

CONFIDENTIAL

CUE Executive
Minutes
June 24, 1986

Present: Suzan Zagar, Mary Vorvis, Mary McKenna-Forkin,
Patricia House, Ted Byrne, Joe Denofreo, (Michele
McAnulty)

1. Adoption of agenda - Moved: Mary Vorvis, Seconded: Suzan Zagar, Carried.
2. Adoption of the Minutes. Suzan suggested we revise the motion re. daycare, since according to the bylaws such a vote would have to go to referendum. The Chair (Patricia) asked that we make that point under business arising.

Ted: under item 8. replace 'sometimes filling' with 'says it can fill'.

Motion to adopted as corrected: Moved: Suzan, Seconded: Mary Vorvis, Carried.

3. Business arising from the minutes. Suzan asked for a report on items 4 ii) and 4 v).
Ted reported that 4 ii) was done, and the letter from the BCNU was read at the last GM.
Joe reported on item 4 v), the meeting between Jeff Rose and President Strangway. It was a 'general' meeting, highlighting concern regarding labour relations on campus. They did not get into particulars of individual disputes. Jeff Rose told Strangway (and Eileen Stewart) that Cupe National has targeted the campus for the next round of bargaining, but that it was not too late for Dr. Strangway to do something about the situation. Jeff Rose suggested that, since the communication process seems to have broken down, there should be a joint committee of the three locals and the Administration (Personnel and the President), to look at labour relations and the specific problems we have. Secondly, he indicated to them that if they want cooperation from us, we have to have a commitment from them that there will be no hypocrisy on their part - if they ask for our cooperation they cannot then come to the bargaining table with a lot of concessions as they did last time. The ball was left in Dr. Strangway's court. Jeff has written a letter reviewing what was said at the meeting, and suggesting that Dr. Strangway involve himself directly in labour relations on campus. Since then Eileen Stewart has contacted Joe and the President does want such a committee struck. She expressed concern that the union side of such a committee include the spokesperson from the bargaining committees, so that there would be no conflict between what is said at this committee and what is said at the bargaining table.

At the meeting, Dr. Strangway also discussed the University's budget, and his efforts to keep the current budget level of funding. The initial budget proposed by the government would have required a cut of 150 positions. Strangway managed to convince the Minister that the budget must remain at the 85/86 level.

Joe also reported on Cupe 116's current bargaining. The University is taking the position that the union should roll-over the contract for one year with no wage increase. It is curious that they should take this position, since it would mean that our contract and 116's contract would expire at the same time, which would not seem to be to their advantage. The only thing he can think of is that Eileen Stewart sees some advantage in block bargaining.

Note: since Jeff Rose has written a letter and has not yet received an official response, the substance of the meeting with Dr. Strangway should not be widely discussed.

Item 5 of the previous minutes, the daycare subsidy motion: it should be made clear that it is our intention to send the motion to referendum.

Suzan: correction: we should recommend to the membership that it go to referendum.

Ted: disagrees - we can simply send it out to referendum.

Suzan: no, it has to go to a General Meeting first so that it can be discussed, amended if necessary, and the membership can make a decision whether or not they want it voted on at all.

Ted: agrees.

4. i. Patricia: it is time to confirm Helen in the job, we will have to give the University one month's notice.

Motion: that we confirm Helen in her job and request one year's leave of absence from the University - Moved: Ted, Seconded: Suzan, Carried.

Patricia will convey this decision to Helen and ask her if she wants to stay on.

ii. Overtime. Patricia: she has read some of the discussion that occurred re. the office, our structure, etc. - the only way we can get the office into shape would be to devote a block of time to getting to filing into order - therefore she is requesting that 14 hrs. of overtime be approved for her and Helen so that they can spend two extra days working on the filing.

Motion: to approve the 7hrs. overtime submitted by Patricia - Moved: Suzan, Seconded: Mary Vorvis, Carried.

Exec. minutes, June 24, p. 3

Suzan suggested that instead of approving overtime for Patricia and Helen, we get other members of the executive involved and have a work party. She is acutely aware of the problem: she herself recently spend two hours trying to find a grievance file.

Mary Vorvis: would they be paid?

Suzan: not according to past practice - but if the executive members were to volunteer, the same would be expected of the office staff.

Patricia: such a work party would be impractical, judging by past experience. We did strike a work party of the Grievance Committee to do some of this work and no one showed up. It would make more sense for Helen and her to do it since she knows where everything is, and is still in the process of trying to train Helen.

Mary Vorvis: a work party doesn't ever work well because someone has to coordinate it, and time is lost.

Suzan: what needs to be done - grievance files, contract files?

Patricia: files in boxes, grievance files in four different places - moving filing cabinets, furniture - organizing the library - they have already made plans as to how they want to arrange things - have to index grievance files.

Suzan: won't get indexing done in one weekend

Patricia: we have developed a form for this - but we have to do some initial organizing before we can begin to do the actual indexing, which can be done by volunteers.

There was further discussion of the work to be done, and some discussion of what material had been archived (no one was clear on this question).

Ted: expressed his opinion that, while what Patricia was requesting was reasonable, it was only a start, and that a large part of the problem is one of time management - everyone gets caught up in the ongoing crisis-oriented work of the office, and this already includes Helen - what we need is to block off time during the week when each of us can concentrate on filing and organizing the office, as we did when Patricia trained Helen and Mary on the books.

Motion: that the Executive approve up to 14 hours overtime for Patricia and Helen to organize the files - Moved: Mary Vorvis, Seconded: Mary McKenna-Forkin, Carried.

iii. Cleaning the office. Patricia has a quote for \$80/mo. for everything. It would be two times a month.

Ted: how much was Rosemary paid?

Patricia: \$70/mo.

Mary: is this a company?

Patricia: yes - recommending them on basis of work they do for her and for the False Creek Housing Coop - she trusts them.

Motion - that we use Donna Lee Co. to clean the office at \$80/mo. - Moved: Mary McKenna-Forkin, Seconded: Mary Vorvis, Carried.

iv. Motion: that we sell the scriptomatic, the Rex Rotary, and the stencil cutter - Moved: Ted, Seconded: Suzan, Carried.

v. Dues change. Patricia has never gotten the information from the University regarding what the monthly payroll is. She talked to Libby Nason and she gave a guess, told her to talk to Payroll. Then Libby Nason told Payroll not to talk to Patricia. When Patricia approached LN again, she said that we should have consulted with them first to see if what we were proposing is possible (ie. % check-off). Of course, it is possible because Cupe 116 has it. Patricia wrote LN a letter which she read to the Executive (see Executive binder). The letter requests a check-off at 1.2%. She feels safe with that amount. If it is high we can adjust it.

Ted: what if it's low.

Patricia: we have a problem - but can still be adjusted.

Suzan: I thought the membership approved 1.2%.

Patricia: no, the motion was for that amount which was equal to the current flat rate - 1.2% was presented to them as our best estimate. She asks that Executive approve sending the letter. Agreed.

vi. Orientation. Patricia read a letter to Libby Nason regarding the orientation sessions. We proposed a change to the way of doing orientations, and they did not respond. Currently we are not reaching some of the new members: chiefly in the hospitals, and hourly staff.

vii. Ted read a letter from Rosemary Brown re. NDP consultation meetings with women's organizations. We did not attend the meeting in Victoria, but Ted responded to the letter asking to be kept informed of results, and of upcoming meetings in Vancouver.

5. Work to rule. At some point we should inform our members that they no longer need to refuse voluntary overtime. We do not need to lift the motion to work to rule, but some members are still sticking strictly to it. We should not say anything about this until our R&A grievances are resolved.
6. Section 8. Our unfair labour practices complaint is still not resolved. Ted went back to the Labour Board and made it clear that we either want a resolution or a hearing. Eileen Stewart responded to this by contacting Joe Denofreo and arranging a meeting between herself, him, Libby Nason, and representatives from the local.

7. Employee Assistance Programs. Ted, Patricia and Joe met with Eileen Stewart, and Fred Ursell from the Alcohol and Drug Commission. Eileen Stewart made it clear that a full-scale formal EAP would have to involve all staff on campus, and would not be possible for two-three years (unless we put it on the table). In principal she is in favour of such a program, and would like us to develop a joint policy in the interim, which she feels is a necessary first step toward developing a program. There are some problems with this from our point of view, mostly concerning initial contacts with employees (referrals), and the question of how much of the procedure we would want a policy to outline. Ted and Joe will be meeting with Joy Langan of the CLC to discuss EAPs later this week. Ted is to draw up a draft policy and meet with Libby Nason to discuss. He will prepare this and discuss it with the Executive before his meeting with Libby Nason.

Quorum was lost at this point.

8. Essential Services. Libby Nason has sent us a list of positions in the hospitals that are considered by the hospital administrators (ie. UBC admin. assistants and dept. heads) to be essential. The list is outrageous and, for example, includes 37 of the ~~44~~ Clin. Sec. ls. 76 And this is a 'preliminary' list. She obviously solicited these lists from the departments without giving them any indication of what guidelines are used to determine essential services. She wants us to meet with people from the departments so they can explain to us why these positions are essential.
Joe: if we even discuss this based on her list, we are starting to bargain with one foot in a hole - write her a letter, saying that she has followed no rational guidelines - give her a definition of essential services - cite some cases - tell her we would be prepared to look at a list in line with previous Board decisions: a list with reasons - if this is not acceptable 'perhaps' we should ask the Board for assistance.
9. South Africa. Complaint from member re. Library use of companies listed as having dealings with S.A. Epic and Xerox. When investigated, it turns out that Epic terminals are being serviced by Epic, and that there is a major purchase of photocopying equipment in the offing (Xerox will undoubtedly bid). Ted will investigate further. We should write letter to President, Board of Governors - letter to Minister, w/ copy to opposition.
10. Cupe Women's Conference coming up in Fall. Should we send delegate?

- adjourned - next meeting July 8, 1986.