

Recommendations from Fac. Affair committee re HR policies to Senate 4.8.19

Review of HR policies; 3.27 Emeritus Status; 3.38 Support of Nursing Mothers; 3.37 Personnel Files; 3xx Whistleblower

| 3.27 Emeritus Status v6 | | |
|--------------------------------|---|--|
| Strengths | Limitations | Recommendations |
| Appears very straightforward. | I'm not sure to whom an appeal would go after the president, but antagonisms, etc., are always possible. Also, it says there is no salary/emolument, but are emeritus faculty paid a certain level of salary-- perhaps equivalent to their pre-retirement rank? That would, in effect, be a financial determination in case of continuing to teach. Not sure it needs to be spelled out here, but wanted to mention it. | |
| Short and simple | No procedure on appeal process in case the recommendation is not approved by the president. Timing of recommendation is not clear. | POLICY STATEMENT: Have 10 years FT or FTE? Should we restrict it to faculty and administrators? Should consider FTE |

| 3.38 Support of Nursing Mothers v5 | | |
|---|--|--|
| Strengths | Limitations | Recommendations |
| Clear | Availability of such stations on campus? It provides for time to seek out alternatives, but it seems like the main issue here is infrastructure. | how do employees find the info? If there are insufficient facilities, do we spell out/specify the alternatives nearby? Perhaps a policy shouldn't get into such things, but the practical application will be the next question. |
| | It's not clear if the department of the employee of nursing mom should provide/designate a Lactation Station in the building? | |
| Straightforward | It's not clear if the department of the employee of nursing mom should provide/designate a Lactation Station in the building? | Should we have PROCEDURE 1.b as 1.a.i? RESPONSIBILITIES for Employee #3 is unclear since the search results do not provide useful information. |

| 3.37 Personnel Files v9 | | |
|--------------------------------|--|--|
| Strengths | Limitations | Recommendations |
| | who reviews, what is the process. #3 makes it sound as if we're being assigned a responsibility to find out what's in it and keep track of that. | Soften language of 3 so it doesn't read as a "charge." |
| Clear and concise | <p>PROCEDURE #5 and #6: This may indicate that faculty files are only within the dept, Academic Affairs, and HR. However, they may also have files within their dean's office.</p> <p>PROCEDURE #8: It is unclear who reviews the concerns and what the outcomes may be.</p> | PROCEDURE #6: "faculty activity reports" should be "Performance Evaluation Form" |

| 3.XX Whistleblower v6 | | |
|----------------------------------|--|---|
| Strengths | Limitations | Recommendations |
| Seems to account for everything. | | |
| Straightforward | "Retaliation" only includes direct actions and does not include or mention indirect actions | <p>Good-Faith Disclosure: "... reckless disregard for its truth or falsity" - not sure if we need both truth or falsity.</p> <p>PROCEDURE: "Sexual Harassment, Discrimination, other Equal Opportunity issues" link goes to training page and need to be directed correctly.</p> <p>Link KBOR policy too?</p> |
| | What happens to the whistleblower if he/she withdraws what is reported? Will nothing happen or an investigation be still initiated or continued? | |