

Present: AUCE:  
Fairleigh Funston  
Marcel Dionne  
Barb McEachern  
Jeff Hoskins  
Jean Lawrence (Chairwoman)  
Wendy Bice  
Margie Walley  
Tracy Mitchell  
Ian Mackenzie  
Lil Legault  
Pat Gibson  
Ray Galbraith

University:  
Robert Grant (Chairman)  
Carol Singer  
Erik de Bruijn  
June Prenty

1. Before AUCE presented the remaining few proposals and housekeeping, Jean Lawrence stressed the continuing difficulties that members of the Contract Committee were having in getting away. Grant admitted that he still had "a little bit of static" with certain offices, but that these should soon be overcome.

Grant indicated that he had been called into the President's Office and that the conversation centered around negotiations with AUCE. Negotiations, Grant stated, were to get "moving...regardless of whom is sitting in this chair." Furthermore, he was to meet with the President at 2:30 pm. to discuss the University's proposals. He suggested that we reconvene at around 4:00 pm., and at that time the University would present its proposals "formally". Then, "at the next meeting, we would start to negotiate on the basis of the two documents." But, Grant expressed a desire for both sides to discuss the job evaluation/classification question during the morning session. He said that he was going ahead with his vacation for the month of September and that he did not expect any problems. But, "if we do run into problems, I am prepared to take a plane back." Jean said that AUCE didn't think it would be a problem.

2. Jean Lawrence presented the material submitted by the Contract Committee, "Further Errata" (p. 24-25 of the Union's contract proposal cumulation). After the short presentation, during which Grant requested his customary clarifications in regards to the Union's intent, there was a caucus for coffee and discussion. Grant requested an answer from the Union on the issue of reconvening in the afternoon in order to receive the University's proposals. "Regardless of your answer, I'm prepared to give you, in writing, our proposals today." During the caucus the Contract Committee decided to reconvene that afternoon.
3. After the break, Grant returned to speak to the job evaluation/classification issue. Grant felt that this was "...one of the more troublesome issues", and that it would "...serve some useful purpose to find out what the Union is looking for." Grant proceeded to throw out a series of ideas for the Contract Committee's consumption. He asked: "Are you concerned over the evaluation technique?" (i.e., the point technique). "Is there a conflict between the definitions of the jobs?" "Is there conflict re: job standards (reclassification) and job duties (job specification)?" Grant indicated that he would like to come to grips with the job classification procedure as it was "a source of conflict". He remarked that no progress had been made with the Job Evaluation Committee, and said that he "...would like to set up some approach to getting a discussion going and resolving this issue."

Marcel Dionne indicated that one of the biggest problems was with the listing of the job duties, especially in the Library - job specifications were not in accordance with the Job Descriptions. Fairleigh Funston added that past problems arose over the job spec/Job Description differences. "Different departments cannot decide which supercedes which." Grant re-iterated that he was really trying to come to grips with this and that "this is a very subjective area."

Grant stated that the Job Description should identify: (1.) the reason for the job; (2.) it should show its organizational relationships (3.) the major responsibilities to meet the specifications of the job (4.) the specification outlining the minimum education, skills, experience, etc. to do that job. Grant said that "the job duties are the things we do to meet the responsibilities of that position." Equity should exist between say a Sec II position in one dept. and a Sec II in another dept. But Grant saw "...no point in coming in and throwing down a proposal without having seen your proposals." He added that evaluating jobs was "subjective" and that he favoured adopting a "rational approach" and trying some sort of "...a trial period for say a year." The University, he indicated, was "eager" to come to some agreement on this contentious issue.

Jean Lawrence said that the Contract Committee would consider his ideas and suggestions and would be prepared to discuss the issue of job evaluation/classification at the appropriate time. She stated that the Union was willing to reconvene at 3:30 pm.

The meeting adjourned at 10:40 am. (The next hour in caucus featured an extensive discussion of the points raised by Grant. Various members of the Contract Committee formulated and discussed their positions on the job evaluation/classification issue. No negotiating strategy was decided upon.)

4. Wendy Bice was replaced by Neil Boucher for the afternoon session. The meeting reconvened at 3:30 pm., but Grant did not arrive until shortly after 4:00 pm. Carol Singer was not in attendance for the University.
5. Grant's first words to the Contract Committee were: "I have never tried this technique before. But, I have tried to express our position in the terms of our objectives." He continued with a statement that his Advisory Committee wanted to attempt to build up a "harmonious relationship". With that, he presented two documents: the first entitled "University Proposals for Negotiations with AUCE Local #1 - Objectives", consisting of 1 page and presenting the University's "philosophical approach", the second entitled "Preparations for Negotiations with AUCE Local #1 - Draft of University Proposals", consisting of 10 pages and presenting the University's proposals in regards to the areas of the contract they wanted to see changed. Grant read the document outlining the objectives, and stated: "We will be negotiating Tuesday, 9:30 am." And, during his month absence he said: "We feel we can move during this period."
6. On the issue of absence from work and the number of paid Union negotiators, Grant indicated he had "bad news" - "The University decided not to move from this position (ie., a maximum of 6 paid Union negotiators)." Furthermore, "... we are leaving it at 6 and we are leading the pack. I am bringing the reply and you know where I've been."

Jeff Hoskins initiated a discussion in regards to Grant's claim that the University was leading the pack, and he provided a series of examples to refute the claim. The most Grant said he could do would be to ensure that the elected Union contract representatives could attend every session, but that the University's position was to pay only 6.

Grant said he was aware what a sensitive area this was, and stated that there had been "a lot of discussion". He concluded with: "At this point in time, I can't say any more." - the issue had been settled at a higher level and 6 was the final number. Jean Lawrence indicated that the Union's position could not be formulated until the membership had been consulted.

7. The meeting adjourned at 4:50 pm. "Hopefully, you will have made some good progress by the time I get back."