



ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGE EMPLOYEES
LOCAL #2, Simon Fraser Univeristy

May 11, 1977

SPECIAL ANCHOR

CONTRACT NEGOTIATIONS

Contents:

- "Bonuses Times Three", (a song).
- The University's first wage offer.
- Minutes of negotiations.
- The Union's response to the University's offer.
- A brief on the "Requirements to Bargain in Good Faith".

APR 29 1977

BONUSES TIMES THREE
(SUNG TO THE TUNE OF "COCKTAILS FOR TWO")

TO BARGAIN NOT IN GOOD FAITH,
THEY HAVE GOT US UP A TREE,
MY LORD IT'S A DISGRACE,
ITS BONUSES TIMES THREE!

IN A SMOKEY CONFERENCE ROOM,
WITH CHUCK UPON ONE KNEE,
HE DOES NOT PROMISE US THE MOON,
ITS BONUSES TIMES THREE!

THEY TELL US WE ARE OVERPAID,
BUT ONLY AIR IS JUST FOR FREE,
THEY TELL US WE HAVE GOT IT MADE,
ITS BONUSES TIMES THREE!

A MODIFIED WEEK IS NOT FOR US,
AND SHIFT CHANGES ARE BOUND TO BE,
THEY SAY WERE MAKING TOO MUCH FUSS,
WE'VE GOT BONUSES TIMES THREE!

BY FR & BF

University Financial Proposal

April 22, 1977

Principles Only

1. A 16-month contract ending March 31, 1978.
2. No increase or change in wage scales as shown at Appendix A-5 of current contract.
3. No change to benefits in current contract except, subject to Board of Governors approval in May, possible changes in the method of paying medical and dental premiums.
4. The wage scales of grade 0 and 1 open to negotiations.
5. Wage scales for grades 11 and 12 to be discussed. **
6. Three one-time bonuses be paid: the first as of March 31, 1977; the second as of April 1, 1977; with the last payable on or before November 21, 1977, under the following conditions:
 - (a) Paid to all full-time and part-time continuing employees only.
 - (b) Not payable to employees who:
 - (i) Have ceased to be employees of the University,
 - (ii) Not payable to employees not being paid by the University, such as employees on extended leave without pay, and similar absences without pay.
 - (c) Where bonuses are paid in arrears, those who become continuing employees subsequent to November 22, 1976 and before March 31, 1977, or subsequent to April 1, 1977 and before the date of signing of the contract, shall have bonuses pro-rated based on the number of days or hours worked in the period. This shall apply to all continuing employees joining the work force in a bonus period.
 - (d) Where bonuses are paid in advance and the employee ceases to be paid by the University prior to the end of the bonus period, recovery of unearned bonuses shall be made by the University. Bonus periods, unless otherwise negotiated, shall be:
 - (i) November 22, 1976 to March 31, 1977
 - (ii) April 1, 1977 to November 20, 1977
 - (iii) November 21, 1977 to March 31, 1978
7. Except for salary grades 0, 1, 11, and 12, temporary employees wage scales through March 31, 1978, shall be as per Appendix A-5 in the current contract.

** As of April 22, Chuck Buchanan was not certain of the University's position here. (Union note)

MINUTES OF NEGOTIATIONS - April 21, (taken by the AUCE NEGOTIATING TEAM)
1977

Note: this is the part of the minutes for April 21 that deals with the administration's first final money offer. The other part of the minutes will arrive in due course.

All speaking done by Perce

All speaking done by Chuck Buchanan

We have looked at your submission on wages. We found in it restraint although the average increase asked for was 9%. I'm going to read some figures to you: the increases you got over the Nov. 1974 wages represent an average 60% increase in 2 years. They go from a 70% increase in grade 2 to an increase of 51% in grade 10. During this time, the increase in the cost of living in Vancouver increased by 19.4%. The contract gained by the union was 3 times the increase of the cost of living in Vancouver. At that time (Nov. 1974), the university paid a mid-point salary on the Vancouver wage scale, By July 22, 1976, the average salary was 7.53 per hour and the average bi-weekly salary was 523.73. The benefit cost per hour was \$2.42, for an average hourly rate for an S.F.U. employee of \$9.95. In the last year of the contract, the wage increase was 16.7%. The Vancouver cost of living increase in this period was 8.6%. These are very high figures. Were these figures to become public knowledge, there would be an outcry. On March 22, 1976, we received a directive from the Minister of Education (B.C.), we are now forced to budget ahead to cover the cost of salaries and we cannot commit money into the next fiscal year to pay salaries. We also must bring our salaries into line with the fiscal year. On April 10, 1977 we received a letter from the Treasury Board (B.C., I assume) that stated that we now have to submit to the Government Employees Relations Bureau (GERB) all information about salaries. This might indicate that this body has final approval on all our contracts. The letter also stated that all public

sector salaries must be in line with those paid in the private sector. We are not prepared to increase our wage scales. It is our position to leave them as they are now. Also its our position to try and convince the union to allow this contract to run until March 31,1978. These scalse (SFU's) are so far ahead of the wage scales we compared to (eg. B.C.I.T., I.C.B.C., B.C.G.E.U. groups). We have no choice except to freeze the wages at S.F.U. The grade 2 level at S.F.U. is 10.8% to 15% ahead of the other public service institutions in B.C. The other grades are also far ahead of the other public service wage scales:

Grade 3	is 12.4%	above the average;
Grade 4	13.9%	
Grade 5	is 11.4%	
Grade 6	16.0%	
Grade 7	14.4%	
Grade 8	15.8%	
Grade 9	11.8%	
Grade 10	14.5%	
11	14.7%	
12	10.8%	

These figures are based on the scale rate and not the base rate. We are prepared to concern ourselves with bonuses that are payable in 3 separate stages; at the end of March(1977); possibly April 1(1977); and prior to November 21(1977). These will be one-shot bonuses that are not tied to the wage scales; rates, months or hours. A flat bonus fro every single employee. People who joined the university after the termination of the last contract will be paid a pro-rated amount based on the number of days worked. The last bonus, paid in advance, would be repayable on a pro rata basis if the person left the University before the end of the contract. That's the principle of what I'm talking about. If we gain acceptance of the principle, we can talk on the amount of the bonuses. In the A.I.B/. Gidelines, increment steps are included in the increases but it has no bearing on the bonuses: people will progress along the step increments. I don't mean that people

We'll take a break and prepare our questions.

Caucus: 2:50 - 3:15 p.m.

Regarding grades 11 and 12, we would have to negotiate a rate for them.

Grades 0 and 1?

You stated that this bonus was for continuing employees, what about people on leave?

Sick Leave?

People on Leave of Absence?

When would people get their money?

What about people who are paid in advance?

Is the university making any proposals on benefits?

I'm sure that you are aware that many of the contract you cited are now expired.

How much are our Shelters ahead of

will be frozen on their step.

I want to make it clear that I'm not prepared to talk money today.

We would like to leave it for now because I don't know where their wage scale is.

That would be a separate negotiation.

If they are here when the bonus is paid.

We'll consider that. I'm not saying no or yes I gave you just the outline of the University's principles.

No, they're not getting paid.

The dates being considered are the 31st of March and the 22nd of Nov. The last date has to be before Nov. 21, 1977.

If we give a bonus, and the person immediately left the University, we would expect it to be paid back on a pro-rated basis. Anybody who has left the University will not get the bonus.

No, that's all included in the A.I.B. The only change might be with our proposal on the payment of medical and dental plans that goes to the BoG in May.

yes, but we have to go on the available contracts. However, the new contracts (of the other Unions), will only reduce the percentage and not close the gap.

those at U.B.C.?

Job descriptions were compared then?

q
When will the university be prepared to negotiate the salaries for grades 11 and 12?

When will we be discussing the dollar figures of the bonuses?

What's the name of the Employee's coordinating council?

What are the principles we have to agree on?

2

Are the percentage bonuses?

Say the bonus was \$160, if I left on Nov. 1 how much would be owing to me?

How much do I owe you, 3/4 of a month?

Was there a reason for a flat rate rather than a percentage?

So the University thinks that it is fairer for everyone to get the same

I have no idea.

Job descriptions were compared- but, I'm not sure if they were for grades 0 and 1.

I said I didn't know. It will be in these financial negotiations.

I said that we would look at that after the principles had been accepted by you.

The Government Employee Relations Bureau.

- 1) A 16.25 month contract that runs to March 31, 1978.
- 2) The steps in the present wage scales will remain.
- 3) With the exception of grades 0 and 1, the present wage scale will remain as is.
- 4) The University will upon the signing of the contract pay 3 bonuses....

Positively not. A flat amount to each employee regardless of grade and step.

You've already been paid, you owe us.

No, it's based on the number of working days each month. We would be prepared to put in something in that if the leave within X days or weeks, they would be expected to pay back X dollars. What we are trying to prevent is overt abuse of the bonuses.

We feel that all employees should get the same amount. Your scales are very high now. There are X amount of dollars involved but it is negotiable.

amount even though we asked for a percentage increase?

Could we have a Caucus?

Caucus: 3:50 - 4:00 p.m.

When will you be ready to do the salaries for Grades 0, 1, 11, and 12?

You said that we would have to negotiate these.

If the membership doesn't accept the principles, what do we do?

In what way?

Will the administration and the faculty also be under this new board?

All employees of the university?

I'm disappointed that the ^{university} is bringing up the increases in our first contract. If these figures were public knowledge, there would be an outcry according to you. These figures are public knowledge. I'm really sorry that we are being offered the same deal that we were offered last year at the Cariboo Trails Hotel.

We'll let you know. Would we be able to have a paid membership meeting on this?

Believe me, I never doubted that for a moment.

Oh come on Perce. I said that the principle was non-negotiable. There is a set amount of dollars involved but how it's distributed is negotiable.

Before we can discuss money, 11 and 12 is separate, we have to have acceptance of our principle

We have to have acceptance of our principles first.

I guess that we would be at an impasse. I think that it's an advantage to the union.

It would give a bad effect on the University.

It's directed at everybody, but what happens to the faculty, I can't say. It's a guess, please don't put it down as a university quote.

At no place in this letter does it separate out anyone. I'm of the opinion that it applies to people like myself.

I'll cry tomorrow. When will we meet next time

We'll see. Go and talk to Personnel. Perce, I want you to understand that these bonuses will be within the A.I.B. guidelines

May 11, 1977

AUCE Local Two
Response to "University Financial Proposal" of
April 22, 1977

The membership of AUCE Local Two instructed its contract committee to negotiate a 9% wage increase for all grades other than grades "0" and "1". This moderate request will not even permit us to keep up with the cost of living. In 1976, according to the Consumer Price Index, prices rose by 9.1% in Vancouver -- a faster rate of increase than in any other city in Canada. A monthly comparison of the rise in Vancouver's cost of living over the previous year with the rise in the C.P.I. for Canada as a whole follows.

		J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D
1976	Can.	9.6	9.1	9.0	8.9	8.9	7.8	6.8	6.2	6.5	6.2	5.6	5.8
	Van.	9.0	9.0	11.3	11.9	11.6	10.6	9.1	8.9	9.3	8.8	8.6	8.6
1977	Can.	6.1	6.7	7.4									
	Van.	8.7	9.1	7.2									

In 1976 B.C. consumers faced auto insurance rates upped by 100 to 400 per cent (and ^{MANY} of our members are under 25, the hardest hit group), sales tax increased by 40%, medicare premiums increased by 50%, home heating oil price increases, increased electricity rates, a 300% increase in hospital insurance charges and a 40% increase in bus fares. Numerous other items, such as S.F.U. parking fees and increased cafeteria prices add to the cost of living for AUCE members.

The rationale for the University's proposal is ostensibly that members of the A.U.C.E. bargaining unit are already over-paid. However, the University's "Request for Operating and Capital Funds, 1977/1978", submitted to the Universities' Council in August, 1976, includes the following sentence:

"Funds equal to a 4 percent increase in the 1976/1977 salary pool for A.U.C.E. have been requested to meet the cost of these step increases (referring to the increases which the contract provides every six months for the first four years in a position) as well as 7 percent across-the-board".

The Union believes that the University's submission was made in good faith, and that the University's officers sincerely believed last August that a 7% across-the-board increase was warranted for A.U.C.E. members. How can it be that now, though our wages remain unchanged, no wage increase is warranted?

In the same brief, the University suggested to the Universities Council that an across-the-board increase of 9% would be necessary to maintain the faculty's real wages in view of projected cost-of-living increases. By coincidence, this increase is exactly the amount by which the Union members also decided their wages should be increased to maintain buying power.

The increase finally allotted to the University's budget was 9.3%. Thus, if the Union's proposal for a 9% increase were met, the increase in the A.U.C.E. bargaining unit's share of the budget would still not be in proportion to the increase in the total budget. Ordinarily, one might argue that as the University expands the number of bargaining unit employees would also increase, so that part of the 9.3% increase would be paying for salaries of more employees, but in fact the number of continuing employees in our bargaining unit has actually diminished even though new courses and programmes have been mounted since the signing of the first contract.

The University indicated in the discussion of wages of April 22, 1977 that information about salaries has to be submitted to the Government Employee Relations Bureau, and that this bureau might have final approval on the contract. If this were true, the Union might well ask why it is not negotiating with this body in Victoria, if indeed the final decision is theirs. Would the University accept negotiating with Local 2 representatives if final approval of the contract came from the Provincial A.U.C.E.? We think not.

However, the Government Employee Relations Bureau assured a Contract Committee member that the bureau's function is to collect information on contract settlements of public sector employees in order to establish a central source of such information and to negotiate and administer contracts for the British Columbia Government Employees Union, the nurses' union, and the union of professional workers employed directly by the provincial government. During the same conversation, the Contract Committee member was assured that the Bureau has no veto power over contracts negotiated by any other employers in the public sector.

The University also stated that the provincial government has directed that wages paid in the public sector should not exceed wages paid in the private sector. At the risk of being labelled cynical, we suggest that this directive is not so much in the interest of the ordinary tax-payer, who would not expect government employees to subsidize the economy of the province by accepting low wages, as it is in the interest of private business. As ordinary taxpayers, we expect the government to set an example by paying a fair wage for a day's work, by providing adequate benefits, by eliminating discriminatory policies and adjusting discriminatory wage scales. We understand that this example is not always beneficial to private business because it may eventually force private business to improve its standards of employment. However, just as the Union does not want to obscure the real issue with a discussion of conflict of interest, we believe that the University does not really want to avoid wage talks by dwelling on the direction given by the Treasury Board.

The University's negotiators also mentioned that if the wages paid to A.U.C.E. Local 2 were public knowledge there would be an outcry. Of course, the figures are public knowledge because the University publishes its wages in an annual Public Bodies Financial Information Act Return. As well, the terms of the settlement were publicized in June, 1975 when the contract was signed. However, to address the spirit of the point the University was making, we ask that the University consider the reaction of the underpaid unorganized workers who have seen our contract. Rather than raising a public outcry, they have been pleased and impressed that S.F.U. is among the employers which have made progress in recognizing the worth of white-collar jobs.

The University's negotiators have pointed out that in the last year of the contract, the wage increase was 16.7%. It should be recognized that it was the University's negotiators who pressed for a two-year settlement in the first contract negotiations, and that the membership was initially much opposed to a long contract. The three 8% increases awarded in the second year of the contract were part of the University's final offer, not part of the Union's demand, since the Union was opposed to a two year contract at that time. To be blunt, it appears that the University is now chagrined that the long contract for which it pressed in the last negotiations turned out to be less than the boon it was intended to be.

However, we can surmise that the last wage settlement was not really as 'out-of-line' as we are now expected to believe. After all, the University officials who participated directly and indirectly in those negotiations have not been demoted or relieved of their duties. (Some have had promotions.) The members of the Board of Governors who approved the settlement have not been recalled or forced to resign by public pressure. It seems that in spite of the present stance of the University negotiators, the settlement was actually just and reasonable. In fact, President Jewett recalled in a speech last autumn that she herself "went through 'trauma' trying to reconcile her role as a tough, responsible fiscal manager of a university and her sense of compassion for a poorly-paid minority group".

Let us examine the reason that the present S.F.U. wages are somewhat higher in some grades than the wages of other public sector educational institutions. The wage controls instituted by the federal government during the life of the A.U.C.E. Local 2 contract had the effect of limiting the increases allowed to unionized employees at U.B.C., B.C.I.T., Douglas College, and some local school boards. However, this is not in itself a reason that A.U.C.E. Local Two should accept a wage settlement that would substantially reduce the purchasing power of its wages by the end of the second contract.

To further answer the University's statements that members of the A.U.C.E. Local bargaining unit were awarded too large a wage settlement in the first contract, the Contract Committee invites the University to reconsider the arguments presented at that time in support of our wage proposal.

Starting wage for a clerk-typist at S.F.U. in November 1974 was \$500 per month, while starting wage for a custodian was just over \$830 per month. The discrepancy between wages for the A.U.C.E. bargaining unit and the wages of S.F.U.'s other unionized employees was not limited to the clerical-secreatrial area. An entry-level electronics technician in A.U.C.E. earned \$861.05 per month in November, 1974, while an electrician in the polyparty union earned \$1,195.18 per month. Of course, this should not be construed as an implication that the workers in the polyparty unions were overpaid. Rather, it illustrates that workers who can negotiate their wages obtain a more equitable settlement than workers who must rely entirely on the good-will of management.

To support a claim that A.U.C.E. Local members have been overpaid for the last two years by merely comparing the salary scale in our first contract (November 1974-November 1976) to the Consumer Price Index for the same period, or to the wage settlements won by other sectors of workers, is to deliberately ignore the fact that SFU's first contract with its clerical, library and technical workers was a first step -- long overdue -- in bringing the standard of living of unorganized workers, for a two-year period, closer to that enjoyed for many years by organized workers.

Any claim of 'overpayment' further ignores the fact that clerical work is almost always performed by women who are usually unorganized and invariably underpaid. It should not be necessary to explain to those who protest that one cannot equate the poor pay in clerical occupations with discrimination -- that although not all clerical workers are women, clerical work has for the most part of this century been performed by women and is characterized by a sub-standard wage for the entire occupation, regardless of the sex of the particular employee now working in that occupation.

It would appear that at one time, the University was concerned with the status of women at universities. In an interview in Branching Out, September/October, 1974, S.F.U.'s President was asked if she thought married women were exploited by having to take low-paying jobs in universities because of their family responsibilities. She answered, "Indeed, partly because the women themselves haven't become organized. Both full-time and part-time academic staff are being exploited, to say nothing of the support staff. . . . Equality

in salaries already exists in some places and so does equality for similar talents, but it still has a long way to go. But I think there should be active groups on every campus who are pushing all the time for this."

By July 22, 1976, date of the last increase allowed by the first A.U.C.E. Local 2 contract, the original goal of equal pay for work of equal value was still not achieved. However, the lowest rated clerical job (Clerk I) did carry the same rate of pay as that enjoyed by the lowest rated job in the polyparty group (Custodian) as of April, 1975. During the first negotiations, Bruce Young, Personnel Director, stated that the Union's plea for equal pay for work of equal value was valid, but that we could not expect to catch up to the workers who had traditionally been unionized in only one contract. The Union accepted that argument reluctantly and signed a contract that fell short of what we believed to be a legitimate and well-supported proposal.

Related to this issue is the federal human rights bill (Bill C-25) which is expected to be proclaimed in the summer of 1977. The bill has received second reading in the House of Commons and is now being considered by a parliamentary committee. The bill contains the provision that men and women must receive equal pay for work of equal value. Legislators found that this provision was necessary to guarantee true equality because the existing laws which require only that men and women receive the same pay for the same work does not address the problem of sex-typed jobs described above. Since the University in the first contract proposed and won the right to place the sentence "The University is an Equal Opportunity Employer" on each job posting, it should surely not be opposed to this principle which has been endorsed by the United Nations for over twenty years.

Since the signing of A.U.C.E.'s first contract, the University has awarded the polyparty unions an increase which, even after the rollback imposed by the Anti-Inflation Board, amounts to 11%. A.U.C.E. has proposed an increase of only 9%, and has proposed no increase in the area of health benefits, except that hourly-paid employees not eligible for coverage should receive a flat-rate hourly compensation in lieu of coverage.

Further, Local 2 is not taking full advantage of the Anti-Inflation Board provision that increases over the guidelines can be allowed if the increases will eliminate discrepancies based on sex discrimination. Many members felt that this provision could have been used to raise the lowest clerical grades to the same wage level as that of the lowest technical grades, since the qualifications for entry level jobs in both areas are similar.

The Contract Committee asks the University's representatives to consider all these points, and to come to the next negotiating session with a just and reasonable wage offer.

COMPARABLE STARTING SALARIES

Classifications	S.F.U.	CUPE U. Vic	CUPE U. Vic	MREU Vanc. College	U.B.C.	MREU Vanc. College	CUPE U.B.C.
	July 73/74	Jan. 1 1973	Jan. 1 1974	Jan. 1 1973	July 1 1973	Jan. 1 1974	Apr. 1 1974
Cashier	425			574	469-523	644	
Secretary I	493	515	559	603	516	675	
Secretary II	535	565	613	720	533	806	
Secretary III	594	620	670	788	635	882	
Keypunch Operator I	493	407	447	488	502	558	
Keypunch Operator II	535	491	535	552		622	
Keypunch Operator III	594	565	613		567		
Payroll Clerk	493			659	669	738	
Senior Clerks	493	565	613	588-752	523-669	658-842	
Duplicating Operator I	450	407	447	488		558	
Duplicating Operator II	535	468	511	528		598	
Duplicating Operator III		540	585				
Nurse I	654	681	733				
Nurse II	708	784	839				
S.F.U. - Clerk Typist I					482		
U. Vic - Library Assistant 3	410	447	489				
U.B.C. - Library Assistant 2							
S.F.U. - Clerk 3 (5)					572		
U. Vic - Library Assistant 4	493	491	535				
U.B.C. - Library Assistant 3							
S.F.U. - Lead Hand (5)					572		
U. Vic - Library Assistant 4	493	491	535				
U.B.C. - Library Assistant 3							
Technician 1	425	540	585				721
Technician 2	493	620	670				700
Technician 3	654	681	733				893
Technician 4	708		877				1055
Technician Supervisor 5	762		918				1164