

UTfA Newsletter

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO *faculty* ASSOCIATION | No. 1 (2012–13) | APRIL 10, 2013

Annual General Meeting 2013

Thursday, April 18, 2013
3:30 to 6:00 p.m.

Tanz Neuroscience Building
Room 6, Imperial Oil Lecture Auditorium
6 Queen's Park Crescent West

AGENDA

1. Minutes of the Previous Meeting
2. Introduction of Mathilde Savard-Corbeil, Al Miller Memorial Award Recipient, and Johnny Huang, UTFA Undergraduate Tuition Award Recipient
3. Reports of the Officers*
4. Reports of the Chairs of Committees*
*The reports included here will not be read at the meeting. However, the President, Vice-Presidents, Treasurer, and Committee Chairs will answer any questions. The 2011–12 audited financial statements are attached.
5. Guest Speaker: Hugh Mackenzie, Economist, Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives
6. Questions from the Floor
7. Special Joint Advisory Committee Update
 - a. New Stream
 - b. Tenure Stream
8. Other Business

Members are invited to a reception after the meeting in the Faculty Club Lounge, 41 Willcocks Street.

INSIDE THIS ISSUE

Reports from the Executive Committee

President	3
Vice-President, Salary, Benefits and Pensions	6
Vice-President, Grievances	7
Vice-President, University and External Affairs	8
Treasurer	9
Chair of the Equity Committee	10
Chair of the Librarians Committee	11
Chair of the Membership Committee	12
Chair of the Teaching Stream Committee	13
A Member-at-Large	15
Audited Financial Statements	17
Minutes of the 2012 Annual General Meeting	28
Upcoming Events	36

Report of the President

Introduction

My term as UTFA President began on July 1 of 2012. I want to thank the UTFA membership for the honour of representing you. I also want to thank my colleagues on the Executive and Council for their support and for the opportunity to work with them, and our office staff, whose work is critical but invisible to most of the membership.

On behalf of UTFA, I extend congratulations to Professor Meric Gertler on being named the next President of the University of Toronto. All of us in UTFA's leadership look forward to working with Professor Gertler in our common mission to improve an already world-class University. I also want to recognize Professor David Naylor for his service as President of the University of Toronto since 2005. We are all in your debt, Dr. Naylor.

Background: Whom Does UTFA Represent?

UTFA represents approximately 3,000 faculty and librarians on all three campuses of the U of T, including about 500 retirees. If you are a faculty member or librarian with an appointment in excess of one year in duration, UTFA represents you (but if you are not sure, by all means be in touch!). However, not all whom we represent are members. Since 1998, all new hires are included as dues paying members by default, with an opt-out provision currently exercised by very few. For those hired prior to 1998, membership is by voluntary opt-in, and the majority of these colleagues have indeed joined.

UTFA is the only democratically accountable collective and independent advocate of faculty and librarians at the University, so being in touch with and answerable to our membership is a high priority. UTFA functions largely on a parliamentary model, with representatives of sixty constituencies forming our Council, the primary decision-making body of the Association. Council establishes, for instance, our platforms for bargaining, while also

ratifying any voluntary (i.e., not arbitrated) settlements. We could certainly move to a system of direct membership ratification (a change I would welcome) but this would require constitutional change at a general meeting of the membership. Other than the President (elected by the full membership), positions on the UTFA Executive for one- or two-year terms are filled by the Council. A Nominating Committee forwards recommendations to the Council, after which additional nominations may be made, followed by elections. This process begins in February of each year, with Council electing the new Executive in May. UTFA members do *not* need to hold Council seats in order to be candidates for most of the positions on the Executive. So, if you are interested in being considered by our Council for election to any one of the ten positions open to the broader membership, please contact me or someone else from our Executive or Council. The chair of our Nominating Committee this year is Katharine Rankin.

To better represent and be accountable to our membership, over the course of the last six years UTFA has made a concerted effort to renew itself, recruit new leadership, and broaden our direct engagement with faculty and librarians in their diverse professional settings. In 2007, UTFA Council created the Membership Committee with a mandate to coordinate outreach and communications in order to improve the connection between UTFA's membership and its leadership and to facilitate dialogue among members more broadly. These efforts are vital to ensuring that the University is governed in a collegial manner and that faculty and librarians have a meaningful voice in shaping the conditions of their work as teachers, scholars, and professionals.

I have had the good fortune to meet many of you face-to-face over the course of this year in visits to academic units, and I thank you for inviting me. If I have not yet been to your department or program for a brief conversation about the affairs of UTFA, contact your unit head and our office (faculty@utfa.org) and we can set something up. More generally, if you have ideas about how UTFA can better

represent you and your colleagues, write to membership@utfa.org.

Tour d'Horizon

We face important challenges at this university and in higher education more generally. As documented through the tireless work of my predecessor, George Luste, our pension plan continues to groan under the weight of accumulated debt. The solution to this problem is not obvious, and it would take a remarkable upturn in both the markets and the performance of the asset managers to eliminate the debt. At the same time, the provincial government has signalled recently that broader changes may be coming to university pension plans, changes that may include pooled asset management, 50–50 cost sharing between employee groups and employers (presumably with provision for truly joint governance), and benefits restructuring. We will continue to stay abreast of and keep you informed about these and other issues. I want to thank our colleagues Laurence Booth, Ettore Damiano, Jennifer Jenkins, George Luste, and Helen Rosenthal for their work as our representatives on the pension board.

The provincial government, under new leadership, has recently announced a change in tuition fee policy, lowering the cap on annual increases from 5 to 3 per cent. This could have significant consequences for the University. At the same time, we continue to look for a broader policy platform on higher education from the government and the other parties, one that includes provision for sustainable funding. While UTFA added its voice to the coalition of faculty, students, and administrators criticizing last fall's MTCU discussion paper on higher education, we do need to confront various challenges and opportunities presented by, for example, the spread of online teaching and learning. UTFA is committed to ensuring that your voices are heard on these and other issues, not least so that academic freedom in deliberations over matters that shape the context of teaching, research, and professional activities within the University is upheld.

Other News and the Year It Was

Members will be pleased to know that UTFA is in good financial shape, benefitting from the capable stewardship of our new Treasurer, Michael Meth. The new Executive inherited a sound financial foundation, with a solid reserve and several years of running close to break-even (which really should be the goal for an organization such as this).

I refer you to our financial statements and Michael's report herein, but it looks like we are headed for another year in the black. If our surpluses grow too large, we will look to make adjustments, but we must always be aware of the unevenness of demands on our financial resources as unforeseen challenges emerge. This year, costs could be reduced because we are not engaged in mediation or arbitration, having negotiated a compensation agreement last summer that extends through the end of June 2014.

I am also very proud that we were able to negotiate and ratify a first collective agreement for our colleagues at the University of St. Michael's College, a certified unit within UTFA. Bargaining wrapped up in September of 2012. As a member of the negotiating team, I can confirm that the process was not always easy, and significant differences needed to be bridged. But we reached an agreement that I expect will serve USMC well. I want to thank all of our colleagues at USMC for their inspiring solidarity, and also acknowledge the hard work undertaken by members of the negotiating team, together with Peter Simpson of CAUT, in seeing this process through. I was honoured to be involved and I learned a lot!

The SJAC Process: Revisiting Our MoA

We are about to commence talks under the Special Joint Advisory Committee (SJAC) process established a year ago during mediation between UTFA and the Governing Council. Changes to the landscape of higher education (for example, the increased importance of private funding in a climate of government austerity, a shift toward online courses and course delivery, more government oversight of and involvement in teaching and research, and questions about the growth of administrative authority) motivate our examination of the role of the faculty association in representing the collective interests of faculty and librarians at U of T.

UTFA's role was codified in 1977 in our Memorandum of Agreement (MoA) – featuring limited scope collective bargaining to deal primarily with compensation issues. Now, more and more of our members are seeking an expanded role for UTFA. We will report in more detail in the coming weeks on our February survey, but it overwhelmingly confirms that members want UTFA's capacity modernized and expanded to deal more effectively with academic policies. The SJAC process will explore ways of modernizing the MoA and will also look specifically at the role of faculty

and librarians in significant academic planning exercises. The SJAC also features two subcommittees dealing with appointments policies for faculty. More background and information concerning the SJAC and the issues we will be addressing in negotiations may be found in our [December 2012 newsletter](#).

More broadly, UTFA's position – as reinforced by the UTFA Council at its March meeting – is that the appointments-related matters being negotiated under the SJAC process, together with other academic policies comprising the terms and shaping the context of our work, should be negotiated using a formal collective bargaining process such as the one we now use to determine compensation settlements. The key features of this bargaining process include provision for good faith bargaining by both parties, timelines, provision for information sharing, and a mechanism (i.e., professional neutral third party mediation and arbitration when necessary) for resolving any outstanding disputes so that negotiations reach a productive and timely conclusion.

Members new to these issues sometimes ask: what is the relationship between expanding the scope of collective bargaining on the one hand and playing a role in the substantive aspects of appointments policies and the procedural aspects of academic planning on the other? Doesn't the MoA already afford UTFA an adequate role in the determination of these and other academic policies?

The short answer is no. It is true that the so-called frozen policies in Article 2 of the MoA cannot be changed without the consent of UTFA and the Governing Council, at least in principle. But there are three immediate problems. First, over the years we have seen that changes in the policies are often the result, not of negotiation, but of the proliferation of unilateral guidelines and memos that, over time, take on the force of policy. This proliferation seriously undermines collegial governance. Second, the Article 2 list excludes

matters of central concern to faculty and librarians, including the procedural aspects of academic planning. Third, when UTFA and the Governing Council fail to agree on changes to frozen policies, there is no provision to break the impasse at all, let alone in a timely way.

For these reasons, there is a direct connection between proposing to expand the scope of collective bargaining and proposing to change substantive policy matters that shape the context of our work. A broader and more accountable process of negotiating is a way of holding both UTFA negotiators and Governing Council representatives to a high standard of conduct, while ensuring that UTFA proposals (and those of the Governing Council for that matter) are afforded a fair and substantive hearing. As we have seen in previous negotiations, including over the workload policy, the involvement or potential involvement of an independent mediator/arbitrator is particularly essential in keeping negotiations moving toward a timely and productive resolution when the parties are unable to agree on their own.

For these reasons, we need to change the *way* we negotiate, not as an end unto itself, but as a means to improving the quality and responsiveness of *what* we negotiate. This is what we are looking for in the package of changes we hope the SJAC process delivers. You and this university deserve no less.

Look for a more detailed report on the results of our recent survey and an update on the SJAC process in the coming weeks. For now, I want to thank members for their support, as well as my colleagues on the UTFA Executive, Council, and committees for their important contributions to the University and to UTFA. I encourage you all to read the important reports by other members of our leadership in this newsletter and I hope to see you at the AGM on April 18th.

Scott Prudham
President

Report of the Vice-President, Salary, Benefits and Pensions

Salary

I took over the position of Vice-President, Salary, Benefits and Pensions following last summer's successfully concluded round of bargaining. Our current contract runs through June of 2014, and the SBP committee will begin the process of preparing for the next round of bargaining in the fall of 2013. By attending meetings of OCUFA's Collective Bargaining Committee, I have become aware of some of the issues we may face, and some of the options that might be available to us, at the bargaining table next year. While repeating that she is not in favour of the wage freeze approach taken by the last administration, Ontario's new premier, Kathleen Wynne, went out of her way in a recent meeting with representatives of OCUFA to say that her government will be coming to our sector "looking for zeros" in upcoming rounds of bargaining. In addition, many post-secondary institutions in Ontario face ongoing pressure to increase the amount of teaching being conducted by non-tenure track faculty. Increases in workload and in contributions to pension plans as well as increasing calls for forms of post-tenure evaluation are also featuring in recent bargaining discussions.

Given the current political and economic climate, it will be more important than ever to inform ourselves about how revenue is distributed at the University and who is paying most for the continued decline in provincial funding. Right now, province-wide full-time and part-time faculty salaries represent 19 per cent of Ontario universities' annual expenditures and 29 per cent of operating expenses, down from 24 and 32 per cent respectively in 1998-99 (Source: Council of Finance Officers – Universities of Ontario). Tuition fees, needless to say, have risen over that same period. Canadian full-time students in undergraduate programs paid 5.0% more on average in tuition fees for the 2012-13 academic year last fall than they did a year earlier. This follows a 4.3% increase in 2011-12. In comparison, inflation as measured by the Consumer Price Index was 1.3% between July 2011 and July 2012 (Statistics Canada).

Benefits

The Administration indicated last year that it might be interested in considering changes to the Long Term

Disability plan; specifically, they are considering switching from an ASO (Administrative Services Only) plan to something more like a fully insured plan for all eligible University employees. Such changes might simplify administration of the plan and lower the cost of coverage for UTFA members. On the other hand, the new plan might result in different costs for different employee groups at U of T (e.g., faculty and librarians may end up paying less than they do now for their LTD plan while maintenance and grounds staff pay more). Our benefits consultant, Gary Kawaguchi, has prepared a package of material outlining our current plan and the implications of the kind of changes the Administration is considering. In January, we gave the Administration the names of UTFA's representatives on a joint committee to consider changing the plan and indicated that we were ready to meet as soon as they had received proposals and estimates on a new plan from insurance companies.

Pensions

The latest actuarial reports on the University's pension plan reveal that the plan's deficit increased slightly this year. The most optimistic assessment (going concern solvency) suggests that the deficit grew by \$160 million this year. The cost of this deficit affects the University's operating budget and builds pressure on faculty to increase their contributions.

I took part in a discussion of pension reform organized by OCUFA in January and I also met (along with UTFA Executive members Ettore Damiano and Jennifer Jenkins) with our pensions consultant, Mark Zigler, in order to keep an eye on the progress of the Morneau recommendations. Right now, the health of our pension plan continues to be more of a concern than the question of whether or how to pool investments along the lines suggested by the Morneau report. None of the changes suggested by Morneau would solve U of T's ongoing pension problems, and whether or not such a pooling would be better for our members in the long run remains a debatable question. All we can say for sure is that the political momentum is going to drive us toward greater sharing of risk and return in public sector pension plans. The Liberal government remains committed to moving plans closer to 50-50 cost sharing over the next

five years (as stated in its 2012 budget). Recent developments in provincial politics might have slowed down movement on the Morneau initiative, but the drive towards pooling of investments continues. Members wishing to know more about this process might read the report or the summary prepared for UTFA by the law firm Koskie Minsky.

I want to express my appreciation to the members of the Executive and the office staff, who have helped me to survive

my first year as Vice-President, Salary, Benefits and Pensions. I also want to thank all of the UTFA members who have participated on the SBP Committee in the past year. I look forward to drawing on the expertise of the committee in the fall as we prepare for bargaining in 2014.

Paul Downes

Vice-President, Salary, Benefits and Pensions

Report of the Vice-President, Grievances

Tenure Issues and Teaching

The grievance portfolio offers advice to approximately 20 per cent of the tenure candidates (around 75 to 100) who go up for tenure in a given year. We see tenure candidates from across the disciplines and for a wide range of reasons. Most have strong files but find the process unclear and therefore seek advice. Many candidates need help responding to inadequate or inadvertently misleading summaries of evidence.

Over the past three years, one candidate achieved tenure on excellence in teaching and competence in research/creative professional activity. Over this same period, only nine candidates achieved tenure based on excellence in both teaching and research/creative professional activity. In previous AGM newsletters, UTFA has identified a reluctance on the part of tenure committees to acknowledge the fine teaching of those in our tenure stream who have demonstrated excellence in both research and teaching. The Administration has now signalled a greater willingness to acknowledge the importance of teaching as a professorial activity in the tenure review. In the coming years, we might see a higher number of faculty go up for tenure in both categories of excellence.

New Stream Negotiations

By the time this newsletter is circulated, negotiations will be under way over a new appointments policy that will include the current teaching stream and non-CUPE contract faculty, especially those in professional divisions, who currently lack an appropriate appointment category.

These negotiations are integral to the SJAC process. The “new stream,” a placeholder term, will offer secure, scholarly, teaching-intensive appointments with improved ranks and titles. The members of the New Stream Subcommittee that is negotiating this policy are Connie Guberman, Brock MacDonald, Cynthia Messenger (chair), Jun Nogami, and Scott Prudham.

My years of service to the University community as grievance officer and as chair of the Teaching Stream and Appointments Committees have taught me that appointments policy must evolve if it is to reflect its cultural and educational context. Only a robust framework for negotiating and re-negotiating appointments issues will keep pace, for example, with human rights laws and human resources practices, and with growing pressures on our faculty and librarians. Our frozen policy framework means that faculty may be seriously disadvantaged by policy that was once leading edge. If our appointments policies for all three streams were strengthened, working conditions and therefore productivity would improve, and U of T’s ability to recruit and retain faculty and librarians would be enhanced. Better policies would also mean fewer grievances.

Grievance Committee

This year the UTFA Grievance Committee focused on UTFA’s legal representation policy and on evolving human rights concerns, including family status issues (child care and elder care) as they affect the appointments of faculty and librarians.

Grievance Statistics

Currently, UTFA is handling approximately 100 open files. UTFA will not receive statistics for tenure denials for 2012–13 until later this year.

In 2011–12, 15 teaching stream faculty went up for promotion to senior lecturer, and 1 was denied.

In 2011–12, 77 faculty went up for tenure, 75 were granted tenure, 2 were denied, and 0 are pending.

Tenure Workshop

Once again this year the grievance portfolio will sponsor a tenure workshop: May 8, from 2:00 to 3:30 p.m., at University College, Room 179. This workshop will also cover the three-year review. All are welcome.

Thanks

I would like to acknowledge the lawyers and staff in the grievance portfolio and the lawyers of Sack, Goldblatt,

Mitchell, who all serve our members so well. UTFA's General Counsel, Heather Diggle, the Acting General Counsel, Alison Warrian, Counsel Reni Chang, and Grievance Assistant Rucsandra Schmelzer are all part of the excellent UTFA grievance team. Chris Penn and Marta Horban also play a crucial role in support of our members, and I am grateful to them for all of the extra work they undertake so cheerfully. Finally I would like to acknowledge and thank the UTFA Grievance Committee: Mounir AbouHaidar, Claude Evans, Helen Grad, Shashi Kant, Linda Kohn, Brock MacDonald, Jun Nogami, Scott Prudham, Henri-Paul Sicsic, and Michael Bramah.

Cynthia Messenger
Vice-President, Grievances

Report of the Vice-President, University and External Affairs

C. B. Macpherson Lecture

This year's edition of the C. B. Macpherson Lecture took place on March 20, 2013 and turned out to be an inspiring and memorable event. Our guest lecturer was Stephen Lewis, veteran Canadian diplomat, politician, and social justice advocate. His lecture was entitled "Where in the world is the world headed?" and was at various times sobering, moving, and very humorous. At least 400 members, colleagues, and friends filled the Medical Sciences auditorium and attended the reception afterwards. Many UTFA members and student volunteers helped out on the evening, and I thank them all. I want especially to thank the UTFA staff, particularly Chris Penn, Marta Horban, and David Mackenzie, for all of the detailed organizing work that made the marquee public event of our faculty association possible.

CAUT and OCUFA

I represented UTFA at the regular meetings of the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT) and the Ontario

Confederation of University Faculty Associations (OCUFA) in the fall of 2012. I missed the OCUFA Board of Directors meeting in February, during my parental leave, but will attend the CAUT Council meeting in April. It is important to note that CAUT will soon begin a formal search for a new Executive Director, to replace Jim Turk. Also, on behalf of OCUFA I participated as the host and moderator of a special town hall meeting held at OISE on March 28 – part of a series of such meetings called "Austerity and Ontario's Universities: Finding a Way Forward."

Engaging with Students

In keeping with UTFA's desire to build strong links with the student body, I've assisted with various requests for collaboration, whenever possible. For example, Harriet Sonne de Torrens and I attended and showed our support at a special information session on the subject of threats of violence against some female U of T students. Also, following a request from a student group, we've sent a letter

to the City of Toronto requesting safer cycling infrastructures around the St. George campus.

Awards

I am delighted to present the UTFA Undergraduate Tuition Award to **Johnny Huang** and the Al Miller Memorial Award to **Mathilde Savard-Corbeil**. It was extremely difficult to identify a single winner in each category. I will discuss the possibility of UTFA increasing its student support in the future with my Executive colleagues.

Also note that CAUT and OCUFA offer many awards for faculty and librarians deserving of special recognition (see (<http://www.caut.ca/pages.asp?page=322> and <http://ocufa.on.ca/ocufa-awards/>). Please do not hesitate to contact us if you need assistance or advice on how to nominate an outstanding colleague for an appropriate honour.

Report of the Treasurer

UTFA is in good financial health. We have concluded the last fiscal year with an operational surplus of approximately \$289,000 and our reserve fund investments have held steady at \$2.4 million. The surplus in operations is due to a combination of prudent fiscal management as well as a quiet year in negotiations, which has contributed to several budgeted expenses not being realized.

The investments in the reserve fund continue to be overseen by the Financial Advisory Committee, consisting of George Luste, Laurence Booth, Louis Florence, and myself. We have met twice this fiscal year to review the investments of the fund and to discuss policies required to administer a reserve the size of ours. The reserve continues to be invested in cashable GICs and ETFs replicating the performance of equity and fixed income markets. We believe that the investment vehicles chosen represent a relatively low and well-diversified risk profile appropriate for the purposes of UTFA.

This first year as treasurer has been an excellent learning experience, and I am grateful to the staff at the UTFA

The U&EA Committee

Special thanks to Linda Kohn, Reid Locklin, Jody MacDonald, Victor Ostapchuk, and Kent Weaver for their invaluable support and contributions. The committee made decisions on the student awards, engaged in university governance processes, and provided vital assistance with the C.B. Macpherson Lecture. As chair, I deeply appreciate their participation and guidance.

The UTFA Office Staff

Chris Penn, Marta Horban, and David Mackenzie have been very helpful and were particularly supportive while I was away on parental leave.

Luc Tremblay
Vice-President, University and External Affairs

offices, particularly Marta Horban, Chris Penn, and Lyze Dowden (our former bookkeeper who, fortunately, was still with us for the successful completion of our fiscal year end).

I also wish to specifically thank my predecessor Dennis Patrick, who so ably steered UTFA's finances for seven years. Dennis's work in establishing sound financial policies and transparency makes the job of the treasurer that much easier today, and more importantly, has contributed to making UTFA financially viable and more transparent.

Attached to this AGM newsletter, you will find UTFA's audited statements for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2012. Let me thank our audit firm, Cowperthwaite Mehta, for the timely completion of our audit and continued advice throughout the year.

Michael Meth
Treasurer

Report of the Chair of the Equity Committee

Over the past year, UTFA's Equity Committee focused on meeting the needs of our diverse membership in relation to concerns such as those named in the Ontario Human Rights Code, including disability and accessibility, gender, race, culture, ethnicity, Aboriginal status, sexual and gender orientation, age, and family status.

Accessibility

UTFA's commitment to meeting the accessibility needs, as best we can, for our members with a disability was approved by Council in 2012. A new policy, the *Accessible Member Service Plan*, was developed in compliance with the provincial *Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act* (AODA) governing the removal of barriers to participation by individuals with disabilities. Disabilities can be of different severity, visible (such as physical) or non-visible (such as mental health), and have effects that are short or long term. Mental health and musculoskeletal concerns are the leading reasons for accommodation requests by faculty, as identified by U of T's Health and Well-being Programs and Services.

Gender

The Chair is a member of CAUT's Women Academic Staff Working Group, whose broad mandate is to advance the diverse interests of women academic staff in universities and colleges across Canada. In the past year the Working Group has discussed the need for more effective mentoring both for newly appointed women faculty and for those moving to full professor; the impact of disability and gender; and concerns with the negative effect of traditional approaches to understanding academic freedom. Members of the Working Group and other equity-focused committees have called on CAUT to hire a staff person dedicated to addressing equity in a coordinated and consistent manner.

In January 2013, OCUFA's Status of Women Committee released a preliminary report, *Echoes of the Past, Vision of the Future: Transforming social cultures and structures for Ontario's women faculty and librarians*, that concluded that "much more needs to be done to promote gender equity in universities." Many of its findings resonate with the experiences of women faculty and librarians at U of T. It notes that "women academics continue to struggle to achieve substantive equality in the workplace, both in terms of the overall statistical profile ... and in terms of lived experience." In particular it

identifies failure to meet expectations of a particular model of academic success resulting in inequitable treatment for women and other equity seeking groups; and the lack of effective support structures or processes particularly in relation to mentoring, stress, parental leave, harassment (including sexual harassment), salaries, and tenure and promotion. The above-mentioned issues are not new to women faculty at U of T. We will continue working with our colleagues at the provincial and national levels to highlight these concerns and to develop strategies for change. In particular, the Equity Committee will be hosting informal conversations with women faculty and librarians and the OCUFA group in the late spring, and I am coordinating the collection of policy documents related to gender at universities across the country for the CAUT Working Group. More locally, the joint Administration/UTFA working group established to discuss issues of tri-campus salary inequality, including gender, is ongoing.

The Equity Committee is planning to host a forum in the fall to encourage open discussion of issues related to race, ethnicity and culture. It will explore the intersection of equity concerns and academic freedom and address the misconception that equity and diversity imply the dilution of excellence.

Improving UTFA's communications to members about equity issues has been a priority over the past year. Committee member Roma Kail and I are in the process of developing "answers to questions" most in need of clarification to our members. Priority questions are those that have been raised by members seeking advice in relation to family status and inappropriate and discriminatory comments. If you have a concern related to equity or diversity, or would like one highlighted, please contact me at guberman@utfa.org.

I would like to thank the members of the Equity Committee for their participation: Kathy Bickmore, Roma Kail, Will Kwan, John Ricco, Jesook Song, Scott Prudham, Judith Teichman, Judith Taylor, and Charmaine Williams. Special thanks to Rinaldo Walcott for our continuing conversations. I would also like to express my great appreciation to Cynthia Messenger and Alison Warrian for their insights and expertise, and to UTFA staff Marta Horban, Chris Penn, and David Mackenzie for all of their assistance.

Connie Guberman
Chair, Equity Committee

Report of the Chair of the Librarians Committee

Three major projects were undertaken by the Librarians Committee in 2012–13. The first continues the ongoing review of the *Policies for Librarians* (written in 1978), which UTFA seeks to update. The second was a joint survey undertaken by the Librarians and Teaching Stream Committees concerning scholarship in our professions. Lastly, the committee was very busy organizing the celebration of academic librarianship on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the UTFA Librarians Committee (2003–13) held on March 25, 2013.

The University of Toronto has one of the finest library systems in Canada, ranked third in North America. Yet we have only an inadequate and incomplete (unsigned) set of appointments policies for librarians. The Chair presented information about the dated policies concerning hiring, appointment, and promotion in the *Policies for Librarians* to the general membership at the April 2012 Annual General Meeting, as well as to the members of the UTFA Appointments Committee and to the Executive and legal counsel in the fall of 2012. Our concerns are widely shared, and on January 17, 2013, UTFA Council passed the following motion:

“The Executive recognizes the serious flaws in the *Policies for Librarians* and strongly supports the development of a new appointments policy for academic librarians at the University of Toronto.”

For librarians, as for the teaching stream and tenure stream faculty, the current SJAC negotiations between UTFA and the Administration on the MoA are a pivotal opportunity. Attempts in the past thirty-five years to obtain up-to-date policies concerning our academic appointments and roles in academic planning for faculty and librarians have met with little progress, and are impeded by restrictions on UTFA’s bargaining capacity, codified in the MoA since the late 1970s. With the support of UTFA Council and Executive for a new librarians’ policy, a sub-group of the Librarians Committee has been meeting to write a draft, in consultation with CAUT, continuing the earlier work of Rea Devakos, the first chair of the Librarians Committee (2003–08).

The second project undertaken by the Librarians Committee was collaborating with the Teaching Stream Committee in November 2012 in a survey on the role of scholarship

and professional creative endeavours within our respective professions and, in the case of librarians, current issues relating to our 10 annual research days. The results affirmed that colleagues view scholarship as a key component of academic librarianship and that there was a need for library administrators to demonstrate support for scholarship. UTFA is committed to a vision of academic librarianship featuring three areas of emphasis: professional practice, service, and research and scholarly contributions (as reflected in the 2011 workload policy).

Our third major project this year has been the celebration of the 10th anniversary of the Librarians Committee (2003–13). “The Search for Librarians’ Power,” a special event held on March 25, 2013 at the University of Toronto Faculty Club, featured the following speakers: David Naylor, Larry Alford, Cynthia Messenger, Ken Lavin, Larry Alford, Scott Prudham, and keynote speaker Peter Russell. It was followed by a panel discussion with representatives from OCUFA and CAUT, plus Rea Devakos (the first chair of the Librarians Committee), and Scott Prudham. The event showcased the scholarship of librarians over the years and presented a pictorial history of our librarians and libraries. The celebration concluded with a performance of Middle Eastern music by Suzanne Meyers Sawa, a member of the Librarians Committee and Librarian at the Music Library, and George Dimitri Sawa.

The Librarians Committee increased to twenty members this year, including representation from the teaching stream and retirees (see the list of members at the end of this report). In addition, Michael Meth, Librarian and Director of Information Resources and Services at OISE Library was appointed to the position of UTFA Treasurer; Jeff Newman, College Librarian at New College accepted the position of Speaker at Council; and Harriet Sonne de Torrens is a member of the Special Joint Advisory Committee to review the MoA.

Representing librarians at our three campuses on UTFA Council are Victoria Skelton, Sarah Fedko, and Shelley Hawrychuk. Librarian Emeritus Robin Healey represents retired members on the Council. Sarah Fedko was on UTFA’s 2013 Nominating Committee. She also serves with Shelly Hawrychuk and Robin Healey on the Advisory Committee on the University of Toronto Library System – a

long-standing arrangement that dates back to the existence of the Librarians Association of the University of Toronto. Victoria Skelton was on the 2011–12 negotiating team and Kent Weaver served on the 2012 Nominating Committee. Representatives on the Joint Librarian/Administration Committee were Jeff Newman, Harriet Sonne de Torrens, Suzanne Meyers Sawa, and Judith Teichman, Professor of Political Science and International Development Studies at UTSC.

The U of T Academic Librarians Blog continues to be active and has helped to promote greater awareness about current issues facing academic librarians in Canada at <http://utlibrarians.wordpress.com/>.

Members of the Librarians Committee this past year were: Sarah Fedko (UTSC Library), Marcel Fortin (Map and

Data Library), Shelley Hawrychuk (UTM Library), Robin Healey (Librarian Emeritus), Sheril Hook (UTM Library), Brock MacDonald (teaching stream), Loryl MacDonald (University Archivist), Noel McFerran (John M. Kelley Library), Michael Meth (OISE Library), Jeff Newman (New College Library), Effie Patelos (Architecture, Landscape and Design Library), Fabiano Rocha (East Asian Library), Christina Santolin (Robarts Library), Suzanne Meyers Sawa (Music Library), Lisa Sherlock (E.J.Pratt Library), Andrea Shier (Criminology Information Service Library), Victoria Skelton (Industrial Relations and Human Resources Library), Harriet Sonne de Torrens (Visual Resource Library, UTM), Michelle Spence (Engineering and Computer Science Library), and Kent Weaver (Robarts Library).

Harriet Sonne de Torrens
Chair, Librarians Committee

Report of the Chair of the Membership Committee

This year the work of UTFA's Membership Committee has revolved primarily around supporting our joint initiative with the Administration to renew and modernize the Memorandum of Agreement. UTFA's positions in this process are only as strong and effective as our membership is informed and involved. Thus outreach efforts that have now become routine to the everyday business of the Association – focus groups, participation in unit faculty meetings, meeting new hires – have assumed a heightened significance this year. As always, we are committed to hearing the range of perspectives from our members across disciplines, academic appointments, and the three campuses.

Since the beginning of our internal SJAC consultations at the end of November, we've held 26 focus groups, in a wide variety of departments and units. They include: three meetings each at OISE and Victoria College; five meetings with librarians on all three campuses; and meetings with Spanish/Portuguese/Italian/and Slavic languages; University College; Institute of Women and Gender Studies; Geography and Sociology at UTSC; Forestry; Historical and Cultural Studies at UTSC; Cell and Systems Biology; science departments at UTM; English; Computer Sciences; Pharmacy; History; Fine Art; and others.

Our outreach capacity has hinged on participation and support from members of the Membership Committee, Executive Committee and Council. Over a dozen volunteers met on November 1, 2012 to constitute an outreach team available for leading focus group discussions. This team has worked with members of Council who have taken the initiative to coordinate discussions in their constituencies. Many of them have also helped us refine our messages and develop fresh articulations of the imperative for a strong faculty/librarian voice in University governance.

As February's survey also revealed, our consultations find widespread support for expanding UTFA's capacity to bargain the terms and conditions of our employment, and to play a role in the procedural aspects of academic planning. We have also encountered some unsolicited support for certification, and impatience with UTFA's chosen path of working for fundamental change through our established framework. Many other issues have come up in our consultations including: appointments policies for librarians; academic restructuring at OISE; inconsistent application of the workload policy; concerns about online teaching evaluations; uncertainty about PTR decisions; copyright and fair dealing issues; the challenge of corporate philanthropy; and the nature

and transparency of UTFa's internal governance. Overall, there is growing awareness of the need to ensure a fair process for deliberating the substantive issues – one that specifically secures rights to conflict resolution and good faith bargaining.

UTFa's Membership Committee hosted a special forum on October 11, 2012 called "Who makes decisions for the University?" The event emerged directly out of last year's consultations, which revealed an appetite for a more academic focus to some of UTFa's events. The forum featured a distinguished panel of presenters on the broad themes of "Power, Governance and the Future of Academia," led by Randy Martin, professor of Art and Public Policy at the Tisch School of the Arts, at New York University. Professor Martin is a recognized expert in questions of university governance, and the author of *Under New Management: Universities, Administrative Labor, and the Professional Turn*. Other presenters included Professor Glen Jones, Ontario Research Chair on Post-Secondary Policy and Evaluation at OISE, and Peter Simpson, Assistant Executive Director of CAUT.

Once again, members of Council showed strong support for this event, assisting with communication and promotion. The auditorium was packed and the feedback from members who attended has all been positive. Both Glen Jones and Peter Simpson have since been consulted by UTFa's team

on the Special Joint Advisory Committee, to ensure that the research communicated at the forum informs our positions in negotiations with the Administration on the MoA.

Finally, I'd like to note that at the end of the academic year I will be stepping down from the position of Chair of the Membership Committee, which I have held for three years. In doing so I would like to thank Scott Prudham for his consistent support and vision on matters of member outreach and engagement. Council members have responded with vigorous and creative communications with their constituencies, and I am grateful for the initiative and momentum that will undoubtedly grow in the months to come. I want to thank everyone on the Membership Committee, especially those who have helped organize and lead focus groups, and a special thank you to Judith Taylor for helping out while I was away. Thanks also to the UTFa staff, especially David Mackenzie and Chris Penn, for their coordinating and assistance. Finally, it has been a privilege and honour to travel the breadth of this great university and glimpse the dedication and commitment of our faculty and librarians. I return to full-time service in Geography and Planning freshly inspired by these encounters with respected colleagues.

Katharine Rankin
Chair, Membership Committee

Report of the Chair of the Teaching Stream Committee

Continuing from 2011–12, four major issues involving the teaching stream have been the focus of our attention this year: implementation of unit-level workload policies, the new online teaching evaluations, support for teaching stream faculty's research and scholarship, and the SJAC subcommittee negotiating the creation of a new faculty stream.

Workload

Members will recall that preparation of unit workload policies under the Workload Policy and Procedures for Faculty and Librarians (WLPP) last year involved problems for many teaching stream faculty. In some units, teaching

stream faculty were not invited to participate on workload committees and so had minimal opportunity to contribute to policy development; in others, policies were approved that effectively reinforced long-standing inequities in teaching stream faculty workloads. Finally, some problems were not peculiar to the teaching stream but were issues for all faculty, e.g., local policies that omitted such important aspects of workload as availability of TA support.

Delays in the completion and higher-level approval of many units' workload policies have somewhat slowed down our ability to follow up on these issues. The Administration

supplied us with a complete set of all the approved policies in the fall, and we have since reviewed them with the help of UTFA's lawyers. Given the large number of policies that violate either the letter or the spirit of the WLPP, we are exploring options for a single, comprehensive response, rather than tackling the problems unit by unit. We'll keep members informed on this in the year to come.

Online Teaching Evaluations

The Administration's phasing-in of online teaching evaluations has continued this year, and seems to have involved a number of technical complications. We have not yet been given access to all the data from the pilot phase of the evaluations last year, nor do we yet have access to this year's data, apart from very general institution-wide statistics that do not tell us very much. Many individual members have reported significant drops in the number of evaluations completed in their courses, one of the potential problems about which we have been concerned since the beginning of this initiative. We will continue to press for the agreed-upon complete disclosure of online evaluation data, so that we can properly assess the impact of the new forms on all our members.

Support for Teaching Stream Research and Scholarship

Thanks to many members' input, we have become increasingly aware of inequities in the support given by many units to teaching stream faculty's research and scholarship activities. UTFA has previously fought an association grievance related to this issue, specifically to ensure that teaching stream members' research and scholarship would be given appropriate weight in PTR decisions. Unfortunately, this continues to be an issue.

This year we collaborated with our Librarian colleagues on a survey to gather more information on this matter, both in itself and in relation to workload issues in general, which are closely related. Roughly 33 per cent of teaching stream faculty participated in the survey. Among the results:

- 78% reported pressure to teach in all three terms.
- 72% have no time to do research or scholarship between September and April.
- 76% can only do research or scholarship during the Summer term.
- Fewer than half of respondents believed their research

or scholarship (whether it be research in their discipline, scholarship of teaching and learning, or creative/professional practice) was given proper credit in PTR and promotion reviews; roughly one-third of the remainder reported uncertainty on this question.

- 89% reported being "actively discouraged" from seeking research funding by their unit heads.

These results indicate the scope and severity of the problems our members face in this area.

New Stream Negotiations

Under the terms of the Special Joint Advisory Committee on the Memorandum of Agreement agreed to by the Administration and UTFA in 2012, a subcommittee has been created to discuss the formation of a new stream, encompassing the current teaching stream and professionals whose teaching is based on expertise in practice. UTFA's subcommittee members are Cynthia Messenger (Chair), Connie Guberman, Jun Nogami, and me. The basic negotiating positions for the committee were approved at the March 20, 2013 Council meeting; our first meeting with the Administration took place on April 1st; and further meetings have been scheduled through May. As well as providing proper appointments for the professionals who will come under the terms of the new stream, our goal is to achieve substantial improvements for the existing teaching stream in areas such as title, hiring, review, and promotion processes, security, and support for research and scholarship. Consistent with U of T's stature as a research intensive institution, UTFA will be seeking agreement on a vision of the new faculty stream that is teaching intensive, not teaching only, in part to facilitate synergies between teaching and scholarly (including creative and professional) activities. In turn, our emphasis on security is underpinned by a commitment to ensuring academic freedom in teaching as well as in research, creative, and professional work for colleagues who hold these appointments.

The new stream negotiation is an encouraging and exciting development, the outcome of a long process of preparation and preliminary discussion that began with the formation of a working group to explore the possibility of a new stream following the 2009 SBP negotiations. Special thanks are owed to Cynthia Messenger, who has been involved in this process from the start and whose perseverance has played a major role in bringing it to this point.

Promotion to Senior Lecturer Workshop

UTFA will be presenting a workshop to assist teaching stream faculty members preparing for the promotion process. It will be held on May 2nd in Room BL205 in the Claude Bissell Building, 140 St. George Street, from 9:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m. All members of UTFA's teaching stream are welcome to attend. To register, please email faculty@utfa.org before April 25, 2013.

Matthew Allen, Don Boyes, Jim Clarke, Shadi Dalili, Alistair Dias, Tyler Evans-Tokaryk, Connie Guberman, Kevin Komisaruk, Donna Losell, Jody MacDonald, Cynthia Messenger, Suzanne Meyers Sawa, Geeta Paray-Clarke, Judith Poë, Margaret Procter, Bart Testa, and Terezia Zoric.

W. Brock MacDonald
Chair, Teaching Stream Committee

Thanks

In conclusion, I want to express my appreciation to all the members of the Teaching Stream Committee this year:

Report of a Member-at-Large

In my first year as an UTFA Executive Committee Member-at-Large I have built a portfolio based on my experience as a research scientist and educator of undergraduates and graduate students at UTM. With Judith Teichman, Reni Chang, and Scott Prudham I have served for a year and continue to serve on the Tri-Campus Salary Working Group. Our objective, along with a team representing the Administration, is to apply appropriate statistical models to salary distributions across a host of filtering variables including campus, department, faculty, gender, and rank. Another project has been Campus Governance, arising as a result of changes in the terms of reference for UTM and UTSC Councils and subsidiary committees – and now for Governing Council and its committees. From June through December, 2012, with UTFA colleagues Judith Poë, Harriet Sonne de Torrens, and Connie Guberman, I was part of a coalition representing Student Unions across the three campuses, CUPE, and the Steelworkers. Working with Governing Council, we achieved improved representation and built a foundation for future cooperation. Working with leaders of student government has been a welcome new experience at the University; I represented UTFA on the panel at the UTMSU Town Hall on Education (in response to Glen Murray's PSE White Paper, September 26, 2012) and the dialogue continues on other issues.

On behalf of UTFA, I hosted Scott Prudham at an information session associated with a regular faculty meeting of the UTM Biology Department as well as hosting an

UTFA focus group on February 6, 2013, attended by UTFA members from the Departments of Psychology, Chemistry, Geography and Biology. I serve on four UTFA committees: Membership, Appointments, Grievance, and University Affairs.

Looking forward, I am a member of the SJAC subcommittee on Tenure and Promotions that has been preparing for meetings starting in April with the representatives of the Administration. I have been elected to the Academic Board for a two-year term commencing in the fall of 2013. Locally, I am developing a new course for top first-year science students at UTM and I intend to closely follow developments from the province regarding post-secondary education. I also intend to find avenues of effective expression to contest federal policies on the funding agencies and on communication by government scientists that are diminishing Canada's capacity for creative research, academic freedom, and our stature as a democracy.

Linda Kohn
Member-at-Large

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO FACULTY
ASSOCIATION**

FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

JUNE 30, 2012

Cowperthwaite Mehta

C H A R T E R E D A C C O U N T A N T S

INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT

To the Members,
University of Toronto Faculty Association:

Report on the Financial Statements

We have audited the accompanying financial statements of the University of Toronto Faculty Association, which comprise the balance sheet as at June 30, 2012 and the statements of changes in fund balances, operations and cash flows for the year then ended, and a summary of significant accounting policies and other explanatory information.

Management's Responsibility for the Financial Statements

Management is responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of these financial statements in accordance with Canadian generally accepted accounting principles and for such internal control as management determines is necessary to enable the preparation of financial statements that are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error.

Auditor's Responsibility

Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audit. We conducted our audit in accordance with Canadian generally accepted auditing standards. Those standards require that we comply with ethical requirements and plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free from material misstatement.

An audit involves performing procedures to obtain audit evidence about the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. The procedures selected depend on the auditor's judgment, including the assessment of the risks of material misstatement of the financial statements, whether due to fraud or error. In making those risk assessments, the auditor considers internal control relevant to the entity's preparation and fair presentation of the financial statements in order to design audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the entity's internal control. An audit also includes evaluating the appropriateness of accounting policies used and the reasonableness of accounting estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall presentation of the financial statements.

We believe that the audit evidence we have obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for our qualified audit opinion.

Basis for Qualified Opinion

In common with many not-for-profit organizations, the organization derives revenue from membership fees, the completeness of which is not susceptible of satisfactory audit verification. Accordingly, verification of this revenue was limited to the amounts recorded in the records of the organization, and we were not able to determine whether any adjustments might be necessary to membership fee revenue, excess of revenue over expenses for the year, assets and fund balances.

Qualified Opinion

In our opinion, except for the effect of adjustments, if any, which we might have determined to be necessary had we been able to satisfy ourselves concerning the completeness of membership fee revenue, the financial statements present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the University of Toronto Faculty Association as at June 30, 2012, and its financial performance and its cash flows for the year then ended in accordance with Canadian generally accepted accounting principles.

Cowperthwaite Mehta

Chartered Accountants
Licensed Public Accountants

September 19, 2012
Toronto, Canada

187 Gerrard Street East Toronto Canada M5A 2E5 Telephone 416/323-3200 Facsimile 416/323-9637



UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO FACULTY ASSOCIATION

BALANCE SHEET

AS AT JUNE 30, 2012

	2012	2011
ASSETS		
Current assets		
Cash (note 4)	\$ 434,903	\$ 233,422
Marketable securities (note 5)	2,399,526	2,407,890
Accounts receivable	14,032	13,666
Prepaid expenses	<u>12,010</u>	<u>9,124</u>
	<u>2,860,471</u>	<u>2,664,102</u>
Capital assets (note 6)	<u>28,144</u>	<u>59,426</u>
	<u>\$ 2,888,615</u>	<u>\$ 2,723,528</u>
LIABILITIES AND FUND BALANCES		
Current liabilities		
Accounts payable and accrued liabilities	\$ <u>150,076</u>	\$ <u>249,066</u>
Fund balances		
Invested in capital assets	28,144	59,426
Contingency reserve (note 7)	750,000	750,000
Unrestricted	<u>1,960,395</u>	<u>1,665,036</u>
	<u>2,738,539</u>	<u>2,474,462</u>
	<u>\$ 2,888,615</u>	<u>\$ 2,723,528</u>

Approved on behalf of the UTFA Council:

see accompanying notes

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO FACULTY ASSOCIATION

STATEMENT OF CHANGES IN FUND BALANCES

FOR THE YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012

	2012			2011	
	<u>Unrestricted</u>	<u>Invested in capital assets</u>	<u>Contingency reserve (note 7)</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Total</u>
Balance, beginning of year	\$ 1,665,036	\$ 59,426	\$ 750,000	\$ 2,474,462	\$ 2,235,439
Excess of revenue over expenses for the year	264,077			264,077	239,023
Amortization	<u>31,282</u>	<u>(31,282)</u>			
Balance, end of year	<u>\$ 1,960,395</u>	<u>\$ 28,144</u>	<u>\$ 750,000</u>	<u>\$ 2,738,539</u>	<u>\$ 2,474,462</u>

see accompanying notes

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO FACULTY ASSOCIATION**STATEMENT OF OPERATIONS****FOR THE YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

	2012	2011
REVENUE		
Membership fees (note 8)	\$ 2,530,086	\$ 2,492,309
Operating subsidies (note 9)	95,258	66,393
Investment income (loss)	<u>(6,725)</u>	<u>177,768</u>
	<u>2,618,619</u>	<u>2,736,470</u>
EXPENSES		
Staffing and related	718,175	666,901
Legal, audit and consulting	549,892	786,295
CAUT (Canadian Association of University Teachers) fees	372,975	366,475
OCUFA (Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Assoc.) fees	320,944	312,537
Stipends	87,080	101,122
Rent	88,227	59,312
Donations and contributions	55,200	800
Office and general	33,883	34,915
Meetings, conferences and training	33,037	38,717
Outreach	18,382	47,352
Office equipment	14,952	9,297
Committee expenses	11,488	8,442
Insurance	8,710	8,592
Tuition scholarships	6,046	6,406
Library	3,357	2,400
Advertising and communications	912	819
Amortization	<u>31,282</u>	<u>47,065</u>
	<u>2,354,542</u>	<u>2,497,447</u>
EXCESS OF REVENUE OVER EXPENSES FOR THE YEAR	<u>\$ 264,077</u>	<u>\$ 239,023</u>

see accompanying notes

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO FACULTY ASSOCIATION

STATEMENT OF CASH FLOWS

FOR THE YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012

	<u>2012</u>	<u>2011</u>
OPERATING ACTIVITIES		
Excess of revenue over expenses	\$ 264,077	\$ 239,023
Non-cash items:		
Amortization	31,282	47,065
Net change in non-cash working capital items (below)	<u>(102,242)</u>	<u>(18,949)</u>
Cash provided from operations	<u>193,117</u>	<u>267,139</u>
INVESTING ACTIVITIES		
Decrease (increase) in marketable securities	8,364	(204,159)
Purchase of capital assets	<u> </u>	<u>(33,134)</u>
Cash provided by (used for) investing activities	<u>8,364</u>	<u>(237,293)</u>
NET CASH ACTIVITY FOR THE YEAR	201,481	29,846
CASH, BEGINNING OF YEAR	<u>233,422</u>	<u>203,576</u>
CASH, END OF YEAR	<u>\$ 434,903</u>	<u>\$ 233,422</u>
Net change in non-cash working capital items:		
Accounts receivable	\$ (366)	\$ (1,763)
Prepaid expenses	(2,886)	(1,816)
Accounts payable	<u>(98,990)</u>	<u>(15,370)</u>
	<u>\$ (102,242)</u>	<u>\$ (18,949)</u>

see accompanying notes

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO FACULTY ASSOCIATION**NOTES TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS****JUNE 30, 2012**

1. THE FUND

The University of Toronto Faculty Association (the "Association") is an unincorporated association that was formed in 1940. The purpose of the Association is to promote the welfare of current and retired faculty, librarians and research associates of the University of Toronto, the University of St. Michael's College, the University of Trinity College and Victoria University and generally to advance the interests of teachers, researchers and librarians in Canadian universities.

The affairs of the Association are managed by a Council of about 60 people, who are elected by the membership on a constituency basis for three-year terms.

The Association is exempt from income taxes under section 149(1)(l) of the Income Tax Act.

2. SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES

The Association follows accounting principles generally accepted in Canada in preparing its financial statements. The significant accounting policies used are as follows:

Marketable securities held-for-trading

The Association has classified their marketable securities as "held-for-trading". The marketable securities are recognized at fair value based on market prices. Gains and losses from dispositions and fluctuations in market value are recognized in the statement of operations in the period in which they arise.

Capital assets

Capital assets are recorded at cost. Amortization is provided on a straight line basis over the assets' estimated useful lives as follows:

Furniture and equipment	Straight-line over 5 years
Computer equipment	Straight-line over 3 years
Leasehold improvements	Straight-line over 5 years

In the year of acquisition, amortization is charged at one-half the normal rates.

Capital assets are reviewed for impairment whenever events or changes in circumstances indicate that the carrying value of an asset may not be recoverable. Impairment is assessed by comparing the carrying amount of an assets with its expected future net undiscounted cash flows from use together with its residual value (net recoverable value). If such assets are considered impaired, the impairment to be recognized is measured by the amount by which the carrying amount of the assets exceed its fair value. Any impairment results in a write-down of the asset and charge to income during the year.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO FACULTY ASSOCIATION**NOTES TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS****JUNE 30, 2012**

Revenue recognition

The Association follows the deferral method of accounting for revenue. Membership fee revenue is composed of unrestricted contributions that are recognized as revenue when received or receivable, if the amount to be received is readily determinable and collection is reasonably assured.

Restricted contributions, if any, are recognized as revenue in the year in which the related expenses are incurred. Unspent restricted contributions are reported as deferred revenue on the statement of financial position.

Membership fees are calculated by multiplying a mill rate, as set by the organization, by the member's salary.

Operating subsidies are recognized in the period that the corresponding expense is incurred.

The change in fair value of the marketable securities for the year is included in investment income in the statement of operations. The investment income is composed of realized gains or losses for the year, unrealized gains or losses for the year, and interest and dividend income earned during the year.

Expense recognition

Expenses are recognized when incurred. The free rent is recorded at its contractual value (note 9).

Use of estimates

The preparation of the financial statements in conformity with Canadian generally accepted accounting principles requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities at the date of the financial statements and the reported amounts of revenue and expenses during the reporting period. Estimates are used when accounting for certain items such as asset impairments and disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities.

By their nature, these estimates are subject to measurement uncertainty and the effect on the financial statements of changes in such estimates in future periods could be significant.

3. FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS AND RISKS**Fair value of financial instruments**

The fair value of cash, accounts receivable, and accounts payable and accrued liabilities is approximately equal to their carrying value due to the short-term maturity of these instruments.

The fair value of marketable securities is approximated by their quoted market value.

Credit and concentration risks

A concentration of credit risk arises when a group of customers has a common economic characteristic, so their ability to meet their obligations is expected to be affected similarly by changes in economic or other conditions. For the Association, significant concentration of risk is related to the University of Toronto and its affiliated colleges which is the employer of all its members.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO FACULTY ASSOCIATION

NOTES TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

JUNE 30, 2012

4. CASH

Cash is composed of:

	<u>2012</u>	<u>2011</u>
Cash in bank	\$ 433,568	\$ 232,492
TD Waterhouse cash balance	1,035	630
Petty cash	<u>300</u>	<u>300</u>
	<u>\$ 434,903</u>	<u>\$ 233,422</u>

5. MARKETABLE SECURITIES

Marketable securities, which are classified as held-for-trading and are held by TD Waterhouse, are composed of the following, at market value:

	<u>2012</u>	<u>2011</u>
Canadian common shares and equivalents	\$ 1,637,699	\$ 301,715
Canadian short-term notes and equivalents	761,827	750,000
Mutual funds	<u> </u>	<u>1,356,175</u>
	<u>\$ 2,399,526</u>	<u>\$ 2,407,890</u>

6. CAPITAL ASSETS

Capital assets, recorded at cost, are as follows:

	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Accumulated Amortization</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2011</u>
Furniture and equipment	\$ 107,821	\$ 93,306	\$ 14,515	\$ 24,699
Computer equipment	<u>31,090</u>	<u>17,726</u>	<u>13,364</u>	<u>23,728</u>
	<u>\$ 138,911</u>	<u>\$ 111,032</u>	27,879	48,427
Leasehold improvements			<u>265</u>	<u>10,999</u>
			<u>\$ 28,144</u>	<u>\$ 59,426</u>

7. CONTINGENCY RESERVE

The Association's Council has restricted \$750,000 of its net assets to be held as a reserve for salary, benefits and pension negotiations, major grievances, academic freedom and other contingencies. This internally-restricted amount is not available for other purposes without the approval of the Council.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO FACULTY ASSOCIATION

NOTES TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

JUNE 30, 2012

8. MEMBERSHIP FEES

Membership fees are from the following sources:

	<u>2012</u>	<u>2011</u>
University of Toronto	\$ 2,460,034	\$ 2,442,035
Retired members	35,797	21,400
University of Victoria College	18,603	15,955
University of St. Michael's College	10,993	8,819
University of Trinity College	<u>4,659</u>	<u>4,100</u>
	<u>\$ 2,530,086</u>	<u>\$ 2,492,309</u>

9. OPERATING SUBSIDIES

Under an agreement, the University of Toronto provides the Association with various services, the most significant of which are free rent and a telephone line subsidy. The market value of the rent and telephone line have been recorded as expenses and corresponding subsidies in the statement of operations.

In addition, the Association has an agreement with the University of Toronto for the university administration staff to provide for teaching release times equivalent to 2.500 full time employees ("FTE") (2.5 FTE in 2011). For the year ended June 30, 2012, the release times were as follows:

	<u>2012</u>	<u>2011</u>
	<u>FTE</u>	<u>FTE</u>
President	0.825	1.000
Vice President - Grievances	0.400	0.500
Vice President - Salary, Benefits and Pension	0.400	0.400
Vice President - University and External affairs	0.125	0.100
Treasurer	0.125	0.100
Chair - Appointments Committee	0.125	0.100
Chair - Equity Committee	0.125	0.100
Chair - Librarians Committee	0.125	0.100
Chair - Teaching Stream Committee	0.125	0.100
Chair - Membership	<u>0.125</u>	<u>0.100</u>
	<u>2.500</u>	<u>2.500</u>

In 2012, only 2.175 FTE release time was claimed by the Association. The remaining 0.325 is being carried forward to 2013.

The value of these salaries and benefits paid by the University of Toronto is not reflected in the financial statements.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO FACULTY ASSOCIATION**NOTES TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS****JUNE 30, 2012**

10. CONTRACTUAL OBLIGATION

The Association is committed to minimum payments under an operating lease agreement for office equipment expiring June 30, 2015. Future annual minimum lease payment are as follows:

2013	\$	4,906
2014		4,906
2015		<u>4,906</u>
	\$	<u>14,718</u>

UTFA Annual General Meeting 2012 | Minutes

Wednesday, April 18, 2012, 3:00 to 5:30 p.m.
Faculty Club – Main Dining Room – 41 Willcocks Street

W. Nelson called the meeting to order at 3:25 p.m.

1. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

It was duly moved and seconded that

the minutes of the April 2011 meeting be approved.

W. Nelson requested one change.

K. Weaver, seconded by, R. Locklin, moved that

the minutes of the April 2011 meeting be approved as amended.

Carried

2. Introduction of Jennifer Tsoung, Al Miller Memorial Award Recipient, and Yunjeong Lee, UTFA Undergrad Tuition Award Recipient

L. Tremblay introduced Jennifer Tsoung and Yunjeong Lee.

Jennifer Tsoung, the recipient of the Al Miller Memorial Award, works in the field of Chemistry and has won numerous awards, including an NSERC USRA and the Canadian Society of Chemistry Silver Medal. Yunjeong Lee, the recipient of the UTFA Undergraduate Tuition Award, is a double major in Human Biology (Global Health) and Anthropology.

Jennifer Tsoung and Yunjeong Lee thanked the members of UTFA for their generous support.

The members showed their appreciation through applause.

L. Tremblay thanked the members of the University and External Affairs Committee for their efforts in reviewing all the applications for this year's awards.

2. Reports of the Officers

W. Nelson said that written reports were included in the *Newsletter* and asked the members if they had any questions of the Officers.

Report of the President

There were no questions.

Report of the Vice-President, Salary, Benefits and Pensions

There were no questions.

Report of the Vice-President, Grievances

There were no questions.

Report of the Vice-President, University and External Affairs

There were no questions.

Report of the Treasurer

There was a discussion, initiated by a question from the floor, about the reasons behind expenditures for external legal fees.

D. Patrick replied that over those years the two main sources of legal costs were grievances and salary, benefits and pensions negotiations and from year to year there are spikes and then dips.

G. Luste noted that the Administration uses lawyers and so we need lawyers. Our legal expenses increase when salary, benefits and pensions negotiations take place over two years; we may have large bills for one year but not the second. Mediator and arbitrator fees are also part of the expenses.

G. Luste also emphasized that some grievances, though expensive, UTFA takes on because they involve important issues of principle. And, he pointed out, carrying grievances and negotiating compensation agreements are core functions of the Association.

3. Reports of the Chairs of Committees

W. Nelson said that written reports were included in the *Newsletter* and would not be read at the meeting. He asked the members if they had any questions of the Chairs of Committees.

Report of the Chair of the Appointments Committee and Workload Advisory Committee

A member asked about a statement on page 22 of the *Newsletter* that “The Appointments Committee will be considering administrative appointments policy.”

J. Teichman said that the issue had to do with the selection of chairs and our concerns about process.

Report of the Chair of the Equity Committee

There were no questions.

Report of the Chair of the Librarians Committee

There were no questions.

Report of the Chair of the Membership Committee

There were no questions.

Report of the Chair of the Teaching Stream Committee

There were no questions.

5. Changes to UTFA Constitution and By-laws – Motions

R. Locklin said that two separate motions were necessary to implement the changes to the Constitution and By-laws being presented. The first, to amend the Constitution, required approval by 2/3 of the members present. The second, to change the By-laws, required a simple majority. Because the motions were so intimately related, it seemed appropriate to propose them as one motion. If it were approved by 2/3 then both changes could go through.

Main motion:

UTFA Council, seconded by H. Sonne de Torrens, recommends that the UTFA Constitution and By-laws be amended in accordance with the revised language dated April 18, 2012. These changes will take effect immediately upon being passed by the membership at the Annual General Meeting.

R. Locklin asked S. Prudham to provide some background information.

D. Losell rose on a point of order. Article 4.4 of the Constitution indicates that members of Council shall be

elected by the regular members of the Association, which she indicated the members of USMC are not. Nor can the membership of the USMC bargaining unit be part of UTFA. You cannot vote on something that contradicts your organization’s constitution and by-laws.

W. Nelson said that changes to the Constitution over the years were made by a 2/3 vote. He believed that the solution to the question presented was that if the members voted by 2/3 to change the Constitution and By-laws then that could be done. W. Nelson said that the discussion could proceed and members who opposed the changes could vote against the motion.

S. Prudham provided some background. The faculty and librarians at St. Michael’s College certified, with UTFA as their bargaining agent, and were presently negotiating a first contract with St. Michael’s College. They have been UTFA members for many years. What has changed is that they have certified and their relationship with their employer has changed. There were concerns about UTFA being able to represent them because they didn’t have any formal rights like UTFA has through the Memorandum of Agreement, with its grievance articles, Article 6, etc.

- In September 2009 S. Prudham and C. Messenger were invited to a meeting with USMC faculty and librarians concerning governance at USMC and the role of UTFA in representing USMC colleagues. In October 2010 an UTFA arbitration award was issued covering the compensation settlement for July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2011.
- The USMC administration imposed a wage freeze on its faculty and librarians instead of extending the salary increases in the arbitration award.
- USMC came to UTFA in December 2010 to ask for assistance. UTFA agreed to go to the provincial tribunal on public sector wage restraint to seek relief. In January 2011 USMC members asked to meet to discuss certification and their other options. Present were G. Luste and S. Prudham from UTFA and S. Barrett and C. Lace from Sack, Goldblatt, Mitchell. USMC members expressed a strong desire to stay within UTFA, and there was a long conversation about the pros and cons of certifying and other options.
- In February 2011 USMC members advised UTFA that they wanted to seek certification and formally asked UTFA to act as their bargaining agent under the Labour Relations Act.
- USMC’s administration fought the USMC-UTFA

application before the Labour Board and lost. The Board ruled that there is no legal impediment to UTFA's being the bargaining agent for a certified unit even though UTFA is not certified in its relationship with the University of Toronto.

- In February 2011 UTFA Council passed a motion stating, "UTFA Council approves UTFA's application for certification to the Ontario Labour Relations Board on behalf of the University of St. Michael's College faculty and librarians in order to be their bargaining agent."
- Nothing about this motion formally alters our relationship with our employer, U of T.
- Faculty and librarians at USMC are represented by us but have a different employer, USMC.
- In September 2011 bargaining for the USMC unit's first contract began.
- UTFA Council struck a committee to propose changes to the Constitution and By-laws that would allow us to administer this new relationship. This Committee consisted of R. Locklin, S. Prudham, M. Attridge, L. Tremblay, and H. Diggle (General Counsel) with advice from SGM.
- In February and March 2012 UTFA Council reviewed the draft changes to the Constitution and By-laws. Council voted in March to bring forward the changes presented to the AGM today.

S. Prudham said that there are 20 people (13 faculty and 7 librarians) in the bargaining unit

A member asked about a recent UTFA survey, and asked what justifies UTFA's dedicating resources to the USMC certification.

S. Prudham emphasized that the matter before the members was not whether or not we should be acting as an agent for USMC. That decision was made by Council. On certification our outreach has shown that the UTFA membership is divided; but the matter now before the members is the proposed changes to the By-laws and Constitution to administer the USMC unit.

S. Prudham explained that the Constitutional changes are needed so that all know what the norms are and to specify how we are going to give force to our role as bargaining agent. In certifying with UTFA they have given us a lot of responsibility and we should hold ourselves accountable.

A member asked what will happen if other groups at U of T approach UTFA with the same request.

S. Prudham noted that this was discussed at Council, and it was decided to deal with that question case by case .

R. Locklin said that he was the Chair of the Constitutional Review Committee. He has a joint appointment with St. Michael's College and the Department of Religion but is not a member of this bargaining unit.

R. Locklin said that the committee's duty was to look at the reality that USMC was the certified unit and UTFA was the trade union representing it, and to articulate the governance relationship between the members of this unit and the UTFA leadership.

He noted that three principles guided the committee's work.

The first principle was mutual autonomy.

The second principle was mutual accountability.

The third principle was that accountability will be left to the UTFA leadership.

In extreme circumstances the UTFA Executive or President can remove members of the USMC leadership team and/or appoint a temporary supervisor. Most issues will presumably be resolved locally, but the committee thought it important to stipulate clearly where the final authority lies in case of a disagreement or a form of misbehaviour.

R. Locklin welcomed questions on the Executive Summary and the proposed changes to the Constitution and By-laws. Most of the substantive content of the proposed changes would be in Article 18 of the By-laws. Most of the changes being proposed in other articles of the Constitution and By-laws were meant to harmonize them to the new Article 18. The most significant changes to the Constitution and By-laws were in Article 4.10 of the Constitution and Articles 2.5, 5.1, 6.1 and 7.6 of the By-laws.

The objection raised earlier questioned whether the change to Article 4.10 of the Constitution contradicts Article 4.4, which states that any member of Council has to be elected. Article 4.10 stipulates that the Chair of the USMC leadership team will be a non-voting *ex officio* member of Council. The committee's understanding is that this is covered by the clause that introduces 4.10, which says, "notwithstanding anything else in this Article, the Past-President of the Association, and any person who is an Officer of the Association or the Chair of any standing committee of Council and is not otherwise a member of

Council, shall be a member *ex officio*, with all the voting privileges of the elected members.”

A member asked about the proposal to raise the mil rate to .95, which will increase the present \$8,000 in dues from St. Michaels’s College by about \$1,000. U of T members presently contribute approximately \$2 million. How will UTFA separate that money? UTFA has already used other members’ money on the members at USMC.

S. Prudham said that UTFA has been conscious of extra costs and is trying to contain them. One way is to make better use of the services of CAUT, such as its collective bargaining support. Legal representation is expensive, because we have formal legal processes involving a third party mediator and, if necessary, arbitration. In more conventional collective bargaining, our advice for USMC is coming from CAUT, whose services we already pay for. The Olivieri case shows that when bad things happen it is important to be a member of CAUT. Another measure to contain costs is seeking to join the CAUT Defence Fund, which functions as a kind of insurance fund as well as support for faculty who are on strike. USMC members would contribute to that through a surcharge on the membership rates that would only apply to their 20 members.

S. Prudham introduced Peter Simpson, Assistant Executive Director of CAUT, who was invited to attend the AGM in part to acknowledge his assistance in the USMC bargaining.

P. Simpson said that the CAUT Defence Fund charges \$5 per insured member, gives them \$80 strike pay per day, and pays for continuing benefits as well as ancillary costs associated with a strike.

S. Prudham said that there is no doubt that costs will be incurred in this relationship but those will be greatest up front, as first collective agreements are usually the most difficult to negotiate.

A member asked why UTFA wanted to accept this role, with the added costs and added time.

S. Prudham said solidarity was the main reason. USMC members asked for our help and we agreed.

R. Locklin noted that the changes proposed are to make clear how those costs will be contained, e.g., the final word on grievances is with the Vice-President, Grievances. The revisions are meant to establish where

final authority lies on any decisions, including financial ones.

G. Luste said it is important to look at whether the cost is one-time-only or ongoing. One-time-only start-up costs are not unusual in our work.

USMC members have a different employer, but they have been under the U of T tent for decades. Our MoA does not cover St. Michaels’s, Trinity or Victoria, but the federated colleges have always tended to follow what the U of T faculty and librarians have. USMC faculty certified because in the last agreement their Administration refused to give them what UTFA negotiated, thus violating traditional practice.

A member asked what would happen to the relationship if the motion to change the Constitution and By-laws gets voted down.

S. Prudham said that the relationship would remain. UTFA would still be USMC’s bargaining agent. But how to administer that relationship would not be clear.

D. Losell rose on a point of order asking whether the changes proposed contravened the Constitution because they refer to “units,” and UTFA does not have units as members.

R. Locklin said that the Committee never thought of the unit as a member. The unit represents members.

W. Nelson said that UTFA’s concern is not whether the unit is a unit, but whether its members are members of UTFA, and he sees no problems with the wording.

A. Rubinoff, seconded by J. Newman, moved that:

the question be put.

Carried.

W. Nelson asked who was in favour of the first motion presented.

Carried.

The second motion deals with the mil rate of the USMC Unit.

S. Prudham said that this motion comes from the members of the unit. They felt that if they were going to ask UTFA to be the bargaining unit then they should pay a higher mil rate.

Second motion:

UTFA Council, seconded by H. Sonne de Torrens, recommends that the mil rate for the USMC unit members be adjusted to 0.95. This change will take effect on July 1, 2012.

Carried.

6. Apportionment – Motion

G. Luste called the members' attention to the sheet outlining the motion on apportionment.

UTFA Council, seconded by E. Damiano, moved that:

the Annual General Meeting accept the recommendation of the Apportionment Committee on the reapportionment of UTFA Council seats and constituencies.

The summary shows that the committee first divided the 56 seats of Council among eight sections, proportionally to the number of members as of January, using three apportionment methods. It then determined the number of seats for each constituency and thus the change in number of seats relative to the current apportionment. Council now has one seat too many (57, instead of the 56 prescribed by the Constitution) and this too was taken into account.

In the final outcome:

- Arts and Science (100) goes from 22 seats to 19 (-3 seats)
- UTM (200) maintains its 5 seats
- UTSC (300) goes from 5 seats to 6 (+1 seat)
- Engineering and Applied Science (400) maintains its 4 seats
- Medical Science (500) maintains its 5 seats
- OISE (600) maintains its 4 seats
- Professional Faculties (700) go from 8 seats to 10 (+2 seats)
- and Librarians (800) go from 4 seats to 3 (-1 seat)

G. Luste indicated that members from the eight sections participated at the initial meeting in February. All committee members but one voted for this breakdown of constituencies. The recommendation was approved by UTFA Executive and then by UTFA Council.

E. Sousa said that he participated in the Apportionment Committee. He argued that the calculation was not done

correctly, and that the Committee was not given enough time to deal with this matter. E. Sousa presented his own calculations, contending that Engineering should get one more seat.

G. Luste said that the committee tried to be as fair as possible.

M. A. Guttman, seconded by C. Guberman, moved that:

the question be put.

Carried.

W. Nelson asked who was in favour of the motion.

Carried.

7. Special Topics

(i) Looking back on the last decade at UTFA – Emeritus Professor George Luste

G. Luste talked about the effect of serendipity on life decisions – how you meet your future spouse, what career you choose – and on his coming to UTFA. In 1999 he was considering early retirement. He took a solo canoe trip in the south Arctic and, near the end, had to wait out the weather for three days on land. He kept busy by writing about things he had complained about, and pensions came to mind. He wrote 78 pages and decided to volunteer at UTFA. Three years later he became President.

In 2000–2001 UTFA was in a precarious financial situation. Income was marginal and hundreds of thousands of dollars were owed in legal expenses on the Olivieri case. Today UTFA has over \$2.5 million for future unexpected major issues. Early on, it was agreed that the Association's priorities would be salary, benefits and pensions negotiations; grievances, especially on tenure appeals; and making sure that PTR and ATB payments kept up with inflation. Then came a frightening moment when a previous Provost sent UTFA a letter, in December, on the last day of classes, advising that they were going to tear up the MoA unless we agreed to their terms about certain clinical faculty issues. UTFA realized then that it was not prepared to communicate urgently with its members. Today UTFA has over 3,200 email addresses, allowing for quick communication.

Over time, the office was renovated, computers were updated, and our website improved, though it is still a

work in progress. Our next imperative was greater member participation, so to make that happen we formed the Membership Committee. S. Prudham was the first chair, then Katharine Rankin took over.

The quality of our teaching and research was a constant concern. Increasing undergraduate numbers led to the emergence of workload as a key issue. The term “workload” somewhat obscures the central motivation of protecting our time to give good quality teaching and research.

After gathering over 20 years’ worth of actuarial annual reports G. Luste was able to get a picture of what had happened to the pension plan. Today we have a new Pension Committee. That took a lot of hard work, five years of negotiations, many appearances before the Business Board, and the writing of several information reports, providing facts and information rather than taking ideological positions. The UTFA website has links to many pension-related articles and newsletters, as well as items on the U of T budget model, how large undergraduate classes subsidize professional faculties, and other financial issues.

G. Luste said that UTFA needs to improve its staff support, its website, and the retiree membership database. Information for active members comes directly from Human Resources but we have to build the retired members’ records internally. Outreach to faculty is an ongoing priority: the purpose of UTFA is to represent our members.

G. Luste said that he is very concerned about the chronic underfunding of U of T’s mission to be an internationally competitive public research and teaching university. U of T is funded the same as every other university in Ontario, yet aspires to be at a higher level. There are more and more undergraduates per faculty member, and the portion of the total operating budget spent on instructional salaries has fallen by about one-third over the last 13 to 14 years. Information Report #20 from January 2012 shows that in that time U of T has added over 24,000 more undergraduate students, but it has not added more full-time teaching staff. An earlier report showed that undergraduate units have been subsidizing the professional faculties by \$40 to \$50 million per year over the last six years. These economic problems create the prospect of a permanent two-tiered faculty class – a very senior tenure stream permanent faculty and then a lower tier with lower salaries.

G. Luste said that U of T has foisted a major problem on members. For 17 years it put no money into the pension plan, nor did it put money in during years when markets

were very strong. UTAM (University of Toronto Asset Management) recently lost yet another billion dollars with its investments. The U of T pension plan is far worse off than that of any other university in Ontario.

G. Luste said that he will continue assisting with the transition for the incoming President, and also continue as Chair of the Pension Committee for the next two years.

He concluded with some remarks about William Nelson. Howard Marks, in his most recent newsletter, made him think of W. Nelson. Marks asked, “what good is history, after all it is in the past?” He went on to say, “the truth is, history can be one of our greatest aids, in investing as in life. . . . I feel a lot of my ability to add value comes from the amount of history I’ve witnessed and the significance I’ve extracted from it.” In that connection, W. Nelson did a great service when he published a history of the Faculty Association and then updated it in 2006. All members should read it.

G. Luste said that this would be W. Nelson’s last year at the AGM as chair. He asked the members to thank W. Nelson for his years of service to UTFA.

The members showed their appreciation through a standing ovation.

G. Luste also sincerely thanked all of the colleagues and staff who assisted him over the years.

W. Nelson thanked G. Luste for his kind words. He commented briefly on his own past, reminding members that he was part of the Association of Teaching Staff in 1969 and served for 17 years on the Executive Committee, 21 years on Council, and more as a non-member speaker. For the last decade he stayed around because he liked working with G. Luste.

(ii) Challenges in implementing the new workload policy and tri-campus issues – Professor Judith Teichman

J. Teichman said that in 2010, as chair of the Equity Committee, she authored a report with R. Chang on salary issues at U of T. She was often asked what she was doing about its findings: that gender inequality in salaries continued to exist at U of T and that there were tri-campus salary inequalities, with lower salaries at the east/west campuses. G. Luste recommended trying to get at the problem through a working group, and there was now a working group on salary inequality, focussed on the tri-campus

issue but also dealing with gender. Initially focussing on the tenure stream, it also intends to look at the teaching stream. The Administration's own reexamination of the data confirms UTFA's findings. One problem is that starting salaries are not collected centrally, so one must go directly to departments to obtain this information. It will probably emerge that there are different reasons for the salary inequalities, depending on the disciplines and departments.

Regarding workload, the Workload Advisory Committee wanted a policy developed that would protect time for scholarly research. It came up with the idea of having unit workload committees developing norms for distributing workload within the unit. In well administered units with empathetic Deans or Chairs who are concerned about equity among their faculty members, workload was not a big issue. However, in many parts of the University things do not work that way. Mechanisms are needed to ensure research time is protected. Even where things go well, a future Dean or Chair may be less empathetic and efficient.

Since the 1990s enrolment has doubled at both UTSC and UTM, creating some serious workload issues. Her concern is how the unit workload committee is going to get at the inequalities of workload in the same discipline across the entire university. The Tri-campus Workload Committee was established to address this. For example, TA support for Political Science at UTSC is considerably less than St. George colleagues could expect – thus workload can interfere with the research productivity of colleagues at the east/west campuses, who have a higher demand on their time for service and teaching.

J. Teichman advised the members that if they have any problems or questions on workload matters, they should write to workload@utfa.org. She already has a growing file of email. Many problems have been identified, from unrepresentative committees to faulty selection processes. The Workload Policy clearly says that there should be input from all faculty members on who is going to sit on the workload committees but in many cases this does not happen. Another issue is metrics. How do you measure people's workload? Most members teach courses, but this is not true everywhere. In some units there is a lot of one-on-one with students, and some people do much more of that than others. How do we get members of a unit workload committee to agree that some common metric ought to be developed? Workload documents arise at the local level and circumstances are very distinct across the campuses. Also, some unit workload committees were told by Chairs and

Deans that they could only codify existing practices. This was contrary to the original intent, which was that you may have good practices and you want to codify those, but you need to open everything up for discussion.

Many workload committees got started very late, especially where Chairs and Deans were resistant, and some of the workload documents are very vague, in some cases because administrators did not want too many details. The original intent of the Tri-campus Workload Committee had been to look at the different workloads in the same discipline across the three campuses, but now it can't do that because of directives not to provide the kind of detail that that requires. The committee will have to collect that data on its own.

She reiterated that any members who have concerns that she has not raised should write to her at workload@utfa.org and let her know.

(iii) Current bargaining and MoA issues – Professor Scott Prudham

S. Prudham reported that UTFA Council had approved without dissent a new agreement with the Administration, to form a Special Joint Advisory Committee (SJAC), with equal representation from UTFA and the Administration, to deal with the need to reform and modernize the MoA. The core terms of reference also include looking at the role of faculty and librarians in academic planning.

S. Prudham said that the final outstanding matter was the role to be played by a third party facilitator. UTFA insisted on some form of expert facilitation–mediation and two names have been agreed to. One is Frank Iacobucci, a former Supreme Court justice and also a former Provost and acting President at U of T. The other is John McCamus, a highly respected professor at Osgoode Hall Law School. The Administration would accept either and has asked UTFA to choose.

This agreement also creates two subcommittees, one to deal with outstanding concerns around tenure and one to advance negotiations over the new faculty stream, dealing with the current teaching stream and professional faculty.

It is important to understand, however, that there is no monetary settlement yet. The team is still working to get a mediated/voluntary settlement but there are serious unresolved issues. Arbitration dates have been scheduled for June and the team is working toward that deadline.

S. Prudham read from the agreement:

The Memorandum of Agreement governing the relationship between the University and the Association has been in existence for 35 years. During that period of time, its terms, including the process of collective bargaining and arbitration, has served the parties and the faculty, librarians, students and staff of the University of Toronto well. At the same time, while the Memorandum has been revised by mutual agreement on a number of occasions, the parties acknowledge that the terms and scope of the Memorandum warrant ongoing review and modernization.

The parties agree that consistent with the Memorandum's stated purpose to promote the welfare of the University and its faculty and librarians within a context of maintaining harmonious and collegial relationships within the University, it is time for a meaningful collegial discussion, examination and review of the Memorandum of Agreement and policies related thereto.

S. Prudham repeated that the parties have also agreed to examine the role of faculty and librarians in academic planning.

The members showed their appreciation through a standing ovation.

S. Prudham thanked the UTFA Bargaining Team for its hard work and long hours.

The members showed their appreciation through applause.

S. Prudham also thanked the members and their colleagues for their demonstrated support for UTFA's critique of the existing framework.

Members asked about the time frame for the SJAC discussions.

S. Prudham answered that the SJAC will do its work over the next academic year. He anticipated starting to meet in September.

P. Russell asked to say a few words about George Luste. George's period in office has been an extraordinary chapter in the life of UTFA and P. Russell asked the members to stand to thank G. Luste for his leadership.

The members showed their appreciation through a standing ovation.

8. Remarks by the President-elect

S. Prudham thanked P. Russell and mentioned plans for a special event marking G. Luste's presidency, probably in September.

S. Prudham introduced a video made by Paul Hamel and Judith Taylor on "Collegiality & Governance at the University of Toronto."

S. Prudham thanked the members who supported him to become the next UTFA President. There will be a lot of work to do and he looks forward to working with everybody.

The members showed their appreciation through applause.

9. Other Business

The video was shown. The members showed their appreciation through applause at the end.

J. Teichman thanked Paul Hamel and Judith Taylor for all the work they put into producing the video.

D. Bailey, seconded, K. Rankin, moved that:

the meeting adjourn.

Carried.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Chris Penn
Administrative Assistant



UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
faculty ASSOCIATION

PROMOTION TO SENIOR LECTURER WORKSHOP

Claude T. Bissell Building
140 St. George Street
Room BL205

Thursday, May 2, 2013
9:30 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

The University of Toronto Faculty Association is presenting a workshop to assist faculty members in the Teaching Stream in preparing for promotion consideration.

This workshop is open to all Teaching Stream members of the Association.

Members should register by email to faculty@utfa.org before April 25, 2013, with their name, department and/or faculty and rank (e.g., lecturer).

If you have any particular issues that you wish to discuss, please let us know in your email.

TENURE WORKSHOP

University College
15 King's College Circle
Room UC 179

Wednesday, May 8, 2013
2:00 to 3:30 p.m.

The University of Toronto Faculty Association is presenting a workshop on the three-year review and the tenure review.

This workshop is open to all members of the Association.

Members should register by email to faculty@utfa.org before May 1, 2013.

The workshop will focus on the following:

- The three-year review
- The tenure process