I. Call to Order — Laurie Connelly called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

II. Old Business:

   Minutes of the July 19, 2001 meeting, II.a.
   The minutes of the July 19, 2001 meeting were approved as distributed.

III. New Business:

   Formalize a policy on Telecommuting, III.a.
   Jo Rogers provided two handouts of the guidelines being developed at the state level, based on the Governor’s executive orders on telework and flexible work hours. An interagency task force will decide how to comply with the executive orders. We will need to send in a report on numbers of employees, by December, so the task force has a baseline. Targets will be set, with periodic data reporting over the long term. Agencies with policies in place have until February 2002 to send in their current or revised policies, and the others have until May 2002 to forward their new policy. The goal of the executive order is to increase the percentage of state employees using of flex-time and telework options. We have a twist in higher education because of faculty teaching schedules. A campus committee will be formed, to include representatives from all areas, to work on the policy. It may be two policies, or be combined into one.

   Class Series Study for IT & Implementation Plan, III.b.
   Del Thompson noted that a sentence in the next-to-last copy of the draft document does not appear in the last copy. He asked if the specialized areas would be identified now, during the allocation process. Jo Rogers and Ken Berg will be discussing this further, regarding SPRs (special position requirements), and how to be consistent across the state. Del noted that page 43 of the contract is related to this issue. Both labor and management will need a list of the current positions with SPRs. Labor also asked for copies of any future SPRs applied in this class study process, so that they could have input. It was noted that the purpose of compacting the classes is defeated by applying SPRs—which just expands them again. Human resources has set a deadline of October 8 for the position questionnaires to be returned. They plan to have the allocations completed by December 3, so that there is time for interviews where there are employee or supervisor concerns. The final decisions will be implemented January 1, 2002. No desk audits will occur unless there is a concern. Human Resources will be making their decisions from the questionnaire responses, the job description, and discussions with the supervisor. Mr. Berg noted that the key to the process is the supervisor and employee agreeing on what the employee does. If they don’t agree, a discussion has to take place and a decision made based upon the evidence/documentation of the work performed. If the employee is unhappy, he/she can appeal. The employees have the right to union representation at the discussion/meeting. Ms. Dygert asked, since 6767 is funded, does the university get the money up front, as a lump sum, or is it allocated position by position? Jo Rogers said the state estimated an actual flat 10% of the roster of the impacted positions (position by position). We don’t know how the true, absolute allocation is going to work. She will try to get a definitive answer from the state.
Management position on Article XVII, Section 6, III.c.
Ms. Connelly noted that, to management’s knowledge, this section has not been used before. Ms. Dygert believes it was used in 1997, when the university eliminated the Graphics Laboratory in the Library. She said Kathy Fleming probably worked on it, but maybe not at this table. Ms. Connelly said management focused on the technological changes, tied to retraining, and that it would have to result in a lack of skills to do the job. The employee’s actual skill set is the problem, therefore reasonable efforts for retraining is the trigger. Mr. Thompson said at the time the contract was written, the IT folks were moving to a whole new system. Their skills/abilities were there but they would need retraining on the new system rather than being replaced by new, currently skilled people. Ms. Dygert said she thought it centered more around a person being replaced by technology, so they should be retrained for another position. Ms. Rogers noted that the current position layoff has been put on hold until this can be assessed. Ms. Dygert said labor cannot agree totally—e.g. if a switchboard operator’s duties are replaced by voice mail, they still have the skill, but the need went away. Ms. Rogers replied that the skill set went away—we need to determine what’s reasonable, and what’s not reasonable. We need a definition of skill set. It has to be determined whether an employee has any layoff options with their current skill set. Management will review the current situation in light of this discussion. Labor is not necessarily in agreement with management’s view of this item.

Disposition: The current layoff has been put on hold pending further investigation into this issue. Human Resources will research the previous use of this section, possibly in 1997.

IV. Other Business/Announcements:

It was decided to meet on Wednesday, October 24, from 2:30 – 4:30 p.m. Agenda prep will probably be held October 10, from 1-2. Connie will check and send out notices.

The meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.