

news from CUASA

Volume 13, No. 15

Editor: Jon Alexander

June 1983

BRIEF TO INFLATION RESTRAINT BOARD

CUASA has submitted an application to the Ontario Inflation Restraint Board asking the Board to rule that payments made pursuant to our CDI plan are in fact NOT restricted or prohibited by the Act. A brief submitted in support of our application has been prepared by our legal advisors, Sack, Charney, Goldblatt & Mitchell, with the assistance of the OCUFA 179 Committee. The Committee published the following summary of the brief and we are reprinting it for your information.

The purpose of the present application before the Board is to obtain a ruling as to whether the University, pursuant to the Inflation Restraint Act, is required to continue to make payments pursuant to the Career Development Plan, contained in the collective agreement, to all members of the bargaining unit.

It is the position of the Association, for reasons more fully set out below, that payments made pursuant to the Career Development Plan

- 1) are not payments for or in recognition of any of the specified headings set out in subsections (a) to (e) of section 12(5) and thus are not restricted;
- 2) constitute an increase in compensation "as a result of the proper promotion of a person to a different or more responsible position", contained in a compensation plan in existence prior to September 21, 1982, and that, as a result, nothing in section 12(5) of the Act prevents such increase being paid.

In general, a faculty member's salary consists of three components; a scale increase, which constitutes a general increase in base salary to all employees; a merit increment, designed to recognize especially meritorious performance of duties, and a "progress through the ranks" payment, known at some universities as a "career development" or "career progress" plan. These latter plans are promotional in nature. University faculty and librarians do not ordinarily receive, as might be expected, increases in compensation as a result of their promotion to a different rank; thus, a person who has been promoted from assistant professor to associate professor, or from associate professor to professor, would not generally obtain an increase in compensation at the time at which the promotion is granted. In turn, the university recognizes that the measure of responsibility of individual faculty members continually increases with respect to the administration of the department itself, and with respect to students, and the academic community in general. Thus, rather than grant promotional payments in a lump sum when an individual obtains a change in rank, such sums should be paid on a gradual basis, commensurate with an individual faculty member's increased responsibility.

This purpose has been recognized not only by the academic community, but by arbitrators who have been required to determine salary settlements in a university context.

As detailed above, the general manner in which faculty compensation is paid is reflected in the collective agreement entered into between the Association and Carleton University. Three types of compensation are contained in the collective agreement, each designed to meet a distinct purpose.

- i) Scale Increases
- ii) Scholarly Achievement Awards
- iii) Career Development Payments



BRIEF TO INFLATION RESTRAINT BOARD (continued)

Article 41 of the collective agreement provides for payments to be made pursuant to the Career Development Plan. The parties to the agreement are clear in enunciating its 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.

This understanding set out in the collective agreement is commensurate with the Joint Submission made by Carleton University and CUASA to the Anti-Inflation Board on January 14, 1976.

Effect of Section 12(5) on CDI Payments

Given the description of payments made pursuant to the Career Development Plan set out above, it is the position of the Association that such payments cannot be construed as payments in recognition of (a) meritorious or satisfactory work performance; (b) the completion of a specified period of work experience; (c) the successful completion of a program or course of professional or technical education; (d) regularly scheduled increments in remuneration; or (e) length of time in employment, but rather such payments are a graduated series of promotional increases to take the place of a lump sum promotion payment. While satisfactory work performance may be an element in whether or not an employee should be promoted, it does not mean that PTR payments are in recognition of satisfactory work performance. Rather, they are in recognition of the increasingly responsible role which university faculty play, and in recognition of promotion. As the board of arbitration held in the University of Calgary case, promotion through the ranks is a "reward for additional experience and responsibility, and the only means by which financial recognition for job promotion is achieved within the academic community".

It is the Association's respectful submission that, given that the payments made pursuant to the Plan have been negotiated by the parties, and as such constitute a vested right granted to employees, any interference with such right should not be countenanced unless the Legislature specifically and clearly directs that that is the case. For the reasons set out above, it is our view that the Legislature has not purported to restrict payment of such amounts and that, as a result, this Board should rule that any payment made pursuant to the Career Development Plan is not restricted by the provisions of section 12(5) of the Inflation Restraint Act.

OHIP PREMIUM INCREASE

We received the following memo from Brian McFadyen, Manager, Compensation and Benefits:

As a result of the recent Provincial Budget, OHIP premiums will increase 5% effective June 1, 1983. Consequently, the increase in premiums, in accordance with Article 40.3(a) of the current CUASA collective agreement, is passed on to CUASA members.

Therefore, commencing in June 1983 the OHIP monthly premiums for CUASA members will increase by \$1.35 for single coverage and \$2.70 for family coverage. The total revised premiums will be \$22.37 - single; \$44.74 - family.

BOB JONES - INSURANCE

Bob Jones is in the CUASA office, 447 St. Pat's on Tuesdays and Wednesdays from 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. to assist you with auto, life and home insurance at group rates for Carleton employees. Bob's number at Carleton is 231-4310 and his toll free number is 1-800-267-7996.

CUASA OFFICE SUMMER HOURS:

TUESDAYS, WEDNESDAYS AND THURSDAYS

9:00 A.M. TO 3:00 P.M.

447 ST. PATRICK'S BUILDING - 231-6387

Pat Finn is in England for the summer and Brenda Irvin will be holding down the fort for her again this year at the hours shown above. With only one person to cover the office, it may be that when you phone you find you are answered by a telephone answering machine. Please don't hang up in frustration. Leave a message and we'll get back to you as soon as possible.

If you need advice or assistance outside of our posted hours, please call:

	<u>Office</u>	<u>Home</u>
J. George Neuspiel, President	231-7504	225-3707
Nils Jensen, President-Elect	231-7504	737-7504
Stan Jones, Grievance Chairman	231-5573	745-7423

* * * * *

STRESS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

This is from CAUT's table talk, Vol. III, no. 5, May 30, 1983.

The results of a survey on "Job-Related Stress Among Massachusetts State College Teachers" were reproduced last year in the NEA Advocate (January/February, 1982), Professors Jack Szplier (Westfield State College) and Robert Alexander (University of Massachusetts). These were the results:

CAUSES

"Occupational stress is a problem at all levels of Massachusetts public education."

Over half of the respondents (52 percent) reported frequent to constant stress at work. Only

eight percent reported similar stress during vacations.

Only 50 percent of the respondents reported taking one or more sick days, but 44 percent of those were stress-related.

**TOP 10 JOB STRESSORS REPORTED BY
STATE COLLEGE TEACHERS**

	DEGREE OF STRESS IN PERCENT				
	NONE	MINOR	MODERATE	MAJOR	RANK
Excessive paper work	14	28	36	22	1
Self-induced pressure (ex. high expectations)	17	24	34	25	2
Insufficient income	17	28	29	26	3
Few financial incentives for good teaching	26	21	25	28	4
"Uneven" work load during a semester	22	26	30	23	5
Lack of interest from students	16	38	27	18	6
Lack of praise for good teaching	30	27	21	22	7
Pressure to keep up with your field	24	32	31	12	8
Committee work	31	31	23	15	9.5
Lack of preparation time	27	36	26	12	9.5

COPING

Faculty were asked to report how they coped with stress. The most popular method? Watching television or a movie.

**10 MOST POPULAR
STRATEGIES**

As reported by College Teachers

Watching TV/movie	51%
Listening to music	46%
Talking to family/friends	42%
Exercise	41%
Sleeping	34%
Coffee	33%
Walking	27%
Avoiding people	27%
Snacks	26%
Becoming immersed in work	25%

"The constant barrage of paperwork and last-minute changes from administration, particularly during registration time, indicates no sensitivity to the pressures on faculty."