

AGENDA FOR EXECUTIVE MEETING
TUESDAY, MARCH 16, 1976
5:15 in the UNION OFFICE

1. Adoption of agenda.
2. Notice to chairperson for next Executive meeting, March 24th - Marcel Dionne.
3. Adoption of minutes as attached.
4. Business arising from minutes:
 - (a) discussion of Union Organizer and Union Office
 - (b) mailing service - Frances Wasserlein
 - (c) film showing of "Don't Call Me Baby" - Peggy Smith
 - (d) report on meeting with community colleges - Nancy Wiggs
5. Correspondence:
 - (a) letter from Pentacare Child Care Society
 - (b) letter from Janice Doyle about rotating chairship of executive meetings
6. Business arising from general membership meeting of March 11, 1976.
7. Financial report.
8. Committee reports:
 - (a) Communications - Judy Todhunter
 - (b) Grievance - (see attached by Ray Galbraith)
 - (c) Strike - Carol Pincock
 - (d) Contract - Margie Wally
 - (e) Job Evaluation - Maureen Gitta
9. Provincial report - Nancy Wiggs
10. Other business

- agenda prepared by Joan Cosar, March 10, 1976.

- typed by Joan Cosar

AUCE Local 1, Executive Meeting, 16 March 1976 - 5:15 p.m.

Joan Cosar, Chair

Present: Bonnie Schoenberger, Recording Secty; Peggy Smith, Organizer; Maureen Gitta, Job Evaluation Cmte.; Marcel Dionne, Chairperson, Grievance Cmte.; Frances Wasserlein, Treasurer; Margot Scherk, D; Carol Pincock, Strike Cmte.; Neil Boucher, A; Jerry Andersen, B; Joan Cosar, H; Margie Wally, H; Nancy Wiggs, Vice President.

1. Adoption of Agenda

Nancy/Jerry That the agenda as circulated be adopted.

Frances mentioned that she did not have anything to report under 4b) and this item was removed from the agenda.

the agenda as amended was

CARRIED

2. Notice to Chairperson of next Executive Meeting

Marcel will not be able to chair the next meeting. Neil offered to do so. Marcel's name was added at the end of the list of chairpersons.

3. Adoption of Minutes

Margot was at the 2 March meeting but not included in the list of those present. Item 4d) was not clear to a member and it was clarified as meaning that executive representatives when officially representing the union at meetings with non-AUCE people, should be instructed by the Executive on how to proceed. It was not felt that this clarification should be included in the previous meeting's minutes. Emerald is unable to present motions as she is not a member of the executive and the motion she did present will be shown as Nancy's motion with Marcel as seconder.

Neil/Nancy that the minutes as amended be adopted

CARRIED

4 a) Union Organizer/Office

Peggy did not have a written report prepared but had listed some items and would elaborate upon them. First she gave a list of job duties - keeping the log book, office hours 11:00 - 3:00 with mornings and Mondays the busiest away-from-the-office times; office duties, answering the phone, mail, preparing for meetings (membership, executive, grievance) and attending meetings; cleaning up the office, filing, looking after the plants, and general office organization. Things which need to be done - more organization of office space; helping out committees; working with membership files; by-law amendments and printing; preparing a stewards phone book, office manual and address and phone list; working on the library. Things she would like to do - comprehensive research, establish contact with other women's organizations, interview people on campus about their work. Items needed for the office - a Gestafax, large enclosed cupboards, and another person.

The problem with membership records was discussed further. Louise has not been working on them recently and this may be the result of her dissatisfaction with the executive. Unfortunately she does not wish to attend an executive meeting to air her views. One person had heard that she was thinking of resigning.

Neil/Margot That Nancy contact Louise to ask her to clarify her position as membership secretary.

CARRIED

It was left up to Nancy how she would contact Louise but that if they heard nothing from Louise by the next executive meeting a letter would be sent to her asking for

clarification.

(The following is a summary of discussion on the union organizer with almost all comments recorded, although not verbatim. Marks, //, indicate a change in speaker.)

Is there any way Peggy could serve on the Working Conditions Committee? We all are involved in various activities on our own time, perhaps she could do this as an extracurricular activity. // Peggy is an alternate on that committee. There is a lot of research to be done and the organizer should have the time to do this. There must be considerable discussion before there should be another person working in the office. There is enough work for another full-time person. Perhaps a sub-committee should be struck to present the pros and cons of another office worker.

Neil/Peggy That the executive strike a sub-committee to present the pros and cons of hiring another person to work in the union office and the amount of time they should work. Their report should be presented to the executive on April 13.

The reason this item came up on the agenda was because of complaints received that there often was no one in the office. // It would be a good idea to charge that sub-committee, in consultation with people who have worked in the office, with putting together some well defined terms of reference - what is expected of a union organizer. Now we are reacting to some complaints coming from all different directions. The sub-committee should set out the tasks of the organizer.// That is not to the point, we are discussing hiring another person. The question is, is there enough work for another person. Jerry was on the old committee set up to investigate this same issue of what the organizer should do and would like to be involved again. We must settle the problems which have come up now and then go into new action on whether we can support another worker. // There should be a specific reporting date included in the motion (this was incorporated).

CARRIED

Margot/Jerry That the above motion be reconsidered.

People who had voted against the previous motion were asked to give their reasons for so doing. The terms of reference of the sub-committee were too vague and there is nothing about preparing terms of reference for either the first or the second person in the office. The motion does not include any provision for discussion of the current problems.

The motion to reconsider was withdrawn.

Peggy/Marcel That the motion to reconsider be tabled until after discussion of problems with the current organization of the union office.

CARRIED

It would be helpful to have some recommendations from Peggy. // We must have a list of priorities. It is difficult to set priorities because of the large amount of paper work. My priorities are the education of stewards, improvements in division structure, some philosophical research and work with day care on campus. // One problem involved directly with the recent complaints received is the phone answering service which was disconnected during the strike. // There is insufficient guidance from the executive to the organizer. // Originally I was glad there were no limits on the job because it meant I could set my own terms. People took for granted that I was responsible. I stayed away from the various committees because past experience showed that it was easy for the organizer to be drawn into them and become their main support. // Some blame should be placed on the executive for the division structure.

The grievance committee can run without her presence and any committee should be able to do so. More time should be spent in the office - 4 hours a day is just not enough to do all the office work required. // Priority should be given to the technical side of running a union, such as paper work. The philosophical things come second to keeping a union working well. During the strike it took three hours to get the certification papers. Files are very important - perhaps first priority. // One of the most important parts of this problem is that we are trying to have one person do two different jobs. We must have a person very involved with the union and another to take care of the clerical side. It is an impossible situation to expect one person to do both jobs. // There is no way I would have taken the job if it were simply clerical. // We should be discussing some definite recommendations, such as increasing office hours. // We should pay the organizer for the type of work we need done, not for the kind of work that person would like to do. // We must tell that person what we want done. // I would prefer to have two people sharing both jobs, doing half the clerical work and half the research, etc. // The clerical work is not as important as the philosophical research. // It is really important to be able to find something. If we don't get the meeting agenda out to the members 7 days in advance of the meeting, the meeting could be declared null and void - that's clerical work of importance. There will have to be strong support for taking a recommendation to hire an additional person to the membership. // Discussion should turn to clear cut recommendations for solutions.

Marcel/Frances That Peggy prepare a set of recommendations to present to the next executive meeting, responding to the issues raised tonight, on the union organizer position and running the union office. CARRIED

Discussion should return to the motion to reconsider at this point but that motion was withdrawn in light of the following motion.

Frances/ That the executive sub-committee as discussed previously (motion by Neil, seconded by Peggy) be charged with determining a list of job duties for all people hired to work in the union office. CARRIED

It was felt that discussion of this motion should be tabled until the next executive meeting at which time Peggy would present her recommendations on the union office/organizer situation. It was mentioned that a questionnaire circulated to the membership might be an effective means of learning their opinions on this situation.

Marcel/Neil That discussion of the above motion be tabled until the next executive meeting. CARRIED

4c) Film Showing

There has been some interest in showing the film at division meetings or during a lunch break. Peggy will try to arrange having the film on hand if there is a request for a showing.

4d) Community Colleges Meeting (Nancy)

It was not at all as had been anticipated. It involved discussion with a group of people who were in, or had graduate from, a library technical course. They were interested in finding out why they were not being hired at UBC, although they were better trained than LA's. Basil Stuart-Stubbs had been their first choice as guest, AUCE representatives were their second choice. A lot of them were involved with CUPE and were not satisfied with that union. There was a discussion of AUCE, its formation and function. Interest was expressed in arranging a meeting with Nancy and Basil and some of the people from that meeting.

5 a) Pentacare Child Care Society

They want to start a day care centre on campus and require funding, with a goal of \$15,000. It was felt there should be some clarification as to who these people were, which was not provided in the letter, which was read

Frances/Jerry That the union organizer contact the Pentacare Child Care Society to find out what the staff involvement would be, and to ask that a representative come to our next executive meeting to speak on their behalf, with that person's talk being scheduled near the beginning of the agenda (business arising from the minutes). CARRIED

5 b) A member pointed out that having a rotating chairship of executive meetings was unconstitutional as the President should preside over such meetings.

Nancy/Marcel That the executive give notice of motion for the next membership meeting to amend the section of the by-laws restricting the rotating of the chair at executive meetings. CARRIED

Frances/Margot That in response to this question from a member of the union, the next executive meeting will be chaired by Ian McKenzie, pending resolution of this question. CARRIED

Neil will prepare the agenda.

c) Vancouver Taxi Union. They had written us a letter asking for a letter of support of their attempts to organize.

Before any action could be taken on this discussion the quorum was lost. There is a suggestion, however, that at the next executive meeting a motion be presented that a letter of support should be sent, and that discussion of such a letter be indicated in the agenda.

Meeting adjourned at 6:50 p.m.

Not too much has happened since the last report in the way of new grievances. The most recent grievance filed was one in Forestry, an employee file and transfer grievance. These are now at Step 4 (Union Grievance Committee/University Labour Committee) and are scheduled to be discussed next week.

The Grievance Committee/University Labour Committee meeting of 9mr76 was one of those rare occasions when obvious change in Personnel policies occurred, and we were present as witnesses. This was the inaugural meeting with AUCE for the new Director of Employee Relations, Robert Grant. His performance was a masterpiece of polished, managerial techniques. He was articulate, and unlike Wes Clark, went immediately to the core of each grievance or query we presented. Grant was conciliatory in the extreme, and business-like. Either charm or "toughness" could be turned on and off like a tap, at will. After two years of Clark's stalling and misinterpretations of the contract, we were refreshed by the new breeze, we hesitate to call it a wind, blowing in Personnel. The Grievance Committee were impressed by the first act; we know we now have a slick professional to deal with, and our awareness of and our approach to the new situation will have to change. We see why he was chosen by Connaghan - Grant is his twin, his carbon copy. And AUCE knows how Connaghan feels, from recent, past experience

During the meeting, Marcel Dionne, our chairperson, requested confirmation of the successful resolution of a lay-off grievance. Grant replied: "You have the right to ask for things in writing." In the recent past we have been hassled by Clark in regards to the interpretation of notification by the University per Articles 5.03 and 33.03. Grant simply stated that "this is not something we want to debate"; and that it should be automatically done. Grant suggested a meeting to facilitate carrying out the intent of the clauses as we presented them. Grant continued: "You give us somebody. Let's sit down and do it. No argument." and, to his Committee he said: "Let's give them what the contract says we will. It's not something we want to fight about." And, finally: "I've learned more here today than in the last weeks." On the IRC lay-off grievance, Grant, as business-like as ever, stated: "We would like more time to review the circumstances." We would get an answer by 15mr76. Discussion around the Jeff Hoskins grievance (i.e., temporary employee recall list grievance) dragged on after Clark once again threw in the bogus issue of qualifications. Grant ended the conversation/argument of his Committee quickly. He pointed out to his Committee that they were dealing with a grievance focusing on the issue of backpay. He said: "I don't think it goes beyond that. Everything beyond that is not necessary. We shouldn't vent our emotions." An answer would be forthcoming by 15mr76. Grant accepted the Union's interpretation of the Letter of Agreement re: Key punch Classifications Review, another issue which Clark had confused and misinterpreted. Grant pointblank asked Clark if the University had bided by the interpretation of the contract in this instance. When Clark answered with a vague negative, Grant turned to Clark and said: "I want to see you administer this agreement here." Before the meeting adjourned, Marcel Dionne requested that further meetings be held in the morning. Grant agreed and suggested that there be time limits. The meeting adjourned on a final statement by Grant: "Hopefully, we'll get down to a shorter list of grievances."

Many of the cob-webs, fog, and entanglements surrounding the interpretation of the contract had been swept away. Grant's initial effort was impressive; he had for all intents and purposes "pistol-whipped" Clark in public. How much of this was for show, for our consumption, or for Wes Clark was not certain. Grant was smooth as velvet; we had witnessed a slick, articulate approach to management-labour relations. It was an interesting show, and how long it plays and what direction the plot takes is unknown. The Grievance Committee must continue to be vigilant in regards to violations of employee rights and the contract. AUCE's past actions were instrumental in initiating the "Palace Revolution" underway in Personnel. But one new Director of Employee Relations will not make that difference. Yet, it was a fine debut.

much of a

Report from the Job Evaluation Committee to the Executive Committee -
16 March 1976

Five members of the Job Evaluation Committee - Maureen Gitta, Kevin Grace, Yvonne Mitchell, Emerald Murphy and Rayleen Nash - met yesterday to discuss our individual ideas with regard to the use of the 'point system' as an alternate classification system and, further, to come to some collective agreement as to the purposes of our Committee. Certain members felt that it would be impossible to introduce any new type of evaluation/classification system on the campus without first obtaining data from our members on their specific job duties, job descriptions, etc. According to Article 31.02 of the Contract we are responsible for setting up a "standard format" (form) to distribute to the various Department Heads so that members can submit a list of their job duties. We are contacting other AUCE locals, other colleges, technical institutions (e.g. BCIT), universities and various local businesses (e.g. B.C. Hydro, B.C. Tel, MacMillan Bloedel) to find out what format they use for their employees. From this information we will devise one for members of this bargaining unit and will submit it to the Executive Committee for discussion -- and then to the membership for approval -- when it is completed. We therefore decided to forego any decision with regard to the use of the 'point system' or any other system, such as the 'factor system', until we have completed this first task.

The University has instructed us that they still consider this a 'joint committee' and they do not intend to meet among themselves but will only meet as a committee when they meet with us.

Maureen Gitta