EASTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Labor Management Committee
Supervisory Unit Management Committee
Thursday, September 21, 2000
2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

PUB 357

MINUTES

Members Present: Jim Besse, Mike Frumkin, Kandys Dygert, Tom McArthur, Mike Irish, 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 2:05 p.m. She complimented Mr. McArthur on his remarks at the Welcome Back Breakfast, noting that they were consistent with the mission of the university.

II. Old Business:

Minutes of August 17, 2000, II.a.—Judith Siminoe
The minutes were accepted as presented.

Disposition: The minutes of August 17, 2000 were accepted as presented and will be distributed according to the contract.

Bargaining Unit Integrity, II.b.—Judith Siminoe
Ms. Siminoe distributed management’s proposal regarding Interpretation of Bargaining Unit Integrity, dated 9/21/00. Discussion included the following points/comments:

• Bylaw 820-060-160 addresses the student job pool—a general policy statement by the BOT stating a commitment to hiring students that is part of the student employment regulations.

• In 1992-93 $2.3 million was spent on part-time employment, in 1996-97 $3.8 million was spent, while enrollment went from 7600 to 5900. Classified staff numbers decreased and student employees increased, even though student enrollment declined. (Materials distributed are attached to the official minutes.)

• Why not hire those students as classified staff? Don’t use the students to avoid hiring classified staff.

• The numbers distributed by labor reflect non-work study—part-time only (part-time hourly student and non-student).

• Problem of contracting out--non-classified staff should not be performing classified work.

• Civil service rules, 04 exemption chapter, talk about 1050 hour limit and allows for work up to that limit before being eligible for classified staff status. How can we balance the maintenance of classified staff numbers with the university mission of providing education for students, and jobs to help support them in that effort. Instead of looking at numbers, look at what happens each year.

• How can we measure the change, and what methodology should be used to track it?

• Cost efficiency factor.

• Problem of the roll over of temporary workers when they reach 1050 hours.

Mr. Thompson proposed using 1994-95 as a baseline, and asked that management guarantee that classified staff hours not erode below 75%; students working as part-time help should be counted. Ms. Rogers responded that going back to 1994-95 is holding the new administration to something they had nothing to do with. Why hold them accountable for past problems? She feels we should agree upon measuring this administration beginning when they came in the door. Ms. Dygert said this is asking labor to hold administration harmless, because the numbers were down when the current administration came in. She believes the fair thing to do is to use the date the contract was signed, and ensure that the percentage doesn’t go down. How do we get to that? How do we ensure that that happens? We need meaningful discussion, but need to agree on a baseline.
Dr. Frumkin suggested that if we assume we are all trying to reach a core goal of the university, maybe what we need to take a look at realistically is what would the dollar cost be to get the work done? Is there any way we can do this within a reasonable framework. Ms. Dygert replied that classified work is classified work. A contract is a contract. Labors goal is to protect and expand classified positions.

Ms. Siminoe asked how much is erosion? Management doesn’t want to be locked in to an obligation of creating positions, and paying for them, in order to avoid erosion. Ms. Dygert replied that we need a goal; we need to establish parameters, and then review it quarterly. Mr. Thompson noted that this section of the contract is meaningless without an agreement on how to measure erosion.

Management requested to caucus for 10-15 minutes.

Ms. Siminoe stated that management would like to come back to the table at the next meeting with another proposal, attempting to establish a proportion.

Disposition: Management will draft another proposal establishing a proportion to use for measuring erosion. They will present the proposal to labor at the next agenda prep meeting so labor has time to review it prior to the next meeting.

III. New Business:

Reschedule or postpone October meeting, III.a.—Judith Siminoe

Ms. Siminoe asked if it would be safe to skip the meeting in October and wait until November 16. Management. Labor agreed, but suggested that the minutes from this meeting be prepared and signed early.

Mr. Thompson responded to management’s formal response to the contracting out issue, noting that labor will presume that this was a step 2 response to the issue once the minutes are signed. Labor will pursue any other legal remedies available to them.

Ms. Dygert requested further discussion of the key policy at the November meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30.