

Dispute Resolution Process

Initial Problem-Solving

Discussion between the Employee and their most immediate out-of-scope supervisor is the first, and most important in the dispute resolution process. The discussion is not meant to be a superficial technicality prior to a grievance. Real attempts to resolve the issue should be made at the front-line level.

Although it is tempting to neglect the initial problem-solving stage, it is a component of the Dispute Resolution Process set out at Article 32.07 of the UNA-AHS Collective Agreement. The only situation that allows an exception to having a discussion is a dispute arising from discipline.

Employees and Managers may feel uncomfortable having these conversations with each other. Employees are encouraged to trust their immediate supervisor and to raise concerns without making it personal. Immediate supervisors are encouraged to recognize that it is difficult for an Employee to come forward with concerns and are discouraged from taking the concern as a personal attack. Trusting one another and working together to solve problems can become habit forming.

There are times where an Employee and their immediate supervisor are not able to resolve the issue. The issue may involve a complex, technical application of Collective Agreement language, or may already be infused with hurt feelings or broken trust. In these cases, both UNA and AHS encourage the Employee to ask their local representative(s) or their Labour Relations Officer to assist with the initial problem-solving discussion. Likewise, the parties encourage an immediate supervisor to seek out the assistance of their Human Resources Advisor.

As early as possible in the process, have specific discussions related to information requirements. For example:

- Try to define the issue in a way that is understood by both parties.
- Can you agree upon some facts?
- If there are facts in dispute – will additional information either verify the facts or support further discussions?
- Is the assistance of others required?
- Is this an interpretative issue that would have potential implications provincially?