Faculty Council proposes controversial new grievance process.

The process would cut the wait period from 340 days to 90 days.
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Faculty Council members discussed revamping a heavily scrutinized faculty grievance process, a debate that highlighted escalating concern over administration power.

Grievance Process Investigative Officer Laurie Mintz, along with her colleagues, Faculty Council members Judith Goodman and Leona Rubin, presented a plan to reform to the grievance process.

"I want to beg you to give it a try," Mintz said. "More cases will be solved (and) justice will be done."

The plan calls for the creation of a Grievance Resolution Panel, which consists of two tenured faculty members and one administrator who would make a recommendation about grievances to Chancellor Brady Deaton. From there, if the grievant decides to uphold the panel's decision,
the chancellor is given the final say in the matter.

The proposal also calls for a Faculty Council Oversight Committee to act as a watchdog over the actions of the panel and chancellor, and also to make sure necessary remedies are implemented. The entire process, Mintz said, would promote mediation and compromise.

The make-up of the panel came under fire from various members of the council for not adequately protecting faculty members from potential administration power plays.

"It's like a fox protecting the chicken coop," council member Alan Luger said.

Mintz defended the panel by saying it would make decisions based on an "intimate knowledge" of the grievances presented and "not have someone else just dump a big box of documents" in front of them.

Several comments highlighted frustration from numerous delays faculty members have faced when dealing with administration officials.

"I have no rights other than what the university decides," council member Tom Marrero said.

The proposal turns the previous process, which took at best 340 days to settle, into a swifter 90-day system that prevents, fixes and solves problems, Mintz said.

Faculty Council Chairman Tom Phillips asked his colleagues about a possible vote Sept. 25, but the issue remained undecided. When the vote occurs, all faculty members will have a chance to submit their opinions.

But for faculty members who have previously filed grievances, the old process emphasized growing mistrust of administration officials.

"The only thing flawed with the old grievance process was that the chancellor did not implement the grievances of the Faculty Council," council member Rainer Glaser said.

Glaser related how he once filed a complaint and did not actually have a hearing until two years later, a far cry from the promised 340-day process.

Glaser said administrators also found ways to stall the wishes of the previous grievance panel, causing the entire procedure to lengthen greatly.

"If a grievance panel makes a decision, you take it," Glaser said. "The chancellor always found ways around it, and that's an outrage."