

Minutes

Executive Meeting - Thursday, March 12, 1981
2:30-5:55 pm.
Union Office

Present: Wendy Bice, Carole Cameron, Joan Treleaven, Sharon Newman, Helen Glavina, Suzan Zagar, Marcel Dionne, Andreana Phillips, Wendy Lymer

Before the meeting began, Carole Cameron expressed concern that the University has been establishing policies not in conjunction with studies which are proving that certain aspects of technological changes are hazardous to health.

1. Adoption of agenda:

Moved by Wendy Lymer THAT THE AGENDA BE ADOPTED AS CIRCULATED.
Seconded by Wendy Bice

The motion was CARRIED.

2. Adoption of the minutes of the February 19, 1981 Executive meeting:

Several errors were recognized and corrected. The date of the Executive meeting Minutes was changed to February 19, 1981 from March 12, 1981. On page four, "and assessments" was struck from the sentence beginning "It was decided to reimburse Effie West half of the dues" On page five, in the second paragraph, the last sentence now reads "The motion was amended to \$8000.00 but received opposition and was not carried. The original motion was ~~returned and~~ accepted." On page six, the latter part of the first paragraph of the Executive report was deleted due to its contentious nature. The third paragraph of the Executive report was also struck due to the personal nature of the statements.

Moved by Suzan Zagar THAT THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 19, 1981 EXECUTIVE
Seconded by Wendy Bice MEETING BE ADOPTED AS AMENDED.

The motion was CARRIED.

3. Business arising from the minutes:

Wendy Lymer reported that she had been in contact with the Spartacus Educational Association with regard to the purchase of the book "Women in Russia". She hoped to pick up a copy on the forthcoming Saturday. Helen Glavina offered to pick up a copy for the Union Office as she planned to visit the shop after the Executive Meeting. This proposal was accepted with payment to Helen to occur upon receipt of the book.

Helen Glavina inquired about the Steward Training Seminar which had been mentioned at the Executive meeting in February. (The Steward seminar would be rescheduled for April 25 and 26.) ~~Sharon Newman indicated that those stewards interested should contact Sheila Perret with regard to obtaining funds for the seminar.~~

Carole Cameron reported that she had written to Labour Canada to obtain information on the 1981 Financial Assistance Program for Labour Education. As we are an independent union who wishes to develop our labour education activities, we are eligible for the grant. The money would be used to finance Local seminars for shop stewards and anyone on the Executive.

4. Business arising from the correspondence:

Helen Glavina asked if the Executive would be willing to sign a petition which

opposes U.S. intervention in El Salvador and, at the same time, make a donation in support of the protest. She added that the El Salvador situation was threatening to become another Viet Nam if it were to continue. Carole Cameron commented that after what happened in Viet Nam, **no one** could be in favour of American interference in other countries' affairs. Helen then made a formal request that a small donation be sent to the El Salvador Committee. It was noted that our position with regard to donation requests was to contribute to groups of people who have much in common with AUCE.

Moved by Carole Cameron
Seconded by Helen Glavina

THAT THE EXECUTIVE CONTRIBUTE \$5.00 WHICH WOULD ACCOMPANY OUR SIGNATURE ON A PETITION OPPOSING U.S. INTERVENTION IN EL SALVADOR.

The motion was CARRIED.

5. Secretary-Treasurer's report:

Wendy Lymer informed the Executive that she had gathered all the paperwork together in preparation for a trip to the auditors. She indicated that Advanced Accounting Services would be contacted shortly for an appointment. Helen Glavina suggested that Wendy try the Trade Union Research Bureau

Wendy commented that she would call that agency and attempt to get an estimate while at the same time stipulating a deadline for the actual report. We would be prepared to do business if the proposed agency could meet with those conditions.

Wendy also reported that a cheque in the amount of \$250.00 was delivered by Suzan Zagar to representatives of Local Five on the weekend just passed.

Helen Glavina requested funds for reports she and Shirley Irvine hoped to have copied from a newspaper guild's files on the VDT issue. Their plan was **also** to obtain copies of reports from the Workmen's Compensation Board which had not already been duplicated from other sources. Carole informed Helen that the Labour Standards Branch had prepared legislation for the first reading on video display terminal regulations.

6. Union Organizer's report:

Carole Cameron stated that warning letters would be sent to new members who have not responded to the first two letters which request that they submit the initiation fee and a completed membership record form. Carole read the letter to the Executive. She indicated that the procedure to obtain the initiation fee would not be necessary once the new dues deduction form was put into effect at Employee Relations. The new form allows for automatic deduction of the initiation fee with the commencement of dues deductions.

Sheila Porter

It was agreed to reimburse her for the cost of attending the Conference.

Carole also reported on the B.C. Projectionists' Union's protest of the possible removal of their licenses. Carole suggested that we send a letter to the Minister of Health and Welfare endorsing the protest.

Moved by Carole Cameron
Seconded by Wendy Bice

THAT A LETTER BE SENT TO THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT BASED ON THE B.C. FEDERATION OF LABOUR LETTER OF ENDORSEMENT OF THE B.C. PROJECTIONISTS' UNION'S STAND ON THE LICENSING ISSUE.

The motion was CARRIED.

Carole commented on a report from the "Friends of the Centre" Committee received March 11, 1981. It appears that some people on the Committee may be doing bargaining unit work and that the Union was intending to watch the situation closely.

The next item of importance related to the recent firing of a probationary employee. The case was being investigated. Carole offered a brief report of Murray Adam's return to the bargaining unit. Kevin Grace had met with Marcel Dionne to express his dissatisfaction with the union. Kevin was disappointed that Murray had been given a promotion upon returning to the bargaining unit and he felt that the Union was not working in his (Kevin's) best interest. Kevin especially wanted to know why he did not get the job. Carole intended to write a letter to Kevin quoting Article 22.03 and offering an explanation as to why he was discussed at a meeting with the University where Murray was chosen as the successful applicant. Carole reported on the incidents leading up to Kevin Grace's complaint. A discussion ensued.

Marcel Dionne commented that when an employee applies and receives a job outside of the bargaining unit, then he/she has been severed and cannot be considered as having transferred. Carole responded that Article F(b) of the By-laws should say specifically that if a member transfers to a job outside the bargaining unit that that person is in essence severed but this is not the case.

Suzan Zagar commented that Murray resigned from his position at the Registrar's Office but the University would not accept it and placed Murray on holidays until a position could be found for him. Carole informed the Executive that Kevin should be grieving his case and that he would receive the full support of the Grievance Committee if he should decide to do so. Murray could be brought back successfully under article 22.08 of the collective agreement and would consequently receive a position at the same level at which he left.

Suzan felt that Article 22.03, Hiring Policy, was violated by this situation. Kevin could base his grievance on this article as well.

Carole, in reference to a meeting with the University on this case, said that the Union would agree to a III position being offered to Murray but that we were against the University offering him (Murray) a promotion. The Registrar's Office had indicated a willingness to accept Murray in the position to which he was hired.

7. Union Co-ordinator's report:

Wendy Bice provided a follow-up to the current budget-cut dilemma. A meeting with Erik De Bruijn and James Brown was set up to discuss the cuts. Jane Strudwick intended to replace Mr. Brown at the meeting. Peter Davern who was to attend the meeting also was panic stricken and referred any questions to Jane. However, a meeting was finally satisfactorily scheduled.

Another meeting with Mr. De Bruijn involved a position in Xeroxing which was to be preserved.

Wendy also reported on Susan Heming's complaint about her ex-employer. Wendy reviewed the letter she had received from Susan. There had been no contact as a result of this complaint with the University except for a brief discussion with Wes Clark. It was his intention not to force the issue.

Wendy had received a phone call from a member who expressed dissatisfaction with the operation of the University with regard job applications and was frustrated by the inability of the Union to settle the problem satisfactorily. Carole and Wendy while at Employee Relations one day reiterated this concern to Wes Clark and asked him to look into it.

Wendy next reported briefly on a member who was having problems with her supervisor. Pat Latotski was concerned that she had not been made more fully aware of her job duties. Her reclassification had not been processed yet. Jane Strudwick phoned to say that she (Jane) would attend a disciplinary meeting at which Wendy would reside in order to discuss Pat's job duties. Pat has indicated that she would like to quit that particular job and has begun applying for other jobs due to what she feels is extreme harassment.

An administrative position in housing was under scrutiny. Wendy had corresponded with Jane Strudwick inquiring about whether or not the person filling this position was doing two jobs. Wendy stressed that the University is cutting back on AUCE positions. However, they are required to post positions which become vacant. They are also required to give the Union three months notice of cutbacks which they seldom do. They must fill all vacancies over three months in length.

In preparation for the Benefits meeting, dental and medical contracts have been requested from various medical associations. The restructuring of the existing sick leave plan is provided by the Wage Indemnity Plan. The meeting has been set up to see what the University's intention is with the present benefits plan. An extension of the letter of agreement will be necessary.

Wendy then read a letter from a member requesting that the amounts deducted be checked for accuracy. It was agreed to reimburse Anne Schaefer \$1.25 for overpayment of the assessment. A letter from Betty Andres requesting a refund for dues and assessment paid was denied as the amounts deducted were found to be correct.

8. Communications Committee report:

Wendy Lymer reported that an assessment notice for part-time people would be placed in the next newsletter as the claims of incorrect assessment deductions directly applied to that aspect of the membership. Wendy indicated that the deadline for submissions was April 2; she requested that any reports the Executive wished to have published be submitted by noon on April 2nd.

The April newsletter would be jointly coordinated by Ray Galbraith and Jet Blake. Wendy's holidays at the end of March would prevent her participation in that particular publication.

A list of correspondence received since the last Executive meeting was circulated.

9. Grievance Committee report:

Carole reported that the arbitrator for Isabelle McCaughran's case wouldn't come to the campus. Arrangements might have to be made for an off-campus hearing. The dates for Linda Cairn's arbitration had not been assigned as yet. Lissett Nelson's case has been scheduled for May 11, 12, and 13. Kitti Cheema's case has been put off until August. Hugh Ladner will be the arbitrator but will not be available until then.

An extension on the Pension Plan grievance has been agreed upon with the University.

Lastly, Wendy reported that she had received two complaints on various ways letters

have been placed in employees' files. One of the complainants indicated that the University refuses to transfer when bad reports are on file.

10. Provincial report:

Suzan Zagar reported that an executive meeting was scheduled for this weekend. Local Five has gone back to work. They are waiting to apply for appeal. For three days, the strike closed down the College completely. A mediator has been appointed in the dispute. Local reports would be discussed on Friday at the evening meeting. Constitutional amendments (by-laws changes) had to be received by the Secretary-Treasurer before the Conference and after they had been presented to the memberships of the various locals.

On the agenda for the April and/or May meetings, Suzan and Richard Melanson intended to present major amendments to the membership regarding, for example, overtime of salaried officers in the Provincial Office. Suzan commented that delegates, historically, have never met to discuss constitutional amendments before the Conference. Carole suggested that Suzan submit changes to be proposed, in writing, and arrange a meeting. Carole added that a central source of information which could serve as a basis for proposals was a folder on the Union Office bulletin board which holds recommendations for constitutional changes.

Marcel Dionne commented that union business should be discussed first and foremost over other business such as constitutional changes at membership meetings.

11. Job Evaluation Committee report:

Sharon Newman stated that no one showed up at the last meeting of the Committee which is held every Wednesday at noon. Carole reported that she was investigating unions with work similar to that of AUCE positions.

12. Executive report:

Carole Cameron began by stating that the vote on the per capita tax issue which occurred at the February membership meeting was done incorrectly. Hearing the number of affirmative votes as requested by Marcel at that meeting could be detrimental to further votes cast on any decision.

Copies of Computer-Operator job descriptions and an accompanying letter from the University were then distributed to the Executive. The Union has sixty days to respond to the University's proposal or the new job specifications will be implemented as is. Carole offered two questions for the University's proposal: Who will confront the University on this issue and what position will we take on their proposal?

Marcel remarked that the Union was put in a bad light during last year's negotiations when an agreement was made to spread the proposed increases for computer operators throughout the existing pay grades. A complete turnover in computer operators was the result. There is a lack of supply and a great demand for computer operators everywhere and the University is making an attempt to recognize this.

Suzan was concerned that many AUCE positions are being cut back. Was it not contradictory to our philosophy that computer operators deserve an increase when nothing worthwhile is offered to the remaining members of this bargaining unit? Why can't the computer operators understand that 97% of the bargaining unit is underpaid? Should we not take this issue to the membership?

Marcel felt that if the membership were informed of the issue and turned down the University's proposal, bitterness and divisiveness would most likely result.

Suzan felt that the same position which existed at contract negotiations last year should be maintained now. Added duties are not a priority in reclassifications but experience and training are considered to be relevant. Suzan stressed that the level of responsibility was important, too. Marcel inquired as to what kind of value should be placed on the level of responsibility. Carole suggested that it was more difficult to resolve the problem of equating secretarial responsibilities with that for which a computer operator is accountable. A secretary isn't any less valuable to an institution but society is not ready to recognize that importance.

Wendy Bice commented that the issue of "equal pay for work of equal value" was applicable to this situation. She felt it was in the University's best interest to satisfy a small group of people with a good deal of bargaining power. Marcel asked why the computer operators should be expected to, in essence, bargain for the whole of the membership. Suzan feared that a trend which would split the professional staff from the clerical staff was developing.

Carole suggested that there would be problems if the membership was informed of the issue at hand. How would we present the ramifications of the University's proposal? Can we equalize their weight in the bargaining unit?

Marcel suggested that a recommendation be presented to the membership. It was decided that a questionnaire would be drafted by Sharon Newman and Carole Cameron and that it would be sent to the membership for a response.

Moved by Carole Cameron
Seconded by Wendy Bice

THAT A QUESTIONNAIRE AND ACCOMPANYING LETTER BE DRAWN UP BY CAROLE CAMERON AND SHARON NEWMAN REGARDING A PROPOSAL BY THE UNIVERSITY TO UPGRADE A GROUP OF PEOPLE IN THE BARGAINING UNIT AND THAT FEEDBACK BE RECEIVED NO LATER THAN THE DATE OF THE APRIL MEMBERSHIP MEETING.

The motion was CARRIED.

13. Next meeting of the Executive: March 26, 1981 (By-laws)
14. Next Membership meeting: April 23, 1981
15. Other Business:

Marcel Dionne who is a member of the UBC Traffic and Security Committee reported on a proposed increase in parking stickers. An overall increase of 20% with a further increase of \$40.00 for faculty and staff was proposed. The \$40.00 was expected to subsidize future parkades on campus. There would be no more subsidies for parking stickers **as a result** of budget cuts. Supposedly, a parking sticker would insure that the subscriber gets a parking spot on campus. The University also assumes that, in the future, parkades will be flooded with subscribers. Suzan Zagar intended to submit arguments opposing the increase and letters would be drafted and sent, based on those arguments, to the President's Office, the Ubysey and to the Traffic and Security Committee. Marcel commented that if we wanted more parking spaces at UBC that we must be prepared to pay for them.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:55 pm.