

**IBB Bargaining Meeting Notes  
February 15, 2012**

Participants: Darlene Andert, Steve Belcher, Lucero Carvajal, Lois Christensen, Ines Delgado (observer), Joan Glacken, Maddy Isaacs (facilitator), Kathy Miller (note taker), Jeff Kleeger, Monika Renard, Hudson Rogers, David Vazquez, Jim Wohlpart

David Vazquez provided an update regarding budget-related legislative activity. He indicated that with the recent release of the details, the University has a better understanding of the impacts of the proposed budget reduction that came out of the Senate in the past few days. He said that if the budget is passed as it is, FGCU would sustain an approximate \$2.134 million reduction. He said that the approximated \$2.134 reduction is just to align revenues to appropriations. He indicated that other impacts are to be expected due to change in various items but that would depend on the specifics of the final budget. He said that the proposed Senate budget includes a change to the SUS ORP that would reduce employer costs but at the expense of the contributions to employee retirement accounts by 2%. He noted that this also exists in the House version of the bill, but the monetary impacts might not be the same. Maddy said she has learned that the legislative budget proposal also includes a \$2.5 million funding for Governor's Western University in Utah to develop online programs for students in Florida. She said this is a small amount in relation to the bigger picture but if passed it could have a long range negative impact on all the SUS university distance learning coursework.

The Team approved (thumbed up) the meeting notes of February 2 with amendments for clarification. The Team also approved the meeting notes from February 8 with minor changes for clarification.

Maddy asked if the Team wanted to continue its work on the grievance article as reflected in the February 2 meeting notes or proceed with a discussion of the C&I study. Jeff suggested taking ten (10) minutes to discuss what the Team wants to do with the study. Monika said that she preferred to finish the work on the grievance article. Steve agreed with Monika. Jeff said he does not want to delay C&I because faculty want to know results. Hudson read Section 23.8 of the CBA and said that we had agreed to have a subgroup consistent with the requirements of the procurement office for engaging the consultant as agreed in Article 23.8. When the subgroup met, we agreed not to try and influence the consultant and the subgroup met only once after the study was delivered.

Maddy asked if Steve or Hudson remembered Monika or Maddy talking about individual salaries being addressed in the study. Hudson said he remembered that discussion and asked if Maddy or Monika recalled that in that discussion the consultant said addressing individual salaries was beyond the scope of the study as described in the RFP, but they agreed to provide the data and a formula which would allow a faculty member to calculate their own projected salary. Jeff said that faculty will need to see data if they are to find the C&I meaningful. He said that failing to provide data at the individual level will make it seem like the study effort was wasted and expensive. Hudson said we agreed to the wording in the RFP contract. He said that we can have a healthy discussion about what the study results mean but we need to be mindful of what was agreed to in the CBA and what was requested in the RFP.

44 Maddy called for a process check and asked if the Team was going to have a discussion on the C&I study  
45 and do something jointly, or are we going separate ways. Monika said it seems clear that Administration  
46 does not want to continue this conversation. Hudson said he had not heard an Administration response  
47 and that Maddy's question was whether to finish Article 20 or move to Article 23. Hudson said that the  
48 notes of previous Team meetings reflect that management wants to look at all of the articles with  
49 financial impact simultaneously. That suggests that we should continue with Article 20. Maddy said she  
50 disagreed and that she viewed the C&I discussion as a question about whether UFF should proceed with  
51 running the numbers for individuals on its own or if the Team would do it together. She said that faculty  
52 are asking about the study and a timely response is important.

53

54 Steve called for a caucus.

55

56 When the Team reconvened, Jim said that management wants to make sure we are all "on the same  
57 page" with the C&I study. He said that management understands that the subgroup was formed to  
58 commission the study and that has been completed. He said that we now have a host of options and  
59 can deal with the study as a whole group, constitute a subgroup to do something specific with the study,  
60 or constitute a subgroup to decide what to do next. Maddy said she thought it was reasonable to ask  
61 whether we want to do it together or separately. She said there is pressure to release information and  
62 we can save conversations about responding for when we know about money. Hudson said that  
63 management is not prepared to discuss funding until after the state budget has been finalized.

64

65 Jeff said he thought it was important to do something with the study and we could have the issues fine-  
66 tuned in a committee. He said that it would be most useful to commission a subcommittee and tell them  
67 what to do. Maddy said she did not think there was agreement about that. Steve said there have been  
68 statements and interpretations of the study issued already. Maddy said the Provost was the first to  
69 announce the results of the study. She said the Union has a duty to announce to its constituency what is  
70 happening. Steve noted that Monika and the Provost issued a Joint Announcement that included a link  
71 to the full C&I Study Report. Jeff said it would be more beneficial if the IBB Team can make a joint  
72 statement. Jim said that two groups (CIP 51 and 52) need to be studied. Steve said that there is interest  
73 in studying CIP 51 and 52 and he understands there are strong feelings about the C&I study because it  
74 impacts pay. Jeff said that in a sense, this is a process check. Monika said no, that she will absolutely not  
75 agree to look only at CIP 51 and 52".

76

77 Maddy said it can be the decision of the group to go our separate ways and interpret the study as we  
78 see fit. Steve said we can make a decision about what we are going to do, or when we are going to do it.  
79 Monika said we have done a number of salary studies in the past; we compared individual salaries and  
80 then decided what, if anything, we would do about it.

81

82 Jeff said that identifying the problem is separate from deciding what we will do about it. Maddy said we  
83 can try sending this to a subcommittee to see if we can agree on a method for addressing the data on  
84 the level of individuals within two to three weeks. Steve said he wanted to clarify what a subcommittee

85 would do. He asked if Maddy was talking about CIP 51 and 52, or all of the CIP categories, or something  
86 else.

87  
88 Monika said the UFF was responding to Jim’s earlier question about whether we would do all of the  
89 categories. Hudson said he did not want to be a party to charades. He said that the group had heard  
90 two positions and it may not make sense to have a subcommittee that would be charged with  
91 determining what method to use to derive projected individual salaries. He said that such a  
92 subcommittee would be charged with undertaking an already made decision and not with deciding if we  
93 should go beyond CIP 51 and 52. Steve said that we did not need a subcommittee to determine if we  
94 would do all, none, or only CIP 51 and 52. He said we may not need a subcommittee to delve any  
95 further.

96  
97 Ines said the group should table the discussion or move on because the Team could not agree. Maddy  
98 said there is no need for a subcommittee and since we could not agree, we have agreed to go our  
99 separate ways. Hudson said Maddy has stated several times we are agreeing to do something when that  
100 is not the case. He said that a number of positional suggestions have been discussed, including doing a  
101 review of all faculty together or separately, doing CIP codes 51 and 52, and not doing anything at this  
102 time. Hudson said we should not characterize these discussions as we are at “A” and you are at “B”, so  
103 that means that we have agreed let’s do “C”. He said that the respective views seem positional and are  
104 legitimate and does not mean that we have to agree. Monika said that UFF will do “BANTA” – the best  
105 alternative to a negotiated agreement. Maddy said that we had talked about doing this jointly but could  
106 not reach agreement about how. Hudson said it should not be inferred that management agrees with  
107 what you are planning on doing.

108  
109 The Team agreed that the agenda for the next meeting would be the following three items listed in the  
110 meeting notes at the close of the February 2 meeting.

- 111
- 112 1. Up to 60 days to file IR after the event, but after the first 30 days, must be able to document  
113 attempts to resolve the issue.
  - 114 2. During first 30 days there can be a mutual decision by the parties to go to Academic Affairs and  
115 request an extension of up to 15 days to file an IR.
  - 116 3. During first 30 days there can be a mutual decision by the parties to go to Academic Affairs and  
117 request an extension of up to 15 days. The faculty member has 7 days after the extension to file  
118 an IR.

119  
120 The next meeting is scheduled for Friday February 17, 2012 from 1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. in AB5, Room  
121 309.

122  
123 The Management team will facilitate the next meeting.  
124