

**IN THE MATTER OF AN INTEREST ARBITRATION
BEFORE ARBITRATOR WILLIAM KAPLAN**

B E T W E E N:

THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO FACULTY ASSOCIATION

- AND -

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

UTFA'S INTEREST ARBITRATION BRIEF

Goldblatt Partners LLP

20 Dundas Street West, Suite 1039
Toronto, ON M5G 2C2
Fax: 416-591-7333

Emma Phillips

Phone: 416-979-4240

Email: ephillips@goldblattpartners.com

Counsel for UTFA

April 20, 2020

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO FACULTY ASSOCIATION

INTEREST ARBITRATION BRIEF

April 20, 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. OVERVIEW	2
II. INTRODUCTION	3
III. PRINCIPLES APPLICABLE IN THIS INTEREST ARBITRATION	4
IV. SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS	6
V. BACKGROUND TO UTFA’S PROPOSALS ON <i>WLPP</i> AND <i>PTR</i>	7
a. The Workload Burden and the <i>WLPP</i>	9
<i>The Problem of Unreasonable and Inequitable Distribution of Work</i>	10
<i>The WLPP Has Not Resolved the Problems of Inequitable and Unreasonable Workload</i>	14
<i>The WLPP Has Not Produced a Transparent Process of Workload Allocation</i>	20
<i>Workload concerns are real and recurrent, despite limited workload disputes or grievances that proceed beyond step one</i>	25
b. The Teaching Stream in Transition	30
VI. <i>WLPP</i> PROPOSALS	37
a. Article 2.18	37
(i) Lack of Fairness in Evaluation	39
(ii) Inequitable Distribution of Workload	43
(iii) University of Toronto Polices Already Rely on the Concept of “Weighting” of Responsibilities	45
(iii) The written assignment of workload should be provided by June 30 of the year	50
b. Article 7.2 – The Need for Protected Time For Scholarship	51
VII. <i>PTR</i> PROPOSALS	54
a. “The Balance of Teaching Research and Service”	54
b. “Point Systems and the Evaluation”	60

I. OVERVIEW

1. The University of Toronto Faculty Association makes two proposals to amend the *Workload Policy and Procedures* (the “WLPP”) and two proposals to amend the aspects of the Academic Administrative Procedures Manual (the “AAPM”) relating to Progress Through the Ranks (the “PTR Policy”).¹ These proposals, set out below, are driven by the fact that the WLPP and *PTR Policy*, in their current form, are inadequate to address the significant and concrete problems of over-work and inequitable distribution of work affecting UTFA members. Specifically:
 - UTFA members have for many years expressed that their workload is “crushing”. This experience of over-work has not improved since the introduction of the WLPP, as is apparent from surveys by the Administration and UTFA before and since the WLPP’s introduction. It is evident that the WLPP does not provide the tools UTFA and its members need to address excessive and inequitable workload, including clear workload norms.
 - The experience of over-work—in particular as a result of disproportionately higher teaching and service obligations—and the absence of clear workload norms disadvantages UTFA members who identify as women or as racialized *vis a vis* their male and non-racialized colleagues.
 - The experience of over-work and the absence of clear workload norms also particularly disadvantages faculty members outside of the tenure stream, including in the Teaching Stream, and those faculty members with part-time contractually limited term appointments. The further away a faculty member’s appointment is from the male-dominated tenure stream norm of “40/40/20”, the more unclear their expected distribution of effort and the more subject they become to excessive teaching and service workloads.
 - Teaching Stream and Part-Time Appointments, both of which are feminized, are also vulnerable to excessive teaching and service workloads because of the failure of the WLPP and the *PTR Policy* to ensure that reasonable time for scholarship is defined and protected.
 - The WLPP’s commitment to equitable distribution of workload and to giving comparable weight to comparable work cannot be enforced without greater transparency in members’ distribution of responsibilities. The WLPP rests on the model that workload should be established through collegial processes at the local level, but fails to provide UTFA members with the tools they need to advocate for

¹ The instructions contained in the AAPM are guidelines that do not have the binding force of policy. Nevertheless, the AAPM directions with respect to PTR are generally treated and function by unit heads as policy. As such, UTFA’s proposals refer to the PTR components of the AAPM as the “*PTR Policy*”.

more equitable distribution of workload because the WLPP does not ensure transparency with respect to a member's expected distribution of responsibilities.

- The Administration resists introducing more transparent workload norms on the premise that workload in the university sector should not or cannot be quantified. This is belied by unit PTR policies and workload policies which often quantify workload, as well as by collective agreement language at other universities, which routinely quantify expected distribution of effort.
2. These principles motivate and inform UTFA's proposals to:
 - (i) amend the WLPP to introduce greater transparency in distribution of effort/responsibilities;
 - (ii) amend the WLPP to clarify and give meaningful protection to right to "reasonable" time to conduct scholarship for Teaching Stream faculty;
 - (iii) amend the *PTR Policy* to ensure that all three components of a Teaching Stream faculty member's appointment are given credit for the purposes of PTR; and
 - (iv) modify the *PTR Policy* to ensure that the point system used for PTR for Teaching Stream is the same type (though not necessarily the same distribution of points) as used in the tenure stream.
 3. Ultimately, these are modest proposals to address significant and persistent problems impacting the workload and compensation of UTFA members.

II. INTRODUCTION

4. In the fall of 2017, the University of Toronto Faculty Association and the University Administration entered into negotiations on a range of monetary and workload issues pursuant to Article 6 of the *Memorandum of Agreement* (the "MOA"). On April 25, 2018, and with the assistance of mediator/arbitrator William Kaplan, the parties entered into a Memorandum of Settlement with respect to certain monetary items for the two-year period commencing July 1, 2018 and ending June 30, 2020. At the same time, the parties agreed to engage in further mediation with respect to the Association's proposals regarding the *Workload Policy and Procedures* (the "WLPP"), the aspects of the Academic Administrative Procedures Manual (the "AAPM") relating to Progress Through the Ranks (the "*PTR Policy*"), and PDAD&C Memorandum #28, which sets out the University's *Salary Adjustments and Determination of Starting Salary for New Faculty* (the "*Salary Adjustment Policy*").
5. The Faculty Association and the Administration engaged in mediation over the fall 2018 and winter/spring 2019. With the assistance of Mediator Kaplan, the parties agreed to a number of improvements to the WLPP and to the *PTR Policy*. The agreed-upon changes are reflected in tracked changes in the documents at **TABs A and B** (highlighted language

remains in dispute between the parties). The original policy documents are at **TABs C and D**.

6. By email exchanges dated February 11 and 13, 2019, the parties agreed that any outstanding proposals would be addressed through written submissions to the arbitrator, and that either party could determine after the exchange of submissions whether an in-person attendance would be necessary. While the Administration objected to the arbitrability of the Association's proposals to amend the *PTR Policy* under Article 6 of the *MOA*, the parties ultimately agreed to allow the arbitrator to determine UTFA's unresolved PTR proposals on a mutually agreed without prejudice or precedent basis and outside of the Article 6 process. There is no dispute that the Association's proposals to amend the *WLPP* are subject to binding arbitration pursuant to Article 6 of the *MOA*.
7. In a further email exchange on April 16, 2019, the parties agreed that proposals with respect to the *Salary Adjustment Policy* would be deferred pending the outcome of mediation relating to UTFA's grievance regarding gender discrimination in compensation for faculty and librarians at the University of Toronto (**TAB E**). The parties subsequently agreed to continue to hold this matter in abeyance while the Association grievance on Salary Discrimination (dated June 4, 2019) is being litigated before the Grievance Review Panel.
8. These submissions outline UTFA's outstanding proposals with respect to the *WLPP* and the *PTR Policy*.

III. PRINCIPLES APPLICABLE IN THIS INTEREST ARBITRATION

9. In *Air Canada v. CAW-Canada, Local 2002* [2011 CarswellOnt 9467], Arbitrator Kevin Burkett described the key principles that guide interest arbitration awards as follows, at paras 66-68:

The terms replication, gradualism and demonstrated need are used to describe the guiding principles of boards of interest arbitration. Replication refers to the objective of fashioning an award that, to the extent possible, replicates the settlement the parties would have reached had the dispute been allowed to run its full course. In this regard, interest arbitrators look to benchmarks in the community (in our case to other major Canadian corporations and to the airline industry) and to the bargaining history between the parties.

The principle of gradualism reflects the reality that collective bargaining between mature bargaining parties, as these are, is a continuum that most often accomplishes gradual change as distinct from drastic change. It follows that absent compelling evidence, an interest arbitrator will be loath to award "breakthrough" items.

The principle of demonstrated need, as applied to a major economic item, provides a counterbalance to the principle of gradualism. It does so by

establishing the basis upon which a board of interest arbitration will award a "breakthrough" item. A party seeking a major or even a radical change must convincingly establish the need for such change; hence the term demonstrated need.

10. In UTFA's submission, while there is certainly a demonstrated need for clear, strong policies to establish parameters for the distribution of workload and PTR, UTFA's proposals are for incremental changes to the *WLPP* and the *PTR Policy* to improve the ability of these policies to respond to the significant concerns of UTFA members. UTFA is not proposing either "breakthrough" items or "radical changes". Further, as described below, UTFA's proposals are in-step with agreements negotiated by other Faculty Associations and University Administrations in Canada.
11. Moreover, interest arbitrators have repeatedly recognized that the University of Toronto's competitive position *vis a vis* other Ontario and Canadian research universities should be a guiding factor in determining the terms and conditions of UTFA's members employment. In UTFA's contention, this principle applies not only to salaries and benefits, but also to the policies that govern member workload and distribution of merit pay.
12. The "top of market" principle has been recognized by interest arbitrators for almost forty years. For example, in his 1982 interest arbitration award between these two parties, Arbitrator Burkett underscored "the important role played by a pre-eminent university such as the University of Toronto, and the contribution made by its faculty in furthering objectives of the institution and serving the needs of society." (**TAB F**)
13. Similarly, in his 2006 interest arbitration award between these two parties, Chief Justice Winkler emphasized that increases to compensation will be driven by the mutual commitment of the University and the Association to ensuring that the University is, and remains, a leader among the world's best teaching and research institutions of higher learning, as well as the university sector 'marketplace' within which this goal is pursued:

In essence, the University has staked out a position at the top of the relevant market or "industry segment". **It implicitly admits that maintaining that position depends to a large degree on maintaining the quality of its faculty and librarians.** That in turn requires, leaving aside the intangibles, ensuring that the total compensation package available to those faculty members and librarians is sufficient to place them at the top of the market as well. That will be the starting point for our analysis of the specific proposals.

Winkler Award, 2006 at para 20, **TAB G**

14. Just as these principles guide interest arbitration awards respecting compensation, they should equally guide decisions about the policies that define the terms and conditions of UTFA members' employment. This is especially true in relation to workload policies, given the close relationship between workload and compensation. Indeed, given the very high expectations placed on UTFA members to achieve a consistent level of excellence in

their professional activities, it is all the more important to ensure that UTFA members also enjoy fair and appropriate terms and conditions of employment—both as fundamental workplace protections, and to ensure that they have the conditions within which to continue to attain excellence in their work.

15. Faculty members and librarians at the University of Toronto should therefore maintain “top of market” status in compensation *and* in respect of their other terms of conditions of employment. As Chief Justice Winkler recognized in 2006, these parties share an abiding commitment to excellence and to the reputation of the University. In striving every day to achieve that standard of excellence, UTFA members require – and are entitled to – clear, fair, and equitable policies. This is currently not the case.

IV. SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

16. UTFA has two outstanding proposals relating to the *WLPP*.
17. Section 2.18 of the *WLPP* (currently section 2.14 of the *WLPP*) entitles each faculty member and librarian to an annual “written assignment of their workload duties”. UTFA has proposed that these workload letters include details with respect to the member’s teaching and service assignments, including the proportion of the member’s overall responsibilities that the member is expected to devote to each of teaching and service, or in the case of librarians, professional practice and service. UTFA further proposes that where a member’s assignment is materially different from the unit’s workload norms, the variation and the reason for it should be communicated to the member in the workload letter.
18. These amendments to section 2.18 will significantly strengthen transparency in workload, enabling members to ensure a more equitable distribution of workload within the unit. This is particularly important for female faculty members and members of other equity-seeking groups, who often bear a heavier teaching and administrative load. By comparison, and given the fundamental principle of fairness at stake, it is notable that a number of Ontario universities have expressly recognized that distribution of effort should be articulated *and* communicated to faculty members.
19. UTFA also proposes a revision of section 7.2 of the *WLPP*. Currently, the *WLPP* entitles Teaching Stream faculty to “reasonable time” for scholarship, but fails to establish adequate parameters for this critical protection. Having reasonable time to engage in scholarly work is a particular problem in the Teaching Stream because, as discussed more fully below, of inconsistent practices across the University and the failure in some units to recognize the scholarly nature of the stream and the corresponding need for protected time for scholarly activities.
20. UTFA therefore proposes the addition of the words “normally, scholarship and/or pedagogical/professional development accounts for no less than the service component of a Teaching Stream faculty member’s workload” to Article 7.2 of the *WLPP*. UTFA’s goal is to ensure that *all* faculty members and librarians have access to appropriately protected

time to engage in scholarship and/or pedagogical/professional development, appropriate to their stream. This is not currently the case.

21. Further, UTFA proposes modest amendments to the *PTR Policy*. These proposals are designed to clarify that Teaching Stream faculty members are to be assessed for the purposes of PTR on the basis of all three “principal components” of their work, that is: teaching, service, and scholarship, which may take the form of creative professional activity and includes pedagogical/professional development and/or discipline-based scholarship in relation to, or relevant to, the field in which they teach. Currently, the *PTR Policy* references only teaching and service.
22. UTFA’s proposals are animated by the goals of strengthening transparency and clarity of workload distribution, defending UTFA’s most vulnerable members by introducing stronger mechanisms for the equitable distribution of workload, and protecting necessary time for members to exercise and meet their professional responsibilities, including scholarly activities.
23. UTFA’s members are entitled to know the relative breakdown of their three areas of responsibility (teaching/professional practice (for librarians); research/scholarship/creative professional activity; and service) and the proportion of effort/emphasis that is expected in each area; to protected time for each area of professional responsibility; and to be assessed for the purposes of PTR on the basis of all three areas of professional responsibility. This clarity is critical not only so that UTFA members know what expectations they are being held to, including in relation to their PTR assessments, but also so that they can ensure that workload is being equitably distributed within their units, and that they have adequate time to dedicate to all three areas of responsibility. Transparency in expected distribution of effort/emphasis is therefore critical to the parties’ commitment to fairness in evaluation, equity in distribution of workload, and protected time to meet professional obligations.

V. BACKGROUND TO UTFA’S PROPOSALS ON WLPP AND PTR

24. There are two important contextual factors giving rise to UTFA’s proposed changes to the *WLPP* and the *PTR Policy*. First, UTFA’s members continue to experience an overwhelmingly high workload, inequitably distributed within units, and disproportionately borne by female members and likely also by members of other equity-seeking groups.² The *WLPP* in its current state is inadequate to address these concerns.
25. Second, the Teaching Stream continues to be a stream in transition that is subject to competing and sometimes mutually contradictory demands on its time. More work needs

² Because of limitations on data collected by the Administration and/or disclosed by the Administration to UTFA, UTFA has limited information with respect to workload experiences of members who identify as members of equity-seeking groups, apart from those who identify as women. However, there is some indication in the data collected by the University, discussed below, that members who identify as visible minorities experience disproportionately high administrative and teaching loads. This data is also consistent with broader research in the university sector.

to be done to reinforce the scholarly nature of the Teaching Stream and to protect Teaching Stream faculty from being viewed as a “teaching-only” stream, as opposed to a “teaching-intensive” stream. While certain norms with respect to the Tenure Stream are deeply embedded in the University of Toronto culture—for example that workload generally follows a “40/40/20” distribution—these norms do not yet exist in the Teaching Stream. With respect to workload, this problem manifests variously for different Teaching Stream faculty, depending on the culture in the unit:

- i. Some Teaching Stream faculty are perceived as teaching-only, and are overloaded with courses (see for example para. 72, showing units in which Teaching Stream faculty are assigned 200-300% more teaching than Tenure Stream faculty). Faculty members in these units are generally assigned an 80-20 distribution of effort, and directed to integrate pedagogical professional development/scholarship into their teaching time, leaving them without any protected time to carry out their scholarly activities.
 - ii. Other Teaching Stream faculty are held to high standards for research/scholarship/pedagogical and professional development—for example the expectation that they will publish peer-reviewed articles in high-ranking journals—but find that these standards are extremely challenging to meet because of the heavy teaching load they carry. This is the experience of many recently hired Teaching Stream faculty who possess strong research credentials that they and their departments expect them to continue to develop.
 - iii. A third group of Teaching Stream faculty are assigned a nominally reasonable distribution of effort, for example an implicit 60-20-20, with the promise of dedicated time for scholarship. However, these faculty are routinely assigned the biggest and most demanding courses, the most time-consuming service assignments (without release), frequent new teaching preparations, and/or extra summer responsibilities. As a result, their assigned six half-courses proportionately add up to significantly more than “1.5 times” the time and effort the four half-courses assigned to their Tenure Stream colleagues. This group find that the principle that “comparable work will be weighed in the same manner”, promised by the *WLPP*, is unenforceable because individual faculty members are not clearly or explicitly told what their expected distribution of effort is, and cannot compare as against the distribution of effort of their Tenure Stream colleagues. The result is that even despite a formal recognition of 60-20-20 (or in some cases 70 teaching - 10 scholarship-20 service) excessive teaching and service loads leave almost no time for scholarly work, and the workload overall is crushing.
26. The absence of clear policy language in the *WLPP* to guide distribution of workload leaves Teaching Stream members particularly vulnerable to inconsistent practices with respect to, for example, protecting time for scholarship and unreasonably heavy teaching and administrative service loads. Similarly, the failure of the *PTR Policy* to expressly acknowledge that Teaching Stream members are to be assessed on the basis of their scholarly activities for the purposes of PTR undermines the scholarly nature of the stream.

27. Notably, there are even fewer protections for part-time faculty, the vast majority of whom are employed under serial appointment short term-contracts with changing percentage appointments and unclear distribution of effort. These members are particularly vulnerable to overwork, with little if any time protected for scholarly activities.

a. **The Workload Burden and the *WLPP***

28. UTFA has been raising its members' concerns regarding workload with the Administration for well over a decade. These efforts arose in response to the persistent plea from a large number of UTFA members, from all three streams, and from contract and part-time faculty, to manage an overwhelmingly heavy workload. In surveys of UTFA members from 2008, workload was consistently described as "crushing" and unreasonable, while the distribution of workload was viewed as inequitable and untransparent.

29. As a result, workload was a key issue going into the 2007-2009 round of bargaining. However, UTFA's ability to negotiate workload was at that time significantly curtailed, and the parties ultimately agreed to a joint committee on workload and worklife balance. The limitations on UTFA's ability to negotiate led UTFA to seek to expand Article 6 of the MOA to allow UTFA to negotiate workload in the 2009-2011 round of negotiations, resulting both in critical amendments to Article 6 and in the creation of the *WLPP* in January 2011.

30. As a result, when UTFA and the Administration negotiated the *WLPP* in 2011, a key, shared goal was to establish conditions for the fair, reasonable, and equitable distribution of workload. This objective was ultimately articulated in Article 1 of the *WLPP*, which commits the University of Toronto to establishing and assigning workload to faculty members and librarians according to the following three principles, among others:

- i. **"A fair, reasonable and equitable distribution of workload;"**
- ii. **"A transparent process of workload allocation within a unit, based on decisions made in accordance with criteria that are known to members within that unit;"**
- iii. **"Assignment of individual workload based on the principle that comparable work will be weighed in the same manner."**

31. Notably, however, UTFA understood that the full realization of these important goals would have to be incremental over time, and would require refinement as the parties gained on-the-ground experience. As UTFA's President stated in a bargaining newsletter to members at that time:

[O]ur firm position is that **workload is far too complex a problem for us to solve all at once**, a perception that is strongly echoed by the experiences of faculty associations whose comprehensive bargaining frameworks have allowed for **incremental improvements to workload articles based on the**

accumulation of experience over years. We too will need to refine our approach in years to come.

[Emphasis added.]

(TAB H)

32. In UTFA's submission, the *WLPP* is only very partially equipped to achieve these important objectives, and it is not yet an effective tool to address the workload problems that gave rise to the *WLPP* to begin with. The incremental changes anticipated by UTFA in 2009 must continue to be made. The Association's current proposals are, therefore, designed to further the Association and Administration's shared goals by creating stronger mechanisms within the *WLPP* to achieve these commitments. These amendments are critical to addressing the ongoing and persistent workload concerns of UTFA members.

The Problem of Unreasonable and Inequitable Distribution of Work

33. UTFA members have long expressed a major concern that their workload is too heavy, and more specifically that there is a lack of transparency at the University of Toronto regarding workload expectations, including the relative distribution of their three areas of responsibility. Concerns about lack of transparency in relation to DOE is highest among those who teach more and/or who take on more service than is typical in the (male-dominated) Tenure Stream of 40-40-20. In particular, female faculty members have expressed a much higher rate of dissatisfaction with their workload than do their male colleagues, in both the Tenure Stream and the Teaching Stream. Librarians have also expressed a persistent concern with heavy workloads.
34. The depth of UTFA members' concerns were highlighted in a series of comprehensive surveys commissioned by the University Administration, referred to as the "Speaking Up" surveys. The first two Speaking Up surveys, conducted in 2006 and 2010,³ revealed a significant concern by UTFA members about unreasonable workloads, particularly among female faculty members.⁴ Indeed, these surveys make clear that for many years, female faculty have been struggling much more significantly than their male counterparts to achieve a manageable workload and to meet performance expectations. A third Speaking Up survey, discussed further below, was conducted in 2014,⁵ and a fourth survey, called

³ Conducted by Mercer Delta Consulting in 2006 and Ipsos Reid in 2010.

⁴ Survey questions varied somewhat between the three survey years, as did the demographic breakdown of the groups polled, making comparison across years more challenging. The survey also tracked members of other equity seeking groups, however in many cases this data was not disclosed to UTFA because of an ethics protocol which redacted information from small groups that could identify the responding individuals.

⁵ Conducted by Ipsos Reid.

the “Speaking Out” survey, is being conducted in 2020.⁶ The results of the 2020 survey are not yet available.

35. The results of the various Speaking Up surveys are summarized in the chart below (and are attached as **TABS I, J, K**).

Speaking Up Surveys: 2006, 2010, 2014

Survey Response	2006 Results⁷	2010 Results	2014 Results
Rated their workload as heavy/much too heavy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 74% of female members • 64% of male members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 80% of Teaching Stream women • 79% of Tenure Stream women • 69% of Teaching Stream men • 69% of Tenure Stream men • 72% of librarians 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 76% of Teaching Stream women • 57% of Teaching Stream men • 75% of Tenure Stream women • 64% of Tenure Stream men • 68% Tenure Stream visible minority faculty members • 69% of librarians
Rated committee and/or administrative responsibilities as an extensive source of stress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 26% of female faculty members • 23% of male faculty members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 32% of Teaching Stream women • 20% Teaching Stream men • 27% of Tenure Stream women • 25% of Tenure Stream men 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 24% of Teaching Stream women • 16% of Teaching Stream men • 25% of Tenure Stream women • 18% of Tenure Stream men
Rated teaching responsibilities as an extensive source of stress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 27% of female faculty members • 22% of male faculty members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 40% of Teaching Stream women • 25% of Teaching Stream men • 28% of Tenure Stream women • 22% of Tenure Stream men • 32% of visible minority faculty members • 25% of non-visible minority faculty members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 38% of Teaching Stream women • 28% of Teaching Stream men • 20% of Tenure Stream women • 15% of Tenure Stream men • 22% of Tenure Stream visible minority faculty members

⁶ Notably, the Administration did not carry out a survey in 2018, and even in the fourth survey currently being conducted, relevant questions about workload—including the impact of heavy workload on educational quality and work/life balance—have been removed.

⁷ The 2006 Speaking Up Survey did not distinguish between Tenure Stream and Teaching Stream faculty. Unless otherwise indicated, survey results are for faculty and librarians.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 16% of Tenure Stream non-visible minority faculty members
Reported scholarly productivity as an extensive source of stress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 41% of female faculty members • 30% of male faculty members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 29% of Teaching Stream women • 7% of Teaching Stream men • 44% of visible minority faculty members • 36% of non-visible minority faculty members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 40% of Tenure Stream women • 26% of Tenure Stream men
Disagreed/strongly disagreed that the balance of time for teaching and research is appropriate⁸	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 36% of female faculty members • 24% of male faculty members 	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 38% of Teaching Stream women • 14% of Teaching Stream men*
Agreed/strongly agreed that the stress of work negatively affected their job performance⁹	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 36% of female members • 29% of male members • 32% of librarians 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 60% of female members • 54% of male members • 64% of visible minority members • 56% of non-visible minority members • 54% of librarians 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 27% of Teaching Stream women • 25% of Teaching Stream men* • 36% of Tenure Stream women • 30% of Tenure Stream men • 34% of Teaching Stream visible minority faculty members* • 20% of Teaching Stream non-visible minority faculty members* • 41% of Tenure Stream visible minority faculty members • 31% of Tenure Stream non-visible minority faculty members
Reported being dissatisfied/very dissatisfied with how equitably committee assignments are distributed across department	N/A	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20% of all Teaching Stream faculty members • 26% of Teaching Stream women • 12% of Teaching Stream men*)

⁸ In the 2006 Speaking Up Survey, the question was framed as “I think the balance of time for teaching and research is appropriate”. In 2014, the question was reworded as “I am able to balance the teaching, scholarship, and service activities expected of me”.

⁹ In the 2010 Speaking Up Survey, the equivalent answer was “sometimes/often”.

Reported that they spent too much time on administrative tasks	N/A	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 60% of Teaching Stream women • 46% of Teaching Stream men
Expressed dissatisfaction with the portion of their time spent on service	N/A	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 23% of Teaching Stream women • 15% of Teaching Stream men

* For confidentiality reasons, the Administration redacted answers with fewer than 10 responses from the 2014 Speaking Up Survey data. As a result, the Association did not receive results for “strongly agree”, “strongly disagree” or “very dissatisfied” for these questions.

36. As is evident from the responses to the Speaking Up Surveys, female faculty members expressed particular concern about the burden of unreasonable administrative responsibilities and teaching responsibilities, and significant dissatisfaction with their ability to balance the teaching, scholarship, and service activities expected of them. These concerns were also disproportionately raised by visible minority faculty.
37. Not surprisingly given these reported concerns, a disproportionately high proportion of female and visible minority faculty, as well as librarians, responded that their workload was heavy or much too heavy, and reported that the stress of work negatively affected their job performance.
38. The same concerns about inequitable distributions of workload have been a consistent and prominent feature identified in the various surveys UTFA has conducted of its own membership.¹⁰ For example, these concerns are sharply illustrated in comments made by UTFA members in response to a 2008 UTFA Workload Survey:
 - “There is significant disparity and unfairness in the way workload is distributed since some faculty have more leverage and hold more influence over some others in charge of course assignments so they are able to have lighter loads compared to others that do not have this type of influence or say.”
 - “There is not much information available about what the various workloads (60/20/20 research/teaching/admin, for example) are supposed to look like. Is it meant to divide a 40-hour week? Or are pre-tenure faculty supposed to be working 60+ hours per week? The people in my [department] teach wildly varying amounts of official course time, so it is hard to know what is expected and what is fair.”
 - “Administrative work takes up a lot of time and I often feel that women end up taking on a fair share of this because of requirements to have diversity on hiring committees for example.”

¹⁰ Membership surveys conducted by UTFA include: 2008 Workload Survey; 2008 Librarian Workload Survey; 2017 General Membership Survey; 2017 Part-Time Appointment Survey; 2020 Teaching Stream Survey.

- “I don’t think UTFA can reasonably address the workload issue without also addressing several issues related to the Teaching Stream. It is beyond challenging and frustrating to have to do so much more of the teaching, administration and service than the professorial stream for so much less respect and pay.”
- “The workload has greatly increased with no noticeable plan to effectively address this situation. Service to students begins to suffer as former levels of service can no longer be maintained. Stress and overwork affects the health and personal lives of staff, causing them to take more sick days, become more susceptible to serious illness and interfering with their quality of life and personal and professional development.” (2008 Librarian Workload Survey)

39. While the survey data from the 2006, 2008, and 2010 surveys are in some cases more than a decade old, they document a clear pattern of over-work, particularly affecting female and racialized faculty. Unfortunately, the advent of the WLPP has not resolved these problems of an inequitable and unreasonable workload and these same patterns persist at the University of Toronto.

The WLPP Has Not Resolved the Problems of Inequitable and Unreasonable Workload

40. As noted, the parties negotiated the implementation of the *WLPP* in January, 2011. However, even despite the advent of the *WLPP*, the sentiment that the workload of faculty and librarians is unreasonably high has remained—reflecting the fact that the *WLPP* does not yet provide the tools that are needed to achieve the goals of a reasonable, equitable, and transparent workload. Rather, UTFA continues to hear substantively similar concerns raised by its members seeking advice, within focus groups and through other outreach sessions, and reflected in a range of surveys of UTFA’s members.

41. In a 2017 UTFA General Survey, for example, members commented that “the hours required to complete the job are impossible” and “the academic year is 24 weeks of insanity”. Responses to UTFA’s recent 2020 Teaching Stream survey highlighted these concerns even more strongly. Respondents repeatedly identified their workload, teaching workload, and a general lack of “time”, as a barrier to their ability to conduct scholarship. For example:

- “Most significant barriers you face in engaging in scholarship/research/CPA” was “time...enrolments are huge, much larger than they were a decade ago. I am course coordinator ... and I have no free time. I am working between 50 and 60 hours a week. My colleagues and I are burned out...”
- “I have a part-time appointment and teach overload to be able to make enough money to sustain my family, and the expectations for scholarship production seem unreasonable. Also, the expectations of how much time and how much scholarship should be produced are unclear. I feel I am being expected to produce like full-time faculty.”

42. Notably, the experiences of overwork continue to be significantly worse for female members and members who identify as a visible minority. This is amply illustrated by the findings of the Administration's 2014 Speaking Up survey, outlined in the chart above, which found that three-quarters of Teaching Stream and Tenure Stream women rated their workload as heavy or much too heavy. Note that in contrast to their male counterparts, these results are more than a third higher for Teaching Stream women. 40% of Tenure Stream visible minorities also reported that the stress of work was negatively affecting their job performance, compared to 31% of Tenure Stream faculty who do not identify as visible minorities. Similarly, a much higher proportion of women—about 1.5 times more female faculty than male faculty in both faculty streams—reported administrative responsibilities as an extensive source of stress. Women faculty also disproportionately reported that they were spending too much time on administrative tasks, further expressing dissatisfaction with the proportion of their time spent on Service. Teaching Stream women were also 1.35 times more likely to report that teaching responsibilities were an extensive source of stress than Teaching Stream men, and that they did not feel able to balance the teaching, scholarship, and service activities expected of them. Indeed, in relation to balancing the three principle areas of effort required of them, Teaching Stream women expressed a rate of dissatisfaction more than 2.5 times that of male Teaching Stream faculty.
43. The inequitable distribution of teaching and service work to female and racialized faculty has also been documented in the expert literature. Studies of the university sector have shown that, on average, female faculty perform significantly more service than do male faculty, controlling for rank, field, department, etc. Similarly, research demonstrates that racialized and LGBTQ2S faculty experience a disproportionate service burden and carry heavier teaching loads.

Guarino, C.M. & Borden, V.M.H. *Res High Educ* (2017) 58: 672.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-017-9454-2>;

Social Sciences Feminist Network Research Interest Group. "The Burden of Invisible Work in Academia: Social Inequalities and Time Use in Five University Departments." *Humboldt Journal of Social Relations*, vol. 39, 2017, pp. 228–245. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/90007882. Accessed 7 Feb. 2020.

Griffin, K. A. & Reddick, R. J. (2011). Surveillance and sacrifice: Gender differences in the mentoring patterns of Black professors at predominantly White research universities. *American Educational Research Journal*, 48(5), 1032-1057.

Henderson, T. L., Hunter, A. G., & Hildreth, G. J. (2010). Outsiders within the academy: Strategies for resistance and mentoring African American women. *Michigan Family Review*, 14(1), 28-41.

TABS L, M, N, O

44. While there could be a number of explanations for the high level of dissatisfaction experienced by these members of equity-seeking groups, in UTFA's experience, a particular source of stress is the disproportionately heavy teaching and administrative loads

assigned to some faculty members, combined with a general lack of transparency about workload expectations. Put more bluntly, the reason that faculty who are women and racialized members tend to express greater unhappiness and stress related to heavy workloads is likely because they are, in fact, generally assigned heavier service and teaching loads.

45. Part-time faculty, who are more likely to be women and/or to be racialized at the University of Toronto, express particular concern about heavy teaching and service loads which leave them almost no time for research/scholarship:
- “I want to emphasize this point again: I don't have enough time to pursue research and pedagogy innovation as needed unless I overwork all the time. And, it has become a culture, a hidden rule of game in my unit that people are competing on who can sleep less and less. Very unhealthy and not sustainable.”
 - “Priority #2: Workload. Why? For the better part of 8 years there have been too many weeks I have worked 5-6 days/week although I am 0.75. This is due to the minute details that need to be attended to well before the course starts all the way through to after the end of each course....I am required to engage in scholarship development to even have a glimmer of hope to move up to a full time position but the course/teaching and service workload has been so heavy, it has been almost impossible to engage in scholarly activities...”
 - “Work load is excessive for 50% appointment - no time for development and improvement of courses - worried about job security as most people in my department have been let go”.
 - “Workload and job security. My part time status is temporary due to a health issues, but the ambiguity of what amount of work constitutes a % partial appointment compared with a full appointment creates on-going conflicts over workload, and makes me worry about my job security”.
 - “Workload, especially as it relates to progress and career progression. Part-time people are often asked to do work that protects/relieves tenure and tenure-stream people (e.g. committee work, dealing with students), making it even harder for part-time people to get ahead on the metrics that count (e.g. grants and publications). Part-time people are moved from one course to another, which takes more time than having one consistent course over several years. Movement from part-time to tenure stream is very difficult without an extremely supportive and organized department Chair. Related to these issues are questions of increased student enrollments, with little to no additional support for part-time people. For example, we could have an additional 20 students in a course and there would be no additional time or resource allocated. Sometimes resources are cut because of "budget constraints".

- “Teaching workload exceeds appointment level and salary, with no time for research/creative professional activities. As a result, I am not able to receive proper merit pay”.
- “I teach as many courses as my tenured colleagues, and do as much (usually significantly more) research. And yet my job is described as "part-time" and valued at 58% of a "full-time" job. There is no reasonable justification for this”.
- “Research and CPA are recognized but often have to be done outside of paid work time. I essentially work full time on a part time salary”.

(2017 Part-Time Appointments Survey)

46. The continued unhappiness with heavy, disproportionate, and inequitable workloads make it plainly apparent that the *WLPP* is not fully equipped to accomplish what it was designed to do.
47. In particular, in its current iteration the *WLPP* does not meet the parties’ **first** shared goal of establishing “**a fair, reasonable and equitable distribution** of workload” (section 1).
48. For example, in response to UTFA’s 2017 General Survey of its membership, members commented as follows:
 - “There is variation in workload with the bulk of administrative duties seeming to fall to female faculty as well as those who are pre-tenure. This can impede productivity in terms of number of publications and funded grants - two elements that play a significant role in assessing merit pay increases”.
 - “Some of my colleagues, who are never around, constantly dodge service assignments. The distribution of work within my unit is not distributed equally”.
 - “High levels of stress due to other - mostly male- faculty members that do not do their service duties”.
 - “Gendered labour (ie. Women do all the service, while men feign incompetence at service oriented tasks)”.
 - “The women in our department take on a ton of "service" that is not recognized as such but that is crucial to the smooth running of the department and the well-being of our students. Suspect this may cause a gendered salary anomaly”.
 - “Gender inequalities (esp. service work)”.
 - “[The workload policy] is a joke, frankly, a [...] cover for quite unequal treatment”.
 - “Workload is terribly uneven in my faculty and there seems to be no goal in sight to remedy the situation”.

- “Issues of equity and fairness have not been taken into consideration. Faculty members who have requested to consider issues of fairness in workload distribution have been ignored or worse”.
 - “Some faculty do an enormous amount, some very little--and the workload policy has no impact on that”.
 - “Huge inequity in workload exists (e.g., service) and the workload letters explicitly state that while certain committee work is listed in the letter, we can always be asked to do more at the discretion of the Chair. What's the point of the letter then?”
 - “Inadequate recognition of gender disparities in workplace (e.g., impact of maternity leave, disproportionate service burden placed on women faculty, gender bias in course evaluations)”.
 - “The primary issue is the distribution of service between research stream and Teaching Stream faculty. The research stream are assigned little”.
 - “The research-faculty completely lack understanding of the workload that is involved in the coordination of large service courses, and thus do not compensate for it accordingly.”
 - “Workload is arbitrarily allocated by our direct supervisor and most of the time, we are unable to negotiate or contest it. Since I do not yet hold permanent status ... it is extremely challenging to address this issue without endangering my current appointment. Because of this, it is also very difficult to make sure that the main areas of responsibility (professional practice, service, and scholarship) are equally fulfilled”.
 - “The workload has greatly increased with no noticeable plan to effectively address this situation. Service to students begins to suffer as former levels of service can no longer be maintained. Stress and overwork affects the health and personal lives of staff, causing them to take more sick days, become more susceptible to serious illness and interfering with their quality of life and personal and professional development.”
49. Teaching Stream faculty similarly commented on the lack of equity and fairness in their workloads in UTFA’s 2020 survey. For example:
- “Workload issues a. the present distribution of workload in the Department of [redacted] is not equitable; large class sizes, contact hours, advising duties, supervision of teaching assistants, marking are not weighted fairly; c. recent unit wide reduction in tenure-stream teaching - 2.0 FCE from 2.5 FCE - has resulted in increased workload and teaching-related demands for teaching stream faculty who continue to teach 3.5 FCE. This type of inequality is a significant barrier I'm facing right now if I want to engage in research”.

- “Make the teaching loads appropriately reflective of a 60/20/20 split. We are doing twice the teaching of research stream faculty not 1.5x it.”
- “Even when research funding is available, I have found my ability to conduct meaningful research during the academic year frustrated by heavy teaching, service, and administrative loads. We cannot temporarily reduce our teaching loads in the same way, or with the same ease, as tenure-stream faculty, and we often have to teach with the worst schedules (we tend to be scheduled after the tenure-stream faculty make their choices)”.
- “Revise teaching load policy especially for large courses. a large course worth 0.5FCE with several hundred students and many TAs should count for more than 0.5FCE”.
- “Do something about our teaching loads. It's way worse than it used to be, although I'm teaching the same number of courses as ever. Using the number of sections as a measure of workload is too coarse. The TA support we receive is abysmal. We teach as many or more sections and students as our peers at other universities, yet we have about half the TA support. I would like a formal comparison made in Ontario and across Canada. We really should compare ourselves to the top 20 institutions”.
- “Due to my heavy teaching load, it is not possible for me to find time for scholarship/research. The period Sept-April is completely taken with teaching. Summers go by very fast as, in addition to personal matters, family and social obligations, I also need to review the following year's courses. There never seems to be enough time to put aside for scholarship and research”.
- “I have zero time for scholarship right now due to the heavy teaching load (3.5 FCE)...”.
- “An emphasis to engage in service work limits my ability to pursue scholarship and CPA”.
- “I am so busy with teaching and administrative duties, I do not have time. This is my first year and I am planning 6 courses, including some brand new courses. Some of my courses have 70 students in them, and just managing course administration is a huge load. I also have service duties, as well as service within my disciplinary field. No one has sat down and discussed a research agenda with me, or provided any mentorship in my first year. Perhaps because I am on a 2 year contract, there isn't the impetus to invest in me”.
- “I find that I definitely have to work very hard to find the time to apply and the time to facilitate the research while teaching 6 courses and doing my service committee work”.

- “Six 0.5 courses is totally unreasonable for a Teaching Stream professor, lecturer or instructor. UTFA should really do something about this!”
- “My big challenge has always been the heavy teaching workload. Even if I were to get funding for scholarship/research, it is the time factor that would get in the way”.

(See **Appendix A** for additional responses to UTFA’s 2020 Teaching Stream Survey.)

The WLPP Has Not Produced a Transparent Process of Workload Allocation

50. Similarly, UTFA’s experience is that the *WLPP* is not, in its current form, achieving the parties’ **second** shared goal of providing “a **transparent process** of workload allocation within a unit” (section 1). Rather, UTFA members regularly point out that the inequitable distribution of workload is due, in part, to the lack of transparency in *distribution of workload*. For example, in response to UTFA’s 2017 General Survey, many members reported concerns regarding a lack of transparency around workload allocation:
- “The policy and how workload is determined and if it is equally shared among faculty is unclear”.
 - “I am not aware what the criteria are besides tradition, i.e. this is how it has always been”.
 - “I taught a course for 0.5 credit for two years. The following two years it was co-taught by two full-time instructors. They each received 0.5 credit, essentially saying I did the same amount of work for half the credit. There really is no transparency in the workload allocation in my department, and as such, if there is a unit policy, I am not at all satisfied”.
 - “Non transparent allocation of workload, I don't know if it's fair if I don't know what others are doing”.
 - “There are some criteria stated but [they] seem to vary widely when applied to different faculty members. Some teaching (e.g., graduate courses) for which there is a demand (on the part of students) is not counted/credited as part of assigned workload even when those teaching duties are carried out”.

- “There is clear communication on an individual basis, but no transparency with regard to who is doing what. Some folks are not doing service, but their lack of work is kept hidden”.
- “We have a workload policy committee, and I am on it. However, we have not had a meeting. I truly have no idea what are the criteria used in allocating workload”.
- “It is a mystery to me, to be entirely honest. Certainly, the allocation of workload does not at all appear even to me”.
- “It is unclear in my division what the workload expectations are. As is probably the case across the university, more is always seen as better - especially under the current merit pay system. To do enough research, publish enough, do well in teaching, secure enough funding, the expectation is for faculty to work around the clock”.
- “Lack of an effective workload policy has greatly harmed many aspects of my career and quality of life”.
- “Workload that precludes fit between teaching and research”.
- “Workload (balance between teaching, research, service)”.
- “Conflicting messages about expectations for teaching and research priorities”.

51. In particular, comments on UTFA’s 2020 survey of Teaching Stream faculty highlighted the lack of protected time for scholarship that results from a lack of transparency in the expected distribution of effort. For example:

- “There should be dedicated time for scholarship/research/CPA. The faculty does not recognize the 60/20/20 split for teaching stream appointments”.
- “Review of 80/20 workload distribution - correct this to make a consistent policy; i.e, support of research from supervisors should concur with official workload distribution for TS faculty”.
- “Time. At 80% teaching 20% service and 20% scholarship there is no time for scholarship. Being assessed at 60/20/20 means you have to find the time and give up other parts of yourself to fit it in”.
- “If "scholarship = research," then that takes time. An explicit 60/20/20 breakdown of workload is essential, by lowering the teaching load to make space for faculty members to meaningfully engage in research endeavours. Anything else amounts to an expectation that people overwork in order to meet criteria for performance and promotion — clearly not a sustainable expectation!”

- “Time. My teaching and admin load consumes more than 80% of my work time. Scholarship is done on the side of the desk”.
 - “Time. I teach double a research professor. If they have 40/40/20 for teaching/research/service and I have 80/20 for teaching/service and do the same amount of service as a researcher....that research comes out of my own time”.
 - “Our department's PTR letters continue to refer to an 80/20 split—or some other two-way teaching/service split that has been, in the past at least, unilaterally determined and communicated by the Chair after the fact. This representation of the distribution of effort is not in keeping with the three distinct areas of work that are recognized for the teaching stream at the University of Toronto, nor is it helpful or instructive for faculty members as they strive to plan their time and their career paths (especially in the continued absence of effective mentorship in these areas.)”
 - “Since 80% of time is committed to teaching, there is no time provided to scholarship/research. In order to conduct scholarship/research, this must be done on one's own time (if you have the energy after long teaching days)”.
 - “The perception that Teaching Stream faculty should be teaching more than non-Teaching Stream faculty, and as such that we should be working 80/20/20”.
 - “A broader understanding of what teaching-stream scholarship entails. There are ways to invest and contribute to broader pedagogical understanding beyond publication in peer-review journals. There is inadequate funding for conference participation (if that conference involves travel) for part-time faculty, as the funds are reduced for us. Also, much clearer articulation of how much scholarship production 20% of a 75% appointment is. How much are we expected to produce to be deemed as meeting or exceeding expectations?”
 - “[A priority should be] formalizing the 60/20/20 workload and encouraging a PTR process that reflects that” and “more REAL time allocated to research and scholarship”.
52. As previously described, the failure to establish transparent and consistent workload norms for the Teaching Stream results in a lack of meaningful protection for scholarly work. This manifests variously as: (i) Teaching Stream faculty members who are treated as teaching-only and are directed to integrate their scholarly activities into their teaching (i.e. an 80/20 distribution); (ii) Teaching Stream faculty who are held to high scholarly standards (such as the expectation of publication of peer-reviewed journal articles in highly-ranked international journals) but are not given protected time to carry out scholarship because they are overloaded with teaching and service; and/or (iii) Teaching Stream faculty who are nominally assigned a 60-20-20 split, but who are routinely assigned the largest and heaviest courses, such that their six half courses assignments add up to

significantly more than 1.5 times the four half courses assigned to Tenure Stream colleagues. Similarly, Teaching Stream faculty in this position routinely experience that their administrative and committee assignments are significantly heavier than those assigned to Tenure Stream colleagues, despite the fact that service purportedly makes up 20% of the workload in both streams. Finally, it is evident that the *WLPP* is not yet equipped to realize the parties' **third** shared goal, that the "assignment of individual workload [is] based on the principle that **comparable work will be weighed in the same manner.**" In response to UTFA's 2017 General Survey, for example, many members reported concerns that comparable work is not given the same weight:

- "Still much remains at the discretion of the head of department and we do not receive a list of teaching allocations for all faculty and committee memberships and some justification for the imbalances which seem to exist".
- "Teaching a 500-student class while supervising 5 TAs still gives the same one teaching credit as teaching an 18-student class with no TA".
- "Other than teaching load, no other workload issues - eg. service, supervision have been established nor have any guidelines regarding how to judge these during PTR reviews".
- "Committee appointments and other administrative work are made in my department on the basis of politicking and snarky nepotism".
- "Two senior professors are allowed to teach in the fall [...] year after year, offering specialist courses that few students are interested in (meaning, they teach none of the more general courses that attract more students or are perceived as more central to our curriculum) ... They supervise no students, they publish nothing, they attend virtually no committee meetings (although are active in reviewing admissions files). How this is allowed to continue year on end is, well, astonishing and speaks to the completely mysterious workload allocation process in my department".
- "I continue to be unhappy about the absence of value given to Ph.D. supervisions, which do not seem to count as "work"".
- "The devil is in the detail: not in how many FCEs you are asked to teach - but which classes (some are much more work than others) and how often, as well as unequal PhD supervision responsibilities".
- "While my department has a reasonable workload policy in turn of FCEs, it does not take into account the fact that all FCEs are not equal. I teach one class of 400+ students and another of ~200".
- "There is neither fairness, nor equity. All my proposals to amend issues of unfairness and lack equity have been ignored".

- “There is significant inequity between satellite campuses and UTSG. This in addition to the commute we have to do between the campuses. There is no consideration of teaching very large classes vs small classes. Workload inequity is my biggest problem at U of T”.
53. Comments of this nature highlight a major failing in the approach taken at the University of Toronto to addressing workload issues. Other universities have adopted more prescriptive language which clearly delineates distribution of effort for faculty members (see comparator information at paras. 121-126). The University of Toronto’s approach, by contrast, relies on the application of broad principles, such as that comparable work will be given comparable weight. Such principles, however, are only effective if there is transparency in information, without which they are highly malleable. The combination of a lack of standardization and a lack of clarity/transparency allows for the deeply inequitable distribution of work to persist, and for the significant overwork of the more marginalized of UTFA’s members.
54. In UTFA’s experience, the problem of lack of transparency in workload becomes more acute the less well it aligns with that of a typical (male) faculty member’s appointment in the Tenure Stream. For those faculty members whose appointments most closely reflect the “norm”, i.e. full-time tenured faculty members without extra administrative responsibilities whose workload reflects a typical 40/40/20 distribution, the expected distribution of workload may be broadly understood because of the deeply ingrained norms that exist within the Tenure Stream at the University of Toronto (and more broadly within the university sector). These members are much less likely to need to rely upon the *WLPP* to assist them in understanding or regulating the expected distribution of emphasis within their workloads.
55. However, a sizable proportion of UTFA faculty members do not fall within this normative model. While approximately 2032 of the faculty members working at the University of Toronto are full-time Tenure Stream faculty, more than 900 faculty fall into other streams, including approximately:
- 480 full-time Teaching Stream (249 of whom, or 51.9%, identify as female or “X”);
 - 231 part-time Teaching Stream (142 of whom, or 61.5%, identify as female or “X”);
 - 133 part-time “non-Teaching Stream professoriate” (i.e. part-time faculty who are neither within the Teaching Stream nor Tenure Stream; UTFA has not been provided with the gender breakdown of these members but expects that they are disproportionately female); and
 - 72 CLTAs (35 of whom, or 48.6% identify as female).
56. Notably, the Tenure Stream continues to be significantly male-dominated—approximately 63% male—whereas the other streams are more highly feminized. In stark contrast to their Tenure Stream colleagues, 55% of all Teaching Stream faculty identify as female or X, and

of those who are part-time Teaching Stream faculty, 62% identify as female or X. Similarly, women make up nearly half (49%) of non-teaching stream, full-time CLTAs, but only 37% of the tenure stream. Women also appear to be overrepresented as part-time Non-Tenure Stream Faculty.

57. UTFA has heard innumerable examples of faculty members in these appointment categories who are unclear with respect to:
- Their percentage distribution of workload;
 - The number of courses or student contact hours that equate to their expected teaching workload;
 - The number of committee and other service assignments that equate to their expected service load; and
 - Whether they are entitled to protected time for research/scholarship, and how much protected research/scholarship time they are entitled to (particularly in the Teaching Stream and among part-time faculty).
58. The problem of overwork and inequitable distribution of workload has therefore been a long-standing concern for many UTFA members and has particularly impacted women and visible minorities. In UTFA's submission, greater clarity and transparency in the distribution of effort or proportion of responsibilities that members are expected to meet will go some distance to helping members to address these pressing concerns.

Workload concerns are real and recurrent, despite limited workload disputes or grievances that proceed beyond step one

59. Finally, it should be noted that members in these circumstances are very reluctant to file a workload complaint or grievance, particularly where they experience more precarity in their employment (for example, part-time faculty who work on serial contracts). This reluctance to file a grievance or workload complaint is magnified by the lack of transparency in workload letters, which makes it particularly challenging for members to discern how their workload compares to others within the unit, and or for UTFA to provide informed advice about whether a grievance or workload dispute should be filed.
60. Nevertheless, UTFA regularly advises members with respect to workload issues. The following is a sample of workload concerns raised by UTFA members:
- A full-time Associate Professor, Teaching Stream who taught seven half courses per year sought assistance from UTFA in challenging an overwhelming workload. Over several years, Teaching Stream faculty in his unit had been assigned courses with larger and larger student enrollments that required much more administrative work and grading. The member wanted to secure lower teaching workloads for the Teaching Stream members in his unit because he and his colleagues had little or no time to work on their own scholarship and seemed to have much heavier workloads

than cognate units. Given that the unit workload policy was silent on factors that could lead to course credits/releases (e.g., high course enrollments, level of TA support, etc.), and that a DOE for Teaching Stream faculty is not specified in the WLPP, the member did not believe a workload complaint would be successful.

- A full-time, racialized, Assistant Professor sought assistance in requesting a tenure review delay and help in reducing her workload (in particular, teaching release). The member had been assigned to teach numerous new courses since the beginning of her appointment but did not feel she could refuse the assignments due to her pre-tenure status. This extra time spent teaching reduced the time she could devote to research. Because the member was the only racialized woman faculty member in her program, she received a disproportionate share of requests to serve on dissertation and thesis committees. Although the member eventually obtained short-term relief from her overly-heavy teaching responsibilities, the course reduction was a conditional upon her agreement to teach an extra course after obtaining tenure. The member reluctantly accepted this arrangement so that she could allocate more of her time to research. She chose not to pursue a workload complaint to maintain a positive relationship with her Chair who would be key to her successful bid for tenure.
- A part-time member (50% FTE) in a single-department Faculty had a workload that appeared to exceed the norm set out in the unit's workload policy because the member believed that he worked significantly more hours teaching than colleagues with a higher percentage appointment. UTFA filed a workload complaint on the basis that the member's workload was not fair or equitable and that a delay in providing the member's workload assignment was a breach of both the WLPP and of the unit workload policy. UTFA further requested more detailed disclosure about individual workload assignments as the information available within the workload letters was insufficient to allow for comparison. This is in large part due to the variation of course formats (lectures vs. clinic courses), the duration of the assigned courses (with some courses scheduled for several weeks rather than over the course of the term), and the assignment of co-instructors for some courses (multiple faculty may be assigned to co-teach, without specifying the percentage of the course they are responsible for), etc. The member's careful efforts to quantify the time required to complete assigned activities were dismissed by his Dean who questioned the member's credibility and substituted his own preferred estimates. The Dean ultimately dismissed the complaint, in part because the member could not prove that his assigned workload in hours was greater than that of other colleagues in the unit. The member was discouraged by his inability to compare his workload with colleagues and decided not to pursue the workload complaint further.
- An Assistant Professor, Teaching Stream, approached UTFA due to concerns about her heavy workload. She believed that her teaching load, vis-à-vis other Teaching Stream faculty in cognate disciplines, was extraordinarily high. She described working in a female-dominated professional Faculty where both she and her colleagues were overburdened with heavy workloads to the detriment of their

scholarship. Teaching Stream faculty in the unit are assigned both higher service workloads and larger courses with more students and administrative responsibilities than their Tenure Stream counterparts. Lacking permanency, and seeing no prospect of successfully challenging workload inequities, the member chose not to file a workload complaint, and opted to leave the University soon after instead.

- A tenured full Professor sought assistance dealing with a workload issue related to her undergraduate coordinator role. For several years she has been receiving a 0.5 course release/credit for her service, but over the years the workload for this role had dramatically increased (more student queries, with limited administrative staff supports, for example). The member believed that her increased service obligations meant she had to either put in extra hours in the evening or put less time towards her research and teaching. The unit workload policy did not contemplate additional course credit for expanded service responsibilities and because there was no language setting out the proportion of time faculty should spend on each of the three principal components of workload (DOE), the member did not believe a strong argument could be made that too much of her time was being taken up by service. The member chose not to file a workload complaint.
- A full-time Associate Professor working in a unit with a large component of clinical faculty came to UTFA for assistance on workload. In the member's large department (with close to one hundred full and part-time faculty) the twin burdens of administration and curriculum development are carried by the relatively small number of non-clinical tenured faculty. Although the member was certain that her administrative workload was exceptionally high and detracted from her research efforts, she decided not to file a workload complaint because her unit's workload policy was silent on expectations about DOE.
- A part-time member in the Faculty of Arts & Science had a 50% appointment. She was assigned to act as a TA coordinator within her service responsibilities, but they hugely exceeded normal (proportionate) time for service. In the first year of her position, the member estimated that the hours involved were at least triple those of a typical half-course. In her second year, after some adjustments agreed to with her chair, the member estimated that the work involved was more than double the hours of a typical half-course. This workload detracted from the time she had for research/scholarship. Furthermore, a heavy portion of the work was scheduled in May-June (to meet with the committee in person, as mandated by the chair) and in July-August (to send TA appointment letters and coordinate in advance of the fall semester). The member was concerned that being mandated to work in the summer months was contrary to the WLPP as she was obliged to work and be on campus in all three terms. The unit workload policy was silent on when heavy workload assignments qualify for course release and/or how much course release is given for particularly heavy assignments. The member did not want to file a grievance or workload complaint because she was in a precarious position.

- A full-time cross-appointed CLTA was working in a large undergraduate unit with no Teaching Stream colleagues. On top of her heavy teaching load, the faculty member was assigned time-consuming program direction duties that involved responding to a large number of students with insufficient administrative support. The scope of the duties made it impossible to perform any significant level of scholarship including pedagogical professional development and the unit workload policy was silent on the proportion of time she ought to allocate to the heavy service assignments.
- A pre-tenure faculty member came to UTFA with concerns about her workload as one of the few racialized women faculty on her suburban campus. She was frequently approached by students who share her racial identity, including from outside her department, to act as a mentor and graduate committee member. Given the high rate of attrition for certain racialized students, the member felt morally obligated to say yes to these requests. While she taught the normative number of courses annually, she supervised an unusually high number of undergraduate and graduate students, reducing the time she could allocate to her research. Her unit's workload policy was silent on whether and how student supervision loads reduce course load. After examining the WLPP with UTFA, the member determined, as a pre-tenure faculty member, not to file a workload complaint because she believed it was not in her best interest to push the matter further.
- A full-time pre-continuing status member was worried because a course she had put significant effort into developing, and that she had been teaching successfully, was reassigned. She would therefore have to spend unexpected time developing another course prior to her review rather than being able to devote her efforts to other professional obligations, including her scholarship and PPD. While there was language in her unit workload policy that promised "course stability" for pre-tenure faculty, the same protection was not offered for pre-promotion teaching stream members.
- A full-time faculty member expressed concerns about the heavy workload associated with a very large online course that she was teaching. Previously, she had received a 0.5 course release/credit to make up for the extra workload but expressed concern that the lack of clarity in faculty workload expectations in her unit meant that she would need to "fight" every time she sought recognition for the additional work she was taking on.
- Four full-time pre-tenure faculty members came to UTFA about their teaching workloads. They were concerned about being asked to teach excessive course loads; that in determining their teaching assignments their unit head Associate Dean was not appropriately considering class size, course preparation/development, etc.; and that teaching assignments were not being equitably distributed among faculty members in their unit. The faculty members were concerned that the heavy teaching assignments and time needed to develop new courses would detract from their time to devote to their research. The members were reluctant to file a workload complaint as they were all pre-tenure.

- An Assistant Professor, Teaching Stream teaches a large introductory course (~1000 students) that is credited as equivalent to two courses due to its large enrollment. A tenure-stream faculty member teaching the same course, with the same course-credit, has approximately 30% fewer students. The unit workload policy is silent on how enrollment numbers impact course credit/release. The member has raised her concerns with her Chair and is awaiting the Chair's response.
 - A tenure stream member returned from a research and study leave and was assigned a course that he believed should count as two courses, given its high enrollment and the heavy workload involved in course preparation. Similar courses in the same unit with comparably high enrollments that were being taught by other faculty generated this double credit; however, the unit workload policy was silent on how such decisions were made. The assigned course had previously been taught by a sessional instructor who may have been unaware that UTFA members were being given extra credit for large (and difficult-to-prepare-for) courses, and in any case had not obtained any additional consideration. The member believed that the lack of specificity in the unit workload policy undermined his chances of winning a workload complaint. Instead, the member negotiated with his chair who was only willing to grant the additional course credit for teaching the demanding course if the member also agreed to accept additional service responsibilities, including the completion of a particular grant application. Seeing no other viable option, the member agreed.
61. These examples illustrate the difficulty that members regularly express with understanding, assessing, and comparing their workload assignments, even where the workload appears to be excessive. They also illustrate how difficult it is for members to pursue a formal workload complaint or grievance when they cannot clearly identify how their workload compares to that of their colleagues. This lack of transparency has a strong deterrence effect, impeding members from coming forward with valid concerns.
62. In other cases, members may grieve at Step 1 by raising a concern with their Chair, and the matter is resolved through a partial and unsatisfactory remedy, which the member is reluctant to dispute at Step 2 of the grievance process, because this would require them to directly challenge their Chair's decision-making. This is a particular problem for UTFA's most precarious members. To UTFA's knowledge, grievances resolved at Step 1 in this manner are not reported to the Dean's Office or to the Senior Administration. The fact that few workload issues are grieved at the higher levels of the grievance process cannot be understood, therefore, as an indication that there are no problems or inequities in the distribution of workload, or that these issues are not being grieved to chairs and unit heads.
63. Members are also reluctant to bring a workload complaint because the language in the *WLPP* itself is ambiguous and unclear. Teaching Stream faculty are uncertain what it means to have "reasonable time" to carry out their scholarship in the face of Chairs who tell them that, for example, their workload consists of 80% teaching and 20% service, and that the 80% teaching load comprises their scholarship. (A view which, as discussed below,

UTFA strongly disputes.) Without a clearer understanding of the protections available under the *WLPP*, members are reluctant to pursue a formal grievance.

64. Given this general reluctance to file workload complaints or to grieve, it is critical that the *WLPP* provide clear direction to unit heads with respect to the allocation of workload. The *WLPP* must be a document that serves all faculty members and librarians, and in particular the most vulnerable, not only those who enjoy protections as a result of unstated cultural norms. UTFA members require stronger express protections built into the *WLPP* in order to more clearly guide Chairs and Administrators with respect to the protections to which UTFA members are entitled, and to give members the additional information *they* need in order to be able to better protect themselves from inequitable distribution of workload, being overloaded with teaching/professional practice or service, or being denied adequate time to carry out their scholarly work.

b. The Teaching Stream In Transition

65. The second important contextual factor to UTFA’s proposals is the ongoing repositioning of the Teaching Stream as full partners in the scholarly and intellectual functions of the University of Toronto. Over the last twenty years, the status of the stream as a scholarly stream has been confirmed and strengthened. In 2003, as outlined in the University’s *Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments*, Lecturers were assessed on “scholarship as evidenced in teaching and related professional activities.”¹¹ Since then, and in particular in the last 5-10 years, there has been a growing recognition of the value of a scholarly Teaching Stream. This has included:
- An Association grievance in 2008-09 which resulted in an explicit recognition of the right of Teaching Stream faculty to engage in and be credited for discipline-based scholarship, and not only pedagogical scholarship;
 - The adoption of professorial titles for Teaching Stream faculty in 2015;
 - The normalization of the PhD, or equivalent, as the qualification for appointment;
 - The revision in 2015 of the *PPAA* affirming that to obtain continuing status, Teaching Stream faculty are required to engage in scholarship: “evidence of demonstrated and continuing future pedagogical/professional development”; and
 - The recognition of the rank of full Professor, Teaching Stream in 2015.

¹¹ This policy, in section 30, subsection vii, states, “A positive recommendation [for promotion to senior lecturer] will require the judgment of excellence in teaching and evidence of *continued* future pedagogical /professional development” (emphasis added).

66. In particular, it is significant that the policies governing the conferral of continuing status and promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream (the *Policies and Procedures on Academic Appointments* and the *Policies and Procedures on Promotion in the Teaching Stream*, respectively), both require that Teaching Stream faculty engage in scholarship. In other words, a Teaching Stream faculty member will not have their contract renewed or be given permanent employment status, or advance further in their career, if they do not engage in a meaningful way in scholarly activities. Furthermore, these policies specifically define scholarship to include pedagogical/professional development, creative professional activities, and/or disciplined-based scholarship in relation to, or relevant to, the field in which the faculty member teaches.
67. The parties' mutual recognition of the scholarly nature of the Teaching Stream reflects an understanding that research and scholarly practice are intimately connected to the quality of teaching practice. In many cases, this includes discipline-specific research and or creative professional activity in addition to pedagogically focused scholarly work.
68. However, the *WLPP* has not kept up with these important developments in the Teaching Stream. Indeed, there continues to be a serious misunderstanding of the scholarly nature of the Teaching Stream among some chairs and academic administrators across the University which the *WLPP* has failed to address. While research/scholarship has become an increased part of hiring and promotion, in many cases this has not translated into practices that support research/scholarship for members within the stream.
69. There are likely two reasons for this continued disparity in practice across the University.
70. **First**, there are no established norms for distribution of effort in the Teaching Stream. In the Tenure Stream, there is a widespread understanding that a faculty member will typically be expected to engage in 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service. (In a very few units, such as those found in Medicine, 20% teaching, 60% research, and 20% service is the explicit norm.) So embedded is this norm that it is articulated in various sections of the *PTR Policy*.
71. By comparison, distribution of workload in the Teaching Stream varies considerably. In a small number of units, the workload document reflects a practice of 60% teaching, 20% scholarship, and 20% service. In such units, the Teaching Stream teaches no more than 1.5 times, or 150% as much as, the Tenure Stream.

Units where Teaching Stream faculty teach 150% (or less) of the course load taught by Tenure Stream faculty

Full Course Equivalent (FCE) Ratios, Teaching Stream: Tenure Stream

Centre for Aboriginal Initiatives	(3.0:2.0)
Anthropology	(3.0:2.0)
Applied Psych. & Human Development	(3.0:2.0)
Cinema Studies	(3.0:2.0)
Curriculum, Teaching, and Learning	(3.0:2.0)

French	(3.5:2.5)
Germanic Language and Literature	(3.5:2.5)
Italian Studies	(3.5:2.5)
Leadership, Higher, and Adult Education	(3.0:2.0)
Linguistics	(3.0:2.0)
Centre for the Study of Religion	(3.0:2.0)
Social Justice Education	(3.0:2.0)
Women Studies and Gender Studies	(3.0:2.0)

72. In many units across the University, however, Teaching Stream faculty teach course loads well in excess of their Tenure Stream colleagues, including as much as 300% of a Tenure Stream faculty member's course load:

Units where Teaching Stream faculty teach 200% or more of the course load taught by Tenure Stream faculty

FCE) Ratios, Teaching Stream: Tenure Stream

Aerospace Studies	(3.0:1.5)
Astronomy and Astrophysics	(3.0:1.5)
Biomaterial & Biomedical Engineering	(3.0:1.5)
Chemical Engineering	(3.0:1.5)
Civil Engineering	(3.0:1.5)
Computer Science	(3.0:1.0) [<i>Teaching Stream teach 300% of a Tenure Stream load</i>]
Earth Sciences	(3.0:1.5)
Ecology & Evolutionary Biology	(2.5:1.0)
Economics	(4.0:2.0)
Geography and Planning	(3.0:1.5)
Mathematics	(3.5:1.5) [<i>Teaching Stream teach 233% of a Tenure Stream load</i>]
Mechanical and Industrial Engineering	(3.0:1.5)
Faculty of Music	(3.0:1.5)
Physics	(3.0:1.5)
UTM Computer Science	(3.0:1.25)
UTM Economics	(4.0:2.0)
UTM Mathematics	(3.5:1.25) [<i>Teaching Stream teach 280% of a Tenure Stream load</i>]

Units where Teaching Stream faculty teach 175% of the course load taught by Tenure Stream faculty

FCE Ratios, Teaching Stream: Tenure Stream

Criminology and Sociolegal Studies	(3.5:2.0)
English	(3.5:2.0)
History	(3.0-3.5:2.0)
Industrial Relations and Human Resources	(3.5:2.0)
Centre for Medieval Studies	(3.5:2.0)
Munk School of Global Affairs	(3.5:2.0)
Near and Middle Eastern Civilizations	(3.5:2.0)
Philosophy	(3.5:2.0)
Political Science	(3.5:2.0)
Public Policy and Governance	(3.5:2.0)
Faculty of Social Work	(3.5:2.0)
Sociology	(3.5:2.0)
Statistics	(3.0:1.63)
UTM English & Drama	(3.5:2.0)
UTM Sociology	(3.5:2.0)

UTM Visual Studies	(3.5:2.0)
UTSC Centre for Critical Development	(3.5:2.0)
UTSC English	(3.5:2.0)
UTSC Management	(3.5:2.0)
UTSC Philosophy	(3.5:2.0)

73. Again, if in a particular unit a course load of 1.5 FCE is understood to comprise 40% of a Tenure Stream faculty member's workload, it is untenable that a Teaching Stream faculty member in that same unit can reasonably be asked to carry a 3.0 FCE teaching load **and** 20% service **and** "reasonable" time to engage in scholarship. In the same way, if in a particular unit a course load of 2.0 FCE is understood to comprise 40% of a Tenure Stream faculty member's workload, it is untenable that a Teaching Stream faculty member in that same unit can reasonably be asked to carry a 3.5 FCE teaching load **and** 20% service **and** "reasonable" time to engage in scholarship.
74. In some units, chairs routinely assign teaching and service on the basis of an 80% teaching load and 20% service, with no dedicated time for scholarship. The PTR document for the UTSC Centre for French and Linguistics, for example, states:

I. Teaching-stream and CLTA faculty

For teaching-stream faculty, we use a 10-point scale, divided into two components: 8 points for teaching and professional development, and 2 points for service.

....

Of the eight points assigned to [Teaching and professional development], seven are allocated to teaching and one to professional development. These weights reflect the view that, in the context of PTR evaluation, much of one's pedagogical and professional development is a means to an end – the end being improved teaching, which receives the lion's share of the weight.

TAB P

[emphasis added]

75. Similarly, UTFA is aware that some units fail to allocate any points in their PTR scheme for scholarship for Teaching Stream members. For example, a PTR letter from the Department of Historical Studies at UTM states as follows:

"In general, three components are considered in arriving at the PTR award: teaching, research and service. These are normally weighted in a 4:4:2 ratio for professorial stream and in an 8:0:2 ratio for teaching stream faculty, producing an overall score ranging from zero to ten."

TAB Q

76. These kinds of point schemes are highly problematic. The position that the allocation of 80% teaching “comprises” 10% time for scholarship (in the form of Professional Development), or that “0” points are allocated for scholarship is, in UTFA’s view, untenable and clearly violates the entitlement of all faculty members to protected time for scholarship in the *WLPP*.
77. Similarly, the *PTR Policy* recognizes that there are *three* principal components to all faculty appointments: teaching, scholarship, and service. “Reasonable” time must be understood to mean a meaningful opportunity to engage in scholarly activity, including pedagogical and professional development. In UTFA’s view, anything less than a 20% allocation (effectively one day a week) is insufficient for a faculty member to conceptualize, undertake, and engage in any serious and sustained scholarly program, whether this involves research and writing peer-reviewed articles, participation at or contributions to academic conferences, professional work that allows the faculty member to maintain a mastery of their subject area or profession, or other forms of creative professional activity.
78. A faculty member carrying an 80% teaching load will not have adequate time to devote to their scholarship. For example, in many units, an 80% teaching load translates into a 4.0 FCE course load, *double* that of a Tenure Stream faculty member. In a few units, Teaching Stream faculty are teaching *more than double* the FCE’s of their Tenure Stream colleagues. Practically speaking, it is simply implausible that a faculty member will be able to carry such heavy loads, additional service obligations, *and* have the dedicated time and mental energy to engage in a program of scholarship.
79. Additionally, the argument that Teaching Stream faculty members’ time for scholarship is “integrated” into their work teaching courses violates “...the [WLPP] principle that **comparable work will be weighed in the same manner.**” In other words, if a Tenure Stream faculty member teaches a course and has additional *separate* time for conducting their scholarship, the same course taught by a Teaching Stream faculty member cannot be bundled with the extra expectation of scholarly work, including PPD, as part of the same course assignment.
80. Moreover, “integrating” time for scholarship into a member’s teaching load requires that the faculty member’s scholarship be closely and rigidly tied to their teaching obligations. It fragments and downgrades the faculty member’s scholarly activities, making the member’s ability to fulfill scholarly commitments overly dependent upon the courses they are assigned to teach by others. It effectively prevents faculty from exercising their right to engage in discipline-based scholarship. Such a position violates University policy, which clearly recognizes that for Teaching Stream faculty, scholarship can take the form of pedagogical/professional development, creative professional activities, and/or discipline-based scholarship. Indeed, such a policy violates the academic freedom of the affected faculty members, by requiring them to engage in research directly related to the actual courses they are assigned to teach.
81. **Second**, the disparity in practice around distribution of workload in the Teaching Stream results from a lack of clarity in the *WLPP* itself. The *WLPP* establishes only that faculty are entitled to “reasonable time” for scholarship and does not provide any guidance on what

is intended by “reasonable” under the Policy. As is evident from the unit workload documents described above, some unit heads believe that an 80/20 distribution of effort is “reasonable” under the current terms of the *WLPP*. Given the fact that there are no deep-rooted cultural norms around the Teaching Stream, clear policy language is all the more important. Yet the *WLPP* in its current form simply is not strong enough to direct unit heads to ensure that Teaching Stream faculty are given dedicated time for scholarship.

82. Again, the problem of inadequate time for scholarship for Teaching Stream faculty is amply illustrated by the responses to UTFA’s 2020 Teaching Stream survey, including members’ continued experience that they are either treated as a “teaching-only” stream or, at the opposite end of the spectrum, that they are held to the same research expectations as the Tenure Stream despite being (disproportionately) overloaded with teaching and service compared to their Tenure Stream colleagues. A small selection of survey responses includes the following:

- “Despite all the work that has been done to date to define TS at UofT, there are many faculty members that view TS as glorified instructors and suggest that TS only teach. Collectively, TS are definitely not viewed as 'equals' within the faculty”.
- “Greater emphasis for all in understanding the scope of what teaching stream faculty do: ie there's a sense that all we do/are expected to do is teach. Our stream should be reframed as teaching intensive rather than not doing research”.
- “[Scholarship/research/CPA] is something that contributes towards change of status, but for which we are given no time to allot to it. If we can use it to argue for teaching excellence, we should have the option of allotting some of our time towards it”.
- “I think scholarship should be factored into workload and given designated time”.
- “I feel that there is an expectation of scholarship/research yet this is not reflected in my teaching workload assignment. I am expected to do scholarship/research on my own time and penalized if I don't do this”.
- “There is an informal expectation that teaching stream faculty still publish in peer-reviewed journals - yet, of course, do not get time off from teaching to conduct this complex work. This is something that is not formalized in faculty documents, but rather is part of the ‘hidden’ expectations among interactions with faculty leadership”.
- “We have no time built into our workload, we also do not get time for grant applications or access to research assistants to help with the applications - so we spend hours on grants, ethics, analyzing data and writing all of our own work, on our own time. We do not get conference support to disseminate the work, even though it is accepted with the U of T name. I have gone to three international conferences with oral presentations and paid out of my own pocket for each one”.

- “As a teaching stream member I feel pressure to perform close to the research stream level (e.g., publications, conferences) while teaching more courses with a greater number of students. Eg. professional preparation courses may have 36 students x 6 classes (often given to teaching stream) while some graduate course have 6-15 students (often for research stream)”.

83. Faculty members also described being routinely assigned the largest and heaviest courses, and administrative and committee assignments that are significantly heavier than those assigned to Tenure Stream colleagues, despite the fact that service purportedly makes up 20% of the workload in both streams. For example:

- “The expectations of teaching, service and leadership seem higher for the teaching stream. My CPA/research/scholarship is done only because I work 10 hour days and many weekends and holidays”.
- “In my department there is a great tendency to put administrative burden on us (I was a member of seven committees since September 2019, spent god knows how many hours designing promotional material for our outreach activities and [...] similar tasks), this is also the second year I do not have a semester free of teaching”.
- “They give us so much extra work (3.5 FCE's for Teaching Stream vs 2.0 FCE's for Professorial Stream) that there is little time. Service is also considerable; the committees assigned are labour-intensive”.

(See **Appendix A** for additional responses to the 2020 Teaching Stream Survey.)

84. It is evident that the WLPP and *PTR Policy* have failed in all respects to ensure a reasonable and equitable distribution of workload for Teaching Stream Faculty, with meaningful time for scholarship, and in which all three components of their appointment are given credit in the PTR process.

VI. WLPP PROPOSALS

85. Proposals are set out in the blue text below. Note that the Administration and the Association have already agreed to certain amendments to Article 2.18, indicated below in tracked changes (and set out in the document attached as **TAB A**). UTFA's proposed new language is highlighted in yellow.

a. Article 2.18 (currently Article 2.14 of the WLPP)

86. UTFA originally proposed the following amendment to Article 2.18 (2.14 in the existing *WLPP*):

Written assignments of workload. Each member will be provided with a written assignment of their workload duties on an annual basis which includes the member's percentage appointment and details (including respective weightings) of teaching and service or, in the case of librarians, professional practice, and service no later than June 30th. All written assignments for each Unit will be collected in the Office of the Unit Head and made readily available for review at the request of any member of the Unit or the Association. Provided it is technologically practical to do so, the University and UTFA will discuss in Joint Committee and endeavour to agree on copies being posted on a unit internet site or other password-protected website, accessible to UTFA and its members in the applicable unit, subject to any confidential accommodation agreements, with a target implementation date of January 1, 2020.

87. In response to concerns raised by the Administration in the course of mediation, UTFA has revised its proposal as follows.

UTFA Proposal:

Written assignments of workload. Each member will be provided with a written assignment of ~~his/her~~ their workload duties on an annual basis by no later than June 30th which includes details of teaching and service. This includes the member's percentage FTE appointment, and details of the member's teaching and service assignments (including the proportion of the member's overall responsibilities the member is expected to undertake relating to each of teaching and service, or in the case of librarians, professional practice and service). Where an individual member's assignment is materially difference from the unit's workload norms, standards or ranges, the variation and the reason for it should be identified in the individual member's written assignment of workload, subject to any confidential accommodation agreements. All written assignments for each Unit will be collected in the Office of the Unit Head and made readily available for review at the request of any member of the Unit or the Association.

Provided it is technologically practical to do so, the University and UTFA will discuss in Joint Committee and endeavour to agree on copies being posted on a unit

internet site or other password-protected website, accessible to UTFA and its members in the applicable unit, subject to any confidential accommodation agreements, with a target implementation date of January 1, 2020.

UTFA understands the following to be the Administration's proposal:

Written assignments of workload. Each member will be provided with a written assignment of ~~his/her~~ their workload duties on an annual basis which includes the member's percentage appointment and details of teaching and service or, in the case of librarians, professional practice, and service normally no later than June 30th. Where, due to special circumstances, there is a significant variation from the workload norms, standards or ranges in the assignment of an individual's workload, the variation and the reason for it should be identified in the written assignment of workload, subject to any confidential accommodation agreements. All written assignments for each Unit will be collected in the Office of the Unit Head and made readily available for review at the request of any member of the Unit or the Association.

Provided it is technologically practical to do so, the University and UTFA will discuss in Joint Committee and endeavour to agree on copies being posted on a unit internet site or other password-protected website, accessible to UTFA and its members in the applicable unit, subject to any confidential accommodation agreements, with a target implementation date of January 1, 2020.

Rationale for UTFA's Proposal:

88. As noted, some of the central goals of the *WLPP* are to protect the right of members to a "fair, reasonable and equitable distribution of workload", a "transparent process of workload allocation", and to ensure that "comparable work will be weighed in the same manner".
89. These goals were intended to be accomplished in part through Article 2.18 (currently 2.14) of the *WLPP*, which establishes that every member is entitled to receive a written workload letter on an annual basis which includes details of their teaching and service assignments. These written assignments are then collected within the unit and made available for review by any member of the unit.
90. The fundamental premise of Article 2.18 is that members cannot ensure that their workload is equitably distributed unless it is (1) written down, (2) available for review, and (3) can be compared vis a vis the workload of other members in the unit.
91. While this premise remains sound, the current articulation of Article 2.18 falls short of these stated and important goals.
92. Although Article 2.18 entitles members to know what their assignments are, it does not entitle them to know (1) what the overall proportion of their professional responsibilities is, (2) how their assignments relate to their proportion of responsibilities, or (3) how the

proportion of responsibilities relates to how they will be evaluated at the end of the year for PTR.

93. For example, a part-time faculty member who has a 50% FTE appointment may have an appointment letter stating that the member's appointment requires them to carry out teaching, scholarship, and service. The annual workload letter might further specify that the member is required to teach 2.5 FCE, that they will act as Undergraduate Coordinator, and that they will serve on an Admissions committee and a Curriculum committee. In these circumstances, the member has no idea:

- what their expected distribution of workload is *within* the 50% FTE, as between their teaching, scholarship, and service obligations;
- whether it is reasonable that they be assigned 2.5 FCE to satisfy their teaching workload, and/or whether it is reasonable that they be assigned the role of Undergraduate Coordinator, and to serve on two work-intensive committees to satisfy their service workload; and
- whether they have any reasonable protected time to carry out scholarship, or how much scholarship they could reasonably be expected to undertake given their other obligations.

94. This lack of transparency in workload allocation presents a fundamental barrier to achieving the Administration's commitments, as established in Article 1.2. In particular, the lack of transparency in workload undermines fairness in workload in two important ways.

(i) Lack of Fairness in Evaluation

95. First, it is fundamentally unfair to evaluate a member's work product at the end of the year without providing clear indications at the outset of the year with respect to their expected distribution of effort. As a matter of fairness, there should be some consistency and correlation between a member's distribution of workload and the basis for their evaluation.

96. In response to the 2020 UTFA survey of Teaching Stream faculty, many faculty members raised concerns regarding this issue. For example:

- While I can emphasize my research and CPA in my annual PTR report, I have no control over the weight the PTR committee or dean places upon it".
- "Scholarship [should] be an official part of PTR - right now, with teaching at 80% and service at 20%, our tenure-stream colleagues and department chairs can get a little confused as to what we're doing if we're not in the classroom".
- "I would love a PTR scale setting out exactly how research/CPA from teaching-stream faculty will be weighed by the PTR committee [...]"

- “Recognize that teaching takes up a huge amount of time. If a person does significant service, little time remains for much research. More importantly, there are no written explanations presented in the PTR. How can somebody exceed expectations if the expectations are not written down anywhere?”
 - “I am so overwhelmingly bogged down by my teaching and service commitments that scholarship always had to be fit around the edges. I don't think my department's promotions committee had a high expectation for scholarship, so when I did do some it was reflected favourably in my annual evaluation. For me it have been an odd situation; the bar may have possibly been set low for me because everyone is so clueless about the expectations of the teaching stream.”
97. To be clear, UTFA recognizes that the workload of faculty members and librarians is inherently fluid. Members’ work cannot be rigidly quantified or measured according to units of time or some other measure. Moreover, members’ professional activities may change over the course of the year as their research activities, teaching commitments, and service obligations develop, sometimes in unexpected ways. There can also be overlap between and among the three principal components of faculty appointments, as research activities, pedagogical developments, and administrative service may inform and influence each other.
98. Put differently, it is not UTFA’s view that members will or should rigidly allocate their time depending on respective distribution of effort or weighting of duties. It would be artificial and unrealistic to think that the work of faculty members and academic librarians can be carved up in this way.
99. On the other hand, any faculty member or librarian could fill up their full appointment dealing *only* with research activities, or focusing *only* on teaching duties and the needs of students, or working *only* on service commitments to the University and to their disciplinary areas. Faculty members and librarians must therefore continually juggle their academic responsibilities to ensure that they are devoting an adequate level of emphasis to fulfill each of the *three* principal components for which they are responsible. They must determine where to allocate their time and energy, and have some ability to gauge when they have met their obligations in one area and are justified in turning their attention to their other responsibilities.
100. As a matter of fairness, therefore, it is only appropriate to communicate to members in advance, before they start the academic year, the relative distribution of responsibilities upon which they will ultimately be assessed. Given the financial consequences resulting from PTR decisions, clarity and transparency in workload has material and long-lasting consequences.
101. In this regard, it is relevant that many units specifically include references to the relative weight in the division of a faculty member’s work in their PTR instructions. In other words, the units themselves understand and expect that the weight attributable to teaching, research/scholarship, and service can be articulated or quantified in some respect, and that

this can be communicated to faculty members in order to guide their professional activities. The C, for example, provide as follows:

A. The PTR Committee and its responsibilities

[...]

(b) Before meeting, each committee member independently rates each faculty member on teaching, research and service. **Under normal circumstances, each faculty member is rated from 1-40 for teaching; 1-40 for research; and 1-20 for service, for a total score out of a possible 100 points. Faculty members with reduced teaching loads, extra service or on research leave are evaluated according to weights that reflect the division of their work.** More detail about how these three areas are evaluated is given in sections B and C below.

B. Criteria used for evaluation

[...]

Service is weighted by its importance and the amount of work (be sure to report the number of hours you spend on committee activities)

[Emphasis added.]

TAB R

102. In addition, some units have developed PTR evaluation rubrics that establish very specific details with respect to the quantum of points to be assigned for each type of activity, within the three broad areas of responsibility. Notably, these rubrics generally take into account the time commitment required by a faculty member for each type of activity, among other factors.
103. For example, the Department of Sociology at St. George establishes the number of points to be allocated to a member for:

Teaching:

- Undergraduate half-courses taught (5 pts each)
- Graduate half-courses taught (7.5 pts each)
- Graduate or undergraduate supervised readings (2 pts each)
- Graduate supervisions, “based on hours and # of students” (light load < 5 pts; medium load < 10 pts; heavy load < 15pts)

- Completed MA theses (2 pts each) and completed PhD theses (5 pts each)
- PhD examination Committees (1 pt each)
- Secondary Supervisions (2 pts/st/yr)

Service:

- Disciplinary Representative (“size of discipline, amount of turmoil”) (< 5 pts)
- Supervisor of Studies (“size of discipline, # of students advised”) (< 5 pts)
- Divisional, college and university committee (3 pts each)
- Tenure or promotion committee (2 pts each)
- Search Committee (< 3 pts each)
- Scholarly and professional association committees, boards (< 3 pts each)

104. Similarly, the Department of Linguistics “PTR System” document for 2018-19 (**TAB S**) provides as follows:

The PTR is split 40% Teaching, 40% Research, and 20% Service. Staff members on leave are given PTR based on 100% Research; however, graduate supervision and service are taken into account, when appropriate.

Teaching PTR is the sum of Undergraduate Teaching and Graduate Teaching, where each counts for 20%.

Undergraduate Teaching is computed by adding (# of courses x 10) + (# of students divided by 4) + (average teaching evaluation x 10) + (scores for teaching development weighted according to scope and time involved as indicated on the Departmental PTR Scoring Memo, attached)

The Graduate Teaching value is computed by (# of courses x 10) + (# of students divided by 2) + (average teaching evaluation x 5) + (scores for supervision etc. as weighted on Memo). The Graduate Components consist of a number of factors weighted by their importance and the faculty time involved as on the Departmental PTR Scoring Memo.

Research PTR is the sum of Research Components. The Research Components consist of a number of factors weighted by their importance and the faculty time involved as on the Departmental PTR Scoring Memo.

The Service Components consist of a number of factors weighted by their importance and the faculty time involved as on the Departmental PTR Scoring Memo.

[...]

105. These are only some examples. A number of additional unit PTR documents are attached at **TABS R-V**.
106. The annual activity reports that faculty members are required to fill out by April 30 every year equally require faculty members to itemize and quantify their activities in each of the three areas of professional responsibility. For example, the Faculty of Arts & Science Annual Activity Report for Tenure Stream Faculty (**TAB W**) requires faculty members not only to list the course and section #, but also to:
- “Indicate the hours you personally spent teaching classes/tutorials.”
 - “Indicate the hours you personally spent teaching labs.”
 - Include the number of supervision hours per month for undergraduate, Masters and PhD students.
107. Similar instructions are given to Teaching Stream faculty on their Annual Activity Report form (**TAB X**).
108. UTFA acknowledges that the exercise carried out by units in the evaluation of PTR at the end of the academic year is different and distinct from the assignment of workload at the beginning of the academic year. However, what these PTR evaluation instructions and Annual Activity report forms make clear is that:
- (1) Work responsibilities involved in teaching and service are regularly measured and quantified by units at the University of Toronto, whether according to number of hours spent, number of courses taught, number of students involved, how intensive the commitment is, etc., and such quantification is not antithetical to an academic workplace; and
 - (2) Given the quantification of workload for the purposes of PTR evaluation and merit pay increases, it is only a matter of fairness that the assignment of workload at the outset of the year should in some way be aligned with the quantification of workload for the purposes of evaluation at the end of the year.
109. As such, it is only fair that UTFA members should be provided with clear and transparent information about their relative distribution of responsibilities in their workload letters.

(ii) Inequitable Distribution of Workload

110. Second, without more transparent information with respect to members’ expected proportion of responsibilities, there is no way for members to ensure that workload is being distributed equitably within their unit.

111. Again, the basic principle of Article 2.18 is that members should be able not only to know their work assignments but also to compare their work assignments with their colleagues to ensure equitable distribution. Such comparison is severely hampered if the member does not know either how their own assignments relate to the relative proportion of responsibilities, or how their colleagues' assignments relate to their relative proportion of responsibilities.
112. Take for example the part-time member described in paragraph 93, above. In that example, the member is on a 50% FTE appointment and has been assigned five half-courses, or a 2.5 FCE teaching load. In order to be able to compare her teaching load with that of her colleagues (including colleagues who are full-time Tenure Stream faculty, full-time Teaching Stream members, or other part-time members with various FTE appointments), the member needs to know not only what her relative teaching load is, but also what her colleagues' relative teaching load is.
113. Under UTFA's proposal, for example, the member might be advised that the Teaching Stream distribution of effort/emphasis (DOE) is as follows: teaching load is 60%, service load is 20% (and by implication her relative proportion of scholarly/PPD responsibilities is 20%). For a 50% part-time appointee, each of these would be pro-rated, i.e. 30% teaching; 10% service; 10% scholarship/PPD. By looking at her colleagues' workload letters, she might also be able to determine that her full-time Tenure Stream colleagues are teaching four half courses, or a 2.0 FCE, for 40% of a full-time appointment. On this basis, she might come to realize that she is teaching 2.5 FCE for what amounts to 30% of a full-time appointment, whereas the tenure-track member is teaching 2.0 FCE for 40% of a full-time appointment. With this additional information, the part-time member would be in a much better position to be able to initiate a collegial discussion with her Chair about a more equitable distribution of workload or increasing her percentage FTE, or, if this was unsuccessful, to bring a workload complaint under the *WLPP*.
114. Members' ability to know their assigned relative proportion of responsibilities is therefore critical information to ensure the equitable distribution of workload (within the relevant unit) promised under the *WLPP*.
115. Further, it is important that this information be proactively given to members as a routine requirement under the *WLPP*, rather than requiring members to request such information from their unit heads. If members are required to request information of unit heads, the unfortunate reality is that many will not do so. A proactive requirement under the *WLPP* to communicate to members their distribution of workload will have the dual benefit of requiring unit heads to articulate the expected proportion of responsibilities for each member (which may in itself have a disciplining effect on the distribution of workload), and of enabling members to meaningfully assess their workload vis a vis their colleagues and to address inequities where necessary.

(iii) **University Policies at the University of Toronto Already Rely on the Concept of “Weighting” of Responsibilities**

116. In UTFA’s submission, any argument that the introduction of language with respect to proportion of responsibilities or respective weightings would be a radical change at the University of Toronto is a “straw man”. As already noted, units across the University of Toronto already engage in a degree of quantification of work responsibilities through the PTR process, including by assessing the time commitments involved in various kinds of teaching and service activities.
117. Moreover, the *PTR Policy* itself acknowledges the long-standing and widespread practice in the Tenure Stream of a 40/40/20 distribution of effort as follows:

Some units have employed a ten-point scheme as a model, based on **four points for teaching, four points for research and two for service**. This will be varied for those faculty who hold an appointment as Lecturer/Senior Lecturer (or Tutor/Senior Tutor) and for librarians whose assessment criteria will be different.

[Emphasis added.]

118. While the *PTR Policy* suggests that “some units” have employed a ten-point scale, to UTFA’s knowledge most, if not nearly all, units assessing PTR for Tenure Stream faculty members apply this 40/40/20 distribution of effort.
119. The *PTR Policy* further acknowledges under “The Balance of Teaching, Research and Service” that the three principal components of a faculty member’s activities are subject to different “weights”:

The PTR scheme allows each unit to determine the balance amongst the three principal components of a faculty member’s activities, teaching, research and service. This flexibility is important for recognizing the unique missions of units and the differences in agreed upon activities of individuals. **Normally, for professorial staff the portion of the total PTR allocated to teaching and research is approximately equal, but in a limited number of cases, an argument might be made that an atypical weighting of activities** that reflects that a different balance between teaching and research for the individual concerned is appropriate. **A separate weighting of teaching and service should be made for teaching-stream staff.** A teaching-stream faculty member who engages in pedagogical and/or discipline-based scholarship in relation to the field in which they teach shall be evaluated on that activity. Weighting of staff on research and study leave should reflect the research and service duties undertaken during their leave.

A change of the balance in duties requires the approval of the unit and division heads. Such an adjustment must be made at least a year in

advance of the application of a modified weighting of responsibilities to the person's Annual Activity Report. In no circumstances should a tenure-stream faculty member be fully relieved of either teaching or research activities and there should always be a service component for each individual. Such arrangements should be for a fixed period with a review of their appropriateness at the end of the period.

[Emphasis added.]

120. In other words, the *PTR Policy* **assumes** that faculty members have an established weighting of their three areas of responsibility. It is only fair, and a logical corollary of this assumption embedded in the *PTR Policy*, that faculty members will be *told* what that weighting is.

Other institutions require DOE be communicated to faculty members

121. Given the fundamental principle of fairness at stake, a number of universities have also expressly recognized that distribution of effort should be articulated *and* communicated to faculty members. For example:

- *University of Waterloo*: **“The overall rating (R) for each member shall be computed as the weighted average of the individuals ratings in teaching, scholarship and service for the year(s) being reviewed...The weight for each area shall be as specified in the member’s letter of appointment.** In the absence of specified weights for professorial positions, the normal weights shall be 40 percent for teaching, 40 percent for scholarship, and 20 percent for service; for lecturer positions, the normal weights shall be 80 percent for teaching and 20 percent for service*. Weights and duties may be adjusted in a formal agreement between the member and the chair (with the approval of the Dean): Article 13.5.5(a).

“The weights shall be at least 20 percent in every category, except in the case of lecturer appointments*. The weight redistribution does not modify the performance quality expected in any of the three areas, though expectations for quantity will change”: Article 13.5.5(b).

“The performance evaluation of a member shall be done with all evaluators being informed of the weights in each area, and any adjustments made to the weights in each area, over the entire period for which evaluation data is being considered. Each member shall be informed of the weight information used in their evaluation”: Article 13.5.5(d).

“The Chair shall inform the member in writing of her/his final individual and overall ratings and shall provide an opportunity for the member to discuss her/his performance evaluation”: Article 13.5.8.

[*Note that the distribution of effort for lecturers at the University of Waterloo is not the same as for Teaching Stream professors at the University of Toronto.]

- *McMaster University*: “**Faculty members whose assigned teaching, research and service responsibilities have been changed may be awarded CP/M using a formula that is weighted to more accurately reflect their new balance of responsibilities.** The process for making this change will involve the faculty member, chair and Dean. Subsequent changes in the faculty member’s assigned contributions should be documented in writing from the chair and/or dean. A record of all the changes described above should be kept in the Dean’s office”: “*Statement on Balancing Teaching, Research and Service Contributions for Tenure-Stream Faculty Members*”
- *University of Western Ontario*, Article 1.1: Subject to the provisions of Clause 2 of the *Article Alternative Workload*, **the Normal Workload, as defined in this Article, of Probationary or Tenured Members shall balance Teaching, Research and Service such that the commitment of activity in each of Teaching and Research shall be approximately equal and each shall be greater than in the area of Service.** For Probationary and Tenured Members whose Teaching component of Workload constitutes at least thirty per cent of Academic Responsibilities, the credit given for the amount of graduate supervision shall not be such that it eliminates all of the Member’s other Academic Responsibilities in the area of Teaching

122. *Guelph University*:

18.11 A **[Distribution of Effort] DOE for each Member shall be defined in his/her Letter of Appointment and as mutually negotiated in any subsequent agreements documented in the Member’s Official File. The DOE defines the relative effort with respect to activities undertaken in fulfillment of his/her academic responsibilities in the areas of Teaching, Scholarship and Service.**

18.12 **The DOE shall be the basis for the assignment of duties. The translation of DOE percentages into Teaching and Service assignments, while it may vary from Department to Department, must be clearly delineated for the Members of each Department.** DOE may only be modified through negotiation and agreement of the Dean and the Member.

18.13 Unless otherwise agreed to in writing by the Dean and the Faculty Member, the default DOE shall be forty percent (40%) teaching, forty percent (40%) Scholarship, and twenty percent (20%) Service.

123. *Laurentian University:*

Article 5.40 – Academic Workload

5.40.2 The academic workload of a full-time Member during the academic year includes: (a) teaching/professional librarianship/archives management, including the supervision of graduate and undergraduate students; (b) scholarly activity, including commitments to external granting agencies; (c) University governance, administrative duties, and other contributions to the University. **The normal guideline for the distribution of the workload among the three (3) main workload components is: forty percent (40%) teaching/professional librarianship/archives management, including the supervision of graduate and undergraduate students; forty percent (40%) scholarly activity, including commitments to external granting agencies; and twenty percent (20%) University governance, administrative duties, and other contributions to the University.**

124. *Northern Ontario School of Medicine:*

A. Teaching Faculty

(i) The workload of a Member shall normally balance teaching, research and service such that the commitment of activity in each of teaching and research shall be approximately equal and each shall be greater than in the area of service. An exception is a Faculty Member in a Research Chair in which the workload can be greater in the area of research than teaching and service.

125. *University of Victoria:*

Standards for Faculty Members in Academic Units:

27.1 Each Academic Unit must have a written Standard for the Distribution of Duties and Responsibilities of Faculty Members (hereafter, the “Standard”), and must review the Standard, and amend it as required, within six months of every renegotiation of this Agreement to ensure that the academic objectives and mandate of the unit are achieved.

27.2 The Standard will describe the norm for Faculty Members holding tenured, tenure-track, Assistant Teaching Professor, Associate Teaching Professor, Artist-in-Residence and Limited-Term appointments.

Assignment of Duties: Faculty

27.14 Within each Academic Unit, the duties and responsibilities of Members will be equitably distributed to achieve the academic objectives and mandate of the unit.

27.15 The duties and responsibilities of tenured, tenure-track, Artists-in-Residence and Limited-Term Faculty Members include teaching duties and responsibilities as described in the Standard of each Academic Unit, scholarship, research, and professional activities, and academic and administrative duties described in the Standard.

...

27.25 The Standard for Faculty Members establishes a norm across the unit. The **ratio of research and assigned teaching, academic and administrative duties and responsibilities** may vary from the Standard from time to time provided that over time the aggregate contribution of each Faculty Member in a unit with regard to teaching, scholarship, professional activities, academic and administrative duties and responsibilities referred to in sections 27.15 and 27.16 is balanced and equitable.

126. *University of Regina*, 16.3:

The collegial governance process followed in developing the Criteria Document of each Faculty shall result in **a document that is transparent in describing the expectations of the members**. Expectations may vary according to the duties and position/rank of the academic staff member. Given the importance of the Faculty Criteria Document when used in the review process to assess the performance of members, **clarity regarding duties and expectations is essential**. In particular, the nature of accomplishments required for tenure, promotion and merit shall be set out clearly.

[Emphasis added.]

127. As noted, UTFA does not propose that in providing members with clearer information regarding their distribution of effort (such as 40/40/20, or 60/20/20) that members should or would mechanically allocate their time accordingly. Across the university sector, it is common to describe a faculty member's workload, and the relative proportion of responsibilities. Such a practice does not impose rigid or artificial boundaries on academic activities, and is not unusual in the academic sector.
128. Ultimately, UTFA members have a right to know, in advance, their relative proportion of responsibilities within their overall workload so that they can ensure their workload is aligned with the norms in the unit and the system of evaluation, and so they can ensure a more equitable allocation of workload. The *WLPP* should be amended accordingly.

(iv) The written assignment of workload should be provided by June 30 of the year

129. Article 2.18 (currently Article 2.14) of the WLPP currently provides that each member will be provided with a written assignment of their workload duties on an annual basis. The parties have agreed that Article 2.18 should be revised to require that written assignment of workload is to UTFA members by no later than June 30 of each year. The Administration's proposal, however, tempers this timeline by requiring only that the written assignment by workload will be "normally" provided no later than June 30. In UTFA's view, the addition of "normally" only further weakens the obligations on unit heads to be transparent with members with respect to their workload and to provide information about their workload in a timely way. There is no reason that unit heads should not be able to provide the written workload letter before June 30. Course assignments are assigned well in advance of June 30, as are most committee assignments (which generally recur on an annual basis and/or can be predicted in advance). It is therefore reasonable to require that members be provided with their workload assignments before the start of the academic year, rather than to ask that this "normally" occur.

b. **Article 7.2 – The Need for Protected Time For Scholarship**

UTFA Proposal:

Scholarship in the Teaching Stream. Scholarship refers to any combination of discipline-based scholarship in relation to or relevant to the field in which the faculty member teaches, the scholarship of teaching and learning, and creative /professional activities. **Normally, scholarship and/or pedagogical/professional development accounts for no less than the service component of a Teaching Stream faculty member’s workload; each faculty member is entitled to reasonable time for scholarship and/or pedagogical/professional development in determining workload as set out in paragraph 30(x)(b) of the PPAA ***.

*e.g. discipline-based scholarship in relation to, or relevant to, the field in which the faculty member teaches; participation at, and contributions to, academic conferences where sessions on pedagogical research and technique are prominent; teaching-related activity by the faculty member outside of his or her classroom functions and responsibilities; professional work that allows the faculty member to maintain a mastery of his or her subject area in accordance with appropriate divisional guidelines.

Administration Proposal:

The Administration proposes no change to Article 7.2.

Rationale for UTFA’s Proposal:

130. Article 7.2 of the *WLPP* currently provides that Teaching Stream faculty are entitled to “reasonable time for pedagogical/professional development”. UTFA proposes amending 7.2 to provide clearer parameters with respect to what “reasonable time” entails. More specifically, UTFA proposes that a member’s time for scholarship and/or pedagogical/professional development should normally account for no less than the service component of their workload. This will generally translate into a 20% allocation for scholarship.
131. When the *WLPP* was first negotiated by the parties in the 2009-2011 round of bargaining, the parties engaged in considerable discussion of what “reasonable” time for scholarship would entail. The term “reasonable time” was to be a placeholder for further elaboration over time. The need to define and refine this crucial protection is one of the incremental changes that UTFA anticipated would need to occur over subsequent rounds of negotiation.
132. Indeed, UTFA has made repeated attempts to gain robust protections for time to conduct scholarship for Teaching Stream members. This has included proposals to cap either teaching load and/or service load in relation to the loads carried by Tenure Stream faculty (e.g., Teaching Stream members should not be assigned more than 150% of the teaching load assigned to Tenure Stream members).

133. In UTFA's view, these measures would be a more effective mechanism to protect Teaching Stream faculty from over-work, however the Administration has resisted any such caps. As an alternative, therefore, and as a very minimum, UTFA submits that additional language should be added to Article 7.2 to protect reasonable time for scholarly activities—scholarly activities which the Administration has recognized as both an entitlement and an obligation. In other words, UTFA's proposed modification of Article 7.2 is both modest and incremental, but it is a minimal necessity to ensure that the existing protection in Article 7.2 can be meaningfully implemented across the University.
134. As previously highlighted, the Teaching Stream continues to evolve. While the scholarly nature of the Teaching Stream has been fully endorsed by the Administration in a number of ways—for example the requirement to engage in scholarly activities for the purposes of continuing status and promotion to full Professor, Teaching Stream—the *WLPP* has not kept up with this evolution. As a result, while some units have embraced the nature of the Teaching Stream as a teaching-intensive scholarly stream, other units continue to assert that Teaching Stream faculty should carry an 80% teaching load, leaving no time for scholarly activities. Such disparity is not only a problem because it creates inconsistency across the University, but also because it leaves many Teaching Stream members vulnerable to overwhelming workloads and fails to honour their entitlement to protected time for scholarship.
135. To be effective, therefore, the *WLPP* must include clearer and more specific parameters to protect scholarly work for Teaching Stream faculty. In UTFA's view, anything less than 20% (effectively one day a week) is insufficient time for a faculty member to meaningfully engage in serious scholarly activity.
136. UTFA's section 7.2 proposal is therefore responsive to the persistent concerns among Teaching Stream members, and in particular female Teaching Stream members and part-time members, relating to their heavy teaching and administrative workloads and the need to protect adequate time for scholarship, including pedagogical/professional development or creative professional activities.
137. For example, the following are some of the specific concerns raised with UTFA by Teaching Stream faculty, which in some cases have resulted in grievances being filed:
 - A full-time Teaching Stream member in a Life Sciences discipline was concerned that his high course load did not allow time for him to conduct scholarship.
 - A CLTA member's service load gradually increased in scope without corresponding course release, leaving no time for research/scholarship.
 - A full-time Teaching Stream member's service increased without a corresponding decline in teaching load. Further, existing administrative help was removed without accounting for the higher workload. The member was left with no time for scholarship.

- A series of Teaching Stream faculty members from professional disciplines seek assistance, given that the expectations for Teaching Stream scholarship are changing, and that their scholarship is being evaluated as if they are in the Tenure Stream (i.e., only peer-reviewed publication, and only in highly ranked journals, is valued). However, these faculty cannot access the things that are required to excel by these metrics—most importantly dedicated time for research, but also large grants, graduate students, funding for travel to international conferences.
- A part-time faculty member with a 50% appointment was assigned service duties that far exceeded the service duties requirement in their appointment letter, including by being assigned as a TA Coordinator. This left no time for scholarship.
- A cross-appointed faculty member raised that her teaching and service in two units required her to do more service than what she felt her single appointed colleagues were doing, leaving her with insufficient time to do research/scholarship.
- Another cross-appointed member had concerns about workload and demands on their time from one of the units. The member complained of insufficient time to do research/scholarship in light of her high service and teaching.
- A faculty member works in a unit where there are few Teaching Stream faculty. She was asked to serve on her department's Workload Committee, where she encountered resistance to the fact that there are three distinct components of workload for faculty in the Teaching Stream. Because the WLPP is silent on DOE, the member failed to convince the Unit Workload Committee that time for scholarship must be protected for Teaching Stream colleagues. Despite her best efforts in committee meetings to get the three components of workload for Teaching Stream faculty members acknowledged in the unit workload policy, she was unsuccessful and no changes to the unit policy were made. The member, who was pre-continuing status, opted not to pursue the matter further with a complaint as she did not want to create an antagonistic relationship with her colleagues or Chair.
- A part-time Teaching Stream faculty member from a professional school worked for almost a decade without being granted a sabbatical by her department. She had wanted to apply for full-time tenure- or continuing-stream faculty positions, because she was teaching more than her full-time colleagues, but was losing hope because she of her extensive teaching and administrative burden. Her extremely high teaching workload, including curriculum development for, and the teaching of, large clinical courses, meant she had scant time to conduct research/scholarship. When she approached her Chair with her sabbatical application, her application was rejected because in her Chair's view her proposal lacked a sufficiently ambitious research agenda. The member was unable to advocate for herself effectively because she could not figure out how to compare her teaching workload with that of her colleagues who do not teach large lab/clinical courses and she was too busy and precariously employed to challenge her Chair.

138. UTFA's section 7.2 proposal is designed both to clarify that Teaching Stream faculty are entitled to engage in scholarship other than pedagogical/professional development and to protect Teaching Stream faculty members' right to meaningfully engage in scholarly work by ensuring that they have sufficient room in their appointments to perform such activities.

VII. PTR PROPOSALS

1. Agreed upon items

The items agreed upon by the parties in mediation are in tracked changes in the document attached as **TAB B**. Outstanding items are highlighted in yellow.

2. Outstanding Proposals

a. “The Balance of Teaching Research and Service”

UTFA Proposal:

The PTR scheme allows each unit to determine the balance amongst the three principal components of a faculty member's activities: teaching, research and service. This flexibility is important for recognizing the unique missions of units and the differences in agreed upon activities of individuals.

Normally, for ~~professorial staff~~ non-Teaching Stream professorial faculty, the portion of the total PTR allocated to teaching, and research/scholarship (which can also take the form of creative professional activity) is approximately equal, but in a limited number of cases, an argument might be made that an atypical weighting of activities ~~that reflects that a different balance between teaching and research~~ all three areas of activity for the individual concerned is appropriate.

A separate weighting of teaching ~~and~~, service and scholarship (which may take the form of creative professional activity and includes pedagogical/professional development and/or discipline-based scholarship in relation to, or relevant to, the field in which they teach) should be made for teaching-stream staff faculty. ~~A Teaching Stream faculty member who engages in pedagogical and/or discipline-based scholarship in relation to the field in which they teach shall be evaluated on that activity.~~

Weighting of ~~staff~~ faculty on research and study leave should reflect the research/scholarship and service duties undertaken during their leave.

Librarians should be assessed on the variety of activities undertaken (professional practice including teaching, if applicable; research and scholarly contributions; and service).

A change of the balance in duties requires the approval of the unit and division heads. Such an adjustment must be made at least a year in advance of the application of a modified

weighting of responsibilities to the person's Annual Activity Report. In no circumstances should a Tenure Stream faculty member be fully relieved of either teaching or research activities and there should always be a service component for each individual. Such arrangements should be for a fixed period with a review of their appropriateness at the end of the period.

Administration Proposal:

The PTR scheme allows each unit to determine the balance amongst the three principal components of a faculty member's activities: teaching, research and service. This flexibility is important for recognizing the unique missions of units and the differences in agreed upon activities of individuals.

Normally, for ~~professorial staff~~ non-Teaching Stream professorial faculty the portion of the total PTR allocated to teaching and research and scholarship, which can also take the form of creative professional activity, is approximately equal, but in a limited number of cases, an argument might be made that an atypical weighting of activities ~~that reflects that a different balance between teaching and research~~ all three areas of activity for the individual concerned is appropriate.

A separate weighting of teaching, pedagogical/professional work and service should be made for teaching-stream ~~staff~~ faculty. A teaching stream faculty member who engages in pedagogical and/or discipline-based scholarship in relation to the field in which they teach and/or creative/professional work that allows the faculty member to maintain a mastery of their subject area¹, shall be evaluated on that activity and this evaluation will be appropriately weighted in the PTR assessment.

Weighting of staff faculty on research and study leave should reflect the research or pedagogical/professional work and service duties undertaken during their leave.

Librarians should be assessed on the variety of activities undertaken (professional practice including teaching, if applicable; research and scholarly contributions; and service).

A change of the balance in duties requires the approval of the unit and division heads. Such an adjustment must be made at least a year in advance of the application of a modified weighting of responsibilities to the person's Annual Activity Report. In no circumstances should a tenure stream faculty member be fully relieved of either teaching or research activities and there should always be a service component for each individual. Such arrangements should be for a fixed period with a review of their appropriateness at the end of the period.

¹ See PPAA section 30(x)(b): "...e.g. discipline-based scholarship in relation to, or relevant to, the field in which the faculty member teaches; participation at, and contributions to, academic conferences where sessions on pedagogical research and technique are

prominent; teaching-related activity by the faculty member outside of his or her classroom functions and responsibilities; professional work that allows the faculty member to maintain a mastery of his or her subject area in accordance with appropriate divisional guidelines.”

Rationale for UTFA’s Proposal:

139. UTFA proposes that the *PTR Policy* be amended to ensure that a unit’s PTR scheme reflects that - for the Teaching Stream - teaching, service and scholarship will be assessed.
140. The *PTR Policy* currently recognizes that there are “three principal components” to faculty appointments: “teaching, research and service”. This is a critical protection which acknowledges that the Teaching Stream is a scholarly stream engaged in a range of scholarly activities, which should be taken into account for the purposes of PTR.
141. With respect to the Tenure Stream, the *PTR Policy* clearly establishes that the PTR scheme must balance all three components of the appointment (teaching, research and service), and in fact states that “the portion of the total PTR allocated to teaching and research is approximately equal”. However, the *PTR Policy* is much less clear with respect to the Teaching Stream, stating only that a separate weighting of “teaching and service” should be made for Teaching Stream faculty, and that only those Teaching Stream members “who engage in pedagogical and/or discipline-based scholarship” should be evaluated on that activity. With this language, and contrary to the important acknowledgement that all faculty have three principal components to their appointments, scholarship for the Teaching Stream is reduced to an optional activity for the purposes of PTR. The *PTR Policy* is therefore internally inconsistent and ambiguous. This failure to acknowledge that the Teaching Stream is fundamentally a scholarly stream (albeit with a more teaching-intensive focus) exacerbates the existing misapprehension in some units that Teaching Stream faculty do not require protected time to engage in scholarship, and therefore that they can be loaded down with excessive teaching and service loads.
142. The problems created by the lack of clarity in the *PTR Policy* is reflected in the experiences of Teaching Stream faculty. In UTFA’s 2020 survey of Teaching Stream faculty members, for example, members commented:
 - “While I can emphasize my research and CPA in my annual PTR report, I have no control over the weight the PTR committee or dean places upon it”.
 - LACK OF ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF OUR WORK: Our department's PTR letters continue to refer to an 80/20 split—or some other two-way teaching/service split that has been, in the past at least, unilaterally determined and communicated by the Chair after the fact. This representation of the distribution of effort is not in keeping with the three distinct areas of work that are recognized for the teaching stream at the University of Toronto, nor is it helpful or instructive for faculty members as they strive to plan their time and their career paths (especially in the continued absence of effective mentorship in these areas.)...”.

- “I choose the emphasis of my scholarship, however it is not rewarded through merit pay”.
 - “Have scholarship be an official part of PTR - right now, with teaching at 80% and service at 20%, our tenure-stream colleagues and department chairs can get a little confused as to what we're doing if we're not in the classroom (e.g., "you get the summers off, then, don't you!"). I have encouraged this within my own department, to no avail - the argument is that we don't need to "innovate" new classes or techniques every year (this is true - but I think this shows the lack of understanding of what else we are capable of doing, outside the classroom - also, this would mean the department would need to support us in our outside pursuits and put value on things like blog posts, online teaching resources, etc., which is considered mostly like a cute little service thing we do). (2) Limit the number of classes taught by teaching stream to a 3-3 load. Our department is currently 3-4. Although officially we get release if we teach certain kinds of classes (labs, etc.), that policy is absolutely not followed in any circumstance. It's disheartening”.
 - “I would love a PTR scale setting out exactly how research/CPA from teaching-stream faculty will be weighed by the PTR committee...”.
 - “Formalizing the 60/20/20 workload and encouraging a PTR process that reflects that”.
 - “More recognition from PTR for success in scholarship”.
143. UTFA makes two proposals to rectify this ambiguity in the *PTR Policy*. First, UTFA proposes that the *PTR Policy* be amended to expressly acknowledge—as it does for the Tenure Stream—that the unit’s PTR scheme must balance all three components of a Teaching Stream faculty member’s job responsibilities. To be clear, UTFA acknowledges and accepts that a *separate* weighting of teaching, service and scholarship should apply to the Teaching Stream than to the Tenure Stream. However, the *PTR Policy* should clearly acknowledge that unit PTR schemes will allocate PTR on the basis of each of the “three principal components” of a Teaching Stream member’s work.
144. The Administration’s proposal, by contrast, suggests that not all Teaching Stream faculty are engaged in scholarship (“a teaching stream faculty member **who** engages in pedagogical and/or discipline-based scholarship...shall be evaluated on that activity....”). This position is highly problematic. As set out below, the policies governing the review of Teaching Stream faculty for continuing status and promotion have evolved, and it is now clearly a requirement that Teaching Stream faculty engage in scholarship, including professional/pedagogical development. This is not merely an “option” for Teaching Stream faculty. The Administration’s proposal therefore plays into an outdated notion that the Teaching Stream is a teaching-*only* stream and undermines the scholarly nature of the stream. Teaching Stream faculty members are required to engage in scholarly activities for the purposes of continuing status reviews and promotion, and should be credited for these same activities in their PTR assessment.

145. Second, the Administration’s proposal narrows the type of scholarly work in which Teaching Stream faculty members engage. In its proposal, the Administration proposes that the “teaching, pedagogical/professional **work**, and service” of Teaching Stream faculty should be weighed for the purposes of PTR. However, “pedagogical/professional work” is not a known or accepted term at the University of Toronto, and has no clearly defined meaning. By contrast, “pedagogical/professional **development**” is a clearly established term that is widely used and understood across the University. Most importantly, the parties have already negotiated a definition of “pedagogical/professional development” in the *Policies and Procedures on Academic Appointments* (the *PPAA*), as follows:

discipline-based scholarship in relation to, or relevant to, the field in which the faculty member teaches; participation at, and contributions to, academic conferences where sessions on pedagogical research and technique are prominent; teaching-related activity by the faculty member outside of his or her classroom functions and responsibilities; professional work that allows the faculty member to maintain a mastery of his or her subject area in accordance with appropriate divisional guidelines.

146. The introduction of a new and undefined term, “pedagogical/professional work”, into the PTR document will only exacerbate confusion about the scholarly nature of the Teaching Stream and entrench the perception that Teaching Stream members can be assigned an 80/20 distribution of responsibilities. The *PTR Policy* also already acknowledges that the members of the Teaching Stream have three principle components to their appointment, “teaching, research and service”, and it is unacceptable to narrow this important statement by describing scholarship in the Teaching Stream as “pedagogical/professional work”.
147. Notably, in amendments to the *Policies and Procedures on Academic Appointments* (the *PPPA*) negotiated in 2014, the parties expressly recognized the range of scholarly activities upon which Teaching Stream faculty should be assessed are as follows:

Continuing Status Review

30(x) A positive recommendation for continuing status will require the judgment of excellence in teaching **and evidence of demonstrated and continuing future pedagogical/professional development.**

a) Excellence in teaching may be demonstrated through a combination of excellent teaching skills, creative educational leadership and/or achievement, and innovative teaching initiatives in accordance with appropriate divisional guidelines.

b) Evidence of demonstrated and continuing future pedagogical/professional development may be demonstrated in a variety of ways e.g. discipline-based scholarship in relation to, or relevant to, the field in which the faculty member teaches; participation at, and contributions to, academic conferences where

sessions on pedagogical research and technique are prominent; teaching-related activity by the faculty member outside of his or her classroom functions and responsibilities; professional work that allows the faculty member to maintain a mastery of his or her subject area in accordance with appropriate divisional guidelines.

[Emphasis added.]

148. Similarly, the *Policy and Procedures on Promotion in the Teaching Stream* (the *PPPT*), negotiated in 2016, includes a similar description of scholarship in the Teaching Stream for the purposes of promotion to full Professor:

Attributes of Educational Leadership and/or Achievement and Ongoing Pedagogical/Professional Development

[...]

10. Evidence of continuing future pedagogical/professional development may be demonstrated in a variety of ways e.g., discipline-based scholarship in relation to, or relevant to, the field in which the faculty member teaches, participation at, and contributions to, academic conferences where sessions on pedagogical research and technique are prominent, teaching-related activity by the faculty member outside of his or her classroom functions and responsibilities, and professional work that allows the faculty member to maintain a mastery of his or her subject area in accordance with appropriate divisional guidelines.

[Emphasis added.]

149. While these provisions were negotiated in the context of assessment for continuing status and promotion, there is no reasonable basis to assert that “scholarship” for the purposes of PTR should differ materially from “scholarship” for the purposes of continuing status or promotion. Indeed, it would be unreasonable for Teaching Stream faculty to be assessed on the basis of a *different* conception of scholarly activity for the purposes of yearly performance assessments than for assessments for continuing status and promotion.
150. The broad scope of scholarship already accepted by the parties in the *PPAA* and in the *PPPT* must therefore also be incorporated into the *PTR Policy*. This is necessary to acknowledge and reflect the wide range of scholarly activities in which Teaching Stream faculty engage. The Administration’s reference to “pedagogical/professional work” effectively erases other forms of scholarly activity from the professional responsibilities of Teaching Stream members.
151. UTFA therefore proposes that the scholarly activities upon which a Teaching Stream member is assessed for the purposes of PTR should be clearly articulated in the *PTR Policy*, as set out in UTFA’s proposed language.

b. “Point Systems and the Evaluation”

UTFA Proposal

Some units have employed a ten-point scheme as a model, based, for the non-Teaching Stream professorial faculty, on four points for teaching, four points for research and scholarship, which can also take the form of creative professional activity, and two for service. **This point scheme** will be varied for ~~those faculty who hold an appointment as Lecturer/Senior Lecturer (or Tutor/Senior Tutor) and~~ Teaching Stream faculty. A rating scale will be used for librarians whose evaluation criteria will be different.

While a point scheme has a number of positive aspects there have been some untoward effects of the scheme on awards. An arithmetic evaluation of a positive score where an individual is not meeting his or her responsibilities is inappropriate. The range of points awarded should use the full scale. For example, the award of 2 on a 0 to 4 scale for teaching performance that is barely acceptable by the standards of the unit would be an inappropriate evaluation. While a score of zero points is expected to be rare, use of the full 0 to 4 scale is equally as appropriate in the evaluation of teaching as it is in the evaluation of research. It is important to use the full range of scores so that the application of the scale does not inadvertently bias the recognition of one activity over another.

While point schemes are useful indicators, they should not replace the judgment of the Dean or ~~Chair/Director~~ appropriate administrative head on the overall performance of the individual. If a point system is used, it should be indicative of a relative level of performance, not an absolute value that is translated arithmetically into the PTR award. If a point system is not used, the ~~Dean or Chair/Director~~ appropriate administrative head, must still document the criteria for evaluation.

Administration Proposal:

Some units have employed a ten-point scheme as a model, based, for the non-Teaching Stream professorial faculty, on four points for teaching, four points for research and scholarship, which can also take the form of creative professional activity, and two for service. **Point schemes** will be varied for ~~those faculty who hold an appointment as Lecturer/Senior Lecturer (or Tutor/Senior Tutor) and~~ Teaching Stream faculty. A rating scale will be used for librarians whose evaluation criteria will be different.

While a point scheme has a number of positive aspects there have been some untoward effects of the scheme on awards. An arithmetic evaluation of a positive score where an individual is not meeting his or her responsibilities is inappropriate. The range of points awarded should use the full scale. For example, the award of 2 on a 0 to 4 scale for teaching performance that is barely acceptable by the standards of the unit would be an inappropriate evaluation. While a score of zero points is expected to be rare, use of the full 0 to 4 scale

is equally as appropriate in the evaluation of teaching as it is in the evaluation of research. It is important to use the full range of scores so that the application of the scale does not inadvertently bias the recognition of one activity over another.

While point schemes are useful indicators, they should not replace the judgment of the Dean or ~~Chair/Director~~ appropriate administrative head on the overall performance of the individual. If a point system is used, it should be indicative of a relative level of performance, not an absolute value that is translated arithmetically into the PTR award. If a point system is not used, the ~~Dean or Chair/Director~~ appropriate administrative head, must still document the criteria for evaluation.

Rationale for UTFA's Proposal

152. The AAPM acknowledges that some units have established a point scheme as a model for Tenure Stream faculty. This has generally taken the form of a ten-point scheme, with four points for teaching, four points for research/scholarship/creative professional activities, and two for service.
153. Where such a point scheme is being utilized, UTFA acknowledges that the distribution of points will vary for Teaching Stream faculty. For example, some units employ a ten-point scheme whereby six points are allocated for teaching, two points are allocated to scholarship, and two points are allocated for service. Accordingly, the parties have agreed that the language of the AAPM should be clarified to indicate that the distribution of points in the PTR scheme will be varied for Teaching Stream faculty.
154. In UTFA's view, this agreement is best captured by stating that "This point scheme will be varied for Teaching Stream faculty." The Administration, by contrast, proposes that "Point schemes will be varied for Teaching Stream faculty." [emphasis added] While subtle, the distinction between the parties' proposals is material. The Administration's phrasing leaves open the possibility not only that the distribution of points may vary for the Teaching Stream, but also that the whole nature of the point scheme itself might vary. For example, some units reading the Administration's proposed language might take the position that they can impose a different *type* of point scheme, utilizing different categories of assessment (for example, 8 points for teaching and 2 points for service; or 10 points for teaching, 5 points for professional development and 5 points for service).
155. UTFA therefore asserts that the language in the *PTR Policy* must clearly indicate that it is not the point scheme as a whole (i.e., the categories of assessment) that varies as between teaching and Tenure Stream faculty, but rather the distribution of points within the point scheme.

All of which is respectfully submitted this day, April 20, 2020.

Appendix A

Selection of Responses from UTFA 2020 Teaching Stream Survey

[Comments on the statement “I feel free to choose the emphasis of my scholarship/research/CPA work”.]

- “There is no time to do scholarship/research/CPA work [...] so the research I choose to do is off the side of my desk and on my own time (nights and weekends)”.
- “There is little or no encouragement from my Dean to do research. If I did it would be on my own time”.
- “While I can emphasize my research and CPA in my annual PTR report, I have no control over the weight the PTR committee or dean places upon it”.
- “They give us so much extra work (3.5 FCE's for Teaching Stream vs 2.0 FCE's for Professorial Stream) that there is little time. Service is also considerable; the committees assigned are labour-intensive”.
- “It is something that contributes towards change of status, but for which we are given no time to allot to it. If we can use it to argue for teaching excellence, we should have the option of allotting some of our time towards it”.
- “I am free to choose the emphasis, however my workload is often an impediment to actually getting the research done”.
- “Agree but I have to carve out time after 80% teaching and 20% service”.
- “I’ve been actively and repeatedly discouraged from doing research by my tenured colleagues, multiple chairs, and the administration. One senior tenured faculty member referred to me as an “academic with a small-a” because teaching stream is not a real academic post. It’s idiotic and deeply humiliating! They think we are somehow less competent scholars and treat us like work horses - doing the teaching and service they think is beneath them”.
- “I feel free but it is not factored into my workload”.
- “I have zero time for scholarship right now due to the heavy teaching load (3.5 FCE)”.
- “I choose the emphasis of my scholarship, however it is not rewarded through merit pay”.
- “Technically free in that I am allowed, and have lab space from my department. Less free in the amount of time I actually have for such pursuits, with a 7 half-course teaching load”.

- “I feel that there is an expectation of scholarship/research yet this is not reflected in my teaching workload assignment. I am expected to do scholarship/research on my own time and penalized if I don't do this”.
- “I can choose it- I just don't have time to work on it”.
- “There is an informal expectation that teaching stream faculty still publish in peer-reviewed journals - yet, of course, do not get time off from teaching to conduct this complex work. This is something that is not formalized in faculty documents, but rather is part of the "hidden" expectations among interactions with faculty leadership”.

[Comments on what members consider to be the most significant barriers to engaging in scholarship/research/CPA]

- “Time. At 80% teaching 20% service and 20% scholarship there is no time for scholarship. Being assessed at 60/20/20 means you have to find the time and give up other parts of yourself to fit it in”.
- “The amount of time that I am expected to do to teach my courses and the amount of time that it is expected from me to undertake administrative tasks. As the coordinator of large classes, I feel I am overwhelmed to do it all. I would appreciate more support and understanding from the Chair of my department and the rest of the faculty members”.
- “The administrative work and the teaching work load. I teach 7 half credit courses during the academic year”.
- “Time and access to research funds [...] we have no time built into our workload, we also do not get time for grant applications or access to research assistants to help with the applications - so we spend hours on grants, ethics, analyzing data and writing all of our own work, on our own time. We do not get conference support to disseminate the work, even though it is accepted with the U of T name. I have gone to three international conferences with oral presentations and paid out of my own pocket for each one”.
- “Time! Research is research, and it takes time to plan, implement, and publish, whether it is discipline-based or pedagogical. It's difficult to find the time to fit in any research with a higher teaching load than for tenure stream, since not only are we teaching more classes but we are also expected to be performing well in those classes. Fitting research in on top of that is a struggle”.
- “Time as during the terms I spend 100% of my time teaching and when I am not teaching I spend 60% of the time preparing for teaching. This makes it difficult to devote time to ongoing and long-term research projects”.
- “Workload”.
- “Time to engage in these activities”.

- “Time - the expectations of teaching, service and leadership seem higher for the teaching stream. My CPA/research/scholarship is done only because I work 10 hour days and many weekends and holidays”.
- “TIME & WORKLOAD! There is a trade-off between course workload and the ability to engage in research”.
- “Time! With teaching innovations and service, it is hard to find the time”.
- “There is no time to do it”.
- “Time due to teaching load and access to graduate students”.
- “The teaching workload”.
- “Funding and teaching load. The teaching loads for teaching stream seem to vary tremendously across disciplines and faculties. I think mine is a little high compared to others”.
- “Lack of time”.
- “Time constraint: I have a lot of teaching and don't have enough time to explore the projects I want to take on”.
- “Precarious (or misunderstood) status of appointment”.
- “Time. I have a part-time appointment and teach overload to be able to make enough money to sustain my family, and the expectations for scholarship production seem unreasonable. Also, the expectations of how much time and how much scholarship should be produced are unclear. I feel I am being expected to produce like full-time faculty”.
- “Time - an emphasis to engage in service work limits my ability to pursue scholarship and CPA”.
- “A course load that is far too heavy. I also started a long time ago on a very small salary, which took a long time to grow into something on which I could live. I always had to teach extra courses”.
- “Too heavy a teaching load (3/4)”.
- “Heavy teaching load. I have 3.5FCEs. Although I teach multiple sections of the same courses, as the courses are required for all students in our program, it involves a lot of student contacts and issues, which make the engagement in scholarship/research very difficult”.
- “Teaching and service are time-consuming, I don't get much research done during the fall/winter terms”.
- “Not being giving time to pursue it”.
- “Time for research due to teaching commitments”.
- “Not having ample time to pursue it”.
- “Lack of time due to heavy teaching workload and lack of personnel support (eg. graduate student) as compared to research stream faculties”.

- “Time availability and resources”.
- “Time”.
- “I have no funds available to me, and my teaching load is so heavy I have absolutely no [time]!”
- “UNCLEAR EXPECTATIONS: Unclear and shifting expectations related to scholarship for the teaching stream has caused confusion and what some are concerned may be an insurmountable loss of momentum in that area of their work. Inconsistent advice over many years (related to disciplinary vs pedagogical scholarship, whether presenting about and publishing results of classroom experiments is expected, or what projects could and would be supported for funding, for example) has caused research agendas to be delayed, stalled, or otherwise frustrated. LACK OF SUPPORT FOR DISCIPLINARY RESEARCH: Disciplinary scholarship by teaching stream faculty has had little institutional support at UofT (even though it is explicitly allowed in policy language) and continues to be questioned and implicitly (and sometimes explicitly) discouraged, sidelined, or suppressed, apparently because it is perceived that tenure stream faculty should be doing it”.
- “TIME: Even when research funding is available, I have found my ability to conduct meaningful research during the academic year frustrated by heavy teaching, service, and administrative loads. We cannot temporarily reduce our teaching loads in the same way, or with the same ease, as tenure-stream faculty, and we often have to teach with the worst schedules (we tend to be scheduled after the tenure-stream faculty make their choices)”.
- “Due to my heavy teaching load, it is not possible for me to find time for scholarship/research. The period Sept-April is completely taken with teaching. Summers go by very fast as, in addition to personal matters, family and social obligations, I also need to review the following year’s courses. There never seems to be enough time to put aside for scholarship and research”.
- “An enormous teaching load in the face of increasing enrolments”.
- “Part-time status in a teaching position and the need to maintain other employment”.
- “Teaching load, job insecurity”.
- “Spoke to this in my last comment - that is, given the combined demands of teaching and leadership roles, there is limited time to be active in research”.
- “Too busy teaching!”
- “Time”.
- “I have no extra time for doing research”.
- “Finding time to do any type of research or attend conferences in between teaching with a heavy course load”.

- “Workload issues a. the present distribution of workload in the Department of [redacted] is not equitable; large class sizes, contact hours, advising duties, supervision of teaching assistants, marking are not weighted fairly; c. recent unit wide reduction in tenure-stream teaching - 2.0 FCE from 2.5 FCE - has resulted in increased workload and teaching-related demands for teaching stream faculty who continue to teach 3.5 FCE. This type of inequality is a significant barrier I'm facing right now if I want to engage in research”.
- “I am so busy with teaching and administrative duties, I do not have time. This is my first year and I am planning 6 courses, including some brand new courses. Some of my courses have 70 students in them, and just managing course administration is a huge load. I also have service duties, as well as service within my disciplinary field. No one has sat down and discussed a research agenda with me, or provided any mentorship in my first year. Perhaps because I am on a 2 year contract, there isn't the impetus to invest in me”.
- “Almost 100% time on teaching and administration”.
- “Time!”
- “Time. My teaching and admin load consumes more than 80% of my work time. Scholarship is done on the side of the desk”.
- “Time and recognition that we are also [...] professionals in our disciplines and have the same background as our tenure colleagues. In my department there is a great tendency to put administrative burden on us (I was a member of seven committees since September 2019, spent god knows how many hours designing promotional material for our outreach activities and and similar tasks), this is also the second year I do not have a semester free of teaching. I've been told strait to my face that I am actually "not a faculty" and that I am "a teacher not a real [scientist]" Under this climate I'll never have a chance to create something, prosper and give my community and students what they deserve. Yet alone that I have stagnated both intellectually and professional as teaching stream faculty at this institution. And I have been here almost 10 years”.
- “Since 80% of time is committed to teaching, there is no time provided to scholarship/research. In order to conduct scholarship/research, this must be done on one's own time (if you have the energy after long teaching days)”.
- “Time: obviously it is hard to conduct as much research as one might like when you have a relatively heavy teaching load”.
- “Time. I teach double a research professor. If they have 40/40/20 for teaching/research/service and I have 80/20 for teaching/service and do the same amount of service as a researcher [...] that research comes out of my own time”.
- “Time. [redacted] enrolments are huge, much larger than they were a decade ago. [...] I am course coordinator [...] and I have no free time. I am working between 50 and 60 hours a week. My colleagues and I are burned out. Most of us work on the weekend because we can't get our jobs done during regular work hours”.

- “I am so overwhelmingly bogged down by my teaching and service commitments that scholarship always had to be fit around the edges. I don't think my department's promotions committee had a high expectation for scholarship, so when I did do some it was reflected favourably in my annual evaluation. For me it have been an odd situation; the bar may have possibly been set low for me because everyone is so clueless about the expectations of the teaching stream”.
- “The perception that Teaching Stream faculty should be teaching more than non-Teaching Stream faculty, and as such that we should be working 80/20/20”.
- “TIME--my workload is ridiculous”.
- “Time”.
- “Time - not allocated for research”.
- “Enough time available to do it. Not presently feasible with my teaching and admin load, though encouraged strongly”.
- “I don't have any time. My teaching load is too high”.
- “Time. Very busy with teaching and administration”.
- “Time as my load is heavy teaching and admin at the moment”.
- “Time”.

[Additional respondent comments on how to support Teaching Stream scholarship]

- “Make the teaching loads appropriately reflective of a 60/20/20 split. We are doing twice the teaching of research stream faculty not 1.5x it”.
- “The reduction of the teaching load.
 - Have scholarship be an official part of PTR - right now, with teaching at 80% and service at 20%, our tenure-stream colleagues and department chairs can get a little confused as to what we're doing if we're not in the classroom (e.g., "you get the summers off, then, don't you!"). I have encouraged this within my own department, to no avail - the argument is that we don't need to "innovate" new classes or techniques every year (this is true - but I think this shows the lack of understanding of what else we are capable of doing, outside the classroom - also, this would mean the department would need to support us in our outside pursuits and put value on things like blog posts, online teaching resources, etc., which is considered mostly like a cute little service thing we do). (2) Limit the number of classes taught by teaching stream to a 3-3 load. Our department is currently 3-4. Although officially we get release if we teach certain kinds of classes (labs, etc.), that policy is absolutely not followed in any circumstance. It's disheartening”.

- “We require teaching release if we are to properly engage in this important work”.
- “Teaching stream should have 20% of their time dedicated to scholarship”.
- “Revise teaching load policy especially for large courses. a large course worth 0.5FCE with several hundred students and many TAs should count for more than 0.5FCE”.
- “A decreased workload which will allow us more time to engage in this type of scholarship”.
- “Improve and help/standardize the workload policies. Teaching relief (for taking on research) or a reduction in the amount of FCE's one has to teach”.
- “Course release when a large grant has been won. Considering number of students being taught and support for larger number of students overall (especially from a marking perspective). As a teaching stream member I feel pressure to perform close to the research stream level (e.g., publications, conferences) while teaching more courses with a greater number of students. Eg. professional preparation courses may have 36 students x 6 classes (often given to teaching stream) while some graduate course have 6-15 students (often for research stream)”.
- “Review of 80/20 workload distribution - correct this to make a consistent policy; i.e, support of research from supervisors should concur with official workload distribution for TS faculty”.
- “I would love a PTR scale setting out exactly how research/CPA from teaching-stream faculty will be weighed by the PTR committee”.
- “A broader understanding of what teaching-stream scholarship entails. There are ways to invest and contribute to broader pedagogical understanding beyond publication in peer-review journals. There is inadequate funding for conference participation (if that conference involves travel) for part-time faculty, as the funds are reduced for us. Also, much clearer articulation of how much scholarship production 20% of a 75% appointment is. How much are we expected to produce to be deemed as meeting or exceeding expectations?”.
- “We simply cannot have nearly double the course load. In my department, CLTA's, all recent spousal appointments, teach 2.5 FCE's and are treated better than faculty in the teaching stream in all respects. We teach 3.5 FCE's”.
- “Less workload and more support”.
- “Reflection that scholarship takes time”.
- “Decreasing our teaching workload would definitely be a big step forward”.
- “Formalizing the 60/20/20 workload and encouraging a PTR process that reflects that”.
- “I think scholarship should be factored into workload and given designated time”.

- “It would also be welcome for teaching stream to be eligible for periodic release/rebalance of teaching loads if undertaking larger research projects. The current teaching load assignments make it very challenging to take on research”.
- “Expansion of the definition of scholarship”.
- “It's impossible to do proper research when you are teaching 10 courses a year + an overwhelming amount of service. I believe tackling the workload release is fundamental”.
- “If "scholarship = research," then that takes time. An explicit 60/20/20 breakdown of workload is essential, by lowering the teaching load to make space for faculty members to meaningfully engage in research endeavours. Anything else amounts to an expectation that people overwork in order to meet criteria for performance and promotion — clearly not a sustainable expectation!”
- “Recognize that teaching takes up a huge amount of time. If a person does significant service, little time remains for much research. More importantly, there are no written explanations presented in the PTR. How can somebody exceed expectations if the expectations are not written down anywhere?”
- “Make administration understand that it is not only enough to make a policy and change titles/labels (from "lecturer" to "professor), but that they also have to provide conditions and atmosphere conducive for meeting the policies and requirements for promotion. I'll never get a chance to be even considered for professorship with this work-load, total lack of support for funding and dismissal of any idea that is related to discipline-based research or not related to some sort of teaching zeitgeist”.
- “There should be dedicated time for scholarship/research/CPA. The faculty does not recognize the 60/20/20 split for teaching stream appointments. In addition, there should be support services for faculty members to enhance their research. There needs to be more recognition and education of [administrators] on the scholarship on teaching and learning. Some administrators think that using student outcomes in research is prohibited”.
- “Do something about our teaching loads. It's way worse than it used to be, although I'm teaching the same number of courses as ever. Using the number of sections as a measure of workload is too coarse. The TA support we receive is abysmal. We teach as many or more sections and students as our peers at other universities, yet we have about half the TA support. I would like a formal comparison made in Ontario and across Canada. We really should compare ourselves to the top 20 institutions”.
- “Insist that appointments have clear parameters for research and that workload policies are better articulated and regulated”.
- “A process where teaching stream faculty can apply for a reduced teaching load to pursue scholarship (for example, a free semester or a reduced teaching load). More recognition from PTR for success in scholarship”.
- “Designate a proportion to scholarly activities and research”.

- “More REAL time allocated to research and scholarship”.
- “Time for research”.

[Additional respondent comments on how to support Teaching Stream scholarship continued]

- “Teaching loads for teaching stream must be normalized to 2.5. We also need more funds for research”.
- “I find that I definitely have to work very hard to find the time to apply and the time to facilitate the research while teaching 6 courses and doing my service committee work”.
- “[...] Six 0.5 courses is totally unreasonable for ant Teaching Stream professor, lecturer or instructor. UTFA should really do something about this!”
- “[...] LACK OF ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF OUR WORK: Our department's PTR letters continue to refer to an 80/20 split—or some other two-way teaching/service split that has been, in the past at least, unilaterally determined and communicated by the Chair after the fact. This representation of the distribution of effort is not in keeping with the three distinct areas of work that are recognized for the teaching stream at the University of Toronto, nor is it helpful or instructive for faculty members as they strive to plan their time and their career paths (especially in the continued absence of effective mentorship in these areas.)...”.
- “My big challenge has always been the heavy teaching workload. Even if I were to get funding for scholarship/research, it is the time factor that would get in the way”.
- “Greater emphasis for all in understanding the scope of what teaching stream faculty do: ie there's a sense that all we do/are expected to do is teach. Our stream should be reframed as teaching intensive rather than not doing research”.
- “Despite all the work that has been done to date to define TS at UofT, there are many faculty members that view TS as glorified instructors and suggest that TS only teach. Collectively, TS are definitely not viewed as 'equals' within the faculty”.
- “Sometimes it feels like that teaching stream faculty are second-class faculty”.
- “The false dichotomy of teaching versus research has negative effects on existing students, the relationship between streams, outside funders, teaching stream professionalization, NSSE results, ability to attract top students, etc. The university needs to stop giving recognition rewards to teaching stream and start making dedicated funds available to teaching stream to undertake discipline based research that helps put an engaged, excited, upgraded, educator at the front of every class in the university”.