

# tuf times

Published by UH/CLC Guild, Local 4033, Texas United Faculty  
Vol. 3, No. 1, Fall 1982

## WHAT TUF WANTS FOR UH/CLC

At its first meeting of the year, TUF adopted the following platform:

TUF pledges to cooperate with the Faculty Senate and UH/CLC faculty members to achieve the following goals.

1. Faculty professional organizations, such as TUF, should have the right to meet on campus. As you may know, the UH/CLC administration has denied us this right, even though a host of student organizations meet on campus.
2. Increased respect for UH/CLC faculty. TUF believes that most decisions which affect faculty should be made on the Program level by the faculty. For example, Program faculty should in most cases make tenure and promotion decisions.
3. The Faculty Senate is considering a proposal to allow faculty to take vacations from administering the student evaluation of teaching. During these vacations faculty could experiment with new courses and teaching techniques. TUF supports this proposal.
4. Hiring and firing should largely be done by the faculty. There should be no firing until a strong appeal procedure is in place.
5. TUF supports Program development at UH/CLC. Programs in existence here should be strengthened, not threatened with retrenchment.
6. All UH/CLC faculty should receive cost-of-living raises every year. Any additional money that is available can go to merit raises.
7. The grievance procedure for the University should be strengthened. Decisions made by the faculty grievance committee should almost always be final.
8. UH/CLC's fringe benefit package, particularly the medical plan, should be strengthened.
9. TUF supports efforts to provide child care at UH/CLC.
10. TUF opposes sex discrimination in hiring and in distribution of merit pay.
11. TUF believes that any decision about moving to disciplinary suites should be made by the faculty.
12. TUF will support wholeheartedly any individuals or groups who wish to press a grievance. We have experience with grievances and we are willing to share that experience. Those wishing assistance in preparing an annual report may also consult with us.

What do you think of these goals? Whether or not you agree with all of them, please let us have your views. We would like to start a letters column. Send your comments to Curt Smith, Box 309.

## CONCLUSION TO "ANATOMY OF A GRIEVANCE"

To jog your memories: The original "Anatomy of a Grievance" was published in the TUF TIMES in the Spring 1982 edition, and concerned a grievance over a performance evaluation of a faculty member by a Program Director. The faculty member's major claim was that inaccurate and unverifiable materials should not be placed in a faculty member's file. The Dean argued that such material could be placed there in the name of "free and open communication" within the University, especially since the faculty member had sufficient ability to rebut such material.

(over)

The Faculty Grievance Committee, upon appeal from the grievant, found for the faculty member, agreeing that unverifiable and inaccurate material ought not to be placed in a faculty member's file.

The Vice Chancellor and Provost overruled the Faculty Grievance Committee and supported the Dean, acting without the request of the grievant.

The grievant appealed to the then-Chancellor Dr. Neumann 1) the Provost's decision overruling the Faculty Grievance Committee, and 2) the Provost's decision to act without the request of the grievant, which the grievance procedure seems clearly to require.

Chancellor Neumann's reply, dated June 15, 1982 (summer break), argued that since evaluations are opinion, the issue of accuracy and substantiation is irrelevant. He also argued that the Provost based his right to unilaterally review and reject the Faculty Grievance Committee's report on the instructions, in the procedure, that the Provost inform all concerned parties of his decision, apparently a reference to the last sentence in paragraph two, page two of the procedure. Since this instruction follows the statement that the grievance may be appealed to the Provost only if the grievant wishes, the Chancellor's argument seems to be a little problematical. The issue originally appealed to him was that the Provost had acted without the request of the grievant, an action which the procedures made no provision for.

Suffice it to say, however, that the points raised by the handling of the grievance by administrators from Program Director to Provost remain.

1. All administrators, from Dean through Chancellor, evidently agree that the range of an administrator's discretion in what constitutes an evaluation of a faculty member's performance takes precedence over any question of veracity or substantiation.

2. The Provost and Chancellor can evidently ignore the grievance procedure that they accepted. The grievance procedure in force and followed in this case came from the Provost's office.

3. The Provost, and Chancellor Neumann, overruled the Faculty Grievance Committee completely, revealing the tendency of UH/CLC administrators, including the Dean and Program Director in this case, to simply ignore faculty recommendations and faculty governance when it does not suit their purposes.

The one change in this situation is that we have a new Chancellor. Let us hope that he feels more commitment to established guidelines and rules, and that he acts on that feeling.

DID YOU KNOW THAT...

Your \$14/month dues for TUF membership entitles you to:

- \$1,000,000 occupational liability insurance
- Grievance handling to defend your rights
- Effective representation in Austin and Washington
- A death benefit for your beneficiary of \$5,000

Moreover, your dues are tax deductible and are easily payable by automatic bank draft.

Please consider joining this completely democratic organization of your colleagues.

CONCLUSION TO "ANATOMY OF A GRIEVANCE"

To our memory: The original "Anatomy of a Grievance" was published in the TUF TIMES in the Spring 1982 edition, and concerned a grievance over a performance evaluation of a faculty member by a Program Director. The faculty member's major claim was that inaccurate and unverifiable material should not be placed in a faculty member's file. The Dean argued that such material could be placed there in the name of "free and open communication" within the University, especially since the faculty member had sufficient ability to report such material.

(over)