
THE FACULTY VOICE

The Newsletter of the FSU Chapter, United Faculty of Florida

Website: <http://www.fsu.edu/~uffinfo/>

FEA/NEA-AFL-CIO
Volume 16, No. 3

April 2001
Editor: Dan Kimel

The Need to Nurture Collegial Governance

Collegial governance has been the hallmark of outstanding institutions of higher education and research for more than two centuries. Collegial governance is a system in which the views of all of the major parties to a decision are seriously considered, and decisions are made by a process of consensus building. High level scholarship and high quality instruction both rely on an atmosphere of interdependent support and trust. It is for this reason that collegial governance is so important to the life of great universities.

Collegial governance stands as an affirmation that institutional control by an individual, or a small group of individuals, is not possible for institutions of higher learning. If we look deeply into the process of control and direction in the business sector, it is possible to see that even here individual control is an

of all of our own moods, desires, and behaviors. The idea of exerting individual control over the behavior of a large group of people is even less feasible.

March of 2001 saw the delivery of a memorandum concerning submission of student grades from the Office of the Provost. Retroactive to Fall 2000, a penalty of \$10.00 per student grade will be assessed against department funds for final grade rosters that are submitted after the Registrar's official deadline. Clearly the decisions leading to the development of this memorandum were not reached by a process of collegial governance.

April of 2001 saw the delivery of a draft memorandum from the Office of the Provost on the subject of "Promotion and Tenure." This memorandum announced a proposed policy, retroactive to Fall 2000, that **"if a department sends a candidate forward for promotion or tenure with a positive vote and that candidate is turned down for any reason at a higher level, the position and rate will revert to the Provost's reserve."**

The first matter is a university housekeeping policy, and is of interest only because it reveals a shift in the decision making process in the institution. The matter of promotion and tenure is at the very heart of the institution. If collegial governance is lost at this point, we can expect the trends toward development of a large trade school to quicken.

The Leadership Secrets of Attila the Hun has been a runaway bestseller business management book. The title is catchy. It gives the impression that a ruthless leadership style can lead to greatness in areas other than military campaigns. It should be noted that Attila did not found any great centers of learning or research. Attila's secrets will fail in a university environment because they do not contain the interdependent support and trust that are essential to both education and research.

UFF supports all aspects of collegial governance and decision making at the university. We are convinced that there is no viable alternative to a

In this issue....

Contract Ratification.....2

UFF/Administration
Consultation.....3

JOIN UFF

illusion.

Human institutions do not function in that way. As individuals we have a difficult time maintaining control

UFF-FSU Consults with University Administration

collegial decision making process. The reestablishment and redirecting of the collegial decision making process at Florida State is a task to which we all need to attend. As faculty, we speak to university leaders at all levels. We need to communicate our views on collegial decision making in a way that can be heard.

As we move into the era of independent university boards of trustees, we need to pay clear attention to the legislature and communicate our views on collegial governance and effective university administration. The University of California system is a great educational institution because the legislature in California has understood the basic idea that collegial governance works well in higher education. We need to develop that same idea in the Florida Legislature. In a period of high change it is possible to have maximum impact. Now is the time to act.

Join UFF.

Contract Ratification of BOR/UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement

History was made on 9 February 2001 when the United Faculty of Florida ratified its 2001/03 collective bargaining agreement with the Board of Regents. In all likelihood, this will be the last agreement made with the Board of Regents, at least in its present form. The new agreement will go into force on 30 June 2001 and remain in effect until 7 January 2003.

Records were broken at FSU, where more than double the usual number of faculty voted on ratification. Similar records were smashed at other campuses. For instance Florida Gulf Coast University, where multi-year contracts have been an issue, had over 60% of their bargaining unit vote on ratification. University of South Florida had an institution high turnout of nearly 500 faculty. Statewide, nearly 2000 faculty voted, for a participation rate of 24% of the bargaining unit.

Key provisions of the new agreement include:

Guaranteed minimum of \$600 for 9-month contract faculty.

General overall increase of approximately 3%.

Applicants for promotion/tenure now have opportunity to respond to material added above the initial level.

Phased retirement available after 6 years in FRS/ORP.

Retiree benefits will now include continued use of university e-mail address.

Faculty are now entitled to assignments that provide equitable opportunity for merit raises, effectively extending the application to full professors.

Faculty on sabbatical will now be able to supplement their income (to a total of 100%) from grants administered by the University.

Future negotiations will likely be conducted between members of the faculty and representatives of the yet-to-be named FSU Board of Trustees. If you have an interest in becoming part of the bargaining process, the Executive Board needs to hear from you. Training will be made available next fall, and there will be opportunities for exchanging with other campuses strategies and ideas. Join your bargaining team today!

UFF-FSU Consults with University Administration

On 27 March 2001, members of the UFF-FSU executive committee met with representatives of the FSU administration, pursuant to article 2.2 of the Collective Bargaining agreement. This thrice yearly consultation (once each semester) is an opportunity for both sides to discuss with one another topics of mutual interest and importance, and Spring semester 2001 was no exception. The first item on the agenda and probably the minds of many faculty was the timetable for the establishment of the local FSU Board of Trustees. It is most probable that new boards of trustees throughout the state will assume responsibility for their respective institutions between 1 July 2001 and 7 January 2002. During that time, a working group will be established to handle the responsibilities which will be devolving down to the local level. Regarding the constituency of the Board of Trustees, there is little criteria for nomination to it. At least two members of the eleven member board will be from outside of Florida, and a majority of the members cannot be from the local county, in our case, Leon County. Names are being forwarded to Governor Bush, who will appoint individuals, with confirmation of the Florida Senate.

In the area of establishing a negotiating environment, it was pointed out that FSU will have its status changed to that of a corporate entity as of 1 July this year. Since the UFF local chapter has already identified its bargaining team, both sides are prepared to bargain locally. However, the possibility was pointed out that the upcoming economic reopener contract for 2002/03 may be bargained state-wide, as many other SUS campuses will probably not have their own boards of trustees in place. Either way, the chapter and the administration are prepared to bargain.

The question of interim contract enforcement arrangements was raised. When the Board of Regents dissolves in July, the status of Step 2 grievances (that is, grievances resolved at the BOR/UFF level) is thrown into question. It was agreed that Christopher Gorsuch, grievance committee chair for UFF-FSU and Neil Betten, administration representative for contract enforcement, would meet to solve procedural problems as they arise, and to develop a successor procedure to the existing Step 2 arrangement. It was also agreed that release time for this summer for the purpose of contract enforcement would be acceptable; future release would be subject to local negotiation.

University policy in evaluations was the subject of some discussion. It was brought to the attention of the UFF-FSU executive committee that tenure-earning faculty were being given insufficient notice of deficient performance, or at least insufficient remedy on how to improve performance. It was agreed that it was not good practice to not continually inform faculty on their progress toward tenure. A letter from the university administration to the various deans and department heads will be issued, reminding them of the importance of the timeliness of evaluative feedback, particularly in the case of tenure-earning faculty.

The final topic for discussion was the promotion and tenure of minorities and women at FSU. The UFF-FSU executive committee has become aware of a great body of anecdotal evidence regarding the denial of tenure to minorities and especially women. While the individual incidents of tenure denial can be appreciated, it is difficult to detect any pattern of discrimination without some statistical basis. As these statistics are not presently kept, it was agreed that Dr. Susan Losh, Associate Professor in Educational Research and Dr. John Kalb of the Budget and Analysis office would collaborate to produce statistics regarding the ethnicity and gender of assistant and associate professors applying for promotion/tenure during their respective years in rank. This will be done for all faculty applying between fall 1999 and spring 2001. It is anticipated this data will reveal any patterns in denial of tenure based on gender and/or ethnicity and whether it is statistically significant.

Due to the rapidly deteriorating status of the Board of Regents, it is anticipated that there may be a consultation during this summer, possibly before 1 July. Faculty who wish to have topics brought up for consultation, and who could also assist in their presentation are more than welcome to contact any member of the executive committee.