

UNREASONABLE CSU POSITION ON FY 2007 COMPENSATION FORCES IMPASSE IN NEGOTIATIONS

Our contract with the CSU was predicated on the CSU receiving 1% more than "compact" funding. The state budget signed by Governor Schwarzenegger failed to provide the CSU with the extra funding. Therefore, CSUEU and CSU returned to the bargaining table on September 6th to reopen bargaining on compensation for FY 2007/08.

In July 2007, CSUEU presented a proposal to the CSU, seeking to maximize the amount of the general salary increase by not funding the 0.992% market salary adjustment which would have targeted only a few of the 200 classifications represented by the union. This resulted in a General Salary Increase proposal of 3.688% for all employees.

On September 6th, the CSU rejected the union's proposal and insisted that the equivalent of a 1% general salary increase be dedicated, in unknown amounts, to unspecified classifications for the purpose of providing market salary adjustments. The CSU acknowledged that this would result in a smaller general salary increase.

CSUEU informed the CSU that the biggest problem regarding salaries was salary stagnation – caused by the elimination of salary steps in 1996 and the failure of the CSU to use in-range progression to move employees through the open salary ranges that were unilaterally imposed. IRPs were intended to be used to recognize assigned or enhanced skills, performance, and lead work assignments, as well as to help retain employees in classification with salary lags. Most CSUEU-represented employees remain clustered at the low end of their salary range. The CSU's failure to move employees through their classification's open salary range must be addressed separately from cost-of-living increases.

In FY 2005/06, out of 16,000 CSUEU-represented employees, only 6% received IRPs!

CSUEU and CSU also discussed compensation for FY 2008/09, but failed to reach an agreement. The next step is for CSUEU and CSU to file a petition to the State Public Employment Relations Board declaring impasse and seeking the appointment of a state mediator to facilitate a resolution of these issues.

Comparison of CSUEU and CSU proposals

	CSUEU Proposal	CSU Proposal
Total package	4.25%	4.25%
General Salary Increase	3.688%	2.707%
Service Salary Increase	1.00%	1.00%
Market Salary Adjustments	None	1.00%

EMPLOYEES UNON SERV Loral 2779	MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION ● California State University Employees Union/C 1108 'O' Street ● Sacramento, CA 95814 ● (916) 444-8134 PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT Chapter		
Social Security No.	Last Name	First Name	Initial
Number and Street		City	Zip Code
Employed by		Department or Campus -	work location Room No.
Classification	E-mail	() Business Phone	() Home Phone
CSUEÚ Bylaws and Policies, the withholding from my pay files of CSUEU and CSEA, wh between CSUEU and the Call Headquarters, 1129 10th Stre must remain a member for the	including those of the CSEA Policy File. I or retirement allowance of dues and any b nich are subject to amendment, and are a fornia State University, and a copy of the let, Sacramento, California 95814. Should e duration of the MOU, except that I may	n becoming a member I authorize CSUEI benefit deductions. I understand that my ffected by applicable labor contract(s) ("A Policy Files and applicable MOU are alwad d an applicable MOU provide for the mair terminate membership during the last thin	te of CSEA, and hereby agree to abide by the U to establish with the appropriate agency membership rights are set forth in the Policy Memorandum of Understanding" or "MOU") Ays available to me by contacting CSUEU Intenance of membership, I understand that I ty (30) days of such MOU. Do per month for CSUEU's non-partisan politi-
CSUEU-001 Rev. 05/06	By writing my initials in this box I instruct CSUEU to withhold an additional \$2.00 per month for political activity.	Signature:	