PRESIDENT’S VOICE
Not All Under-Ten Courses Are Created Equal

Instead of one-size-fits-all solutions, why doesn’t the Administration make principled decisions about which courses should be retained and which ones should be cancelled?

By Mary C. (Cella) Olmstead
President, QUFA

This edition of QUFA Voices is devoted to finances and budget cuts, topics that are dominating activities and discussions at QUFA HQ.

No one reading this article needs to be convinced that a lack of public funding for postsecondary education is decimating our institutions. At Queen’s, budgetary issues have resulted in layoffs, a hiring freeze, and dramatic alterations to our teaching and research programs. One of the most controversial is a decision to eliminate undergraduate courses with fewer than ten students, the subject of a heated, three-and-a-half-hour Faculty of Arts and Science (FAS) Faculty Board meeting last Friday. We heard about the hours of number crunching in the Dean’s office that revealed a large number of FAS courses with enrolments below this minimum target and twenty-four percent of classes across Queen’s with fewer than twenty students. At the FAS Town Hall on 11 December 2023, Provost Evans said, “Surely, there can be no debate that smaller classes are more expensive to teach than larger ones.” Surely, no one can
I was thinking about this issue last week at the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT) President’s Forum when I learned that most Canadian universities have a course enrolment minimum, usually ten to fifteen students (I freely admit this was news to me). In contrast to Queen’s, however, everyone I spoke to listed specific protected-enrolment courses. Music was the most common, but other exemptions included upper-level language classes, specialized labs, and fine art. I was also struck by how differently an enrolment requirement unfolded at other institutions. I heard how “we worked with the Dean’s office to co-list courses across departments,” “we modified program requirements to free up resources for smaller seminar courses,” and “we identified graduate and undergraduate courses that could be combined.” At Faculty Board, the Associate Dean assured us that FAS would consider adopting any or all of these strategies, which are likely to be more effective if instituted before the courses disappear. To that point, David Porreca from the University of Waterloo described efforts to protect his home department of Classics as follows:

When we heard these initiatives were coming down the pipeline (i.e., two or three years in advance!), we combined upper-level courses across universities so we could all meet the minimum enrolments.

Faculty members initiated and designed the plan, but he conceded that administrators at three separate institutions facilitated its implementation by allowing cross-registration at no extra cost to the students. While somewhat cumbersome in its delivery, Classics is surviving at this tech-centric university. Proactive efforts by the chair of our own Classics department to secure the future of his department met a different fate.¹

Going back to the numbers, even my home department of Psychology, with one of the highest enrolments in FAS, occasionally runs courses that hover around ten students. Cancelling these electives may restrict the breadth of topics our students are exposed to, but will not affect program learning outcomes or degree-level expectations. Most importantly, there will be no impact on the quality of students we attract or the expertise of those we graduate (apologies to my colleagues whose classes were cancelled). This is clearly not the case for the Dan School, in which core components of music programming will disappear when under-ten courses end up on the chopping block. As Daryn Lehoux so elegantly explained at Faculty Board, some departments will be unable to ensure academic advancement of future students unless they have the opportunity to restructure their courses before the under-ten restriction is enforced. No doubt there are other types of courses, possibly in Languages, Literatures, and Cultures (LLCU), that fall between the minimal-maximal damage divide that separates Psychology and Music.

So, rather than a one-size-fits-all elimination, why not make principled decisions about the courses that can and should be retained? Dean Crow intimated at Faculty Board that under-ten courses set for the chopping block are largely dispensable, in that “many of these classes are not essential for degree progression.” But what if they are essential for something else? Could we inadvertently remove all courses in one department that teach students to “recognize gaps and identify limitations of one’s knowledge” (arguably, the most important degree-level expectation today)? Shouldn’t these decisions, with the potential to alter pedagogical goals and objectives, involve the
relevant departments? If the quantitative goals of the administration and qualitative judgements of departments are misaligned, provide a forum and timeframe to resolve these differences.

Undertaking this evaluative process would surely lead to broader and more nuanced discussion of how restrictions (as well as limits!) on enrolments in specific courses could support our academic mission. Establishing principles in advance has the added benefit of guiding future decisions, both in terms of program development and course redesign. No one doubts that these discussions should involve budgets, but even this weekend Principal Deane confirmed, once again, that Queen’s is not on the verge of imminent collapse. So, conversations about enrolment restrictions should occur in the context of the institution’s financial situation, not as a consequence of it.

A discussion of eliminating under-ten courses will continue at the FAS Faculty Board meeting on Friday 2 February 2024 at 3.30 p.m. via Zoom. All faculty in FAS are voting members.

If you are concerned with Queen’s budgetary decisions, please share your comments with our Board of Trustee faculty representatives Vicki Remenda (vicki.remenda@queensu.ca) and Alana Butler (alana.butler@queensu.ca), and please copy QUFA (qufa@queensu.ca) when you do. Thanks!

Notes

1https://www.queensu.ca/classics/?fbclid=IwAR3PqJSjXBO6ldN9jDbnWxliQq9p67TpgR_MBo2uf_n1aFExpkOTo7JCXBxQ

Mary C. (Cella) Olmstead can be reached at olmstead@queensu.ca.

FYI

Our Questions for the Provost

Here is the list of questions QUFA President Cella Olmstead and other Senators submitted to Provost Evans before the special Senate meeting this past January

By Mary C. (Cella) Olmstead
President, QUFA

Before the special Senate meeting of 17 January 2024, a group of Senators and I submitted a list of questions for the Provost that focused on internal financial decisions and pushed for a commitment to collegial governance.

1. Regarding capital reserves:
   a. How much of the $164 million in capital reserves is allocated to specific projects?
   b. Can you provide a breakdown of these allocations?
   c. Are any of the capital reserve funds earmarked for infrastructure upkeep and repairs?
   d. If not, how are these costs covered in the current budget?

2. At different town halls across campus, the allocation of PIF investment income has been referred to as an “executive” or “central” decision. Who has input into this decision and who, specifically, is the final decision-maker?

3. Your FAQ reports that there is $258 million of internally restricted endowments (separate from restrictions set by external donors). What are these restrictions, and what is the decision-making process that determines these restrictions?

4. When will the Board of Trustees next discuss the endowment spend rate, and what consultation processes will this include? How are the needs of the academic mission of the university factored into this decision?

5. In a 15 February 2022 letter to Queen’s faculty and staff, Principal Deane noted that a review of the current budget model was underway with recommendations from a steering committee to be communicated broadly by Spring 2022. According to your Web site (Review of Queen’s Budget Model, 2022), “recommendations from Huron Consulting Group have been submitted and are under consideration”:
   a. What is the status of this review?
   b. If the current budget model is to be altered, how is this impacting the restructuring of programs and operations in each faculty that result from budget cuts?

6. At the 11 December 2023 Faculty of Arts and Science (FAS) town hall, you pointed out that operations of this faculty are not financially sustainable without transfer payments from other faculties, at least under the current budget model: “We are now in a position of saying ‘which units are considered to be productive, or “worthy,” or “financially an asset.”’
   a. If transfer payment from other faculties to FAS are required in the short-term, who is responsible for initiating this process?
   b. What factors influence whether transfers occur, who makes these decisions, and how are faculties consulted?
   c. How can we ensure that
transfers are done equitably, considering the very small margins that smaller faculties operate on and given the externally competitive environment some faculties (such as Law) face?

7. If FAS cannot continue to operate in its current structure:

a. What is the long-term vision for this faculty and its place in the larger institution?

b. If there is no long-term vision, what is the process to initiate and develop one?

c. Given that substantial modifications to FAS programs, including admission category changes, are already underway and “need to be adopted no later than April 2024” (e-mail from Associate Dean (Academic), 3 Jan. 2023), how will a visioning exercise that includes collegial decision making unfold?

8. The Senate, as one of three governing bodies of the University, “is responsible for determining all matters of academic character affecting the University as a whole.”¹ Given that proposed changes to FAS operations and structure owing to budget cuts will affect academic programming and delivery, what measures are in place, or will be put in place, to ensure that Senate has adequate oversight to fulfil its responsibility to the broader University community?

Note

¹https://www.queensu.ca/secretariat/senate/senate

Mary C. (Cella) Olmstead can be reached at olmstead@queensu.ca.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S VOICE
Cross-Subsidization for Dummies
Queen’s ill-conceived “Activity-Based” budgeting model forgets the whole point of a university: to bring disparate disciplines together under one unified roof

By Leslie Jermyn
Executive Director, QUFA

I am not so much the author of this piece as I am a metaphorical collection of arrows on a signpost directing us to think about our budget history and university budget logic more generally. I am relying on the work of the budget literate to highlight weaknesses in the Queen’s Faculty of Arts and Science (FAS) revenue attribution system and how those weaknesses are being exacerbated in the current “crisis.” I am also going to remind readers of how long QUFA has been raising this issue with Queen’s leadership, and how many senior administrators have told us that they hear us and plan to do something about it.

Queen’s “New” Budget Model: Activity-Based Budgeting

Some will recall that under the stewardship of Provost Alan Harrison (2011-2016), Queen’s implemented an Activity-Based Budget (ABB) model, which rolled out gradually from 2013-2014 to full implementation in 2019-2020. The general principle of ABB (also known as Responsibility Centre Management) is that each “revenue centre” in an organization should be responsible for and have control over its costs with a mind to achieving balanced budgets across the enterprise. In addition to covering its own costs, each centre must also pay a tax to “central” to cover shared service costs.

QUFA commissioned a review of this model in 2016-2017, which culminated in the report titled “Queen’s University New Budget Model” by John Holmes (Professor Emeritus and former QUFA President), which you can find on the QUFA Web site.¹ QUFA was prompted to commission this important work because of the real concerns in FAS about the choice to “drive the model to the unit level.” The Report was widely shared and well-received by Queen’s administration.

In most university contexts where ABB has been introduced, the
revenue centres are presumed to be at the faculty level; that means that within a departmentalized faculty like FAS, individual units do not have to attempt (or pretend) that they all run on the same formulae of per-student costs for teaching or per-researcher costs for conducting research. A thirty-second thought experiment comparing applied music or language instruction with teaching Math or Sociology makes clear that costs per student are in no way comparable. Another thought experiment comparing the costs of field research in biology or experimention in physics with library research in History or English makes this point with respect to research. This basic common sense was ignored on purpose in the implementation of the model at Queen’s in FAS where each unit has to be responsible for generating sufficient revenue to cover its costs and tax to central (the University Fund). Holmes had this to say about the decision in FAS:

The wisdom of driving revenue attribution down to the departmental level in a faculty with such a diverse range of pedagogic practices is questionable. Short of very extensive modification, the [FAS] NBM is incapable of being fully implemented without causing irrepairable damage to the academic fabric of the faculty. (7)

The model also made certain kinds of research into a budget liability—not a good thing at a research university with sliding rankings.

As well as these flaws in the model, Holmes found that the University Fund tax rate was too low, so that there were insufficient funds available in the Fund for new initiatives or hold harmless transfers (that were in place until full implementation in 2019-2020). There was also some question as to the lack of transparency in how the Provost and Principal decided where to allocate Fund monies.

Subsequent Provosts have acknowledged these flaws. I recall a very friendly QUFA Town Hall with then newly appointed Provost Benoit-Antoine Bacon (2016-2018) in which we were assured that Queen’s was aware of the issue and would be addressing it. Since then, nothing has been done about the skewed revenues and costs of teaching across FAS, but there have been corrections to how research was costed.

When Patrick Deane became Principal in 2019, QUFA was still raising the FAS unit-level attribution of revenue and costs as a core concern. Principal Deane agreed that it was concerning and committed to do something about it. In 2022, the Principal initiated a review of the budget model and Queen’s contracted with Huron Consulting Group to gather information.² It’s been two years now since the review started and … crickets. It’s going on seven years since the Holmes Report.

That’s the Queen’s story, but what about this argument that there should be cross-subsidization? Is that just a union position that runs counter to good economic management?

The Point of Universities

From their origins, universities were communities of scholars who banded together to offer (largely) non-vocational education to would-be professionals. The core value of a university education since at least the twentieth century has been that it offers both breadth and depth of education. That only happens when you unite a variety of disciplines under one roof. Since disciplines have different learning and research requirements, they have different budget profiles even while the twenty-first century per-student funding model does not differentiate substantially among the disciplines housed together in many arts and science faculties. But don’t take my rose-coloured-glasses word for it. Alex

Usher of Higher Education Strategy Associates, who is not prone to defending traditions for their own sake or to taking pro-faculty positions, had this to say about cross-subsidization with respect to a misguided Auditor General’s report on York University:
The AG’s Office seems to think that every program should post a profit (or at least a balance)…. Quite simply, the entire purpose of a university is to find synergies across disciplines. If that weren’t the case, we would just have free-standing schools of political science or Mechanical Engineering or whatever. That means universities by definition are supposed to ignore purely program- or discipline-level considerations, particularly when it comes to finances. Universities are supposed to cross-subsidize across disciplines: that is one of their central functions.¹

I highly recommend the full Blog post for other insights into assessing “program viability,” but the takeaway is that over ten years ago, a decision was taken at Queen’s to destroy one of the core functions of bringing together a diverse community of scholars to offer both broad and deep instruction to aspiring professionals and citizens. At least, it is destroyed when FAS or one of its constituent units needs subsidization. Recall the generous “donation” of 100 FAS student places to the Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science and the Smith School of Business (two of the richest faculties) when Ford’s tuition freezes created budget problems there.

In the current crisis, not only is Queen’s leadership allowing the ill-conceived FAS budget model to persist, the Dean’s office is doubling down on inequities by insisting that all units share the budget cuts “evenly.” This is to take liberties with the meaning of “even,” and results in further, deeply unfair consequences in small and teaching-heavy units like Classics, LLCU, and the Dan School. More specifically, there is no way a unit with three Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) faculty will experience a thirteen percent budget cut “evenly” with a unit with twenty-three FTEs. Further, a seminar course may be able to retain its value and pedagogical characteristics with eleven students, but applied music instruction simply does not work that way. Provost Evans has made comments about Classics having to beg for indulgence from richer units. That is a failure of management, not evidence of it.

There is absolutely no need for and no sense in pursuing the myth of financial independence of sub-faculty units, and it is past time that Queen’s leaders honour their commitments to reconsider this decision. I recall another provostial town hall with the architect of the misshapen New Budget Model, Alan Harrison. When asked if driving the model to the unit level wasn’t going to result in the disappearance of some disciplines, he gave a slight shrug and an insouciant smile and said nothing more. He moved on, but today’s leadership has to come to terms with his choices and whether they resonate with Queen’s vision and mission as a comprehensive and mutually beneficial community of scholars and learners.

Notes


³https://higheredstrategy.com/does-ontarios-auditor-general-understand-universities/

Leslie Jermyn can be reached at qufaed@queensu.ca.
ANALYSIS
“Queen’s could cease to exist”
The stories we tell with financial accounts

By the Budget and Finance Review Committee, QUFA

Shareholders, tax authorities, union officials, government-subsidy policy-makers, and investment analysts could all be told a different accounting story, each of which was embedded in and arising from a particular audited financial statement. Significantly different stories can be told today from the same database of events and transactions, each of which conforms to generally accepted accounting standards.

As Norman Macintosh, long-time Queen’s accounting professor, and Teri Shearer, current Queen’s Deputy Provost, highlight in the above quote, the same financial statement can paint different pictures geared to different audiences. The importance of such narratives became readily apparent over the last month as Provost Matthew Evans’ statement that “Queen’s could cease to exist” to an internal Queen’s audience made its way into the national media and set off a news cycle that harmed the university’s reputation at the point when students were making choices on where to apply. While the budgetary pressures caused by the provincial government’s decision to freeze tuition and grants in an environment of high inflation are undoubtedly real and challenging for the university, narratives of the resources available to face these pressures frame what is viewed as possible in response to the budgetary challenge.

The Provost’s statement was based upon a narrative of Queen’s finances that used the amount of money in Queen’s operating contingencies (unit-based reserves) and a budget deficit projection (rather than audited financial statements) to state the university does not have the funds needed to operate at current levels for two more years. Yet a month later at a special Senate meeting VP (Finance) Donna Janiec revealed that $20 million of investment income went into capital reserves last year, and the same may be true for tens of millions more this year, depending on investment returns from its Pooled Investment Fund (currently at $40 million for the year according to the VP (Finance)). How can we square the circle of these competing stories? Is Queen’s about to run out of reserves, or is it so flush with cash that it can place tens of millions away for future use? And, importantly, how is the university’s strategic vision guiding the administration’s choices on such funding priorities?

The difference in these narratives comes down to what the administration considers to be its reserves as well as decisions made about how to allocate funds within different accounting categories. Provost Evans has made it clear that

At a recent town-hall meeting, Provost Matthew Evans said, “Queen’s could cease to exist.” What led the Provost to make this extraordinary statement? The QUFA Budget and Finance Review Committee breaks it down in this Analysis.
h is conception of reserves does not include capital reserves (which recent figures place at $167 million\(^5\)), but is instead limited to the aforementioned operating contingencies. At the same time, the VP (Finance)'s comments reveals that the administration is continuing to place funds into capital reserves, effectively disappearing these funds from the administration's description of the money available to manage budgetary pressures. During the Senate meeting, the VP (Finance) made it clear that this is a choice rather than a necessity. As she admitted to Senate\(^6\) when pressed on the issue, income from the Pooled Investment Fund “could be used instead of the faculty [drawing] down on those carry forwards [e.g., operating contingencies]”\(^.\) Yet, legitimate debate over how such income could be used to help mitigate the operating deficit has been largely ignored. There exists a middle ground between allocating university operations a budget that is limited to a 0.9% return from the Pooled Investment Fund and the administrations’ concern\(^7\) with the reliability of using investment income for operations in the face of market volatility (a subject we plan to explore in a future edition of QUFA Voices).

Different decisions about what counts as a reserve or where to place funds would thus make the claims of a two-year window for action that have circulated untenable. Indeed, if the tens of millions in investment income going into capital reserves were instead directed to the newly created “Deficit Mitigation Fund”\(^8\) during this moment of stress, then suddenly the timeline for change would drastically shift. Such a timeline would allow for more careful consideration of how to protect the university’s academic mission than is currently seen. This would not depart from past practices or the university’s own description of possibilities: investment income has been used to address deficits\(^5\) in the recent past, and a university FAQ suggests that capital reserves could be used to make up for shortfalls\(^10\) in investment income.

That financial accounts can tell different stories is something the administration is aware of and has sought to manage. Last year, the university made the decision\(^11\) to retire $30 million in internal loans outstanding for the Queen’s Centre. This resulted in a corresponding $30-million dollar increase in the stated operating deficit in order to “fund” this reduction of debt. As the Provost wrote in response to a question submitted to the Senate by QUFA President Cella Olmstead about the decision, this transfer was “an internal accounting decision ... [that] had no impact on the cash available to the university.” Further, he added (and later reproduced in an online FAQ):

> Offsetting these two amounts reduced the risk that a reader of the annual financial report would reach an incorrect conclusion about the funds available to support new capital infrastructure at Queen’s.\(^12\)

Here, then, the university sought to manage the university community’s understanding of the level of capital reserves. This had a secondary effect of raising the publicly reported 2022-2023 operating budget deficit from $20 million to $50 million. While the university eventually clarified this discrepancy after pressure from QUFA and student groups to do so, the damage was already done, and the Globe and Mail had reported the $50 million figure in its coverage.\(^13\)

The stories shaping discussion of the operating deficit are not limited to a focus on reserves and investment income. The special Senate meeting also included a discussion of Queen’s budget model, including requesting a report from Huron Consulting\(^14\) on consultations over the model that the university promised to release in 2022 but which has remained on the shelf. While much of the focus on the budget pressures has focused on the Faculty of Arts and Science (FAS), the allocation of deficit to each faculty or school is based on how the budget model allocates funds and expenses (e.g. how much is transferred from central to units and vice versa). As Principal Patrick Deane stated during the Senate meeting:

> If you look at the situation in Arts and Science it is clear that were a different budget model in place, and here I am talking about things such as contributions of the faculties to central services and issues of that sort, something of the challenge which faces Arts and Sciences could be addressed through rethinking the budget model. But the sources coming into the university are finite and circumscribed.\(^15\)

The Principal makes an important point that the budget model does not reduce the budgetary pressure felt at the university-wide level. But he also highlights that the way certain units are bearing the brunt of these pressures is based on a particular narration and model of the
university’s finances. For instance, the Provost’s claim at the FAS town hall that a “case will have to be made [to] the Dean of Medicine, Engineering, Business, that they’re going to put some of their money in to support Classics” would change under a different system of allocating funds. While the Deficit Mitigation Fund is a temporary fix to this problem, the larger question of how the budget model advances a vision for the future of the university remains unaddressed in the haste to cut.

Where do these competing narratives leave us in terms of the current moment? The key takeaway is, we argue, that while the budgetary pressures facing the university are real and need to be laid at the door of the provincial government through concerted advocacy, the decisions being made on how to handle this crisis, what resources are available to do so, and what parts of the university should bear the largest burdens are profoundly political rather than innately technical. Under a collegial system, faculty should be involved in charting the future of the university rather than simply implementing the path charted from above.

Notes
3https://queensuniversity.civicweb.net/Portal/MeetingInformation.aspx?Org=Cal&Id=2665
4https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=I0uHdcf7x5I&t=2565s
5https://www.queensu.ca/financialservices/sites/finswww/files/uploaded_files/Publications/Annual%20Budget%20Reports/Queen's%20University%202023.pdf
6https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=I0uHdcf7x5I&t=2809s
7https://www.queensu.ca/provost/budget-and-enrolment-planning/operating-budget-deficit-updates
9https://queensuniversity.civicweb.net/document/191104/
10https://www.queensu.ca/financialservices/publications/detailed-financial-faqs
12https://www.queensu.ca/financialservices/publications/detailed-financial-faqs
15https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=I0uHdcf7x5I&t=1387s
16https://docs.google.com/document/u/0/d/e/2PACX-1vSVjMCV5Qx5b7y-He5O8v8sCrrDZc2yUyn_2aVz53UpY2jK57M1dxGIOdM05jU8htAm-umH4IBA-1/pub?pli=1

GET INVOLVED!
Call for Nominations
The nominations process for QUFA Executive positions is now underway

By Leslie Jermyn
Executive Director, QUFA

We’re beginning the nominations process for 2024 that culminates with elections to Executive Committee positions at the Spring General Meeting.

In the first instance, we are putting together the Nominations Committee (per By-Law 1 of the QUFA Constitution 1) and would like to hear from you if you are interested to be part of it. The “Nom Comm” works virtually, and largely through e-mail communications with a few meetings to check in. Committee members brainstorm potential candidates for open Executive positions and reach out to them to solicit interest. The Committee then recommends candidates to the Spring General Meeting. We need two members who are not from the Executive Committee or QUFA Council on this committee. Please get in touch if you are interested in participating this year.

We are also asking for interest in running for Executive positions that are open this year. These include (per 9.2 (vi) of the QUFA Constitution):

- Treasurer
- Secretary
- Grievance Committee Chair
- Joint Committee to Administer the Agreement (JCAA) Co-Chair
- Librarian and Archivist Representative
- Equity Representative
- Continuing Adjunct Representative
- 1st of 2 Members at Large (2-year term)
- Health and Safety Representative (newly converted to an elected position, one-year term to start)
GET INVOLVED
Call for Chief Negotiator
A new round of bargaining will begin in 2025, so QUFA is now looking for a Chief Negotiator to head up the Negotiating Team

By Leslie Jermyn
Executive Director, QUFA

In preparation for bargaining in 2025, the QUFA Executive is looking for members who wish to participate by joining the Bargaining Team or becoming a Chief Negotiator. The practice of having Co-Chief Negotiators has been successful in the past, so the Executive may select two people for the next round. Below, please find the information you need to understand the role, and its time and energy commitments.

Bargaining Governance and the Role of the Chief Negotiator

Bargaining procedures and decision-making is governed by Article 13 of the QUFA Constitution¹ and by the “QUFA Protocol Regarding Authority and Processes for Negotiating Collective Agreements,” which is contained in Section 3 of the QUFA Policies and Protocols² document. In combination, these documents outline duties and responsibilities for the Executive Committee, QUFA Council, and the Chief Negotiator and Bargaining Team. In addition, many aspects of bargaining are governed by the Ontario Labour Relations Act (e.g., conducting strike votes).

The Executive Committee has the power to select or replace all members of the Bargaining Team, including the Chief Negotiator. Council has the right to approve the Executive’s decision. In addition, the Executive and Council have final approval over the bargaining mandate for each round. The Bargaining Team develops this mandate based on member consultation and with Executive oversight. The Team must work within the parameters of this mandate or seek further instruction if matters are tabled that exceed their mandate. The Chief Negotiator is the primary spokesperson for the Team, and normally attends Executive meetings during and in the immediate lead-up to bargaining. The Chief Negotiator is also the primary spokesperson for the Team at member meetings.

Bargaining Timelines and Time Commitment

Bargaining preparations unfold well in advance of the actual negotiations. Normally, negotiations begin a month or so before the expiry of the current Collective Agreement (30 June 2025). By that time, the Bargaining Team needs to have developed proposals based on an approved mandate. While the Executive and Council have initial authority to approve a mandate, the members convened at a Bargaining Unit meeting also have the right to speak to the mandate and vote on any motion to approve a mandate. This is generally done at the appropriate General Meeting (Fall or Spring). Based on these guidelines, the following timeline of work for the Chief Negotiator is applicable (based on expiry on 30 June 2025):

- January to April 2024: Chief Negotiator(s) named and in consultation with the Executive, Bargaining Team formed.
- May to August 2024: Bargaining Team trained; member consultation and outreach mapped.
- September to November 2024: Member outreach to build mandate.
- December 2024: Mandate approved by Executive, Council, and members at FGM.
- January to March or April 2025: Bargaining Team develops proposals.
- March, April, or May 2025:

Note


Leslie Jermyn can be reached at qufaed@queensu.ca.
Negotiations initiated with Queen’s.

- **Summer 2025**: Negotiations continue. There is usually one hiatus in July for people to enjoy vacations.
- **September or October 2025**: Conciliation and preparation for strike if agreement not reached.
- **October to December 2025**: Either strike or settlement (or strike plus settlement) and implementation of the new Collective Agreement (CA). Once the new CA is finalized, the Chief Negotiator is finished their formal work.

The job is a two-year commitment of varying intensity. Roughly speaking, the first two-thirds of 2024 are lower intensity with attendance at Executive and a few team meetings. Fall 2024 is of medium intensity depending on how the Team elects to interact with the membership. Spring 2025 is of medium intensity as the Team develops proposals (this work can be done via e-mail as well as in meetings). Once bargaining begins, the work becomes more intense because the Chief Negotiator must attend Executive, Council, Bargaining preparation, and negotiation sessions, and any extra member meetings (including those leading to taking a strike vote). In addition, bargaining alerts have to be written or at least vetted by the Chief Negotiator. The Chief Negotiator also fruitfully participates in weekly calls with OCUFA to keep tabs on negotiations around the province.

**Support and Resources**

QUFA will provide the Chief Negotiator and Bargaining Team with training and professional support (QUFA staff, internal and external legal advice if needed) throughout the process.

For the Chief Negotiator, the “Release Time Policy” (also in the Policies and Protocols document) allocates one unit of time (half course or financial equivalent) in the term preceding negotiations and two units for each term in which negotiations are underway. However, if workload is high prior to that first term of release, the Executive could consider an additional unit of release time. In the projected timeline above, the minimum number of units is five.

Bargaining Team members generally get one unit of release time for each term they are in active negotiations. In the timeline projected above, each Team member would get two or three units of release depending on the start date of negotiations.

**Why be a Chief Negotiator?**

While this represents a significant time and energy commitment, negotiating a new CA is one of the most stimulating and important jobs in the union world. It requires attention to detail on the one hand, and a fine sense of high-level strategy on the other. It hones one’s linguistic logic and rewards those who can discern subtext in live communications. Finding creative compromises is a key part of the job. Chief Negotiators gain a unique perspective on how the university works and have a unique opportunity to influence those processes and short and long-term decisions (by the union and by management).

The Chief Negotiator is a leader who guides the Bargaining Team and helps the team to generate the necessary camaraderie and solidarity that sustain commitment to the mandate and the members. Negotiations can often be frustrating and tiring, but when Bargaining Teams find their rhythm and their humour, it is also an enjoyable and rewarding experience. It’s not for everyone, but those who try it often become lifetime negotiators.

**Joining the 2025 Team**

If you would like to be part of the next Bargaining Team or be a Chief Negotiator (the Executive may assign Co-Chiefs), please send a statement of interest and tell us about relevant experiences that would make you a good choice. You can send this information to QUFA President Mary Olmstead at qufaed@queensu.ca, with “Bargaining 2025” in the subject line.

**Notes**


Leslie Jermyn can be reached at qufaed@queensu.ca.
BENEFITS

Benefit Coverage While on Academic Leave

QUFA Members can still submit claims for drug, dental, and paramedical services while they’re on academic leave.

By QUFA Staff

Extended health care and dental coverage for non-emergency care will continue as long as the plan member (and dependents) has provincial health care in their province of residence. If a plan member (and their dependents) is planning to be away from Canada for a period greater than six months, they will need to check with their provincial health ministry (in Ontario, visit a Service Ontario Centre) before leaving to make sure their coverage stays active. The plan covers the same services and supplies that would have been eligible under the plan had the treatment been received in Canada, and are subject to the plan maximums and coinsurance levels for listed services.

How to Submit Claims While on Academic Leave Outside of Canada

Here are three typical examples of claims a member might wish to make while on academic leave outside Canada:

Submitting a Claim for a Drug Expense

- Pharmacies outside of Canada are not able to submit electronically. As a result, the member will need to pay out of pocket and submit the receipts for reimbursement.
- Submitting online: Submit the claim using the plan member Web site or mobile app. Select the expense type “Service Not Listed,” proceed with the reimbursement details, and attach a copy of the pharmacy receipt with the service codes.
- Submitting a paper claim: Download a claim form from the plan member site (“Claims” > “Claims Form” > “Extended Health Care”). Complete and sign the claim form, then mail it along with the pharmacy receipt to the Canadian address provided.

Submitting a Dental Claim

- Dental providers outside of Canada are not able to submit a claim electronically. As a result, the member will need to pay out of pocket and submit the receipts for reimbursement.
- Submitting online: Submit the claim using the plan member Web site or mobile app. Select the expense type “Service Not Listed,” proceed with the reimbursement details, and attach a copy of the dental receipt with the service codes.
- Submitting a paper claim: Download a claim form from the plan member site (“Claims” > “Claims Form” > “Dental Claim”). Complete and sign the claim form, then mail it along with the dental receipt with the service codes to the Canadian address provided.

Submitting a Paramedical Claim

- The member will need to pay out of pocket for any services received and submit the receipts for reimbursement.
- Submitting online: Submit the claim using the plan member Web site or mobile app. Select the expense type “Service Not Listed,” proceed with the reimbursement details, and attach a copy of the receipt.
- Submitting a paper claim: Download a claim form from the plan member site (“Claims” > “Claims Form” > “Extended Health Care”). Complete and sign the claim form, then mail it along with the receipt to the Canadian address provided.

Other Good Things to Know

The amount of the claim is reimbursed based on the exchange rate at the time the claim is processed. Manulife reimburses based on the plan maximums as well as the reasonable and customary (R&C) limits. If the amount submitted is more than these amounts, the remaining amount will be an out-of-pocket expense for the plan member.

QUFA can be reached at qufa@queensu.ca.
GRIEVANCE CORNER
Work and Adjunct FAQs
Answers to frequently asked questions about workload, work assignment, and Adjunct rights

By QUFA Staff

In the context of budget restrictions and reductions, many QUFA Members are concerned about changes to their work assignment, including whether or not they will continue to be employed at Queen’s. In addressing Member questions, it has become clear that there is confusion around Term and Continuing Adjunct rights in particular, and not much familiarity with tenure or tenure-track workload and possibility for variation from the standard. This FAQ addresses the questions we’ve heard so far. If you have other questions, please get in touch with us.

Term Adjunct Issues (Articles 32, 28, 29)

What right does Specific Right of Reappointment (SRoR) convey?

If a Term Adjunct teaches the same course three times in five years, has three evaluations noting satisfactory performance of duties, and has a record of good teaching, they may earn the Specific Right of Reappointment (SRoR) to that course in the same format in which they taught it (e.g., in class, online).

Can a course that a Term Adjunct typically teaches be given to another instructor to teach?

Yes, any course can be reassigned to a permanent member (tenured, tenure-track, or Continuing Adjunct), or to a more senior Term Adjunct, or one with General Right of Reappointment (GRoR) (see below). It can also be assigned to a Teaching Fellow who would not otherwise have an opportunity to teach as part of their graduate education.

What if they have SRoR for that course?

If a Term Adjunct with SRoR for a course is not being assigned to teach it because it isn’t offered or has been given to another person, the Head will inform the Term Adjunct in writing of the reasons.

What happens if two Term Adjuncts have SRoR to the same course because there are multiple sections but the decision is made to eliminate one or more sections? Who gets priority over the remaining teaching?

Priority is granted as follows:

1. The person who has taught most often and has taught this course in the last five years;
2. If they are tied, then the person who taught most recently;
3. If they are still tied, then the person who has the superior record of teaching shall be appointed.

What right does General Right of Reappointment (GRoR) convey?

With SRoR and at least four consecutive years of service in which they have taught at least four full course equivalents, a Term Adjunct may apply for the GRoR. If granted, this right conveys the right to be reappointed for one to three years in courses the Term Adjunct is demonstrably qualified to teach and for which they have SRoR.

Does GRoR guarantee work for the Term Adjunct?

No, the person’s courses could be reassigned to a permanent member (tenured, tenure-track, or Continuing Adjunct) or could be discontinued. In the latter case, the person may teach other courses for which they are demonstrably qualified to teach, if such exist.

Continuing Adjunct Issues (Articles 29, 32)

If overall course offerings are reduced, so that a Continuing Adjunct no longer has their usual courses available to teach, can their salary be reduced? Can they be terminated?

No and no. The contract between Queen’s and a Continuing Adjunct is permanent as long as the person continues to be willing to work and to
follow the rules of the Collective Agreement (CA) and university policies. If one’s usual courses are not available because of restructuring of a program or low enrolments, the member and Head should discuss what other courses are to be offered that the member could teach.

Can Continuing Adjuncts be assigned courses they haven’t taught before? Are there any limits to which courses they can teach?

There is no set limit on what topics the member may instruct. Like tenure or tenure-track members, Continuing Adjuncts can be expected to have broad expertise or to be able to develop it for the purposes of undergraduate teaching.

Gaming the Adjunct Promotion System

Is it permissible for course offerings and assignments to be manipulated to prevent a Term Adjunct from acquiring sufficient teaching to qualify for promotion?

It is absolutely not permissible to do this. The CA is based on the assumption that hiring decisions will follow rational principles as outlined in Article 25.10.2 and that curricular decisions will be made for pedagogical reasons, not to prevent a Member from acquiring rights. That said, it would require evidence of a pattern of program offering decisions or course assignment decisions or hiring decisions in order to demonstrate that there was a bad-faith effort to deny a member the opportunity to be promoted; a single instance of failing to be hired for a particular course or for a sufficient number of courses would not demonstrate bad faith.

Continuing and Tenure or Tenure-Track Member Workload Issues (Articles 15, 32, 37)

What force does a unit’s Workload Standard have for how much teaching can be assigned?

The Workload Standard determines how much teaching and service is required to make up a standard full-time equivalent (FTE) tenured position. Those on reduced responsibility or with partial FTEs are assigned duties pro-rated to their FTE.

A member can be assigned more or less teaching than the Workload Standard suggests in a couple of ways:

1. Members may be hired with an alternate teaching load described in their appointment letters (over or under the norm in their unit).
2. Continuing Adjuncts, as teaching only or teaching and service only, teach double the unit standard for an FTE of 1.
3. Members can carry teaching credits or debits as long as over any five-year period, their total load is consistent with the Workload Standard. This is contingent upon the program obligations being met as a first priority.
4. Members may teach overload courses that are compensated at the rates outlined for Term Adjunct teaching (see Article 42.4).
5. Members may have course buy-outs as a result of a heavy service load or for research grant purposes.

There are a few other times when teaching may be reduced (e.g., during the Initial Tenure-Track appointment), but these are the main ways teaching work deviates from the Workload Standard.

If you have a question about these parts of the CA, please reach out to Micheline Waring or Doug Nesbitt. If you believe your rights have been abrogated, please reach out to Karen Sisson.

QUFA can be reached at qufa@queensu.ca.