

## SIAST Professional Services Bargaining Unit

February 2007

### Strike Vote

We have been at the table with the employer since September 2006 and continue to face difficulties in our negotiations. We have made no progress at all at the table (save agreement on one item) and face nothing but stalling tactics and delays. We have not been able to resolve **any** outstanding issues. In fact, the employer's proposals consist of numerous take-aways. A number of the most important problems we face are outlined below.

### Joint Job Evaluation process

The employer has proposed adding another employer representative (Job Analyst) to the Joint Job Evaluation Committee. This would give the employer more voting power than the union on this committee. We find this unacceptable.

### Hiring process and employment security

The employer's proposals would strip most of the employment security language from our collective agreement. The measures are draconian to say the least and show no respect for our members, the work they do and their loyal service. If adopted, these measures would make us expendable and easily discarded, would block advancement or even bumping opportunities, and provide a direct route to the unemployment lines for many. Their proposals include:

1. The employer has proposed a change in the definition of "qualifications" which would allow them to impose unrealistic qualifications and/or prerequisites on job postings.
2. The employer wants to redefine "recent experience" to mean that an applicant must have used required skills, knowledge, etc. in two out of the last five years. This would not recognize past abilities that may not have been used in the last five years, for example, keyboarding. We believe this is an unrealistic expectation and the employer is attempting to build in an unfair barrier to screen people out.
3. The employer has proposed changes to the definition of an internal applicant which would result in probationary employees not being able to bid on competitions. In the staffing process, this change would also eliminate any preference being given to members of our own bargaining unit over members of the academic unit.

...2

1440 Broadway Avenue,  
Regina, SK S4P 1E2  
(p) 522.8571  
1.800.667.5221  
(f) 352.1969

1114-22nd Street West,  
Saskatoon, SK S7M 0S5  
(p) 652.1811  
1.800.667.9791  
(f) 664.7134

33-11th Street West,  
Prince Albert, SK S6V 3A8  
(p) 764.5201  
1.800.667.9355  
(f) 763.4763

[www.sgeu.org](http://www.sgeu.org)

4. The employer is proposing that casual employees be considered out-of-scope. They further propose that casual employees continue to be considered "casual" until such time as they pass probation in a full-time or part-time position.
5. The employer wants to eliminate the expedited process to resolve non-appointment disputes.
6. When new funding becomes available and reassignments occur as a result, the employer is proposing that these reassignments no longer need to be posted nor would they be subject to challenge by more senior qualified people.
7. The employer further proposes that if employees choose not to accept a reassignment, they will automatically be put on the re-employment list and would no longer be able to exercise bumping rights on demonstrated competence.
8. The employer contends that they can reassign employees at any time and employees will have no right to refuse a reassignment. By placing an employee who refuses a reassignment onto the re-employment list, the employer is basically saying, "take it or leave...you're unemployed."

### **Monetary offer**

Our discussions around any monetary increase have been less than satisfactory. SIAST offered our bargaining unit a 6% wage increase over 3 years. They offered the academic unit 9.5% over 3 years. Currently, the Public Service/Government Employment (PS/GE) Bargaining Unit has been offered 12% over 3 years.

In addition to a low wage offer, SIAST informed the Negotiating Committee that all monetary items will be costed to the mandate which is contradictory to what is happening at both the academic and public service tables. SIAST indicated to us that they will not necessarily table the same monetary position with us that they tabled with the academic unit and that they have no authority to table what was offered to the public service.

The Negotiating Committee emphatically says "No" to their offer. We are left to wonder if they undervalue our services that badly? Do they honestly think we would settle for 3.5% less than the academic unit and half of what government is offering the public service? Again, we say "No" and want to know what the membership thinks.

### **Extended Health Plan**

At the table, SIAST indicated that we will be required to purchase all other monetary proposals from the mandate. They have made no commitment to fund the extended health plan, which again is contrary to what government tabled with the public service.

## **Strike vote meetings**

The offers made to us certainly appear to undervalue our services and show that SIAST has little respect or regard for us as their employees. The disdainful attitude towards us at the table has led us to believe we have no alternative but to go to the membership for a strike vote.

The meetings will be held:

### **Palliser Campus**

**February 6**

**4:30 p.m.**

### **Kelsey Campus/Admin Office**

**February 8**

**4:30 p.m.**

### **Wascana Campus**

**February 12**

**4:30 p.m.**

### **Woodland Campus**

**February 13**

**4:30 p.m.**

There will be a short meeting to provide an update on negotiations and an opportunity for members to ask questions. Members of the Negotiating Committee will be on campus all day on the meeting dates.

In solidarity

SIAST Professional Services Negotiating Committee

Tracey Kurtenbach Chair

Shawna North Palliser Campus (or Duane Guy)

Joan Popadynech Kelsey Campus

Terri Hamill Wascana Campus

Debbie Lehner Woodland Campus