

## **Mass UMA Working Group (the Group)**

**September 20, 2007**

**FMCS, 99 Summer St. Boston**

### **Meeting Notes**

#### **Agenda:**

- Introduction and agenda
- Committee reports:
  - Process – revised timeline, re-affirmation of Facilitator
  - Legislative – status update
  - Confidentiality/Privilege– progress update
  - Public Sector – feedback re interim recommendation
  - Mediator Definition – progress update, including preliminary survey results
- Process Map (timeline adjustments)
- Next steps/meetings for Working Group

#### **Attendees:**

Josh Flax (Facilitator), Melissa Brodrick, Kurt Dettman, John Fiske, Lynda Robbins, Robin DiGiammarino, Vicky Bennet, Maria Joseph

#### **Discussion:**

##### **Process Committee**

The Process Committee proposed that the timeline of the Process Map be adjusted to reflect where the Committees are in their respective areas. The Committee also recommended that interim target dates be established for each Committee to report back to the UMA Working Group. The goal is to have the Group's work done by the time the Legislature schedules a hearing on the substance of the UMA bill.

As discussed at the July meeting, the Process Committee made a request that Josh Flax be re-affirmed as the Facilitator (this is reflected in the updated Collaboration Guidelines previously posted on the Group's web site). After discussion, the consensus was that Josh should remain as Facilitator, and the Process Committee's former role under Section VI will now be performed by Josh as the Facilitator, with the Process Committee in a support mode.

##### **Legislative Committee**

Vicky reported for the Legislative Committee that the Joint Committee on Labor and Workforce Development had a new contact (Anna Lucey) with whom Chuck Doran had spoken. She indicated that in October the first hearing on the bill may be scheduled. Vicky was asked what feedback the Committee needed from the Group if this happens. The discussion about the initial Legislative hearing focused on a substitute (corrected) bill and a request to postpone the substantive hearing until next year to give the Group sufficient time to complete its process. After discussion the consensus was that the longer the delay on the bill

the better so that the Group had more time to complete its work. The dates of May or June (preferred) 2008 were discussed as the preferred alternatives, assuming that the Legislature does not have other reasons to schedule it earlier. Vicky is going to check with Chuck and get back to the Group with an update as soon as more is known from the Joint Committee. Once the Legislative dates are confirmed, the Process Committee will circulate an updated Process Map with new dates.

### Public Sector Committee

The Public Sector Committee has posted on the Group's web site and emailed its report and recommendations to the Group. It has also presented white papers to the Governor's Legal Counsel and the AGO Chief of the Government Bureau. After the Committee receives feedback from the Group, it intends to re-activate those contacts. After discussion, the consensus was that the Committee should prepare and circulate a survey similar to the Mediator Definition Committee's.

### Confidentiality Committee

Josh reported that he did not have an update from the Confidentiality Committee, except that there was not a consensus and there was lots of work to do. The Group discussed the need for the Committee to designate a Convener and to report whatever progress it could to the Group so that the Group can begin to consider its options in this area. Linda pointed out that this was the most controversial part of the UMA and that it was a more difficult issue to deal with. The meeting participants asked for information on what the Committee needed to make progress and asked how the Group could help them complete their work. Josh is going to get in touch with members of the Committee to determine (or designate) a Convener and get a commitment on when the Committee will report back to the Group.

### Mediator Definition Committee

Robin reported that the survey from the Mediator Definition Committee had received 64 responses (out of about 120 emails sent out to the Group's list). The Committee is evaluating the results and planned to meet soon to determine to what extent the results would change the Committee's recommendations to the Group. The Mediator Definition Committee will report the results of this process at the October Group meeting.

### Other Issues

The Group discussed the results of the "Meeting Wizard" survey. Lynda is going to circulate new proposed dates for the October and November meetings (the candidates are 10/30 and 11/27 or 28).

The Group discussed how to re-invigorate the UMA Working Group process. Attendance at meetings has dropped off, and the feedback loops, although enhanced, are not generating participation from the Group as originally envisioned in September of 2006. The Group discussed seeing if the November meeting could be moved to Suffolk Law School and whether we can get a guest speaker from the Legislature to go over the Legislative process. This would ensure that everyone has a better understanding of the importance of the work the Group is doing, and would encourage all interested parties to be represented and heard as the UMA is taken up by the Legislature.

Next Steps

Future Meeting Schedule:

**October Meeting—10/30/07 (tentative)**

**November Meeting—11/27 or 28/07 (tentative)**

**No December Meeting**