

AGENDA COMMITTEE

→ ←
AC • DC

DIRECT COMMUNICATION

FACULTY MEETING: Wednesday, April 16 CAB 110 3-5 p.m.

Agenda:

1. Proposal to form Management and the Public Interest (MPI) as a new Specialty Area (See attached.) - (20 minutes)
2. Report from the DTF on Sexual Harassment - (30 minutes)
(Proposal for faculty approval of report)
3. Report from relevant administrators on Student Advising Center - (30 minutes)
(See attached.)

Don Finkel called the meeting to order at 3:15 and established that there was a quorum.

AGENDA ITEMS

1. Minutes of the previous meeting.

Minutes of the February 19, 1986 meeting were approved.

2. Proposal to form Management and the Public Interest as a new specialty area.

Barbara Smith referred to a document in the 4/16/86 agenda package which provided an historical overview of MPI. From 1976 to 1982, MPI was a specialty area. In 1982, it was "administratively collapsed" with a new specialty area, Applied Social Theory, in the hope that it would broaden the faculty base enough to sustain the curriculum. That solution seems to be failing.

Don Finkel explained that two months ago when the proposal was sent to the Agenda Committee by the deans and conveners, it was thought that a decision should be delayed until the outcome of strategic planning. However, Barbara recently convinced the Agenda Committee not to delay.

Kirk Thompson expressed concern for Applied Social Theory. Rita Pougiales, a former AST convener, felt the area would indeed be smaller, but still healthy. Burt Guttman suggested that the decision be postponed until the conclusion of strategic planning.

David Powell moved that MPI be reconstituted as a specialty area. Jin Darney offered a friendly amendment which would require that there be a staffing interlink with Political Economy. The proposal passed.

3. Report from the DTF on Sexual Harassment.

Last week the faculty met in governance groups to discuss the recently distributed Sexual Harassment DTF report. Discussion continued today -- led first by DTF chair Art Mulka. Art announced that the DTF is anticipating that final recommendations to the president and Board of Trustees will take place next fall.

In the faculty governance groups' meetings, it became clear that there is considerable confusion surrounding the language of the document with regard to policy and legal issues. There was also concern for protection of civil and academic rights, as well as clarity of process. Finally, there were questions about the proposed education training (e.g., "elitist" approach?).

Margarita Mendoza de Sugiyama was then introduced and explained her role in relationship to sexual harassment. At this point, the grievance procedure that exists and has been adopted by faculty and the institution is defined in the Faculty Handbook (section 3.300). When a complaint is

brought to the Affirmative Action office, it is handled as an allegation. The accused is always given the right to respond, and rights of all persons involved are protected as the matter is investigated. Margarita pointed out that the DTF report is supported by the Evergreen Social Contract and the Affirmative Action Policy.

Kirk Thompson moved that an amendment to the policy statement developed in his group last week, be added:

This policy shall not be construed in a manner that curtails academic freedom of faculty and students to choose instructional materials and to discuss them in a manner appropriate to the program theme.

Don asked for clarification as to what exactly the faculty were being asked to vote on today. Art and Margarita directed the body to examine the following statements.

POLICY STATEMENT

Sexual harassment is a form of sexual discrimination and is a violation of the College's Affirmative Action Policy. The Evergreen State College will not condone or tolerate sexual harassment by students, staff, administrators, or faculty and will vigorously protect the civil rights of all community members. Sexual harassment is defined as the use of one's authority or power (explicitly or implicitly) to coerce another into unwanted sexual relations or to punish another for his or her refusal. Sexual harassment is also involved when a member of the College community creates an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working or educational environment through verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature. Under the law, third parties may file a complaint of sexual harassment.

VIOLATION OF POLICY

Violations of the college's policy on sexual harassment are considered violations of the laws applying to discrimination, that is, Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act as amended and Title LX of the Federal Education Amendments of 1972. (See 29 CFR, part 1604, in the WAC 176-109-020.)

Employees held in violation may be met with appropriate sanctions according to the gravity of the case, including warning, reprimand, suspension without pay for a specified length of time, or reassignment to different teaching or working responsibilities. Acts of sexual harassment of a very serious nature may warrant a recommendation of removal for cause or may warrant criminal action.

Students held in violation may face a warning, conditional re-enrollment, or disenrollment, depending on the seriousness of the case.

David Powell questioned why suggestions raised in the other governance groups had not been incorporated into the proposal. He asked that the policies be re-drafted to reflect those suggestions.

John Aiken pointed out that the meeting agenda asks faculty to vote on the entire report. Several people urged that that be done. Kirk voiced alarm that the issue of academic freedom had not been adequately addressed. Patrick Hill suggested that the faculty approve at least a minimal portion of the document at this time, and that dialogue and refinement be allowed to continue through next year.

The vote on Kirk's amendment to the POLICY STATEMENT passed.

Terry Setter moved that we endorse the POLICY STATEMENT as amended, subject to future "language clarification." The motion passed. Don asked Art to work with the DTF to remove ambiguities in the statement.

A straw vote to endorse the educational strategy outlined in the report was aborted. Barbara suggested that final approval of the report be delayed until the next Faculty Meeting so that the opportunity for a more thoughtful discussion would exist. Art asked faculty who were not satisfied with the document's language to provide the DTF with some constructive assistance in the interim.

4. Report from relevant administrators on the Student Advising Center.

With only a few minutes remaining in the meeting for discussion of this item, Patrick referred to the Advising Center information in the 4/16/86 agenda package and very briefly described (1) how the Student Advising Center would be funded (money from faculty lines); (2) the attempts being made to find an appropriate space for the Center; and (3) the proposed personnel structure. He assured that present Learning Resource Center personnel would not lose their jobs and that an additional "faculty-type" director would be brought on to beef up the advising effort and coordinate the different operations.

Mary Nelson expressed her concern about reduced internship possibilities over the coming years. Patrick said that he and the deans are hopeful that this co-location would help restore Co-op Ed. to at least its previous level, although it is still not known whether all current Co-op Ed. personnel will be retained in the new base.

Although there were several questions and issues remaining, there was no time for continued discussion. Kirk proposed that in light of the need for urgent, budget-related decisions, matters concerning the Student Advising Center be remanded to the Agenda Committee. The motion passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10.