



Faculty Senate Archives

Faculty Senate

Academic year 2018-2019

Attachment 5 to Faculty Senate Meeting April 8, 2019

Human Resources Policy Recommendations from Faculty Affairs

Additional information: Digitized by University Libraries Technical Services and archived in SOAR: Shocker Open Access Repository at:
<http://soar.wichita.edu/handle/10057/15785>

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?	