for Student Involvement \& Leadership's (CSIL) OrgSync software (funded by UISG \& GPSG)
6. Utilization of the University's trademarks in accordance with the UI Trademark Licensing Department's program and policies;
7. Eligibility for use of campus meeting facilities and outdoor spaces;
8. Eligibility, but not the right, to utilize UI Fleet Services vehicles in accordance with state and University policies, procedures, guidelines, and insurance requirements;
9. Eligibility, but not the right, to utilize University staff and programming resources;
10. Eligibility, but not the right, to utilize Information Technology Services Mass Mail once each semester;
11. Eligibility to apply for awards and honors presented to University registered organizations and members; and
12. Eligibility to apply for Student Organization Office Suite (SOOS) or Student Activity Center (SAC) office space and/or storage space.

- Below are references to discipline cases involving RSOs. It is important to note we do our due diligence investigating alleged violations of Ul policy.
- Hazing policy violation case - Delta Sigma Pi Business Fraternity (found responsible)
- Alcohol policy violation case - Alpha Kappa Psi Business Fraternity (found responsible)
- Free Speech/Title IX policy violation case - UI Feminist Union (found responsible)
- Human Rights policy violation case - 24/7 (found not responsible)
- Student organization funds policy violation case - Chinese Students \& Scholars Association (found responsible)
- Variety of policy violations cases involving fraternities and sororities - some found responsible and some found not responsible

What: Ensure all Registered Student Organizations (RSO) have governing documents that have all required statements

- Required statements
- Human Rights Clause
- Financial Statement

When: All governing documents need to be submitted to and approved by CSIL by June 1, 2018 .
How: Governing document submission and review

- Pre-work
- Restrict access so RSOs cannot submit governing documents in their profiles on OrgSync
- Create a form where RSOs can submit governing documents to CSIL for approval
- Distribute form to RSOs
- Messaging and Outreach
- Send mass messaging to RSOs who need to update their governing documents
- Target messaging depending on needs of the RSO
- Set office hours for groups to bring governing documents for in person feedback from Coordinator for Student Organization Development
- Timeline
- Collect, review and advice RSO's on governing document updates on a rolling basis
- Require all first submissions by no later than May 3, 2018
- Review all RSO governing documents and submit feedback to Orgs by May 16, 2018.
- Require all final submissions by June 1, 2018
- Review
- Set bi-weekly review days where available CSIL staff assist Coordinator for Student Organization Development with reviewing governing documents
- Consequences for RSOs
- RSOs failing to reach update their governing document in time will go defunct until all requirements are met
- RSOS will not be approved participants at the Fall student organization fair until all requirements are met


## PROCESS FOR ORGANIZATION COMPLIANCE:

Call Andy if you need to: 414-852-6021
Nate Levin's direct line: 4-3340

## HOW TO GET TO DOCUMENTS ON SHARE DRIVE:

File path: $\quad$ CSIL Share Drive $\rightarrow$ Student Organization Management $\rightarrow$ Constitutions $\rightarrow$ Org Compliance 2018

## All files required for Org Compliance are in this folder or on shared Excel spreadsheet that Laurynn

 created.
## RSOS WHO SUBMIT GOVERNING DOCS USING THE ORGSYNC FORM:

1) In the CSIL umbrella page of OrgSync there is a form called "Organization Governing Document Submission". That form will have groups that have who are approved, denied, or deferred.
2) When approving a constitution using the OrgSync form you can check it "Approved". A message will be sent to the submitter
3) If the organization is not yet compliant you can mark it "Denied". A message will appears on your screen that you may want to tweak prior to sending. You can also mark it "Deferred" and let the submitter/org know via email. - I believe this option works better than sending the communication via OrgSync.

## REVIEWING, APPROVING OR DENYING RSO CONSTITUTION SUBMISSIONS:

1) When a RSO submits governing documents to be approved they either fill out the form or send an email to the CSIL-Student-Org-@uiowa.edu email account. Andy will forward anything he gets to his UI Email address to CSIL-Student-Org.
a) When opening up a constitution, first look for the Human Rights Clause
b) Check to make sure it is the most current HR Clause (current clause includes: pregnancy, status in US Military, and genetic information).
c) Briefly skim to make sure no language that would contradict the HR Clause is included. If included, it is usually found in the leadership qualifications, elections or membership sections. If you believe there is language that contradicts the HR Clause call and email constitution to Nate Levin 4-3340

2) If constitution is fully updated you can save the file in the folder titled Compliant Org Constitutions 6.13-6.18 - Andy will put them in portals when he gets back on June 19, 2018.
a) Once approved please delete the organization from the Student Organization Governance Follow-up document, the shared excel spreadsheet.
i) You will also need to update the spreadsheet titled "All Orgs Compliance Check" located in the share drive file path listed above.
(1) There are two spots on this spreadsheet to highlight (in green) The first is on the "Data" tab, the second is on the "Outreach 5.13 tab". KEY AT BOTTOM OF SPREADSHEET
3) If constitution is not fully update, please mark the group "Deferred" or "Denied" and reach out to the Organization's submitter (FORM SUBMISSIONS ONLY)

HOW TO DEREGISTER ORGS:

1) Go to the Admin tab on OrgSync and select "CSIL"
2) Click "Organizations"
3) Search for the Organization needing to be deregistered and click on it to expand field
4) On left had side click "Disable" tab.
a) Leave following message in text box "This organization is being disabled due to failing to submit governing documents compliant with the Human Rights Clause"
b) Click "Disable"
5) Click "Profile" tab and then "View/Edit Profile"
6) Change name of organization to add "Defunct Summer 2018" at the end
7) Change the category to Defunct.

CHATTING WITH ORGS WHO HAVE QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS REGARDING CHANGE IN THEIR SELECTION OF MEMBERSHIP OR LEADERSHIP

Registered Student Organizations RSOs are considered University programs and thus must comply with all policies including the Human Rights Clause. The Human Rights Clause is encompassing of all RSO activities including the selection of membership and/or leadership. RSOs can still have purposes/mission statements related to specific classes or characteristics of the HR Clause, but obtainment of membership or leadership cannot be contingent on the agreement, disagreement, subscription to, etc. of stated beliefs/purposes which are covered in the HR Clause.

## ORGS WITH CONTRADICTORY LANGUAGE:

General Counsel was given a list of Student Organizations that are not in compliance with the Human Rights Clause due to language that conflicts with the Clause. I have asked them to point out specific language in each constitution that was sent in order to be able to share this with the org leaders.

If Nate sends you any Org constitution with their determination on contradictory language the RSO will need to be reached out to and informed that specific contradictory language will need to be removed for approval.


Center for Student Involvement \& Leadership
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Executive Summary<br>Student Organization Constitution Review

## Background:

Student organizations are registered (rather than recognized) by the University of Iowa through an initial review process conducted by the Student Organization Review Committee (SORC). Semiannually, student organizations reregister and through this process are expected to upclate their officers/advisors and governing documents. Annually, student organizations are required to attend a student organization policy and procedures review program. It is through training, routine communication, and accountability processes (conducted as needed) that the University's expectations of student organizations are articulated.

Review Process:
The Center for Student Involvement \& Leadership staff conducted a review of approximately 500 of the more than 550 student organization constitutions during the weeks of January 15 and January 29:2018. Fraternities and sororities have not been required to submit their constitutions in the past, and it was discovered several organizations' documents are in inaccessible formats, therefore, not all student organizations were reviewed.

Student organizations at the University of Iowa are officially categorized as Sponsored, Affiliated, or General organizations, and informally by interest areas such as Academic, Fraternity/Sorority, Spiritual/Religious, Sports, Performing Arts, etc. Regardless of category, all organizations are expected to adhere to the University of Iowa's Statement of Fiuman Rights, except social fiaternities/sororities who maintain a legally protected single gender status. In addition, all student organizations are expected to adhere to specific regulations regarding their financial accounts and maintain a membership of at least $80 \%$ students.

Of specific importance to this review of registered student organizations' governing documents was threefold:, 1) consistency with the University of Iowa's Statement of Human Rights, 2) adherence to the financial expectation outlined in the Code of Student Life, and 3) $80 \%$ student membership. An evaluation rubric was utilized by staff to note inconsistencies in constitutional language pertaining to "race, creed, color, religion, national origin, age, sex, pregnancy, disability, genetic information, status as a U.S. veteran, service in the US. military, sexual orientation, gender identity, associational preferences, or any other classification that deprives the person of consideration as an individual.." as well as financial matters and membership makeup.

## Findings:

This process was valuable in discovering various inconsistencies with the statement of human rights, the financial regulation, as well as illuminating the need for general feedback for student organizations regarding their governing documents. Many of these issues would not have been realized in our historic model of responding to requests for review or official complaints. The following themes were found through the review:


1. Approximately. $17 \%$ of the organizations were noted for additional review to further assess inconsistent language. Student organizations' documents containing language inconsistent with the Human Rights Statement, were primarily those associated with one of the protected classes/characteristics in the statement. The inconsistency was typically related to the class/characteristic with which the group is associated (i.e. a ren's acapella group, or a women's sport group for example).
2. $32 \%$ of the organizations state the Human Rights Statement verbatim in their constitutions. Another $59 \%$ of the organizations have a portion of the Stacement. Only $9 \%$ do not contain any part of the Statemene. The expectation that $80 \%$ of organization membership being comprised of UI students surfaced as the most common missing element of the Human Rights Statement.
3. Approximately, $58 \%$ of the student organizations reviewed did now include the expected financial clause verbatim in their governing clocuments. Conversely, $42 \%$ included the notation on financial matters.

## Recommendations:

At the appropriate time, and ar the direction of the Attorney General's office, University of Iowa Counsel, and Senior University Leadership, provide additional communication (i.e direcrives as needed) and education to student organizations about the University of Iowa's expectations for governing documents as well as operation of their organizations.

Determine a sustainable method of collecting and reviewing student organization constitutions/ governing documents in the future.

Require student organizations to reregister annually (not semi-annually) and through said registration process certify their governing documents and practices are consistent with the University of Iowa's Statement of Human Rights and Code of Student Life.

Develop and implement clear(er) expectations for student organizations through the Code of Student Life.

Develop and utilize a Conduct Review Board for the adjudication of alleged violations of the Code of Student Iife for student organizations. This Review Board should be utilized particularly when issues pertaining to such serious matters as the Statement of Human Rights are being addressed.

## Historical Framework

Historically, the Ul has allowed a group of students with a common bellef/interest to become and remain recognized/registered as long as they include the Ul Hurnan Rights Policy (verbatim) in their constitution or bylaws and do not behave or act in violation of it. The only other verbatim clause required relates to finances. Both clauses are listed below.

The Ul has recognized/registered student organizations (RSOs) whose names suggest a belief/interest restricted to a particular creed or particular demographic. These RSOs maintain their recognized/registered status as long as anv student can attend their meetings and events, and as long as the UH Human Rights Policy is observed in the process of selecting members or leaders.

If it becomes known that an RSO allegedly behaved or acted in a way that violates the Ul Human Rights Policy or any other applicable Ul policy, that RSO is investigated and will be found either responsible or not responsible for the violation.

The process of learning about alfeged Ul policy violations is largely a complaint-driven one.
If we receive a complaint, we investigate and produce a finding.
If we learn about a violation absent a complaint, we investigate and produce a finding.
If we do not receive a complaint or do not learn about a violation, we do not investigate.

In sum, the UI has operated under the premise that, regardless of STATED beliefs/interests, an RSO can remain recognized/registered as long as they have not been found to have BEHAVED or ACTED in violation of any Ul policy, including the Ul Human Rights policy.

## Required verbatim clause related to the UI Human Rights Policy:

in no aspect of its programs shall there be ony difference in the treatment of persons on the basis of race, creed, color, religion, notional origin, age, sex, pregnancy, disability, genetic information, status as a U.5. veteran, service in the U.S. mithtary, sexual orientotion, gender identity, associotional preferences, or any other classification which would deprive the person of consideration as an individual. The organization will guarantee that equol opportunity and equal access to membership, programming, focilfies, and benefits shall be open to all persons. Eighty percent ( $80 \%$ ) of thls organiaation's membership must be composed of Ul students.

## Required verbatim clause related to Fimances:

(INSERT ORGANIZATION NAMIE HERE) is required to deposit olf receipts in and make disbursements through the Student Organization Business Office, Fraternity Business Services, or Recreational Services. Upon dissolution, state money and mondatory student fees revert back to the granting organization. Inactive organizetions will be considered dissolved after five years of no account activity. Revenue generated dollars or "Oo funds" must be divided as stoted in this Constitution and carried out by our leadership. Our organization's remaining revenute generated dollors or "OO funds" will be divided or disbursed to (INSERT OR OUTLINE THE NAAAE OF AA ORGANIZATION WHERE YOUR STUDENT ORGANIZATHN'S REVENUE GETEERATED DOLLARS OR OQ MONEY SHOULD BE DIVIDED OR DISBURSED). If this organizotion has dissolved ond revenue genetoted dolfars or "00 funds" have not been divided as stated in this Constitution by five years from last account activity, funds in our "00 account" will revert to an occount specified for this purpose within student government(s). These funds will then be availoble for distribution through student government's) guidellines in accordonce with University of lowo policy.

| Nexel： | Name of Student Ore |  <br>  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | opalabic boneyiseliom the ong＇s consitutiont |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | tesemativs | Nembeeth |  | Aanisor | and | Hersen | Stx | Ore |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 24.7 |  |  |  | Pb |  |  | to |  | fanh ${ }^{\text {com }}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  <br>  <br>  |
|  | MSSP Precta Misisty |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Salotation |  |  |  |  |  |  | ai |  |  <br>  <br>  <br>  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ctamimeravional |  |  |  |  |  | 20 | $\infty$ |  |  |
|  |  | 150 |  | \％ |  | ves | ras？ | eo | no | Vosen |
|  |  |  | aid | ${ }^{108}$ |  | bex | 100 |  | 0 |  |
|  | cic sudernt cirstian ferlion |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  <br>  csco |
|  | cu |  |  | no |  | Fres | － | $\infty$ | ， |  <br>  |
| Technically，Lis pecoupdors not cmemply wibh seandardstor turient oceraizatkens． |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Imam Mandi Ofanizulon | ve |  |  |  |  |  | （miknown： becontetis Noder is <br>  Zot Farlu tratict fart furturs E－nylythlion． Mentiontid in |  |  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  De fribl（imen <br>  |
|  | Interavilomit Achtuor | yen | no | ＋m | 12 | m | 0 | 160 | 1 |  |
|  |  |  | res | ${ }_{0}$ | jem |  | 10 | 15 |  |  |
|  | tovelyous | 1 m | no | ＋0\％ | 1m |  | m | \％ | \％ |  |
| Mis somstivvienistor a Ourch creunoil <br>  | Letherin Campur Ministrecoumi |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Werlion stuvens＇s Ascedtion |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | to |  <br>  any mat wote of holl any office：＂ |
|  | Orncosorcristion felownip | no | tor |  |  |  |  |  | $\infty$ |  |
|  | Rasio Chiss |  | \％o | no | no |  | \％ | $\infty$ |  |  <br>  |
|  | SLP Pasis uplvestly Cemer | －0， | \％ | no | too |  | no | m | no |  |
|  | The Sancorpary |  | $\infty$ | ros | 10 |  | ne |  | m |  <br>  |
|  | wadi．ceaters |  | Ses | 1 | n | Tes | $\infty$ |  | do |  |
|  |  | mo | no | no | \％ |  | 0 | 100 | 2 |  |
|  | Teu Onoszacthdic semice fremity | no | \％o | $\infty$ | $\infty$ | ma | no | \％ | no |  |
|  | Salayicanous Amoisalon | no． | 0 | 100 | 13 | po | 10 | 10 | 0 |  |
|  |  | $\frac{\text { no }}{\text { fo }}$ | ：no | no | $\frac{n 0}{10}$ | \％ | $\frac{180}{100}$ | ，ino | mo |  |
|  |  | tro | $\infty$ | mi |  |  | 1 no |  | m |  |
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Christensen, Betty [AG]

| From: | Nelson, William R |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Wednesday, February 07, $20188: 41$ AM |
| To: | Shivers, Melissa S |
| Subject: | List of Spiritual Religious Orgs.xIsx |
| Attachments: | List of Spiritual Religious Orgs.xisx |

Melissa,

Here is the list you requested. There are 32 RSOs.

In the review process, we reviewed 31 RSOs in this category, because we did not review BLinC.

I just wanted to explain the 31 versus 32 issue. Let me know if you need something else.

Bill

William R. Nelson, Ph.D.
Executive Director, lowa Memorial Union
145 IMU
The University of lowa
lowa City, IA 52242-1317
319/335-3059
william-nelson@uiowa.edu
imu.uiowa.edu

1
BLinC-DEF

| Name | Category |
| :--- | :--- |
| Bridges International (UI Chapter) | Spiritual \& Religious |
| Campus Bible Fellowship | Spiritual \& Religious |
| Campus Christian Fellowship | Spiritual \& Religious |
| Cru | Spiritual \& Religious |
| Chabad Jewish Student Association | Spiritual \& Religious |
| Chinese Student Christian Fellowship | Spiritual \& Religious |
| Geneva Campus Ministry | Spiritual \& Religious |
| Hillel (University of lowa) | Spiritual \& Religious |
| Latter-day Saint Student Association | Spiritual \& Religious |
| Muslim Students Association | Spiritual \& Religious |
| Newman Catholic Student Center | Spiritual \& Religious |
| Orthodox Christian Fellowship | Spiritual \& Religious |
| Twenty Four Seven | Spiritual \& Religious |
| Young Life | Spiritual \& Religious |
| ASk Prayer Ministry | Spiritual \& Religious |
| Salt Company - The | Spiritual \& Religious |
| Baha'i Campus Association | Spiritual \& Religious |
| Agape Chinese Student Fellowship | Spiritual \& Religious |
| Chi Alpha Christian Fellowship | Spiritual \& Religious |
| Christian Medical Association | Spiritual \& Religious |
| Wall-Breakers | Spiritual \& Religious |
| Business Leaders in Christ | Spiritual \& Religious |
| Imam Mahdi Organization | Spiritual \& Religious |
| Ratio Christi | Spiritual \& Religious |
| Athletes in Action | Spiritual \& Religious |
| Lutheran Campus Ministry | Spiritual \& Religious |
| Love Works | Spiritual \& Religious |
| Tau Omega Catholic Service Fraternity | Spiritual \& Religious |
| International Neighbors at lowa | Spiritual \& Religious |
| St. Paul's University Center | Spiritual \& Religious |
| Young Women for America at lowa | Spiritual \& Religious |
| Sikh Awareness Club | Spiritual \& Religious |
|  |  |


| From: | Christiansen, Erika E</o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group <br> (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=c697324856ef494b9b7899ccb6a304f2-eechrist> |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: | Paul J Mintner (paul-mintner@uiowa.edu) [paul-mintner@uiowa.edu](mailto:paul-mintner@uiowa.edu), Kutcher, Andrew M [andrew-kutcher@uiowa.edu](mailto:andrew-kutcher@uiowa.edu) |
| Subject: | Non complaint list - Monday 6/18/18 |
| Date: | Mon, 18 Jun 2018 15:03:40 +0000 |
| Inline-Images: | image001.jpg |

Chinese Student Christian Fellowship
American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics
Association of Nursing Students (UIANS)
English Society (University of Iowa)
Financial Management Association
Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers
Korean Conversation Group
Phi Beta Lambda
Society of Women Engineers
Net Impact Ulowa
Public Relations Student Society of America (PRSSA)
American Academy of Pediatric Dentistry
Christian Pharmacy Fellowship
Graduate Student Anthropology Association (U of I)
InterVarsity Graduate Christian Fellowship
J. Reuben Clark Law Society

Student Iowa School Counseling Association
Tau Sigma Military Dental Club
Asian Pacific American Student Association (U of I)
German Club
Hong Kong Student Association
Indian Student Alliance (ISA)
Japanese Students and Scholars Club
Korean Uiowa Students Association
Malaysian Student Society
Minority Association of Pre-medical Students
Multicultural Business Student Association
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (UI Chapter of NAACP)
Persatuan Mahasiswa Indonesia di Amerika Serikat (Indonesian Student Organization)
Revolution Dance Company
Chinese Dance Club
Hawkapellas - Iowa
Iowa Agni
Young Americans for Liberty
Bass Fishing Team (Iowa)
Alpha Phi Omega-Omicron (APO)
Chinese in Iowa City
Code the Change
MEDLIFE (Medicine, Education and Development for Low Income Families Everywhere)
UISight
CMA EDU
Cookie Dokie
Red Shamrock Student Organization
Students for Human Rights
Campus Bible Fellowship
Cru
Geneva Campus Ministry
Imam Mahdi Organization
Latter-day Saint Student Association
Lutheran Campus Ministry
Sikh Awareness Club
Wall-Breakers
Young Life
Iowa American Student Dental Association (IASDA)

Spiritual \& Religious
Academic
Academic
Academic
Academic
Academic
Academic
Academic
Academic
Environmental
Film/Publications/Media
Graduate \& Professional
Graduate \& Professional
Graduate \& Professional
Graduate \& Professional
Graduate \& Professional
Graduate \& Professional
Graduate \& Professional
Multicultural
Multicultural
Multicultural
Multicultural
Multicultural
Multicultural
Multicultural
Multicultural
Multicultural
Multicultural
Multicultural
Multicultural
Performance
Performance
Performance
Political
Recreation \& Wellness
Service
Service
Service
Service
Service
Special Interest
Special Interest
Special Interest
Special Interest
Spiritual \& Religious
Spiritual \& Religious
Spiritual \& Religious
Spiritual \& Religious
Spiritual \& Religious
Spiritual \& Religious
Spiritual \& Religious
Spiritual \& Religious
Spiritual \& Religious
Student Governance


| From: | Kutcher, Andrew $M</ O=$ EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP <br> (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=340E2AFFD21746A4B5981D279AC059ES-AKUTCHER> |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: | Schrock, Katrina N < katrina-schrock@uiowa.edu> |

Hi Katrina,
We encouraged groups to get there governing documents submitted by the 13 th in order for us to have time to review them and provide feedback prior to the 15 th deadline. The 15 th is our deadline for groups not wanting to be deregistered.

The form to submit will remain open for groups that go deregistered to submit after June 15. If a group goes deregistered they will become reregistered when they submit governing documents compliant with the Human Rights Clause.

Hope this makes sense. Please let me know what questions you have.
Best,
Andy

On Jun 12, 2018, at 11:45 PM, Schrock, Katrina N [katrina-schrock@uiowa.edu](mailto:katrina-schrock@uiowa.edu) wrote:

Andy,

In an email from Laurynn this morning we were told 'Theupdated document(s) are due tomorrow. June 13 娄 or your student
organization will be placed on unregistered status." However, an earlier email from you, dated June ${ }^{\text {st }}$, said: "The deadline to submit changes is June 15, 2018, or your RSO will be de-registered. If de-registered, registration can be reinstated by using the link above to submit governing documents with the Human Rights Clause and no language that is considered contradictory to the Human Rights Clause." Can you please confirm that we have until the close of business on June 15 ?

Thank you,
Katrina

From: Student Organization Help \& Information
Sent: Tuesday, June 12, 2018 4:05 PM
To: Schrock, Katrina N < katrina-schrock@uiowa.edu>; Student Organization Help \& Information < CSIL-Student-Org@uiowa.edu>; Kutcher, Andrew M [andrew-kutcher@uiowa.edu](mailto:andrew-kutcher@uiowa.edu)
Cc: Tamplin, Michelle R [michelle-tamplin@uiowa.edu](mailto:michelle-tamplin@uiowa.edu); Wan, Shu [shu-wan@uiowa.edu](mailto:shu-wan@uiowa.edu); Kim, Yooneui [yooneui-kim@uiowa.edu](mailto:yooneui-kim@uiowa.edu);
kkummer50@gmail.com
Subject: RE: InterVarsity Graduate Christian Fellowship Governing Documents

HI Katrina,

I just received word that we would not approve the change in language you proposed. Student orgs are free to express whatever language they desire in their mission/purpose, but the University and the Center for Student Involvement and Leadership must enforce our Human Rights Clause when it comes to leadership and membership.

I also wanted to let you know that I am out of the office starting tomorrow and will be back in on Tuesday. I will be doing my best to check email while away and would be happy to answer any further questions or address any concerns. I've copied my University Andemail address to this email in order to be able to follow up.


Best,
Andy

From: Schrock, Katrina N
Sent: Tuesday, June 12, 2018 11:25 AM
To: Student Organization Help \& Information < CSIL-Student-Org@uiowa.edu>; King, Laurynn L [laurynn-king@uiowa.edu](mailto:laurynn-king@uiowa.edu)
Cc: Tamplin, Michelle R [michelle-tamplin@uiowa.edu](mailto:michelle-tamplin@uiowa.edu); Wan, Shu [shu-wan@uiowa.edu](mailto:shu-wan@uiowa.edu); Kim, Yooneui [yooneui-kim@uiowa.edu](mailto:yooneui-kim@uiowa.edu);
kkummer50@gmail.com
Subject: RE: InterVarsity Graduate Christian Fellowship Governing Documents

Andy,

Thank you for your clarification! Obviously, I will need to discuss any changes with the rest of the leadership team, but I do have a question. Would changing the language of the constitution from "must subscribe..." to something like "are requested to subscribe..." or "are strongly encouraged to subscribe..." make it so that the constitution is no longer contradictory? Again, I will need to discuss changes, but your input on this matter is greatly appreciated.

Thank you,
Katrina

From: Student Organization Help \& Information
Sent: Tuesday, June 12, 2018 11:19 AM
To: Schrock, Katrina N [katrina-schrock@uiowa.edu](mailto:katrina-schrock@uiowa.edu); Student Organization Help \& Information [CSIL-Student-Org@uiowa.edu](mailto:CSIL-Student-Org@uiowa.edu); King, Laurynn L[laurynn-king@uiowa.edu](mailto:laurynn-king@uiowa.edu)
Cc: Tamplin, Michelle R [michelle-tamplin@uiowa.edu](mailto:michelle-tamplin@uiowa.edu); Wan, Shu [shu-wan@uiowa.edu](mailto:shu-wan@uiowa.edu); Kim, Yooneui [yooneui-kim@uiowa.edu](mailto:yooneui-kim@uiowa.edu);
kkummer50@gmail.com
Subject: RE: InterVarsity Graduate Christian Fellowship Governing Documents

Katrina,

I recognize the wish to have leadership requirements based on Christian beliefs, however Registered Student Organizations are considered University of lowa programs and thus must follow the Human Rights Clause in its entirety. Having a restriction on leadership related to religious beliefs is contradictory to that clause.

I'm happy to chat further about this and provide any information I can.

Best,
Andy

| Andy Kutcher, M.Ed. | Simage001.jpg>145 lowa Memorial <br> Union |
| :--- | :--- |
| he, him, his | Lowa City, lowa 52242-1317 |

## Schedule an appointment with me

From: Schrock, Katrina N
Sent: Tuesday, June 12, 2018 11:02 AM
To: Student Organization Help \& Information < CSIL-Student-Org@uiowa.edu>; King, Laurynn L[laurynn-king@uiowa.edu](mailto:laurynn-king@uiowa.edu)
Cc: Tamplin, Michelle R [michelle-tamplin@uiowa.edu](mailto:michelle-tamplin@uiowa.edu); Wan, Shu [shu-wan@uiowa.edu](mailto:shu-wan@uiowa.edu); Kim, Yooneui [yooneui-kim@uiowa.edu](mailto:yooneui-kim@uiowa.edu); kkummer50@gmail.com
Subject: RE: InterVarsity Graduate Christian Fellowship Governing Documents

Andy,

I would guess that the issues you see involve potential contradictions to the part of the Human Rights Clause that states: "In no aspect of its programs shall there be any difference in the treatment of persons...". From my reading, the language of the constitution does not contradict the later part of the Clause, which states: "...equal access to membership, programming, facilities, and benefits shall be open to all persons". Membership, events, and other facets of the group are not restricted - the only restriction is specifically for leadership positions.

While I understand that this leadership restriction can be construed as a difference in treatment, it is also important to have Christian leadership in a Christian organization. We do not in any way discourage those who may not subscribe to the basis of faith in Article II from participating in IVGCF as members, but we do recognize that having Christian leadership is important to the fulfillment of our purpose.

The above are my thoughts, but I am open to having further dialogue on the matter.

## Katrina

From: Student Organization Help \& Information
Sent: Tuesday, June 12, 2018 10:43 AM
To: Schrock, Katrina N < katrina-schrock@uiowa.edu>; Student Organization Help \& Information < CSIL-Student-Org@uiowa.edu>; King, Laurynn L[laurynn-king@uiowa.edu](mailto:laurynn-king@uiowa.edu)
Cc: Tamplin, Michelle R [michelle-tamplin@uiowa.edu](mailto:michelle-tamplin@uiowa.edu); Wan, Shu [shu-wan@uiowa.edu](mailto:shu-wan@uiowa.edu); Kim, Yooneui [yooneui-kim@uiowa.edu](mailto:yooneui-kim@uiowa.edu);
kkummer50@gmail.com
Subject: RE: InterVarsity Graduate Christian Fellowship Governing Documents

Katrina,

On my initial review I see several issues. As part of compliance with the Human Rights Clause, organizations cannot have any language deemed contradictory to that Clause. I'm seeing potential contradictory language in Articles II, III, IV and VII. The language is directly related to the ability to become a member or to hold leadership positions.

Please let me know your thoughts, questions or concerns. I want to make sure this is clear.

From: Schrock, Katrina N
Sent: Tuesday, June 12, 2018 10:27 AM
To: Student Organization Help \& Information < CSIL-Student-Org@uiowa.cdu>; King, Laurynn L [laurynn-king@uiowa.edu](mailto:laurynn-king@uiowa.edu)
Cc: Tamplin, Michelle R [michelle-tamplin@uiowa.edu](mailto:michelle-tamplin@uiowa.edu); Wan, Shu [shu-wan@uiowa.edu](mailto:shu-wan@uiowa.edu); Kim, Yooneui [yooneui-kim@uiowa.edu](mailto:yooneui-kim@uiowa.edu);
kkummer50@gmail.com
Subject: RE: InterVarsity Graduate Christian Fellowship Governing Documents

Andy,

I've now used the form you linked to submit the updated constitution. Please let me know if there is anything else you need from us, and thank you for your quick reply and for checking into the submission.

Katrina

From: Student Organization Help \& Information
Sent: Tuesday, June 12, 2018 10:06 AM
To: Schrock, Katrina N [katrina-schrock@uiowa.edu](mailto:katrina-schrock@uiowa.edu); King, Laurynn L [laurynn-king@uiowa.edu](mailto:laurynn-king@uiowa.edu)
Cc: Tamplin, Michelle R [michelle-tamplin@uiowa.edu](mailto:michelle-tamplin@uiowa.edu); Wan, Shu [shu-wan@uiowa.edu](mailto:shu-wan@uiowa.edu); Kim, Yooneui [yooneui-kim@uiowa.edu](mailto:yooneui-kim@uiowa.edu);
kkummer50@gmail.com; Student Organization Help \& Information < CSIL-Student-Org@uiowa.edu>
Subject: RE: InterVarsity Graduate Christian Fellowship Governing Documents

Hi Katrina,

Did you use the OrgSync form (https://orgsync.com/14241/forms/311661) to submit? I'm not seeing your submission in the form or on the InterVarsity Graduate Christian Fellowship's OrgSync portal.

Best,
Andy

From: Schrock, Katrina N
Sent: Tuesday, June 12, 2018 9:25 AM
To: King, Laurynn L < laurynn-king@uiowa.edu>
Cc: Tamplin, Michelle R [michelle-tamplin@uiowa.edu](mailto:michelle-tamplin@uiowa.edu); Wan, Shu [shu-wan@uiowa.edu](mailto:shu-wan@uiowa.edu); Kim, Yooneui [yooneui-kim@uiowa.edu](mailto:yooneui-kim@uiowa.edu);
kkummer50@gmail.com; Student Organization Help \& Information < CSIL-Student-Org@uiowa.edu>
Subject: RE: InterVarsity Graduate Christian Fellowship Governing Documents

Laurynn,

I was under the impression that the InterVarsity Graduate Christian Fellowship's constitution had been updated with the Human Rights clause, and submitted to OrgSync on either the $1^{\text {st }}$ or $2^{\text {nd }}$ of June. If this is not the case, I would appreciate if you would let me know as soon as possible, so that we can make the required changes.

Thank you,
Katrina

From: King, Laurynn L
Sent: Tuesday, June 12, 2018 9:15 AM
To: Borbon, Tiffany Yue-Fei <tiffany-borbon\&uiowa.edu>; Slashcheva, Lyubov D [lyubov-slashcheva@uiowa.edu](mailto:lyubov-slashcheva@uiowa.edu)
Cc: Schrock, Katrina N [katrina-schrock@uiowa.edu](mailto:katrina-schrock@uiowa.edu); Tamplin, Michelle R [michelle-tamplin@uiowa.edu](mailto:michelle-tamplin@uiowa.edu); Wan, Shu [shu-wan@uiowa.edu](mailto:shu-wan@uiowa.edu);
Kim, Yooneui [yooneui-kim@uiowa.edu](mailto:yooneui-kim@uiowa.edu); kkummer50@gmail.com; Student Organization Help \& Information [CSIL-Student-Org@uiowa.edu](mailto:CSIL-Student-Org@uiowa.edu)
Subject: RE: InterVarsity Graduate Christian Fellowship Governing Documents

Thank you for your reply, Tiffany. It is important to keep your OrgSync profile updated with your new leadership team's contact information up-todate, so we are able to reach out to the most current representatives.

Enjoy your day,
Laurynn

| Laurynn King | <image002.jpg> |
| :--- | :--- |
| she, her, hers | 157 Iowa Memorial Union |
|  | Iowa City, lowa 52242-1317 |

From: 'Borbon, Tiffany Yue-Fei
Sent: Tuesday, June 12, 2018 9:11 AM
To: King, Laurynn L [laurynn-king@uiowa.edu](mailto:laurynn-king@uiowa.edu); Slashcheva, Lyubov D [lyubov-slashcheva@uiowa.edu](mailto:lyubov-slashcheva@uiowa.edu)
Cc: Schrock, Katrina N [katrina-schrock@uiowa.edu](mailto:katrina-schrock@uiowa.edu); Tamplin, Michelle R [michelle-tamplin@uiowa.edu](mailto:michelle-tamplin@uiowa.edu); Wan, Shu [shu-wan@uiowa.edu](mailto:shu-wan@uiowa.edu);
Kim, Yooneui [yooneui-kim@uiowa.edu](mailto:yooneui-kim@uiowa.edu); kkummer50@gmail.com
Subject: Re: InterVarsity Graduate Christian Fellowship Governing Documents

Hi Laurynn,
We forwarded the original email to the current leadership team. Both Lyubov and I are no longer serving on the team. I believe they were working on updating this information, but I have $\mathrm{CC}^{\prime} \mathrm{d}$ them on this email.

Thanks,
Tiffany

Sent from my Verizon. Samsung Galasy smartphone
-------- Original message --------
From: "King, Laurynn L" [laurynn-king@uiowa.edu](mailto:laurynn-king@uiowa.edu)
Date: 6/12/18 8:44 AM (GMT-06:00)

To: "Borbon, Tiffany Yue-Fei" [tiffany-borbon@uiowa.edu](mailto:tiffany-borbon@uiowa.edu), "Slashcheva, Lyubov D" [lyubov-slashcheva@uiowa.edu](mailto:lyubov-slashcheva@uiowa.edu)
Subject: InterVarsity Graduate Christian Fellowship Governing Documents

Tiffany \& Lyubov -

I am following up to several communications our office has sent regarding InterVarsity Graduate Christian Fellowship Governing Documents on campus. Our office has you listed as contacts for this student organization.

We've sent a few e-mails, and also left voicemails, over the past few months regarding the need to update the organization's governing documents to include the University of Iowa's Human Rights clause. The updated document(s) are due tomorrow. June 13 th or your student organization will be placed on unregistered status.

Please let me know a status update on these documents, or if you have any questions regarding the updates, and I can assist you.

Thank you in advance,
Laurynn

| Laurynn King | <image002.jpg> |
| :--- | :--- |
| she, her, hers | 157 Iowa Memorial Union |
| Iowa City, lowa 52242-1317 |  |

Notice: This UI Health Care e-mail (including attachments) is covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. $2510-2521$ and is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete or destroy all copies of the original message and attachments thereto. Email sent to or from UI Health Care may be retained as required by law or regulation. Thank you.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF IOWA EASTERN DIVISION

| BUSINESS LEADERS IN CHRIST, an, unincorporated association, | CASE NO. 3:17-CV-00080 |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| Plaintiff, |  |
|  |  |
| vs. |  |
|  |  |
| THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA; LYN | DEFENDANT, THE UNIVERSITY OF |
| REDINGTON, in her official capacity as | IOWA, SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL |
| Dean of Students and in her individual | ANSWERS TO FIRST SET OF |
| capacity; THOMAS R. BAKER, in his | INTERROGATORIES |
| official capacity as Assistant Dean of |  |
| Students and in his individual capacity; and |  |
| WILLIAM R. NELSON, in his official |  |
| capacity as Executive Director, Iowa |  |
| Memorial Union, and in his individual capacity, |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| Defendants. |  |
|  |  |

The Defendant, The University of Iowa, hereby submit its second supplemental answers to Plaintiff's First Set of Interrogatories.

THOMAS J. MILLER
Attorney General of Iowa
/s/GEORGE A. CARROLL
George A. Carroll
Assistant Attorney General
Hoover Building, Second Floor
1305 East Walnut Street
Des Moines, Iowa 50319
PHONE: (515) 281-8583
FAX: (515) 281-7219
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## INTERROGATORIES

1. Identify all persons who have, claim to have, or who you believe may have knowledge or information relating to any fact alleged in the pleadings in this action (including Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction) or concerning any fact underlying the subject matter of this action.

ANSWER:

- Andrew Kutcher - knowledge of the complaint, the process, and investigation.
- Marcus Miller - knowledge of the complaint, the process, investigation and outcome.
- Kristi Finger - knowledge of the complaint, the process, and investigation.
- Anita Cory - knowledge of the complaint, the process, and investigation.
- William Nelson - knowledge of the complaint, the process, investigation and outcome.
- Thomas Baker - knowledge of the complaint, the process, investigation and outcome.
- Constance Cervantes - knowledge of the complaint, the process and investigation.
- Lyn Redington - knowledge of the complaint, the process, investigation and outcome.
- Melissa Shivers - knowledge of the complaint, the process, investigation and outcome.
- Angela Ibrahim-Olin - knowledge of the complaint, the process, and investigation.
- Bruce Harreld - knowledge of the complaint, the process, investigation and outcome.
- Peter Matthes - knowledge of the complaint, the process, investigation and outcome.
- Eric Rossow - knowledge of the complaint, the process, and investigation.
- Stuart Stutzman - knowledge of the complaint, the process, and investigation.
- Kenneth Brown - knowledge of the complaint, the process, investigation and outcome.
- Tevin Robbins - knowledge of the complaint, the process, investigation and outcome.
- Jacob Simpson - knowledge of the complaint, the process, and investigation.
- Lilian Sanchez
- Paul Mintner - knowledge of the complaint, the process, and investigation.
- Angie Reams - knowledge of the complaint, the process, and investigation.
- Ellen Link - knowledge of the complaint, the process, and investigation.

2. Describe in detail the nature and substance of the knowledge that you believe the person(s) identified in response to Interrogatory No. 1 may have.

ANSWER:
See answer to Interrogatory No. 1.
3. Identify all persons whom Defendants have consulted concerning BLinC or this lawsuit and describe the nature of each such person's relationship with Defendants.

ANSWER:
See answer to Interrogatory No. 1.
4. Describe in detail the nature of any advice given or statements made to Defendants by the person(s) identified in response to Interrogatory No. 3.

## ANSWER:

Object as attorney/client privilege and attorney work product.
5. Describe all changes since made to the University of Iowa's Human Rights Policy (Operations Manual, Section II, Chapter 3.1), its Nondiscrimination Statement (Operations Manual, Section II, Chapter 6), and its Statement of Policy (Operations Manual, Section II, Chapter 1.2), including the date and substance of the changes.

## ANSWER:

Defendants are unable to respond to this interrogatory because it is unclear.

## Supplemental Answer on 7/13/2018.

1. Code of Fair Practice Statement of Policy: See the 1993 version (70.011b), which is exactly the same as it appears on the Op Manual site today.
2. Human Rights Policy: See the September 2014 and July 1, 2017 versions, including redlining of the section that was revised (II-3.5). Original 1993 HR policy can be found in September 1993 document (70.013).
3. Nondiscrimination Statement: See the January 1999, June 2014, December 2006, and May 2015 versions. Original 1993 policy can be found in the September 1993 document (70.016).

See documents numbered 4662-4668.
6. Identify all student organizations since 1997, including but not limited to fraternities and sororities, that have been refused registration, have been deregistered, or have otherwise been penalized or subjected to official corrective measures by the University of Iowa for any reasons, and identify the reasons for each and the policies invoked to justify or support the University's actions.

ANSWER:
Defendants object to the time frame, but provide the following response from January 1, 2008 to present.

- Futures Trading Academy - Refused registrations due to organizations purpose to provide a professional service.
- Thrive - Refused registrations due to organizations purpose to provide a professional service.
- Spoon University - Refused registration due to organizations affiliation with for profit business, and control of the selection of leadership not residing with UI students.
- University of Iowa Mobile Clinic - Refused registrations due to organizations purpose to provide a professional service.
- Vemma Brand Partners Club - Refused registration due to organization forming to promote a business
- Her Campus - Refused registration due to organization forming to promote a business
- Childreach International - Refused registration due to policy prohibiting Registered Student Organizations from traveling internationally
- TOM's University of Iowa Campus Club - Refused registration due to organization forming to promote a private business
- Apple Users - Refused registration due to organization forming to promote a business
- Undergraduates for Graduate School Advancement
- Big Hawks/Little Hawks - Refused registration due to undergraduate mentoring programs needing to be overseen by a university department
- Freerunning Club - Refused registration due to inherent risks associate with "parkour"
- Cigar Club - Refused registration due to smoking being prohibited in all UI buildings, so the university is not able to provide "specialized facility or location" requested by the organization
- Terra-Hawk - Refused registration due to organization being incorporated and university policy preventing the registration of corporations
- Students Today, Alumni Tomorrow - Refused registration due to Students Today, Alumni Tomorrow Ambassadors already existing as a registered student organization
- Helping Hawks - Refused registration due to need for departmental oversight.
- Student Trade Organization - registration refused due to concerns regarding items being sold, theft at event and improper disposal of materials.
- Global Bridges - Refused registration due to policy prohibiting Registered Student Organizations from traveling internationally
- Mobile Clinic - Refused registration due to organizations purpose to provide a professional service
- UI Investors Club - Refused registration due to organizations purpose to provide a professional service
- University of Iowa International Volunteers - Refused registration due to policy prohibiting Registered Student Organizations from traveling internationally
- Her Campus - Refused registration due to policy prohibiting Registered Student Organizations from promoting private businesses
- Reach Out, Care, Know -Refused registration due to organizations purpose to provide a professional service
- UI Floor Hockey Club - Refused registration due to risk management concerns related to proposed unstructured play by organization
- Student Trade Organization
- Volunteers Around the World - University of Iowa Chapter - Refused registration due to policy prohibiting Registered Student Organizations from traveling internationally and policy prohibiting Registered Student Organizations from collecting medical supplies to send abroad.
- University of Iowa Gaming Group - Refused registration due to purpose and mission of organization already being filled by a Registered Student Organization
- Hawkeye Gymnastics Club - Refused registration due to lack of facility space to support the purpose and mission of the organization, lack of funding by sport clubs to support the functions of the organization, and inherent risk involved with gymnastics activities
- University of Iowa Biodiesel - refused registration due lack of appropriate facility space available, and safety concerns due to the operation of industrial machinery and mixing of dangerous chemicals
- University of Iowa Documentary Film Society - Refused registration due to no student representative from the organization attending the Student Organization Review Committee meeting to answer questions of committee members

De-registered

- Sky Diving Club - Organization was de-registered due to lack of documentation to meet risk management need. See attached supplement.

Supplemental Response 6/12/2018
See documents numbered 2859-2878
7. Describe the reasons for the University of Iowa's actions with regard to each of the student organizations listed in response to Interrogatory No. 6. ANSWER:

See answers to Interrogatory No. 6.
8. Identify all investigations or reviews by Defendants since 1997 concerning actual or alleged violations of the University of Iowa's Human Rights Policy or Nondiscrimination Statement by any student organization, including but not limited to registered student organizations, fraternities, sororities, sports clubs, and sports teams

## ANSWER:

Defendants object to the time frame, but provide the following response from January 1, 2008 to present.
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9. Identify all University of Iowa programs, opportunities, or events existing at any time since 1997 (including but not limited to scholarships, awards, events, admission policies, and educational programs) that employ preference for or against students with regard to their race, creed, color, religion, national origin, age, sex, pregnancy, disability, genetic information, status as a U.S. veteran, service in the U.S. military, sexual orientation, gender identity, political affiliation, or associational preferences.

## ANSWER:

Defendants object to this interrogatory because it is overly broad, burdensome and not likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Notwithstanding this objection, the University of Iowa provides the following response.

1. Advantage Iowa Award: For incoming first-year students who are U.S. citizens or permanent residents and who are from historically underrepresented populations (African American, Hispanic, Native American, Pacific Islander, Multiracial) at the University of Iowa; or who have participated in a federally funded Upward Bound program. A recruitment award with the sole purpose of attracting talented diverse students to UI. The Center for Diversity and Enrichment (CDE) manages the award. It is a merit scholarship so requires a specific GPA and ACT score to qualify. Incoming students who identify as Black/African American, Native American, Hispanic/Latino, Pacific Islander, or first generation are eligible to receive it. Since the point of this award is to recruit diversity to UI, if the student does not meet the eligibility based on identity, they won't be considered for it.
2. Iowa First Nations (IFN): A summer program directed to high school students with Native American identity. It is for students with Native American ancestry so if they are not of Native American ancestry, they would not qualify to take part. The program is directed towards Meskwaki tribe specifically since Admissions and the UI are in partnership with them in relation to recruitment.
3. TRIO Student Support Services: A federally funded grant program with the specific purpose of providing academic, personal, and financial support to first generation, low income, and disabled college students. Services include tutoring, taking specific TRIO courses each year, GRE prep support, one on one coaching, and grant aid.
4. Military and Veteran Student Services: A program under CDE with the sole purpose of providing academic and personal support to student veterans and their dependents including transition support and career services. MVSS services are geared solely towards vets and dependents. These services include tutoring, University of Iowa Veterans Association support, and other related services and activities.
5. Iowa Edge: A summer orientation program for incoming UI students who identify as first generation or as a student of color (all marginalized racial identities including Asian).
6. Hawks and Eyas: A peer mentoring program for CDE eligible students (i.e.. first generation students and students from marginalized backgrounds including LGBTQIA)
7. CDE Graduation: An annual graduation ceremony where CDE students and graduates are recognized for their accomplishments. They receive medallions if they are graduating and special awards and recognitions if nominated by a staff member or faculty member for their accomplishment. CDE eligible students are the focus, i.e. racial/ethnic minorities, first generation students, low income students, military affiliated students, and individuals who identity as LGBTQIA. The campus community is invited each year.
8. CDE partners with Admissions on various minority recruiting trips and endeavors including helping to host campus tours for "special groups", i.e. groups interested in diversity services and traveling out of state for recruiting purposes.
9. Week of Welcome: Held annually the first week of classes, it's a week of activities (ice cream social, military day, carnival day, etc.) hosted by the CDE for CDE eligible students.
10.List all student organizations, including but not limited to fraternities, sororities, sports clubs, and sports teams recognized or sponsored by the University of Iowa at any time since 1997, that have employed criteria for the selection of leadership positions, membership, or participation involving a preference for or against students with regard to their race, creed, color, religion, national origin, age, sex, pregnancy, disability, genetic information, status as a U.S. veteran, service in the U.S. military, sexual orientation, gender identity, political affiliation, or associational preferences.

ANSWER:
Defendants object to the time frame, but provide the following response from January 1, 2008 to present. See documents produced.
11. Identify all sources of any funds, including any student fees, that are made available by the University of Iowa for use by registered student organizations or that are otherwise used to support registered student organizations. ANSWER:

University of Iowa Student Government funding - Activity Fee Graduate and Professional Student Government funding - Activity Fee Center for Student Involvement and Leadership Grant funding Associated Residence Halls funding
12. Identify any communications by Defendants concerning BLinC or this lawsuit, including but not limited to any internal meetings, communications with the Board of Regents, or private conversations concerning BLinC or this lawsuit. ANSWER:

See documents produced.
13. Identify all individuals who played a role in the decision to deregister BLinC and describe their role and their arguments for or against deregistration. ANSWER:

Defendants object to this interrogatory to the extent that it asks for argument. The fact based answer is as follows:

William Nelson

Lyn Redington

See documents produced.
14.Identify any and all compelling interests that the University of Iowa has in preventing religious student groups from selecting leaders who embrace and will agree to follow their religious mission and teachings.

## ANSWER:

Defendants object to this interrogatory because it is asking for legal conclusions and argument. Notwithstanding this objection see Title VII, Title IX, Chapter 216 Iowa Code, and the $14^{\text {th }}$ Amendment to the United States Constitution.
15. Identify any and all sanctions less severe than deregistration that the University of Iowa considered imposing against BLinC and why the University decided not to impose them.

ANSWER:
See documents produced.
16. Explain why the University of Iowa believes that BLinC's statement of faith is discriminatory on its face.

## ANSWER:

Defendants object to the form of this Interrogatory as it calls for legal conclusion. Notwithstanding this objection, the University of Iowa seeks to enforce its rights under the U.S. Constitution, the Iowa Constitution, Federal and State law.
17. Identify how the University of Iowa believes that BLinC must change its leadership selection process to comply with the University's Human Rights Policy and Nondiscrimination Statement.

## ANSWER:

The non-discrimination policy speaks for itself. The University is simply seeking to enforce a content neutral policy.
18. Detail any changes to the University of Iowa's enforcement of its Human Rights Policy or Nondiscrimination Statement since January 23, 2018.

ANSWER:
The Center for Student Involvement and Leadership (CSIL) has revoked the ability for Registered Student Organizations (RSO) to upload governing documents into their OrgSync portal. This action is now limited to staff. Organizations must submit governing documents to CSIL who will review for requirements and approve. CSIL staff will then upload governing documents to an RSO's portal once they have been approved.
19. Identify any communications the University of Iowa has had with any students or any registered student organizations in response to the Court's order dated January 23, 2018.

ANSWER:
The UI communicated with student leaders within BLinC regarding their ability to participate in the Student Organization Fair and the continued use of their locker located within the Tippie College of Business.

CSIL has communicated with numerous student organizations that did not have the required Human Rights Clause or financial statement in their governing documents. The communication was sent via email on April 20, 2018.

## Supplemental Answer on 7/13/2018.

See documents in response to Request for Production Nos. 9 and 10.
20. Explain why the Korean American Student Association and Feminist Union are no longer listed on the University of Iowa's OrgSync website. ANSWER:

Both the Korean Student Organization and the Feminist Union were deregistered for failing to re-register their organization by the registration deadline. Neither Korean American Student Association nor the Feminist Union have taken steps to renew their organization outside of the reregistration period via the Reactivation Process. Organization can re-register outside of the re-registration period by filling out the Organization Reactivation form. The responses to the form are approved by CSIL staff. Approval is based on the organizations perceived ability to re-register within re-registration period in the future.
21. Identify all persons who provided any information used, or any documents reviewed or referenced, in answering these interrogatories.

ANSWER:

Andrew Kutcher

Anita Cory
William Nelson
Kristi Finger
Eric Rossow
Thomas Baker

