## **Collective Bargaining Update for January 19, 2022**



On Wednesday, January 19, bargaining teams for CGH Medical Center (CGHMC) and AFSCME, Council 31, met again to bargain over terms and conditions of employment for some CGHMC employees.

## AFSCME's "Update" Indicates that Union Leaders Still Don't Get It

Since bargaining began on September 20, 2021, we've met with AFSCME's bargaining team 11 times and exchanged many proposals and counter-proposals.

During these sessions, and in other conversations with AFSCME representatives, we've tried to explain some of CGHMC's practices – which are common in all hospitals – like why we use travelers to fill temporary staffing gaps.

We have also tried to explain the challenges we are facing regarding staffing – and the <u>unprecedented disruption</u> that COVID-19 has created in our community.

The union's reaction has been predictable but very disappointing. Rather than seek to understand these *once-in-a-lifetime* challenges, and work with us to find common ground, union representatives have resorted to the same old tired rhetoric in which they blame management for things they don't like or don't understand.

Management is Creating the Staff Shortage at CGH—It's Time for Their put Parlient Care FIRST Owner of Collection o

In their most recent update, **AFSCME leaders continue to blame CGH administrators for "***creating the staffing shortage at CGH.*" The folks at AFSCME don't seem to understand that, while we are focusing on recruitment and retention, how we do that has to make sense. The union's latest proposals and the rhetoric they used in their latest update *confirm that the folks at AFSCME still just don't get it.* 

## AFSCME's Proposals are Not Based on Data, Analysis, or Reality

Union representatives continue to make proposals that are not based on market data – they just seem to pull numbers out of thin air. In fact, when asked why they made certain proposals, the Union admitted, "We didn't base it on any data."

For example, when we raised wages for entry level positions by \$4.00, we did so based on research into the labor market and an analysis of how much we needed to raise entry level wages to match the current market rate for comparable positions. Since implementing those raises, recruiting and retention have improved.

The union now demands the same \$4.00 raise "for every worker who didn't get it." But they offer no research or no market data to justify the demand. It seems they are simply demanding that we raise everyone's pay by \$4.00 because we raised our start rates by that amount.

In our view, the rest of the union's proposals are similarly *unrealistic* and *disconnected* from any market-based analysis. For this reason, the bargaining process continues to be very challenging and slow moving.

## **Information about Future Bargaining Sessions**

Future bargaining sessions are scheduled for January 31 and February 3 and 7; however, **you should know the union's team has told us they are** *unavailable* **for the remainder of February.** As always, we will continue to keep you informed as the process develops.