SEC/EXEC VP JOINT CONFERENCE MINUTES

February 20, 2007 2:30 p.m.

Senate Conference Room 140 McFall

Present: Bernhard, Currie, Dobb, Hebein, Lee, Orel, Pauken, Pinto, Vatan Woodhouse, Williams

Chair Hebein called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

OLD BUSINESS

Hebein: Both issues listed under Old Business (Amorous Relationships Policy and the Reasonable Suspicion of Impairment Protocol) seem to have similar issues of concern for faculty. Faculty would probably support such policies and processes. But faculty would like to feel as though there is some form of shared governance and faculty review when it comes to faculty sanctions related to both of these issues. Dobb: In most instances of peer review by faculty, it is peer review of faculty performance, not peer review of faculty behavior. Our intent of this policy and this protocol is to provide operating standards for supervisors and administrators at the university. They are to provide guidelines for disciplinary action. Lee: I don't know that it is really all that essential to have peer review in these issues. We pay administrators high salaries to implement these disciplinary actions. If faculty feels they have been wrongly accused or inappropriately sanctioned, we have a grievance process. **Hebein:** Yes, but by limiting faculty input to the grievance process automatically casts the situation into an adversarial relationship between faculty and administration. Can we not avoid that adversarial situation by using some form of peer review? **Pauken:** Perhaps, in order to provide confidentiality for faculty and at the same time allow for peer-review or faculty input, why not suggest that the person being accused ask a colleague to act in an advisory capacity.

Reasonable Suspicion of Impairment Protocol Process

Hebein: I believe that Senate would be supportive of such a policy; however I believe that faculty would have major concerns over the sanctions identified or implemented. There is an ad hoc committee that has been appointed from constituent groups to review this protocol and process. I believe that they have only met a couple of times, so I am not sure that we have sufficient feedback in order to discuss this Reasonable Suspicion of Impairment Protocol Process. We will defer this discussion to a later date.

Amorous Relationship Policy

Dobb: I believe that it is essential that we have an Amorous Relationship Policy here at Bowling Green. It is necessary to provide standards and administrative guidance on how to handle disciplinary actions for those who violate the policy. Perhaps, the real issue is whether or not you need to spend more time looking at the Sanctions Policy in relationship to a variety of university policies and procedures. This policy focuses on amorous relationships not on sanctions. Williams: I would agree that the Sanctions Policy being formulated may play a major role in how the Amorous Relationship Policy is implemented and how disciplinary actions might be accomplished. I also feel that there is a lack of definition for what constitutes an Amorous Relationship. Bernhard: I think that we need these kinds of policies to ensure the sanctity of our community. Somehow, we need to address how we help people stay close to each other in the sense of community without crossing the line into amorous relationships that can fracture our community. Vatan Woodhouse: What role do graduate assistants or teaching assistants play relative to this policy? **Dobb:** The Graduate Student Senate needs to take this up and come up with a similar policy and that policy should be placed in the Graduate Student Handbook. Lee: It would seem to me that if this were the case, the policies should be identical. Vatan Woodhouse: I don't think this should go to Graduate Student Senate. I believe that it should go to Graduate Council. Williams: Linda, would you please put these changes in writing and send them to us so we can include them as an attachment to the minutes for today. **Dobb:** I would be delighted to do that. We have been trying to get this policy approved for over 12 years. Please find a copy of the revised Amorous Relationships Policy below:

Consensual Amorous Relationships Policy

The university takes seriously its duty to provide a place to study and work free of situations that may be construed as abuse of authority, an inappropriate conflict of interest, preferential treatment, or other unprofessional and unethical conduct. The policy below is established in order to avoid such instances.

- 1. Within the University community, supervisors and faculty are not to have supervisory, evaluative, instructional, coaching, advisory, or other relationships with students or employees with whom they have or have had a consensual amorous relationship.
- 2. If an amorous relationship exists or develops, the faculty or staff member of superior rank must disclose the relationship to his/her immediate supervisor in a timely manner. The supervisor will then take steps to make alternate arrangements affecting one or both parties, to effectively discontinue any supervisory, evaluative, instructional, coaching, advisory, or other formal connections between them. If possible, such arrangements should be made in ways that respect the interest of all involved and will not be prejudicial toward or against either party.

- 3. The decision of an immediate supervisor may be appealed by either or both parties to the next higher administrative level.
- 4. Disclosure is the responsibility of those who engage in, or are about to engage in, amorous relationships within the University community. Failure to abide by this policy may result in disciplinary actions taken against any negligent party. The range of disciplinary actions would depend upon the circumstances and culpability of those involved. Disciplinary actions may include, but are not limited to, a verbal warning, a letter of warning, temporary reassignment, temporary suspension or other measures, as the case may warrant. The imposition of faculty sanctions beyond the written warning should abide by the policy on sanctions contained elsewhere in the Academic Charter. Disciplinary actions regarding administrative staff and classified staff are administered by the Office of the Executive Vice President; disciplinary actions regarding faculty are administered by the Office of the VPAA/Provost.

NEW BUSINESS

People Soft

Dobb: I would encourage all of you to go through the People Soft training. **Lee:** I am not sure if it a good use of my time to approve all of the expenditures for grants, including minor expenditures. **Hebein:** I also heard from a colleague who attended the People Soft Training for Grant Writers. She felt that it was a lot of work for a very small grant that she had. She felt that this process might discourage people from writing future grants. **Williams:** I would tend to agree. It seems as though the responsibility for grants accounting is being shifted from the Grants Accounting Office to the faculty who write the grants. At one time, Grants Accounting would assume that responsibility and would provide a support service for the grant writer. I do think the new process could discourage people from writing grants. **Dobb:** I think it's great because it gives me a greater autonomy and understanding of my grant accounts. **Williams:** I do think that some faculty may be reluctant to write grants because of this new system. **Dobb:** We certainly don't want that.

ISSUES AND CONCERNS

BG One Accounts

Hebein: In recently reviewing my paycheck on line, I found that my BG #1 Account did not offer me an itemized list of deductions. I called the payroll office and asked how I could get my deductions in an itemized list. I was told that it was impossible to get an itemized list. **Dobb:** I will check into this.

Student Financial Responsibility Accounts

Pauken: Our graduate students have been offended by the recent message from the Bursar's Office saying that they were in default on their accounts. Vatan Woodhouse: Yes, the tone of the letter was very negative. It wasn't until we investigated why these letters went out that we found out why. Dobb: It was because students have their accounts loaded with scholarship or assistantship or grant monies. But the university can't access that money until they get personal student approval to withdraw that money from their accounts. Pauken: So, while the intent of the Bursar's Office was a matter of gaining student permission, the tone of the letter was almost punitive. Dobb: That was certainly not the intent. I will check into that.

Inclement Weather Policy

Dobb: On the Tuesday we closed the university, Mark Gromko and I met and reviewed the weather situation and forecast and decided to get the employees out before the weather conditions worsened. On Wednesday morning, Mark and I consulted via telephone regarding possible closure. At that time, it was listed as a Level 3 or Snow Emergency, which indicated that we should close the university. Williams: Is it the city of Bowling Green or Wood County that has to be at a Level 3? **Dobb:** We check with the Wood County Sheriff. Williams: But Wood County was at a Level 3 by 8:30 the evening before. **Dobb:** But, we don't make that decision until 6:00 in the morning. Williams: I also had a question about class cancellations for that Wednesday evening. The policy indicates that a decision would be made by 4:00 p.m. whether or not evening classes would be held or canceled. **Dobb:** But we canceled classes for the entire day. **Hebein:** But, Ellen is right. The policy reads that a decision will be made about evening classes by 4:00. So, it is somewhat confusing. **Orel:** Is there some reason why the cancellation can't be sent via email or posted on line? **Dobb:** That could be done. Dr. Whipple is getting a committee together to discuss the policy. There should be a faculty representative on that committee to bring up these issues.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Hebein adjourned the meeting at 4:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ellen Williams Faculty Senate Secretary March 27, 2007