

**D\_R\_A\_F\_T**  
**Plymouth State University**  
**FACULTY MEETING MINUTES**  
Wednesday, April 7, 2010

The meeting was called to order at 3:36 p.m.

There were approximately 60 faculty in attendance.

The minutes from the March 3, 2010 meeting were accepted as submitted.

**I. Reports**

- A. Sara Jayne Steen, President – sent electronically.  
When asked about a recent *Union Leader* article on the USNH practice of allowing paid leaves to administrators when they step down, President Steen commented that the responsibility for the management of USNH lies with the Board of Trustees, not with the Legislature. By charter, we are separate from the state government. The practice cited is common across higher education.
- B. Julie Bernier, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs – sent electronically; no questions.
- C. Steve Rheaume, PSU Bookstore Store Manager, and Faculty Members of the Bookstore Advisory Group, “Summary of PSU Bookstore Textbook Ordering” (Report attached as **Appendix A**)  
Steve appeared at the meeting with other Bookstore personnel. He gave brief highlights of his report (attached) and solicited questions. None were asked.
- D. Annie Gagne, Student Trustee, “Student Feedback on Instituting a 6-Week Grade Policy” (Report attached as **Appendix B**)  
Students Annie Gagne, Amber Lewis, Brian Funk and Lindsay Harrington appeared to present their findings (attached) related to increasing the 6-week grade policy to all 4 years. Annie was at the last faculty meeting to observe the discussion on the 6-week grade issue, and she took a report back to the Student Senate. Over the last few weeks an online venue was established for students to share their opinions. There were some questions asked and some discussion. Those students in favor of changing the policy seemed to feel that students would appreciate the feedback and it would help them in their courses. There are students who are quiet and unsure of how to approach their faculty members to initiate such a discussion. Those against seemed to feel that students in college should be more responsible for themselves and their academics and that this was too much hand-holding. A few faculty asked what could be done to empower students to advocate for themselves. The students brought this info to share with faculty as they reconsider this idea.
- E. Terri Dautcher, Chair, Principal Administrators Evaluation Task Force, “Conclusions and Recommendations” (Report Attached as **Appendix C**) Terri gave a brief history of the Task Force and took questions.
- F. Anne Lebreche, Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee, “Report on the Grievance Resolution Committee” (Report attached as **Appendix F**) Anne highlighted parts of her report. No questions.

**III. New Business**

- A. Resolutions of the Standing Committees—none.

- B. **MOTION from the FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE** (Anne Lebreche): That the Plymouth State University Faculty vote to endorse the Faculty Career Flexibility and/or Work/Life Balance Policies. **(See Appendix D.)**

**RATIONALE:** In 2007, PSU received an "Innovation Award" for career faculty flexibility. The Alfred P. Sloan Awards for Faculty Career Flexibility recognize universities for their leadership and accomplishments in implementing groundbreaking policies and practices supporting career flexibility for tenured and tenure-track faculty. The awards program is sponsored by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation and conducted by the American Council on Education (ACE) with support from the Families and Work Institute.

After receiving the award, the University was asked to create and implement a policy to formalize that which had been an informal practice on our campus for several years. This resulted in item #1 in the attached proposed campus policies (see Appendix D). In the process of participation in the SLOAN Cohort over the last two years, we decided to extend our faculty career flexibility policies to include the two additional policies also found in this document.

Provost Bernier, Vice Provost Moore, and Carol Kuzdeba from Human Resources worked on the creation of these policies with regular input from the Faculty Welfare throughout their development.

In Fall 2010, Provost Bernier presented the final draft to the Welfare Committee for endorsement by the committee and by the full faculty. The Faculty Welfare Committee unanimously voted in support of the new Faculty Career Flexibility policies and is now bringing it to the full faculty for a vote.

The motion was made by Anne Lebreche and seconded. Anne also spoke to motion. There was no discussion. This motion requires a majority vote. With a voice vote, *the motion passed*.

- C. **MOTION from FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE** (Anne Lebreche): To amend the Faculty Bylaws, Article XI.F.11 Grievance Resolution Committee, as indicated in the original amendment from Gary McCool on November 4, 2009 **(see Appendix E)**.

**RATIONALE:** When this amendment was discussed on November 4, 2009, it was unclear if the language in the proposed amendment accurately reflected what was in both Human Resources policy and the Faculty Handbook. After careful investigation, the Faculty Welfare Committee has concluded that Gary McCool's amendment does accurately clarify the role of the Grievance Resolution Committee in both documents.

The most widely discussed item in the amendment was under Function, Item 4 "To serve as the hearing panel for faculty under the Grievance Resolution policy of the Human Resources Office, as stated in the PSU Online Policy Manual (OLPM), PSU.V.D.13.2.4.1." The Grievance Resolution Committee role is clearly stated in this section which reads:

"For PSU staff, a hearing panel shall consist of three (3) USNH status employees, at least one of whom must be in the same occupational type as the grievant, and at least one of whom must be in the same occupational type as the person whose actions are being grieved. If the person whose actions are being grieved is a principal administrator, the panel member need only have a supervisory responsibility. **For PSU Faculty, the hearing panel shall be the Grievance**

**Resolution Committee of the Faculty, as described in Section 2.0 of the PSU Faculty Handbook.”**

The Faculty Welfare Committee voted unanimously to accept this amendment as written and recommends that such action be taken on the part of the PSU Faculty.

The motion was made by Anne Lebreche and seconded. Anne also spoke to the motion. Some brief comments were made by faculty and responded to. Because this is a By-laws Amendment, a 2/3 majority is required to pass. *With a hand vote, the motion carried.*

**IV. Announcements**

The meeting adjourned at 4:38 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Alice O’Connor, Scribe

\*\*\*\*\*

**APPENDIX A: Summary of PSU Bookstore Textbook Ordering**

- Submitted by Steve Rheume, PSU Bookstore Store Manager (x52266)

**Your Current Bookstore Advisory Group Members**

- Academic Affairs: Alice O’Connor, David Zehr
- Bookstore: Steve Rheume, Jillian Mulloy, Kristine Nolan
- College of Graduate Studies: Angela Adams
- Faculty: Ben Armsden, Paul Rogalus, Anil Waghe
- Finance & Admin: Linda Dauer, Heather Huckins, Steve Taksar
- Financial Aid: Crystal Finefrock
- Residence Life: Dave Carpentiere
- Student Affairs: Terri Potter, Jennifer White
- Students: Megan Burke, Lexi Cadale, Jake Fox, Kyle Mallinger

*Please feel free to submit Bookstore feedback to any faculty BAG member (Ben Armsden, Paul Rogalus, Anil Waghe), Bookstore Management (Steve Rheume, Jillian Mulloy), and/or Heather Huckins who manages the Bookstore contract for PSU.*

**Textbook Ordering Decision Making**

- Ordering Goal is 20% of books ordered unsold at end of Sales Period (we aim to over order by 20% vs. need)
- Every sell out situation is seen as a misorder, selling out is not acceptable to the PSU Bookstore
- Bookstore pays for 2<sup>nd</sup> Day Air shipping on books that have sold out and need to be reordered

**Recent PSU Bookstore Sell Through History**

- Fall 2009 – 84% sold compared to ordered
- Fall 2009 – 51% sold compared to actual enrollment
- Fall 2008 – 79% sold compared to ordered
- Fall 2008 – 55% sold compared to actual enrollment
- Spring 2010 – 77% sold compared to ordered
- Spring 2010 – 37% sold compared to actual enrollment
- Spring 2009 – 80% sold compared to ordered
- Spring 2009 – 43% sold compared to actual enrollment

### **General Notes on Sell Through History**

- Sold to Actual Enrollment is declining significantly as students explore other purchasing options
- This trend makes textbook ordering extremely difficult as historical data is not always reliable
- Sold to Ordered during last 4 semesters (2 years) averages 80%. Average return to publisher/unsold rate of 20%
- Some classes we do not sell a single copy, some classes we sell nearly actual enrollment, usually sell through is less than half of actual enrollment for most non-first year classes

### **Bookstore Strategy to Improve Decision Making**

- Earlier ordering of textbook to free up Textbook Manager's time to better research enrollment/ordering issues
- Better allocation of resources and personnel during month prior to classes freeing up Textbook Manager's time to research enrollments and ordering numbers
- Increased communication and partnership efforts to better communicate problems to faculty (e.g. if a book sells out, the faculty member is notified what happened, what we are doing to fix the issue, and provide follow up & arrival notification)

### **Challenges to Improved Decision Making**

- Late adoptions within one month of class start date reduce Bookstore effectiveness in troubleshooting existing adoptions/orders due to time intensive nature of the adoption and ordering processes. 20% of adoptions are submitted within one month of classes starting
- Late book adoptions and book changes during the first week of class are especially problematic during a time when we need to be most closely monitoring sell through and placing additional orders as needed for fast moving titles

### **Factors & Considerations Effecting Book Ordering**

#### **Usage in Course Considerations**

- Required, Recommended, or Choice
- Continuation Course – One Semester or Two Semester Usage (very limited orders for 2<sup>nd</sup> semester books)
- Use in Class – Students provide Bookstore feedback regarding how the book was used (needed for good grades?)
- When book is used in Class – PSU Bookstore sells more copies of books used in first month than late in the semester
- Faculty Engagement – How do faculty speak about the book in class, syllabi, recommendations for purchasing, etc.
- Faculty or Department Adoption – Consideration for faculty that do not want to use the department adoption

#### **Historic Considerations (Course & Title)**

- Enrollment History – Same term (Fall, Spring, Winterim, Summer) enrollment history for the course
- Book History – Sales history for the book used for the same course historically
- Unit Sales Trends on Campus – Trends are lower unit sales every year
- Sold Compared to Actual Enrollment as a Percent of History for the Course, for the Title, and for the Term

#### **Availability Considerations**

- Availability of Alternative Format – Hardcover, Paperback, International, Desk Copy, eBook, Concise Version, etc.
- Availability in Online Marketplace – Age of Edition, Publisher, Prevalence in Marketplace, Pricing, Used, etc.
- Availability in Town and On Campus – Quantity of books in town, how many terms has book been adopted, etc.
- Availability of Used vs. New vs. edition – Bookstore more likely to sell used copies, especially of older edition books
- Late Adoption – Adoptions submitted week before or week of class start date sell through at lower rates

### **Title Considerations**

- Edition – How long has the current edition been in the marketplace, are other editions available, new ed Required?
- Returnable – Can we return the book to the publisher if we do not sell it?
- Custom – Custom sell at higher rates (but rarely 100% due to students buying full version online)
- Package – Does the package save the students money and are all components fully used?

### **Enrollment Considerations**

- Overall Enrollment Change – Increase or Decrease?
- Course Level – (1000, 2000, 3000, 4000)
- First Year Class – First Year Students Purchase More Books than Upper Classmen
- Current Enrollment – Frequently reviewed, especially each one month prior to class and first week of class
- New Departments, Programs, Concentrations, Curriculum Changes, etc.

### **Factors & Issues Not Considered in Book Ordering Decision**

- Book Exchange is generally assumed to have all adoptions even if faculty only submitted to the PSU Bookstore
- Specific percentages. i.e. the Bookstore does not order based on a specific percentage across the board for all books
- Current enrollment in exclusion of course history – especially First Year classes & lower level courses that enroll late

\*\*\*\*\*

## **APPENDIX B: Student Feedback on Instituting a 6-Week Grade Policy, Annie Gagne, Student Trustee**

After questioning several constituents and hosting a forum on Facebook, we have developed some information that we feel would be helpful when considering the thought of increasing 6 week grades. Below you will find this information and myself as well as a handful of students will be at the next Faculty Senate meeting to field any questions you may have for us. Thank you for your time and consideration.

### **Information Collected**

#### **Pro Increase**

“I am all for six week grades. I have had more than one [professor] tell me that they couldn’t be bothered to crunch the numbers and tell me my grade in a class. I don’t think it would be asking too much for all [professors] to give a letter grade...”

“I think it would be a great idea. It would let students know whether they need to work harder in their courses or if they are on the right track if the 6-week grades were available to everyone”

“I think this would be a great idea. It would help everyone become a better student because they would know how they are doing in the class and if they need to catch up on assignments or not.”

\*from a staff member “I am a staff member here at PSU and if Professors were to give out 6-week grades to more students, then I would be able to help the students that have been identified to me as in jeopardy on a more regular basis... Anything we can do to help our students succeed is worth it!”

“...if the professors are grading everything anyway, then it would be convenient to have all our grades summed up for us to view. Not every professor posts grades for viewing and sometimes they don’t hand back work [promptly] so it is difficult for us students to assess whether or not we are doing well in the class”

“I think there are a lot of students who’d like to do well but lose sight of things. This could help put them [back on] the right track.”

“Why not? It would eliminate the issue of ‘I didn’t know I was doing poorly until it was too far to come back.’”

“I think its a great idea. I have heard a lot on this issue this week. There always seems to be the surprise of how you got a certain grade at semesters end and I believe this would help with that from both students and teachers sides. Also, not all professors use blackboard to post grades!”

“This shows the areas where you may need to work on some things and also shows where you may be doing better than expected. This could potentially alleviate some stress too.”

“It would be a great help to see where I need improvement and then be able to seek out extra help from my professors instead of finding out at the end when it is too late”

“I think the midterm evaluation is something that would benefit each and every single student. Regardless of if you are a student that does not need the notification to succeed in a class, it would not hurt to see it. And for the student that see's an update half way through the semester and is able to adjust his or her effort and motivation, as many students take the max amount of credits, and makes a positive change in that class for a better outcome, then that is a amazing thing. There is no harm in the evaluation for any student and it can only have a positive outcome.”

### **Against Increase**

“As upperclassmen I believe we can take the initiative to ask out professors for a progress report if it is a concern. I know that if I get my grades back from my tests/homework/projects I will have a general idea and if I am truly concerned I will ask my professor...”

“The only issue I see is we are not in high school anymore; people need to start taking responsibility for themselves. If you want your grades you could always just ask to meet with your teacher.”

“After our first semester students are aware of the way things work here. Some teachers put all grades on blackboard so you can see your grades that way. I think that we don’t need to have 6 week grades given to us after [our] first semester because there are other ways of finding out without any added pressure on the faculty.”

“We are college students, young adults, and need to be treated as such. First semester first year students are new to the college life and need all the guidance that we can provide to them. However, once you’ve made it to the next semester, there is no reason for anyone to not understand what is expected of them and how the system works. If students aren’t sure how they are doing in a class, it is their responsibility to communicate with their professors. This will not only allow students to recognize their progress, but also shows the professor that their students actually care....We are not here to make things easy, we’re here to provide the necessary resources to be successful.”

### **Statistics from the Facebook group**

-143 Students are members of the Facebook Event, 90 maybes

-64 Wall Posts

For: 45

Against: 10

Neutral: 4

Irrelevant: 5

Main Points For 6 Week Grades From Forum:

- some teachers do not always hand back work in a timely fashion
- could help students become better organized
- lets students know if they need to work harder
- benefits all students
- it is difficult to be in a class where teachers do not post grades
- could help advisors advise their students better
- you never know what your participation grade is
- could help improve grades overall

- sometimes difficult for students to access their grades
- could give students the motivation to adjust effort and work habits
- wouldn't cause any harm, would only help
- not all teachers utilize blackboard to post grades
- would eliminate the excuse of not knowing you were doing badly until too late
- will show where improvement is needed

Main Points Against 6 Week Grades From Forum:

- we're adults, not necessary
- need to learn management skills
- students can always talk to professors to get grades
- need to take responsibility for self
- midterm grades are sometimes irrelevant to final grades
- should be able to figure out your own grades
- it is the student's responsibility to talk to their teacher

Thank you again, and please feel free to contact myself or Jillian Spring (jspring1@plymouth.edu) with any questions or concerns.

Annie Gagne  
 USNH Student Trustee  
 amgagne3@plymouth.edu

\*\*\*\*\*

**APPENDIX C**

**Principal Administrators  
 Evaluation Task Force**

**Conclusions & Recommendations**

**Date: April 1, 2010**

**Submitted to: The Faculty Steering Committee**

**Submitted by: Terri Dautcher, Jeff Furlone, John Kulig,  
 Gail Mears, Nate Obin, Christina Schaefer, Nick Sevigney**

**Contents**

Our Charge.....

Process Narrative.....

Summary of Recommendations .....

Guidelines for Future Evaluators .....

Evaluation Instrument .....

## **Our Charge**

Charge to the task force: Develop a formal process - to include general timelines, protocols, templates, etc. - by which future task forces can oversee the evaluation of one or more Principal Administrators per year, beginning in Fall 2010, in a manner that is consistent, transparent, and fair. The task force will draft a proposal to be presented to the faculty. After comment from the faculty, the process will be published on the faculty governance blog.

Timeline: The task force will be formed in October and will present its conclusions to the Steering Committee by [March 31, 2010](#). If the faculty agrees to adopt the task force's recommendations at the [April 7, 2010](#), Faculty Meeting, the task force will be immediately dissolved. If the faculty objects to the recommendations, the task force may be asked to continue work on the charge.

---

## **Process Narrative**

This evaluation process was designed to:

- Provide relevant, useful information to principal administrators through a formal process
- Capture perceptions from a diverse group of stakeholders
- Be easily implemented in the future, on a regular basis

In developing this approach we considered:

- What has been done at other institutions
- The process and instrument used to conduct the previous round of principal administrator evaluations at PSU completed in 2002
- Input from present principal administrators; specifically by incorporating the format of response and information they indicated would be most helpful
- The faculty by-laws and input from the present steering committee members

Other issues discussed by this task force:

- This evaluation process currently applies only to principal administrators; the president and his or her cabinet. As the university's administrative infrastructure is changed, expanding this evaluation process to include other administrators may be important to consider.
- In order to ensure consistent implementation of this process, we encourage the steering committee to consider assigning an existing standing committee or individual (determined by role) responsibility for this annual initiative. We realize this may require a change in the faculty by-laws. Assigning responsibility for this activity to an independent task force may result in a lack of continuity from year to year. If, however, the task force is the preferred approach, then we suggest that a steering committee member be assigned the responsibility of chairing future principal administrators' task forces as part of his or her regular duties.
- In order to simplify the logistics of executing the evaluation process we explored the use of existing campus technology resources. We know that as roles and technology evolves



titles may change. However, we anticipate that there will always be people responsible for faculty technology and information technology. Both of these offices were consulted during this process, and both confirm that they will be available to assist with the implementation of on line technology to complete this process in the future. Using on line evaluation tools will simplify this process for future implementers.

- We attempted to create an evaluation tool that was broad enough to be used to evaluate all administrators and one that offers the person being evaluated useful, informative feedback.

---

### Summary of Recommendations

- Responsibility for implementing this evaluation process:
  - This process needs to be incorporated into the annual calendar of faculty governance activities. We recommend that the Steering Committee assign a standing committee, or a specific individual (determined by role) responsibility for implementing these evaluations.
- Frequency, scope and timing of evaluations:
  - Evaluations should be completed annually.
  - In order to avoid survey fatigue on the part of respondents we recommend that three (3) principal administrators be evaluated annually, and that administrators be evaluated in rotation. The rotation cycle will be determined by those responsible for implementing this process. Factors to be considered when determining rotation should include how long the administrator has been in his or her position, and when he or she was last evaluated.
  - Suggested calendar for implementation:
    - October:
      - Standing committee or individual and/or task force responsible for this effort determines which three administrators will be evaluated.
      - President's office is notified and the request is made for updated job descriptions and a paragraph on recent initiatives for those administrators who will be evaluated. These documents are provided to respondents as part of the evaluation process.
      - Responsible committee reviews the survey instrument to determine if any current issues dictate a change in the points of evaluation.
      - Survey instrument is sent to the president and those administrators who will be evaluated, requesting their input and suggestions.
    - November:
      - Survey instrument is finalized based on feedback from administrators and review by responsible committee.

- Information technology and faculty technology leaders are contacted to request assistance with the creation of on line survey instrument.
  - Respondent emails are captured, and logistics of survey implementation are finalized.
- January:
  - Survey process is finalized and ready to hit ‘send’.
- February:
  - Survey is forwarded to respondents at the beginning of the third week of the semester, with a request that responses be received within two weeks.
  - A reminder is sent to respondents one week before the surveys are due.
  - A reminder is sent to respondents two days before the surveys are due.
- March:
  - Survey results are aggregated by an individual member of the committee responsible for the evaluation process.
  - All survey results are forwarded to the designated administrators.
  - Survey results are secured to ensure privacy.
  - The responsible committee meets to assess the process and document recommendations for the follow year’s implementers.
  - Presentation is made the full faculty to announce completion of the process, data regarding the number and profile of respondents, and present recommendations regarding the next year’s evaluation process. Recommendations for the next year should include which principal administrators should be evaluated.
- Respondents
  - Surveys will be sent to:
    - All faculty (tenure, tenure track, contract, adjunct)
    - All OS staff
    - All PAT staff
    - Student Senators

### **Guidelines for Future Evaluators**

*[This next section of our report repeats content from above, but has been modified to create a stand-alone document that can be pulled from this report and provided to future implementers.]*

This document was created by a task force in 2010 and is intended to serve as guide for individuals responsible for implementing this evaluation process on an annual basis.

You have been asked to facilitate this year's evaluation of principal administrators (defined as the president and members of his or her cabinet). A survey instrument and project management calendar has been created for this activity. Individuals responsible for information technology and faculty technology at PSU will be available to assist you with the logistics of implementing the survey on line.

Thank you for taking responsibility for this important initiative!

### Recommended Project Calendar:

- October:
  - Determine which three administrators will be evaluated.
    - The recommendation to evaluate three administrators per year was made because of the time required of respondents to complete this process; we don't want the quality of response to erode due to survey fatigue. When determining the rotation schedule, please consider which administrators were evaluated last year, and how long each administrator has been in his or her position. New hires may need a bit of time in the environment before being evaluated.
  - President's office is contacted with a request for updated job descriptions and a narrative of recent initiatives for those administrators who will be evaluated.
    - The Office of the President agreed to provide this narrative content as a part of this process on an annual basis.
  - Responsible committee reviews the survey instrument to determine if any current issues may dictate a change in the points of evaluation.
    - Things change in the PSU environment, both internally and externally. These changes may prompt the need to alter the points of evaluation periodically to ensure relevancy.
  - Survey instrument is sent to the president and those administrators who will be evaluated, requesting their input and suggestions.
    - This step was taken when the survey instrument was first developed, but as administrators change it will important to ensure that they stay informed of this process and have input. Those being evaluated should have the chance to influence the process so that information captured remains relevant and useful.

- November:
  - Survey instrument is finalized based on feedback from administrators and review by committee.
  - Information technology and faculty technology leaders are contacted to request assistance with the creation of on line survey instrument.
    - Because titles and roles change we have not designated offices by name or title in this document. Most likely there will always be an office of information technology (providing administrative IT support) and an office responsible for faculty technology needs. There will also be preferred on line survey tools used by PSU that these offices will recommend. These offices should both be contacted, and together they will assist with the implementation of this process. The assignment of roles and tasks will have to be clearly determined each year, and it is expected that faculty responsible for this initiative will play a material role in the logistics of this process.
  - Respondent emails are captured, and logistics of survey implementation are finalized.
    - Surveys will be sent to:
      - All faculty (tenure, tenure track, contract, adjunct)
      - All OS staff
      - All PAT staff
      - Student Senators
- January:
  - Survey process is finalized and ready to hit 'send'.
- February:
  - Survey is forwarded to respondents at the beginning of the third week of the semester, with a request that responses be received within two weeks.
  - A reminder is sent to respondents one week before the surveys are due.
  - A reminder is sent to respondents two days before the surveys are due.
- March:

- Survey results are aggregated by an individual member of the committee responsible for the evaluation process.
  - To ensure privacy for respondents and those being evaluated, it is strongly suggested that one person be designated to complete the final steps of the process.
- All survey results are forwarded to the designated administrators.
  - Results (by individual) are sent to the administrator who was evaluated and to the president. When the president is evaluated results are sent to the president and the chancellor of the university system.
- Survey results are secured to ensure privacy.
- The standing committee responsible for the evaluation process meets to review the overall implementation of the annual evaluation process. The objective of this final meeting is to determine if any aspect of the process should be altered during the next evaluation cycle. For example, if there was a low response rate, what could be done to improve response rate? Recommendations are documented for the next group responsible for implementation.

**Evaluation Instrument**

Principal Administrator Evaluation

This evaluation process, sponsored by the faculty Steering Committee, is designed to provide feedback to <insert name>, <insert title of administrator>. Each year three administrators are evaluated. Your willingness to complete three evaluations on an annual basis is appreciated.

Thank you,  
<insert designated committee member names>

**Next screen:**

Please indicate your position (check each that apply to you).

<input type="checkbox"/>	Full-time Faculty	<input type="checkbox"/>	PAT
<input type="checkbox"/>	Adjunct Faculty	<input type="checkbox"/>	OS
<input type="checkbox"/>	Adjunct Staff (hourly employee)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Student Senator

A brief job description of <insert name of administrator>'s position and a summary of recent initiatives is presented on the next page. We have also provided you with a link to the university's strategic plan. After reviewing this information there are ten points of evaluation you will be asked to consider.

Your responses will be shared with the person being evaluated and the president of the university. The president's evaluations will be shared with the president and the university

system chancellor. Responses will be aggregated so that they cannot be associated with an individual response. All narrative responses will be shared in full, as they are written.

**Next screen:**

- Insert job description for this administrator’s position provided by president’s office
- Insert paragraph on recent initiatives provided by president’s office
- Insert link to PSU strategic plan

**Next screen:**

Please select the response to each statement that best represents your perceptions and then add narrative comments. Narrative comments are strongly encouraged and typically believed to be more useful to the individual being evaluated. If you feel that you have inadequate information on which to base your answer please select “cannot evaluate”.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this evaluation.

**Next screen:**

<insert name of administrator> is visibly engaged with the PSU community.			
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly Disagree
Cannot Evaluate			
Comments related to PSU community engagement:			

**Next screen:**

<insert name of administrator> is effective in supporting a student-centered and high-quality learning community.			
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly Disagree
Cannot Evaluate			
Comments related to the support of student-centered, high-quality learning community:			

**Next screen:**

<insert name of administrator> creates a culture of productivity, efficiency and accountability among faculty, staff and/or administration.			
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly Disagree
Cannot Evaluate			
Comments related to culture of performance:			

**Next screen:**

<insert name of administrator> is effective in ensuring PSU’s financial vitality (enrollment, retention, development, partnerships and more).			
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly Disagree
Cannot Evaluate			
Comments related to financial vitality:			

**Next screen:**

<insert name of administrator> is an effective communicator.			
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly Disagree
Cannot Evaluate			

Comments related to effectiveness of communication:

**Next screen:**

<insert name of administrator> is an effective representative of PSU to stakeholders external to the University (Plymouth residents, state government, accreditation bodies, donors and others).

Strongly Agree      Somewhat Agree      Somewhat disagree      Strongly Disagree  
Cannot Evaluate

Comments related to external representation of PSU:

**Next screen:**

<insert name of administrator> solicits and uses feedback from relevant faculty and/or staff members in making decisions.

Strongly Agree      Somewhat Agree      Somewhat disagree      Strongly Disagree  
Cannot Evaluate

Comments related to the solicitation and use of feedback:

**Next screen:**

<insert name of administrator> is effective in ensuring that faculty and staff are adequately supported in their positions.

Strongly Agree      Somewhat Agree      Somewhat disagree      Strongly Disagree  
Cannot Evaluate

Comments related to support of faculty and staff:

**Next screen:**

I see <insert name of administrator> as a resource to me..

Strongly Agree      Somewhat Agree      Somewhat disagree      Strongly Disagree  
Cannot Evaluate

Comments related to resource:

**Next screen:**

<insert name of administrator> demonstrates overall effective leadership.

Strongly Agree      Somewhat Agree      Somewhat disagree      Strongly Disagree  
Cannot Evaluate

Comments related to overall effectiveness of leadership:

**Next screen:**

What do you see as this individual's overall strengths?

Strengths:

If you indicated areas of concern, what suggestions do you have for this individual to make improvements in these areas? This is the final question in this evaluation.

Suggestions for improvement:

THE END

\*\*\*\*\*

APPENDIX D:

# DRAFT

## PSU Faculty Flexibility and Work/Life Balance Policies:

Proposal to Faculty Welfare from Provost Bernier for discussion and faculty endorsement: In connection with the SLOAN Faculty Career Flexibility Award that PSU received, I am pleased to present the following three proposals aimed at assisting faculty during times when "life events" occur. I am asking for your feedback and for the endorsement of the faculty on these policies.

### 1. Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) for Faculty

**Family and/or medical leave of absence shall be defined as a fully paid approved absence available to** eligible faculty members **for up to 12 weeks per year**. A year is defined as a "rolling" 12 month period measured backward from the date an employee uses any FMLA leave. Leave may be taken:

- upon the birth of the employee's child;
- upon the placement of a child with the employee for adoption or foster care;
- when the employee is needed to care for a child, spouse, or parent who has a serious health condition;
- when the employee is unable to perform the essential functions of his/her position because of a serious health condition.
- to (1) care for a member of the US Armed Forces who incurred a serious injury or illness in the line of duty while on active duty in the US Armed Forces; or to (2) deal with a "qualifying exigency" arising out of a family member's active duty service or call to active duty in the US Armed Forces; or any combination of the two, is considered military-related FMLA leave

*See full policy in Appendices*



PSU proposed additional language.

When FMLA leave occurs for 3 or more weeks during the semester, the faculty member may request release from teaching assignments for the balance of the semester. In this case, the Department Chair in consultation with the faculty member and Provost will determine alternate work assignments for the period following the end of the FMLA leave.

(See USNH Online Policy Manual at USY.V.A.17, available online at: <http://usnholpm.unh.edu/USY/V.Pers/A.17.htm> ; also see OLPM at USY.V.A.14, available online at: <http://usnholpm.unh.edu/USY/V.Pers/A.14.htm> )

*Endorsed by the Faculty ( ...date )*

## 2. “Faculty leave for exigencies” (FLE)

Faculty members that have not completed the minimum 1 year of employment (approximately 1250 hours). The Faculty Leave for Exigencies policy is for **Faculty that are new to PSU and do not yet qualify for FMLA leave (e.g. have not completed the minimum 1 year of employment or approximately 1250 hours). The FLE would allow new faculty to take a leave similar to FMLA without penalty. Like FMLA, leave may be taken:**

- Upon the birth of the employee's child;
- upon the placement of a child with the employee for adoption or foster care;
- when the employee is needed to care for a child, spouse, or parent who has a serious health condition;
- when the employee is unable to perform the essential functions of his/her position because of a serious health condition.
- to (1) care for a member of the US Armed Forces who incurred a serious injury or illness in the line of duty while on active duty in the US Armed Forces; or to (2) deal with a "qualifying exigency" arising out of a family member's active duty service or call to active duty in the US Armed Forces; or any combination of the two, is considered military-related FMLA leave

*Endorsed by the Faculty ( ...date )*

## 3. Tenure-Clock extension for one year for qualifying “Life Event” (maximum of 2 years)

The tenure clock may be extended for any of the following life events: upon the birth of the employee's child; upon the placement of a child with the employee for adoption or foster care; when the employee is needed to care for a child, spouse, or parent who has a serious health condition; or when the employee is unable to perform the essential

functions of his/her position because of a serious health condition as outlined in the FMLA policy.

This policy would provide:

- a faculty member experiencing one of the listed situations or conditions could after consultation with provost and departmental chair delay tenure for an academic year;
- under mitigating circumstances and after consultation with provost and departmental chair, a second year might also be granted.

Please see attached policy and tenure clock extension application form.

*Endorsed by the Faculty (April 7, 2010)*

# Appendices

## Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA).

**17. Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA).** This policy outlines the eligibility criteria for requesting a FMLA leave and the obligation of the institution and the faculty/staff member in order to comply with FMLA regulations.

**17.1 Eligibility.** To be eligible for leave under this policy a faculty/staff member (status or non-status) must have been employed within USNH for at least 12 months in total and must have worked at least 1,250 hours during the 12 month period preceding the commencement of the leave.

**17.2 Definition.** A family and/or medical leave of absence shall be defined as an approved absence available to eligible faculty/staff members for up to 12 weeks per year. A year is defined as a "rolling" 12 month period measured backward from the date a faculty/staff member uses any FMLA leave. Leave may be taken: Upon the birth of a faculty/staff member's child; upon the placement of a child with the a faculty/staff member for adoption or foster care; when a faculty/staff member is needed to care for a child, spouse, or parent who has a serious health condition; or when the faculty/staff member is unable to perform the essential functions of his/her position because of a serious health condition. (For military-related FMLA, see [USY V.A.17.8](#)).

**17.2.1** In order to be considered for a FMLA leave, the faculty/staff member must notify her/his supervisor of the request for the leave and provide appropriate documentation to the Human Resources Office (see [USY V.A.17.4](#)).

**17.2.2** In order to have the leave considered FMLA, the Human Resources Office makes the determination and must notify the faculty/staff member in writing within two days after the determination that the leave the faculty/staff member is currently taking or will be taking is considered to be FMLA leave. If the designation of FMLA leave is not made or notice given, the leave cannot be retroactive and cannot be applied after the faculty/staff member returns to work.

**17.2.2.1** Exceptions. Notification can be done retroactively if the determination is made because medical documentation supporting FMLA was received by Human Resources after the faculty/staff member returned to work, or when Human Resources did not learn the reason for a faculty/staff member's leave until her/his return to work.

**17.2.3** All requests which meet eligibility criteria will be granted for up to 12 weeks. In cases of absence from work which qualify under FMLA and are covered by other paid leave(s), such as workers' compensation or interim disability, the FMLA leave will be concurrent with the other paid leave(s) for a period of up to 12 weeks or for the duration of the other leave(s) if it expires prior to 12 weeks.

**17.3** Conditions of Leave. USNH will require medical documentation sent to the Human Resources Office to support a claim for leave for a faculty/staff member's own serious health condition or to care for a seriously ill child, spouse or parent. Such documentation will be maintained in a separate file in the Human Resources Office and released only on a need-to-know basis. For the faculty/staff member's own medical leave, the documentation must include a statement that the employee is unable to perform the essential functions of the position. For leave to care for a seriously ill child, spouse, or parent, the medical documentation must include an estimate of the amount of time the faculty/staff member is needed to provide care. At its discretion, USNH may require and pay for a second medical opinion and/or periodic documentation. If the first and second opinions differ, USNH (at its own expense) may require the binding opinion of a third health care provider approved jointly by USNH and the faculty/staff member.

**17.3.1** Intermittent Leave. If medically necessary for a serious health condition of the faculty/staff member or the spouse, child or parent, leave may be taken on an intermittent or reduced service schedule. If leave is requested on this basis, however, the USNH may require the employee to transfer temporarily to an alternative position that better accommodates recurring periods of absence or a part-time schedule, provided the position has equivalent base salary rate and benefits.

**17.3.2** In cases of leave for the faculty/staff member's own illness/injury, the faculty/staff member will be required to use established/acrued paid leave policies (includes any leave accrued during an FMLA Leave); however, the faculty/staff member has the option to retain up to the equivalent of 10 Earned Time/vacation days.

**17.3.2.1** For status exempt faculty/staff, paid leave includes use of accrued sick leave, interim disability leave if applicable, then accrued vacation/personal leave (see [USY V.A.12-14](#)).

**17.3.2.2** For status hourly staff, paid leave includes use of accrued Earned Time and Sick Pool (see [USY V.A.11](#)).

**17.3.3** For leaves taken to care for family members, a faculty/staff member may use Family Leave for up to 10 days (see [USY V.A.11.5.10](#) for Earned Time use and [USY V.A.13.2.2](#) for vacation/personal leave use); further usage will require that the faculty/staff member use accrued Earned Time/vacation days; however, the faculty/staff member has the option to retain up to the equivalent of 10 Earned Time/vacation days.

**17.3.4** The mandatory use of accrued leave time is not applicable if the absence is due to a workplace injury/illness and is compensated under workers' compensation. However, per [USY V.A.16.3.1](#), an employee may elect to supplement workers' compensation with accrued leave.

**17.4** Responsibility. The component institutions shall adopt such institutional procedures as are necessary to meet the administrative requirements of this USNH policy.

**17.4.1** Faculty/Staff Member's Responsibility. When the need for leave is foreseeable, such as the birth or adoption of a child, or planned medical treatment, the faculty/staff member must provide 30 days notice. Appropriate documentation (e.g., physician's statements and adoption papers) must be included with the request and sent to the Human Resources Office. In cases of illness, the faculty/staff member will be required to report periodically to Human Resources on his or her leave status and intention to return to work.

**17.4.1.1** Reinstatement. Faculty/staff members must notify their immediate supervisor and the Human Resources Office 30 days prior to the expiration of the leave of intent to return to work.

**17.5** Benefits During Leave. (Applicable to faculty/staff members participating in a medical and/or dental plan prior to leave.)

**17.5.1** Duration of Leave. USNH will continue its usual level of contribution to the staff member's benefits for the duration of the 12-week period. For those benefits that require employee contributions, the faculty/staff member will be billed for that portion of the premium.

**17.5.2** Benefits eligible faculty and staff members on an unpaid Family and Medical leave do not accumulate vacation/personal leave, sick leave or Earned Time and are not eligible to receive compensation for jury duty, bereavement leave, holidays, short-term military leave or tuition waiver benefits for themselves. (See Leave Without Pay policy, [USY V.C.16.3](#))

**17.5.3** Failure to Return from Leave (or returns, but fails to stay 30 calendar days). In the event that a faculty/staff member elects not to return to work, or returns but fails to stay 30 calendar days upon completion of an approved paid and/or unpaid leave of absence, USNH may recover the cost of any payments made to maintain the employee's benefit coverage, unless the failure to return to work was for reasons beyond the faculty/staff member's control.

**17.6** Collective Bargaining Agreements. All provisions of this policy shall prevail except as modified by any applicable collective bargaining agreements.

**17.7** Compassionate Donation Program.

**17.7.1** Definition. A USNH institution may establish a compassionate donation program which provides a means for status employees who earn vacation leave or Earned Time to voluntarily and anonymously donate annual leave or Earned Time to another employee whose absence from work qualifies under the Family Medical Leave Act and who has exhausted, or will exhaust, her/his applicable paid leave time. Compassionate time donations do not apply to intermittent FMLA situations. Days contributed are donated directly to an employee, not to a leave bank. While the maximum total leave period for an employee is six months, the maximum donated time is 20 days (150 hours for staff working 37.5 hours per week/160 hours for those working 40 hours per week). This donated time is converted to the monetary value of the receiver's hourly or daily rate for the hours/days donated, and is not considered earnings for purposes of benefit deductions. This program will be coordinated by the campus Human Resources Office and may include the establishment of a campus oversight committee. Confidentiality of medical information for those receiving donated days will be maintained.

**17.7.2** Other conditions. The role of the institution is to facilitate the administration of the compassionate donation program, not to encourage or discourage participation in the program, nor disseminate information about those employees in need of donations of time. No employee may coerce, threaten, intimidate, or promise financial benefits for donations of leave time.

**17.7.3** Eligibility. Eligibility for receiving or giving donated time will apply to any status employee who earns vacation leave or Earned Time and whose situation is such that her/his FMLA absence from work is anticipated to be a minimum of 30 calendar days, including a minimum of five days of the 30 which would be unpaid leave, and the employee is planning to return to work for at least 30 calendar days following the FMLA leave. The number of compassionate donation hours/days an employee may receive per 12-month period will be limited to 20 work days per 12-month period. If otherwise eligible, employees are not eligible for compassionate donations if: (1) they are receiving USNH disability or Workers' Compensation benefits, (2) they are on a probationary status due to attendance issues, or (3) the leave is due to pregnancy without medical complications or adoption.

**17.7.4** Donations of Time. Operating Staff may donate Earned Time in minimal increments of 4 hours from their Earned Time accrual, and exempt staff may donate vacation/personal time in minimal increments of 0.5 days from their vacation/personal leave accrual. No Sick Pool or sick leave may be donated. After donating leave, a donating employee must have a minimum balance of one week (e.g. 37.5 or 40 hours/5 days) of Earned Time/vacation time. Time may be donated to a status employee in any department and status employee type covered by this policy. Donated time does not count towards minimum usage requirements. Donations may be made to more than one employee. Each campus will determine a maximum donation per employee, not to exceed 12 days (90/ 96 hours) of Earned Time/vacation time in total per fiscal year, with the maximum pro-rated for percent-time employees. A campus may establish provisions for allowing retroactive

donations, provided the donations are made no more than thirty days after the employee's return to work. No compassionate donations may be made outside the employee's home institution.

**17.7.5 Use of Donated Compassionate time.** An employee receiving compassionate donations will not accrue Earned Time/vacation/personal/sick time on compassionate donation time days. The recipient's home department will pay the cost of the employee's salary that is covered by compassionate donations. Compassionate donations do not delay the formal start of an unpaid leave of absence for the recipient. Use of compassionate donations cannot extend beyond the end of the employee's appointment period.

**17.7.6 Reporting.** The institution shall establish a process to ensure that the donor and recipient time/leave are correctly recorded on appropriate time cards/leave records.

**17.7.7 Termination of Leave.** An employee's use of compassionate donation time ends when one or more of the following occur: the employee returns to work; the maximum amount of compassionate donation has been used; medical documentation for the employee, spouse, child, or parent releases the employee to return to work; the employee terminates employment; there are no more donations of leave time to the employee.

**17.8 Military-Related FMLA Leave.** FMLA leave approved for a faculty/staff member to (1) care for a member of the US Armed Forces who incurred a serious injury or illness in the line of duty while on active duty in the US Armed Forces; or to (2) deal with a "qualifying exigency" arising out of a family member's active duty service or call to active duty in the US Armed Forces; or any combination of the two, is considered military-related FMLA leave.

**17.8.1 Eligibility.** To qualify for a military-related FMLA leave, the faculty staff member must be eligible for FMLA leave (see [USY V.A.17.1](#)) and must be the spouse, parent, child, or "next of kin" (nearest blood relative) of a member of the US Armed Forces, including the National Guard and Reserves.

**17.8.2** In order to be considered for a FMLA leave, the faculty/staff member must notify her/his supervisor of the request for the leave and provide appropriate documentation to the Human Resources Office (see [USY V.A.17.4](#)).

**17.8.3** All requests which meet eligibility criteria will be granted for up to 12 weeks for "qualifying exigency" leave and for up to 26 weeks for leave to care for a member of the US Armed Forces. The combination of FMLA leave that includes leave to care for a family member in the US Armed Forces and other types of FMLA leave may not exceed 26 weeks in a 12-month period.

**17.8.4** During such leave, a faculty/staff member may use Family Leave for up to 10 days (see [USY V.A.11.5.10](#) for Earned Time use and [USY V.A.13.2.2](#) for vacation/personal leave use); further usage will require that the faculty/staff member use accrued Earned Time/vacation days; however, the faculty/staff member has the option to retain up to the equivalent of 10 Earned Time/vacation days.

**17.8.5** Responsibilities during FMLA leave. See [USY V.A.17.4](#)

**17.8.6** Conditions of FMLA leave to care for a family service member with a serious injury or illness. Such leave may extend up to 26 weeks in a twelve-month period. Medical documentation to support the leave request must be sent to the Human Resources Office. Such documentation will be maintained in a separate file in the Human Resources Office and released only on a need-to-know basis.

**17.8.6.1** Benefits During Leave. (Applicable to faculty/staff members participating in a medical and/or dental plan prior to leave.)

**17.8.6.1.1** Duration of Leave. USNH will continue its usual level of contribution to the staff member's benefits for the duration of the 26-week period. For those benefits that require employee contributions, the faculty/staff member will be billed for that portion of the premium.

**17.8.6.1.2** Benefits-eligible faculty and staff members on an unpaid Family and Medical leave do not accumulate vacation/personal leave, sick leave or Earned Time and are not eligible to receive compensation for jury duty, bereavement leave, holidays, short-term military leave or tuition waiver benefits for themselves. (See Leaves Without Pay policy, [USY V.C.16.3](#))

**17.8.7** Conditions of FMLA leave due to "qualifying exigency" arising from a family member's active duty or call to active duty service in the military. ***[Policy will be developed when Federal regulations are provided.]***

**17.9** Collective Bargaining Agreements. All provisions of this policy shall prevail except as modified by any applicable collective bargaining agreements.

## **Plymouth State University Tenure Clock Extension Policy DRAFT**

### Tenure Clock Extension Policy

Extensions of the pre-tenure period are subject to the following conditions:

#### 1. Automatic Extensions

A one-year extension of the pre-tenure period will be granted automatically for the following reasons:

- a. the birth or adoption of a child; or
- b. the death of the faculty member's spouse or child.

#### 2. Discretionary Extensions

A one-year extension of the pre-tenure period may be granted on a discretionary basis if requested by a faculty member for circumstances that significantly impede progress toward tenure, such as:

- a. a serious health condition of the faculty member; or
- b. a serious health condition of the faculty member's child, spouse, or parent, for whom the faculty member is required to provide significant caregiving; or
- c. other extraordinary circumstances beyond the control of the faculty member.

For both automatic and discretionary extensions of the pre-tenure period, the faculty member must submit a Tenure Clock Extension Form to the Provost as soon as possible after the qualifying event or circumstance, but in no case later than September 15 of the penultimate year of the probationary period. If the Provost has not been notified in this manner, the probationary period remains unchanged.

Extensions of the pre-tenure period for any reason will normally be limited to a total of two years.

Tenure candidates who have been granted an extension of the pre-tenure period will be reviewed under the same academic standards as a candidate who has not had an extension.

Endorsed by the Faculty (4-7-2010)

**Office of the Provost  
TENURE CLOCK EXTENSION FORM**

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Department \_\_\_\_\_ College \_\_\_\_\_

Dates of your initial pre-tenure period \_\_\_\_\_

Details of any previously approved changes in your pre-tenure period \_\_\_\_\_

*Please check the appropriate box below and attach documentation of the relevant event or circumstances. In the case of a Requested Extension, please also attach a statement outlining the reasons for your request.*

**Automatic Extension**

A tenure-track faculty member is eligible for an automatic one-year extension of the pre-tenure period for the birth or adoption of a child, or the death of a spouse, or child.

**Requested Extension**

A tenure-track faculty member may request a one-year extension of the pre-tenure period for his or her serious health condition; for a serious health condition of her or his child, spouse, or parent; or for other extraordinary circumstances beyond her or his control that could significantly impede progress toward tenure.

**SIGNATURES**

*Please attach additional comments as necessary. In the case of a denial, the department chair and dean must include a written justification.*

_____	Faculty Member	_____	Date	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	Deny*	_____	Date	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	Department Chair	_____	Date	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	Deny*	_____	Date	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	Dean	_____	Date	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	Deny*	_____	Date	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	Provost	_____	Date	_____	_____	_____	_____

\* Note that approval is automatic in cases of childbirth or adoption, or the death of a spouse or child.

\*\*\*\*\*

## APPENDIX E

To: Pat Cantor, Faculty Speaker  
From: Gary McCool  
Date: October 27, 2009

### Item for Agenda of November 4, 2009 Faculty Meeting

Motion to amend the Faculty Bylaws, Article XI. F. 11. Grievance Resolution Committee, as indicated below (additions in **bold**; deletions ~~struck through~~).

#### 11. Grievance Resolution Committee

a. Composition:

The Grievance Resolution Committee shall have five (5) members, four elected by ballot of the faculty and one the chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee, ex officio. All five members must be tenured. The term of each elected member shall be two years. Two members shall be elected each year and shall assume the office at the beginning of the next academic year.

No faculty member, other than the Chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee, may serve on both the Grievance Resolution Committee and the Faculty Welfare Committee.

b. Function:

- (1) To meet at least once each semester for the purpose of training all members on the Grievance procedure.
- (2) To educate the Faculty about the Grievance procedure (for example, through Faculty workshops, online training, etc.).
- (3) To mediate faculty grievances, **in accord with the Faculty Handbook, Section 2.18 Grievance Policy.**
- (4) **To serve as the hearing panel for faculty under the Grievance Resolution policy of the Human Resources Office, as stated in the PSU Online Policy Manual (OLPM), PSU.V.D.13.2.4.1.**
- (5) **To hear any appeal brought in accord with the Faculty Handbook, Section 2.9 F.3. Dismissal for Cause.**
- (~~4~~) **(6)** To perform such other duties as specified by the Faculty Handbook and these Bylaws.

*[amended 2-7-07 and name changed from former Review Committee]*

Explanation: When the proposal by the Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC) to remove the Faculty Grievance Policy from the Faculty Handbook and disband the Grievance Resolution Committee (GRC) was brought to the April 1, 2009 Faculty Meeting, it was clear from the discussion that there was some confusion over the specifics of the duties of the GRC. While the FWC proposal was defeated in April, the potential for confusion still existed. This amendment seeks to clarify that the GRC chiefly has 3 responsibilities: 1) to mediate faculty grievances (according to the Faculty Grievance policy), 2) to serve as the "hearing panel" for faculty choosing to use the grievance resolution procedure of the Human Resources Office, and 3) to serve as an appeal body in the situation of a Dismissal for Cause.

## APPENDIX F

Report from the Grievance Resolution Committee



April 2010

Background Information

In 2006, the Governance Implementation Task Force charged: “The Faculty Welfare Committee, in consultation with the Faculty Review Committee (now Grievance Resolution), will appoint a five-person joint task force.....to study the role and efficacy of the Faculty Review Committee.” In the spring of 2009, the Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC) and Grievance Resolution Committee (GRC) brought a motion before the PSU Faculty to dissolve the Grievance Resolution Committee. The well-researched rationale for this motion included a number of important points: 1) GRC members have no training related to issues under their purview (i.e. discrimination, violations of employment-related policies, etc.); 2) the current policy offers little in way of true resolution and 3) there is confusion about what issues can be handled by the GRC and when a faculty member might be best served by the Human Resources Grievance Policy. After much discussion, PSU Faculty voted overwhelmingly to retain the Grievance Resolution Committee.

The present

The GRC met several times this year and discussed both the need for the committee and the types of issues that the panel should entertain and address. The committee agreed that issues such as workplace bullying, interpersonal conflicts and hostile work environment were areas on which a Faculty Grievance Policy should focus. Much work remains on developing a brand new grievance policy that first, determines what issues the GRC should handle and what issues are better served by the HR grievance route; and secondly, craft policies and procedures that reflect those issues and truly bring “resolution” to a problem.

Future action

It is now time to move forward. PSU Faculty voted to retain the GRC, and there has been much discussion on ways in which the faculty grievance policy can be updated and improved. Immediately after faculty elections are announced, I will ask for a joint committee meeting of current and incoming members of the Faculty Welfare Committee and the Grievance Resolution Committees to discuss plans for developing this brand new policy. Given that Faculty Welfare is a principle policymaking committee (and the work done by both the FWC and GRC is so intertwined), it would be best to begin a dialog between both committees’ members so that clear, definable goals are identified for the next academic year.

Respectfully submitted,  
Anne M. Lebreche  
Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee  
Ex officio member, Grievance Resolution Committee

Other GRC members: Soo Jang, Bill Kietzman, Phil Lonergan and Paul Rogalus