

December 13, 2006

A

Two Issues of Note in Negotiations

C

1. The Administration's APE Proposal: Management by Objectives

T

In accordance with our collective agreement, every year each member of the faculty bargaining unit, whether full-time or part-time, is required to submit an Annual Report. The Annual Report is the basis of the Annual Performance Evaluation (APE) and becomes part of the official record of the member's work.

S

The Administration proposes to add to the Annual Report a statement of each member's "objectives" for the coming academic year in the applicable areas of teaching, research and service. Moreover, it proposes that the APE process include the discussion and setting of objectives for each member. The proposal is silent on who sets the objectives and on how objective-setting would affect APE scores and Promotion and Tenure decisions. Potentially it gives the Administration wide latitude and opens the door to a process that would undermine faculty members' academic freedom to choose research directions and flexibly respond to new opportunities. Academic freedom in the area of teaching could also be compromised. If objectives for teaching refer to scores on teaching evaluations, the process would discourage instructors from taking unpopular positions in the classroom.

In principle, there is nothing wrong with setting objectives and planning. Faculty members plan all the time, in all three areas of responsibilities. The issue is who controls the planning process. By proposing that planning by objectives be incorporated into the APE article of our collective agreement, the Administration proposes to control the planning process—to say nothing of a proposal for a kind of planning (Managing by Objectives) discredited in business studies and management theory. Planning a career—its shape and direction—is what autonomous professionals do. Micro-management by the employer has no place in a professional career. Indeed, with only one exception, no faculty collective agreement in Canada contains such a provision.

Some members may recall the PACFED Report (*Provost's Advisory Committee on Faculty Evaluation and Development*), in which the Administration tried to implement a scheme for micro-managing scholarly productivity. The PACFED proposal was so odious that it led to the drive to certify UWOFA as a union. PACFED's ill-considered and vigorously rejected proposals have now resurfaced in current negotiations in the Administration's proposal for the APE process. These proposals were bad in 1997, and seeing them again in 2006 raises grave concerns.

The UWOFA Board has passed a motion supporting your negotiating team in its opposition to this provocative and objectionable proposal. Your union will defend your right to manage your career without the interference of the Administration acting under the influence of ephemeral managerial enthusiasms.

2. Does the Administration's Salary Proposal Close the Salary Gap?

Salaries for full-time faculty at UWO are significantly lower than at comparable institutions. Bargaining Bulletin 20 (http://www.uwofa.ca/bb3/bb3_061013.pdf) provided information on 2005-06 average full-time salaries for five of the Bovey Six universities (data for Toronto were, and still are, unavailable). With the "Bovey Mid 3"—McMaster, Queen's and Waterloo—as the comparison group, the salary gaps by age group were:

	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60+
Dollars	\$4,806	\$58	\$3,574	\$10,564	\$9,981	\$8,216	\$6,171
Percent of UWO Salary	6.23%	0.07%	3.89%	11.17%	9.90%	7.43%	5.21%

How does the most recent Administration proposal address this problem?

In a word, inadequately. Let's discuss first what is proposed for 2006-07.

- The Administration's proposal for **Scale** (or Across the Board) increases of 2.75% is less than that at all the other Bovey Five, except Guelph.
- All the Bovey Six have a **Career Progress/Merit/Progress through the Ranks** plan under which salaries increase annually, with the amount depending on each member's job performance and current salary. At UWO the Performance Linked Career Progress (PLCP) component of salaries should fulfill this role. However, past PLCP amounts have been roughly two-thirds of what similarly situated faculty at the other Bovey Five have received. This has caused the salary gap to widen over time. As discussed in another Bulletin (No. 22, http://www.uwofa.ca/bb3/bb3_061107.pdf), the Administration's latest proposal would continue this pattern. Indeed, the Administration has stated explicitly that it is not committed to a competitive Career Progress plan.
- The Administration has acknowledged the existence of a mid-career salary sag, and it has made a proposal for **Mid-Career Catch Up** of \$500,000 in each of the first two years, provided we agree to a four-year contract. These funds would be targeted to mid-career tenure-stream faculty. However, the amount proposed will NOT close the gaps. Mechanisms for distributing such funds have not been discussed, but if they were divided equally among members aged 40-59 as of July 1, 2005, each person would receive an estimated \$962. Clearly, this would hardly make a dent in the gaps for age ranges 45-49, 50-54 and 55-59 shown in Table 1 above.
- The Administration's proposal includes a small **Anomalies Fund** intended to remedy unusually low salaries of individuals.

Where would we stand under the Administration's offer?

Table 2 gives estimates of the salary gaps for 2006-07 (calculated using the average salary for each age band in 2005-06, and assuming the same population as Table 1). At the other places, scale and average career progress/merit amounts have been applied. For UWO, *all* the components of the Administration's offer—scale, career progress, anomalies adjustments (assumed distributed evenly across age groups, on average), and mid-career catch up for 2006-07 (distributed to those in the age range 45-59)—are included.

	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60+
Dollars	\$6,014	\$1,178	\$4,856	\$11,450	\$10,584	\$8,740	\$7,202
Percent of UWO Salary	7.35%	1.31%	5.01%	11.44%	9.94%	7.51%	5.84%

What the Administration proposes for 2006-07 would not close any of the salary gaps. At best, it comes close to holding the line for the mid-career age ranges eligible for salary catch up funds. For other groups, the gaps in 2006-07 would be larger than in 2005-06.

What will happen after 2006-07?

We don't know for certain. McMaster, Queen's and Waterloo have agreements up to 2007-08, with scale or across-the-board increases about the same or slightly more than for 2006-07, and exceeding the Administration's proposed scale of 2.75% in 2007-08. Negotiations at Toronto and Guelph for 2007-08 have not yet started, but there is no reason to believe faculty there will achieve much less (if any less) than this year. Guelph has recently unionized, partly because of its relatively low salaries.

For 2007-08, then, the Administration's proposal would hold the line for mid-career age groups (due to the second year of the mid-career catch up funds), but for other age groups the salary gaps would likely grow. After that, if the Administration's proposal came to be, the gaps would probably widen for all age groups.