

Subject: UUP New Paltz Chapter Labor-Management Meeting Notes

4:00pm November 15, 2011

Administration Attendees: President Christian, VP DiStefano, Interim Provost Torsney, Chief of Staff Wright, HR Director Blades, HR Associate Director Papa

UUP Attendees: President Brown, VP Smith, VP Miller, Secretary Hanley, NYSUT Labor Relations Specialist Capowski.

1. Library. a. What is the status of the search to replace the outgoing Dean of the Library, Chui-chun Lee? Will her replacement hold the rank of Dean or Director? What plans are there for consultation with Library faculty in this search?

Per Interim Provost Torsney, there is a 90-day waiver of the posting and an interim replacement will be appointed internally while the nationwide search for a permanent replacement is ongoing. The size and composition of the search committee has not yet been determined. As the incumbent holds the titles of both “Dean” (working title) and “Director” (official title), her replacement is expected to hold both, as well. The library staff will have the same opportunity to provide input as the rest of the campus community; i.e., in the campus-wide forums set up for this purpose. The staff will not be consulted in a separate forum.

b. Are there any plans to implement or explore the possibility of Shared Services in the Library in terms of staff or technical services? Are other areas of the College considering Shared Services?

Citing the example of databases, Torsney noted that shared services are already a reality in the library. However, the library will not be impacted by future shared services initiatives any more heavily than other areas of the campus.

c. What is the status of the on-going Human Resources investigations into bullying and harassment at the Library and other areas of the College?

Torsney indicated that civility in the workplace training is now complete. Brown observed that the matter described to Miller appears to go beyond a training issue. Director Blades stated the matter in question had been looked into, counseling had been administered as needed, training completed, and the problem now appeared to be resolved. Miller suggested that, based on his recent conversations with the library staff, the matter was not resolved. Blades asked that we encourage our members to come forward and contact HR if that is the case.

d. How many academic employees in the Library have received sabbaticals, Drescher leaves and other academic research-oriented leaves? What steps can be taken to ensure that all academic employees, including those in the Library, are given equal and balanced consideration for sabbatical leave(s)?

Torsney indicated such data might be available thru Faculty Governance. As to whether library staff receive proper consideration on their requests for leaves, President Christian stated that no complaints have been received that would suggest there is a problem in that regard.

e. Has the plan for the Library renovation been finalized, and are there plans for Library faculty offices in it? Have librarians been consulted regarding their future work spaces?

Per Christian, renovation plans are being finalized after a long consultative process. The decision to minimize the number of offices for library staff as reflected in the floor plan was not a careless and casual one. It was based on recommendations by the architects. Christian indicated he is aware some people are unhappy with the decision, but the cost of revising the floor plan at this stage would be prohibitive.

2. Assessment. Are there plans to systematically compensate adjuncts who perform significant assessment work, as they have been in the past?

Per Torsney, “yes.”

3. Job Satisfaction. Why were all adjuncts first invited to participate in the COACHE job satisfaction survey, then subsequently told that they would not be participating? Whether inadvertent or not, the message conveyed was clearly not one of inclusion. Is the administration not interested in the job satisfaction of this half of the people teaching here? Does the administration stand by the Interim Provost’s statement that “Data from the COACHE study will be meaningful only if we have broad participation”?

Torsney stated the situation was the result of a clerical error and that an apology had already been rendered to those affected. The survey only measures input from tenure track faculty; that’s how it was designed by the originator. Brown suggested that perhaps we could solicit adjunct input via some other means, and Torsney agreed.

4. .99 Contracts. How many employees at the College are on .99 contracts? What is the rationale behind giving these individuals less than full-time contracts?

Assistant director Papa indicated there are two employees on .99 contracts. They were placed there because they should not be in positions that lead to permanent appointment. The positions were not advertised as full-time, and the fact that they are not full-time was clearly reflected in the appointment letters.

5. Workload. What progress has been made toward developing measures to insure that the workload for academics, professionals and adjuncts remains stable, fair and equitable?

Per President Christian, Interim Provost Torsney is still working to organize the necessary data. The data collection group is now operational and, according to DiStefano, they have recently had their first meeting. Once required data has been collected, membership will be broadened to include faculty participation. Further, the effort was never intended to consider professional workload. Professionals should report their workload issues and concerns to their supervisors.

As for academics, the initial look at the data collected thus far has already revealed great disparities in teaching loads.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Ed Hanley
Chapter Secretary