University of New Mexico UNM Digital Repository

UNM Staff Council

Archives & University Administrative Records

7-5-2012

Staff Council Compensation Committee Meeting, 7/5/2012

UNM Staff Council

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/staff council

Recommended Citation

 $\label{thm:constitution} When the Council Compensation Committee Meeting, 7/5/2012." (2012). https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/staff_council/62$

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Archives & University Administrative Records at UNM Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in UNM Staff Council by an authorized administrator of UNM Digital Repository. For more information, please contact disc@unm.edu.

Staff Council Standing Committee Minutes



Committee Name: Compensation Committee

Regular Meeting time: 1st Thursday of each month, noon to 1:00 p.m.

Meeting Date and Place: Thursday, July 5, 2012, Faculty Staff Club Meeting Room

Members Present: Tom Rolland, Ann Rickard, Daniel Weems, Amie Ortiz, Suzanne McConaghy

Members Excused: Marie St Clair, Carol Bernard, Danelle Callan

Members Absent: Theresa Everling, Danielle Gilliam,

Guests Present: none

Minutes submitted by: Suzanne McConaghy

	Subject	Notes	Follow-Up
1	Meeting called to		
	order @ 12:12		
2	Constituent	The first 2 comments refer to this week's mailing from	
	Comments &	USUNM (union), found at the end of these minutes:	
	Discussion Thereof		
		1) Staff are and have been doing far more than they should	
		for far longer than 20 dayssome of us have been years at	
		it. Departments do not utilize the desk audit system.	
		,	
		2) I am not part of the union though I am held in check	
		salary wise by union rules/regulations. Perf Review is a	
		toothless piece of paper. As union keeps the herd together	
		and we all are rewarded or chastised by the group.	
		and the analysis of the great property of th	
		3) Faculty in my area got raises which will figure into their	Faculty raises are generally due to
		retirement percentages. We are getting \$1100 in August	their contracts.
		this does NOT calculate into retirement as the holiday	
		bonus last year did not add to retirement calculations.	
		UNM has make it clear that long/time knowledgeable staff	
		is not in their top priority brackets.	
		is not in their top priority stashess.	
		4) A post-doc with our dep't for several years could not	The tax on the annual leave lump
		move into an actual staff position until she was able to	sum should be refunded by the IRS.
		fund herself on a grant. When this happened she lost all	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
		her annual leave that she had accrued. I don't know the	
		HR rules but it seems if someone is staff (even post doc)	
		and moves into a position within the same dep't their	
		leave should transfer. She tried to donate her leave (sick	
		and annual) to other staff or even the cat leave fund and it	
		would not work. The final resolution was she was paid out	
		for the annual leave but highly taxed on it and she lost all	
		her sick leave.	
		5) Re: new hires being brought on at the same grade and	
		title but at a higher salary rate than current people in the	
		position within the dep't. It seems that the dep't can come	
		back and say the new person has more experience than	
		the current employee at that grade even though they have	
		been doing that specific job for several years. Is this true?	
3	Meeting adjourned		Next meeting:
	at 1:05 p.m.		Thursday, August 2, 2012
-			

United Staff UNM, Local 6155

UNITED STAFF UNM UNION, Local 6155

American Federation of Teachers and the AFL-CIO

530 Jefferson NE Albuquerque, NM 87108 Email: unitedstaffunm@gmail.com July 2, 2012

Dear USUNM Bargaining Unit Member,

The purpose of this correspondence is to give you an update on the 2012 USUNM Negotiations Session. Last week we gave you and the bargaining unit the news of an update as well. During the last session, both teams declared they were at impasse and submitted their last best and final offer (LBFO). Neither side accepted the other team's offer. Impasse occurs when after engaging in a good faith negotiation, the parties are unable to reach an agreement in certain areas. Per our Contract, mediation ensues with a neutral mediator – Federal Mediation Services Mediator- David Martinez. A mediation impasse session was just scheduled late last Friday afternoon between UNM, USUNM Union and David Martinez for last Monday, July 2, 2012 from 10:00 AM to 2:00 PM and a session for Monday, July 6, 2012, from 10:00 AM to 5:00 PM. The team will continue to negotiate in good faith throughout the impasse session.

Which Areas are causing the Impasse?

As far as USUNM is concerned, there are a few key areas that we will are going to impasse on —wages, the performance review and the grievance process. Specifically, USUNM is proposing a more objective standard be applied to the newly created and performance review article won by the Union last year. Moreover, USUNM is proposing that employees being asked to take on significant duties of a higher grade for ten consecutive days or 20 days within a month (i.e. the interim and in-range appointment) should receive an increase in their base pay of not less than 5% for the additional duties. UNM is saying no. UNM states they have a system with desk audits, HR Consultants and Compensation. The Union argues that the current system is subjective takes months, and the end results can be the employees received nothing for the extra duties and UNM receives free upgraded labor. It is worth noting that the City and State workers have a similar automatic adjustment in their contracts. UNM wants to keep this very subjective HR system in place that rarely pays employees for their interim or in-range appointments.

The Union also asked for a raise in addition to the one-time pay equity supplement. USUNM proposed that ALL employees regardless of their performance review ratings should receive the 1100.00 payment. UNM proposed to tie the one-time payment to the performance review ratings. The Union argued several points in regular negotiations that UNM is currently in litigation over the performance review's 2 subjective ratings, employees who received a "Needs Improvement" rating can no longer grieve the rating because the time has passed and they were not informed at the beginning that this rating would cost them \$1100.00. UNM agreed to not tie the \$1100.00 one-time pay equity payment to the performance reviews. Thus, only the raise and the interim and in-range appointments will be key issues in the impasse sessions. There are other issues that will be brought up during the impasse session as well.

Thank you for your time, Doris Williams