



## **Committee on the Economic and Social Well-Being of the Faculty (CESWF)**

Minutes of Meeting: 10/30/23

Circulated: 11/30/23

Approved: 12/4/23

Present: Yasmina Laouar (Chair), Hakem Al-Ruston, Elham Mahmoudi, Rebekah Modrak (SACUA liaison), Chris Rider, Suzanne Selig, Yulia Sevryugina, Louise Stein, John Thomas

Absent: K. Rivet Amico, Christina Aplin-Snider, Elif Oral

Guests: Michèle Hannoosh

Faculty Senate Office: Eric Vandenberghe, Luke, McCarthy

**1:02pm:** Call to Order, Approval of Agenda and Minutes

The agenda was approved. The minutes for the September CESWF meeting were approved.

**1:02pm-1:06pm: Brief introduction of the committee**

Summary: Brief introductions were made by the committee members to this meetings' guest- Michèle Hannoosh.

Action: Introductions

**1:06pm-2:24pm: Introduction of University Faculty Ombuds Dr. Michèle Hannoosh and further questions from the committee**

Summary: Hannoosh introduced herself to the committee and provided an overview of the [Ombuds Office](#). The history of the Ombuds office was discussed. The Ombuds see approximately 100 cases per year between the two of them. Six years ago, the office was expanded to two individuals to meet the growing demand for their services.

The Chair introduced relevant items from the committee charge that are pertinent to the ongoing discussion with the guest. Pre-formulated questions are posed to the group, as well as the guest.

Hannoosh discussed the retaliation SPG that had been brought up by the committee previously. It was crafted narrowly to be involved with those reported for misconduct. It does not apply to all forms of retaliation. Should this SPG be expanded to cover other forms of retaliation and/or should a new SPG be created to address this need? This issue is to be discussed by the committee members at a later time.

Reverse retaliation is an issue brought up by the guest.

What factors determine when an investigation is initiated? It can depend on the type of complaint. There are specific areas in which certain groups have jurisdiction. ECRT handles



accusations related to gender discrimination. ECRT may contact the respondent if they decide not investigate to work to address the accusation in a way that does not entail having a formal proceeding. The process of an ECRT investigation is reviewed by the guest.

The guest describes a database in ECRT, which is internally housed, that notes when a complaint is lodged.

Further discussion on ECRT is held. It grew out of the former OIE office. ECRT has a large staff and answers directly to the President of the University.

The guest provides further clarification on the role of the ombuds, and what they are able to do.

An issue is brought up on SPGs regarding implementation of consequences related to grievances.

The difference between formal and informal complaints are discussed.

Consequences of an investigation of a complaint are discussed. Faculty can lose privileges while investigations take place that cannot be fully recovered in the instance that they are successful in defending themselves against complaints. Areas that can be affected include merit raises, service responsibilities, etc.

A member brings up that respondents of complaints should be provided with the process and procedures for their hearings, etc.

Action: Discussion

**2:24pm:** Adjournment

Respectfully submitted,

Eric Vandenberghe  
Faculty Governance Coordinator  
Faculty Senate Office