

UUP Labor-Management Notes
Wednesday, March 16, 2016
9:30 am

For UUP: Beth Wilson, Kevin Saunders, Mike Malloy, Bill Capowski

For the Admin: Don Christian, Michelle Halstead, Jodi Papa, Dawn Blades

1. **Follow-up on core hours vs. professional obligation.** When we discussed this topic in some earlier labor-management meetings, we shared some specific departments in which there were widely-reported issues with core hours being imposed on professionals whose regular obligation includes evening and weekend hours. Has the administration spoken with the supervisors in question?

We asked if there had been any progress in one particular area that we discussed at the previous meeting; Admin reported that the Dean in question had only been spoken to recently, and so we will need time to see if he changes his practice in response.

2. **Workload creep/adjustments for increased volume of work.** We have seen a number of cases in which a particular element in a professional's performance program has increased substantially in volume; given that the Administration does not recognize this, on its own, as a reason for a salary increase, how are supervisors being informed/trained to handle this situation? Shouldn't the performance program of the employee in question be *adjusted/changed, removing or reducing some of the duties already there, in order to keep the workload at a stable level?*

Saunders described situations for some professionals, in which a significant new volume of work was added (for example, when an IT professional has a new building come on line with x additional computer labs to service), but that other duties were not being reduced to accommodate the load. Blades reiterated HR's position that an increase in volume does NOT involve a change in performance program; Capowski pointed out that the overall workload might be adjusted by reducing the frequency of other tasks.

Christian made the point that while we are very good at adding things, we seem to be not as good at taking duties away, given the current budget situation. He added that this situation makes it imperative that we re-think the way we do things, to find creative solutions that might enable us to drop certain things and refocus our energies on the new tasks at hand. Wilson agreed, pointing out that there needed to be greater cooperation between supervisors and their employees in organizing the work load. Blades reported that Anneliese Kniffen in HR was working to develop a supervisor training series, but that getting supervisors to attend continues to be an issue (especially as the one who really need the guidance seem to be the least likely to take advantage of this training). Further discussion raised the idea of developing a monthly brown bag for supervisors to exchange ideas and to address specific problems they were encountering with their peers.

- 3. Bulletin boards.** Article 13 of the Agreement allows for UUP to post information on one bulletin board in each department on the campus. We would like to take advantage of this right more systematically than we have in the past. While there are a number of specifically UUP-designated bulletin boards in certain locations on campus, not every department has one. What protocol would the Administration suggest as we ask our department reps to pursue this, in cases where there is no previously assigned bulletin board space (or possibly no bulletin boards at all)?

UUP needs to approve the material being posted; given fire hazard and other concerns, any new bulletin boards will need to be installed by Facilities. Admin asked UUP to provide more information on specific departments which currently have no bulletin board space provided for UUP material. Will be followed up at the next labor-management meeting.

- 4. Supervisors in some areas hostile to union membership/activity.** As we have been undertaking a new membership drive, it has come to our attention that certain departments/areas on campus have supervisors who create an anti-union atmosphere for their subordinates. Given the Administration's recognition that union service should count as Service in our members' dossiers and applications for merit awards, etc., it seems contradictory that there are areas in which such union membership/work is actively discouraged. How can the Administration help to redress this situation?

President Christian's first response was to pointedly deny that union service ever counted as institutional service for purposes of reappointment/promotion dossiers. (This runs counter to our recollection of multiple conversations in the past, and we will follow up at a subsequent meeting.) According to Christian, "we recognize and support it, but it is not service to the College."

Regarding the anti-union atmosphere, Saunders pointed out that in some areas, members of the bargaining unit expressed reluctance to even sign a membership card. Wilson pointed out that while we did not have much in the way of documentation, when we hear so many employees in certain areas expressing such skittishness about any involvement with the union, it's clear that something is going on. Christian agreed, and expressed some surprise that such negative messages were being promulgated. He stated assertively that he does not condone such anti-union messaging from supervisors, whether explicit or implicit.

- 5. Academic year contracts for adjuncts.** Despite repeated assurances by the Administration that it would prefer to process one academic year contract rather than two single-semester contracts for adjuncts whose services will be needed in both Fall and Spring, there are some department chairs who will not issue academic year appointments. The adjuncts in these departments do not feel like they have much recourse in the situation, for fear of not being assigned work at all. How would the Administration

recommend that we proceed in these cases? How may the department chairs be held accountable for this behavior?

Papa and Blades affirmed that the College's message to department chairs is that where feasible, adjuncts should be receiving academic year contracts, and agreed to follow up with the departments where that message seemed not to be getting through.

UUP Labor-Management Agenda
Wednesday, March 16, 2016
9:30 am

1. **Follow-up on core hours vs. professional obligation.** When we discussed this topic in some earlier labor-management meetings, we shared some specific departments in which there were widely-reported issues with core hours being imposed on professionals whose regular obligation includes evening and weekend hours. Has the administration spoken with the supervisors in question?
2. **Workload creep/adjustments for increased volume of work.** We have seen a number of cases in which a particular element in a professional's performance program has increased substantially in volume; given that the Administration does not recognize this, on its own, as a reason for a salary increase, how are supervisors being informed/trained to handle this situation? Shouldn't the performance program of the employee in question be adjusted/changed, removing or reducing some of the duties already there, in order to keep the workload at a stable level?
3. **Bulletin boards.** Article 13 of the Agreement allows for UUP to post information on one bulletin board in each department on the campus. We would like to take advantage of this right more systematically than we have in the past. While there are a number of specifically UUP-designated bulletin boards in certain locations on campus, not every department has one. What protocol would the Administration suggest as we ask our department reps to pursue this, in cases where there is no previously assigned bulletin board space (or possibly no bulletin boards at all)?
4. **Supervisors in some areas hostile to union membership/activity.** As we have been undertaking a new membership drive, it has come to our attention that certain departments/areas on campus have supervisors who create an anti-union atmosphere for their subordinates. Given the Administration's recognition that union service should count as Service in our members' dossiers and applications for merit awards, etc., it seems contradictory that there are areas in which such union membership/work is actively discouraged. How can the Administration help to redress this situation?
5. **Academic year contracts for adjuncts.** Despite repeated assurances by the Administration that it would prefer to process one academic year contract rather than two single-semester contracts for adjuncts whose services will be needed in both Fall and Spring, there are some department chairs who will not issue academic year appointments. The adjuncts in these departments do not feel like they have much recourse in the situation, for fear of not being assigned work at all. How would the Administration recommend that we proceed in these cases? How may the department chairs be held accountable for this behavior?