



association of university and college employees

November 9, 1981

PRESS RELEASE

- FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE -

On October 1, 1981, the Contract Committee of AUCE (Association of University and College Employees) Local 1 met with UBC representatives to request a mid-contract wage increase. We sought recognition of the fact that increases in the cost of living had outstripped the 9.5% wage increase contained in the second year of our 1980/81-1981/82 contract, and that other unionized university employees were being offered wage increases of 15%.

On October 16th, the University responded with a three-phase proposal, which offered wage increases ranging between 1.19% and 6.01%, effective October 1st. In addition, the proposal contained provisions for revision of the existing standard job descriptions by March 31, 1982, and use of the revised job descriptions to establish wage rates in a new contract effective April 1, 1982.

The AUCE Contract Committee responded with a series of specific questions about the meaning, intent and negotiability of the university's proposal. We asked:

1. whether the phases were inseparable and non-negotiable,
2. why the effective date was October 1st, in light of April 1 and July 1 offers to non-union technical and administrative staff, respectively,
3. how the university proposed to perform the job standards review,
4. what the university's view was of the consequences of a failure to reach agreement by March 31, 1982,
5. whether the university shared our concern that a prior agreement on job standards could prejudice contract negotiations in the new year,
6. whether the university was prepared to separate the wage proposal (Phase I) from the job evaluation proposals (Phases II & III),

In letters of October 29th and November 4th, the university replied:

1. that the phases were inseparable, and that the wage proposal was non-negotiable,
2. that the effective date was October 1st (no explanation was offered in response to our direct question),
3. that the job standard review would proceed by negotiation,
4. that prior agreement on job standards would not, in the university's view, prejudice contract negotiations.

..... 2

The university did not respond at all to our question about the March 31, 1982 "deadline", nor did it appear to understand our concern about the effect of a job standard review on the longer process of contract negotiations.

On November 5th, the Contract Committee recommended that the union membership reject the university's proposal, but remain ready to negotiate both wages and job evaluation. The reasons for our recommendation were:

1. the university's answers to our questions as to the meaning and intent of the proposal are unsatisfactory or unclear,
2. the university insists that the three phases of its proposal stand as a package, thus confusing the two issues of wages and review of job standards,
3. we wish to keep open the door to further consideration and negotiation on both issues.

On November 5, 1981, the membership of AUCE Local 1 rejected the university's three-phase proposal, and instructed the Contract Committee to undertake further negotiations.

AUCE does seek a wage increase, and is prepared to negotiate on job evaluation. It is not willing to accept a proposal which appears both inadequate and unclear.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT THE AUCE LOCAL 1 UNION OFFICE, 224-2308

On behalf of the Contract Committee

Wendy Bice, Union Co-ordinator
A.U.C.E. Local I