

DRAFT

November 17, 2017

For distribution to UTFA members for feedback

Proposed Revisions to the Academic Administrative Manual (AAPM) Instructions on the Processes Related to PTR

This *draft* proposal is for UTFA Salaries/Benefits/Workload bargaining commencing December 2017 (Without prejudice)

Please provide feedback at: PTR@utfa.org

Preamble

- a) Progress-through-the-ranks (PTR) is a critical component of the remuneration of UTFA members, and is regularly negotiated by UTFA and the University Administration. Negotiations related to salary are covered under Article 6 of the Memorandum of Agreement and are subject to arbitration. U of T has, however, no existing negotiated policy on the distribution of individual PTR increases. Rather, instructions for how to implement merit-based increases to annual salary are set out in an annual PDAD&C issued by the Office of the Provost. Those instructions have made their way into the Academic Administrative Procedures Manual (AAPM). It is time to formalize these crucial instructions by bringing them into negotiations between the U of T Administration and UTFA.
- b) As a first step to negotiating improvements to the distribution of individual PTR awards with the University of Toronto Administration, UTFA proposes revisions, set out below, to the 2017 version of the AAPM. These revisions are designed to address problems that faculty and librarians have raised with UTFA, some of which are reflected in a range of PTR grievances that have been brought forward over recent years.
- c) The proposals outlined address all three streams (both fulltime and part-time): the tenure stream, the teaching stream, and the librarians.

- d) That UTFA does not comment in this document on all of the language in the AAPM covering PTR should not be interpreted to mean that UTFA accepts that language. UTFA views the proposed changes as a first step in developing a more coherent, consistent and transparent PTR process across the University. They are intended to initiate a longer-term process of reform, involving further proposals in future rounds of bargaining, such as proposals related to the distribution of PTR. The fact that UTFA makes these initial PTR proposals related to the AAPM should not be interpreted to suggest that UTFA accepts other aspects of the PTR process.
-

1. PTR in small groups:

The University Administration offers two purposes for the 5% merit pool (commonly known as the Dean's Award or the Chief Librarian's Merit Award): a) "to reward those colleagues who have demonstrated that they are leaders in their field or who have made an outstanding contribution" and b) "as a means for heads of small units (fewer than six individuals in a pool of academic staff members) to reward exceptional merit." Such "small groups" may be found in each of the three streams.

Comment: UTFA will not address in this document the 5% merit pool and its use to reward those who, in the view of the Administration, are outstanding. UTFA maintains its position that the Dean's or the Chief Librarian's merit awards should not come out of the overall PTR monies negotiated by UTFA, and that the process for the distribution of merit awards must be more transparent and equitable.

Faculty and librarians have reported unfairness and inefficacy in the distribution of the 5% merit pay in small pools. Small groups currently find that they may not count on a small group award in any given year. The phrase "exceptional merit" is not defined or contextualized in the AAPM in terms of the small group. If the members of a small group were exceptional, then they should receive extra merit pay (Dean's or Chief Librarian's Award), regardless of the size of the pool. *A separate fund needs to be established for small groups.*

Proposal 1 a): Any funds designated *small group* will be distributed for the reason that the group is small. A separate fund will be established for this purpose. This

practice will not preclude *also* awarding members of the small group for outstanding performance from the normal Dean or Chief Librarian merit Award funds. In some instances, therefore, members in small pools may receive a PTR award deriving from three (3) funds: PTR, small group and a merit award.

Proposal 1 b): Small groups need to be redefined. The “fewer than six individuals” prescription is arbitrary. Statistical analysis must be undertaken to define small groups more accurately in relation to and to assess the extent of their disadvantage in terms of the merit pay system. Small groups may be found in each of the three streams: the tenure stream, the teaching stream, and the librarians.

Proposal 1 c): Once the small group is redefined, members of small groups shall receive small-group funds (in addition to any other PTR award or merit award as appropriate) each and every year.

Proposal 1 d): A Joint Working Committee, consisting of members of all three streams, shall be constituted to address PTR issues affecting small groups in all three streams. The Joint Working Committee will make recommendations to the parties prior to July 1, 2019 or such later date as is mutually agreed.

2. Part-Time and Contract Faculty and Librarians:

According to the AAPM, academic staff on both part-time and contractually-limited term appointments are eligible for PTR. The decentralized budget model should provide for “a pro-rated amount [of funding] for all part-time academic staff who are to be considered for PTR on the same basis as their full-time colleagues.” Likewise, “increases for part-time staff should be determined on the basis of their annualized salaries and appropriately pro-rated.” **UTFA has found that these instructions are not followed. Part-time and full-time appointed contract faculty and librarians are often systematically disadvantaged in the assignment of PTR. Some of those renewed on contract report that they are treated as though they are new employees who are not eligible for PTR.**

Comment on Proposal 2 a) and 2 b): The text in the AAPM must be revised to make clear that part-time and contract appointees who are renewed or reappointed on an annual basis shall not be treated as though they are new hires for the purposes of salary increments.

Proposal 2 a): In the decentralized budget model each academic division is responsible for providing the base budget funds that are to be expended fully on merit-driven base salary increases for faculty and librarians. This includes a pro-rated amount for all part-time faculty and librarians who are to be considered for PTR on the same basis as their fulltime colleagues.

Proposal 2 b): Consistent with Provostial directive, new faculty and librarian appointments effective after January 31st are considered new hires. Therefore, appointees in these positions are not entitled to ATB or PTR increases on July 1st of that same year. Part-time and contract faculty and librarians whose appointments are being renewed or reappointed are entitled to ATB or PTR increases and shall be reviewed for PTR at the same time as their full-time colleagues.

Proposal 2 c): Increases for part-time faculty and librarians will be determined on the basis of their annualized salaries and will be appropriately pro-rated. PTR committees will be reminded to assess candidate's achievement relative to their percentage appointment. It is inappropriate for PTR committees to compare level of achievement of part-time members against full-time members' level of achievement without taking into account the part-time member's percentage appointment.

Comment on Proposal 2 d): UTFA has been advised by some part-time appointees that they are evaluated for PTR purposes on the basis of their research/scholarly activities/creative professional activity (CPA) (as well as teaching and/or administrative responsibilities and service), despite the fact that under the terms of their appointment letters they are not responsible for carrying out research/scholarship/creative professional activity. The Workload Policy and Procedures for Faculty and Librarians ('WLPP') states that all faculty and librarian appointments must include some component of the three main areas of responsibility. One exception would be part-time members on an appointment of less than 50%, who are exempted from service duties under the "Policy and Procedures on Employment Conditions of Part-Time Academic Staff". (Note that UTFA's forthcoming part-time proposal will propose changing this threshold to 40%.) Notwithstanding this exemption, these part-time appointments must include a component of research/scholarship/creative professional activity. UTFA proposes language to address these circumstances.

Proposal 2 d): Barring circumstances of human rights accommodation or cases in which policy excludes service duties for some appointments, *all* faculty and

librarian appointments must include some component of each of the three main areas of responsibility (research/scholarship/creative professional activity; teaching/professional practice; and service). Without prejudice to this position, if the appointment of a part-time faculty member or librarian does not include research/scholarship/creative professional activity, or includes reduced research/scholarship/creative professional activity, the member should be evaluated accordingly for the purposes of PTR.

3. The Evaluation Process and Criteria Used in the Assessment:

The AAPM states the following: “The evaluation process for PTR awards needs to be clearly understood by all faculty and librarians.” UTFA has found that some unit heads do not know about this directive, do not understand it, or choose to ignore it.

Proposal 3 a): Each unit shall, through collegial deliberation, arrive at an agreement on an internal policy and procedures for assessing PTR, in a manner consistent with the principles set out in the AAPM. PTR assessment policy and procedures shall be provided in writing at the beginning of each academic year and reiterated in writing at the time of the evaluation.

4. Procedure for Evaluation:

Proposal 4 a): A PTR Advisory Committee must be formed in each unit and shall reflect the array of appointments in the unit. Membership should not remain static year on year but should rotate among members of the unit at least once every two years and shall reflect the array of appointments in the unit. On a regular basis, and at least one month before the members of the committee shall be selected annually, the unit head shall invite eligible faculty in stages, going first to those who have not recently served. Membership on this committee and its mandate shall be announced by March 31. Members of this committee shall not have access to the salary information of those being assessed, nor shall committee members decide the amounts of each PTR award. Members of the committee shall receive the activity report, cv, and performance assessment (in the case of librarians) of all unit members being assessed. The unit or division head shall decide on the dollar figure for each PTR award.

Comment: Further discussion at the bargaining table will be required to better understand how a dollar figure is attached to the grade assigned to each librarian. A further proposal may be warranted to address this question.

Proposal 4 b): In writing, the unit head shall communicate to each member of the unit the relative weight of the three components of the appointment that will be evaluated (as appropriate according to stream and/or the appointment letter), the format to be used for the Activity Report, and any unique aspects of the evaluation process for the unit. This shall be distributed to the members of the unit at the beginning of the academic year (i.e. July 1st).

Comment on Proposal 4 c): UTFA has assisted numerous cross-appointed members who have encountered difficulties in understanding how their PTR score was reached, and how their percentage appointments in each unit were considered during their PTR evaluation. Language is required to increase transparency and provide clarity to academic administrators and cross-appointed academic staff about how their PTR is evaluated and scored.

Proposal 4 c): In cases where faculty and librarians evaluated are cross-appointed, or where faculty hold a graduate appointment outside of their primary unit, consultation with other unit or division heads and/or graduate chairs is a critical element of the information-gathering process for PTR assessments and shall be undertaken. Such consultation shall occur in writing and prior to the PTR committee meeting. Members shall provide their Annual Activity Reports and updated curriculum vitae to each applicable unit head. Each unit head and/or graduate chair shall provide an assessment in writing, including details about any applicable point system used, to the primary unit head. In writing these assessments, the percentage appointment in each unit shall be taken into account. It is inappropriate for PTR committees to compare level of achievement for cross-appointed members against full-time members' level of achievement without taking into account the respective percentage appointment of the cross-appointed member in each unit.

5. The Balance of Teaching/Professional Practice; Research/Scholarship/Creative Professional Activity; and Service

Proposal 5 a): As mandated by WLPP, there are three components to every academic appointment, with the exception of faculty members appointed at less than 50%, who are not required to perform service. The PTR scheme allows each

unit reasonable flexibility in determining the balance among the three principal components of a faculty member's or librarian's activities - teaching/professional practice; research/scholarship/creative professional activity; and service. This reasonable flexibility is important for recognizing the unique missions of units and the differences in agreed-upon activities of individuals. A distribution of effort shall not be constructed that undermines the individual's wish to undertake adequately each area of the academic appointment.

Proposal 5 b): Normally, for tenure-stream faculty, the portion of the total PTR allocated to teaching and research/creative professional activity is approximately equal, but, in a limited number of cases, an argument may be made that an atypical weighting of all three areas of activity for the individual concerned is appropriate. In such cases, the member shall discuss with their unit head what the appropriate distribution of effort shall be, and this shall be reflected in the member's Annual Activity report. The PTR committee shall be instructed to conduct its assessment accordingly.

Proposal 5 c): A separate weighting of teaching; scholarship/creative professional activity; and service should be made for teaching-stream faculty. As mandated by the Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments (PPAA) and the WLPP, teaching stream faculty members engage in pedagogical and/or discipline-based scholarship relevant to the field in which they teach. They shall be evaluated on that activity.

Proposal 5 d): Weighting for librarians should account for the wide variety of activities undertaken in that stream (professional practice including teaching, if applicable, research and scholarly contributions, and service).

6. Point Systems and the Evaluation

Proposal 6 a): Some units have employed a ten-point scheme as a model, based, for the tenure stream, on four points for teaching, four points for research/scholarship/creative professional activity and two for service—or 40/40/20.

This distribution of effort will be varied for teaching stream faculty. Often teaching stream faculty will be assigned a 60/20/20 distribution of effort, where no more than 60 is for teaching, no less than 20 is for research/scholarship/creative professional activity, and 20 is for service.

The distribution of effort for librarians will be no more than 80% for professional practice (including teaching, if applicable) and no less than 20% for a combination of service and research and scholarly contributions (as per the WLPP).

Comment on proposal 6 b): While there are advantages to the use of a point system as the primary basis for evaluation, not all groups use point systems in that way. Where a point system is used as the primary basis for evaluation, it is important to note that the purpose of the evaluation is to establish the relative levels of performance of the members of the group and not a set of scores that are translated arithmetically into PTR awards.

Proposal 6 b): Where a point system is not used, the primary basis of evaluation must be documented by the Dean or Chair/Director, and communicated to the recipient of the PTR award. In all instances, for comparative purposes and for the sake of consistency, results must be translated into points and the points must be communicated to the recipient and more generally reported to the unit.

Comment on Proposal 6 c): UTFA has been advised that in some cases, the allocation of points to librarians in their PTR evaluations has been artificially suppressed in order to ensure that there is “room to grow”.

Proposal 6 c): Instructions shall be issued to all PTR committees to the effect that points shall be allocated according to members’ performance relative to their level or rank, and shall not be artificially suppressed.

7. Communications regarding ATB, PTR and Revised Salary

Proposal 7 a): A letter must be sent to each individual, explaining the judgment underlying the award of PTR. The letter must include the scores (including points allocated) for each of the components of the appointment. The letter shall provide appropriate detail of the individual's performance and, for probationary faculty or librarians, the assessment should also be related to the individual's career development.

Proposal 7 b): In addition to the specifics of the individual PTR award, the annual salary increase letter shall include the appropriate histogram(s), and should, when possible, include information on the dollar amount of the ATB (across-theboard salary increase) award (which is applied to the June 30th salary before the award of

PTR). In some years, as a result of lengthy salaries/benefits negotiations, two letters must be issued, one in which the PTR amount is communicated and one in which the ATB award is communicated.

Proposal 7 c): Unit heads are responsible for preparing histograms showing the distribution of total PTR and for forwarding the histograms to the Provost's Office by July 20th of each year. The histograms will be reviewed by the Provost and UTFA representatives. Each member, except those in pools of three or fewer individuals, must receive a divisional or departmental histogram displaying the PTR awards. Members in pools of three or fewer members in multidepartment units must receive a unit-wide or, in the case of librarians, a UTLS histogram and a breakdown by division.

8. Faculty and Librarians on Research and Study Leave

Proposal 8 a): Weighting of the three areas of the academic appointment for faculty and librarians on research and study leave should reflect not only the research/scholarship/creative professional activity but also any teaching (including graduate supervision) and/or service undertaken while on leave.

Proposal 8 b): Faculty and librarians returning from a research and study leave must attach a copy of the completed leave application form to their completed activity report. Faculty and librarians who are on research and study leave during the academic year shall be assessed with reference to the standards applicable to the leave activity and only on those criteria which are appropriate in light of the work planned for their leave. The PTR evaluation should take into account the degree to which the objectives of the approved leave plan have been realized, or, where the objectives have changed during the course of research/scholarship/creative professional activity, the degree to which the revised objectives have been achieved.

Proposal 8 c): Faculty and librarians on research and study leave should be awarded a PTR amount appropriate to their accomplishments and should not simply be awarded the average for the unit. The PTR amount is not to be adjusted downwards for full-time faculty and librarians, despite the fact that they may have been receiving less than full salary while on leave. For an individual who holds a part-time appointment, the amount should be pro-rated to the percentage of FTE that the person normally receives when not on leave.

Proposal 8 d): For librarians who opt not to write an activity report while on research and study leave, their PTR from the previous year shall be carried forward.

9. Faculty and Librarians on Maternity/Parental/Adoption Leave

Proposal 9 a): With respect to PTR, the principle of no professional disadvantage shall prevail for those on maternity/parental/adoption leave. Calculations for PTR should be based on the faculty and librarian's work prior to and after the leave, with allowances for a longer-term review to ensure no anomalies occurred. The faculty and librarian's performance prior to the leave may be a good indication of the PTR for the leave period, although in cases where the faculty or librarian was ill or unable to function at full capacity prior to the leave, it may be necessary to extrapolate over a longer period of time.

10. Faculty and Librarians on Unpaid Leave

Proposal 10 a): Those on unpaid leave do not normally receive a PTR increase, unless they undertake duties in any one of the three areas of the academic appointment.

11. Faculty and Librarians on Sick Leave or LTD

Comment: Based on 2014-2017 SBPW settlement

Proposal 11 a) As is true for maternity/parental leave, the principle of no professional disadvantage shall prevail for those on sick leave and/or LTD. For the first 12 months that faculty and librarians are in receipt of LTD benefits and/or while they are on sick leave, calculations for PTR shall be based on the faculty or librarian's work prior to and after the leave, with allowances for a longer-term review to ensure no anomalies occurred. The faculty and librarian's performance prior to the leave may be a good indication of the PTR for the leave period, although in cases where the member was ill or unable to function at full capacity prior to the leave, it may be necessary to extrapolate over a longer period of time. For faculty and librarians on LTD for more than 12 months, on returning to work after being on LTD, faculty and librarians will be considered eligible for

PTR on a pro-rata basis during the relevant PTR period during which they return to active employment.

12. Faculty and Librarians on Compassionate Care Leave, Family Caregiver Leave, Family Medical Leave, Critically Ill Childcare Leave (hereinafter 'Compassionate Care Leave')

Proposal 12 a) As is true for maternity/parental leave, the principle of no professional disadvantage shall prevail for those on Compassionate Care Leave. For the period that faculty and librarians are on such leaves, for up to 12 months, calculations for PTR shall be based on the faculty and librarian's work prior to and after the leave, with allowances for a longer-term review to ensure no anomalies occurred. The faculty or librarian's performance prior to the leave may be a good indication of the PTR for the leave period, although in cases where the member was ill or unable to function at full capacity prior to the leave, it may be necessary to extrapolate over a longer period of time. For faculty and librarians on Compassionate Care Leave for more than 12 months, on returning to work after being on the leave, faculty and librarians will be considered eligible for PTR on a prorata basis during the relevant PTR period during which they return to active employment.

13. Individuals Facing Challenges

Proposal 13 a): The PTR review will help to identify those individuals facing challenges in their career development. The head of a unit shall meet with all individuals who have been identified as having difficulties relative to their colleagues in the unit, or who have received an unusually low assessment in any of the three areas of the academic appointment, and shall identify for the faculty or librarian the challenges that have been identified, consult with the faculty or librarian to understand the reason for their challenge(s), and provide constructive steps that can be taken in a reasonable timeframe to remedy those deficiencies.

Proposal 13 b): In discussions with the head of the unit, the faculty member or librarian shall be encouraged to identify any needed change in assigned duties or any needed support, such as additional teaching assistant hours. Faculty and librarians should also be encouraged to identify any need for accommodation, if relevant. Advice/assistance may include referral to a course or workshop on teaching/professional practice, or to the services of a teaching consultant; help in

formulating research grants or planning a research/scholarship/creative professional activity endeavour or project; or referral to other appropriate supports. A letter detailing the unit head's concerns and suggested ways to remedy the difficulties shall follow the meeting.

Proposal 13 c): The Dean/Chief Librarian or, in single department Faculties, the Provost's Office, must be informed of cases in which individuals have, over a lengthy period of time, consistently failed to meet expectations that have been clearly identified. The Dean, Chief Librarian or Provost's office can offer advice to the unit head.

Proposal 13 d): PTR shall not be used as a disciplinary tool. PTR is to be used to recognize achievement and merit, and must not be used in a punitive manner.

Proposal 13 e): PTR shall not be used to reward excessive workloads. As stated in 11 d) above, PTR is to be used to award achievement.

14. Appeal Process

Proposal 14 a): Faculty and librarians may appeal PTR decisions as outlined in Article 7 of the [Memorandum of Agreement](#).

15. Faculty and Librarians who Retire or Cease Employment during the Academic Year

Proposal 15 a): No merit award is calculated for individuals who are not currently employed by the University. Individuals who retire on or before June 30th do not receive an ATB or PTR award for the following July 1st.

16. Assessment of Teaching

Comment on Proposal 16 a): The AAPM states that “the assessment of excellence in teaching should never be based on a single indicator, such as student course evaluations.” UTFA has been advised that in some cases, student questionnaires on courses and teaching (“SQCTs”) form the primary or even sole basis upon which teaching has been assessed for the purposes of PTR. UTFA has proposed language to ensure that an array of teaching related duties will be

assessed, as per the faculty or librarian's annual activity report, in determining a PTR score for teaching.

Proposal 16 a): The assessment of teaching should never be based on any single indicator, such as SQCTs. Decisions should be based on a careful analysis of all the material filed annually as part of the candidate's Annual Activity Report (which might include, for example, evidence of teaching-related duties, creative professional activity related to teaching, innovations in teaching, curriculum development or educational leadership), of which student course evaluations form only a single source of data. A process that considers a broader array of evidence is more fair to each candidate, and is more likely to produce an accurate assessment of achievement in teaching.