

We are coming to a new phase of the Article 9 process, at least for some of the proposals. Two quick pointers, then some explanation.

1. Seven-day deadline to add materials. If your school has not yet received a 30-day extension for deliberations, you should submit any written materials you wish to be included in the package of materials known as the “program change plan” within the next seven days. These are the materials faculty will review when voting on these plans in departments, college committees, the FS, and GC. A prudent deadline for faculty assigned to proposed schools that have not qualified for an extension is **this Friday, February 16**. Send such materials to Associate Provost Dave DiLalla.

2. Extension votes. Faculty in schools whose makeup has changed may still have time to vote for an extension (on the FA reading of the CBA). So keep those votes coming if you want more time for your deliberations.

The FA believes that the 90-day clock should have restarted when the makeup of affected faculty changed in any proposed school. Such changes effectively produce a new proposal, which should have restarted the Article 9 process. This would mean that many proposed schools, even those that have not voted for an extension, are not yet at the 90-day deadline. But, as we’ve noted before, it is not prudent to assume that a grievance will be successful. Hence we are in the position of giving you advice about what is pressing, on the administration’s view of the contract (basically item 1 above), and what is still possible on our reading of the contract (item 2 above).

1. Adding materials to your file. The contract allows you seven days from the end of the 90-day discussion period in 9.04 (a period now ending for those without extensions) to submit documentation, including “dissenting opinions” and “written responses.” These will become part of the package known as the “program change plan,” which will be made available to all departmental faculty voting on your school proposal, to college level review committees, and to the faculty senate and/or graduate council, in the process outlined in 9.05.

Please pay careful attention to this deadline to assure the inclusion of these materials in the program change package going forward. In proposed schools who received program change proposals on or about November 13, and where the affected units have not shortened or extended the discussion period, we advise faculty to submit any additional materials they have to Associate Provost Dave DiLalla by **Friday, February 16**.

Individuals, groups of faculty, or units can supply such material. Letters previously sent to the administration or Board of Trustees could be included here as well. One key focus should be factors specific to your own school. The administration’s Article 9 proposals said almost nothing about the unique circumstances of individual units: this

is your opportunity to say why the school proposal works or does not work for your area in particular. You may also include any comments on the process in your area: did it go smoothly, or has implementation been confusing and chaotic?

As the FS, GC, and FA will be reviewing plans for each new school, which could include comments from every department involved, it would be a good idea to be as concise as possible, and to include charts, graphs, and/or bullet-point lists if you can. Make your comments easy to read.

This is also the time to ensure that you have shared with Associate Provost DiLalla all results of non-binding votes, minutes from meetings, and any other documents that capture relevant discussion during the review period.

The purpose in all of this is to assure that colleagues have the fullest possible information on which to base their votes as they review the proposed plans.

2. Extension deadline. On the FA reading of the CBA, the 90-day limit is not yet passed for any school whose makeup has changed. Faculty in such schools could therefore still vote for extensions. Such votes may become important should an arbitrator rule in our favor. At a minimum, they could be included in the materials included with the Program Change Proposal (if they are cast within the seven-day limit).

In solidarity,

Dave Johnson

President, SIUC-FA

FA [Website](#)

FA on [Facebook](#)

OFFICERS

Dave Johnson, President dmj2@me.com

Segun Ojewuyi, Vice President sojewuyi@gmail.com

Debbie Bruns, Secretary brunsdebbie@gmail.com

Joe Shapiro, Treasurer jps Shapiro@gmail.com

Dan Becque, DRC Chair mdbecque@gmail.com

COLLEGE REPS

Agriculture: Paul Henry p Henry@siu.edu

CASA: Sam Pavel spavel@siu.edu

CoEHS: Patrick Dilley pdilleyphd@me.com

CoLA: Anne Fletcher beasleybe@earthlink.net

Engineering: Open

Library: Phil Howze p howze@siu.edu

MCMA: Rob Spahr rspahr@siu.edu

Science: Randy Hughes hrhughes@siu.edu