

Labor-Management Meeting Agenda

Friday, February 14, 2014, 3.30 PM, HAB 803

1. **Performance Evaluations.** Please provide the list of all UUP bargaining unit members whose last performance evaluation was completed December 31, 2012, or earlier. What is the time-table (and the plan) for getting to full compliance with this requirement?

2. **Open SUNY.** How will the College compensate instructors of courses in Open SUNY whose enrollments significantly exceed the designated course cap?

3. **START-UP NY.** The College recently submitted its application for funding through Round III of the NYSUNY 2020 Challenge Grant to build a 20,000-square-foot building to house its planned Mechanical Engineering program and to secure key equipment for that initiative. The College has publicly announced that the proposed building will also provide office and laboratory space to companies looking to take advantage of the START-UP NY program. Please provide UUP with a copy of the College's START-UP NY plan, as required by the statute, including a description of the land or property to be designated as tax-free, a description of the type of companies SUNY New Paltz will be seeking to attract and how they relate to the institution's academic mission.

4. **On-call/Recall.** Given that President Christian has identified no UUP bargaining unit members as eligible for on-call or recall pay, will SUNY New Paltz agree to assign all on-call and recall duties to personnel outside of the UUP bargaining unit? Does the College administration affirm that no UUP bargaining unit members are required to take calls, email, page, etc., after they have left the workstation for the day or for the week? If not, please provide a list of UUP bargaining unit members who are required to take calls, pages, email, etc., after they have left the workstation for the day or for the week.

5. **edTPA.** How are supervisors of student teachers being additionally compensated for their significantly increased workload due to the implementation of the new edTPA (Teacher Performance Assessment)?

6. **DSA.** What measures has the College undertaken to improve the distribution of Discretionary Salary Awards to both full-time and part-time academic and professional UUP bargaining-unit members in the current year?

7. **Instructorships.** How has the College been using the title of *Instructor* in its appointments of teaching faculty?

UUP Labor-Management Meeting Notes
Friday, February 14, 2014, 3.30 PM, HAB 803

In attendance:

Admin: Don Christian, Phil Mauceri, Michelle Halstead, Shelly Wright, Dawn Blades
For UUP: Peter D.G. Brown, Beth E. Wilson, William Capowski (NYSUT)

Prior to addressing issues on the formal agenda, there was discussion of the College's inclement weather policies, and issues reported by UUP members (particularly professional staff) who have had a difficult time accessing their workplaces despite being required to report for work. The administration reiterated that the College's operating procedures for staff are clearly stated in the official inclement weather policies posted online; ultimately it is the employee's decision whether it is safe to come in or not. Employees and their supervisors are responsible for being aware of the standing policies.

1. **Performance Evaluations.** Please provide the list of all UUP bargaining unit members whose last performance evaluation was completed December 31, 2012, or earlier. What is the time-table (and the plan) for getting to full compliance with this requirement?

The administration is not providing this list, instead asking that anyone for whom this is an issue should come to HR. Admin is doing trainings for supervisors and is working toward improved compliance, although the areas in which there are significant problems with compliance are especially difficult to reach.

Brown stated that the UUP chapter at Purchase received such a list; why can't we see it here?

Capowski noted that the issue of compliance with the performance evaluation requirement was a shared problem between the union and management; how can we partner on this?

Christian noted that although compliance was a requirement for supervisors to be considered for DSI/DSA, a number of them still don't respond. Capowski noted that under the new Agreement, the importance of this requirement is being emphasized; Christian stated that the administration does not disagree.

2. **Open SUNY.** How will the College compensate instructors of courses in Open SUNY whose enrollments significantly exceed the designated course cap?

Mauceri stated that the online policy in place caps courses at approximately 25 students; for each student above that level, the instructor is paid \$170 per student. If enrollment rises to a critical level, a new section is opened.

Brown inquired whether all of New Paltz's online courses are part of Open SUNY. According to Mauceri, our courses are all listed on the SUNY Learning Network; at this point, Open SUNY features only programs and support structures at the moment, so it doesn't really apply.

3. **START-UP NY.** The College recently submitted its application for funding through Round III of the NYSUNY 2020 Challenge Grant to build a 20,000-square-foot building to house its planned Mechanical Engineering program and to secure key equipment for that initiative. The College has publicly announced that the proposed building will also provide office and laboratory space to companies looking to take advantage of the START-UP NY program. Please provide UUP with a copy of the College's START-UP NY plan, as required by the statute, including a description of the land or property to be designated as tax-free, a description of the type of companies SUNY New Paltz will be seeking to attract and how they relate to the institution's academic mission.

Christian stated that the process is guided by the Research Foundation; there is an initial plan under review, to which the administration is making some structural changes in order to comply with the State program. When that plan is finalized, it will be shared with the various parties who are to receive it, including UUP. Wright noted that this should take place shortly, by early March, after which there is a 30 day waiting period.

Christian stated that the College will be looking to partner with firms doing things that will enhance the academic programs we already have, and possibly hire our students. 3D is obviously one of our key connections in that regard. The overall shortage of space on campus for academic programs will be a significant obstacle for pursuit of this program.

4. **On-call/Recall.** Given that President Christian has identified no UUP bargaining unit members as eligible for on-call or recall pay, will SUNY New Paltz agree to assign all on-call and recall duties to personnel outside of the UUP bargaining unit? Does the College administration affirm that no UUP bargaining unit members are required to take calls, email, page, etc., after they have left the workstation for the day or for the week? If not, please provide a list of UUP bargaining unit members who are required to take calls, pages, email, etc., after they have left the workstation for the day or for the week.

Brown noted that despite previous demands, the President has not identified anyone as eligible for this provision of the Agreement on our campus. Blades cited a recent memo from John Marino (NYSUT Labor Relations) stating that simply receiving calls, carrying a pager, or responding to emails was not sufficient to qualify an employee for on-call/recall, and that on-call would require that their movement be restricted, while recall applies only when someone is called in to return to the workplace.

Capowski noted that this issue still lacks clear definition in the Agreement as it stands, and that it may be worked out more specifically by MOU. Brown raised the point that there are six SUNY campuses where this issue is being raised as a class-action grievance, which could have implications for New Paltz. Here, our Exec. Cte. has not yet decided whether to pursue such a class-action grievance or not.

5. **edTPA.** How are supervisors of student teachers being additionally compensated for their significantly increased workload due to the implementation of the new edTPA (Teacher Performance Assessment)?

Brown reported complaints from a number of members who supervise student teachers about the increased workload they are having as a result of the new edTPA requirement. Mauceri asked if it was really an increase in workload, or if it was actually a redistribution/restructuring of the supervisor's obligation. He stated that the administration is still unsure about this question; if it is a question of absolute increase in workload, then yes, they would entertain the idea of additional compensation, but if not, if it is just a question of changing methods and not an increase in overall workload, there would be no increase in compensation. The administration is waiting to hear back from the Dean of Education on this issue.

6. **DSA.** What measures has the College undertaken to improve the distribution of Discretionary Salary Awards to both full-time and part-time academic and professional UUP bargaining-unit members in the current year?

Wilson noted that the part-time issue was addressed at the previous part-time labor-management meeting, when the administration stated that they would be eliminating the application process altogether for part-time academic and professional faculty, in favor of an across-the-board distribution of the pool as it is defined under the new Agreement. With regard to full-time employees, the administration noted that the Faculty had voted to streamline the process, eliminating the central committee, but only so long as the awards remained as DSA (not DSI).

Brown inquired about professionals, as they seem to have been left out of the conversation. They should know that they can self-nominate for DSA, and that they don't have to wait for their supervisor to do so. Christian stated that the administration will attempt to make the call for DSA applications for professionals as clearly as possible, and that professionals have historically operated on a different timeline, which will resume in May 2014 as usual.

7. **Instructorships.** How has the College been using the title of *Instructor* in its appointments of teaching faculty?

According to Mauceri, the title Instructor has been used as an equivalent of clinical faculty at the medical schools; here, this has applied only to faculty in the Communications Disorders department. Brown asked if there might be a way to expand this usage, possibly to include the growing number of full-time Lecturers; the difference being that according to the Board of Trustees policies, Instructors are eligible for tenure, while Lecturers are not.

Wilson raised the issue of long-time Lecturers still needing to produce voluminous dossiers every two or three years for reappointment, which many of them feel to be insulting. A number of years ago, she recalled, there had been an effort to streamline the reappointment process, but it

resulted only in making a teaching-only lecturer-specific set of guidelines (which was an improvement), but not in fundamentally reducing the burden of applying for reappointment.

Christian recalled the notion of reducing significantly the requirements for lecturer reappointment (he was Provost when the concept was initially raised), and suggested that there should be a way of significantly reducing the dossier required from the second reappointment onward.

Maurceri mentioned a model at another school he had heard of, where full-time lecturers were given contracts of increasing duration, from two to three, to as many as seven years. Wilson noted that the Board of Trustees policies would be a constraint in our case on this practice. Brown noted that putting people on Instructor (tenurable) lines would be another way to accomplish this sort of job security. It was agreed that the issue should be revisited in greater depth at subsequent meetings.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth E. Wilson