

## Faculty Salary Rationalization

by D.W. Sida

Many people are scared by this term: faculty, because it is thought of only in terms of equalisation to hold everyone at the same level and to protect the incompetent; the administrators, because their most glaring inequalities will come to light. As we are rational human beings (!) we should always welcome a rational salary policy. The combination of scale increases together with career progress increments is a step in this direction. However, a very necessary addition is a system of additional awards and corrections.

In the summer negotiations the administration declined to have anything to do with merit. They did agree, however, that the salary picture, with respect to anomalous distributions, will be investigated and anomalies will be corrected. A subcommittee has been set up under the collective agreement to make a feasibility study with a view to making recommendations on a future program of rectification. Your representatives are Barry Rutland and myself.

How big a problem remains to be seen because there have been so many complicating factors built in over the years. The most common include the inequalities between departments and faculties about hiring levels. (An initial salary could depend upon one's luck as regards the chairman or Dean, because there was no policy for establishing starting salaries.) A second systemic factor is the old merit scheme, whereby one's award could depend more on being friends with the chairman or being in his research field, than on being meritorious in the academic sense. Secrecy generates discrimination. Fortunately, the third usual factor, promotion, does not affect the problem since there are no maxima associated with the rank structure.

Although there is not a market differential scheme (the Association is committed to obtaining one) there are nonetheless, such differentials. These were obtained by private deals with Dean or President, rather than any peer evaluation; and of course were built in for life. The proposals made by the Association (and ignored by the Administration) called for such differentials to be of limited duration and then renewed if justified. We are also told that female anomalies have been dealt with. (The administration spent nearly six thousand dollars last year among female faculty in apparently correcting this problem!)

If a rational system calls for an improved relationship between salary and an academic index (based upon age, experience, qualifications, and contributions) how does one achieve this? Establishing such an index is virtually impossible if one expects precision. However, rather broader guidelines can be developed to remove the most glaring inconsistencies and to give people more confidence in pursuing a career in

*continued on page 2*

## Council Elections

An earlier CUASA Newsletter reported Council's approval of a revised system of representation: the new system, called "unit representation," attempts to make Council more nearly reflect the varied interests of a diverse university community. The principle essentially is that every department or School has at least one representative on Council, except for the very small departments which are invited to group themselves for representation.

More information on the details of unit representation will follow in the next Newsletter. But it is already certain that elections of Council members will be needed in approximately half of the departments, obviously those currently without any Council representative but also some that receive additional representation under the unit system.

The elections will be held in the week of 8 November. All departments affected by this change will shortly receive the procedural details, and a request for nominations! The unit system tries to make your Council more democratic, but the responsibility is yours to make the system work!

## PRESIDENT'S REPORT

### Who Calls The Shots

Andrew Brook

The Association has managed to get a copy of a remarkable letter from Harry Parrott, Minister of Colleges and Universities, to the University Presidents of the certified Universities. In it Parrott informs the University Presidents of how the provincial government is interpreting the AIB regulations in its relationships with its own employees, and 'urges' the Presidents to do likewise.

The province, Parrott says, is refusing to make any offers over the arithmetic guidelines as they interpret them, and in the event of a settlement (through arbitration, say) which is over the guidelines, is refusing to make any joint submission to the AIB to defend the settlement.

Needless to say, this letter constitutes an unwarranted interference by the MCU in the internal affairs of the Universities (which are private corporations, even to the point of having their own legislation).

However, the letter also makes even clearer the gloomy fact that our real paymaster — and the real agent sitting across the bargaining table from us—is the provincial government. A gloomy fact, because the sanctions which the law allows us cannot be brought directly to bear on the government. The need for province-wide bargaining is becoming urgent. If we are to suffer the liabilities of being treated as civil servants, we ought to develop the means to gain a few of the advantages, too—advantages such as high salaries and pension plans with the iron-clad guarantees of the power to tax behind them.

And in the meantime, what are our senior administrators doing about this sort of interference by the provincial government? I haven't heard of anything.

♦ ♦ ♦ ♦

Former Dean of the Faculty of Arts, L.M. Read, sent a Report on his year as Dean to the members of his faculty which contained some strong criticisms of faculty unionization. The report was circulated in August.

I was somewhat surprised by his criticisms. Professor Read played a key role in some of the negotiation last winter, negotiations which solved long-standing problems at Carleton. These problems would not have been solved without the pressure the Association was able to bring to bear. Professor Read, therefore, knows first-hand the advantages to the whole institution which unionization has brought.

One of Read's criticisms is that unionization accentuates what he calls standardization. By 'standardization' he seems to mean putting the rule of law in place of the rule of men—i.e. putting agreed, public, enforceable rules and regulations in place of private, unchallengeable administrative decision-making. I for one do not see that as a bad thing. Moreover, Read himself provides a classic example of what hap-



The New Pay Package

pens when decisions are not challengeable. He describes, early in his Report, the situation with respect to promotions in the Humanities last year—a situation which clearly upset him. Promotions, however, are almost the only item in the Collective Agreement where rights of grievance are abridged. The rule of law has its attractions.

Another of Read's criticisms is that unionization is built on mistrust between faculty and administrators. Read urges that there is no reason for such mistrust.

To this a number of comments are appropriate. First, trust or mistrust is not at issue. With the best will in the world, those making decisions make mistakes. A way of correcting mistakes must exist, a way which frees administrators of the difficult task of being the final and binding judge of their own decisions.

Secondly, a climate in which the rule of law prevails is a climate in which mistrust has no home.

Thirdly, when we are asking whether mistrust is appropriate, it is vitally important to distinguish between, say, Deans on the one hand, and, says members of the Board of Governors and provincial government on the other. Even if we grant the latter all the good will in the world, their lack of experience with universities and their various goals and priorities will virtually guarantee that often they will not do what we would consider to be in the interests of the Universities. This is so obvious as hardly to bear repeating.

Fourthly, Deans and other academic administrators are so loaded down with day-to-day work and particularly with day-to-day and year-to-year budgetary problems that it would, perhaps, be unrealistic to expect them to be able to give the long view of the university the attention it deserves. This task must be done by faculty who are not immersed in administration. It is to everybody's benefit if the faculty who are interested in doing so have the power and the mechanisms to ensure that their deliberations have some effect on University planning. Their futures, not to say the future of higher learning, are at stake.

Class war becoming Byzantine game-playing—that seems to be Read's forecast. Surely a situation of two parties, both with some power to force a decision, sitting together to resolve problems is as good a way as any to ensure that both parts of the forecast will be wrong.

\* \* \* \*

Two issues of some long-term importance are before us now: Guidelines on Workload, and Career Development Assessment Guidelines. A working paper prepared by members of the Association on each topic is reprinted elsewhere in this Newsletter. It is only a matter of time before the province again begins to make noises about our workload. We must be able to resist the sort of ham-handed messing around with quality of the education which would result. But we want guidelines which not only provide protection, but also fit comfortably with members' expectations. So let us have your comments.

\* \* \* \*

I've been approached by a number of members urging that the Association must begin to take some responsibility for the quality of the work done by professional academics. They argue (a) that no one else

is going to do it, and (b) we can hardly consider ourselves a *professional* association (unionized or not) until we take some responsibility for standards in the profession. I personally see some large practical problems with this suggestion. If we were a self-employed profession, things might be different. But we are not. I would be extremely interested to have members' reactions.

\* \* \* \*

This winter we must prepare our positions for the negotiations to come this summer. Are we satisfied with our grievance, promotion, career development, sabbatical, benefits, etc., etc. provisions? What new areas of terms and conditions of employment do we wish to see added to our Agreement? What should our salary objectives be? Are we satisfied that the proportion of university resources going to academic salaries is reasonable? — The quality of our next Contract will be in direct proportion to quality of the work done by the membership this winter on these and similar questions.

I urge everyone interested in such topics to let your name stand for Council in the elections soon to come, and also to let me or the office (ph. 6387) have your name and area of interest. A set of drafting committees will be formed very soon.

## Grievances

During the past year the Grievance Administration Committee has helped process eighteen individual, and nine Association grievances.

*Individual Grievances.* Most of the individual grievances were concerned with the denial of the Career Development Increment, although others involved a faculty appointment, a salary anomaly (female) and a formal reprimand. Three of the grievances were resolved by the University in favour of the grievor before the cases could be heard at a formal meeting of the Grievance Committee. As a result of one of these decisions, C.D.I.'s were awarded to two other faculty members who had not even filed a grievance!

Of the nine cases heard so far by the Grievance Committee only one of the decisions was in favour of the grievor. The Association, after some deliberation, has decided to take some of the stronger cases through to formal arbitration, an issue which we are presently discussing with our lawyers.

*Association Grievances.* Of the three Association grievances heard by the Grievance Committee one was judged not to fall within the jurisdiction of the committee, one case was dismissed on the basis of insufficient grounds, while the cause for complaint in the third grievance was remedied by the University. The other six Association grievances were withdrawn after being resolved by the Contract Administration Committee.

The University has turned down our informal request for a re-evaluation of those candidates in Group 1 (formerly Arts 1) who were denied promotion from the assistant to the associate professor level, even though they were recommended by either their departmental and/or divisional committees. The Association felt

that there was some indication that the guidelines for promotion for these candidates had not been strictly followed, and that the reasons given for denial were not specific enough. The Association will be going ahead with a formal grievance on this issue.

We are trying to reduce the time taken between the filing of the formal grievance and its hearing by the Grievance Committee. It should be remembered however that this is the first year of the implementation of the grievance procedures and as predicted there were many unforeseen difficulties. The decisions reached by the Grievance Committee, particularly those involving C.D.I.'s, have produced some important precedents, which along with the decisions reached by the arbitrator, should make the next round of hearings much easier.

---

## FACULTY SALARY RATIONALIZATION - continued from page 1

this University: an improvement in morale would be no bad thing. Of course, the fine tuning (as with promotions) would depend not upon objective measures like age but ephemeral quantities like good teaching and worthwhile research.

A beginning might be to set up minimum salaries based on some Academic Index; these should be related to comparable positions in the High School system and Federal Civil Service. We should begin with those up to the age of about 35-40.

Such a scheme would give some protection to junior faculty and also prevent the administration from under cutting salary levels.

An alternative could be a grid system from the floor of the assistant professor to the top of the career development scheme. Initial placing could be based largely on a formula, but with speed through the grid determined principally by the C.D.I. together with occasional additions for merit. Both would require what is now largely lacking, namely, peer evaluation on acceptable criteria, rather than solely on front office fiat.

Of course, merit can be separated out from Salary Rationalization if it is awarded as an annual affair while warranted, or given as a tax free research and travel grant. Merit can also be used to reinstate those denied a career development increment back to their previous position on a grid when they have made good the deficiencies. Grievance procedures will never replace criteria, peer evaluation, and timely warnings to individuals from Deans and Departmental Chairmen.

The advantage of a grid system with fixed steps is that the administrators are then required to justify divergences from it in a few specific cases and these instances are clear to the individuals concerned, since they would be aware of *what their salary should be* at any given state in their career.

We hope to arrive at other possible models in the course of the study. Initially, we will try to determine how difficult the task is and then attempt to produce some order out of the chaos we expect to find.

However, if you have any ideas please write to me c/o Department of Mathematics.

## New Group Life Insurance Plan

As you are aware, we were required to devise a new Group Life Insurance scheme by September 1st to meet provincial regulations that forbid the "diminishing term" type of plan we have had hitherto as discriminatory with regard to age. That plan was adopted originally to provide higher benefits to younger members of the bargaining unit, who generally have younger dependents and are at the lower end of the salary scales. The committee struck to deal with the problem of a new plan selected two models, one offering a Basic Death Benefit (BDB) of twice annual salary with optional coverage in units of 1 x Salary, and the other with the same BDB and a Survivor Income Benefit (SIB) of \$100.00 per month per eligible dependent.

The committee polled members on their preferences regarding the two models in June. Because any plan meeting the new provincial requirements would leave younger members at less coverage at higher costs, the committee recommended Model II, as providing higher net benefits to such members. About 150 members responded to the poll, splitting almost evenly between the alternatives. In view of the fact that there was no clear mandate for the model recommended, and that a plan based on that model would benefit an ever-decreasing minority of an aging population, the committee opted for a plan based on Model I, modified to meet the needs of younger members as far as possible.

The new plan provides a Basic Death Benefit of 2 x Annual Salary rounded up to the next \$1000.00 when not already a multiple of 1000 to every member of the unit. Thus, if your salary from September 1st is \$25,000 your insurance coverage is \$50,000; if it is \$17,700 it is \$36,000. In addition, members may purchase optional units of \$10,000 each to a maximum of \$100,000. This is more flexible than the options of salary multiples in the original Model I, which, on projection, tended to escalate rapidly in both cost and coverage. The total amount of insurance an individual may purchase under the new plan, basic and optional, is currently \$200,000.

Crown Life remains the carrier, since their rate for the BDB of \$0.16 per thousand dollars of coverage per month is about 40% less than that prevailing in the industry generally, and was bettered marginally by only one competitor, whose bid was less satisfactory in other respects. The optional feature is "steprated" according to age groups, from a monthly premium of \$0.60 per \$10,000 unit for members under 30 to \$11.60 for members between 60 and 64. These rates are a little more favourable to older members than those generally prevailing in the industry.

A new cost sharing arrangement was negotiated in the September 1st salary settlement as an integral feature of the plan from CUASA's point of view. The employer will pay 100% of the BDB, on the basis of an amount to each member sufficient to purchase coverage to 2 x the average annual salary of the unit, rounded to \$8.00 a month. This cost-sharing formula in conjunction with the \$10,000 optional units will permit younger members to match the coverage they enjoyed under the old plan at little or no additional costs to themselves. As an example, an individual 30 years of age, at a salary of \$15,000 and with three dependents, who, under the old plan had coverage of 7 units of \$12,744

= \$89,208, will receive under the new plan automatic coverage of 2 x \$15,000 = \$30,000, costing the University 3 x \$1.60 = \$4.80 a month. In addition, the university will pay \$8.00 - \$4.80 = \$3.20 towards the purchase of optional units; at the rate of \$0.70 per unit per month, this individual could purchase six units for an additional coverage of \$60,000 and a total coverage of \$90,000 augmented annually in relation to salary increases, for a period of five years at no greater personal cost than he or she incurred under the old plan and the old 50/50 cost sharing arrangement. If this individual did not wish to retain this high rate of coverage as the rates increased with age and need diminished, options could be shed, one or two at a time, to level costs and to achieve something like the diminishing term plan we have had to give up.

An older member, aged 50 with three dependents and earning \$30,000, will have basic coverage of \$60,000 costing him 6 x \$1.60 = \$9.60 - \$8.00 university contribution or \$1.60 per month, deducted from salary — an amount no greater than he or she has been paying under the old plan, in most cases. Of course, this individual would have to meet the costs of optional coverage from salary. However, under the old plan his/her units were worth only \$2,808 for a total coverage of \$19,656. Members who are at or near the average salary of the bargaining unit appear to benefit least from the new arrangement, for while their BDBs are met largely or wholly by the employer, they receive little or nothing towards the purchase of options. However, if such a member is over 40, he or she will gain absolutely in coverage, and if under 40, he/she can purchase options at relatively low cost. Altogether, the new plan together with the new cost-sharing arrangement, benefit all members of the bargaining unit as equitably as possible.

The new plan provides for conversion to an individual term plan for a year and to whole life thereafter, at standard rates, on resignation on retirement. A short-form medical statement is required for optional insurance, unless 75% of the unit seeks optional coverage, in which case evidence for insurability will be waived. It must be pointed out that any surplus from the employer's \$8.00 monthly contribution after the cost of the basic compulsory coverage has been met can be used only to purchase optional insurance; it cannot be applied to other benefits or taken in salary.

Barry Rutland

## Faculty Workload Proposal

Academic workload is a complex problem. Members of faculty have four main functions as indicated in the Rights and Responsibilities clause (Article 15):

1. Teaching
2. Research/scholarship or creative professional contributions, and professional development
3. Governance and Administration
4. Service to their profession and the community

It is difficult to identify the exact proportions of these activities in the work profile of individual faculty members. Moreover, it varies from person to person, because the institution has always allowed some specialization of function. Individual faculty members may be more oriented to lower, or upper, level teaching. Some produce more scholarship than others and some direct more research students. Thus any useful guideline must deal with average workload over some given unit of faculty members. In an 11 month working year, an approximate division of faculty functions at Carleton is:

Teaching 50%

Research and Scholarship 35%

Governance, Administration and Service to the learned professions and the Community 15%

However, this must be interpreted cautiously. Two problems plague all attempts to subdivide academic workload. First, teaching and scholarship are frequently joint products of the same effort. Secondly, teaching effort is best considered in terms of *inputs*: contact hours and class sizes. Research effort is best considered in *outputs*, such as books, articles, papers, manuscripts, and reports. These two problems will lead to the caution exhibited in the formulae below, of which there are two. The first proposal will address teaching workload. The second will address the other matters.

### A. Teaching Workload

Accepting the proposition that a typical lecture course of 3 hours per week implies at least 2 hours per class hour for preparation, grading, and student counselling, a basic teaching assignment of 3 lecture courses or equivalent, (\*see the proposition in A(2) below on determining equivalents), implies a weekly work load from September through April of 27 hours. On the basis of a 40 hour work week this is 68% of workload. Weighted for the full eleven month working year this constitutes 49% of workload. In full appreciation of the fact that most members of the faculty are prepared to accept a workload in excess of 40 hours per week\* (and that there are a few unusual holidays in the academic calendar) we accept as additional to three courses, the supervision of an average of two thesis students in graduate or honours programs.

There is another factor. Unusually large courses impose special problems of grading and student counselling as well as maintenance of quality of instruction. Teaching is a process of poorly understood human interaction. If it is to succeed, teaching must allow a humane element to emerge. This implies the recognition of the student as a

person (as was said in the sixties) not to be "folded, spindled or mutilated". Carleton University, with its historic involvement with the community, bears a special responsibility to preserve individual rights and values. To enable faculty to treat students humanely, and since quality of instruction often varies inversely to numbers taught, there must be an upper limit on the number of students for whom each faculty member bears responsibility. Although different methods of organizing teaching allow for some variations in class size, it is again useful to set guidelines on average. The desirable average is 75 student courses per faculty member. The elite American institutions and many British institutions would not allow the value to exceed 48 student courses per faculty member. In consequence of these considerations, we propose the following regulations:

1. The teaching workload for full time faculty members of the bargaining unit shall be regulated by an average for the faculty or school. The maximum average\*\* for a faculty or school shall be the equivalent of 3 full lecture courses (taking account of all scheduled and tutorial graduate and under-graduate teaching) and the supervision of 2 honours or graduate thesis students per year.
2. Other forms of teaching are to be related to the standard 3 lecture hour course reference format. To achieve the best guidelines here, the parties agree to request each faculty board to develop guidelines for relating the other types of instruction given in its faculty to the standard lecture format and report these to the Senate. The parties further agree to request the Senate to forward an approved list of faculty board reports to the JCAA for use in administration of this workload policy and to invite the Senate to report changes from time to time as teaching practices evolve. If the faculty boards and Senate do not agree to the request or do not forward such guidelines to the JCAA within eight months, the parties agree to reconstitute the workload committee to develop them.
3. An average load of 75 plus or minus 7 student courses per FTE faculty member shall be set as an objective to be achieved in each faculty within 3 years. The average for the university as a whole shall not be allowed to move away from the objective in any year and the average for a faculty shall not be allowed to move away from the objective in two consecutive years.
4. In any given year the amount of time devoted to each of the many functions of faculty members varies considerably from person to person. Moreover, the particular situation of various departments sometimes imposes special demands on faculty members' time. It is, therefore, impossible for all faculty to fall within the regulations above in each year. However, some limits are desirable, in order to ensure that all members of faculty have time for all their essential functions. The parties, therefore, agree as follows:
  - i) Usually heavy governance, administrative, service or research/scholarship commitments will be compensated by a reduction in teaching assignments.
  - ii) Teaching workload of an individual faculty member shall not exceed the average number of courses (ie. the equivalent of three) by more than 1/6th in any

given year, the total number of student course credits for which an individual faculty member is responsible shall not exceed the average by more than 1/3 in any given year, and where an individual faculty member's teaching workload does exceed the average, there shall be a corresponding reduction in the institution's expectations concerning the individual's performance of his/her other main functions. An individual member of faculty may, however, voluntarily accept a teaching workload greater than the maximums specified if either

- (a) he/she indicates in writing (with a copy to the Association) that he/she is willing to do so, or
- (b) he/she is paid for overload teaching at the agreed rates. No teaching assignments which are greater than the average of the equivalent of three courses will be made for a period of greater than one year without the written consent of the faculty member concerned.

In determining the teaching workload of an individual faculty member, allowance will be made, on a reasonable basis, for participation in his/her courses of other faculty members and for any assistance he/she may receive from teaching assistants, demonstrators, post-doctoral students, etc.

No faculty member will be expected to exceed the average of the equivalent of three courses, or the average of 75 plus or minus 7 student credit courses, in any year in which he/she is offering more than one course for the first time. In any year in which a faculty member is offering the equivalent of two or more courses for the first time, every effort will be made to arrange a total teaching assignment which is under the averages stated in these regulations.

Credit will be given for teaching which occurs outside an individual faculty member's department, and the University will use transferred teaching assignments wherever it would be academically sound to do so, in order to alleviate inter-faculty imbalances in teaching loads and achieve the averages stated in these regulations.

#### B. Research/Scholarship

No limits can be set on research activities; nor is it possible to determine research or scholarly productivity in any precise way. While a faculty member's research or scholarly activities must be considered for other purposes, they enter into a workload policy only to the extent that the value of such activities, and their central place in a university, must be recognized. The advancement of knowledge can only occur in an atmosphere of active and creative research and scholarship. The Employer thus agrees to assign the various functions of faculty members other than research and scholarship (and professional development, which flows naturally out of research/scholarship) in such a way as to ensure that every faculty member has time to pursue his research or scholarly interests and engage in professional development. In order to make possible a collective understanding of the work being done in the institution, the parties have already agreed, in Article 15.7, to a procedure for reporting research or scholarly activities.

#### C. Governance/Administration and Service

The Deans of the Faculties shall undertake to ensure a reasonable distribution of assignments with respect to Administration and Governance. They may compensate unusually heavy commitments in either area or with respect to service to the learned professions or the community.

\* Studies at Toronto and the University of California place faculty work week between 40 to 60 hours.

\*\*Since many members of the bargaining unit carry special administrative responsibility, e.g. acting as chairmen, the desirable average is somewhat below the maximum.



With this edition of the Newsletter begins a new feature — a Letters column. Below are three responses to the Editor's personal soliciting, Janice Yalden telling of her experiences with research expenses and income tax and two criticisms of the CDI part of the collective agreement. The Letters column is intended to be a forum for any matter of concern to the CUASA membership. It is, for example, one more way Council and the Steering Committee can ascertain the members' feelings with respect to their efforts to date and what should be done in the future negotiations.

So send your letters to the Editor, CUASA Newsletter, 424 HP.

### Research and Income Tax

#### The Editor

Since taxes are ever with us, perhaps an account of my recent experiences in filling out the loathsome tax form may be of assistance to some of our colleagues. In the fall of 1975 I carried out a piece of contract research, and on reading the 1975 CAUT income tax guide, found that I could claim as deductions against the professional income thus earned, certain expenses connected with operating an office in my residence. Since I was not completely sure of how to proceed even after studying the CAUT guide, I consulted some of my wiser, though not necessarily older, colleagues and also talked with the CAUT-OCUFA tax expert, Charles Hebdon.

We all agreed that it would be unwise to claim capital cost allowance on the value of that part of my house being used as an office for the research, because "previously allowed capital cost allowance may be recaptured and included in income if the assets being depreciated are subsequently sold or converted to a non-business use." (CAUT income tax guide 1975, p. 4.) Even if I never moved, whenever I ceased to use my study as an office, the amount allowed for such use would be included in my income for the year and I could be faced

eventually with a large and unwelcome income tax bill.

However, it seemed that I might charge other expenses, and here I received varying accounts of how to proceed. It seems that there are many styles, and in any case I was cautioned not to use the CAUT guide as though it were a template. What I came up with was a statement of the following:

- a) office expenses and operating costs;
- b) an amount for purchase of supplies;
- c) an amount for books and periodicals directly related to the research in question; and
- d) capital cost allowance on the furniture and equipment in my study, including an amount for additions in 1975 (e.g. typewriter, shelves), calculated at 20% depreciation.

I also attached to my return a detailed statement of how I arrived at (a), namely by calculating the cost for the year for the entire house of realty taxes, interest on mortgage, repairs, insurance, heat, phone, water, light, etc. and dividing by the number of rooms in the house. I kept all receipts, and was especially careful in assembling those under (c).

I was advised by all to charge only a reasonable proportion of the professional income: 25-33% was the suggested range. As it happened, I had calculated an amount equivalent to about 27% of the income as the cost of carrying office operating costs. I submitted my return, and was advised that the amount of tax had been correctly calculated. I would strongly advise any colleagues who have earned extra professional income for the first time and who have incurred the expense of maintaining a study or office in their homes or used their automobile or incurred travel expenses in order to earn such income, to study the CAUT income tax guide and to consult others before submitting their tax returns. It takes time, to be sure, but can represent some saving in the long run.

#### Janice Yalden, Linguistics

*Ed. note:* Charles Hebdan, the CAUT-OCUFA tax expert, can be reached at 416 - 979-2117. And the Editor also has had personal profit from his uncanny ability to unravel the labyrinthine puzzles of income tax law, especially with respect to research, sabbaticals, and the like.

## CDI Woes

The Editor

With the current re-openers out of the way, let me express my admiration for the present and past negotiating teams' zeal, responsibility, imaginativeness, and, above all, determination. Speaking as one who in the early days had misgivings about certification and who, while contributing nothing to the task, has gained much from the labours of those who have fulfilled it, ill would it beseem me to voice any criticisms of the settlements made so far. Nevertheless, if I had any I would still voice them — but in fact I have none.

That doesn't mean I don't have a few notions to air that I hope next year's negotiators will ponder. One is an old bugbear — the unfairness of across-the-board percentage settlements. I still believe that



"And now apparently we have to listen to some sort of dissent."

these should be weighted in favour of the low paid junior faculty members; that 10% for example, on the pay cheque of an \$18,000 assistant means relatively more than the same 10% for a \$28,000 associate; that if 8% were agreed on as a global average increase and if faculty salaries could be divided into three approximately equal groupings, then 10% for the lowest third, 8% for the middle group, and 6% for the top third would be more equitable. I am not convinced by the usual management argument that in consequence senior people would move elsewhere for more money. There aren't many such openings, and if there were the candidates might well go anyway. A few such losses did occur this year and I doubt if money had much to do with them.

My other bugbear is a new one. My hat would be off to any negotiating team that fought to get rid of that execrable CDI scheme. Harmful alike to individual morale and departmental esprit de corps, shameful in its expense of spirit, and wasteful of everyone's energy, the plan can hardly be said to reward a deserving few when, 80% or more in a department may receive it. What it does, rather than rewarding true (and hence exceptional) merit, is penalize an undeserving few for demerit, and in the nature of things it does so very capriciously. Thereby igominy is suffered by the scapegoats and distress by their colleagues, who all too often can see no reason for the separation. Scrap it and re-cycle most of the money into scale increase. Not all of it, however. Set up a true merit bonus fund and let the various levels of administration decide how to reward a favoured few instead of penalizing a disfavoured few. (With those very few who really are

undeserving, not simply of a bonus but in fact of what the average satisfactory person gets, there are other ways of dealing.) But no one likes to be the only person in a group black-listed on sometimes tenuous, even specious grounds for a mere CDI, though judged otherwise satisfactory; nor do the colleagues of that person enjoy the spectacle. Conversely, no one worth while would be envious if one out of that group were chosen for special recognition. Nor does such a one-shot award have to be made in cash; and it certainly should not be cumulative, as the CDI is now. For example, the meritorious person could take the bonus in such tax-free perquisites as three-year subscriptions to professional journals, all-expense paid trips to conferences, typing and research allowances, free xeroxing, and similar benefits. Or cold cash, of course, if preferred.

Well, it's easy enough to write letters like this — a lot easier than trying to write one's book, to be sure. Thanks, though, to a certain degree of security achieved by CUASA for its members, one can go at that grim task with a slightly easier mind than in the dark days a few years ago, when scholarly labours of that kind were beyond powers of human concentration. In that respect, the administration owes CUASA a debt of thanks.

Douglas Wurtele  
Dept. of English

The Editor

A number of CUASA members are not very happy with the Career Development Increment as it is currently applied. It

seems to be neither fish nor fowl, neither a recognition of merit nor an automatic award for duty done. The small percentage of instructors who did not receive a CDI seem, by virtue of their number, to have been arbitrarily dealt with.

Perhaps the CDI was invented to circumvent the restrictions imposed by the Anti-Inflation Board. If so, perhaps it will disappear with the demise of the AIB, and that will be that.

But if the Union and the Administration are looking for ways to encourage superior scholarship and teaching through financial incentives, I would hope that together they might consider the establishment of a general fund for each division from which an annual award for superior teaching and/or scholarship might be made. The award would sponsor a paid leave of absence for the recipient during which he would pursue some scholarly interest. Such an award seems a more palpable recognition of both merit and service than the current CDI, even though most of us might never receive it.

**Faith Gildenhuys**  
Assistant Professor, English

## The Kantowicz Affair

Last spring Professor Edward Kantowicz (History) laid a charge before the Ontario Labour Relations Board. He alleged that CUASA had achieved its certification by fraud and misrepresentation, by virtue of the fact that members had not been informed of the legal restrictions surrounding the application of the Rand formula with respect to diverting dues to a charity.

The charge was heard in Toronto early in July. Late in August we received the ORLB decision, in which it was pointed out that CUASA's Rand formula was much more liberal than the law requires, that the affirmation of conscientious objection which CUASA and the University agreed to request was well within the spirit of the relevant legislation, that the list of charities available was a broad and reasonable list, that in any case the charity list was protected from bias—an unusual feature—by the requirement CUASA accepted voluntarily that it must be acceptable to the Administration, and that, in sum, there was no cause to continue the hearing. The Board then terminated the hearing—an unusual procedure which seems to be reserved for especially groundless complaints. (The Board usually simply finds for or against the complainant.)

The Board decision will prove very useful in the years to come, because it is the first extended clarification of the Board's attitude to Rand formula conscientious objections. It is a carefully reasoned statement, and will help all Ontario Associations form a clearer and more thoroughly reasoned attitude to the question. (Copies of the full decision are available at the CUASA office, 424 HP.)

The Association and the Administration had in fact agreed to accept his choice of charity quite some time before his charge was heard by the ORLB.

Cost to the Association of defending this action: about \$1,000.

*Ed. note: The following article from the Student Association appears in keeping with the wish to make the Newsletter a forum open to ALL segments of the university community.*

## National Student Day

The essence of National Student Day is involvement. That can be done at first by becoming directly involved in trying to direct the future of education in Canada through serious discussion of the issues confronting us. Last May, by a unanimous vote, the representatives of over 200,000 post-secondary students of the National Union of Students created a program to culminate in National Student Day. They did so on the basis of concern — concern over a lack of planning and direction in education in Canada, cutbacks striking at social services and education, unemployment for both undergraduates and post graduates, the current negotiations over the Fiscal Arrangements Act, the relation ship between the post-secondary institutions and labour, and in general with the crisis in Canadian education stemming from a lack of coherent priorities and principles for guiding that education system.

Here at Carleton we intend to address all these questions on November 9th. At the moment we have an afternoon and evening of workshops and speakers. The participants invited to direct discussion are knowledgeable and eminent persons from the community and the university. It is our hope that the debate can form a publishable record of National Student Day.

Many students are undoubtedly unaware of the what and why of education, but to get them involved in serious discussion on National Student Day will require efforts by all of us. Those of us that feel that education is an important element of Canadian society must begin to bring our ideas and solutions before both the general and university communities. It is crucial that those concerned with education at Carleton understand the current crisis of our educational system. We need to address ourselves to these questions. National Student Day is just the beginning of bringing the social relevance of education back into clear focus. Please discuss this question with your students and if you have any proposals or questions please address them to Riel Miller, CUSA, 231-4380. Thank you.

## Statute Review

**Paul Laughton**

In our newsletter of July 28, 1976, we reported the formation of a committee of CUASA to formulate a brief for the University Statute Review Committee. The latter Committee will be hearing briefs in November on proposed changes in the Carleton University Act.

Your committee, consisting of A. Brook (Phil.), E. Oppenheimer (Germ.) and P. Laughton (Chem.) as chairman, during the summer has been reviewing the material from the University Committee and recent Ontario acts, and, after consultation with several advisors in the bargaining unit, has sent out revised draft proposals to CAUT, OCUFA, and our lawyer Jeff Sack. When

their comments are received, or in a couple of weeks, a semi-final version will be taken to Council for approval. Any interested members of the bargaining unit may obtain copies of the latest draft from the CUASA office. We would welcome comments from members at any time, but particularly of course during the next fortnight.

The general trend in our draft is to codify the role of Senate in University Government, which now is in principle though not likely in practice subject to bylaw of the Board of Governors. (Powers of the Senate now read: "Unless otherwise determined by by-law of the Board, the Senate shall;".) Our proposal is to make our government bicameral by entrenching the role of Senate and giving it the power also to make by-laws.

In addition to including the present protection of the rights of Faculty, we are also proposing a number of changes, selected from other recent Acts, which enhance the role of Faculty through the Senate. EG. we propose: increased and directly elected faculty and student membership on the Board in consideration of the Lieutenant-Governor-In-Council appointees which will be required in any new Act; decrease in the voting rights of the numerous ex-officio members of Senate; increase in the proportion of elected faculty members on the Executive Committee of Senate; more important roles for Senate and Faculty Boards in the appointment and change in status of various University officers from the President on down; rules which will replace willfully inactive elected members of Senate and Board; securing the right, apparently contrary to Government recommendations, of faculty members on the Board to be present, though perhaps not voting, when contracts are being discussed; and a limit, contrary to Government recommendations, on the right of the Minister to require any information whatsoever in university reports, possibly including personal information about individuals.

Several other items have been included in our proposals, recognizing the risk of rigidity, which have become current practice protected under our present contracts. Your Committee has undertaken to consult with other bodies such as Students' Council before submitting our brief.



# Documents!

Three important documents are currently being developed:

- **Policy on Faculty Workload**
- **Career Development Assessment Guidelines**
- **Brief on Revising the Carleton University Act**

Your Council and Steering Committee urgently need to know your views on each of them. First drafts of the first two are reprinted below. Please read them and make your views known to your Council member, to a member of the Steering Committee, or to the office (424 HP, ph. 6387).

Draft copies of our brief on revising the Carleton University Act are available from the office. Our brief has the status of a set of recommendations to the joint Senate/Board Committee on Statute Review, which in turn will make recommendations, through Senate and the Board, to the province legislature. Some issues of central importance to the Association lurk in the background of our Act, so we hope a good number of our members will take the opportunity to comment on the draft of our brief. The Association will be finalizing its brief on Friday, October 29th. (Some 15 members of the Association have already been consulted; the final brief will be approved, of course, by council.) Some of the issues are discussed elsewhere in this Newsletter.

## Working Paper on Career Development Guidelines

In implementing the Career Development Plan last winter, problems were encountered over procedures and over criteria. The procedural problems seem to have been fairly adequately sorted out. But the lack of a clear statement of criteria or guidelines by which to assess awards and denials seems to continue to be a problem, as it was for the Deans making the assessments and for the Grievance Committee in its review of some of the denials. This working paper is a first attempt to sketch such guidelines.

### Career Development Increment Guidelines

#### I - Purpose

The purpose of the Career Development Plan is to provide financial progress, through a series of annual increments, in the career of a member of the academic staff. It is designed to achieve orderly promotion within rank. Because the awarding of increments involves a kind of promotion (of a sort quite different, however, from rank promotion, which often involves no financial advancement), the Plan contains a provision for denying an increment to the relatively small portion of academic staff whose academic/professional development is judged on reasonable grounds, based on the guidelines which follow, by the relevant Dean (or, where appropriate, the University Librarian) to be below the standard set by the bulk of the relevant academic staff of Carleton University.

#### II - Guidelines for the Denial of Career Development Increments Librarians

The University Library Committee, pursuant to Article 10.7, has generated criteria for Career Development Increment assessments for librarians.

#### III - Instructors

Criteria for assessing Instructors for the purposes of awarding or denying Career Development Increments are to be considered by the Instructor Evaluation Criteria Committee, pursuant to Article 10.9(a).

#### IV - Faculty

1) As identified in the Collective Agreement, the responsibilities of faculty members relate to their performance of an appropriate combination, though not necessarily all, of the activities of teaching, scholarship/research, governance and administration (through active contributions to departmental and faculty committees, councils and tasks, and, when called upon and to a reasonable extent, through active membership in other University bodies), and contributions to the learned professions and the community at large.

These responsibilities seem an appropriate base on which to build guidelines for the award or denial of Career Development Increments. For purposes of these Guidelines, teaching shall be treated as one area of assessment, scholarship/research as a second, and the remainder (governance, administration, community service and service to the learned professions) as a third, to be called service.

Because teaching, and preparation, marking, consultations and other duties directly associated with teaching (including course and instructional development), occupy about half the time of an average member of faculty, teaching is the appropriate area of assessment on which to build guidelines for Career Development assessments.

Teaching performance may be above-average, average or below-average. To each of these the following guidelines will apply:

i) *Above-average teaching.* Performance in teaching and/or related activities which is above-average shall be sufficient by itself to ensure the award of a Career Development Increment.

ii) *Average Teaching.* Performance in teaching and/or related activities which is average together with performance in one or both of the other two areas of assessment which is average or better shall be sufficient to ensure the award of a Career Development Increment. If performance in teaching and/or related activities is average and performance in both the other two areas of assessment is substantially below average, the Dean (or University Librarian) may, at his/her discretion, deny a Career Development Increment.

iii) *Below-average teaching.* Performance in teaching and/or related activities which is somewhat below average together with at least average performance in both the other two areas of assessment, or above-average performance in at least one of the other two areas of assessment, shall not be grounds for the denial of a Career Development Increment. Performance in teaching and/or related activities which is substantially below average may, at the discretion of the relevant Dean (or University Librarian), be grounds by itself for the denial of a Career Development Increment.

2) Assessment of performance in teaching and related activities shall be equitable and may be based on teaching evaluations (including student questionnaires and peer evaluations) and on assessments by relevant departmental committees, so long as such evaluations and assessments are in accord with the provisions of the Collective Agreement.

3) Assessment of performance in the areas of research or scholarship and service shall be equitable and may be based on peer evaluations and on assessments by relevant departmental committees.

#### V - Standards of Assessment

In assessing whether the performance of a librarian, instructor or member of faculty in each of the appropriate areas of performance has been above-average, average, or below-average, judgements shall be based, for each individual, on standards appropriate to someone in the same category of employment at the level of professional development of the individual concerned.

Professional development is evidenced by years of professional or related service. However, standards by which performance shall be assessed do not automatically shift with increased service. For members of faculty, for example, the first one or two years of a first appointment require one standard of assessment, the remaining years normally spent as an Assistant Professor a second, the years normally spent as an Associate Professor a third, and the years normally spent as a Professor a fourth. The years of professional or related service of an individual determine into

which group he/she would normally fall, and thus which standard of assessment is the appropriate one to use for Career Development Increment assessments.

In addition, assessments of performance in research or scholarship, where appropriate, shall be based on levels of performance normal for an individual with similar professional service in the individual's discipline.

The standards of assessment described in this Article shall be applied reasonably.

#### VI - Period of Assessment

Assessment shall be of performance as a whole in the twelve-month period immediately prior to the date on which an increment is to take effect. No account shall be taken of any deficiency unless the deficiency has been found to exist in this period.

#### VII - Leave of Absence

Where, due to leave of absence or other

reason, an individual has not performed tasks in one or more of the appropriate areas of performance for more than one-half of the assessment period in question, the Dean (or University Librarian) may substitute or otherwise take into account the appropriate assessment for the period of assessment immediately prior to the one in question. So long as an individual remains an employee, however, simple non-performance of tasks in one or more of the areas of performance shall not, so long as the non-performance is by prior arrangement, be held to an individual's disadvantage.

#### VIII - Information

1) Denials of Career Development Increments shall be reported by the Dean (or University Librarian) to employees by the deadlines called for by the appropriate agreement in force at the time. The Dean's (or University Librarian's) report shall be accompanied by a statement, in writing,

of the reasons for the denial, which shall identify the guideline(s) under which the increment has been denied, and indicate, not just the guideline(s) alleged not to have been met, but how the guideline(s) was (were) not met, giving sufficient detail of alleged deficiencies in performance to allow the individual to respond from the facts of his/her own case. In the event of a grievance against the Dean's (or University Librarian's) decision, no grounds for denial not contained in this statement of reasons shall be introduced by the University.

2) A failure by an employee to provide information, of a sort generally provided by members of the bargaining unit, concerning his/her performance in any of the areas of performance may be taken into account by the Dean (or University Librarian) in making his/her decision.



"I came here to ponder the futility of it all, but I can see it's useless."

## CUASA Steering Committee 1976-77

#### President:

Andy Brook (Philosophy) 3686

#### President - elect and Salary Chairman:

Derek Sida (Mathematics) 6752/5500

#### Past-president:

Tony Wand (Philosophy) 3686

#### Secretary and Information Officer:

Jim Wilcox (English) 2669

#### Treasurer:

Valerie Swinton (Library) 4354

#### Staff Welfare Chairman:

Barry Rutland (English) 2676

#### Grievance Chairman:

Keith Bell (Geology) 3743

#### Member-at-large:

Douq Millar (Engineering) 3627

☆ CUASA Office (424 Herzberg) 6387

