

# QUFA VOICES

## VOICES IN THIS ISSUE

- QUFA IMAGES: The QUFA Art Prize, by Paul Young . . . 1**  
**PRESIDENT'S VOICE: An Executive Director for QUFA, by Paul Young . . . 1-2**  
**PENSIONS: Pension Options If You Continue Working Beyond 65, by the Pension Working Group . . . 3-5**  
**FYI: The Limits of Academic Freedom, by Diane Beauchemin and Mark Jones . . . 6-8**  
**GRIEVANCE CORNER: Heads of Departments and the Grievance Process, by Ramneek Pooni . . . 8**  
**WORTH REPEATING: QUFA's Collective Agreements Pioneered Equity in Queen's Ideas and Practices, by Elaine Berman . . . 9**  
**ANNOUNCEMENT: Volunteer to Serve on a QUFA Committee, by Diane Beauchemin . . . 10**  
**ANNOUNCEMENT: Teaching and Academic Librarian Awards, by Staff . . . 10**

### PRESIDENT'S VOICE

## An Executive Director for QUFA

QUFA will soon hire an Executive Director, the QUFA Art Prize is nearing completion, and the Activity-Based Budget Model has been implemented

By Paul Young  
President, QUFA



March brings us a new university budget, reports of further erosion of the student/faculty ratio, the hiring of an Executive Director for QUFA, and a new mural for the Queen's Centre.

### An Executive Director for QUFA

QUFA has come to an agreement to hire an Executive Director for the QUFA office. This process has involved a nationwide search and careful selection for experience in the academic setting, working with unions, and managerial experience. There are still a few details

### QUFA IMAGES

## The QUFA Art Prize



Paul Young

The QUFA Art Prize is a collaborative project between QUFA and the AMS. The winner, Aleks Bartosik (BFA '01), is currently working on this mural on the second floor of the Queen's Centre. The theme is diversity and student-faculty interaction. When it is complete, the mural will remain as a lasting tribute to these values. *QUFA Voices* encourages QUFA Members to go to the Queen's Centre and see the mural's progress.

to iron out, and so we cannot release the name for a few weeks. However, we have a signed agreement, and the new Executive Director will be starting 1 June 2013. The timing will provide for a substantial transition period of overlap with our current staff members. I do not expect any disruption of current services, and in fact I expect to see an expansion of our activities.

### The QUFA Art Prize

In this issue of *QUFA Voices*, we have included a photograph of our QUFA Art Prize mural in the Queen's Centre as it moves forward. As with the search for our Executive Director, we advertised and cast our net nationally for artists interested in competing. The task of the panel revolved around choosing an exciting artistic impression of our vision that would stand the test of time in this permanent installation. Ultimately, the mural will include a plaque expressing the artist's vision and interpretation of our criteria in her own words. I urge you to go over to the Queen's Centre and have a look. If you are lucky, you will catch the artist, Aleks Bartosik (BFA '01), at work.

### The Activity-Based Budget Model

The activity-based budget model has been rolled out in the upcoming 2013-2014 budget under development. The budget was presented at the last Board meeting, and the Provost has come to

QUFA to present it to our Budget Analysis Committee. There is not a lot more to report other than that the numbers are more firm relative to earlier discussions of where it was heading. Some Schools and Faculties face significant budget squeezes, although there is a promise to maintain the current funding levels for a couple of years. The shuffling of resources, ultimately, is always under political control, whether in the old model or the new; it just happens at different levels within the system. How it is all finally reconciled remains to be seen. Some faculties have opted to take the model to the departmental level, and others will only allow it to filter down to the faculty.

What is most important is that adequate resources are made available to disciplines where tuition is not deregulated and the capacity of those disciplines to increase revenue is limited. A University is not a standalone technical school, business school, or medical establishment. We pride ourselves on providing a broad opportunity for learning, and we must come to terms for paying for it out of our collective budget.

Quite apart from balancing the budget, we must also address how it is spent. In our largest faculty, Arts and Science, our full-time staff equivalent has fallen again. With the loss of 56 positions from our high of 476 in 2008, our EFTS is now the same as it was in 2000. The number of arts and science students has increased

by over 25% since 2000. This increase might be good for the budget, but it is bad for education. Although we are having active discussions of new teaching paradigms that will process more students with lower labour costs, in the final analysis, if we continue to lose full service faculty, we also degrade our capacity to do research, and we will rapidly lose our position in the broader world. As a residential institution, that is a grave risk. There is nothing in the recent Queen's budget estimate and projections of it through to 2016 that gives any reason for optimism for the institution as a whole. For an institution such as ours, the cost of raising student numbers is a degraded student-faculty ratio except where government grants increase or tuition is deregulated. Neither of these scenarios seems likely.

### Opportunities to Get Involved

I always say that I am the optimist in the crowd, so I should end on a positive note. Too many of us complain but do not engage to change things for the better. If you have views on where the future should lie, then you should participate. Volunteer with QUFA, or Senate Committees, or the Senate itself. If we play a role in governance, then the outcome is likely to be far better for us than if we do not.

***Paul Young can be reached at paul.young@qufa.ca.***

## QUFA VOICES ■ MARCH – APRIL 2013 ■ VOLUME 8, NUMBER 4, ISSUE 40

*QUFA Voices* is published every two months by the Queen's University Faculty Association (QUFA), 9 St Lawrence Avenue, Kingston, Ontario, K7L 3N6, Canada (qufa@queensu.ca). It is distributed electronically to all QUFA Members via the QUFA-NEWSLETTER-L listserv. Past issues are archived on the QUFA Web site at <http://www.qufa.ca/publications/>.

*QUFA Voices* publishes QUFA-related news and information for QUFA Members and provides QUFA Members with a forum to express their QUFA-related ideas and opinions. We want to hear from you! Please send your QUFA-related story ideas, news items, opinion pieces, letters to the editor, photographs, and other submissions to the editor at [robert.may@qufa.ca](mailto:robert.may@qufa.ca).

*QUFA Voices* is edited by Robert G. May (English). He can be reached at [robert.may@qufa.ca](mailto:robert.may@qufa.ca).

## PENSIONS

## Pension Options if You Continue Working Beyond 65

Important pension information for QUFA Members who intend to work beyond age 65

By the Pension Working Group, QUFA



This article is primarily for the information of QUFA Members who shortly will be approaching their so-called Normal

Retirement Date (NRD). For faculty, the NRD is usually the 30 June following your 65th birthday. Mandatory retirement at age 65 was abolished at Queen's in 2005, and a number of faculty now continue working beyond what previously would have been their NRD.

As you approach age 65, you will receive a letter from Queen's Human Resources asking whether you intend to work beyond your NRD and, if so, what you plan to do regarding your pension. The following article describes your available pension options and highlights some possible factors to consider in choosing between them.

### What Are the Options?

Active members of the pension plan who remain in the service of the University past their NRD have the following options available to them:

#### **a) Continue to Make Pension Contributions**

You may continue to contribute to the plan and accrue service during the period of the postponed retirement. Canada Revenue Agency (CRA) rules require that the pension must be taken no later than the year you turn age 71.

#### **b) Cease Making Pension Contributions but Defer Taking the Pension**

You may cease to contribute to the plan and defer the commencement of your pension until their postponed retirement date. CRA rules require that the pension must be taken no later than the year you turn age 71.

#### **c) Start Taking the Pension**

You may commence your pension as of your NRD, in which case you would cease making further contributions and accruing further benefits under the plan. You would then be receiving both salary and pension.

#### **d) Transfer the Cash Value of Your Pension Out of the Plan**

Under any of the three scenarios above, and at the time you would otherwise take your pension, rather than receive a Queen's pension, you can elect to leave the plan and withdraw the cash value of your pension. The cash value is the greater of your actual account balance or the commuted value of the corresponding defined benefit (there will be more information on this option and commuted values later in this article).

#### **How Will Your Pension Be Calculated if You Elect Option a) or b)?**

*If you go out on a Money Purchase Pension (MPP):*

Under both options a) and b), the Money Purchase Pension (MPP) payable at your eventual postponed retirement date will be determined as the amount of pension that can be provided by your then money purchase account balance, based on the actuarial assumptions in effect at that time. This calculation will reflect the fact that the you will be commencing a pension at an age later than 65 (i.e., if Professor X and Professor Y aged 65 and 68 respectively retire in the same year with the same account balance,

Professor Y will receive a higher MPP than Professor X).

*If you go out on the Minimum Guarantee Pension (MGP):*

Under Option a), the MGP is calculated in the same manner as if you had retired at your NRD. However, the calculation would take into account and reflect your service and earnings in the period since your NRD and hence be higher than the MGP you would have received had you taken it at age 65.

Under option b), the MGP will be determined as the actuarial equivalent of the pension that would have been payable at the NRD. This means that the pension will be higher than if you had taken it at your NRD, to reflect the fact that you are taking it at a later date. The amount of the adjustment is dependent on interest rates in effect at the time you actually retire.

#### **Which Option Should I Choose?**

*There is no definitive answer to this question.* Much depends on your own specific circumstances and your assessment of what is likely to happen in the period between your NRD and the time you actually commence taking your pension (e.g., your expectation with regard to future financial market returns, annual salary increases, etc.).

One important consideration is whether, based on your recent annual pension statements, you expect to go out with a MPP or a MGP. Bearing this in mind, the following are some of factors you may wish to consider.

#### **With Regard to Option a):**

- Your Money Purchase Account will have continued to accrue additional contributions (from both your own contributions and the employer's contributions). As long as the QPP enjoys positive annual investment

returns, you will have a larger money purchase account balance when you retire. Assuming that you do go out on a MPP, your starting pension will be higher due to:

- the larger account balance that you will have accrued, and
  - the fact that by beginning the pension at a later age, actuarially you will be taking the pension for a shorter period.
- Remember that, as a result of changes to the QPP agreed to during the 2011 round of collective bargaining, at the time you take the pension there will be a charge against your money purchase account balance to fund the pension non-reduction provision of the plan. This charge is to be phased in three steps: after 1 September 2012, the charge is 1.5% of your money purchase account balance; after 1 September 2013, it is 3.0%; and after 1 September 2014, it is 4.5%. This charge will reduce the money purchase account balance on which your starting pension will be calculated.
  - If you continue to make contributions and go out on a MGP, you will have a larger pension than if you take it at your NRD because you will have accrued more years of service in the plan and, presumably, your final average salary will be higher (these are the two key variables that determine the value of your initial MGP). However, note the first point below under option b).

#### **With Regard to Option b):**

- If you anticipate that, in all likelihood, you will go out on the

MGP, you may decide it would be better to take Option b) rather than continue to contribute to the plan (i.e., Option a)). Why?

- If you stop making contributions but defer taking the pension until you retire, you will get an actuarially increased pension at the later retirement date. The amount of the increase is dependent on the interest rates in effect at the time (as an example, given the interest rates then in effect, if you had retired in November 2011 at age 68, your deferred MGP would have been 117% of the MGP you would have received at 65).
- In addition to the actuarial increase to the age 65 MGP, during the deferral period and up to age 71, you could contribute up to the maximum allowable annual amount to an RRSP (the maximum RRSP deduction limit for 2013 is \$24,270), which would add to your overall retirement savings: you will no longer be making contributions to the Queen's Pension Plan, which will free up cash for you to redirect to the RRSP.

#### **With Regard to Option c):**

- Income tax considerations. You will be drawing both your salary and a pension, which probably will result in a significant amount of income tax to be paid. If you have a spouse, CRA rules allow you to split your pension income with your spouse for income tax purposes. Depending on your spouse's income, this could enable you to offset some of the income tax

that you would otherwise have to pay.

- Since you are continuing to draw a salary and no longer making contributions to the QPP, you will be able to contribute up to the maximum allowable annual amount to an RRSP (currently \$23,820) until age 71 and, hence, provide more savings for your eventual retirement. Since RRSP contributions are tax-deductible, this will also help to offset some income tax.

#### **With Regard to Option d):**

Earlier, we mentioned that, rather than stay in the plan and receive a Queen's pension, you can elect, at the time you would otherwise take your pension, to leave the plan and withdraw the cash value of your pension. This is also one of the options available to people who either retire early or leave Queen's to take up an appointment elsewhere.

If you withdraw from the plan, then you will receive the *greater* of:

- Your money purchase account balance (with no charge applied to it for the non-reduction provision, since you will not be taking a Queen's pension); or
- The commuted value of the minimum guarantee pension. The commuted value is determined by an actuarial formula such that it is sufficient, at then current interest rates, to fund a pension equal to your MG pension, assuming an average life expectancy. Because interest rates are currently at very low levels, the commuted value of minimum guarantee pension may well exceed the value of your money purchase account.

CRA rules allow you to transfer a significant part of the cash value to a tax-



sheltered vehicle (e.g., a locked-in retirement account (LIRA)), so that it is taxable only when eventually paid out to you. As with all retirement savings options, payments must begin no later than the year you turn age 71, in this case, from a Registered Retirement Income Fund (RRIF) or equivalent. The balance that is excluded from the tax-sheltered transfer must be taken in cash and is taxed at source.

There are clearly risks and downsides involved in withdrawing the cash value (CV) of your pension:

- First and most obviously, the retirement income you actually receive from your LIRA/RRIF will depend on the performance of the investments which you choose. Hence, your retirement income could be less than you expected, and less than you would have received if you had remained in the Queen's plan. On the other hand, and, depending on your skill as an investor and the investment advice you receive, it could be higher.
- Should you choose, on the other hand, to guarantee your retirement income by using the cash value to purchase an annuity from an insurance company, the annual annuity payments are unlikely to be greater than the Queen's pension you would have received had you remained in the plan.
- If you do not purchase an annuity, you risk running out of money should you live longer than the average (whereas the pension plan, like an annuity, provides you with "insurance" against longevity by providing a pension for life).
- The Queen's pension plan provides for future indexing of pension payments when the fund return (averaged over the prior six years)

exceeds 6%. Given the non-reduction guarantee, your Queen's pension will not be reduced even when annual fund returns fall below 6% or even below 0%. While indexed annuities are available in the market, they are very costly, and most people opt for non-indexed annuities.

- One instance where taking the cash value might well be a preferred option is if you do not have a spouse and have a shortened life expectancy due to an existing medical condition. In this case, if you have taken the cash value, there could be a significant amount of money left to the beneficiaries of your estate.

One possible attraction of taking the cash value, for those who are going out on an MG pension and who have confidence in their investment ability, is that, at present, the commuted value of MG pensions are very high and may well exceed the value of your money purchase account. This is because interest rates are at historically low levels. However, those same low interest rates mean that bond interest rates, GIC rates, and the annual annuity payments that your lump-sum cash value will buy are also low.

In summary, it is very unwise to consider withdrawing the cash value of your pension without very careful consideration, including a realistic assessment of your own investment ability, and before securing reliable financial advice from a disinterested party (not an investment manager eager to administer your pension savings for a fee).

*Thanks to Bob Weisnagel (Pensions Office) for his helpful comments on a draft of this article.*

**The Pension Working Group can be reached at [john.holmes@qufa.ca](mailto:john.holmes@qufa.ca).**

## ON THE WEB

# QUFA Online

Members can interact online with QUFA in many different ways!

### 1. QUFA Web Site



[www.queensu.ca](http://www.queensu.ca)

### 2. QUFA Forum



[qufa.wordpress.com](http://qufa.wordpress.com)

### 3. QUFA on Facebook



[facebook.com/groups/qufagroup](https://facebook.com/groups/qufagroup)

### 4. QUFA on Twitter



[@QUFAtweet](https://twitter.com/QUFAtweet)

FYI

## The Limits of Academic Freedom

A report on the 2013 Harry Crowe Conference

By Diane Beauchemin  
Vice President, QUFA

and Mark Jones  
Co-Chair, Political Action and  
Communications Committee, QUFA



The 2013 Harry Crowe Conference explored ways in which Academic Freedom (AF) is or may be either infringed or

legitimately limited by factors such as professional norms, conceptions of “institutional autonomy,” religious belief (especially within religious academic institutions), equity, law, and university-industry collaborations.

Jon Thomson (President of the Board of Directors, Harry Crowe Foundation) gave the opening address, entitled “AF: A Contested Concept.” He reviewed the history of AF as a concept (discussed as early as 1380 at Oxford) and of selected cases since 1900. He contrasted key aspects of the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT) Policy Statement on AF (Nov. 2011) with the revised Statement on AF issued by the Association of Colleges and Universities of Canada (AUCC) in October 2011. CAUT maintains that AF includes freedom in research and publication, in teaching, and in both intramural and extramural expression, and that it is both an individual and a collective right. It also provides that AF requires faculty involvement in academic governance. Thomson pointed out that CAUT nowhere explicitly acknowledges AF’s limitation by law, by institutional autonomy or aims, or by professional norms. On the other hand, he noted one implicit limitation: “members of the

academic staff do not have the right to limit the AF of other members.” Other limits may be imposed by codes of ethical conduct in professional disciplines such as medicine.

As Thomson noted, the 2011 AUCC Statement on AF is weaker than its previous (1988) statement and significantly weaker than the CAUT policy. The AUCC asserts, “AF must be based on institutional integrity ... and institutional autonomy,” and makes no reference to freedom of intramural or extramural expression. Nor does it frame AF as requiring involvement of academic staff in university governance. Thomson concluded that the AUCC’s revised conception of AF is less robust than that which obtained “in universities of the Second German Reich (1871-1918).”

Panel I was on “AF and Professional Norms.” Penny Stuart read the paper of Joan Scott (History, Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, NJ), who was ill. Scott pointed out that, while disciplinary norms sometimes protect members against academic administrators, they can also work against members who are branching out or challenging accepted views. There is increasing tension between individuals and the university, resulting, for example, in tenure denials where the university interprets professional norms as giving it the right to discipline without interference.

Mark Gabbert (History, U. of Manitoba) talked about the metrics that are increasingly applied for faculty evaluation (number of papers, citations, etc.) and the increasing popularity of norms with the employer. He condemned the general lack of solidarity when discipline is unjustly applied and urged people to resist the temptation of legalizing norms.

Matthew Finkin (Law, U. of Illinois) pointed out that there is nothing about ghost writing (i.e., writing under the

names of other people who agreed) in norms, which explains why it is commonly practised in several disciplines, such as political science.

Panel II looked at “AF and Institutional Autonomy.” Len Findlay (English, U. of Saskatchewan) pointed out that economism eats values, including academic value. He condemned secret searches, opaque partnerships, and silencing in the name of “the brand.” He wondered why so many university administrations see CAUT as *the* threat to institutional autonomy, and use the race for resources and reputation as an opportunity to shrink or eliminate disciplines while preserving administration bloat. He pleaded for reanimation of Senate and Council as a new form of solidarity.

Patrick Deane (President, McMaster U.) said that institutional autonomy is autocracy if it trumps AF, but that fundraising and financial pressures lead administrations away from collegiality. He affirmed that the needs of faculty must be those of the administration, or the academy cannot survive: “The institution has no existence separate from the professoriate.” Thus, he agreed with Findlay that administrations must reassert collegial governance; but as public funding declines, he said, it becomes increasingly difficult to protect the university’s academic mission.

David Rabban (Law, U. of Texas) spoke historically about how institutional autonomy came to conflict with AF. The US Supreme Court first addressed AF in the 1950s; in 1957, Justice Warren connected AF with the First Amendment rights of individuals to free speech, positioning AF as the “special concern of the First Amendment.” Not until the late 1970s was the AF of *the institution* theorized (by Justice Lewis Powell in 1978). Rabban deplored the erosion of the academy by the divide-to-conquer mentality.

Panel III considered “AF and Religious Belief.” John Baker (Philosophy, U. of Calgary) questioned the extent to which religious freedom and AF can exist in an institution that complies with a particular religion, such as Islam. He described AF as an essentially contested concept. He had heard it argued that there could be more than one kind of AF, but he could not accept that. He spoke of “faith tests,” which ensure that curricula are consistent with orthodoxy, but he argued that institutions that do not sponsor what can be defended by arguments and evidence are not universities.

William Bruneau (Educational Theory, UBC) noted the historically close relations between religion and higher education in Canada; by the 1960s, it was thought that they had gone separate ways, but the 1990s saw a resurgence of faith-based institutions—some strictly for pastoral education, but most offer higher education in arts and sciences. There are 33 religiously oriented universities in Canada, 17 of them Catholic. Some require faculty members to pass a faith test, affirming that they are practising Christians, that their private and public lives are ordered according to Christian beliefs (including no smoking, drinking, etc.), and that they will not criticize the university privately or publicly. He noted that CAUT has openly opposed such requirements.

Gerald Gerbrandt (President Emeritus, Canadian Mennonite University) spoke in support of AF as fundamental to universities, and affirmed that a religiously oriented institution can respect AF. He said there is actually little difference in the way academic subjects are taught in a faith-based school, but that such schools also include discussion of religion.

John Wiens (Education, U. of Manitoba) maintained that religion (especially fundamentalism) is a threat to AF. He quoted Habermas’s *The Future of Human Nature* as affirming that democratic

common sense insists on reasons acceptable not just to the members of one religious community. He questioned whether public money should go to faith-based universities, and whether the latter’s credits should be transferable to public universities.

Panel IV looked at “AF and Equity.” Richard Moon (Law, U. of Windsor) noted that Canadian society has been hesitant to legalize civility standards. He asked what standards should apply by law, and how they should differ for classrooms, given that students are captive audiences. For example, the free-speech rule may be stricter in the classroom (no racial or homophobic comments, etc.).

Anver Saloojee (Political Science, Ryerson U.) discussed the CAUT Policy Statement on AF as a “John Stuart Mill, marketplace of ideas” notion of AF. He cited the problem of the tolerance afforded to Phillip Rushton, and noted the dangers of AF as a Eurocentric concept, justifying some views but not others. He concluded that AF does not confer a right to discriminate, and that we must strengthen *both* AF and anti-discrimination clauses.

David Schneiderman (Law, U. of Toronto) expressed doubts about clause 6 of the CAUT Policy Statement on AF, and about toleration as a part of AF. He also cautioned against “over-reaching” workplace policies that may result in all ideas not getting equal shares in the classroom.

Panel V focused on “AF and the Law.” Angela Regnier (Professional Officer, CAUT) talked about research confidentiality, pointing out that universities should defend it, including in sensitive fields where there may be competing public interests between ethical research and gathering evidence for prosecution. She gave the example of two criminologists (from U. of Ottawa) conducting extensive research on sex

workers. They had promised their informants confidentiality, but police pursuing a murder suspect demanded their records. Their university is not financially supporting their legal case, but CAUT is. Regnier stressed that AF does not specifically protect confidentiality.

Leslie Green (Law, U. of Oxford) said that AF is a cluster of special rights, and that a right can be waived. For example, she gave the example of Queen’s refusal to respond to the CAUT report on Michael Mason because, supposedly, QUFA should have grieved according to the collective agreement: but it forgot that QUFA can waive its right to grieve.

Jamie Cameron (Law, York U.) talked about the civility project recently launched in the House of Commons, where members of parliament could be subject to penalties and even suspension if they do not behave. She argued that civility and respect regulations are problematic, as there are risks of selective enforcement and of chilling free speech. Those whose messages are on the fringe are more likely to be singled out. Regulating civility is a misguided way of improving debate; those who would normally speak out will either refrain or tone it down.

Panel VI considered AF in the context of the growth of university-industry collaborations. Sheldon Krinsky (Social Sciences, Tufts U.) questioned why more and more universities bring business managers to run their affairs. He warned that commercialization of universities can distort the production of knowledge and limit AF; in fact, it will make AF irrelevant. Financial stress on universities has encouraged predatory corporations to take advantage; corporations view science not as a generator of truth but as an input in production. Such mentality leads to selling drug secrets to Wall Street firms and prescribing behaviour of physicians. It affects the outcomes of research: industry-funded research will

yield pro-industry results. The US Bayh-Dole Act of 1980 gave universities title to property developed with taxpayer money; through corporate collaboration, this means that while the public supports the research and takes the risk, the profits go to the private sector. He cited the Berkeley-BP agreement and the recent Cornell-NYC Tech, where commerce and academia are indistinguishable.

Risa Lieberwitz (Labour and Employment Law, Cornell U.) touched on many of the same points. She noted that each time government funding is reduced, corporate funding and university-industry relations rise, and so does corporate involvement in research and teaching. Even basic research may be funded in exchange for patents on inventions.

Jim Turk (Executive Director, CAUT) said that there was more than AF at risk in these collaborations; in fact, academic integrity is at stake. The CAUT is examining Canadian universities' industrial collaborations and will soon release its report. To preserve academic integrity, academic decisions (hiring, research priorities, supervision and evaluation of students) should be made by academic staff, and there should be no interference with the dissemination of knowledge. The university's industrial partner should only be a donor, not a participant in the administration of an academic program. Turk discussed the case of a UBC faculty member who refused to sign her intellectual property away for an online course, grieved, and won.

***Diane Beauchemin can be reached at [diane.beauchemin@qufa.ca](mailto:diane.beauchemin@qufa.ca).***

***Mark Jones can be reached at [mark.jones@qufa.ca](mailto:mark.jones@qufa.ca).***

## GRIEVANCE CORNER

# Heads of Departments and the Grievance Process

**Where do Department Heads fit into QUFA's Grievance Process?**

**By Ramneek Pooni  
Member Services Officer, QUFA**



Recently, QUFA held a Heads' Caucus meeting. These meetings occur once or twice annually and present the Heads

with a chance to air their concerns, to ask questions, and generally to discuss matters that are peculiar to the jobs they perform. At the last meeting, a question arose as to how the Heads fit into the grievance process. We thought it would be useful to elaborate on this issue for all QUFA Members.

Heads are QUFA Members, but they take on responsibilities and make decisions that are delegated to the position by the Deans. If a Head acts as a result of this delegated authority, those actions are managerial and are done on behalf of the University Administration.

In such a case, if a Head's actions abrogate the collective agreement and a QUFA Member comes to the union with a complaint or grievance, then QUFA's obligation is to represent the Member who is not the Head. The Head must look to the Dean for support, not to QUFA, and any formal grievance would be made against the Dean or other senior University administrator (Article 41.6), even though the Head might have a role in the process by providing information.

On the other hand, if the Head has a complaint about the University Administration's abrogation of the

collective agreement, whether as a faculty member or as a Head, then QUFA would represent the Head in that complaint or grievance.

In any question of an abrogation of the collective agreement, QUFA's and Queen's University's ultimate responsibility must be to uphold the integrity of the collective agreement. As with any complicated document, there will be questions about what some provisions mean, how some processes should be conducted, and so on. In such cases, some Heads consult with both QUFA and the Faculty Relations Office (Queen's University's labour relations contact for QUFA) before making decisions or acting, so that they are aware of the issues involved ahead of time.

Sometimes, it is most sensible for QUFA and Faculty Relations to help a Head by coming to an agreement about how something should be resolved. This sort of collaboration is not uncommon, and Heads should not hesitate to approach QUFA and/or Faculty Relations if they have questions or concerns.

QUFA is very aware of the tricky position Heads find themselves in, caught between union and administration, and would prefer to support them in making decisions that do not invite complaints or grievances.

***Ramneek Pooni can be reached at [poonir@queensu.ca](mailto:poonir@queensu.ca).***

## Spread the Word!

QUFA encourages you to print out and post a copy of this issue of **QUFA Voices** in a visible place in your department or unit.

Thanks!



## WORTH REPEATING

## QUFA's Collective Agreements (1997-Present) Pioneered Equity in Queen's Ideas and Practices

QUFA is proud of its pioneering role in collective bargaining with the Administration to implement a wide range of provisions to improve equity for Queen's faculty, librarians, and archivists

By Elaine Berman  
Administrative Officer, QUFA



In 1995, the passage of the second Employment Equity Legislation (*Employment Equity Act, S.C. 1995, c.46*) federally

set the stage for changes in Canadian workplaces for the introduction of new ideas and practices related to equity.

In the same year, the Queen's University Faculty Association (QUFA) certified as the sole bargaining agent for most faculty, librarians, and archivists at Queen's. A second bargaining unit certified in 2003, supporting Sessional Adjuncts who taught three or fewer half-courses per year, a group of faculty who had not been included in the original bargaining unit, and who lacked the protection of rights guaranteed the Term Adjuncts who taught four or more courses per year. The two bargaining units, containing almost all faculty teaching for pay at Queen's, amalgamated in July 2007.

Since 1995, the QUFA founders and its bargaining teams negotiated a range of key provisions for the faculty, librarians, and archivists, full-time and part-time appointees, based on the principles of equity and diversity in six collective

agreements (1997-present). QUFA is proud of its pioneering role, in persuading the Administration to accept a range of ideas and practices to improve employment equity at this University. The following list (non-exhaustive) provides an impressive list of examples. (Articles mentioned refer to the current 2011-2015 Collective Agreement<sup>1</sup>):

- Non-Discrimination Clause (Article 9);
- Duty to Accommodate persons with a physical or mental disability in the workplace (Article 9);
- Employment Equity provisions for new appointments and personnel processes, including recognition of four "Designated Groups" (women, members of visible minorities, Aboriginal peoples, and persons with disabilities) and "Equity-Seeking groups" (the four Designated Groups plus persons of non-heterosexual orientation or gender identity), the role of Equity Representative on all hiring and renewal, tenure and promotion committees (Article 24);
- Fairer and more consistent processes for Members applying for renewal, tenure, and promotion (Article 30 for Tenure-track and Tenured Faculty, Article 31 for Librarians and Archivists, Article 32 for the Reappointment and Promotion of Adjunct Members);
- Family-friendly Benefits: Childcare Benefit (Appendix M), Tuition Support Plan for dependents and spouses (Appendix N), Personal Leaves including Child-Care Leaves with and without salary top up, Postponement of Personnel Decisions of one year for each such leave (Article 33);

- More equitable distribution of workload within academic departments (Article 37).

In addition to the changes brought through bargaining, QUFA faculty in collaboration with like-minded employees from other employee groups also worked towards same sex rights such as benefits to same sex partners.

QUFA also introduced Fair Employment Week as an annual local initiative inspired by CAUT's national campaign to highlight the important role of Contract Academic Staff (Adjuncts) and the difficulties they face as contingent workers in the post-secondary educational sector.

### Note

<sup>1</sup><http://www.queensu.ca/provost/faculty/facultyrelations/qufa/collectiveagreement/WEBSITECAWITHLINKSSept252012.pdf>

*This article originally appeared in the February 2013 issue of Equity Matters, of the Council on Employment Equity, Queen's University*

**Elaine Berman can be reached at [qufa@queensu.ca](mailto:qufa@queensu.ca).**

### ON THE WEB

## Equity Online

QUFA encourages you to visit the Web site of the Equity Office at Queen's University:



<http://www.queensu.ca/equity/>

## ANNOUNCEMENT

## Volunteer to Serve on a QUFA Committee!

An update from the QUFA Nominations Committee 2013 on QUFA's Vacancies for 2013-2014

By Diane Beauchemin  
Vice President, QUFA



Following the call for volunteers sent at the end of January 2013, several committees are still missing one or more

members:

- one Term or Continuing adjunct on the JCAA (Joint Committee for the Administration of the Agreement);
- one Term Adjunct Representative on Council;
- one Continuing Adjunct Representative on Council;
- one Member on the Benefits Oversight Committee;
- one QUFA Observer on SCAD (Senate Committee for Academic Development);
- one Member on PACC (Political Action and Communications Committee);
- two Members on the QUFA Ad hoc Pension Committee;
- one Member on the QUFA Web Site Committee;
- one QUFA Representative from Engineering and Applied Science for the Joint Health and Safety Committee;
- one QUFA Representative from Health Sciences for the Joint Health and Safety Committee;
- one Trustee Alternate on the CAUT Defence Fund; and
- one QUFA Representative on the Queen's Food Committee.

Most of the above positions involve infrequent meetings (as few as a couple of times per year), except for the JCAA, which usually meets monthly from September to June, with up to one additional monthly meeting over the same period with the CMCA (Committee for the Management of the Collective Agreement). Council meets monthly from September to May.

For details on any of the above opportunities, please contact Elaine Berman or myself.

Regarding Council, several academic units are without representatives (please see <http://www.qufa.ca/governance/qufolks.php#Council>). If you are interested in serving in this capacity, please put your name forward to your Head so that an election may be conducted. In fact, representatives are often elected by acclamation.

If you have not already done so, please consider getting involved. I look forward to hearing from more of you!

**Diane Beauchemin can be reached at [diane.beauchemin@chem.queensu.ca](mailto:diane.beauchemin@chem.queensu.ca).**

**Elaine Berman can be reached at [qufa@queensu.ca](mailto:qufa@queensu.ca).**

## Voice Your Opinion

Do you have an opinion about anything you have read in QUFA Voices?

If so, send a letter to the editor!

[robert.may@qufa.ca](mailto:robert.may@qufa.ca)

## ANNOUNCEMENT

## OCUFA Teaching and Academic Librarianship Awards

Nominate someone for a teaching or academic librarianship award

By Staff  
QUFA Voices



QUFA Members should consider nominating a deserving colleague for an OCUFA teaching award or an academic

librarianship award. Follow the links below for complete instructions:

### Teaching Awards

#### Guidelines for nominations:

<http://ocufa.on.ca/wordpress/assets/TeachingGuidelines-July2009-en.pdf>

#### Nomination Form:

<http://ocufa.on.ca/wordpress/assets/Teaching-nomination-form-En.pdf>

### Academic Librarianship Awards

#### Guidelines for nominations:

<http://ocufa.on.ca/wordpress/assets/LibrarianshipGuidelines-July2009-en.pdf>

#### Nomination Form:

<http://ocufa.on.ca/wordpress/assets/Librarian-nomination-form-En.pdf>

### Writing Winning Nominations

**"Reflections on Academic Award Nominations that Succeed" by Cathy Matthews (from OCUFA Forum):**

[http://ocufa.on.ca/wordpress/assets/writing\\_nominations.pdf](http://ocufa.on.ca/wordpress/assets/writing_nominations.pdf)

**QUFA can be reached at [qufa@queensu.ca](mailto:qufa@queensu.ca).**