

UDMPU Board
Minutes of February 27, 2007 meeting
C&F 119

Present: Maureen Anthony, Stokes Baker, Mike Canjar, Cindy Gillham, Heather Hill-Vasquez, Clint Hirst, JoAnne Isbey, Doug MacDonald, Kris McLonis, Tricia Thomas, Prasad Venugopal, Larry Zeff

Excused: Mary Higby, Stephen Manning, Jill Spreitzer

The meeting began at 12:50 PM with the approval of the minutes from the February 13 meeting.

Elections

Preparations for mailing out the notices of the March 27 election are being finalized. It was noted that envelopes are in the UDMPU office but that stamps need to be purchased. Hirst said that he would take responsibility for mailing out the election notices. A motion was made to authorize Hirst to write a check requiring only his signature (a one-time exception) to pay for postage. The motion was seconded and approved.

Anthony and Thomas volunteered to pick up pizza and beverages for the March 27 meeting. A motion was made and seconded to authorize them to spend up to \$250 for purchasing the pizza and beverages; the motion was approved with the thanks of the board members.

Hirst alerted the board members to a letter he had received from the U.S. Labor Department requesting that any union member convicted of any crime listed in the document available at

<http://www.dol.gov/esa/regs/compliance/olms/504unionoffholdempl.pdf>

refrain from running for any union position. Canjar suggested that this alert should be included in the election mailing, so that union members could determine privately and in advance whether or not it would be legal for any of them to seek office. It was agreed that this would be the best course of action to take.

Treasurer's report

Hirst reported that there is currently \$109,695.57 in union funds. There has been no other financial activity other than UDMPU dues going in and MEA/NEA dues going out. A motion was made and seconded to accept the treasurer's report; the motion carried.

Grievance report

Manning had submitted the grievance report, which Zeff read. The report was essentially the same as the report from the February 13 meeting, except for a telephone conversation which had occurred between Manning and Zeff regarding a question from a faculty member currently in the sixth year of employment. This faculty member had not

applied for tenure and wanted to know whether s/he was eligible for a seventh year of employment. There was some discussion about the wording of the contract addressing this matter. It was agreed that the faculty member was entitled to the seventh year of employment, as long as s/he understood that s/he was not also entitled to apply for tenure during that year since this action should have been taken during the sixth year of employment.

A motion was made and seconded to accept the grievance report. The motion carried.

Adjunct/full-time faculty

A question was raised as to whether the ratio of 65% full-time faculty and 35% adjunct faculty stated in the current contract must be applied in every single department or unit. It was agreed that this ratio is interpreted as the percentage on the overall university level, not on the departmental/unit level.

Anthony and Thomas brought up a related issue in the College of Health Professions. That college has an overwhelming number of adjunct faculty members who are supervised by a very small number of full-time faculty members who receive no teaching load credit for the extra work involved.

It was agreed that the problem in CHP exists to greater and lesser degrees in the other colleges, and that perhaps a class-action suit would be the best way to address the overwork issue. Venugopal made a motion to authorize the Grievance Committee to have conversations with the various academic units as to whether they also feel overworked. The Grievance Committee would report the results of these conversations to the UDMPU Board so that the officers could bring up the issue at an Executive Liaison meeting. The faculty members in those units that are experiencing overwork would also be asked whether they were willing to file grievances. This motion was seconded and approved.

Executive Liaison report

Canjar reported on the discussion with Barbara Schirmer on the issue of arranging the equivalent of course release time for a librarian who might be elected to an officer's position. The initial request was to grant a librarian in such a position ten hours per week to devote to the responsibilities of the position. According to Canjar, Schirmer had stated her belief that ten hours per week was excessive but that she would work with Margaret Auer, the Dean of Libraries/IDS, to determine a suitable number of hours that could be granted to a librarian in a union officer's position.

Zeff reported that the issue of CLAE syllabi being subject to review before approval was not raised at the meeting, so as not to create an issue until/unless the requirement is enforced. Venugopal suggested that Schirmer should be asked at the next Executive Liaison meeting what she knows about the syllabi requirement.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:20 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Kris McLonis