

Bargaining Session 13

6/24/15

Meeting Notes – Drafted by Mary McGrath

Administrative Team: Deb Huizinga, Heather Horn, Leslie Arvan, Robb Craddock, James Yoon, Paul Redman, Drew Slaughter

Bargaining Team: Paul Ruben, Mary McGrath, Dorothee Schneider, Kay Emmert, Jon Nadler, Sasha Mobley, Dan Steward, Gus Wood.

Start time 1:55pm

Introductions

- Bargaining dates confirmed for July 15, 1:30, July 29, 1:30, August 11, 1:30,
 - Rooms reserved. Kay wants a day's notice for room location.
- Fall dates? We will make a calendar at the next session.

Economic proposals? "No"

Kay: When can we expect economic Proposals?

LA: A lot of language on the table, when we get more tentative agreements and noneconomic items settled, then they will be in position to discuss. Still no budget from state, but our proposals are discussed internally.

- Personnel Files: We began a discussion of the "Personnel Files" proposal.

Kay: both proposals very similar but some considerations on our end missing in their proposal.

 - i. We will accept item A. BUT add "official personnel file overall be in "compliance with the IPRRA."
 - ii. Date stamping. Be clear what time items were added to the official personnel file to avoid adding items that would speak to a past event. How will the adding of items be tracked?
 - iii. How does the process work physically? A description was requested to help keep members informed.
 - iv. Departments shouldn't keep a separate and different file to be used internally.
 - v. Having a statement of some kind about what items go into a personnel file is important to us. Many members are not aware of this file.
- b. Same as item F
 - i. First line, evaluative materials – important to clarify what this means for members.
- c. Same as item E
 - i. What is meant by "review"?
- d. Item I
 - i. Members should be able to make copies of materials in personnel file.

- ii. Materials from file should not be shared by anyone outside of employer without notifying the member/employee.
 - iii. Reiterated the point that clarifying definitions pertaining to personnel file is key in informing members about these files at all.
- e. Item J
 - i. How will grievance materials be submitted, filed, tracked, etc.?
- f. Our item B is unique
 - i. Keeping non-academic related items (or job related activities) out of the file.
- g. Our item C
 - i. Notify member/employee when something is submitted to a personnel file.
 - ii. Item D tags along with C.
 - iii. No materials should be submitted anonymously.
- h. Our item G, H, and J
 - i. Making people aware of the process.
 - ii. Grieving the placement of the item in the file not the file itself.

Admin. invited to respond to our language proposals:

Leslie: I agree, we are on the same page on many things. We do not want to agree on anything that goes against what the IRRRA requires. Many of the things you mentioned about challenging items in file, who submits items, etc. are already covered in the IPRRA. If we decide to put in all of this detail, as long as we tie it into the IPRRA, as it might be amended from time to time, that's fine. But generally when it's covered by a statute we don't need to have all the detail. We should be able to work something out, understanding that union members would want things in one place.

Leslie: Burdensome concerns: date stamping all materials. Most documents have dates built into them. Doesn't seem necessary to have an additional date on top of date on typical file.

It could be good to talk about how personnel files are handled. AHR is the official file. When an employee makes a request, AHR contacts the relevant academic dept. then sends it onto dept. combining any necessary documents. Same concern with notifying employee/member whenever a new file is added. Also, anonymous items have never been added so language addressing this is not necessary.

We could give you language back on item B.

Rob C: whispering to Leslie. Expresses concern with copying union president.

Leslie: We haven't yet settled on discipline specific language. More appropriate in a discipline file rather than personnel file. Generally concern with paragraph D.

Members have access to their files as provided by the act. Specifics create confusion. Our interests are in complying with the act. We are committed to complying with the act. (Talks to self for a bit and to other admins) (Requested to take a caucus at 2:22)

Kay: Before we have a caucus, wants to introduce topic of evaluations. Most departments do not have a clear process for evaluations. Most common form of evaluation for NTT faculty are ICES forms. Several depts. are in the process of creating more detailed evaluation processes and materials for NTT faculty. Faculty themselves are often ignored when they request an evaluation. We would like a contract article as a basic starting place for evaluations. Our proposal says that

Evaluations need to occur.

Evaluations should be linked to promotions, merit raises and change in contract length.

Proposal gives a lot of latitude to each dept.

Description and procedure of evaluation needs to be clearly stated.

Criteria should be created by dept. with a faculty member.

Faculty members whose skills and job responsibilities require teaching are most suited to do this.

Rob C: Question: Conceptually we agree that evaluations should be a part of the official file, why would anyone grieve what is placed in the file?

Kay: Response: Depends on who places the item and how the items are defined. We will discuss this question in caucus further and get back to you.

Kay reads the testimonials. Speaks to why many NTTs are calling for clearer protocols to help improve the view of teaching staff as academic professionals. This can only reflect well on the quality of education our students are receiving. Reiterates point that those studying the teaching profession should be involved in setting the criteria for any faculty involved in teaching.

Anything you want us to discuss during caucus.

Leslie: Any additional feedback on discrimination? **Kay:** We are planning counterproposals but do not have them today.

Caucus begins at 2:44pm

Caucus ends at 3:46pm

Leslie: counterproposal on personnel files; reads through the proposal.

Kay: We'll want to review and compare as a team.

Leslie: We think evaluations has already been addressed by Provost in Communications 25 and 26. We don't see a need to include contract language when we've already addressed it in other

places. Department needs to retain flexibility and control. We'll need more conversation about this. "Management Rights" proposal, item number 9, addresses evaluations. We don't want to agree to anything in this article that hasn't yet been discussed in the "Management Rights" article.

Kay: The majority of the bargaining unit is not in positions that apply to the language of the Provost Communications. The Communications are therefore insufficient. Sometimes there is no language at all pertaining to lecturers and instructors. Departments are applying them (evaluations) at will. Content isn't so much the issue as infrastructure.

Wrap up:

More of a response on evaluations next time? Leslie says yes.

Kay requested that the admin. consider inconsistency between documents as a problem.

Leslie wants to discuss grievance procedure for next session.

Kay wants to discuss reappointment and non-reappointment as well. Leslie believes it will be a difficult topic but agreed to put it on the agenda.

Kay pushed again on economic proposals, establishing that we are aware of how budgets get passed late and often at the last minute. Leslie said the university will continue to operate even if no budget is passed by early August. The university has reserves. Budget committee plans for times like this. The state still owes us millions of dollars from current fiscal year. Points out that yes we get funds but most are from non-discretionary funds. It is not all available for how the university admin. chooses how to use it. Most of it is dedicated to a particular item.