

Questions to their responses (only those considered non- monetary) to our U1 workload proposals

11.02 G2

- What is the CEC’s rationale for stating that the newly proposed non-monetary **11.01 G2**, is not warranted when the workload variables identified were outlined in the Kaplan award as requiring the attention of the WTF, and are identified in the WTF report as both not being compensated on full time professor and instructor workloads (survey and focus group outcomes) and also require a remedy (chair recommendations).

11.02 A6

- What is the CEC’s rationale for stating that the newly proposed non-monetary **11.02 A6** violates the intent of workload disputes being resolved in “speedy” processes, when the proposal aims to address WMG functioning (which can delay workload dispute resolutions), not resolve individual workload complaints?

11.02 C2

- What is the CEC’s rationale for not responding to the newly proposed **11.02 C2** when it is non-monetary and aims to address the workload variables identified in the Kaplan award as requiring the attention of the WTF, and are identified in the WTF report as both not being compensated on full time professor and instructor workloads (survey and focus group outcomes) and are also requiring a remedy (recommendations).

11.02 D1

- Can the CEC outline how our proposals will increase the time taken for resolving workload disputes?

11.01 F3

- This information is currently not included in the SWF, and specifically called for in Recommendation 2 of the Flaherty Workload Taskforce Report. There is no inclusion of this information in your proposed M5 update to the CBIS subcommittee.

11.02 F5

- What is the CEC’s rationale for stating that the newly proposed non-monetary **11.02 F5** expands the arbitration process and is contrary to the expedited workload dispute resolution process, when the focus of arbitration process is clarified, and legal representation for both sides is removed?
-

Questions to their responses (only those considered non- monetary) to our **U2 Partial-Load** proposals

26.10 D

- What is the CEC's objection to the newly proposed non-monetary 26.10 D?

26.10 E

- What is the CEC's objection to the proposed non-monetary 26.10 E?

26.10 F

- What is the CEC's rationale that makes 26.10 F a monetary proposal?
-

Questions to their revised **M5 LOU- College Bargaining Information Subcommittee**

- Given that the proposed subcommittee consists of two members from the CEC and two members from OPSEU-SEFPO, how does the CEC envision a pathway forward when decisions lie on split grounds and there is no mechanism for breaking that tie?
- Given that the CEC proposal lacks any timelines for data collection at each college, and a deadline for the collation and delivery of that information to the subcommittee, what mechanism would be available for prompting that critical information for the subcommittee's work?
- The data and report prepared by this subcommittee is to be used for bargaining, does the CEC not see merit in an annual delivery date for that report, in order to ensure that both sides have adequate information for bargaining purposes?