

*Will
file
copy*

V. Barfield

June 28, 1976

Dean Bischoff

Terminal Contract

This will acknowledge our meeting, Thursday, June 24, 1976 at which time we discussed the 18-month terminal contract recommended by the Head of the Department of Athletics for the Assistant Director of Athletics.

As a result of this discussion, it is my understanding that you, as Dean of the School of Physical Education will ask the School Personnel Committee to provide me, through some means or other, all documentation concerning the Personnel action forwarded to the Committee by the Head of the Department of Athletics as well as a letter of transmittal from the Committee to me. I urge you to effect this action promptly.

I further understand that you, as Dean, will inquire as to the whereabouts of the evaluation of the Assistant Director of Athletics alluded to by the Head of the Department of Athletics in his letter of May 17, 1976.

With regard to your question concerning procedural violations, the Assistant Director of Athletics stated that since she had not been provided, by the Head of the Department of Athletics, the personnel policies governing her employment, she did not know whether, in fact, specific violations had occurred. However, she did state that in itself, the lack of such receipt of personnel policies by her, constituted a procedural violation and the lack of an evaluation indicated procedural violations on the part of the Head of the Department of Athletics, according to the School of Physical Education Administrative Policies (Sept. 1973).

Lastly, I wish to reiterate for the record your answers, as Dean, to several questions asked by the Assistant Director of Athletics.

1. What are the reasons for the terminal contract? As the Dean reads the file, the reasons given were those in the letter to the Assistant Director of Athletics by the Head of the Department of Athletics. No other documentation, known to the Dean, was given by the Department Head to the Committee, except the response by the Assistant Director of Athletics. As to who transmitted the documents to the Committee is not clear to the Dean.

2. How was the Assistant Director of Athletics evaluated? The Dean stated that nothing known to him was submitted to the Committee.

June 28, 1976

*Will
Melin
Lynn*

3. What is the appeal procedure for such actions? The Dean gave four ways: PAUMA Grievance Committee, School Grievance Committee, legal action outside the University, Administrative appeal. However, the Dean stated the faculty governance process was not available to the Assistant Director of Athletics.

4. Is it appropriate for the Assistant Director of Athletics to schedule a meeting with members of the School Personnel Committee? The Dean advised that she may request one, but the Committee is not required to meet. And further, according to the Dean, the Committee is only required to justify recommendations contrary to the Department Head. Additionally, the Dean stated that the Committee members were tenured faculty members who were on academic year appointments which could preclude further interaction until September 1976.

5. Will copies of all documents forwarded to the School Personnel Committee by the Head of the Department of Athletics be furnished to the Assistant Director of Athletics? The Dean agreed to have documents transmitted to her by the Committee.

6. Has the complaint with Equal Employment Opportunity Commission filed by the Assistant Director of Athletics influenced this action? The Dean said he could not answer for the Head of the Department of Athletics, but he doubted the members of the School Personnel Committee knew of the complaint.

I appreciate your willingness to discuss this serious matter with me, and trust I have accurately paraphrased the discussion. If there are discrepancies or distortions in the above, please clarify same.

Vivian Barfield
Assistant Athletic Director