



PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

American Association of University Professors

Promoting Quality Higher Education – An Investment in Oregon's Future

VIA EMAIL AND
PDF ATTACHMENT

Date: October 17, 2017

To: Shelly Chabon, PSU Vice Provost Academic Personnel chabonr@pdx.edu
Julia Getchell, PSU DAELR julia.getchell@pdx.edu
Carla Harclerod, PSU Associate Vice Provost cjh7@pdx.edu

From: Phil Lesch, Executive Director

C: Jose Padin, President jose.aaup@gmail.com
David Hansen, Vice President Collective Bargaining hansend@pdx.edu
Susan Tardiff, PSU Special Assistant to Vice Provost tardiff@pdx.edu
Hannah Miller, PSU Executive Assistant hmm9@pdx.edu
Sally Lajoie, OR ERB Mediator Sally.LAJOIE@oregon.gov

Re: CEASE AND DESIST implementation of changes to the evaluation of Advisors

It has come to our attention that Pathway Directors were told last week that they had permission autonomously develop their own unique methods and structures by which the advisers working under them will be evaluated. We know of one Pathway where the Pathway Director plans to implement a system called "a '360 degree evaluation' in which each of the advisers will need to solicit input regarding advisor performance from students, faculty from the departments they advise for, and from advising peers.

The likely outcome that there will be little consistency in the way that advisers are given performance evaluations across Pathways.

As you know, the evaluation of academic professionals is described in Article 18, Section 8. The evaluation procedures that have been developed upon the Article 18, Section 8 language are likely well established past practices. The administration does not have PSU-AAUP's permission to subvert the contract around advisor evaluation procedures, or to unilaterally alter established past practices around Advisor employment practices without our agreement. To do down this path, if what has been reported is true, after we have submitted a demand to bargain is probably an Unfair Labor Practice.

It is inappropriate for Pathways Directors to be given permission to develop their own advising methodologies at this stage of bargaining. Indeed, we have an interest in ensuring that the evaluation procedures are consistent, as are the standards upon which all advisors are evaluated and what has been reported is deeply antagonistic to PSU-AAUP's interests. As we have already agreed to bargain on the advising redesign implementation using IBB, we demand that all work to develop advisor evaluation methodologies be ceased immediately, and that the University desist in effecting any changes in any and all matters regarding advising redesign implementation that covers evaluation, any item in our CBA, or any item that even remotely addresses a matter dealing with wages, hours or conditions of employment.

It was our expectation that ALL matters in the Advising Redesign Implementation that involve bargaining items were to stop upon the presentation of our Demand to Bargain. As such, we reiterate that it is our expectation that any implementation items that fall within our subjects of bargaining that have commenced despite our demand to bargain be stopped immediately and that no action be taken until we are completed with bargaining.

Failure to immediately cease and desist as demanded in this letter could result in the Association filing an Unfair Practice Charge against the University, and/or the repudiation of our willingness to continue on this matter using Interest Based Bargaining. It will certainly have a long-term impact on the labor relations relationship.

We look forward to hearing from you.