

Notes from the IBB Meeting

Friday March 4, 2011

1:00-4:00 AB3 210

Participants: Jennifer Baker, Lucero Carvajal, Lois Christensen, Beth Elliott, Maddy Isaacs, Jeff Kleeger, Morgan T. Paine, Hudson Rogers, David Steckler, David Vazquez, Jim Wohlpart

Facilitator: Rogers for Management replaced by Vazquez after 10 minutes

Observer: Sue Putman

Note-taker: Maddy Isaacs

1. Review of prior meeting minutes. Meeting notes were “thumbed up” as amended.
 - Discussed Lines 26 and 28 as repetitive; concluded to strike line 28 as redundant.
2. Develop potential options for “UFF access to information”
 - Craft language for UFF to make appropriate requests and for management to be responsive.
 - Centralize work flow of requests from one person in UFF and for receiver at University.
 - Make sure to specify sender and receiver of requests.
 - Use website to make reports available.
 - A mechanism for responses to be processed.
 - A timeline and acknowledgement.
 - More background information with requests.
 - Collegial approach to requests and responses.
 - Specific language to request information and specific language to acknowledge requests.

Reminded the group during the discussion to be reminded that we defend the contract and the not the person (on both sides).

3. Held each of the above against standards & criteria:

- Is it feasible?
 - Will work
 - Legal
 - Affordable
 - Easy to understand
 - Explainable
 - Other
- Is it beneficial?
 - Benefits stated interests
 - Harm other stated interests?

- Is it acceptable?
 - Parties accept options?
 - Fair?
- Specific language to request information and specific language to acknowledge requests.
 - Struck due to non-consensus- Met all standards with questions about “will it work,” legal (law says management cannot require specific format and language if he refuses under 447), fairness, and potential for more grievances dependent upon specific language selected and then used in practice.
- Struck due to non-consensus - Craft language for UFF to make appropriate requests and for management to be responsive.
 - Could run afoul of law as restrictive of rights and might be harmful to University.

A discussion ensued about how or why we would include CBA language that repeats legal obligations that the contract cannot supersede and language that is aspirational.

No takeaways from today (to carry forward).

For next agenda:

Continue evaluating options where left off.

UFF to run next meeting on Tuesday – all day (9-4) AB 7 402.

Possible next items upon completion of evaluation of options. – Names of the parties; Aligning CBA language with BOT/BOG.