

MANAGEMENT/APSCUF COACHES' MEET AND DISCUSS

8:00 a.m. Tuesday, April 17, 2007

Sullivan Board Room

#23 MINUTES

APSCUF representatives present were: Mark Cloud, Heather Kendra, Andrew Waeger, Pat Rudy, and Cheryl Orndorf as recording secretary.

Management representatives present were: Roger Johnson, Alan Anderson, Tara Fulton, and Denise Shoemaker.

Sharon Taylor was invited by APSCUF and attended.

I. Approval of Meeting Minutes

The minutes of the December 19, 2006, meeting were approved. The approval of the minutes of the February 20, 2007, meeting was postponed.

II. Grievance Update

APSCUF reported the salary grievance has been moved to arbitration and the evaluation grievance has been continued.

III. High School Senior Tryouts

APSCUF reported all coaches, for whom tryouts are legal, have requested the Athletic Director (AD) approve the opportunity to utilize this tool in recruiting. APSCUF is seeking management's support on this issue. Management requested proof that there was a vote and it was unanimous. APSCUF reported it was brought up in discussion and verbally every coach that is eligible voted yes. Management still wants clarification on this issue and is not sure what CBA language covers this issue. Management continues to support the ADs capacity to address this issue. APSCUF believes this is a management decision. The AD is not management. Some sister institutions have this flexibility. There are students that call and say I just tried out at University X, can I come and tryout there and LHU coaches have to say no. Why can't this be done on a one-year trial basis? S. Taylor reported she has recommended to management the liability outweighs the benefit. APSCUF asked management to seek legal help on this issue and to see how other campuses have somehow overcome those legal hurdles.

IV. Management Restrictions: Article 7.1.A, D

APSCUF reported limits have been placed on mailing, printing, and traveling, which infringes on the ability of APSCUF coaches to fulfill their duties in recruitment and fundraising. Management reported traveling is taking place for recruiting. Management has not placed any limitations on printing or anything else. The Athletic Department has a budget, which was not decreased. The increases have been due to transportation costs and are not unique to this department. Management is looking for additional funds, but as of now there are no more. Management agrees these are very important activities. APSCUF asked why earlier warnings were not evident in November or December. S. Taylor clarified as the budget was getting tight the admissions office agreed to absorb the mail costs for the admissions packets the coaches mail. Only those pieces have been going through admissions. There are no restrictions, but coaches have been asked not to be frivolous. APSCUF asked if the coaches ability to do fundraising has been limited? Some coaches will come to the AD with specific requests and those requests were approved. Previously the mailings all came out of the regular budget when it was unlimited, but it may be that now the copies have to come out as the fundraising expense. APSCUF asked if there are expense requests that have not been approved. S. Taylor responded there were some sports that haven't traveled as much as others. There were 5-6 sports that were given a little extra to spend as needed for spring. Some sports had exhausted their budgets. Others were prorated or given what was left of their budget. APSCUF also reported a number of coaches have been told by the department secretary that no more print cartridges can be purchased. APSCUF asked if management can assure the coaches that in some fashion they will be able to have some print cartridges? Management feels that is micromanaging. APSCUF understands the avoidance of micromanagement, but how can coaches function without being able to print materials? R. Johnson will have a discussion with S. Taylor who was not aware of a print cartridge issue. There was a discussion about getting a networked printer.

V. Driving Athletic Vans: Article 16.2.A "University shall transport..." "Coaches may elect to drive..."

APSCUF expressed concern with student-athletes driving the buses as it does not believe there is a provision for this. There are safety concerns. However, it is difficult to find drivers for three vans. Management is similarly concerned about safety issues. It is possible for student employees to drive, but there are restrictions and it is avoided where possible. There was a brief discussion on this issue with no resolution.

VI. Overtime Approval

APSCUF asked management to please describe the current procedure for overtime approval of FLSA affected coaches. What is the role of the athletic director and how and when are her views incorporated into the decision process? APSCUF also requests the provost to explain his policy for guiding his decisions for approval/disapproval. Management responded by quoting some language from a letter he sent to S. Taylor, which included a form that will be used for approving overtime. S. Taylor shared the form and it has been provided to the coaches. Management does not have a good grip on the final number of overtime hours that LHU can afford in this year's budget. R. Johnson is attempting to make reasoned decisions. He made a denial, but later reversed it when more information was provided. There are a couple of other overtime denials, but he didn't know the context. If approval forms come in too late, that will present problems. Overtime needs can't always be anticipated, but it is very difficult if the approval comes retroactively, which allows for no control over the budget. APSCUF appreciates management working with the AD to make the best decisions possible. Overtime is not restricted to in season only. Management would like the coaches to come together and give some suggested criteria. It is difficult to make an objective decision. There will likely be an absolute cut-off, but management does not know the amount. Thus, management asks for restraint and frugality.

VII. Reclassification for FLSA

APSCUF asked if the Assistant Directors of Admissions have been reclassified and no longer fall under the rules for FLSA. How are the Assistant Directors of Admissions different than the assistant coaches? Management explained some already had exempt status and unlike the assistant coaches, the assistant directors make the final decisions in writing to admit people. Assistant coaches do not make final decisions in writing. There are only two assistant coaches throughout the state system that have exempt status; one is being reconsidered and perhaps withdrawn. The state system is making the decisions. LHU management attempted to have all the assistant coaches classified as exempt, but it was not approved. This is statewide with oversight by the office of administration.

VIII. East Campus

APSCUF asked if East Campus can be reopened. There are major office space issues for coaches. East Campus could provide some relief. It doesn't need to be heated during this time of year and there is no air conditioning. Management reported it is not presently on the facilities plan. APSCUF asked why that is. S. Taylor believes the academic facilities plan does not have athletic plans. Can the facilities committee be asked to please place this on the agenda for its next meeting? In light of the wrestling center status [not happening], there are other coaches interested. Both parties will make this request.

IX. Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, June 5 at 8:00, in Sullivan Board Room.

The meeting adjourned at 8:58 a.m.

Roger Johnson
Interim Provost and VP Academic Affairs

Mark Cloud
APSCUF Chapter President