



## Questions and answers

**Q. I am already at the maximum of my pay scale receiving the 3 per cent max plus merit. Will I continue receiving additional max plus merit increases in the future?**

NO. You will not receive any additional max plus merit increases. But, you could lose the 3 per cent you've already earned for the max merit if the employer determines your work is not satisfactory. Simply put, there is no new money for staff in this convoluted language.

**Q. I am an OAG 8 and I work on the computer four hours per day. Will the employer pay for my eye exam?**

NO. The government has delisted OHIP payments and no longer pays for eye exams so the employer wants to gut the current VDT language. The employer's proposed language for employees working on VDT's will only pay \$40.00 for each exam if you work six and one half consecutive hours per day (6 ½) on the computer and only every **two** years. Currently you are entitled to full coverage for eye exams once per year if you work on a computer.

**Q. Is the employer's offer the same as they negotiated with AMAPCEO?**

The employer's offer is actually worse than AMAPCEO's collective agreement.

AMAPCEO workers already had an entitlement to ten (10) unpaid emergency family leave days, a new classification system and some superior benefits. They gained an extra compensating day off, as well as overtime improvements for their employees who have the same hours of work arrangement as our Schedule 6 employees. In addition they received up to eight (8) weeks unpaid leave of absence for family medical leave and a two per cent per year salary increase.

AMAPCEO agreed to amendments to their termination pay language, but have a clarity note added that employees who retire under a provision of their pension plan are not voluntary resignations for the purposes of the termination pay article. Therefore AMAPCEO employees who retire will not lose any of their future termination payment entitlement.

*(Continued on page 2)*

## Q&As (cont'd)

(Continued from page 1)

### Q. Do we have a strike deadline?

NO. The membership has asked us to do things differently. We have NOT requested the No Board report at this time.

### Q. Why are we asking for the employer to pay for Factor 80? Why don't we just extend it ourselves like we have done in the past?

The **employee's** share of the pension surplus has funded Factor 80 extensions for the last two rounds. We have depleted our surplus. The employer now has a surplus of \$359 million in their rate revitalization fund that can only be used to improve the pension plan. Over the next three years, 3,800 members are eligible to retire under Factor 80. This would cost the employer only \$173 million; that's less than half of their surplus fund.

### What are the proposed amendments to Schedule 6?

We have proposed the removal of Schedule 6. Schedule 6 was in fact removed from AMAPCEO's offer. To date, the employer has refused to even respond to our proposal. While the employer agreed to compensate Schedule 6 employees in the AMPCEO unit for extra hours worked, they maintain their position that our members should work free overtime.

## From the Corrections Table:

### Q. Why is the wage offer inadequate?

For the Corrections Bargaining Unit, the employer has offered an increase of two per cent on Jan. 1st, 2005, two per cent on Jan. 1, 2006 and two per cent on Jan. 1, 2007 (six percent over three years). Increases are to be compounded.

For the same period (2005-2007) the private prison operator at the Central North Correctional Centre offered the following to Correctional Officers working there: Jan. 1, 2005 - 2.4 percent; Jan. 1, 2006 - 2.6 percent; Jan. 1st, 2007 - 2.75 percent (7.75 per cent over 3 years). This offer was rejected by OPSEU Local 369 members.

With the "2, 2 and 2" employer offer, OPS Correctional Officers would be *making nearly \$1,000 less per year* than what Correctional Officers in the private jail rejected. Similarly, the current offer would mean that Probation Officers would make \$1,140 per year *less* than they would if they were to receive the equivalent 7.75 percent CNCC rejected offer.

### Q. Do we in the public service deserve less than the private sector?

NO.

(Continued on page 3)

## Q&As (cont'd)

*(Continued from page 2)*

### **Q. Why do we want an improvement in the Probation Officers Allowance?**

There has been no change to the number of allowance days for more than 20 years. The job of a probation and parole officer is more difficult, complex, stressful and time consuming than it was in 1985. Our officers need more time out of the workplace to maintain their mental and physical health. This is a no cost item for the employer.

### **Q. Why do we want Appendix 24 rights for Youth Justice, Oakridge and Probation offices and Probation and Parole offices?**

Appendix 24 has been in place in Correctional Institutions since the last contract. It has led to approximately 500 rollovers to full time classified status for unclassified cooks, records clerks, nurses, maintenance workers and correctional officers. It's a fair system based on seniority which would, if implemented, also help to improve morale in Probation, Probation and Parole, Youth Justice and Oakridge worksites. Unclassified seniority rights would also assist in eliminating manipulation of conversions by the employer. This is a no cost item for the employer.

### **Q. Why do we want professional fees paid for by the employer?**

The overall cost to the employer is small. It's only right that when the employer requires an

employee to have a professional status as a job requirement then they should pay for it. This would also assist the employer in retaining its employees in these areas.

### **Q. Why do we want pension improvements?**

If you work at Oakridge or a Correctional/Youth Justice Institution, Probation office or a Probation and Parole office, you need only look around your workplace to see long-term employees suffering from stress and burnout. It's a job where violence and/or the threat of violence is omnipresent. Employees have little, if any, control over their jobs. There is virtually no recognition or acknowledgement of the job performed and some of the worst managers possible are often entrenched in the workplace.

We need to continue to allow our long term employees to retire at an earlier date so they can enjoy some of that retirement and opportunities for classified jobs can be made available when they leave. The employer has a surplus in its part of the OPSEU Pension Trust which could easily fund what we want.

### **Q. Why do we want liability coverage for lawsuits and criminal charges involving workplace incidents?**

Our bargaining unit members are increasingly being sued or accused of criminal acts by clients, residents, patients or inmates. The employer's policy for legal coverage is a joke. We can't do our jobs when we continuously face the prospect of not only frivolous lawsuits

*(Continued on page 4)*

## Q&As (cont'd)

and phony criminal charges being thrown at us but also having to hire lawyers, often at our own expense to defend ourselves. We deserve the same protection communication operators and secretaries in OPP detachments currently have.

### **Q. Why do we want salary continuance for employees who grieve their unjust dismissal?**

Three Correctional Officers working at Maplehurst Complex were criminally charged in July, 2003. In May 2004 they were fired. This May all charges against these officers were thrown out by the judge. The presiding judge said that it was perverse that they had been fired and without income for a year based on an accusation by a notoriously unreliable, violent inmate. These individuals will now have to begin the grievance process to get their jobs back. Two other Correctional Officers at Niagara Detention Centre also had their charges thrown out by a judge one year ago. They are still going through the grievance process to get their jobs back and have had no income for two years. The judge is right. This is perverse.

### **Q. Why do we want vacation improvements?**

Our jobs are more stressful than ever. We need the time off.

### **Q. Why do we want improvement to union leave?**

Our local union executives have greater workloads, responsibilities and more complex tasks. They can't be expected to continue to utilize more and more time outside their working hours to get the job done. This is a very low cost to the employer.

### **Q. Why do we need a "work of the bargaining unit" clause?**

We need it to protect our jobs and our job security. Currently we have an ongoing complaint at the St. Lawrence Valley/Brockville Jail facility where our work is being done by others. This language is a no cost item for the employer.

### **Q. Why do we want to move Central North Correctional Centre Correctional Officers into the OPS?**

They deserve the same level of safety and standards as OPS employees. This language is a no cost item for the employer.

The Corrections Bargaining Team unanimously recommends that members cast a strong NO vote to this degrading offer.

# Probation offices mobilized

Community Corrections offices have come out strong once again to challenge the employer to bargain respectfully. Probation offices and Parole and Probation offices across Ontario are engaging in creative job actions that are sending a strong message to the employer: There will be no peace for the next three years if we don't get a fair contract.

Probation Officers and OAG staff have embraced Black Tuesdays as well as other "colour" days and continue to display their unity at the workplace. Group coffee breaks and wellness breaks have become commonplace.

Slowing down to a healthy pace to avoid stress has helped staff cope during these tough times. Being diligent with technology, community corrections staff have used their out of office assistants to send auto replies on their email system. The auto-reply message states that they are in but "too busy" and may not be able to respond to emails quickly. This is very professional and appropriate use of the technology as it lets the employer know they may have to wait for a response, especially if they send out a mass message to many thousand recipients.

The bargaining team asked acting managers to step down, and they responded with 14 of 17 returning to their home positions. Three have become full time since May 2.

Some Eastern Region staff were directed to attend a mandatory area meeting. Their meeting ended quickly when the Area Manager was met

with a sea of black and a wall of silence. They were as co-operative as the employer is at the corrections bargaining table.

Much of the actions are symbolic measures, however, they are having a large cumulative impact. Do not underestimate the value of your efforts.

Mobilization is about taking a small chunk of time to invest in your contract. You only get an opportunity to improve your quality of life once every three years or so. Everybody doing just a little will add up to a powerful response that will give the bargaining team leverage at the table. Get on board and send the message.

## Mindless Managers

### **“Are you slowing down because of negotiations?”**

A Sudbury court manager realizes that staff members in a particular department were backlogged and he needed to find out why.

This “mindless manager” decided to stand directly behind his workers while they do their job. This tactic can make members nervous and is direct intimidation.

He was quoted as saying, “I don't know if it is because of negotiations going on, but you people are not working at full capacity. Are you slowing down because of negotiations?”

Of course not. They are moving as fast as the employer is at the bargaining table.

# The Sunshine Club – 19th edition

The Sunshine Club is the list of public service managers who earn over \$100,000 per year. Here are the names for our 19th edition.

Name	Ministry	Current Position	(Strike Year)	(Non-Strike Year)
			2002 Salary	2003 Salary
<b>David Hallett</b>	Management Board of Cabinet	Associate Deputy Minister	<b>\$192,764</b>	<b>Under 100k</b>
<b>Henrik Vogt</b>	Ministry of Labour	Manager, Niagara / St. Catharines	<b>\$128,123</b>	<b>Under 100k</b>
<b>Daniel Lafranier</b>	Ministry of Children and Youth Services	Regional Director	<b>\$114,363</b>	<b>\$ 111,379</b>
<b>Terence O'Neill</b>	Ministry of Environment	Program Manager, IEB	<b>\$114,271</b>	<b>Under 100k</b>
<b>Jim Arcangeletti</b>	Ministry of Community and Social Services	Community Support Manager, Sault Ste. Marie	<b>\$101,314</b>	<b>Under 100k</b>

## *In Corrections:*

Name	Current Position	(Strike Year)	(Non-Strike Year)
		2002 Salary	2003 Salary
<b>Daniel Lefebvre</b>	Operational Manager, Ottawa-Carleton Detention Centre	<b>\$159,945</b>	<b>Under 100k</b>
<b>Michael Richard</b>	Operational Manager, Metropolitan Toronto West Correctional Centre	<b>\$158,959</b>	<b>Under 100k</b>
<b>Zolton Polya</b>	Deputy Superintendent – Operations, Central East Correctional Centre	<b>\$153,413</b>	<b>Under 100k</b>
<b>Christine Eden</b>	Operational Manager, Maplehurst Correctional Centre	<b>\$135,616</b>	<b>Under 100k</b>
<b>Allan White</b>	Operational Manager, Elgin-Middlesex Detention Centre	<b>\$134,118</b>	<b>Under 100k</b>

# ***Your OPSEU OPS bargaining teams***

## ***Central/Unified Team:***

**Marg Simmons (Chair)**, Central Enforcement and Renewal Committee

**Linda Thibert**, OPSEU Region 1

**Doug Peebles**, Region 2

**Kathleen Demareski**, Region 3

**Rhéal Delaquis**, Region 4

**Paul Myers**, Region 5

**Eric Morin (Vice-Chair)**, Region 6

**John Watson**, Region 7

**Bob Houston**, Administrative category

**Brian Chauvin**, Corrections

**Carl Thibodeau**, Institutional & Health Care

**Sandra Noad**, Office Administration

**Beth Anich**, Office Administration

**Ken Fraser**, Technical/Operational & Maintenance

**Moira Cowan**, Unclassified members

**centralubu@bellnet.ca**

**unclassified@bellnet.ca**

## ***Corrections Team:***

**Jack Hopkins**, OPSEU Region 1

**Barry Scanlon (Chair)**, Region 2

**Glenna Caldwell**, Region 3

**Robert Curran (Vice-Chair)**, Region 4

**Dave Graves**, Region 5

**Joe Wright**, Region 6

**Len Mason**, Region 7

**corrections@bellnet.ca**

*The Source* is your only accurate source of Central and Corrections Bargaining Team information. Do not rely on gossip and rumours. We will provide the facts. Your editors are Len Mason, Beth Anich and Moira Cowan. *The Source* is authorized for distribution by Barry Scanlon, chair, Corrections Team, Marg Simmons, chair, Central Bargaining Team and Leah Casselman, President.