

UUP Labor-Management Agenda

Monday, October 30, 2017

10:00 am

- 1. Clarification of requirements for professional re-appointment/permanent appointment dossiers.** We have been hearing from some professionals that their supervisors are asking for less information to be included in their dossiers than previously required. Have there been changes to this process that we should be communicating to our members?
- 2. Workload issues caused by not filling/delayed filling of vacancies.** Some of our professional members have been reporting an increase in their workloads caused by vacancies left unfilled in their departments, as the other employees in that unit are asked to cover the work that previously went to the now-vacant position. We would like to discuss the impact of the College's hiring 'frost', and expectations of our members in affected areas.
- 3. Adjunct office space (again).** In our previous discussions on this topic, the Administration has maintained that it prefers to locate adjunct offices in/near the departments which they serve; in general, this is a good principle, but in practice, we continue to have reports that such spaces are not universally available. We would like to discuss the possibility of (re-)establishing one or more group office spaces, providing access to computers, printers, a copier, etc., and ideally with some more secluded space to hold confidential meetings with students.
- 4. Re-application being required of some returning part-timers.** We have been made aware that there are some areas in which even long-serving part-time employees are being asked to complete an online application, as though they are incoming new hires, for employment in upcoming semesters. On what basis is this being required? Shouldn't existing employees be invited to return without having to go through this process?
- 5. Determinations at the start of Title IX (and other) investigations.** We would like to know how the Administration determines its immediate response to Title IX and other allegations—what are the criteria being used to decide to ban an employee from being on campus as the initial investigation is being conducted? Is there consideration of a presumption of innocence at this point?