

Financial Services - Payroll grievance

Step. 2, Sept. 20, 1985

Presentation, with responses - Ted's notes

Ted Byrne, Chuck Erickson, Craig Smith, Bob Seeley

- CS wanted brief preliminary discussion: said he and BS had met with CE and Denise same morning and discussed problem - he understood core of the problem was the original split between Payroll and Fac. and Staff Records - there is some difficulty with the actual split of duties, and people are being sent back and forth between the Payroll pillar and the FandSR post - they have made commitment to try to clear up this difficulty - CE said that this was definitely a problem, and clearing it up would help, but that he didn't consider it to be the core problem

- 5.04 - Clerk 2 vacant - filled with temp (Linda's position)
Clerk 2 vacant since June 10th - filled with temps
Clerk 1 indefinitely vacant - filled with temps.

problem of time it takes to train these people - and fact that the Clerk 1 position has been vacant most of the time - this was established - is filled as needed, which is not majority of time (get details) - CS: no undue pressure resulting from use of temps - TB: point is the time it takes to train them - CE supports this - CS agrees is problem - Clerk 3s - used to be 3 doing monthly, now only 2 - agreed that this was true - original split was between Payroll and F&SR, the input and output used to be done by Payroll, now input done by F&SR and output only by Payroll - so was some reduction there - but both CE and BS agreed that in the case of Kerris and Cheryl (Clerk 3s) there was an increase in workload

- added duties: Clerk 4, Chuck - added student monthly and expo passes (neglected to mention this)
-Kerris and Cheryl - now do hourly and student monthly: split payroll, no training - used to hire two people to help out in Sept., haven't done that this year - BS: confirms this is true - CS: wouldn't really help because bringing in temps on short notice/ need to train them, don't know what to do, some of the tasks complicated BS: we could use extra help for sure - BS,CS: Clerk 2, Laney actually should be doing this work as well, so there would be three - but she's new, hasn't been trained, hasn't been shown how to do, is not doing currently - TB: training time, have to help each other, haven't been given proper backup and training - no increase in volume, so why so much overtime - CS,CE,BS: discussion of volume, agreement that volume not up - but BS contradicted this, at this point and later, said that there seem to be a lot of layoffs in Cupe hourly, not just one or two, but batches

of six or seven - sessional faculty payroll up (payroll or terminations?) - later he said couldn't really explain increase in volume but was there - my argument: if no increase in volume then overtime is indication that the other problems we are discussing are serious - Kerris and Cheryl did 12 hrs. of overtime last weekend each - BS: nobody complaining about overtime, why are you complaining about this, they don't want the extra money? (friendly) - TB: no just saying if they are working overtime and no increase in volume then there must be other reasons - CS: not many over-time requests - Kerris and Cheryl only that once - Denise a small amount of overtime, but correcting some errors she had made - two cut off dates, rather than one - back to back - work their butts off to get completed for one then find next day they have to meet the next - CS: time of year, fact of life, this is result of change, can't do anything about - TB: is a problem, should look at how it was handled etc. CS: would consider - TB: worried about meeting deadlines, complaints, very worried about pressure and volume leading to errors and the errors coming back on them later, them being blamed CS: realize this, always a problem, Finance like that, time of year

- Clerk 3 position (Peggy, Linda) - added Faculty payroll, no equivalent deduction of duties - they disputed this, since input taken away

- R&A not involved in payroll split, not involved in Payroll and F&SR split - told him of Grant's letter - didn't want to discuss R&A - should talk to Personnel he said

- activity report forms: made point that we consider this added duty at same time as reduction of workforce

5.05, 22.01 - jobs required on continuing basis - obviously - so can't fill Clerk 2 (since June 10) and Clerk 1 with temps. - agreed about Clerk 2 (said he would get back to me) - but said they could not justify filling Clerk 1 position on ongoing basis, so justified in using temps when necessary to do clerk 1 type work, filing etc. - vacant since May

- 24.05 - working procedures: splitting of payroll, activity report forms - lack of consultation - read them the article - they seemed to agree hadn't been followed - activity report forms: to be continued forever (said he couldn't comment, should talk to Personnel) - entire R&A process no consultation - he said we should discuss with personnel - we said ES had told us problem was with managers - he said he would discuss with Libby Nason - also told story about meeting where final report, mgrs. told not to let staff see - wouldn't comment on this, didn't think there had been final report - what did we want - ans: accurate information

- we discussed the time required to perform tasks stated on the activity report form - the times are inaccurate (witness the 3.5 min. for time sheet; when Chuck timed it took much longer) - he said that the times were not final, could be adjusted, had to be reasonable, that the supervisors gave that information in the first place, and that they would have final say as to what the standards are - supers. have to be satisfied that the information is accurate

payroll grievance, p. 2

31.02 - list of duties - have to draw up accurate lists when the duties change - BS: did job descriptions for each job when the split with FSR was first put in place - Chuck was involved - these are on file with PS - the split in payroll also reflected in the new descriptions...?? - they will look into this and make sure accurate and on file with Personnel - Union has not rec'd copies

23.01 - activity report form = document on file - may be used to evaluate performance, and could lead to discipline, etc. - so grieving accuracy of information (R&A standards) - doesn't add up: Maria's eg. - eg. of Chuck being measured filling out time sheets
- CS didn't have an answer on this for me - will have to check with Libby Nason
- our fear that this information will be used to evaluate performance - against assurances to the contract from Personnel

- classifications: interchangeable duties - have to watch integrity of classifications - not part of grievance, but just discussion

- sick leave, dental appointments: Maria using holiday for dental appointment (BS: she wanted whole day off, and we said was inconvenient, but we finally agreed, then she changed her mind and decided to take during holiday - don't know if she did that because of pressure from us (via. Denise), but it was not a dental appt. request, was request for whole day off a holiday to have wisdom teeth pulled (this is true)

- listed ailments:

- Denise: ulcer, rash
- Cheryl: stiff neck, loss of sleep, nightmares (broken teeth not mentioned)
- Chuck: migraines
- Maria: migraines, general health, worried about surviving
- Laney - hives, nervousness
- Peggy - leave of absence, tension related illness

- loss of flextime, no wage increase, increments not paid, no one wants to work under these conditions - add Ritchie and Associates and this is the result - I pin most of the problems on the R&A review