

Bargaining Session 14

July 15, 2015

prepared by Dorothee Schneider

Union representatives met with the administration's bargaining team for their Fourteenth session at the Fire Services Institute for approximately three hours.

The administration team presented no Fall bargaining dates and no economic proposals.

Kay opened the discussion by stating that the admin. grievance proposal language was not acceptable and that it raised a number of questions which she then proceeded went over in detail.

Of particular concern were the short response times the admin. proposal imposes on the union at various steps (ten calendar days) and the requirement that grievants go through what admin. calls an "informal" process before filing for a grievance with a unit supervisor or dean.

Kay also criticized the limiting language in the admin. proposal: while the parameters of when a grievance can be filed, are outlined in the beginning of the article, more limitations are added to later section often in a vague way. Kay also expressed concern and disagreement over the limits played on an arbitrator's ruling. Admin. representatives responded that these limits were appropriate (the arbitrator might be "wrong") and, in the case of the arbitrator, were commonly applied. Our team remained unconvinced by this argument.

The discussion then moved on to preamble, discrimination/non-discrimination and personnel file -- our counterproposals. Kay pointed out that the preamble was important to us because it alluded to our working conditions and the commonalities we have with the university community as a whole. Kay also explained the slight modifications we had made to our non-discrimination article in response to a previous discussion.

Kay then proceeded to explain the union's counter proposal on Access to Personnel File. Taking the Union's proposal as a basis, admin. Proposal language had been inserted as had language that resulted from our last discussion on the subject. Our team insisted that compliance with the Illinois Personnel Record Review Act needed to precede any other clause. It is also important to us that faculty members have the right to grieve the placement of any document in their file and that the record relating to the grievance process shall be separate from the personnel file.

After a caucus of 90 minutes, our teams met again and the administration group then presented a counter proposal on personnel file. The counterproposal did not incorporate all of our concerns and we agreed to have it up for discussion again at our next meeting.

Arvan then provided responses to the points Kay had raised regarding the Grievance article. On many issues the admin. team indicated room for flexibility (such as the time frame for filing and responding), other issues such as how to classify informal pre-grievance discussions, remained unresolved.

We agreed to meet again on July 29 at 1:30 and to discuss the following topics.

Admin: corrected Personnel File article

Response to Purpose/Preamble

Response to Non-Discrimination

Union: Response to Grievance

New topics: Appointment/Reappointment

No Strike

The meeting adjourned at 4:50