

LETTER OF UNDERSTANDING #XX (NEW)

BETWEEN

ALBERTA HEALTH SERVICES
(hereinafter referred to as the Employer)

- and -

HEALTH SCIENCES ASSOCIATION OF ALBERTA
(hereinafter referred to as the Union)

RE: WORKLOAD APPEAL PROCESS

1. Workload

- (a) The Parties recognize the importance of discussions regarding workload. Workload is understood to be an objective assessment of the support (staffing, training, communication, skill mix), equipment (devices, technology, supplies), and/or time available to the Employee to complete their assigned work.
- (b) The Parties recognize that workload may fluctuate and may be impacted by numerous factors including, but not limited to:
- acuity,
 - changes in patient population,
 - seasonality,
 - surge periods,
 - process improvements and efficiencies,
 - staff/resource fluctuations, and
 - increasing demands.

2. Discussing Workload Concerns

- (a) The Employee shall first discuss their workload concern with their immediate supervisor and attempt to resolve the matter at this stage. In the event that it is not resolved, the Employee has the ability to request a formal evaluation of their workload concern through the following Workload Appeal Process:

3. Level 1 – Formal Workload Evaluation

- (a) The Parties agree that only workload concerns that are ongoing, systemic, and long-term in nature (evidenced by the fact that the concern has continued for a minimum period of sixty (60) calendar days) may be considered as part of the Workload Appeal Process.
- (b) Where an Employee or group of Employees has a workload concern that is ongoing, systematic and long-term in nature, the Employee(s) may request, in writing, that

their Manager conduct a formal workload evaluation. In this written submission, the Employee(s) must include an explanation of the factors they believe are leading to workload concerns, based on the understood components of workload (support, equipment and/or time to complete assigned work). This should include proposed solutions to the workload concerns. The Manager (or designate) shall meet with the Employee(s) and respond in writing within twenty-one (21) calendar days following the meeting.

4. Level 2 – Review by Department Director

If the Manager and the Employee or group of Employees are unable to resolve the workload concern, the Employee(s) may within seven (7) calendar days of the response at Level 1, request the Department Director (or designate) undertake a further review of their workload concern. The Department Director (or designate) will respond within fourteen (14) calendar days of receipt of the workload concern.

5. Level 3 – Review by Senior Operating/Program Officer

If the Employee or group of Employees is not satisfied with the outcome at Level 2, within seven (7) calendar days of the response at Level 2, the Employee may request the Senior Operating/Program Officer (or designate) review their workload concern. The Senior Operating/Program Officer (or designate) shall make the final decision regarding the workload evaluation, and convey the decision in writing, to the Employee(s) within twenty-one (21) days.

6. The time limits in the Workload Appeal Process may be extended by mutual agreement of the Parties. A subsequent evaluation request for the same workload concern within the same unit or area may only be made where substantive changes have occurred since the last review.

7. Dispute Resolution

(a) The timelines and process steps in this Letter of Understanding are subject to Article 46: Grievance Procedure.

(b) The final decision regarding the outcome of the Workload Appeal Process is not subject to Article 46: Grievance Procedure.

8. The parties agree to implement the Workload Appeal Process outlined above on a trial basis.

This Letter of Understanding will expire March 31, 2028 or upon the date of ratification of the next Collective Agreement, whichever is later.