



Campus Negotiations Stall Trouble Says Jewett

HOW DOES IT FEEL TO BE A ZERO?

The terms of the University's bonus offer are probably well-known to all AUCE members by now. However, there are a number of conditions placed on this cash offer. The bonus will be paid "as soon after the signing of the contract as is physically possible." In addition to all temporary employees being disqualified from receiving this bonus, many permanent staff members will also not receive the full five hundred and forty dollars. Employees, who have left the University between Nov. 22/76 and the signing of this second contract, will not be eligible. People who commenced work here after Dec. 1/76 will only receive a pro-rata amount. Furthermore, money will be recovered - on a pro-rata basis - in those circumstances where the University feels that there has been an overpayment.

A cash bonus would possibly be acceptable to anyone who plans to work on campus for approximately a year. Bear in mind, though, that the consequences of accepting a bonus in lieu of an increase will undoubtedly affect anyone who will be here for more than one year.

With this in mind, Union members should, therefore, be aware of two major points regarding a bonus - points which have perhaps not fully been explored and are certainly not explicitly explained by the University:

- a) Acceptance of a bonus means a percentage loss which will probably not only never be recoverable; this loss will also continually widen with each new contract we negotiate.
- b) Since the University's pension plan payments are calculated on the basis of your highest five years' wages, this percentage loss - which results in a percentage loss of future earnings - also results in a percentage loss of pension payments.

Before you decide whether or not you would be willing to accept a bonus, serious consideration should be given to the questions of how many people would be eligible for the bonus and how much of it these people would actually receive. Also, the long-term consequences of accepting a bonus would have to be carefully weighed against the benefits of "taking the money and running." Good luck on your decision!

SUPERVISORY FACT-SHEET MANAGEMENT POLICY A(69) I

Policy A(69)I - (Physical and Mental Working Environment) -, as currently revised, outlines the requirements for a properly disruptive and unhealthy staff working environment. We must caution our supervisors that the utmost discretion is necessary to the proper maintenance of that fine line between legality and insanity. It is however, both the responsibility of and within the jurisdiction of the individual supervisors to ensure that this revised policy is enforced.

Rumours of high wage settlements are constantly with us, but we don't hear much about the wages of the lowest paid workers on campus, the Grades 0's and 1's in the AUCE bargaining unit. Work now assigned to these classifications was paid at a rate of \$4.44 per hour in June 1975, but today in August 1977, the same work carries rates of \$3.00 per hour for Grade 0's and an unchanged \$4.44 per hour for Grade 1's. Library shelvers, who were paid a starting Grade 2 rate, \$4.44 per hour in June 1975, are now paid \$3.00 per hour in August 1977. Between the first of June and mid-July of this year, there was a 50% turnover among the library shelvers. Some of the disgruntled ex-Grade 0's and 1's reported that they were told when hired that the low rate would not prevail forever, because a new contract was being negotiated that would provide a higher rate. The higher rate proposed by the University is a princely \$3.30 for Grade 0 and \$4.94 for Grade 1. Although the Union had hoped to achieve rates for these grades which would keep the percentage differential between these grades consistent with that between the higher grades, it would now settle for \$4.44 for Grade 0 and would accept \$4.94 for Grade 1, if the misclassified shelvers are placed back in Grade 2. This problem is especially aggravating because the University signed a letter of agreement in June 1975 stating that student assistants would have full retroactivity under the contract when the Labour Board found them to be in the bargaining unit. Later, the Board listened to University pleas of tight budgets and gave them permission to violate the original agreement. As one of these ex-employees put it, "I don't know whose fault it is, but I was #%%&!#". Remember too, when you look at George Suart's charts, that temporary workers in some of those institutions get money in lieu of eligibility for benefits. The Union is negotiating for all its members, not

To that end, we suggest a few basic guidelines which may assist supervisors in the construction of a viable procedure by which to execute Policy A(69)I:

1. If any requests are received by staff members, the supervisor should first verify that such request will in no way benefit that or any other employee. "Recurring pneumonia, as a result of improper heating equipment" is not a sufficient reason for replacement of said equipment, whereas "changing the heating equipment in this office would make the temperature here intolerable" is adequate ground for changing it.
2. Any symptoms of staff contentment (ie. - smiles, calm nerves, etc.) should be countered with severe discipline, on the ground of insubordination in the form of silent contempt. This justification, however, must be used with care, as an independent arbitrator may view such behavior as "silent admiration".
3. Wherever possible, the contract benefits for staff should be challenged and/or denied.

just continuing employees. With the increasing numbers of temps on campus, we have to.

MORE SALARY COMPARISONS

	Full Prof.	Assoc. Prof.	Ass't. Prof.	Group 4*
SFU	\$26,928	21,878	16,828	15,818
UVic	25,250	19,775	15,550	12,250
UBC	23,000	17,200	13,900	11,500

These rates appeared in the Canadian Association of University Teachers Bulletin, April 1977, page 9 as part of a chart entitled "Summary Data on University Teacher Salary Scale Minimums, by Province and Institution, 1976-77".

Full professors in the Alberta universities make more than full profs at SFU. The only institutions that pay higher than SFU in all grades are Laurentian University at Sudbury and Ecole Polytechnique in Montreal.

We would like to have made a chart showing comparative salaries for top administrators, but the required SFU information will not be made public until late September 1977.

Being "ahead of the market" did not deter SFU faculty from being awarded wage increases averaging 10% in 1977-1978.

* Group 4: Rank immediately below assistant professor.

"Men are paid more because of the law of supply and demand".

--Right: a good man is hard to find.
--Elizabeth Godley
SORWUC

Any resulting disagreements will then be forced to arbitration, in compliance with Policy S(12)-IV - (Erosion of Resistance).

General confusion and instability should be promoted at all times. In this process, however, extreme care must be taken only to confuse employees, not fellow supervisors and administrators.

Where any question arises involving morality or ethics, a detailed statement of specific information should be sent to one of the Personnel Sub-stations for "official" approval. In this way, charges can only be brought against an office - not an individual. Such procedure would superbly accommodate our practice of shifting blame and further serves to confuse particular issues.

In closing, we should bear in mind at all times our Golden Rule:

"Screw up your courage:
you've screwed everything else."

Happenings

AUCE NEWS MEMO TO SUPERVISORS

OUR GOALS - HOW FAR AWAY ARE THEY NOW?

In June 1975 AUCE Local 2 and SFU signed their first contract. This contract brought the wages of our entry level clerks to \$850/mo. as of Nov. 1976 and gave them parity with the wages of entry level janitors employed by SFU as of April 1, 1974.

The first contract was an attempt to give the office, clerical and technical workers of SFU parity with other unionized workers on campus whose jobs required similar qualifications and responsibilities.

Our success was only partial: the parity was a year behind. Today the entry level janitor gets \$1038/mo.; our Gr.2 clerks get \$850. We are still a long way from equal pay for work of equal value.

The Union still believes in equal pay for work of equal value. However, faced with AIB regulations, and budget cutbacks, the Union decided that it would be most fair to ask for only a 9% increase. After 10 months we have dropped to 4 1/2% from Nov. 22/76 to Nov. 22/77 and \$45 across the board Nov. 22/77 to March 31/78.

The Union has temporarily abandoned its battle for equal pay for equal work. We have lowered our wage demands. We have done our best to recognize the financial problems of the University. How far must we back down? It's your turn, Mr. Stuart.

OUR PROPOSAL FOR SETTLEMENT

The membership of AUCE Local 2 at SFU is gravely concerned over the apparent inflexibility of the University to negotiate a new contract quickly and satisfactorily.

Our 625 members have been without a contract since Nov. 22/76. After a month of mediation which began in June, the University is now wanting to reopen negotiation on nine items already signed by both parties. This combined with the impractical wage offer resulted in an adjournment of mediation the

OUR PROPOSAL FOR SETTLEMENT (Continued)

We ask the members of the University community to consider the following points:

In June 1975 AUCE Local 2 and Simon Fraser University signed a contract which provided for five salary increases over a 2-year period.

The last increase, effective July 22, 1976, provided a clerk-typist, Grade 2, with roughly the same salary as that enjoyed by a labourer in the campus trade unions on March 31, 1976. Recognition was made of the principle of equal pay for work of equal value. The trade unions have since received an 11% pay increase.

Simon Fraser University's budget for the 1977-1978 period was increased by 9.3%.

Faculty have been awarded a 6% salary increase, plus an additional 3% to be distributed as merit pay.

Administrative staff have been awarded a 6% increase, and will also receive merit increases totalling 3%.

Graduate students working as teaching assistants have been promised a 6% increase.

The Consumer Price Index for Vancouver as of June 1, 1977 showed a 3.9% increase over the December 1, 1976 CPI. British Columbia wage settlements in the first quarter of 1977 provided an average annual increase of 7.4%.

week of July 18/77.

AUCE Local 2 is asking for a 4 1/2% salary increase for Grades 2-10, the salary classifications in which most members are employed.

In June 1975 AUCE Local 2 and Simon Fraser University signed, in the presence of mediator Jock Waterston, a letter of agreement which provided for complete retroactivity of salary increases for employees whose eligibility for Union membership was in dispute before the B.C. Labour Relations Board at that date. The retroactive money was to be paid at the time when the employee in this category was found to be in the bargaining unit. This letter of agreement was not honoured by Simon Fraser University.

The Union is asking that the salaries of the higher-paid employees in this category, those in Grades 11 and 12, be placed as of November 1976 on the salary grid proposed by the University in these negotiations, and that a 4 1/2% increase be awarded to these employees for the year November 22, 1976 to November 22, 1977.

The lower-paid employees in this category were paid \$4.44 per hour until the Labour Relations Board declared them to be in the bargaining unit.

At that time the University decreased the salary for a number of the positions held by these employees to \$3.00 per hour. The rest of the group continued to receive \$4.44 per hour.

The Union is asking that wages for the first group be restored to \$4.44 per hour and that the Library shelvees be restored to their former Grade 2 classification. The Union would accept the University's offer of \$4.94 per hour for employees in the second group. The Union has arrived at this proposal for settlement of the wage section of the contract after careful consideration of the University's budget and the AIB guidelines. The 4 1/2% increase plus a further 1 1/2% increase, calculated by automatic 6-month step increments for most employees, would bring the AIB's costing of the Union's proposal to 6%.

The latest University Personnel News-memo from Bruce Young leaves supervisors in the dark on more than one topic. Dealing with the first item, however, AUCE negotiations are at a stalemate. While wages are a major issue, there are other MAJOR issues still to be resolved.

Mr. Young lists other articles still in contention: Article 35 Maternity Leave, Article 26.03 Shift, Article 19 Contract-Out, Article 15.01(b) Job Descriptions,

Article 14.01(b) Layoff, Article 4.06 (a&b), Article 15.02(a) and Article 2.01(c). The Union asked that two articles, 35 and 26.03, be reopened to "readjust the wording to fit the intent agreed upon" before these articles were initialed. When the Union pointed out the loophole in Article 26.03, the University decided that "that was just fine, thank you, we'll be happy to use that loophole". The Unemployment Insurance Commission does not like our Maternity Clause. The University is willing to discuss new wording, but only if the Union can bring wording to the table that the University approves (i.e. the University will not contribute even mental effort towards a solution, only words such as "the University will not look at anything which appears to contravene the law"). In these two articles the Union is not asking for anything that was not already agreed upon, just a clarification in wording. Mr. Young forgot to mention that the rest of the articles were also agreed to and initialed before mediation began. We were well into mediation before the University asked for these clauses to be reopened. The University clearly wishes to alter the intent of these articles. It is very obvious that the University, in offering us an increase from a \$350 bonus to a \$540 bonus, felt the necessity to take back rights they already agreed to give us. (Or was this our punishment for asking for a mediator?) It is interesting to note that one article the University asked to be reopened is the same article that has been in effect since June 1975 (Article 2.01(c)). We wonder why the University, after all this time, after agreeing to include the same article in our second contract, now wants this article changed?

BOSSES EXERCISING THEIR RIGHT TO TAKE JOB ACTION

