

# Faculty of Arts Council - Minutes

Wednesday, June 6, 2018 (12:30-1:30 PM)

**Present:** Tim Babcock, Carlos Colorado, Brandon Christopher, Barbara Foucault, Colin Goff, Hugh Grant, Pauline Greenhill, James Hanley, Steven Kohm, Shauna MacKinnon, Lisa McLean, Jaqueline McLeod Rogers, Jaqueline Romanow, Catherine Taylor, Sante Viselli, Tracy Whalen, Conor Whately

**Regrets:** Rachel Berg, Roewan Crowe, Linda DeRiviere, Neil Funk-Unrau, Matt Gibbs, Roy Loewen, Sante Viselli, Doug Williams

---

## PSAC Negotiations

Marni Yasumatsu and Shelley Mangiacotti from Human Resources came to speak with Arts Council members about their Department's experiences with the PSAC agreement. The agreement was imposed through arbitration for a one-year period, effective January 1, 2017. The contract has expired but we are still governed by it.

Marni and Shelley are looking for feedback on particular challenges Departments experienced, as these may be areas that can be improved in the next round of negotiations.

### (i) Posting process

- Faculty members who drafted postings were instructed to forward these directly to HR. Departments would prefer if these were sent to the Departments first and then forwarded on to HR for posting. *Marni and Shelley can follow up with Bryan Ward on this aspect of the process.*
- Where there is an academic component, ideally students would be asked to give authority to Departments to check their grades.
- The emergency posting process was cumbersome. If a TA dropped out during the term, the Department had to go through all of the applications that had been submitted for that position and try to contact applicants and get responses from them in a timely way.
- Marni and Shelley indicate that it may be possible to expand exceptions to the posting requirement, so that Departments don't have to go through the posting process, for example, for positions that only have a few hours. Chairs generally agree that ideally they wouldn't have to post for positions having 15 hours or less.
- The form itself was problematic. Departments suggest that the information that applicants are required to submit needs to be listed at the **top** of the form where applicants will see it, otherwise Departments are left having to phone each of the applicants to request the required information.

### (ii) Selection process

- Members get "priority" on a position, i.e., AC 1 or 2, if they've previously held the same position for the same course - unless there has been documented unsatisfactory performance.

- If there's no evaluation for a member's work in a previous position, then it's considered satisfactory. It's the instructor's responsibility to complete the evaluations.
- Concern was expressed that completing the evaluations for PSAC members is a responsibility that's been added for faculty members, including Chairs, with no discussion with UWFA.
- If there's only one position, but two members with priority, then the instructor can select the person they want, but they may need to interview both applicants so that would be able to explain why they picked one over the other.
- Erin McCarthy in HR sends out the information about evaluating PSAC members at the beginning of the term. *It may be possible to ask Erin to send out a reminder to instructors during the term.*
- Marni states that while, from our perspective, it is desirable to spread around opportunities for TAs/markers/demo, this is in conflict with the PSAC's goal to have security for their members, and that's what was imposed by on us by the Labour Board.

*In the next round of negotiations, Marni and Shelley suggest we could try to get priority on just one section only.*

- Chairs request that when PSAC members are set-up for Payroll, they notify the hiring manager, so that PSAC members don't end up working overtime, if they're also working another position.
- Chairs suggest that, for example, when several intro courses that have the same qualifications are posted, Departments be allowed to post for all of them in one global posting and have students indicate their preferences. Ideally applicants would be asked to indicate their availability or they could indicate their preference of sections.

(iii) Classifications

- Classifications were divided broadly into AC2 – TAs (higher level of responsibility) and AC1 - marker/demo/tutors (less responsibility). However, in one Department required markers that work at a higher level and to be paid at the AC2 rate, so this was modified.