

EXCAL: Security presently runs on a "Timken" schedule, involving five days straight of eight hour shifts, then 56 hours off. Many officers, however, have proposed working a 12 hour shift instead. Was this proposal considered?

SANTARELLI: On September 12, 1985, I wrote to the officers "I am surprised to learn that most officers are not happy with the (eight hour rotating) schedule . . . yet I am willing to consider any proposal that represents the wishes of the officers . . ."

[A 12 hour shift was later proposed] But the supervisors didn't want a 12 hour shift; some officers are not happy with the 12 hours shift; and anyway, I didn't want it from previous experience . . . I opposed it because it's a bad shift.

In the ensuing time we went through one shift after another. I went to the TTC, I went to Peel, I went to Metro, I went to Bell telephone—now this isn't my job—and I said to the Union, "Look, I'll send you down to London, Ontario, go down to the University of Toronto, go elsewhere, visit other universities and see their shift schedule. I'll pay your expenses."

But we never got an indication that anyone wanted to go. So it's unfair to say that management wouldn't do this or that. Really, the officers should be the ones who determine the shift, because if it's something I've forced on them, I know it's a constant thorn in their side. But I never got a favourable response from them at all . . . [Santarelli later agreed to a 12 hours shift, but Security asked for eight conditions to be met with it, and Personnel turned down six of them]. This week a non-Union security officer came and said that Claude Williams, the Chief Steward, had authorized him to discuss the 12 hour schedule with me, and I said, "Hey, I can't negotiate with a security officer; it's got to be the Union, because that's the rule . . ." I'm still happy to implement it if we could iron out some things here; at least discuss them. I will accept (their) piece of paper, but I can't action it until the Union presents it as a proposal . . . But you know why they haven't come back to talk with me? Because they still can't get to an agreement. Some of the officers don't want it. Some are settling into the Timken schedule.

EXCAL: But isn't there still frustration about the Timken schedule, not getting weekends off?

SANTARELLI: I'll be perfectly honest with you. I said to Mrs. Warren (director of security services), "I'm going to bring this thing to a head. Okay? Because we've let it drag on and on and on." So I did. And it's a good schedule, except that I realize, I like my weekends, and they must too . . . But we've got to iron out some of these nitty gritty things that are tied up on an eight day shift schedule around which this contract is written. So let's get back to the contract and they'll (the officers) be much better off. If the majority of officers want it (the 12 hour schedule), then there it is. But now they're not talking to each other, as I understand.

EXCAL: What about other schedules? Why were they denied?

SANTARELLI: We've got to have rotating shifts because we want more officers on around the clock. In the dark hours that's our biggest problem on this campus; we are genuinely concerned about the safety of women on campus, and men too. And we've recently had a few cases of sexual assault in the dark hours, and that's when we want the manpower.

EXCAL: So the Timken schedule is no better or no worse than any other?

SANTARELLI: No. Absolutely not. It's in use in probably 70 percent of industrial organizations in the US and Canada.

EXCAL: So what was the problem two weeks ago with the D-squad of security opting for their Timken night off? They said that it was a protest measure against the schedule, and also that they weren't paid their double time and a half (for their Timken day work on September 4).

SANTARELLI: You're absolutely right. We missed paying them their overtime Timken pay earlier, about a month or six weeks ago. Twice they were promised it would be in the pay cheque, and twice it wasn't . . . So we screwed up. But I couldn't believe that an officer would protest something so dearly at the expense of losing \$125 (overtime pay).

EXCAL: Who handles the pay cheques, personnel or your department?

SANTARELLI: I would have to say it was a misunderstanding within my department as to the actual application of the overtime rates, as we had just changed to the Timken schedule. The reason why it didn't get into the pay cheque earlier, I couldn't say with a 100 percent certainty. It was not in this department, but it's in a management's ballpark anyway. It was regrettable that it wasn't brought to my attention, because I know what money means to a person. If you want to get back at someone, hit them in the pocketbook, and look out. And when you don't pay people for hours worked, boy, that's one of the most emotional issues you can get yourself involved in. But it happens.

EXCAL: Going back to the gun incident on October 7 (where the security officers were not told by the supervisor that the man had a gun and police were not called).

SANTARELLI: . . . The security control centre supervisor sent a security officer over (to the scene). Well, I could have cried when I saw that (on the report). If there's anyone with a weapon, you call 31 Division.

EXCAL: But the supervisor didn't. And York security officers weren't aware that the man was armed.

SANTARELLI: No, no. And the Supervisor shouldn't have done that (dispatch officers without notifying them of danger), but there wasn't a policy on the situation. Yet if it's a life-threatening situation, you should use common sense.



EXCAL: So what happened with the supervisor?

SANTARELLI: Well, I talked to him, and in retrospect he realizes that wasn't the thing to do in that situation.

EXCAL: But there have been gun incidents on campus before, such as four years ago in the Central Square cafeteria, and the supervisor automatically called the police. It seems strange that it would have to be written down as a policy.

SANTARELLI: It certainly has to be as far as I'm concerned. If it necessitates me making a policy to achieve that that will be done. On the other hand, maybe the training hasn't been good enough.

EXCAL: What about the apology which you allegedly promised to PCO Hendrickson from David Kurosky (Assistant Director of Safety) on July 11 and which was escalated into a grievance and has now been taken to arbitration with the Ontario Labour Relations Board?

SANTARELLI: At no time did I say that I would write an apology, or that I'd ask Mr. Kurosky to write an apology. [Reading from a letter] "Mr. Kurosky did not at any time talk to Parking control officer Hendrickson's doctor." . . . Then one day, about July 2, 3, or 4, Lloyd Scott (the Union lawyer) and Claude (Williams, Chief Steward of Security) and I were talking about this, that and the other thing . . . and Claude said to me—and Claude and I get along fine, although at the moment he's got a bee in his bonnet—"Oh, Mr. Santarelli, please, get her (Hendrickson) off my back; just a little apology." and I said, "Claude, I wrote you a letter on this," and we talked and said, "Well, look, Claude, I'll see if I can get the two of them (Hendrickson and Kurosky) together, and settle this thing amicably." But at no time would I as a manager ever say "Yes, I will write an apology," because at this point, there's nothing to apologize for.

EXCAL: Williams and Hendrickson both told Excalibur that Kurosky had called Hendrickson's doctor, and you now say that Kurosky didn't. Did you confirm this information with Hendrickson's doctor, or Kurosky?

SANTARELLI: Kurosky.

EXCAL: So you didn't actually call Hendrickson's doctor to confirm this?

SANTARELLI: No, sir.

EXCAL: Then doesn't this amount to one person's statement (Kurosky's) against another's (Hendrickson's)?

SANTARELLI: True . . . Are you saying that maybe I should have called the doctor?

EXCAL: Well, if you're stating a fact that no such call took place, (we) would assume it was on the basis of some evidence.

SANTARELLI: . . . At no time did (Kurosky) speak to the doctor—he spoke to the nurse.

EXCAL: What about the parking control officers now having to walk from their stations, alone, to the East Office Building, with up to \$450 on them?

SANTARELLI: That (in the Excalibur editorial, Nov. 6) was the first time I had heard of that, and there was probably some concern. First of all, we do indeed have officers out there who have had some days up to \$450, sometimes more than that, but it has never come up as a matter of concern to anybody.

What I suspect this (issue) stems from is the fact that recently we've had some complaints from staff members who have paid to park in reserved lots. On investigation, we found that our parking control officers, who have paid for peripheral parking privileges, are parking in the reserved lots because they are assigned to (work in) those inner lots. We don't have space now in the reserved parking lots.

EXCAL: But doesn't it seem dangerous if the parking officers have to walk with so much money? They're wearing uniforms and are an open target.

SANTARELLI: To the best of my knowledge, this has never come up before, that they (the PCOs) are concerned about carrying money . . . How much jewellery do you have on right now?

EXCAL: About \$ 2 worth . . .

SANTARELLI: [laughter] Okay, but how many women on this campus would have material things on them or money in excess of the value of \$450?

EXCAL: But they're not paid to wear it. And they're not wearing a uniform, which is an open target.

SANTARELLI: Okay, well, I guess the point is, if they (the PCOs) feel uncomfortable about it, and don't want to carry the money, then we will probably make an arrangement and make a pick-up from them . . . Remember now, that Parking Control Officers are working daylight hours, and returning in daylight hours, on a campus that's heavily populated.

[Santarelli then noted that Student Security, who work in parking booths at night, are always driven to and from their stations.] . . . I'll go speak to my parking manager after this (meeting). But this campus is relatively safe and I don't want to create the impression that it's an unsafe campus.

EXCAL: What about grievances? It seems that there are an awful lot of them.

SANTARELLI: Of course there's an awful lot, though I've never counted them. When I started—well, I'll be perfectly honest: when Claude Williams became the Chief Steward—now I'd like to address some of these (complaints) right from the grievances themselves, because I want you to understand what the grievance procedure is and what a grievance is all about.

Most of the grievances I receive are as a result of a misunderstanding on the part of the Union with respect to this Agreement (the Contract Agreement between the United Plant Guard Workers of America, local XXX, and York University).

It says here, in article 1: ". . . the University recognizes the Union as the exclusive bargaining agent of all security employed to protect the property of York University and Metropolitan Toronto, save and except supervisors, persons above the rank of supervisor, persons regularly employed for not more than 24 hours per week . . ."

The Union's point if this "you've got people on for more than 24 hours (relieving officers on sick leave, for example); they should be paying Union dues." Now the University doesn't really care. We can collect Union dues; it doesn't cost the University. It costs the individual.

But what protection, under this contract, does the individual have? They (the Union), don't know . . . However, that is probably the biggest single reason why I get grievances . . . Now I don't consider that to be indicative of bad management on my part.

EXCAL: Roughly what percentage of the grievances are of this nature?

SANTARELLI: 70, 75, 80 (percent) . . .

[Santarelli noted at length that another major grievance is with regard to unfair distribution of overtime hours, not in keeping with the volunteer overtime list posted each day.] But we always straighten these out and pay the officer who is grieving time and a half.

. . . Now, my hand on the Bible, in the time that I've been here, which is roughly two and a half years, there have been two real emotional issues that I would say could fall in the category of causing a morale problem . . . If morale is so bad, there's not a damn thing I can do . . . It's like death and taxes; they (the shifts) have to be covered.