



Bargaining 2003

UPDATE

PLEASE DISTRIBUTE

#6 / SEPTEMBER 11, 2003

Point, Counterpoint

CSEA and CSU met again on September 3 and 4, 2003, and made slight progress. CSEA's bargaining team believes that the CSU continues to misrepresent the union's proposals on several issues, and we wish to set the record straight.

TOPIC	CSU position	CSEA position
Golden Handshake	The CSU continues to tie their golden handshake proposal of a possible-2-year-service-credit if the Governor signs an Executive Order to CSEA giving up its right to bargain over parking fees and performance pay, no GSI, no rural health care subsidy, and no guarantee that any layoffs would be mitigated.	CSEA co-sponsored 2 bills in the legislature that would provide incentives for early retirement. We have told the CSU that we would be interested in a golden handshake that helped mitigate layoffs and would not negatively impact the workload of employees who remained on the job.
Employee Assistance Program	After a barrage of email from employees at Monterey Bay, the CSU abandoned its effort to eliminate EAPs on some campuses. Nonetheless, they still want to be able to change providers and potentially reduce the level of services provided.	Services such as psychological counseling, substance abuse treatment, smoking cessation, debt management, stress reduction, child care/elder care referral, and dealing with difficult co-workers are too important to risk curtailment. CSEA wants to ensure that there is no decrease in the services currently provided.
Parking Fees	CSU wants CSEA to give up its right to bargain over parking fee increases, which would open the door to doubling or tripling existing parking fees.	CSEA will not waive its right to bargain over parking fees, and will certainly not agree to increased fees in any year when there is no management proposal for any compensation increases.
In-Range Progression	The CSU produced data supporting CSEA's figures that only 10% of the employees we represent have received IRPs over the past 4 years. The CSU also proposes to reduce the minimum IRP amount from 3% to 2%. So, those few employees who receive IRPs could receive even less.	IRPs were intended to reward employees for their increased value to the university. Is the CSU saying that 90% of us have little, if any, value to them?
Merit Pay	The CSU wants CSEA to give up the right to bargain over merit salary increases, which would essentially bring back discretionary, subjective performance pay, no longer tied to annual performance evaluations.	CSEA wants to retain the MSI program which was hammered out three years ago after a high-level labor-management committee recommended that subjective performance pay be eliminated. CSEA's ultimate goal is to return to step increases, based on satisfactory performance.

TOPIC	CSU position	CSEA position
Rural health care	The CSU acknowledged that the cost of living is not lower at rural campuses like Monterey Bay, but they contend there isn't enough money to continue this program.	Employees in rural areas with no access to HMOs spend an inordinate amount of money on health care. Continuing the modest, \$500 per year, rural health care subsidy would cost the CSU \$300,000, which is only 1/10 of 1% of their budget.
Chain of command?	<p>Despite much discussion and criticism from CSEA, the CSU resubmitted its absurd proposals for employees seeking in-range progressions, bonuses, stipends, flex time due to dependent care needs, and alternate pay plans to submit their requests to the Board of Trustees or the Chancellor's Office, rather than go to their own administrator or president.</p> <p>Another example of CSU's absurd proposals is the one that provides that only an "eligible" employee will be granted an appointment with "the CSU" to find out if they are eligible for NDI, IDL, PERS, disability, etc.</p>	The contract defines "CSU" as <i>collectively</i> referring to the Board of Trustees, the Office of the Chancellor, and the universities. Up until now, this term has been used primarily for notice to and meetings with the Union as part of an ongoing labor-management relationship. The CSU claims that by replacing "appropriate administrator" and "president" with "the CSU," they have more "flexibility" in determining whom they designate to meet with employees. The truth is, however, that they will force the Chancellor's Office and the Trustees to engage in rather mundane functions best left to an employee's manager.
Compensation philosophy	The CSU offered no apologies for their insulting comments in August. "Love-it-or-leave-it" has not been retracted.	CSEA will continue to bargain in good faith and is committed to providing the best possible services to the students, faculty and staff with whom we work.

Next Bargaining Dates - October 2003

October 1, 2003	Sonoma State
October 28-29, 2003	Office of the Chancellor

