

Senate Bill 264 – Managerial Exclusion clause changes

a Member of the General Grant Committee

Senator Shields – we would like you to hold the bill up in committee for awhile.

For SEIU the over-riding policy question is "how do we make sure every state and tuition dollar is going as far as it can to educate students thru a statewide system of higher education?" For a year and half since the passage of SB 242 – and the separation of OUS from state agency status – OUS managers were not excluded from being bargaining unit members. SEIU continuously pointed this out to legal folks at OUS to no avail – and now they are looking to clarify our point – exactly. In the meantime OUS does not participate in posting contracts to the State's Transparency Website; does not require feasibility studies when contracting out; and does not report staff ratios within the faculty, classified and non-classified workers. And OUS is not part of any effort to reduce middle managers in state government.

State service has drilled down on these issues - over the last biennium – and has saved over \$200 million dollars by setting goals and delivering on reducing the span of control with House Bills 2020 in 2011 and then HB 4131 in 2012. This is needed at OUS and on every campus if we will reduce tuition costs and maintain a viable public university system.

So the questions for the OUS folks – in favor of making this "housekeeping change" - from OUS could be:

- 1) It's my understanding that OUS is taking the position that it should be treated differently from state agencies for the purposes of setting targets for worker-to-manager staffing ratios? Is that correct?
- 2) Isn't it true that OUS believes that HB 2020 and HB 4131 regarding managerial staffing ratios should not be extended to apply to OUS? Because OUS is different from state agencies, correct?
- 3) And isn't it true that OUS thinks it should be treated differently from the State of Oregon for the purposes of categorizing employees and reporting data about numbers of employees by category?. For example, it's my understanding that the staffing data you recently supplied to House Higher Education Committee chaired by Rep Michael Dembrow used an entirely different set of data from the data that's been provided by state agencies? Is that correct?
- 4) (Following up on previous question if necessary). Isn't it true that the data that OUS recently supplied to (Rep Dembrow's committee) identifying numbers of OUS employees by category came from the Integrated Post-Secondary Education Data System (IPEDS) as reported to the US Department of Education, rather than categorizing employees based on categories of employees as defined by PECBA, such as excluded supervisory, managerial, confidential and public employees subject to collective bargaining?

5) How is it that you think that OUS should be treated differently from state agencies on all of these issues and yet you want to be treated the same as state agencies for the purposes of excluding so-called managerial employees from collective bargaining? How do you reconcile these positions?

6) Don't you think it would make more sense for us to hold this question about managerial employees in abeyance and put it on the back burner until we've really worked through and gotten to the bottom of the issue of administrative bloat and excessive numbers of administrative and managerial employees in the Oregon University System?

7) Wouldn't you agree that OUS should be prioritizing front-line services to students over administrative and managerial staff?