

4-26-1995

CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 04/26/1995

Sue Tirotta

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes>

Recommended Citation

Tirotta, Sue, "CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 04/26/1995" (1995). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 611.
<http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes/611>

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

Presiding Officer: Sidney Nesselroad
Recording Secretary: Susan Tirota

Meeting was called to order at 3:10 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Senators: All Senators or their Alternates were present except Chambers, Christie, Nott, Starbuck and Weyandt.
Visitors: Michelle Kidwell, Anne Bulliung, Robert Jacobs, Nancy Howard, Barbara Radke, Carolyn Wells, Bill Swain, and Greg Alarid.

CHANGES TO AGENDA

None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

***MOTION NO. 3004** Ken Gamon moved and Carolyn Thomas seconded a motion to approve the minutes of the April 5, 1995, Faculty Senate meeting with the following correction: page 1, Reports, Chair, MOTION NO. 3002: change Charles Rubin, English, to read Charles Rubin, Geology. Motion passed.

COMMUNICATIONS

-3/28/95 letter from Robert Jacobs, Chair-Ad Hoc Committee on Consensual Relationships; referred to Executive Committee (see report below).

REPORTS

1. CHAIR

PROPOSED GUIDELINE CHANGES - DISTINGUISHED PROFESSOR AWARDS

Eric Roth (Music), 1995 Chair of the Distinguished Professor Screening Committee, reported that the Committee reviewed the current Distinguished Professor guidelines [complete text of guidelines available on \$GOCAT, menu path 7>5>6>1] and recommended several changes to improve the process and encourage greater recognition of recipients. He noted that Provost Thomas Moore approved the proposed changes on April 12, 1995:

***MOTION NO. 3005** Eric Roth moved and Ken Gamon seconded a motion to change deadline dates: Letters of nomination due December 1 or, if this date falls on a weekend, the first school day thereafter [rather than December 15], and supporting files due by February 1 or, if this date falls on a weekend, the first school day thereafter [rather than February 15]. Motion passed.

***MOTION NO. 3006** Eric Roth moved and Ken Gamon seconded a motion to underline for emphasis on notice flyer: "Review the guidelines carefully in order to choose the most suitable category for your candidate". Motion passed.

***MOTION NO. 3007** Eric Roth moved and Ken Gamon seconded a motion to revise item #4, paragraph 3, of the Distinguished Professor-Teaching guidelines to read: "Student evaluations of instruction, arranged chronologically, that reflect the full range of the teaching assignment. [In the past, some nominees have included all evaluations from all classes taught at CWU.]" Motion passed.

***MOTION NO. 3008** Eric Roth moved and Steve Olson seconded a motion to add to item #4, Distinguished Professor-Teaching, a fourth paragraph to read: "Representative class syllabi." Motion passed.

***MOTION No. 3009** Eric Roth moved and James Sahlstrand seconded a motion to add to Item #4, Distinguished Professor-Teaching, a fifth paragraph to read: "If a video tape is included in the file, please limit the length to 15 minutes." Motion passed.

1. CHAIR, continued

Eric Roth noted that, as a result of the above approved changes, the numbering will be revised so that item #6, Distinguished Professor-Teaching, is an indented paragraph under Item #5, and Item #7 is renumbered as #6.

-Chair Nesselroad reported that the Faculty Senate Office has distributed the Faculty Opinion Survey of Administrators. The deadline for return of the survey is 5:00 p.m., Wednesday, May 10, 1995.

-The President has requested that the Faculty Senate and the Affirmative Action Office, both of which report under the President's area, submit formal strategic planning documents. Chair Nesselroad reported that he intends to submit goals, objectives and actions that will strengthen shared governance at C.W.U., reestablish faith in the Faculty Senate, educate faculty regarding lines of communication and reportage, and reorganize the Senate standing committees to be more effective as well as integrated into the university-wide strategic planning process. The Chair reported that the Senate's Academic Affairs Committee is now working toward reorganization, and the C.W.U. Faculty Senate has become involved with the Western States Association of Faculty Governance.

-Deans' Council has been involved in developing an academic budget proposal based on priority lists submitted by the Deans. The Deans participated in a "from the bottom up" process and ordered their priorities based on the expressed needs of individual faculty through their department chairs. Chair Nesselroad explained that, despite the Senate's approval of Budget Committee MOTION NO. 3003 on April 5, 1995, recommending increases in faculty FTE positions, few of the Deans' requests were for increased faculty numbers, and academic priorities have centered around support for and enhancement of existing services.

-Senator Beverly Heckart commented that the Faculty Senate, unlike the Academic Chairs' Organization and other groups, was not scheduled on the interview itinerary for the candidates for Dean of Graduate Studies, and she recommended that the Senate be routinely included in such processes in the future.

2. PRESIDENT

President Nelson reported that the Senate had approved the supplemental budget request, which includes a \$650,000 request for the C.W.U. Library. It is expected that the House will consider the supplemental budget in the very near future.

President Ivory Nelson distributed copies of his 4/24/95 letter to Nita Rinehart, Chair-Senate Ways and Means Committee, and a 4/17/95 letter from Terry Teale, Executive Director-Council of Presidents, to all Budget Conferees. Both letters expressed clear preference for the Senate version of the state biennial budget. President Nelson also distributed a comparison of House and Senate higher education tuition proposals based on ESSB 5325. He reported that in-state students currently pay about 31.5% of the cost of their higher education, and proposed increases in tuition have not been accompanied by companion legislation for additional student financial aid. Although students have been active this year in promoting their interests in Olympia, tax cuts have been proposed for property owners and business but none have been considered for students. The President explained that this is a critical year for establishing baseline budgets under Initiative #601.

3. CENTRAL INVESTMENT FUND (CIF)

Campus Chair of this year's CIF fund drive Bill Swain (Director, Admissions and Academic Advising Services) reported that this year's campaign will begin in mid-May. CIF hopes to increase its scholarship level to high quality students, and also hopes to devote 10% of monies collected to an endowment for future scholarship programs. Mr. Swain asked that the Faculty Senate endorse the 1995 CIF campaign and presented the text of a suggested motion to do so:

11. AD HOC COMMITTEE ON CONSENSUAL RELATIONSHIPS, continued

1. The party subject to the conflict of interest is to be relieved immediately of all evaluative processes involving the other party to the relationship, and alternative objective evaluation procedures are to be established.
2. If the situation does not allow the complete execution of step 1 above (e. g., there is no one other than the person subject to conflict of interest qualified to evaluate the other person in the relationship,) then a plan of evaluation involving review of evaluations by a superior must be agreed to by both parties in the relationship.
3. In either case above, a written report describing the nature of the conflict of interest and the means devised to remedy it must be prepared. The report is to be kept in a separate file -- i.e., not in the normal personnel files -- and is to be destroyed six months after the supervisory or evaluative functions of the staff member would normally have ended.

In cases of conflict of interest by reason of consensual relationships, mere failure on the part of the party subject to conflict of interest may result in reprimand (Faculty Code, section 10.20.B.) Failure to comply with provisions as outlined in steps 1 - 3 above may result in other disciplinary actions as defined in Section 10.12 of the Faculty Code.

In addition to the above, the following should be noted: Amorous relationships between faculty and students which occur outside the instructional or supervisory context may also lead to difficulties. Such personal relationships still involve the danger that the teacher may unexpectedly be placed in a position of responsibility for the other person's instruction, evaluation or recommendation. In addition, others may speculate that an instructional or advisory relationship may exist even when there is none, thus giving rise to assumptions of inequitable academic advantage for the student involved. This perception -- even if false -- damages the educational goals of the University.

[INFORMATION ITEM: The Ad Hoc Committee on Consensual Relationships also recommends the following additions to the Sexual Harassment Policy [see Section 2-2.2.12 of the University Policies Manual for complete policy]:

Amorous relationships between faculty members and students, between supervisors and subordinates, and between peers may involve sexual harassment in the following instances:

- i. when the powers exercised by faculty in evaluating students' work, awarding students' grades and providing recommendations constrain the student's freedom to choose whether to enter into or end a romantic or sexual relationships with a faculty member.
- ii. when subordinates may not feel free to reject or end a romantic or sexual relationship with a supervisor, or
- iii. when peers may not feel free to reject or end a romantic or sexual relationship because of the involvement of one in decisions affecting the professional status of the other.]

* * * * *

Chair Nesselroad explained that President Nelson charged the Faculty Senate on December 8, 1994, to "research and recommend language which can be incorporated into an institutional policy regarding personal relationships and conflict of interest, especially as they relate to faculty/student dating." The Senate Executive Committee reviewed the Ad Hoc Committee's original draft and has made few substantive changes, with the exception of the addition of #2 above, which has been added for discussion purposes. President Nelson reported that he distributed copies of the draft to the Association of Administrators and the Employee Council (c/o the Director of Personnel Services).

Robert Jacobs reported that it was the Ad Hoc Committee's intention to deal with consensual relationships outside the realm of the existing sexual harassment policy. The proposed policy is based on the

11. AD HOC COMMITTEE ON CONSENSUAL RELATIONSHIPS, continued

Committee's extensive research of other university's accepted policies and attempts to free faculty members from the potential conflict of interest that necessarily arises out of faculty/student consensual relationships. He added that the Committee would not recommend the retention in the policy #2 (above) because of the unlikelihood of such an occasion arising.

Senators questioned whether Assistant Attorney General Teresa Kulik had been consulted regarding the legality of the proposed policy and the rights of privacy and confidentiality of those involved in consensual relationship reporting. Code Committee Chair Beverly Heckart and Senator Charles McGehee reported that complete confidentiality cannot be assured, as the law allows the opening of almost any file introduced into the public domain. Dr. Heckart recommended that #3 be revised to abide by the existing statute of limitations, which requires retention of reports for three years rather than the proposed six month period.

Senators and visitors commented that the proposed policy is very vague concerning what constitutes the inception of an "amorous, romantic or sexual relationship;" #2 potentially allows faculty to continue to maintain some authority over the other party in the relationship; it is unclear who is responsible for registering and reporting the relationship; student's may feel their privacy is compromised by the reporting requirement; faculty may be judged and evaluated as unprofessional by their peers if they report a consensual relationship with a student.

Robert Jacobs stated that the Committee attempted to present a policy that would not drive consensual relationships underground, but it recognized the impossibility of dealing with all possible contingencies. Chair Nesselroad cautioned that although there is a difference between sexual harassment and a consensual relationship, when one person has authority over another, conflict of interest already exists. Code Committee Chair Heckart stated that this policy would not necessarily protect the university from lawsuits in the case of a consensual relationship gone sour, and faculty must face the fact that they ultimately risk reprimand, censure, suspension or dismissal from their job if a relationship goes wrong. Affirmative Action Director Nancy Howard stated that her office often receives requests from new faculty members concerning the university's policy on faculty dating students, and faculty apparently want guidance in this area and need to know the university community's expectations. Senator Jim Hawkins suggested that a policy on consensual relationships become part of a more complete and inclusive code of professional ethical behavior. President Nelson commented that the university remains liable in a cases of sexual harassment allegations regardless of whether or not the university knows such harassment is occurring.

Senator Deborah Medlar introduced the following suggested amendment to the policy wording: "Faculty shall not establish romantic, amorous or sexual relationships with students who are currently enrolled in their classes or on whose graduate committees they sit. Faculty shall wait until the end of the quarter to begin romantic, amorous or sexual relations with such students." RATIONALE: 1) A student is placed in a very awkward position when a professor in a class in which he or she is enrolled asks him or her out, or otherwise attempts to initiate a relationship. No student should be put in a position of having to say "yes" to a current professor or risk discomfort after rejecting the professor's advances. 2) A faculty member can wait for 10 weeks to ask a student out. The inconvenience of waiting does not justify putting the student in such an awkward position. 3) The proposed draft does not require faculty to be relieved of any valuative duties if a faculty member attempts to establish a romantic, amorous or sexual relationship with a student who rejects the faculty member's advances. If the student feels uncomfortable with the faculty member after the rejection, he or she has no remedy.

Senator Eric Roth commented that in many departments such as Music, Theatre Arts, and Art, a faculty member often has a one-to-one teaching relationship with a student throughout their entire four-year course of study.

President Nelson commented that he liked the draft policy and would be willing to extend his original June 1995 deadline on inception of a consensual relationships policy if the Senate required more time for discussion. In response to questions, Code Committee Chair Heckart stated that a consensual relationships policy would be referenced in the Faculty Code with other university internal policies [see Faculty Code section 2.30, General Responsibilities of Faculty], but should be placed in its entirety in the University Policies Manual. A consensual relationships policy statement will be presented to the Senate for vote on May 17, 1995.

3. CENTRAL INVESTMENT FUND, continued

***MOTION NO. 3010** Beverly Heckart moved and Ken Gamon seconded a motion that the Faculty Senate endorse the 1995 Central Investment Fund Campaign, as follows:

Endorsement

Whereas, the faculty of Central Washington University work hard to provide the best educational environment for their student body; and

Whereas, students of character and leadership help foster a strong academic environment to which Central faculty are so committed; and

Whereas, the Central Investment Fund Scholarship has been instrumental to bringing 502 leadership merit students to our campus since 1977; and

Whereas, the faculty of Central Washington University have generously committed their personal resources in support of the Central Investment Fund Scholarships;

Now, therefore, we the Faculty Senate of Central Washington University do hereby endorse the 1995 Central Investment Fund Campaign on campus, and encourage all faculty of Central Washington University to affirm their commitment to students through their generous support of the Central Investment Fund Scholarship Program.

Sidney Nesselroad, Chair, C.W.U. Faculty Senate (signed)
Motion passed.

Dated: April 26, 1995

4. COUNCIL OF FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES

CFR member Ken Gamon reminded Senators of the Draft CFR Resolution presented to it for discussion on April 5, 1995:

DRAFT RESOLUTION:

WHEREAS the CFR has voted to form a committee whose purpose it will be to:

1. Prepare and recommend an organization more adequate to protect the interests and to conduct the business of the CFR.
2. Generate contributed funds from concerned faculty persons and to propose ways to responsibly protect, preserve and expend such funds;

NOW, THEREFORE, we the Faculty Senate of Central Washington University resolve to:

- a. Appoint a representative to the working committee of the CFR.
- b. Take vigorous steps to inform faculty constituents of these matters.
- c. Encourage and develop means whereby faculty members may pledge to contribute 2-4 dollars per pay period, which amount is to be deducted by the payroll office and deposited in an appropriate CFR account.
- d. Determine ways to generate a modest fund sufficient to defer expenses of the working committee chair during the organizational period.

The CFR pledges to provide regular reports of its activities and of the use of contributed funds. Every effort will be made to ensure that necessary organizational work will be completed by the beginning of the fall quarter, 1996.

Senator Gamon reported that the CFR met on April 14, 1995, and representatives from other universities also expressed concerns about the draft resolution, and the proposal is expected to be the primary topic of the May CFR meeting.

***MOTION NO. 3011** Dieter Romboy moved and Eric Roth seconded a motion to table consideration of the CFR Draft Resolution until revised guidelines are presented. Motion passed.

5. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

No report

6. BUDGET COMMITTEE

***MOTION NO. 3012** Ken Gamon moved the Budget Committee recommendation that the Faculty Senate request that the C.W.U. Administration define all categories of FTE [full time equivalent] and associated dollar amounts to allow accurate and understandable comparisons and use these figures consistently in budget discussions. Furthermore, any differences between these internal budget numbers and the numbers submitted to outside agencies should be reconciled and explained to the faculty.

President Ivory Nelson commented that he would also like to see standardization of FTE definitions, but reporting requirements of various agencies make this impossible. Senators spoke in favor of the need to clarify reported information.

MOTION NO. 3012 passed.

7. CODE COMMITTEE

Code Committee chair Beverly Heckart reported that the Committee plans to bring proposed Faculty Code changes before the Senate on May 31, 1995.

8. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

Curriculum Committee member Steve Olson reported that the Curriculum Planning and Procedures Guide is now available on GOCAT [menu path: \$GOCAT>7>6>2].

9. PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

No report

10. PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

No report

11. AD HOC COMMITTEE ON CONSENSUAL RELATIONSHIPS

[Members: Robert Jacobs, Political Science [CLAS]; Deborah Medlar, Accounting (SBE); Jim Ponzetti, Home Economics (CPS); Nancy Howard, Affirmative Action; Anne Bulliung, Graduate Student]

Ad Hoc Committee Chair Robert Jacobs presented the following draft policy on consensual relations for discussion:

***** DRAFT - FOR DISCUSSION ONLY*******Faculty Policy on Consensual Relations**

Consensual relationships that are of concern to the faculty of Central Washington University are those amorous, romantic, or sexual relationships to which both parties appear to have consented but where one party has a professional responsibility to the other as teacher, advisor, supervisor or evaluator. Those with professional authority must neither abuse nor seem to abuse the power with which they are entrusted.

Faculty of the University are advised that any romantic relationship with their students or with other faculty or employees over whom they have authority may make them liable to formal disciplinary action under the University sexual harassment policy. Even when both parties have consented at the outset to the development of such a relationship, it is the person in a position of authority who, by virtue of his or her special responsibility, will be held accountable for unprofessional behavior should a complaint arise.

For this reason faculty should not establish romantic, amorous or sexual relationships with those over whom they have authority. Should such a relationship already exist or come into existence notwithstanding this policy, a conflict of interest exists. In any case in which such a conflict of interest exists or comes into existence, the faculty member who has authority over the other person in the relationship is required to report the matter immediately to his or her own supervisor. That supervisor will then take the following actions:

OLD BUSINESS

-Faculty Senate Chair-elect reminded those faculty members who have expressed concern about the confidentiality of their replies to the Faculty Opinion Survey of Administrators that they may enclose their return envelope in a second mailing envelope or hand-carry their reply directly to the Faculty Senate Office in Barge Hall 409.

-Senators questioned the status of the Faculty Senate's recommendation to the Board of Trustees concerning collective bargaining. Chair Nesselroad reported that Board Chair Ron Dotzauer plans to invite Faculty Senate representatives to the Board retreat in the Fall to discuss issues related to faculty/administrator/Board communication. It was reported that Eastern Washington University has ratified its collective bargaining contract, and a copy of the contract will be put on file in the C.W.U. Faculty Senate Office for review by interested parties. President Nelson stated that he had reviewed the E.W.U. contract and found it to be very similar to C.W.U.'s current Faculty Code of Personnel Policy and Procedure.

NEW BUSINESS

None

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

***** NEXT REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING: May 17, 1995 *****

FACULTY SENATE REGULAR MEETING
3:10 p.m., Wednesday, April 26, 1995
SUB 204-205

- I. ROLL CALL**
- II. CHANGES TO AGENDA**
- III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: April 5, 1995**
- IV. COMMUNICATIONS**
 - 3/28/95 letter from Robert Jacobs, Chair-Ad Hoc Committee on Consensual Relationships; referred to Executive Committee.
- V. REPORTS**
 - 1. CHAIR**
 - MOTION: Changes to Distinguished Professor Awards Guidelines [attached]
 - 2. PRESIDENT**
 - 3. CENTRAL INVESTMENT FUND (CIF)**
 - 4. COUNCIL OF FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES - Ken Gamon**
 - Resolution on CFR funding [attached]
 - 5. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE (Charles McGehee, Chair)**
 - 6. BUDGET COMMITTEE (Don Cocheba, Chair)**
 - Motion: Definition of FTE [attached]
 - 7. CODE COMMITTEE (Beverly Heckart, Chair)**
 - 8. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE (Clara Baker, Chair)**
 - 9. PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (Rex Wirth, Chair)**
 - 10. PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE (Bobby Cummings, Chair)**
 - 11. AD HOC COMMITTEE ON CONSENSUAL RELATIONSHIPS [Bob Jacobs, Chair]**
 - Draft Guidelines on Consensual Relations [attached]
- VI. OLD BUSINESS**
- VII. NEW BUSINESS**
- VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

***** NEXT REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING: May 17, 1995 *****

CHAIR

GUIDELINES - DISTINGUISHED PROFESSOR OF THE UNIVERSITY

[complete guidelines available on \$GOCAT, menu path 7>5>6>1]

MOTION: The 1995-96 Distinguished Professor Screening Committee recommends the following changes to the Procedural Guidelines for Distinguished Professor of Teaching [accepted 4/12/95 by the Provost/VP for Academic Affairs]:

- 1) Change deadline dates: Letters of nomination due December 1 [rather than December 15], and supporting files due by February 1 [rather than February 15].
- 2) Underline for emphasis on notice flyer: "Review the guidelines carefully in order to choose the most suitable category for your candidate"
- 3) Revise Item #4, paragraph 3 to read: "Student evaluations of instruction, arranged chronologically, that reflect the full range of the teaching assignment." [Rationale: In the past, some nominees have included all evaluations from all classes taught at CWU.]
- 4) Add to Item #4 a fourth paragraph to read: "Representative class syllabi."
- 5) Add to Item #4 a fifth paragraph to read: "If a video tape is included in the file, please limit the length to 15 minutes."
- 6) Revise the numbering so that Item #6 is an indented paragraph under Item #5, and Item #7 is renumbered as #6.

DISTINGUISHED PROFESSOR -- TEACHING

Teaching excellence shall be determined by a demonstrated breadth and depth of knowledge; clarity in methodology and organization of materials, and effective methods of presentation; continued scholarship and an integration of this into the course work; and assistance to students in understanding the value and relevance of the subject matter and course materials, both within the discipline and in a broader academic context.

The nominee's notebook should contain the following items organized in the following order:

1. Letter of nomination bearing the date stamp of the Faculty Senate office verifying submission by December 15.
2. Vitae of nominee. The vitae should verify that the nominee is a full-time member of the CWU faculty and has a minimum of six years' full-time service at CWU. The vitae must bear the date stamp of the Faculty Senate office verifying submission of the notebook by February 15.
3. Personal statement by nominee of philosophy, goals and achievements in the area of teaching.
4. Evidence of teaching skills in the area of communication and methodology, exemplified in the clarity of organization and presentation of course materials and the challenge to and motivation of students; to be corroborated by:
 - Letters of recommendation, support or corroboration from colleagues, associates, students or relevant others.
 - ~~Summaries of s~~Student evaluations of instruction, arranged chronologically, that reflect the full range of the teaching assignment.
 - Representative class syllabi.
 - If a video tape is included in the file, please limit the length to 15 minutes.
5. Evidence of continued scholarship as demonstrated by:
- ~~6.~~ Participation in professional activities such as conferences, symposia, colloquia, exhibitions; membership in professional associations; publication in professional journals; continuing education in one's field or related fields; efforts in the development of new courses to broaden and update the university curriculum or other relevant evidence of continued scholarship.
- ~~7.6.~~ Evidence of extent of participation in student advisement.

COUNCIL OF FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES (CFR)

RESOLUTION [presented for discussion at 4/5/95 Faculty Senate meeting]:

WHEREAS the CFR has voted to form a committee whose purpose it will be to:

1. Prepare and recommend an organization more adequate to protect the interests and to conduct the business of the CFR.
2. Generate contributed funds from concerned faculty persons and to propose ways to responsibly protect, preserve and expend such funds;

NOW, THEREFORE, we the Faculty Senate of Central Washington University resolve to:

- a. Appoint a representative to the working committee of the CFR.
- b. Take vigorous steps to inform faculty constituents of these matters.
- c. Encourage and develop means whereby faculty members may pledge to contribute 2-4 dollars per pay period, which amount is to be deducted by the payroll office and deposited in an appropriate CFR account.
- d. Determine ways to generate a modest fund sufficient to defer expenses of the working committee chair during the organizational period.

The CFR pledges to provide regular reports of its activities and of the use of contributed funds. Every effort will be made to ensure that necessary organizational work will be completed by the beginning of the fall quarter, 1996.

* * * * *

BUDGET COMMITTEE

The Faculty Senate Budget Committee recommends:

MOTION: The Faculty Senate requests that the C.W.U. Administration define all categories of FTE [full time equivalent] and associated dollar amounts to allow accurate and understandable comparisons and use these figures consistently in budget discussions. Furthermore, any differences between these internal budget numbers and the numbers submitted to outside agencies should be reconciled and explained to the faculty.

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON CONSENSUAL RELATIONSHIPS [Bob Jacobs, Political Science - CHAIR (CLAS); Deborah Medlar, Accounting (SBE); Jim Ponzetti, Home Economics (CPS); Nancy Howard, Affirmative Action; Anne Bulliung, Graduate Student]

***** DRAFT - FOR DISCUSSION ONLY*** Faculty Policy on Consensual Relations**

Consensual relationships that are of concern to the faculty of Central Washington University are those amorous, romantic, or sexual relationships to which both parties appear to have consented but where one party has a professional responsibility to the other as teacher, advisor, supervisor or evaluator. Those with professional authority must neither abuse nor seem to abuse the power with which they are entrusted.

Faculty of the University are advised that any romantic relationship with their students or with other faculty or employees over whom they have authority may make them liable to formal disciplinary action under the University sexual harassment policy. Even when both parties have consented at the outset to the development of such a relationship, it is the person in a position of authority who, by virtue of his or her special responsibility, will be held accountable for unprofessional behavior should a complaint arise.

For this reason faculty should not establish romantic, amorous or sexual relationships with those over whom they have authority. Should such a relationship already exist or come into existence notwithstanding this policy, a conflict of interest exists. In any case in which such a conflict of interest exists or comes into existence, the faculty member who has authority over the other person in the relationship is required to report the matter immediately to his or her own supervisor. That supervisor will then take the following actions:

1. The party subject to the conflict of interest is to be relieved immediately of all evaluative processes involving the other party to the relationship, and alternative objective evaluation procedures are to be established.
2. If the situation does not allow the complete execution of step 1 above (e. g., there is no one other than the person subject to conflict of interest qualified to evaluate the other person in the relationship,) then a plan of evaluation involving review of evaluations by a superior must be agreed to by both parties in the relationship.
3. In either case above, a written report describing the nature of the conflict of interest and the means devised to remedy it must be prepared. The report is to be kept in a separate file -- i.e., not in the normal personnel files -- and is to be destroyed six months after the supervisory or evaluative functions of the staff member would normally have ended.

In cases of conflict of interest by reason of consensual relationships, mere failure on the part of the party subject to conflict of interest may result in reprimand (Faculty Code, section 10.20.B.) Failure to comply with provisions as outlined in steps 1 - 3 above may result in other disciplinary actions as defined in Section 10.12 of the Faculty Code.

In addition to the above, the following should be noted: Amorous relationships between faculty and students which occur outside the instructional or supervisory context may also lead to difficulties. Such personal relationships still involve the danger that the teacher may unexpectedly be placed in a position of responsibility for the other person's instruction, evaluation or recommendation. In addition, others may speculate that an instructional or advisory relationship may exist even when there is none, thus giving rise to assumptions of inequitable academic advantage for the student involved. This perception -- even if false -- damages the educational goals of the University.

INFORMATION ITEM: The Ad Hoc Committee on Consensual Relationships also recommends the following additions to the Sexual Harassment Policy [see Section 2-2.2.12 of the University Policies Manual for complete policy]:

Amorous relationships between faculty members and students, between supervisors and subordinates, and between peers may involve sexual harassment in the following instances:

- i. when the powers exercised by faculty in evaluating students' work, awarding students' grades and providing recommendations constrain the student's freedom to choose whether to enter into or end a romantic or sexual relationships with a faculty member.
- ii. when subordinates may not feel free to reject or end a romantic or sexual relationship with a supervisor; or
- iii. when peers may not feel free to reject or end a romantic or sexual relationship because of the involvement of one in decisions affecting the professional status of the other.

ROLL CALL 1994-95

- Walter ARLT
- Linda BEATH
- Minerva CAPLES
- Robert CARBAUGH
- Matt CHAMBERS
- Shawn CHRISTIE
- Bobby CUMMINGS
- Terry DeVIETTI
- Susan DONAHOE
- Barry DONAHUE
- Robert FORDAN
- Ken GAMON
- Michael GLEASON
- Jim HAWKINS
- Webster HOOD
- Walter KAMINSKI
- Charles MCGEHEE
- Deborah MEDLAR
- Robert MYERS
- Ivory NELSON
- Connie NOTT
- Sidney NESSELROAD
- Vince NETHERY
- Steve OLSON
- Rob PERKINS
- Dan RAMSDELL
- Dieter ROMBOY
- James ROBERTS
- Sharon ROSELL
- Eric ROTH
- Charles RUBIN
- James SAHLSTRAND
- Carolyn SCHACTLER
- Hugh SPALL
- Kristan STARBUCK
- Morris UEBELACKER
- Lisa WEYANDT [pron. Y'-ANT]
- Rex WIRTH
- Thomas YEH

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: April 26, 1995

- Stephen JEFFERIES
- Dan FENNERTY
- Carol BUTTERFIELD
- Don COCHEBA
- Greg CARLSON
-
- Roger FOUTS
- Dale OTTO
- George TOWN
-
- James HARPER
-
- Mark ZETTERBERG
- Peter BURKHOLDER
- Brue BARNES
- David KAUFMAN
- Gary HEESACKER
- Patrick OWENS
- Thomas MOORE
-
- Andrew SPENCER
- Robert GREGSON
- Terry MARTIN
- Cathy BERTELSON
- Beverly HECKART
- Stella MORENO
- C. Wayne JOHNSTON
- Michael BRAUNSTEIN
- Geoffrey BOERS
- James HINTHORNE
- Margaret SAHLSTRAND
- Carolyn THOMAS
-
-
- John ALWIN
- Roger FOUTS
-
- Jerry HOGAN

April 26, 1995

Date

VISITOR SIGN-IN SHEET

Michelle Kidwell
Anne Bunting
Robert Jacobs
Tuesy Howard
Barbara Radke
Christyn Welch
Bill Swain

Please sign your name and return sheet to Faculty Senate secretary directly after the meeting. Thank you.



CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Department of Political Science

RECEIVED
MAR 31 1995
CWU FACULTY SENATE

March 28, 1995

Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Campus

Gentlepeople:

Your *ad hoc* Committee on Consensual Relationships submits herewith a draft for a consensual relations policy together with its recommendation for a strengthening addendum to the Sexual Harassment Policy. The latter has also been submitted to the Affirmative Action Committee for its consideration.

The Committee recommends that the policy be adopted and incorporated into the Faculty Code.

Sincerely yours,

Robert Jacobs



Draft

Consensual relationships that are of concern to Central Washington University are those amorous, romantic, or sexual relationships to which both parties appear to have consented but where one party has a professional responsibility to the other as teacher, advisor, supervisor or evaluator. Those with professional authority must neither abuse nor seem to abuse the power with which they are entrusted.

Faculty and supervisors of the University are advised that any romantic relationship with their students or employees may make them liable to formal disciplinary action under the University sexual harassment policy. Even when both parties have consented at the outset to the development of such a relationship, it is the administrator or instructor who, by virtue of his or her special responsibility, will be held accountable for unprofessional behavior should a complaint arise.

Amorous relationships between faculty or administrators and students or employees which occur outside the instructional or supervisory context may also lead to difficulties. Such personal relationships still involve the danger that the teacher or supervisor may unexpectedly be placed in a position of responsibility for the other person's instruction, evaluation or recommendation. In addition, others may speculate that an instructional or supervisory relationship may exist even when there is none, thus giving rise to assumptions of inequitable academic or professional advantage for the student or employee involved. This perception -- even if false -- damages the educational goals of the University.

For these reasons it is Central Washington University's view that faculty and supervisors should not establish romantic, amorous or sexual relationships with those over whom they have authority. Should such a relationship already exist or come into existence notwithstanding this policy, a conflict of interest exists. The teacher or supervisor is required to report the matter immediately to his or her own supervisor who must take the following actions:

1. The party subject to the conflict of interest is to be relieved immediately of all evaluative processes involving the other party to the relationship, and alternative objective evaluation procedures are to be established.
2. A written report describing the nature of the conflict of interest and the means devised to remedy it must be prepared. The report is to be kept in a separate file -- i.e., not in the normal personnel files -- and is to be destroyed six months after the supervisory or evaluative functions of the staff member would normally have ended.

Committee on Censensual Relations -- March 28, 1995

Draft -- Addition to Sexual Harassment Policy

Amorous relationships between faculty members and students, between supervisors and subordinates, and between peers may involve sexual harassment in the following instances:

- i. when the powers exercised by faculty in evaluating students' work, awarding students' grades and providing recommendations constrain the student's freedom to choose whether to enter into or end a romantic or sexual relationship with a faculty member.
- ii. when subordinates may not feel free to reject or end a romantic or sexual relationship with a supervisor; or
- iii. when peers may not feel free to reject or end a romantic or sexual relationship because of the involvement of one in decisions affecting the professional status of the other.



RECEIVED

APR 7 1995

CWU FACULTY SENATE

MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee

FROM: Philip M. Backlund, Associate Dean
College of Letters, Arts and Sciences

DATE: March 31, 1995

SUBJECT: General Studies Degree

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'P. Backlund', is written over the 'FROM' field of the memorandum.

I am writing this memo to provide further information regarding a general or liberal studies degree here at Central Washington University. Last Friday, Dean Pappas, Business School Associate Dean John Lasik, Bill Swain and I met to discuss the idea. While we do not have a final proposal yet, we did agree that such a degree would be useful here and we look forward to talking with the Curriculum Committee about it. Here are some of the items we discussed.

1. Who would take such a degree? We see the potential market for this degree as coming from three groups of students: 1) As more and more departments develop entrance requirements to their majors and thus restrict the number of majors allowed, some students will not be able to get into their major of choice. A general studies degree would give these students an option other than beginning again with another degree program. 2) Some students come to the university needing no specific degree. They may intend to go into the family business, or into a profession (such as the military) that requires no specific degree. A general studies degree would give these students a broad liberal arts education. 3) Some students wish to obtain the broadest possible college education. A general studies degree would provide these students with a solid liberal arts background.

2. Do other schools have such a degree? We did not do an extensive catalog search, but did locate several such degrees in colleges throughout the state. For example, WSU has a general studies program with four different degree concentrations: Humanities, Social Sciences, Sciences, and Liberal Arts. The program is designed for students who have varied interests that cut across the usual departmental boundaries and who wish to play a major role in deciding on a suitable curriculum of study. WWU has a Liberal Studies degree focusing on the study of the humanities, comparative cultures, and the academic study of religion. UW has a General Studies degree that can either be custom designed or the student can pick from several organized interdisciplinary programs. Portland State University has a General

7B

Studies degree with concentrations in arts and letters, sciences, or social sciences.

Each of these programs are constructed in unique ways. The primary point we are making here is that many other schools in the state have such a degree.

3. What would the degree look like? We envision something similar to an upper division general education program with perhaps six or more blocks of classes such as communication (written and oral), the sciences, the social sciences, humanities, the arts, cultural studies, and others that might be designed. The student might take ten credits out of five different blocks for a fifty-credit major. With a major of that size, the student would be required to take a minor. This plan would fit the proposed changes to our general education program well.

We believe a general or liberal studies degree would be of benefit to the students of Central Washington University and are therefore asking the Curriculum Committee's blessing in pursuing the development of such a degree. We look forward to talking with you about it.

cc: Dean Brown
Dean Denman
Dean Pappas
John Lasik
Bill Swain