

FACULTY COUNCIL
Minutes
Wednesday, December 16, 2015
3:00-5:00 PM – CLC 206, WTC; IC 332, LSC; Cuneo 405, SSOM

Members Present: Battaglia, G.; Bohanon, H.; Bryn, M.; Classen, T.; Conley, J.; Graham, D.; Holschen, J.; Jellish, W.; Lash, N.; Lombardo, R.; Melian, E.; Miller, H.; Morris, P.; Ruppman, T.; Shanahan, A.; Shoenberger, A.; Shriberg, D.; Singh, S.; Stemen, D.; Uprichard, S.

1. Meeting was called to order at 3:02pm by Tim Classen.
2. Approval of September minutes. Moved: Ruppman. Seconded: Conley. Motion passed 10-0-2.
3. University Senate (Classen): The September meeting of the University Senate was mainly concerned with issues involving the presidential search in the search committee, and with discussion of the new student demonstration policy. The November meeting spent its first hour on the presidential search, and the remainder on the demonstration policy.
4. SSOM/HSD (Uprichard): There was a “town hall” meeting at HSD last week, in which information on the BSI was presented and discussed. (Circulated memo.) BSI currently covers 60 faculty (a number which does not include junior faculty or senior administrators). Overall, I think the numbers suggest a rather generous system (perhaps one they cannot sustain as their salary pay out was 55% higher this year than past years). Out of the 60, 80% received an incentive, over and above their base pay plus supplement. 5% maxed out their incentive (\$40K). 8% remained even. 12% would have received cuts, had they been implemented this year; but the decision has been taken not to do so, at least this year. (This assumes that a three-year rolling average system for evening out variations is underway, but I will need to confirm this.)
 - Comment: even the 350 “base” points have to be certified by department chairs eligibility. But even if guaranteed, this amounts to only 29% of one’s former income. In addition, much of the point allocation one receives is out of the faculty members control. Six months into the year, only now is the “dashboard” for evaluation opening up for fiscal 2016. There have been reports of errors in information on the dashboard. SU: what about a survey to all faculty at HSD on the BSI system performance, perhaps in cooperation with the BSI committee and the Dean?
 - **Motion: Faculty Council calls for a survey to be composed, in collaboration between the BSI Committee, the Dean’s Office, and the Faculty Council representatives of SSOM, along with HSD research services, to capture faculty sentiment and views in response to the initial implementation of the BSI plan, and**

which will include data from the initial and “shadow years.”
Approved 18-0-1.

5. Chair’s Report (Classen):

- Presidential Search Committee: In the last month the search firm retained by the University (Isaacson Miller) held several “listening sessions” at HSD and LSC. Today we met to discuss the layout for the position ad. Next meeting will be in mid-February to discuss the initial raft of applicants (according to Parkinson, perhaps 40 in the initial pool; hoping to get this down to 10 by April).

6. SEIU/Faculty Forward issue:

- Hearings with NLRB have taken place (Dec. 2-7). We are still waiting on a decision. NTT faculty employed as of mid-November would be voting; 30% must approve for the balloting process to begin, then 50% + 1 of those who vote is the vote needed to form the union.
- There was an open forum last Monday, with Tom Kelly and David Prasse from the administration, and Matt Hoffman (Sociology), former grad student/SEIU rep. About 50-60 faculty attended.
- ***University administration positions:***
 1. FT & PT have different needs: so should the bargaining pool be split up? They have different benefit packages, experience, etc. (Are grad student adjuncts exempt?)
 2. SEIU originally sought to represent a portion of our full-time non-tenure-track and part-time graduate and undergraduate faculty (Adjuncts, Adjunct Professors, Adjunct Instructors, Adjunct Lecturers, Accompanists, Instructors, Lecturers, Lab Instructors, Senior Lecturers, and Visiting Faculty) who are working in some of the academic programs that are housed at our Lake Shore Campus, including the College of Arts and Sciences, the English Language Learning Program, and The Graduate School. At the hearing, the Union changed its position and stated that it wanted to represent a limited unit that included all full-time non-tenure-track and part-time faculty who are teaching in the College of Arts and Sciences, including those who may be teaching classes at the Water Tower Campus (Comp Sci & Criminal Justice). The Union also stated that it would no longer seek to represent faculty members in the English Language Learning Program, The Graduate School, or Visiting Faculty.
 3. The Administration’s position is based on our interpretation of NLRB case law, which requires that employees in the same voting unit share common terms and conditions of employment. Second, we believe that a unit of part-time faculty should not be limited to

the College of Arts and Sciences. Our position is that part-time faculty across the entire University, except the Stritch School of Medicine (which both parties agreed is excluded), should be able to participate in the vote.

4. Religious exemption – that we are seeking to preserve “freedom of religious institutions from government interference with regard to their religious mission.” (Is this argument really seriously intended by the admin? Do we provide a “religious educational environment”? Is the argument similar to the one claiming that birth control must be excluded from health insurance coverage (but still covered by BCBS)?)

5. The AJCU supports the Administration’s position.

- AAUP & History Dept have written letters expressing concerns over university administration’s response.
- Discussion: FC takes no position yet, pending outcome of NLRB hearing.

7. Handbook Revisions:

- Chapter 7.B.6 (pp. 5-6): Strike entire paragraph beginning with “Consideration by the Board of Trustees.” *Approved 16-0-0.*
- Chapter 7.B.3 (p. 4): First sentence changed to read: **“The Faculty Hearing Committee shall be comprised of five faculty members, of whom at least three will be members elected by Faculty Council from among its members, and of whom at most two may be faculty members who are not current members of the Council but who will have been nominated by its members on the basis of specialty or expertise.”** *Approved 16-0-0.*
- Chapter 7.B.4 (p. 4): In the second sentence, strike the words, **“with the President and”**. *Approved 15-1-0.* On legal counsel (p. 5), the first sentence of the second full paragraph should read, **“The faculty member may have the option of assistance by a fellow faculty member for counsel, or by legal counsel, whose functions should be similar to those of the representative chosen by the President, who may also have the assistance of legal counsel.”** *Approved 16-0-0.*

8. Motion to adjourn: Miller. Second: Battaglia. Meeting adjourned 5:05pm

Respectfully submitted by
Hugh Miller, PhD, Secretary