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Annual Report
Clemson Faculty Grievance Board
2012 Activities

• Petitions and Hearings Report
• 5-year Grievance Policy Review
  – Benchmark Review
  – Analysis of Findings of Facts HP Reports
  – Survey of Grievance Policy Participants
• Handbook Development
Categories of Petitions Filed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>GC1</th>
<th>GC2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Grievability Decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>NonGrievable (Provost)</th>
<th>NonGrievable (GB)</th>
<th>Grievable by Provost</th>
<th>Grievable by GB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**
- **NonGrievable (Provost)**
- **NonGrievable (GB)**
- **Grievable by Provost**
- **Grievable by GB**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Complaints Supported by HP Rept</th>
<th>Complaints not Supported by HP Rept</th>
<th>Complaints not Supported by Provost</th>
<th>HP Recommendations Supported by Provost</th>
<th>Grievance Appealed to President</th>
<th>Grievance Appealed to Board of Trustees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Petitioners' Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sources of Petitions

- Library
- HEHD
- E&S
- BBS
- AFLS
- AAH

Year:
- 2012
- 2011
- 2010
- 2009
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Benchmarks Review

• Analysis of 11 Institutions’ faculty grievance policies
  – Auburn, Boston College, Colorado State, Cornell, Kansas State, Michigan State, Mississippi State, Penn State, Purdue, TAMU, UFL

• Notable policies differences at other institutions:
  – Petitions go to Faculty, not Administrative Office-
  – Less review time
  – All parties are present for the hearings
  – All participants (including advisors/advocates) are providing service to the university without penalty and with positive recognition
  – Hearings are recorded
  – Hearing processes are the same regardless of the type of complaint
Benchmarks Review
Recommendations to PC

• Lessen the Provost’s review time from 20 to 15 days
• Move to a single day hearing for all types of grievances (not just Category 1)
• Audio record Category 2 Hearings
• Recognize service of both Counselors and Board members in workload.
• Ensure that staff are excused from duties to participate in Hearings
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Analysis of 5 years of Findings of Fact

HP Reports to Provost

- Findings section of Hearing Panel reports to Provost between 2007 and 2012
- 13 Cases (including both G1 and G2)
- Two coders
- Inter-rater reliability of .82
- Report includes only agreed upon codes of 199 findings
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5 years of HP Findings of Fact: Code Development

Definitions of *Faculty Manual Terms* used in Findings

- Anonymity/confidentiality
- Collegiality
- Due Process
- Policy
- Procedures
- 11 Other *terms*
90% of the 199 Findings of Fact

- duePro: 33%
- Collea: 25%
- pol: 20%
- Pro: 12%
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Implications

- Annual process for departments and committees to review written policies as well as clarify procedures
- Training for administrators and faculty on documentation steps
- Attention to dysfunctional working relationships through training for both faculty and administrators
In what role did you serve in your most recent Grievance Process experience for which you wish to provide feedback to the Grievance Board? [Choose only one response.]

- Petitioner: 24%
- Respondent: 26%
- Hearing Panel Members: 29%
- Witness: 8%
- Grievance Counselor: 13%
Participants in Attempts to Resolve F2F

- Dean: 5
- Chair: 5
- Assoc. Dean: 2
- FS Rep: 1
- Ombud: 1
- A&E Rep: 1
- Other Admin: 3
Other Efforts Pre-Grievance

Faculty Senate Office

Grievance Counselor

Ombud Office

Access & Equity

HR
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Helpfulness of Different Process Resources

- Grievance Counselor: 6
- Faculty Senate Office: 5
- Faculty Manual: 4
- Ombud Office: 3
- Access & Equity: 0
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Degree to Which Counselor was an Advocate

To what degree do you feel that the Grievance Counselor served as your advocate in the process?

- To No Degree: 38%
- To a Small Degree: 0%
- To a Degree: 12%
- To a Great Degree: 50%
- Not Applicable: 0%
Reasons for Choosing a GC

[choose as many answers as apply] I chose to go to a Grievance Counselor who

- represents my college: 25%
- did not represent my college: 0%
- was recommended to me: 63%
- would not know the people I was talking about: 0%
- would have insight and knowledge about the situation because they work near me or in my college: 25%
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Throughout the Hearing Process, I was updated on the process.
Throughout the Hearing Process, my questions were answered ...
Throughout the Hearing Process, I was listened to by the Hearing Panel
Throughout the Hearing Process, it moved in a timely manner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Petitioner</td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Witness</td>
<td>HP Member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I was well informed on the Hearing Panel's final report to the Provost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Petitioner</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Witness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree Somewhat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Handbook Development

• Principles:
  – Emphasis on clarity for consistency of experience
  – Working document for common practices

• Content
  – Define terms
  – Clarify Roles
  – Potential to “pull out” role-based sections