

CONTRACT BULLETIN

TO: ALL MEMBERS

FROM: THE CONTRACT COMMITTEE

It's up to you. This is probably the last opportunity - except perhaps in an emergency situation - for you, the membership, to formulate this year's contract proposals. In this newsletter you will discover a list of the comments, criticisms, and opinions of the previously mailed proposals and some new suggestions received since. This bulletin will form the core of the Special Membership Meeting to be held on Thursday, February 16th, in Hebb Theatre. This two hour meeting will be concerned solely with this year's upcoming negotiations. The purpose will be to discuss the proposals submitted to date and to compose a final referendum ballot. The Contract Committee will present a suggested ballot based upon the proposals received to date. The voting will be held for two days the following week to enable the Contract Committee to begin negotiating with the University as soon as possible.

Your attendance and contributions are necessary to ensure consistent and strong support for this year's contract proposals and Contract Committee.

An apology - most of the comments received were signed, but unfortunately we misplaced some of the signatures when preparing - ie., cutting and pasting - the last contract bulletin.

MEMBERSHIP MEETING

HEBB THEATRE

THURSDAY, FEB. 16TH

12:30 - 2:30 PM.

1. Over the past three years, the Library has been eliminating by attrition the position of LA III Stack Attendant. Stack attendants have been routinely replaced by LA I shelvers. The differences between the two positions in practice are minimal; duties, work load, and responsibilities are for all intents and purposes identical. The difference in job definitions seems to hinge only on the supervision of student assistnats, and even here there is a good deal of matter-of-course overlapping.
2. The work performed by LA I shelvers is physically demanding; in an average week a third on ones work hours may be occupied by book moves (redistributing the collection within the stacks). Because of the physical stamina required, LA I circulation assistant positions are commonly preferred over/against LA I shelver positions.
3. In the course of their work, LA I shelvers are not given experience in paper-work skills and routines that would enhance their chances of promotion and transfer; in this sense shelver positions are analagous to those of keypunch operators: both are locked into their positions.

The ideal solution, for us, would be the reinstatement of the LA III Stack Attendant position; perhaps some intermediate or special category can be created by contract negotiations to cover our situation.

-Ian Spence and Alfred Tse

The undersigned strongly object to paying 5% of their salary to the University Pension Plan.

Members can now start their own tax deductible pension plan or registered home owners plan which can be withdrawn at any time if an emergency situation should occur.

We suggest that the contract committee try to negotiate a solution for the large proportion of AUCE members who do not wish to be part of the University Pension Plan.

-Leslie McDiarmid, Gladys Tiplady, Ruby Rudd, H. McIlroy, K.G. Humphries, C. Gilfilian, Laura Ceklaj, Margot Scherk, Dianne Longson, M. Francis, Kenna Leatherdale, Doris Raven, Lily Kuhn, F. Hillier.

ARTICLE 27.03 - VACATION SCHEDULE FOR SECOND CALENDAR YEAR

I think that if this stupid article is not eliminated in this set of contract negotiations, there is something severely wrong with us. It came into existence under the false belief that people in their second year would be more likely to take their full vacation entitlement and then skip town before it had been officially earned.

Why this should happen to second year employees more than others escapes me; not to mention the fact that we seem to become reliable and trustworthy on January 1st of the year after our second year. Aside from the fact that this article is stupid and discriminatory (and without the least basis in fact), it is administratively more trouble than it could possibly be worth.

Let's send this article back to the middle ages where it belongs.

-Neil Boucher, Payroll

What happens if I become totally disabled?

I look to my Group Total Disability Plan and what do I see? That members of the University "Academic and Administrative Executive Staff" automatically qualify if they are unable to perform their exact job or one very similar based on education, training or experience. However, in the case of "all other employees" (that's us), we do not qualify if we are able to engage in "any occupation for wage or profit".

Does this mean washing dishes part-time for minimum wage, or selling pencils, or picking strawberries?

Thus we see that the Administration, Faculty, and Librarians would easily qualify for a disability pension of roughly one half of their monthly salaries. On the other hand, we would have difficulty getting any benefit because we must be rendered incapable of performing "any occupation for wage or profit".

The brochure states under sub-heading Rehabilitative Employment:

Rehabilitative employment is allowed for members of the Academic and Administrative Executive staff following completion of the qualifying period. This permits earnings up to 10% of their gross income immediately prior to disability without incurring a reduction in Disability Benefits. 50% of earnings in excess of 10% will be used as a reduction of Disability Benefits. In no case, however, shall the total of Disability Benefits and rehabilitative earnings exceed 75% of gross income immediately prior to having become disabled.

This means that the Administration, Faculty and Librarians only will be allowed to 'rehabilitate' and be paid a portion of their former salary in addition to the disability benefits. Note: all benefits are Income Tax free! Also, it makes one wonder if a person who is capable of performing a portion of the duties should qualify as being totally disabled in the first place. This seems like a very cozy arrangement for 'those what already has'.

Note the exclusions in various parts of the plan which help the Administration, Faculty, and Librarians but exclude us from receiving benefits. For example, under subsection Benefit Period (c):

With respect to Academic and Administrative Executive staff - the 30th of June next succeeding the employee's 65th birthday.

With respect to all other employees - the employee's 65th birthday.

Under subsection Limitations, second paragraph:

For all employees other than members of the Academic and Administrative Executive staff benefits are not payable for disability resulting from bodily injury sustained by an employee while doing any act or thing pertaining to any occupation or employment for wage or profit outside of his duties and responsibilities with the University.

Under subsection Limitations, listed among the standard insurance company disclaimers is a category of exclusion from benefits which is blatantly discriminatory against women - pregnancy. If a woman suffers a disability as a result of pregnancy she is unable to collect disability benefits under this plan.

WAGES (item to which I give top priority)

'The present wages could stand ...' - RIDICULOUS!

'The maximum possible under the AIB guidelines' - O.K., but I think we should AIM for much more, at least to begin with.

'\$90 which is equivalent to 9.1%' - the intent is O.K., but it doesn't make sense because \$90 can't be 9.1% of everybody's salary can it? (I would favour an across-the-board increase in principle.)

'\$262 per month ...' - I would support this, if the Contract Committee is prepared to fight for it.

I think we should be aiming more for EQUAL PAY FOR WORK OF EQUAL VALUE than for satisfying the AIB guidelines!

UNIVERSITY HOLIDAYS (any idea which increases vacations, I give second priority to after wages).

The Christmas - New Year holiday is an excellent idea which I would like to see pursued.

Union meetings - I think 12 would be sufficient, unless this could be used to "bargain" with later on - ie. we could eventually reduce the demand from 15 to 12.

"GENERAL SUGGESTIONS"

"present contract must not be weakened.." - I agree. "Not make any changes in present contract but concentrate on wages" - I would definitely support this.

4

This is by way of elaboration on my earlier proposal that the Union's wage demands for the next contract be in the form of a fairly large but not unreasonably large overall demand, part of which would be an actual increase in the wages of present union members and the rest being used to increase the membership by hiring new people from the ranks of the unemployed.

Before I set out my reasons for thinking this might be a good move may I remind you (or inform you if you're not aware of it) that at least since our last contract was signed the University has been compensating for the increased payroll by decreasing staff by attrition. For every three jobs that are vacated in a Department, only two are allowed to be filled. Another thing to keep in mind is that it is the nature of labour disputes over contract negotiations that the union is almost always, in the eyes of the public at any rate, the heavy, because they are the ones making waves and trying to change the status quo. Whether or not the changes the union is demanding are just, members of the public who are not personally involved in the dispute see militant action on the part of a union as a nuisance at best and downright intolerable at worst in view of the coverage the media give to the unemployment problem, their response being influenced heavily by how much they are inconvenienced by strike.

The plan I have outlined would have very distinct benefits for the union, as I see it.

- (1) Those Departments which have suffered through attrition would benefit by lightening the workload on the present staff members and would prevent the University from "filling in" where absolutely necessary with temporary help who do not have the benefits guaranteed by the contract for full-time or part-time continuing employees, and often are not aware of those benefits they do have under the contract, and who, of course, are paid on the lowest possible wage scale instead of allowing someone to come in full-time and work his or her way up to a higher step on the scale.
- (2) If the overall wage package presented by the Union was a bit over the A.I.B. guidelines, the A.I.B. wouldn't dare discourage an effort to provide new jobs, which is what they would be doing if they rolled us back.
- (3) Such a wage proposal might prove useful to the University in its attempts to gain a better grant from the government of B.C. Again, the provincial government, like the federal government, wouldn't like to be placed in the position of discouraging a contract which was making a concrete effort to create jobs.
- (4) An increase in the membership means an increase in membership dues, thus helping improve the financial status of the union.
- (5) It would probably get local coverage by the news media, and might even be picked up by the national news. This wouldn't hurt our image at all - we'd be the "good guys" for a change and if the University or any government dragged it's feet, which is not likely, they would be the "bad guys" and this would be remembered next time our contract came up for negotiation (and remember, we won't be under AIB controls then) and we would have gained a reputation as a reasonable union with more support for our position than we would have if we appeared to be out for every last penny we could get. The reason I think it would get good coverage is because I don't think it's ever been done before by any union I know of.

-Irene Abbott, Chemistry

IN SUPPORT OF THE PROPOSED IMPROVEMENT TO HUMAN RIGHTS (ARTICLE 9)

The University has been discriminating against employees whose physical disabilities do not interfere with their ability to do their jobs. A good example of this is the recent grievance arbitration concerning the employee in the Main Library who was denied a promotion solely on the basis of her hearing disability. This woman now has nearly 9 years seniority and in all this time, despite many attempts, she has succeeded in transferring only once.

Her personal file contains a record of misconceptions about the hearing disabled. For example, statements that appear in several evaluation reports imply that this woman also has learning difficulties; that her communication skills are so limited she would be better off working on her own; that her hearing disability prevents her from using the telephone, and so on.

At the arbitration hearing we demonstrated, through the testimony of an audiologist, that this woman through the combined use of lip reading and hearing aids, has an advantage over people with normal hearing, especially in situations where the noise level is high. Several witnesses testified that they experienced no difficulty communicating with her, and we learned that she does use the telephone without any special device. Perhaps more important than anything else is the fact that she applied for the promotion because she had confidence in her own ability to do the job.

The proposed change to Article 9 would prevent the University from denying people like her their rights under the Contract.

-Grievance Committee

TO: Contract Committee

FROM: Darlene Crowe

The following are my comments on the items raised in the last bulletin about possible contract negotiations:

- NO MORE THAN 10 ITEMS SHOULD GO BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY IN CONTRACT NEGOTIATIONS

yes, yes, yes

- PICKET LINES

Leave article as it is. I feel that we should have to notify the University that the picket line is a bona fide one.

- UNIVERSITY HOLIDAYS

I certainly hope that this is not going to be a priority item, for it's unlikely that the university is going to agree to it. (the time between Christmas and New Years)

- HOURS OF WORK

If you working a 30 hour week how can you possibly be a full time employee?

- OVERTIME

Definitely, overtime should be voluntary.

- MATERNITY LEAVE

Yes, remove the union's liability to pay for maternity benefits of employees who quit within 6 months, possibly as suggested by paying benefits after the 6 months are up. This is something that should have been put into the contract last year.

- WAGES

6% increase over one year with a COLA bonus.

definitely no to only 5% increase and using the other 3%-5% to subsidize other understaffed departments. Chances of this money being used for that purpose are slim indeed.

I agree with 4th item on page 6. Now is not the time to go after equal work for equal pay and try and catch up to CUPE. This will only cause more trouble among union ranks and it's totally unrealistic while the AIB remains in power.

- INCREMENT POLICY

yes, definitely increase to \$30 per step. \$20 is ludicrous.

What does being an ex-housewife have to do with coping out on contract negotiations. Each negotiations should try to improve on our contract to some degree.

The contract provides for an employee to receive, up to five days preceding her/his last working day, any cheques which may fall due during a vacation or leave of absence. It seems only sensible than an employee who is leaving the University altogether should, likewise, be able to collect anything that is owing before they leave campus.

It does not appear that the University has a consistent policy on this at present, as some employees do receive cheques on the last day of work while some cheques, in particular vacation pay, are held back and mailed later.

February 6, 1978

Resignation/Paycheques Articles 27.09 and 33.07

The contract provides for an employee to receive working day any cheques which are due or which may fall due during a vacation or leave of absence. It seems only sensible that an employee who is leaving the University altogether should, likewise, be able to collect anything that is owing before they leave campus.

It does not appear that the University has a consistent policy on this at present, as some employees do receive cheques on the last day of work while some cheques, in particular vacation pay, are held back and mailed later.

Temporary Employee Benefits Article 30.09

Temporary employees are denied benefits such as medical and dental appointments and sick leave simply because they take positions of less than three months duration during their initial phase of employment with the University. After they have accumulated three months seniority they become continuing employees and are entitled to these benefits. Probationary employees in continuing positions, with no seniority with the University, receive these benefits from their first day of work. There is no justification for this discrimination except the University's desire to maintain the second class status of this group of employees.

Cost of Living Allowance

A COLA clause "geared to the ever increasing cost of living" is, at first glance, an attractive, sensible solution to the ever present problem of maintaining our wages at a rate that will keep up with inflation. Unfortunately, the examples of other unions have shown that it is nearly impossible to persuade an employer to negotiate a COLA which comes anywhere near to bridging the gap between costs and wages. Employers tend to view COLA agreements as an inexpensive and expedient way of settling the wage issue in each contract year. Clearly, the acceptance of an "allowance" of this kind undermines the ability of a Union to negotiate a meaningful increase on its basic salaries. Since COLA payments are in the form of a bonus, they do not affect the negotiated salaries, and the original wage base falls further and further behind with each contract settlement.

Jean Lawrence
Health Care & Epidemiology

Comments on AUCE's contract proposals for the 1978-79 negotiations

The items presented for membership consideration raised a number of possible priorities for our next set of negotiations. I have listed my personal choices for further consideration below, however I would first like to comment on what I believe should be our main objective this time around.

The Contract Committee should take as their main goal the need to have this year's negotiations occur with relative speed and maximum membership participation, to avoid the long drawn out and divisive wrangling we experienced last year.

To this end we should take a maximum of ten items to the table for negotiation. In determining these ten items we should try to choose those proposals which will appeal to a significant number of employees - in that way ensuring that they have concrete membership support. We should include proposals directed towards solving some of the oft-heard grievances expressed by our senior people - grievances which are real and which appear to be seriously dividing this union.

Above all we should recognize that we do have an excellent contract at present, one which we want to maintain. We do not want to alienate the membership of our union by taking excessive demands to the contract table. I believe that the future of our union will be greatly affected by the way in which we conduct negotiations this time - we can either unite people behind a small number of well-supported items, or continue to erode membership support. The choice is up to the membership of this union, and the responsibility lies with the Contract Committee.

Possible Contract Proposals

1. Contracting Out (5.05)

The addition of a clause ensuring that the Union be informed and consulted in each instance of contracting out would seem imperative. Otherwise our present clause really means nothing. This should be possible to achieve as it is a common clause in Union contracts.

2. Leave of Absence (7.02)

Change as suggested in the first set of proposals. This seems to be a simple but necessary housekeeping measure.

3. Human Rights (Article 9)

Change as suggested in the first set of proposals.

4. Job Postings (Article 22.01)

Change as stated in the first set of proposals. An important addition for reasons of union security.

5. Maternity Leave

The two changes as stated in the first set of proposals should be incorporated into a single new clause on Maternity Leave. This would be more equitable for both the employer and the union.

6. Union meetings (Article 10)

A top priority this time should be that of gaining at least 12 lunch-hour union meetings per year.

7. University Holidays (Article 26.05)

We should try again to get the 3 days between Christmas and New Year's. Perhaps this would not be one of our top priorities but it could be stressed more if the University's wage offer is on the low side.

8. Step Increase to be \$30.00

This change would provide a little more incentive than presently exists for seeking promotion and also give a few more dollars compensation for longer service employees.

9. Pat LeVac Proposal

An article designed to compensate senior people by Extended Service Pay as outlined in Pat LeVac's item in the last Across Campus. This would mean Extended Service Pay of \$10.00/month for every five years of service from the fifth calendar year.

EX: Employees with 5 - 10 years service - add \$10.00/mth.
 10 - 15 years service - add \$20.00/mth.
 15 - 20 years service - add \$30.00/mth.

Of course these rates would have to be negotiable but perhaps in this set of negotiations we could at least begin to implement some such plan.

10. Wages

A \$90.00 across the board increase would seem to be a realistic goal in this set of negotiations. This is approximately equal to the present rate of inflation of 9.9%. The rationale for such an increase is clear. Also, our Contract Committee should continue to stress our ultimate goal of equal pay for work of equal value though the possibility of attaining this goal appears unrealistic at this time.

Cathy Agnew
Division E

ARTICLE 16 - COURT DUTY

The University's periodic interpretation of this article is that it does not cover witnesses summoned to attend arbitrations because, the argument goes, an arbitration is different from a court. However, if you look at Section 102 of the Labour Code you will find that an arbitrator has the power to "summon and enforce the attendance of witnesses ... in the same manner as a court of record in civil cases."

By changing this article to include specific reference to subpoenaed witnesses to arbitrations we will eliminate this recurring dispute.

-Grievance Committee

Article 10 - Union Meetings

In August 1974, we were in the process of negotiating our first contract and at that point in time we did not have two hour membership meetings on University time. One month later we had negotiated six two hour membership meetings for the following contractual year. In December 1975, we settled for an additional three meetings, for a total of nine. It was only during last year's negotiations that we failed to improve upon our contract in this vital area.

In the context of past negotiations and in view of consistent membership support for lunch hour meetings, it is still opportune and important that we press for more meetings. We should bargain for fifteen, but I feel that we should settle for a minimum of twelve. No other clause in the contract offers the membership to have access to involvement in Union affairs on such a significant scale.

Past Contract Committees have viewed this as a priority item and this year's Committee is no exception. The arguments for supporting this proposal are self-evident. The precedent for Union meetings on University time was established three years ago when the University recognized the validity of the Union's arguments. In this area we are not breaking new ground; we are simply consolidating and improving upon past gains. This is a proposal which must surely meet with the approval of the overwhelming majority of the membership - a membership interested in a union which functions as democratically as possible.

Ray Galbraith

Across-the-Board vs. Percentage Increase Debate

Last year's negotiations were punctuated in the late stages by the across-the-board vs. the percentage increase debate. The special edition of Across Campus - May 27, 1977 - distributed to the membership covered many aspects of the debate. If you should have that newsletter, please refer to it. If not, there are a few copies available in the Union office for your perusal.

In our first year we won a \$225 across-the-board increase. The original University offer was basically a percentage proposal ranging from \$38 for the lower classifications to approximately \$80 to the highest classification. Our second contract was concerned with the restructuring of the wage scale which provided increases ranging from, for example, \$127 for a Clerk I to \$192 for a Clerk III. The approach taken was not the across-the-board route. Our third set of negotiations was settled on an across-the-board basis - \$91 (\$54 and \$37) over 18 months.

Reprinted below are some of the articles from the May 1977 newsletter.

... I feel guilty when I look around me in the Finance department. I see clerks IV around me some of whom have been at the top step of clerk IV since I started here (four years ago). They receive no step increase, there are no promotions available (they aren't computer operators and P&S positions are few and very far between) and they feel a little neglected. Their deductions are larger than mine, their expenses are greater than mine, and consequently their increases are less than mine. An across-the-board increase is not acceptable to me. I will vote for a percentage increase.

Neil Boucher

I want to express my support for an across the board increase over a percentage one. I am an LA III in my ninth year of employment with the University, this time around. I worked here once earlier for 1 1/2 years.

I get the impression, from the letters supporting percentage increases, that people in the LA III and LA IV categories have delusions of grandeur. We all work under the same conditions here. The only possible difference between my job and someone who is an LA I or II would be the degree of complication in our various tasks.

Certainly, the pressure, abuse and general non-appreciation of our efforts has nothing whatever to do with my classification or the salary I am receiving. The idea that one should be monetarily rewarded for putting in a certain amount of time out here is just ridiculous.

For one thing, since we got a union, it takes much, much longer to reach the top categories. For another, generally speaking, people in the top categories are more set in their lives, often not bearing the whole financial burden themselves.

I fail to understand the logic in statements like "why should that person be making almost as much money as me when I have worked here 10 years and they only 3 years." Money just can't be the basis for reward of service - it is too important and necessary to all of us.

As for responsibility and being paid for it, you can only bear as much of that as you want to. Supervisory people are in our bargaining unit because they have no authority to hire and fire and if you are being used by your boss in this way you only have yourselves to blame.

Take off the rose coloured glasses, friends - did you really believe all that stuff about starting at the bottom and working your way to the top? We are all in this together, please try to remember it.

Mind you, some people get off thinking they are better than others, or at least worth more. If more money is your only game, possibly management is the department you should be looking to for employment.

[Redacted]

Carol Cameron
Library Assistant III
Serials Division, Lib.

At this time, for this specific contract (1976-Mar. 1978), I am in favour of adopting a percentage principle in negotiating our wage increase.

Perhaps the major reason I favor a percentage increase is that for the last two years we have negotiated across-the-board increases. The net result has been that employees at the higher end of the pay scale have been receiving less cash in hand than those at the lower end. If you link this with the fact that our wage scale was drastically reduced

[Redacted]
continued...

from 33 steps to 10 last time, you begin to see a strange thing happening. There is less and less incentive in seeking a promotion and once you have been at UBC for a few years, seniority accrued means little in dollar terms. Seniority becomes a detriment rather than an asset. Those jobs which have more responsibility, or those people who have been at UBC for a long time, are not properly compensated in monetary terms. Perhaps it would be more just to have our wage increases negotiated in an alternating fashion: i.e. one year we have across-the-board, the next year percentage, etc.

One further work on this issue. I am tired of hearing over and over at membership meetings that everyone has to face the same cost of living and therefore to be fair, everyone should have the same dollar increase. Neither percentage nor across-the-board ensures an identical increase. To me, this is a phony issue. The real issue is: do we want to lump everyone together in a middle-of-the-road pay scale, or do we want to reward those people who have more seniority, more responsibility, and therefore deserve a few more dollars in their paycheques? Do we want to offer some incentive for promotion and long term service, or do we want to encourage employees to work on a short term basis? A percentage increase this time would bring a much needed element back into our pay scale.

Cathy Agnew
Math Department

I am one of those long service and senior people. I was fortunate. I started as a Clerk II in 1964 when there were more jobs available and turnover was high. I rose through the ranks quickly so that by 1968 I was an LA IV. So far as I know I got all the merit increases going. There was once, I recall, a 'double merit raise' handed out to a select few of us. Those were pre-Union days!

Towards the end of the sixties, however, I began to notice that other LAs were not advancing at my rate. For every promotion that I got as many as 10 equally qualified LAs stayed put. That situation hasn't improved. Many such people are trapped in the lower classifications working every bit as hard as those of us at or near the top.

I cannot agree with Pat LaVac, Robert Gaytan & Valerie Pusey or any other percentage increase supporter. Their view seems to be that, because they are at the senior levels, they should be continually rewarded for just that reason. In addition to their obviously higher salaries they and I have other advantages; we have for example greater job security, generally more interesting jobs, more opportunity for transfer and promotion, longer vacations and first choice where a conflict arises over vacation scheduling. Also, the Pension Plan is not compulsory for those of us who were hired prior to 1971. This enables us to use that money for superior pension arrangements or investments.

continued...

A percentage increase would be, in my view, a retrogressive step, particularly so because it would be of greatest benefit to a minority at the top and of least benefit to a majority at the lower end of the scale; as such it would only serve to widen the gap that we fought so hard to close in our last contract.

Ann Hutchison
LA IV
Main Library

We have been members of AUCE since its inception and wholeheartedly supported our union's efforts in our first contract to bring the level of our lowest category up to a fair standard. Since that time, as each contract is being negotiated, we have been urged to continue this method of increase, with the members of the contract committee urging that this is a 'commitment' -- "a loaf of bread costs just as much for a Clerk I as it does for a Clerk IV". If this be true -- then it is time that we realized that with each across the board increase -- the amount of that increase taken home by those in the higher categories gets less and less. IT IS THEREFORE TIME that those of us who have devoted a number of years working at the University to gain a senior level position with its attendant responsibilities be able to afford that loaf of bread just as the lower categories do. It is only fair that service and responsibility reap some kind of reward...For we, the undersigned, it would appear that our wishes are being passed over, all longtime employees have to feel this way when the responsibility and service of years is disregarded.

Various Members of
Division A of the
Registrar's Office

... Many of the reasons why I am opposed to a percentage increase have been dealt with - some have not. Misconceptions and myths run amok. Arguments and positions are not developed to their logical conclusions. The debate is necessary, but it should have been initiated after this set of negotiations had been resolved. Many questions remained unanswered.

... I am an LA IV with seven years of library experience. I support - barely - a wife and a child, and I believe I have benefited greatly from the different approaches taken in the past sets of negotiations. I support the across-the-board approach - as do many other members in the higher classifications. We are by no means a monolithic group harbouring resentments that we have been shafted because of past sacrifices.

I will vote for an across-the-board increase.

Ray Galbraith
Main Library

Some comments submitted for the 1978 negotiations follow:

**It seems to me that we may not be allowed any increase under the AIB guidelines for the next six months and I don't know what we would be allowed for the following six months. Personally, I think it was a mistake to shelve our stand for parity with CUPE's Technician I, as our base rate of pay. I think we should reinstate that demand and consistently stick to it. We will not convince anybody including ourselves that we are worth as much as others doing work of equal value (and being paid more) if we feebly say that the AIB won't allow it so why ask for it. If we do not ask for it now, once the AIB is off our backs our case will be that much weaker with many of our newer members completely oblivious to the issue of equal pay for work of equal value. We should make our wage proposal an across the board increase of \$262 (the difference between the 1977-78 Technician I rate and our Pay Grade I rate) per month.

**That we do not have anymore ACROSS-THE-BOARD type of increases. This should be a % one which is much more fair and just to those of us who are senior and have lost out on the other type of raises "twice" (I think) by now.

**I am bitterly opposed to an across-the-board increase if it should happen yet again for the fourth successive year. I fail to understand, in fairness to all members of our Union, how another across-the-board increase can possible be justified.

**I will try to be brief. I am annoyed that past contract committees have implied to the membership that across-the-board increases are "our policy". That is untrue and manipulative. I believe we should vote every time a new contract comes up what kind of increase would suit the majority of members best - each and every year. In our present society, people are paid according to their skills and experience and that is why I think it is grossly unfair for an experienced staff member with years of service to the University, with many skills that took time, money and effort to achieve, to receive an annual increment LESS than the junior member with 4 months to 4 years service! The long-service employee would be delighted to receive the same dollars per month increases and the only way we can achieve parity with short-term employees is by way of the percentage increase. Although I agree that would give the long-service people more dollars initially, that would immediately be off-set by the July 1st annual increments that the short-service people receive.

**...I believe that it is time for negotiations on wages to recognize the responsibilities of senior personnel - in other words, let's have a Percentage increase, no matter how small.

**Personally, I feel that our next wage increase should be on a percentage basis. We have reached the point now where there is no economic incentive to move to a higher rating, because the salary differential is too small.

**We should be given a percentage raise and not across-the-board.

**As to the thorny issue of the across-the-board vs. the %age debate, the Contract Committee will have to decide upon a recommendation to the membership. Personally, I favour the across-the-board approach - the reasons were spelled out in last year's debate.

MORE SUGGESTIONS (received since last mailing)

That Article 33.06 Disciplinary Action/Employee Files be rewritten to omit any reference to types of documents, i.e. "At the request of an employee any document shall be removed from the employee's file ..."

Motivation:

Since the onus is on the Union to prove that the documents in question fall into the category of censure, letter of reprimand, or adverse report the University has simply countered our arguments by saying that they are anything but. Since we cannot pin them down to anything specific it would be better if we did away with the categories altogether.

Grievance Committee

1. Minimum 48 hour weekend for shift-workers.
2. Increase in shift differential.
3. Make pension plan voluntary.
4. When hiring experienced personnel .. they should be paid at a pay scale accordingly.
5. Move that Easter Sunday be recognized as a statutory holiday.
6. Re overtime .. only a qualified person should replace another qualified person.. e.g. computer operators should replace computer operators when one is sick etc.
7. Change pay scales for computer operators and senior operators to be at least parallel with S.F.U. standards.
8. EXTRA money for working weekends .. they are consistently a part of an operator's shift and he receives no extra premium for it .. (when working days).

I see that some of these motions have already been suggested, but I wanted you to know you can count on my vote and the majority of the operators at the Computing Centre.

John Perring, Computing Centre

INCREMENT POLICY

In the second paragraph under this heading, you mention a suggestion that step increases be raised to \$30. An alternative suggestion I would like the membership to be able to consider is:

<u>Steps:</u>	<u>1-2</u>	<u>2-3</u>	<u>3-4</u>	<u>4-5</u>	<u>5-6</u>
	\$20	\$25	\$30	\$35	\$40

This idea was first suggested to me by Fairleigh quite some time ago as something she would like to see implemented. I find it to be very reasonable and would like the opinions of other members.

Valerie Pusey
Graduate Studies

SICK LEAVE

That sick leave that is not taken during an employee's time of employment accumulate and then at the time that she/he quits or retires the sick leave be "given back" either as holidays or money.

That we investigate and negotiate with the University the subject of 'sick leave banking' such as AUCE Local 4 at Capilano College has. This would enable people with major illnesses or accidents to draw on the collected unused sick leave of the whole Union.

QUESTIONS

1. TUITION WAIVER (Article 21.01)

I would like to know what problems we are now having with this clause, what we thought we agreed to, and how the present wording is different.

I would also like to see clarification of 'year' in this clause next time, i.e. academic (Sept 1 - Aug 31), or calendar (Jan 1 - Dec 31).

2. HOURS OF WORK (Article 28)

What is meant by "... change to provide the option of working a 30-hour week"? I don't understand the meaning or ramifications of this possibility.

3. SHIFT WORK (Article 28.05)

What is meant by "shift workers get at least a 48-hour weekend"? Is it a regular weekend in question here, or just two days off together at the end of a particular shift week, i.e. Tuesday/Wednesday, or Thursday/Friday, etc.?

Valerie Pusey
Graduate Studies

ANSWERS

1. We thought we agreed to:
taking or auditing one course at a time to a maximum of 6 units, or the equivalent in fees, i.e. \$250, per year, credit or non-credit. The problem is the University doesn't agree. Specifically, with auditing courses and the definition of "year (12 months)".

2 & 3.

The Contract Committee doesn't know. You could ask the people who suggested these at the February 16th Meeting.