

TSSU REPORT: Joint Committee process 2012- 2014**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This is the report of the TSSU members of the Joint Committee, prepared following completion of the process, prior to commencement of the next round of bargaining between the Teaching Support Staff Union and Simon Fraser University.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The TSSU Joint Committee members recommend:

Child Care Bursary

that Article XXVIII be amended to mirror the Emily Campbell Bursary system, so that both students and non-students are eligible, and that the criteria for receiving the award are to be determined jointly by the TSSU and the Employer.

Union Facilities

that Article VI be amended to reflect SFU's expansion to several campuses, and possible further expansion in the future to other campuses, in terms of bulletin boards, mail access, and access to shared office space with other Employee groups on campuses beyond Burnaby. Further, that the parties sign an MOU facilitating TSSU's ability to ask for its office space needs to be addressed in the Space Planning Process at SFU.

ELC/ITP Continuing Status

that L Article III.A.2 be amended such that temporary positions shall exist only to replace Continuing Instructors who are temporarily absent.

Tutor Markers

- 1. that the TSSU, as the only representative organization for those delivering CODE courses, be invited to participate fully in any review of the operation of CODE and the delivery of distance courses;*
- 2. that Tutor/Markers be given the right to know immediately the name of the their contact person at CODE;*
- 3. that the parties address, as a priority, the hours of work formula, the supervision language, and the CODE course development issues, in the next round of bargaining.*

Sessional Instructors

- 1. that SFU make a commitment to working with Faculty and the TSSU to establish a reasonable method for ensuring that teaching evaluations for Sessionals are completed.*

2. that the parties give top priority in the upcoming round of bargaining to addressing the issue of earned security for successful Sessional Instructors, as well as their workload issues.

TA Priority

- 1. that SFU commit to reviewing the TA/TM hiring practices of its academic departments to ensure that the agreed priority system is being fully implemented;*
- 2. that SFU agree to provide the TSSU with a list of applicants for every TA/TM position in each of the semesters between now and the ratification of a new collective agreement. TSSU will then use this information to facilitate the full application of the new priority system;*
- 3. that the parties commit to addressing issues of Graduate student access to TA and TM employment as a priority in the next round of bargaining.*

Joint Committee Process

that the TSSU Bargaining Committee not replicate the Joint Committee process in subsequent bargaining settlements in the foreseeable future. The Union's members of the Joint Committee recommend that this be reviewed in the event the Union concludes that there has been a substantive change in approach to Labour Relations at SFU.

The context for these recommendations is provided by the full report. Nothing in this process prejudices the issues or approaches of the Union in the upcoming round of bargaining.

TSSU report DRAFT 2

Joint Committee process 2012 – 2014.

INTRODUCTION

This is the report of the TSSU members of the Joint Committee, prepared following completion of the process, prior to commencement of the next round of bargaining between the Teaching Support Staff Union and Simon Fraser University.

The TSSU Joint Committee was formed in order to carry out the agreement between the parties in a Memorandum of Agreement, dated November 20, 2012, as part of the settlement process for the 2010 – 2014 round of bargaining.

The MOU sets out that the parties will establish a joint working committee, with at least three members each, with further specification that at least one of the SFU members of the committee had to be a faculty member with recent teaching experience. The MOU states:

“This committee will meet at least once per month until the commencement of the next round of bargaining. The purpose of the Committee will be to continue the discussion of the issues that were raised by the parties during the negotiations, but were left unresolved. This Committee will produce a joint report prior to the next round of bargaining. The parties also agree solutions that address items and issues raised in this Committee may be implemented by mutual agreement prior to the next round of bargaining.”

TSSU's committee membership consisted of Karen Dean (spokesperson for the TSSU), Colin Tether, Scott Yano, David Newman, Mary Breadner, Mohammed Sheriffdeen, Haida Arsenault-Antolick, Sarah Topps and Orion Kidder. SFU's members of the Committee were Chris Hatty (spokesperson for the Employer), Yvonne Tabin, Colleen Wood, Tony Williams, Barb Sherman and Tom Perry.

The Joint Committee met on eight occasions, commencing on April 8th and concluding on December 13, 2013.

The MOU established a broad ranging mandate for the Committee in relation to the issues to be reviewed, listing nine specific items, while noting that the discussions were not to be limited to those issues.

Although the TSSU proposed on more than one occasion ways the Committee could fulfill its mandate to “produce a joint report,” the SFU members of the committee did not agree, or offer any alternative suggestions. Consequently,

there are two reports: the first below is SFU's, contained in a letter dated Feb. 7, 2014, and replicated here in its entirety:

TSSU Committee; The University's Committee makes the following recommendations to the Bargaining Committee for the next round of negotiations: 1. Clarify the roles and responsibilities of the Tutor Marker, the Course Supervisor and CODE with the intent of addressing any lack of clarity that may be identified. 2. Review the current and newly negotiated language regarding departmental priority as it pertains to merit based scholarships and fellowships. Regards, (etc.).

The following constitutes TSSU's report on the Joint Committee process, and recommendations to the next round of bargaining.

THE ISSUES:

1. Child Care Bursary

The TSSU Joint Committee members recommend:

That Article XXVIII be amended to mirror the Emily Campbell Bursary system, such that both students and non-students are eligible, and that the criteria for receiving the award are to be determined jointly by the TSSU and the Employer.

The TSSU sought to change the Child Care Bursary into a jointly administered Fund, because it concluded, based on information provided by SFU, that this was the only mechanism by which the funds could be properly distributed to TSSU members, who are parents, students and non-students.

SFU recognized no problems with this Bursary, because more funds than available had been used in the previous three semesters. TSSU asserted that problems remain because its non-student members cannot access the fund, and the money was being distributed to only a few people. TSSU believes that individuals are discouraged from applying for the fund by the onerous application requirements and because Bursary eligibility rules do not fit the situations of the graduate and other TSSU members.

SFU stated legal requirements prevented a bursary for which non-students were eligible; however, TSSU research unearthed a bursary, administered by the Financial Awards office, which is open to non-student employees, and which has a simpler application process and criteria: the Emily Campbell Childcare Bursary. In discussion, SFU revealed that the monies dispersed from the Emily Campbell Childcare Bursary are reported by SFU to Revenue Canada as employment related income for non-student recipients, and as Bursary monies for student recipients.

SFU took the position that it is solely the prerogative of the Financial Awards office to determine if they are willing to administer particular bursaries. The Committee was told that Financial Awards does not wish to administer the Emily Campbell Bursary, and is not likely to wish to administer a TSSU Bursary that does not fit its “norm.” SFU continued to assert, throughout the four meetings in which this was placed on the agenda by the Union, that there was not a problem with the TSSU Childcare Bursary.

The SFU response on the Child Care Bursary issues during the Joint Committee process took the same form as it had taken in collective bargaining.

TSSU expressed optimism that the discussions of the joint committee had illuminated a practical solution to problems that not only needed to be fixed, but which addressed the Union’s key concerns.

2. Facilities

The TSSU Joint Committee members recommend:

“That Article VI be amended to reflect SFU’s expansion to several campuses, and possible further expansion in the future to other campuses, in terms of bulletin boards, mail access, and access to shared office space with other Employee groups on campuses beyond Burnaby. Further, that the parties sign an MOU facilitating TSSU’s ability to ask for its office space needs to be addressed in the Space Planning Process at SFU.”

The TSSU sought to ensure that its physical presence continued to be functional for serving its membership and its role as a representative organization at SFU. Language was presented and introduced to reflect changes to make this physical presence possible at all campuses of Simon Fraser University, to secure sufficient functional office space when possible, and to provide bulletin board space where its members were located.

By the conclusion of bargaining in 2012, the TSSU had fully canvassed its space problems— four people work in two small AQ offices, and little private operation space is available at other campuses— and reiterated that the language of the agreement did not properly reflect the existence of other campuses (Article VI only references Harbour Centre).

In the Joint Committee discussions, the TSSU presented proposals, which ensured that the language of the Agreement could reflect operation at all of SFU’s campuses, and would ensure that the TSSU had the necessary office space to function in 2013 and beyond. In discussion SFU proposed that it could facilitate addressing TSSU’s space needs with the regular processes SFU employs to allocate space.

SFU noted that TSSU had been given space to operate every Tuesday at Harbour Centre, and posited that similar arrangements might be possible at Surrey. SFU stated that TSSU should make efforts in that regard. TSSU expressed appreciation for the efforts of both the VP Academic and the Registrar's office at Harbour Centre to allow it to use their space once a week. TSSU added that this was helpful but did not address the need in the longer term, because the space was only useable "in the moment," and could not be properly occupied by the Union(s). TSSU made it clear that space shared with other employee groups would be more than sufficient to meet the needs at campuses other than Burnaby.

SFU explained their space planning process, but would not agree that TSSU could present its space issues through that process, but suggested it should make efforts through individual departments. TSSU advised not only that it was aware that many departments had space issues, but also that it simply sought the right to put its problems in the "queue" along with others.

TSSU further advised that the bulletin board and mail access problem was in relation to other campuses, and needed to be addressed to acknowledge that SFU was operating full campuses at other locations. SFU advised that it would not consider altering the language of the Agreement to reflect the new locations at which it operates, or access to facilities at those new locations.

The SFU response to the Facilities issues during the Joint Committee process was unchanged from that taken in collective bargaining.

3. ELC/ITP Definition of Continuing

The TSSU Joint Committee members recommend:

"That L Article III.A.2 be amended such that temporary positions shall exist only to replace Continuing Instructors who are temporarily absent."

TSSU sought to achieve some sense of continuity and commitment in regard to these important programs. TSSU pointed out that the recent Task Force on English as an Additional Language Instruction at SFU had concluded the importance to SFU of continuing to offer a diversity of pedagogies in the delivery of instruction. The ELC program was significant in that review, and the Interpretation and Translation Program adds equal depth and diversity to SFU's offerings. Both of these programs require stability to continue to contribute to SFU.

TSSU stated that the language applicable to the ELC/ITP programs (L Article III) had lead to a "casualization" of this work, such that, at the commencement of

2010 bargaining, the ITP was being run entirely on “temporary” positions. As tenure is key to the integrity of the academy, so is continuing status key to the successful implementation of effective language pedagogy. TSSU further pointed to the history of its CLI instructors, who had previously had full seniority rights and benefits.

SFU advised that the difference between the CLI and the ELC/ITP programs was that ELC/ITP courses are non-credit, making them more enrolment and revenue dependent. SFU further advised that, in their view, it was not possible for the program to convert teachers to continuing status, because it would affect its ability to lay-off in the event of failing enrolment. SFU finally asserted that these programs operate on a cost recovery basis.

TSSU pointed out that employment status made no difference in lay-off situations.. TSSU also advised that it had recently learned that those employees who had been made continuing by agreement at the bargaining table were being denied access to benefits, despite the change in status. TSSU finally advised that the cost recovery nature of the program had not inhibited a significant growth in management personnel, despite falling enrollment.

SFU concluded the discussion with the advice that nothing had changed as a result of the ELC/ITP MOA at the bargaining table. Those who were made continuing by the MOA, were subsequently brought back to work as temporary instructors, as this is the way the program has always operated. TSSU strongly disagreed.

The SFU response on amending L Article III.2 during the Joint Committee process was unchanged from that it made in collective bargaining.

4. Tutor Markers – Distance Education

The TSSU Joint Committee members recommend:

4. *that the TSSU, as the only representative organization for those delivering CODE courses, be invited to participate fully in any review of the operation of CODE and the delivery of distance courses;*
5. *that Tutor/Markers be given the right to know immediately the name of their contact person at CODE;*
6. *that the parties address, as a priority, the hours of work formula, the supervision language, and the CODE course development issues, in the next round of bargaining.*

TSSU sought to address the language of Article XV, which had remained significantly the same, since the first collective agreement between the parties. The language was crafted during a time when distance courses were provided as

binders with Cassette tapes and in which students contacted instructors via mail and telephone. TSSU advised that most of its current workload problems were related to CODE courses.

TSSU provided a full canvass of issues for those delivering distance education at SFU. Specifically, the formula for determining hours of work is antiquated and does not account for new delivery systems, or increased communications. The Union identified the systemic failure, in the provision of course supervision for Distance education, to provide Course Supervisors sufficient time to embrace the role fully; Tutor Markers unable to get a response were left to fend for themselves. The language reflects a level of supervision that is the exception, not the rule. TSSU raised concerns about the dearth of training and technical support in relation to the introduction of a new platform, and about the need for a more systematic approach to Course development, so courses offered were of the highest possible quality and relevance. Finally, CODE does not properly account for the significant variation in work required for courses such as “W” courses, in which the mode of instruction significantly increases the necessary delivery time. Individuals may acquire additional base units, but this necessity reflects a problem in the system.

TSSU reviewed the specific language of the Article in relation to current practices and delivery models.

SFU provided TSSU with new information, when it advised that a review was going to be conducted in relation to CODE.

As of the final meeting, the parties had not yet agreed on a way to address the issues TSSU raised.

5. Sessional Instructors

The TSSU Joint Committee members recommend:

- “1. that SFU make a commitment to working with Faculty and the TSSU to establish a reasonable method for ensuring that teaching evaluations for Sessionals are completed.*
- 2. that the parties give top priority in the upcoming round of bargaining to addressing the issue of earned security for successful Sessional Instructors, as well as their workload issues.”*

TSSU sought to address the situation at SFU where quality teachers cannot achieve any sense of security despite successful teaching, though TSSU members fulfil 25% of the teaching responsibilities at SFU. TSSU further noted that many respected Canadian Universities, including Brock, Toronto, McGill, York and even BC, allow successful teachers to earn some semblance of

security. The Union asserted that valuing teaching had to, at some point, involve valuing good teachers.

The Union also outlined the lack of any control over workload without class size limits or triggers for assigning TA support. Faculty have a seat at the table in allocating resources and ensuring some semblance of equality in teaching loads, but Sessionals are excluded from that process. The Union also advised Sessionals were not being evaluated, despite language in the Collective Agreement which made it mandatory to each appointment. TSSU ascribed the lack of evaluation in large part to Faculty workload issues.

SFU did not engage with discussion of the issues of earned security. Some members of its committee discussed the problem of employment evaluations.

TSSU asked for data as to the number of Sessional appointments being awarded to graduates, but there was no agreement to provide that information.

SFU did not respond to proposals to amend Article XIV during the Joint Committee process.

6. Teaching Assistants

The TSSU Joint Committee members recommend:

4. *that SFU commit to reviewing the TA/TM hiring practices of its academic departments to ensure that the agreed priority system is being fully implemented;*
5. *that SFU agree to provide the TSSU with a list of applicants for every TA/TM position in each of the semesters between now and the ratification of a new collective agreement. TSSU will then use this information to facilitate the full application of the new priority system;*
6. *that the parties commit to addressing issues of Graduate student access to TA and TM employment as a priority in the next round of bargaining.*

TSSU sought to address a “nexus of interest” between it and the broader University community regarding access of Graduate students to TA/TM work, in relation to the TA priority system, and the centralized posting system. TSSU recognized that support for Graduates was key to attracting the right Graduate students to SFU, and that in turn the quality of the graduate program was a large determinant of the success of the institution in general. TSSU felt, therefore, that significant common ground should exist on the issue of assuring that the system of awarding TA/TM positions supports this goal.

TSSU posited that the lack of one central posting and “awarding” date created problems, particularly if a university wished to ensure the orderly support of its Graduate population. TSSU advised that many other institutions had used a

single application date successfully to ensure the efficient and effective support of their graduates.

Next, TSSU discussed the practice of some departments limiting the number of positions one could apply for, or, alternatively, requiring each TA to apply to each professor for each course. In some cases, these individual application processes also involve interviews and a full application process. TSSU expressed concern that many departments were requiring the “permission” of a Graduate thesis supervisor, prior to consideration of an application to work as a TA or TM, and that there had been no shift away from External or Undergrad appointments.

TSSU expressed concern that many departments were exercising control over the on-campus work that a Graduate could access, either with denial of positions, or a refusal to allow access to more than one position, and were asking to be told in the application process for a TAship if Graduates had applied for monies, or were working off campus. There also was concern about the new language around “merit based scholarships” being a tie- breaker in the awarding of positions. Some departments had been splitting Fellowships, such that they did not provide enough monies to warrant a denial of a TAship, but were resulting in such denial.

During the discussion of the latter, the entire Committee reached agreement that this ought to be addressed, and how. There was agreement that it was not the intention of the parties to deny access to work on the basis of the awarding of merit based scholarships whose value did not replicate that of an average TAship. The TSSU offered to draft a Memorandum to address this issue immediately. This was done right away, but SFU advised, following the receipt of the draft, that it no longer agreed to make this alteration, as provided by the Joint Committee MOA, prior to the next round of bargaining.

The question of exercising control over on-campus work, because off-campus work by domestic Graduates is not within the purview of the institution, raises concerns as to difficult outcomes for International graduate students unable to work off campus because of visa restrictions.

Following the withdrawal of agreement on the MOA, the Employer response on addressing issues arising in Article XIII and XV, in relation to access to work and posting provisions, during the Joint Committee process was the same as it had been in collective bargaining.

7. The Joint Committee Process

The Memorandum of Agreement establishing this joint working committee set out its purpose to “continue the discussion on the issues that were raised by the parties during the negotiations, but were left unresolved.” This was not simply a chance to exchange ideas freely, or an opportunity to share concerns, but explicitly an extension of the bargaining process, the product of which is a Collective Agreement. In that regard, it is a familiar forum for the University, because the Senate and Faculty Association are continually engaged in policy and procedure negotiation.

This Memorandum was signed during the final days of bargaining, following three mediation efforts and significant strike action by the TSSU withholding grades and staffing picket lines. The agreement followed the express frustration of the Union with largely unfruitful bargaining over a thirty month period, and the Union approached the joint committee process hopeful that substantive bargaining could take place, and that the parties could find ways to address outstanding issues productively ahead of bargaining.

Both parties understood this was an extension of bargaining, and the Employer insisted that all discussions were “with prejudice”(as they are at the bargaining table), and therefore able to be relied upon and quoted as positions of either party. For its part, TSSU prepared to participate with amendments to the Collective Agreement. Draft language proposals were prepared, with an expectation that counter proposals would be forthcoming, such that some progress would be achieved at the end of the day in grappling with the unresolved issues left from the 2010 -2014 bargaining table. This proved not to be the case.

The TSSU sought to apply the terms of the Memorandum of Agreement with frequent meetings to ensure that the Committee could fulfill the mandate set out in the MOA, and substantive discussions and outcomes on language issues we were to address, but were not successful in either of these efforts. Proposals as to how a joint report could be produced led nowhere. TSSU believes that, beyond the specifics of how this process was applied, there are systemic problems with such processes, under the current situation.

TSSU provided an agenda to each and every session of the committee. SFU did not provide a single item for discussion. TSSU did enquire as to the Employer’s desired agenda items, but none was provided.

From the beginning of the process, and throughout, we sought to increase the frequency of meetings. The Employer advised the MOU provided for one meeting per month, and that they were satisfied that that was sufficient. TSSU distributed copies of the MOU on the Joint Committee, clarifying that it specified meetings

were to be held “*at least* once per month.” TSSU was unable to address all of the issues remaining from the last round of bargaining.

Early in the process, the Employer’s committee expressed concern that the Joint Committee was not there to discuss specific language changes. TSSU again referred to the Memorandum, and noted the entire purpose of the process was to address any possible language changes. Later in the process, some Employer committee members did clarify that they did not intend to preclude consideration of language proposals, although at no point was a counter proposal made.

There was agreement reached on one item in relation to merit based scholarships (see TA section and Appendices). However, agreement to sign an MOA was subsequently withdrawn by SFU, and consequently, not one agreement was reached through this process.

TSSU raised the need to produce a joint report as contemplated in the MOA. TSSU proposed that outside of any agreed changes to the collective agreement, and in relation to those issues for which no resolution was achieved, we could produce Summary sheets setting out the discussion and the positions of the parties. TSSU produced two sheets (appended: Child Care Bursary and Facilities). The positions recorded therein as the Employer’s were derived from the Union’s notes. TSSU wished to ensure that the committee process resulted in clear understanding of each party’s position, and that the Employer could amend any language in relation to their position. SFU would not agree to this suggestion, nor would they propose any different approach. Consequently, there is no jointly produced Joint Committee report, nor any other “product” of the process.

The discussion of the Joint Committee process at the bargaining table suggested that we could explore a system of ongoing negotiation to parallel the ongoing policy development in which the Faculty and the Employer are involved. Unfortunately, there is no easy way to replicate that system, because it involves a far more collegial relationship based on a system of peer participation at all levels. Faculty members have voting seats in Senate, where many of these policies are derived. As a result, jointly agreed to policies and procedures are produced.

The TSSU, though, has no capacity to bring a reluctant Employer to agreement in such a process, and therein lies the systemic problem in seeking to replicate an ongoing bargaining process, particularly in the event that one or another of the parties does not wish to reach agreement.

The TSSU therefore recommends:

that the TSSU Bargaining Committee not replicate the Joint Committee process in subsequent bargaining settlements in the foreseeable future. The Union’s members of the Joint Committee recommend that this be reviewed in the event

the Union concludes that there has been a substantive change in approach to Labour Relations at SFU.

Conclusion

This Joint Committee process was intended as an extension of the last round of bargaining. In that regard it is not determinative of the positions of either party in relation to the upcoming round of bargaining. Our experience in this process has shown that there must be significant improvements in the approach to bargaining in 2014. It is not possible to engage properly unless both parties respect the issues and concerns brought to the table, and make a sincere effort to engage in enshrining solutions in the Collective Agreement. To do less fails both the bargaining process, and the needs of the University community as a whole.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

The TSSU Joint Committee members.

Appendices.

APPENDIX I

Memorandum of Agreement

Between:

The Teaching Support Staff Union

("the Union")

Simon Fraser University

("the University")

RE: Article XIII F 3.b

Effective immediately, the above referenced Parties agree to amend Article XIII F 3.b as follows:

"b. Departments must establish a detailed priority system for use in any selection between applicants within a priority group as outlined in Article XIII F. The detailed department priority system will include a statement that if an assignment within a priority group requires a selection between applicants, the graduate student without financial support equaling at least the monetary value of a four (4) base unit assignment from merit based scholarships or merit based fellowships during the semester of appointment will have priority for the appointment. Departments must post the detailed priority system by the end of the eighth (8th) week of the semester prior to its implementation and keep it posted in a prominent location. The Department shall forward to the Union office a copy of any such system at the time it is first posted and each time it is amended. Any exceptions to this procedure shall be by mutual consent of the parties."

Agreed this _____ day of December, 2013.

For the Union

For the University

APPENDIX II

The following is TSSU's summary of the discussions to date of the Child Care Bursary issue. (Issued July 8, 2013)

The Issue:

TSSU sought to change the Child Care Bursary into a jointly administered Fund, as it concluded, based on information provided by SFU, that this was the only mechanism by which the funds could be properly distributed to TSSU members who are parents, students and non-students alike.

The Discussion:

1. SFU asserted that there were no problems with the Bursary, as more than the available funds had been expended in the last three semesters.
2. TSSU asserted that the problems remain, both because its non-student members cannot access the fund, and because the money was being distributed to only a few people. TSSU believes that individuals are discouraged from applying for the fund both due to the onerous application requirements and because Bursary eligibility rules are not a good fit to the graduate and other TSSU member population.
3. SFU asserted that it was not legal to have a bursary for which non-students were eligible.
4. TSSU research unearthed a bursary, administered by the Financial Awards office, which is open to non-student employees, and which has a simpler application process and criteria: the Emily Campbell Childcare Bursary.
5. SFU agreed that the monies from the Emily Campbell Childcare bursary are reported by SFU to Revenue Canada as employment related income for non-student recipients, and as Bursary monies for student recipients.
6. SFU asserted that it is the prerogative of the Financial Awards office to determine if they are willing to administer particular Bursaries. SFU advised that Financial Awards does not want to administer the Emily Campbell Bursary, and is not likely to wish to administer a TSSU Bursary that does not fit its "norm". SFU continues to assert that there is not a problem with the TSSU Childcare Bursary.
7. TSSU asserted that the problems need to be fixed, and that the discussion in the Joint Committee had illuminated that the very solution TSSU proposed was in fact possible. TSSU was very concerned as to an assertion that a department or division at SFU has the power to refuse to administer.

APPENDIX III

The following is TSSU's summary of the discussions to date of Union Facilities issues.

The Issue:

→TSSU wishes to ensure its physical presence at SFU continued to be functional in order to serve its membership and its role as a representative organization in a modern workplace. Language was presented and introduced to reflect changes such that this is possible at all campuses that SFU operates, sufficient office space to function is secured when possible and bulletin board space is provided.

The Discussion:

→SFU asserted that TSSU had been given space to operate from every Tuesday at Harbour Centre, and that similar arrangements might be possible at Surrey. SFU thought TSSU should pursue that through Surrey campus authorities;

→TSSU expressed appreciation for the efforts of both the VP Academic and the Registrar office at Harbour Centre to allow it to use their space, but the space was not particularly useful, as we could not leave things there. In addition, it was very inaccessible;

→SFU asserted that there are serious space issues throughout the campus and that there was no available solution. SFU did advise that there was a space planning process, but also advised that TSSU should approach department's to attempt to solve its space problems through those departments;

→TSSU asserted that it had sought, in bargaining, to simply be part of the space planning process, and have support from SFU to have its space needs placed in the "que" along with others seeking additional room. The Union has a contractual relationship that it is asking SFU to respect in addressing its needs, while understanding that the space needs of others are important;

→TSSU advised that the bulletin board issue was in relation to other campuses and outside of the current obligation to provide one next to Department General offices. In addition, TSSU seeks reasonable access to receiving mail for its members working at other campuses;

→SFU asserted that mail and bulletin boards and space are all matters TSSU ought to pursue with individual departments. SFU will not consider altering the language of the Agreement to reflect the new locations at which SFU operates, or access to facilities at those new locations;