Association of University and College Employees

c/o Graduate Students Society, University of Victoria, P.O. Box 1700, Victoria, V8W 2Y2.
Telephone 721-7583.

May 3/82

Wilf Bellmond,
President
AUCE Local 5
c/o College of New Caledonia
Prince George, B. C.

Dear Wilf:

Re: Secession Procedures for Local 5, Prince George

As a member of the Local 5 Inquiry SUB Sommittee, I would like to respond to your recent letter, and perhaps clear up a misunderstanding.

At our provincial meeting on February 26 and 27, we devoted over three hours to the issue of secession procedures and their intent. At the conclusion we agreed that:

"an inquiry may consist of the following steps:

1) A meeting with the Local Executive
2) Meetings with Local Stewards
3) Informal meetings with Local members
4) A questionnaire to be sent to each member
5) A formal Membership Meeting chaired by the Provincial executive.

Specifically regarding the Local 5 inquiry, it was agreed that: "the subcommittee shall consist of those provincial executive members who can go to Prince George to conduct the inquiry and that if possible they shall report on the results of the inquiry at the next provincial meeting."

The intent of this motion was that the members of the subcommittee decide which steps to take, or in what order, and attempt to have the inquiry completed before the next provincial meeting. The executive passed an amended motion which states "the inquiry shall include a membership meeting at Local 5".

Therefore, the subcommittee's decision to implement a questionnaire for Local 5 was a move sanctioned by the full provincial executive. That subcommittee finalized the content and format of the questionnaire via a conference call on March 2, 1982 and copies were ready to be mailed on March 10, 1982. As a member of that subcommittee I am concerned by your charge that our acts are to be interpreted as a "deliberate attempt to thwart our petition to secede . . . " We fully intended to have the inquiry fully completed by the March 23 provincial executive meeting.

I spoke with two members of Local 5 (Elaine McPherson, Diane Kaufman ) requesting the home addresses of your members if possible. There are two reasons for this request. I am unfamiliar with the mail distribution system at the college, and did not know if the members would receive the questionnaire on the same day. It is standard practice in survey research to try to insure that each respondent receives the questionnaire at approximately the same time and under similar circumstances to reduce the effects of possible biasing intervening variables. This refers to minimizing differential perceptions of intent of working, etc. Because the questionnaire was not pretested it is possible that some of the questions could be vague or elicit totally different responses than originally intended by the authors. If each respondent fills out the questionnaire alone, hopefully this would become apparent by the variety of responses to the same question. However, if the respondents discuss the question and reach a consensus as to its perceived intent, we would have no way of knowing that in fact the question was either misunderstood or irrelevant in that context.

The request for home addresses was for this reason only, and I in no way foresaw that it could be perceived as an unnecessary exercise designed to frustrate the respondents. However, since this is the case I apologize on behalf of the committee. Hopefully, this will clear up any misunderstanding regarding thd decision for, and timing of, the questionnaire process.

Your application for secession will be expedited in good faith and as quickly as possible. The information elicited is for our purposes only, as any application to secede necessarily requires our most serious consideration.

If you require any further information, please do not hesitate to call me at [redacted]

On behalf on the subcommittee,

Kathy Chopik

Kathy Chopik,
President, Local 7