

1 Bargaining Team Meeting Notes

2 October 5, 2011

3 AB5, Room 309, 1:30 – 3:30

4

5 Participants: Jennifer Baker, Steve Belcher, Lucero Carvajal, Lois Christensen, Ines Delgado-Alberto  
6 (observer), Joan Glacken, Madeline Holzem, Maddy Isaacs( Facilitator), Kathy Miller (note taker), Monika  
7 Renard, Hudson Rogers, David Steckler, David Vazquez, Jim Wohlpart

8

9 Maddy opened the meeting by asking for agenda items. The group agreed to the following agenda.

10

- 11 1. Review and approve notes of September 28
- 12 2. Continue with base salary increase portion / ultimate ratification
- 13 3. Feedback from Friday's announcement
- 14 4. Questions about PATF implementation – is there a need to negotiate?

15

16 Notes

17

18 The notes from the meeting of 9/28/2011 were reviewed, revised, and approved as amended. It was  
19 agreed that Steve will post the revised notes on the web rather than circulate them via e-mail. Steve  
20 indicated that once posted, one may view the notes by clicking on the date of the meeting.

21

22 Feedback from Friday's announcements

23

24 Maddy described feedback that UFF-FGCU has received from faculty indicating that:

- 25 • some faculty think the Union was obstructive and interfered with faculty getting bonuses,
- 26 • the 2% raise is in danger of not coming on Jan. 1,
- 27 • the UFF should start bargaining in the context of the President's raise.

28

29 Steve noted that as an institution we have to deal with internal and external perception problems. These  
30 perceptions may only be held by a few individuals, but it is regrettable that such perceptions exist. We  
31 can try to clarify, but individuals may choose not to believe the clarifications.

32

33 Maddy observed that we have to honor what we say here (at the bargaining table) or there will be no  
34 trust. UFF does not believe the original announcement, which required a follow-up announcement was  
35 ill-intended, but we need to get away from having to have this conversation again and again. As long as  
36 we all agree there's no malice, we can move forward.

37

38 Steve indicated that we are still dealing with the perceptions of individuals who are not here for the  
39 discussion. He said that the Provost and President both said essentially the same thing in their messages  
40 and yet individuals have varying perceptions even though they were not at the bargaining table. Steve

41 said that as HR Director he sees and understands that people have different perceptions even without  
42 the facts. Steve asked, "Did you get any positive press?"

43  
44 Monika said "yes." She said that in the halls people have come up to her and said thanks for the bonus.

45  
46 Maddy said that the announcement indicated that there would be a minimum of 2% base salary  
47 increase to come January 1 and IBB requires an identification of interests. Monika said that we should  
48 start with the list of interests which was developed at the last meeting. Steve said that we need to be  
49 mindful of and must talk about a timeline.

50  
51 Salary increase

52 A "minimum 2% base salary increase" was noted in Friday's announcements. Interests were identified  
53 based on the list generated at the September 28 meeting.

- 54 • Not as urgent – to be implemented January 1
- 55 • Must get it done and ratified by UFF-FGCU & BOT (special meeting)

56  
57 A discussion of the timeline ensued. Maddy said that UFF-FGCU should be able to ratify an agreement in  
58 1 - 2 weeks using electronic voting. Hudson noted that scheduling a properly noticed special meeting of  
59 the BOT would take some time for coordinating Trustee availability for briefings and the meeting.

60  
61 Interests (salary increase)

- 62 • Addressing misinformation / rumors (mutual)
- 63 • Eligibility (mutual)
- 64 • Negativity -- Good Faith (UFF)  
65                      Good Faith 2012-13 (Mgt.)
- 66 • Improving announced raise and truly bargaining (UFF)
- 67 • Not management rubber stamp (UFF)
- 68 • Dealing with all of the issues (UFF)
- 69 • Multiple steps to deal with all of the issues (mutual)
- 70 • Ability to fund raises (mutual)

71  
72 Brainstorming

- 73 • Some kind of improvement to what was announced – perhaps connected to C&I
- 74 • Could improve:
  - 75           effective date
  - 76           amount of raise
  - 77           eligibility
- 78 • Other compensation options such as parking
- 79 • Add wording to the contract that would allow cost-of-living increases
- 80 • Providing what we can afford (2%)
- 81 • Providing what the institution chooses -- priorities

82

83 Discussion

84

85 Monika said that in general we should speak about the amount to be provided. She said that the UFF  
86 needed some improvement in the amount of the raise so that they are not just rubber stamping the  
87 raise offered by the University. Monika suggested including Compression and Inversion as the UFF  
88 needed some kind of improvement. She said that there are many options including, increasing the  
89 amount of the raise, providing the raise at an earlier date, or addressing eligibility. Monika said that we  
90 could include cost of living raises, or match the president's raise.

91

92 David Steckler asked if we could talk about other offsets. He asked what a 1% increase for the in-unit  
93 faculty would cost. David Vazquez indicated that he could get more accurate figures, but his rough  
94 estimate was that 1% of the in-unit faculty salaries require about \$250,000 annually. He added that he  
95 was only talking about those salaries that are funded by General Revenue. Maddy observed that that  
96 would be about \$125K for this year. Hudson agreed and indicated that it would be annualized at 2%  
97 beginning in 2012-13. He said that factoring in the bonus the actual amount of money received for  
98 2011-2012 would average about 2% and would be greater than 2% for persons making less than  
99 \$100,000 per year.

100

101 Monika asked David Vazquez if he would explain how funding for the 2% increases was identified since  
102 there was nothing available for raises when we finished bargaining in the spring. David Vazquez  
103 explained that it was a combination of factors. He said that we did not have the tuition shortfall we  
104 anticipated, and the legislative reduction was not as steep as was predicted during the session.

105

106 Madeline said that if one applies the current eligibility language, the cost for all faculty increases is  
107 about \$530,000 annually. She said that she did not have figures on hand to indicate what portion of the  
108 total was for those faculty in the bargaining unit.

109

110 A discussion ensued about the funding challenges we are continuing to face. It was noted that funding  
111 from the State has declined significantly over the past 4 years: state support has declined from over 60%  
112 to about 45% of the University's budget.

113 Maddy asked David Vazquez to bring cost information to inform our discussions. She said that she  
114 wanted information on:

- 115 • What would it cost to implement the raises before January 1 on an incremental monthly basis?
- 116 • What would it cost to increase the amount of the raise incrementally by .5%?

117

118 Monika observed that it is difficult to hear that the BOT is willing to give the President a 5% raise but not  
119 willing to provide cost-of-living increases to faculty. She added that the President's \$80,000 bonus is  
120 more than the entire salary of many faculty members. She asked "How can we believe that 2% was all  
121 that there is, when a few months ago we were told that there would be no raise for 2011-2012?"

122 David Vazquez said that given the fall 2011 enrollment the Cabinet looked at all projected revenue and  
123 costs for 2011-2012 and determined that a 2% increase plus a \$1,000 bonus was feasible without

124 placing the University in a precarious position. He said that such a determination was not possible  
125 during the spring semester as, at that time, it was not possible to determine the outcome of the 2011  
126 Legislative session, nor was there data on the actual fall 2011 enrollment.

127

128 Dates for next meetings are:

- 129 • Tuesday 10/11 from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon in AB7, Room 402, and
- 130 • Wednesday 10/12 from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon in AB5, Room 210.

131

132 The Management Team will facilitate the next meeting.

133

134 The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m

135