

**UDMPU General Membership Meeting  
Minutes – 1/22/09**

Present: N. Al-Holou; Maureen Anthony; Stokes Baker; Dave Bartley; Jocelyn Bennett-Garraway; Mark Benvenuto; Laurie Britt-Smith; Mike Canjar; Nihad Dukhan; Roy Finkenbine; James Graves; Harold Greene; Mary-Catherine Harrison; Heather Hill-Vásquez; Hsiao-Lan Hu; Bonnie Korn; Mohan Kushna; Joslen Letscher; James Lynch; Kris McLonis; Stephen Manning; Matt Mio; Gail Mitchell; Judith Mouch; Joseph Nolan; Mary O'Shaughnessy; Gail Presbey; Todd Ray; Karen Selby; Katy Snyder; Tricia Thomas; Jim Tubbs; Kate Walters; Prasad Venugopal; Joanne Yastik; Sandy Yost; Larry Zeff

I. Call to Order.

II. A motion was made to approve the minutes of the 9/25/08 General Membership Meeting and the motion passed.

III. Announcements.

A. Canjar provided basic information regarding the creation of TIAA-CREF supplemental accounts for those UDMPU members who contribute more than 3% to their retirement accounts. Further information is available from Netina Anding in Human Resources who is willing to work with individual UDMPU members in creating supplemental accounts. Members who do not contribute more than 3% do not need to take any action.

B. Canjar reported that some non-tenure-track full-time faculty do not appear to have received their 3% pay raises as required by the contract. This problem is being rectified. Canjar urged all non-tenure-track full-time-faculty to check their pay stubs for their 3% raise and contact him if there is a problem.

C. Problems with parking continue. Two UDMPU Board members will be gathering data regarding these problems and the data will be presented to the administration as further evidence of ongoing violations that continue to prevent faculty from parking in their designated spaces.

D. Canjar indicated that there are a number of problems with implementation of the new contract. These were discussed later in the meeting (see below).

IV. Treasurer's Report.

A. McLonis reported \$53,048.79 in checking and \$69,969.34 in savings for a total of \$123,018.13 in the Comerica accounts.

B. A check for MEA dues in the amount of \$16,762.11 will soon be issued.

C. Canjar assured the membership that the accounts are FDIC insured and that all dues money is safe.

D. A motion was made to accept the Treasurer's Report and the motion passed.

V. Grievance Report.

A. Manning reported that, as has been the practice in the past, all potential grievances are first handled in a "pre-grievance" manner in the hopes that agreements can be reached and problems rectified before proceeding to the official grievance procedure. One exception to this practice occurred prior to Christmas when a grievance was filed because the administration was slow in providing information as required by the contract. Once the grievance was filed, the administration agreed to and provided the asked-for remedy, and the grievance was subsequently withdrawn.

B. Manning then asked those present if they wished to raise any issues connected with possible grievances. No issues were raised.

C. A motion was made to accept the Grievance Report and the motion passed.

VI. E.L. (Executive Liaison) Update.

A. Canjar reported that the administration has yet to provide data in connection with section 9.4 (Chairperson/Area Coordinator Salary for Additional Service) of the contract. The effective date of the application of this salary adjustment as determined by the new formula in 9.4 isn't clear although some UDMPU members argue that the effective date should be 8/16/08 as the current contract begins with this date. In response to this, the administration was asked to provide data in order to determine whether the majority of current Chairs and Area Coordinators would benefit or not benefit from the implementation of the new formula. As the data has not yet been supplied, a meeting will be scheduled with Canjar, Institutional Research, and the Interim AVP in attendance.

B. There has been a delay in receiving the data indicating the percentage of bargaining unit sections taught by full-time faculty as opposed to part-time faculty for Term I of 2008-9 as required by the contract in section 3.3 (b) – (d). The data was only just provided to the UDMPU. Canjar provided a handout. The numbers indicate that the percentage as enumerated in the contract has not been met and calculations indicate that the "corrective action" as required by the new contract should result in seven new—not replacement—faculty lines.

C. Section 5.10 of the contract, "Lecturers," was discussed.

1. The new contract allows for a total of four lecturers. These were hired with undue haste over a very short time at the end of last semester. Concerns were raised over this haste and the truncated search process and its potentially negative results including a lack of attention to hiring minority applicants. Note was made of the fact that the administration knew about the lecturer positions in September but did not take action until the last days of the semester.

2. In addition, the administration seems to be unclear and/or confused as to the nature and length of these appointments. The UDMPU officers worked to clear up a number of these confusions at the E.L. One specific contractual violation involves the hiring of a Senior Lecturer who does not hold a terminal degree as required by the contract in section 5.8 (a)(xv). The administration has been made aware of this violation and steps are being taken to rectify the problem. In addition, the administration was referred to the contract language regarding the probationary period and its implications for the four lecturers hired to begin teaching in January 2009. As stated in section 5.5(a) of the contract: "For the purposes of this paragraph a contract year shall be a twelve (12) month period commencing on August 16 following the employee's original date of hire . . . ." Thus, the first year of any full-time faculty member—including lecturers—begins August 16 after the faculty member's date of hire and the four new lecturers, hired in January 2009, will continue their employment through May 15, 2010.

3. A discussion ensued regarding the difference between an instructor and a lecturer resulting in the assertion that an instructor position is a term appointment whereas a lecturer has rank and is a track position.

4. Also discussed was the possibility that a college/department which has been granted one of the new lecturer positions would, as a result, not be granted a tenure-track position.

D. An issue was raised regarding a potential problem with an administrative review of a faculty member's research because the applicable administrator is not familiar with the faculty member's research area. It was suggested that the faculty member's department should really carry the most weight in evaluating his/her research.

E. A motion was made to adjourn and the motion passed with adjournment at 1:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Heather Hill-Vásquez