Bargaining Team Meeting Notes
October 18, 2011

Participants: Darlene Andert, Tony Barringer, Steve Belcher, Lucero Carvajal, Lois Christensen, Ines Delgado-Alberto (observer), Beth Elliott, Joan Glacken, Maddy Isaacs, Kathy Miller (note taker), Hudson Rogers, David Vazquez (facilitator), Jim Wohlpart

Meeting notes of October 12 were revised and approved as amended. There were no substantive changes.

A question was raised about whether the bargaining meetings are noticed in the correct place on the Provost’s web page. Steve indicated that he will review and ensure that the notices are organized under the correct header dates. He said that he could arrange to place the dates higher up on the webpage so that they could be more readily seen. Maddy noted that UFF still has an issue with the September 26 meeting noticed as full book bargaining and suggested adding a note that it was not a bargaining meeting. Steve said that he will take a look at it.

David Vazquez asked if we agreed to look at the brainstorm items on the list reflected in the notes from the last meeting. Beth said that she thought that the ball was in management’s court to look at what was suggested and come back with a response today. Steve said the management team had placed the brainstorm items from the notes into a spreadsheet and he distribute the sheet to the Team. He asked if we wanted to discuss the sheet in light of a question Jim raised at the last meeting, namely do any of the items from the brainstorming list fall under the CBA? Steve said that we were open on Article 23 as previously stated. He said that a number of the items on the list do not relate to Article 23 and might be more appropriately addressed in other venues. He said, that for example, parking-related ideas might be raised in the campus committee on parking.

Maddy said that she agreed that not all the items are related to Article 23. She noted that if we referred the item of parking to the parking committee we would be asking them to address something that should be bargained at the table. Steve said that he was suggesting that bargaining is open on Article 23 and from the management’s perspective other issues outside of Article 23 should not be bargained. He said that the IBB Team had been involved in brainstorming but the items on the list do not pertain to Article 23 which is the article under discussion. Hudson agreed, indicating that we were meeting only to revise the CBA language in Article 23.4 of the 2011-2014 CBA because the parties had previously agreed that there would be no raise for 2011-2012.

Maddy suggested that the management perspective seemed to ignore the full context of bargaining created by management’s premature announcement that there would be a 2011-2012 raise. She said that there is a broader context and the UFF had asked for brainstorming. She said that the brainstorming was the first time she heard of management’s willingness to consider anything. She said that if the brainstorming was done without providing consideration or if it was just an exercise and not really bargaining, that would be problematic. Maddy reminded the team that we could open other
issues by mutual agreement and that the bonus implementation letter we agreed to at the table, for example, was not part of the contract. Maddy said she was troubled by what sounded like a refusal to bargain in good faith.

A question was raised about the Union’s expectations when we came to the table today. Beth responded that they (UFF) expected management to have considered the list of items and returned to the table with information about them. Darlene said we could consider parking to be a base salary adjustment and have it fit under Article 23. Beth said that the expectation was that management would take the time to look into the issues raised by the items on the list. She said that she expected the Management Team to say “here’s what we have done.”

Steve said management has reviewed the list and noted that there is a cost associated with some of the items. He said that some of the items are subject to different areas for discussion and others are not related to bargaining. He said there are items in which we share a common interest as a University community. We have common interests in helping faculty with research and in faculty development. He noted that there are items on the list that are already being strongly supported by Academic Affairs such as the Seldin workshops and TLAI (Teaching, Learning, and Assessment Initiative). He said that he is aware that the Provost is interested in doing more in the interest of faculty development. He said that these are areas where we share a common interest in student learning, improving, and retooling, but not to add as a part of bargaining and certainly not as part of Article 23.4. He said that the items raised should be discussed in the appropriate venues as they are not subject to Article 23.

Steve said that he disagreed that management was not engaged in good faith bargaining. He said that management team has looked at and discussed the items on the list and previously indicated that we share common interest on some of those. He observed that this was the fourth day of bargaining and that the payroll staff had worked extremely hard to assist us in getting the bonuses out all in good faith and at very short notice. He said that David Vazquez had spoken to the group by phone and discussed the limitations of providing the raise earlier. He said that management has reflected on its missteps in the bargaining process and there were e-mails sent out by the Provost and the President and he does not expect those missteps to happen again. He reminded the group that there are things to be done before a raise can be implemented. He noted that there is a clock ticking and we need to come to a place where there is an agreement. He said that there is an acknowledgement that there are some things that can be done via bargaining and some lie outside of bargaining. Steve said that during brainstorming he suggested having a faculty lounge but he does not believe that is an appropriate topic for bargaining even though he can acknowledge that a faculty lounge exists at other schools.

Beth said that not everything we agree to at the table is part of the contract. She said that the intent of brainstorming was to get something done. She said that she heard that it is about money. She stated that UFF asked for the proposed raise to be provided on December 1, 2011 and heard “no.” She said that something else could be provided, like the restoration of additional faculty development money in the Faculty Senate as faculty are getting less money. She said that the thing, from the brainstorming that is most important to UFF is the restoration of professional development funding. Travel is more
expensive so it would be good for the UFF to go back and state that we worked to improve faculty working conditions and that does not necessarily need to be in the contract. She also observed that UFF also wants to close out the bargaining session.

Jim said that management shares many of the same interests and the Provost has worked to improve the funds in the Senate even in hard economic times. He said that he feels that there are other appropriate venues for discussion of the items such as Faculty Senate discussing professional development funding with the Provost. Hudson reminded the group that Article 21.2 notes that professional development funding is soft money and the amount will vary. He said that Academic Affairs has already supplemented the funding to make up for losses sustained by the Foundation and he is aware that the Provost usually discusses this with the Senate leadership. Jim said that the professional development funding should be discussed in the Faculty Senate.

It was observed that the Union was saying that it wants something to bring to its members beyond the 2% raise that has been announced. Hudson said that management is not able to accede to what has been requested.

It was noted that in IBB issues can arise that are not part of bargaining but they can be discussed separately and may be handled with a MOU. Hudson said that management is not willing to bring permissive subjects of bargaining to the table especially since this was about Article 23.4. Steve suggested that might be good to discuss mandatory and permissive issues for bargaining so that everyone understands Hudson’s reference to permissive subjects of bargaining. He said that the 2% salary increase is to be effective on January 1, 2011 and that is the proposal that has been placed on the table.

Hudson said he did not know whether UFF had responded to the 2% raise proposal. He reminded everyone at the table that we were bargaining to change the ratified 2011-12 Agreement that has language which states that there would be no bonus or salary increase. He suggested that perhaps there were different perceptions of what we have mutually agreed to open as he was not aware of a mutual agreement to open anything other than Article 23.4. He said that absent any mutual agreement to open anything else he was not in a position to support any of the items on the list, though we was speaking only for himself and not for other members of the management team.

UFF requested a caucus.

When the group reconvened, Maddy said that the team only engaged in IBB and problem solving as long as it helped management with its ULP (Unfair Labor Practice) problem. She said that with the ULP off the table and now that the UFF needs to resolve a problem, the management team is no longer interested in using IBB and is now using positional bargaining. Maddy said that IBB is code for the UFF to help the University solve its problems and management will be positional when it is time to solve UFF problems. Maddy said she would have preferred to hear that we do not have the $45,000 to pay the raise on December 1, 2011 rather than to hear that it is not a priority. She said that the UFF will have to
talk about IBB or positional bargaining as they had great hopes for getting something more with the items raised but those have been shot down piece by piece. She said that management was choosing not to help out the UFF and is not interested in providing and additional $45,000 to pay the raise one month earlier. She said that the UFF was willing to accept the proposed 2% raise and move forward with the ratification process. She said that this has been IBB for only one side and that is not IBB.

Steve said as a Team we can talk about IBB. He said that we have a meeting scheduled on November 10, and had originally set that as an IBB training date. Management is open to talking about IBB as a process and suggests we use the November 10 meeting for that purpose. He observed that as part of IBB a combined approach might also be considered. He said that his recollection was that during the IBB training the Team noted that it was possible to use IBB until we reached a point where either or both sides felt that it would be preferable to move to positional bargaining on a given subject. He said that IBB has worked for both of us before and may still be helpful to both sides.

Steve said that he would like to acknowledge UFF’s views and asked if we were ready to discuss language. He said that he was saddened with how we got here especially since we have the 2012-2013 agreement to bargain. He asked what the Team wanted to do about a joint announcement.

Maddy asked the team to remember that UFF does not want to hear about good faith bargaining. She said that the UFF wants to experience it and have not had a good start. Steve asked what the UFF wanted to do about language. Maddy responded, what do you propose, as we are clearly positional at this point.

The following language placed on the board was approved (“thumbs up”) by the Team.

**Article 22.4**

**B. Base Salary Adjustment.** Effective January 1, 2012 the University shall provide all eligible employees a 2011-2012 across-the-board base salary increase equal to two percent (2%) of the employee’s December 31, 2011 base salary.

Darlene said that she would hate to see IBB lost. She asked if the salary increase could be provided on December 15. Steve indicated that the management Team had fully vetted all options and was not able to provide the raise earlier than January 1, 2012. Darlene said that she appreciated the candor.

After the TA (Tentative Agreement) Steve asked if we wanted to issue a joint statement. He said that he will also contact Susan Evans to find out more about how this will proceed to the BOT.

Maddy said that she will need to talk to the UFF Team to see if they want to do a joint statement or if they will do it separately. Maddy said that she has to bring this back to their Team and does not know what approach they will decide on using. Steve said that he will wait to hear from Maddy about an announcement of this agreement.
Maddy said that she will take the suggestion about using November 10 for training back to the Union for discussion. She said that there are four (4) articles to be re-opened. Beyond the November 10, 2011 (9:30 a.m. - 2:30 p.m.) meeting, additional meeting dates were established as follows:

- Tuesday November 15, 1:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.
- Monday November 28, 9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.
- Thursday December 1, 1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Next Meeting will be facilitated by UFF.

Meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.