
FAC'S SHEET

Newsletter of the University of Scranton Faculty Affairs Council
October 2013

October Meeting Set!

FAC Schedules Membership Meeting for October 8th in the McIlhenny Ballroom, TDC

The second FAC meeting for the 2013-2014 academic year is scheduled for Tuesday, October 8th in the McIlhenny Ballroom on the 4th floor of the DeNaples Center.

Lunch will be served beginning at 11:15 a.m. with the business meeting starting at 11:30 a.m.

The Executive Committee urges all members to attend. Check in the right hand column for the agenda.

FAC Meetings for 2013-2014

The FAC Executive Committee has scheduled monthly membership meetings for the upcoming academic year on the following dates and at the places indicated. All regular meetings are set for Tuesdays and begin at 11:30 a.m. Additional meetings may be called to address special issues or concerns.

October 8, 2013	Tues.	407 TDC
November 12, 2013	Tues.	509 Brennan
December 10, 2013	Tues.	407 TDC
February 11, 2014	Tues.	407 TDC
March 11, 2014	Tues.	407 TDC
April 8, 2014	Tues.	509 Brennan
May 13, 2014	Tues.	407 TDC

FAC'S SHEET

is published periodically by the Faculty Affairs Council at the University of Scranton. The editor is Betsey Moylan. Comments and suggestions from the membership are welcomed. Members may also check FAC's Web site at www.scranton.edu/fac for further information on the Faculty Affairs Council, an affiliate of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). Copies of the Faculty Contract and Handbook are found on the site.

AGENDA

for October 8th Meeting

1. Chair's Report - Michael Friedman
 - A. Preparing for Negotiations
 - B. FAC/Senate Department Chair Committee
 - C. FAC Forum on Shared Governance
 - D. Program Director Compensation
 - E. Administrative Changes
 2. Contract Administrator's Report - Kevin Nordberg
 3. Treasurer's Report - Dan West
 4. Grievance Officer's Report - Len Champney
 5. New Business
 - A. Visiting Assistant Professors
-

In Remembrance of Charles J. (Jerry) Thoman

By Paul Fahey

Jerry Thoman was a member of our Dept. of Chemistry and an important force within FAC during the early days of the union's formation. At the founding of the Faculty Affairs Council there were understandably strains between some of the Jesuit faculty who felt conflicted about unionizing when management had several of their brother Jesuits and the Board of Trustees has a large fraction of Jesuit trustees. At that time Jerry Thoman was Jerry Thoman, S.J. and he aggressively ran to be a FAC officer, won a seat, and aggressively served. He was important to the lay faculty in showing Jesuit support of the union and he was more than important in securing fair faculty contracts as a FAC officer/negotiator. During the negotiations in 1979, when inflation was quite high (double digit), Jerry was rock solid in making sure that the faculty did not lose buying

(Continued on Page 4)

Minutes from September 10th FAC Meeting

1. **Chair's Report** Friedman welcomed the new faculty and announced that all 18 have joined the union.

A. Preparing for Negotiations – Since we are heading into the second year of the 2012-15 Faculty Contract, it is time to start gearing up for negotiations again. The second year is spent gathering information from the faculty about their priorities for the next round of talks. This preparation consists of Town Meetings in the fall and a negotiations survey in the spring. Town Meetings involve a visit by one of the FAC officers to a department meeting to listen to the concerns expressed by the members of that department with regard to wages, hours, and working conditions. The FAC officers have divided up the 25 departments into five groups of five, and department chairs should expect to hear shortly from one of the officers about scheduling such a meeting. The Town Meetings are very open-ended and unstructured, but the survey in the spring will ask more pointed questions and attempt to gauge how important certain issues are in relation to others. The Executive Committee thanks the membership for participating in these activities, which are crucial to putting together FAC's positions for table talks.

B. FAC/Senate Department Chair Committee – Last semester, in response to the issues raised by the administration's Department Chair Concept, the Faculty Senate and FAC jointly established a faculty committee charged with examining the role of the department chair at the U. The working group of this committee met for the first time near the end of last semester, and members continued to communicate by electronic means over the summer. Those conversations produced a draft of a document detailing the duties of a department chair. This document has since been shared with the committee's response group, and once the response group replies, that feedback will be used to revise the document. Also, the working group is going to begin evaluating the arguments presented by the administration in favor of converting department chairs to administrators, and that material will be incorporated into the committee's final advisory report. The committee expects to have this report finished by the end of this term.

C. Ridge Row Lot Parking – Faculty members whose offices are in buildings adjacent to the Ridge Row lot may now park there on an unrestricted basis. Also, faculty members who cannot find faculty-reserved spaces in the other faculty lots may park in Ridge Row. There is no need to inform Public Safety if you do so.

D. FAC Forum Sept. 24 – As of today's meeting date, the Provost has not responded to the invitation for administrator attendance at the Forum. He will continue to press the Provost when they meet on Thursday and will inform the faculty via email of any commitment made at that time.

E. Merit Adjustments – All of the deans made the Sept. 1 deadline for the publication of the criteria and application procedures in their colleges. The criteria and procedures vary significantly from college to college, and the chair recommended that faculty members ask questions of the deans to make sure that they understand the process clearly. He urged all faculty to apply for these merit adjustments by the deadline of Feb. 15, 2014. For next year, the across-the-board increase will be somewhere between 1.5% and 3.0% depending upon inflation, but merit adjustments will be applied in addition to the ATB.

F. Program Director Compensation – FAC has received a request from the administration for an MOU to allow certain program directors to take their compensation in an alternative format. The Contract specifies that the minimum compensation for a program director is three credits of overload stipend and three credits of released time. Some faculty members have asked to be allowed to take their compensation as six credits of released time or as six credits of overload stipend, and the administration seems to be supporting their request. During contract negotiations, FAC argued that program directors should be allowed to take their minimum of six credits of compensation in whatever form best suited the needs of their program (all stipend, all released time, or a combination), but the administration refused to agree. FAC would like to advise all program directors that there is apparently a willingness on the administration's behalf to allow a little more flexibility than the contract suggests, and that program directors should discuss this matter with their deans, if some alternative arrangement would be preferable. Kevin Nordberg recommended that program directors refer to Article 36 in the Faculty Contract.

2. Contract Administrator's Report- Kevin Nordberg announced that Andrew Berger and Cristos Pargianas have agreed to serve on the newly reconvened Patent Subcommittee. Nordberg is in the initial stages of examining the new contracts of faculty members, and he reminded returning members to contact him if they see discrepancies in their raises this year. He also responded

(Continued on Page 4)

2013 AAUP Summer Institute Reflections
by Stacey Muir

This summer I attended the AAUP Summer Institute as the Rosenberg Grant recipient. As I wrote in my application, I had hoped to learn how to advocate for faculty rights and authority in the classroom, in curriculum, and in research; to learn how to be a better voice and leader; and to learn how to work more effectively with administration. I also anticipated that the Institute would give me ideas to bring back to FAC as we deal with challenges and opportunities that lie ahead of us. The Institute met many of my expectations and gave me some insight into some particular matters here. Throughout the entire Institute, and particularly in the workshops I attended on faculty advocacy, one of the things I found quite striking was the constant reminder of how academic freedom and shared governance are interwoven. In fact, one session on strengthening both shared governance and academic freedom protections on campus closed before registration was complete due to the interest that those related subjects generated! Throughout several workshops I attended, emphasis was placed not only on the protection granted to faculty to speak on matters of institutional governance, but also on our responsibility to engage in and critically examine our governance system. While a governance *system* at its most basic level is a structure that allocates authority, for this system to be productive, it must *share* the authority in a meaningful and honest way.

What was also clear from the Institute is the fact that the AAUP, and hence, FAC, do not stand in the way of shared governance. Rather they have a role as protectors and advocates for our rights to share governance. The AAUP is quite clear that institutional decision-making can have profound impacts on teaching and research, and therefore, for that simple reason alone, should involve faculty. Still beyond this reason, “grounds for thinking an institutional policy desirable or undesirable must be heard and assessed if the community is to have confidence that its policies are appropriate” [“On the Relationship of Faculty Governance to Academic Freedom,” AAUP Statement, p.143]. I found this idea to be a sound basis for guiding our ongoing conversations on what shared governance should be, and more than that, why we should have it. Moreover, in the AAUP “Statement on Government,” it is clear that collective bargaining provides an avenue through which all parties involved should work to “ensure appropriate governance structures which will protect the right of all faculty to participate in institutional governance” [p. 140].

Two other workshops I attended that I found incredibly useful dealt with contract campaigns. Discussions included strategies for effective communication, engagement, and action. My experiences up until the last negotiations were that they consisted of relatively cooperative give and take. Given our recent experiences, however, the discussions with faculty from other institutions and strategies they have employed successfully were quite insightful. Additionally, these conversations gave me ideas that I believe are transferrable to our university. Another workshop on advanced contract development issues related to distance learning showed me that we have done great work in these areas. It also gave me pointers on how to compose contract language to protect faculty rights regarding curriculum and pedagogy, and well as rights to the materials faculty produce.

Overall, the Institute reminded me of why shared governance is important, and it provided ways to defend faculty rights in all aspects of our university life, from teaching and research to institutional decision making. I also gained a great deal of encouragement from being around faculty who share some of the same concerns as us and have been successful in addressing them. It was easy to see that faculty caring about students goes hand in hand with caring about the direction of their university. I have already had fruitful conversations with union leadership and members since I returned from the Institute, and I look forward to many more as we head into our negotiation preparations this year and our continued conversations on the value and practice of shared governance.

Luncheon Menu for October 8th Meeting

- ***Vegan Butternut Squash Soup with Caramelized Pears***
- ***Three Green Salad with 2 dressings***
- ***Baked Salmon***
- ***Chicken Breast with Fresh Herbs***
- ***Grilled Fall Veggies***
- ***Lemon and Berry Squares***
- ***Coffee, Tea, Sodas, Water***
- ***Rolls and Butter***

Luncheon Service begins at 11:15 A.M.

Minutes from September 10th
(Continued from Page 2)

to an inquiry regarding funds for travel beyond the \$2,000 allocated to each faculty member. The Provost has the option of funding such travel at his discretion.

3. Treasurer's Report – Dan West detailed the various expenses that were paid out during the summer – AAUP, ARAMark, and legal fees. He also noted that signatures of three FAC officers are required for withdrawing funds from the union's UBS fund, making for appropriate checks and balances.

4. Grievance Officer's Report- Len Champney reported on a complaint and a grievance against the PCPS Dean regarding explanation for denial of released time following a sabbatical. Since the Faculty Handbook does not specifically state that a dean is required to provide a justification for such a denial, the issue will be included on the Faculty Handbook Committee's agenda during the fall semester.

5. Old Business - Michael Friedman

A. Service Criteria for Promotion and Tenure – The Handbook Committee continues to work on this important document and the officers hope to bring a revised version of the document back to the faculty for further discussion and a potential vote at some point during this semester.

6. New Business – Friedman explained that the two items distributed via email last week regarding Handbook revisions were now up for discussion and had the potential of being voted on since there was currently a quorum at the meeting. After a brief rationale for each revision, Friedman called the question on **Released Time Notification to Department Chairs and Personal Appeals to the President**. There was a unanimous vote on each item and the revisions passed. They will now be forwarded to the Provost and the Board of Trustees.

A question from the floor was raised regarding the 9:9 ratio for teaching that has been a suggested part of contract negotiations during the past several rounds. Data collection will be part of the preparation for negotiations and should allow for comparison with our peer institutions. The FAC Officers promised to keep the faculty apprised of any findings in this area.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:45 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,
Betsey Moylan

Thoman
(Continued from Page 1)

power. This negotiation was stressful and strained and it spawned the only public job action ever taken by FAC—a boycott of the graduation pageantry and processional. It was not a total boycott as the overwhelming majority of us attended, but not in academic attire. Following graduation the negotiations were quite tense with management threatening to hire replacement faculty for the fall. Tempers flared at this threat and management backed off. Eventually both sides were close enough that three of the five FAC officers/negotiators agreed to support and recommend to the faculty management's offer. One abstained (me) and one totally refused—Jerry Thoman. Obviously, Jerry would not see a nickel for himself. He was completely motivated to serve and support justice and fairness.

Thanks to Kristen Yarmey, I have been able to re-read some *Aquinas* accounts of that period that refreshed my memory of just how staunch Jerry was. You might get a sense of that era by following this link and reading the *Aquinas* articles in 1979.

https://royaldrive.scranton.edu/xythoswfs/webui/xy-44910137_1-t_TDTKq6F2

Thoman was so important as a negotiator because he was a superb numbers and statistics person. He built his salary arguments by ferreting out salary data for comparisons and by effectively presenting that data in argument. In that era it could be difficult to obtain salary and wage and financial data but Thoman somehow did. Our University management at that time did not share financial data. Thoman had ways. (Also, one of the negotiators would regularly go to the computer center to take home discarded print-outs for his kids' arts and crafts. On occasion, useful University financial data came for free from this recycling effort.) It is my recollection that Thoman started and produced the FAC newsletter—called FAC Bull—with an endearing happy bull face on the front. He could be exceptionally witty and he had great fun combining recent science to comically solve social problems. Eventually, Jerry fell in love with Grace Garrett Miller and he decided to marry and leave the University. He took an academic appointment in Texas and then from there one in Philadelphia.

In regard to FAC he was the right person at the right time.