

Wed 5/14

FA Negotiation Team: Paul Cartie, David Michalak, Julie Martin, Karyn Moyer, Kennie Leet, Tim Skinner

College Negotiation Team: Jeff Anderson, Laura Hodel, Penny Kelly, Racquel Smith, Michael Sullivan, Jeanette Tillotson, Colin Leonard (lawyer)

Dr. Hawkins opened the meeting and made the following points:

- Current contract has some issues that make it hard to work under
- Feels dated and doesn't reflect our current structure
- Doesn't appear particularly student friendly
 - Timing issues
 - Issues related to allowing the organization to recruit students
- Hopes that the new contract will be forward-thinking to allow us to adjust to the changing nature of community colleges
 - Timing of things
 - Addressing adult learners
 - The defined roles for everyone
- Hopes that the negotiation sessions and the new contract creates an atmosphere of collegiality all around

After introductions, the teams exchanged proposals and then separated into different rooms to review them.

When we reconvene a little over 30 minutes later, the college negotiation team had no questions for us. Colin Leonard stated that

- They understand our proposals. They will look at them more closely and come back and respond at the next meeting.
- They had also discussed dates for our next session during the time away.

We had a couple questions on our part

- Can you explain the rationale for removing the entire Surveillance article from the contract?

Response:

- It's a remnant of a period at the college that no longer exists.
- Establishes a level of distrust that isn't good for labor relations.
- The fact that the FA feels that it needs protection from surveillance is surprising and "not heard of" - an article like this has never been in a contract with a faculty union (according to Colin Leonard).
- If you feel like you are being surveilled, we should know about it - it is inappropriate in a college setting to have an article like this in the contract.
- Adding in the suggested language in article 26 doesn't change anything in the way that we read it. Why is the additional language necessary?

Response:

- If the FA can produce written authorization for payroll deductions that shows authorization **and** that the person is an FA member, this will probably satisfy the Admin concerns that the new language is meant to address.
- Right now, the college doesn't know that individuals who had authorized payroll deductions are members of the organization (stated by Colin Leonard).
 - They will check on their end to see what they are currently given by members satisfies the concern.
- Because taking dues out of the paycheck of someone who is not an FA member is a Constitutional violation, it is important that we are on the same page.

Our final thoughts stated in the meeting about the college's proposal: the FA is willing to work on the 5-day rule, but fully deleting Article 38.J (5 day rule) and Article 53 (surveillance) is not something we are comfortable with doing.

Next meet days are set for June 16th and June 18th.