

GENERAL MEMBERSHIP MEETING
15 SEPTEMBER, 1988
IRC #1, 12:30 - 2:30 P.M.
A G E N D A

1. ROLL CALL OF OFFICERS
2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA
3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES OF JUNE 15, 1988
4. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES
 - a) Nominations for:
1st Vice-President
Nomination received for Shirley Irvine
2nd Vice-President
Recording Secretary
Trustees (3)
 - b) Oath of Office
 - c) Notice of Motions
 - i. MOVED and SECONDED by the Executive 27 Jan./88
"That all arbitrations be approved by the
Membership"
 - d) Contract Proposals
5. PRESIDENT'S REPORT
6. SECRETARY/TREASURER'S REPORT
 - i. Notice of Motion
MOVED and SECONDED by the Executive
"That funding be approved to retain part-time office
help (Clerk I level) one day per week from 1
September, 1988 to 31 December, 1988".
7. BUSINESS AGENT'S REPORT
8. COMMITTEE REPORTS
 - i. Grievance Committee
 - ii. Health & Safety Committee
 - iii. Contract Committee
 - iv. Job Evaluation
 - v. Education
 - vi. Communications
9. OTHER BUSINESS

MEMBERSHIP CARDS REQUIRED!!!!

GENERAL MEMBERSHIP MEETING
15 SEPTEMBER, 1988
M I N U T E S

The Chair called the meeting to order at 12:40 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL OF OFFICERS
Pamela Lundrigan, Chair (President)
Susan Claybo (Chair, Job Evaluation Committee)
Diana Ellis (Secretary-Treasurer)
Lee Bryant (Sergeant-at-Arms)
Rebecca Davey (Admin. Sec.)
Rod Haynes (Business Agent)
Joe Denofreo (CUPE Representative)

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA
MOVED Ellis SECONDED Lebitschnig
"That Item # 4 d. on the agenda be moved to #9"
CARRIED

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES OF JUNE 15, 1988
MOVED Pound SECONDED Love
"That the minutes of June 15, 1988 be adopted as
circulated."
CARRIED

4. BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES
 - a) **Nominations for:**

1st Vice-President
A nomination has been received for Shirley Irvine.
Kitty Byrne seconded the nomination. Shirley
accepted, and was seated by acclamation.
2nd Vice-President
There were no nominations. The position remains open.
Recording Secretary
There were no nominations. The position remains open.
3 Trustees
Diana Elllis nominated Suzan Zagar. Suzan declined
the nomination. The position remains open.

 - b) **Oath of Office:**
The Oath of Office was administered to Diana Ellis and
Shirley Irvine.

c) **Notice of Motions:**

i. MOVED and SECONDED by the Executive 27 January, 1988

"That all arbitrations be approved by the Membership"

Don't put this in Policy binder

Alannah Anderson spoke to the motion as follows:
"I believe that the decision to take grievances to arbitration should rest finally with the membership for various reasons.

1. Democratic. No executive member or committee member has a mandate to make decisions that will change the direction of the Union. In all other cases, major decisions must be voted on and decided by the membership.

2. Arbitrations set precedents. The decisions affect the workers all across Canada--whether we lose or win. Better that the decision is a collective one made by the whole group rather than a committee.

3. Educational for the membership--all will learn principles and philosophy of the union movement.

The arguments against doing it this way do not, in my opinion, withstand scrutiny.

a) Confidentiality is not an issue as all Arbitrations are published to read across Canada

b) Grievance Committee will not be hamstrung--they can invoke arbitration and later withdraw if necessary. They will be able to negotiate with even greater strength with the whole membership behind them.

c) This is consistent with tradition in other CUPE locals and other unions.

Shirley Irvine, Chair of the Grievance Committee, spoke against the motion. Her concerns were as follows:

a) Membership approval is not required for financial reasons, as the amount to be spent on arbitrations is limited by the budget. Membership approval would be required if arbitrations reached the point of surpassing the budget.

- b) Only grievances with merit go to arbitration
- c) Settlement is almost always reached before arbitration takes place. There have been no arbitrations in at least the past three years.
- d) The two parties prefer to negotiate as they have more control over the decisions.
- e) There would be fewer grievance settlements if arbitration could not be invoked without going to the membership for approval
- f) The tendency is for the University to settle only after invoking arbitration
- g) Currently, grievances are being settled without arbitration taking place
- h) It would not be practical. There is not enough time available at membership meetings to discuss grievance situations thoroughly. Details of the Collective Agreement would have to be discussed in detail and understood by all members.
- i) Grievance handling requires hours of time and extensive knowledge of procedure. The decision to proceed to arbitration must be an informed one.
- j) Membership involvement in the decision to go to Arbitration would allow no privacy for the grievor. In some cases health problems are involved.

In summary, Shirley felt that a requirement for approval of arbitrations by the membership would not be practical, necessary or workable.

Suzan Zagar spoke against the motion as follows: When the motion was discussed last year, the Grievance Committee was opposed to the idea. This reflects the opinion of the committee. The committee does not have a mandate to change, but to uphold the Collective Agreement. Suzan emphasized that she trusts the committee, who have been elected to perform an important job. If members feel that they are not performing the job satisfactorily, there are provisions in the bylaws for questioning their decisions. This committee has served us very well. They are few in number, but perform a fantastic job. We must show trust in their decisions. Members have been

invited to join committees. If they want further involvement in decision-making processes, they should JOIN THE COMMITTEE. Grievances should not be discussed at membership meetings, as manipulation is a danger. There would also be the possibility of an arbitration not being filed as a result of a stacked decision. If a member is not happy with a decision, s(he) can take it to the membership. Confidentiality and privacy would always be a concern, possibly resulting in grievors refusing to go to arbitration.

Marion Gordon spoke against the motion as follows:

- Arbitration decisions do set precedents, and therefore a decision to go to arbitration should be made by highly informed committee members.
- It would be impossible to allow enough time for an informed decision to be made at a membership meeting.
- Why call the question? Grievors may go to the membership if necessary.

Kitty Byrne spoke against the motion as follows:

- The dangers of the proposed procedure outweigh the advantages of a superficial appearance of democracy.
- Discussion of grievances at a membership meeting is not the same as being fully informed.
- The membership may request more information if they wish.
- The Grievance Committee has been duly elected. We should show faith in the election process. The Committee consists of trained individuals, who are there to make decisions. The membership is not sufficiently informed to make these decisions.

Alannah stated that the motion was not intended as an indication of any lack of confidence in the Grievance Committee. However, many members who are unable to participate in committees still wish to be informed. Shirley pointed out that committee meetings are open--any member may attend. Kitty stated that the membership has a responsibility to be vigilant.

Joe Denofreo spoke to the motion, stating that in most locals the committees report to the membership on violations of the Collective Agreement and their seriousness. If a grievor goes to arbitration, it goes to the membership. Section VII of the Labour Code may be invoked if necessary. There is also the question of expenditure, which can be challenged. Details of individual cases are not aired, but the case explained in a summary report to the membership.

The Chair called the question, and a vote was taken.

The motion was **DEFEATED**

5. **PRESIDENT'S REPORT**

i. **Recruitment Campaign**

Pamela Lundrigan reported that at the first meeting of the campaign to recruit members to serve on various committees, of 86 members notified only three attended, and they were already heavily involved in union activities. She further emphasized the need for support. Marion Gordon emphasized that there is a need not only for committee members, but also for contact people and other volunteers. Any help, however little, is greatly appreciated.

ii. **Telereg**

Introduction of the Telereg system of registration has resulted in new duties for many members. The University Classification Committee is reviewing this situation, and will report further at the next meeting. In the meantime, the union is requesting feedback from members regarding the level of access which they have to Telereg, and what new duties have been added to their workload which are not already in their Job Descriptions.

iii. **Business Agent**

Pamela announced that the Business Agent, Rod Haynes, has resigned for personal reasons effective 6 November, 1988. She expressed the Executive's thanks for Rod's work for the union. It is now, therefore, necessary to strike a Hiring Committee for a replacement. The proposed amended bylaws contain language governing the formation of a Hiring Committee as follows:

H.1 b) "A Hiring Committee shall be struck composed of the President, the Secretary-Treasurer, the Chairs of two of the major standing committees and one member at large to attend to the hiring of a Business Agent."

Discussion followed regarding the optimum number of members of such a committee.

MOVED Zagar SECONDED Gordon

"That an interim amendment to the proposed bylaw be approved allowing two members-at-large to serve on the Hiring Committee."

CARRIED (21 - 20)

Nominations were invited for members-at-large to serve on the hiring committee.

Diana Ellis nominated Elizabeth Zook. Elizabeth was not present, so the nomination was withdrawn.

Shirley Irvine nominated Kitty Byrne. Kitty accepted the nomination.

Suzan Zagar nominated Ann Hutchison. Ann declined the nomination.

Marjorie Stewart nominated Marion Gordon. Marion accepted the nomination.

Kitty Byrne and Marion Gordon were seated on the Hiring Committee by acclamation.

6. SECRETARY-TREASURER'S REPORT

Diana Ellis reported that the Financial Statements for June, July, August and September will be published in the upcoming newsletter.

i. **Notice of Motion**

MOVED and SECONDED by the Executive

"That funding be approved to retain part-time office help (Clerk I level) one day per week from 1 September, 1988 to 31 September, 1988".

Diana detailed the heavy workload which exists in the union office. The approval for a Clerk 1 for two days per week has expired. It is anticipated that budget approval will be requested for two days per week in 1989. In the meantime, clerical assistance is necessary for the office to function.

CARRIED

Diana went on to say that the \$5 assessment which was made in August is covered under item # K.3 in the bylaws. The funds will be going into the Strike Fund under our current bylaws.

7. BUSINESS AGENT'S REPORT

Rod Haynes emphasized the need for participation from all members, however little time they can give the union. It is absolutely necessary for the continued existence of the local. The need for Shop Stewards is desperate. Members know best what the needs are. Training is available for those who are willing to participate in the process. Rod stated that significant changes have taken place in the staff of Personnel Services which, he believes, reflect the new, hard-line policy of the University. The membership as a whole can not rely on a few people to protect their interests. The legal system is not on the side of employees. We are currently working in a climate which is highly unfavourable for the Labour Movement.

The only way to achieve a more democratic workplace is through democratic participation in your union. The workplace is not a democratic environment. If and when industrial action is necessary and he is available, he will help.

8. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Pamela outlined the traditional Union procedure of membership ratification of committee reports and suggested we begin doing this. Each chair would move acceptance, a member would second, and the question would be called.

i. Grievance

Shirley Irvine reported as follows:

The committee is close to a settlement on the grievance relating to medical/dental appointment time. Arbitration was invoked, and negotiations continue. Shirley provided the background of this grievance, and outlined the Union's and the University's positions. UBC has proposed a movable average based on the previous 12 months.

Arbitration has been invoked in the Tuition Waiver Benefit Grievance. No offer of settlement has been received.

Arbitration has been invoked in the case of Loss of Bargaining Unit Work. This is a situation where part of a member's work was given to a supervisor, and the member replaced by a secretary at a lower level.

The Grievance Committee will discuss several such cases at each membership meeting.

It was announced that Marion Gordon has resigned as Chief Shop Steward. Thanks and appreciation were expressed for all Marion's hard work in this capacity. Pamela reiterated the earlier plea for more active shop stewards. Currently, there are only 4 - 5 active shop stewards to serve approximately 1,400 members. Two of these are on the Grievance Committee. Obviously, this is untenable. If members expect to be serviced, more people have to come forward. Training is available for those who volunteer. CUPE will offer steward training when asked, and the CLC is offering like courses at SFU in October.

Suzan Zagar raised the question of WHY members are not volunteering? Several answers were forthcoming, a selection including:

- people say they have "too much work in the office" even to attend General Membership meetings.
- people are hesitant to tell their supervisors that they are leaving the office for union-related purposes
- other unions have problems with participation levels. Do other unions **require** attendance at meetings?

The Chair pointed out as enticement or incentive that the Grievance Committee is booked off to attend meetings.

Joe Denofreo stated that under the new Labour Code, unions are prohibited from making attendance at meetings mandatory. The issue is, do you want representation and a union? Unless participation increases, the employer will move against the union, and a decertification vote could result. UBC has a poor record of labour relations.

MOVED Irvine SECONDED Erickson

"That the Grievance Committee report be accepted."

CARRIED

ii. **Health & Safety**

Estelle Lebitschnig reported that the University committee has not yet met. She has asked for leave of absence (September 1 to December 31 1988) from the Executive due to a heavy course load. The committee needs more people. New chemicals are being brought onto campus. The committee must ensure that professionals are following established guidelines in handling these materials.

MOVED Lebitschnig SECONDED Gordon

"That the Health & Safety Committee report be accepted."

CARRIED

iii. **Contract**

Pamela Lundrigan introduced the Contract Committee as follows:

Pamela Lundrigan, Chair, (ex officio); Alannah Anderson; Lee Bryant; Diana Ellis; Nan Love; Shauna Smith.

Contract matters were dealt with under a separate agenda item.

iv. **Job Evaluation**

Susan Claybo reported that the Job Evaluation committee is now fully functional. Too many enquiries are being received by committee members, so she urged members considering applying for reclassification to phone the union office and request guidelines to follow when completing the application. Personnel Services is currently backlogged with applications, and are booking appointments in December. They have stated that they will make retroactive payments if necessary. Research shows that over the past year 80% of all applications for reclassification have been approved. If a member is unsure as to whether or not her/his job is wrongly classified, s(he) should send a list of duties and job description to the office, and a member of the committee will provide advice.

For maximum efficiency, the committee needs members from a variety of departments. Unless more members participate in the committee, burnout will result.

MOVED Claybo SECONDED Erickson
"That the Job Evaluation Committee report be accepted".

CARRIED

Kitty Byrne warned members that there is a time limitation on retroactive pay resulting from a reclassification.

v. **Education**

Diana Ellis reminded members of the CLC courses being offered at SFU in October. These include Basic Steward Training; Parliamentary Procedure; Negotiating, and others. The Union will pay for interested members to attend these courses.

MOVED Ellis SECONDED Erickson
"That the Education committee report be accepted"

CARRIED

vi. **Communications**

Diana Ellis reported that she attended a course on newsletter production, which she found extremely informative. The committee still needs more members, and a Chair.

MOVED Ellis SECONDED Gordon
"That the Communications committee report be accepted."

CARRIED

9. **OTHER BUSINESS**

i. **Contract Proposals**

Pamela explained that since new members have joined the Contract committee, the committee as a whole should be ratified.

It was therefore

MOVED Melanson SECONDED Gordon

"That the Contract committee be ratified by the membership".

CARRIED

MOVED Byrne SECONDED Irvine

"That the Union contract a study comparing UBC clerical and library workers' classification/levels of skill and wages with other universities across Canada and a study of our sister local CUPE 116 with the intention of establishing a fair wage demand and equal pay for work of equal value standards for the campus."

Chuck Erickson inquired as to the cost of such a study. Kitty suggested that support may be available through CUPE. She went on to say that members' raises are not keeping up with increases in the cost of living. We are the working poor. We have a status quo contract, and we must do better. Cheryl Abbott asked if there is time to complete such a study before contract negotiations begin. Pamela stated that some research has been done already by Rod Haynes. This has shown that the upper levels of job classifications are significantly lower than comparable positions in other organizations. Kitty emphasized that the negotiating committee should be able to present solid research to the University. Rod supported that, saying that it had not been possible to complete a sophisticated study in the office. However, his study has shown that in one classification salary levels have fallen 18% below the "keep up" level. In other words, these members are earning 80% of what they earned in the mid-70s. Members will have to fight to ensure a fair wage settlement. Currently, he said, "...you are poor and powerless."

Diana Ellis stated that research material is available from CUPE. Some of the "SALAD" (System for the Analysis of Labour Data) material has been received, and more is expected shortly. Kitty reiterated that the Contract committee should get the backing of solid research.

CARRIED

MOVED Byrne SECONDED Irvine

"That during the present negotiations between the Union and the University, the Contract Committee bring to each General Membership Meeting a full and complete report of the status of said negotiations."

Suzan Zagar stated that in the previous negotiations, a wage offer made by the University was not revealed to the membership. If this motion was intended to avoid such an occurrence, then she would support it. Diana Ellis said that the offer to which Suzan was referring was an inadequate one, and that subsequently Joe Denofreo, who is a highly skilled negotiator, obtained a higher wage settlement. When negotiations are taking place, the committee must have room to negotiate. Chuck Erickson and Cheryl Abbott both expressed agreement with Diana's position. Nan Love stated that she, too, agreed with Diana, as it is important for the committee to have some leeway in negotiations. She pointed out further that not everyone attending union meetings is necessarily friendly to the union, and information might be leaked to the University. A better alternative would be to have more people on the negotiating committee. Any

member who so wishes may obtain information from the committee. Susan Claybo said that when she became curious about the union, she joined a committee in order to become better informed!

Marion Gordon said that when money is being discussed, everyone shows up at meetings, and information may be transferred to management.

A vote was taken.

DEFEATED

Karen Shaw raised the question of Health and Safety provisions within the Collective Agreement. Currently, we have no protection other than a statement which provides for application of WCB regulations. If WCB regulations change, we have no recourse through the Collective Agreement. She suggested that existing WCB language be incorporated into our Collective Agreement, and that clauses be added covering such matters as Health & Safety meetings; unsafe workplaces; workplace inspections, and investigations. The current trend in Health and Safety protection is not good, and we are at risk of finding ourselves without protection.

The Chair requested that Karen submit proposals to the Contract Committee, and introduced her to Nan Love, who agreed to work with Karen on this.

CONTRACT PROPOSALS

The Chair reminded the meeting that these contract proposals were just that: PROPOSALS, and as such, they were subject to revision, etc. She asked members to keep in mind that the Contract committee did not think their proposals were final. She further stated that the proposals represent a starting position in the negotiation process.

Article 5.05:

The Chair pointed out that the current Contracting Out language was contained on the left-hand side of the document, and the proposed language, which allows no contracting out whatsoever, was contained on the right. She detailed some of the more recent experience the Union had been having with the University on this issue, ie. the fact that UBC has consistently (over the past 12 months) been using about 50% of their allotted number (which is no more than 2% of the bargaining unit to be employed at any given time) in the Limited Time Only pool, and that this subject is on the agenda at every Labour Committee meeting.

After some discussion, the Chair called the question. Kitty Byrne pointed out that as there had been no announcement of a vote, any voting on contract proposals should be deferred until the next meeting. The Chair acceded.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED Erickson SECONDED Gordon

"That the meeting be adjourned (2:30 p.m.)"

CARRIED

/rd

Member\08.min