

PPC meeting September 29, 2021

Attending: Laura Atchley, Meg Cotter-Lynch (chair), Steve Csaki, William Fridley, Chaehyun Lee, Matthew Sparacio, Doug Wood

Visiting: Mike Davis

Absent: Ashley Hampton

Meeting called to order at 3:32pm, adjourned at 4:51pm.

- I. Review of draft revisions of the Telework Policy:
 - a. Meg Cotter-Lynch pre-circulated a draft with proposed revisions, building upon the Staff Senate's proposed edits, and addressing the following concerns
 - i. Potentially reduced flexibility in timing/location of faculty work, including around dependent care
 - ii. Concern about the intrusive nature of OSHA requirement when applied to a private residence
 - b. This draft was discussed, with the following further concerns or proposed amendments:
 - i. Mike Davis explained the major concern of the university regarding liability for worker's compensation. It is [not possible to waive your right to worker's compensation](#), as proposed in the edits hoping to address OSHA requirements. Proposed edits will need to be revised to account for these legal concerns.
 - ii. In response to concern about the invasive nature of in-person inspections of private residences, it was proposed that a photo or video inspection of the teleworking workspace be incorporated in the policy as the ordinary first step in workspace inspections, reducing the necessity for in-person inspections.
 1. Mike further pointed out that there will need to be amendment of the language that indicates that inspections will be conducted by the direct supervisor, due to the fact that many private residences are not ADA accessible.
 - iii. The committee agrees with the Staff Senate's identification of the need for an appeal process for telework decision-making; while

such an appeal process for staff is within the purview of Staff Senate, this committee will draft a policy for faculty. The committee agreed that the Faculty Appellate committee would likely be the correct avenue for this process, which would therefore require revision of the Appellate committee's charge in APPM.

iv. There is continued lack of clarity about the need for a teleworking agreement for fully online adjuncts; if a teleworking agreement is needed, then further clarity is required regarding how it might apply to these workers. Mike clarified that online adjuncts are protected by worker's compensation, so some sort of appropriate documentation will be needed.

v. Mike explained the difference between "structured" and "unstructured" work time; sections of the current policy that refer to dependent care will be revised to incorporate this distinction.

c. The committee agreed that Meg would further revise the draft to reflect today's discussion, and submit the revised draft to the committee for review during the week of October 18th. The committee will meet at 3pm on October 27th to consider the updated draft.

II. Meg Cotter-Lynch and Kay Daigle received the faculty salary data requested from Teresa Golden; Meg then circulated this spreadsheet to the committee prior to today's meeting. The committee briefly discussed the categories on the spreadsheet, and identified some preliminary areas for further discussion, including:

a. Clarification of certain categories of faculty (e.g. 10 vs 12 month contracts, some faculty with administrative duties)

b. Comparative salary data with peer institutions and salary equity reviews within departments as potential avenues for future consideration