Executive Committee Minutes

8.27.2018


1. Approval of minutes from May EC meeting (attached). Moved and seconded. Motion carried with 3 abstentions.

2. Motions for funding

   a. Motion to fund lunch for the EC. Moved and seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

   b. Motion to approve $150 discretionary funds to President for ancillary expenses. Moved and seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

3. President’s Report – See attached

   a. Summer labor-management issues – Haven’t met formally since May but have been meeting informally. Question about increased teaching loads in the SPH. Gathered historic data about what people have been teaching in the past and presented it to management. May file an improper practice charge against the university. The SPH may adjust their Spring teaching load and/or pay people for extra teaching service. A member mentioned that this speaks to the importance of training needed for deans, directors, etc.

   b. Discussed President Rodriguez and his open door policy that we can leverage as well as his focus on resolving the budget deficits at the university. He wants to
centralize things at the university and get rid of inefficiencies. A member mentioned that we want to watch out for what this might mean but it might be a good thing to diffuse the power that deans have.

c. Increase in parking fee. We have had a conversation about it requesting an end to this increase and to offer refunds. It was noted that many universities have much higher parking fees.

d. Pay bill has passed. This should help us get our raises on time.

e. General Membership Meeting, Fall DA – Discussed details of the meeting. Motion to fund the meeting ($18 per person x about 300 people). Motion to fund was moved and seconded. Passed unanimously, no abstentions.

f. Deborah LaFond would like to have a conversation about how we do the minutes and Aaron noted that he will put that on the next agenda.

g. DA in Buffalo – one of its foci will be on organizing and membership building.

4. Announcements / Reports from Officers and Committees

a. There was a professionals meeting last week in which they discussed salary, workload, and other issues. Reminder that professionals are part of the faculty and a lot of people don’t know it. We will do a campaign to help people know.

b. Budgeting post-Janus. We don’t have fee payers anymore. Allison discussed budgetary guidelines and noted that we can proceed with the budget we developed in the Spring. Regarding the supplementary allocation proposals, chapters had to reduce their proposals. It’s unclear if allocation will go up or not. Seems like we will be in good shape from a budgetary perspective this year.

c. Strategic Plan Implementation - Marco is our representative. They have met 3 times. SP was unveiled in April and the implementation phase is happening now, led by Stellar and Christakis. We fought them and were able to choose a representative. There are 20 members on the committee. Been meeting once per month. They don’t seem to have a well-thought out plan. Schools and units were asked to submit their action plans. Cost is $40 million but yet there is a budget crisis. This led to a budget presentation by Todd Foreman. The numbers do not
They say that “they were expecting more support from the state,” though they are not saying it is UUP’s fault anymore. Proposed something like a Compact Planning process. Marco said that it seems like a waste of time if it’s not going to be funded. They said that maybe they can come up with $500,000 to $1,000,000. Discussed the idea of just putting the money into the website. After the meetings, 3 deans and 1 chair approached him and said they appreciated his comments, that the things he said were things they were thinking but didn’t want to say out loud. Underscores how important it is that we fought to be at this table. We need to attend and speak up at such meetings. It’s a very deadening managerial culture. Aaron mentioned that Todd said he would come and present the budget to this group.

d. Funding request from the Solidarity Committee. See attached from Larry Wittner for Mark Brenner and Labor Day Picnic. Jim Collins spoke in support of both events. Motion to spend $250 carries unanimously with no abstentions.


a. Member engagement, new cards – Bring positive programming to all the members and help engage members. We don’t get dues from new members who don’t sign a card. Only 2 or 3 people have actually reached out to Aaron wanting to opt out of the union.

b. Contract implementation, DSA/DSI money – Re: DSI, there is .5% that is at the discretion of the campus President. This is money on base. Aaron proposed making a plan as a unit and presenting it to the Administration. Faculty may want to address this at the departmental level. Professionals perhaps will want to address longevity issues, etc. and there are already proposals on the table re: contingent raises. We have until next Fall to give the President direction. Also, we will want to monitor the spending of the equity/compression money once it is being implemented. Question was raised as to whether management is going to want us sticking our nose in this? Probably not. We will have to make a case and push for this. We have articulated a set of principles for years now. A lot of academics like the idea of merit, but they don’t realize that the administration is often rewarding their favorites and so it’s not really based on “merit.” We could collect feedback on this topic through our existing committee structures. Another thought was to at least ask for transparency in the process.
Regarding the DSA money in December, we could offer a proposal to the membership. We have $1.4 million. It would cost $300,000 to bring contingents up to $4000 and years of service payments. For full-timers, we could fall back on equity but there is also the issue of years of service. For those who have worked 7 or more years, they would get more. We could come up with a concrete plan. (If we can get somewhere with this, then it could influence how we move forward with DSI).

Re: DSA, there is enough to give something to everyone. We would have to have a proposal by the time of the general membership meeting for a vote. We want the full support of the membership. They will need to know this is on the agenda in advance and/or see the language in advance. The inclination is to build on principles of equity with modifications re: longevity. It puts some pressure on them to identify what their principles are. Also important to remember that a flat fee benefits the lowest paid. Also, the simpler the better as HR has had trouble implementing these kinds of things in the past. It was noted that there is nothing in this contract that says it has to go to contingents. Will circulate 2 options to the EC– flat amount for everyone and flat amount + longevity, in order to bring a vetted proposal/s to the membership.

c. Preliminary committee assignments – See attached. Motion to approve and seconded. Passed unanimously with no abstentions.