

FACULTY AFFAIRS MINUTES

March 6, 2007

Betsy Cauble-chair, Regina Beard, Kathleen Greene, Mark Haub, William Hsu, Judy Hughey, Kaleen Knopp, Walter Renberg, Sheri Smith.

Guests—

Roger Adams, Judy Anderson, Jane Rowlett, Frank Spikes.

Motion was made and passed to approve January 23, 2007 minutes.

Motion was made and passed to approve February 20, 2007 minutes.

Continuing Business—

Limited Retirement Health Care Bridge (LRHC)—discussion

Jane Rowlett was invited to discuss/answer questions about the LRHC. Immediate action is needed to advance this proposal to Faculty Senate for consideration. Points of discussion regarding the LRHC that FAC considered were:

- ❖ Bridges the gap between early retirement (before age 65) and Medicare eligibility
- ❖ Currently the University-paid benefits is approximately \$25,000 per retiree
- ❖ The benefit would become effective once the administration signs off on it.
- ❖ This benefit is a privilege not a right. For example, it is possible that adequate funds to provide it might not be available.
- ❖ Applicants not automatically approved. Applications approved case by case.

Rowlett suggested that once the proposal is approved by Administration, it be added to the University Handbook.

Hughey moved to accept the language and forward to Executive Committee for inclusion on the FAC agenda. Knopp seconded.

Hughey then added a friendly amendment to remove “*Note that at the current time, the maximum would be approximately \$25,000 for the employee/spouse coverage for the full thirty six months*” language.

Motion approved.

Graduate Council (GC)

Cauble informed the group that she notified the Graduate Council(GC) of FAC declination allowing GTAs to participate in the grievance process as articulated in Appendix G. GC may request FAC act in a consultant role in the future.

Grievance procedure

Extended discussion took place regarding the ramifications of moving tenure denial process from Appendix G procedures to Appendix M (Dismissal of Tenured Faculty).

FAC intent is to make grievance process less legalistic and more accessible to potential grievants while maintaining appropriate structure for the hearings. Possible resolutions include rewriting Appendix M to include tenure denial section, writing a tenure denial process and assigning it a separate section in the University Handbook or reworking current Appendix G language to clarify the entire grievance process.

Rowlett articulated the difference in the two processes. For an Appendix M process, the grievant has property rights to tenure. The burden of proof to take away those property rights is with the University. For the Appendix G process, the burden of proof is with the grievant. Even for denial of tenure, the grievant is in a “probationary” status and must show that the denial of tenure was the result of some problem with the University’s process. She stressed the importance of writing a complete complaint so that all grievant concerns can be heard at the hearing. She also agreed that process could be further clarified.

Cauble suggested the need for FAC to get a better understanding of the process before attempting to change the language and asked for volunteers to serve on several “sub-committees” to review, by the March 27 meeting, the following grievance procedures components:

❖ **Review print/online procedures for the administrative aspect:**

Kathy Greene
Sheri Smith

❖ **Review grounds for complaints and directions to potential grievant for compiling and submitting a complaint:**

Regina Beard
Kaleen Knopp

❖ **Open meeting language:**

Rick McFarland
Dave Nichols

❖ **Overall reading of Appendix G:**

Walter Renberg
Betsy Cauble

❖ **General grievance board:**

Mark Haub
Judy Hughey

❖ **Language Inconsistencies:**

Bill Hsu
Judy Anderson

The issue of the role of faculty advocates is very complex. Spikes suggested clearly defining the responsibilities of the Faculty Advocate, i.e. whether they are support for the grievant or act in role similar to that of an attorney. FAC needs to clarify and clearly state the role of the faculty advocate.

Other business

Cauble reminded group:

- ❖ April 17 meeting will begin at 2:30 p.m. to avoid conflict with another University event.
- ❖ Need to identify/elect committee chair for next year by semester’s end.

Meeting adjourned.

Submitted,
Regina Beard