



Regular Stream Faculty (RSF) and Teaching Intensive Faculty (TIF): Options for the Future

Update no. 8 on Collective Bargaining

**APUO Executive Committee
January 2012**

Overview (1/2)

- APUO members overwhelmingly rejected the employer's TIF proposal in our December 2011 survey (44% participation rate; 80% rejected).
- It is not clear, however, what alternative option(s) our members prefer. The APUO Executive is therefore seeking to better understand our members' preferences so that we can effectively and successfully represent you in these negotiations.
- In this document, we:
 - Outline three possible positions the APUO could take.
 - Offer some background, issues and considerations we believe members should take into account while pondering these options.
 - Provide links to several previous updates (about the financial situation of the employer and the previous analysis of the employer's original TIF proposal).
 - Ask you to answer a one question survey in regard to your preferences on the three options.

Overview (2/2)

- In contrast to the previous negotiations update #5 on the employer's TIF proposal, we are not offering an extensive analysis of the "Pros" and "Cons, and "Who wins?" and "Who loses?" with each option. This is because while it was clear to us the employer's proposal was clearly not in the interests of our members or a quality university education, we expect that each of these three options might be the preferred option by some APUO members.
- Given this, after the presentation of each of the three options, we will mention some key issues and considerations we believe that you may want to take into account while reflecting on these options.

Three different and viable options

Options	Characteristics
<p>1. Converting Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) to RSF</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All full-time professors are to be hired under regular workload conditions (e.g. 40% teaching; 40% scholarly activities; 20% academic service). • Previous MOU that originally allowed for the pilot creation of temporary replacement professors/lecturers (i.e. limited term, without tenure) <i>remain expired</i>. • 41 existing ‘replacement professor/lecturer positions (the result of previous MOU) are opened up for competition and converted into permanent full-time faculty positions with regular workload conditions.
<p>2. Renewing MOU and limited term TIF</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All regular full-time ‘tenurable’ professors are hired under regular workload conditions (e.g. 40% teaching; 40% scholarly activities; 20% academic service). • Memoranda of Understanding <i>are renewed</i> to allow 41 existing replacement professor/lecturer positions to continue as limited term appointments for the next five (5) years. • Teaching load would be 150% of a unit’s normal teaching load, and scholarly activities workload (including the scholarship of teaching and learning) would be proportionally reduced. The academic service workload would remain the same (e.g. 60% teaching; 20% scholarly activities; 20% academic service).
<p>3. Creating a permanent TIF</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a formal and permanent two-track system with RSF (40% teaching; 40% scholarly activities; 20% academic service) and a limited number of TIF (60% teaching; 20% scholarly activities; 20% academic service). • Teaching load would be 150% of a unit’s normal teaching load, and scholarly activities workload (including the scholarship of teaching and scholarly activities) would be proportionally reduced. The academic service workload would remain the same. • Maximum course load of 18 credits per year over 2 terms, including a maximum of 12 non repetitive credits (or 4 courses) per year. • Total number of TIF positions would be determined through collective bargaining.

Background, Issues and Considerations (1/3)

- The 2005-2006 Memoranda of Understanding (that created the limited term positions were intended (and justified) as a *temporary* measure to help deal with influx of the 2003-2004 'double cohort' (two years worth of high school students graduating when Ontario eliminated grade 13 in 2003).
- It was not envisaged as creating a new type of full-time tenured professor. It was envisaged as a negotiated and non-permanent compromise to give the employer flexibility to hire quickly at a point when it needed some short-term additional teaching.
- As our previous update made clear, the employer is in an excellent financial situation, and even expects to have budgetary surpluses each of the next three years. Moreover, that update demonstrated that although the student population of the University grew by 58% over the last decade, the employer chose to hire only 38% more regular professors over the same time period despite banking a \$500 million surplus.
- Growing class sizes and higher student-professor ratios are thus the consequences of choices made by the employer over the years. Other choices could have been made. A new TIF is not a financial imperative or necessity – it is a choice.

Background, Issues and Considerations (2/3)

- Consequently, there are a variety of viable alternatives to reduce student-faculty ratio and workload:
 - As indicated in the previous update, there are no reliable studies that demonstrate that TIF results in better quality university education, nor the opposite. There is little (if any) difference in that respect between RSF and TIF.
 - As shown in previous updates, the employer could/should have been hiring far more regular stream professors over the last decade to keep pace with student growth – and it can afford to do so now.
 - There is already some workload flexibility in the existing collective agreement. If a professor wishes to, he/she can agree with the employer to a higher teaching load (for example, 15 or 18 credits in a unit where the norm is 12 credits), if he/she wants to devote more time to teaching and less to scholarly activities – the agreement of a member is of course compulsory and a higher teaching load can't be arbitrarily imposed by the employer.

Background, Issues and Considerations (3/3)

- In order to choose their preferred option, we suggest that members consider, among other things, how they think each of the three options will impact (positive, negative or insignificant) the following issues:
 - The quality of education at both graduate and undergraduate levels.
 - The reputation of the University and its programs.
 - The career prospects and working conditions of future APUO members, including professional mobility.
 - Fairness and collegiality amongst APUO members, including tenure and promotions.
 - Point of equilibrium between the three components of an academic career (teaching, scholarly activities, and academic service).
 - Finally, the relationship between teaching and scholarly activities (are they inextricably linked or not?), and the nature of the academic career.
- For further context, you can find all of the previous updates [here](#). More specifically:
 - The most recent update (#7) on the financial situation of the University is [here](#).
 - Update #5 on the employer's TIF proposal is [here](#) and the results of that survey are [here](#).

Question: Which of the three options do you prefer?

- **Survey question: Which one of the three options do you prefer?**
 1. Converting MOU to RSF, as described in this update.
 2. Renewing MOU and limited term TIF, as described in this update.
 3. Creating a permanent TIF, under the conditions described in this update.

- **Logistics:**
 - You will receive an email from the “Question Pro” survey site providing you with the link to the survey. Please express your view as soon as possible and no later than by the end of the day, Friday 20 January.
 - Please note: your user name will be the first email you were given on your arrival to the University. The password will be the last three digits of your employee number. If the first digit (or the first two digits) of that group is (are) 0, please just enter the last two digits (or the last digit).
 - The survey is set up to be completely anonymous and the APUO will never have access to any individual information about you. It will be able to tabulate results by department and faculty, but will have no individual information on any respondent.
 - Thank you for your attention to this matter. It is a crucial issue that will profoundly impact the shape of the University and the APUO needs to know where you stand on it.