



CAAT Academic Negotiating Team

TO: CAAT Academic Local Presidents
FROM: Ted Montgomery, Negotiating Team Chair
DATE: January 28, 2006
RE: Negotiations Update

Once again, the management negotiating committee has circulated a correspondence – ostensibly written for managers but obviously aimed at faculty readers – that misrepresents the facts.

Workload

Management claims: “None of Management’s proposals increase faculty workload.” At the bargaining table management has told us repeatedly that they wish to “redistribute workload.” They mean that the total number of teaching hours taught by the total numbers of teachers will not increase. Truth is the redistribution will increase many teachers’ workloads. And the proposals have additional increases. These reveal management’s actual intent.

Management has proposed the right to assign additional work at 44 hours per week for all 36 or 38 weeks including weeks where there is no teaching. All 36 or 38 weeks with or without teaching will be designated as “teaching weeks.” Further, beyond those weeks, management is still demanding the right to document all activities in all non-teaching periods without the issuance of a SWF to record such work. This is all additional work. Management also told the faculty team at the bargaining table that colleges would reduce the number of part time teachers by “redistributing” that work also to full-time faculty if they could use averaging. Management asserts that they are “asking for no significant changes to the status quo.” It is misleading and untrue.

No Settlement Reached

Bargaining is stalled because management refuses to offer any improvements at all in workload. When the faculty team asked them point blank what is in their offer for faculty, management told us – averaging and pilot projects. Their proposals, by their own admission, are all about transferring work from one full-timer to another and from part-time to full-time. That is their only solution to the quality problems identified by Rae.

The pilot projects were developed with no faculty involvement. Both remove weekly caps and one removes all workload caps. That they describe as a way “to build consensus around change.”

The union proposed authentic academic councils similar to university senates with the authority to make academic decisions. Management’s negotiator told us that proposal was a non-starter. Such bodies were “not appropriate for college faculty.” Management also told the faculty team that they would never allow teachers the right to determine evaluation methods for their courses so long as there was credit for evaluation. Consensus building, but only around the changes management wants.

On January 24, management still did not respond the union’s position tabled on December 16. When asked how much they were prepared to spend on workload changes to the Collective

Agreement, they replied that spending would only be on a college-by-college basis. Accordingly, any Collective Agreement amendments had to be cost-neutral – their redistribution model of some sort.

Salary

Management's bogus salary comparison goes back to 2002, before our current Collective Agreement existed. It also, and this is very important to realize, excludes from the high school salaries, the additional 0.5% in their contracts for each of their last 2 years. Management also completely ignores Ontario university settlements. They again further violate the Wages and Benefits Report by using college support staff and other jurisdictions. Still no mention of college senior administrative increases. Management references 2-step coordinator allowances and the recognition allowance but mentions neither the high school department head allowances, nor the various other special allowances many high school teachers receive, nor the many allowances of university professors. Management knows full well that their salary offer lowers our position significantly (by over \$3000) against the midpoint in the gap between our comparator groups. They would have us fall further and further behind.

Management describes their salary offer of 12.6% at the end of four years as "generous." Wonder what they call the 20.65% increases their top managers got in the last two years reported?

The Vote

Management claims that the union has not made our proposals public. This is totally false and can only be seen as intended to be inflammatory. Every local has a copy of the exact contract language currently proposed by the union. That December 16th position is on the OPSEU website.

Management have made it clear that there will be no further changes to their offer until the colleges are faced with the possibility of a strike. They reinforced that message on January 24 when they offered nothing on workload.

Faculty went on strike in 1989 because, with only a 52% strike vote, management would not improve their offer. In 2001, with a 72 % strike vote, and in 2004, with a 74.5% strike vote, management improved their offer and there was a settlement with no strike both times. Will there be a strike? That is up to management. We now know for sure that management's offer will not improve without a strike support vote. The size of the majority voting in favour will influence their reaction. We can be certain that management will see every vote against a strike mandate as reason to hold on to their workload concessions instead of improvements, and to hold down salaries.

The mediator has already scheduled talks for Feb. 15 & 16. As in previous years, the faculty team hopes to go into those meetings with the strong message of support from faculty – a message that will reach the leaders in the college system even if it still falls on deaf ears at the bargaining table.

For the team,

Ted Montgomery, Faculty Bargaining Team Chair