

Executive Meeting, Aug. 31, 1983, minutes

Present: Karen Shaw, Kitti Cheema, Wendy Osborne, Shirley Irvine, Fairleigh, Adrien Kiernan, Ted Byrne, Suzan Zagar

1. Union Coordinator's report. Ted Byrne reported on Operation Solidarity. The Public Sector Committee meeting he attended last week where a program of action was brought by the steering committee (see attached). This program was xeroxed and circulated among the executive and discussion of it was moved to the end of today's agenda. AUCE has established an ad-hoc solidarity committee at local 1 which is to meet once a week and be responsible in future for attending meetings of Solidarity Coalition, and for coordinating Solidarity actions on campus, and communicating Solidarity information to membership. This committee currently consists of Judy Wright, Margey Wally, Zoe Hills and Marilyn Kennedy. The university Campus Community Alliance is meeting on Friday. This will be the fourth meeting. The only major action planned, outside of Solidarity actions, per se, is a general meeting to be held by the students and attended by the membership of other Alliance members. This was scheduled for the 22 of Sept., but it is not likely to occur that soon.

There will be an LRB hearing on campus Sept. 20 concerning the Copy and Duplicating staff who have applied to change bargaining unit. The LRB officers will be taking a view of the print shop, and interviewing the workers concerned. Our lawyer and one of our staff will be in attendance. This procedure, according to our lawyer, is unusual.

Ted and Fairleigh will be meeting with AUCE member Shaun Tanassee to discuss the university's application to us to have his position removed from our bargaining unit. According to the university the position is more properly described as a Assistant Technician. The Executive expressed opposition to relinquishing the position. It was decided that Fairleigh would analyse the situation and make a proposal/report to the Executive.

Roslyn Moran's appeal of reclassification from LA 3 to LA 4 will be heard on Friday this week. Kitti suggested that we should thoroughly investigate the consequences of Roslyn being reinstated if her appeal is successful (the appeal is to be heard after her date of lay off, and the question of her reinstatement is not decided, and could result in a grievance). Susan suggested that we consult with our lawyer. Do we want to argue that she should be reinstated? What are the ramifications of such an argument. Adrien argued strongly that she should be reinstated, and Kitti said that she wasn't opposed to that, but that we should look further into the question.

2. Grievance Report. Fairleigh Wettig reported on the Betty York case. Betty has not yet been convinced to grieve. Grievance Committee will take to step 3 without her being involved if necessary, but probably would not proceed to arbitration without her approval, since she would undoubtedly be subpoenaed and might prove a poor witness for herself. Fairleigh recapped the history of the case. The discharge was not non-culpable as we had anticipated, and this is a further reason for proceeding to grievance. Fairleigh ask several questions of the university on the 23d of Aug. (discharge meeting) which were not then answered. She followed up with a letter asking the same questions, and has not yet received a reply. We have not yet contacted the university re. step 3 grievance and are awaiting reply to above mentioned questions before doing so.

Ted

reported on the situation of the Word Processing Operator reclass grievances. The university has proposed new job descriptions for the Sec. 3 and 4 categories which would incorporate word processing operator functions. They would then do away with the Word Processing Operator position. Ted said that it was the feeling of the people who attended the meeting with the university (the Grievance Committee) that the offer should be rejected, and that we should proceed with the reclass grievances. The university can then come to us with their proposals at negotiations, and our response would then hinge to some extent on whether we had been successful with the reclasses. Adrienne asked about people who do only word processing work and have no secretarial duties. She said that after reading the proposed job descriptions she too would reject them out of hand. But she thinks that, since some secs. do have word processing duties, that this should be reflected in their job descriptions. This whole situation is somewhat ironic, since what the university is now offering appears to be more like what we tried to get from them two years ago when they first proposed WPO categories (Ted). Shirley said that AUCE's original objection to the WPO categories was an objection to having people sit all day at WP equipment. This new university proposal doesn't change that in any way. Also, the university has not said that using WP equipment would mean automatic reclass to Sec. 3 or 4 position (ie. one could use WP equipment all day and still be a Sec. 2). Suzan mentioned the problem of specific makes of equipment being mentioned in the job standards (see attached). This would effect the ability of workers to transfer within the classifications. We don't want split classifications. It was felt that the university is taking a long-term view and not addressing the problem as it now exists. Fairleigh remarked on the timing of this proposal: the univ. obviously thinks we have a good case for reclassing these people and want to cut us off at the pass. We should write a letter rejecting their proposal. Even considering it at this point could prejudice our grievances.

Motion that such a letter be written was passed.

Fairleigh then reported on the Murray Winn case. She talked to his doctor. The doctor claims that the university acted precipitously. Murray suffers only from some anxiety. Is capable of working. Doctor recommends that they put him back on the job. He is not dangerous according to her. She will write us a letter. Suzan made a strong statement that Murray should be fully compensated, not only for his loss of pay but for emotional stress caused by the incident, etc.

Shari Altman was discussed next. Fairleigh described the situation. The grievance is over a memo from the employer to the employee requesting that she take and 'immediate' medical leave of absence. Ted elaborated a bit on the background to the culminating incident. Shirley mentioned that Shari's fellow workers had at one point written a letter of complain about her to their supervisor. This last item could come out at arbitration.

The Rona Broverman arbitration is being dropped at Rona's request. It is not felt to be a strong enough case. There has been an argument with the University over the arbitrator's list. The University claims that Mervin Chertkow is the next arbitrator on the list for disciplinary arbitrations, and the Union claims the next arbitrator is Bruce McColl, since Chertkow was used for the Vera Scott case last summer. The University argues that the Vera Scott case was heard before the agreement was signed. Grievance committee will probably be writing letter to withdraw grievance.

Allanah Richards was briefly discussed (Kitti handled this case). No grievance has yet been filed.

The Grievance Committee made an agreement with the University that, since an LA 3 in LPC quit her job, Flo Tang will stay where she is, Billie Kassamali will go to Cat. Products, and Allanah Anderson will not be bumped. Meanwhile, Roslyn Moran, LA 3 Psych. Reading Room, will have her reclass appeal heard this Friday. If Roslyn were reclass, and stayed in her job, the above situation would have to be reconsidered. Ted also explained to the Executive the motion that Roslyn is planning to bring to the next general meeting, namely that the membership instruct the Union Executive to open negotiations with the University in order to secure a new lay off clause, one which would allow a laid off employee to be recalled to a position at a lower classification than the one they left. Kitti: we cannot open negotiations for one item, unless the University agrees, and in that case the whole contract would be open for negotiation. Suzan said that the motion would be out of order at a general meeting at any rate, since we have a contract which has not yet expired and negotiations do not begin until next year.

Health and Safety Committee Report,
3rd Health and Safety Committee Report, Karen Shaw. The Campus Committee has not met since end of July, so no report on that at this time.

Karen has written a letter to Robert Grant re. who

the members of the VDT Committee are. No reply as yet. She also wrote to Grant asking that certain memos on Ann Turner's desk (she's head cataloguer, LPC) be copied for her. Response to that letter came from Libby Nason to Pat House, objecting to letters coming from people other than those in the Union office, and saying that she didn't understand the letter anyway. Karen will write a follow up letter.

Karen said that she gets many requests from individuals who should really be addressing their questions to their local safety committees, and only to the Union if there matters cannot be settled at that level. Union should have reps on all local safety committees. Karen will find out which committees are functioning on campus and inform membership (there should be 35 such committees and are probably only about 12 in operation.

Grant wrote to WCB to clarify question of what the criteria are for compensating people who have accidents on Univ. property. WCB answered that the criteria are not black and white, and each case has to be investigated individually.

4. Contract Committee Report, Adrien Kiernan. The Contract Committee had one two hour meeting already. Adrien was elected chair, but not necessarily spokesperson. The members of the committee will mostly be taking Labour Relations 1, through BCIT. Negotiations will begin in Dec., according to a committee decision. Items for negotiation will be limited to ten. The survey circulated earlier in the year will be re-circulated now. Judi Wolch will collate and bring results to committee. A study session will be held on Oct. 4 at VGH, all day. Strategy: strong strike committee. One spokesperson at table, one recording secretary (Adrien has gotten June Jenson to volunteer to serve as rec. sec.), and one person to coordinate documents. These people, said Fairleigh, would be the key people at the table, and hopefully we would then appear much more organized than in the past. Kitti said that she was concerned about Oct. 4 being the date of the next meeting. Too far off, if negotiations to begin in Dec. (which she does not agree with). We have not got much time to get our proposals through the membership for approval. Kitti wants evening meeting(s) before Oct. 4. Since the majority of the Contract Committee were present at this meeting a date was set for a meeting on an evening next week. There followed some further discussion of strategy. Suzan and Shirley disagree with minimum no. of issues being taken to table. Fairleigh defended the concept of a small no. of issues, no outrageous demands, only minimum of important issues, attempt to achieve credibility in eyes of membership.

5. Next meeting. Sept. 27.

6. Wording of referendum on secession. See exec. minutes from last meeting.

7. Solidarity. Some discussion of Luncheon at Gracies. Suzan has gotten very adverse response to our publicizing this event. Ted accepted responsibility for sending out leaflet. Kitti said that in future Exec. should decide if such leaflets, etc., should be distributed. There was general agreement on this.

There followed discussion on the program of action brought by the steering committee of the Public Sector Committee to the last meeting of that group (see attached).

Some discussion of Solidarity Coalition. Ted remarked that the universities representative on the regional Coalition steering committee would be coming from the local campus groups (ie. Campus Community Alliance, SFU campus coalition), and so the faculty's lack of involvement in our Campus Community Alliance would cost them on that front.

8. Overtime. Overtime for Union staff again discussed. Kitti 'clarified' her intention in putting forward original motion. Anything in the job description of the individual staff member which caused them to work overtime (eg. Fairleigh on grievances, Ted on contract, Pat on budget), such overtime would be compensated. Anything else (eg. Fairleigh at Contract Committee mtgs, etc.) would not be compensated. Overtime or time in lieu? Some confusion on this question. Kitti claimed it should be straight time in lieu, Adrien that it should be double time in lieu, or whatever the contract provided for. A full discussion of this issue is to be had at the next exec. meeting when the full exec. is hopefully present. Kitti, who put forward original motion, will work on clarifying it in meantime, and bring proposals for ammendment to make it more understandable.

9. Agenda for general meeting. Other than the usual items, we will hear Operation Solidarity reports, including motions, the motion on the referendum wording. All other motions: by-law etc. Union staff will dig out all notices of motion and append them to notic of general meeting which will go out next week.

There was then some general discussion of the budget. Budget cannot be passed until after referendum. This holds up possible purchase of computer for office. No purchase without dues increase.

Shirley proposed that letters and other info which appeared in newsletter re secession be reprinted and accompany referendum.