The Faculty Adjudication Panel was presented with 5 new petitions during the 2018-2019 academic year. One of these petitions was consolidated with petitions filed in 2017-2018 academic year. Four of the new petitions were resolved. The consolidated matter is ongoing.

**Petition 1:** A faculty member alleged violations of statutory labor regulations and university policy for failure to make the petitioner's personnel file available for review, resulting in an unjust situation. After receiving and considering the response, the interim chair concluded that, while the petitioner's claims were timely filed, the petitioner failed to show that the alleged violations affected the terms, conditions, and course of petitioner's employment, and therefore the petitioner's claims were dismissed. Petitioner's concerns regarding improper redaction of files were speculative and, therefore, not appropriate for adjudication.

**Petition 2:** A professor/department chair asserted 18 claims against three respondents. The petitioner brought seven separate claims against the University’s President for: improper deprivation of right to representation; improper deprivation of petitioner’s right to vote on housekeeping changes; improper alteration of terms of petitioner’s employment; improper deprivation of procedural safeguards; unnecessary harm through infliction of mental anguish, embarrassment, and invasion of privacy; unconstitutionally overbroad executive order; and injustices through violations of law and policy. After considering the response, the interim chair determined that claims 1 through 4, 9, 17, and 18 were timely filed but dismissed these claims as not proper for adjudication as to this respondent. The same petitioner asserted nine separate claims against an investigation and resolution specialist for: unnecessary harm through infliction of mental anguish and distress, humiliation, embarrassment, and invasion of privacy; deprivation of petitioner’s right to a neutral, objective, fair, and impartial investigation in violation of university policy; unnecessary damage to reputation; denial of due process to cross examine witnesses in violation of state and federal law; exhibiting animus motivated by discriminatory bias toward petitioner; improperly exceeding respondent’s role as fact-finder; failure to report suspected violations of state law in violation of Board of Regents regulation; and injustices in violation of law and policy. After considering the response, the interim chair determined that all these claims were timely filed by the petitioner as to this respondent but dismissed claims 9, 10 through 16, and 18 as not proper for adjudication.

Finally, the same petitioner asserted six separate claims against a dean for: violation of due process by failing to inform petitioner fully of the allegations against him before requesting a UCIRO investigation; attempted misleading of petitioner regarding the nature of the allegations against him; violation of right to due process by failing to offer a “five-person discussion” before requesting a UCIRO investigation; failing to report a
suspected violation of state law, in violation of a Board of Regents policy; unnecessary harm through infliction of mental anguish and distress, humiliation, embarrassment, and invasion of privacy; and injustices in violation of law and policy. After considering the response, the interim chair determined that these claims were timely filed by the petitioner but dismissed claim 8 due to the inapplicability of a criminal statute. The interim chair deemed the other five claims [5, 6, 7, 9, 18] as appropriate for brief adjudication and appointed a hearing officer to review the matter. The hearing officer found against the petitioner on these remaining claims. The petitioner did not request review by a brief adjudication panel, and the decision of the hearing officer’s decision stands.

**Petition 3:** A clinical assistant professor asserted claims against a professor alleging: a non-meritorious rating contained misrepresentations, including allegations of unlawful conduct related to discrimination and harassment; unprofessional conduct; and improper calculation of incentive pay. After receiving and considering the response, the interim chair determined that all of the claims were timely and that the first and third claims were appropriate for comprehensive adjudication. With respect to the second claim, the interim chair concluded that there was an insufficient basis for review, but the evidence of the alleged conduct could be considered for the purpose of establishing irrelevant or impermissible considerations by the respondent. A hearing officer was appointed, and a three-person hearing panel appointed and convened. The petitioner later withdrew the complaint and the hearing officer dismissed the matter.

**Petition 4:** A professor asserted claims against an interim department chair and the Executive Vice President for Medical Affairs and Dean of the School of Medicine alleging: a respondent had improperly allowed and encouraged advertisement for and the hiring of a physician; a respondent had conducted himself contrary to the university’s policy of professional conduct, which resulted in unjust treatment, Numerous remedies were sought. After receiving and considering the response, the interim chair determined that the petitioner’s petition was untimely and therefore not proper for comprehensive adjudication.

**Consolidated Petitions:** A professor asserted claims against the Provost and a department chair charging that an ad hoc committee to investigate the professor’s faculty merit was improperly convened. The professor challenged the appointment of the committee, the involvement of the Provost, and a failure to involve a secondary appointment unit. Prior to a ruling by the chair, the Provost then asserted claims against the professor and against a dean and a department chair as nonparty participants for violations of university rules and policies and neglect of duty.

After receiving and considering the respondents’ materials with respect to both petitions, the chair consolidated the parties’ claims because they arose out of the same or similar factual circumstances. The chair ordered that the professor’s claims with respect to the appointment of the committee and the Provost’s involvement were untimely but that his third claim as to the secondary appointment unit was timely and proper for adjudication. The chair then determined that the Provost’s claims were both timely and proper for
comprehensive adjudication and appointed a hearing officer. The appointment of a hearing panel was delayed for the summer, and an adjudication panel was appointed the following school year.

Prior to the appointment of an adjudication panel, the same professor then asserted claims against a professor/former department chair and another tenured professor/department chair alleging that his designation as a non-meritorious faculty member was improper and that the assessment of his merit was not validly conducted by either of the departments.

The adjudication chair then stepped down, and an interim adjudication chair was appointed. After receiving and considering the responses, the interim chair determined the claims against the first respondent were untimely and dismissed them. With respect to the claims against the second respondent, the interim chair determined the claims were timely and appropriate for comprehensive adjudication to the extent they were governed by the faculty code section 24-34.B.10.

This petition was then consolidated with the other consolidated petition. The hearing officer, appointed to hear the consolidated petitions, issued a new scheduling order to accommodate the new claim against the second respondent. In addition, a comprehensive adjudication hearing panel had been previously convened and appointed by the former chair. The hearing officer subsequently considered the Provost’s motions in limine, denying two motions and granting one motion. At present, this matter is ongoing.