

UGFA GENERAL MEETING, May 11, 2021 and May 18, 2022

UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH FACULTY ASSOCIATION

The **DRAFT** minutes of the Annual General Meeting held via ZOOM on Wednesday May 11, 2021 at 10:00 a.m. with 71 members present, recessing at Noon; and Wednesday May 18, 2022 beginning at 10:00 a.m.

1. Call to order
The meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m.
2. Approval of Agenda
MOTION: That the agenda be approved as distributed
Cunningham/Cormack passed
3. Approval of May 2021 Minutes
MOTION: That the minutes of May 2021 be approved as distributed.
Grogan/Brookes passed

Professor DeCoste informed the Members that we are not recording the meeting but that there will be a transcript available for people to come to the UGFA House to view if they would like to do so; and, that while the chat function is active, it will not be monitored, so Members will have to raise their hand to ask a question

4. Order of the Day 10:05 a.m.
 - a. Approval of Collective Bargaining Principles
Professor Kunze reviewed the collective bargaining process and presented the proposed 2022 Bargaining Principles (NOTE: proposed Principles will be attached to the minutes once presented to management.) There was a brief discussion.

MOTION: That the 2022 Bargaining Principles be approved as presented.
Grogan/Brookes passed

Professor Kunze thanked the membership for their trust and noted UGFA will continue to .

5. President's Report
Professor DeCoste reviewed the attached report.

8. Grievance Report
Professor Cormack and Professor Hathaway reviewed the status of various issues over the past year (attached). There was a lengthy discussion on various examples of harassment and what actions UGFA can/does take. There was a lengthy discussion on human rights complaints and non-academic misconduct,

whether there is work underway betwixt other Associations facing similar instances; defamation of faculty.

6. Recess

MOTION: That we recess until Wednesday May 18 at 10:00 a.m.
Sherwood/Madan passed

Reconvened Wednesday May 18 at 10:00 a.m. via Zoom

7. Order of the Day – Guest Tim Lopinski, auditor from Tonin & Co

a. Presentation of the 2020/2021 Audited Statement

Mr. Lopinski, Tonin and Co. reviewed the audited statement.

MOTION: That the 2020/2021 audited statement be approved as presented.

Cormack/Cunningham passed

b. Presentation of the Draft 2021/22 Year End

Professor Grogan reviewed the draft year end making note of

MOTION: That, in consultation with the auditor, additional funds from 2021/22 be allocated to the defence fund. Such allocation shall allow \$70,000 to remain in the chequing account.

Grogan/Cormack passed

MOTION: That the proposed 2021/22 year-end be approved as presented.

Grogan/Power passed

c. Presentation of the Proposed 2022/23 Budget Year

Professor Grogan reviewed the proposed 2022/23 budget. Professor Grogan noted that currently dues are deducted on the average salary within a rank. If we change to a percentage of actual salary being deducted, it would be more equitable for the membership.

MOTION: That the membership fees be increased to 1.36% and that dues be deducted from each pay.

Grogan/Cormack passed

MOTION: That the proposed 2022/23 budget be approved.

Grogan/Marcone passed

MOTION: That when the 2022/23 proposed year end is brought forward for approval, the UGFA Executive shall direct the auditor mandate funds as where necessary.

Grogan/Sherwood passed

Professor DeCoste noted that the grievance report was given in the first session so we moved on to the Vice-President's report.

9. Vice-President's Report

Professor Kunze reviewed the attached report.

10. Committee Reports

a. Economic Benefits

Professor Gismondi reviewed the attached report.

b. Health & Safety

Professor Hathaway reviewed the attached report. There was a brief discussion on whether there was something positive in the future and it was noted that this is a corporate campaign and there is little cause for positivity.

c. Academic Freedom

Professor Kunze noted the report from Professor Glasauer, outgoing Academic Freedom Chair, will be posted on-line at the end of the meeting. The need to be vigilant on defending Academic Freedom was noted.

d. OCUFA/Unit 2

Professor Cunningham reviewed the attached report.

11. Other Business

Professor Boulding thanked the Faculty Association for all the work that is done on the behalf of Members. Professor Kunze noted that through the OCUFA lens that Professor DeCoste had such a clear head and as such were really able to help individual faculty.

12. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:40 a.m.

UGFA President's Report, AGM May 2022

COVID-19

It's no secret that the COVID-19 pandemic has presented UGFA members with many challenges, both professional and personal. UGFA members have expressed to the Executive Committee a wide range of views on issues like mask and vaccine mandates and return-to-campus protocols. The UGFA executive committee has done our best to represent the interests of all UGFA members throughout this period. We were able to negotiate a series of Letters of Understanding that governed the terms and conditions of employment of UGFA members in these unusual times. While we appreciate that some aspects of these LOUs were disappointing to some of you, our legal counsel has said

that they are the envy of faculty associations across Ontario. We expect that some of the issues that have proved especially challenging over these last couple of years will be important at the bargaining table, in particular mode of course delivery and sick leave.

DHR

The UGFA has been dealing with a number of challenges with the Office of Diversity and Human Rights for a number of years. Among these challenges are unacceptably long timelines for the completion of investigations. Investigations are supposed to take a couple of months. They had begun to take as long as 18 months. COVID has been a factor in this, of course, but we certainly don't feel that such lengthy delays can be attributed entirely to COVID. We are also concerned that, at least in one case, a fact-finding team for an investigation in which an UGFA member was the respondent did not include a faculty member, as per protocol. (It's possible that this occurred more than once, and we were just not made aware of it.) Another concern is that in some cases, the person providing an initial assessment of a possible complaint also participated in the investigation, which we see as a conflict of interest. Additionally, the Human Rights Advisory Group had met only once in two years when meetings had previously been held 3 or 4 times a year. Through my participation in the Campus Coalition, which includes the leadership of other bargaining units on campus, I learned that they were also having challenges with DHR. In the middle of March, I drafted a letter that was also signed by the presidents of three other bargaining units on campus (CUPE 3913, OSSTF, and Steelworkers) and which detailed our concerns, which we sent to Charlotte, with the Board of Governors, the Provost, and the VP for HR in copy. Together we represent about 80% of employees on campus, so I think this was a strong gesture. Just a couple of days ago, the presidents of the 4 bargaining units met with Gwen the VP HR, and the VP DHR to discuss how to improve things. The VP DHR informed us that that office has recently hired another staff member, and they hope to make another hire in the near future. We hope that this will improve the issue of unacceptably lengthy investigations. The VP DHR also indicated that the Human Rights Advisory Group would go back to meeting four times a year. Our challenges with the Office of Diversity and Human Rights have been maddening especially in a context in which the Administration constantly trumpets its commitment to equity issues while at the same time neglecting an office that ought to play an important role in ensuring it. We will continue to look for progress on this issue in the future.

JC

The Joint Committee includes four representatives from the UGFA, and four representatives of the Administration. Generally, these include the UGFA President and the Provost. According to our collective agreement, "The Joint Committee shall attempt to foster effective communications and working relationships between the Parties and shall attempt to maintain a spirit of mutual co-operation and respect." It is meant to meet monthly during the academic year. We have found meetings of this committee to be a bit frustrating, as the administration rarely identifies any items for the agenda and rarely offers substantive responses to agenda items brought by the UGFA, despite knowing in

advance of the meetings what these agenda items are. We feel that this reflects the Administration feeling its relationship with the UGFA to be a low priority. Despite this, we continued to give these meetings our best efforts.

The broader landscape reflects a time of particularly fraught relations between faculty associations and university administrations. Recent times have seen an unprecedented number of strikes by faculty associations at Canadian universities. The president of CAUT has suggested that this is due largely due to the erosion of collegial governance as well as increasing interventions by provincial governments in university matters. We certainly have seen this at Guelph, and I know that you'll hear a bit more about this in the grievance report.

UGFA Executive Committee for 2022-2023

This is my last AGM as President of the UGFA; my term ends at the end of the month. I wanted to say thank you to the membership for giving me the opportunity to serve in this capacity. I wanted to say a particular thank you to Herb Kunze, who was the UGFA President when I served as Vice-President and whose shoes I am certain I did not fill, and who has also served as Vice-President during my term as President. I am so grateful for the support you have shown me in so many ways. The UGFA is very lucky to have such an outstanding staff, which has worked so very hard during these challenging times, so thank you very much to Kirsten, Denise, Jon, and especially Sue Hubers, who somehow manages not to drop any of the many, many ball she has in the air while simultaneously keeping the rest of us on track.

President: Herb Kunze, Math & Stats; Vice-President: Louise Grogan, Economics & Finance; Grievance Information Officer: Andy Hathaway, Sociology & Anthropology; Past-President: Mary DeCoste, Languages & Literature; Academic Freedom Officer: Susan Chuang, FRAN; Economic Benefits Chair: Steve Gismondi, Math & Stats; Health & Safety Chair: Pavneesh Madan, Biomedical Science; OCUFA Director: Lezlie Cunningham, Ridgetown; Treasurer: Elected from amongst Council at the first Council meeting in June.

GRIEVANCE INFORMATION OFFICER Report to UGFA Annual General Meeting

In defending UGFA members' rights under the Collective Agreement (CA), the Faculty Association has dealt with over 90 cases since 1 June 2021. These include 5 Arbitrations / Mediations, 19 Grievances, 11 Disciplinary Investigations, 15 Human Rights Complaints (7 cases representing 15 members as both complainants and respondents), 10 requests for Medical Accommodation, 1 Tenure & Promotion Appeal, as well as 32 other issues that resulted in formal meetings with the Administration.

The arbitration / mediation (the latter is typically the last process before the final arbitration, but still uses the professional services of an arbitrator jointly agreed upon by the UGFA and the Administration or appointed by the Ministry of Labour) of a grievance

represents the UGFA's most powerful tool to defend the CA. It occurs only at the end of a very lengthy process that begins with the identification of the issue and follows meetings with the affected members and with the Administration, the preparation and filing of a grievance, the Administration's response to the grievance, further meetings with the Administration, and consultations with UGFA's legal counsel. The costs of arbitrations / mediations are considerable: the arbitrator's fee, the fees for UGFA's legal counsel, the time spent by UGFA Staff and Executive members; but these costs are justified in terms of the strength of the UGFA's argument (legal counsel will advise against such an undertaking if the UGFA is unlikely to be successful) and the issue's importance to the entire membership.

In September 2021 the UGFA announced its intention to proceed to arbitration with a policy grievance filed on 3 May 2021 regarding the violation of members' rights in Unit 2 (College Professors at the Ridgetown Campus) on multiple issues including the Administration's failure to provide a proper teaching schedule. The grievance was resolved through mediation in December, however the UGFA has subsequently filed other grievances in response to further violations of the Unit 2 CA. Another arbitration was also scheduled for December regarding the Administration's failure to provide the UGFA with the list of all credit courses taught by members and non-members for the preceding academic year in keeping with Article 13.2 f of the CA. This issue was resolved on 21 December (although the Administration did not deliver all the required information as promised) but given the late date of this resolution the UGFA had to pay the full cost for an arbitration that did not occur. On 26 April 2022 a mediation resolved a grievance filed by the UGFA regarding the Administration's decision not to grant UGFA members a paid holiday on September 30 for Truth and Reconciliation Day. As a result of this mediation, members will receive another paid holiday between the end of Fall exams in December and the beginning of Winter term in January. As this report is submitted, two other arbitrations are pending which reflect the sharp decline of collegial governance at the University of Guelph. On 16 November 2021 the UGFA grieved the Administration's unilateral re-interpretation of "faculty member" regarding the membership of Senate committees and even departmental curriculum committees. This case will go before an arbitrator on 31 May 2022. On 1 April 2022 the UGFA grieved the University President's denial of promotion for a member despite the college committee's recommendation of promotion. Given the implications of this arbitrary decision for our peer-review Tenure and Promotion process, the UGFA determined that this case be submitted to arbitration as soon as possible: the date has not yet been set.

A grievance is a formal allegation by the UGFA that the Administration has violated specific terms of the CA. If the Administration denies a grievance, that is responds that it has not violated the CA, the UGFA must then determine whether to submit the grievance to arbitration. In 2021-22 the UGFA succeeded in resolving several grievances through constructive discussion with the Office of Faculty and Academic Staff Relations (FASR). Despite their successful resolution, however, the launching of these grievances demonstrates the UGFA's on-going concerns about the Administration's failure to follow the CA regarding: compensation and salary anomalies; the Administration's responsibility to protect members' privacy; the Tenure, Promotion,

and Performance Review process; disciplinary investigations and the imposition of discipline; the Administration's responsibility to protect the health, safety, and security of members; the imposition of new electronic systems without meaningful consultation.

Beyond those headed for arbitration, other grievances remain unresolved. On March 30 the UGFA filed a grievance regarding faculty appointments: the Administration had involved an external recruitment firm in the search for a department chair. At a meeting on April 11, the Administration assured the UGFA they had "fixed the problem," yet the advertisement for the position continues to indicate involvement of the external firm. On 19 April the UGFA grieved the Administration's failure to provide all members with lists of all courses in every unit, including course enrollments and number of TAs assigned to each course, in keeping with Article 18.20 of the CA. A meeting with the Administration on this grievance has not yet occurred. Despite the recent settlement of issues affecting Unit 2 members, on 2 May the UGFA filed two new grievances regarding the management of the Ridgetown Campus: one concerns challenges to a member's medical accommodation; the other is a response to the Administration's unilateral alterations to position descriptions, and to terms and conditions of employment. Four Unit 2 members have also appealed their course assignments, which further demonstrates the poor management and declining morale at Ridgetown.

Two other grievances currently in abeyance (but which the UGFA Executive approved for arbitration) involve the bullying of UGFA members by students. Multiple faculty members have been investigated for possible discipline based on questionable student allegations: the UGFA regards many of these allegations as frivolous or vexatious and others as threats to Academic Freedom. We continue to see a worrying pattern of students (graduate and undergraduate) bullying, harassing, and defaming their professors. Despite repeated requests, the Administration has failed to address this behaviour. The UGFA continues to press for a new student code of conduct that would prohibit attacks against members' reputations and integrity and that would include real sanctions for such behavior. This goal should be addressed in collective bargaining.

Another worrying theme that emerged during the past year is the increasing number of members filing human rights or other kinds of complaints against other members. In these cases, the UGFA represents both complainants and respondents, with no exchange of information between the UGFA representatives on opposite sides of the case. It is rare that the results of these complaints restore collegiality or tranquility in the workplace, however, and both parties usually remain unsatisfied. The UGFA believes that this growing culture of complaints reflects the increasingly stressful conditions of work, but also believes that it is a consequence of the Administration's failure to manage the university effectively.

Bill Cormack, out-going GIO
Andy Hathaway, in-coming GIO

UGFA Annual General Meeting (Part 2) Vice-President's Report

H. Kunze

The past year was very busy. There are thankfully many high points to report, and also a few low points that must be mentioned.

UGFA Awards Committee

The only committee identified in the UGFA Constitution as being chaired by the Vice-President is the Awards Committee, and it really is an enjoyable responsibility: the committee gets to read about the amazing things that our members do. Reading the many impressive nomination packages is inspiring, and it also reinforces my sense of the importance of Academic Freedom in teaching, as the many nominees deliver their outstanding teaching often by using wildly different approaches.

The Unit 2 Teaching Award Committee met on March 9. I'm very happy to announce that Jennifer Campbell has been awarded the 2022 UGFA Unit 2 Award for Excellence in Teaching!

The Unit 1 Awards Committee met on May 2, and the Unit 1 award recipients will be announced at the first UGFA Council meeting of the Fall semester.

I want to give my sincere thanks to all of the nominators and contributors. It was clear to the Awards Committees that these packages are often a labour of love for an amazing colleague and person, and I value that sense of community and fondness even more given the sort of isolation and separation we have endured over the past couple of years. I also would like to thank the members who served on the Awards Committees, and I hope that they found it to be a rewarding experience.

University Pension Plan (UPP)

Looking back, the initial work, maybe really just initial conversations, about a university-sector pension plan began back in 2012 or so. I remember well the first big meeting in 2014 at a hotel near the Toronto airport, with most universities present: administration representatives, different faculty associations, different trade unions, unrepresented non-unionized staff, mediators, and more. It was a zoo! A few years would pass, with a few attempts to create the UPP stalling and halting—really, collapsing—for various reasons, right up to the end of 2016.

And then, in January 2017, the tri-university attempt by Guelph, Queen's, and Toronto began, building on past work. It has required an incredible amount of effort, and it tested and further expanded my knowledge and "skill" in directions I never expected my career to take. It has been interesting to "credentialize" my pension knowledge through formal examinations and I felt that I had the full support of UGFA Executive, Council, and, indeed, the full membership, and I did my best to represent UGFA's interests.

All of the work delivered: on July 1, 2021, the UPP came to life! Without even a single glitch in the matrix, thanks to the careful work of UPP staff.

Some highlights of the past year:

- All pension plans from the three founding universities transferred into the UPP with a going-concern surplus. By entering a Jointly-Sponsored Pension Plan, the university escapes the solvency funding requirements, so the understanding we had based upon the earlier Professional Plan valuation was that the University was looking at a \$100M going-concern liability, while escaping a \$680M solvency liability. Perhaps counter to one's intuition, during the pandemic, all of the universities seem to have had very good investment years, which helped turn around the numbers everywhere. Keep in mind that there will be yearly valuations to determine future liability/gain for past service, with each university owning any liability for the first ten years of the UPP and the liability being shared gradually with the plan over the subsequent ten years.
(As a side note, the investment good fortune extends to non-pension investments: during the fiscal year ending April 2021, the University lost much revenue from parking and residence, for example, but the \$60M decrease in revenue was heavily offset by the \$50M spike in investment returns.)
- On January 1, 2022, the UGFA entered the UPP as a Participating Employer. We have no role in governance on the employer side, of course, but our staff are now accruing a UPP pension! I failed to make this happen for July 1, 2021, but we did manage to negotiate a six-month buy-back provision that our staff members may choose to access.
- Also on January 1, 2022, UPP staff and UTFA staff became members of the plan, and Trent University converted their faculty pension plan to the UPP.
- On April 1, 2022, the UPP took over the management of UofT's pension assets, so the UPP now manages all \$11.6B in plan assets.
- The UPP BoT, CEO, and Staff held a few plan member meetings during the past year, most notably related to Responsible Investing. A web search on the name of the CEO, Barbara Zvan, reflects her strong record on and commitment to RI principles.
- The Employee Sponsor Committee was very busy during the past year, and work related to building the plan continues even after the plan has come into effect. An outreach component related to holding this role emerged once the plan existed: I have been a point person for OCUFA, including playing a role at their workshops, fielding questions at various meetings, being on the OCUFA Finance Committee and working at that workshop, and organizing a first formal meeting for OCUFA leadership and the UPP staff. Representatives from OCUFA members institutions have reached out to me directly with questions, and I've presented to them on various topics. Just last week, I gave

a presentation to WLUFAs members on UPP governance and consent bargaining (my fourth presentation at WLU), and on May 18, the day that this reported is delivered at our AGM, I'm also speaking on UGFA's experience in a session on day two of a three- day OCUFA pension conference.

I have built many relationships through the UPP work, with my colleagues on the Employee Sponsor Committee, including our advisors; with the employer-side representatives; with many other Faculty Associations with pension- or finance-related questions, and with legal and other experts through conference involvement; and with colleagues on campus who have contacted me with various sorts of question. It has been a rich endeavor for somebody like me, who values human contact and interaction. I have to give my deepest thanks to Mary DeCoste and Sue Hubers for their unwavering support, in the last year especially related to getting UGFA into the UPP as a Participating Employer.

Joint Salary Review

Background: The Collective Agreement ratified in 2017 included Letter of Understanding 13 on a Joint Salary Review (JSR), which would "examine the issue of salary anomalies, if any, and make recommendation for correction of any identified anomalies." This LOU was bargained during the period that the Administration started its own salary review, and a "note" in the LOU specifically stated that "the ongoing equity salary review will continue notwithstanding this letter." In hindsight, perhaps the Administration believed that, by mentioning their solo review, this note suggested that their solo review might serve as a substitute for a joint review. In any case, the JSR did not start, and, when the Administration's solo review resulted in a ~\$2K base increase for all faculty members who identify as female, they suggested to us that they had satisfied the obligation of the LOU. Instead of agreeing with that suggestion, we grieved, and were successful in arbitration, on two points: the salary increase not having been applied retroactively to the date of the salary data set, and the salary increase not having been awarded to all UGFA members who identify as female. An additional arbitration dealing with the absence of the required JSR led to a facilitator being brought in to help the UGFA and the Administration move forward on that initiative.

In the past year, the JSR committee has had many facilitated meetings and significant progress has been made. Presently, we have agreed on the data set and are working on the modeling. There is no guarantee that the committee work will reach the stage of producing recommendations, as per its mandate, but I remain dedicated to and optimistic for that outcome.

The process we've followed has involved the sharing of confidential data, program code, and outputs, producing an environment of common/shared understanding that could not exist otherwise and is quite unique compared to my past and other

interactions with the Administration; so, I have to thank the Administration team for their willingness to have this productive setting. Of course, I thank all of the UGFA members involved, Bill Cormack, Mary DeCoste, Steve Gismondi, Andy Hathaway, and Sue Hubers. In fact, I have to give an enormous extra thank you to Steve specifically, as he has done an incredible amount of work.

Senate

Last year, I wrote that, “My experience on Senate in no way reflects the vision of collegial governance that lives in my heart.” Well, that’s still completely true. Senate was the usual theatre again over the past year, but it had many highly distressing moments, three of which I have to include in this report:

- Members of Senate were clearly anxious not just to hear about the Administration’s pandemic plans, but also to feel that those plans were sensible and compassionate, among other things. Senate meetings often featured challenging questions—about the high level of fear that the speaking member has, about the Administration lobbying for Public Health exemptions, about the scientific basis for decisions, about freedom of faculty members to make decisions related to their teaching, etc.—and the responses were rarely satisfactory answers, at least in my opinion. Question periods were stopped so that the “business of Senate” could proceed. I always came away from Senate very sad that the reasonable and palpable concern and fear seemed to be so unrecognized or, worse, disregarded by the Administration.
- As Fall 2021 approached, there was a Senate meeting on August 25. In the opening period, the President was pressed by various faculty members about the same sort of challenging topics listed in the first bullet. The responses were evasive: the government is slow to make policies, UoG is part of a sector-wide response, self-praise for switching from an attestation to proof of vax, the 250-student course cap will reduce density, and so on. I felt that the silence following each response spoke volumes. A few days before the start of classes, when pressed on enforcement of safety measures, the President said, “What does compliance look like? We are working on that.” The Provost chimed in at one point, “We are expecting that faculty with children under 12 will be able to safely teach.” You get the idea. This meeting led to a group of faculty members assembling the needed support to force a special meeting of Senate just one week later on September 2, with this motion put forward:
“Resolved that, for the F21/W22 academic year, Senate temporarily approves fully remote, non-distance education course formats, asserts that instructors are the best qualified to determine the manner in which they will teach their courses, and affirms that oversight of course formats should occur primarily at the departmental/school level.”

I saw the motion as requiring that the Administration bargain this outcome

with UGFA, as Senate cannot dictate our terms and conditions of employment. The power of the Chair of Senate was on full display at this meeting. Before you knew it, the motion was sent to the Bylaws committee, and ten days later Senators received an email saying that the Administration had received legal advice saying that Senate does not have the jurisdiction to pass such a motion.

The Administration had consistently declared throughout the year that the focus of their decision-making is on students, and they were asked at this meeting whether and how they had consulted with students. The kindest interpretation of their response is that they didn't really do so much of this, but, you know, they sort just sort of know.

One of our faculty colleagues discussed a student survey they had run.

Another member self-identified as being active in pedagogical research. In response, two Senators unleashed attacks that don't deserve air time, but were thereafter referred to as "being credentialized," and I would say, "being decredentialized." It was horrible scene, and the President did nothing to defuse it. In fact, the only reaction she had was in response to another member who voiced loud outrage at the affair; she chastised this person. The sad story continued, as one of the two targeted members resigned from Senate, with an article in the local press documenting the events at Senate. The article came out on the day of a subsequent Senate meeting, so one might expect that the other Senators and the President may have opened Senate with some thoughtful words, including an apology for behaviour at and mishandling of the earlier meeting. Nope.

- At the November Senate meeting, the proposed membership of the Chancellor Selection Committee was presented. It was mentioned that the committee must include three faculty members, and it was clear that one of the people counted as a faculty member was, in fact, a Dean. The following exchange occurred (HK=me, FM1 and FM2 are two faculty members):

HK: With respect, [X] is a Dean, and within the Senate Membership he is reported as an ex- officio member of Senate not a faculty member.

Secretariat: One doesn't have to be a faculty member on Senate to be a faculty member on this committee.

HK: But does one need to be a faculty member?

Secretariat: Oh, we are going with the definition that a faculty member is anybody who holds a tenure-track or tenured appointment as a Professor.

HK: Who is eligible to be nominated as a Senate faculty member and who votes? Secretariat: Oh, that's different again.

...

FM1: I'm not ready to vote, since the representation question has to be answered. There have been various issues involving what a faculty member is...

Secretariat: Faculty are tenured or tenure-track professors. [X]'s role on this committee is consistent with past practice. It's been identified as a concern. We will be looking at this. When they are on Senate they are ex-officio, but when they are on committees and not ex-officio they are faculty.

FM1: So, we let them be what they want to be at the moment. Secretariat: Sputter.

Charlotte: We need to move along, so we'll just listen to FM2's question.

FM2: Since there is a clear definition of faculty that includes 800 or so people, why not explain why we couldn't find three faculty members who would be uncontentious?

Presenter: Under Senate rules for selection committee slates, they are faculty members. We operated on not excluding anybody who is eligible until somebody says they are not eligible. The Secretariat has said they are eligible because they are tenured professors.

Charlotte: Let's move forward.

FM: So if it is anybody who is tenured, then faculty members includes the president, provost, and vice-presidents?

Secretariat: That's correct.

And then Charlotte gave this the hook. The vote on the committee membership passed with 61% support.

The end of my term as Vice-President also marks the end of my term as the UGFA Member on Senate. I have to thank Louise Grogan, the next Vice-President, for taking on the Senate role, and, while I don't expect it, I do hope that has some good experiences at Senate.

Letter of Understanding 14: Workload

As a reminder, the Letter of Understanding reads, "A joint committee shall be established within 8 weeks of ratification of the Collective Agreement to review and make recommendations to the Joint Committee relative to the assigned workload of Members."

With regret, I don't think that there is anything meaningful I can report on this file. We did have a number of meetings throughout the year, but I don't think we got anywhere. The Administration is hung up on the idea that UGFA members want recognition for the work they do, which is true, of course, but nobody wants to know that there are additional fields in an eCV. The Administration seems unable to recognize that work, especially BS work, needs to be reduced.

We tried framing this as a wellness issue because, you know, they care so much about wellness, right? We didn't get anywhere. We tried framing this as an issue about institutional reputation, as the amount of research declines, or the quality of teaching, reference letters, and so on, decline: think of the effect on the various types of reviews our various types of programs undergo. We didn't get anywhere.

As hard as it is to write, part of the “problem” is that, since members love their work and love their students, members are willing to break their backs for a while when things are busy; in so doing, none of their work suffers and they get through the crunch. But then that becomes the new normal, which just keeps ratcheting upwards, along with regular sprinkles of increased work we don’t particular love (new forms, new software, and so on).

Bleak note: There is no solution elsewhere. Every Association reports the same problem.

I want to thank again the committee members who increased their workload in order to discuss workload: Steve Gismondi, Neil MacLusky, and Sandra Parmegiani.

**Economic Benefits Report
Steve Gismondi, Chair**

It has been a pleasure to serve as your UGFA Economic Benefits Committee Chair this past year. A brief report is presented below in the form of a chart/timeline regarding some of the projects I’ve been involved with, including summary details. In short, it’s been an “eye-opening” experience. I comment that it’s critical to each members’ livelihood – that UGFA be consulted and involved in administrative decisions regarding all financial matters. For example, even the development of training materials for T&P helps to maintain adherence to Article 21 and the agreed T&P process in the best interests of promotion of our members.

Brief Report

<u>May</u>	<u>June</u>	<u>July</u>	<u>Aug</u>	<u>Sep</u>	<u>Oct</u>	<u>Nov</u>	<u>Dec</u>	<u>Jan</u>	<u>Feb</u>	<u>Mar</u>	<u>Apr</u>
T&P - with FASR including training presentations											
Pension - UPP Launch, Info Sessions, BoG, Investments, Monitoring											
		Sedona to UNIWeb - with FASR re: testing & launch									
			JSR Cmtee - much analysis								
									Bargaining Prep Cmtee inc. Benefits Review		

T&P Portfolio: Last year, myself and Mary DeCoste met with FASR on a variety of occasions to develop training materials for T&P committee members. These materials are maintained as Power Point presentations and videos in CourseLink. Our goal was to ensure an accurate interpretation of Article 21 as presented in these materials. During the fall, we participated in three joint training sessions with FASR for T&P department and college committee members, including college floaters. If you have questions about the T&P process, please email me at gismondi@uoguelph.ca.

Pension Portfolio: Last July, our former UoG pension plan balance was successfully and uneventfully transferred to the University Pension Plan (UPP). This was a notable achievement, the culmination of many years of planning and dedicated work. Most recently, Herb Kunze managed these details. As your UGFA representative on the BoG Pensions Sub-committee (dissolved late last year), I reported to Council re: details of the transfer. Of minor note, a previously projected “going concern” never materialized. The UoG HR department continues to liaison with UPP re: questions and preparation for retirement. Note also that the interactive Pension Projection tool is available (through a link) posted at <https://pensions.uoguelph.ca/>. Annual pension statements, a variety of explicit pension plan details, including definitions and the text of trust agreements etc. are available here as well. I’ve likewise attended (and will continue to attend) a variety of pension related meetings and conferences. I’m also available to direct you re: questions about your pension. Email me at gismondi@uoguelph.ca. The UPP website (our main “go to”) is: <https://myupp.ca/>.

JSR Portfolio: Last year I joined our Joint Salary Review committee (JSR). I help to investigate the idea of defining equity-based salary anomalies within our membership. Briefly, a specific point in time is declared where members’ salary information is captured, made anonymous, analyzed, and ultimately compared to a model(s) of predicted salaries for the purpose of defining and identifying anomalous salaries. That is, a variety of statistical models are developed and discussed. The planned outcome of this work is a future report to be shared with our membership, where UGFA is allowed limited commentary. A past report of the most recent review is available at: https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=&ved=2ahUKEwiiu_X8-tL3AhX4Ap0JHd4CAQcQFnoECAUQAQ&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.uoguelph.ca%2Fvpacademic%2Fpdfs%2FPublic-Faculty-Salary-Analysis.pdf&usq=AOvVaw22zm3ch6zbs39AUM9vzTwL.

Bargaining Committee Portfolio: Collective agreement language, interpretation and possible additions/deletions were reviewed these past few months, as related to a variety of Articles and LOUs. The work is ongoing. This is in preparation for potential requests to open articles as part of the bargaining process. I’ve also participated in meetings specific to bargaining principles, member benefits and compensation. I’ve likewise attended (and will continue to attend) a variety of bargaining related meetings and conferences. I will serve on the Bargaining Committee in a secondary role, as needed this summer and fall.

Health & Safety Chair, Report to UGFA General Meeting, 18 May 2022

Naomi Klein’s book *The Shock Doctrine* describes a strategy in which crises are exploited to establish controversial and questionable policies. Those most effected are too emotionally and physically distracted to respond and effectively resist. Well, here we are two years and then some in to the pandemic and the signs are all around us. I’m not talking about Spring!

The good news is that management, with some prodding from the unions, appears to recognize its obligation to adhere to most health and safety regulations that are required by law. Doing the bare minimum, of course, has been contentious as U of G employees realize that business interests often overshadow their concerns for health and safety, and the conditions under which they do their work. As our team of lawyers often tell us, or remind us, management rights trump our rights. Can they do that? Yes they can!

In previous reports to AGM, I have sought to balance my appraisal of a hopeless situation with a dose of cautious optimism. After all, the University is seeking to position itself as a top employer. Its position on the Forbes list hinges on commitment to employee satisfaction. Hence it has a wellness program that unfortunately to date prefers to pay lip service to employee mental health than engage with its employees and find actual solutions.

Rather than accepting that this would be good for business and show leadership in listening to the voice of the employee, we get empty platitudes and yoga. The latest bold initiative designed to gain our trust (and secure the Manulife gold standard) replaces wellness with wellbeing, a more “wholistic” view of health.

Is it cynical to call this a distraction from real issues to avoid pursuing organizational solutions? Of course not! Academics need to tell it like it is. This is a PR campaign. It is corporate behaviour. Those of us with friends who work in that world can confirm that good employers have wellness programs. There are plenty of resources out there they can point to if you’re “not feeling quite yourself today” and willing to seek help.

This is a world where all roads lead to Homewood. Surely not the best that one of Canada’s top employers can do. Starting off by citing Naomi Klein, of course, opens up a door to quote some Dickens for good measure. “Please, can we have some more?” Now there’s a Twist!

Please stop bringing up our mental health. It’s shameless and insulting. They can do better and they know it. If only they would listen. In the meantime, UGFA will keep pushing for engagement and speaking truth to power at every opportunity. It has been an honour serving our members in this role.

Andy Hathaway

Susan Glasauer, Academic Freedom report 2022

This is the end of my 2nd term as AF chair and I’m sorry I can’t be at the AGM in person to give my last report. Thanks to Sue Chuang for her willingness to serve as the next AF chair. Thanks to members of Council and the Executive Council for the moments of levity despite (or because of) the many challenges over the last few years. And thanks especially for the effective and empathic leadership of UGFA.

In the last year, we did not have a candidate for the Academic Freedom award. Sue Chuang will pick up with the award in the new term. It's been a difficult few years for academic freedom. Faculty have been busy dealing with expanding workloads, and many of us have been isolated from each other in new ways. Academic freedom has not been given much attention in Canada, other than during the first half year of the pandemic when there was concern about violations of AF with online teaching formats. Instead, there has been much more attention in the press to how students have suffered, especially in terms of mental health and the negative impacts on learning. Given the lack of attention it has gotten lately, what is the current state of academic freedom? I'll comment on this briefly in general terms, because there just isn't enough information for rigorous analysis – and that flags one current problem with AF in Canada and more broadly. What I can report is based on information from UGFA members, the nature of the increasing grievances at Guelph, and a number of recent books and articles on academic freedom, corporatization of universities and the shift of universities to a customer service model. Others may draw different conclusions from that information, and I am happy to share the reports and books that I've collected.

A real threat to academic freedom is not necessarily the splashy and often vitriolic news coverage of faculty who make controversial public statements. That happens, but it doesn't happen as much as the outcry can lead us to believe. Instead, AF is whittled down bit by bit when we feel compelled to filter our speech, in the classroom and in other professional contexts. In the first part of the AGM last week, there was a discussion around the use of social media by students to attack their professors, with management claiming that policing such platforms is outside their control. As someone pointed out in the chat box at that meeting, if this is true, then why does management pay so much attention to it? So it's no wonder that we filter our speech; cases that proceed to formal investigation have destroyed careers and reputations, and the injustice suffered by faculty in many cases leads us to realize how little it takes. We can easily put ourselves in those shoes.

We also recognize that some students are particularly vulnerable these days. The pandemic has hit many of them hard, and in our humanity we don't want to add to their burdens. The mental health of faculty has been far less in discussion. We are expected to always be "the adults in the room" despite teaching roomfuls of adults. And we can feel pressure to avoid pushing students in the necessary and often challenging quest for truth because of the discomfort that it may cause them. My respect for faculty who teach and conduct research on controversial topics has grown enormously in the last few years. They are on the front lines. What they do is critical to developing effective citizens who know how to question the status quo and who recognize the complexity of the problems we face as a society. We need to support them.

There are other challenges for academic freedom. At a recent council meeting, I brought up how the entrenchment of corporate culture in universities is a growing threat. It doesn't need much imagination to see corporate approaches being rapidly implemented at Guelph. The strong push to bring more the international students - recently called "customers" by a dean - to Guelph is especially troubling. Who will inform

these students of the integral role of academic freedom in their university education? Some of these students come from countries with authoritarian governments, where academic freedom is clearly not supported.

We can never be complacent about our right to academic freedom. It is reestablished for UGFA members at Guelph with each new collective agreement. This makes it dynamic and open for negotiation every few years. Because of this, we need to be sure that we support academic freedom and defend it loudly and clearly against subtly erosive forces as much as we defend it against more obvious violations.

Thanks for your support!

OCUFA REPORT FOR UGFA AGM MAY 2022

Submitted by Lezlie Cunningham

Key Points from the October meeting

The proposed priorities for the upcoming year were set to

- Good jobs for all including fairness for contract faculty, workload and equity and with Covid, health and safety
- Public universities for all including funding, public funding realities in a pandemic, performance based funding and
- Reengage and build capacity and mobilize support from OCUFA Members organizations
- OCUFA established its election advocacy platform and plan
- A return to campus plan including a framework and instructions. I attended an excellent Covid webinar with members of the Ontario Science table.
- The idea of micro credentialing was discussed with an obvious NO from the board

Key points from the February meeting

This was the best OCUFA meeting so far. Frank Graves from the ECOS group presented a great polling research highlighting the pulse of Canadians and expectations for the upcoming June 2022 election. From that, OCUFA further developed an election strategy which includes target ridings with a small vote margin from the previous election. In addition, Laura Mae Lindo, MPP NDP, from Kitchener spoke on the topic of equity. The primary focus and outcome of this meeting were to plan for the election and issues surrounding equity and the priorities.

Key points from the May meeting

OCUFA has reached out to all the major parties to disclose their platforms regarding university education.

The official platform for the NDP indicated that the party was favourable to reversing cuts to OSAP, converting loans to grants, wiping out student loan interest, scrapping

performance base funding. The platform also includes, wanting to do a find and fix audit, encouraging reviews of sexual violence policy, funding for culturally competent trauma-informed services on campus, legislation to protect student union, and investing in co-ops and internships and work-integrated learning. The NDP supports 10 permanent personal emergency leave days.

Specifically, the NDP want “fair treatment for contract workers including faculty”, to repeal Bill 124, increasing funding in line with OCUFAA recommendation for funding Northern Ontario/Bilingualism/Indigenous grants.

The official platform for the Liberal Party indicated that they were favourable to reversal of OSAP cut, committed to keeping tuition fees the same and 10 paid sick day. OCUFA found the platform to be thin but responses on public record indicate that that the part has promised a 1 billion investment in post-secondary school funding, to increase operating grants support faculty renewal strategies to hire more full-time faculty and provide support for a northern Ontario independent francophone university. The Liberals will not remove performance base funding but plan to repeal Bill 124.

The Green Party Platform includes reversing OSAP cuts, converting loans to grants for low and middle income students, eliminate interest on student debt, provide 3.7 billion in funding over 4 years, Remove performance-based funding, provide 10 paid sick days, repeal performance base funding and is committed to faculty renewal and making education and university grants a priority.

In addition a great deal of time at the meeting was spent on explaining the UPP to the Board Members. Thanks to Herb, I was already well informed so didn't learn anything new.

The OCUFA SWEC (Equity Committee) introduced the new OCUFA Employment Equity Primer which includes definitions, actions and checklist and is intended for associations to provide a wide variety of examples of how to imagine and incorporate an equity lens into the work you are already doing. Unfortunately, the document is was imbedded in the information package but a promise was made to share with associations soon.

UGFA UNIT 2 Report for AGM – May 18, 2022 Submitted by Lezlie Cunningham

The UGFA has spent a lot of time supporting Unit 2 over the past year especially in the area of holding our new administration (new Assistant Dean Academic and new Director) accountable to our Collective agreement as it seems they In August of 2021, simply did not want to abide by the terms therein. Areas of concern included: scheduling of courses and stand up hours and removing lab section repeats from

Members workloads. Decision were being made about how courses were being delivered without any consultation with the Member assigned to teach the course. In addition, it took them months to fill coordinator positions and at one point the Assistant Dean Academic was acting as a coordinator.

The UGFA filed numerous grievances regarding workload and lack of support and help and it became apparent that management was doing things differently than before. Also, grievances were filed on lack of management to post available jobs, lack of schedules for members in a timely manner and management's failure to provide appointment letters to the association.

As a result of the appointment letters grievance, it was mutually decided that all UGFA Regular Full-Time Members would receive appointment letters by the end of March/early April. Our collective agreement asks for Member input and areas of expertise to be submitted (once requested by Management) to the ADA. Subsequently, appointment letters were sent to most Members, but the assignment of duties indicated a blatant disregard for Member's preferences or expertise. In addition, labs repeats were removed and some accommodations were disregarded. This has prompted further involvement from the UGFA who are helping the affected members through the appeals process as laid out in our agreement.

We did manage to get our Covid LOU rollover and after 2 plus years of trying, we were finally able to reach an agreement on Vet Tech job descriptions which are now finalized.

The recipient of the UGFA Teaching Award was Jennifer Campbell, RVT.