

## **UUP Executive Board Meeting Minutes**

2 November, 2011

Attending: Peter D. G. Brown, Bill Capowski, Alan Dunefsky, Ed Felton, John Hain, Richard Kelder, Susan Lehrer, Glenn McNitt, Jeff Miller, Corinne Nyquist, Jerry Persaud, A. J. Williams-Meyers, Rachel Rigolino, Linda Smith

1. Meeting called to order at 12:03.
2. The amended meeting agenda (to treat Old Business first before moving to committee and officer reports) was approved and adopted.
3. Minutes of the 10/19 Executive Board adopted unanimously.
4. Old Business: Mid-semester evaluation. Brown elicited comments and suggestions about the performance of the union. A number of members spoke; brief summaries provided here:

McNitt: Thought it too early on to accurately assess performance. Assessment at the end of the semester would be more accurate and helpful.

Goodman: Averred that assessment at this time would be valuable. Noted that the number of people involved in union activities on campus is much larger now, and the excitement level is high.

Kelder: Agreed that the New Paltz chapter is off to a good start this semester.

Williams-Meyers: Suggested that the enthusiasm of the core supporters of the union needs to be pushed out to the periphery of the bargaining unit.

Brown: Commented that approximately 120 people regularly participate in union activities across campus (20 at E-Board meetings; 50 Department Representatives; 50 individuals active in committees).

Dunefsky: Noted that 11:00 meetings are difficult for professional staff to attend; suggested 12:00 instead, so they could use their lunch hour.

Felton: Praised Brown for his energy and commitment to UUP, but also noted that some of Brown's responses to perceived criticisms seemed overly defensive or too quick to rein in discussion.

Goodman: Good assessments need better structure. We should first have a list of expectations or goals with which to compare our performance (maybe refer back to goals agreed to at summer retreat?). Perhaps we need another retreat or a series of on-going evaluations?

Kelder: Emphasized the need to prepare the bargaining unit for likely tensions or public criticisms surrounding the contract. The chapter needs a plan in advance to deal with these issues when the contract is proposed or debated in public. Also recommended a forum on workers rights and/or on recent criticisms of public employees.

Persaud: Echoing Kelder's concerns, said that the union does not want to appear soft in hard times. Junior faculty, in particular, are concerned about the contract and may not be aware of the union's role (or position) in negotiating it. Suggested a 'union day' or union-related conversations multiple times in a

semester, and stressed the need for on-going public discourse, especially in the wider context of what is happening to colleges and universities across the country.

5. Labor-Management Agenda. The following items were suggested:

Kelder: (a) Follow-up on .99 contracts, which seem to deprive employee of benefits while requiring virtually full-time work.

(b) Compensation for assessment work by contingent faculty members

Nyquist: Brought up a number of library issues:

(a) Lack of support for leaves, sabbaticals, grants by library dean

(b) Consultation over appointment of new dean or director

(c) Shared services

Smith: Problems with office space (or lack thereof) across campus on both academic and professional side.

6. Smith proposed renewing the chapter's subscription to Survey Monkey at a cost of \$200. The proposal passed unanimously.

7. Campus Equity Week. Brown mentioned the success of the C.E.W. activities, noting the collection of approximately 1800 signatures on the petition, with a goal of 2000. Lehrer noted that the petition needs to be addressed to someone in particular.

8. Rigolino indicated the need for a chair of the Communications Committee.

9. Persaud reported that the Affirmative Action Committee was up and running. Possible future activities include an information sessions on affirmative action.

10. Felton reported that contingent faculty members were initially invited by Provost Torsney to participate in a survey of job satisfaction (developed by the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education out of Harvard). Today they were uninvited by email.

11. The deadline for the next issue of the *Bullhorn* is November 10<sup>th</sup>. Submissions should go to Rachel Rigolino.

12. Meeting adjourned at 12:05pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Jeff Miller  
Secretary *pro tempore*