

**Bargaining Team Meeting Notes  
November 10, 2011**

Participants: Darlene Andert, Steve Belcher, Lois Christensen, Sue Putnam (observer), Joan Glacken, Maddy Isaacs (facilitator), Jeff Kleeger, Kathy Miller (note taker), Monika Renard, Hudson Rogers, Jim Wohlpart

The Team met for Interest Based Bargaining (IBB) training beginning at 9:30 a.m. After the IBB training, bargaining ensued.

Meeting notes of October 18, 2011 were reviewed and approved as amended. There were no substantive changes.

Steve agreed to send an Outlook update message regarding upcoming IBB meetings.

Maddy began the session by identifying the four open Articles:

Article 17 Leaves

Article 20 Grievances

Article 23 Salaries

Article 24 Benefits

Hudson asked if this was all that will be addressed during this round of bargaining. Maddy stated that the UFF reserved the right to open Article 31.2 at a later date. She said that Article 31.2 can be opened on an annual basis but the Union is not choosing to open it at this time but may decide to reopen it later.

Hudson questioned whether Article 31.2 could be opened after the dates specified in Article 29 for opening Articles. Discussion ensued about whether Article 31.2 is subject to the conditions in Article 29. Maddy said that the UFF view is that it was not subject to Article 29 and could be re-opened at any time during bargaining. She said that the Union asserts it has the right to open Article 31.2 although, at this time, it does not intend to open it but may re-open it later depending on how things progress.

Steve talked about the intent of setting a date for reopeners. He said that the idea was to get everything on the table for consideration. He suggested that knowing Article 31.2 can be re-opened at any moment would affect bargaining and that we need to agree when it is no longer under consideration. Hudson said that re-opening Article 31.2 as we progress through the re-opened articles places a cloud over the contract negotiations. He said that makes it difficult for him to work through each article, getting a "thumbs up." He said that it is saying, if there is no agreement on items we want then we will re-open Article 31.2. He said that he will have to decide how to proceed under such conditions if it was determined that Article 31.2 was not subject to the timeline established in Article 29. Steve said that we can negotiate on the re-opened articles without calling for TA because if Article 31.2 is subsequently re-opened it can have an impact on the prior agreements and language for the re-

43 opened articles. Jim said that management believes the Union's assertion that there is not currently a  
44 plan to re-open 31.2, but recognize that there is a possibility that it may be re-opened. Hudson added  
45 that while he was not speaking for the entire management team he just wanted to make it known that  
46 he sees not placing everything on the table as impacting the way he will approach bargaining.

47

48 Steve suggested beginning discussions with Article 20 Grievances. He said that he views the other three  
49 articles (17, 23, and 24) as all having financial implications and it is his intention to address those in a  
50 holistic manner. He said that the legislature will also be in session and we may have better information  
51 about budget and other legislative actions. Maddy agreed and said that UFF will also raise the issue of  
52 domestic partner benefits when addressing the benefits article.

53

54 Discussion of Article 20 Grievances ensued. Maddy indicated that the Union's main concern is to make  
55 sure that faculty rights for substantive due process hearing are not interfered with by minor procedural  
56 due process procedures. She expressed concern that the current process seems to be set up to help  
57 administration deflect genuine grievance issues based on minor procedural problems such as the  
58 timeline and required signatures. Maddy emphasized that the Union's role is to protect rights under the  
59 CBA, not necessarily to protect individuals. She said that the UFF wants faculty to have issues fairly  
60 heard and not dismissed for procedural reasons. She reiterated that when important issues are  
61 deflected by minor procedural issues it trivializes management's decisions and authority.

62

63 Steve said that management recognizes the responsibility and role of the Union, but believes in the  
64 philosophy of having a strong grievance procedure, and that includes the need to have timeframes.  
65 Maddy said that she agreed that there have to be timeframes but indicated that there is a need to  
66 address timeframes as she had concerns, for example, about grievances filed at the end of the semester.

67

68 Maddy said that some faculty perceive the IR (Informal Resolution) process as part of the grievance  
69 process and make an effort to informally work through issues before filing IR, thus missing the filing IR  
70 deadline. Steve said that if IR is perceived as part of the grievance process, it is not working as we  
71 intended. He suggested this could be a failure to educate the university community about how it ought  
72 to work.

73

74 The Team agreed to prepare a "Sudden Prep" for Article 20 to guide the discussion at the next meeting  
75 (November 15).

76

77 Meetings were confirmed as follows:

78 Tuesday November 15, 1-4 p.m.

79 Monday November 28, 9-11 a.m.

80 Thursday December 1, 1-4 p.m.

81

82 The Management Team will facilitate the November 15, 2011 meeting.

83

84 Meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.