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UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA
BOARD OF VISITORS AGENDA SUMMARY

BOARD MEETING: February 5, 2009

COMMITTEE: The University of Virginia's College at Wise

AGENDA ITEM: I. Grievance Procedures for Administrative and Professional General Faculty

BACKGROUND: A grievance policy exists for teaching faculty at Wise, but until now there has not been such a policy for Administrative and Professional General Faculty.

DISCUSSION: The newly developed policy clearly differentiates between two groups of general faculty: (1) Academic General Faculty, who may take grievances to the Faculty Relations Committee, as do the Teaching Faculty, and (2) Administrative and Professional General Faculty, whose teaching duties are tangential to their administrative duties. This policy is written to serve the needs of the latter group. In the event of a grievance, those administering this policy will follow the three phase procedure outlined in the Grievance Procedure that is compatible with the policy in use at the University of Virginia. The attached policy has been reviewed by the Office of the General Counsel and approved by The University of Virginia’s College at Wise Board.

ACTION REQUIRED: Approval by the Committee on The University of Virginia’s College at Wise and by the Board of Visitors

APPROVAL OF THE GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE FOR ADMINISTRATIVE AND PROFESSIONAL FACULTY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA’S COLLEGE AT WISE

RESOLVED, the Board of Visitors approves the Grievance Procedure for Administrative and Professional General Faculty at The University of Virginia’s College at Wise, and authorizes the College’s administration to make modifications with prior review of the General Counsel for legal sufficiency.
BACKGROUND: Crockett Hall, the oldest building on the campus of The University of Virginia’s College at Wise, was home to the Wise County Poor Farm before the county sold the farm and the building in 1954 for $1 to house Clinch Valley College.

The historical structure was the primary academic building for the 109 students who formed the College’s first class. The building is named for Samuel Crockett, a University of Virginia extension agent who played a major role in the College’s founding.

In later years, Crockett Hall was transformed from an academic and administrative facility into a residence hall. It was closed for renovations near the turn of the century.

An historic renovation of the College’s most significant building began in July 2007 with Burwil Construction handling the $6.9 million project. The renovation was funded by state general funds.

Following the completion of renovation this fall, Crockett Hall once again serves students and includes the offices of Admissions, Financial Aid, Registrar, Cashier, Advising and Retention, and Assessment.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Pippin will give a presentation featuring photographs of Crockett Hall’s storied history and its historic renovation.
UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA
BOARD OF VISITORS AGENDA SUMMARY

BOARD MEETING: February 5, 2009

COMMITTEE: The University of Virginia's College at Wise

AGENDA ITEM: II.B. Southwest Virginia Technology Development Center

ACTION REQUIRED: None

BACKGROUND: One of the major initiatives of the Office of Economic Development at the College is the establishment of the Southwest Virginia Technology Development Center. The Center is located in Lebanon, and was part of the initial economic development proposals Russell County submitted to CGI and Northrop Grumman as the companies evaluated potential sites for establishing their new operations. The entire Southwest Virginia educational community has focused efforts in meeting the training needs of CGI and Northrop Grumman, two IT giants who are creating 733 new jobs in Lebanon.

The Russell County Industrial Development Authority asked The University of Virginia's College at Wise to manage the Technology Development Center. The Center provides technical educational programs and professional development seminars and workshops.

DISCUSSION: The Center packages customized training solutions designed to address an employer’s specific needs.

Soon after Northrop Grumman hired Information Help Desk personnel for the VITA project, the company identified a significant gap in the technical skills of their new hires. As of the end of December 2008, thirty persons have completed a 40 hour program devised by the Center, and Northrop Grumman has expressed their intent to utilize the program as part of this on-going professional development strategy.

Over this past year, companies and organizations such as Alcoa, First Bank and Trust, and Emory & Henry College have requested customized training from the Center.
In May 2008, The Excellence in Leadership Institute was created to respond to a gap in leadership development in Southwest Virginia: employers have expressed concerns about a significant gap in the level of leadership and management skills in the region’s workforce. With pending retirements, succession planning has become an ever-increasing concern for many employers.

In collaboration with the University of Virginia’s Leadership Development Center, the first leadership program, “Meeting the Leadership Challenge”, was launched. Seven companies representing manufacturing, academia, government and service were among the participants.

Similarly, the “Effective Supervisor” program which ran from October 1 to December 3, graduated fourteen representatives from the manufacturing, customer service, and information technology sectors.

Employers who have participated in the leadership and management development programs include Alpha Natural Resources, First Bank & Trust, True Point Bank, Alcoa Wheels and Transportation Products, the Southwest Virginia Higher Education Center, Old Dominion University, Small Business Development Centers, and K-Va-T Food Stores (Food City).

An overview of activities at the Technology Development Center follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program/Initiative</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Business Fundamentals Workshops</td>
<td>Free eight-session course to develop business management skills. Provided by the Virginia Department of Business Assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>One-day Leadership Development program designed to address leadership needs across all levels of the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadband 101</td>
<td>One-day seminar regarding a basic overview of Broadband, terminology and applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security 101</td>
<td>One-Day seminar about the basics of protecting organizational and personal networks, terminology, issues/concerns and useful applications and/or resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Software Testing*</td>
<td>Customized 32 hour program for CGI which was broadcast via phone and live-meeting to Birmingham, Alabama, and Atlanta, Georgia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Essentials</td>
<td>Customized three-day training program for CGI. Content included Communications and the DiSC Personality Profile, Time Management, Problem Solving, and Business/Technical Writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL/SQL</td>
<td>Customized four-day training program for CGI as dictated by a recent contract won by the company. Programming language course was provided by an instructor from Radford University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS Office 2003</td>
<td>Customized three-day training program for Alcoa. Content included basic operation of Windows XP, MS Word, Excel, and Outlook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Technical Academy</td>
<td>Launched a series of three courses for the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Professionals Network</td>
<td>Organized a professional/social group consisting of IT professionals throughout the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation Basics</td>
<td>Facilitation Basics makes meetings more manageable by teaching essential tools for creating more effective outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS Project 2007</td>
<td>Utilizing the Microsoft Project 2007 tool, participants learn basic principles and best practices of project management as well as the technical aspects of the MS Project tool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The “Effective Supervisor”</td>
<td>Newly appointed supervisors or team leads practice skills in the core competencies of Time Management, HR principles, Performance Management and Coaching, Problem Resolution, Communication and Leadership.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA
BOARD OF VISITORS AGENDA SUMMARY

BOARD MEETING: February 5, 2009

COMMITTEE: The University of Virginia's College at Wise

AGENDA ITEM: III. The University of Virginia’s College at Wise Issues Under Consideration in other Board of Visitors Committees

ACTION REQUIRED: None

The Buildings and Grounds Committee will be asked, on February 5, to approve the schematic design of the College’s Multipurpose Center.

The Finance Committee will be asked, also on February 5, to approve the financial plans for capital projects to be initiated by 2012 in the proposed Major Capital Projects Program (2010-2020). There are six proposed projects at Wise in the Program: an alternative energy feasibility study; a campus telecommunications infrastructure project; safety modifications to the dams in the western part of the campus; a new library; a proscenium theater; and the establishment of a maintenance reserve for 2010-2012.
Grievance Procedures for Administrative and Professional General Faculty

I. Introduction

This procedure is intended to provide the College with a fair and efficient means of resolving certain complaints brought by Administrative and Professional General Faculty with respect to their employment. (*see below).

A. Complaints Covered by Phases I, II, and III:

This procedure has three phases. Phase I consists of two levels of review. Complaints qualifying for Phase I may qualify for further review, utilizing either Further Investigation Phase II or the Hearing Phase III, but not both unless authorized by the Chancellor.

1. Phase I

a. Complaint of Illegal Discrimination — a complaint made by the faculty member alleging discrimination because of his or her race, color, sexual orientation, gender, religion, political affiliation, age, handicap, national origin or veteran's status, or harassment on the basis of any of the foregoing.

b. Complaint of Disciplinary Action — a complaint of unwarranted disciplinary action in his or her employment.

c. Complaint of Breach of Employment Contract.

d. Complaint of Reprisal — a complaint of acts of reprisal as a result of using this procedure or being a witness for another complainant using this procedure or for reporting improper conduct to appropriate College officers or public officials.

*See www.virginia.edu/genfac/bylaws for definition of Administrative and Professional General Faculty.
2. **Phase II**

Complaints qualifying for Phase II review are those which the Chancellor or his or her designee decides, as described below, should be investigated further.

3. **Phase III**

Complaints qualifying for the Phase III reviews are those which the Chancellor or his or her designee decides, as described below, should be reviewed through a hearing procedure.

B. Extensions of Time Periods

1. **Phase I and Qualification Proceedings**

The time periods applicable in Phase I and the qualification proceedings under Section III may be extended by written agreement of the complainant and the relevant College official involved in a particular step, or by the Chancellor or his or her designee upon a written determination that good cause exists for the extension.

2. **Phase II**

The time periods applicable in Phase II review may be extended by written agreement of the complainant, the appropriate management representative and the investigator, or by the Chancellor or his or her designee upon a written determination that good cause exists for the extension.

3. **Phase III**

The time periods applicable in the Phase III may be extended by written agreement of the parties and the panel, or by the Chancellor or his designee upon a written determination that good cause exists for the extension.
C. Noncompliance Issues

Any issues relating to noncompliance with these procedures shall be promptly presented to the Chancellor for resolution.

D. Delegation by the Chancellor

If the Chancellor deems it appropriate, he or she may delegate some or all of the Chancellor’s duties under this procedure.

E. Alternates

In the following cases the Chancellor may designate, at the complainant’s timely request, in writing, to the Chancellor or on the Chancellor’s own motion independent of any such request, an alternate to perform the role of one or more persons under this procedure:

1. A complaint directed at a person discharging any official duty on behalf of the College under this procedure who also immediately supervises the complainant;

2. A complaint directed at a person who would be a reviewer under this procedure;

3. A complaint against the Chancellor.

F. Attorneys

1. Other than for the Panel:

Attorneys or other advisors representing the parties may be present during any hearing or meeting called for by this procedure, so long as such presence is not disruptive. However, the attorney or advisor may not participate in the proceedings or speak for or on behalf of the party represented.
2. For the Panel:

A hearing panel may have counsel present at any time. The panel's counsel shall not question witnesses and shall be available to the panel to provide such legal advice as may be requested or advisable, however any factual findings are and shall be the prerogative of the panel. Counsel for the panel as may be needed shall be provided by the University's Office of General Counsel or Office of the Attorney General; provided any lawyer who may have provided legal advice to management concerning the grievance or the matter on which it is based shall not serve as counsel to the hearing panel.

II. Phase I Review Procedures

A. Standard First Level of Phase I Review

1. Bring complaint to Director of Human Resources. Complainants are encouraged to discuss their grievances in person with those able to resolve them before the procedure described in this document is initiated. If the complainants are not comfortable discussing their grievances directly with each other, they can request the assistance of a third party mediator to informally discuss their grievances in an effort to resolve them before the procedure described in this document is initiated. The mediator can be assigned by the Director of Human Resources or the Chancellor. This procedure is not intended as a substitute for such discussions, but rather as an additional means of resolving disputes.

2. If the dispute cannot be resolved through informal discussion, the complainant must initiate a review by providing their immediate supervisor, within ten calendar days of the event which is the basis for the complaint, a written statement describing both the nature of the complaint and the relief requested. Failure to timely provide the written statement shall preclude proceeding under this grievance procedure unless the Chancellor may rule otherwise finding good cause to proceed and that the failure to timely
provide the written statement is not attributable to the fault of the complainant. The complainant and the supervisor should attempt to resolve the complaint informally during the supervisor's following five workdays.

3. Within ten workdays after receipt of the complainant's written statement, the complainant's immediate supervisor shall provide to the complainant a written response to the statement. The response shall state the supervisor's decision and the supporting reasons.

B. Anonymous First Level Review Option

1. For complaints of harassment or discrimination, instead of proceeding as stated in above, the complainant may initiate this Anonymous Review within ten calendar days after the event which is the basis for the complaint. The complainant must request in writing, that the Chancellor review the complaint directly. The Chancellor may designate an appropriate individual to conduct the review who shall not be the immediate supervisor of the complainant or otherwise the subject of the complaint. The anonymity of the complainant shall be respected to the extent practicable except as may be required by law or necessary in connection with the investigation.

2. The designate shall take such steps as the designate and the complainant deem appropriate to attempt to resolve the complaint without the need for disciplinary action or further use of this procedure.

3. The complainant may terminate the Anonymous Review at any time upon informing the designate in writing or by initiating a complaint as described in Section II.A in a timely manner.

C. Second Level of Phase I Review

1. If the immediate supervisor's response from the First Level Review does not resolve the complaint to the complainant's satisfaction, the complainant may advance the complaint to the Second Level Review.
Within five days of receipt of the immediate supervisor's response, a written statement describing the complaint and the relief requested must be submitted to the Director of Human Resources, with copy to the immediate supervisor and the head of the department (or appropriate vice chancellor as provided in the next paragraph.)

2. A Second Level reviewer shall be the head of the complainant's department or, if the head was the First Level reviewer, the appropriate vice chancellor or other person reporting to the Chancellor or, if such person was the First Level reviewer, the Chancellor or his or her designee.

3. The Second Level reviewer shall schedule a meeting with the complainant to be held within five workdays (of the Second Level reviewer) after receipt of the complainant's statement. The Second Level reviewer shall also gather such additional information concerning the complaint as he or she deems appropriate.

4. Within ten workdays after meeting with the complainant, the Second Level reviewer shall provide the complainant a written response to the complaint, with a copy to the Chancellor. The response shall state the reviewer's decision and the supporting reasons.

III. Request for Further Investigation Phase II or Hearing Phase III Reviews

A. Further Investigation Phase II

1. If the Second Level reviewer's response does not resolve the complaint to the complainant's satisfaction, the complainant may request the Chancellor to qualify the complaint either for Further Investigation Phase II or Hearing Phase III. Such a request must be submitted to the Chancellor in writing, with a copy to the First and Second Level reviewers, within ten calendar days after the complainant's receipt of the Second Level reviewer's
response. The request to the Chancellor must be timely as above provided and include the complainant's statement of the complaint, the relief requested, the facts the complainant claims support the complaint, and an explanation of why the complainant believes the complaint should be reviewed by a Further Investigation Phase II or Hearing Phase III review. Failure to comply with the foregoing shall preclude further proceedings hereunder, unless the Chancellor directs otherwise for good cause.

Within ten workdays after receipt of the complainant's statement, the Chancellor shall normally provide to the complainant a written decision (with copies to the first and second step reviewers) on whether the complaint qualifies for Further Investigation Phase II or Hearing Phase III. If the complaint does not qualify for either Further Investigation or Hearing Phases, processing of the complaint under this procedure is terminated. The decision shall include a brief statement of the Chancellor's reasoning.

2. If Further Investigation Phase II is ordered, the Chancellor shall designate an investigator, who shall not be under the authority of the previous reviewers or report to the immediate supervisor.

B. Hearing Phase III Review

1. A Hearing Phase III Review shall be ordered if the Chancellor determines after consultation with counsel that a procedural due process hearing is legally required or would be in the College's best interest.

2. If a Hearing Phase III is ordered, the Chancellor shall provide a copy of the decision to the chair of the Administrative and Professional General Faculty Hearing Committee and shall include in the decision a determination of which party shall have the burden of proof on which issues. Such decision is not grievable. In the case of disciplinary action against the
complainant, management shall have the burden of proving that its action was a reasonable exercise of discretion.

IV. Further Investigation Phase II Procedures

A. Investigation

The investigator shall investigate and gather relevant facts by whatever means he or she determines to be most effective and efficient, provided the investigator shall conduct at least one meeting at which the complainant and the appropriate management representative shall be present and afforded an opportunity to respond to each other's presentations concerning the complaint.

B. Report

As soon as practicable and normally within thirty workdays after the investigator's receipt of the Chancellor's decision qualifying the complaint for Further Investigation Phase II, the investigator shall provide his or her report and recommendations to the Chancellor.

If the investigator determines that the evidence qualified the complaint further review, the complainant or management may within five days after receipt of the report provide the Chancellor a written request for review and modification of the report. The Chancellor may at his or her discretion, review the matter and take such action as deemed appropriate. Within ten workdays after receipt of the request for review, the Chancellor shall provide a written response to the complainant and the First and Second Level reviewers.

C. Decision

Within ten workdays after receipt of a copy of the investigator's initial report or within ten workdays after completion of any revised report, the Chancellor shall provide to the complainant a written statement of whether the College will provide the complainant with any relief.
D. Request for Reconsideration

Within ten workdays after receipt of the Chancellor's statement, the complainant may submit to the Chancellor a written statement requesting the Chancellor to reconsider the decision and describing why the complainant believes the Chancellor's statement is incorrect. The Chancellor shall provide to the complainant a response within ten workdays after receipt of the complainant's request. That response shall be the final step under this procedure.

V. Hearing Phase III Procedures

A. Selection of Hearing Panel

Within ten workdays from the Chancellor's decision ordering Hearing Phase III, the hearing panel shall be selected. Each vice chancellor shall appoint one General Faculty member from his or her division to serve a two-year term as a member of the Administrative Hearing Panel. In addition, the Chancellor shall appoint a member-at-large and will insure that members terms are staggered the parties of the composition of the panel in writing. The Panel Chair may disclose the names of the parties and the general nature of the complaint to aid prospective members in their decisions as to whether they should serve or decline due to potential bias or conflict.

B. Challenges of Panel Members

Within five calendar days after receipt of the Administrative and Professional General Hearing Relations Committee Chair's written notification of the panel members, either party may petition the Chair to replace one or more of the members for good cause. The petition shall be in writing and provide the necessary factual basis for the Chair to review and decide, and the petition shall be copied to the other party to the grievance.

C. Replacement Members

The Administrative and Professional General Faculty Hearing Committee Chair shall provide to the parties a decision on any challenges and a designation of any replacement panel members.
D. Scheduling the Hearing

Within ten workdays after receipt of notice by the Administrative and Professional General Faculty Hearing Committee Chair that the panel has been selected, the chair shall provide to the involved parties and the other panel members written notice of the time and place of the hearing, which shall normally be held at least fifteen, but not more than thirty workdays after designation of the panel.

E. Description of the Case

Within ten workdays after receipt by the parties of notice that the panel has been selected, the party with the burden of proof shall provide the other party and the panel chair with a description of the party's case against the other, including a statement of the charges, a summary description of the evidence supporting the charges and a description of any relief requested.

F. Response

Within five days after receipt of the description of the case against him or her, the party not having the burden of proof shall provide the other party and the panel chair with a written response stating his or her position on the charges, and the evidence supporting that position.

G. Witnesses and Document Lists

Each party shall provide to the other and the panel chair at least five calendar days before the hearing a list of witnesses expected to be called and any documents to be introduced, with such information to be updated with any additions occurring within five days of the hearing. Any witness or document not identified shall not be permitted at the hearing unless the panel chair finds good cause and that the responsible party was not at fault. The parties are each responsible for making arrangements for their witnesses and documents being present and available on time at the hearing.
H. Resolution of Pre-Hearing and Hearing Issues

The panel chair is the presiding officer authorized to resolve all issues with respect to the proceedings, including any evidentiary issues and, in doing so, may consult the panel.

I. Persons Present

The involved parties shall be entitled to be present during the entire hearing, excluding the panel deliberations. Witnesses other than the parties may be present only while giving their testimony. Other than the person recording the hearing, no other person shall be present except as the panel chair permits provided the parties may have legal counsel present to listen and observe the proceedings without disruption.

J. Recording

The panel chair shall arrange for the hearing to be recorded. The panel chair may arrange for preparation of any transcript of the recording which it determines is needed by the panel. The expense of the recording and any such transcript ordered by the panel chair shall be paid by the Office of the Chancellor. Either party wishing a transcript may arrange with the person who recorded the hearing to obtain a transcript, but at their expense.

K. Procedural and Evidentiary Questions

Except as provided in this procedure, the panel chair shall not be bound by the rules of procedure or evidence, applicable to judicial proceedings and the panel may take into account any evidence to the extent it deems the evidence to be reliable and relevant. The panel chair shall be responsible for ruling on all evidentiary questions and in doing so may consult the panel.

L. Order of the Proceedings

Except as the panel chair may provide otherwise, the order of the hearing shall be as follows. The party with the burden of proof may make an opening statement, followed by the other party's opening statement. The party with the
burden of proof shall then present evidence, followed by the other party's presentation of evidence, followed by rebuttal evidence by the party with the burden of proof. The panel may allow such additional evidence as it deems appropriate. The panel may request the parties to produce evidence on particular issues, and the panel itself may request witnesses to testify or may present other evidence. Upon completion of the presentation of evidence, the party with the burden of proof may make a closing statement, followed by the other party's closing statement, and the party with the burden of proof may then make a rebuttal statement.

M. Questions of Witnesses

Subject to the oversight and direction of the panel chair, the parties may directly and reasonably question any person testifying at the hearing provided the questioning is not abusive or argumentative and designed to produce relevant and probative information and the panel members may also ask witnesses questions at any time.

N. Additional Sessions

The chair may adjourn the hearing from and reconvene it for such additional sessions as the chair may determine, provided that the hearing shall normally be completed within thirty days of its commencement unless the panel chair and the parties agree otherwise.

O. Written Statements

At the chair's request, the parties shall submit written statements on any matters designated by the chair in consultation with the panel, including proposed findings of fact and recommendations.

P. Hearing Phase III Panel Report

Within thirty workdays after conclusion of the hearing or, where applicable, the panel's receipt of the parties written statements or any transcript requested by the panel, the panel shall provide to the Chancellor and the parties a written report. The report shall be divided into two sections, the first being the panel's factual findings,
and the second, the panel's recommendations to the Chancellor on how the College should respond to the complaint. The contents of the panel's report shall be determined by simple majority vote, provided that dissenting or concurring members shall be entitled to submit separate written statements which shall accompany the report.

Q. Chancellor's Review and Decision

1. The Chancellor shall accept as true the panel's factual findings unless the Chancellor has reasonable grounds for reopening the hearing. In the event of such grounds, the Chancellor may request the panel to promptly conduct additional hearing proceedings, or the Chancellor may conduct such proceedings, and a supplemental report on the factual findings shall be provided to the parties within ten workdays after completion of any such proceedings.

Within ten workdays after the receipt of the panel's report and any supplemental report, the parties may provide to the Chancellor and the other party their written arguments, as opposed to additional evidence, in support of their respective positions. In addition, the parties may request an opportunity to present oral arguments. The Chancellor may or may not allow such arguments. The Chancellor may also, in the presence of or by copy to the parties, ask the panel members questions relating to their report. The Chancellor may obtain and review any or all of the hearing transcript and exhibits.

2. Chancellor's Decision

Within thirty workdays after receipt of the panel's report, any supplemental report or any transcript requested by the Chancellor, or completion of oral arguments, whichever last occurs, the Chancellor shall normally provide to the parties and the panel a written decision on the requested relief.
3. Request for Reconsideration

Within ten workdays after receipt of the Chancellor's decision, either party may provide to the Chancellor and panel a written request for reconsideration which shall describe why the party believes the Chancellor's decision is incorrect. The Chancellor may conduct such additional proceedings as he or she deems appropriate. Within ten workdays after receipt of the request for reconsideration or conclusion of any such additional proceedings, the Chancellor shall provide to the parties and panel a response to the request. That response shall be the final step under this procedure.

VI. Amendments

This "Grievance Procedure for General Faculty," may be amended at any time by the Chancellor who shall determine whether it is appropriate for any particular amendment to apply to pending as well as future complaints.

Approved by The University of Virginia's College at Wise Board, October 9, 2008.

Approved by the Board of Visitors, ________________.
Sample Procedure

Grievance Procedures for Administrative and Professional General Faculty

PHASE I (Standard First Level)

1. Complaint brought to Director of Human Resources

2. Informal discussions arranged by Director of Human Resources

If not resolved:

3. Complaint is filed with supervisor (or their next level of supervision if immediate supervisor is the object of complaint); within 10 calendar days.

4. Within 10 workdays supervisor sends response

If not resolved:

SECOND LEVEL

1. File written complaint with Director of Human Resources within 5 workdays

2. Second Level reviewer appointed by Director of Human Resources

3. Supervisor will schedule meeting; collect information;

4. Written response of decision to employee within 10 workdays
If not resolved:

FURTHER INVESTIGATION PHASE II OR HEARING PHASE III

1. Request Chancellor to qualify the complaint for Further Investigation II or Hearing III within 10 calendar days.

2. Chancellor - written decision to go to Phase II or III or not within 10 workdays.

If not, end of procedure.

If yes, go to Further Investigation Phase II

1. Chancellor appoints investigator

2. Investigator interviews parties, reviews evidence

3. Investigator’s recommendation to Chancellor within 30 workdays

4. Chancellor written statement to complainant normally within 10 workdays

5. If complainant is not satisfied, complainant can, within 10 workdays, file for a reconsideration response - final step

"Or" HEARING PHASE III

1. Chancellor decides if hearing is needed

2. Normally within ten workdays, assemble Hearing Panel

3. Hearing panel conducts first hearing within 15-30 workdays. (Can settle before hearing begins.)

4. Panel reports within 30 workdays after conclusion of the hearing to Chancellor

5. Chancellor accepts report or order further hearing (10 workdays) after final proceeding, Chancellor’s decision.

6. Complainant may request a reconsideration of Chancellor’s decision within 10 workdays.