



Bargaining Session #5

December 6, 2022

Raven opened the bargaining session by making three new proposals and one revised proposal:

- Dues checkoff, which is a way for the CWA to collect dues from employees through the paycheck process. This is standard in most union contracts. We also included language in our proposal to allow for the negotiation of a union security clause if Wisconsin ever rescinds its right-to-work law, and the CWA requests that Raven require union dues or agency fees in order for a QA tester to keep their job.
- Labor-management committee. It allows for management and union representatives to meet and discuss issues that might come up at work, in between negotiations. We think this would help in discussing issues in the workplace. The union claimed in its bargaining update that a labor-management committee is “toothless.” That is untrue. Labor-management committees are common in union contracts, and are generally viewed both as an effective way to resolve new issues during a contract, if those issues would otherwise have to go through formal bargaining, and as a good way to build a problem-solving partnership with a union. CWA has apparently rejected this idea.
- Just cause discipline, which is the common standard in union contracts for discipline. We also proposed a probationary period for new employees.
- Additionally, Raven made a revised proposal relating to the rights that management would have to run the business.

CWA made one proposal about mentoring. The parties had a productive discussion on how informal mentoring works.

We spent a lot of the time at the bargaining table discussing CWA’s information requests, but not much time about our proposals. Here is another example of a CWA information request about employees not at Raven:

“Please provide a list, without names, of all employees **worldwide** who utilized the ‘confidential’ arbitration process...”

The CWA has not explained why it needs information about employees worldwide to represent approximately 25 QA employees at Raven.

Our attorneys repeatedly asked the Union to take positions on meaningful issues in bargaining, but their attorney avoided doing so. For instance, Raven’s attorney asked the Union’s attorney for his position about specific parts of the Company’s non-discrimination proposal. Instead of responding, the Union’s attorney kept talking about information requests that had nothing to do with the issue. The Union’s attorney also refused to explain why he has not engaged in any meaningful discussions away from the bargaining table about issues such as information requests.

The Union made even more information requests at this session. CWA again rejected our request for bargaining over these requests to narrow them to information that applies to Raven or to split costs over compiling the information, even though we explained how much information that the CWA had requested and how much work it would take to compile and review it. There were thousands of responsive records. When a union makes such broad requests, the law provides that it has to bargain over ways to reduce the burden of producing the information. The Union outright refused.

We asked the CWA to provide additional dates that they are available.

The parties did not reach any tentative agreements in this bargaining session.