**UUP Executive Board - Meeting Minutes**

**Meeting Information**

**Meeting Date/Time:** 10.5.20 at 12:00 - 1:00 p.m.

**Meeting Purpose:** Meeting of the Executive Board UUP SB West Chapter

**Meeting Location:** Virtually with Zoom

**Note Taker(s):** Jackie Donnelly

**Chapter Attendees** (voting members\*): Dominique Barone, Diane Bello, Alissa Betz, Paula Di-Pasquale-Alvarez\*, Jackie Donnelly\*, James Doyle, Josh Dubnau, Crystal Fleming\*, Nancy Gaugler, Jeffrey Heinz\*, Shoshana Hershkowitz\*, Odaliz Hernandez, Jennifer Jokinen\*, Nick Koridis\*, Richard Lakowski, Ken Lindblom, Pam Matzner, Charles McAteer\*, Liz Montegary\*, Laura Pellizzi, Ed Quinn\*, Arty Shertzer, Joe Simonetti, Andrew Solar-Greco, Francesca Spedalieri\*, Jan Tassie, Rich Thailer, Diana Tischler, Jason Torre, Colleen Walsh, Frederick Walter, Lisa Willis, Judith Wishnia\*, Pam Wolfskill\*, Charles Wrigley\*, Martha Zadok

**1 - Call to Order -** Ed Quinn (EQ), Chapter President calls the meeting to order.

**2 - Adopt Agenda -** A call is made to adopt today’s agenda. Motion - Seconded.

**3 - Approval of Executive Board Meeting Minutes (**[**Sept 10th**](https://docs.google.com/document/d/16UNmnFJy_ZfNFUAvA8UjvnWR4MJ5sp7qzclFUtfstJM/edit) **&** [**Sept 24th**](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1iQVD-MKvsRgERCCVkM1a5fWzAHGOWq7BmirBYjg6nK8/edit)**)**

A call is made to approve executive board meeting minutes as outlined above - motion made, seconded. No discussion, approved “as is” - no changes requested.

**4 - COVID Testing on Campus - Management Meeting with Campus Union Presidents**

Josh Dubnau (JD) - Good meeting in general regarding testing. Reviewed the MOU that was signed between UUP and SUNY - UUP employees will be tested no less than students. Resident students are currently being tested once per week. Need clarification on testing frequency as there is discrepancy between press release and what was discussed in this meeting. Was a good start, need to discuss where the testing will be, cost to employees - should be no fee, but employees may need to provide health insurance for follow up care just in case.

EQ - They are looking at the student activities center as a potential testing site. There is no cost for pool testing. If there is a positive in the pool and that group needs to be retested, is there a cost?

JD - No cost to employees either way. Just need to clarify whether follow up would go on insurance or is it paid for by SUNY.

EQ - In terms of notification, you will be provided with a letter stating you need to get tested.

JD - Overall, we are moving in the right direction, but I do have some concerns that we might be too late given the increase in covid in parts of NY. They are trying and making good efforts, but there are issues we can advocate for.

EQ - At the Stony Brook Council meeting, it was mentioned that they are setting up a second site on campus for testing.

Dick Lakowski (DL) - I’m here on campus every day and I utilize the gym. I fill out the campus clearance form every time, and that is what allows me to stay on campus and use the gym. I’ve never been tested on campus before. Should we be concerned? Should you be concerned Ed?

EQ - Testing for employees was just approved, and we needed to negotiate the terms. Moving forward, there will be a randomized list of employees to be tested.

Fred Walter (FW) - If we will be selected randomly, how will we be notified? I’m on campus two days/week, so will I have to come on a day I am not here?

EQ - I will have to ask, but I imagine they will ask about when you are on campus.

**5 - Professional Grievance Officer**

EQ - As we all know, Dominique stepped down as the Professional Grievance Officer (PGO), and we need a replacement. I want to put forward the appointment of Arty Shertzer. I would like to put that forward and perhaps Arty would like to say a few words.

Arty Shertzer (AS) - When this came up, I thought it would be a good thing to do. I have been sitting in the background, but I am concerned that if the federal election goes the wrong way and we do not get funding that the budget gap will be enormous.

Several members express concern vocally and in the chat that Arty is currently retired and question whether or not he can serve in this position.

Charlie McAteer (CM) - Arty is retired, but we had Marlene Brennan work previously as PGO as a retiree and did an excellent job. Arty is well-versed in the contract. When we had an issue in the past with the President wanting to shut down the Southampton campus, Arty did a lot to save jobs. Until June 1st, I think he will be a good fill for that position. Lisa also knows this drill and can work with Arty.

JD - Asks about process. Shouldn’t we be having a discussion about this? And if we are discussing, shouldn’t Arty be asked to leave the room? This has been past practice.

AS - Why should I leave? You can say what you want, I can take it.

JD - We agreed that we would discuss vacant officer positions at an executive board meeting and that members would be given an opportunity to express interest as we have done with other officers. Ed, I reached out to you many times via email about filling this vacancy, and as Academic Grievance Office and co-chair of the Grievance Committee, I would like to be actively involved in the discussion. I have never heard about this. It would have been nice to have the opportunity to chat with Arty, we don’t know each other. There is a lack of process, a lack of discussion, and a lack of courtesy. I would like to make a motion to challenge/appeal the ruling of the presiding officer according to Robert’s Rules.

EQ - For process, this applies only to elected officers. This is an appointed position. This is defined very straightforwardly in our bylaws.

Jeff Heinz (JH) - Echos Josh’s position on process. Regarding elected officers and appointed officers, the procedural policy passed by the E-Board in Spring does not make that distinction. So with an appointed position, there is no election, but it was agreed upon that it would go through the process of soliciting interest from all members. I’m disappointed that you didn't reach out to members, the other officers, or to Josh.

Odalis Hernandez (OH) - We should be able to have an open discussion about transparency in this organization.

JD - Robert’s rule here, it’s my understanding that this needs to go to a vote and there is no discussion. Ed, you are ignoring my motion to challenge the presiding officer. This calls for an executive board vote. I need a second.

Paula DiPasquale-Alvarez (P-DA) - This was discussed at the last meeting.

JD - I am challenging the President. I just need a second.

EQ - The process is that the Chapter President appoints the Grievance Officers. We cannot change the bylaws. We are not changing the bylaws.

JH - We already worked out how to fill a vacancy. This should have been on the agenda.

I second the motion to challenge the presiding officer.

Ken Lindblom (KL) - We need proof from a parliamentarian that we do not need discussion. Josh is claiming a rise to challenge does not allow for discussion. Clearly people want to speak to this. We should allow that discussion to unfold.

Liz Montegary (LM) - Asks for clarification of existing procedure/past practice in order to move forward.

JH - Posts in the following in the chat:

**POLICY: Procedures for Filling a Vacated Chapter Officer Position.**

**Executive Board Approved: April 29, 2020**

**As per the Chapter bylaws a vote will be taken to determine whether the Executive Board decides to have a special election or to appoint an individual to fill a vacancy of a chapter officer’s position. If an appointment is decided, the appointment will take place at a subsequent Chapter Executive Board meeting; henceforth “the meeting”. All interested persons would submit their name and credentials to the chapter president and the chapter secretary at least 5 days prior to the meeting. The chapter secretary will send those names and credentials to the members of the Chapter Executive Board and their names will appear on the meeting agenda under the agenda item on the appointment. Only in the event no one submits their name 5 days prior to the meeting may someone at the meeting nominate themselves or another individual present at the meeting.**

JH - This should hold, and this calls for an announcement to the membership.

EQ - That process was called to address vacancies for elected positions - to hold a special election or for the e-Board to appoint that position. This procedure is defined in the bylaws.

Fred Walter (FW) - I’ve looked up Robert's Rules and appealing a ruling by the chair, and it states that it “*is debatable unless the immediately pending question is not debatable.”* Not sure what that means. The bylaws state that the president can appoint with approval. Although the chapter president has the right to appoint this position, the fact is that it is subject to approval.

JD - I withdraw my comment about not needing a discussion. Clearly we are having that now and I believe in democracy, so we should be able to discuss.

EQ - I did mention it at the last meeting. I did send something out to the executive board. Let’s vote on the motion.

**Motion/Vote: A vote of “yes” indicates that you support Josh’s call to challenge the ruling by the chair to appoint a grievance officer without following the procedural policy passed by the executive board last spring. A vote of “no” indicates that you support the chapter president in appointing a grievance officer as he affirms it is “stated in the bylaws.”**

**Vote Count: 7 YES & 6 NO (Votes of “Yes” - Jackie, Jeff, Shoshana, Jennifer, Liz, Francesca, Judy; Votes of “No” - Diane, Paula, Nick, Charlie, Arty, Chuck).**

Jackie Donnelly - Confirms count of 7 “yes” and 6 “no” votes.

Charlie McAteer - Confirms count as outlined above.

EQ - My vote is “No” - therefore it is a tie of 7-7 and so the challenge does not pass.

Members question the appropriateness of the Chapter President voting on this motion as it is directly challenging his ruling as presiding chair. According to Robert’s Rules, this is permissible.

EQ - I now call for a vote on the appointment.

JH - Can we now discuss the appointment? Can the candidate leave the room so that members can openly and frankly discuss the position?

EQ - There is nothing to discuss.

Crystal Fleming (CF) - My apologies for coming to the meeting late, but I am currently teaching my graduate seminar and we are on a quick break. I am catching up on what is happening in this meeting and it is my understanding that Ed you are trying to appoint a grievance officer without a proper discussion and approval from the executive board. I am unable to stay in the meeting as I need to get back to class, but I would like to voice my concerns and if called upon to vote, I would like to register my vote as “no” as I do not support this

EQ - You are not eligible to vote if you are not present in the meeting.

CF - States was concerned that the proposed candidate for PGO was allegedly accused of misconduct and does not feel comfortable moving forward with this nomination. Wants to express her opinion clearly before returning to class. States a discussion about the appropriateness of this appointment is needed, and the executive board should have the right to weigh in on this important decision.

Proposed appointee for PGO, Arty Shertzer, is asked to leave the room again for a discussion to take place. Arty is placed in the zoom waiting room after Ed agrees.

JH - Agrees with Crystal. I was not here when Arty served in the chapter but I did hear about allegations of misconduct that are being referenced. That raises a red flag. This is something that we should be able to discuss openly and in a democratic and transparent way.

Judy Wishnia (JW) - Arty has never come to an executive board meeting since the last election, and he is a voting member. He has not been involved in anything from what I see. This vacancy should go before the entire membership to try and fill it.

JD - Isn’t it the case that if you miss a certain amount of meetings, you can be removed? I have never seen him at a meeting.

Ed - That is part of the proposed bylaws changes. We do not have this as part of our current bylaws.

OH - States that she is incredibly disappointed with how things are being run in this meeting and in the union currently. As a woman, a Professional, and a Board member without a vote, I only have my voice. I am strongly opposed to this person as PGO. His name was not mentioned on the agenda, nor was the fact that an appointment would be voted on. We are using loopholes to make decisions on matters that are of such importance to our members. What happened to democracy? Ed, what you are doing affects people. This person decides to show up to today’s meeting conveniently. This is wrong and I am disappointed.

Dominique Barone (DB) - Expresses disappointment in the Chapter President and states that she immediately informed him by messaging him privately on Zoom once he announced the name of the person he was putting forward, and is concerned of the potential impact this appointment could have on the chapter.

CF - Can we postpone this as we are obviously running out of time?

JD - Yes, it is obvious we will need to table this until the next executive board meeting.

JW- Ed when you sent out this request, it should have gone to the entire membership to solicit interest. I would like to motion that this needs to be tabled and then go to the membership before we discuss at the next meeting.

JH - I second the motion. The announcements should include a blurb describing the position, its responsibilities and so on.

EQ - Okay, let’s bring your motion to table Judy.

Andrew Solar-Greco (A-SG) - I agree with Judy and Jeff here. We need to follow past practice where we solicit interest, we ask for a paragraph of interest that is shared ahead of the meeting, etc. I would add that Ed consult with the officers on this before it goes out and notice be clear that interested parties contact the chapter secretary and chapter president, as per past practice.

EQ - I don’t think we need to take an official vote on Judy’s motion. All in favor of the motion (all members agree) - no objections or abstentions. The motion passes and we will table this until the next meeting which is scheduled for November 10th. Motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded.