Brief History of Issue - why the issue is being considered:
Over the past few years, the Faculty Termination Review Committee and the Faculty Complaint and Grievance Committee have had few, if any, hearings. Thus, the committees only met once each year to elect a chair.

At the Faculty Termination Review Committee of 11/12/09, the concept of merging with the Faculty Complaint and Grievance Committee was briefly discussed. At the Faculty Complaint and Grievance Committee on 11/13/09, a motion to merge was made, seconded, and passed. The Faculty Termination Review Committee members were then polled by the chair of that committee (who also serves on the FCGC and made the merger motion). No objections were voiced via email. Some members expressed support for the idea.

Motions affecting the language of the Faculty Constitution can be brought forward either by 10% of the faculty requesting a vote on the motion or by a majority of the faculty of the University Senate passing the motion. Therefore, the motion is coming forward to the faculty of the Senate.

Points Discussed by Committee:
- Merger makes sense.
- Few hearings have been held.
- Involving over 30 people seems too much; a smaller group would be adequate to handle both committee functions.
- There seems to be little different between the way the two committees function.

A potential Transition process was discussed among the two committee chairs and the Senate Chair: One position on the Faculty Complaint and Grievance Committee can be vacated as the person is now serving in an administrative position. Four people currently serve on both committees. Three have identical terms on both committees; two have different expiring terms. If the one position is left vacant and the two on both committees with different expiring terms only serve until the earlier expiration date, that leaves 8 serving until 2010, 8 serving until 2011, and 9 serving until 2012.

IF 21 members were to form the combined committee, the transition would be as follows.
All members continue until 2010, leaving 25 on the committee.
In spring 2010, elect 7 new members for 2013 resulting in 24 on the committee.
In spring 2011, elect 7 new members for 2014 resulting in 23 on the committee.
In spring 2012, elect 7 new members for 2015 resulting in 21 on the committee.

IF 18 members were to form the combined committee, then the transition would be as follows.
All members continue until 2010, leaving 25 on the committee.
In spring 2010, elect 6 new members for 2013 resulting in 23 on the committee.
In spring 2011, elect 6 new members for 2014 resulting in 21 on the committee.
In spring 2012, elect 6 new members for 2015 resulting in 18 on the committee.

The transition may be completed sooner due to retirements. Either way, the transition will be completed in 3 years or less. The Senate Executive committee believes 18 would be adequate.
MERGER of Faculty Termination Review, Faculty C&G

Pros of Recommendation:
- Eliminates a second committee; Serves the needs of the faculty.

Cons of Recommendation:
- Creates a smaller pool of people who can serve on a hearing committee (size of 5) in the event multiple hearings are required in a given year.

Committee Recommendation:
That the Faculty Termination Review Committee and the Faculty Complaint and Grievance Committee be combined into one committee with 18 members.

MOTION FOR THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

The University Senate Executive Committee by a vote of 11 for to 0 against on 12-1-09 agreed to forward the motion passed by the Faculty Complaint and Grievance Committee to the University Senate on behalf of the FC&G committee.

Recommends that the Constitution of the University Faculty and the University Academic Staff, Article One: University Faculty, Section G University Faculty Committees, 2. Faculty Termination Review Committee and 3. Faculty Complaint and Grievance Committee be changed as shown and the remaining items in Section G be renumbered appropriately and references to these two committees in other Chapters of the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook be edited to reflect the change.

2. Faculty Complaint, Grievance, and Termination Review Committee
   a. Membership: The committee includes fifteen eighteen tenured members of the faculty, elected at large by the faculty, to serve three-year terms with five (six elected each year).
   b. Functions: The function of the Faculty Complaint, Grievance, and Termination Review Committee is to implement the hearing procedures outlined in the Local Implementation Procedures for UWS 6 (complaints and grievances), UWS 3.08 (non-renewal), UWS 4.03 (dismissal), and UWS 5.11 (termination). (US 11/03)

3. Faculty Complaint and Grievance Committee
   a. Membership: The committee includes fifteen tenured faculty members elected by the faculty for three-year terms (five elected each year).
   b. Functions: The function of the Complaint and Grievance Committee is to implement the hearing procedures outlined in Local Implementation Procedures for UWS 6 (complaints and grievances). (US 11/03)

Implementation Date: Fall 2010

Signed: ____________________________________________
Chair of the Committee