

Senate Input on System Policy on Intimate Relationships

Total submissions: 141

Status: terminated

Type: PDF Summary with Answers

ID: 2094458

1. Do you have any comments on how this policy was developed procedurally? Count

Answered 79

Skipped 62

1. No

2. No

3. None

7. no

11. no.

14. No

15. No.

16. No

23. None, the explanations are quite clear.

27. No.

28. None

30. No

34. No. It looks good to me.

35. No

36. None

37. No

39. N/A

40. No

42. *The process by which this policy has been developed has been flawed throughout. It is obviously necessary to have such a policy, but it should have been important to include groups of employees that will be impacted by this, especially academic professionals and labor unions that represent faculty, staff, and service workers across all three campuses. This has not been done and thus their obvious concerns have not been addressed, which will cause innumerable problems that could have been avoided. In addition, this process has not been deliberative at appropriate times, being confused by both system-level and campus-level policy development which have been reported to the senates, but never fully discussed.*

43. NO

44. No

45. No

46. No

49. *I appreciate the detailed summary. Clearly many qualified people have donated many hours of their time to developing thoughtful draft policies.*

50. No.

51. No

55. NO

56. *Overkill. Way too many people, time, resources have been put into this matter that should have been quite easily derived from core values like respect, responsibility, kindness, etc. "All I ever really need to know I learned in kindergarten." Yes, these matters ARE that simple and straightforward.*

57. *No, looks good*

58. *While the number of people selected by administrators to review this proposal is impressive, conspicuously absent is any detailed review by elements of campus shared governance, including the elected representatives of the people it largely will impact, This quick survey/plebiscite, offered with an artificial deadline amid a hugely disruptive crisis is hardly a substitute for the type of careful review elected shared governance should provide.*

59. No

60. No

62. No.

63. NO

64. No.

65. No

67. *i have no problem with it.*

68. *Were community members adequately consulted, particularly those who have been subject to sexual harassment?*

69. no

71. No

72. No

73. No.

75. No.

77. *Appropriate*

82. *As a general comment, the proposing of any new policy that impacts the whole university as a community should be considered both from its positive aspects and its negative aspects including costs (social and economic). I see little documentation of an evaluation of its possible negative impact or cost.*

83. No

84. *No, this seems like a good process with broad input.*

86. *A great example of collaboration and thoroughness.*

88. no

89. No

91. *Under 2. above, it is stated: "The committee also performed polls of faculty, students, and staff, in order to determine what sorts of policies would be best supported by the Urbana communities." What fraction of the faculty, staff and graduate students were polled? What fraction responded. How were those polled determined relative to those not polled?*

93. *This was an extensive and well-considered process. The entities involved should be commended for it.*

95. None

96. *Seems thorough and widely reviewed.*

97. No

99. *I think the policy was extremely well devised with respect to the level of expertise that went into formulating it. At the same time, I think that many stakeholders on the three campuses will feel that they have not been adequately consulted before too much was finalized. That may make implementation harder, and may mean that some important values or concerns from the three campuses on the ground are not fully reflected in these documents. One way to move forward is to allow sufficient flexibility at the implementation stage to engender wider spread support. But I would strongly suggest ensuring that you socialize the policies and allow some flexibility in implementation and so on as things move forward, so that you have a well-accepted policy that is sensitive to a range of values and has broad support in all three communities. I do foresee some resistance and unnecessarily complex consequences if this is not done carefully.*

101. *The procedure appears to be carefully planned and adequately thorough.*

105. No

106. *No. It appears to have been very thoughtfully developed and stakeholders at all levels appear to have been consulted.*

110. no

111. No.

112. none

113. No

115. No

117. No

119. No.

120. No

121. none

122. *This procedure seems sufficient.*

125. No comments

127. *The period of feedback after the creation of the draft policy has been somewhat short, and more time for faculty input might have led to both improvements in the policy and a broadening of support for certain aspects of the policy that might need fine-tuning.*

130. No

131. No

132. No

133. *Despite the need for such a policy and its relative (but not complete) acceptability, the process by which it was developed was deeply flawed because of the extreme over-representation of System and University administrative personnel and the under-representation of faculty. Now, the Senate is being asked to weigh in under the Damocles Sword of a very tight deadline, all while being quarantined. The policy, as with the other one on employment background checks is written to protect the Board of Trustees and the administrators in HR consistently close faculty out of processes all while imposing ever more regulations and dreadful "training" programs on us (especially true of the System level HR).*

136. No.

138. *I'm disappointed in the lack of student representation on the Intimate Personal Relationships and Considerations of Sexual Misconduct in Prior Employment Committees, but otherwise have no issues.*

139. *appears to be thorough, but I would like to see more attention on bullying with or without sexual misconduct being involved.*

140. *Seems very appropriate.*

2. *Do you have any comments on how the Senate or its committees should study this policy and develop recommendations to improve local implementation over the coming year?* Count

Answered	76
Skipped	65

1. No

2. No

3. *Not at this time*

7. no

11. *It will need to be run through relevant committees such as the Committee for Student Life and the Conference on Conduct Governance...*

14. No

15. No.

16. No

23. *None, the plan appears to be a good course of action.*

27. *The implementation of management plans for intimate personal relationships is almost certainly beyond the administrative competence of many who would be in positions to draft them across campus. This issue is fraught with legal risk for UIUC if these management plans are worse than the underlying problem they are seeking to address. I favor prohibiting intimate relationships between people in supervisory relationships, as defined in the document, but simply require that people change roles if they seek to continue the relationship. No management plans.*

28. *The timeline seems very thorough. Therefore, I do not have any further comments at this time.*

30. No

34. *No. This looks good to me. Obviously, adjustments might need to be made later--once facts emerge--but for now, this looks good.*

35. No

36. None

37. For details, see full discussion below. More generally speaking, all in all, this policy begins with a sound basis -- cases where there are obvious opportunities for abuse of authority or favoritism -- and then expands to include a wide range of unspecified or irrelevant hypothetical cases where conflict of interest *could* occur, and then treats these vague unspecified cases as if they were real evidence and deserving of the same treatment meted out to the well known and well attested situations. The policy also seems more concerned with promoting the interests of the university than with protecting the interests of either students or faculty. This policy would be a lot more clear, a lot more easy to administer, and a lot less open to frivolous accusations and uneven implementation if it were more specifically limited to well defined situations where there is wide agreement that a relationship is inappropriate. Such as faculty relationships with undergraduates, or faculty involved with graduate students who are their advisees or students in their classes. It is very clear in these situations that there are possibilities for favoritism and conflicts of interest. These are relations that either need to be ended, or to have a management plan. When the proposal expands into vaguer kinds of connections, as between faculty and grad students merely in the same department, it begins to flounder.

38. Talk more with people who are in some sort of student-faculty relationship. Learn more about what IS happening, as opposed to focusing mostly on what would be ideal.

39. N/A

40. No

42. There are wide-ranging implications of this policy. I think every standing senate committee should review it for any (and I mean any) implications for their committee's purview as part of their charges for the Fall.

43. NO

44. No

45. No

46. No

49. On the consensual relations policy: 1. Keep track of how many self-reports there are at each campus, and report these figures to the Senates and USC at the beginning of the 2021-22 academic year. 2. At the beginning of the 2021-22 academic year, poll unit EO's for their input on whether and how the policy has made any change in unit dynamics. On the background checks policy: 1. Ask for figures on how many findings were reported and the result of each hiring deliberation post-finding, just as we do for the criminal background checks. A senate committee such as GUP could be tasked with monitoring these figures over the years. 2. Toward the end of the 2020-21 academic year, ask for a report on the estimated cost to expand the policy beyond tenured faculty to a) all faculty hires; 2) all faculty and staff hires.

50. No.

51. Add two more undergraduate students into the process (i.e. one from UIC and UIS in addition to the already appointed UIUC student)

55. NO

56. Too much has gone into this. For heaven's sake, PLEASE no more required training. I can see it coming....an annual 2 hr online training course laid on everyone in the universe until it finally occurs to someone that our real motivation is "virtual signaling."

58. First, recommend that the May deadline for implementation be delayed until that study can be conducted. We're being asked to sign off on a document that contains blanks in it. It's important topic, to be sure, but it isn't so urgent that it needs to be shoved through with blanks and without full consideration, first by one or more appropriate Senate committees and then by the full Senate, meeting in a way that facilitates actual discussion, not plebiscite voting and random comments that cannot be shared and expanded upon in real time the way debate typically occurs.

59. No

60. No

62. No.

63. *Discussion should go beyond the committee. The committee should recommend policy. But there should be wider discussion and input beyond the committee recommendations. I also think you have a situation where you will have a contradiction in some cases, where you most likely have faculty who have in the past violated the policy that you may adapt moving forward. What do you do about that?*

64. No.

65. No

67. *by email*

69. *no*

71. No

72. No

73. No.

75. No.

77. *Appropriate*

82. *The policies will raise both social value issues and political issues. Many of the edge cases (like a close friend of a faculty member becoming an undergraduate will be difficult to navigate. How much is the university willing to enter into contention over issues because in some circumstances this policy may create moments when university staff must act like judge and jury. What are the protections for the university in making these decisions. What are the recourses available to individuals that wish to appeal decisions made in such matters? I havent seen any discussion of what the University wants to achieve with this policy or any metrics associated with such achievement. How does the university measure that it has succeeded in its new policy and that the new policy hasnt created any addition unforeseen problems? Is there going to be metric and will the metric be published? What level of enforcement (and overhead/cost) must this policy be carried out?*

83. No

88. *no*

89. No

91. No.

93. *n/a*

95. *I believe the Senate and its committees should exercise patience in observing the impact of the policies and the logistics of the procedures as we move forward, perhaps waiting a year or some other relevant cycle of time before addressing modifications/improvements.*

97. No

99. *In my view, a number of committees on this campus--e.g., USSP, GUP, Equality and Opportunity, Student Life, CAFT, and probably many others--should be asked for input over the initial implementation year. Some mechanism should be used to coordinate and render this input coherent and allow for the full Senate to vote on recommended changes at the implementation stage. I think people will be much more supportive of the policy if all three senates ultimately do something like this and the USC offers formal recommendations for development of these policies next year. I would prefer to call these "pilot" policies until we are ready to stand by them in a number of details and can say they have been properly socialized and supported by all three*

campuses. There's no need for this to cause a "fight," and procedure over the next year will be very important for whether this produces a positive cultural change or a lot of resentment (or both and in what proportions).

101. no

102. I think we should consider (1) limitations this policy places on intimate relations between people, and (2) the inevitable tangle of educational bureaucracy that will arise (imagine going to some office asking for permission to date a graduate student).

105. No

106. Appropriate committees should be given ample opportunity to provide suggestions and comments.

107. Collect survey feedback from a broad swath of faculty and staff once the policy is in near-final form.

110. no

111. No.

112. The generalness of the ban demands close Senate scrutiny of procedures and policies for exemptions.

113. No

115. No

117. No

119. No.

120. No

121. standard senate shared governance approaches seem appropriate to me

122. I think it is important to make sure that errors in background check records are addressed. Errors/inconsistencies can arise through no fault of the prospective employee (identity crime, for example). Background checks are important, and they should be correct.

124. The policy focuses too much on punitive measures, legalistic language, and shaming to be effective in improving conditions. The language should shift to DISCLOSURE and TRANSPARENCY in order to make shame drive these relationships underground (which only makes things LESS safe for the person with less power in the relationship).

125. The General University Policy Committee should continually monitor the implementation of the new guidelines and policies as part of its regular business.

127. This should be an ongoing process, with multiple committees evaluating the consequences and impact. There will likely need to be adjustment of the policy going forward as its real impact is assessed.

130. No

131. No

132. No

133. Considering that the Board is going to get the policy and adopt it, most likely with few changes, what point is there for having a Senate or its committee waste its time on this. There is, however, a important problem that the policy has in its use of a definition of faculty that is inconsistent with the university statutes as well as failing to include people with faculty appointments who do not do the specific activities involved here. Likewise, because of the focus on the common instructional scenarios, the position of faculty appointees and APs who are involved

in research rather than instruction, much wider consultation with a number of Senate committees is going to be needed.

136. It will be important to collect data on the impact of implementation. Factors to consider: number of disclosures per number of applications considered; number of findings of misconduct identified via disclosure; number of findings of misconduct identified in the absence of disclosure; association between findings of misconduct and hiring of the applicant; demographic data on the applicants with findings of misconduct; categories of misconduct identified. These baseline data are needed to determine the magnitude of the problem and the effectiveness of the policy.

140. I like the idea of the pilot program mentioned above and would like to see the Senate kept in the loop on the roll-out of the implementation of it, to have a chance to weigh in as issues may come to light as it is implemented. I would also like the data collected in the "review its success, usefulness, and/or need for any exceptions one year and then three years" to be shared with the Senate, to keep Senators informed.

3. Do you have any comments on the scope or definitions section of this draft policy?	Count
Answered	78
Skipped	63

1. No

2. No.

3. The meaning of dating could be ambiguous. Does it include interaction on social media? Private chats and texts? Should the definition of intimate personal relationships include that the relationship is consensual to distinguish this from stalking or harassment?

7. no

9. no

11. No.

14. No

15. I think there are real problems in defining the lower boundaries of what dating might be, and a conversation about getting to know another person might be perceived as a prelude to dating by one, and not the other. If two people find out in conversation that they both like a particular restaurant and plan to eat there one weekend, and then coordinate their times so they sit together (but pay separately and don't interact apart from the meal). Is it a date? Who decides?

16. No

23. None, definitions are clear.

28. None

30. No

34. No.

35. No

36. None

37. The most significant terms are left undefined. Just what is meant by a "relationship of a sexual, amorous, dating, or romantic nature"? These are terms dripping with subjectivity, and it is chilling to think that that some university officer or committee would be in the position of defining what constitutes an "amorous" relationship. In general parlance, "intimate" translates as "sexual." So, is this policy limited to actual sexual intercourse going on -- which certainly would qualify as

*"amorous" -- or would it extend to a walk together across the quad, or accompanying each other to a ballroom dance at the Regent? Readers need more guidance here as to just what qualifies as an "Intimate Relationship." Without greater specificity, there will be massive uncertainty about what qualifies, and "violations" would simply be in the eye of the beholder. In addition, in the university model, a *single* instance of even perceived "dating" or "amorous" involvement (having lunch together, perhaps, or a sympathetic hand holding in a restaurant?) then could morph into not just a "relationship" but a full blown "Intimate Personal Relationship"; viz. "Any contact of a sexual, amorous, dating, or romantic nature would be considered an 'Intimate Personal Relationship' under this policy even if it does not recur." This is just bizarre. No reasonable person believes that a single "amorous" incident (however defined) constitutes an "intimate relationship," and no amount of university pronouncements can make it so. Trivializing this issue in this way also, again, opens up opportunities for abuse by overzealous university officials who would have the opportunity to see wrongdoing in almost any kind of social encounter*

39. N/A

40. No

41. Are visiting researchers, etc. considered staff?

42. These definitions are unclear in at least three ways: 1) There are employees, such as academic professionals, that serve as "faculty" as part of their job duties and "staff" as part. 2) "Teaching assistants" also mis-applies to graduate students who might teach as part of their job duties or serve in other capacities, such as a "research assistant" which would make them "staff"? 3) These terms and their use throughout do not allow for the obvious issues of jobs that cross categories and employees that may change job type. What, for example of a graduate student who was serving in a research capacity one semester, then becomes a teaching faculty the next, and an academic professional with mixed duties a couple of years later...? (this is not a hypothetical...)

43. NO

44. No

45. No

49. Definition of "Intimate Personal Relationship": The word "amorous" in the definition is too vague, and the word "dating" might mean different things in different cultures. Even within the same culture, it might not be obvious even to the people involved whether a relationship is a "dating" relationship. What is the policy trying to police? People's feelings? Or specific behaviors? The more prudent approach would be to focus NOT on "relationships," but on behaviors that the university has a right to police or prohibit, since it is both useless and objectionable to try to prohibit certain emotions. The behaviors that the policy seems to be concerned with are sexual behaviors--broadly conceived--in situations that would put the university at risk or undermine the integrity of our educational and research missions.

50. No.

51. No

55. NO

56. *The lawyers really earned their money, but it seems OK with me.*

58. *It is unclear whether this applies to high-ranking administrative positions within the university.*

59. No

60. no

62. No. Seems reasonable.

63. Yes:" *Any contact of a sexual, amorous, dating, or romantic nature would be considered an "Intimate Personal Relationship" under this policy even if it does not recur." This definition seems to be legal nightmare and is likely to cause all sorts of problems moving forward. In particular, the "romantic" wording is incredibly poorly-defined, especially with other language stating it could even*

be a one-time event. Would this include: a. an "emotional" relationship characterized by emails, coffee-breaks together, sharing of confidences, etc. Who would decide that this was "emotional" as opposed to a non-romantic friendship? b. Exchange of gifts. c. Expression of admiration for a person- including respect, for example, of their academic performance. d. Even, opening the door for someone and other signs of attention. Would someone consider this a "romantic" gesture. e. Would this include for example a professor taking their students out for lunch or dinner to celebrate a thesis defense, a paper being accepted, etc- even if this was a routine event done for a number of students and used to discuss career advice? How would one tell this apart from a "romantic" but nonrecurring event.

64. No.

65. No

67. no.

69. no

70. *These definitions seem precise and clear.*

71. No

72. No

73. No.

75. No.

77. *Looks good*

83. No

88. no

89. No

91. No.

93. *The draft policy appears comprehensive and executable within the U of I system.*

95. None

96. No

97. no

98. no

99. *None (though haven't honestly read everything as carefully as I might if I were doing a formal policy review)*

101. *The definitions are very good.*

105. No

106. No.

108. *The scope of the definition of students should be expanded to include non-credit bearing, i.e., auditors.*

110. no

111. No.

112. *amorous and romantic are rather vague terms - how will findings define what is romantic or amorous?*

113. No

115. No

117. No

119. No.

120. No

121. *I am not sure that the GEO agrees with the term teaching assistant to include undergraduate students. Please confirm with the GEO for consistency*

122. *These seem fine.*

125. *None*

127. *We need to be careful about having multiple different documents that define "faculty" in different ways. Definitions should ultimately align with governing documents of the University (statutes and bylaws). It may also be necessary to better define terms in the "Intimate Personal Relationship" paragraph that have some ambiguity. Finally, where do "Research Assistants" fall in this?*

130. No

131. *Somewhere there will have to be some definitions or examples of: "sexual, amorous, dating, or romantic nature".*

132. No

133. *As noted above the definition of "faculty" is both too narrow and too broad. At the least, if the definition is to be this broad, the category needs to be retitled to something like "Instruction and Research Related Academic Staff."*

134. *The definition of an "intimate personal relationship" is circular and extremely vague. More importantly, it appears to focus on thoughts and feelings as opposed to actions. This campus is no place for the Thought Police.*

136. No

138. *Should there be further clarification on where student employees lie within these definitions? Would they be classified as students or staff, and which of the later requirements would they be subject to?*

139. *If an AP has both teaching and administrative duties are they faculty or staff?*

140. *Seems comprehensive to me.*

4. *Do you have any comments on the purpose of the policy?*

Count

Answered	75
Skipped	66

1. No

2. Fine.

3. *This sometimes crosses from consensual to nonconsensual language. There is a fundamental difference between a consensual relationship and a nonconsensual relationship. Are we establishing equivalency here? If a relationship becomes nonconsensual there is established policy. Are we merging the two? If they are distinct, at what point does a relationship become nonconsensual?*

7. no

9. no

11. No.

14. No

15. *I've already communicated my concerns to Barb Wilson on this.*

16. No

23. None.

27. *No. I support the policy.*

28. *This is well-stated and thoughtfully written.*

30. No

34. *As on the next two slides, I'm worried about whether these formulations properly cover "non-relationships." As you will see, on the one hand, I worry about faculty who will say, say, that "we were not dating or in a relationship, we just had sex once" --and then that case of "having had sex" actually amounted to sexual assault. I.e. is it the case that these kinds of formulations presuppose "a relationship"--i.e. two parties that view themselves as being in a relationship--in ways that will get those committing sexual assaults or engage in harassing behavior a way out here?*

35. No

36. None

37. *The proposal raises various hypothetical possibilities of what *might* or *could* happen as a result of romantic relationships between faculty and students, and is full of terminology such as "may suffer", "may lead", "may extend", "the possibility"; "the possibility exists", "may be perceived", and so on. Which leads to the consequence that faculty or students can be convicted based on simple hypothesis, or presumption of future wrongdoing, where none has been shown to exist. Rather than dealing with unspecified hypothetical situations, the policy should focus on well-known real situations where issues of abuse of authority or favoritism are in fact known to occur.*

39. N/A

40. No

42. *The majority of this is good, though upends many senses of what once would have been taken as acceptable relationships. I have no problem upending those, but note that I don't think all players in our campus community agree on this new logic or read it the same way...*

43. NO

44. No

45. No

46. *A bit too broad and vague. The fact that a relationship may potentially be injurious is not, in and of itself, a reason to bar it. A faculty member may, in the future, be named God too, but the probability is low and the potential future conflicts of interest involved there obscure the ability of the proposal to deal with real problems in the present.*

49. *No argument that our university must have a policy in place that makes it clear that it is not OK for instructors to sexually prey upon their students. A trickier question is whether it is healthier to set up management plans for situations in which two adults in the same unit fall in love with each other --or to decree that love is outlawed in such situations. The policy as stated will be very difficult to implement, because of the difficulty of reliably determining when two people are "in" the sort of relationship prohibited here; and because, even if both parties recognize that such a relationship exists, they may be reluctant to report the relationship.*

50. No.

51. No

55. *All true but unenforceable*

56. *This is not a Purpose Statement....this is legalese...this is a speech. Here is a test: If the President of a peer university were to read this, would they want to adopt it. Probably not. I suggest you reduce this to 100 words.*

58. No

59. No

60. no

62. No.

63. *There are many existing and long-term marriages that occurred between faculty and graduate students. In some cases they might be separated by just a few years. Many units / departments involved hundreds of faculty and students. I agree that there is a possibility of conflict of interest. But that exists as well for relationships among faculty in the same department of which there are many examples as well. I agree that this possibility of conflict of interest exists. But currently we have mechanisms in place to deal with those conflicts of interest. I don't agree that such mechanisms are impossible to implement, which seems possibly implied.*

64. No.

65. No

67. no

69. no

71. No

72. *Wordy and pious*

73. No.

75. No.

77. *Appropriate*

82. *Peter Drucker is quoted often as saying "if you can't measure it, you cant improve it". The University needs to define some metrics to be used to measure the success of the policy on intimate personal relationships. Given that there is a large body of evidence now that targeted social networking attacks can change "perceptions", this policy would seem somewhat poorly defined.*

83. No

86. *Seems reasonable to the point of stating the obvious.*

89. *No additional comments. I support the purpose of this policy.*

91. No.

93. n/a

95. None

97. no

98. *yes-- evaluative authority does not trump racism or the patriarchy-- so for example male grad students can be harassing faculty of color; also students can harass a professor-- what does one do in these cases?*

99. *I might specify in the final paragraph that we are talking about "conflicts" and reducing "the risk of any actual or apparent conflict of interest" that results not simply "from Intimate Personal Relationship," but ones that may generate these problems. Otherwise, I like this.*

101. *Given the huge role that the University plays in each student's - be it undergraduate or graduate/professional student - the policy also creates a role model for society how to effectively manage such critical issues.*

102. *Although I appreciate an attempt to avoid conflicts of interest, I think this policy goes too far.*

105. *No*

106. *No.*

108. *None.*

110. *no*

111. *No.*

112. *The policy goals are fine; the policy itself seems rigid and somewhat excessive, particularly in its inability to envision consensual relationships with non-traditional undergraduate students (i.e., in the late 20s, 30s, 40s) and faculty that might not carry 'the inherent risk of coercion and the perception by others of exploitation', at least without defining exemption policies and processes.*

113. *No*

115. *No*

117. *no*

119. *No.*

120. *No*

121. *None.*

122. *The reasoning is sound.*

125. *None*

130. *No*

131. *Does this mean that relationships between full professors is acceptable because there is no "unequal institutional authority"?*

132. *No*

133. *This is basically reasonable.*

136. *No*

140. *Seems appropriate.*

5. *Do you have any comments on the requirements on faculty, teaching assistants, staff, and individuals with authority?* Count

Answered **82**

Skipped **59**

1. No

2. *Where a supervisory or evaluative authority exists, intimate relationships create conflicts of interest that clearly are the University's business. However, in the absence of such authority, adults have a fundamental right to engage in intimate relationships without interference. On that basis, I oppose points two and four above, and the second part of point three. If no supervisory or evaluative authority exists, the university should neither prohibit nor require disclosure of such relationships. I have no problem with University articulating that it discourages such relationships. I have a personal reason for these views. My father, a professor, married an undergraduate at the same institution who was not in any of his classes and not majoring in his area of specialty. They had a 25 year happy marriage until my father's early death. I would not exist if these rules were in place then, and my parents followed them. These proposed rules may prevent some harm, but they will also prevent some happiness. It is quite possible that the proposed rules will create a net loss in human happiness. But more importantly, I just don't think such private relationships, free of authority or conflict of interest issues, are any of the University's business.*

3. *For TAs, cases where there is no supervisory or evaluative authority with an undergraduate. Does this mean any intimate relationship with any university student? What about TAs that have supervisory or evaluative authority over fellow graduate students? Why is it limited to undergraduates?*

7. no

9. no

11. *I agree that there should be prohibitions on these kinds of relationships. I do know, however, that there are many younger faculty members who come to Champaign Urbana and are single. I think there will likely be many violations of the policy for that reason.*

14. No

15. *Historically, there have been many long-term relationships in mathematics departments all over the world that develop between advanced graduate students and beginning untenured faculty. Love is a very strong force, and those involved will either (1) Become violators of this policy or (2) Have devastating effects on their careers.*

16. No

19. *While I think I understand and support the intent of the policy to limit interpersonal relationships that often become problematic, I do offer an opposing view about the blanket prohibition of relationships with undergraduates. This is a large university with so many staff that will never meet or interact. Also, our undergraduate population is aging nationally and many undergraduates are older. It seems to me that it would be entirely permissible for an undergraduate to date a faculty or staff member who has no supervisory or other authority or connection. It seems to me that the rule for graduate and undergraduate students could be the same, requiring reporting and oversight. Again, I understand and fully support the goal of protecting our students. This feels like too broad of a brush to me.*

23. None.

26. *I wonder about the likelihood of people reporting Intimate Personal Relationships, but that doesn't mean we shouldn't include that.*

27. No. I support the policy.

28. *The requirements are well-written. I imagine, the real issue will be the reporting of any failure to meet the requirements. The challenge will be in the enforcement of this policy.*

30. No

32. *Is the policy on relationships between faculty and graduate students who are not in the same department or program and who are not in a situation of evaluative authority intentionally left vague?*

34. *Perhaps the only worry I have is that sexual assaults or harassment often involve two parties that, in important ways, are not in a "relationship." It's rather that one, A, wrongly imagines a relationship, but subjects the other to wrongful behavior. But there really isn't a relationship going on; there's just one person violating or harassing another.*

35. No

36. None

37. *The proposed policy takes a "one size fits all" approach to relationships of this nature, presuming implicitly that a relationship between a professor and an 18-year-old undergraduate is the same as a relationship with a 40-year-old grad student (as, for example, in the section on Management Plans). Few would disagree with a policy prohibiting intimate relationships between faculty and undergraduates. Everyone accepts that. But relationships between faculty and adult graduate students, which have a long and storied history, are a different matter. The university's plan for dealing with these latter relationships, although well meaning, also is full of inconsistencies and false reasoning, and as a result is vague and unconvincing. Thus, Section V.A.4, proposing to address the issue of "Relationships Between Faculty or Staff and Graduate/Professional Students," is especially problematic. For one thing, when it prohibits relations between faculty and grad students "in the same department or program" it is far too broad. Yes, we all already understand that relationships in which a faculty member has direct authority over a grad student -- as a dissertation advisee, or a student in a class -- are to be avoided. That is very clear. But relations between everyone in the department? No rational or sensible justification is given for this expansion: the statement, "the possibility exists that the Faculty or Staff member may influence evaluation or academic or career advancement of a student within the Faculty or Staff member's program, even if the Faculty or Staff member does not directly supervise the Graduate/Professional Student," is far too vague and hypothetical (see above). One could just as easily hypothesize the "possible" use of influence for students in any department, and thus expand the relationship ban to include everyone. But we need to be very clear here, and identify situations where a faculty member clearly would have the opportunity to exercise influence over a grad student -- as a PhD advisee or a student in a class, and not be vaguely hypothesizing about unspecified forms of influence that merely "could" happen, even if we can't identify what they might be. Even more egregiously, Section A4 does *not* address the issue of relationships between faculty and grad students in different departments. The reader must use a process of elimination to conclude (or at least infer) that relationships between faculty and graduate students in *different* departments are permitted. But in such an important matter, to be complete, to be very clear, and to be ethically and morally honest, this needs to be spelled out -- otherwise the policy will have a very obvious undefined grey area.*

38. *It's too simplistic. It makes no distinctions between TT and specialized faculty, for one. It makes no allowances for other differences in age, position, etc. I think it's great to want to protect grad students from predatory behavior (and past actions have shown this to be necessary); however, you have to make some allowances for autonomy and personal decisions of graduate students, all of whom _are adults_.*

39. N/A

40. No.

42. *I have a hard time believing that every aspect of this would hold up to legal scrutiny and frankly, some of this seems that it would be immediately problematic in practice. To pick a minor issue-- what of a relationship between a faculty member and graduate student when one or the other becomes cross-appointed in a way that puts them in the same unit (as happens regularly)?*

43. NO

44. No

45. No

49. *"unless the relevant unit grants...an exception": on what basis? Who gets to decide? the department head? How do we decide what the relevant unit is--the department, the School, the*

college? Before an implementation plan can be developed, this part of the policy should be fleshed out.

50. No.

51. I disagree with not allowing TA relationships with undergraduate students. There are many TAs that are also undergraduate students and this adds both a burden and restriction of their ability to form personal relationships just because they are, in many times, "volunteering" their time for academia.

53. It seems like a violation of the privacy of individuals to have to report relationship status to the University. Would this sort of reporting be guaranteed to be anonymous? If someone wanted to collect and report data on relationships for study, would the IRB ever approve such a thing?

54. looks OK to me

58. Imagine a faculty or staff member whose spouse has not completed a bachelor's degree. The spouse seeks to enroll as an undergraduate in a program other than one involving the faculty or staff member. As I read this, that would be illegal yet I sense nothing that would imperil the standards established in the previous section. This might happen far more often than you would expect, particularly in the academic professional ranks. The third point probably would have made illegal half the relationships that eventually resulted in spousal hires here. I am aware of several.

59. What happens when a faculty member or instructor has had an established relationship with someone who becomes a graduate student in that same department? Would this be prohibited even when the student is well qualified to be admitted to that department and would not be working directly with the faculty member they have a relationship with? I think this type of situation may be more common than one might realize. Some exception language should be included.

60. No

62. No.

63. 1. There are many of the same conflict of interest possibilities between two faculty member - or faculty and staff- in the same unit. What is different? Will you also prohibit these? How will you handle this for married couple where both members have tenure in the same department? 2. "Unless the relevant unit grants the ...": This is a problem. What you are saying is the same behaviors that are allowed in one unit will not be allowed in another unit, based presumably on the decision of the executive officer of the unit, which will vary between units. I think this is possibly illegal, but regardless will likely create all sorts of problems. What would happen, for example if the executive officer is replaced by another? So suddenly an ongoing, intimate relationship, possibly even a marriage, is suddenly not allowed where it was allowed before? How will you handle a situation where there is a for example already an intimate relationship of long-standing, but a change in unit leadership and a subsequent change in policy? I believe you need a specific policy that will be uniform. That policy would state the conditions under which these relationships could or could not proceed, but should be not at the discretion of the executive officer. 3. I have real doubts about the legality. Suppose you have two adults that want a relationship. They have no direct conflict in terms fo a supervisory position. They may be about the same age. This seems to be an infringement of personal liberty, particularly when the decision is left to the opinion of the EO and different EOs could decide differently for the same situation.

64. No, I think that this is fair and acceptable.

65. no

67. no.

68. I find the limitation which permits Faculty or Staff to have intimate Personal Relationships with Grad/Prof students OUTSIDE the same department quite curious.

69. no

71. No

73. No.

75. No.

77. Appropriate

82. *What protection is afforded the relevant unit "grant" authority? It might also expose that authority to "perceptions" of inappropriate behavior wrt intimate personal relationships. Isn't the impact of this to make any authorization extremely unlikely?*

83. No

86. *Well, my first PhD student at UIUC would perhaps not be happily married today to one of my colleagues if this policy had been in effect when they were a student here.*

89. No

91. *I presume this applies to graduate TAs who happen to be teaching a course taken by other graduate students? If there is evaluative authority by the grad TA over another grad student in the course an intimate relationship is prohibited, unless it existed prior to the course, or unless special exception/permission is applied for and granted?*

93. *These requirements are welcomed changes to the system policies.*

95. None

96. *I think the section on relationships between teaching assistants and students is problematic, in regards to the reporting requirement for teaching assistants without supervisory or evaluative authority.*

97. no

98. *yes-- we all know of violators-- but we also know that the university protects faculty and administrators-- and whistleblowers are not protected*

99. *Should the emphasis be on not "entering into" any relationships with evaluative authority? Or not "entering into or being in any"? With the possibility that one can remove oneself from the position of authority (or must) if one is in a prior relationship. I think it would help with the reception of the undergrad part if it were to say something like: "Given how often undergraduates change majors and how easy it is for them to be placed under the authority of a professor, faculty and students are prohibited from entering into any Intimate Personal Relationship, regardless of whether the faculty or staff has supervisory authority or evaluative authority..." I'm also going to hope the exceptions clause helps here. This is a very broad rule. I understand the wrongs that this policy is trying to prevent; but there are also some exceptions where beautiful things happen between people who are in love and who don't exactly fit the wrongs we're trying to target but do fall into this broad category. E.g., people who are already married and then spouse begins an undergrad degree. People where the undergrad is 40, the TA is 35, and there is no supervisory authority or evaluative authority (and no serial predation or anything like that). I worry that even preventing all relationships in the same field is a little strong. Sometimes people in the same field share deep interests and there are beautiful, loving relationships that can form in those contexts, without any of the types of harms or risks that the purpose statement says we are targeting. I think if we go this way, a lot of flexibility and thought should be put into developing the exceptions clause in consultation with stakeholders on the ground at all three institutions. It would also be nice to avoid the implication that some very good marriages and relationships are not somehow second-class or worse. The trick is distinguishing between good and abusive relationships; or good ones and ones that involve coercion, conflicts of interest, or undermine our ability to both be and appear impartial as professors.*

101. *The rukles are well crafted.*

102. *I think this is way too harsh, and less restrictive approaches could be found. One can take the policy regarding children of faculty and staff becoming students at UI as a model.*

105. No

106. *Relationships between faculty or staff and graduate professional students should not be so strict. Graduate students are adults (in some cases older adults), and as long as consent is provided, and as long as there is no supervisory authority, they should be allowed to engage in consensual relationships if reported. It seems like graduate students are disadvantaged by this policy. They would be forced to leave a department if they chose to engage in a consensual relationship with a faculty or staff member in their existing department.*

108. *It needs to be clarified as to whether the prohibition of intimate personal relationships with graduate or professional students in the same department or program as a faculty or staff member, regardless of whether the faculty or staff member currently has supervisory or evaluative authority over the student." Some readers could construe this as suggesting only if they held such authority. I believe it meant to be more capacious than that.*

110. *no*

111. *No.*

112. *The undergraduate policy seems to sweeping, without recognizes hypothetical situations of non-traditional undergraduate students and faculty that might occur. The prohibition on relationships between faculty and graduate/professional students in the same department or program, even without supervisory/evaluative authority, seems excessive.*

113. *No*

115. *No*

117. *It seems to me that the description of the policy could be more explicit in banning "Intimate Personal Relationships." The policy states "Intimate Personal Relationships are strongly discouraged..." Instead, I suggest that the policy state the following: "Intimate Relationships are prohibited between faculty and staff with undergraduate and graduate students unless the relevant unit grants the employee or individual with authority an exception under this policy."*

119. *No.*

120. *No*

121. *None*

122. *This seems clear.*

124. *Prohibitions like this only mean people who want to skirt the rules will either 1) make their relationships secret or 2) wait for a certain power differential to shift (like ask someone out the day after grades are due). Again, more important is 1) indicating the problematic nature of these relationships and 2) encouraging disclosure in order to protect all parties. You want to dissuade without using legalistic language that will make people hide.*

125. *None, this seems very straightforward and clear.*

127. *Teaching assistants should not be required to report relationships with undergraduate students who they do not supervisory or evaluative authority over.*

130. *No*

131. *Relationships Between Faculty and Faculty should be addressed.*

132. *No*

133. *Elements are reasonable, but this is going to be deficient because of the flawed definitions used at the outset. They need go back to the drawing board.*

134. *Discouraging something is not a policy, but a suggestion. I agree certain actions should be prohibited, but they need to be clearly and narrowly defined first. "Amorous" and "romantic" mean nothing and everything in this context. However, the very idea of reporting human interactions to the administration and seeking to develop a "management plan" for human interactions is taken*

straight from 1984. Either prohibit it or leave it alone, but first make sure there is no ambiguity as to what can be sanctioned.

136. No

140. Seem appropriate

6. Do you have any comments on the exceptions to the policy?

Count

Answered 79

Skipped 62

1. No

2. I support this policy only for those cases in which a private relationship exists that could create a conflict of interest.

3. Why are previous relationships grandfathered in? Why would other exceptions be rare if the relationship is consensual and open, known to those in charge, with a management plan?

6. The "2. Other Exceptions" section seems a little unclear. Can anyone apply for an exception? Under what extenuating circumstances might one be granted? I'm concerned that after reading the first pages which strongly and correctly state that these relationships are not permitted, this brief statement may make one feel that all one needs to do is apply for an exception.

7. no

9. I believe option 2 may be quite overloaded, considering new employees will want to take advantage of discounted tuition for significant others and this seems to obstruct that.

11. I think there will be a lot of "case by case" exception requests. I am concerned about how this will be done. The "hospital"? will decide? Why? Who exactly, would decide here at in Champaign Urbana? How will we make sure that this process is fair?

14. No

15. See previous comments. Faculty/Student couples will have to study the way same sex or mixed race couples were treated in the past, in order to find a way to survive.

16. No

19. I am pleased to see there is a process for exceptions and hope that humanity will be used when it involves any student and a strong consideration of the relationship between people who would likely never meet on campus (i.e. a 35 year old Engineering undergraduate and a 25 year old south farm employee; of which I am neither).

23. None.

27. No management plans or exceptions. These are too complicated for University staff to deal with and raise real legal risks.

28. I am sure that the committee along with legal counsel has considered the legal hurdles here. However, on more of a practical level, I can see how people who might be in new relationships that existed prior to the effective date of this policy may be reticent to even define their own private relationship let alone report it might feel uncomfortable by all of this. I am not sure there is a real way to capture that group of people but there is a real grey area here where people might be in a situation where they might not consider their interaction a "relationship" within the meaning of this policy. The challenge in all of this will be those who fall in the grey area.

30. No

34. *I have the worry I had on the previous slide also here: if, say, a faculty has sexually assaulted a student, it's not clear to me that this case would be covered by 1. One can imagine, I think, that this faculty could even say "I never was in a relationship with that student." etc.*

35. No

36. None

37. *The section on "Relationships Existing Before the Effective Date of This Policy" makes no distinction between undergraduates and graduate students, and has the appearance of permitting relations with undergrads to continue as long as they began before the implementation of the policy. I just wanted to clarify that this is what the university means here.*

38. *Who will evaluate those exceptions? On what basis? And to whom do those people report? That's a great deal of power over the sex lives of employees without any clear checks.*

39. N/A

40. No

41. *What happens if somebody's significant other decides to go to graduate school and is accepted into the same department? This relationship could have begun after the date of this policy.*

42. *This needs to be more explanatory and clarify if the prohibitions in V.A have exceptions due to changes in employment status and job type--a glaring oversight that will bring some employees into a situation which would now be prohibited. I cannot stress enough how problematic this oversight is.*

43. NO

44. No

45. No

49. *Unlike in the previous section, this language spells out "the relevant University, System Offices, or Hospital." How would that work? the guilty couple has a hearing before the Chancellor?*

50. No.

51. No

53. *The very idea that there could be exceptions mean that this policy cannot widely be applied.*

54. none

58. *This only somewhat solves the problems noted with the previous section. It somewhat smacks of placing a scarlet letter on certain relationships. Are we actually aware of the scope of this problem? Are we building an atomic flyswatter to deal with a very small number of cases? This, not the intellectual reasons for the policy, needs to be clear in the background statements.*

59. *This is part addresses the concerns I stated on the previous page, however the language here I believe should include examples of what would be consider for an exception to the policy. As it is written it appears that the decision may come across as quite arbitrary. I personally believe that prior relationships between faculty and graduate students who become students in the same department should be automatically exempted from the policy as long as the student doesn't work directly with the faculty member they have a relationship with.*

60. No

62. No.

63. *Again, how will you handle a new intimate relationship after adopting this policy where one EO gives permission but then the EO is replaced by a new EO that forbids it?*

64. No.

65. no

67. no

68. *I'd be more comfortable with 'other exceptions' if the process for considering such a request was more fully described.*

69. no

71. No

72. *"Any approved exception will require the development of a Management Plan under V.D." is a catastrophic misphrasing.*

73. No.

75. No.

77. *Appropriate*

82. *Since the threat includes perception, 2. may actually be difficult to do?*

83. No

84. *Having read the proposed policy my biggest concern is with current violators of this policy on our campus. Faculty members who engage in romantic relationships with graduate students have already lied about the situation to their colleagues and continue to do so. The policy sounds very reasonable to me, but I worry about these cases. What are department heads to do if the faculty and graduate student concerned won't admit to a relationship? Allowing known cases of this type to continue under the new policy would be very damaging, because students would conclude that we don't take seriously our own policy.*

91. No.

93. n/a

95. *I would hope that there would be significant leeway for consensual relationships in the "Management Plan." Retaining employment without violating the policies, or without creating unintended optics of preferential treatment, for example.*

97. no

98. *who gets to determine what is an exception?*

99. *I do like the fact that exception 2 says "exceptions will be granted . . . when the relationship will not cause or threaten to cause the issues outlined in Section IV." This seems the right approach. Would it help to say who has the burden of showing this? At the implementation stage, I think it should be made easy to do this for relationships that really are non-problematic. Maybe even take out "in rare instances." Maybe "Exceptions will be granted when the relationship will not cause. . . ., including by creating a culture where it is broadly perceived that faculty are using students as a dating pool." (I'm sure there's a better way to say this--the point is that if it's happening here and there because people really fall in love, that's different than if a faculty member is a predator or lots of people are dating students and undermining professionalism and the appearance of impartiality and why students are even there in the first place.)*

101. *The case-by-case basis is risky as the results may lead to inconsistencies depending on who is the decision maker. There will be a need to a set of criteria that will provide a basis for more consistency/uniformity.*

102. *Rise up, Herr Kafka, this country needs you (to handle #2)*

105. No

106. No.

108. *Is item 2 necessary? Can't faculty wait until they lack any authority or conflicts of interest in their interactions with students?*

110. no

111. No.

112. *Reporting mechanisms and procedures seem fine to me. The 'other exceptions' language seems rather chilling, that they "will be granted in rare instances" - again, going back to hypothetical situation of non-traditional undergraduate student who meets faculty in entirely different field without any supervisory/evaluative role, that this would be only be considered 'in rare instances' strikes me as excessive.*

113. No

115. no

119. No.

120. No

121. None

122. *What would an example of an "other exception" be?*

124. *Again, who will request an exception before the relationship is established? Policy like this needs to more strongly consider how to protect victims rather than protect the institution from legal liability.*

125. *As long as a clear review process is implemented in other sections of this policy, this seems very clear.*

130. No

131. No

132. No

133. *Weak drafting. The word "exception", which becomes a pivot point elsewhere in the policy, needs to be used the the text of #1.*

136. No

139. *who will conduct the case-by-case review?*

140. No

7. *Do you have any comments on the sections on reporting procedures or the development of management plans?* Count

Answered	73
Skipped	68

1. No

2. *I would support this mechanism, but only for cases in which the private relationship would create a conflict of interest.*

7. *Are we all going to be mandatory reporters for this and have to take an additional 2-hour yearly training? In order to shield the university from lawsuits in yet another area? I'd like to avoid adding to that ballooning burden.*

9. no

11. *I think it will be important to keep the management plans confidential. Who will receive a copy of the plan?*

14. No

15. *Nothing says love like "a management plan".*

16. No

23. None.

27. *The management plans are a truly terrible idea. The concept of an administrative document to control human relationships is surreal in its naivety. No administrator could navigate the legal perils here. The discussions alone would be a legal minefield. Change roles if you want to have a relationship. No exceptions.*

28. *Where will the reports be stored? How long will the system retain this information? I imagine that the privacy concerns have been identified and managed by legal counsel?*

30. No

34. *I believe it could be wise to develop clear procedures here, both of which kinds of sexual misconduct should typically entail. For example, rape of students should typically entail which punishment? I believe we should have fairly clear categories to be employed. I believe that the senate should receive reports each year that would include: how many and which kinds of sexual misconduct happened this previous AY, and which punishments were used in response.*

35. No

36. None

37. *When it comes to enforcement, there is a certain kafkaesque quality to the proposal. On the one hand, it criminalizes (and make no mistake about it, "criminalizing" is the right word in light of the serious penalties listed for "violations of the policy" at the end of the document) relationships between faculty and students, and mandates a long list of penalties for violations. But on the other hand it states 1) "ongoing relationships that would violate this Policy ... must be reported," and 2) "Faculty, Staff, Teaching Assistants" are required "to report Intimate Personal Relationships when required under this Policy." Thus, all of the reporting described in the policy appears to be based on self-reporting by the parties involved. But that puts faculty, staff, and TA's in the position of self-incriminating themselves, and thus opens them up to the imposition of the penalties at the end of the document. Another loose end is that there is nothing specific about what is to be done when a couple is accused of being in an "Intimate Personal Relationship" by a third party. How are such accusations to be handled? Does a chairperson or dean then require the filing of a report, which would clearly be impossible if no such relationship existed? Is there a hearing in which the accused parties must defend themselves against the charge of being in an "Intimate Personal Relationship"? And if so, what kind of evidence would be presented? Or is self-reporting intended to be the *only* way that these relationships are reported, even if the couple has "gone public," so to speak, with the relationship. Again, this whole issue needs rethinking, and greater specificity is needed. And regarding mitigation. So what happens to faculty and students who are discovered in "Intimate Personal Relationships"? There seems to be a major inconsistency in dealing with this issue. Section V.B.2 flatly states, "Exceptions will be granted in rare instances," but section V.B.1 already had stated that a faculty member apprehended in an illicit relationship "is required to cooperate in the development of and comply with a management plan." This makes it sound like exceptions are provided as a matter of course so long as the faculty member develops a "management plan." So which is it? Are exceptions granted only rarely, or are they merely contingent on the crafting of a management plan? And another glaring omission is the failure to address the issue of what happens if a violation is perceived to be so egregious that the university refers to allow a "management plan." Is the faculty member then required to end the relationship or face punitive action? Again, if the university is going to craft a comprehensive statement dealing with these situations, it can't deal with the more complex aspects simply by ignoring them. In addition, the proposal states that a model "management plan" will "include appropriate measures*

to eliminate any Supervisory or Evaluative Authority between parties” and “ensure that parties to the relationship will not later be placed in a position where one may exercise Supervisory or Evaluative Authority over the other.” This is what one would expect when a faculty member has direct “authority” over a student, as, for example, a dissertation advisee or student in a class. That makes good sense. But there seems to be no room here for more vague situations, where a faculty member and grad student just happen to be in the same department (also prohibited by the policy), but the faculty member has no authority over the student. If there is no direct connection, how can an effective “management plan” be developed? Which also would seem to argue against the broad policy of prohibiting relationships simply because a faculty member and grad student happen to be in the same department (or program). And also in this vein, the proposal also seems to dodge another issue. In the Management Plan section there is no distinction made between graduate students and undergrads. So what about relationships in what normally is considered to be a more egregiously forbidden category, between faculty and undergraduates? Are they also eligible for “management plans,” as the current reading implicitly suggests”?

39. N/A

40. no

42. Fine, I suppose. It seems deeply paternalistic and Orwellian to "manage" the relationships of employees and this language does nothing to alleviate employee anxieties. In addition, this is one portion that must be dealt with in coordination with union contracts, as it will be immediately challenged as a series of unfair labor practices.

43. NO

44. No

45. No

49. It's good to have a policy in place to protect the institution. But it's hard to imagine how this would work. What if a couple is accused of being in a relationship, and they either deny it or refuse to disclose details about their private life? Would such a policy just encourage secrecy, which causes its own problems in terms of unit dynamics?

50. No.

51. No

53. Again, I feel like reporting requirements-especially requirements that would require people to state that they are having sexual relationships- are a gross violation of privacy. All the harassment training I have taken tells me that the reporting requirement will be misused and be inappropriate.

54. looks OK

55. What standard of proof will there be?

56. For such a lofty System Policy, C & D cap it all off by saying no system-wide procedures or plans apply because each university will write their own rules.

58. This is odious. Either forbid or allow, don't attempt to regulate. "Management plan" is a bad word for this. Terms under which a conflict does or does not exist should be spelled out clearly enough that a third party stepping in to "manage" people's relationships would not be needed.

59. No

60. No

62. No.

63. This is fine. But again, it seems arbitrary and illegal to leave the decision about whether you allow an intimate relationship- but set limits in terms of supervision of one member of this relationship over the other- or don't allow an intimate relationship in the hands of the unit. Then you

have very different policies in place among different units, or even the same unit with a change in leadership.

64. No.

65. no

67. no

69. no

71. No

73. No.

75. No.

77. *Why not develop a U of I system wide management plans?*

82. *How do you measure the effectiveness of this procedure? Doesn't this introduce new levels of conflict, particularly from the point of view of perceptions (see comments earlier.)*

83. No

91. No.

93. n/a

95. None

97. no

98. *"officials" should be independent of the university-- otherwise they inevitably protect the university*

99. *I worry about gay people who are not out having to disclose their relationships. Is there some way to address this? Perhaps through privacy and confidentiality issues? I also worry about people who are unclear about what they think the status of their relationship is. Is there some way to allow the implementation process to develop ideas to address such issues with sufficient flexibility? I should also say that when I was living in Chicago, I never even came across students. As a (relatively) younger gay person here, it feels like almost everyone I might meet is either a student or somehow connected to one by a few degrees of separation. My response has been to just not date in Champaign. But it's a lonely response--not ideal. I feel like I'd favor all parts of this policy more if I were at UIC than at UIUC or UI Springfield for application to some younger, single people.*

102. *While relationships violating the UI policy need to be reported, I am concerned with the requirement to "specify the information required:" there should be a line between search for relevant information, and lurid interest in details of someone's intimate life.*

105. No

106. No.

108. none.

110. no

111. No.

112. *Both reporting procedures and management plans broadly defined here seem sensible to me, though naturally the devil will be in the details worked out at individual universities.*

113. *How will employees know who the designated officials are in each unit? The term "periodically" is vague. How often would management plans be reviewed? Providing a range might be more useful here (for example, every 6-24 months, depending on the rate of turnover in each unit).*

115. no

117. 1. I'm a bit confused as to what office or persons will oversee investigation of violators of this policy 2. "withauthority" copying editing issue

119. No.

120. No

121. None

122. This seems fine.

124. Again, using terms like "reporting" over "disclosure," "transparency," "inviting conversation," etc keeps it in the legal realm. And we already know from 30 years of research that mandatory reporting in sexual harassment doesn't work and cannot be increased beyond about 6%. Why continue to do what we know doesn't work?

125. None.

130. typo above: "withauthority" is lacking a space

131. Will there be an attempt to unify the plans between Urbana-Champaign, Chicago, and Springfield?

132. No

133. Meh!

135. How can a defendant prove his/her innocence? What are the resources available. How about accusing someone with malicious intent? how about the measures against false accuser (i.e. plaintiff)

136. The described management plans do not include a discussion of policy options if the parties to the personal relationship disagree with the management plan that has been established or options for redress of grievance if the parties perceive that they are being subject to unfair treatment in the reporting and management plan.

140. No

8. Do you have any comments on the sections on confidentiality or records retention? Count

Answered	64
Skipped	77

1. No

2. Fine.

7. no

9. no

11. no.

14. No

15. No

16. No

23. None.

28. *Perhaps outlining examples of the applicable law will help those who are not lawyers understand how long the information is stored and to whom it may be disclosed and for what purposes.*

30. No

34. No.

35. No

36. None

37. No

39. N/A

40. NO

43. NO

44. No

45. No

49. *It would be nice to know what is meant by "applicable law." What laws ARE applicable?*

50. No.

51. No

53. *What are the guarantees here? Someone sees this information. In fact, since relationship status is reported to someone within their unit, it almost certainly has the potential be embarrassing or damaging.*

54. *sounds OK*

58. *Keeping of records -- even confidential ones -- also is odious and perilous, despite promises of confidentiality. Make the rules clear enough that anyone knows he or she risks termination if they initiate a relationship in violation of standards. If a violation is then discovered, terminate. But don't try to regulate and keep records of the regulation. The nobility of the goals aside, this is way too Big Brother for American society.*

59. No

60. No

62. *It would be good to specify what "disclosed only in accordance with applicable law" means. What laws (local, state, federal) in effect at what time (at time of potential offense, time of discovery of potential offense, time of finding)?*

63. *What is the applicable law? The law of the State and the Federal government? Or the policy of the University? How will you handle this during a change in unit leadership? How will you keep a relationship confidential if you have to change the relationship between the two members of the couple? There will be cases in which someone will have to recuse themselves from a vote, etc.*

64. No.

65. no

67. no

69. no

71. No

73. No.

75. No.

77. *Appropriate*

83. No

91. No.

93. *n/a*

95. *None*

97. *no*

98. *I do not trust the promise of confidentiality*

99. *Nope.*

105. *No*

106. *No.*

110. *no*

111. *No.*

112. *none*

113. *No*

115. *no*

119. *No.*

120. *No*

121. *None*

122. *This seems fine.*

124. *Again, confidentiality in this manner protects perpetrators and institutions, not necessarily victims. When people have to hide their relationships or their relationships are deemed confidential, how would anyone ever think we can have open and honest relationships about sexual behavior, discrimination, harassment, or consensual/nonconsensual relationships?*

125. *None.*

130. *No*

131. *No*

132. *If these new policies are to avoid conflict of interest or preferential treatment as well as being transparent, why is the information being held confidential?*

133. *Ok. Except there needs to be citation to specific university policies on confidentiality and records retention. It is not enough to just make the vague reference to the importance of both confidentiality and retention. Instead, this policy needs to indicate what it means by "confidentiality" as well as indicate with who the information is shared for administrative reasons. Further, what about state law on employee records?*

136. *No*

140. *Does this confidentiality section impact the earlier decision to ask new hires and transfers to sign a waiver of confidentiality mentioned in the part about prior sexual harassment issues?*

9. Do you have any comments on the section on consequences for violations? Count

Answered 72

Skipped 69

1. No

2. Fine, if these consequences are limited to private relationships that constitute a conflict of interest.

7. Does this need some language mandating commensurability of punishment with the violation? Revocation of tenure and termination should be limited to cases of repeated or extreme offense. This is the relationship policy, not the harassment policy. Lose your head and lose tenure seems like a bad policy.

9. no

11. what are the consequences for the student, if any? If we are assuming that we are trying to "protect" the student, should there really be any consequence for them?

14. No

15. There is a huge difference between exploitative relationships and relationships based on mutual respect. I don't know how a bureaucracy can determine this, but your policy does not reflect the difference at all. I have explained this in detail to Barb Wilson.

16. No

23. None.

27. The disciplinary actions will ultimately trigger lawsuits regarding freedom of association and the management plans will be Exhibit A. Please don't implement management plans. And that's no even considering liability for relationships that fail. Now the University is a partner to the relationship via a "Management Plan" and could be charged with facilitating abuse etc, and all fallout from failed relationships. We have no business or expertise in regulating complex human relationships. We can say which violate our workspace expectations but that's it.

28. Because "revocation of tenure" is included - the issues surrounding the grey areas will become even more important to address, I imagine. I applaud the spirit of this policy and the efforts here, but I imagine there will be many comments about this.

30. No

34. I'm worried that this formulation will, in effect, privilege the privileged, such as famous professors and men. I am worried that, like in the past, they will receive written warnings or required to take training, or maybe even have their positions converted into non-teaching, non-administrative, purely research positions (as they are no longer authorized to be with students, faculty, or staff). I'm worried that it leaves too much discretion to administrators, including the related, common temptation for all administrators to worry more about the university's reputation than about the victims of sexual misconduct.

35. No

36. None

37. The proposal concludes with a whole laundry list of penalties for "violating the terms of this Policy," up to and including "termination of employment, including revocation of tenure" for "Violations of this Policy." Which makes this very serious stuff! But it is very unclear about what constitutes a violation. A violation of what? Having a prohibited relationship at all? Which certainly is a "violation of the policy." Being merely accused of being in an "Intimate Relationship"? Not coming up with a suitable "management plan"? Not abiding by a "management plan"? In the

punitive section, we need more specifics about what constitutes a "violation," and at the very least some semblance of due process.

39. I might wonder: What if the relevant disciplinary procedures consulted in statutes, handbooks, policies, procedures, practices, or contracts differ, disagree, or contradict one another? I would like more clear direction on the consequences section, and how it might be handled if there are issues locating a specific policy elsewhere.

40. including revocation of tenure - Thank you!

41. Who is going to decide the appropriate consequence for violations?

42. I don't believe this blanket policy is clear enough about how some of these actions are allowed. In particular, some combinations of things here (especially those related to tenure) seem to immediately violate University Statutes. Finally, some of them violate union contract procedures.

43. NO

44. No

45. No

49. It would be good to include some wording to the effect that "the punishment fits the [so-called] crime." That is, being a sexual predator would be appropriate cause for revocation of tenure; what would be an appropriate punishment for a 25-year-old TA seeing a movie with a 22-year-old undergraduate? "Loss of privileges" (what kind of privileges?) etc.

50. No.

51. No

53. Does this mean a person who does not want to disclose a relationship for personal reasons would be punished for failure to disclose and forced to disclose the relationship?

54. good

58. Again, don't try to manage situations. Eliminate them by transfer, demotion to the point that violation ceases, or termination. Management via training, counseling, warnings, probation, etc. opens the door to a bureaucracy overseeing personal relationships. That's unacceptable.

59. No

60. no

62. No.

63. Again I think. there is a question about legality with regard to civil liberties. This is particularly true when you have defined the rules in such a way that a relationship that was allowed previously might be disallowed with a change in unit leadership. But I think there is another problem with different rules for different units decided apparently arbitrarily by units. All of this suggests that you need a uniform policy in which you establish rules by which these relationships are handled in terms of eliminating conflicts of interest. But the vagueness of the current policy- how it will be decided- and problems of inconsistency in how rules are applied, seems to be huge problem with the current language.

64. No.

65. no

67. no

69. no

71. No

73. *I feel that violations of this policy will inevitably occur and that the more extreme disciplinary actions such as expulsion and revocation of tenure should be rarely, if ever, be used.*

75. No.

77. *Appropriate*

82. *Are the protections and support for the individual accused of violating this policy the same for other offenses including legal actions?*

83. No

86. *Without the relevant disciplinary procedures it is rather hard to judge this policy.*

91. No.

93. n/a

94. *Has this been left intentionally vague? The way it is written seems ripe for the kind of uneven application of consequences that make these types of policies weak and routinely ignored/violated.*

95. None

96. *no, this seems reasonable.*

97. no

98. *I am seeing an intersectional deployment here-- white males tend to be protected... women less so [even though they are a small minority of violators]; people of color are scapegoated*

99. *I think this should be fleshed out a great deal in the implementation period. I think the sanctions should match what is happening--not just if it is a strict policy violation but if it is the type of abusive, harassing, harmful, exploitative, coercive relationship that we are really trying to target, or whether it is a healthy relationship that people feel shy or private about. I don't know how to draw those distinctions well at an administrative level, but I would hate for a faculty member to be terminated because s/he falls in love and meets someone with whom s/he relates so deeply that it deepens both of their attachments to life. Or have to give up their jobs. I think some of this could be handled at the remedy stage; but I'd love to keep some flexibility here and allow the campus's to try to develop guidelines that are appropriate to their communities with appropriate and broad stakeholder input. I note that if a relationship is abusive and harassing and so on, a faculty member could be terminated for sexual harassment. You don't need a consensual relations policy for that. But if it is not, I would want the remedies to fit the degree to which there are actual problems (even if not reporting is one element of that, but not the whole).*

105. *Revocation of tenure seems excessive. Why firing isn't enough? Intimate relationships at the workplace might be undesirable, but they are not crime! Let's not find ourselves in the other extreme now: for a long time there was nothing, now we are stripping people from their academic rank. NOT OUR ROLE!*

106. *Who determines consequences will need to be stipulated. Also, there should be consistency across units for similar types of infractions.*

110. no

111. No.

112. *Abstractly this is fine; once again, to return to the hypothetical of the non-traditional undergraduate meeting a faculty in an entirely different field with no evaluative role- that such a relationship may lead to "termination of employment, including revocation of tenure" highlights the excessive nature, in principle at least, of the policy. Greater details of how exemption policies work, beyond being 'rare', would go some way to assuaging my concerns and anxieties that this policy is overreaching its stated goals, and possibly generating problematic unintended consequences.*

113. No

115. no

119. No.

120. No

121. None

122. This seems fine.

124. Again, this is language that protects the institution, makes people fearful, and drives bad behavior underground. But it won't stop the bad behavior.

125. None.

130. No

131. No

132. No

133. Of course it makes sense that non-compliance would have an effect leading to discipline but this document just passes that off on some vague idea that ultimately will be written by the HR folks without any faculty or shared governance input. That is a particular problem that really should get serious attention before this thing goes to the Board.

136. What investigative procedures will be followed to determine that a violation has occurred? What opportunities will the personnel have to respond to the accusation of misconduct? Who will be charged with making the determination of misconduct and the appropriate consequences?

139. hurrah! hopefully these consequences will be applied!

140. No

10. Below, please check up to four sections that you think need or deserve the most Senate or faculty input at the implementation phase, both in the short term and over the next year, as these high-level policies are given concrete implementation.

	Percent	Count
Scope and Definitions	20%	28
Purpose Language	7%	10
Requirements on Faculty, Teaching Assistants, Staff, and Individuals with Authority	52%	74
Exceptions	43%	60
Reporting Procedures & Development of Management Plans	51%	72
Confidentiality and Records Retention	26%	37
Consequences for Violations of the Policy	55%	77

11. Do you have any other comments you would like to relay on the policy as a whole or any of its parts? Count

	Answered	61
	Skipped	80

1. No

3. *This should be looked at as part of a comprehensive policy on sexual harassment and stalking and not as a standalone policy with a delineation between consensual and nonconsensual relationships, the latter subject to relevant laws and policies.*

10. *The policy's purpose is well-intentioned. It does a clear job of listing what is prohibited. But the language may leave some people confused about the many intimate relationships that exist (or will exist) between faculty (or staff) where no reporting relationship, unit relationship, or power differential exists. Can language be added to make clear that those relationships are permissible and not the target of this policy? Maybe it's in here and I missed it. I did see the "pre-existing" clause. But it still seems a touch threatening to me. Thank you for considering and for all your hard work!*

14. *This seems well-thought out and vetted.*

15. *When I was a 23 yr old assistant professor of mathematics at Duke, I started dating a 22 yr graduate student. This was in 1976. We have had an equal partnership ever since and have been married since 2002. This policy would have ruined our lives. -- Bruce Reznick (so you don't have to try to figure out who this is.)*

16. No

17. *No - only to thank all involved for the dedication and careful work that has already gone into this policy.*

23. None.

30. No

34. *I'm very grateful for all your work on this. As can be seen from my comments, I'm most worried about to what extent this proposals deals to a sufficient degree with the problem of sexual perpetrators currently on campus. I am also worried that there is nothing in this proposal that makes it harder for people not to punish serious offenders because they are famous or well established in their fields. So far in this process, I have found it unfortunate that there isn't more care taken when presenting this in the senate or generally. Given the statistics, there may be people in the audience who have been sexually assaulted by faculty or there may be faculty who have worked very hard to try to protect theirs students, but in the past there was no way to do this. These failures to protect and deal with sexual misconduct on campus is not a thing of the past: it lives on in wounds and probably in the actual, current student body and faculty (and others), I believe that these facts should be acknowledged and taken into account as related issues and concerns are discussed in the senate. We should rush to talk about how we should aim to be leaders; we should also take a time to recognize and be sorry about all those we have failed, all those who currently feel unprotected, and all those who are struggling with wounds resulting from previous sexual assaults.*

35. No

36. *None; it seems very well thought out*

37. *No. I think I've already said enough*

38. *I applaud the spirit of this policy. I am deeply uncomfortable with the totality of its prohibitions. I can see, moreover, that the writers of the policy share this discomfort--the vagueness of the exceptions language suggests as much. Much more attention is needed to how such exceptions*

might be evaluated. If we can't do that, then we ought to scrap the whole policy and strengthen sexual misconduct policy in other areas.

39. N/A

42. [The web form apparently will only allow me to select four sections... "scope and definitions" also must be addressed] Nearly all of this document is problematic and was arrived at in a confusing manner. It would change the working lives of all employees in the system and does not clearly address the changes in job status that are common, the role of labor unions and their contracts, and the mixed nature of the work people do. There was no place for this, because the policy doesn't include it, but there is also no sense of what employees should do about casual romantic encounters, lapses in judgment regarding relationships, misunderstandings about relationship status, etc. The solution that they must bring things forward to a management plan to be supervised by parties who themselves are not guaranteed to be disinterested is not a solution. Finally, there has been much work done at the campus level to generate campus policies. Their status and relationship to all of this is unclear and will now be even less clear moving forward. And that's all disregarding the obviously anti-statutory aspects and the dubious legality of some of these provisions. I recommend these not be sent to the Board of Trustees for a vote in this state.

43. NO

44. No

45. Relationships **will** happen, and some of these will be not only mutually desired but beneficial. It is important to prepare for this and not make all participants feel like criminals. That said, the negative aspects of these relationships also occurs. My point is only to remember that disclosure and transparency, however desirable, is not always immediate. So some intelligent kindness would go far.

46. Not really. A few of the requirements attempt to institutionalize virtuous behavior rather than sanction unvirtuous behavior and, in a few cases, potential future conflicts of interest aren't a thing - that's just not a legally justified, foreseeable reason for a university to act. Let's use an analogy - we know, cognitively, that students learn better if they don't listen to music while studying. Yet we don't stop it. The behavior is, for the student in the long term, harmful. Yet we wouldn't even consider banning stereo devices from campus because there was a "potential that somebody in the future might listen to one while studying..." The possibility that somebody, somewhere at the university might sometime, somewhere, someday in the future oversee someone else is no basis for a policy on sexual conflicts of interest. The distracts from enforcing actual conflicts of interest in the here-and-now and creates an expansive bureaucracy for oversight at the expense of dealing with problems in the here-and-now.

51. Overall good, but needs some work on the TA perspective of this newly proposed policy.

54. no

56. How has this exercise moved us ahead? This policy uses too many words to say too little.

58. This is an important policy that is being rushed through for no apparent reason. Wait a year and do it right.

59. No

60. no

63. I think you need to go back to the drawing board for reasons stated. I also think you have to consult carefully with more than one legal counsel. This University is spending very large amounts of money defending decisions and policies that have been subsequently declared illegal by state and federal rules. Note =I checked all Boxes above. I unchecked all since it would not allow me to finish the survey without doing that.

64. I don't understand how violations will be discovered.

65. no

67. no

69. no

71. No

73. *I hope I am wrong but I feel there will be quite a few violations of this policy and that the participants will seek to hide these relationships.*

75. *I think the policy was thoroughly considered and vetted, is comprehensive, and overall, well-done.*

82. *How does the university measure whether this policy is being effective, whether the policy needs to be revised, and what are the costs of the policy? Why only 4 sections?*

87. *This is an important issue to resolve.*

91. *See my comments on how the polling was done.*

93. n/a

95. None

99. *I think it's important to be realistic about the fact that consensual relations policies may not do much to prevent sexually abusive relationships or sexual harassment. I think this is low hanging fruit, which might conceivably be pushed into an implementable policy more quickly, but I think the most important changes this campus will see will come from the Urbana Report on Faculty Sexual Misconduct and its attempt to broaden the classes of unwelcome conduct that are targeted by institutional policies. My honest guess, based in the empirical research to date, is that a consensual relations policy will do not very much at all, though it may help a little around the edges--and will likely also have some negative cultural effects around sound happiness around some decent relationships. I hope the system will strongly support the further efforts Urbana has been making to target broader forms of sexual harassment and related unwelcome sexual and sex-based conduct--which has the potential to make us a national leader on these topics.*

100. *No additional comments. There are typos and word spacing issues throughout so there will need to be another edit.*

106. *If the policy in relation to faculty/staff consensual relationships is so strict, I'm afraid that they will not be reported. It is better to have a policy where someone in a position of authority cannot supervise or teach a graduate student but can have a consensual relationship as long as it is reported.*

107. *The reporting procedures and development of management plans will take a lot of careful consideration - I hope that the University Senate is consulted again at that stage.*

111. No.

112. *To sum up, the policy goals are good; the policy itself, particularly in its categorical nature without expressing in detail any exemption grounds beyond 'in rare cases', strikes me as an overly aggressive, and which may well generate unintended problems.*

113. *No extra questions.*

115. no

117. *While I strongly support this proposed "System Policy on Intimate Relationships" it seems to me that the University needs to do a better job in addressing the larger and more prevalent issue of sexual harassment and assault on campus.*

119. No.

120. No

121. None

124. *The research literature does not support a consensual relationship policy like this.*

125. *There must be a process by which shared governance can allow for regular review of the implementation of these policies both at the System level and the University level. This process must also be protected and reviewed regularly by USSP. I can easily see how in the spirit of confidentiality, the Administration at both the University and System levels oversee this entire policy and its implementation without faculty and student input. There also needs to be a greater voice within this process from graduate students who are generally under-represented within Senate committees and within the Senate itself.*

127. *The portion involving TAs, who are themselves students, needing to disclose relationships with other students when they are not in a supervisory relationship should be re-evaluated.*

128. *The consequences for violations should have priority over to the confidentiality. The confidentiality should not be an excuse for refraining the investigation or any form of covering up.*

130. *What happens when two parties unknowingly enter into a prohibited relationship after the enactment of the policy (i.e., they were unaware of each other's position/status in the University)? Should they immediately cease the relationship? Should they disclose anything? Should they seek an exception (if applicable)? Should the definition of undergraduate students be as broad as currently written? For example, should a non-traditional student taking only a single undergraduate class online be considered an undergraduate student and part of the more restrictive policy on relationships? It seems (at least for me) it would be more appropriate for them to be subject to the graduate student relationship policy.*

131. *No*

132. *the Confidentiality needs to be examined if this policy is to avoid preferential treatments,*

133. *I support having a policy to "manage" the inevitable "intimate relations" issues that arise in an organization this large, and support the idea that they should be prohibited in regard to undergraduates below the age of 21 or 25 and should not be allowed within departments. A management plan is not a bad idea, but beyond the principles, this proposal has too many ragged edges to have the SEC doing anything but calling for much more work.*

136. *No*

140. *No*