

# University Faculty Affairs MEETING MINUTES

**September 24, 2018**

12:00 PM – 1:00 PM

**Warren Lawless Conference Room**

CHAIR: Rodney Hicks

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

ABSENT:

NON-VOTING MEMBERS: Elizabeth Rega

SECRETARY: Alyssa Rodriguez

Topic	Proposed Discussion	Actions
<b>1. Call to Order</b>	Meeting was called to order at 12:07pm.	
<b>EXECUTIVE SESSION</b>		
<b>3. Approval of minutes – Aug 27</b>		<b>Dr. Chaney motioned to approve the minutes as written, Dr. Lutfy seconded, all were in favor.</b>
<p><b>4. Grievance Committee</b></p> <p>9 proposals for changes to the handbook have been submitted by the chair of the grievance committee.</p>	<p>Request for Grievance Committee to take up the charge of reviewing and making recommendation on staff grievances until the Provost establishes a means of grievance review that is fair and not conflicted by the presence of HR and supervisors.</p> <p><b>Discussion</b> – Dr. Hicks met with legal, provost, and HR following the august 27<sup>th</sup> meeting. Dr Hicks sent an email to Dr Kachani - Thank you for submitting the request to UFAC this week that highlighted on the concerns of a faculty member that approached you. You will recall in your note to UFAC that there was a request to alter the scope of the Grievance committee to include Staff.</p> <p>I am acknowledging the request. I have calendared the request for the next UFAC meeting (September 24). I took the responsibility as chair to investigate following the brief discussion we had this past week. Here is what I have found.</p> <p>The issue is outside the scope of the faculty handbook. The feedback that I received was that the faculty handbook had policies and procedures afforded to those employees that in the class of faculty. This sounds like a restrictive clause, but the handbook is the voice of the faculty. While faculty support staff in the workplace, grievance committee would not change its scope of work or composition for a different class of employees.</p> <p>The issue that is requested may have arisen for a specific incidence at Western U. However, nationwide, the common practice is that one handbook (in this</p>	<p><b>Dr. Bertone has taken this proposal for the Grievance Committee out.</b></p>

	<p>case the faculty handbook) is limited in its scope and applicable to the intended class. Some of the roots of this restriction from employment laws directing how organizations operate</p> <p>Existing University policies are in place for staff members.</p> <p>As chair of UFAC, I have met with representatives from Legal, the Provost's office, and HR. Each of the parties rendered the same conclusion independently of each other. I do believe I have reached out to the most appropriate parties and gotten feedback.</p> <p>I want to commend the faculty who brought forth the issue to you as Senator. Your request will be on the next agenda since the issue was submitted in writing. Fair discussion will be allowed. The UFAC's response will be documented through minutes. You, in turn, will be able to share with the faculty member that the issue was explored. Most likely, a motion to close the question without action will occur. I would imagine that this is not the result the faculty member was seeking; but the process of submitting the question, having background work done, having a discussion in open forum, and reaching a motion was honored. I hope you share the process worked with the faculty member and encourage the faculty member to continue to participate in the process of shared governance. Also, throughout all of the discussions, at no time was the faculty member's name attached to the question.</p> <p>I am happy to meet with you ahead of time of next month's meeting if you have questions.</p>	
	<p><b>Grievance committee proposal 2</b>  The grievance committee requests that the senate request that the staff council be re-convened. In addition, that council will develop a grievance process independent of human resources and supervisors. There is no such process and the staff are inappropriately vulnerable in this regard.  <b>Discussion</b> – The staff needs somewhere to be able to go and not have any fear of retaliation. Would like to ask the senate to implement the staff council.</p>	<p><b>Dr. Lutfy will draft a short statement regarding a staff council resolution. Also including Simone Miller to help with the language. The committee would also need examples so that it could carry more weight when requesting something of this nature.</b></p>
	<p><b>Grievance committee proposal 3</b>  The Grievance committee expressed the term of office to be extended to three years  <b>Discussion</b> – It was suggested to also add more members as well as having the terms staggered.</p>	<p><b>Dr. Lutfy will take proposals three through nine and work with Dr. Joe Bertone and the Grievance Committee to draft language regarding these proposals.</b></p>
	<p><b>Grievance committee proposal 4</b>  The Grievance committee meets when there is a grievance but also to discuss other business.  <b>Discussion</b> – The committee could meet whenever the chair calls a meeting.</p>	

	<p><b>Grievance committee proposal 5</b>  Replace with: 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 assure the issue will be addressed.  Rationale: There are essentially no campus facilities to deal with these issues. The deficits and conflict of interest in having these issues dealt with by human resources are clear.  <b>Discussion</b> – An Ombudsmen would really help out with this issue.</p>	
	<p><b>Grievance committee proposal 6</b>  Recommended changes to section II of the Grievance procedures by adding 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.  However, this is not required.  Rationale: Bullying etc., authority, etc. may preclude a grievant to do this.  <b>Discussion -</b></p>	
	<p><b>Grievance committee proposal 7</b>  The Grievance committee recommends changing six months to 180 days under the deans response.  <b>Discussion</b> – Stipulated to be changed to working days equal to six months</p>	
	<p><b>Grievance committee proposal 8</b>  Recommends changing section M provost decision Provost's Decision:  The Provost shall decide the grievance, within fifteen (15) working days, which can be extended after notice  Addition: and submitting the reason for the delay.  Rationale: these issues are too personally important to be delayed to this extent without a reason for the delay.</p>	
	<p><b>Grievance committee proposal 9</b>  Pertains to the BOT changing "in as early as time frame as possible" to "in 60 days of receiving the appeal"  <b>Discussion</b> – change to working days.</p>	
<p><b>Next Meeting</b></p>	<p>October 22, 2018 - Warren Lawless Conference Room, AAC</p>	
<p><b>Adjournment</b></p>	<p>The meeting was adjourned at 1pm.</p>	