



---

Michael Conners, President  
(608) 246-6161

**PSRP General Membership Meeting—  
May 8, 2003**

**Meeting Notes**

**I. Call to Order**

A quorum was present and the President called the meeting to order at 12:35 p.m. Some of the locations were experiencing technical difficulty and were unable to make connection for the entire meeting.

**II. Approval of January 9 & March 5, 2003 Meeting Notes**

Approval of the meeting notes was tabled until the next meeting, as many had not taken the opportunity to review them for discussion.

**III. Treasurer's Report**

The Treasurer reported the following balances:

Legal Fund - \$39,682.47

Checking - \$15,725.11 (May dues will decrease this by about \$9,000)

Savings/CDs - \$19,049.56

**TOTAL ASSETS = \$74,457.14**

Thanked the Budget Committee members – Bonny Laufenberg, Patti Keena-Briggs, Martha Klaila – for their work in auditing the books from January 2001 through December 31, 2002. The Committee found the books to be in good order. Recommendations/finding/comments included:

- a) Need to follow-up on a refund check that the local had not received.
- b) Accounting Procedure Manual not current.
- c) Suggestion to have a back-up for the treasurer when gone so disbursements still are done.

**IV. Reclassification Redesign / Questions on Recent Materials**

Susan Agee presented the report on the redesign. She reviewed the revisions made and clarified the use of some of the forms, as there appears to have been confusion on some of them. A summary is being prepared and will be available at each campus. The Executive Board has requested a meeting with the consultants and the committee members with the hope of this occurring in early June.

The floor was opened up for questions.

**Q:** What about the document that will be filled out?

**A:** This is still being worked on, but it is large. There is not much difference in the size from the last process.

**Q:** Is the submission time frame the same, i.e., November 1 deadline annually?

**A:** Yes. The three month performing of duties stipulation has been removed – now as soon as the duties become permanent you are eligible to apply for a reclassification.

**Q:** The percentages on the pay schedule, is it on the base or the current hourly rate?

**A:** If we agree to the new system, it is based on your current salary and is no longer a salary grid.

**Q:** Did the committee talk about the number of pay ranges since it was one of the members recommendations?

**A:** This committee has not, since it would mean starting all over.

**Q:** As it is now, if the committee decides a position has not changed significantly the decision is not appealable. Has anybody looked into this?

**A:** Our recommendation is that anyone submitting a form is to be reviewed. The term “significant” is defined. The committee is a combination of PSRP and management and our PSRP committee members need to push for the review. We do have some control at the table.

**Follow-up Comment:** A previous committee member added that this needs to be looked into. There experience shows there is some brow-beating that takes place and they get people to back off and then get the decision they want.

**Q:** A supervisor can request a reclassification review with an employees signature, but can an employee request a reclassification review without their supervisor signing off?

**A:** We are recommending that we follow the same current process. The supervisor can sign off in disagreement.

**Q:** What about this years reclass?

**A:** The due date was November 1, 2002 and they will be reviewed. This year all reclassifications will be on hold until we get an agreement.

**Q:** Will employees receive back pay if reclassifications are on hold for years?

**A:** You can submit your form, but they will not be looked at. We will have to ask about back-pay – don't recall if this was discussed at the last bargaining or not.

**Q:** What is the current number of red-lined PSRP's?

**A:** I believe it is 65.

**Follow-up Comment:** This seems to be a high number. Isn't there concern about this? The placement of people and the job titles should be a concern since information used to do so could be real old and using old data is concerning.

**Response:** Yes, there may have been a lot of old data used, but the committee had to start somewhere.

**Q:** Probably would have been better to do a mandatory process for all members since there are so many changes...was that considered?

**A:** We could put this up as an option for the membership to vote on.

**Q:** What happens if there is no agreement?

**A:** Reclassifications are held and we will have to take this issue back to the bargaining table.

**Q:** If that is the case we would have to go back and discuss back pay. This seems unfair to hold off too long.

**A:** We could try to negotiate this. A lot depends upon us.

**Q:** How will people reclass this year under the old system but be recalculated into the new system?

**A:** We have points in the new grades and will convert into the new system.

**Q:** Those reclasses in the last year have moved into a different grid. Are you going to go back and make sure they are placed right?

**A:** This document has already been updated.

**Q:** Do we then assume that the reclass has put us each in the right place?

**A:** Yes.

**Q:** Of the red-lined positions, how many are aware of it and are there any patterns where these fall?

**A:** Administrative clerks seem to have been a large group red-lined. This was a tough group because some have not been reclassified in several years. We also saw that when we clumped ranges, the higher range with the higher seniority seemed to be impacted more. We are not sure if all the people know that they are red-lined – numbers have changed since beginning.

**Q:** With 65 red-lined this is way over 15% of our membership being negatively affected.

**A:** We came up with the system that we feel is the best that can be agreed upon.

**Q:** Maybe the 65 should be evaluated personally by the consultants.

**A:** We hope they will all appeal the decision. Who ever appeals at the orientation stage will be given the full due process.

***Follow-up Comments:*** Why would you have to fill out a 30-page document to show your value and maintain your range? How many people do you think are going to be moved with the appeal?

**Q:** How long will the 65 people be red-lined?

**A:** About 3 years.

**Q:** Can you email the 65 people so they know they are being affected?

**A:** The Union will communicate with these people. We will also get all the forms sent out.

## **V. Health Benefits Meetings**

The president summarized the recent meetings held. There were positive remarks from staff that we are being proactive. The committee will continue to stay on top of these issues the best they can.

## **VI. Other Business**

A. Tyson Foods

The Union has established an "Adopt a Family Program". The Executive Board has approved establishing an account with the MATC Credit Union for members wishing to contribute to the fund through a payroll deduction donation. If you would like to donate using the payroll deduction, forms must be completed and turned into the Terry Wermuth, Union Treasurer, by May 19<sup>th</sup>. You also may make a one-time donation at any time to the fund through the Credit Union. Terry Wermuth informed those already on payroll deduction that they will need to go to the Credit Union to increase their deduction.

B. SCFL Bean Feed

Tickets for the SCFL annual Bean Feed are available from Robin Gee for \$4.50 each. The even will be held May 29 at 6 pm at the Labor Temple on South Park Street.

C. SCFL Delegate

Robin Gee shared the need to have more delegates to SCFL. The organization meets one evening a month (currently Monday). If interested in being a delegate, notify the Executive Board.

Linda Bahr moved to adjourn the meeting. Rich Brewer seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 1:30 pm

Respectfully submitted,



Bonnie J. Vandre-Blewett  
PSRP Local #3872 Secretary