UUP Labor Management Meeting NOTES for November 20, 2024

Chapter Attendance: Pamela, Anna, Kelly, Janet, Sophia, Emma, Michelle Courture (LRS)
Management Attendance: Lindsay, Rob

Data requests are in **bold.**

University Budget

- On October 2, Sr. Vice President Julie Majak presented information to the University community regarding the 23-24 budget actuals and 24-25 projections. Regarding Personal Service Labor (PSR), 2023-24 PSR was $53,631,412 and 2024-25 is $61,320,972, a difference of $7,689,560.
- The chapter acknowledges that some of the difference could be for budgeted positions that were not yet filled; **we request a breakdown of the difference by category of employee (MC, UUP, CSEA).**
- **The chapter requests the number of employees and total 2024-25 salary budget for each of those categories (MC, UUP, CSEA).**

DISCUSSION: _The Chapter will review the data and get back to the management team._

Professional Workload

- The chapter has heard of professionals whose professional obligations are also measured in the number of students (advisers, for example).
- **What titles include this measure? The chapter requests a list of titles and a sample program.**
- What is the procedure for offering extra service to those employees whose load exceeds their obligation?

DISCUSSION: Lindsay explains she has not heard of anyone in the group being over their obligation except that one director proactively inquired about developing a process for extra pay service to get ahead of any issues should there be an uptick in workload due to enrollment increases. She would know when/if any extra work paperwork comes through. OP advisor groups do have the same headcount metrics tied to their work but she's not aware of other groups; they're actively working with director and Seana to discuss procedures for offering extra service, and how similar processes might be applied to the advisor group(s) across the board.

Rob explained that one of the benefits of the existing centralized model is to have equitable processes for these extra service pay processes for this group. *The Chapter requested to caucus.*

Faculty Workload Data Requests

- The chapter requests a list of all line faculty members who are teaching this year, showing:
    - Name
    - Department
    - Line percentage if not full time
    - Target and actual numbers for teaching credits
    - Target and actual numbers for mentee credits
- If this is not possible by the LM meeting, the chapter requests the priority be the list for part-time line faculty.

DISCUSSION: The chapter received the data from HR and will review it and circle back to management with questions. Rob explains that some of the workload overages were an unexpected carryover from previous years. *The Chapter (through Anastasia) points out that the majority of mentors in the data are over their loads. This kind of workload is not sustainable.* Rob explains that there are and will be some anomalies in what the data says, not because the data is wrong but because there is a story about that/those numbers that helps them to make sense. The path forward is to ensure that everyone is properly compensated for the work they're doing. *The Chapter will set up a meeting with Management and Chris Jackson about these numbers and anomalies, and another meeting w/ Management regarding the ongoing IP.*

Faculty Searches

Have part time faculty been encouraged to apply for the full-time faculty vacancies?

DISCUSSION: Lindsay explains that deans and colleagues have been encouraged to get the word out to PT mentors about opportunities; positions are also posted for all time find. Roc adds that in some cases PT mentors have ended up in the search pools, and sometimes in the final pools.

Faculty Reviews: *It was announced in the October 28 OIT Town Hall that the University is moving to an application called Watermark for faculty reviews.*

- When is the roll out, and how will it be tested?
  - Rob explains that we are already using this suite of products. One of the tools within Watermark is focused on faculty review and tenure. It's similar to a Lotus Notes based tool. There's a 20-person implementation team involved in working through transitioning to this tool. Plan to go live January 6.
- What are the plans for training on the program?
  - Training will occur prior to January 6. Training list will include deans, department chairs, and various other stakeholders including the 24 faculty up for promotion and/or tenure. The process for tenure/promotion review outlined in the Faculty Handbooks is being worked through in its existing order in Watermark. The goal is to have faculty trained on the new platform so that they can upload their documents into Watermark come January. This will involve using the existing E.R.F. in Lotus Notes for some stages and then having those files transferred over to Watermark so that only the faculty up for review and those who are working on the relevant IPRCs and APC are trained in Watermark for this review cycle. Additional training of all faculty will occur after we get through this year.
  - *The Chapter asks if Management can share any powerpoints or information about this conversion to help us to better understand the tool? We would like to avoid the kinds of issues that happened with the migration of the PE review process to the Interview Exchange.* Watermark will provide the training, but, as resources become available, they will be open for everyone's use.
  - *The Chapter asks for clarification about which documents will be migrated to Watermark and which will need to be uploaded?*
    - Rob explains that everything prior to Step 7 in the faculty review process will be put into the existing E.R.F. by referees and colleagues; these documents will then be transferred into Watermark by Connie Reynolds, who has taken over what used to be Sarah Cronin's position. Everything after that will be uploaded by the candidate into Watermark, which is very simple and will be covered in training.
    - *The Chapter asks that the management team consider the historic documents that will also need to be transferred into Watermark. At the very least, the previous two reviews need to be available as part of a candidate's portfolio. As well, all historic documents should be accessible if/as needed.*
- How was it determined to use this program? Is it used SUNY wide, was there a bid, does the University use this for other functions, etc.?
  - ???

- Will there be any loss of functionality, especially in terms of confidentiality in each step, be lost?
    - No anticipated loss of functionality. The app seems easy to use, and should help provide greater ease to the review process.
- Any improved functionality?
    - We expect that Watermark will allow for the automation of some parts of the process, making it easier to get candidates and their colleagues to enter elements at the required times.

The Chapter requests to be included in the implementation committee and training to better understand the conversion and process, and to assist in avoiding any issues. Rob agreed. Pamela will send names of people to be included in the training.

The Chapter suggests the creation and use of a checklist to ensure that every item that needs to be transferred into Watermark is transferred and that every step of the review process is followed/programmed into Watermark.

Mandatory Training Compensation for Adjuncts

The previous settlement has expired. How is the University compensating adjuncts who are required to attend mandatory training?

DISCUSSION: The Chapter asks if there's some mechanism for determining if an adjunct has already completed a SUNY or state training at another SUNY or another agency. **Lindsay doesn't know who works where else; however, anyone in this situation can simply contact HR to let them know they've completed the training and present official proof of completion for that state training.** HR is going to move forward with a cleaner options based pathway for completion of certain mandatory annual training, specifically the ethics training in order to get ahead of the aforementioned issue as well as timing issues since the new ethics training is now a synchronous training. Lindsay will send the Chapter a list of all of the mandated training for the Chapter to send out to members.

The Chapter asks how it's handled when an adjunct has completed their training but then their classes are canceled, or they have an appointment letter but no obligation? Lindsay explains that if they have not received a reply from an adjunct after multiple reminders to complete mandatory training and attempts to communicate, they infer this adjunct is no longer teaching with the institution. There's a lot of manual work that goes sifting through these lists, and every

possible good faith effort is made to communicate about these missing training. If someone is not under any obligation then they aren't under any obligation.

The Chancellor's Message & Potential National Changes (Department of Ed, for example)

The chapter would like to discuss preparations for what may happen to higher education funding, regulations, or other changes.

DISCUSSION: *The Chapter reaffirms its commitment to working with Management to advocate for SUNY Empire as policy changes inevitably impact funding for public education. Additionally, some pragmatic concerns have emerged for employees, information we collect for perspective students, student Visas, etc.*