

QUFA VOICES

VOICES IN THIS ISSUE

- QUFA NEWS: QUFA Welcomes a New Member of Staff . . . 1**
PRESIDENT'S VOICE: New Changes at QUFA to Meet New Challenges, by Paul Young . . . 1-2
COLLECTIVE BARGAINING: Collective Bargaining Will Begin in 2014, by Steve Iscoe . . . 2-3
FYI: Anomalies Side-Table: The Issue, by Grant Amyot, Susan Fitzgibbon, John Holmes, and Steve Iscoe . . . 3-6
ON THE WEB: Additional Salary Information, by Susan Fitzgibbon . . . 4
GRIEVANCE CORNER: Referee Selection for RTP Process, by Phil Goldman . . . 6-7

PRESIDENT'S VOICE

New Changes at QUFA to Meet New Challenges

Paul Young's term as QUFA president comes to an end, and QUFA welcomes a new executive director

By Paul Young
President, QUFA



This month marks the end of my term as president of QUFA. Diane Beauchemin takes over on 1 July 2013, and I will rotate to the past-president position.

It has been an interesting two years, initially dominated by the activities surrounding bargaining. This was an education in itself. Bargaining can never be far from a union's thoughts, and we have started to collect information and mobilize for the next round of collective bargaining in 2015. These activities will be led by Diane, but to be effective, it is essential that our staff, volunteers on the

executive, council and various committees, and the QUFA Membership at large engage with the issues at hand.

This is also a time of renewal for the QUFA office. Elaine Berman will complete her phased retirement plan at the end of the 2013-2014 academic year, and Phil Goldman leaves us on 30 June 2013. Both Elaine and Phil have been instrumental in shaping QUFA and have contributed a great deal to our success.

Leslie Jermyn has joined us as QUFA's new executive director. She brings a new perspective to our organization and will help us shape the future.

One area where we must focus is to continue to broaden our active representation to all units at Queen's. Faculty Associations function best when all groups are engaged with their governance and actively present the diverse views we expect to find on a university campus.

Provincial and national legislation will have a major impact on all of us at QUFA going forward. Issues include the austerity framework, which places postsecondary education in a position of

QUFA NEWS

QUFA Welcomes a New Member of Staff

Leslie Jermyn is QUFA's new executive director

Leslie Jermyn joined our staff as QUFA's new executive director on 3 June 2013.

You will find a short biography on Leslie on the QUFA Web site: www.qufa.ca/news/2013/2013.05.09.QUFA_Welcomes_a_New_Executive_Director.php.

Leslie can be reached at 613.533.3033 or qufa@queensu.ca. Elaine Berman will continue at QUFA until the end of 2013 and can now be reached at 613.533.6000 x75753 or 6esb@queensu.ca.

Watch the next issue of *QUFA Voices* for a longer article about Leslie and the other changes coming to the QUFA office.

declining resources; increasing enrolments; and a decaying faculty-student ratio. Although these issues have been going on for some time, they are now driving the consolidation or loss of departments and some programs. It will inevitably have repercussions for workload and our effectiveness as educators.

We are also facing rhetoric and some legislation designed to reduce the effectiveness of unions and to interfere with bargaining rights. This affects all unions, not just ours, and it is occurring at both the federal and provincial levels. It represents a major challenge, and we must engage fully with our national and provincial organizations, as well as more broadly with the labour movement in Canada, if the trend is to be stopped or reversed.

Last, the seemingly never-ending pension issue is still with us, although encouragingly, our plan is currently showing strong investment returns. The Ontario government, however, seems intent on promoting changes in the structure of the postsecondary pension system, and we can expect legislation in the near future.

I have enjoyed my time as QUFA president and look forward to the next couple of years.

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

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Collective Bargaining Will Begin in 2014

QUFA is preparing for collective bargaining by identifying potentially contentious aspects of the Collective Agreement

**By Steve Iscoe
Council Chair, QUFA**



The Collective Agreement (CA) between the University Administration and QUFA expires 30 April 2015. We expect bargaining to begin in 2014.

Your QUFA executive and, especially, those who will be bargaining on your behalf, want input from Members in advance of the beginning of bargaining so that we can best represent your interests.

To assist, we will, starting in September 2013, post information about aspects of the CA that, based on past experience, may be contentious. These include the following:

- Changes to the salary model (article 42). This will likely include topics such as whether or not to include merit in base salary, abatement at

higher salary levels, and anomalies;

- Working conditions as related to activity-based budgeting;
- Use of adjuncts or teaching-only faculty;
- Role of adjuncts in “blended” courses and/or distance education;
- Use of external rankings to evaluate performance of units (article 11);
- Access to University facilities during strikes or lockouts (article 12; e.g., access to laboratory equipment for required maintenance or experimental animals so as not to jeopardize research);
- Intellectual property (article 16; e.g., are changes needed to address issues related to development of courseware, especially that related to “blended” courses and distance education? What about material developed for use by a third party, such as Blyth?);
- Annual performance review and evaluation of teaching (articles 28 and 29; e.g., use of USAT);
- Anonymity of individuals submitting letters relevant to a colleague’s application for renewal, tenure, or promotion (article 30.11.1);

QUFA VOICES ■ JULY – AUGUST 2013 ■ VOLUME 8, NUMBER 5, ISSUE 41

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.

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

- Working conditions and workload (articles 36 and 37; e.g., much work has been downloaded to members as a result of PeopleSoft);
- Reappointment and promotion of adjunct members (article 32; a complex article that needs careful evaluation and probably revision);
- Merger or closure of academic units for financial (rather than academic) reasons in situations where the University is not able or willing to invoke financial exigency under article 38 (i.e., when the financial viability of the University as a whole is not in question). This article would parallel article 39;
- Strike and lockout (article 12; does QUFA want to keep the strike/lockout provision or try to reinstate the previous provision for compulsory arbitration?);
- A new article related to employment in international programs (QUFA believes the terms and conditions of any employment in such programs should be governed by the CA);
- Requirement for the University to inform agencies or publishers of academic misconduct by Members (i.e., delete “normally” from article 17.4.6).

Other aspects may include phased retirements and retiree benefits (e.g., loss of dental and eye care).

If you have other suggestions or comments on any of the above, please contact your QUFA representative or any member of the executive or QUFA office.

A copy of the current CA can be found online at www.qufa.ca/ca/.

Steve Iscoe can be reached at iscoes@queensu.ca.

FYI

Anomalies Side Table: The Issue

QUFA and the University Administration are at odds over Anomalies Side Table pay-outs amounting to about \$425,000 of faculty salaries

**By Grant Amyot
AST Member, QUFA**

**Susan Fitzgibbon
QUFA Staff**

**John Holmes
JCAA Co-Chair, QUFA**

**and Steve Iscoe
Chair, QUFA Council**



An issue has arisen with regard to administering the salary anomaly fund under the 2008-2011 Collective Agreement (CA). The salary anomalies analysis is carried out annually by the Anomalies Side Table (AST), a side-table of the Joint Committee on the Administration of the Agreement (JCAA).¹ At some point in the past, the AST analyses fell behind schedule, and the AST has only recently arrived at the analysis for 2008-2009, the first year of the 2008-2011 CA. Currently, QUFA and the University hold differing interpretations of the sections of the 2008-2011 CA that pertain to the AST salary anomaly fund (Article 41.2.5 and Appendix K).

This issue is of considerable concern to QUFA because there is about \$425,000 worth of salary increases at stake, money that QUFA bargained with the University for in 2008, that our Members voted to ratify, and which is yet to be paid out.² In addition, the value of “retroactive” salary adjustments (to take account of the fact that these increases should have been phased in from 2008 to 2010) and additional employer pension

contributions that will need to be applied to awards from the anomaly funds is steadily increasing.³ The delay in payment and the growing retroactive amount must also be of concern to the University given the desirability of “tying up loose ends” before fully implementing the new university budgeting model.

The purpose of this piece is to provide QUFA Members with background information on the anomalies process and the issue at stake.

Background: The Anomalies Side-Table Process

Addressing anomalously low individual faculty salaries has a long history at Queen’s. In October 1983, before certification, a report from the Task Force on Faculty Compensation described the then purpose of the Anomalies Fund in this way:

Further increments may be awarded to individuals from an Anomalies Fund when

(a) review of salary statistics indicates that an individual is underpaid in comparison with colleagues of similar experience and performance, or

(b) the demand for an individual’s expertise or accomplishment makes such an increment necessary.

Claims for such increments must be carefully examined, as they have been in the past. The total funds available for such increments should be the subject of annual review in the Consultative Group.

Since QUFA certified in 1995, the purposes and processes of the Anomalies Fund have evolved. In the 2008-2011 CA, it is divided between the AST of the JCAA and the Principal’s Anomaly Fund. The AST Fund and the Principal’s Anomaly Fund are both intended to distribute

money to achieve pay equity between men and women, and to maintain the equitable application within disciplines of the faculty career development and merit policies. Market demand and retention payments are the sole responsibility of the Principal's Fund.⁴

The Principal's Anomaly Fund addresses anomalies identified either by self-identification, self-application, or by recommendations from heads and deans. The AST uses regression models based on actual salaries and individuals' years of experience and merit history to produce "expected" salary curves that are then used to identify those individuals whose salaries are judged to be anomalous. The AST analysis is conducted in two stages: Round 1 addresses anomalies within each discipline group, and Round 2 addresses anomalies between discipline groups by concentrating funds on the lowest-paid groups. Salaries that fall below the calculated regression line are less than predicted by the actual distribution of salaries in a discipline or a set group of disciplines.

The discipline groups eligible for anomaly adjustments have changed over time in response both to there not being enough money in the Fund to address anomalies in higher-paying disciplines and to broader market forces changing the composition of the "lower paid disciplines" group over time. For purposes of the 2008-2011 CA, the discipline groups eligible for funds from the AST are Physical Sciences (excluding Engineers and Computing and Information Science), Social Sciences (excluding Economics), Humanities, Basic Health Sciences, Nursing and Rehabilitation Therapy, and Education.

When analyses of anomalies within discipline groups first began in 1997, the Pay Review Panel (the predecessor of the AST) used a line 5% below the calculated expected salary for a given combination of years of experience and 10-year merit

history as the basis for its awards. This reflected the fact that the anomalies fund available was insufficient to correct the large anomalies that existed at that time. In the early years of the AST, there was not enough money to bring all salaries below the 5% line up to that line, and so people would receive partial payments proportional to the difference between their actual salary and the 5% cut-off. Over time, however, the most glaring anomalies were addressed, and funds were available to bring all Members up to the 5% line. For the 2005-2006 analysis, there was enough money to bring all Members to within 3.8% of the line, and pay-outs were made accordingly, so as to spend the entire amount available. For the 2006-2007 analysis, however, the Administration rejected an AST recommendation to the JCAA that the cut-off be adjusted to 4.135% in order to pay out all of the \$75,000 allocated to Round 1. Consequently, for 2006-2007, only \$28,000 was paid out in Round 1 using the 5% cut-off. The parties, however, agreed to use the balance of the \$75,000 to help adjust the salaries of three individuals whose anomalous salaries stemmed from their having received low starting salaries.⁵ In the 2007-2008 analysis, only \$12,324 was paid out in Round 1 using the 5% cut-off, and the balance of the \$75,000 available was retained by the University. In every year, Round 2 money has been paid out in full.

The Current Issue with Regard to the 2008-2009 AST Analysis

For each year of the 2008-2011 CA, there is \$150,000 assigned to Round 1 (within discipline group anomalies) and \$200,000 for Round 2 (between discipline group anomalies).⁶ For the 2008-2009 Round 1 pay-out, the AST calculates that just under \$8,000 of the \$150,000 is needed to correct anomalies within the 6 eligible discipline groups if 5% is used as the cut-off criterion.

ON THE WEB

Additional Salary Information

You will find additional salary information on the Faculty Relations Web site

**By Susan Fitzgibbon
QUFA Staff**

In the past, Members' annual salary letters contained the following additional information:

- the University-wide distribution of career development and merit scores by Faculty and rank, and
- box plots of nominal academic salaries by experience group (for both your specific discipline group and the University as a whole).

This information is now available on the Faculty Relations Web site:

<http://queensu.ca/provost/faculty/facultyrelations/qufa/2013-14FacultySalaryStatistics.html>

Using your NetID and password, you will now be able to access the *Notes to Accompany 2013-2014 Salary Statistics* (which contains the distribution of merit scores), the aggregate (excluding Clinical Medicine) box plot, as well as all of the discipline-group specific box plots.

Do you want to know where your discipline group stands in terms of compensation and number of faculty hired? Visit this Web site.

Susan Fitzgibbon can be reached at fitzgibb@queensu.ca.

QUFA's position is that the money in the 2008-2011 Anomalies Fund is one component of a total compensation package bargained for in 2008 and must be paid out to QUFA Members. In other words, to attain the total percentage increase in compensation agreed to at the bargaining table in 2008, all of the Anomalies money must be paid out. Changes to the language of the 2008-2011 Collective Agreement from the previous agreement reflect this intention. To disburse all \$150,000 of Round 1 monies for 2008-2009 to correct anomalies within a "discipline" (and not across groups; that's Round 2), the cut-off would need to be set at about 2.4% below the mean for a given combination of years of experience and merit history.

The Administration does not share QUFA's view that all the money in Round 1 should be paid out. In spite of the fact that the 5% cut-off has not been used consistently by the AST, they maintain that they have the right to retain any money remaining after a pay-out using a 5% below-the-line cut-off, and they have indicated that this is the position they will take if the matter should go to arbitration. The Administration's position would leave approximately \$142,000 of unspent Round 1 money for 2008-2009 and, by extension, similarly large amounts of unspent money earmarked for within-discipline anomalies in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011.⁷ This is money that was bargained for QUFA Members but which will now not be paid to them if the Administration's position prevails.

To summarize:

- QUFA holds that all of the \$150,000 assigned to Round 1 in each year or the 2008-2011 Collective Agreement should be paid out. For 2008-2009, this entails moving the cut-off from 5% to 2.4% below the regression line.

- The Administration holds that not all of the \$150,000 should be paid out; only about \$8,000 is needed to address salaries that fall more than 5% below the regression line.

A Complication: The Administration's "Without Prejudice" Proposal

In early April, the Administration made a "without prejudice" proposal to QUFA in an effort to avoid taking the disagreement to an arbitrator. The key element in their proposal was to take \$100,000 of the Round 1 AST Funds (i.e., 2/3 of the \$150,000) from each of the three years of the 2008-2011 CA and use it to fund one additional QNS tenure-track appointment (i.e., three QNS appointments rather than the planned two per year) in each of 2014-2015, 2015-2016, and 2016-2017.⁸

In essence, QUFA was being asked to reopen a CA, ratified by both QUFA Members and the Board of Trustees, and to forego promised past compensation to pay for future faculty renewal.

Given that QUFA has long argued that the Administration should hire more full-time faculty to address the deteriorating student/faculty ratio, the Administration proposal represented a smart political move on their part. However, in the continued absence of an overall faculty renewal staffing plan for the University, there is no guarantee that the "extra" QNS appointments would not simply be used as substitutes for appointments that would have been made anyway.⁹ In other words, there is no guarantee that they would, in fact, represent a net addition to the longer-term faculty complement.

QUFA's Position

The Administration's proposal has been much discussed by the QUFA executive, at QUFA council, and at the JCAA. At the QUFA Spring General Meeting held on 24 April 2013, there was little interest in the

Administration's proposal among the Members present.

QUFA executive members stand by their interpretation of the 2008-2011 CA and the position that all of the funds allocated to the Anomalies Side-Table must be paid out to Members. QUFA has initiated the grievance process to defend this position.

Notes

¹The AST is a joint-committee consisting of two nominees from QUFA (currently Grant Amyot (Political Studies) and Barbara Kisilevsky (Nursing)) and two nominated by the University (currently, John Dixon (Geology) and Lorne Carmichael (Economics)).

²This represents about 0.33% of the total faculty salary mass, so it is substantial.

³For example, assume that, as a result of the 2008-2009 AST analysis, an individual Member receives an increase of, say, \$1,000 for 2008-2009. The \$1,000 then becomes part of the Member's nominal base salary. Since the award will not be paid out until the 2008-2009 AST analysis is completed later in 2013, he or she should receive a lump sum of approximately \$5,245 at the time of the pay-out to cover both the initial award for the 5 salary years 2008-2013 and the scale increases on this amount that would have been received between 2009 and 2013. At the time of the pay-out, the employer would also need to make an additional contribution of approximately \$393 to the Member's money purchase pension account. The total amount of retroactive salary at stake is conservatively estimated at \$1.6 million as of 1 May 2013.

⁴Note that the market demand and retention payments from the Principal's Fund can have the side-effect of creating more or greater anomalies as defined by the mathematical models, thereby

creating a “whipsaw” of salary increases within disciplines.

⁵Normally, the JCAA refers such cases to the appropriate dean with a request that the salary be adjusted from faculty funds rather than AST funds. In this instance, it was agreed to use the balance of 2006-2007 Round-1 money for this purpose.

⁶An additional \$300,000 special adjustment for 2010-2011 that was bargained for in 2008 is to be added to Round 2 in 2010-2011 for a total of \$500,000.

⁷Note that the current 2011-2015 CA has zero dollars attached to both the AST and the Principal’s Anomalies Fund.

⁸The other element of the Administration’s proposal was to agree to a previous QUFA suggestion that Members of the former Queen’s Theological College (now Queen’s School of Religion) be included in the AST process for 2010-2011.

⁹The Senate Academic Planning Task Force was tasked with addressing faculty renewal in 2012-2013. The Task Force, however, has been seized with the other issue assigned to it—“virtualization and online learning”—and has not had sufficient time to address faculty renewal.

Grant Amyot can be reached at amyotg@queensu.ca.

Susan Fitzgibbon can be reached at fitzgibb@queensu.ca.

John Holmes can be reached at holmesj@queensu.ca.

Steve Iscoe can be reached at iscoes@queensu.ca.

GRIEVANCE CORNER

Referee Selection for RTP Process

What should you think about as you assemble your list of referees for renewal, tenure, and/or promotion?

**By Phil Goldman
Grievance Officer, QUFA**



Faculty going forward for renewal, tenure, and/or promotion (RTP) all confront the need to provide a list of potential referees who are “qualified” to assess their scholarship or creative work. The Collective Agreement (CA) does not provide much direction on what to think about when making a list, other than specifying how many referees are required for each personnel process and how many must come from the candidate’s list. Nevertheless, some broader understanding of the centrality of referee selection can be gleaned from the history and protocols governing RTP processes.

The first CA departed in significant ways from how RTP matters were dealt with before certification. The aim was to eliminate as far as possible practices and biases that were believed to hinder fairness, equity, and scholarly diversity. They included the operation of personal hostilities, rigid methodological and paradigm disagreements, gender and racial bias, and a general “clubiness” test. Some of these dispositions remain, as evidenced by our experience that a large majority of RTP difficulties that come to QUFA emanate from women and racially identified candidates. However, the provisions in the CA, including the centrality of external scholarship validation, have minimized the impact that these attitudes might otherwise have.

What follows is a short list of best practices that have informed the referee selection and assessment process.

1. Your selections should be informed by how you define your area of expertise. It is therefore important for you to describe your scholarship and where it is situated in your research areas. Increasingly, we see candidates whose work overlaps a number of fields. However, to justify proposing one or more referees in areas that are outside the normal boundaries of work in your department requires some exploration of what it is you do. This can be done well or badly, so don’t slough this off.
2. A potential referee’s title, e.g. Dean, doesn’t necessarily qualify him or her as an expert. Think about it this way: is this a person to whom a journal in your field would send your manuscript for evaluation?
3. Because of the importance attached to expert assessments of the content of your scholarship (hence the “journal” model), it is never sufficient to have a committee rely upon “proxies” for quality. Referees are expected to read what you submit and to comment on it. The number of publications, the putative standing of the publishers, the frequency of citations, etc., are not, by themselves, sufficient to constitute an evaluation of quality. If

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!

they were, there would be little reason to require “qualified” referees.

4. While it may seem obvious, your referees should be among scholars who would make up your normal academic audience. For example, should your research interest be geographically defined as South Asia, then your referees should also be expected readers of your work by virtue of their work on South Asia or at least on cognate areas. One implication is that the relevant vehicles for publication may deviate from the standard list of top journals because of who your audience is.
5. An RTP committee’s primary responsibility when it comes to research is to provide a full and fair reading of the referees’ evaluations. It is never appropriate for a committee to substitute its view of the quality of scholarship for those of the referees unless it provides clear and compelling reasons as to why those (one or more) assessments are unreliable.
6. Some of the language in the CA dealing with faculty assessments is best characterized as “superlative.” “Excellent” or “distinguished” is a bit like an A+ in grading. There is often considerable variation among faculty in awarding such high grades. So too is it the case when referees evaluate scholarship. Our experience is that referees from Britain or Europe seem less inclined towards superlatives. Faculty might keep this in mind when selecting referees. Additionally, academic cultural differences highlight the importance of not relying on “magic words,” but rather on paying attention to the full content of submitted evaluations.
7. We regularly confront issues of quantity versus quality. The CA speaks about quality. Nevertheless,

there should be a sufficient quantity of scholarship for the referees to be able to make a reliable judgment of quality. This need not take the form of many publications, since there is considerable variation in numbers and length, usually related to fields of inquiry. Books, monographs, articles, research notes, etc., are differently valued in different areas, so one cannot prejudge questions of quantity and length.

At the end of the day, the selection of your referees reflects what you are about. How you define your scholarship is an exercise in academic freedom, but it also carries with it a high level of academic responsibility. Your list of referees should be made up of scholars who are comfortable with your academic interests and whose academic credentials are substantial. Careful attention to their selection is second only to you presenting a solid academic file.

Until 2010, QUFA and Faculty Relations held joint sessions to explain the RTP process, including a discussion about referee letters. The 2010 sessions, Part 1 in June and Part 2 in September, were recorded, and you can view them via the Faculty Relations Web site: <http://www.queensu.ca/provost/faculty/facultyrelations/qufa/renewal.html> (see the links on the left side).

Some of the earlier dates in the process have changed since then, but the principles guiding the process remain the same. You will also find links to handouts for the sessions that give an overview of the process and the presentations.

Again, remember that the dates earlier in the process have changed and you should refer to the current collective agreement for the correct dates.

Phil Goldman can be reached at goldmanp@queensu.ca.

ON THE WEB

QUFA Online

Members can interact online with QUFA in many different ways!

1. QUFA Web Site



www.queensu.ca

2. QUFA Forum



qufa.wordpress.com

3. QUFA on Facebook



facebook.com/groups/qufagroup

4. QUFA on Twitter



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