

MINUTES

Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs
September 10, 2008

Members present: Lou Gorr, Ellen Plummer, Frances Keene, Hal Irvin, Nick Spruill, Michelle Adcock, Marilyn King, Charles Lytton, Kay Hunnings, Pat Hyer, Ray Ali, Karen Sanders, Melinda West, Richard Sorensen

Members absent: Kelly Oaks and Kevin Ayoub

Guests: Marshall Chaney, observing for ELPS 6304 class
Mary Grace Campos, observing for ELPS 6304 class

Recorder: Cyndi Hutchison

1. Welcome and Introductions

- Commission Chair Frances Keene welcomed those in attendance.
- Members introduced themselves.

2. Grievance Procedures (Faculty Handbook and Resolution)

F. Keene reorganized and reworked the Grievance Procedures and Resolution over the summer and distributed handouts to the Commission for discussion and approval.

Faculty Handbook

Section 3.11.1 (new) – Informal Resolution of Conflicts (from Chapter 2 of the Faculty Handbook)

- There are ways to deal with conflict rather than filing a grievance – should be able to resolve most faculty concerns or complaints through informal communication;
- The faculty member may request assistance of a reconciliation team to assist in the process. Previous language stated that there was a “standing committee”; proposed revision designates a reconciliation team, which could be faculty senate reconciliation committee, or other appropriate group as needed and approved by CAPFA.

Section 3.11.2 – Valid Issues for Grievance

- Deleted Number 2: *substantive violations of promotion and tenure procedures (see appeal process in section 2.8.5) or substantive violations of promotion and continued appointment procedures (see appeal process in section 2.9.8)* as it is not relevant for A/P faculty members.

Section 3.11.4 – The Formal Grievance Procedure

- Step One: Provide a written statement instead of an oral statement to his or her director or department head within 30 days of when the event or action occurred;
- Step Two: If resolution of the grievance proposed in written response is not acceptable, the grievant may advance the grievance to the dean or vice president within five workdays of receiving the written response from his or her director or department head;
- Step Three: The grievant may advance to the level of provost or associate vice president for human resources within five workdays of receiving the response from the second-level administrator if the response is not acceptable. Advancement of a grievance in step three will include consideration by an impartial hearing panel of the Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs unless the grievant requests that the senior administrator rule on the grievance directly, without the advice of a faculty panel;
- Step Four: If the senior administrator’s decision is not acceptable to the grievant AND not consonant with the recommendations of the hearing panel, the grievant may appeal in writing to the president within 20 calendar days. The president’s decision is final.

Grievance Process Resolution: The resolution was modified to include the ad hoc panels to replace the standing committee.

The proposed revisions to the grievance process must first be approved by the Commission, then presented to the University Council for two readings and a vote, and then presented to the Board of Visitors for approval.

The commission members will read the proposed changes to the Handbook and to the procedures document and will discuss it at the October meeting.

3. Policy for Administrative and Professional Faculty to Teach For-Credit Courses

F. Keene and E. Plummer are working on the draft resolution.

P. Hyer proposed to the committee that we accept the policy as is in order to take to the November Board meeting. The importance of pushing the policy through is because the classified staff who have the option to convert to AP faculty need to make their decision this fall. If the November Board meeting deadline is missed, this policy could not be presented to the Board until March.

R. Sorensen suggested that a sentence be included to affirm that the supervisor makes the determination whether teaching is considered within in the A/P faculty member's job description or duty above reasonable job expectations.

- **ACTION:** L. Gorr made a motion to move forward and R. Sorensen seconded. Voted unanimously by the commission and policy was approved. Resolution forthcoming.

4. Mentoring Program for AP Faculty

F. Keene discussed the need for a mentoring program for AP Faculty and asked what role CAPFA might play in establishing a program. As an example, she used the Women's Center Mentoring Program and how it was valuable for her.

H. Irvin suggested that the mentoring initiative is something that should be university wide – extending to not only AP faculty, but including classified staff.

Many areas have some type of mentoring program in place, but typically extend to only effective programming training and retention.

- Develop a Volunteer Model so that goals and outcome can be established
 - Determine where the internal pool of mentors comes from
 - Establish goals and outcome of mentoring process (retention and growth)

The commission decided to carry the discussion to the next meeting and will invite Tony Gambill and Makeisha Williams to attend the meeting in order to be part of the discussion.

5. Update on HE Restructuring

H. Irvin discussed the AP resolution which was passed by the Board. The process is almost complete in determining which classified positions are eligible to convert to AP faculty. Classified staff will begin making their decision on whether to convert or not in October.

As there were no additional items to be discussed, the meeting adjourned.

The next meeting is scheduled for October 8th.