

Executive Meeting A.U.C.E. Local 1

18 May 1976 5:15

<u>Agenda:</u>	<u>Time</u>
1. No Smoking	
2. Adoption of the Agenda	(3)
3. Adoption of minutes of 12 May special Executive Meeting	(2)
4. Correspondence	(5)
5. Job Evaluation Committee Report - Raleen Nash	(12)
6. Sick Leave Committee Report - Lil Legault	(5)
7. University Housing Co-op	(5)
8. Grievance Committee report - Marcel Dionne	(5)
9. Provincial Report - Nancy Wiggs	(8)
10. Contract Committee Report - Margie Whalley	(3)
11. Strike Committee Report - Pat Gibson (?)	(12)
12. Trustee's Report (By-law revisions) - Robert Gayton	(10)
13. AUCE Local #1 as sponsor of Canada-Chile Support Group	(5)
14. Attendance at membership meetings	(10)
15. Report on progress of Steward Seminar - Fairleigh Funston	(3)
16. Union Organizer report - Fairleigh Funston	(2)
17. Discussion of which Committee's Chairpersons sit on Executive, and how replacements are designated for these people - Nancy Wiggs	(10)
18. Other Business	(5)

** As this is a lengthy agenda and many of the items for discussion and reports to be given have failed our recognition for some time now due to emergency situations and lack of time I would very much like to see us adhere to the suggested time limits. If you would like these limits changed please come to the meeting with a definite suggestion of alternate time allotments and present them under item 2.

Fairleigh

Fairleigh Funston was in the chair.

Present at the meeting were:

- Rayleen Nash Job Evaluation Committee
- Barbara Wynne-Edwards Job Evaluation Committee
- Marcel Dionne Chairperson Grievance Committee
- Shirley Chan Trustee
- Fairleigh Funston Union Organizer
- Penny Swanson Communications Committee
- Jerry Andersen Division "B" Rep.
- Margot Scherk Division "D" Rep.
- Roberta Crosby Division "G" Rep.

1. No Smoking

2. Adoption of the Agenda

Marcel Dionne
Shirley Chan

That #7 University Housing Co-op
and #13 AUCE Local #1 as sponsor
of Canada-Chile Support Group be
moved to the bottom of the agenda.

CARRIED

Margot Scherk
Marcel Dionne

That #10 Contract Committee Report
be tabled to the next Executive
meeting.

CARRIED

Margot Scherk
Jerry Andersen

That #11 Strike Committee Report
and #12 Trustee's Report be
tabled to the next Executive
meeting.

CARRIED

Marcel Dionne
Shirley Chan

That the agenda as amended be
adopted.

CARRIED

3. Adoption of minutes of 12 May special Executive Meeting.

Jerry Andersen
Margot Scherk

CARRIED

4. Correspondence

Letter from Diana Boyd dated May 6/76. Protest against
handling of motion passed at special emergency meeting
that AUCE members at VGH not cross HEU picket lines.
Desires that Trustees apologize to Membership. Shirley
Chan will answer letter.

Letter from Robert Gaytan suggesting that in the Executive's monthly report be included the names of the members of the Executive who should have been at the Executive meeting and a list of those who actually attended.

Jerry Andersen
Margot Scherk

That discussion re: above letter be tabled to the next Executive meeting and that Robert Gaytan be there.

CARRIED.

Letter from Provincial Executive to Executive of Local #1 re: Assertiveness Training Summer Workshop.

Jerry Andersen
Marcel Dionne

That the Executive draw the attention of the Membership to the workshop, and limit the attendance of 4 members from Local #1 and seek the guidance of the Membership as to who should be allowed to go.

CARRIED

Margot Scherk
Jerry Andersen

That Local #1 bear the \$50.00 registration cost for the 4 people from Local # 1 to attend the Workshop.

CARRIED

Letter of resignation from Valerie Pusey as Grievance Committee Steward from Division A.

Margot Scherk
Jerry Andersen

draft
That the Executive draft a letter of thanks to Val for her efforts.

CARRIED

Jerry Andersen
Margot Scherk

That we write letter of appreciation to Robert Gaytan for his services as Trustee.

CARRIED

5. Job Evaluation Committee Report

Maureen Gitta has become too busy in her job to attend meetings with the University but will remain a member of the committee. Emerald Murphy has offered to go to the meetings in her stead.

Barbara Wynne-Edwards presented the committees Interim Report of April 13, 1976 and most recent report of May 18, 1976. Discussion of May 18th Report.

Vicki Meynert
Marcel Dionne

That the Job Evaluation Committee publish a report in the Newsletter and that the Committee report be placed on the agenda for the next General Membership meeting.

CARRIED

6. Sick Leave Committee Report

Lil Legault was unable to attend the meeting and sent the following report to Nancy Wiggs.

"Here is some of my rambling of the meeting we had with SFU's Grievance Committee and our last meeting with the University committee:

(1) SFU's Grievance Committee:

Our committee asked SFU if they had any problems with the Sick Leave clause and the answer we were given was NO.

I also asked about the last paragraph of the Sick Leave clause which reads 'Five (5) years or more - twenty-six (26) weeks at one hundred per cent (100%) of salary.' Their interpretation of that clause is that a person could be sick the whole 26 weeks and come back to work for one day or even a week and have another 26 weeks (if needed) and when the second twenty six weeks are used up then that person would go on disability insurance.

(2) Our meeting with the University on Friday, May 14, 1976 was as follows:

The University committee also interpreted the last paragraph of the sick leave clause as the same as SFU's.

UBC (referring to AUCE's) sick year last year (1975) total cost to the University was \$326,000.00 -- this does not include the people that were on the extended sick leave benefit (i.e. maternity).

We have asked the University Committee to get figures from SFU as far as total money costing the university and hopefully a breakdown (library, etc.).

Our last meeting with the University, hopefully, is scheduled for June 3, 1976 at 2:00 p.m. when we hope to have cleared up all the paper work."

8. Grievance Committee Report

Marcel Dionne reported that the Emerald Murphy/misclassification arbitration was handled very admirably by Frances Wasserlein. There has been no answer from Mr. Bird Re: the Bennett arbitration case.

Maternity leave grievance has been successfully won by AUCE.

9. Provincial Report

Report handed in by Nancy Wiggs
Assertiveness Training Workshop: The Provincial has approved all details concerning an Assertiveness Training Workshop to be held in the Summer. The purpose of the workshop is to train people who will take an active role in a large (about 100 people) workshop that the Provincial hopes to hold in the Fall. Only four people from each of the Coastal Locals will be able to attend the Summer workshop,

and Locals will be asked to pay half the tuition fee for each person (about \$12.50) to cover the cost of the salary of the Seminar leader. Margot Scherk is organizing the the workshop--so if you have any questions, please contact her. (I think that four people from Local 1 have already expressed an interest in taking part in the training program this Summer, but check with Margot.) This project promises to be one of the most exciting things that the Provincial has ever taken part in.

Affiliation Report to Convention: Melody Rudd and I are the subcommittee of the Provincial Executive which have been studying the question of affiliation with any and all labour organizations in order to report to the June convention. We have now completed this report which contains a two pronged recommendation:

1. That we set up a working committee with SORWUC whose major task will be to organize unorganized clerical workers, and to put out a joint newsletter on outside groups and interests. It should be pointed out that SORWUC has already voted in support of such a committee; and
2. That a referendum with a newsletter attached outlining arguments pro and con be sent out on the question of affiliation with the CCU. Our report on this question explaining why we want to hold a referendum will be in the Provincial newsletter which is coming out this week. There should be lots of hot and heavy debate at the membership level on this question.

What should the Provincial be?: The Provincial Executive does not want the Convention to recommend to the membership only one possible direction that the Provincial can take, for it tends to present the membership with an all or nothing option. We are recommending that a referendum giving four choices of levels of activity for the provincial. The least active is that the Provincial be a Strike fund and newsletter, right up to the Provincial Executive having a full-time person, and a downtown office. There is also a question on the referendum to decide if any full-time person should be the Secretary Treasurer or a Union Organizer. With such a choice the debate must take place at the membership level and not at a convention of the active minority.

Jerry Andersen
Marcel Dionne

Procedural motion to read #16
Union Organizer report then
carry on with the rest of the agenda.

CARRIED

16. Three or four women, depending on the day, from VGH have been working in the Union Office. They are organizing the Membership files; trying to implement a new system to help the Membership Secretary. The University Endowment Lands garbage collection system maintains that we are no longer entitled to a garbage bin. The rest of Executive recommended to Fairleigh that she contact the landlord to see what can be done to rectify the situation.

Announcement concerning the Peltier Support Committee meeting.

Marcel Dionne
Jerry Andersen

That anyone wishing to attend the Peltier Support Committee meeting do so on their own and not as a representative of AUCE Local #1.

CARRIED

An up-to-date extensive stewards list is being prepared.

14. Attendance at membership meetings

Members are not going to Membership meetings and taking 2 hour lunches. A divisional meeting of Division B suggested that a system of fines might be set up for members who do not attend one out of three Membership meetings.

15. Report on progress of Steward Seminar

Jerry Andersen
Margot Scherk

That the Stewards Seminar provide coffee thru Food Services for the stewards attending the seminar.

CARRIED

Vicki Meynert
Margot Scherk

That we rent the film called "Don't Call me Baby Anymore" and allot up to \$50.00 for possible rental fee.

CARRIED

Tentative programme :

Morning: History of the Union - ½ hour
 Grievance Manual - 1 ¼ hours
 Contract - presentation

Afternoon Contract - discussion (small groups)
 Divisional Discussion of problems - steward structure, etc.
 Report: General Discussion re: a functioning steward structure.

Notice to be given to Margie Whalley to be Chairperson of the next Executive meeting to be held on May 26, 1976.

The meeting adjourned at 7:00 P.M.

REPORT TO THE A.U.C.E. EXECUTIVE FROM THE
JOB EVALUATION COMMITTEE.

Broadly speaking, the contract requires that the committee shall proceed to build a file of job specifications for all A.U.C.E. members and to make recommendations for the implementation of a new job evaluation system.

After a review of literature available and committee discussion, the following points have become clear:

- a) in order for a job specification to have any value at all it must be:
 - 1) designed to fit the specific job evaluation system into which it will be fed;
 - 2) designed by a professional job analyst who is familiar with the system of evaluation to be used and the important criteria to be recovered;
 - 3) compiled in common across campus; i.e. the same person or persons should conduct all interviews.
- b) that the committee has neither the time nor the continuity to acquire the kind of knowledge which would make us competent job analysts or knowledgeable enough to evaluate a system:
- c) that the A.U.C.E. membership should not discount the work already done by the previous committee and should be prepared to accept conclusions and recommendations based on that work:

Reluctantly, it must be accepted that we are in a supplicant position in the field of job evaluation. We have neither the resources nor the expertise (however questionable) to do a competent job. To rely on the fortitude over a number of years of a union committee to become competent in the area of job analysis is unrealistic. The committee has arrived at the conclusion that we must assume the role of monitors of the system with recall to the membership for support and ultimate approval.

April 13, 1976.

REPORT TO THE A.U.C.E. EXECUTIVE
FROM THE JOB EVALUATION COMMITTEE

May 18th, 1976

Following a further meeting with the University Job Evaluation Committee, the Union Committee has resolved to carry the following three proposals to the Executive and subsequently to the Membership:

- (i) that the combined University/Union Committee agree upon a suitable job specification format to be carried to the Membership for approval. As the discussion has proceeded thus far, this format would probably resemble closely that currently used by the library to eliminate any excessive duplication. Rayleen Nash has undertaken to contact the library workers to determine how satisfactory this form has been and will report before our recommendation is made;
- (ii) that upon consensus to the format, copies will be circulated to all department heads with the request that it be completed, signed by the employee and the department head responsible and kept on file in the department (as per the 1975-76 Contract);
- (iii) that the Union Committee continue to meet with the University Committee in their deliberations on a possible new system of Job Evaluation. It appears likely that a request to run trials on one or more systems will come up during the contract negotiations for 1976/77 and that a new system will be proposed during the 1977/78 negotiations. We feel that it is important that the Union Committee participate in these deliberations so as to provide first hand information to the Membership and to the contract committee/s.

In our own deliberations we have come up with the following comments on the point system of job evaluation which was examined by the 1974/75 committee. We present this now with the object of receiving feedback from the Executive as to the direction in which we should proceed. Our line of reasoning is as follows:

It is surely agreed that the university is a highly diversified institution with isolated pockets of workers with identical jobs. Mostly, however, each job is an entity unto itself with varying degrees of responsibility, pressure, complexity, etc. To evaluate and reward these jobs fairly it would seem logical to identify common areas for all jobs and then to measure the degree to which a particular job complies relative to others. The next step is to then give a value to common areas themselves, i.e. just how important 'pressure' is in the overall job picture. The degree can then be multiplied by the importance given to the area and a tally made which determines the level of reward for that job, regardless of its basic title. Appendix I and II give a schematic explanation of the above. In evaluating these, please bear in mind that they are highly idealized and should be viewed only with the objective of getting the message across rather than fixing values to specific areas. To fix these values is where the greatest amount of work and collaboration will take place and the figures in the schematic are simplified to make comprehension easier. It is possible for a fair amount of subjectivity to take place, but this would be the advantage of having the Union Committee participating in the deliberations.

It has become clear to us that this is a most satisfactory method of accommodating the diversity on campus and allows a reasonable amount of flexibility. It should be possible also for an employee to determine his/her own point value by asking the set of questions for each factor (see Appendix II) to determine the degree of their job within that factor and to arrive at a total number of points by simple multiplication and addition.

The committee also recommends that a union representative sit in on the cross campus interviews which will be involved in the setting up of a new system.

APPENDIX 1

KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS 1 → 10 (LOW → HIGH)										
RESPONSIBILITY 1 → 10 (LOW → HIGH)										
EXPERIENCE 1 → 10 (LOW → HIGH)										
COMPLEXITY 1 → 10 (LOW → HIGH)										
SUPERVISION & TRAINING RESP. 1 → 10 (LOW → HIGH)										
PRESSURE 1 → 10 (LOW → HIGH)										
ACCOUNTABILITY & ACCURACY 1 → 10 (LOW → HIGH)										
PERSONAL CONTACT 1 → 10 (LOW → HIGH)										

8 COMMON FACTORS - DEGREE RANKED 1-10 (LOW → HIGH)

IMPORTANCE ATTACHED TO EACH OF 8 FACTORS

SECRETARIES I (1 → 333) II (334 → 766) III (667 → 1000)	17	17	11	13	12	9	11	10
TECHNICAL EMPLOYEES I (1 → 333) II (334 → 666) III (667 → 1000)								
STENOS I (1 → 333) II (334 → 666) III (667 → 1000)								
CLERKS I (1 → 333) II (334 → 666) III (667 → 1000)								

TOTAL SCORE, AFTER MULTIPLYING DEGREE OF FACTOR BY OVERALL IMPORTANCE ATTACHED TO EACH FACTOR.

SECRETARIES
TECHNICAL EMPLOYEES eg. Technicians Computers Operators.
STENOS
CLERKS

4 BASIC AREAS

TOTAL 100

MULTIPLY

APPENDIX II

EXPERIENCE (11%)

This factor measures the related work experience required to perform the job.

<u>Degree Level</u>	<u>Points</u>
1. No related experience required; employees can comprehend job duties immediately.	2
2. Limited experience of a routine and unvaried nature.	3
3. Limited experience of a varied nature where task knowledge is applicable to the job.	4
4. General experience encompassing a broad range of work processes applicable to the job.	6
5. General experience encompassing a broad range of specialized and varied work processes applicable to the job.	8
6. Significant, varied and broad experience encompassing highly specialized activities applicable to the job.	10

INTERDEPARTMENTAL
MEMORANDUM

TO Nancy Wiggs, Vice-president

AUCE Local #1

FROM Lil Legault

Elementary Division Office

Faculty of Education

May 17,

19 76

Dear Nancy:

Here is some of my rambling of the meeting we had with SFU's Grievance Committee and our last meeting with the University committee:

(1) SFU's Grievance Committee:

Our committee asked SFU if they had any problems with the Sick Leave clause and the answer we were given was NO.

I also asked about the last paragraph of the Sick Leave clause which reads "Five (5) years or more - twenty-six (26) weeks at one hundred percent (100%) of salary." There interpretation of that clause is a person could be sick the whole 26 weeks and come back to work for one day or even a week and have another 26 weeks (if needed) and when the second twenty six weeks are used up then that person would go on disability insurance.

(2) Our meeting with the University on Friday, May 14, 1976 was as follows:

The University committee also interpreted the last paragraph of the sick leave clause as the same as SFU's.

UBC (referring to AUCE's) sick year last year (1975) total cost to the University was \$326,000.00 -- this does not include the people that were on the extended sick leave benefit (i.e. maternity).

We have asked the University Committee to get figures from SFU as far as total money costing the university and hopefully a breakdown (library, etc.)

Our last meeting with the University, hopefully, is scheduled for June 3, 1976 at 2:00 p.m. when we hope to have cleared up all the paper work.

Lil

Agenda Item 11--Discussion of which Committee's Chairpersons sit on Executive and how replacements are designated for these people

I know this sounds like a confusing item, but I'll try to explain:

Right now, as far as I know, the executive consists of

President
Vice-President
Recording Secretary
Membership Secretary
Treasurer
Union Organizer
Trustee
Trustee
Chairperson, Contract Committee
Chairperson, Grievance Committee
Chairperson, Communications Committee
Chairperson, Strike Committee (when in service)
9 Division Reps.
21 People

This brings up some questions:

1. Are provincial reps. on the executive (should they be)?
2. Is the Chairperson of Job Evaluation Committee(should they be)?
3. Is the Chairperson of Working Conditions Com. (should they be)?
4. Is the Chairperson of Sick Leave Study Com. (should they be)?
5. what about any other such committees?
6. If they are not members, should they become members, should they be expected to attend meetings to report, should they only come when the Executive asks them to or when they want to, should they merely report to us in writing and to the membership? In other words, what is their status with respect to the Executive?

The other problem is this: should we ask the Standing Committees to give us the names of their Chairperson and alternate (for purposes of Executive Meetings)? Right now, if two people from a Committee show up and want to vote, chances there is no record (in memo form or in the minutes) of who the Chairperson and alternate is, so we would not be able to let either vote.

Provincial Report:

A few things of importance have happened in the Provincial :

1. Assertiveness Training Workshop: The Provincial has approved all details concerning an Assertiveness Training Workshop to be held in the Summer. The purpose of the workshop is to train people who will take an active role in a large (about 100 people) workshop that the Provincial hopes to hold in the Fall. Only four people from each of the Coastal Locals will be able to attend the Summer workshop, and Locals will be asked to pay half the tuition fee for each person (about \$12:50) to cover the cost of the salary of the Seminar leader. Margot Scherk is organizing the workshop--so if you have any questions, please contact her. (I think that four people from Local 1 have already expressed an interest in taking part in the training program this Summer, but check with Margot.) This project promises to be one of the most exciting things that the Provincial has ever taken part in.
2. Affiliation Report to Convention: Melody Rudd and I are the subcommittee of the Provincial Executive which have been studying the question of affiliation with any and all labour organizations in order to report to the June convention. We have now completed this report which contains a two pronged recommendation:
 1. That we set up a working committee with SORWUC whose major task will be to organize unorganized clerical workers, and and to put out a joint newsletter on outside groups and interests. It should be pointed out that SORWUC has already voted in support of such a committee; and
 2. That a referendum with a newsletter attached outlining arguments pro and con be sent out on the question of affiliation with the CCU. Our report on this question explaining why we want to hold a referendum will be in the Provincial newsletter which is coming out this week. There should be lots of hot and heavy debate at the membership level on this question.
3. What should the Provincial be?: The Provincial Executive does not want the Convention to recommend to the membership only one possible direction that the Provincial can take, for it tends to present the membership with an all or nothing option. We are recommending that a referendum giving four choices of levels of activity for the provincial. The least active is that the Provincial be a Strike fund and newsletter, right up to the Provincial Executive having a full-time person, and a downtown office. There is also a question on the referendum to decide if any full-time person should be the Secretary Treasurer or a Union Organizer. With such a choice the debate must take place at the membership level and not at a convention of the active minority.