

1 **Bargaining Team Meeting Notes**

2 October 11, 2011

3 AB7 402, 9:00am – 12:00pm

4

5 Participants: Tony Barringer, Steve Belcher, Lucero Carvajal, Lois Christensen, Beth Elliott, Sue Putnam  
6 (observer), Joan Glacken, Madeline Holzem, Maddy Isaacs, Kathy Miller (note taker), Monika Renard,  
7 Hudson Rogers (Facilitator), David Steckler, Jim Wohlpart

8

9 Notes

10 Meeting notes of October 5 were revised and approved as amended by the IBB Team. There were no  
11 substantive changes.

12

13 Hudson suggested opening the discussion with the interests previously identified and listed in lines 60  
14 through 80 of the October 5, 2011 notes. Monika said she was concerned that management may not  
15 have expressed all of its interests. Specifically, she asked whether management can offer faculty  
16 something and not offer it to staff.

17

18 Hudson said that is not a management interest as the bargaining session has to do with in-unit faculty.  
19 Maddy asked if other management representatives on the bargaining team agreed that it was not an  
20 interest. Discussion ensued and it was agreed that management did not have that interest.

21

22 Maddy asked if the budget information requested at the last meeting was gathered. Since David  
23 Vazquez was not available to participate in this meeting (of 10/11/11), Hudson described the faculty  
24 raise pool. He said that the pool, to which the cost of benefits must be added, is 2% of the July 1, 2011  
25 base salaries of approximately \$21.9 million or about \$450,000. He also said that for 2011-2012 the  
26 funding made available also included about \$170,000 plus benefits that was used to fund promotions.  
27 The January 1, 2012 implementation date means that the financial impact for the 2011-12 fiscal year is  
28 about \$225,000 plus benefits. He noted that by his calculation, the \$1,000 lump sum bonus cost about  
29 \$345,000.

30

31 The team discussed how promotional raises are funded for faculty and for staff. Hudson noted that  
32 faculty promotion raises are funded with new revenue added to Academic Affairs. Since there has not  
33 been General Revenue increases from the State for the past few years, staff promotions and  
34 reclassifications have been funded from existing department and/or college operating budgets based  
35 upon turnover and have not be funded centrally as are faculty promotions. Maddy asserted that staff  
36 promotion monies are added to the units and that department budgets are accordingly increased  
37 annually. Maddy also asserted that new positions are additionally funded to departments as they are  
38 authorized. Jim and Steve indicated that is not how staff promotions have historically been funded for  
39 Arts and Sciences and Human Resources, respectively. Madeline stated that the way staff get promoted  
40 or reclassified is not based upon a promotion track like faculty and are the result of turnover vacancies  
41 and the assignment of new additional duties and responsibilities. Kathy commented that the discussion  
42 had drifted well past the subject of a base salary increase and David S. agreed.

43

44 Beth asked why moving the implementation date back to December 1, 2011 is a problem if funding has  
45 already been identified and was for last year. Hudson indicated that the raise under discussion was for  
46 the current year (2011-2012) and has to be funded from this year's budget. He described the funding  
47 and budgeting process indicating that since the University does not do "zero based budgeting," raises  
48 for faculty, including promotion increases, comes via the addition of new funds to Academic Affairs and  
49 is not a reallocation of existing funds. Since about 2005 there have been no across-the-board raises by  
50 the State. All raises have been funded internally by the University and paid on January 1 because the  
51 University will have collected revenues and saved on maintenance costs and controlling costs by  
52 measures such as temperature control and by closing for a week in December.

53

54 Maddy offered a correction, indicating that the last State provided an increase in 2007. Monika also said  
55 that the bargaining team is trying to problem-solve and not just explain the situation. She said that the  
56 2% raise was announced and UFF wants to bargain about the raise. Monika said she does not believe  
57 there is no money and suggested that the raises be implemented on August 1, 2011.

58

59 Hudson talked about some of the information presented during the Board of Trustee's budget workshop  
60 in September 2011 as context for bargaining. He said that VP Steve Magiera described a margin of  
61 about \$435,000 for a \$100+ million budget. He characterized that as a very slim margin. Hudson added  
62 that making a decision on a raise involves doing as much as possible based on constraints. He observed  
63 that for 2011-2012 the University has offered 2% across the board plus a \$1,000 bonus. With the  
64 economic situation that the University is facing one could argue that it might be easier not to give raises  
65 because the CBA was already approved with no raises. However, providing raises for this year was an  
66 important priority once the University knew its financial position.

67

68 Maddy said that the announcement was made within 48 hours of the news about the President's raise  
69 and bonus. She said that this is all public information and also part of the context in which we are  
70 bargaining.

71

72 The Team took a break. When bargaining reconvened Steve said he had some thoughts to share with  
73 the Team. He said he had been listening to our conversation and that he is very concerned about what  
74 we may face in the coming legislative session. He said that during the 2011 session the legislature's  
75 focus seemed to be more on K-12. However, from what has been in the news, higher education appears  
76 to be a topic of focus for the upcoming 2012 session. Steve recalled the conversations the Bargaining  
77 Team had last spring about getting a contract in place. He said that he remains concerned about what  
78 challenges we are likely to face in the next session.

79

80 Steve noted that none of the management team in the room had been at the table when the raises and  
81 bonuses were determined and are not able to give further insights into the overall thinking behind the  
82 raise proposal except that it comes from internal funds generated by the University. He said that last  
83 spring the UFF was in a tough spot given the ongoing legislative pressures. He said that now  
84 management is in a tough spot because the State has not provided funding for a raise in many years and

85 the 2% base salary increase announced and offered must come from internal University funds which  
86 means other priorities must suffer. He said that as we resolve this and get the raises implemented, we  
87 are going to have more challenges ahead. Steve said that he is concerned that not everyone has a clear  
88 understanding or appreciation of higher education and the challenges faced and we are going to have to  
89 work together. He said that management wants to resolve this but is not in a position to “sweeten the  
90 coffee” as suggested. Steve said that management needs the understanding of UFF just as UFF needed  
91 management’s understanding last spring.

92

93 Maddy said UFF agreed to some changes in the CBA last spring to accommodate management’s need to  
94 bring something back from bargaining. She said that now the UFF wants management to do the same.

95

96 David Steckler suggested that if the university could find \$4.8 million to complete the Health Sciences  
97 building, it should be able to find \$45,000 per month to make an earlier implementation of the salary  
98 increase work. Kathy said that the \$3.8 million is from capital funds that cannot be used for salaries.  
99 Steve observed that if David Vazquez were present, he could speak to the financial issues.

100

101 Monika said that the UFF is not telling the University where to find the money -- just that it needs to be  
102 found. Monika said that she knows the University has the money and would like to see the raises  
103 implemented August 1, 2011 or some kind of improvement in the raise. Beth suggested management  
104 consider starting the raises on December 1. Jim indicated that there was nothing more. Maddy asked if  
105 the Management Team knows for sure that there is nothing more to give.

106

107 Steve asked for a caucus.

108

109 After the caucus, Hudson reported to the group that we tried to talk with David Vazquez but he was tied  
110 up with interviews for the VP of Advancement. Jim and Beth suggested that the Team stop bargaining  
111 for today and reconvene tomorrow when David might be available to present budget information. The  
112 intent is to at least talk with David Vazquez and bring information back to the table for tomorrow’s  
113 session. Maddy said she’d like to hear whether there is a possibility of making the raises effective  
114 December 1 and that she is asking not why it cannot be done but if it can be done.

115

116 The UFF Team will facilitate the next meeting to be held Tuesday, October 18, 2011 from 1pm – 4pm in  
117 AB5 Room 210.

118

119 The meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.