
Meet and Confer - Highlights

AFSCME & Management
Thursday, April 28, 2016

- I. Public Comment
 - a. None
- II. Meeting Highlights – April 14
 - a. Approved; No revisions or corrections
- III. AFSCME Proposals
 - a. E6, Educational Leave
 - i. After questions were raised by Management, AFSCME revised the original presentation to clarify where in the policy this new appendix would be placed.
 - ii. Currently, there is no language in policy regarding paid educational leave which caused issues when an employee approved for this leave returned.
 - iii. AFSCME based their proposal on the Exempt policy; the Exempt team is also proposing changes and shared their return to work language with AFSCME.
 - iv. Discussion regarding what would happen with an employee who was out on paid education leave and the terms and conditions of their employment changed (restructure, reduction in force, etc.).
 - v. This discussion also took place with the Exempt team and language was developed to address the issue; this language was also used in AFSCME's proposal.
 - vi. No further discussion; proposal was signed.
 - b. E3, Accrual and Accumulation
 - i. The amounts in this proposal mirrors that of current exempt policy and would put non-exempt employees in line with exempt employees.
 - ii. Management questioned, given the financial circumstances of the College and that this was not discussed last year, why AFSCME feels it should be brought forward now.
 - iii. AFSCME stated this was brought up last year and it is being brought forward this year because this is what our constituents have asked for, along with performance evaluations.
 - iv. Discussion regarding the wisdom of bringing forward every request received without considering whether or not it is a pressing issue that should be brought forward especially considering the current financial constraints of the College.
 - v. It is AFSCME's belief Exempt and Non-Exempt should have the same accrual rates and personal opinions do not enter into it; the issue is will Management agree or not.
 - vi. Although there is not significant disagreement in adjusting the overall accumulation maximum, there is a definite cost implication on increasing the accrual rates and the ESC would need to be consulted.
 - vii. As this is the last meeting, there was discussion on how best to proceed with this proposal.

1. Management is unwilling to sign as is and must confer with the ESC to ensure no issues will result from raising the maximum accumulation rate; AFSCME felt this work to verify with the ESC could have been done when Management first received the proposal.
- c. E8 and B2, Compensation
 - i. Teams discussed the original proposal (B2) and AFSCME's counter-proposal
 - ii. Language was added to the beginning of the original proposal to address the status of the Step Progression Plan.
 - iii. Teams agreed to refer to number three (3) as "Change to Lower Classification Range (involuntary)" and number four (4) as "Change to Lower Classification Range (voluntary)".
 - iv. Step Plans approved in 2015 are no longer valid – they would have been considered had a new plan been identified.
 - v. To help clarify the proposed deduction and step placement, team members went through an example.
 - vi. No further discussion; proposal was signed.
- IV. Management Proposals
- a. E3, Leaves and Holidays
 - i. It was determined, after originally signing in early April, while working on a similar proposal with the Exempt team, language was needed to clarify the Thanksgiving holiday.
 - ii. Language was also added to clarify the rationale.
 - iii. No further discussion; proposal signed.
- V. AFSCME expressed their disappointment in this year's process, especially noting the limited amount of time to meet in comparison to past years.
- a. Management explained the intent was to only bring forth a small number of proposals, not the 40-50 that were brought forward last year, that would help address urgent issues such as compliance or budgetary restrictions.
 - b. AFSCME stated they had nothing to do with the HLC violations and situations such as performance evaluations were a top priority for their group.
 - c. Discussion regarding the work of the task force and how the meet and confer process or structure might change as a result of their work.
 - d. AFSCME submitted seven new proposals the evening prior to this meeting- Management felt this was not in good faith and could not, therefore discuss them.
 - e. AFSCME said they, in good faith, worked on the reduction in force proposal despite the fact it was sent to them the day before a meeting, and have only brought forward those proposals based on survey results.