



University of Delaware

Attachment 21

OFFICE OF THE DEAN
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
NEWARK, DELAWARE 19716

(302) 451-2311
FAX (302) 292-3569

March 3, 1990

MEMORANDUM

TO : Linda Gottfredson
FROM : Frank Murray, Dean, College of Education
SUBJECT : Resolution of Step 2 Grievance

I received your request for a Step 2 grievance hearing on March 1st. In preparation for the hearing I give you my opinions about the claims contained in your memorandum to me so you and your advisors can give some thought to my concerns in preparation for our meeting.

Academic Complaints and Procedural Grievances. The collective bargaining contract, as you know, distinguishes between academic complaints, which are resolved ultimately by the Provost, and grievances, which stem from procedural errors and are resolved ultimately through binding arbitration. Complaints and grievances are treated in a similar way through Step 2, but go to different parties thereafter. Although you claim that all the actions taken by the Departmental Committee and Chair were in violation to some stated procedure, and therefore grievable, I am unable to find a clear statement of a procedure or policy that would require each party to do what you claim they should have done.

If all the actions in your memorandum are breaches in a procedure, then what is left -- in terms of the bargaining agreement -- in the category of "complaint?" Please give some thought to the distinction between grievance and complaint as it applies to your allegations.

Timeliness. The grievance must be filed within twenty-five working days of the event or your knowledge of the event(s) that you are grieving. I would place your knowledge of the event at or about the time of the departmental faculty meeting (Nov. 6th). Your grievance was filed on February 1st which is considerably after the twenty-five day period and thereby your right to grieve has been forfeited. Time limits must be agreed to by both parties in writing and I have seen nothing to indicate that a



Step 2 Grievance

2

time limit extension was requested or granted.

Your grievance against the chair's actions (January 24th) was filed within the twenty-five day limit, I believe, and can be considered.

Specific Complaints and Grievances.

Grievance. Setting aside the timeliness question, only one of the actions you cite seems to qualify as a grievable action as defined by the contract. Grievable actions must be **administrative** and they must contravene a procedure that is **required** by a specific policy [article 8.1]. Whether the actions of a faculty group constitutes an **administrative** action is arguable and there is precedent at Delaware that the faculty cannot grieve the actions of other faculty; you can only grieve the actions of those outside the bargaining unit.

Should you be eligible to grieve the actions of those within the bargaining unit, the fact that the Department's P & T Committee did not "send" their recommendation to the faculty would seem to qualify as grievable because their policy requires that the recommendation be "sent." As it was, the recommendation was "given" to the faculty at the meeting. Whether there is an important material difference between "sending" and "giving" is an issue, of course, but the intention of the policy is to have **each** member of the department consider the committee's recommendation, which they did with no one objecting to not having the committee's recommendation before the meeting.

Article 16.1 defines a grievable action as "an administrative action not in accordance with past application or interpretation of the above policies" [those specified in the preceding paragraph]. It is my understanding that in the past, and certainly in your case last year, the Department did not send the recommendation to the faculty prior to the meeting, but rather distributed it at the meeting as they did this year. Thus, I do not see that this year's action deviated from the "past application or interpretation" of the policy as it would have to for the action to be grievable.

Thus, I find that there is no basis for a grievance. Even so, I agree with you that it would have been better, given that the P & T Committee was bringing a recommendation that overturned the prior committee's recommendation, to have given the faculty notice that the recommendation was different this year. I also agree with the Chair's proposed remedy which seems perfectly appropriate to me, viz. to have the Department have another meeting in which each member could have the time to fully study the question before them. In general, the remedy for procedural errors is to redo the procedure without the error, and I can see no reason why we would deviate from that rule in this case.

I am willing to ask the Department to reconsider its decision in another meeting. My view is that the Department cannot be required to do this because, in fact, it made no error and its actions were in accordance with its past practice with respect to your case last year and other cases they have considered. However, I think it would be wise to have the Department confirm or amend its conclusion, particularly in light of the fact that some faculty may have felt unprepared to vote on an entirely new recommendation on November 6th. I will ask them to do this.

Complaints.

I consider your other issues to be "complaints" as they do not involve a violation of any established procedure or past practice; that is, the Department and Chair are not required to do the things you would like them to do, nor are they prohibited by any policy from doing what they have done.

I comment about the other items you have raised in the order you presented them.

Item IA.1 The Committee is nowhere required to "report" the evidence from the external peer review. The Committee has no reporting function at all. The Committee is not permitted to "ignore" any evidence, but there is no evidence that they did. The fact that they did not write about some evidence is not necessarily a sign that they did not consider it or that they ignored it. In fact I am sure from my discussions with the Committee that they were fully aware of what was in your dossier. There is no way to know what the Committee relied on, or how they balanced what they read, in coming to their conclusions; nor are they required to divulge how they did their work. They are only required to formulate a judgment about whether or not the candidate met the standards and to give reasons for their conclusions in writing. This they did.

Your allegation implies that the Committee distorted the record or attempted to mislead the Department and so forth, but this would not really be possible in this Department because all members of the Department have access to your dossier and can read the material for themselves. Similarly, the Department heard and read the minority opinion, which gave a contrary evaluation, and evidently they did not find the arguments persuasive. I have to conclude that the Department was fully informed about the contents of your dossier.

Item IA.2 The most troubling aspect of this allegation is that you know, or believe you know, that the one negative

Step 2 Grievance

4

reviewer is the person you claim you objected to. That you could know this is a procedural error and counter to our requirement that external reviews are confidential, and it is improper for you to have this information. Apart from this serious breach in our policies and procedures, there is no firm evidence that you formally objected to anyone. The correspondence I have seen on this topic leaves the issue contested.

However, even if you had objected to a person on the grounds that the person could be expected to find fault with your work, the Committee is still permitted to solicit the review on the grounds that it could learn something that other reviewers might not reveal. In general, the only time reviews are not solicited is when there is a conflict of interest [examples are given in the Faculty Handbook and do not cover intellectual differences]; an academic disagreement or taking the other side of a controversial issue does not constitute in and of itself conflict of interest. Moreover, the negative reviewer is a respected member of the academy as his vita indicates. I think the Committee would have been remiss had they not solicited a letter at least one person who holds strong views opposed to your own.

There is no limit on the number of reviews that can be solicited and in controversial cases, as you claim yours is, it is prudent to have a large number of diverse reviewers. No error was made in soliciting a ninth reviewer nor is there evidence that the Committee or the Department was unaware of the alleged inaccuracies in any of the reviewer's letters. Again, they were in a position to decide the matter for themselves as they are required to do under their guidelines.

Item IA.3 That the Chair mentioned what you term a political view or point in his letter is not evidence that he ignored all the peer reviews or that he based his conclusion on that point. Moreover, we have no policy or procedure that requires that the Chair, or any other member of the Department, be an expert in the candidate's field. In fact, the Department's P & T document makes it clear that the opposite is the case, namely, the members of the Department will evaluate whether the intent of their criteria are met and expert opinions only inform, not determine, their decision.

Item IC.1-2 The Chair's decision, as I understand it, is that your two articles this year are below standard. He draws the conclusion that you have failed to meet two critical standards, namely that

each [article] should be accurate, systematic, and thorough, exhibit knowledge relevant to the topic, and demonstrate appropriate analytic ability, depth, and clarity,

Step 2 Grievance

5

and that there be

evidence that your future work will be at the standard of a full professor.

Your two most recent articles, being judged below standard on the first count, are also the grounds for the view that your future work will be below standard. This is not an unreasonable view, but apart from that, it is entirely consistent with the guidelines, which require -- not that each be exemplary as you say, but that each be accurate, and so forth. The Chair's judgment, even if it is wrong, is not grievable and as it is a departmental standard that each article exhibit characteristics that he [and others] feel yours do not exhibit, he obviously did adhere to the Department's criteria for scholarship in this instance. He, as he said, did not ignore your entire record, but found that your later work did not meet two additional criteria -- that each piece have certain characteristics named in the guidelines and that your future work would meet the standard of the rank to which you are seeking promotion. That you met the criteria for scholarship with respect to your overall record does not mean that you also met the criteria with respect to each article nor to the evaluation of your promise as a scholar of full professor rank.

Item D. The Committee's letter gives their reasons for their conclusions. There is no doubt about why they did not recommend promotion -- they found your recent work below standard [for the reasons cited above] and predicted, on those grounds, that your future work might be below standard as well. These are their reasons and they are adequate to support their conclusion that you did not satisfy all the criteria for scholarly accomplishment.

II. Academic Freedom.

Here we must make very clear the distinction between the content or subject matter of your work and the quality of your work. Your memorandum, I think, confuses these on occasion, while the Chair and the Department are only speaking about the quality of the work insofar as it can be separated from the content. The Department, of course, has no list of approved topics, or acceptable conclusions, and so forth, and there is no objection to your work because it generates controversy. In fact I think too much is being made about the controversial nature of your work, some of which is, as you know, deliberately manufactured by your editors and others. The best explanation we have for the Chair's and Department's objection to your recent work is on the grounds each has given in their recommendations, namely it fails to have the characteristics of scholarly writing and so forth. That the Chair mentions that your work challenges assumptions or that it generates controversy, and so on, does not

Step 2 Grievance

6

mean that he found your work below standard because of these features of your work. Your claim is tantamount to the claim that the denial of promotion inherently entails an infringement of academic freedom. The Department and Chair simply have good reasons for finding that your recent work is below the standards we set for scholarship; that they also could have had bad reasons or improper reasons or that they hold beliefs about you that are untrue, etc. does not take away from the fact that they have good reasons that provide a sufficient basis for their conclusions.

You allege that the Chair and the Department Committee are simply mistaken in their analysis, and that is entirely possible. The remedy for this is the subsequent reviews by other administrators and more inclusive faculty committees that are provided for in the University's promotion review process. That the Chair, or the Committee, or the whole Department came to the wrong conclusion about the value of your work, saw the evidence in the dossier imperfectly, and so on does not constitute a procedural error. Nor does it constitute a violation of academic freedom; otherwise, all dialectic in the academy would violate the very freedom that makes it possible. You are free, as far as I can tell, to pursue your line of research to its natural conclusions and no administrative action has or will be taken to interfere with your decision to pursue this line of research.

Your claim that the Chair and the Committee (and by implication the whole Department) have decided the value of your work on political grounds is a very serious charge and one that has never characterized the Department at any other time. Why they should have decided the value of your scholarship on improper grounds and the value of your teaching and service on proper grounds puzzles me in your account. You would think they would be equally concerned about the content of your teaching, if your account of events is accurate, yet they judged the quality of your teaching to be very good. How is it that they could correctly separate content from quality in this case, but not in the case of your scholarship?

If I were to believe your charge, I would need to pursue a remedy that would remove nearly all of them from their positions on the grounds of gross irresponsibility; we simply cannot have people at the University and in the College who would do what you claim they have done -- namely, ignore evidence, judge the value of intellectual ideas only in terms of their political views (all remarkably the same in this case), and basically abandon the principles of the academy and follow their personal bias in this instance -- and then only this year, but not last year. Your charges belittle the struggles of intellect and conscience I know went on.

The College places a high value on academic freedom, yours and everyone else's; you would not have been tenured last year if

Step 2 Grievance

7

this were not the case because the controversial nature of your work was apparent last year and was a part of the discussions I participated in about your case. Your work this year did not depart in any significant way from the findings and conclusions you had written about previously; there is no new content so to speak, your views on the panel report are highly predictable from the work available to the Committee et al. last year. As the content is more or less the same over the years, it is hard to see that the problem lies there; it lies instead with the way you make these recent arguments. The College went to some trouble last year, well beyond what they are required to do under any policy or procedure, to insure that you received tenure and in doing so they explicitly called attention to the controversial nature of your work.

I do not know what motivated the Department or Chair to evaluate your scholarship the way they did, nor am I in a position to speculate about what was really on their minds. What I do see is that their conclusions are supportable by their analysis and that is all we require.

The Remedy

We need to have an evaluation of your scholarship from the Department and the Chair and I do not see how removing their respective evaluations gives us what we need. I have no basis for believing that the 1988 recommendations are less procedurally flawed than the 1989 recommendations so the substitution of one for the other on that basis makes no sense to me.

Moreover, I think the remedy you propose is unethical because it would imply that the Chair and Department had written and approved a document they had never seen or considered. What would their signatures signify? Your proposal is simply preposterous.

The point of the grievance is not necessarily to change the outcome of the procedure, but only to get the procedure right. The point of a complaint, however, is different; it is to change that which caused the complaint. This is why it is important to categorize your allegations more carefully.

I have set this all out before our meeting so you will have the benefit of my analysis of the case to date. I am very interested in hearing your views about my concerns and conclusions in the hope that we can resolve the grievance and complaints at the Step 2 level.

cc: Ralph Ferretti
Vic Martuza
George Cicala
Maxine Colm
Richard Murray



University of Delaware

Attachment 22

OFFICE OF THE DEAN
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
NEWARK, DELAWARE 19716

(302) 451-2311
FAX (302) 292-3569

5 March 1990

TO: Faculty, Department of Educational Studies

FROM: Frank Murray, Dean *Frank*

SUBJECT: The Gottfredson Grievance

.....PLEASE RESPOND BY RETURN MAIL.....

I am considering a Step 2 Grievance from Linda Gottfredson about issues surrounding the procedure by which the Department formulated its conclusions about her level of scholarly accomplishment. One of her allegations is that we violated a procedure that we "send" the P&T Committee's recommendation to the Department when we in fact "gave" it to the Department at its November 6th meeting. Her view is that some members of the Department were in fact unprepared to vote on a recommendation that departed from the prior year's recommendation and that had the recommendation been "sent," as required, the vote might have been different, etc. I would like to make some progress with this issue and I need to have your responses to the following items:

- 1. Were you unprepared to vote at the Nov. 6th meeting?
Yes No
- 2. Do you think the Department should have another meeting at which they would affirm, amend, etc., the decision they made on Nov. 6th? Yes No
- 3. With what you have learned about the case since the meeting, do you think you might change your vote if we were to vote again? Yes No

PLEASE RESPOND BY RETURN MAIL.

All responses will be kept confidential and it will be helpful to me if you were to sign your response, but that is not essential for my purposes. I am interested in any other comments you would have on the subject.

cc: M. Colm
R.B. Murray
G. Cicala



University of Delaware

Attachment 23

OFFICE OF THE DEAN
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
NEWARK, DELAWARE 19716

(302) 451-2311
FAX (302) 292-3569

12 March 1990

TO: Linda Gottfredson
FROM: Frank Murray, Dean *Frank D. Murray*
SUBJECT: Resolution of your Step 2 Grievance-Complaints (As discussed at the 3/9/90 Hearing)

I proposed at the hearing last Friday (9 March 90) an action we could take that I believe we all thought could be responsive to your wishes. It does address all your concerns and has the potential for addressing the errors you allege in the Department's actions.

The logic behind the action is based upon the following considerations:

In the Department's current procedures there is a defense against the kinds of errors you allege are part of the Promotion and Tenure Committee's work this year. It requires the reasonable assumption that most people in the Department do not have the biases, etc. you allege operated in the Promotion and Tenure Committee this year, particularly if the members of the Department were to have ample opportunity to study the evidence. As it is, one-third of the respondents to the questionnaire reported that, in effect, they needed more time to study the dossier before they would have been prepared to consider the contrary recommendation they received about your promotion this year.

It seems to me that it would always be our policy to reconsider any action we have taken if there is reason to believe that we were not in possession of the best information available and that we came to the wrong conclusion for that reason. My proposal is based **solely** on the fact that one-third of the respondents said they needed more time and I am willing to re-open the discussion for that reason and that reason alone. In other words, I do not think that there were any procedural errors in this case, although I do think, as I have said before, that it would have been better if the P&T Committee's report had been sent in sufficient time for those who opposed its conclusions to prepare an effective set of counter arguments. Of course there

Linda Gottfredson
12 March 1990
Page 2

is no requirement that the faculty vote at the meeting at which they receive the P & T report and any member of the Department, including your supporters, could have requested the delay we are now attempting to implement. However, I understand that there are good reasons why they did not do that at the time.

In fact only one-third of the voting members need to agree with your version of the inaccuracies and unjustified conclusions about your research and scholarship that characterize this year's report. Thus, it is reasonable to assume that if your claims have merit, one-third of your colleagues will see your point.

Proposal. I propose that we schedule a two-part meeting of the Department, with each part being approximately one hour in length. In the first part you would be present (with George Cicala as an observer, if you wish). During this part of the meeting you can present whatever information you want the Department to have and they can ask you questions about your dossier, what you have presented, and any matter relevant to this case. It would be best, I think, if you were to prepare a written document of the facts of the case from your perspective and draw explicit attention to the errors in the committee's report.

In the second part of the meeting the Department would reconsider and vote again on the P&T report in light of the discussion that had just concluded. If one-third of the eligible voting members agree with your claims, the report would be withdrawn and your objectives would be won. If, on the other hand, the report's arguments and conclusions were reaffirmed, that fact would be communicated as the outcome of the meeting. It is also possible that the Department would reaffirm its conclusions, but would wish to modify some of the reasons that were advanced in support of the conclusions. In that case, a revised report would be sent forward. In the event that the Department could not write a report that would have two-thirds support, that fact would be noted and no report would be sent forward.

My purpose in proposing this two-part meeting is to resolve your grievance and complaint in a way that addresses effectively the points you raise without at the same time agreeing with any of your claims. From the College's point of view we could take the action I propose solely because a sufficient number of faculty say they needed more time and for that reason alone it would be prudent for us to give them more time to consider the issue.

Linda Gottfredson
12 March 1990
Page 3

From your perspective, even if all you claim is true, it would still be appropriate to address your claims by having the whole Department reconsider the case in the expectation that, if you are right, at least one-third of your colleagues will agree with you.

I will attend the meeting as a member of the Department and may participate in the discussion but I will not vote.

cc: R. B. Murray
M. Colm
G. Cicala
V. Martuza
R. Ferretti

Memorandum



April 12, 1990

TO: Linda Gottfredson
FROM: Frank B. Murray, Dean *Frank*
SUBJECT: Time Extension

Given that we need to have further discussion about your wish to resolve your grievance at Step 2, I am willing to extend the deadline for your response to my proposal to April 30 on the expectation that we can meet after AERA and before the Southeast Holmes meeting (April 26-28).

FBM:jph
cc: Maxine Colm
George Cicala
Vic Martuza



Memorandum

RECEIVED

APR 30 1990

OFFICE OF THE DEAN
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

April 26, 1990

Attachment 25

TO: Frank Murray, Dean

FROM: Linda Gottfredson *lg*

RE: Step 2 Grievance

I appreciated your efforts to work with the Department P&T Committee and was disappointed by their response.

I met with Vic Martuza on Tuesday to discuss actions that he and the department committee could take in order to resolve my grievance. He has agreed to work with that committee to see if some resolution can be reached at Step 2.

Therefore I would like to extend until May 31 the deadline for my response to your proposal for resolving my Step 2 grievance.

If you sign below, I will distribute this memo to the appropriate persons.

AGREED: *Frank Murray*
Frank Murray, Dean

cc: Maxine Colm
George Cicala
Vic Martuza

CONSERVE ENERGY SO ENERGY CAN SERVE YOU



Memorandum

May 8, 1990



TO: Frank B. Murray, Dean
College of Education

FROM: Victor K. Martuza, Chair
Educational Studies

SUBJECT: Jan Blits' April 27, 1990 Memo to You Concerning His Promotion

After reading and reflecting on the contents of Dr. Blits' memo, I feel it important to set the record straight regarding the P&T Committee selection process and to correct a number of false claims which he makes as well as some misunderstandings upon which he seems to be operating. I am not in a position to comment on his relationship with specific members of the Department except to note that, in my judgment, he is not without blame for any difficulties he may be experiencing with other faculty. I am also not in a position to comment on statements he attributes to you during your private conversations with him, except in one instance where you either misunderstood my position or he misunderstood what you told him.

First of all, the Chair of the Department is charged with nominating faculty for appointment to all Department and College committees. Final appointment is subject to the approval of the entire department faculty. As in the past, a preliminary list of nominations was distributed for faculty comment. The faculty-as-a-whole will have an opportunity to act on these nominations shortly. Needless to say, the faculty-as-a-whole can always make changes or substitutions as it deems appropriate. This is how the process has always operated in the past and that is how it will operate this year. If Dr. Blits would like to make a case to the Department that the composition of the Committee ought to be changed, he will have an opportunity to do so.

The following comments pertain to specific statements Dr. Blits made in his memorandum to you:

1. *Page 2, paragraph 2.* Dr. Golinkoff has served on a variety of Promotion and Tenure Committees over the years at the Department, College and University levels. As far as I know, she has always done a thorough and conscientious job in that role. I have no reason to believe that she will not continue to act in a completely professional manner in her capacity as a member of next year's College P&T Committee. Clearly, Dr. Blits' second statement beginning with "as the only. . ." is incorrect since a full professor is nominated by each department and there is never any certainty that a particular nominee will be chosen as Chair in advance of the decision you make regarding that appointment.

2. *Page 2, paragraph 3.* As far as I know, there is no "house rule" which requires an individual who has just been promoted to be appointed to the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee for the following year. While such appointments may have happened with regularity in the past, the controlling factors were the relatively small size of the Department and the rank constraints to which this Committee's composition must conform.
3. *Page 2, paragraph 3.* The second sentence beginning with "Then he said that. . ." is false. I never said that. Concerning the remainder of the paragraph, I did tell Dr. Blits (and Dr. Gottfredson, in a separate conversation) that I felt the timing was not right for her appointment to the Promotion and Tenure Committee next year and that such an appointment would make more sense when the controversy generated by her current grievance had faded.
4. *Page 2, final paragraph.* Dr. Blits' claim that I refused "to accept the legitimacy of her promotion" is also false. In fact, I was one of the first people in the Department to congratulate her on the positive recommendation she received from the Provost and I subsequently met with her to initiate a discussion about how we might proceed toward resolving the conflicts which have resulted from her grievance and the way in which she has conducted her affairs in regards to that grievance. While I still believe that my recommendation was appropriate, I have no difficulty in accepting the final result of the overall Promotion and Tenure process and I believe that my behavior towards Linda is clear evidence of that fact.

Dr. Blits has a propensity to use exaggeration and overstatement as a way of making his points and he does so again in this paragraph. I did not say that anyone recommended her promotion because of "political pressure" nor did I impugn the integrity of my superiors to defend my negative recommendation. I did say that the threat of a grievance action and hints of civil litigation have the potential to influence such decisions.

5. *Page 3, paragraph 2.* I never claimed or implied that my "reappointment of only one member of this year's Department Committee would be understood by everyone as [my] tacit rebuke of this year's Committee."

Dr. Frank B. Murray
May 8, 1990
Page Three

6. *Page 3, paragraph 3.* I did not "warn" Dr. Blits about anything. It is no secret that the Departments expectations at each level of promotion have in fact risen over the past several years. I believe that faculty who have served on Promotion and Tenure committees over the time period discussed will testify to the fact that "ratcheting up" has occurred in the form of tougher standards dealing with the quality of the work examined. Part of my responsibility as Chair is to advise faculty about Departmental expectations as I understand them. Dr. Blits has a history of interpreting any advice that he does not wish to be given as either a threat or a warning. A recent exchange of memos between us concerning his teaching activities in the Department provides further evidence along these lines.

7. *Last page.* Dr. Blits says that I refused "to do anything to disabuse the Department of its biased view of [his] co-authored work with Linda." My concerns about the co-authored work were contained in my recommendation regarding Dr. Gottfredson's promotion. I have not seen any information since the writing of that recommendation which has dispelled my concerns. To my knowledge, Dr. Blits has not done anything to change either the Departments view or mine on this matter. The only specific references to those co-authored works appearing in the various Promotion and Tenure recommendations and in the reactions to the Society article have been negative. On what grounds am I to go to the Department in order to argue the merits of those articles?

After reflecting on my various conversations with Dr. Blits during the past year, I have come to the conclusion that he interprets everything I say or do in a manner consistent with his conspiracy theory. His memo to you is the most recent example of this. Not only is this type of behavior inappropriate, but it can result in creating the very conditions Dr. Blits claims he wants to avoid. I would appreciate your advice about this matter and would be willing to meet with you and Dr. Blits to discuss this if you feel that would be useful.

VRM/mrc

cc: ✓ Dr. Jan Blits
Dr. George Cicala
Dr. Gordon Di Renzo

UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE INTERDEPARTMENTAL
Memorandum

Attachment 27



May 25, 1990

TO: Frank Murray, Dean

FROM: Linda Gottfredson *lg*

RE: Step 2 Grievance

You will recall that we agreed to delay the deadline for my reply to your response to my Step 2 Grievance until May 31 so that Vic Martuza and I could work on resolving matters.

Vic had apparently agreed to work with me on "resolving conflicts in the Department," but not in the context of the Step 2 Grievance. He asked me to apprise you of my misunderstanding of his intentions.

I still prefer to resolve my grievance within the department, so I talked to Ralph Ferretti about the possibility of opening discussions with his P&T committee for that purpose. He agreed to entertain the possibility, so I would like to delay the deadline for another month, to June 30.

If you sign below, I will distribute this memo to the appropriate persons.

AGREED: _____
Frank Murray, Dean

cc: Maxine Colm
George Cicala
Vic Martuza
Ralph Ferretti

CONSERVE ENERGY SO ENERGY CAN SERVE YOU



Memorandum



June 7, 1990

TO: Linda Gottfredson
FROM: Frank B. Murray *Frank B. Murray*
SUBJECT: **Your Grievance/Complaint**

My conversations with Ralph Ferretti do not indicate that much progress will be made with regard to the items you allege in your grievance complaint. We can, of course, proceed with my proposal for a departmental faculty meeting but apart from that I believe the resources of the College on this issue have been exhausted. For this reason, I am not granting an extension and ask that you accept my solution or, if you wish, send the matter on to the University level.

FBM:jph
cc: Maxine Colm
George Cicala
Vic Martuza



29 September 17 Blits' complaint on the promotion process to the Faculty Welfare and Privileges Committee (with attachments)

see Blits complaint, which is listed as a separate set of entries