

APSS Meeting
April 12, 2018
KC 1104
12:00 p.m.

Agenda

- I. Call meeting to order 12:03 p.m.
- II. Roll Call – Becky Bakale, Erica Baker-Bringedahl, Coreen Bedford, Lindsay Bogi, Lindsey Burns, Barb Ellis, Cheryl Fischer, Bill Grimaldi, Vicki Helgeson, Michelle Holstege, Sandra Jennings, Tami John, Rhonda LeMieux, Patrick Perry, Janet Potgeter, Hollie Rago, Deb Rotman, Mark Saint Amour, Carol Talsma, Vicki Wenger
- III. Approval of March meeting minutes – HR – comment on correction to the dates dues will resume on 8/21/18. Motion to approve minutes 2nd and approved.
- IV. Presidents Report – heartwarming to see we have member on STD and needed vacation hours to supplement her medical leave. Overnight the request was filled and the member will be covered.
 - a. Thank you to those who were nominated – we would like to see more people become involved.
- V. Treasurers Report – written report given. Balances were verified on 4/9/18 by Becky. We are sending out gift cards to those members that have retired this quarter. Motion to accept the report as written, motion 2nd and carried.
- VI. Membership Report – written report is given. One of the new staff members left the university. There were no retirees on the report from HRO, however there are a couple that have retired. VH had a couple of changes to PSS location of offices. That will be on the next report per Cheryl as it has not occurred yet. No other comments. Motion to accept the March report, 2nd and carried.
- VII. Communications Report – no report. The pet newsletter was very fun and it was a great suggestion from a member. Any other ideas/topics would be appreciated!
- VIII. Member Relations Report – No outstanding issues or grievances. Coreen is here because we had a few calls on a recent issue. I would like to get some clarity as this could happen in the future. The university is at a point they would like to scale down. This is an issue that was bargained. We were approached by a Dean that wanted to move some people in his college. The actual verbiage in the contract says “department”. The intent was to allow for a dean or a chair with the Dean’s position was to move a member with the approval of the Dean, HRO, I & E and the union. We fought for the language as we have never been able to do this in the past. There will

be information that is confidential that cannot be shared with everyone when some of these things occur. This is why we have a union, we have 2 members that were C2 and the Dean wanted to move them in to a C3 role. As long as all 4 parties agreed to this move it was allowed to occur. There are people that are upset that this occurred because they felt they were not given a chance at this position. I want to clarify because I see this possibly occurring more often. BR1 – so we started with scaling back from the university, are they filling the C2? They will probably not scale back on those positions. One has been posted and the other has not. A department in Student Services was eliminated, the staff in there were given the option of a buy out or reassignment. The 2 PSS members were given positions those two moved from the department within the division and moved into a non-academic position CLAS. There are a number of schools that are merging/reorganizing. BR2 – so those position are more of a reorganization. CLAS advising because they were combining SASC needed another staff member. Coreen – so this situation has to do with section 8.5, Vacancies can be filled by organization advancement within the department and shall not require a posting. HR, APSS, I & E, the member and the Dean all have a role in this decision. The contract says hiring department – from one perspective, the members viewed it as Department, and we know this has happened in the past but usually it was an issue being resolved. It benefitted everyone all around. In this situation the people said they liked where they were at and went from a C2 to a C3 and others in that CLAS felt it was unfair. I have made some phone calls and talked with some other members of the bargaining team. The intent is broader than department. We had actually wanted it broader. What we want is internals first. Now we are looking at department vs. college. The information that has not been made privy to the membership, are the conversations that occurred between those 4 departments. We are not privy to that information either. What I do know is there are positions that are not being filled due to the financial considerations of the university. There are some slight squeaks about wages at certain levels. Then we go back to 2 C2 members and promoted the 2's into the 3's and they are backfilling 1 of the positions. There is intent to the language that discussed at the bargaining table. I know in my presentations I mentioned department level and possibly up to the college level, because we have leaders or supervisors that could have manipulated the language in another way. BR3 – I remember from an academic unit standpoint, I work for a department with two people, would I be the only person or would it be in the College. Could they be placed into the role without an open search? BR4 – I appreciate there was an intent, I was thinking in the department you could slide up and that is fair. What happened here it really did not give anyone else an opportunity. There are reasons we are not privy to know. I am finding that a hard criteria to swallow, others that want advancement from a c3 to a c3 – how did those reasons come into play. If someone wanted a lateral move because they are not happy where they are – that is an important piece of what we should do. There were probably members that would have gone after that position and they did not have the opportunity. I hope it doesn't happen again like this. BR3 – my concern is in CLAS there is way more opportunity than PCEC, or other smaller colleges. How is this as an academic unit going to look? Even if it is limited to a division or a college, it takes away the opportunity to move around. Coreen – and we also hear I am the only person in my department and I try to get into here and I never do because

there are so many other people. I understand both sides of this. Cheryl – how often do you think this will happen, this is the 1st time that this has occurred? Every instance that this occurs is taken into consideration, we have an opportunity to say no, if they give us the information I hope you would trust that we would make the right decision. BR5 – I can honestly say I have at least 5 people come to me and they are hearing that the Dean's office is "tapping" people they don't think it is fair. Let's go back to BR4's statement if someone is tapping and wants to move people. If one person is allowed to make that decision, is I & E going to approve. Coreen – I have seen it where I & E has turned down a situation. I respectfully can say from your perspective, had I been sitting there I would have wondered why. This is going to be one of those it is done and over, and it will be perceived in a different way than what the intent was for this situation. How do we move forward? There has to be a level of trust with the board and if that has eroded then maybe that is another issue to discuss. We do know there will be potential program cuts/ layoffs. We have support staff out there that have soft money funding their position. I think this is a great lesson learned on a whole number of levels. I think we will look closer at the decisions being made, is this really the right thing. I don't know what else can be done. If we say we will stay with only the specific contract language, we will lose some of our ability to work with the contract. We have always worked with that flexibility and we have pretty much been errorless. BR1 – I think we cannot have our cake and eat it to, I think it will be a stepping stone and we can tighten up our language in the future that is what the contract is for. RL – so much of our conversations were based on past practices, so even if it wasn't written we can pull from situation and develop from what was done in the past. BR6 – has this been a change from previous years. BR4 – some of this is experience based, to think that we don't trust you makes me feel bad, going forward if a similar situation comes up be very cautious and consider all sides. If the position had been opened up to applications maybe they would have picked someone else. The union gives more support and guidance to people when you want to move around to different departments. Just in the future – we cannot back pedal but it is probably still a good thing and I think it is important to know what the climate may look like over the next 2 years. You may have people drop out. At the same time, if we don't have the flexibility to move outside of the department what if you have 2 people in one department and one person loses their job because we cannot move people. The 2 in this situation did not even ask for this move, the Dean made a decision of what he wanted to do and then went to HRO, if he hadn't had the flexibility to move his people would someone lose a job? We take all that into consideration before we give our opinion. BR4 – the big bump in the road is one of the people had contact and nobody had a chance to apply for it. In this case this person was cherry picked to move into the C3 position. Cheryl – we started all this language 5 contracts ago, because the biggest issue was externals were getting the jobs. How do you know if you open this up they don't hire an external? Coreen there is also language in here that does NOT limit the university in the ability to move people where they want. We have to know when to work with the university and when not to. The intent was to help our internals, to not get them stepped over by an external person. We had to put some language in there to move people to keep positions. Coreen – one more scenario – we have 2 positions, they eliminate one

position and we do not allow them to move that person to another position in that college. They have enough seniority to bump all the others and they would then continue to bump until they get to the least senior PSS. I hear all of what you are saying and I understand your concerns. The board has to have some flexibility to work with HRO, I & E and the departments going forward in the next couple years. BR7 – how worried should people be about potential financial issues? We have to do other things to get students to come here because there are fewer students to recruit. That is occurring across the nation not just state of Michigan. There is nothing being said of what is going to happen – no layoffs etc. but we don't know with the demographic situation. Cheryl – this is not to scare anyone it is reality to understand the purpose of our union to help our staff. Remember this our number of support staff we have 1 to every 3 or 4 at another university. BR5 – so if these people that are upset who represents them what part of the contract will they use – failure to represent per Coreen. There is language in the front of the contract that may address it – Coreen will review and get back to BR5.

- IX. Building Representative Reports
- X. Old Business
- XI. New Business

Meeting adjourned 1:05 p.m.