

---

---

# Employer refuses to bargain and **NURSES** Walk Out

Today the **NURSES** of our UMPNC/MNA bargaining team met with the University in another attempt to reach a comprehensive agreement.

The University began the session by refusing to bargain in good faith with our union, taking a hard line and refusing to address the commitments Dr. Spahlinger made regarding staffing. They have made it clear do not intend to bargain over our staffing proposal, nor any other issues that the hospital decides are “permissive” or “illegal” subject of bargaining. If a subject is permissive or illegal, then an employer is not obligated to bargain over it. The University asked that we withdraw all such subjects.

We do not agree that a crucial issue such as staffing is a permissive subject. **The University remains obligated to bargain and their actions today are illegal and demonstrate a lack of respect for our nurses, patients, and the law.**

Moreover, the University’s proposal would:

- **Cut NURSE retirement benefits\***
- Set up a **two-tiered lower wage scale** based on the geographic location in which a **NURSE** works
- Allow **management to control selection of our NURSE representatives to committees** that address mandatory subjects of bargaining

\*Note: the reduction in retirement contributions would mean that nurses no longer would receive any contributions for overtime, holiday, and shift differential pay. A nurse could lose thousands of dollars in contributions each year, amounting to a substantial loss in retirement savings at the end of your career.

The University also will not agree to any accountability in regard to Victors Care.

The only change in management’s proposal from previous editions was the addition of the University’s newly announced parental leave policy. You can read management’s entire proposal online: <https://www.minurses.org/cms/assets/uploads/2018/09/University-Package-Proposal-Sep-5-2018-11-05.pdf>

Our UMPNC bargaining team was surprised when the University asked for an additional date of September 5th, but we quickly committed to the date. Even though several **NURSES** had scheduled PTO for this time, we came to the table ready to bargain.

We now know that they asked for this additional session for a reason. **After refusing to engage with us on the issue of parental leave from the start of bargaining, they have now included OUR issue in their proposal.** It is the only change they made after a two-week break.

Continued on the next page.

Our UMPNC bargaining team brought the issue of family leave to the bargaining table months before contract expiration. It was on our initial list of issues brought forward in February. In the May 3rd bargaining update, we explained the significance of parental leave: <https://www.minurses.org/cms/assets/uploads/2018/05/05.03.18-UMPNC-Newsletter.pdf>

Among other things, **NURSES** pushed for parental leave of eight weeks. At that time management refused to engage on the issue. They would not present any of their own options. In fact, they rejected our ideas as unrealistic.

In the week before contract expiration, on June 22nd, the University suddenly made a proposal to cut nurses' retirement, PTO, and extended sick leave in order to provide nurses with an undefined parental leave policy sometime in the future. Refer to our June 22nd update: <https://www.minurses.org/cms/assets/uploads/2018/06/06.22.18-UMPNC-Newsletter.pdf>

We rejected that proposal. **NURSES** deserve, and the University can afford, the addition of family leave without sacrificing other benefits.

We are glad to see that the University finally has agreed with us that parental leave is an important benefit for working parents at this institution, however the manner in which they have presented this proposal, at this time, is disingenuous and a clear attempt to divide **NURSES**.

Now management has put parental leave back into their proposal, and they don't officially tie it to concessions. But make no mistake: the University still want us to give up on retirement, staffing, equal wages, and all other issues.

**NURSE** proposals on issues such as union representation, drug testing, and third-party information requests, are reasonable and of minimal cost, if any, to the University. We explained those issues at previous general membership meetings. Those issues could easily be resolved if the University wanted to do so. **NURSES** will not be bullied into withdrawing our commonsense solutions on those issues.

We believe today's proposal, along with the employer's course of actions leading up to it, is extremely disingenuous as well as disrespectful of **NURSES'** intelligence. It does not appear to be a good faith attempt to reach mutual agreement on the important issues. We have negotiations scheduled for next week and we hope that the Employer comes to the table with a real intention to make progress.

make sure that the  
administration **SEES**  
and **HEARS** us

## U of M Board of **REGENTS** Meeting

**Thursday, September 20; 1:30 p.m.**

Richard L. Postma Family Clubhouse; 500 E. Stadium Blvd., Ann Arbor