Members Present: Bruce DeFrates, Kandys Dygert, Michael Irish, Rick Nesbitt, Rod Nicholls, 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 2:15 p.m.

II. Old Business:

   Minutes of April 19, 2001, II.a.—Judith Siminoe
   The minutes of the April 19, 2001 meeting were approved and will be signed and distributed according to the contract.

   Definition and Discussion Pertaining to Surveillance, II.b.—Del Thompson
   Ms. Siminoe explained that dictionary definitions of surveillance were attached to the agenda, and that this issue comes forward from discussion at the last meeting regarding the key card entry system in Monroe Hall. Management does not view the key card issue as surveillance. Ms. Dygert said the definition is not all-inclusive as it does not specify types of surveillance (e.g. electronic, video). Ms. Siminoe explained that the Monroe Hall system is a point-of-entry system and not a camera watching people come and go. It only tracks the first person to unlock the door in the morning, so management does not believe it falls under the category of electronic surveillance. The need is not for overseeing employees, but for security reasons only. Ms. Dygert agreed that the definition is acceptable, in conjunction with the contract, because it does not say “watch over”. Her concern was with how we use that key card information, and asked if labor can be assured that the information isn’t used to track employees as they work. The information needs to be limited in use, for safety only, and not monitoring an employee’s work habits. Ms. Siminoe said the definitions of surveillance are all right in interpreting the term in our contract. Electronic surveillance—the intent to watch or monitor an employee’s action—is prohibited. Management’s intent is not to track or monitor employees at work, but information garnered should be able to be used if necessary to investigate or discipline. Ms. Dygert agreed, as long as any other use is discussed at this table. Anytime an issue comes up, it will be discussed at JLM to determine that it is for security and not monitoring.

   Disposition: Labor agreed with the definition of surveillance. Management agreed that any issues involving other use of the tracking information would be discussed at JLM to determine that it is for security reasons only.

   Heavy Equipment Operation, II.c.—Del Thompson
   Ms. Siminoe explained that there have been questions about whether the categories are appropriate for heavy equipment use. Ken Berg said the only piece of equipment Eastern has that fits the heavy equipment state benchmark is the Ford three-axle truck, not the backhoe as it is ¼ yard and not 1/3 yard. He said it is also the kind of work the equipment is use for, not just the size. Is it appropriate for a gardener lead to operate the backhoe, and if so, under what conditions? Management believes that it is okay, under the limitations listed on the Karen Wichman handout. Labor will review the information and if they have any further questions they will bring it back. Ms. Rogers said we can look at a specific position, regarding effort and time, if a reallocation is being pursued.

   Disposition: Labor will review the heavy equipment operation information and bring it back to the table if they have any further questions.
III. New Business:

Discussion Pertaining to Bonus Pay Section of the Contract, III.a.—Jolynn Rogers
Ms. Rogers explained that a situation came up around this. A person was on vacation leave when their department needed to contact them for ½ hour. Human Resources had the employee modify their annual leave as reported on their time sheet. The question came up when a steward thought the employee should have received bonus pay. Management’s interpretation was that it should be a leave modification, as it occurred during regular work hours. Labor sees it as call back because the employee was not notified prior to their ending shift that they were going to have to perform work. Labor fully supports that this person pursue his contractual rights. Labor is not in agreement of management’s interpretation of the situation.

Disposition: Labor is not in agreement with management’s interpretation of bonus pay and fully supports the employee pursuing his contractual rights.

Code of Conduct Document in Physical Plant, III.b.—Del Thompson
Mr. Thompson said labor believes this document should have come to JLM prior to being published and distributed. It seems like it is something that, if it were to exist, shouldn’t be applied to just one section of campus. Mr. Irish explained that the document is part of the performance expectations of the Facilities employees—so it was set up for this group of people and not the entire campus. Ms. Siminoe agreed that these things are incumbent on everyone, but that this document serves as a grouping/summary/reminder to this particular group of employees. It is the result of a recent remediation where Ms. Dygert asked that management create a set of expectations. Ms. Dygert agreed with the intent, but stated that the document should have been discussed with the union and not implemented unilaterally. She also believes the code of conduct should be applied across campus not just in one bargaining unit.

Management’s view is that we are trying to resolve some individual issues by encompassing the entire group. The reality is that employees want to see in writing what they are being evaluated against. Not having it in writing gives you nothing to measure against. The intent was to bring clarity to the working relationship. If employees don’t understand, they should be talking with their supervisors. It is a performance expectation/working relationship issue.

Ms. Dygert said she had to disagree that this document is what management says it is—it becomes a policy that people will be evaluated against—a working condition. It is subjective. At the time of evaluation, management can discuss problems individually without writing it up and posting or circulating it. It is a change in working conditions that hasn’t been published before. She believes it should have been brought to the table, perhaps tweaked and presented to both Bargaining Units.

Ms. Siminoe said management’s intent is to remind people that these are expectations to be shared in a working environment. Mr. Thompson brought up the fact that it may be the way it was enacted/prepared rather than the content itself. There was no union involvement and no copy was sent to the union. Ms. Rogers said it is a modification to the performance expectation for working relationships, not a policy issue, so management had no intention to cut out the union representative. Labor does not agree with the document, and Ms. Dygert said a pattern is apparent—management doesn’t bring important issues to the table. Ms. Siminoe reiterated that management’s intention wasn’t to be disrespectful to the union, but was an attempt to solve a problem.

Disposition: Unknown. Discussion of different perspectives on the issue. Union’s position is that this is not a valid document.

IV. Other Business/Announcements

Spokane Center Web Cam System, IV.a.—Bruce DeFrates
Mr. DeFrates gave background on this item. He and Allen Barrom discussed having a video cam between their two offices, as well as the need for security at the Spokane Center—a better way to protect the staff. Mr. Barrom discovered he could set up a web cam system much cheaper than buying a standard security system. The Spokane Center’s location is at the edge of a high crime area in Spokane, where theft is a major threat. Transients walk in off the street, and they received a bomb threat recently. With a system in place they might have identified the perpetrator of the bomb threat. They would like to install 2 cameras on the front doors, one at the back door, one at the loading dock, one at the front counter, and 2 at the
bookstore. The cameras take still shots every few seconds; these are stored in the computer for two weeks and only accessed if needed. They are purged every two weeks.

Mr. Nicholls agreed that we need to do something for security at the Spokane Center, but his concerns are the cameras on the front desk and at the bookstore. Web cam links can be accessed by anyone, anywhere, if they are able to get into our website. Mr. Thompson said computer security can be enabled to restrict access to all but the local host or the host plus one other computer. If we set it up that way, we can tell by the IP address who is accessing the information. Mr. DeFrates noted that the staff is overwhelmingly concerned about the security issue. Ms. Dygert said there are personal safety issues also. Labor would need to see where the cameras are to be positioned, then both sides need to agree on how that information will be accessed and who accesses it. It will also be necessary to post the fact that cameras are being used. Labor is not against the use of a web cam system at the Spokane Center, they just need to agree on various issues. Ms. Siminoe suggested that we hold our next meeting at the Spokane Center, and add Bob Anderson and Allen Barrom to the meeting. Labor will talk to staff in the meantime for their input.

Disposition: Connie will set up the next JLM meeting at the Spokane Center, including Bob Anderson and Allen Barrom, to review the proposed camera locations.

The meeting adjourned at 3:40 p.m.