

Policy 36 – Dispute Resolution for University Support Staff  
Summary of Decisions  
2009-2022

	Description of Complaint	Decision
1.	Staff member required that service credits be recalculated and vacation allotment retroactively instated.	The decision was upheld since due process was respected under Policy 18.
2.	Staff member was terminated with cause and requested a hearing, alleging that rules were not correctly conveyed.	The decision was overturned and the staff member reinstated.
3.	Staff member was given an informal letter construed as disciplinary in nature and alleged that university policies had been breached.	The decision was upheld since the letter respected criteria under Policy 18.
4.	Staff member was terminated with cause and requested a hearing, alleging a breach of Policy 18.	The decision was upheld since due process was respected under Policy 18.
5.	Staff member was terminated and requested a hearing.	The staff member was granted internal status as the member's situation was deemed to be included in Policy 18.
6.	Staff member contested their performance appraisal, alleging it was similar to a discipline measure.	The performance appraisal was to be redone, as it did not meet the requirements under Policy 18.
7.	Staff member contested their written warning, alleging that no oral warning had been given.	Requirements under Policy 18 were followed and the written warning was maintained.
8.	A complainant submitted a request to the Tribunal.	Since the Complainant was not eligible under Policies 33 and 36, the tribunal declined jurisdiction.
9.	Staff member contested a warning letter requesting immediate improvements.	The warning letter was to be removed from the employee's file as it did not meet the requirements under Policy 18.