

Negotiations 6/15/2007 11:15 am
Boynton W-120
Notes by Cherrene Horazuk

Bob Altman – I was giving you the credit for the art behind you, but it turns out that it's somebody else's.

Gladys McKenzie – Josea can explain that to you. We have a lot of information to give you today. We want to give you our health insurance proposal. We also have a response on nearly everything on the table. We also have a guest here today. Sandy Sherman serves on the Benefits Advisory Committee (BAC) for the union. We felt it was important that she be here for health insurance talks. We're going to start by sharing the presentation we made to the BAC on health insurance. Jody Ebert, our other representative on the BAC, will present that. There are copies coming around.

Jody read AFSCME's statement to the BAC.

Gladys – Do you have any questions or comments?

Bob – No questions. I think it's understandable.

Gladys–There's a theme that continues for our members about not being able to make ends meet. Not being able to afford what we could afford 10-15 years ago. Our standard of living is continuing to decline. We are at negotiations to fix that; to turn it around. Part of that is health insurance. The information that we shared about the standard of living and the devaluation of our work was info that did not include health insurance statistics. That data did not include increases in health insurance costs. These increases have been on top of the grim situation we already shared with you. We thought it was extremely important to get our proposals to you in light of you saying yesterday that the employer has not finalized their plan for insurance. We are concerned that those proposals are not coming in a timely way for negotiations. It's important for the health insurance decision-makers to know what's important for us. I assume that you will share our health insurance proposals with them?

Bob– I'm not going to keep your request a secret.

Gladys – Our concern is not that you would keep our proposal a secret but that it gets to them as they are making decisions in this short period of time.

Gladys – Our first proposal (Union Insurance 1 or UI-1) would add health club discounts and a discount for rec centers on all campuses and remote worksites where those facilities exist. This is obviously in keeping with the University's goals in the area of wellness.

UI2 – We referred to this in the statement that Jody read. We would cap an employee's share of the premiums for the base plan and health partners for all union employees.

UI3 – We propose to roll back the out of pocket maximum to \$500 and \$1000 for family plan.

UI4 – We propose that any employee who has passed probation and is laid off receive six months of employer paid health insurance.

UI5 – We propose to raise the annual cap on dental expenses covered to \$2000.

UI6 – This is a data request. We would like a comprehensive list of items covered under the category of durable medical equipment. Is the University's printed list comprehensive?

Bob - Can I ask a question about UI2? You're proposing that the cap would be a dollar cap, not a change in percentages?

Gladys– That's correct. We want to hold the line on what our members are paying. Do you have anything else related to this proposal?

Bob – It's very likely that I'll have additional points, but not now.

Gladys– We also have a response to your proposal and what we heard from you yesterday. It took us a bit longer in prepping a response than initially anticipated. This is because we have a high degree of dissatisfaction with what took place yesterday. As a result, I asked our committee to speak directly to you about how they are feeling.

Krista Gallagher– I'm a 9-year employee. Yesterday things were said as responses that bothered me. The contract works for us; it works well from our perspective. The same reasons were used in 2005 for not addressing our proposals. This is a contract between 2 parties. We don't bring issues forward to use up time. We bring them with the goal of solving them together.

Denise Osterholm - I'm the president of 3801 in Duluth and I have to say some things don't work for us. This is a contract between both parties. To not consider us and to only say, the contract works for us, is completely dismissive. You said you would make an effort to explain your response to each proposal. It is not enough to just say, this works for us, we don't want to change it. We are bringing things forward because they aren't working. I appreciate that you said you would bring a wage prop on the 28th. In 2005 things moved slowly all summer long. The week before school started we got a proposal of half a percent. That was an insult. It is demeaning to us to get discounted and get offers that are unacceptable.

Patty Pals – Hi, I'm a 22 year employee. This is my first time in negotiations. I'm a union steward at Boynton Health Service. The Issues we brought forward to you last meeting, were issues are members brought to us. Denying 48hr notice for disciplinary action given to the union steward and employee is not asking to much as this not only protects us it protects the employer as well and for you to come in here and tell us no to every proposal

we brought forward to you is not negotiating. Your comments last week were very rude and offensive. It's not ok that you think you can say no to all of our proposals and feel this is negotiating, it's not.

Barb Bezat – I'm a 24-year employee in the libraries. This is my third time in negotiations. I had assumed that this time we would be able to cut through the layers of wasteful chatter. Instead, it seems like one more round where your comments are scripted. We are here to reach an agreement. Our members are waiting.

Brad Sigal – You responded to our proposals by saying, we don't want to change things, this with works for us, from our perspective, we're surprised you're bringing it up, etc. To me, it sounds a lot like when you're in a relationship, when are things like that said? – it's usually the man's response when a woman says there are problems. This is an important issue because clerical workers are 90% women. It's insulting to hear this is working for us. I would like you to think about that. The University has a choice to make. We can have a constructive process or we can have something else.

Polly – I've worked at the U for 30 years. My job recently got sold to Aramark and I took a 40% cut to come back to the U. This is my third time in negotiations. Every time, we're not taken seriously and we're insulted. By not taking us seriously, you're insulting us. I'd like to speak to the example of a personal holiday – you say you can't treat us differently from other employee groups. I ask you to seriously consider, are there any real reasons you could not do this. We want a serious conversation. My analysis of the situation is that those of you sitting at the table have no power. We need the real decision makers here to hear what we are saying. We are asking for serious things that we really need. I don't know how that information gets filtered. They're just doing their bean counting. Many employees need second jobs. Our requests are not frivolous. Our language changes are not frivolous. You need to tell them this. They need to hear it. If it were them sitting at the table, we'd be done in a week. Let's get to it.

Phyllis Walker – I've worked at the U for 20 years. I wasn't able to be here yesterday, but got a report at our membership meeting last night. Our members were outraged at the complete lack of respect shown for the people who keep the University functioning. I have never seen the U take negotiations seriously or take us seriously. I want you to know, though, that your disrespect has only strengthened our commitment to stand our ground.

Kelly Ahern – This is my fourth round of negotiations. I'd like to talk about this in terms of proposals. We don't bring wish lists to the table. We don't want cars after 5 years or puppies on our birthday. The proposals we bring forward are on issues where members have been affected. We have been told repeatedly that the U is one employer. We've brought proposals that bring consistency. Then we're met with arguments of the need for flexibility. However, your flexibility only protects bad decisions and helps incompetent supervisors. Because our proposals affect real people, they deserve real discussion, and we deserve real respect.

Greg Knoblauch – This is my fourth time negotiating. I'm still waiting to see something besides institutionalized disrespect. I can see that in the name tags – yours say university. Ours do not, even though we are University employees. I also see it in the issue of emergency closings. This proposal gives the U the opportunity to show concern for the safety of all employees. People weren't leaving early to go play in the snow. They were leaving early because their kids were being sent home from school, and they needed their parents to be there. They left early to ensure that they got home safely in bad weather. The current policy sets up a situation where supervisors get paid with no repercussions, and union workers have to use vacation time to ensure their kids get home safely.

Cherrene Horazuk – I'd like to echo what other members of our committee have said about being insulted by you stating that the U administration is vehemently opposed to our proposals, and that the contract is working for you. This type of statement devalues the contract, the union, and the thousands of University employees who are saying that the contract is not working for us. I'm also incredibly insulted that the administration will not be giving us a wage proposal until two days before the contract is up. Over the past couple of weeks, we have been holding informational meetings all over campus to discuss what's been happening to our standard of living. The uniform response has been shock and anger at the level of disrespect that the administration has shown by devaluing our jobs while giving substantial raises to senior administrators. Round after round, we are insulted and disrespected. It would be bad enough if it was just the negotiators' opinions. But, because this has happened every time, it's clear that the insults aren't coming from the negotiators. The disrespect is coming down from the top.

Kelly Alghamdi Zimmerschied – After yesterday, I was thinking back to my most recent English class, where we were encouraged to do multiple rewrites, make compromises, and give feedback. That was what earned an A. We are here to negotiate, not desecrate, our contract. This is a contract for everybody. What value do you place on the future? Yesterday you told us that no matter how many times we work on rewriting a proposal, the answer will still be no. If that is the case, what are we doing here?

Cindy Prange – I'm a 25-year employee. I'd like to speak specifically to proposal U9 about hiring priority. You said you were surprised to see this proposal and that the employer is vehemently opposed to it. To me, this means an employee is not valued enough to be seriously considered for promotion. It also means that you don't value supervisor to make right decision from the start.

Kelly Ryan – I'm a 20-year employee and a steward. I have lots of opportunities to meet with HR reps for disciplinary meetings and what I heard yesterday is similar. I'm insulted by the language and tone. You expressed surprise and told us the content of our proposals was inappropriate. You were chiding and condescending, as if you were reprimanding an employee or a parent scolding child. Neither case is true. We are equal parties negotiating a joint contract. We deserve to be treated as such.

Ginger Nohl – I was invited to East Cliff this past Wednesday to a recognition for long term employees. As a 25 year employee I attended and listened to the President's wife,

one of the Regents and Carol Carrier compliment all of us on how valued long term employees are at the University and how we "run the place". A week or so ago at the table we presented our proposals and management came back to us with nothing to offer us and refused all of our proposals without giving us any hope of promise. This is my second round in negotiating an AFSCME contract and it was my hope that this time we would all come to the table in good faith, but this again is not the case. I guess now I realize that the administration at UMM can talk out of both sides of their mouth. I feel so infuriated.

Chris Koehler - I've been an employee here at the University for 20 years and I do work two jobs to make ends meet. This is my first negotiation and I'd heard about the lack of respect at negotiations but to actually see it was eye opening. To say 'we don't want to change it, it works for us' is demeaning, we wouldn't bring these things up if they were working for the employees. This is a negotiation, not a parent telling a child, 'No you can't have that.'

Ron Kubick– I have worked at the U for 20 years and this is my 9th negotiations. I am disappointed in the disrespect you have shown to my time and my commitment to my job. I am told repeatedly by my supervisor how valuable I am. You waste my time by not addressing our issues.

Joyce Carlson – This is my second negotiations with the U. As I was entering the negotiations this time, I had a hopeful positive view, because the tone about how we were going to structure negotiations was positive. Yesterday – the tone of administration was dismissive and inappropriately tutorial. There is much experience on this committee. These are your peers, these committee members. They have considerable experience and they require your respect.

Gladys – It's clear how upset our committee was and is with what took place yesterday. We don't expect to be here just getting "no" on our proposals. I have sat at other tables with other employer where it's not only "no". Instead, the employer will say, "We're interested in this piece of your proposal. We want to look at it. We want to understand what's gone on in this situation." We have contracts all over the country with hiring priority. We have employers that have an initial 3 month probationary period – all over the country, the metro area. This can also be found with employers without unionized workers. Somehow these institutions continue to be productive and do their work. The recurring theme from the University administration, however, is that you do not value your staff. We see this over and over and over again. You want consistency when it works for the University. You want inconsistency when it works for the U. We want a real discussion. We don't want to proceed in this discussion from "no". That makes these negotiations harder. It drives a wedge that, frankly, having worked with many of you, I don't think is necessary. Our message to the U is that we expect respect. That is shown by dealing with these issues in a serious manner. This theme will be heard throughout our response to you.

We'll give you our responses to your proposals, then move into our proposals. What I'm going to do is deal with proposals to specific contracts, then proposals that are common to all of the contracts.

In the clerical contract, your first proposal was to delete references to the transition from 33 classifications to 8 classifications. A. Remove the grids from the old classifications. We can agree to that. However, we do think the historical references are important beyond what is referenced in your proposal C. Let me give you an example – somebody who is an office and administrative specialist. Somebody who is an office and administrative specialist, and is then reassigned to another position, but wants to know the history of the position to be able to determine seniority.

Bob – So, you're thinking parts of F need to stay?

Gladys – Yes. We think the most appropriate place is in Article 2 where classes are identified. We are willing to talk about where it should go, but our main concern is that the history still be there to identify. If we can do that, then we are in agreement with point C.

Gladys – We can also agree to eliminate Appendix D1 and move it to D with the new negotiated ranges.

I am going to skip over proposals 3 and 4 because these were made across all contracts.

Regarding the Tech contract: Proposal 1 to delete classes – we have an interest in keeping these classifications. We don't know that the U will never use these classes again. These have been identified as classifications that belong in this bargaining unit. The work belongs in this bargaining unit. It's our view that they should remain in the contract.

We are okay with the technical change in section 2-paid leave of absence. However, you know we have a proposal to change language.

Bob – We are still looking at the proposal you put forward. Consistency of definition is important to us.

Gladys - So, we're of like minds on how to proceed on that.

Proposals 4 and 5 are across all contracts. Proposal three is agreeable (the technical change).

In the health care contract: Proposal 1 – At this point, we would look to maintain these classes. However, we are interested in a discussion of nursing area work in general. We brought a proposal forward on the NA and CNA positions, and would like to roll this in to that discussion.

Your proposal 2 – 75% time. We're concerned about a situation in which an employee is nudged gently or not so gently to reduce their appointment and then finds his or her self without any recourse. You have the ability to reduce appointments. As it reads now, it's employer driven, and an employee has recourse, in terms of a reduction being a layoff.

Bob – We're not looking to be able to do something. It's about an employee voluntarily reducing their hours. But I understand your concerns about an employee being manipulated. I think we could deal with this situation on a case-by-case basis.

Gladys – We are far more comfortable looking at it on a case-by-case basis. We can talk about this further.

Proposal 3 – Based on the clarification you gave us yesterday, we can agree to this.

Proposal 4 is across all contracts, so I'll hold on it.

Proposal 5 – We're willing to talk about this one. This is an important piece of info for our members. We don't think it's getting posted. Or the postings are so old, we can't find them. The assignment change language is not something people would normally be aware of. We understand that if somebody has taken a job, they are not immediately interested in changing. But we want to ensure there is some strong employer obligation to ensure an employee is made aware of their rights. There have been willy-nilly situations. This has flagged other issues related to assignment changes.

Proposal 6 – We are aware of the situation that you raised that led to this proposal. Our understanding of what occurred is that all employees were given notice at the same time and made aware of situation. The most senior employee then had 21 days to make a decision. Other employees had the same info during that time, and were in a position to be thinking about whether they would want to take it, if the more senior employee refused it. In effect, the less senior employees had more time to make a decision. We don't see this as a problem for our members.

Bob – We didn't get feedback from your members that it was problematic.

Gladys – The feedback we got was that they weren't brought in on the decision, when they had lots of ideas for how to bring in more money and make it more viable. They felt disrespected at not being brought in to the process. They felt blindsided. This (the timeline) was not brought to us as their main concern.

Proposal 7 – We checked the language against the MOU. It's pretty much the same. We find this agreeable.

Proposal 8 – This is a technical change, and we find it agreeable.

Bob – We know A is correct. We need to look at it, though, because we want to reference the correct part of the law.

Gladys– We have an interest in it being accurate, as well.

The final issues are on all three contracts. Regarding the strikethroughs on the salary articles – we are not interested in discussing this until we see a wage proposal.

Bob – We will give new language along with the wage proposal.

Gladys– We will wait for the language proposal.

On the issue of 30 days notice – We are waiting for more information from you.

Bob – I have gathered some information, but I couldn't articulately convey it, so we should wait until I'm fully briefed.

Gladys – On the proposed new administrative units, again, we are waiting for a listing from the U.

Turning to our (the Union's) proposals:

U1 – The central issue for us is that we don't want an employee to be forced to take vacation time because there's a holiday. We have supervisors who don't want to work with an employee to make up the time or adjust the schedule.

Bob – So, it's more a question about forcing people. If I'm half time, are there supervisors who are saying "you must take 4 hours of vacation to make your paycheck whole."

Gladys – No. We're talking about people who work four ten hour shifts. A person works ten hours, but on a holiday is only getting paid for eight. They then have to use vacation to make up the two hour difference.

Bob – In your example, are employees being forced to take 2 hours to make paycheck whole?

Gladys – I don't want to get into semantical quibbling. People are needing to take vacation to get a full paycheck.

Bob – So they are not being forced by a supervisor. It's just that they have to take 2 hours to earn a full paycheck.

Gladys – That's our main concern in the proposal, though we continue the proposal as is.

Proposal U2 – As we have talked about this, the issue presents itself most strongly in Duluth. There is a committee that exists and puts together a ballot on how employees want holidays to land. What we want is a choice of a floating personal holiday to be an option on the ballot.

Bob – Currently, when the ballot comes out, the four days are all attached to a specified date. You would like the ballot to have those days to include the option of a day at each employee's choosing.

Gladys – ballot could have four days specified, and additionally, give the option of a day of each employee's choice.

Bob – So, the issue is not the voting process; it's that all the days are designated on the ballot. It's a possibility that they would choose to designate all. They don't mind that?

Gladys – that's correct.

Proposal U3 – We're waiting to see what your deliberations produce.

Proposal U4 – We're still talking about this. Jody, could I ask you to talk about the situation you dealt with.

Jody Ebert – We have an employee who filled out FMLA paperwork for her dying mother. She was told by her supervisor that she could only use 2 weeks of sick leave. After that she could only use leave without pay, even though she had more sick leave available.

Bob – The current language says 5 days, plus an additional 5 for FMLA.

Gladys – our general experience and practice is that there is a demand for concurrent use of sick and vacation with FMLA. Employees have not wanted to use this. The employer has said they don't want an employee to use 12 weeks FMLA and then use sick and vacation on top of it. This language is in contradiction to what the practice has been.

U5 – We will drop this proposal.

U6 – Greg Knoblauch eloquently represented our position on this. This is not really a choice situation for the vast majority of people who leave before a closure. It's about people needing to get home in an emergency. The fact that it doesn't happen often ought to make it doable. This is an issue of basic respect for our lives, for the things that we need to deal with out of the workplace. The U wants to be known as a family friendly employer. The U could put its money where its mouth is at no cost.

U7 – You told us that you weren't interested in eliminating subsequent probation. That it's part of the hiring process and that supervisors and the employer might be less inclined to hire internally. If you want to push our buttons, this is a big one. Everybody in the room knows that most employers have a single probationary period. Harvard, who the U wants to emulate, has a single probation. They get by with a single probation. The key is that they respect their workforce, their employees, and that they respect their supervisors. We think that it's a lack of confidence vote in your supervisors that you need multiple

probations. It's as if it's "Probations are us University". This is a disincentive to mobility, especially to the most proven employees, who don't want to make themselves vulnerable. The U is losing out on their expertise. The U should look at this to really say, "Yes indeed, we respect our employees. We have to have the expertise they can bring."

Ron – I would like to tell you how silly this is. Two contracts ago, they eliminated the job class I was in. I had to move to a new job class. I had to go on probation after 16 years with the U. My boss said, "I'm really sorry. This is silly, but the U is making me."

Gladys– Where I find this most offensive are with employees who are laid off after years of service, and end up having to do a subsequent probation. Probation, and they get set up to fail because the supervisor doesn't want them.

U8 – This is our proposal having to do with student workers. I have some examples. Animal care, veterinary medicine – six years ago, there were 6 full time AFSCME workers and 1 student. Now, there are 2 AFSCME and 4 students working nearly full time during the summer.

As I look at the data you provided, the largest growth in the student work has been in classification 278, clerical and administrative support. In the advanced level, the quantity of students has almost doubled since 2000. While you said the numbers have stayed fairly consistent at the entry and intermediate levels, the ratio between students doing clerical work and clerical workers over the years has changed. Looking just a bit further into the past, the ratio would have been 1 student for every 5 clerical workers. Now it is nearly 1:1. If you look at the total number of students in this position, that's approximately 1700. On a bad day, that's approximately the same number of employees in 3800 and 3801 combined.

Parking and transportation is another area where we see lots of students used in positions that we think are full time bargaining unit positions. Our estimate is that there are nearly twice as many students as AFSCME. This is the office area, not teamsters jobs.

When I worked at the U a really, really, long time ago, I worked in admissions. There was a lot of photocopying to do, and I always thought that that was a dandy student job. But the other jobs at the U were jobs that required a certain level of understanding of process and procedure, the U would want somebody who was committed to the job.

U9 – Bob, you heard a lot already in response ...

Bob (interrupting) – I really feel bad that it was interpreted the way it was. I used the word "surprised" tongue in cheek. I used the word to make light. I know how important this was. I knew about this long before I started working at the U. Before I started here, I spoke with Bev Hall. I am aware of the importance that this holds to your members. Unfortunately, I didn't communicate my feelings well. It was certainly on the proposal list the last time it was negotiated. Again, I said it tongue in cheek. I do apologize. I don't mean to offend. You don't have to worry that I understand the importance.

Gladys – I am very concerned that the U doesn't understand the importance. Again, I am very concerned that they don't consider it important. This is a message, a real message to the workforce. As one of our committee members once said – when you walk in the door, you're immediately less important than the person who may walk in behind you. People talked about being at Eastcliff and being told they were vital. They were rewarded for their years of experience, with what, did you get lunch?

Ron – no.

Laughs.

Ron – We did get hors d'oeuvres and a mug.

Gladys– This is the way that the message could really get sent to staff. It's good for the U to hire people who already know this place. Half of your committee could talk about the things they know how to do. They know who to call, etc. It's time that this gets recognized in this way.

U10 – I need to discuss this more with my members. But I will say that the trainee position is getting posted when the non-trainee position isn't posted first.

Bob – What's the issue? Only the trainee position gets posted?

Gladys– The situations I'm familiar with are somebody who's brought in with 13 years of dental assistant experience, but doesn't have certification. The U requires it, but it isn't required by law to do the work. They are placed into a trainee position. 3, 5, or even 7 months later, the training doesn't seem to have happened. This is a nine month period of time followed by a six month probationary period. I think enough has been said for today. We'll come back to it.

Bob – Is the nine month trainee period followed by the six month probation also an issue?

Gladys – It's huge. It's been abused.

U11 – We're going to skip this for the time being as well.

U12, 13, and 14 – You said you wanted to deal with this in wages. So we'll wait.

U15 – We want to propose a meeting with Mary Luther on this issue during negotiations. This would be done by a subgroup, obviously. We would like to explore what she or her office has done to look at this classification. We would also want to share our perspective with her.

Bob – You gave us some information last time. Is there a distinction that you have, that I could share with Mary? What is the impetus?

Joyce – We want to spend more time to put something together for Mary. The subgroup should look at it and should include those whom it affects.

Gladys – We're hearing from our members that there are two distinct levels. That's why we want to meet.

Joyce – Because they are broad-banded, there are people doing tech work who are leaving the tech unit, and then are essentially performing work that should belong in our unit.

U18 – Grievance procedure. Our desire is to have a more objective hearing at step 2 and 3. We understand that the hearing officer will always be a representative of the employer. Often, though step 2 and 3 hearing officers are too close and jeopardize the integrity of the process. Frankly, resolving grievances at the lowest level possible is not happening because we are not getting any objectivity from our hearing officers. We have step 3 officers who were directly involved in determining discipline. We are not attempting to choose your individual hearing officers. That is not at all a part of this proposal. We are trying to get at a process we both said in the past that we wanted it to do. We want to get as neutral a look as possible to get us through the process, and get it resolved. At step 3, somebody outside the direct report line might provide more pressure to get it resolved before it reaches step three. I did a very informal poll to find out how many decisions have been resolved for an employee since the union formed and it's been extremely minimal.

Bob – I have to say, I'm a hearing officer, and I have never issued in favor of an employee. I have never done this by saying the employer is wrong. Instead, I'll go back to the employer and suggest changes. Many of those settlements might have otherwise been done in favor of the employee, but they are just not worded that way.

Gladys – We wouldn't be here if that was happening, but that is generally not what is happening.

Joyce – We also did talk about that example in our count.

Ken – The only settlement I recall in our favor was when Joyce pointed out that federal law was being broken. That's the only one I can recall. There's too much beholdings in a department for there to be impartiality.

Bob – I think the right way to settle it in the employee's favor is to settle it, not to find in the employee's favor.

Gladys – We're not seeing that problem solving situation. People in the administrative unit report line are dug in and are not looking to resolve.

U19 and U20 – We are continuing these proposals. This is one of those areas where consistency is a good thing for all of us. Bob, you said you recognize due process and legal obligations. It's good that you do. It would help supervisors understand this if the language is in the contract. If something isn't working in the contract from one of our perspectives, we need to talk it through and resolve it.

I would like you to clarify notification of union – is that your understanding or is that the meaning of the language?

Bob – I don't think the language requires it right now.

Gladys – Then we want it to.

U21 – This is not just of benefit to the union, but is also of benefit to the employer. It's particularly difficult as a scheduling issue. Sue could probably talk to the ramifications of Rhonda's schedule, with her being in and out. Having the 50% leave helps to alleviate this and create continuity in the workplace. We have this for all other locals, large, big, small. All of them at the U have it.

U22 – We will drop this proposal. We do want to give a bit of history on the University Labor Management Committee. When the ULMC was established, we were sitting across the table with deans, VPs, etc. and were creating important relationships with decision-makers in collegiate units. This has changed over time, and we are now in the room with hr reps that we see on a regular basis. This doesn't have the same kind of value for us.

Bob – How long did it function?

Gladys – For most of the life of the clerical and tech locals.

Linda – more than a decade?

Gladys – a majority of time.

Jody – up until 2003, we think.

Bob – The ULMC came into existence with the union and functioned until 2003?

Gladys – Since the existence of the clerical union, and functioned loosely, as in “the committee met”.

U23 – Turn to section 5 of the clerical contract. You had indicated that you believe that we already have the ability in section 5 to establish LMC's on all of the campuses. I want to make sure that that's the employer position.

Bob – That is my understanding, but I want to double check that. I want to make sure it's not just my opinion.

Gladys– If it's not just your opinion, than we consider the issue dealt with.

U24 – Expand bumping rights for employees. This is an issue of respect for senior employees. We have situations where a 30 year employee is going out the door while a 7 month employee is staying because the senior employee doesn't have the right to bump to a higher percentage position.

Bob – So, we are still going to look at the least senior, who could be a full-time employee. You wouldn't be thinking that the least senior or the one within the definition. This is for somebody who's only option is to bump a full-time. You want to get it down to the lowest senior?

Gladys– Currently, first you look in your department, and look for the same appointment type who is least senior. If that doesn't exist, you have the choice of a lesser appointment and identifying that as your bump. You don't have the option of going to a higher percentage if the same percentage doesn't exist. We would like to give that option.

Bob – A person would first look at the same appointment. Then, if there is nobody there, go to lower percentage or to a higher percentage?

Gladys– That's in the ballpark. We're open to talking about it if the concept is agreeable. We are trying to avoid a situation where the less senior person stays when a more senior person goes. We've seen people messing with appointments to protect people.

Bob – help me understand this.

Polly – I had a question posed to me in my job as an HR call center person. The question was about how to augment an employee who had been reduced to 75% and was receiving an augment of 25% to avoid being bumped. The department was gaming the system to prevent that person from being bumped.

Gladys – It can also work in the opposite direction, where there are two 75% employees and they increase the less senior to 100% to avoid a bump.

Okay, that takes us through everything.

Bob – I think we're breaking at 2:00 today. I don't think we'll be returning with anything substantive. We'll take the rest of the time to caucus.

The next meeting will be at 10:00 on the 28th.