SPECIAL MEMBERSHIP MEETING
IRC 2
12:30 - 2:30
NOV. 5, 1981
Dear Mr. Grant:

The Contract Committee has considered and put before the Union membership for discussion, your letter of 16 October, which includes a proposal of wage increases for AUCE Local 1 members. We have been instructed by the Union membership to seek clarification of the meaning, intent and negotiability of that proposal.

We are unsure whether the University regards all three phases of the proposal as inseparable and non-negotiable parts of a single package. Can you enlighten us?

We note that the effective date of the proposed changes in our wage rates is 1 October, in marked contrast to the 1 April effective date of wage adjustments offered to non-union technical staff, and the 1 July effective date of wage adjustments offered to non-union administrative and professional staff. What explanation is the University able to offer for these discrepancies?

With regard to Phase II, we wonder how the University intends to perform the proposed review of job standards. Would it perform its own review and present the results to the Union for acceptance or rejection? Would it undertake to negotiate changes in job standards with the Union?

We remind you that Article 31.01 of the collective agreement contains provision for changes in job descriptions and pay grades, after sixty days notice, and with the Union's consent. This procedure does not seem to us to require a separate agreement. What is the University's view of the consequences of a failure to reach agreement by the 31 March, 1982 "deadline"?

With regard to Phase III, we are concerned that any prior agreement on revised job standards could prejudice negotiations for a new collective agreement effective from 1 April, 1982. Does the University recognize and share this concern? Is the University prepared to separate Phase I from Phases II and III, given an agreement that revised job standards would be the subject of contract negotiations after 1 January, 1982?

... continued ...
It is the Union's intention to call a special two-hour membership meeting for Thursday, 5 November, to discuss the University's proposal, and to report on the University's response to this letter. At that time the Contract Committee will make a recommendation on acceptance or rejection of the proposal. We would appreciate any information you can give us which will assist us in formulating a reasonable and informed position.

If you feel that further meetings would be helpful in clarifying the University's proposal or the Union's questions about it, please contact me.

Yours truly,

Murray Adams
Contract Committee Chairperson
AUCE Local 1
November 3, 1981

Mr. R.A. Grant  
Director  
Employee Relations Dept.  
Campus Mail

Dear Mr. Grant:

The Contract Committee has received your letter of 29th October, 1981. We repeat the question: Is the University prepared to separate Phase I from Phases II and III, given an agreement that revised job standards would be the subject of contract negotiations after 1 January, 1982?

If the Contract Committee is to make a recommendation on Phase I at our November 5th membership meeting, it is essential that we have your written response to this question by 12:00 noon tomorrow, Wednesday, November 4th, 1981.

Yours truly,

Murray Adams  
Chairperson, Contract Committee  
AUCE Local 1