EASTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Labor Management Committee
Supervisory Unit Management Committee
Thursday, November 16, 2000
2:00 – 4:00 p.m.

PUB 357

MINUTES

Members Present: Jim Besse, Mike Frumkin, Kandys Dygert, Tom McArthur, Rod Nicholls, Penny Rose, Judith Penrod Siminoe, Del Thompson

Resource Persons: Ken Berg, Jo Rogers

Recording Secretary: Connie Gross

I. Call to Order
Judith Siminoe called the meeting to order at 2:07 p.m. Mr. Thompson introduced Rod Nicholls as the new President of Local 931, and Penny Rose as Chairman of Bargaining Unit II. He also extended thanks to Tom McArthur for his service as President of the Local.

II. Old Business:

Minutes of September 21, 2000, II.a.—Judith Siminoe
Mr. Thompson pointed out that in the paragraph under II.b. where he proposed using 1994-95 as a baseline, his intent was that, as specified in the contract, there should be no erosion or lessening of classified hours worked as compared to the classified hours worked in 1994-95, e.g. the proportion might stay the same while the hours could actually go down. The actual number established the baseline, not the proportion or percentage. His concern is that he wasn’t talking just the percentages as established in the baseline, but also the hours—in ledger one as well as all university. He requested the insertion of the word “hours” between ‘staff’ and ‘not’: “…that classified staff hours not erode below 75%…”

Discussion continued around the bargaining unit integrity issue. Mr. Thompson handed out a chart (attached to the official minutes) and will check to see if his chart includes overtime hours. He proposes using hours that don’t include overtime because we need some kind of demonstrable unit of measure. Too often there are too many gray areas.

Ms. Rogers asked if we could use the 75% as a trigger/threshold for discussion, with a margin of error.

Ms. Dygert sees the percentage as a ceiling, not a floor.

Ms. Dygert requested one further change in the last line of p. 1—“feels” to “believes”

Disposition: The minutes of the September 21, 2000 meeting were approved with two changes. The corrected minutes will be distributed according to the contract.

Bargaining Unit Integrity, II.b.—Judith Siminoe
Ms. Siminoe distributed management’s “Proposed Proportion to Measure Erosion” (a copy is attached to official minutes) She explained that management was thinking in terms of FTE rather than hours. The budget office will be posting this data on the web on a regular basis. Management proposes a review at the university level and proposes that student work study be excluded. They agree with the concept of establishing a baseline of FY 1995. She explained that management does not want to hold classified work at a set percentage of all work performed at EWU because of changes in the work being performed and in job class specifications. This proposal would provide for an annual review and
discussion of whether changes have occurred, and if so, why, without guaranteeing that the level of work performed by classified staff can be held constant. Is there a corridor or trigger approach? And if so, what would it be? E.g. if we decide that we’re going to have a ratio—what is the window or variance?

Disposition: After discussion of the proposal, both sides agreed to 1) review bargaining unit integrity at the university level (with a decision to be made later regarding whether this review should be across all ledgers); 2) use a base year of FY 1995; and 3) track overtime but do not add it into the hourly total. Mr. Thompson will talk to Tesha Kropidlowski about the web data. Both sides agreed that work-study will not be counted; but no agreement was reached regarding the inclusion/exclusion of student hourly. Labor agreed that there should be a variance approach, the dimensions of which are to be determined later.

Key Policy, II.c.—Kandys Dygert
Ms. Dygert said labor believes this should be a key access card and area procedure for classified staff, possibly along with staff, but excluding students. Regarding implementation of the procedure, labor requests that any modifications be brought back to the appropriate union management table (classified or faculty). She has some concerns over the general procedures—it appears there is no limit to some penalties and/or processing fees, and she is concerned about having the fees due and payable immediately. Labor has some questions about #7 and thinks it might be a possible workload issue in regard to the reasonableness of the 48-hour notification request. Items #11 and #12 say lost or stolen keys have to be reported within 48 hours. Ms. Dygert questioned if that was from the day you know it’s lost or stolen, or from the day you realized the keys are missing. (language issue). She also noted that no form was attached—labor would like to see what the lost or stolen key report looks like. The description of how to get a master key is not the process currently being utilized. Regarding key authorization, maybe a person should be designated with this authority rather than counting on the dean or vice president to be available. Also, if keys are truly stolen, should the person be responsible? This has very rarely involved classified staff. The people working in the key area indicated students lose the most keys, then faculty, and then staff. It was noted that grand masters are checked in each night. Labor will have another meeting to draft a proposal for the next meeting.

Disposition: Labor will draft a proposal to be discussed at the next meeting.

III. New Business:
McArthur memo dated 10/11/00, III.a.—Judith Siminoe
Ms. Siminoe said the memo was disappointing to receive and to have it shared with other people. She said some of the issues could be discussed at this table, and other issues have possible resolutions in process. She believes this was not a constructive way to try to deal with the issues, and would prefer that we not communicate our concerns in this manner.

Labor asked to take a brief caucus.

Ms. Dygert understands Ms. Siminoe’s comments, however labor believes it is not a labor/management issue and asks that it not be attached to the agenda or minutes, and that it have no disposition. Ms. Siminoe disagrees as to whether it is a labor/management issue. Both sides need to work together and communicate, however she agrees not to attach the memo to the official minutes and that there will be no disposition.

Proposed 2001 Meeting Schedule, III.b.—Judith Siminoe
Labor approved the schedule, as long as no holidays are included.

Disposition: The Proposed 2001 Meeting Schedule was approved as distributed.
IV. Other Business/Announcements

Reschedule or cancel December 21 Meeting, IV.a.—Judith Siminoe

Ms. Siminoe reported that she will be out of town when the next meeting is scheduled, and asked if labor would prefer rescheduling or canceling the Dec. 21 meeting. Labor agreed to skip the December meeting, (unless a need arises in the meantime), which will allow more time for data analysis. The next scheduled meeting is on January 18, 2001.

Ms. Rogers reported on the issue of employees in the food service area not receiving 2 consecutive days off. She examined timesheets for the person mentioned and saw no problems since September. Mr. Thompson said he was aware of two issues: scheduling in general is not consistent and they are telling someone that her Thanksgiving holiday counts as one of her 2 consecutive days off. Ms. Rogers said she will speak with the manager of that area. Ms. Dygert suggested management compare the way scheduling was done in the past and how it is currently being handled. She noted the current scheduling practices make it difficult for employees to have an orderly life.

The meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.
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