

CUE

GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE MEETING - Minutes

March 4, 1987

Alannah Anderson - chair, recording.  
Suzan Zagar, Adrien Kiernan, (Joe Denofreo)

1. Adoption of the Adgenda - moved Adrien Kiernan, Second Suzan Zagar.  
Carried
2. Adoption of the minutes for Feb. 18 -  
Feb. 11 - M/S Suzan Zagar, Adrien Kiernan  
Carried
3. Adoption of the Report to the Executive

Item number 1. on the report was clarified to read that "the university is not responsible for removing disciplinary documents older than two years, but that these documents are to be ignored or not used. Since the intent of the clause is to clear the record of employees whose work habits, etc. have improved, we take this position with the understanding that no copies are kept in other files, and access to the files that may contain 'old' material is not available to possible future supervisors.

Item number 3. the revised wording of the interpretation of the leave for medical appointmemnts carried after being M/S by Adrien Kiernan, Suzan Zagar. This will be taken to Libby Nason for approval by the University.

4. Joe Denofreo's summary of grievances:

1. Jan Ashdown - Employee Files  
Joe sent her a letter reminding her to review her file and remove the dicsiplinary letter.
2. Gardner/Zirkirchen - non-payment of overtime  
The University offered to pay for 6 months (\$550 & \$350) after we asked for 24 months. JD then asked for a lump sum as it is easier to settle since no 'proof' of actual over-time worked will be required ( no-one knows what it is as the period extends over a 6 year period). The lump sum JD is trying to get is \$800-900 for one and \$500-600 for the other.
3. Taina Dawson - job reclass/down-grade.  
She has started a new job, Clerk IV in Finance, but the retro-active pay is not yet settled. TD would like it to go back to Jan 1st, the University is offering to go back to Aug. 1st, JD is asking for April 1st.
4. Doreen Bartens - Medical Appointments  
This is waiting on settling the interpretation as discussed in the above mentioned report.
5. Florence Halama - hiring policy  
Arbitration date is set for June 22, Bruce McColl arbitrator. She had applied for a Sect. IV at the AIDS Clinic but the University hired outside the bargaining unit as they felt her personality was not suited to the job.



6. Dora Fiddler - job reclass/improper pay deduction/retro. pay.  
She was originally hired by CUSO who then left campus and DF was moved to another job on campus. We are arguing that her job was a mis-classification, not a re-classification. In the process, Finance paid her the re-class money, but they over-paid her and then wrote demanding repayment of the over payment. We are asking that Finance leave her alone until the amount of retro-active pay is owing to her as she may owe nothing for the over-payment. (Retro for 21 months)
7. Sharon Thompson - long-term-disability  
We can do nothing for her until we get the wording improved on eligibility for LTD.
8. Rochelle de la Giroday - reprimand.  
Settled. She accepts a verbal reprimand as she says she deserved it. The written reprimand has been removed.
9. Chuck Erickson-see item 11 below
10. Denise Field - substance abuse policy.  
We must settle an over-all policy on how to handle employees that are having a substance abuse problem. We are grieving the way it was handled. DF has handled her problem but we feel that she wasn't treated in a way that had her best interest in mind. It could have back-fired and caused her more damage as it was too brutal. Alannah suggested that we have specially trained stewards that can deal with this issue given that substance abusers have special problems. We are aiming to work for a trial period for whatever agreement we strike with the University. What we will do is promise the first meeting with the employee will generate no grievance from us since we want to get maximum co-operation from the University in gettin the employee to seek treatment.
11. Faculty Club - hiring policy for the Clerk III  
The FC hired an outside employee after both Maria Chung & Chuck Erickson both applied for the job. The Board of Directors of the FC have since decided to offer the job to CE. He has less seniority than MC. (CE doesn't want the job even though he would like to transfer out of his dept) We are involking arbitration for MC. We think that she should have a chance to try the job and discover whether or not she is capable or not.
12. Pat Baron - harrassment  
She has made a trial lateral transfer to University Press. Though she doesn't have the required training on MYCON the U. has offered to train her for one week. She will decide 1. if she wants the job, 2. if she needs more training, 3. would she prefer another job.
13. Teresa Fast - improper deduction of pay/sick leave  
She was hit by a car, phoned in to work and asked how much sick time she had. She was told (by acting Administrator) that she has 22 days. She returned to work to discover that the Administrator felt she didn't have 22 days. Her doctor required that she begin working ½ time after the accident but Finance paid her full wages even after she informed them on receipt of the first pay check. Finance



then proceeded to dock her for the overpayment and what was owing for the sick leave that she allegedly owed the University. We are grieving on the grounds of 'injurious reliance' in that she took the sick leave in good faith and could have applied for UIC if she were told she didn't have any. The U has agreed to pay her \$122 for the sick leave and close the case since the \$s have already been deducted for the overpayment, or - U will give her back the total funds (\$700) deducted and ask her to pay back the over-payment (less \$122) at a rate of \$25 per month, or - the easiest route would be to get a letter stating that she worked  $\frac{1}{2}$  time for a few days so she can apply for money from ICBC, take the \$122, and since the overpayment was (wrongfully) deducted from her pay that is not owing and her personal crisis is past. Libby Nason is trying to get Finance to stop acting independently on matters such as this. She would prefer all these situations be handed over to her.

15. Library flex-time We don't know why this is still on the books because no-one is unhappy about their working hours.

16. Trevor Tunnacliffe - harrassment

These problems continue. The latest being that he was denied the right to attend the last union meeting aparently without just cause as the supervisor was in the office during the whole period and TT was asked to do his 'rounds' We are trying to find a place for him to transfer. He is willing to take a demotion to get out of his situation. A L.A. II is coming up in Gifts and Exchanges but employers feel that he would be too independent, unsupervised.

17. Bargaining Unit Work

At Woodward Library there have been staff cuts in the Serials division. There is a mounting back-log which a librarian is doing. This has been going on for 6 months and since this is work that belong to the bargaining unit, Suzan Zagar and Alannah Anderson will ask that either present staff at the L.A. level be asked to work over-time to do it, or someone be given a temporary promotion, or that another L.A. be hired to do the job. This issue is important enough that we will carry it as far as we need to to protect jobs for the membership.



	Yes	No
I am comfortable with my immediate supervisor.	_____	_____
I am comfortable with my Department Head	_____	_____
I am comfortable with my co-workers	_____	_____
I am comfortable with	_____	_____
I am comfortable with the size of my work-load	_____	_____
I receive recognition for a job well done	_____	_____
My work is scheduled in such a way as to lessen whatever stress may occur.	_____	_____
The physical environment is generally quite comfortable.	_____	_____
- temperature	_____	_____
- furniture	_____	_____
- space	_____	_____
- state of repair	_____	_____
- atmosphere	_____	_____
I feel that my job is secure	_____	_____
I enjoy working at U.B.C.	_____	_____
There is enough opportunity for advancement	_____	_____
I take pride in doing a good job	_____	_____

If you answered NO to any of the above questions, does the stress created by the situations :

Increase illness? \_\_\_\_\_

Create insomnia \_\_\_\_\_

Do you have serious illnesses that may be



The job of secretary to the Union Office is a most special one

The secretary is hired and paid to work in the union office by the executive in the name of the membership. She is responsible for carrying out work for the membership, her employer, as represented by the executive. Her difficulty lies in the fact that the executive constantly changes as the years go by. Each election brings different people to executive positions. This means the secretary has a different 'boss' every year. Each executive, because it consists of new people, will have a different style, a different focus. The staff in the office has the task of adapting to these changes.

There are other problems but I would like to itemize them and tackle each one separately.

With the best intentions, and working with the ideal of equality in mind, previous executives have written our by-laws, hired the secretary, and established our present executive and office structure. Some of it works but it is not perfect. Like most human endeavours, we rarely get it right the first time (or the second or third for that matter). Achieving the ideal is an evolutionary process.

Individuals deserve equal rights, equal respect, equal opportunity for development and growth. But responsibilities are not equal and situations are not prone to create equal demands. Individuals do not have equal abilities. And, in spite of the best intentions I mentioned, inequalities have crept into our structure.

For example:

- all the office staff are paid at the same rate but the responsibilities are not equal.
- two staff members are elected and one is hired. The hired staff is subject to yearly review by the executive which acts as the 'boss'. The elected staff are subject 'review' by way of election.
- elected staff have vote on the executive but hired staff do not.
- elected staff members were paid to attend executive meetings while other executive members volunteered their time.
- finally, when everyone is equal, no-one is in charge.

What we need to change now is:

1. No executive member is paid to attend meetings.
2. The executive is 'in charge' and responsible as they were elected to be. No executive will please everyone and no executive will stay forever. The executive determines what jobs must be done and how it will be done.
3. All paid staff should be hired and answerable to the membership via the executive.



Another problem that was not foreseen was the possibility of conflict-of-interest if the staff are part of the same bargaining unit as their employers. If the secretary is a member of the union that hires her she has an interest in the decisions that are made. There is no problem when the executive and the membership have the same ideas as the secretary. Even with the best of all possible worlds the executive and the secretary will never think alike all the time. When a new executive is elected even more differences will occur.

The solution to this problem is to have the staff belong to another union or write an independent contract but not to be recognized as a member of CUE while in the employ of CUE. Confidentiality will not create any conflict if this is the route we take. Since the union acting as an employer, philosophically believes in unionization, the relationship between employee and employer should be relatively easy. With this scenario, staff can disagree with the policies and decisions taken by the executive but since those decisions will not directly affect the staff member no conflict will exist. This solution also offers greater protection for the employee as she would have recourse to the grievance procedure as written in her contract with us.

Once the relationship of secretary to executive and membership is cleared up, there still remains the difficulty of having to adapt to changing executives. Since this is the first time there has been an employed secretary in the office during a change of executive we are all inexperienced and unprepared. It is important for us and for future executives that this process be refined and made as smooth as possible. Dealing with this will also reduce the stress that must be felt by staff members.

It is important to remember that the function of all people involved is that of service. The executive is in service to the membership and the staff is in service to the executive. The staff member must have the ability and the desire to adapt to each new executive, to assist the executive in accomplishing the tasks that they see as important. While accommodating and adjusting to these many changes she must maintain her own integrity, her own sense of self, with confidence and self-assuredness. She is her own person, keeps her own counsel, follows instructions, offers suggestions and assists in every way possible. Though she is a 'servant' to 'servants' this is in no way demeaning, but commands the highest respect.

Whatever we do, the next executive will do something different. We only hope that future transitions will be smoother as a result of our experience and suggestions.