

Faculty Senate

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Committees/Councils](#) » [Faculty Grievance Committee](#) » [Annual Reports](#) » Annual Report 2011-2012

Faculty Grievance Committee

Annual Report

Membership

Guillermo R. Giannico '12, Chair	Fisheries and Wildlife
Richmond Barbour '12	English
Staci Simonich '13	Environmental and Molecular Toxicology
Alan Bakalinsky '14	Food Science and Technology
Mirabelle Fernandes-Paul '14	Women's Center

Summary of Activities

A total of two university faculty members contacted the Chair of the Faculty Grievance Committee to determine whether a grievance procedure was the appropriate option to resolve the job-related problems or issues they were facing. After consultation with the Chair, one of these faculty members decided to have the issue resolved through the Office of Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity; the other faculty member presented a grievance for denial of tenure. This grievance resulted in a hearing on November 2, 2011 and a Committee recommendation to President Ray On December 6, 2011. It should be noted that this grievance was separate from, albeit related to, an earlier grievance by the same faculty member that was heard by this Committee in 2010. All members of the Committee were in attendance during the hearing and participated in preparing the final recommendation. It is not appropriate to comment on the specifics of this case in this report.

Recommendations

The experience of the Committee during this grievance process led us to present the following recommendations to the Faculty Senate's Executive Committee.

1. To work with the university administration to ensure that all colleges and departments/units properly advise faculty going up for tenure or promotion about the criteria in place for them so that they don't find themselves straddling a gap between the procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure published in the online version of the Faculty Handbook and those actually applied to them.
2. To work with the Provost's Office to ensure that any academic unit that has shown a pattern of violations of procedural guidelines to the tenure and promotion process brings its procedures into alignment with the principles and criteria of the university guidelines.
3. To avoid the President's direct involvement during the initial appeal process by a grievant (unless the grievant decides to bypass the Faculty Grievance Committee and files an appeal directly to the President). If the grievant files an appeal to the Faculty Grievance Committee, then the Committee's decision is written as a recommendation to the President, and he/she makes the final decision. This grievance process would follow OAR576-050-0025 and -0030 closer than the current process does, and involve the President only once in the appeal process rather than twice as we experienced. However, this change may significantly increase the work load on the Faculty Grievance Committee, and how to tackle this will need to be considered by the Senate's Executive Committee.
4. To reconsider request in 2000-2001 Report by Faculty Grievance Committee for Faculty Senate support for a proposal by the AAUP to establish a "legal defense fund" to provide some pre-determined legal advice services to grievant.