



# Questions answered on roll-back

A committee has been struck to meet with the University regarding the AIB rollback. Members of the committee are: Fairleigh Funston, Pat Gibson, Jeff Hoskins, Frances Wasserlein and Judy Wright. A number of other members of the Executive have also volunteered to assist in the work of the committee.

Several questions have been frequently asked about the implications of the AIB decision. The committee would like to attempt to answer as many as possible before a special membership meeting. The urgency of calling a meeting has been alleviated by a joint application by the Union and the University for an extension of the thirty day time limit to establish a response to the AIB.

*Can we appeal the AIB decision? Should we?*

Can we? - yes, of course we could BUT should we is indeed another question. The appeals procedure seems to be somewhat obscure. We could appeal to the AIB, but this would require presentation of new evidence, and we seem to have put all our rocks in one cannon and shot them - we just don't have any more rocks. Also, it is possible to appeal to the AIB administrator, Tansley, but practice has shown this to be unwise as he is inclined to rollback even further, and has said so on a number of occasions.

*What are some possible alternatives for implementing the rollback?*

The methods of rollback which would maintain the integrity of our hard-won pay structure are:

**Plan A:** a 4 percent reduction across the board, on the following formula:

if the September, 1975 total payroll equals 100%,  
then the present total payroll equals 119.17%,  
but the AIB says it should be 115%, so the formula is:

each individual salary x  $\frac{115.00}{119.17}$  = new salary for each individual employee

This would have the effect of reducing the total payroll to what the AIB says it should be by reducing each salary by the same proportion. The pay scale under Plan A would look something like the following. NOTE: these figures are close, but not definitive.

	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	Step 6
I	734	754	773	792	812	831
I-Interm.	773	792	812	831	850	870
II	812	831	850	870	889	908
II-Interm.	850	870	889	908	928	947
III	908	928	947	966	986	1005
III-Interm.	947	966	986	1005	1024	1044
IV	1005	1024	1044	1063	1084	1106
V	1084	1106	1127	1148	1169	1191
VI	1169	1191	1212	1233	1254	1276
VII	1254	1276	1297	1318	1339	1361

**Plan B:** an across the board dollar reduction, on the following formula:

$$\frac{\text{total payroll now} - \text{total payroll allowed}}{\text{number of employees}} = \$34^*$$

\*very approximately

This figure would then be deducted from each step of the pay structure, so under Plan B the pay scale would look something like this:

	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	Step 6
I	726	746	766	786	806	826
I-Interm.	766	786	806	826	846	866
II	806	826	846	866	886	906
II-Interm.	846	866	886	906	926	946
III	906	926	946	966	986	1006
III-Interm.	946	966	986	1006	1026	1046
IV	1006	1026	1046	1066	1088	1110
V	1088	1110	1132	1154	1176	1198
VI	1176	1198	1220	1242	1264	1286
VII	1264	1286	1308	1330	1352	1374

**Plan C:** a return to the pay rates of October 1, 1975 could be close enough to the required reduction as to work. Those rates were as follows:

*What about the BCTF lawsuit? Does it affect us?*

The teachers have a suit pending against the Provincial Government regarding the constitutionality of applying AIB legislation (imposed in June, 1976 by the province) retroactively to October, 1975, more than nine months. They also question the AIB's authority to rollback arbitrated settlements.

If they win their case it could set a precedent for the rest of us under provincial jurisdiction, regarding payback of funds received prior to June, 1976. The suit will be heard early in the new year.

*What about the BCTF lawsuit? Does it affect us?*

The teachers have a suit pending against the Provincial Government regarding the constitutionality of applying AIB legislation (imposed in June, 1976 by the province) retroactively to October, 1975, more than nine months. They also question the AIB's authority to rollback arbitrated settlements.

If they win their case it could set a precedent for the rest of us under provincial jurisdiction, regarding payback of funds received prior to June, 1976. The suit will be heard early in the new year.

*January change in union dues*

The deduction of Union Dues at the new rates will begin in January. The new rates are: \$6.50 for full-time members and \$3.00 for part-time members (20 hours per week maximum).

Some people who have been paying \$2 per month will suddenly find themselves paying the full \$6.50. This is because the University has agreed to correct their long-standing error in deducting all hourly-paid employees at the part-time rate. So, if the dues increase seems inordinately large to you it is because you have been paying too little all along. Some people will also find that dues are being deducted from the mid-month paycheque as well as or instead of at the end of the month. This is because Data Processing is instituting a new procedure to ensure that all Union members pay the correct dues, not too much or too little as has been happening on occasion.

-Jeff Hoskins  
Treasurer

*Threats to the Grievance Committee*

Lack of time prevents a regular Grievance Committee report this time. However, I will note a couple of very important issues that have arisen in the last couple of weeks.

It is now the University's official position that there is no such thing as a misclassification grievance. This rather startling move goes clearly against the spirit of Article 31.05 and also against well over two years of established practice.

## January change in union dues

The deduction of Union Dues at the new rates will begin in January. The new rates are: \$6.50 for full-time members and \$3.00 for part-time members (20 hours per week maximum).

Some people who have been paying \$2 per month will suddenly find themselves paying the full \$6.50. This is because the University has agreed to correct their long-standing error in deducting all hourly-paid employees at the part-time rate. So, if the dues increase seems inordinately large to you it is because you have been paying too little all along. Some people will also find that dues are being deducted from the mid-month paycheque as well as or instead of at the end of the month. This is because Data Processing is instituting a new procedure to ensure that all Union members pay the correct dues, not too much or too little as has been happening on occasion.

-Jeff Hoskins  
Treasurer

## Threats to the Grievance Committee

Lack of time prevents a regular Grievance Committee report this time. However, I will note a couple of very important issues that have arisen in the last couple of weeks.

It is now the University's official position that there is no such thing as a misclassification grievance. This rather startling move goes clearly against the spirit of Article 31.05 and also against well over two years of established practice.

*What difference does it make that some people get higher raises than others last year?*

None. In accepting the revised pay scale last year we decided what was fair, and any plan that would maintain the integrity of the pay scale would be just as fair.

It is important to remember that the AIB did not consider each individual's salary, but rather the entire bargaining unit. The rollback is a result of looking at the whole unit and the total payroll. We have been ordered to re-negotiate the contract so that the total payroll will reflect an increase of only 15% over the previous contract.

Therefore, the problem confronting all of us is how to distribute fairly the lesser total payroll allowable.

*What ways can we pay the money back?*

Possible ways of paying the money back are:

1. As a lump sum.
2. As payroll deductions on a monthly basis over a period of time to be negotiated, beginning at a time to be negotiated.

*How does this effect present contract negotiations?*

The question of the rollback relates only to last year's contract. (But, any negotiated increase for 1976-77 contract will be based on the rolled-back pay scale.)

*What are the legalities of an across the board decrease?*

In that the order from the AIB applies to the entire Union, the Union can adopt any method of implementing the rollback that we think is fair. Legal advice has been obtained on this question and substantiates this view.

*What about income tax and other deductions like University Pension Plan, Group Life and Liability, etc.?*

The amount of payroll will not be subject to income tax, CPP or UIC deductions and it seems possible to agree with the University that University Pension Plan, etc. deductions will also not apply. The net result would be that we would get a tax (and other payment) reduction, in effect, as we paid back.

*What about people who have been reclassified or promoted?*

This will not make any difference because the rolled-back contract would be applied retroactively so that a person who was promoted would pay back the difference in pay for their old classification up to the date of their promotion, and the difference in pay for their new classification after promotion.

*What about people who have left the University?*

The committee is not sure, but both the Administration and the Union are attempting to find out.

*What about new employees - since October, 1975 and during the payback period?*

The rolled-back contract will be applied retroactively, and people will pay only in relation to how long they have worked here. New employees hired after the rollback comes into effect will, of course, be paid at the rates of the rolled-back contract.

Kevin Grace - Chairperson/  
Grievance Committee

### NOTICE OF MOTION

(To be voted on at the January General Membership Meeting.)

The membership authorizes the Grievance Committee to take the Kevin Grace 'Employee Files' Grievance to arbitration.

# AUCE STEWARD SEMINAR

The Local 1 Steward Seminar is being held on Wednesday, February 2, 8:30 to 4:30.

## WHY A STEWARD SEMINAR?

Violations of the contract are occurring all over this campus and the first step in preventing this is to have a steward structure and membership who know the contract. Now it is even more critical than ever before that we have a strong, well-informed steward structure. We are in the middle of contract negotiations, we are taking the largest number of grievances we've ever had to arbitration plus we are facing a wage roll back.

The most effective manner for the membership to communicate their views on issues is through their stewards. The stewards, in turn, keep their shop informed of what is happening on the executive level.

## WHO CAN ATTEND?

At a general membership meeting in the spring we approved the payment of a day's wages for stewards to attend a seminar. The University has agreed to allow us to have this seminar during office hours. We must give the University a month's notice of the stewards who will be attending. Many divisions have not elected stewards. Please make sure that your stewards are elected by the end of December and that her/his name is given to your Executive representative or the Union Organizer.

Of course, all stewards will be attending; but any other members who have the time off are most welcome to come. Be prepared to take an active part in the discussion. Please remember to bring your contract and your constitution.

THE STEWARD IS THE MOST IMPORTANT OFFICER OF THE UNION. A STRONG, KNOWLEDGEABLE STEWARD SYSTEM IS VITAL FOR AN EFFECTIVE UNION. LET'S MAKE IT WORK.

## AGENDA

What does a steward do in this Union?

The Grievance Procedure -- How it works and how to process a grievance.

Who wants to grieve: A discussion of the informal problems in the office -- especially intimidation, and people who are afraid to grieve -- Is there anything that can be done?

A critical discussion of how the steward system works in this Union, and how we can make it work better.

The 1975-76 Contract: A clause by clause interpretation. Although the contract is written in black and white, many stewards can vouch for the fact that many parts are still unclear.

Role-playing of Grievances.

Arbitration, Labour Relations Board, Labour Code.

by Doreen Nicholson

## Minutes

AUCE Local #1 General Membership Meeting - SUB Ballroom, December 9, 1976/ 12:30-2:30 pm.

Minutes - Ian Mackenzie, Chairperson; Ray Galbraith, Recording Secretary

2. Motion: That there be a two minute time limit on all speakers for this General Membership Meeting only. Moved by Fairleigh Funston. Seconded by Pat Gibson. The motion was carried.

3. Adoption of agenda - moved/seconded/carried

4. Adoption of previous minutes - moved/seconded/carried

5. Dues referendum results - These were announced by Gary Phillips, a Trustee. The results were as follows:

Motion #1 - No 286  
Yes 485  
Abstentions 54

Motion #2 - No 100  
Yes 644  
Abstentions 83

6. Business arising from the minutes - Closing nominations

a) President - Judy Todhunter and Elizabeth Winterford both agreed to stand. Ian Mackenzie announced that there would be an election.

b) Recording Secretary - Nancy Wiggs was declared elected by acclamation.  
c) Strike Committee - Ian announced that the positions open totalled 4 out of 10 - those elected would be done so at large. Lisette Desu and Irene Randolph were elected by acclamation.

7. Correspondence - Fairleigh Funston read a flier provided by the University Community Credit Union.

8. Financial Statement and Report - Presented by Jeff Hoskins

a) Motion: That the membership accept the statement of income and expense for the period November 1-30, 1976. Moved by Jeff Hoskins. Seconded by Joan Cosar. The motion was carried.  
b) Motion: That the membership authorize \$750 for office expenses for the month of November. Moved by Jeff Hoskins. Seconded by John Hrubes. The motion was carried.

c) Motion: That the membership authorize the payment of \$25.01 to Judy Todhunter (Rep. for the Grievance Committee) to reimburse her for the

remainder of the conference fees (Current Issues in Grievance Arbitration Seminar). We also request that the membership authorize the payment of Judy Todhunter's salary for the 26th November for the attendance of the above seminar. Moved by Jeff Hoskins. Seconded by Neil Boucher. The motion was carried.

d) Motion: That the membership authorize the payment of the Provincial per capita tax. Moved by Jeff Hoskins. Seconded by Emerald Murphy. The motion was carried.

e) Motion: That the membership authorize the payment of \$275 for rental of the SUB Ballroom for today's meeting. Moved by Jeff Hoskins. Seconded by John Hrubes. The motion was carried.

9. Report on AIB roll-back - The report was presented by Frances Wasserlein. She read the 9dc76 letter from the AIB to Ian Mackenzie, AUCE Local #1's President. She indicated that there had been an emergency Executive Meeting on Tuesday, 7dc76 to deal with the roll-back, but she said that the Union had not had sufficient time to find possible solutions - solutions which would not preferably destroy the restructured pay scale. Her report was followed by a brief question period.

Frances proceeded to move a series of motions which had all been seconded by the Executive.

a) That we retain a lawyer for advice if necessary. The motion was carried.

b) That the Executive be responsible for negotiations which will:

i) renegotiate Article 36.02 with the University

ii) do all necessary research.

Part 1) was amended to read: i) renegotiate Article 36.02 and other relevant Articles of the contract with the University. Moved by Rayleen Nash. Seconded by Emerald Murphy. The amendment was carried.

c) That a special 2 hour lunch membership meeting be held within the shortest possible time to present possible solutions for ratification by the membership. The motion was carried.

d) That the Executive be given a mandate to negotiate the best possible solution to this present difficulty, with particular attention to maintaining the integrity of the pay scale.

The motion was amended to read:...

with the ratification of the Union membership. Moved by Judy Todhunter. Seconded by Gay Neille. The motion as amended was carried.

Motion re: Press release - Judy Todhunter moved: That this meeting issue a press release re: the rollback, with the following text: (distributed separately).

Rayleen Nash moved that the Executive delete the last two sentences of Paragraph #6 and replace them with a statement giving the percentage or dollar difference between the AUCE and CUPE base rates, without actually saying what either party earns. The amendment was seconded

by Gay Neille. The amendment was defeated - 222 to 212. The text of the press release as circulated was carried.

10. Contract Report - Ray Galbraith reported that there had been little progress to date in mediation - the Definition of Temporary Employee had been chosen by the mediator as the first major issue to tackle.

11. Grievance Report - Kevin Grace presented the report. Kevin presented a series of motions. He moved that the membership of AUCE Local #1 authorize:

a) Application to the Labour Relations Board of B.C., under Article 96.01 of the Labour Code, for an interpretation of the collective agreement re: Should grievances concerning discharge (Articles 33.03, 33.04, 33.05 of the collective agreement) commence at Step 1 or Step 4 of the Grievance Procedure, Article 35.02? (This is a non-monetary decision). Seconded by Emerald Murphy. The motion was carried.

b) The Grievance Committee to take the reclassification grievances of Avron Hoffman, Louise Pinard and Young Ju Ahn to arbitration. Seconded by Emerald Murphy. The motion was carried.

c) The Grievance Committee to take the mass Stack Attendant demotion grievance to arbitration. Seconded by Emerald Murphy. The motion was carried.

d) The Grievance Committee to take the grievance under Article 34.01 - Job Postings to arbitration. Seconded by Emerald Murphy. The motion was carried.

A motion to adjourn was moved, seconded, and carried. The meeting adjourned at 2:20 pm.

The first meeting of the joint AUCE and Professional Staff Study Committee on the Employment of Women in Non-Academic Positions was held on November 3, 1976, in the Graduate Studies Conference Room.

Professional Staff representatives are Dora Hart of Institutional Analysis and Planning; Allison Law of the Registrar's Office; and Marg Schofield who works in Purchasing.

AUCE representatives present were Shirley Chan from Finance; Roberta Crosby working in Continuing Education; Vicki Meynert also at the Centre; and Frances Wasserlein at Counselling Psychology in the Education Department.

Bob Grant had been invited to attend and relate to us his views on the direction the committee might take. He said that we should try as far as possible to "identify and investigate those policies and practices which may be seen to discriminate against women in their employment relationship with the University and to report on these to the University Administration for amendment or redevelopment." Some of the aspects of the employer/employee relationship we are to consider are: "recruitment, compensation, conditions of employment, promotional opportunities, training and devel-

opment, and general employment policies."

After Bob Grant's departure, the members of the committee agreed that we would hertofore be known as SCE-WNAP and would tentatively meet every second Monday at 4:00 P.M. at a location to be arranged prior to each meeting. The chair of each meeting would rotate, in alphabetical order.

Our second meeting was subsequently held on Nov. 22, 1976, at 4:00 P.M. in the Graduate Studies Conference Room. We discussed material obtained for us by Shirely from the Benefits section of the Finance Dept. and already discovered certain objections which we would like to make in our final report. We agreed to invite Ms. Fran Takemoto from Benefits to our next meeting to give us a brief explanation of the differences to be found between the two pension plans available to UBC employees. We looked briefly at material which Bob Grant had supplied us from Employee Relations, namely, a list prepared by that office giving us the numbers of support staff and clerical and office staff and found that we would like to be able to look at professional staff job descriptions and a representative salary structure. Frances volunteered to write a memo to Mr. Grant to that effect.

by Vicki Meynert

## WE NEED AN EDUCATIONAL PUBLIC MEETING ABOUT THE AIB

The AIB has just rolled back our wages, thereby effectively undermining our ability to attain parity with other workers on campus. We have thus become one more in the long list of unions which have been hit by the controls; among them, the B.C. Teachers' Federation, the Alcan workers, the Alberni Pulp and Paper Mill office workers, the Hospital Employees' Union, the Victoria firemen and dozens of others.

We feel that it is very necessary to dedicate an evening to discuss the effects of the AIB rulings on Canadian unions. Representatives from the Teachers' Federation and other unions and women's groups would be more than happy to address such a meeting and tell us about their own experiences and about their own fights.

AUCE's hosting of the meeting would not mean a big expense for the Local. It would only entail distributing invitations to the meeting to the broadest possible public and making sure that as many AUCE members as possible are able to attend. A collection could be taken at that meeting to pay for the rental of the auditorium and any other minor expenses that might be incurred.

We think that no matter what we decide at the next general membership meeting with regard to the rollback, AUCE should organize some time in January a public meeting of this sort, which may join our efforts of fighting the AIB with those of other unions. At the same time, a meeting like this would give us a very good opportunity to inform the public about our present negotiations and to ask for their support.

(signed) Meg Holdworth, Pat Gibson, Lisette Nelson, Jim Livingston, Jean Lawrence, Margie Wally, Joan Cosar