

University Faculty Affairs MEETING MINUTES

January 28, 2019

12:00 PM – 1:00 PM

Warren Lawless Conference Room

CHAIR: Rodney Hicks

MEMBERS Present: Joshua Cameron, Edward Goering, Malika Kachani, Jerome Lacroix, Kabir Lutfy

ABSENT: Casey Chaney

NON-VOTING MEMBERS: Elizabeth Rega

SECRETARY: Alyssa Rodriguez

Topic	Proposed Discussion	Actions
1. Call to Order	Meeting was called to order at 12:02pm.	
2. Approval of Minutes – Nov 26		Dr. Lutfy motioned to approve the minutes as written, Dr. Lacroix seconded, all were in favor.
3. Update – Remaining College Guidelines	Ms. Rodriguez has created a spreadsheet for the college guidelines and which ones have been received and reviewed. There a still a handful of colleges who haven't turned in their college guidelines, College of Optometry, College of Graduate Nursing, College of Podiatric Medicine, and College of Health Sciences. Will try and get a word document for College of Pharmacy and College of Osteopathic Medicine of the Pacific.	
4. Update – Grievance Committee	The Grievance Committee has submitted 11 proposals to their committees charge.	
	<p>Grievance Committee Proposal 1 The grievance committee would like to change the term of office from one year to three years</p> <p><i>Old language</i> The term of office is for one year:</p> <p><i>New language</i> The term of office is for three years; The terms will be staggered to provide continuity.</p> <p>Rationale: To maintain experience and a reminder to administrative memory for follow through of decisions.</p>	<p>Dr. Lutfy motioned to approve the proposal of changing the term to three years, Dr. Kachani seconded.</p> <p>All were in favor of approving this proposal.</p>
	<p>Grievance Committee Proposal 2 The grievance committee would like to change that the grievance committee meets only when there is a grievance.</p>	Dr. Lutfy motioned to approve proposal two, Dr. Kachani seconded.

	<p><i>Old language</i> The Grievance Committee meets only when there is a grievance.</p> <p><i>New language</i> The Grievance Committee meets when there is a grievance, as well as to address other business.</p> <p>Rationale: discussion of procedures and other issues are needed</p>	<p>All were in favor of approving this proposal.</p>
	<p>Grievance Committee Proposal 3</p> <p><i>Old language</i> This Procedure DOES NOT APPLY to complaints involving allegations of discrimination and/or harassment, or concerns/issues of an interpersonal nature between or amongst faculty members. Please contact Human Resources for the applicable policies/procedures.</p> <p><i>New language</i> These procedures include complaints involving allegations of discrimination, harassment, bullying, and issues of an interpersonal nature between or amongst faculty and staff members. One may also contact Human Resources for the applicable policies/procedures, but it is recommended that a grievance be filed with the grievance committee to ensure the issue will be addressed.</p> <p>Rationale: There are no other venues for recourse to address such issues, outside HR.. The deficits and conflict of interest in having these issues dealt with by human resources are clear</p>	<p>Dr. Kachani motioned to approve proposal three, Dr. Lutfy seconded.</p> <p>All were in favor of approving this proposal.</p>
	<p>Grievance Committee Proposal 4 The grievance committee would like to add language to the following statement</p> <p><i>Old language</i> Before filing a formal grievance, a faculty member should seek to resolve the dispute by discussing it informally with the person(s) who made the disputed action/decision or actively participated in it or who has authority to provide redress.</p> <p><i>New language</i></p>	<p>Dr. Lutfy motioned to approve proposal four, Dr. Cameron seconded.</p> <p>All were in favor of approving this proposal.</p>

	<p>Before filing a formal grievance, a faculty member should seek to resolve the dispute by discussing it informally with the person(s) who made the disputed action/decision or actively participated in it or who has authority to provide redress. <u>However, this is not required.</u></p> <p>Rationale: Bullying etc., authority, etc. may preclude a grievant to do this</p>	
	<p>Grievance Committee Proposal 5 The grievance committee would like to change the number of days a grievant has to respond from 6 months to 180 working days.</p> <p><i>Old language</i> The grievant has six months to call for a Grievance Committee meeting following the receipt of the Dean’s response.</p> <p><i>New language</i> The grievant has <u>one hundred and eighty (180) working days</u> to call for a Grievance Committee meeting following the receipt of the Dean’s response.</p>	<p>Dr. Cameron motioned to approve proposal five, Dr. Kachani seconded.</p> <p>All were in favor of approving this proposal.</p>
	<p>Grievance Committee Proposal 6 The grievance committee would like to change the six (6) months to 180 working days.</p> <p><i>Old language</i> The grievant must request review by the Grievance Committee within six (6) months</p> <p><i>New language</i> The grievant must request review by the Grievance Committee within <u>one hundred and eighty (180) working days</u></p>	<p>Dr. Cameron motioned to approve proposal six, Dr. Kachani seconded.</p> <p>All were in favor of approving this proposal.</p>
	<p>Grievance Committee Proposal 7</p> <p><i>Old language</i> Adding new language to the timeline and development.</p> <p><i>New language</i> The action and submission time-line, in reference only to the Grievant and stated herein, may be modified and relaxed based on new information or other circumstances for the Grievant timeline alone. Examples include, but are not limited to, new information supporting bias against the Grievant, possible double standard application towards</p>	<p>After much discussion, Dr. Lutfy withdrew proposal number seven.</p>

	<p>the Grievant, amendments of the decision, revelations in decision impact, etc. The examples include, but do not limit, the issues that may relax time-line restrictions for the Grievant.</p>	
	<p>Grievance Committee Proposal 8 The grievance committee would like to change the six (6) months to 180 working days.</p> <p><i>Old language</i> and in those circumstances, with supporting evidence, the faculty will be given an opportunity for an extended timeline. At no time will there be less than six (6) months</p> <p><i>New language</i> and in those circumstances, with supporting evidence, the faculty will be given an opportunity for an extended timeline. At no time will there be less than <u>one hundred and eighty (180) working days</u></p>	<p>Dr. Luffy motioned to approve proposal eight, Dr. Lacroix seconded.</p> <p>All were in favor of approving this proposal.</p>
	<p>Grievance Committee Proposal 9 The grievance committee would like to add “the grievance committee and the grievant agree to an extension.” to letter D.</p> <p><i>Old language</i> The Grievance Committee meeting shall be called no later than ten (10) working days after the request has been filed. Generally, all proceedings will be conducted within sixty (60) to ninety (90) working days of the first meeting unless all parties involved agree to an extension.</p> <p><i>New language</i> The Grievance Committee meeting shall be called no later than ten (10) working days after the request has been filed. Generally, all proceedings will be conducted within sixty (60) to ninety (90) working days of the first meeting unless <u>the grievance committee and the grievant agree to an extension.</u></p>	<p>Dr. Lacroix motioned to approve proposal nine, Dr. Kachani seconded.</p> <p>All were in favor of approving this proposal.</p>
	<p>Grievance Committee Proposal 10 The grievance committee would like to add “and submitting the reason for the delay” to letter M.</p> <p><i>Old language</i></p>	<p>Dr. Lacroix motioned to approve proposal ten, Dr. Kachani seconded.</p> <p>All were in favor of approving this proposal.</p>

	<p>The Provost shall decide the grievance, within fifteen (15) working days, which can be extended after notice to all parties, taking into consideration the recommendation of the Grievance Committee and other factors that the Provost may deem appropriate and/or relevant to the matter.</p> <p><i>New language</i> The Provost shall decide the grievance, within fifteen (15) working days, which can be extended after notice <u>and submitting the reason for the delay</u> to all parties, taking into consideration the recommendation of the Grievance Committee and other factors that the Provost may deem appropriate and/or relevant to the matter.</p>	
	<p>Grievance Committee Proposal 11 The grievance committee would like to add a time limit to step four.</p> <p><i>Old language</i> A written decision will be issued to the grievant in as early a time-frame as possible.</p> <p><i>New language</i> A written decision will be issued to the grievant in <u>60 days of receiving the appeal</u>.</p> <p>Rationale: These issues are serious and time sensitive and there is electronic means to meet outside regular board meetings, as needed.</p>	<p>Dr. Kachani motioned to approve proposal eleven, Dr. Lacroix seconded.</p> <p>All were in favor of approving this proposal.</p>
5. Posthumous Awards	<p>A survey was sent out to the faculty regarding posthumous degrees. Questions were raised such as “How far into the degree should they be in order to qualify for the doctorate?” They should have at least completed 65% of degree requirements. “Do we give the award in the discipline of the students enrollment or should it be an honorary doctorate of humane letters?” Dr. Hicks pulled language from different policies from online and put together language for the Posthumous Awards Policy.</p>	<p>Dr. Lutfy made a motion to approve at 65%, Dr. Lacroix seconded, all were in favor.</p>
Next Meeting	Monday, February 25, 2019	
Adjournment	The meeting was adjourned at 12:58pm.	