

Comparison of Management and Union Offers

Management's Offer	Faculty's Offer
<p>Change Existing Article 2 Staffing in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council is not ending the moratorium on Article 2, it ended on September 30, 2017 because we refused their offer • 2.03 A and B are existing articles, management did not add anything new • New 2.03 C removes existing language that converts sessionals into full-time positions and removes the ability of the union to grieve contract staffing during period of the moratorium • This article must stay intact in order to protect and increase full-time positions. 	<p>The union proposes status quo on Article 2, preserving the ability to hire full-time faculty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moratorium has expired • Keep original Article 2.03C • Add management's Article as 2.03 D. Adding this article enabled the union team to obtain important gains in other articles
<p>Adds new Articles 2.04 and 2.05</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The addition of these two articles is a clear concession in relation to Bill 148. • By adding this language to article 2, management is attempting to say that the work performed by contract faculty is not substantially similar to that of full-time faculty. • This would mean the equal pay for equal work provisions of Bill-148 would not apply to them. • This would enshrine the inequity between contract faculty and full-time faculty into our collective agreement, and circumvent our attempt to have contract faculty treated fairly. 	

<p>ARTICLE 8 —UNION BUSINESS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management changes to Articles 8.03 A, 8.03 B, 8.04 B and 8.05 A would severely limit the union’s ability to represent members. • Changes impair the ability of locals to release union stewards to work on behalf of members • Changes will severely reduce the amount of time future bargaining teams can meet to prepare for negotiations 	<p>Keep Article 8 status quo</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It will preserve the union’s ability to represent its members
<p>ARTICLE 11— WORKLOAD</p> <p>Management’s changes to Article 11 would gut faculty workload protections:</p> <p>11.01 B1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed change to 11.01 B1 eliminates the cap on the number of weeks faculty can teach in an academic year. • This change is completely unnecessary. The current modified workload arrangement language in the collective agreement addresses management’s need for this type of flexibility, and ensures that members are not coerced into taking on this extra work. <p>11.01 B2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As this language refers to workload, it belongs in Article 11 not article 2 (2.05 of management’s offer). • This language is vague and does not address faculty concerns about the equivalency of teaching contact hours in different delivery modes <p>11.01 D3</p>	<p>Article 11 remains status quo except for the following changes:</p> <p>11.01 B 2 A "teaching contact hour" is a College scheduled teaching hour assigned to the teacher by the College. Regardless of the delivery mode, courses shall be deemed to have the same number of teaching contact hours as they would if taught entirely in the classroom or laboratory.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The language above keeps teaching contact hours associated with course hours <p>11.02 C 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Union negotiated Article that addresses the issue of student accommodations and workload • Updates the language • Agreed to item

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management’s proposed change to 11.01 D3 would remove the ability to give SWF credit for curriculum development completed in a non-teaching period. <p>11.01 J1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed changes to 11.01 J1 would allow for unlimited overtime. Unlimited overtime will have a direct negative effect on the number of full-time faculty in the system. • It could also lead to undue stress on faculty. <p>11.01 H3 & 11.04 B3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes to these articles expand management control over faculty professional development (PD) • This would allow managers to narrow the scope of what qualifies as PD • This is a blatant attack on our professionalism and academic freedom <p>11.02 C 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updates the language • Agreed to item 	
<p>Articles 26 & 27</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreed to items 	<p>Articles 26 & 27</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negotiated improvements for partial-load seniority, job security and progression through the salary grid • These improvements are completely undermined by management’s proposed changes to Articles 2 and 11
<p>ACADEMIC FREEDOM [NEW LETTER OF UNDERSTANDING]</p>	<p>ARTICLE 13 COPYRIGHT AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management’s proposal on Academic Freedom is blatantly deceitful • It specifies a toothless college policy not an article in the collective agreement • The language provides no real faculty academic freedom in the performance of our professional duties such as teaching, research and counselling • Their language enshrines inequity between faculty teaching at different colleges. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our proposal on academic freedom enshrines it into the collective agreement and clearly identifies our rights, responsibilities and limits within the article • Gives faculty real input into how courses are taught, research is conducted, and students are supported by counsellors and librarians
<p>CLASS DEFINITION</p> <p>PROFESSOR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Without changes, the current class definition gives management total control over academic decisions 	<p>CLASS DEFINITION</p> <p>PROFESSOR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This change is in-line with our proposed academic freedom language. It illustrates collegiality, and democratizes the performance of our respective duties as faculty members.
<p>ARTICLE 14— SALARIES</p> <p>14.03 A 3 Coordinator Allowance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management would allow the abuse of partial-load coordinators, including paying them at a lower wage rate • This also creates inequity in partial-load coordinator pay rates as it does not standardize them 	<p>ARTICLE 14— SALARIES</p> <p>14.03 A 3 Coordinator Allowance - status quo</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remains status quo to ensure equity and fairness
<p>Letter of Understanding on the Joint Task Force is agreed to by both parties.</p>	<p>Letter of Understanding on the Joint Task Force is agreed to by both parties.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The union worked with government to create a provincial joint task force that is funded and facilitated by the Ministry of Advanced Education and Skills Development • All recommendations will be considered for funding by cabinet with interim recommendation to be issued by May, 2018.

<p>Tentative agreement on the following Letters of Understanding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Letter of Understanding on the <i>Fair Workplace, Better Jobs Act</i>, 2017 (Bill 148) • The Letter of Understanding on the Counsellor Class Definition • The Letter of Understanding on Intellectual Property Rights is agreed to by both parties • The Letter of Understanding on the Short-Term Disability Plan 	
<p>Salary increases and benefit improvements are agreed to by the parties except for retroactivity date of year one salary increase.</p>	
<p>30B CLASSIFICATION PLANS 1. APPOINTMENT FACTORS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The changes proposed by management would create a hard cap on formal education • The unlimited discretionary steps would allow management the ability create inequity between members from the date of hire 	<p>30B CLASSIFICATION PLANS 1. APPOINTMENT FACTORS Keep status quo</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current formula ensures that equity and fairness in hiring
<p>Return-to-Work Protocol</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not include provisions for faculty overtime • This type of language led to over 1400 grievances from the 2006 strike, the great majority of which have not been resolved • Does not protect partial-load faculty from over-work and exploitation 	<p>Return-to-Work Protocol</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All work be recorded on a SWF for full-time faculty • Includes provisions for overtime, and provides access to the Workload Monitoring Group • Includes protections for partial-load faculty