

CEC Claims: Fact or Fiction?

CEC Claim	FACT
<p>College Faculty’s proposals on workload, partial-load faculty, and job classification are “unlawful” and “unreasonable.”</p>	<p>There is no ruling from any court or arbitrator that indicates that our proposals could or would be deemed unlawful, and other recently settled Collective Agreements in Ontario suggest that our proposals are well within the scope of bargaining permitted under Bill 124.</p> <p>In fact, the Canadian Association of University Teachers, which represents 72,000 faculty at colleges and universities across Canada, had this to say:</p> <p>“The demands that the union has focused on are fair and reasonable and are necessary for preserving the quality and integrity of post-secondary education in Ontario,” said CAUT executive director David Robinson.</p> <p>Robinson also says the proposals reflect what already exists in most university and college agreements across the country.</p>
<p>College Faculty’s proposals on workload violate Bill 124, as confirmed by the Treasury Board.</p>	<p>Our proposals would not result in faculty doing less work. They simply require the Colleges to accurately reflect the work that is already being done by full-time faculty, but is not captured on the SWF. It also requires explicit recognition of the prep and evaluation work done by partial-load faculty.</p> <p>Further, Bill 124 affects total compensation, not hiring. In fact, there have been many settlements in the health care sector where parties have bargained staffing increases under Bill 124, which did not impact the overall 1% total compensation limit. In addition, the Colleges have seen significant growth in the number of administrators hired since Bill 124 became law.</p>
<p>The Colleges are in terrible financial shape due to the pandemic and there is no money in the system for funding staffing and workload changes.</p>	<p>The colleges have amassed a nearly \$1.4 billion surplus since 2018. College administrators, on average, have seen increases to salary and total compensation far surpassing what’s allowable under Bill 124 since the last round of negotiations—including during the pandemic. The money is there: the priorities need to be adjusted to focus on what’s best for students and the system.</p>
<p>If faculty have intellectual property rights, then Colleges will not be able to engage in research and corporate training partnerships.</p>	<p>Every university in Ontario recognizes faculty’s intellectual property rights as promoting innovation and strengthening the ability to pursue research and other partnerships. The faculty team’s proposals explicitly provide the Colleges with the ability to negotiate the terms of intellectual property rights in order to foster innovation and collaboration.</p>

	<p>The Canadian Association of University Professors (CAUT) says of faculty’s proposal: “Faculty ownership over the course materials they produce is a necessary condition for quality education. It ensures that students’ learning is guided by faculty experts, and not by administrators or government officials. And it protects academic freedom by giving faculty control over the development and use of their ideas.”</p> <p>Faculty in other colleges in Canada already have comparable intellectual property language included in their Collective Agreements.</p>
<p>Workload issues cannot be addressed without adequate data, so another workload task force (WTF) is required.</p>	<p>No previous research in any of the 4 previous workload task forces has resulted in changes to faculty workload. The workload factors have not changed since 1985.</p> <p>We have provided the CEC team with research into workload, including faculty’s experiences and a bibliography related to evaluation and preparation time in online and hybrid classroom environments.</p>
<p>Both teams share a commitment to Indigenization and equity issues.</p>	<p>The CEC team has echoed faculty’s proposal to allow Indigenous faculty to bring Elders/Traditional Knowledge Keepers as advisor and support persons during WMG and grievance and arbitration proceedings. However, they prefer to punt other equity issues and the concerns of Indigenous faculty to subcommittees and round tables that have no dispute resolution processes and no mechanism for the implementation of recommendations.</p> <p>Faculty’s proposals are designed to immediately address structural issues of inequality in hiring, retention, discipline, salary calculation, and recognition of Indigenous knowledge. The faculty team has tried to incorporate the notion of subcommittees, but with binding mechanisms in place to ensure they are productive and meaningful.</p>
<p>Faculty’s demands affect nearly every area of the Collective Agreement.</p>	<p>Faculty’s proposals, which have been significantly reduced in number over the course of bargaining, reflect ongoing issues in the system that have remained unaddressed. Both sides agreed that these issues--workload, staffing, intellectual property rights, partial-load equity, and the counsellor class definition--were important to address in non-binding task forces and committees, previously. Since 2017, these issues have only become more pressing.</p>
<p>The CEC offer of settlement is the best that faculty can achieve in this round of negotiations.</p>	<p>In each round of negotiations in which faculty have demonstrated that they stand behind their demands—through solidarity actions, strong strike mandates, or labour disruption—we have made important gains in our Collective Agreement.</p>