

EXECUTIVE MEETING (Planning)

February 6, 1990

MINUTES

PRESENT:

<b>Greg Fisher</b>	<b>President</b>
<b>Ann Hutchison</b>	<b>2nd Vice-President</b>
<b>Steve Montgomery</b>	<b>H &amp; S Chair</b>
<b>Loretta Clarke</b>	<b>Chief Shop Steward</b>
<b>Sandy Lundy</b>	<b>Recording Secretary</b>
<b>Lynn Jenkinson</b>	<b>Sergeant-at-Arms</b>
<b>Ann Chatwin</b>	<b>Sergeant-at-Arms</b>
<b>Denise Field</b>	<b>Trustee</b>
<b>Diana Ellis</b>	<b>Guest</b>
<b>Paul Tetrault</b>	<b>Business Agent</b>

The meeting was called to order at approximately 3:00.

A. EXTERNAL RELATIONS

The meeting was convened to discuss planning for the year, and was operated on a concensus basis. Under Agenda item I Relations with the University, c) problem areas in current contract language, Technological Change and Erosion of Bargaining Unit was added. Under I f) Other Topics, the following agenda items were added: Proposed student services building, Loss of Parking, Hiring Freeze, Phasing out MTS systems, and Reduction of the Work Force.

1. Relations with the University

a) General discussion of what will be happening in the University Community in the coming year.

Paul Tetrault lead off the discussion, saying the purpose of a planning meeting was to enable the union to do some planning for the coming year and begin to deal with upcoming contract negotiations in 1991. He said that President Strangway's Document "Second to None" notes upcoming technological change in the University system, and the need for staffing know-how. Technological change has the potential to cause significant reductions in our bargaining unit, and is a serious issue. Paul said the purpose of planning is to enable the Union to be aware of events and anticipate them, and not simply react.

b) Preparation for 1991 Contract Negotiations

A discussion was held to alert the Contract Committee to the need for a timetable, the need to obtain the membership's views, possibly through a questionnaire, and to point out that the employer can legally be required to come to the bargaining table four months in advance of the expiration of the contract. Hence, it would be useful if the proposals were ready in the autumn of 1990. It is rumoured that Marcell Sprecher is the new manager of Employee Relations in Personnel, replacing Maureen Simons. The plan is that a working Contract Committee under its chair, 2nd V-P Ann Hutchison, will begin meeting in March with its members notably Ann H., Alannah Anderson and Greg Fisher and a call for nominations will be given.

c) Administration of Current Contract

Arbitrations

Arbitration has been invoked on 35 grievances, and it is conceivable that 20 of these could go to arbitration. Regarding the Bargaining Unit Work grievance in the Library, the parties have jointly agreed upon Vince Ready as an arbitrator. Other possible arbitrations involve management rights restrictions, employee files, reclassifications, and disciplinary matters. These arbitrations will be handled by Paul Tetrault and Joe Denofreo, and one, in the Woodward Library, will be handled by TURB. The arbitrations cost about \$1,000 per day and Denise Field expressed the opinion that the Grievance Committee must obtain approval from the Executive Committee for expenditure of these funds. Ann Hutchison said that trust must be placed in the Grievance Committee's recommendations. Sandy Lundy pointed out that the operative word is recommendation.

Sandy expressed the opinion that the Grievance Committee must bring forward its recommendations to the Executive. No committee is autonomous, and final approval must be sought.

c) Problem Areas in Current Language

Regarding erosion of the Bargaining Unit and Technological Change, it was pointed out by Paul that as many as 50 to 75 of our positions may have been moved to the A & P level. We may make application to the Industrial Relations Council to have these returned to the Bargaining Unit. Regarding Technological Change and automating of the library, it was again pointed out that this is a matter of major importance for our union. It was felt that changes which are proposed at UBC are probably similar to those planned or taking place at other Universities, and the CUPE National Union may have knowledge of this. **Paul and Greg will talk to Joe Denofreo.**

Similarly, **Alannah will discuss this at Library Committees and the CUPE Lower Mainland Workers Committee.**

d) Joint Committee Participation

Joint Job Evaluation Committee

The opinion was expressed by Ann H. that our involvement should be minimal. Alannah Anderson thinks that bargaining for pay equity should not be approached through job evaluation, that other methods are effective. Paul feels that additional information is needed on what these other methods of negotiating pay equity are, and what the link is between these methods for arriving at pay equity. Regarding the Joint Job Evaluation Committee, Greg has also received a letter from Vice-President Gellatly, inviting our participation in an University-wide Joint Job Evaluation Committee. Gellatly's letter, or letters were not made available to the Executive, however, and no conclusion was reached on whether we should be active on the "little" committee (required under our Letter of Agreement) or the "big" committee (Gellatly's campus wide Job Evaluation Committee) or neither.

Other Joint Committees

Opinion is divided on whether to be involved, not involved or participate in joint committees based on the individual merits of each. Regarding the Employment Equity Committee, Neil Gaviger of the Federal Contractor's Program is coming to campus, and Alannah would like to remain on this committee at least to meet and question him, and will report back to the Executive. Greg Fisher reported that he had received a letter asking our Union to encourage our members to volunteer their services for 75th Anniversary Celebration activities. Opinion was divided as to the response to this. Loretta Clarke felt that if our members wish to volunteer their own time for these activities, it is not up to the Union to discourage them or say how they should use their leisure time. Denise Field thought we shouldn't be negative about so many things. This letter also has not been made available to the Executive, so Greg was asked to bring froward a response for approval of the Executive, and in the meantime will not make a public statement about this. The planning meeting will re-convene at 2:00 p.m. on February 20, and will begin discussion under 1. f) "Other Topics"

Meeting was adjourned at approximately 6:00 p.m.

Sandy Lundy  
Recording Secretary

exec/73.min

