Management
Labor Management Committee

Thursday, July 17, 1997
3:00 -4:00 p.m.
Showalter Hall, Room 107

MINUTES
(Approved at September 23, 1997 Meeting)

Members Present: Ken Dolan (chair), Jim Besse, Phyllis Edmundson, Kandys Dygert, Kathy Fleming, Curt Huff, Jane Johnson, Pat Rast

Members Not Present:

Resource Persons: Ken Berg, Samantha Hopf, Annie Cole

Resource Persons Not Present:

Ex-Officio: Tom McArthur

Guests: N/A

Recording Secretary: Crystal Schwenk for Angie O’Neill

I. Call to Order and Quorum.

Ken Dolan called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

II. Action Item:

Approval of Minutes, II.a. — Mr. Dolan
The minutes for the May 8, May 29, and June 19 meeting minutes were not approved. May 29 meeting minutes approval/changes are crucial. Changes can be dropped off to Angie; finalization of all meeting minutes expected at next BU 1 meeting.

Disposition:
The minutes require changes and were not approved by BU 1 and 2.

III. Information Items:
Five Year Dining Plan, III.a.
Mr. Huff requested postponement until the next BU 1 meeting. At Ms. Dygert’s request, Mr. Huff will try to get proposal to her before the next meeting for review.

Reasonable Accommodation Policy Proposal UGS-92-001, III.a. — Annie Cole
Ms. Cole confirmed a July 18 meeting in order to accomplish drafting of proposals for next BU I meeting.

Background Check Policy, III.b. — Kathy Fleming
Ms. Fleming asked if there was any change. She was told things are still going forward. It was previously agreed that BU I would have the opportunity to review proposed policies before they are put into effect. Ms. Fleming inquired as to who the payee of background check cost of $10/person would be. Mr. Dolan did not know.

Update on Review of Policy & Procedure Manual for Custodial Services, III.c. — Ken Berg
Mr. Berg received the manual and comments from the Attorney General’s Office and provided that document to Mr. Huff. Mr. Huff gave the manual and information from the Attorney General’s Office to Ms. Wichman for the necessary changes. Mr. Huff wanted the manual issue removed from the agenda and stated that if they ever decided to use it, that it would come back to this Labor Management table. Ms. Fleming requested the item stay on the agenda.

Employee Surveillance, III.d. — Annie Cole
Mr. Dolan stated for the record that the administration’s position is that this item is a security issue as a response to the state audit report, not an employee surveillance issue. Upon request from previous BU I meeting, Ms. Cole contacted the Attorney General who is unable to provide legal advice for Labor Management concerning surveillance. She explained her job description entails attorney client privilege for Management and therefore, would not be drafting a memo for Labor Management in the area of surveillance.

Ms. Fleming responded that the initial inquiry concerned determining the basis for the administration to place cameras on employees. Ms. Cole had understood in the contract there would be no employee surveillance and the question from BU 1 is whether placing cameras in the Bookstore and PUB is considered employee surveillance or surveillance allowed for other purposes. Ms. Fleming suggested in order to protect against theft, the cameras should be placed at the entrance and exits, rather than directed at the cashiers. Mr. Huff reminded Labor he had mentioned surveying customers as they approach cashier, aisles and delivery sections of the Bookstore, and the Food Service sections. The intent is to provide security for University assets. Ms. Fleming stated that it is against the contract to set up surveillance of classified staff employees. Presently, there is no request for proposal, and will not be one for at least one month. Mr. Huff will bring the request for proposal for Labor Management’s review and is unsure whether the request for proposal included the placement of the cameras. Management’s position, as stated by Mr. Dolan, was that if a camera system was misused, it would be contrary to the contract, as is it being proposed, it is a security issue and it is therefore, permissible under the contract from Management’s position. Ms. Fleming understood Management’s position,
however, when cameras are directed at employees, it is electronic surveillance and that is against the contract. It is a violation of the contract to have video surveillance of a classified staff employee. The National Bookstore Association stated that theft average is roughly 6%, not including employee theft. Ms. Fleming requested this item to stay on the agenda.

**Summer Custodial Services for Pearce and Dressler Hall, III.f.** - Curt Huff

Mr. Huff distributed handouts referring to agenda items III. f., h., i. Ten temporary employees have been hired, as well as some students, in order to help with the additional work load created by the Seahawks Training Camp. Temporary employees are filling the positions of full time custodial staff who have willingly transferred to work with the Seahawks during the training camp. Ms. Dygert was concerned about the supervision of temporary employees by full time custodial staff. Mr. Huff stated that full time employees will return to their original position when the Seahawks Training Camp is over.

**Supervisors/Stewards Training, III.g.** re: Contract - Kandys Dygert/Kathy Fleming

Ms. Dygert requested to re-visit the issue and ask Labor to have stewards from Bargaining Unit 1 present during training sessions. Ms. Dygert voiced her concern of no joint training for the purposes of supervisors and staff based on the contract. Ms. Fleming, in her capacity as a steward, has had difficulty with a supervisor accepting a grievance and that supervisor ordered her out of the building. The original agreement during contract negotiations was for supervisor/steward training and BU 1 believes stewards should be attending and participating in training sessions. Ms. Dygert expressed concern with not implementing contract regulations of training and the fact that this is causing disruption. Mr. Huff explained that most, not all, of the supervisors had gone through the training. The problem is that supervisors are not aware of their obligations. Mr. Dolan suggested putting together a list of the problems for discussion. The issue is that the stewards are not part of the sessions. The training and the training modules are satisfactory. Mr. Dolan suggested BU 1 review this item with Human Resources and keep supervisor/steward training on the agenda for the next meeting. Mr. Dolan further suggested having Ms. Rogers attend the next meeting to give an update on the training process and determine what the rational is for addressing which modules stewards will attend.

**Request Form for Shift change used in Custodial Services, III.h.** - Ken Berg

Flex time is a set of core hours. As long as the employee works the core hours, the rest of the hours may be “flexed” daily. The employee is allowed to adjust, or flex, their schedule as long as they work their full shift hours. Request for flex time is to be in writing. Presently there is no flex time request form.

**Summer Work Schedule for Physical Plant, III.i.** - Curt Huff

Mr. Huff received a request for flex time at the Physical Plant from Mr. Gibb. Mr. Huff was asked to bring this request to a special Labor Management meeting. The request was a scheduling change from Management and was not on the Special Meeting agenda, therefore, Labor requested that the request not be discussed but carried forward to the next regular meeting. Mr. Huff’s current understanding is that the request was originally from the
employees and that most of the shops are now working four-10 hour shifts with an expiration date of September 15, 1997.

There was additional discussion that when it is agreed that an item will be carried forward, that item should be carried forward and be on the next agenda.

Union’s Layoff Counter Proposals, III.j.
Ms. Fleming stated that Labor’s position is that it is not appropriate for the Planning and Budgeting Board (PBB) to be directly involved in the Union’s Layoff Counter Proposals. In the past, Labor has been able to meet directly with the individuals in charge of specific budget areas to know more about the needs and restrictions of the areas. With the July 29th notification of layoff date, Labor has no opportunity to adjust any of the proposals. Labor’s goal is to save as many classified positions as possible and, if no consideration is given to the proposals until after final deadline date, there is no way to work with the administration to agree on possible alternatives.

Mr. Dolan stated that, as previously agreed at Labor Management, the administration will continue to receive counter proposals through July 29th. Laid off employees have three days to select their options plus 15 calendar days.

Ms. Fleming requested that the submitted counter proposals be reviewed and returned to Labor for possible revisions. Originally, August 15 was the day agreed to, with the prior 18 days for the process. Ms. Dygert expressed concern for distribution of work after layoffs without a reorganization plan. The University is contractually obligated to accept proposals. Ms. Dygert stated that it appears that Management/Administration accepts proposals and Labor does not receive proposals. Labor would like a distinct procedure for the process of the thoughtful consideration of proposals. Mr. Dolan stated that the President will receive proposals from BU 1, how he chooses to review those materials is up to him. Ms. Dygert said she thought the PBB was for total University budgets, while the current concern is with individual areas. Previously it was agreed that Labor could not give information directly to individual areas, instead everything had to be provided strictly to Mr. Stewart.

Ms. Fleming pointed out that if layoffs were to start August 15, the layoff notices would have to be mailed before the final counter proposals were received. Management called a caucus. Upon returning, Ms. Cole stated that nothing would be decided until all proposals were submitted by the deadline, July 29, 1997; therefore, no decisions can be made earlier than July 30, 1997. The President or designee will consult with appropriate budget heads and no notices will go out until the process has been completed and a final decision is made on the budget. Mr. Dolan stated that if Management cannot make a budget decision by July 29th, then every day there is a delay the notification process will also move accordingly. Mr. Dolan said that the President may use the PBB meeting as part of his decision process. Ms. Dygert informed Management that Labor would be talking with the appropriate people about the budget information, in order to gather information. She also expressed concern about not receiving any reorganization plans after repeated requests. A reorganization plan is necessary because this
reorganization is based on the lack of funds, and a reorganization plan should address how work loads will be redistributed. Ms. Dygert again requested from the Administration the reorganization plan to help with meaningful counter proposals. Mr. Dolan asked that when Labor submits an up-to-date, complete package of all proposals to include all comments and proposed alternatives.

**Erosion of BU 1 Contract Issues, Article X., Section 4, III.k. - Kandys Dygert**
The Union believes it is inappropriate to use administrative exempt classification for jobs that were classified. Four employees had filed appeals because they had been inappropriately categorized as administrative exempt. Mr. Berg replied that those positions are presently considered classified based on a recent Personnel Board ruling and they will be classified as soon as Human Resources has completed the paper work. Ms. Dygert asked if similar positions will receive notice about being returned to classified status. Mr. Berg said that this had not been decided and was only knowledgeable of the four requested reclassifications, however, agreed that all positions that bring erosion to the Bargaining Unit, by not meeting the exempt provisions, should be reclassified. However, the order from the Personnel Board Rule Hearing applies only to the specific four individuals. Ms. Dygert requested Mr. Berg to immediately establish a mechanism for determining proper job classifications. Ms. Dygert also wanted a time frame in which this work would be completed. This item is to be carried forward to the next BU 1 agenda.

**Meeting Times, III.l. - Kathy Fleming**
Labor expressed the need for two hour BU 1 meetings, rather than the currently scheduled one hour, and a change of the BU 1 meeting schedule, in order to accommodate Union pre-meeting time, which conflicts with the current schedule. The membership discussed various alternative meeting times but Management did not accept any of the proposed times. Ms. Dygert requested to hold a special BU 1/Management meeting to determine a date for next month’s meeting rather than the current time allowed. Management agreed to set up a special meeting. All attending were asked to bring their calendars.

**Agenda Prep, III.m. - Kathy Fleming**
Ms. Fleming stated that she would take part in Agenda Prep and that she would be submitting BU 1 items in writing.

**Reports, IV.**

**BU I - Kathy Fleming**

None

The meeting adjourned at 5:08 p.m.