

## **Faculty Governance: Summary of Key Faculty Grievance Procedure Recommendations**

### **Pre-grievance**

1. Academic units must provide more transparent and detailed policies in their Faculty Handbook / Faculty Guidelines because these are the basis for determining violations of policy.
2. Faculty must receive documentation of any decision that impacts their employment. (Faculty are being sanctioned as retaliation and there is no paper trail; promotion and tenure decisions must have a paper trail in which rationales for all decisions are documented and shared with faculty.)
3. Develop a mediation process to avoid grievance (due to the stress, cost of a grievance, and impact to the unit), which would need to include someone from the Provost's Office or the Provost. (We could require that this process takes place in good faith to file a grievance; in that case, the window of time to file a grievance must be extended even more.)
4. Faculty Grievance Monitors should receive an honorarium and should report on all cases to the Faculty Senate Office.

### **During the grievance**

1. Standardize all processes. (Law and Medicine don't use the standard grievance process model that was approved by the Senate Assembly; some schools appoint grievance board members from their ECs.)
2. Extend the window of time to file a grievance from 90 to 120 days in order to provide more time to resolve issues without filing a grievance.
3. The faculty member and dean should be provided with an attorney, independent of the university. (This is due to the expense of the grievance; the inequity of not protecting faculty whistleblowers who are pointing out violations; and the OGC connections with Academic HR, ECRT, and the provost. As a consequence, the dean being grieved has significant advantages.)
4. GHB members who are from the grievant's school cannot chair the GHB.
5. If a GHB declines to hear a case but SACUA later rules that the application is in fact grievable, a new GHB should be formed.

### **After the grievance**

1. Unanimous decisions by a GHB cannot be appealed.
2. Reconsider how appeals are handled so that appeals of a Dean do not go to someone in the administrative chain of command.
3. A GHB's findings and recommendations must be binding and enforceable.
4. Develop a post-grievance process to acknowledge the findings, to ensure accountability, and to ensure that there is no retaliation (including a review a year later).
5. The finding of a violation should be communicated to the Unit's Executive Committee and should prompt a review of the Unit's policies and guidelines.
6. Academic HR will share each case and the Grievance Hearing Board recommendation with the Faculty Senate Office (FSO) at the conclusion of each case, including any appeal or provostial action post-grievance to allow the FSO to develop long term data about the grievance process outcomes. The FSO will treat the cases as confidential.

### **Grievance Task Force process**

1. Recommendations should be reviewed by SACUA while still in process but heading towards conclusion.
2. Final recommendations should be shared with SACUA and the Senate Assembly for a vote.