

## **UUP Labor Management Meeting Notes**

Monday, March 17, 2014

1:30 - 3:00 p.m.

UU 124

**Present:** Fran Goldman, John Oldfield, Benita Roth, Darryl Wood, Sheila Doyle, Valerie Hampton, JoAnn Navarro, Joe Schultz

### **Items from Management**

#### **Campus Climate Survey**

There was discussion of a “Campus Climate Survey” to look at questions diversity, equity and inclusion, gender, disability, veterans, etc. on this campus. Diversity officer Valerie Hampton was the point person on explaining the intentions behind the project. Hampton has “prescreened” the survey with selected groups such as the Faculty Senate, UUP, CSEA, and some students. (Benita took the survey and had several comments). Hampton’s office has also been running sessions to obtain feedback before the survey rolls out later in the semester.

Hampton reported that the campus had never done such a survey before. UUP asked about what the results of the survey would guide; Hampton answered that it would be used for possible training, looking at our academic offerings to see where we can be a bit more inclusive, and otherwise designing some initiatives and areas to move forward. Positive or negative forward.

UUP asked to be informed of progress re: the survey. Hampton promised to do that. UUP asked about who was going to review survey results; Hampton answered “a committee on diversity and some faculty members.” Hampton said that reports on the survey would be distributed to various levels of the public, with the raw data being available to a more limited group. Hampton said that ideally the office is looking for a response rate of 30% or about 4000 responses give or take. UUP recommended multiple reminders. Hampton discussed marketing incentives for filling out the survey.

Management stressed that the survey is not to be intended as a mechanism to file a formal complaint. If you have an issue, you need to use the official procedure to file a formal complaint.

### **Items from UUP**

#### **On-Going Items**

**On call/Recall – update re: state and campus efforts to decide on the effect of OC/RC and campus efforts to designate OC/RC staff. Have HR directors met yet? Continued discussion on question of defining “work station.” Reminder to management that UUP would like to see any lists designating OC/RC workers before they are sent in/finalized.**

UUP inquired as to whether or not HR directors statewide had met in order to clarify, from management's side, how they were planning to proceed on oc/rc.

Management had "one-half of update." As of yet, no campus list of oc/rc had been finalized. UUP inquired as to what the timeline was and if UUP could look at the list before it was finalized. Management replied that there was no timeline at this point. Last time they talked with SUNY, there appears to be two different schools of thought on this oc/rc (namely, the question of whether management had the option of keeping old systems of compensation (or lack thereof) for units that had other arrangements, or whether the new contracts oc/rc provisions were meant to cover all UUP employees regardless of past arrangements. In the interim, UUP inquired as to whether or not any employees had been subject to recall, and Management stated that they were not aware of any recalls.

UUP asked about the as yet undecided question of how to define a work station. Management replied that the definition of work station was secondary to them and that their first priority was designation. UUP disputed the logic of this. Management reiterated that they were committed to respecting any existing arrangements in place.

UUP stressed that the agreement with the state (i.e. the contract) has language about work duties and work site and talks about returning to work, which means it's where you do it. If you do your work when you are traveling, you get paid because you are working. UUP intimated that there was ongoing discussion with the state (i.e. grievances) re: the OC/RC contract clause and SUNY's disputes about its relevance. Management also indicated that as of yet, the list they plan to designate includes employees eligible for RC only.

**Parking – UUP would like to know when the bargaining units will be meeting with management regarding the proposed fee increase for registration. UUP would also like the breakdown of cost/expenses re: parking that justifies the fee increase, as discussed at the last meeting.**

UUP (Benita): This topic is moot. We are meeting on Wednesday.  
Management (Joe Schultz): I am hoping to get the data out today.

**Adjunct Pay –UUP is expecting data on adjuncts' salaries from the academic year Fall 2012-Spring 2013. Discussion will depend on whether data has been given (by Kelly Wemette).**

UUP (Benita): I still do not have this information.  
Management (Joe Schultz): It will be this week. Kelly gives us the raw data, and we take the names out. .  
UUP (Benita): It's been months since we've asked for this. We want it.

**Leadership development/supervisory program - UUP would like an update on who is participating in the current program and would like to know the results (obtain a copy of the report etc.) from the last program.**

There was considerable discussion of the ongoing leadership development/supervisor training program. UUP had several issues. First there were not many faculty participating in the current classes which total 42 people. UUP has questions about how the program is being evaluated. UUP also believes that there are missing components in the curriculum. We would like to have a copy of the curriculum. We had access to three online modules that were done. We would like to have access to what is being covered. Being that the University is committed to this program, we would like some further discussion about who is involved and the evaluation of the curriculum.

Management answered that the evaluation is being done by the Center for Leadership Studies, Shelly Dionne, and that there was a survey distributed after each individual session and then a final evaluation. Management (Navarro) will check with Shelly Dionne.

UUP (John) noted that he had a conversation with people that went to the last seminar. The course seemed to be very light on conflict resolution, and when the subject was brought up it was suppressed. For some reason or another, they did not want to get into that. On a personal note, conflict resolution is probably one of the most keystones to proper management. Management noted that this omission seemed odd and that they would check on the curriculum. UUP continued that we were concerned that real world situations were not dealt with. At least some of the material was quite abstract in its presentation. The reason we pushed for this in recent years, is to help supervisors.

There was discussion about whether or not comments came from those “forced” to go or who self-nominated for the program. Management stated that there were not as many of “the unwilling” this semester. Discussion ensued about the online modules, the ratio of faculty to professional supervisors, the curriculum, Management asked for help in ideas for recruiting more faculty. UUP suggested that information about the seminar has not trickled down to faculty. Stated that the university ombudsman had heard from one program director that he would like to have a program available for incoming chairs and wanted to know more about the program. Management stated that “the senior officers group” on campus pushed participation in the program. UUP (Darryl) stated that both Jim Dix and Darryl, as former UUP Binghamton Chapter Presidents pushed this issue of leadership training. We have had departmental chairs on the Executive Board. When these chairs heard about this concept, they thought it was a great idea. Years ago, I heard that the Harpur Dean was also excited about the concept. However it was noted that the leadership seminar has not been on the agenda for chairs’ meetings in Harpur for some time. Management (Navarro) stated that she would try to get the seminar on the agenda for the meeting at the end of April, because we will be talking about the fall program. At least the deans will be talking about it.

UUP suggested that Management send a letter to incoming chairs inviting them to the seminar. UUP also stated that they wanted to see the assessment evaluation when it was completed. UUP noted that the initiative for the seminar came from UUP, and we should continue to have some input into the curriculum. Their conditions of work is important. We need to look at the curriculum. Going forward it would be good to have a better idea of what the curriculum is as changes go forward and tweaking happens, etc. UUP noted that we were encouraged by Shelly’s remarks that Management is willing to do this until we get through all 400 supervisors.

Management (Navarro) noted that she had been in touch with the mentors for the seminar participants, and that they had good comments about the experience although some pairings worked less well

**Intellectual property concern – In the February LM meeting, the provost put forward the idea of a committee being convened to design a campus policy re: intellectual property concerns. Has this happened? Timeline. UUP wants to be represented on such a committee and reiterates a commitment not just to intellectual property rights in terms of possible uses involving monetary gain, but also with the right of the faculty/professional member to determine when and how such material is used for issues involving discipline, promotion, and tenure.**

**Secondly, has there been word from SUNY re: policy about the use of intellectual property?**

UUP (Benita): On the assumption that you haven't had any word from SUNY, I did a bit of reaching out to other SUNY campuses of language they have, reviewed our Faculty Handbook, and looked at different kinds of links that are supposedly dealing with online material. Most of the material that I reviewed had to do with who owns it. There was a stunning lack of any consideration of how online material, again some is visual, would be used in terms of discipline, promotion and tenure. It seems that the campus is unwilling to issue some type of statement. In the absence of that, I am going to talk with my colleagues and develop a statement.

Management stated that UUP was asking for the campus to come out with a statement before SUNY does. UUP countered that BU should play a leadership role, because the issue was a grey area, and who's to say how administrators can use online campus or our portfolio without our permission?

Management stated that the Provost is going to have a conversation with the Deans, but that until SUNY comes up with some guidelines, we don't expect to have future issues.

Management also stated that SUNY legal was in conversation with the SUNY Provost's Office on the issue, and that BU felt "stuck" as a campus in determining their own policy. Management also brought up the stalemate over oc/rc as another example of BU being stuck waiting for instructions from SUNY central

Discussion came back to the issue of intellectual property issues, with UUP arguing that ownership was not in dispute, but that the nature of online material presented new challenges as to use, and that the campus hasn't caught up with the implications of online material re: questions of discipline, etc. UUP stated that in all cases, the faculty member has to be able to decide what happens to the material.

Management noted that on the professional side, the University owns it in general if it is in your Performance Program. UUP pointed out that something might be produced by a professional that was not in the performance program and thus constituted a grey area. UUP stated that we would be coming up with a statement on the issue, and since the issue was discipline, promotion and tenure, we needed involve the Faculty Senate (although we

may as our right). Management noted that the University need not agree with our statement and that they would wait for guidance from SUNY.

### New Items

**Plans for growth: President Stenger said in his “state of the university address” that BU has plans for adding 6000 students, 180 new faculty and only 100 new staff. Who will these new staff be – UUP, CSEA, MC, in what proportion? That is to say, what are the projections for who and were staff are to be? (UUP notes that President Stenger will be attending the April 2014 LM meeting but looks forward to discussion this issue in an ongoing fashion).**

Discussion ensued about this issue. Many numbers were floated around. In the next six years we are planning on adding 4,000 students. UUP asked who they would be. Management stated that the growth would be mainly on the graduate side. UUP stated that the 2020 plan called for another 250 employees (150 faculty and 100 staff). Where would they go? Classrooms? Offices? Management stated that these are indeed good questions. UUP emphasized that if new faculty are hired to teach graduates, they are not going to be people accepting the deals as to space etc. that junior people often force themselves to accept.

Management stated that they don't have a firm plan on where the growth will be. Discussion ensued regarding the planned pharmacy school, which would have about 300 new grad students. UUP noted that this left some 2700 other grad students taking what? With whom?

Management noted that the growth vision was President Stenger's and that they had few concrete details. The conversation turned to the question of space. Management noted that BU has less space than most of the four year colleges.

UUP summed up the discussion as there being no real concrete plans for growth or firm projections, and reiterated our desire to be involved and kept informed about plans as they happen, should they happen. We will raise the growth question with the President at the next LM meeting. UUP also noted concerns about pressure on support staff if they cannot hire sufficient numbers of people to cope with the support needs for new students and programs.

---

### “Below the Line” Agenda Items

(As agreed to by UUP and Management during the October 2011 Labor Management meeting, agenda for these meetings may include “below the line” agenda items that are added after the agenda is set. These items can be discussed formally or informally (no notes) at the current Labor Management meeting if both parties agree, or can be postponed to the next Labor Management meeting upon request of either party.)

### Library Tower Elevators:

UUP (Benita): What is up with the Library Tower elevators? One was out about a week ago for several days. This is a health and safety issue.

Management (Joe Schultz): I will check on it.

**Number of Employees on an Approved Reduction of Work Schedule:**

UUP (John): I am on what is called an approved reduction of work schedule. I would like to know how many people like myself there are on campus.

Management (Joe Schultz): The voluntary reduction of work schedule program. And there is another piece of it where you can reduce a percentage 90%; both are a handful on campus. I don't think it's on the faculty side at all.

UUP (Darryl): I can think of at least one academic that is part time. They started 25 years ago, got continuing appointment, could be research, but they only work one semester a year.

Management (Joe Schultz): My guess is it is something historically that was at a Dean's level, not out of our office. I would say there are less than 10.