Faculty Senate Archives

Attachment 2 to Faculty Senate Meeting October 22, 2018

Attendance Policy Draft Review

3.XX Attendance		
Strengths	**Limitations**	**Recommendations**
Strengths: Terms defined	Too wordy and prescriptive No distinction between employees, staff, faculty Use of 'leadership" term is problematic	One policy for employees and another for faculty and administrative staff; There is a need to distinguish between exempt and non-exempt employees. As discussed during the meeting, we need to capture this information within the purpose and/or policy statement. Faculty members may not need to report the days when they are not on campus. As noted in the meeting, faculty may work from home on days when there are no classes/meetings/office hours. needed
Echoing Fred/Deepak, yes, this is detailed and clear.	Again echoing, this is a "clock punching" employee-based set of guidelines, not reflecting faculty scheduling, which is necessarily flexible and variable. It would likely be impossible for faculty to abdicate duties in the ways stipulated without major, self-evident consequences in service meeting absences, class "no shows," etc.	Echoing: differentiate policy based on employee type, perhaps in "Faculty Expectations" section.

Detailed expectations from employees	Appears as applicable to employees working in a shift or regular workday only. Does not consider flexible schedule that faculty may follow.	Differentiate between faculty and other "employee" defined in this policy. Most departments do not have any "Attendance" procedure and faculty do not report absence on days when they do not have classes/office hours. This may be clarified with "Faculty expectations" section. Replace "leadership" with supervisor or something more appropriate.
each item is well stated.	Procedures are not specific and clear.	Ways to communicate might need to be added i.e., email, call, or text.
		Modify purpose and policy to include expectations by the supervisor