Executive Committee

5.15.2018


1. Approval of minutes from April EC meeting (attached). There was a motion to approve by Mike and Marcus seconded. Discussion ensued. There was an amendment to strike the paragraph at the bottom of p. 3. Only one person voted in favor of this and thus the amendment failed. Another amendment was proposed to make a few changes to section 6. Everyone was in favor and no opposed with 7 abstentions.

2. President’s Report. We should be getting word any day now about a tentative agreement. We will be focusing next year on strategic plan implementation and pay equity. There is much work still to do. Marco will represent us on the implementation team. Zena is stepping into a new role as incoming Vice Chair of Senate.

Some administrators were discussing the terms of the contract before the union even really knows what’s going on. The 4% we have known and been planning for and they are anticipating the budgetary impact. It’s in our best interest to give the news about the contract not the administration. Can raise this with Hedberg the next time we meet with him. It’s co-optation, taking credit for something they didn’t do. Discussed PR with regard to Janus case but we need to wait until we know what the case will be. Senate and UUP can work together on trying to understand indirect cost returns and how money flows in the university. On Dec. 4, there was a University Council meeting and the VP for finance presented his budget and had his budget deficit due to 4% raise and therefore need for “clawing back” money. One way we have tried to address how raises are given
out has been trying to work with HR, trying to make the process clearer to our professional members. For management, we do FOIL management salary data every year, but it's not entirely clear what to do with it. We discussed the issue that we are top heavy on this campus, something along the lines of 8 VPs. The only pork that we can find on this campus is at the executive level. Budget problems are used to create dissension, the way different units are pitted against each other. Some units are feeling the erasure of their labor as the students are not counted as majors in their unit and yet there is recruitment, advising, teaching, etc. (instructional credits and budgets). We need to talk more about these things in public. English will have to cancel upper levels courses because not a deep pool of faculty or adjuncts. Rodriguez is perhaps sensitive to this feedback.

Program idea to discuss the costs of interdisciplinary collaboration and work with Senate to put on a forum. Have people who are leaving address these things in their exit interviews.

At the spring DA The Forum was awarded best newsletter and the website was recognized as well. Thanks to Paul, Janna and Eric. We also received two writing awards and the Phil C. Smith award for excellence in communications.

a. Summer EC meeting vote. Meetings are not typically held in June and July but we usually hold a vote. If something comes up with the contract, we may end up having one. Jim and Carol made a motion and all voted for canceling these meetings, with one abstention.

b. Fall BBQ planning. With the loss of the Interfaith Center, we may not be able to do Giffy’s; Sodexo does do BBQ but it is quite expensive. You have to pay for a minimum of 4 hour per chef and will need 3 chefs. The price will come to $7400 just for the BBQ plus the cost of the tent; last year the total combined was about $7500. Hamburgers and hotdogs brings it down a bit; we are planning on about $11,000; maybe it was closer to $9,000 last year (4 for food and 4 for tent). Other ideas were discussed such as the German American house, but turnout could be a problem. What about the Harriman campus? Or, we could do it inside in the ballroom, i.e., move it back inside. Why spend money on a tent? We could still do the BBQ food, but do it inside. The ballroom is better for people with disabilities. Motion to move the meeting back into the ballroom and have the BBQ inside. Discussion ensued. We need to think about the possibility of a contract meeting so perhaps time it with that. Could do a less fancy lunch too, such as a sub platter. Everyone was in favor, no one opposed and there were no abstentions.
c. Motion to give Joe Creamer and his wife a $50 gift out of Good and Welfare. Motion carried unanimously.

3. Announcements / Reports from Officers and Committees. None

4. Discussion of April Labor-Management meeting (notes attached). See President’s Report.

5. Statewide and Chapter Organizing Initiatives (Rob Trimarchi, Senior organizer).

UUP hasn’t done a lot of organizing, but the initial scare of Friedrichs started to trigger signing fee cards. With Janus, we hired from AFT a director of organizing and have hired 7 or 8 organizers from around the state and to help build up chapters’ organizing infrastructure. They are working with campuses and leaders to develop structures to start having conversations with as many people as possible – fee payer conversion is only part of it; the primary focus is to build relationships with members. AFT is helping us to set up a member to member program to build a base. Every campus was invited to attend a training on April 24. Participants went through a 4-hour training and were given a charge to speak with 10 people and build a membership organizing team; each person on that team will be asked to speak with 10 other members. It is an opportunity to map the campus and ask where are we light on the campus in terms of active members.

Aaron will send a list of remaining fee payers (about 50 people). Take a look at the list and reach out to them if you know them. Some remarked that in-person and paper cards are better. Teacher actions of late have been based on these organizing models and they require face-to-face contact not e-mail. We can build on the momentum of the rally and who were at our events but not active in UUP meetings.