

Comments on Salary and Scales

I would go for more aggressive wage increases--like, proper raises as opposed to constantly keeping pace the bare minimum cost of living increase.

I think that it is really important for SMUFU to get the university to increase the level of contribution it is currently making to our pension plan from 8% to 10%. This is in many ways more important than a large increase in pay. As for pay scales, if we are about to enter a period of higher inflationary pressure, then it is the current steps increases should themselves be increased, particularly if the university is not willing to budge on a percentage pay increase (or tries to low-ball the union).

I would like to see a reduction of the number of steps in the Assistant and Associate ranks (particularly for former), so that newer colleagues can move up quickly. As a full professor, I am willing to accept less money in the way of an increase to achieve this, thereby facilitating equity and helping with retention.

I would like to see our salaries closer to the Canadian national average

Comments on Most Important Workload Issue

Reduction of standard teaching to 2-2

A reduced course load or a pre-tenure half sabbatical for probationary faculty would be great. This university wants productive researchers but seems unwilling to support them. - better compensation/recognition for graduate supervision. - automatic course release for grant holders.

Reducing teaching to a 2/2 load instead of the existing 3/2 load for professors who are tenured, have been promoted to the associate professor level, and are research active or engaged in scholarly activities. 2) Reduction in class size would also foster better student classroom engagement. Much of what I can and cannot do in the classroom is determined by class size.

1) tandard teaching load must be 2+2 like in other Canadian universities instead of 2+3 as it is now. 2) SMU and Sobey School of Business in particular MUST support the Journal Publication charges especially when the Faculty member would like to use Conference travel grants for Journal paper page publication charges (e.g., the Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers has a policy where by if the author were to pay a per page publication charge then the Journal article can be accessed by all (open access) - now only Universities that subscribe to IEEE Xplore database can access these articles). This affects the wide dissemination of research results. By the way, SMU library does NOT subsctibe to IEEE Xplore. My request is the the CA be rewored so that the Dean and FGSR can support Journal paper page publication charges instead of or in addition to the Conference Travel grant.

If one thing is achieved in bargaining, I would like to see a 2-2 standard course load for full time professors. I would prioritize this above all else. It is nearly impossible to attend to other obligations while teaching 3 courses in a semester, and research is what gets put on the back burner. It shouldn't.

Comments on Other Workload Issues

2-2 teaching load for faculty with productive research program

2-2 teaching load for faculty with productive research program

A 2/2 teaching load would be great!

A change to a 2/2 load would be wonderful, but if we keep our 3/2 teaching load, the option to teach 2/2/1(summer session) would be very helpful, in addition to providing summer session students with access to more courses with full-time faculty.

Faculty may teach their work load in ANY 2 of the 3 workterms namely, Fall, Winter, Summer instead of the mandatory Fall, Winter as it is now.

Comments on TRP Issues

obstacles to tenure and promotion for equity seeking groups need to be addressed - The university (or the union!) needs to make precedents for previous candidates more clearly available - eg record of publications, etc. - Candidates need more support from colleagues and admin. At other universities, a departmental committee works with the candidate to create the file, solicit letters of support, etc. - the process needs to be moved on line - what a waste of paper! - A formalized process (eg a form or template) for annual reports would be helpful.

Although there is clear language in the collective regarding protocols (how external reviewers should be chosen, etc.), there have been disturbing incidents where Chairs and Deans have enforced these protocols. Something needs to be put in place to protect faculty members in such situations. As well, especially in the case of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, more weight needs to be given to academic conference presentations--SoTL is highly collaborative and nimble at its best and conferencing with SoTL colleagues and development of innovative curricula is as complex and peer-review intensive as publishing a journal article. Also. Other Universities provide pre-tenure faculty a full year sabbatical (funded at 100%) at year three to allow for intense concentration on publishing. If SMU wants to strive for status as a research University, they need to support faculty in that research.

I think ARs should go to the Deans, with consultation with Chairs is necessary (if there are concerns). I think having colleagues weigh in is really problematic, and I've seen

this misused multiple times.

In my experience, the Annual Report are rarely, if ever, used for renewal, tenure, and promotion beyond the academic unit, i.e. the Deans, the URC, and the President don't use them. Most often, the Annual Report simply pit member against member, often they are used to draw poorly constructed comparison. I would get rid of it if I could.

My main complaint with the process is how long it takes. Expediting it would alleviate stress. Why, for example, do we have to submit files in mid-July and then wait until the end of October for letters from external reviewers and the process of evaluation to begin?

no changes. The process works well as currently designed.

Promotion evaluations should involve only faculty in a rank higher than the applicant's application rank. In each of the cases the Chairperson should make her/his report available to the Department for agreement. The Department should have the opportunity to comment on the Dean's report for promotion or tenure in cases where the views might be in variance. Deans and Chairpersons should be required to be more specific in commenting on research performance in Annual Reports in terms of contribution level of the applicant to the research activity, accomplishments, national / international competitive stature of the applicant, research grants success of the applicant.

Tenure and promotion process should acknowledge the difference in quality published research. One highly cited publication should not be considered less than two or three publications in lower tier journals with few to no citations.

The process needs to be followed consistently within and among different Departments and Faculties. For instance, input on annual reports from colleagues should be the norm rather than the exception. Faculty should not be set up for a surprise at tenure or promotion time if little or no useful feedback has been provided from the Dean or the Department. Perhaps after tenure a biannual review may be sufficient, however, if done in a constructive and useful way.

Comments on Retirement Issues

Access to e-mail and library resources should be maintained for retirees

Health benefits should be available to retirees.

I am uncertain at what age members become eligible for retirement bonuses so did not answer one of the questions above. I do believe that there must be adequate incentives for

senior faculty to retire. While it is certainly is not the case for all senior faculty over the age of 65, it is often the case that these colleagues do less research and service, with the burden falling heavily on junior faculty who are simultaneously confronted with significant expectations re: research, teaching, and service. The academic environment for junior faculty is very different today and it is important to recognize this and ensure that appropriate incentives are in place.

I fully agree that health benefits should be provided to retirees. This is a MUST.

I support models that allow people to transition to retirement, over time. The challenge is to ensure that these models do not disrupt timely replacement of full-time faculty positions.

If you retire beyond age 67 (and no new incentive is put in place) you should at least get some \$ for time you worked towards a sabbatical entitlement

While I would like to see health benefits being provided to retirees it should not be at the expense of current members. Perhaps extend it to future retirees and not past retirees. It could be part of an enhanced retirement incentive program.

Top priority for me is that retirees should still have health benefits upon retiring. The very idea that we receive no medical coverage on retiring is alarming. Also, many of our SMU faculty are completely unaware that their medical coverage ends when they retire.

Comments on Equity Issues

This university seems unwilling to keep faculty of colour. Very few seem to make it through the process of tenure and promotion. We need STRONGER LANGUAGE in the CA around targetted equity hiring (see Dalhousie's strategies on this issue). We also need to identify (as above) specific obstacles to T&P for equity seeking faculty.

- In my experience, the minority Faculty who left SMU did so because they were offered even better jobs at more prestigious universities. - Prioritizing race in the hiring process inevitably discriminates against better qualified candidates of the wrong race. In disciplines with extremely few new tenure-track positions, equity hiring seems to create a sense of utter desperation and hopelessness for the non-minority candidates. - I think the union should seriously study the effects of the equity hiring on the opportunities and morale of the non-minority candidates, especially those of the working class background, as the class inequality is apparently, now not seen as an "equity issue" at all.

Consult CAUT & other leading institutions on best practices for proactive recruiting & retention supports at the department and administrative level, and the equity in academia literature: do your homework. After years of suggesting specific measures drawn from these sources I am weary of doing that work for Union leadership, with little result.

Departments should be required to make all hires equity hires, excluding white women, until any balances have been restored. We also need to work on retention of faculty of

colour by not merely throwing them at a white institution, or requiring them to perform symbolic roles. Where faculty of colour are advising large numbers of students informally, they should get course releases, to be funded by faculty who are dormant getting a 3.3 load

Equality of opportunity is vital to a fair hiring process and needs to be safe-guarded. By this I mean that hiring processes should be fair to ALL candidates, including minority candidates, but not only. To be clear: it does NOT mean equality of outcome. Specifically it is counterproductive to hire solely for to create a "diverse" workforce: hiring on such basis has numerous negative effects: (1) it does not serve underrepresented groups as it creates negative impressions of overall competence, (2) the individuals hired (because of the appearance that they did not get the job because of qualifications) and (3) the university (which may not be getting the best candidate for the job).

Equity in merit-based competitions with respect to ethnicity, race, religion, sexuality, gender-identity, ability, etc. would be good. I do not think the cause of equity is advanced when merit ceases to function altogether as a criterion of hiring, but it is also undermined when merit is overlooked as a result of biases towards diverse candidates. It's a bit of a snowball issue, however: the more diversity there is within hiring committees and departments, the more likely it is that diverse candidates will receive fair assessments when they apply for positions.

If the Union and the University are to defend academic standards, the only consideration in hiring and promotion can be merit. We have departed from this considerably in recent years, largely at the Union's behest, and it has been a disgrace. Higher education in this country is in grave condition, in part because of the corporatization of the universities. But while faculty unions affect outrage at the impact of this on higher learning, those unions themselves have done at least as much damage by endlessly politicizing hiring and "scholarship.". The noises that faculty unions--including our own-- make about defending academic standards against the depredations of overpaid managers is less and less convincing, given the damage that union activism has done and continues to do to higher learning. I'm sure the idea of "higher learning" would strikes many union officers as objectionable, because "elitist." (Some of the questions below betray the very adolescence to which I am objecting.)

Comments on Disruptive Classroom Behaviour

Cheating, walking in/out during classes to pick up coffee, etc. If the university plans to continue to recruit international students, they should provide more in-depth orientation, explaining the types of behavior that is inappropriate and unacceptable.

Disruptive behaviour (and even abuse) in classes, and on social media, is a significant issue, especially for women and racialized Indigenous faculty, and this behaviour is undoubtedly reflected in student evaluations. My awareness is that when anything is reported to the administration nothing is done.

I have had no such incidents myself. I know, however, that many of my colleagues have and that the current regulations are inadequate for addressing the problem. I would like to add

that it is not just students who are the problem. I have been deeply disturbed by stories I have heard from female colleagues, especially, who are being bullied and made to feel threatened by other faculty members. The administration currently puts the onus on the victim to solve the problems rather than taking a firm stand on the side of a safe workplace. This issue needs to be addressed at the same time we address issues of disruptive and/or threatening students.

I have had no such incidents myself. I know, however, that many of my colleagues have and that the current regulations are inadequate for addressing the problem. I would like to add that it is not just students who are the problem. I have been deeply disturbed by stories I have heard from female colleagues, especially, who are being bullied and made to feel threatened by other faculty members. The administration currently puts the onus on the victim to solve the problems rather than taking a firm stand on the side of a safe workplace. This issue needs to be addressed at the same time we address issues of disruptive and/or threatening students.

We get very little support as faculty members when it comes to student misconduct. I know of many students who treat faculty members in openly racist and sexist ways and the administration takes no action. The Conflict Resolution process is a farce and ensures that nothing is every done about complaints re: discrimination.

Training and guidance on how to support students with challenges (behaviour or otherwise) is severely lacking. The few workshops I attended were not well done and did nothing to address how to deal with a student with Asperger's who shouts out in class.

The Student Code of Conduct is virtually a useless document on this point. I know that faculty colleagues, including women and racialized groups, have been subjected to harassment. We have strong language in our Academic Regulations pertaining to academic misconduct issues. We need similar processes with respect student behaviour in classes. The best strategy, within the CA negotiations, would be to strike an MOU that would prepare a report that would develop new regulations and bring them under the authority of Senate.

Comments on Collegiality

clear definition of bullying needs to be included in the CA. HR has commented that everyone's definition/idea of bullying is different and uses that as an excuse to not address the issues. The conflict resolution officer needs to be given concrete power to take action, versus counselling and reporting issues. The current practice, and much of the confidentiality, only seems to alleviate the symptoms of dysfunctional departments and give victims an outlet, but it does not change anything or deal with the problems.

A proper faculty lounge with beer

Bulling in the workplace by chairpersons. When one colleague is responsible for the entire's malfunctioning of the department the University should have mechanisms to deal with that person.

Collegiality needs to be improved between staff/admin & faculty. ITSS exists to facilitate teaching & research. Somehow that seems to be forgotten. Will not budge when things like Brightspace do not work or the website is deficient. Please give us the opportunity to provide annual evaluations and feedback in the same manner that students do teaching evaluations. I can't see how else to instill a sense that we are all supposed to be working toward a common goal. These units seem to think of themselves as independent or not accountable. And they're right, they do not have any responsibility to the students, staff or faculty they serve. It's problematic.

I am not sure how to include this in the collective agreement, but as a new faculty member, I see a lack of transparency and open, two-way communication from the administration as a major issue hindering collegial governance.

I would like for the Deans to have more power to make decisions. For example, our hiring process is horribly slow because it is tied up in VPAR/President's office. As a result, it takes over a month to get an offer out, and we lose good faculty candidates. I would also like to see the President and VPAR to actually visit faculties and departments and listen to what concerns faculty and answer questions.

Comments on Health Trust Fund Issues

Most comments were directed at improving benefits of the current plan. We do not negotiate these with the Administration. All of the comments have been forwarded to the Trust for its consideration.