

FACULTY MEETING AGENDA

February 27, 1985

3:00 - 5:00

CAB 110

1. Minutes of the previous meeting (attached; Arney) - 5 minutes.
2. Remarks from the president (Olander) - 15 minutes.
3. Proposal to change Faculty Handbook to add a new category of faculty member (attached; Smith) - 20 minutes.
4. Proposal to change policy on academic standing (attached; Marr) - 15 minutes.
5. Proposal regarding Spring scheduling (to be sent to faculty before 2/27/85; Perkins) - 20 minutes.
6. Faculty action on definitions from Sexual Harassment DTF (proposed definitions to be sent to faculty before 2/27/85; Curtz and Mulka) - 40 minutes.
7. Announcements - 5 minutes.

Chair Bill Arney convened the meeting at 3:10 and established that there was a quorum. The Chair moved Thad Curtz's report to the final item on the agenda.

AGENDA ITEMS

1. Minutes of the previous meeting.

Minutes of the January 23, 1985 meeting were approved.

2. Remarks from President Olander.

At the request of the Agenda Committee, Joe Olander addressed questions concerning TESC governance and the current legislative session. He recognizes the Evergreen Council as the consultative, deliberative body of the college, and his conclusion is derived from reading and researching the Washington Administrative Code and the TESC Social Contract.

The major issue that Olander is bringing before the legislature this session is that of growth at Evergreen. Specifically, he wants clarification of the contradictory mandated growth policies. The college will also be requesting more money for its Vancouver expansion, a reconstructed teacher certification program, and a Pacific Rim study.

3. Proposal to change Faculty Handbook to add a new category of faculty member.

Barbara Smith brought before the group a proposal recommended by the Faculty Hiring DTF that would recognize the fact that we have two categories of associate (visiting) faculty: one that is actually in line for a three-year appointment and one that is truly non-reappointable. By demarcating the two, the DTF feels that a greater commitment to the first category of hires would be demonstrated by the college. Jovana Brown, originator of this proposal on the DTF, then was asked to lead the discussion. She explained that it would allow us to advertise this category of position as one that is renewable, thus perhaps enabling Evergreen to hire more members of protected classes. After lengthy discussion, John Aikin moved that the proposal be returned to the DTF for some re-wording (e.g., change to exclude adjuncts who repeat teaching same courses quarter after quarter) and agreed to assist the DTF in that endeavor. The motion passed.

4. Proposal to change policy on academic standing.

David Marr presented the body with a revised academic standing policy, the product of a 10-member Study Group charged at a recent Faculty Meeting. He reminded the faculty that a combination of circumstances--no sanctioned growth and a present policy which allows students doing sub-standard work to remain at TESC for up to two years--is really not acceptable. The new policy would: (1) reduce the number of quarters a student could perform sub-standard work (earn fewer than three-fourths the number of credits for which he/she is registered) from three to two before being placed on Academic Warning; (2) require a student who has received an Academic

Warning and who, at the next evaluation period, receives either an Incomplete or fewer than three-fourths of the credit for which he/she is registered to take a leave of absence, normally for a year. A waiver of required leave could be granted only by an Academic Dean and would be based on evidence of extenuating circumstances. At the end of a required leave, a student could re-enter if they were able to supply the Academic Dean with "evidence of readiness to assume academic responsibility;" (3) require a student allowed to re-enter to earn at least three-fourths credit at the next evaluation period. Failure to do so would result in dismissal from the college.

David also presented an example of a new semi-quarterly report which would be used in all programs for every student.

The motion to so change the Academic Standing policy did not pass (14-16). Leo Daugherty moved, however, that David and the Study Group bring back to the faculty a revised proposal, one which would mandate neither a faculty/student conference, nor an official written report. The motion passed.

5. Proposal regarding Spring scheduling.

What John Perkins actually shared was a proposal for a modified block scheduling for Fall 1985. He asked for feedback from the group and promised that it will be discussed more at the Faculty Retreat in April.

6. Announcements.

Patrick Hill asked the faculty if they wished to consider having an off-campus Retreat. In a straw vote, the faculty demonstrated their approval of the idea.

7. Faculty action on definitions from Sexual Harassment DTF.

Thad Curtz announced his intention of doing two things at this meeting: (1) to make some brief remarks about where the DTF is likely to go concerning the issue of sexual blackmail; and (2) to try to get a sense of the faculty's thinking ("moral intuitions") about issues involving consensual relationships between faculty and students, and also a sense of the faculty's willingness to adopt in principle a code of professional conduct.

Thad stated that the DTF will likely draft a stronger policy about the sexual blackmail issue which would then enable the college to take more direct administrative action (by way of clear procedures and due process guarantees) in the event of such complaints. He also presented the faculty with several hypothetical situations to determine their consensus as to the appropriateness of different student/faculty actions and behaviors.

He indicated that some faculty have advocated the drafting of a professional code, with provision for votes of censure, to articulate sexual conduct at TESC. He asked for the group's reaction to such a document. In a straw vote, approximately half the body voted that they would support the drafting of such a document.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10.

The Evergreen State College

February 21, 1985

TO: The Faculty

FROM: John Perkins

RE: Scheduling for Fall Quarter, 1985, and beyond,

From one perspective, the experiment with block scheduling has been useful: more classes have been able to obtain rooms commensurate with their class size than was true under an ad lib scheduling system. In addition, more rooms are available for special needs than was previously the case.

We also learned some lessons from the block scheduling experience. First, some faculty don't like it, but we have accommodated almost everyone's idiosyncracies. Second, the current pattern of blocks should be modified for Fall Quarter 1985, because the current arrangement is not optional in terms of traditional patterns of class-room use.

The following is my proposal for Fall Quarter, 1985, and beyond. I believe it creates the space we need and is more in keeping with past preferences for room use. I'd like you to consider it and give it at least a begrudging acceptance at the Faculty Retreat in April.

JP/1c

(OVER)

TIME	MONDAY	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY
8	Schedule at will, 8-12; begin classes on the hour (not half hour)	8-10 block	8-10:30 block	8-10 block	8-10 block
9		10-12 block		10-12 block	10-12 block
10	12-2 block	12-2 block	No Classes Scheduled 10:30-5 p.m.; Governance Day	12- 2 block	Schedule at will, 12-5; begin classes on the hour (not half hour)
11	2-5 block	2-5 block		2- 5 block	
12					
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					

GUIDELINES

1. Programs who ask for space within the block scheduling system will be scheduled first. Programs that don't will be scheduled second.
2. Core programs will receive top priority for "geographic clustering," but they, too, need to follow the scheduling format.
3. Valid academic reasons are the basis for exceptions.
4. Seminar rooms cannot be scheduled in back-to-back blocks except (a) the students change, e.g., your seminar is split into two subsections; or (b) space is available (i.e., your request will be considered last).
5. Block scheduling applies to seminar rooms and to lecture halls.
6. Please don't over schedule or double schedule.

The Evergreen State College

February 22, 1985

Dear Colleague of the Faculty,

There will be a major effort this week to gain input from students, staff, and faculty for the ongoing work of the DTF on Sexual Harassment. A block of time has been reserved for this purpose in the regular faculty meeting on Wednesday, February 27. The DTF needs to know the mind and sense of the faculty before coming up with a first-draft proposal.

The following items will be on the agenda for Wednesday's meeting:

1. Sexual harassment has a wide range of meanings. In practical terms, we need to know where you stand on the following items:

--sexual blackmail: holding students hostage in return for sexual favors

--consensual relationships: entering into romantic, sexual, and other forms of consensual relationships on and off campus with current students

--sexist remarks and behavior: anything from jokes and language to different treatment of men and women in the classroom

2. The felt need for a professional code of conduct dealing with sexual harassment. One of the major administrative problems in dealing with sexual harassment is the fact that policy, sanctions, and procedures are vague and lack specificity.

The attachments to this letter give examples, provide alternative courses of action, and invite your comment on a range of issues of concern to the faculty. Students and staff will be discussing the same agenda items during this week. We urge you to attend the meeting or get input to the committee by mail, by phone, or separate meetings. Your comments can be addressed to the DTF and its membership.

Art Mulka, Chair
Karen Wynkoop
Jeannie Chandler
John Gallagher

Peta Henderson
David Paulsen
Thad Curtz
Lovern King

Jan Lambertz
Roberta Morello (student)
Claudia Stein Koenig (student)

On the basis of comments, discussion, and input from the community at Evergreen (students, staff, and faculty), a draft proposal will be submitted for your consideration in the April faculty meeting.

Sincerely,

Agenda for Faculty Discussion on Wednesday, February 27:

A. Sexual Blackmail

- 1. holding students and their work hostage in return for sexual favors
- 2. examples of this type of sexual blackmail:
 - withholding evaluations
 - threats of not granting credit in full or in part
 - a condition for admission to a course, group contract, or individual contract

B. Sexist Remarks and Behavior

- 1. sexist remarks, attitudes, and behavior
- 2. examples of this type of sexual harassment can be found in the attachment called "Definitions of Sexual Harassment," column 3

A. Issues Involved

- 1. The major issue involved in this type of harassment is the role and power imbalance between a faculty member and a student.
- 2. There is very little direction in the Affirmative Action Policy document, in the faculty handbook, in the procedures via the personnel office that has teeth in it.
- 3. There is little guidance in the dean's evaluation or faculty peer evaluation process that provides sanctions for this type of activity.

A. Issues Involved

- 1. Frequently, what is involved here is an "offensive or intimidating work or academic environment" mentioned in our Affirmative Action Policy or in the EEOC Guidelines.
- 2. The students on campus feel particularly strong about this issue.
- 3. Differing actions and behaviors toward men and women represent real concerns for the students.

A. What is your sense of direction in dealing with this type of sexual harassment?

- 1. Do you want administrative policy and guidelines with specific sanctions? Yes? No? If yes, of what type?
- 2. Grounds for non-renewal of contract: adjunct, visiting, three-year hire?
 - Suspension without pay for a specific length of time?
 - Dismissal from the faculty?
 - Code of Professional Conduct to guide actions?

A. What is your sense of direction for dealing with this of sexual harassment?

- 1. not to be tolerated under any circumstances?
- 2. part of gradual educative and sensitizing process in dealing with men and women students?
- 3. should this area be regulated or legislated?
- 4. should this area be part of peer evaluation?

Agenda Items (cont.)

C. Consensual Relationships

1. These are relationships between faculty and students, staff and students, supervisor and employee. These are mutually consenting romantic and sexual relationships.
2. These relationships could be anything from hanging out together to dating to sexual activity.
3. The statement from the University of Minnesota may be worth citing in this context:

"A faculty member who enters into a sexual relationship with a student (or a supervisor with an employee) where a professional power differential exists must realize that, if a charge of sexual harassment is subsequently lodged, it will be exceedingly difficult to prove immunity on grounds of mutual consent."

C. Issues Involved

1. The primary issue raised for faculty (or staff) is the professional-client relationship. Most professional associations have a code of ethics which expressly deals with the professional-client relationship. This is especially true of sexual activity in the relationship.
2. The role and power differentiation between faculty and student enters here as well, even though the relationship is an apparently consenting one.
3. Romantic and sexual consenting relationships create an ambiguous environment for learning, teaching, and working. The relationships go beyond those directly involved. For some (student, staff, and faculty) the existence of consenting relationships creates an intimidating, hostile, and offensive working and learning environment, noted in the EEOC Guidelines.
4. A paradox exists between the human needs for intimacy and the professional demands of impersonality in the helping professions of teaching, medicine, psychology, etc. Our learning context is one of intimacy; our professional teaching context may need further discussion.

C. What is your sense of direction in dealing with consenting relationships?

What is your opinion of the following types of consenting relationships?

1. open flirtation and come-ons to students.
2. spending a lot of free time with a student.
3. dating students in the program
4. dating students not in the program
5. having a sexual relationship with a student in the program.
6. having a sexual relationship with a student not in the program
7. taking a student or students, for example, to Two-Mile Tavern
8. inviting a student or students to your home for dinner, for a potluck
9. going on a retreat with students in the program

In dealing with the range of consenting relationships, what judgment do we make about them?

- are they simply unwise?
- are they unprofessional?
- are they to be forbidden?

DEFINITIONS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT

GENERAL DEFINITIONS

"Sexual harassment is unwanted sexual or sexist contact or communication, submission to which becomes a factor affecting the individual's employment or academic standing, or which creates an offensive or intimidating work or academic environment." (TESC Affirmative Action Policy (June 1984))

"Sexual harassment is any repeated or unwarranted verbal or physical sexual advances, sexually explicit derogatory statements, or sexually discriminatory remarks made by someone in the workplace which is offensive or objectionable to the recipient or which causes the recipient discomfort or humiliation or which interferes with the recipient's job performance." (NOW)

"Unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature constitute sexual harassment when

- a. submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of an individual's employment;
- b. submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as a basis for employment decisions affecting such individual; or
- c. such conduct has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual's work performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working environment." (EEOC Guidelines)

OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS

Many operational definitions exist in the literature. Most run along a continuum from sexist remarks to actual sexual assault. The following categories--taken from the City of Seattle Survey Questionnaire--are illustrative of most of these operational definitions:

- 1. unwanted sexually suggestive looks or gestures
- 2. unwanted sexual teasing, jokes, comments, or questions
- 3. unwanted and deliberate touching, leaning over, or pinching
- 4. unwanted letters, phone calls, pornography, or sexual objects placed on your desk or in your work place
- 5. unwanted pressures for dates, lunch, cocktails
- 6. unwanted pressure sexual activity
- 7. unwanted attempts to kiss, corner, or fondle
- 8. actual or attempted sexual assault

FACULTY CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR

Faculty behavior in higher education may at times reflect a form of sexual harassment. This behavior may be explicit or implicit, conscious or unconscious, intended or simply perceived. Though the following illustrations single out the behavior of males toward females, it should be assumed that sexual harassment goes both ways.

- 1. comments that disparage women in general
- 2. comments that disparage women's intellectual ability
- 3. comments that divert discussion of a woman student's work toward a discussion of her physical attributes or appearance
- 4. comments that rely on sexist humor
- 5. comments about women faculty that define them in terms of their gender rather than in their professional role
- 6. differing expectations of men and women in the class
- 7. responding to men and women differently in class and outside of class
- 8. encouraging men students while discouraging women students in class, in recommendations, in professional careers.

From:
Art Mulica