

Faculty Handbook Revision Committee
October 14, 2015

Members Present: Nancy Tate, Randy Pembroke, Cynthia Waskowiak, Laura Stephenson, Tracy Routsong, Monica Scheibmeir, Jalen Lowry

Discussion:

Randy updated the Committee on the draft of the non-reappointment and tenure termination edits. He said Dr. Farley is okay with the basic template once we add in the language from the current policy from the formal hearing procedure. After Marc makes that change, Randy may meet with the faculty who served on the most recent termination appeals for their feedback. He or others might also present it to department meetings so that faculty have an opportunity to more closely review the edits before the Faculty Affairs Committee reviews it as an agenda item.

The Committee then discussed the grievance procedure that is found in the Appendix to the Handbook. Cynthia had reviewed all the appendices as part of the general clean-up and thought this one should be discussed. Neither Randy nor Nancy has ever had a grievance filed using this process, which is for terms and conditions of employment, like class schedules, office space, etc. Laura thought she's seen those types of issues informally dealt with by chairs or the deans.

Generally, the Committee thought it a good idea to have a procedure but thought the current one needs some edits, as some wording is confusing and the final appeal is to WUBoR, which seems too far for the issues this addresses. Someone asked how deans deal with faculty who are unhappy with performance reviews, if there was a process. We didn't think so and Laura said that in CAS, faculty would write a rebuttal and she would include that in the personnel file.

Section F of the WUPRPM addresses employee relations, so we looked at that section to see if we could just refer to it if it would cover these issues. The WUPRPM applies to all employees and the Faculty Handbook is specific to faculty. We discussed how to decide which to follow if the grievance involved faculty and staff. Someone suggested adding language to the Faculty Handbook to address that situation.

As for editing the current procedure, it is not clear how a "grievance committee" is formed. We discussed whether to use an existing committee for this function, since it happens rarely, or if another committee should be formed. Tracy thought that "grievance" wasn't a listed committee so it is probably filled as needed; she will ask others at Faculty Senate to see if there is some instruction or guidance in those rules. She will also ask Senate for input on what issues should be in a grievance process and who should address them.

The Committee thought the process should be moved out of the appendix to another section of the Handbook, perhaps after collegiality. The R&R sub-committee updated the ethics section of the Handbook in their draft using AAUP guidance and also addressed collegiality. They also moved that to the beginning of Section 6.

Finally, we discussed our topic for next time. We need to draft some guidance on Performance Improvement Plans, perhaps creating a standard template that can be filled and customized within proper boundaries for each situation. We also need to add categories to the R&R changes before

sending to FAC. The Committee would like a summary of what's been done with a plan for the year. Cynthia and Marc will work on this.

Decisions:

- We should keep a grievance process, but edit it and move to another section.
- Tracy will check with Faculty Senate for their input on the grievance process.
- Next meeting, we will discuss guidelines for a PIP.

Next Meeting October 28, noon, Shawnee Room