

Article 22/25 Taskforce: Problem Statement, Charge, and Configuration

Problem Statement

The IFO/MnSCU Master Agreement mandates processes for Professional Development and Evaluation (Article 22) and also for Tenure, Promotions, and Non-Renewal (Article 25). On our campus, significant confusion about these processes exists: this confusion is confounded by various interpretations of contract language as well as outright violations of the contract. At this point, people of good will who are trying to follow mandated processes often simply don't know what they are supposed to do.

We need uniform processes that are in complete conformity with the IFO/MnSCU Master Agreement, and we need to lay these processes out clearly and in sufficient detail so that both faculty and Administration understand what they need to do to follow the contract as they move through the processes for Article 22 and 25. In addition, the current schedule for these processes is problematic in several respects. A schedule that permits more time for preparation and review of materials, and that conforms to the academic calendar, is needed.

Charge

The Article 22/25 Taskforce shall

1. **Identify the issues and problems concerning the current Article 22/25 processes.** In its assessment, the taskforce shall take into account the Description of Needs (taken from Meet and Confer Notes since 2004) listed below, the IFO/MnSCU Master Agreement, and input from the EC and the Administrative Meet and Confer team.
 2. **Come up with a plan for addressing these needs and issues.** In developing its plan, the taskforce shall form recommendations and procedures that conform with the IFO/MnSCU Master Agreement.
 3. **Develop a timetable for Article 22/25 processes that aligns with the Academic Calendar.** That calendar shall take into account the Problems with the Calendar listed below as well as input from the EC and the Administrative Meet and Confer team. Once this calendar for next year is agreed upon in Meet and Confer, it will set a pattern for subsequent Article 22/25 calendars
-

Configuration

The taskforce will be comprised of 6 people:

- 3 from Administration
 - 3 from EC
-

The Status of the 2004 FA/Administrative Agreement

Through the vehicle of the SCSU Meet and Confer ad hoc Article 22 Committee, during Fall 2004-Spring 2005, the FA and Administration worked together on sorting through issues concerning the Article 22/25 process. In response to this committee's recommendation, a document including local processes for Article 22/25 was agreed upon provisionally on September 14, 2004. In Meet and Confers during that academic year, this document was discussed as a local agreement that might become an LOU. Neither an MOA (a local agreement) or an LOU (an IFO/MnSCU agreement) was ever signed, and subsequent concerns with this document were raised by the FA.

In spring 2007, the FA brought forward an Article 22 and Professional Development Document from the IFO (Pat Arsenault) as the official FA position; the Administration said it preferred the 2004 document that FA considered provisional. (See the Recent History recounted later in this document.) In other words, we no longer have an Administrative/FA agreement.

Descriptions of Needs (taken from Meet and Confer Notes since 2004)

Article 22 -- Professional Development, especially PDPs and PDRs

- We need to shift the emphasis on campus from PDR to PDP so that professional development is encouraged and true mentoring takes place.
- We'd like to get departments really focusing on PDPs. Failure to do the PDP/PDR process within the department leads to big problems when we get to promotion or tenure decisions.
- We need a joint statement on the importance of taking the PDP/PDR process seriously from the first year of a probationary faculty's contract, especially focusing on PDPs. The plans need to be developed well. The departments need to review the plan and PDR very, very seriously.
- Having a little more time to complete the PDP/PDR process in departments would enable faculty/departments to get that process functioning the way it should be. For this reason, the timeline is really important. (See the Problems with the Calendar.)
- There is much confusion on campus about what the contract says. There is confusion about who makes the comments about PDPs and PDRs and where these comments go. There is confusion about the role of the chair in the PDP and PDR process. There is confusion about the nature of the consultation that Deans may have with the chair and the department. There is disagreement between Administration and FA and between MnSCU and the IFO on what the contract says.

Problems with the Calendar

- The calendar only allows 14 days of consultation for the departments on PDPs. There really isn't enough time for them to look at that plan and to do a real consultation because it is done right in the beginning of fall.
- There are only two contractual deadlines, so we would like to look at these fixed dates and adjust the others so that more consultation within departments can occur.
- We could look at an extended period of time for the PDP for new hires the first year, and by the second year, get them into a cycle very much like the 3rd and 4th years.
- Perhaps by looking at those first two years in a different way, we can have faculty truly embrace the consulting role we have with our non-tenured members.
- Deans have a contractual obligation to respond to Article 22 and 25 paperwork, and in some cases, that obligation is not being met in a timely fashion.

The document entitled "Background for Article 22/25 Taskforce" includes a short summary of actions (since 2000) concerning Articles 22/25 that are documented in EC and Senate Minutes as well as Meet and Confer Notes.