**PLYMOUTH STATE UNIVERSITY**

**FACULTY MEETING MINUTES**

**D\_R\_A\_F\_T**

**Wednesday, May 6, 2015**

The meeting began at 3:42 p.m. with approximately 75 people in attendance.

I. The minutes of the April 1, 2015 meeting were accepted as amended.

II. Reports.

A. Sara Jayne Steen, President. The President’s report was emailed out earlier today. There were no questions.

B. Julie Bernier, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Provost’s report was emailed out earlier today. The Provost highlighted the good news in the recently received admissions report, anticipating the largest freshman class ever.

C. Michelle Fistek (Faculty Welfare Committee) (Attachment 1)

D. Ann McClellan (URSA). Ann gave a brief report

They are fine tuning the credit-generating and non-credit-generating programs. The report was sent on Monday to explain the processes being used. Nominations for evaluators are due Friday. Questions or comments?

* Karolyn Kinane – *Will there be conversations as decisions are made? Also, might the new President put a hold on this process?* Yes, there will be further conversations.
* Jonathan Santore – *The process needs to be transparent. He lauded the report that was sent. He’s hoping for authentic information, not a marketing of URSA. He also commented on the 10+ hours/week commitment for evaluators with no release time. He thinks this is much to take on. Other faculty also agreed.* Mary said they would consider this.
* Len Reitsma – *Can you be more definite?* Provost Bernier said that there is no answer yet since they need to discuss it.
* Eric Hoffman – *Thanked all the URSA people already working. He commented on the priorities that the Cabinet set. He hopes that the data being collected is financial and that the decisions will be made based on that.* Mary – They first have to design really good, targeted questions so that people can show how they are making progress on the strategic plan. There are many types of data being requested. The challenge is to determine how resources are spent related to the University structure and also if data is available by department. How do we tease the department data apart? The current goal is to keep working on creating questions and make them available as soon as they are created. They will send out a call to ask for volunteers to do a beta test of the questions to get feedback on if the questions accomplished what was intended.
* Marcel Lebrun – *Is there a cap on how many faculty from each department should be involved?* This is not about a representation model – it’s a stewardship model. They will get a list of nominees and try to create diversity of program, longevity, etc. trying to get the right combination. So far about 25-35 are turning down their nomination.
* Linda Levy -- *Can people writing reports also be evaluators?* The only folks not eligible are administrators above the chair level. *Any student reps?* Because of the workload and time commitment, they talked about it, but have thought not. The 3 students here at this meeting asked for student representation, and said they could do it. They would like to have student reps in the URSA group/PBLG next spring. Every report will be public and they would expect that students could provide relevant input and suggestions.

E. Alex Herbst, Student Body President. (Attachment 2). He read a letter from the Student Senate to thank the faculty for all that they do at PSU, especially retiring faculty.

F. Bob Egbert, Speaker. He expressed thanks to the scribe, Alice O’Connor, and resident tech support provider Kendra Morse for their work this academic year. He asked the faculty to volunteer for the vacant faculty committee openings and expressed his disappointment about the many vacant positions, and that only 30% of faculty are involved in committee work. He listed the openings for people to consider. Jonathan Santore commented that while faculty verbally support a shared governance, they have not been supporting it with volunteering to be on committees. Jonathan supports looking at faculty governance this year and see what can be done to increase participation.

Anne Jung is the next Faculty Speaker.

III. Old Business. (none)

IV. New Business.

A. Resolutions of the Standing Committees. (none)

### B. MOTION to Amend the Faculty Bylaws, Hilary Swank, for the Curriculum Committee. (Attachment 3). The motion was made and seconded. There were no questions or discussion. A voice vote approved the motion.

C. MOTION to Amend the Faculty Bylaws, Michael Fischler, for the Grievance Resolution Committee. (Attachment 4). The motion was made and seconded. Dr. Fischler gave the background for this motion. Trying to bridge the differences between the pros and cons of the previous motion that was defeated was not successful. So, this motion only updates the current by-laws description. The Workplace Bullying Policy was passed previously, but there is no provision to enforce and deal with it. This motion addresses that gap. It gives people to opportunity to choose between the Faculty policy and the HR policy. It was suggested that there be trained ombudsmen to handle it. A vote was taken, and the motion was approved.

V. Announcements

* CETL will be having sessions the first week in June
* Paul Fedorchak (CourseEval Advisory Group) announced that feedback evaluations are not available, and if completed by next Monday, you get a T-shirt!
* Bob Heiner – There will be a reception to honor SS retirees Bryon Middlekauff, Grace Fraser, and Kate Donohue on Wednesday, May 13th, in Rounds 107 from 4-5 pm.
* Mary Ann McGarry – reminder that May 12th, 1-2:30 pm, there will be a potluck in Frost Commons for CETL and Engaged Learning.
* Linda Levy solicited a round of applause for the good work that Bob Egbert has done as Faculty Speaker this year.
* Stephanie Halter gave an update of the faculty SOS Scholarship – it is now over $33,000.

A motion to adjourn was made and seconded at 4:35 p.m.

The faculty gave outgoing President Sara Jayne Steen a round of applause.

The SOS basket was won by Wendy Palmquist.

Following this meeting, the following 2015 faculty award recipients were announced:

**Distinguished Teaching Award**

Roger Blake

Mathematics Department

**Distinguished Adjunct Teaching Award**

Aparna Waghe

Atmospheric Science and Chemistry Department

**Distinguished Graduate Teaching Award**

Kathleen McCabe

Graduate Education

A reception was held to honor this year’s award recipients.

**Attachment 1.** (to follow by email)

**Attachment 2.**



***Student Senate***

S.R. 15 (S) 6

**Resolution** S.R. 15 (S) 6 **Introduced By:** President Herbst

**Co-sponsors:** Vice President Spring

**Action Taken**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ **Certified By:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Eric Lozzi

Speaker of the Senate

**Honoring PSU Retirees**

**Whereas**: The Student Senate recognizes the impact that all the faculty and staff of Plymouth State have on the student body each year; and

**Whereas**: Senate ackowledges that many of our faculty and staff retire each year after many years of service;

**Therefore**

**Let it be**

**Resolved**: That the Student Senate thanks all of the retiring faculty and staff of Plymouth State University; and

**Therefore**

**Further it be**

**Resolved**: That the Student Senate will send a letter each spring to the Faculty, OS, and PAT speakers to be read before each body, thanking the retirees; and

**Therefore**

**Further it be**

**Resolved**: That the Student Senate Communications Committee shall take responsibility for assuring that these letters are sent.

### \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

### Attachment 3.

### Proposal: Remove from Curriculum Committee functions the responsibility to receive, review and respond to program reviews.

### Rationale: It has been several years since the Curriculum Committee last received or reviewed a report from a program review. The Curriculum Committee has neither the time nor the required knowledge to properly read and respond to these reports. Instead, the Curriculum Committee will require departments and programs to take responsibility for demonstrating that any proposed changes reflect the department’s Academic Plan and results of program reviews. A department or program may do so by referring to the results of a program review or to the Academic Plan.

### Article XI Committees

1. Committee Descriptions:

### Curriculum Committee

* 1. Function:
     1. Faculty members of the Committee are considered representatives of the entire faculty.
     2. Departments shall have the right to present all curricular proposals before the Committee and shall be considered advocates for the proposals so presented.
     3. The Committee oversees all courses and programs offered by the University. The Committee considers proposals for curricular changes initiated by departments and other curricular groups and acts to ensure the integrity and coordination of all aspects of the curriculum.
     4. The Committee considers and approves, or denies by its own authority, all minor\* changes in the curriculum. The Committee publishes minor\* changes on the Web. Action on minor\* changes becomes official on the twenty-first day after the action is posted, unless a member of the faculty lodges an objection to the change with the Faculty Speaker prior to the twenty-first day.
     5. The Committee brings before the Faculty the Committee’s recommendations concerning all proposed major\* curricular changes.
     6. ~~The Committee carries out ongoing assessment and evaluation of the University curriculum by receiving, reviewing, and responding to periodic departmental reviews, external reviews, and professional accreditation reviews.~~ The Committee may, by its own initiative, ~~also~~ develop and implement ~~other~~ curriculum review processes.

### \*Major and minor are operatively and dichotomously defined. A minor change is one which is not major; a major change is one which either a member of the Curriculum Committee declared major during the meeting at which the matter was deliberated, or a member of the faculty, within 20 days of posting, has declared major to the Faculty Speaker. Upon being declared major, the Faculty Speaker will notify the Chair of the Curriculum Committee and the person responsible for the proposal. The latter person must provide, in a timely fashion, the Faculty Speaker with the proposal and any supporting materials.

## [amended 12/5/07]

[from PSU Faculty Handbook, pages 65-69 of 12-5-2007 online version]

**\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\***

**Attachment 4.**

**2.17 Grievance Policy**

The Faculty and Administration of Plymouth State University affirm their conviction that the University is an academic community in which policies should be characterized by, and individuals treated in, a spirit of fairness and equity. However, it is recognized that from time to time grievances may arise. It is the purpose of this procedure to encourage prompt resolution of such grievances and to recognize the importance of settling them fairly, without fear or prejudice or reprisal and in a manner which protects the rights of everyone concerned. The aggrieved **(hereafter Grievant) and the accused (hereafter Respondent)** will follow the orderly process hereinafter set forth, and these procedures shall be the final campus remedy used for their resolution.

Any status faculty member – including tenure-track faculty, faculty-in-residence, and contract faculty – is eligible to use this grievance procedure. *[revised 12-30-04 in accord with USNH OLPM USY.V.D.12.3.1.2]*

##### A. Definition

A grievable act is defined as any action (s) which allegedly:

1. violates a Board of Trustees, University System, or institutional policy *[revised 12-20-04 to use wording from USNH OLPM USY.V.D.12.3.1.1]*

2. abrogates or denies a faculty member’s academic freedom (Faculty Handbook, 2.4, Faculty Roles and Responsibilities, Section A, Academic Freedom)

~~3.~~ ~~unfairly discriminates against a faculty member on the basis of sex, sexual orientation, race, age, religion, color, marital status, national origin, or handicap~~**3. violates accepted University procedure for renewal of contract, promotion and/or tenure;**

**4. violates the University’s policy against workplace bullying (Faculty Handbook, 2.4 Faculty Roles and Responsibilities, Section N, Plymouth State University Statement on Workplace Bullying.)**

~~5. violates employment related policies and procedures, excluding dismissal of tenured faculty (see Section 2.9 for conditions involving dismissal including tenured faculty.~~

##### B. Grievance Resolution Committee

Grievance Resolution Committee membership is established under Article XI. F. 11 of the Bylaws of the Plymouth State University Faculty. The Grievance Resolution Committee will strive to maintain confidentiality at all steps throughout the grievance procedure. Attendance at meetings of the Review Committee is by invitation only.

In cases involving promotion or tenure, the Grievance Resolution Committee will not act to substitute for the judgment of a department promotion and tenure committee; but upon application of an aggrieved party will review the fairness of the application of the departmental committee’s procedures.

Any member of the Grievance Resolution Committee who either has, or perceives a conflict of interest in his or her involvement in a particular grievance, shall so inform the Chair and recuse himself or herself from further participation in the formal grievance procedure. If the impartiality of the Chair of the Grievance Resolution Committee is challenged by a party of interest, the Chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee will make the determination as to whether or not a conflict of interest exists. If the impartiality of any other member of the Grievance Resolution Committee is challenged by a party of interest, the Chair of the Grievance Resolution Committee will make a determination as to whether or not a conflict of interest exists. If the currently sitting Chair of the Grievance Resolution Committee is to be removed because of an upheld challenge of impartiality, the new chair (as prescribed in the following paragraph) will make the determination on challenges to any other members of the Grievance Resolution Committee.

In either case, the Faculty Speaker will appoint a replacement who is acceptable to both parties to the grievance case who will serve as a replacement member on the hearing panel. If the Chair of the Grievance Resolution Committee is replaced, then the new constituted hearing panel shall elect a new chair for the impending hearing.

##### C. Grievance Procedure

Any faculty member eligible to use this grievance procedure who feels that he or she has been aggrieved must initiate the grievance process within 10 calendar days following the time when the faculty member could reasonably have been aware of the existence of the situation which is the basis of the grievance and within one year of its occurrence. **However, the Grievance Resolution Committee has discretionary authority at any time during the grievance procedure to extend a deadline as necessary to ensure a thorough and fair process.*[revised 12-20-04 in accord with OLPM V.D.12.3.1.3]***

**1. Informal Grievance Procedure**

Written notification of informal grievance shall be submitted to the Chair of the Grievance Resolution Committee with a copy to the Director of Human Resources who will be responsible for coordinating the stages of the informal grievance process.

Prior to initiating a formal grievance, the grievant must attempt reconciliation with all

appropriate administrators and faculty. These discussions may include Department Chairs, members of the administration, parties of interest, and other persons who are either involved in or affect the situation and/or action for which a grievance may be brought. A qualified mediator agreeable to both parties may be used. Reasonable expenses will be paid by the University.

At the informal discussion, every attempt should be made to reconcile differences through face-to-face discussion and negotiation of the issues. The Grievance Resolution Committee will not be involved in these discussions directly, but will maintain contact with parties involved to help ensure that a good faith effort at reconciliation is made. The informal grievance procedure must be completed within 60 calendar days after the initiation of the process.

If, by the determination of the grievant, no acceptable resolution is forthcoming from the informal process, he or she may then file a formal grievance with the Chair of the Grievance Resolution Committee within 30 calendar days after the completion of the informal grievance procedure but in no event later than 90 calendar days after the initial filing of the grievance at the informal stage.

**2. Formal Grievance Procedure**

Notification: The grievant shall file his/her grievance in writing with the Chair of the Grievance Resolution Committee. The grievance shall identify (1) the nature of the grievance, i.e. the specific action or pattern of actions which is being grieved; (2) the background and reasons why the grievant believes the action was in error; (3) where relevant, the specific provision of the Faculty Handbook, policy, practice or procedure alleged to have been violated and (4) the grievant’s perception of the appropriate remedy of the grievance. Once the grievance has been filed, the Chair shall forward a copy of the grievance to the Respondent(s). The Committee shall meet to discuss the grievance among themselves and shall then schedule a hearing no later than 21 calendar days after receiving the grievance.

Procedure:

The following procedures are to be followed when a faculty member files a grievance:

a. The formal grievance procedure shall include both a prehearing and a formal hearing. During the prehearing and the formal hearing both the grievant and the respondent and their advocates will be allowed to hear and to respond to all testimony. Each party may have one advocate. The advocate must be a PSU employee and shall not have a law degree.

b. The Human Resources Office will make available to the Grievance Resolution Committee all necessary resources and will undertake the facilitation of both the prehearing and the formal hearing.

c. The Prehearing

The Grievance Resolution Committee shall hold a prehearing with the grievant, the respondent, and their advocates. The purpose of the prehearing shall be:

(1) to establish the procedures to be followed in the formal hearing.

(2) to determine witnesses for the formal hearing. To determine these witnesses, the grievant, respondent and the Committee will work together closely, using as criteria (1) witnesses with information relevant to the grievance, and (2) witnesses who can share new information in an effort to avoid redundant testimony.

(3) to determine the relevant documents to be used at the formal hearing.

(4) to identify and summarize the general factual areas about which witnesses will testify.

d. The Formal Hearing

All documents and a summary of areas of testimony identified during the prehearing shall be made available to grievant and respondent before the hearing.

The hearing will include, but is not limited to the grievant and his/her advocate, the ~~person~~ ~~being grieved~~ respondent and his/her advocate, and the Grievance Resolution Committee.

The Grievance Resolution Committee will conduct the formal hearing. The grievant, the respondent, and their advocates have the right to hear the testimony and to respond to testimony during the hearing, and question the witnesses. The Grievance Resolution Committee will make all appropriate decisions as to the conduct of the hearing and the evidence received.

e. Within 10 calendar days of the conclusion of the hearing, the grievant and respondent may submit a written summary of their positions to the Grievance Resolution Committee. Within 21 calendar days from receiving any written summaries the Grievance Resolution Committee shall report in writing to the parties involved and to the ~~President~~ **Provost** its findings and recommendations. If the Committee finds no recommendations appropriate, it will state its reasons for so finding in its report.

f. **The Provost shall be responsible for overseeing the implementation of recommendations from the Grievance Resolution Committee**. If the ~~President~~  **Provost** should determine that implementation of the Grievance Resolution Committee’s recommendation(s) is impossible or would cause grave harm to the University, he or she shall, within 21 calendar days, so inform in writing the Chair of the Grievance Resolution Committee, the grievant and the respondent, setting forth in detail the reasons underlying his or her determination. No grievance resolution shall be considered precedent-setting.

g. Remedies: Insofar as possible, the remedies available under this grievance resolution procedure shall be limited to those necessary to address the grievance.

h. Record-keeping and Access to Records: All materials used in the grievance process, including ~~tape~~ recordings, exhibits, minutes and affidavits, shall be held in a sealed file in the PSU Human Resources Office. This file shall be separate from the individuals’ personnel files. The only people authorized to open the files are the grievant, the respondent, and appropriate administrators who prove an official need to know.

##### D. Appeal

Appeals of decisions and/or recommendations of the Grievance Resolution Committee shall be made to the President, and shall be made within 21 calendar days of the report of the Grievance Resolution Committee. Appeals should clearly state all grounds for the appeal. The President shall decide whether the grounds for appeal have merit and may call for a rehearing of the case, if necessary.

*[revised by Faculty 4-5-00; name changed from Review Committee to Grievance Resolution Committee on 2-7-07]*