

Update

- As you know from previous updates, the employer wants to create a new category of teaching intensive positions, called “Teaching Focused Faculty”. This is one of the main issues of the current bargaining round.
- The consequences of such a change would be profound and long lasting as it would permanently reconfigure the academic career as we know it for future APUO members and have significant effects on existing APUO members and the shape of university education.
- Given the importance of this issue, the APUO executive believes it has the responsibility to share its analysis with its members – both because we are committed to transparency and accountability and because we need to know where our members stand on this issue to ensure that our position is in line with the views of the membership.
- As such, in this update we would like to do three things:
 1. Offer a detailed outline of the employer’s proposal on teaching intensive faculty (slide 2)
 2. Share our analysis of the proposal (slide 3 and 4)
 3. Ask you to participate in a one question survey to indicate whether or not you approve of the employer’s proposal (the survey will be completely confidential and the APUO will not have access to any individual information about respondents – thus who you are and how you vote will remain completely anonymous) (slide 5)

Detailed characteristics of employer's proposal for 'Teaching Focused Faculty' (TFF)

- Teaching load would be 200% of normal teaching load, i.e. 24 credits or 8 courses per year, including 18 credits or 6 non repetitive courses;
- Teach 3 semesters/yr, instead of 2, leaving 22 working days and 22 vacations days free of teaching activities per year;
- Teaching would be limited to undergraduate courses (especially 1st and 2nd years);
- No recognition of disciplinary research and only minimal scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) allowed;
- Tenure and promotion to associate professor would require "superlative" teaching (results of students' surveys have to be in the top quartile of faculty);
- Promotion to full professor would require "superlative" teaching, top quartile students' surveys and national or international teaching awards or prizes;
- Each faculty would hold a referendum to accept or not TFF. If YES wins, faculty can't go back. If NO wins, new referendum would be held in 36 months;
- Number of TFF in a given academic unit to be decided jointly by Dean and academic unit;
- Total number of TFF would represent up to 15% of regular faculty, which at current levels would imply between 190 and 233 TFF members to be hired;
- Replacement professors could be hired under same conditions as TFF for up to 5 years;
- Unlimited number of 8 month sessional lecturers in Medicine and Law could be hired for any course not taught by regular faculty.

APUO Analysis: Who Wins What? Who Loses What?

Issue	Existing APUO members	Future APUO members	Students	Employer
Teaching load - 8 undergraduate courses per year, including 6 different courses, over 3 semesters.	LOSE - New and formal Two tier system of professors; - Perennial divide between APUO members.	LOSE - Extremely heavy teaching load; - De-skilling of research capacity.	LOSE - Extremely heavy teaching load means less time to supervise and prepare between courses.	WIN - Cheapest labor strategy (if measured as number of courses taught by faculty).
FGPS membership - No membership possible, because no graduate supervision allowed.	LOSE - Heavy (and increasing) graduate supervision and teaching loads remain unchanged.	LOSE - No contact with graduate students; - No incentive to keep current with latest field developments.	LOSE - No new tentative thesis or research paper supervisors.	WIN - Rise of managerial control over teaching load and workload.
Research activities - Research restricted to the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL).	LOSE - Very limited research synergy possible, since limited to SoTL	LOSE - No academic freedom to choose their field of research; - Insufficient time to properly support a research program.	LOSE - No new possibilities as R.A. or other types of research integration. - Newest research not brought into classes	WIN - Erosion of academic freedom in favor of more managerial control over research activities.
Service to community - Employer's expectations unclear, but either very limited or non existent.	LOSE - Heavy (and increasing) administrative workloads remain unchanged.	LOSE - Very limited or no influence on program and course creation; - Limited participation in academic unit and faculty life.	N/A	N/A
Assessments and promotions - Restricted to course evaluations (surveys); - Need top evaluations from students.	LOSE - Unattainable tenure and promotions means new colleagues in and out every 6 years or so.	LOSE - Unreasonable expectations to meet, especially for 1 st /2 nd year undergraduate courses; - Unattainable tenure means little job security and revolving door.	LOSE - Revolving door not conducive to higher quality of education or improving students' experience.	WIN - Reduces even further cost of labor strategy (no tenure and no promotions).
Faculty referendum (or never-end-um) - Unfair to small units; - Repetitive process biased.	LOSE - Small departmental units at the mercy of large units' preference; - New divide between APUO members.	N/A	N/A	WIN - Managerial means to hammer the issue until preferred answer is obtained.

Summary of APUO's key concerns

- No empirical studies show that teaching stream faculty (including teaching only) positions improve quality of university education or student experience, as acknowledged by the Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario (2011), even though the agency is in favor of, and heavily promotes, teaching-stream faculty;
- Extremely heavy teaching load + no time/support for research + little professional development = deskilled profs with insufficient time to offer quality educational experience to students;
- Will create a two-class system where TFFs are marginalized as second class professors with less respect from academy and peers (HEQCO, 2011) and no real chance at professional mobility;
- Excessive (unreasonable) expectations for assessments, tenure and promotion = no real job security for TFFs and revolving door;
- Unlikely to significantly address many of the concerns about workload of current APUO members;
- TFF will not contribute to research reputation of units and programs;
- Referendum by faculty unfair to small units; repetitive process until YES wins is biased;
- Academic units might feel compelled to accept TFF (e.g. employer could make 'regular' positions contingent on accepting TFF positions; offer 'bonus' regular positions if TFFs accepted, etc.);
- Reduction of academic freedom and increase of employer control over research activities of professors is dangerous precedent for all APUO members and broader university community across Canada.

Survey Question

Do you support the employer's proposal? YES or NO?

- Please go to <https://apuo.questionpro.com> to express your view as soon as possible and no later than by the end of the day, Wednesday December 14.
- Your username is your uOttawa email.
- Your password is the last 3 digits of your uOttawa employee number.
- As indicated in the cover email, this survey is set up to be completely anonymous and the APUO will never have access to any individual information about you. It will be able to tabulate results by department and faculty, but will have no individual information on any respondent.
- Thank you for your attention in this matter.