

## MINUTES

### JOINT UNION MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING

Tuesday, September 11, 2012 @ 10:00am

ADM 009 (HR Boardroom)

**Members:** George Athans, Janna Steinthorson, Martin Gibb, Rob Wotherspoon, Ken Beckett, Rudy Sager, Karen Whitehouse, Victoria Zalamea

**Regrets:** Pauline Brandes

**Recorder:** K.Zillt

**Chair:** University – George Athans

#### 1. Call to Order: 10:00am

#### 2. Approval of Agenda – approved with a combination of the following items:

- BCGEU Recruitment – discuss recent concerns (J. Steinthorson)
- Interview Process as a whole (K. Whitehouse)
- Training for Faculty members around hiring (J. Steinthorson)

**3. Recruitment/Interview Process/Training** – Karen stated it was brought to her attention that there have been some errors in the posting and interview process lately. Examples were reviewed and it was believed that they were just one-offs and not intentional on the Managers behalf.

- Another example that was given was some internal BCGEU employees felt that they were qualified for a position but weren't selected for the interview process. Janna had worked with the managers and had determined that the applicants weren't qualified. Rob mentioned that if they employee feels that they are qualified and should be interviewed; they should then file a grievance.
- Karen indicated that with an interview process that there was almost an instance of a one person interview panel, with an observer, and questioned what the University mandates, one or two people. George pointed out that it is recommended to have two, and the interview process could be put at risk having only one person if it was ever reviewed in a grievance process, we cannot dictate more and the CA is silent on this issue. The example that was given was on the verge of having only one person, but in the end had two people plus the observer. Karen was concerned that a one person interview panel could be biased.
- Janna is looking to put together a FAQ for Managers on the interview and hiring process, and outline the proper steps, and CA language, to take and ensure there are no errors. Janna (and Krista) are looking to review each department to see what they have in place around training for Faculty regarding hiring TA's and see if it can be standardized for all departments to follow. If nothing is currently in place we will create & develop. **Update progress at next meeting.**
- Janna pointed out that since January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2012 there have been 75 posting, a possible 225+ interviews and there have been less than a handful of issues, so policies have been followed for majority.

**4. Auxiliary Seniority Hours** – George discussed a change to the way seniority is accrued with Auxiliary positions and levels. This would mean giving all new auxiliaries a base appointment of Clerk II, where they would accrue seniority towards their step increases and those in the pool will be grandfathered based on current seniority. For example, if a current Clerk IV enters the auxiliary pool they will be hired for all future jobs at a Clerk IV level, unless the job is at a higher classification. If they are hired at a higher classification, they must stay in that position for a year for them to keep that higher classification. If the position is less than a year, they will step back down to a Clerk IV. The year must be consistent and not accumulative. This would only apply to anyone now coming into the Auxiliary pool and the existing employees will freeze at the level they are at and not step back. **BCGEU to review.**

**5. Posting re-classified positions and restructuring of departments** – Karen questioned the restructuring that has been happening in some departments and the amount of paperwork that is involved with the employees having to re-apply for their own positions and asked to waive the interview process. We reviewed **20.1 Right to Classify or Reclassify Positions and 20.2(a) states that ‘It is understood that if a position is to be reclassified in accordance with Clause 20.1 and posted, the incumbent holding the original position shall be given first and full consideration.’**

- If the employee puts in for the Reclassification, then it isn’t required to be posted, if the University puts in for the reclassification, then the employee must apply.
- George questioned whether there was a specific time where it has had a negative impact and Karen implied there hasn’t been, it just causes unwanted stress to the employee. George stated it would be looked at on a case by case basis and first consideration is always given to the incumbents, and positing will only occur when there is a significant change to the position.

**6. Seniority, Article 26.1(b) and 26.2(b)** – Karen wanted to review the wording in Article 26 in regards to Seniority with regular employee appointments vs. auxiliary employee appointments as it is outlined in 26.1(b) and 26.2(b), but it was decided that it was an item to be reviewed in bargaining. In practice, employees with regular appointments (within their probationary period) have been granted seniority if applying for internal positions.

**7. Shared folder for JJEC members** – Victoria has requested that there be a shared folder on the network for JJEC members to review completed job evaluations. A request has been sent to IT, to be followed up.

**8. JUMC information on HR website needs updating** – Victoria asked to have the new JUMC members updated on the website as well as post the missing meeting minutes from past JUMC meetings. This had been completed prior to the meeting.

**Meeting ended at 11:00am**

**Next Meeting: Tuesday, October 9, 2012**

**Location: HR Boardroom ADM 009**

**Time: 10:00am**