

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS IN THE JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER *

by CHARLES S. LEVY, D.S.W.

Associate Dean, Wurzweiler School of Social Work, Yeshiva University, New York

REPRESENTATIVES of both collective bargaining units and administrations of Jewish community centers face disquieting conflicts as they approach the task of negotiating contracts which govern the relationships between labor and management in the Jewish community center. As Philip B. Willauer put it in a management viewpoint of labor-management relations, "The plain fact is . . . that labor-management conflict is inevitable."¹

Where unions of professional social workers are concerned, conflicts are not only inevitable between labor and management; they are inevitable within the ranks of union members and within the ranks of administrative representatives, whether they are executives, that is, professional personnel, or volunteers, that is, lay personnel. These conflicts stem from the inherent nature of labor-management relations and from the specific expectations of personnel engaged in social work enterprises.

There is little doubt that some of the conflict experienced by social workers in unions derives from their sense of

responsibility both to their clients and to their agency; and some of the conflict experienced by management representatives in social agencies derives from their conception of their responsibility to staff members which is influenced by the social work philosophy which shapes the character of the service of social agencies.

True enough, this is a residue of twentieth century social work practice for there was less embarrassment in the management group about the social deprivation of the labor group until late in the nineteenth century and early in the twentieth century. If Jane Addams was not the minion of the labor group, she was hardly the darling of the industrial management group. She was much too helpful to the union movement to merit the *kudos* of management. From her point of view, moreover, she was much too sensitive about the oppression by employers of unsuspecting immigrants to be kindly disposed toward them. In fact, she complained of the "tainted money," contributed to Hull House by a donor "who was notorious for underpaying the girls in his establishment"² and was hardly inclined to accept his munificence unquestioningly. Nevertheless, in her zeal for

* Presented at a meeting of the Metropolitan Association of Jewish Center Workers, January 16, 1963.

¹ Philip B. Willauer, "Civil Rights in Labor-Management Relations: A Management Viewpoint," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, Vol. 275 (May, 1951), p. 140.

² Jane Addams, *Twenty Years at Hull House*, The New American Library, New York, 1961. pp. 106-107.

justice, Miss Addams and Hull House came as much under the scrutiny of capital as of labor.³

For a time, social agencies were viewed as the pawns of capital, and not always without justification.

"... workers saw powerful social agencies openly aligned against the burgeoning trade unions. They saw employing groups occasionally utilize these agencies as frank instruments for breaking strikes. They saw some of these agencies deliberately withhold relief from the families of striking workers, pressuring able-bodied men and women on relief rolls to serve as scabs in struck factories. And they saw opportunistic directors of social agencies bid openly for contributions from the rich on the ground that private social work kept the lower classes satisfied—that it helped suppress strikes and even revolutionary tendencies among the ignorant "debased" masses of society."⁴

The charitable services did not always seem quite so charitable, and were sometimes regarded as incompatible with the democratic intonations of an unrestricted union movement. As one observer has seen it:

"The leaders of the trade unions, who regarded the manufacturers *a priori* as a class enemy, resented the charities sending clients to work in struck plants, operating non-union shops, furnishing cheap labor and undermining union wage schedules."⁵

If one adds to history the intimidation of a code of ethics⁶ which stresses responsibility for continued service to

³ *Ibid.*, Ch. 10.

⁴ Albert Deutsch, "American Labor and Social Work," *Science and Society*, Vol. VIII, No. 4 (Fall, 1944), pp. 289-304.

⁵ Harold Silver, "Jewish Communal Services: Historical Perspectives," *Journal of Jewish Communal Service*, Vol. XXXIX, No. 1 (Fall, 1962), p. 10.

⁶ See Helen Rehr, "Problems for a Profession in a Strike Situation," *Social Work*, Vol. No. 2 (April, 1960), pp. 22-28. See also National Association of Social Workers, *Code of Ethics*, Adopted August, 1960. See also "A Code of Ethics for Jewish Center Workers," undated, but circa 1957.

agency clients, the conflict about work stoppages and other union devices becomes oppressive to conscientious social workers. On the other hand, if one emphasizes the civil rights implications of personnel practices codes and the Bill of Rights, management representatives suffer agonies of conscience when resisting the representations of union representatives, though mindful of their accountability for contributors' funds. Executives, however, are slung midway between the interests of both, since as professional colleagues of union representatives they are impelled to be considerate of the welfare of personnel, but as representatives of management they are obliged to be considerate of the agency's resources.

Despite the pulls in opposite directions on the participants in labor-management relations, labor-management conflict may truly be viewed as a "socially constructive force."⁷ Unfortunately, however, representatives of both unions and management tend to confuse their roles in the process of negotiation, which militates against the effective performance of the social function of labor-management relations.⁸

For effective labor-management relations, representatives of labor are obliged to represent labor and representatives of management are obliged to represent management. There is little room for the kind of objectivity and empathy which are required for social work service. Professional discipline is inappropriate. On the other hand, some of the principles of interpersonal relations which are characteristic of social work practice and administration may help to accomplish the ends of labor-management relations without un-

⁷ Philip B. Willauer, *loc. cit.*, p. 140.

⁸ See Jack R. Goldberg, "The Professional and his Union in the Jewish Center," *Journal of Jewish Communal Service*, Vol. XXXVI, No. 3 (Spring, 1960), pp. 284-9.

duly violating some of the more sacred principles of social work practice.

This does not mean, however, that social workers, because they are bound by a professional code of behavior, are deprived of the right or opportunity to take active and organized steps to insure their own material welfare. Such steps do not necessarily contravene the assumption of primary responsibility to agency clients although they do assume certain stipulations to safeguard the welfare of agency clients. The following utterance by Virginia P. Robinson of a quarter of a century ago may be considered archaic, therefore, although it might have been quite pertinent at the time, for in 1937 she said with considerable conviction:

"If you can accept with me that service to the client is the essential purpose for which these [welfare] agencies exist, their "product" if you will, and that we would like to see that product as good as possible; if you can accept with me further that the quality of this service grows out of the functioning of the agency as a whole, of the participation of every worker in this service, you may understand something of the problem the union creates when it treats a social work agency as an industrial organization and cuts the administrative and supervisory functions off from other functions in an effort to make them like managing functions in industry. This they are not and cannot be made to be."⁹

The more modern, although hardly unanimous view,¹⁰ as applicable to so-

⁹ Virginia P. Robinson, "Is Unionization Compatible with Social Work?" An address delivered in Philadelphia on March 23, 1937, under the auspices of the National Coordinating Committee of Social Service Employees.

¹⁰ There is considerable difference of opinion among social workers regarding the appropriateness of participation by social workers in unions. Differences of view apply to the resort to strikes and to the use of other union devices to effect changes in the conditions of social work employment, as well as to unionization in general. Positions taken are premised on perspectives of the role of professional practi-

cial agencies as it is to industry, is that:

"Labor management conflict . . . is the interaction of aggressive labor and management groups within the moderating influence of the American social structure that is producing revised definitions of the rights and obligations of the individual.

"The basic right through which the concept of civil liberty must find expression and application in our industrial system is the right of workers to bargain collectively with their employers. It is in the exercise of this right that the individual gains a voice in the determination of the conditions under which he works and under which he and his family live."¹¹

Social workers and their families are as much subject to adverse conditions of employment as are personnel in industry, and consequently are as much entitled to represent their interests through union negotiation as are employees in any industry. Similarly, administrative representatives of social agencies are as accountable for the expenditure of agency funds as are management personnel in industry, and consequently as obliged to represent the interest of contributors and agency beneficiaries as management personnel are to represent owners and stockholders. Hopefully, however, both union and management representatives will be guided by their concern for agency clients and by agency philosophy so that each will accord to the other maximum consideration, and each will strive to resolve differences amicably and considerately so that services will be sustained at a maximum level without un-

tioners, the special character of social services, as well as other distinctive features of the social work profession and social agencies. For illustrations of, and references to various professional positions on these issues, see the articles by Helen Rehr, and Jack R. Goldberg, *supra cit.*, and the letters included in "Points and Viewpoints," in *Social Work*, Vol. 5, No. 3 (July, 1960) pp. 110-16, and Vol. 5, No. 4 (October, 1960) pp. 103-106.

¹¹ Philip B. Willauer, *loc. cit.*, pp. 140-141.

due penalty either to staff or to agency.

Inevitably the issue of the strike emerges, for as Arthur J. Goldberg put it when he served as a legal counselor to unions:

"The right to bargain collectively necessarily implies the right to strike. The possibility of a strike if negotiations fail is the premise and the incentive which alone can lead to successful collective bargaining. Otherwise, there can be no content to the bargaining because there is no terminal point which the parties must both attempt to avoid."¹²

That the representatives of both labor and management are duty-bound to avoid a strike if they possibly can is implicit in this view of labor-management relations and particularly in labor-management relations in social agencies, for at stake is not merely the profit of an enterprise or the productivity of personnel in that enterprise but also the welfare of clientele who do not have the kind of power to enforce a reconciliation, the kind of power possessed by purchasing consumers of a marketable product, and who are instead perhaps completely dependent on the availability of the agency's service.

"In such activities . . . it is reasonable to say that strikes should never occur. But . . . Do we mean that the responsibility for the avoidance of strikes rests upon the workers alone? Or is there an indefinable body known as the public, as well? If we think that the sole responsibility is that of the worker we are, in effect, saying that when a person chooses a career involving particularly exacting and essential service, he has by that choice lost his right of protest . . . obligations run both ways. If strikes are 'unthinkable' so is disregard of the workers' welfare and point of view."¹³

¹² Arthur J. Goldberg, "Civil Rights in Labor-Management Relations: A Labor Viewpoint," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *supra cit.*, p. 150.

¹³ John A. Fitch, *Professional Workers as Trade Unionists*, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO, (Washington, D. C.: circa 1959), pp. 10-11.

Now, after a considerable array of past tribulations, there is little doubt about the validity of unions of professional employees. Issues which have been raised about social work unions and unions of Jewish community center workers, have been largely related to specific concerns, like whether strikes are conscionable or justifiable under any circumstances, rather than whether unions and collective bargaining are consistent with professional responsibility. A labor-management relations policy would have to be formulated within the major premise that unions are valid even in Jewish community centers, and that center employees ought to have the undisputed right to bargain collectively and to anticipate that their collective bargaining efforts will be accorded the dignity of a maximum and conscientious consideration. It is very likely that such a view on the part of management representatives of Jewish community centers will obviate the necessity of strikes and strike threats. Perhaps that is why Leo Perlis, the Director of the AFL-CIO Community Services Division, insisted recently that he was quite prepared to submit to binding arbitration and to a no-strike pledge if complete collective bargaining privileges were granted by managements.¹⁴ Strikes would probably not become necessary if both labor and management representatives committed themselves to the resolution of their differences even to the extent of submitting their otherwise insoluble differences to mutually acceptable impartial third party referees.

The Metropolitan Association of Jewish Center Workers of New York has attempted to formulate a code of behavior designed to guide both union

¹⁴ Leo Perlis, "Issues in Social Welfare," A lecture presented at the Wurzweiler School of Social Work, Yeshiva University, New York, February 25, 1960.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS IN JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER

and management representatives in labor negotiations, in the interest of the fulfillment of the responsibilities of each to the other, and of both to the clientele served by Jewish community centers.¹⁵

The preamble, drafted by the author who served as chairman of the committee which was appointed to propose a policy for the association's consideration, incorporated in essence the principles upon which the proposed policy was based. It read as follows:

"Professional agency personnel must ever be guided by the ethics of their profession both in the pursuit of their professional responsibility and in their personal conduct. As agency employees they have the right of active participation in organized efforts designed to improve their employment conditions. This assumption is based on one hand on the recognition of their legal and moral rights as citizens in a democracy, and, on the other, on the recognition of the importance of employment conditions which provide for their own and their families' economic and other requirements sufficiently to make possible their maximum attention to their professional responsibility.

"As practitioners with responsibility for service to members of the community, and with an abiding concern for their health and welfare, they set a high priority on the maintenance and improvement of social services to the community. They are prepared to devote their energy and their professional skill to the implementation of these services and to do all within their power and their resources to prevent any interruption or impairment of these services. At the same time, they owe to themselves and to their

families the responsibility to act in their own behalf as agency employees.

"As members of a professional association, they have the opportunity to define and act upon such standards of behavior and practice as will insure the maintenance and improvement of agency services. As members of unions they also have the opportunity to participate in such processes as will insure for them democratic and effective means for representing their interests as employees and as members of their profession.

"Since the professional association includes practitioners at both management and employee levels of agency participation, principles to guide professional workers in their role in labor-management relations validly relate to both levels of participation. This consideration carries with it the implication that professional agency personnel at all levels of participation share concern about the nature and continuity of agency service to agency clientele; they share responsibility for conduct consistent with the professional ethics with which they are identified; and they share a preference for such personnel standards as will be duly considerate of the needs of agency personnel as well as agency clientele.

"It is also recognized that—assuming consistency with professional responsibility—the role which management personnel play in labor-management relations is determined by their responsibility as agency executives, and the role of employees who belong to the bargaining unit is determined by the goals and procedures of the bargaining unit. Hopefully, both labor and management representatives—both in the agency board and on the staff—as well as other parties in interest—will proceed at all times with a commitment to exhaust every and all legitimate and valid democratic instrumentalities of labor-management negotiations in order to resolve differences constructively and equitably, in relation to the interests of both groups, in order that agency services may continue uninterrupted, and in order that the dignity of all participants may be properly safeguarded.

"The following policy statement is offered as a guide especially to employee and management representatives on agency staff in order to afford to both a measure of confidence concerning not only what each may expect of the other, but what each may not expect of the other by way of professional behavior in labor-management relations."

¹⁵ A profound debt of gratitude is owed to the members of the committee which produced the policy statement on "The Role of the Professional Worker in Labor-Management Relations," adopted by the Metropolitan Association of Jewish Center Workers of New York in 1961. These members were: Harold Arian, Bernard Berman, Daniel Farinella, Barbara E. Levine, Louis Berkowitz, Abraham Fleischman, Sol Goldstein, Sam Hock, Larry Kirschner, Al Kogut, Alex Rosen, Leah Rosen, Carl Urbont, and (ex-officio) Sol Rafel and Herbert Schneider.

In recognition of their responsibility to agency members, but also with awareness of the mutuality of the responsibility between labor and management representatives, the committee, which consisted of both union members and executives, presented this view of "the rights and responsibilities of both parties":

"The right of the union to strike is inherent in the process of negotiations and helps to determine the rights and responsibilities of both parties. However, in view of the concern of professional practitioners for the welfare of agency clients and in view of their commitment to a professional code of ethics, it is incumbent on both parties to resort to all devices available in order to avoid the necessity of a strike and to insure essential services in the event of a strike. In the interest of reaching an agreement, both union and management should incorporate in their contracts or other agreements a provision for compulsory arbitration or any other mutually acceptable form or technique for achieving a peaceful resolution of the negotiations. A union-management committee should be established in order to study such forms and techniques so that an agreement can be reached well in advance of the contract termination date."

The policy statement then went on to prescribe roles for board members, executives, sub-executives, rank-and-file staff members and agency members. The statement reflected extraordinary sensitivity to the primary responsibility of each of these groups, an obvious attempt on the part of the committee's members to insure appropriate role performance in relation to agency and community expectations. All participants were nevertheless held bound to a code of ethics governed either by the philosophy of the social work profession or the philosophy of the union movement. All participants were deemed responsible for the maintenance and elevation of agencies' standards of practice, but not without due regard for the conditions prerequisite to the implementation of such standards, and not without the ex-

ercise of every effort to improve those conditions as they affect agency staff and clientele alike. A premium was placed on mutual respect and give-and-take good faith negotiations between labor and management.

The position of the committee, strongly put, was that social work students and agency members were not to be manipulated into a role on behalf of the position either of management or of labor, although the efforts of all parties were enlisted in the resolution of differences between labor and management with maximum regard for the rights and responsibilities of all.

It must be remembered that a formulation of policy by a professional association requires recognition of the roles of participants at both labor and management levels since both levels are represented in the professional association. Consequently, none of the expressions in the policy statement are characterized by the militance one might expect of a statement which might be issued by either management or labor. Nevertheless, as a guide to the behavior of participants in labor-management relations, the policy statement is in most respects a model for effective interpersonal relations even in so turbulent a "field" as union negotiations. Scrupulously adhered to, the statement would undoubtedly help the participants to fulfill adequately their responsibility to themselves, to each other, and to agency members whose interests all participants undoubtedly have much at heart.

APPENDIX

I. Place of the Professional in the Labor Union Movement

A. Advantages of a Labor Union for the Professional Worker

1. The union helps the professional worker to better himself economically.

2. The union helps to improve working conditions and personnel practices.
3. The union offers the professional worker an opportunity for cooperating with his colleagues in improving his working conditions.
4. The union helps to establish and maintain job security.
5. The union promotes uniform standards in the field in relation to working conditions.
6. The union provides the professional worker with a guaranteed grievance machinery.
7. The union provides the professional worker with the opportunity to participate in the mainstream of the labor movement, to contribute his own special knowledge in the furtherance of the welfare of workers in the social work field and of the economic welfare of the general community.

B. *Disadvantages of a Labor Union for the Professional Worker*

1. There is a tendency to gear promotion to seniority rather than to merit.
2. A union tends to separate professional workers into two divisions of work status, labor and management.
3. The tactics utilized by a union may be viewed by the professional worker as conflicting with his professional responsibility. Thus he may feel his allegiance to the union as a union member to be in conflict with his allegiance to his clients and agency as a social worker.

C. *Professional Acceptance of the Labor Union*

1. The union movement has proved to be the most effective organization for improving the professional's working conditions and economic standards.
2. A professional worker in a union has an obligation to be sensitive to any incompatibility which may exist between union tactics and goals and the ethics of the social work profession. It is understood, however, that where a dilemma exists regarding such incompatibility, the decision of the professional worker should be related not only to his self-interest but also to his role as a professional worker. However, as indicated elsewhere in this document, priority should at all times be given to those agency services which may be objectively deemed to be essential. In such a case both union and management together share responsibility for determin-

ing and providing for such services without infringing on the rights of either of the parties.

Proposals

The right of the union to strike is inherent in the process of negotiations and *helps to determine the rights and responsibilities of both parties.* However, in view of the concern of professional practitioners for the welfare of agency clients and in view of their commitment to a professional code of ethics, it is incumbent on both parties to resort to all devices available in order to avoid the necessity of a strike and to insure essential services in the event of a strike. In the interest of reaching an agreement, both union and management should incorporate in their contracts or other agreements a provision for compulsory arbitration or any other mutually acceptable form or technique for achieving a peaceful resolution of the negotiations. A union-management committee should be established in order to study such forms and techniques so that an agreement can be reached well in advance of the contract termination date.

II. *The Ethics of Labor Management Relationships*

Underlying the ethical practices of all parties in labor-management relations is a basic commitment to the practice of social work and the understanding that all parties are acting in good faith. With this as a premise, the following is a guide for the participation of the various parties in labor-management activities.

The following general statements are based on the assumption that all agency staff members have the right to join and participate fully in organizations whose objectives are aimed at improving personnel standards and working conditions. This is especially true when

those organizations have been recognized by the board of directors.

A. From the Point of View of the Board

Board members have a commitment to the social work profession through their participation on a board of directors. They are charged with maintaining and elevating the standards of the profession. They should respect the right of staff members to participate fully in union activities. They must accept completely the job of labor-management relations. It is assumed that this is a primary responsibility of board members and this responsibility should not be relegated to the executive.

B. From the Point of View of the Executive

The executive, as a professional social worker, has a definite commitment to maintain and elevate the standards of the profession. While the executive has responsibility to both board and staff, he is primarily related to the profession. During times of negotiation he is identified with management and is more responsible to the board than to staff. The executive has the responsibility to stand for qualitative professional services at all times. In cases where this conflicts with the opinions of board members, he must be guided by the professional standards reflected in the codes of ethics and personnel practices of the professional associations of social workers (NASW) and Jewish community center workers (NAJCW).

C. From the Point of View of the Sub-Executive

The sub-executive, being a professional social worker, has a definite commitment to maintain and elevate the standards of the profession. The sub-executive is a member of management and therefore has the full responsibility

to participate in decision-making on the managerial level. It is ethically right for a sub-executive to be a vehicle of expression between staff and the executive. At the point of negotiations the sub-executive has a greater commitment to board than staff.

D. From the Point of View of the Staff Member (In The Bargaining Unit)

The staff member, being a professional social worker, has a definite commitment to maintain and elevate the standards of the profession. While the staff member has the right to participate fully in union activities he must also be aware of his professional responsibilities. He is fully identified with labor and should participate in the decision-making of that body. The staff member must guard his professional integrity and not get involved in unethical acts, such as the use of agency records and files for the sole purpose of union or personal use.

E. From the Point of View of the Agency Member

If the agency membership has not been involved in labor management disputes, and is not a factor in the decision generally, the involvement of them at the time of final negotiations by either board or staff perverts and manipulates the agency's relationship to the membership. If for some reason, the position of either of the parties to a labor-management dispute should be communicated to the agency's membership, then it would be considered both equitable and ethical for the other party to communicate its position. Enlistment of agency membership's support or action by either party, however, is inconsistent with the intent of this section.

F. From the Point of View of the Student

The student has no role in agency

labor-management relationship: rather, he is subject to the policy and decision of the school.

The use of strike and lock-out as a means of forcing a settlement must be used in the most responsible manner. Before either of these techniques is used, every other possible means must be taken to avert a shut-down of services.

III. The Relationship between Staff Welfare and Client Welfare

- A. Client Welfare—service to clients is at the heart of professional function and agency function.*
- B. Good personnel standards help to insure good staff morale, help insure economic security and influence the quality of individual effort, all of which contributes to better service to meet the needs of clients.
- C. Good personnel standards help to insure the availability of qualified professional staff and to recruit additional personnel to better serve client needs.
- D. The NAJCW Code of Ethics for Jewish Center Workers also states: "The NAJCW believes that the worker in whatever capacity employed should recognize that the professional relationship between himself and his clientele places a special responsibility on him to use that relationship exclusively in the interest of the persons or groups served, and not for promoting his own personal ends. He should therefore refrain from wearing political, union, or controversial buttons and insignia in the agency and elsewhere

* "The NAJCW believes that the worker, in whatever capacity employed, should regard as his primary obligation the welfare of the persons and groups served, consistent with the common welfare and as related to agency function as defined in its constitution, by-laws and formally adopted policies and/or required by law." From NAJCW Code of Ethics for Jewish Center Workers.

while representing the agency or discharging professional functions."

- E. The committee stresses, in relation to labor-management conflicts, that it is of the utmost importance to seek every means to avoid interruption of service. As stated in the NAJCW Code of Ethics, "NAJCW believes that the worker in whatever capacity employed should affirm and interpret the importance of including comprehensive, mutually acceptable, and binding procedures for mediation and arbitration in the written personnel practices of agencies, so that Jewish center services to persons and groups will in all cases be maintained without interruption by strikes, lock-outs, stoppages, slow-downs and picketing."
- F. While recognition is given to the primary aspect of client welfare, nevertheless deadlock labor-management negotiations may sometimes result in an interruption of services. In the case of such interruption, certain essential services should nevertheless be continued (e.g., a day care center for children of working mothers), and all safeguards should be taken with regard to the health and safety of clients.
- G. At no time should the membership of a center be involved by either party in a labor-management conflict. This is a reaffirmation of the point of view expressed in item number four above quoted from the NAJCW Code of Ethics.

IV. The Mutual Responsibilities and Role of the Participants in Agency Labor-Management Relations

In order for labor and management representatives to engage in fruitful negotiations, it is essential that the negotiations take place in an atmosphere of mutual respect and trust without allowing themselves to become caught

up in the need to win at any cost, since such a need leads to behavior which is not conducive to arriving at agreement. The following guidelines are suggested for the achievement of effective negotiations.

A. Mutual Responsibilities of Employees and Management

1. To respect each other's positions in regard to the items with which they are dealing.
2. To negotiate in good faith and make no attempts to subvert the agreement at which they arrive.
3. To make proposals which merit serious consideration by both parties.
4. Not to derogate the efforts or dedication of any of the parties in the relationship.
5. Recognizing that collective bargaining implies elements of give and take as well as tactics and strategy, it is in the best interest of effective results for all parties to act responsibly with mutual restraint and dignity.

B. Responsibility of Board

To afford staff the opportunity to meet periodically with the personnel committee to air concerns and explore potential areas of friction.

C. Responsibilities of Executive

1. To act on his responsibility to the board of directors within the context of sound professional practice.
2. To guide management in its strategy and actions which are in the best interest of the agency's services.
3. To conduct his activities with staff and community in a manner consistent with the professional discipline implied in the professional associations' (NASW and NAJCW) codes of ethics and personnel practices.

D. Responsibility of Sub-Executive

To conduct himself in the manner indicated in Section IV: C3 above.

E. Responsibilities of Staff Member

1. To conduct himself in the manner indicated in IV: C3 above, and not engage in activities which serve to stir up the membership or the community.
2. To act on his responsibility to the board of directors within the context of professional codes of ethics and personnel practices as indicated in Section IV: C3 above.

F. Responsibility of Student

The student has no role in agency labor-management relationship; rather, he is subject to the policy and decision of the school.

G. Responsibility of Agency Members

Agency members are not expected to participate in labor-management disputes. However, they may, upon their own choice and initiative, encourage both parties to resolve their differences fairly and equitably in the interest of continuity and quality of agency service.

H. Responsibilities of Union

1. To represent its members, taking cognizance of their professional commitment.
2. To allow negotiations to move naturally without holding its members to a pre-determined position by being prepared and willing to consider the position of the other party.

I. Responsibilities of Federation

1. To involve itself directly and perceptibly in negotiations.
2. To allow negotiations to move naturally without holding its member agencies to a pre-determined position by being prepared and willing to consider the position of the other party.