

The AAUP meeting of the Executive Committee was called to order in Rm. 110 Math Sciences building at 10:15 a.m., May 1, 2010. Those present were Stephen Montgomery Smith, Jason Aubrey, Sudershan Loyalka, Rainer Glaser, Andrew Twaddle, Galen Suppes and Victoria Johnson. Tribune Reporter Janese Heavin, and Phebe Nichols were also in attendance.

Victoria called the meeting to order and Jason gave an update regarding his and Nicole Monnier's efforts to organize non-tenure faculty. The group now has a blackboard site where they are collecting information. A meeting scheduled for next Friday, when they will vote for the NTTP representatives. The collected rules indicate that the non ranked NTTP are non-inclusive of University faculty rules. However, their rank within the personnel pool is an issue, particularly in Extension, and there are a large group of people who have not been reclassified. Each campus will determine their unranked guidelines. Victoria will go to faculty council to determine if this could be put on the agenda for discussion. It was recommended that the AAUP be contacted to see what their position is. The question was also raised as to their status on the EOC reports that come from Personnel. Jason inquired if it was the goal to have non-regular faculty ranked or unranked, and he has had no response. It was suggested that the long term temporary people be ranked, but our focus should be all non regular faculty. It was suggested that a simple motion be created so that NTTP are inclusive with faculty; then the administration will react. Teaching tenure or research tenure is on record, but a position that is being used over and over, each year, should not have a non-regular status. FC's position is that NTTP should be ranked to vote, but it could be changed. Dean's sole decision making properties of positions becomes a problem when they have total control of tenure track status. It is becoming apparent that faculty are not included in the decision making process, and for an institution to be in financial straights and ignore hiring procedures is unacceptable. The FC rules would need to be changed, before the Collected Rules could be modified. Candidates for the positions are teaching, research and clinical - they have eight candidates. It was recommended that we not be aggressive, and continue to collect more information. We could decide by the fall whether we wish to put this on the agenda.

Sudershan reported on the review committee results; he indicated that policies that have been followed in the past are not being followed. The external review was completed, it was his position that it contained good people, and the committee is writing their report. The concern is that the report will not be reviewed by the unit; so there is the potential that practices are not being followed. They were asked to review all units on campus, but departments were assigned in a very ad hoc fashion at the Provost level. We may end up w/a very good review in the end, but the concern is the result will not be productive. How do we impress upon administration that they must stick to processes, and must be held accountable? Brady Deaton was aware of the process from eight years ago. For accreditation, the department should have one week to correct facts stated in the report, and there is a two week allowance to make corrections for deficiencies. A major concern is that the policies as posted in the Collected Rules are not being followed. There appears to be a secrecy associated w/the process. Is there something concrete that we can pursue? We must address the arbitrary decisions, and power that Administration appears to possess in this process. Discussion ensued with a consensus that this be addressed, and a suggestion was that a sub-committee evaluate violations of policy. Simply put, here is what was done, and here are the concerns we have – document, and post the results. When there is a

list of 20 concerns, then there should be contact w/Administration. A good narrative must be in place so that their one success cannot weld power over 10 plus failures. The Committee concurred that the suggestion is a good idea. It was recommended that a sub-committee talk to the participants, and give substantial documentation to recommend and support a vote of no confidence after sufficient reports of ineffectiveness. The climate of intimidation may be argued as well by collecting these stories. It was suggested that Steven and Rainer serve as a standing committee to review these incidents. It was suggested they could call in a servant to collect and document the case. They will ensure the issues are well investigated, documented and brought before the Executive Committee prior to action.

FC made determination that on-line courses would be bottom up; and the issue is that parents are complaining that they didn't send their sons/daughters to MU to take on-line courses. The executive committee will continue to monitor this situation.

The third agenda item was tabled, as the person believed that progress was being made in their direction. The faculty must stand up and object to funneling their hard fought grant dollars to another.

Sudershan commented that he has a meeting w/Tim Rooney on Monday, and Tim has prepared budget information on each department, which will be posted. Sudershan will make report after his meeting.

Call for elections was proposed and Executive Committee members who do not attend were addressed. Some have been out of the state, or are involved in court cases, and will attend in future. It was recommended that we check w/the non-attending members to ask if they wish to continue. Stephen suggested that we only elect officers, i.e., Pres, VP, Secretary, Treasurer; and motion was made by Sudershan that the same people be retained. The motion was seconded by Victoria, and passed by acclamation.

There being no further business to conduct, the meeting was adjourned at 12 noon.

Respectfully submitted, Phebe Nichols