Bargaining Team Meeting Notes

October 12, 2011

ABS 210, 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 noon

Participants: Darlene Andert, Jennifer Baker, Tony Barringer, Steven Belcher, Lucero Carvajal, Lois Christensen, Ines Delgado-Alberto (observer), Beth Elliott, Joan Glacken, Madeline Holzem, Maddy Isaacs (facilitator), Kathy Miller (note taker), Monika Renard, Hudson Rogers, David Vazquez (by phone), Jim Wohlpart.

Steve indicated that David Vazquez would be available by phone to discuss budget issues.

Meeting notes of October 11, 2011 were revised and approved as amended. There were no substantive changes.

Maddy opened the discussion by noting that we ended the previous meeting early and UFF is awaiting a management response to the UFF’s request to implement the raise as of December 1, 2011 instead of January 1, 2012 by finding an additional $45,000.

Steve noted that Hudson had previously provided approximate data about FGCU’s raise history and he asked Jennifer to share data which she had compiled. Jennifer distributed a chart describing salary increases since FY 04-05, which specified what portions of the increases came from the State and what were provided by the University. The handout also provided projected figures for FY 11-12. Maddy noted that the estimates Hudson provided on October 11 were very close to the actual figures provided in the handout.

Steve offered to contact David Vazquez to have him talk with the Team by phone. Monika said she was hoping management had already talked with him and had some answers. Maddy asked Steve if he could give some indication of whether or not it is possible to find the $45,000 of one-time funding for a December 1, 2011 implementation of a 2% salary increase.

Steve said that he had spoken to the Provost, who in turn spoke with the President, and the 2% is what is being offered effective January 1, 2012 as a base salary increase for 2011-2012. Steve explained that the raise pool is determined by a number of factors that we have previously discussed at the table and he said that those factors have not changed. Beth asked “So the answer is no.” Steve responded, “Yes that is correct” as far as the amount or start date.

Monika asked what things management could offer to improve the raise. Steve said that he does not know. He stated that the focus is on opening Article 23 to bargain and change what was ratified in the spring. Monika said that there has to be something else. Maddy said that Steve’s response means that we are here to ratify what was prematurely offered and rubber stamp it as okay. Steve said we are here to talk about the language of Article 23.4 so that we can bargain and ratify a change from zero (0) to 2%. Maddy asked how management sees this process as different from rubber stamping the premature
announced. She said that we are here to find a way to address faculty compensation. Maddy said that the UFF was here to represent the faculty in good faith bargaining and not rubberstamp what was announced. Steve said that the Team is here to bargain over previous language which says that there would be no raise for 2011-2012.

David Vazquez joined the meeting by phone. David said that every day is a dollar and the University would have to identify additional resources to move the date back (before January 1). He said that the factors of timing and amount offered were determined by the dollar amount we have to work with and that it is a matter of balancing competing priorities with limited funding.

Monika asked if moving the date to December 1 would cost about $45,000. David said that figure is about right. He added that he was not claiming the amount is a king’s ransom; just that it is a complex question in the current budget environment. David added that just recently the revenue estimates for the State were lowered at the General Revenue Estimating conference on October 11. He said that this continues to be a difficult financial environment and while he does not anticipate a budget rescission for the current year, he does anticipate a 5-10% cut for next year unless there is a change in the economic environment. He said that this recent development is also a factor in making decisions.

Maddy said the $45,000 to pay the raise on December 1 would be a one-time distribution. David agreed and added that the cash still has to be found in this year’s budget. David went on to say that given the current economic environment the timing of the raise was a part of the decision that also included a consideration of 2011-2012 enrollment. He said that he thinks it was a good decision, but he was caught a little off-guard when the cabinet announced the decision to move forward with a bonus plus a 2% raise because of the economic environment. He said that moving the effective date to December would mean having to find the funds. The phone call ended.

Maddy returned to her earlier question. She said that this appears to be nothing but a rubber stamp of a premature announcement. Steve said we have been at the bargaining table for three days, listened to UFF’s interests, and have discussed them here and also with the Provost and President. He said that management has considered all the interests and looked at the budget situation and we have, on both sides, bargained in good faith. Steve added that UFF seems to have forgotten that there is good news here as we have received a bonus of $1,000 and on top of that we also have an offer of a 2% raise and that is a good message to bring to faculty. He said that the UFF seems to have forgotten that there is an offer of a raise for 2011-12 when in the current CBA we had previously agreed that there would be none.

Maddy observed that they have not forgotten. She said that she is querying that management has said that there is no money to give the raise earlier and has looked at that against other priorities. She said that is the part that rancor’s her as the faculty is not viewed as a priority. If the President had said the faculty is a priority, she observed, then David would find $45,000 to make it happen. Steve said he disagreed. Jim said he strongly disagreed and he would submit that the President has made the faculty a priority as evidenced by the 2% raise and bonus. Monika said that staff and faculty all got the same thing
so that means there is no indication that the faculty are special. She said that it is like saying that faculty are just people in the organization.

Hudson said that he has not heard management say there is no money to fund the $45,000. Monika said that was exactly what UFF heard and asked if Hudson was saying that money is available but management is not willing to spend it on faculty. Hudson reviewed David’s earlier remarks and said that many factors were considered in determining what could be offered. Maddy said Hudson was confirming that doing something additional for faculty was not a priority. Hudson said that was Maddy’s characterization of his remarks, but not what was said. He referred to the notes from the October 11 meeting about the BOT budget workshop where we learned that the University only has about $450,000 in uncommitted funds after making allocations across various categories to include the commitment to fund the bonus and a 2% raise. Jennifer said those funds would be distributed throughout the year based on needs. Hudson said we do not do zero-based budgeting; we budget at the margin so that in general there are only the new funds to be spread across the array of priorities. He noted that one such priority has been faculty promotion increases which come off the top.

A caucus was called by UFF.

When the Team reconvened, Maddy indicated that she had to leave and Beth would facilitate the remainder of the meeting.

Monika asked if management would engage in brainstorming to come up with ideas to give faculty something. Hudson asked if the Team was truly using the IBB process because he was hearing positional bargaining language in the statement that UFF must get something. Maddy indicated that UFF is hearing the same from management. We are giving you 2% and nothing more or earlier and that is a position too. Hudson acknowledged that is a perception. Beth responded that UFF is interested in brainstorming and said that she wanted to apologize if it appeared that the UFF was positional.

Beth said that UFF appreciated all the information that has been given, but still had an interest of having something before January 1. Beth suggested that the Team spend the next 45 minutes to an hour brainstorming other ways to compensate faculty. She suggested that this could be done by providing such things as faculty development funding, parking, or seeking Foundation funding to move the raise to December 1.

There was discussion about past and current funding of professional development. Brainstorming ensued and a number of options were generated.

**Brainstorming**

- Increase Travel Funds in Colleges (E&G)
- Professional Development Funds in Senate (E&G)
- Professional Development Funds in Senate - Foundation to match $50k
Professional Development Funds increased to match number of faculty
Professional Development Funds added to Senate to free up funds for professional development in the colleges
Parking - Reduction in rate for general parking
Parking - Not charging for parking for a time period
Provide Raise earlier than January 1, 2012
Divert funding from Peter Seldin Workshop to faculty
Payment to faculty who have classes larger than 50
Stipend for faculty attending course design academe
Time off for Professional Development Day
Focus on Faculty Development through the Teaching Learning Academy Initiative (TLAI)
Run seminars on research methods
Celebration of Faculty without having to go through an application process -- highlighting accomplishments of different faculty members on different days
Providing faculty with help with statistics - Quantitative Analysis
Pay someone to help faculty run stats to assist faculty with research
Providing faculty with help with Qualitative Analysis
Pay faculty to run courses to train other faculty
Create a Research Center - a group of faculty who will meet and talk about their research
Create an Internal Directory of Faculty Resources (Internal WiKi) so that faculty can find other faculty with varying expertise
Provide faculty with connections with Practitioners to further research
Provide faculty with tuition reimbursement vouchers - for degree and non-degree seeking courses
Parking: provide gated parking lot to ensure students kept out of faculty parking lots
Faculty Lounge
Faculty Lounge in SoVi
iPads for Faculty
Faculty Resource Center for Copies and Scantron
Webinar(s) for Research
Recognition for which the faculty does not have to write or apply

Beth said that we need to evaluate the ideas and see which fit into the current article that is open.
Monika said that everything needs to be in the contract. She said that in the past we have done things without CBA language. Jim asked if there was anything on the list of ideas that would be covered by the CBA

Beth said that brainstorming time was up and to move forward we might want to categorize the ideas and see if there are shared interests. She said that things on the list may not result in CBA language. Jim asked if anything on the list is contract specific. Monika said, “raise paid early.” Beth suggested that we look at the criteria for evaluating options.
Jim said he appreciated faculty thinking “outside the box” and moving forward in a positive way. He added that management would like some time to digest the ideas which were generated as most were expected and there is the need to collect relevant information to be able to respond.

Beth said that something such as funds in the colleges, providing the raise earlier, and more money in the Senate, could be looked at and answered at the table. She said that we are facing a time limit with getting an agreement but understands that some things deserve time to research given the long-term implications.

Steve noted that some items on the list have a cost and others may not have a cost but that they are worth discussing. He said that we have provided management’s offer concerning Article 23.4. He said that there may be shared interest on the list but he was not sure if the items are related to the article that is open or the offer that has been provided by management. Steve said that at the start of the brainstorming session he had no idea we would be able to fill the board with ideas. He said that it is a testament to the spirit of what can be discussed and what we have done at the table. He said that there is a bargaining session scheduled for next week and we could come back having reviewed the ideas.

Beth observed that we are all interested in making the University a better workplace and it would be appropriate to continue the discussion at the next session. Madeline said that it would be good to come back and categorize the items. Beth said that it would be good to see if there are mutual interests for making this a better place. She said that we do not have to limit ourselves to just one item on the list.

The Management Team will facilitate the next meeting to be held Tuesday, October 18, 2011 from 1pm - 4pm in ABS Room 210.

The meeting concluded at 11:15 am.