MINUTES

JOINT UNION MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING

Tuesday, May 10, 2016
ADM 006A

Members: George Athans, Tena McKenzie, Rob Wotherspoon, Karen Whitehouse, Connie Neid, Martin Gibb, Cheryl Ash, Janna Fisk, Craig MacFarlane

Regrets: Pauline Brandes

Chair: George Athans

1. Call to Order: 10:04am

2. Approval of Agenda

   a) Added in Previous Business item, from April agenda, ‘Review of Contracting Out’

3. Review and Approval of the Minutes from March 8, 2016

   a) All approved.

4. Progress on Action Items/Previous Business

   a) Union review language for Winter Leave and proration for part-time appointments (R. Wotherspoon)
      i. Winter Leave days should be applied the same for part timers. If they work half day, they should get a half day leave.
         1. It’s pro-rating for half time.
         2. Should be treated same as special leave in the past.
      ii. Leave for part time appointments shouldn’t be in excess of their FTE. (G. Athans)
      iii. In the past, whatever day they took off, they got paid for. (K. Whitehouse)
      iv. Overall, part-time employees should not receive greater vacation entitlement than other members through the application winter leave entitlement. (G. Athans)
         1. It’s an issue of equity and should not be manipulated for individual benefit.
         2. Suggested the committee look at this in individual cases as they arise.
      v. It has come up as an issue. Lots of questions now from managers regarding part time employees and Christmas. (J. Fisk)
vi. With job sharing, it would be pro-rated based on FTE, as per language, so shouldn’t have to pay more for part time person. (T. McKenzie)

vii. If there is an issue, history would be helpful. (R. Wotherspoon)

viii. Don’t recall that this issue has been a concern and it’s unlikely that HR has any stats…could request info from managers (G. Athans)

ix. Rather than deal with hypothetical situation, would rather wait until an issue and then discuss the circumstances. (G. Athans)

b) Union review new Classification Titles proposal (R. Wotherspoon)- attachment

i. Reviewed proposal that was emailed to the committee on April 8, 2016, by Tena McKenzie, regarding the proposed new classification titles for the number of new positions in Facilities Management that have been reclassified in the last couple of years. (T. McKenzie)

ii. Clarified just a title change. (R. Wotherspoon)

iii. Titles like ‘support services’ won’t attract people that they are looking for in such positions. (M. Gibb)

iv. Proposed agreement on titles: SUP 9, SUP 10, and SUP 11. (R. Wotherspoon)
   1. Need to review SUP 7 title for next meeting.
      a. Need to discuss ‘assistant’ issue.
      b. Craig McFarlane to help with that.
   2. May have other titles to discuss at future JUMC meetings.

v. Clarification given that only discussing classification ‘title’ change. (J. Fisk)

c) Review of Contracting Out (K. Whitehouse)

i. Facilities representative, Guy Guttman, emailed Karen Whitehouse about four positions contracted out.
   1. All followed format of Collective Agreement.

ii. When positions to be contracted out, the process is for Guy to report to Ken Beckett. (M. Gibb)
   1. If can’t support it, then Guy is given green light to contract out.
   2. Guy emails Union rep, Karen, and explains ‘why’.

iii. Update, since last meeting, on weather station. (G. Athans)
   1. Currently, not being contracted out.
   2. Three new, full time, staff members in place. (M. Gibb)
      a. No auxiliaries.

5. **New Business**

   a) Article 5.2- New Classifications, additional request (T. McKenzie)
      i. Same as 4. b) regarding titles.
b) Joint Job Evaluation – Clarification of Processes and Procedures (J. Fisk)
   ii. A few issues from the last JJEC meeting when discussed language in CA compared to procedure manual.
       1. Managers and employees have right to appeal.
          a. University’s opinion that it should be applied consistently: managers decide what goes into job descriptions but staff can/should be consulted.
          b. Difference is that manager doesn’t have right to grieve it like the employee does when not satisfied.
   iii. Union to go back to original notes as neither LOU nor manual has language regarding rights. (R. Wotherspoon)
       1. 20.4 says “if committee agrees, then…” end of story.
   iv. The right to ‘seek clarification’ seems to be the missing piece of the process. (G. Athans)
   v. Appeal committee should hear from manager and employee. (R. Wotherspoon)
       1. For consistency purposes, all work for job description should be done jointly between manager and employee before appeal even went to the committee.
       2. Then employee should have right to know what’s being said.
       3. Important for employee to know what is expected.
       4. Important for the manger to know, too, as they have to oversee the work.
   vi. This is unusual and first interpretive dispute within the appeal process. (G. Athans)
       1. Should be due process for clarity.
       2. The University will still control job description.
       3. University has no objections to employee being privy to conversations.
   vii. The JJEC decided, as a result of this appeal, that the language in the job description wasn’t reflective of what manager intended and asking ‘where do we go next?’ (J. Fisk)
       1. Not in the authority of committee to decide or change job description.
       2. Inquired if, in this case, it is appropriate to say that the committee can change the job description.
   viii. It is incumbent on manager to change job description as that is the process. (R. Wotherspoon)
   ix. The manager has the opportunity to correct the error. (G. Athans)
       1. Then continue reclassification process.
   x. Union needs to discuss and will let University know their position. (R. Wotherspoon)
   xi. JJEC Committee meets tomorrow: Wednesday, May 11, 2016. (J. Fisk)

6. Concluded: 10:39am
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Responsible Person</th>
<th>Date to be Completed</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Union review new Classification Titles proposal- SUP 7</td>
<td>R. Wotherspoon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agreement on SUP 9, SUP 10 and SUP 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union to discuss current job description appeal and how to move forward</td>
<td>R. Wotherspoon</td>
<td>Wednesday, May 11, 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities representative to continue to contact K. Whitehouse and inform when a position is being contracted out and why.</td>
<td>G. Guttman</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Next meeting:** Tuesday, June 14, 2016  
**Location:** PPS Boardroom ADM 006A  
**Time:** 10:00 am