

This form is provided as a courtesy guide only. Grievants should always reference the source policy, which can be found in ACD [509-02](#) and Procedures manual ([P17](#)) when crafting their grievance request submittals.

Timeliness

- | | | | |
|----|--|------------------------------|---|
| 1. | Is the grievance request being filed within 30 calendar days from the occurrence of the action(s), which form the basis for the grievance? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | Provide documentation proving timeliness and skip to the next section: jurisdiction . |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> No | Proceed to question 2. |
| 2. | Did you consult with an ombudsperson? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | Proceed to question 3. |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> No | A "No" answer to questions 1 and 2 indicates that your grievance is likely untimely. |
| 3. | If you consulted with an ombudsperson, are you filing your grievance service request within 30 calendar days of that consultation? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | Provide documentation proving timeliness and proceed to the next section: jurisdiction . |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> No | Your grievance is likely untimely. |

Jurisdiction

Per the Academic Affairs manual, grievance committees do not have the jurisdiction to evaluate the substance of a faculty member's original case. However, grievance committees may hear cases where alleged substantive policy or procedural violation may have occurred. To help determine jurisdiction you should ask yourself the following question and be sure to address this in your submittal: does the request for grievance service allege a substantive policy or procedural violation? The term "substantive policy/procedural violation" means of sufficient severity that it possibly caused an unfair, erroneous or improper decision

Respondents

Are you identifying a proper respondent? The respondent should be the **individual(s) who are alleged to have actively failed to comply with policy and/or procedure**.

1. Where a change has occurred in the incumbent of an academic administrative office, the current administrator is the respondent.
2. It is not appropriate to name the President, the Provost or the Dean, if the procedural error occurred at a lower level. They should be named if they themselves actively failed to comply with policy and/or procedure.
3. Respondents and witnesses are different. A respondent is allowed to call witnesses and present evidence. A witness is not allowed to do these things. If an individual is not named as a respondent, allegations of misconduct by them should not be part of your grievance. They may still be called as a witness to the conduct of others
4. Multiple or excessive respondents will often lead to delays and requests for reconsideration on your part.
5. You do not have to name someone as a respondent in order to call her/him as a witness

Remedy sought

Have you clearly identified the remedy you seek? The remedies which a grievance committee can recommend are limited. Here are a few examples of acceptable remedies: extension of probation, a new review with procedural changes, a re-review with or without procedural changes, a review consistent with university, college and academic unit policies, if deviation from same was the issue. Please note: The Committee does not have jurisdiction to act as a tenure committee and substitute its judgment that the grievant met tenure requirements.