

## **Recommendation regarding the grievance pool**

Last month the Senate requested the Rules committee to examine an inconsistency between policy and practice with regard to the membership of the grievance pool. This is a list of faculty that is generated annually to potentially serve on a panel of peers if a grievance is filed. The current practice is to include probationary faculty in the list of faculty that is generated annually for the grievance pool. This is in contradiction with Policy 5.06 (VIII) which states that “Each year a Grievance Board consisting of 50 or more tenured faculty members to act as potential Review Committee members will be selected at random from the eligible faculty in proportion to the numbers in each rank, race/ethnicity, and sex.”

Arguments can be made on both sides regarding how best to protect the interests of pre-tenure faculty members:

### Prohibit probationary faculty from being in the grievance pool:

- Putting pre-tenure faculty in the pool puts them at risk by asking them to serve in these tense personnel situations.
- Such hearings are also considerably time consuming and could potentially have repercussions on research productivity toward tenure.
- Tenured faculty retain some sense of what it was like to be untenured and can still appreciate that perspective.

### Allow probationary faculty to serve in the grievance pool:

- If a pre-tenure faculty member came before a grievance panel, it would benefit them to have an untenured peer on the panel.
- Pre-tenure faculty always have the option to opt-out of serving on a panel if they feel it is contrary to their interests.

> **The Rules Committee recommends that the Senate uphold the current policy and prohibit probationary faculty from being in the grievance pool.** [This will require removing the 17 current untenured faculty members and replacing them with tenured members, as well as sending notifications to the new appointees.]