

UDMPU Board
Minutes of January 9, 2007 meeting
CF 228

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

Excused: Mary Higby, Jill Spreitzer

The meeting began at 12:47 PM with the approval of the agenda. Minutes from the December 12, 2006 were not available. McLonis reported that she had been in communication with Higby, who said that she would be unable to take minutes for meetings during January and February. McLonis said that she would take minutes during that period of time.

Canjar reported that later in the day he would email all the faculty Father Stockhausen's reply to the board's letter regarding Stockhausen's refusal to return the TIAA giveback.

Treasurer's report

Hirst reported that the current balance is \$90,888.95, the amount remaining after issuing \$11,756.41 in reimbursement checks to faculty members on phased retirement who had been overcharged for union dues by Human Resources.

A motion was made to approve the treasurer's report. The motion was seconded and approved.

Grievance report

There was some discussion about the email that Manning had sent to the board members in December. This was a forwarded message from Julie Schmid of the AAUP providing general information about the ramifications of switching affiliation from MEA. Hill-Vasquez suggested that a future board meeting be devoted to discussing the message and the pros and cons of switching affiliation to the AAUP. It was agreed that this discussion would be planned for a future date.

A motion was made to approve the grievance report. The motion was seconded and approved.

Shared governance voting

Venugopal reported that, due to extenuating circumstances, members of the McNichols Faculty Assembly were unable to attend this board meeting. (These circumstances had also prevented the MFA members from meeting earlier among themselves to determine a possible meeting date.)

Zeff asked Venugopal what recourse was available under the current shared governance structure for dealing with instances of noncompliance with the principles of shared governance. Venugopal replied that the Shared Governance Task Force will continue to exist beyond the scheduled January 19 vote; this body will continue to bring up instances of noncompliance, halt implementation of any changes in operation that

have not first undergone the appropriate review process, and point out the proper means of review.

McLonis asked whether, should these measures be unsuccessful, an instance of unfair labor practice could be cited because the governance structure is addressed in the UDMPU contract. Zeff and Manning replied that a grievance could be filed, although if such a grievance went to arbitration chances were low that a decision would be made in favor of the union. Manning pointed out that the step of filing a grievance has been and is currently taken sparingly; there has been and is sufficient communication between the union and the administration that usually a grievance can be avoided.

Venugopal pointed out that the administrative violations have been within teams. But faculty members on those teams don't always speak up when these violations are evident or apparent. Manning asked where team-generated proposals go; Venugopal said that they go to the Academic Vice President. It wasn't clear whether or not the proposals also go to the clearinghouse; Venugopal agreed to check the language of the revised shared governance proposal on this matter. He also pointed out that, although the current Academic Vice President is in favor of a clearinghouse, not all of the vice presidents would agree.

There was some discussion about how to handle the scheduled vote on the shared governance structure. Baker asked whether the ballot could be changed to include the option of voting in favor of a governance structure but stating that the current structure needed further revision. Venugopal replied that such a move would come at a price. Only the MFA would have this form of the ballot; the administration and the Law and Dental schools would have the "yes or no" ballot.

The question was also raised as to whether the MFA could postpone the vote to allow for further revision. While Venugopal said that was a possibility, the Shared Governance Task Force might insist on going forth with the vote. Further, Venugopal said that the request for a postponement (which would be the second instance, the first postponement having been requested by the administration) might be seen as an act of bad faith on the part of the faculty.

Consensus could not be reached on whether a "no" vote would be interpreted by the administration as a voting down of only the current structure or as a vote against any kind of governance structure. There was concern that, if the current structure were approved, it still lacked the teeth to prevent the wholesale layoff of full-time faculty (who would then presumably be replaced by adjuncts). Once the structure was in place, the administration would most likely not to agree to any changes that would reduce its power. The opposing point of view was that, under the current governance structure, faculty have power and autonomy that they have never had before. This might be the last best chance to get a structure in place that both sides realize would be continually improved upon.

These points of view and all the related concerns will be addressed at the general membership meeting, scheduled for January 11 from 12:45 till 2:00 in LS 113.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:25 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Kris McLonis