

Minutes

Special Executive Meeting - Tuesday, February 3, 1981
Union Office
2:30 - 5:00 pm.

Present: Suzan Zagar, Wendy Bice, Carole Cameron, Helen Glavina, Joan Treleaven,
Sharon Newman, Wendy Lymer and Marcel Dionne (3:00 pm.)

This meeting was called to deal with amendments to the By-laws.

Suzan Zagar was asked to chair Before the
by-laws were discussed, Wendy Bice asked the Executive to approve a letter she had
composed to President Kenny regarding the Engineering Undergraduate Society's Lady
Godiva ride. In effect, the letter stated AUCE's unequivocal disapproval of the
event and urged the University to take steps to prevent future repetition. If approved,
Wendy also asked that copies be sent to the Dean of Applied Science, the Ubyyssey and
the Vancouver Sun, with a copy to^{be} printed in the Union newsletter.

Moved by Wendy Bice
Seconded by Carole Cameron

THAT A LETTER BE SENT TO THE UBC ADMINISTRATION
IN PROTEST OF THE LADY GODIVA RIDE, THAT COPIES ALSO
BE SENT TO THE DEAN OF APPLIED SCIENCE, THE UBYSSEY,
AND THE VANCOUVER SUN, AND THAT A COPY BE PRINTED IN
THE NEWSLETTER.

The motion was CARRIED.

Carole Cameron informed the Executive that we had received a letter of resignation
from Linda Tretiak. The position of Vice-President would be opened for nominations
at the next Membership Meeting.

Joan Treleaven asked Carole if Kitti Cheema had been contacted regarding her position
as Provincial Representative for Local 1. Carole had contacted Kitti by phone; Kitti
had stated that she would be back in March to resume her duties in the Provincial.
Carole suggested that nominations be opened for an alternate Provincial rep. Suzan
Zagar said she had hoped that an alternate would have been elected before the next
Provincial Executive meeting as she would be unable to attend. The Executive agreed
that it was important that Local 1 endeavor to send a representative to Provincial
meetings in order to have a voice in their decision making process especially under
such a circumstance.

Wendy Lymer asked that submissions for the newsletter had to be received in the office
no later than Wednesday, February 4, 1981 at noon. Any committees with last-minute
reports were urged to meet that deadline.

Before discussion on the by-laws could occur, Marcel Dionne arrived for the meeting.
He asked if any decision had been made on the seating of a Provincial Executive
representative at the next membership meeting. Carole Cameron indicated that she had
drawn up a draft of the agenda for the meeting and had placed Local 1's Executive report
ahead of the Provincial report. With that in mind, the seating of a Provincial rep
should not meet with any opposition. Marcel felt strongly that the representative
should not be permitted to attend.

The Executive then turned to the by-laws. Carole Cameron asked Marcel if he had anything
to propose for Sections F1 and F2, paragraph 2. Marcel requested that those sections
be deferred until the next by-law meeting as he was still working on possible changes.

The Executive agreed to defer.

Carole Cameron then distributed a list of proposed amendments to Local 1 By-laws. The first proposal suggested an addition to paragraph 1 of Section F2.

Moved by Carole Cameron THAT THE SENTENCE "ALL EXECUTIVE MEMBERS WILL SERVE FOR ONE
Seconded by Wendy Bice YEAR IF ELECTED IN DECEMBER, OTHERWISE THEY WILL COMPLETE
A TERM OF OFFICE ENDING IN DECEMBER" BE ADDED AT THE END OF
SECTION F2.

The motion was CARRIED.

Carole explained that Executive terms expire at different times in the year. At present, you are elected to a position for one year. If an individual is elected mid-year, that person is expected to complete the term of office which ends in December.

The Section F2, paragraph 2 amendment was presented by Carole as well. A typo was discovered on Line 5. 'Step 4, Pay Grade 6' was amended to 'Pay Grade 4, Step 6.' Sharon Newman asked why Carole chose that particular wage category. Carole responded that although her proposal was insufficient reward for the duties required, by comparison it was more appealing than the present system. Marcel Dionne understood that if this amendment were adopted by the membership, an L.A. V elected to a paid position would alter the office salaries considerably as the three employees would then be paid on the same level as the L.A. V. Wendy Bice responded that it was extremely vital that incentives such as this amendment offers exist because upon returning to our former positions with the University we must begin where we left off wage-wise. In fact, paid union staff are in limbo while on leave from the University in terms of seniority and wage increases. Carole added that this amendment provides written proof that paid office staff are entitled to all the rights and benefits of the collective agreement whereas before there was no provision. The amendment would also allow people to continually run for the same position. The time limit of one year per person per position would be removed.

Joan Treleaven commented that that might mean the same person could hold a paid office position until they were sixty-five. Carole responded that if people had reservations about there being no time limit, the by-laws could be revised accordingly. No amendment adopted would ever be a permanent fixture in the Local 1 By-laws. She strongly supported a two-year term as it would enable the office staff to become more confident and efficient in their duties. A two-year term would make re-election every year unnecessary. A two-year term would without doubt enable office staff to increase their productivity. Wendy Bice agreed that it would take at least a year to become confident in the Union office. Two years would certainly make a person more constructive and better able to serve the membership. Carole added that, if adopted, the amended by-law would require the establishment of criteria for paid positions and it would become essential that the Union incorporate their demands into the criteria. Those job descriptions should then be designed to attract people knowledgeable in union activities. It is important that members who run for paid positions fulfil the requirements of the forementioned criteria as they would be responsible in dealing with the livelihoods of the membership.

Marcel Dionne said he had reservations about the amendment. He was concerned that paid union employees who present motions to the Executive have the right to vote on those concepts. He felt that the Union Organizer and the Co-ordinator should forfeit their right to vote on the Executive as they should report to the Executive and not be a part of that body during decision-making processes. Otherwise, they could be very influential in turning the vote in the direction which they favoured.

Suzan Zagar felt that we could not deny voting rights to people who make decisions for the Union. It would mean there would be a scimpy number of Executives left to vote on important issues. Helen Glavina agreed with Suzan and questioned Marcel as to the exclusion of the Secretary-Treasurer while denying voting rights to the other staff members. Marcel responded that the Secretary-Treasurer's right to vote should be maintained as that individual was not as involved in, for example, policy changes as the others were. Furthermore, one person could not affect the vote as much as three could. Carole indicated that she had recently received a call from a person suggesting that AUCE seriously consider amalgamating with CUPE. She believed that if she had felt strongly enough about the issue she could have exerted her influence as Marcel suggests, but since she represents this Union she must think and act in terms of the Union.

Carole reminded the Executive that they had to address the criteria which should be based on the section dealing with the election of full-time salaried officers. She confirmed, in answer to Marcel's query, that the three descriptions of the salaried positions in Section G as well as revisions to Sections F and J-13 would be presented to the membership at the meeting in February.

Joan Treleaven voiced a concern of Anne Hutchison's regarding the possible deletion of time limits on paid positions. Her concern was that some people could be kept in the same position year after year on the strength of membership apathy. Marcel interjected that his suggestion to deny Executive voting rights to certain salaried officers was based on this same concern. Joan then asked why potential union officers should fit a list of criteria if it was possible that anyone could handle the positions if properly trained. Carole responded that it was unfair to place important responsibilities on people who were not prepared to handle them. She felt that it wouldn't be fair to the membership to leave serious decisions and issues up to unqualified people with little or no union experience.

Helen Glavina suggested that there should be a balance struck between people who work for the membership and people who work in professional fields. It is extremely important that the very best people be elected to those salaried positions who must deal with people on the University's side.

Carole indicated that there was one option open to the membership if the time factor was deleted from the by-laws. Annual elections would hopefully produce competitors if the membership felt an individual was not performing satisfactorily in their office duties. Suzan Zagar felt that the Executive must offer constructive criticism for those positions in question. Marcel pointed out that when the membership questions decisions made by the Grievance Committee, any negative response is directed at the representative giving the report. That individual's position might be jeopardized if the membership misunderstood the intention of annual elections which could be used to remove unsatisfactory individuals from Union positions. Marcel agreed with Anne Hutchison's concern for the deletion of limits on terms of office for salaried staff adding that such members need at least eight months to orient themselves to their duties.

Wendy Bice favoured a two-year term of office. In her opinion, salaried officers would not become corrupt in two years and, at any rate, biennial elections would prevent that from happening.

At 3:30 pm. Helen Glavina indicated that she had to leave. She asked that it be noted that she was in favour of the motion in principle.

Suzan Zagar informed those present that the Provincial Executive would very likely reject this by-law amendment as Nancy Wiggs intended to put back the motion to remove the limit of two years for salaried union officers. Marcel remarked that Lid Strand had recently indicated that the Provincial did not wish to become involved in this Local's

affairs. He assumed that this meant there would be no intervention by the Provincial in an internal issue such as by-law changes. Carole reminded the Executive of the motion on the Per Capita Tax problem which was published in the February newsletter. If the membership didn't accept the Executive recommendation in that motion, then the membership must also defeat this proposed by-law amendment in keeping with their belief that the Provincial controls this Local's actions.

Marcel then asked how the motion would affect, for example, Wendy Bice's position, if it passed. Would it mean that Wendy could stay on for another two years? Carole responded that Wendy's present term expires in June of 1981. She may choose to run for re-election at that time and if successful, would remain in office for another two years with the same rights in effect. Marcel commented that Wendy could be placed outside the bargaining unit when she returns to the University payroll. Carole quoted Article 7.02 (Full-time Leave of Absence for union activity) as the proviso which insures that Wendy will return to a bargaining unit position when her term of office expires. In effect this article allows for an indefinite period of absence from the University payroll while at the same time securing a future position as a member of AUCE.

Marcel reiterated his suggestion that two of the three salaried staff be excluded from voting privileges on Executive decisions. Carole stated that it would be an inequity to deprive any Executive member of the right to vote. She was firm in her stand against annual elections for salaried officers. Further, she could never remain in office if she was not able to partake in the decision-making process. As a member of the Executive, Carole felt that she had become more in touch with the membership and always based her votes accordingly.

Marcel hypothesized that if our union decided to put two more salaried members into the Union Office should the Provincial Association dissolve, then it would be quite possible for the office staff to control executive decisions. Wendy Bice pointed out that if an increase in office staff did occur, the solution would be to adjust the by-laws and change the quorum for Executive meetings.

Marcel then asked what argument Carole would present to justify the wage amendment. Aside from the fact that the change was long overdue, Carole hoped that the proposed amendment would attract people who were contemplating running for office positions. She felt there was a need to establish a common salary as the present system was grossly inadequate. The Pay Grade 4, Step 6 category was chosen specifically because it would attract attention and because the bargaining unit could identify with it. The very purpose of this Union has been based on the philosophy of "Equal pay for work of equal value" and there is no reason why that philosophy should not be applied to union office salaries as well. Most importantly, we must establish a base rate now, but at the same time a person in a higher pay grade should not be forced to accept a lesser salary nor should a person in a lower pay grade be paid inequitably.

Joan Treleven indicated that she would be very attracted to a position in the union office which paid a salary, for example, equivalent to Marcel's which is a Senior Buyer, if he or someone in his classification accepted a union position. Joan reminded the Executive that measures had to be taken to avoid attracting individuals interested only in the salary aspect. Carole reiterated that prospective nominees would have to meet certain minimum requirements and that the final decision had to be made by the membership in choosing the best applicant. Marcel suggested that the wage amendment be changed to Pay Grade V, Step II, for although it was the same figure as indicated by Carole's proposal, it looked more appealing further up the pay scale. Carole responded that if the proposal were too attractive, members would react to the money only and give their duties secondary consideration. The purpose of established criteria would give priority to those duties rather than to the salary.

Marcel questioned the right of a salaried officer to receive an increase if that individual had only been employed in the union office for six months, as an example. He added that the membership would probably want to discuss this problem in detail. Wendy Lymer suggested that chances were slim that someone in a higher pay grade than Pay Grade 4, Step 6 would undertake to run for a union position. In point of fact, there are only three L.A. V positions on campus; their active participation in a paid position in the union office is highly unlikely because their jobs entail management-oriented services. Carole replied that the intent of her amendment was to place union office staff in the same wage category. In reference to the removal of time limits on salaried positions, Marcel urged that if a member were to reach the age of retirement while in office, then the individual should be required to give at least one month's notice to the membership.

Moved by Carole Cameron
Seconded by Wendy Bice

THAT THE SECOND PARAGRAPH OF BY-LAW SECTION F BE AMENDED TO READ AS FOLLOWS:

"FULL-TIME SALARIED OFFICERS SHALL SERVE FOR TWO YEARS FROM THE DATE THEY ASSUME OFFICE. FULL-TIME SALARIED POSITIONS ARE PAID AS FOLLOWS: ALL PERSONS WORKING FULL-TIME FOR THE UNION WILL BE PAID AT THE SAME RATE. THIS RATE WILL BE REPRESENTED BY STEP 6, PAY GRADE 4. THE FULL-TIME SALARIED STAFF WILL BE ENTITLED TO ALL THE RIGHTS AND BENEFITS OF THE COLLECTIVE AGREEMENT."

The motion was CARRIED.

Suzan commented that the criteria should be the basis for selling this amendment to the membership. She would accept the job as it exists without established criteria. Carole pointed out that the job descriptions could stand for the criteria required but if the membership insisted, criteria could be established for minimum qualifications at least. Marcel asked who would decide who was the best person for the position. Carole replied that that would be the responsibility of the membership. The only difference between what exists in the by-laws now and what existed in the past is the setting up of criteria. Carole then reiterated the necessity for the paying the same wage for the same job. Marcel felt that allowances had to be made for the authority to recall an individual who was found to be unsuitable. Marcel suggested that the duties and criteria be posted at the time when nominations are opened for elected positions. Carole requested that the job description/criteria issue be tabled until the next executive by-law meeting. Lastly, Carole recommended that opening nominations for salaried positions should begin three months prior to the starting date in order that members wishing to run could submit their qualifications for the membership's perusal.

Moved by Marcel Dionne
Seconded by Joan Treleven

THAT MEMBERS WISHING TO RUN FOR FULL-TIME SALARIED POSITIONS MUST SUBMIT A STATEMENT CONTAINING QUALIFICATIONS AND BACKGROUND. THIS STATEMENT WILL APPEAR ON THE ELECTION BALLOT.

The motion was CARRIED.

As no further discussion ensued, Carole moved on to the proposal for an addition to section G.3 which describes the duties of the Secretary-Treasurer. She stated that this proposal had been added to the job descriptions of the two other salaried positions as the duties indicated are shared and are largely clerical in nature.

Moved by Carole Cameron
Seconded by Marcel Dionne

THAT THE LAST SENTENCE OF SECTION G.3 READS AS FOLLOWS:
"THE DUTIES OF THIS POSITION SHALL SHARE THE GENERAL OFFICE WORK (I.E. CORRESPONDENCE, MEETING, FILING, MEMBERSHIP LISTS, ETC.) AND PUBLIC RELATIONS."

The motion was CARRIED.

The next by-law change involved an amendment and addition to section G.6 which is the Union Organiser's job description. In clarifying the duties of this position, Carole pointed out that the Organiser would now be responsible for the training of new union members and would be largely involved in upholding the collective agreement.

Moved by Carole Cameron
Seconded by Wendy Bice

THAT SECTION G.6 OF THE BY-LAWS BE AMENDED TO READ:
"SHALL BE A MEMBER OF THE EXECUTIVE, AN EX-OFFICIO MEMBER OF THE GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE AND SHALL DO WORK RELATED TO THAT COMMITTEE INCLUDING THE TRAINING OF NEW MEMBERS IN THE PROCESSING OF GRIEVANCES. THIS POSITION IS ALSO RESPONSIBLE FOR THE TRAINING OF LOCAL SHOP STEWARDS. THE DUTIES OF THIS POSITION SHALL INCLUDE MAINTAINING THE COLLECTIVE AGREEMENT, ORGANISING THE STEWARD, DIVISION AND COMMITTEE STRUCTURES. FURTHER, THIS POSITION SHALL SHARE THE GENERAL OFFICE WORK (I.E., CORRESPONDENCE, MAILING, FILING, MEMBERSHIP LISTS, ETC.) AND PUBLIC RELATIONS."

In response to a question by Marcel, Carole suggested that a final sentence be added which would allow the Union Organiser to participate on the Contract Committee in the absence of the Co-ordinator.

Moved by Carole Cameron
Seconded by Wendy Bice

THAT SECTION G.6 BE AMENDED AS PROPOSED BUT WITH AN ADDITIONAL SENTENCE READING: "IN THE ABSENCE OF THE UNION CO-ORDINATOR THE UNION ORGANISER WILL BE AN EX-OFFICIO MEMBER OF THE CONTRACT COMMITTEE."

The motion was CARRIED.

A short discussion arose on the problem of Committees not communicating their decisions to the Executive. For example, the Committee to Investigate Bi-Weekly Pay Periods recently presented a proposal to the University without the Executive's endorsement. Thankfully, the proposal was acceptable to both the University and the Union. It was hoped that such a situation would never arise again due to the increased involvement of the Organiser and the Co-ordinator in Committee activities.

The proposed amendment to section G.7 was brought forward by Wendy Bice. She indicated that a large portion of her work dealt with grievances and that when she was not involved with Contract Committee matters, she automatically shared the work of the Organiser.

Moved by Wendy Bice
Seconded by Carole Cameron

THAT SECTION G.7 OF THE BY-LAWS BE AMENDED TO READ:
"SHALL BE A MEMBER OF THE EXECUTIVE, AN EX-OFFICIO MEMBER OF THE CONTRACT COMMITTEE, SHALL BE INVOLVED IN NEGOTIATIONS AND SHALL DO WORK RELATED TO THAT COMMITTEE. WHEN NOT INVOLVED IN NEGOTIATIONS, THIS POSITION SHALL BECOME EX-OFFICIO ON THE GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE AND SHALL DO WORK RELATED TO THAT COMMITTEE. THE DUTIES OF THIS POSITION SHALL INCLUDE MAINTAINING THE COLLECTIVE AGREEMENT, SHARING THE GENERAL OFFICE WORK (I.E., CORRESPONDENCE, MAILING, FILING, MEMBERSHIP LISTS, ETC.) AND PUBLIC RELATIONS."

The motion was CARRIED.

The next proposed by-law amendment would affect section J.13.

Moved by Carole Cameron
Seconded by Wendy Bice

THAT THE THIRD SENTENCE OF SECTION J.L# BE AMENDED TO READ:
"THERE SHALL BE NO SALARIED OFFICERS OF STAFF UNLESS IT IS SO
ESTABLISHED BY A MEMBERSHIP MEETING, WHICH SHALL ALSO DETERMINE
THE SALARIES OF SAME, PROVIDED THOSE SALARIES DO NOT EXCEED
THE HIGHEST WAGE RATE FOR THE BARGAINING UNIT."

The motion was CARRIED.

The last proposal to be discussed at this meeting involved section K.1. Marcel commented that, in the past, part-time employees paid exactly half the amount of the dues in comparison with the amount full-time employees were deducted and that those proportions should be maintained in present and future changes to dues figures. Marcel also stressed that the by-laws should be consistent with the existing dues authorization form.

Carole responded that this proposal was intended to keep the by-law in line with the recently-approved increase in dues. Sharon Newman felt that this proposal should be re-written to avoid the use of figures which would make this By-law adaptable to future changes in union dues. On that point, the Executive agreed that this proposal should be rewritten and brought back to the next by-law meeting for discussion.

Carole inquired if Joan Treleaven was prepared to discuss section G.4 which describes the Membership Secretary position. Joan responded that she felt the position urgently required a full-time employee at least once a week because the files were at a stage where they required that kind of attention. Marcel asked if it would be possible for Joan to oversee the maintenance of the file if it were kept up by the office staff. Suzan felt that when Joan accepted the position she also accepted the responsibility for maintaining the files on a regular basis. If she was not prepared to fulfill her obligation in that regard then the only alternative was for her to resign. Suzan added that it certainly wasn't fair to burden the present or future office employees with the duties of the Membership-Secretary when they have more than enough work of their own to struggle through.

Carole indicated that the next by-law meeting would be held on Thursday, March 5, 1981.

Marcel inquired if we had paid for the Job Evaluation Committee meeting with the University held in October. He felt that the Union was not obligated to pay for those employee salaries because the University has, in the past, not requested payment for AUCE Committee meetings with them. Marcel said that he had already informed the University of our position. Wendy Lymer said she would look into it and report back at the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 pm.