

Collective Bargaining Update as of March 2, 2007 Clarification of the University's Proposal and Principles

The University of Saskatchewan (U of S) tabled a revised proposal on Monday, February 26, 2007, which was the result of careful consideration of the Faculty Association's (USFA) proposals. The University's proposal reflected its ability to meet the interests of the Faculty Association's membership, while addressing the University's commitment to strategies to support recruitment and retention. Our latest offer, as discussed with the USFA over the last four days, represents the best financial package the University can offer.

The University's offer is grounded by the core principles of fiscal responsibility, economic rationale for salary increases, a lead-payer strategy based on reasonable comparators, competitiveness in all aspects of total compensation (benefits, leaves, etc.), a desire to treat all faculty members equitably, and a desire to not disadvantage any group as a result of the compensation reform.

We continue to be committed to the academic culture and traditions of individual input to academic planning, debate and discussion which is fundamental to a University.

The following questions and answers explain, clarify and provide context of the University's revised proposal:

Why did the University of Saskatchewan revise its proposal?

- We understand and appreciate the retention issues the Union has raised with respect to the compensation of Full Professors and have proposed increased salary adjustments for that group
- We continue to emphasize the need to change the compensation model to address recruitment issues for the junior ranks – our updated offer more effectively addresses this issue
- We have provided clarification regarding comparison of average salary increases for faculty and senior administration
- After more than 19 months without an agreement it is important to achieve labour stability and to focus on our future

What improvements did the University make in response to discussions at the bargaining table?

Compensation

- Slope adjustment for Professorial Ranks moved from 2006/2007 to 2005/2006 resulting in retroactive base pay adjustments
- Increased lump sum payments for Professorial Ranks in 2005/2006 to a maximum of \$5,000

- Increased base salary adjustment for Professorial Ranks to \$3,000 for each year of the three year contract (2006 – 2009)
- Provided one additional adds-to-base CDI of \$2,429 to all members who were Full Professors as of July 1, 2006, to be paid effective July 1, 2007 or when they reach the CDI ceiling
- Introduced base salary increases for Librarian Ranks of 3%, 3%, 3%, \$3,000 (flat amount) over four years
- Introduced base salary increases for Teaching Ranks of \$4,000, \$3,000, \$3,000, \$3,000 (flat amount) over four years
- Introduced salary grid reform for Librarian Ranks in 2008/2009
- Introduced Senior Lecturer category to Teaching Ranks

Benefits and Pension

- Increased funding to support benefits, pension and sabbatical travel grants from \$400,000 to \$1,292,343
 - Increased benefit cap funding (\$167,821)
 - Increased Employer pension contributions (0.5%)
 - Health Spending Account \$500 per annum
 - Increased sabbatical travel grants (\$4,000)
- Extended eligibility for 21 week paid leave to adoptive and parental leaves
- Rolled Market supplements for Dentistry and Law into salary forming part of base salary for the purpose of benefit coverage

(See attached proposal tabled on February 26, 2007)

Why do we feel our proposals are economically rational and fiscally responsible?

- Our Full Professors are currently paid in the top quartile of the market and this offer focuses on maintaining that lead-payer strategy
- The cost of living as indicated by CPI in Canada continues to be below 2%
- Our offer is a generous and serious commitment of limited resources to total compensation with an average increase of 3.5% on scale per year for four years, with an additional 3.0% in one time payments immediately for Full Professors in addition to base pay increases over the life of the agreement

Compensation Summary Table

Year	Adjustment
July 1, 2005	<p>Slope Adjustment \$0 to \$5,000 Base Increase Professorial Ranks plus one time payment for differential for those not receiving \$5,000</p> <p>Base Increase Librarian Ranks 3%</p> <p>Base Increase Teaching Ranks \$4,000 (flat amount)</p>
July 1, 2006	<p>Base Increase Professorial Ranks \$3,000 (flat amount)</p> <p>Base Increase Librarian Ranks 3%</p> <p>Base Increase Teaching Ranks \$3,000 (flat amount)</p>
July 1, 2007	<p>New Salary Structure Professorial Ranks</p> <p>Base Increase Professorial Ranks \$3,000 (flat amount)</p> <p>Additional CDI Full Professors (must have been a Full Professor as of July 1, 2006)</p> <p>Base Increase Librarian Ranks 3%</p> <p>Base Increase Teaching Ranks \$3,000 (flat amount)</p> <p>Department Head Administrative Stipend Increase to \$5,000</p> <p>Increase Specials at PRC to 100</p> <p>Benefit and Pension Increases</p>
July 1, 2008	<p>Base Increase Professorial Ranks \$3,000 (flat amount)</p> <p>Base Increase Librarian Ranks \$3,000 (flat amount)</p> <p>New Salary Structure Librarian Ranks</p> <p>Base Increase Teaching Ranks \$3,000 (flat amount)</p>

Our revised compensation proposals represent a significant move to address the concerns raised by the Association in relation to our previous proposal while remaining consistent to the principles of the University's compensation strategy.

Over the course of this past week, the University has engaged in open, interest-based discussions in an attempt to reach an agreement. Bargaining resumes today.

For further updates visit www.usask.ca and click on 'Human Resources', then 'Bargaining Updates'.

Given the complexity and significance of change contemplated by this proposal, it is made on a without prejudice basis with respect to errors, omissions or future revisions and changes.

University of Saskatchewan

Faculty Bargaining, Employer Settlement Offer Monday, February 26, 2007

INTRODUCTION

The parties agree that the most important aspect of this round of Collective Bargaining relates to the recruitment and retention of faculty. The University acknowledges the Faculty Association's compromises in its settlement offer of February 21, 2007 and the quality of the proposals made. We agree we are beginning to find some common ground

The Employer has carefully considered the Faculty Association's recent offer in order to maximize our ability to meet the interests of its membership, while addressing the needs of the University. The Employer has taken aspects of the Faculty Association's offer, and aspects of our last proposals to construct this offer. This is a full and complete package offer in an effort to reach a tentative agreement, replaces all previous offers except as referenced, and acknowledges those items which have been signed off on or agreed to in principle. This offer is open for consideration and discussion until Friday March 2, 2007.

PRINCIPLES

This offer is grounded by the University's core principles of fiscal responsibility, economic rationale for salary increases, a lead payer strategy based on reasonable comparators, competitiveness in all aspects of total compensation (benefits, leaves, etc.), a desire to treat all faculty members equitably, and a desire to not disadvantage any groups as a result of compensation reform.

This proposal also continues to reflect our commitment to the academic culture and traditions of individual input to academic planning, debate and discussion which is fundamental to a University.

ECONOMIC RATIONALE AND FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

The University needs to change the compensation model to address recruitment issues for junior ranks. We understand and appreciate the retention issues the Union has raised with respect to the compensation of full Professors. We have addressed both of these priorities in the following offer.

It is important for the University to reinforce that our full Professors are currently paid in the top quartile of the market and that this offer focuses on maintaining that lead payer strategy. It is also important to continue to note that the cost of living (as indicated by CPI) in Canada continues to be well below 2%. And that the student/teacher ratio overall at the University of Saskatchewan is the lowest in Canada according to the CAUT's data.

Given the complexity and significance of change contemplated by this proposal, it is made on a without prejudice basis with respect to errors, omissions or future revisions and changes.

The Union's proposal of February 21, 2007 continues to be excessive in terms of economic rationale and the University's requirement to be fiscally responsible, particularly in the context of the public sector and a publicly funded institution. The union has not provided an economic rationale for its February 21, 2007 proposals other than to compare faculty salaries to those of senior administrators. The University has made the comparison between the following offer and salary increases to senior administration below and can illustrate that there is parity. Despite that clarification, we continue to question the validity of the comparison given the differing expectations of the roles and the recruitment and retention issues of the two groups.

Term of the Agreement

The University accepts that the Faculty Association's executive has mandated a maximum 3 year collective agreement. We ask the Association to reconsider this decision with its Executive, based on the following offer. We believe that because it took so long to negotiate this agreement it is important to achieve some labour stability, set salary scales to facilitate recruitment and retention, and support multi-year planning initiatives. To do that we believe it is in the interests of both parties to reach a one year agreement on 2005-2006 which is past, then introduce a new 3 year agreement which allows us to move forward. We have modified our offers for 2005-2006 and 200 -2009 to make this more feasible for the Union.

SUMMARY OF MONETARY ADJUSTMENTS:

The monetary offer described below is a generous and serious commitment of limited resources to faculty salaries:

(Revisions to contract language to support the proposed changes is attached)

Summary Table

Year	Adjustment
July 1, 2005	Slope Adjustment 0 to \$5,000 base increase for Professorial Ranks Plus one time payment for differential for those not receiving \$5,000 Base increase to Librarian Ranks and Teaching Ranks
July 1, 2006	Base Increase Professorial Ranks \$3000 (flat amount) Base increase to Librarian Ranks and Teaching Ranks
July 1, 2007	New CDI structure for Professorial Ranks Increase Specials at PRC to 100 Base / Scale adjustment \$3,000 for Professorial Ranks Department Head administrative stipend increase to \$5,000 Benefit and Pension increases Base increase to Librarian and Teaching Ranks
July 1, 2008	Base Adjustment of \$3,000 (flat amount) for Professorial Ranks Base increase to Librarian Ranks and Teaching Ranks and change to grid structure to align with 2008 Associate Professor Floor

Given the complexity and significance of change contemplated by this proposal, it is made on a without prejudice basis with respect to errors, omissions or future revisions and changes.

PROFESSOR RANKS

The Employer believes we have a shared understanding of the need to change the slope of the overall salary lines as per the last proposal from the Faculty Association. In that proposal the Association asked for larger increases (as a comparison to current salaries) to the junior ranks. We believe the slope adjustment described in our January 31 proposal to be a fairer and less complicated way of making that adjustment while also accomplishing the magnitude of relative salary increases required for salaries at the junior ranks.

July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2006

The Employer is proposing that the slope adjustment occur in 2005-2006 as described below, through a one year contract that stands alone, given that the year has passed. We have modified our proposal from only lump sums, to implementing the salary reform in this year, which will result in retroactive base pay increases as per the Employer's January 31, 2007 proposal. We have added increased incentives for Full Professors, Librarians and others to support the transition to the new grid.

Step 1. The slope adjustment will occur by holding the salary of Full Professors who are at or above \$116,500 constant while adjusting the floor of the salary of the Assistant Professor up by \$5,000, drawing a line, then adjusting all salaries up to the line.

Step 2. All salaries, except the highest paid Full Professor, will then be brought up to the new salary line. This will result in **retroactive base salary increases to July 1, 2005**, as per the examples provided in the Employer's January 31, 2007 proposal.

Step 3. A calculation will be made to determine the amount of **one time lump sum** payments as a transition bonus to support the movement to the new model. This one time payment will be determined by taking the difference between the \$5,000 floor adjustment and the based increase received. So for example, if a Professor received a 2,200 base pay increase as a result of slope adjustment, they will then receive a one time lump sum payment of \$2,800 in the same year. If a Professor received no base pay adjustment they will receive a one time \$5,000 lump sum increase instead.

Given the complexity and significance of change contemplated by this proposal, it is made on a without prejudice basis with respect to errors, omissions or future revisions and changes.

3 Year Contract July 1, 2006 to June 30, 2009

Year 1 – July 1, 2006 to June 30, 2007

To preserve the new slope of the line and ensure salaries remain competitive, salary increases in subsequent years must be applied as flat amounts rather than percentage increases, as percentage increases will distort the slope of the line and reinforce any inequities that exist in the systems. Effective July 1, 2006 a base salary increase of \$3,000 will be added to the Professor Ranks scale and to each member.

Year 2 - July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008

In 2007 part 2 of salary reform will be introduced as this allows changes to be made to career development increments and merit on a go forward basis. Historically, changes in rank among faculty at the University of Saskatchewan have been triggered by changes in salary levels rather than by academic readiness. The redesigned model defines the number of normal steps in the career path and separates rank and salary so that base hiring and promotion through the ranks is based on achievement of academic standards. A combination of tables and text are used below to explain the salary reform.

The new salary grids includes a definition of the number of normal steps in the career path and separates rank and salary so that base hiring and promotion through the ranks is based on achievement of academic standards. **We have modified this proposal to A) clarify the impact of salary grid reform on Full Professors, and B) modify the CDI count for Full Professors currently in the system to support their transition to this new model.**

Step 1. Effective July 1, 2007, the career development path for faculty is divided into 18 career development steps from the time of appointment to the highest rank. Advancement through the ranks will be based on the achievement of academic standards established by faculty. A career development increase (CDI) will be applied annually. **The amounts of CDIs will be the same for each rank (\$2,429).** There is a short term and an ongoing cost to this adjustment.

Step 2. In implementation of the new grid, assistant, associate, and Full Professors will receive a new “CDI count”. In the Assistant and Associate Professor Rank, merit will no longer decrease CDI entitlement. Merit can be earned at any rank in addition to the CDIs. In the current model, special increases are applied to progress through the lower two ranks, while special increases do not increase CDI count for Full Professors. **This separation of merit and CDI components of salary for Full Professors is taken into consideration when the new CDI count is calculated for the new grid, so as to not disadvantage Full Professors.**

- **Market supplements for existing faculty in Dentistry and Law will be “rolled” into salaries before CDI counts are determined for existing employees. Faculty appointed to these two college’s as of July 1, 2007 and later will not receive market supplements and Article 19.2.7 will be deleted. New employees will be**

Given the complexity and significance of change contemplated by this proposal, it is made on a without prejudice basis with respect to errors, omissions or future revisions and changes.

hired into the ranks and placed as per the guidelines for recruitment, considering qualifications and experience. MOA to be developed.

- To support the transition to a new salary grid, and to compensate Full Professors for the perceived advantage gained by Assistants and Associates as a result of salary grid reform, **enhance the financial offer to Full Professors by providing an additional CDI to each Full Professor over their career (must have been a full Professor as of July 1, 2006)** In other words, on July 1, 2007, those who were full Professors at the time of salary grid reform (July 1, 2006) will receive a CDI which is not calculated as part of the total CDI count when they reach the new CDI maximum. Those at the CDI maximum at July 1, 2007 will receive this additional CDI; others will receive the additional CDI at the time they reach the new CDI maximum. Those promoted into the rank of Full Professor following July 1, 2006 will be held to the new CDI maximum.
- Effective July 1, 2007, administrative Stipends for Department Heads will be increased to a uniform \$5,000 to recognize the Department Head's role in creating positive and productive work environments and ensuring fair and reasonable workloads.
- Merit amounts will be increased on July 1, 2007 to allow more recognition of outstanding achievements of academic staff. The number of Special Increases allocated by the PRC will be increased from 20 to 100, based on the new increment value of \$2,429. There is an increased on-going cost to this adjustment.

Step 3. Effective July 1, 2007 a base salary increase of \$3,000 will be added to the scale and to each member. Again, a flat amount of increase is necessary to preserve the new slope of the line and ensure salaries remain competitive, as percentage increases will distort the slope of the line and reinforce any inequities that exist in the systems.

Year 3 – July 1, 2008 to June 30 2008

To preserve the new slope of the line and ensure salaries remain competitive, salary increases must be applied as flat amounts rather than percentage increases, as percentage increases will distort the slope of the line and reinforce any inequities that exist in the systems. **Effective July 1, 2008 a base salary increase of \$3,000 per person and to the scale will be applied to the Professor ranks.**

Given the complexity and significance of change contemplated by this proposal, it is made on a without prejudice basis with respect to errors, omissions or future revisions and changes.

LIBRARIAN RANKS

Our survey of salary grids for librarians at comparable institutions indicates that the 4-rank grid at the University of Saskatchewan is an appropriate model, and that in general terms the range from floor of Librarian 1 to ceiling of Librarian IV is also appropriate, although in need of scale increases to maintain competitiveness. Unlike the professorial ranks, there is no compelling reason to apply differential increases across the ranks. Therefore, a series of across-the-board percentage increases is applied in the first three years, followed by grid reform and a fixed-sum across-the-board increase in the final year.

2005-06

Across-the-board 3% on scale.

2006-07

Across-the-board 3% on scale.

2007-08

Across-the-board 3% on scale.

2008-09

A new model is proposed for Librarians that somewhat parallels that developed for professorial, instructor, and lecturer ranks and this new model will be implemented in 2008.

Following the 3 x 3% increases in the preceding three years, the ceiling of the Librarian IV has kept pace with the ceiling of the Associate Professor, and the ceiling of the Librarian III has kept pace with the Assistant Professor. It is proposed that the ceilings of the four ranks be used to establish the basis for the salary scale of each rank, such that each rank includes 6 full increments and 6 half increments as follows:

Librarian I, increment 1600
Librarian II, increment 1800
Librarian III, increment 2100
Librarian IV, increment 2429

The new range in each rank is shorter than in the old grid, and anchoring the new ranges at the ceilings of the ranks lifts the floors of each rank.

Because career development for librarians may differ from that of the professoriate, 6 half increments have been added to each rank in order to extend career development within a rank.

As with other ranks, merit increases earned effective July 1, 2007 will be separated from CDI count.

Given the complexity and significance of change contemplated by this proposal, it is made on a without prejudice basis with respect to errors, omissions or future revisions and changes.

An across-the-board increase of \$3000 effective July 2008 for all librarian ranks reserves the salary range and enhances competitiveness in recruitment.

TEACHING RANKS

The Employer is proposing that the ranks of Instructor and Lecturer be fully implemented in order that demands of teaching, particularly in heavily subscribed programs, be carried in part by professional teaching faculty. To make this an attractive career path for dedicated teaching scholars, it is necessary to address the low salary grid, which is not competitive in the current environment. It is also desirable to develop a further rank, the Senior Lecturer, to allow for career development. To be competitive, it is also necessary to develop standards for promotion through these ranks, and for tenure or permanent status.

At the present time, the Instructor rank is well below the scale for public school teachers with lesser qualifications, and also well below the rank of Librarian 1. Given that qualifications for the Instructor rank include graduate degrees, commonly M.Sc. or Ph.D., it would be appropriate for this rank to begin to approximate the scale of the Librarian 1. The teaching ranks, which should attract Ph.D.-qualified faculty, will extend from the Instructor through to Senior Lecturer and command salaries at the upper end comparable to Associate Professors. In addition, there should be opportunity for salary growth beyond the CDI ceiling through meritorious service.

The Employer proposes grid reform for these ranks, such that 6 full increments plus 6 half increments are available within the Instructor and Lecturer ranks. Overlap with the next rank would occur at the 6th increment. The partial increments would provide for continued career growth for those who delay promotion or whose qualifications or position descriptions are not consistent with promotion.

In order that these ranks become competitive, significant increase to the grid is required. As these ranks have not been commonly utilized, and there are few members currently in these ranks, establishment of a new grid over the lifetime of this Collective Agreement is realistic. Because the floors of these ranks are so low, it is necessary to apply substantial fixed-sum increases across the board, rather than percentage increases.

2005-06

Across-the-board increase of \$4,000.

2006-07

Across-the-board increase of \$3,000.

Move to new grid prior to July 1, 2007. The floor of the Instructor is used as the foundation of the grid. From this point, 6 full increments of \$1,800 and 6 half increments of \$900 provide a range that fully overlaps that of the old scale. Transition from old to new grids is seamless.

Given the complexity and significance of change contemplated by this proposal, it is made on a without prejudice basis with respect to errors, omissions or future revisions and changes.

The floor of the Lecturer is established at the 6th increment of the Instructor, and extends for 6 full increments of \$2,429 in parallel with the revised professorial grid, with which this rank overlaps. Transition of existing members in this rank will also be seamless, and will provide them with additional scope for career development.

The new rank of Senior Lecturer is proposed, with a floor established at the 6th increment above the floor of the Lecturer. Six full increments of \$2,429 are included in this rank, with no half increments. Career growth beyond this ceiling is on the basis of meritorious performance.

2007-08

With all existing faculty in these ranks now on the new grid, the new CDI's are applied on July 1, 2007. As for other ranks, merit earned as of July 1, 2007 is separated from the CDI count. An across-the-board increase of \$3,000 is applied.

2008-09

An across-the-board increase of \$3,000 applied in the final year of the agreement completes the restructuring of the grid, and makes for an attractive career at competitive salaries.

- An MOA is attached regarding the implementation of the Teaching Ranks.

Changes to Recruitment and Retention for All Ranks

The floor of each rank determines the minimum hiring point or the normal promotion point for each range. For example, for the Professor Ranks, the range of six (6) CDIs per rank reflects the normal time spent in each rank in preparation for promotion; although promotion can be earlier or later. If promotion is earlier, the remaining CDIs are carried forward into the next rank, to a total career limit of 18. If promotion is later, the earning of CDIs is capped at six (6) until promotion occurs.

Notwithstanding the above, a new hire can be placed at any point in or above the normal CDI range for any rank. Hiring above a CDI range represents an advancement of CDIs (for market considerations) and/or merit increments (for consideration of the career to date of the successful candidate as per current processes) **based on experience and qualifications**. If CDIs are advanced for market considerations, they are deducted from the total of 18 CDIs available. This will be described in the letter of appointment.

To ensure equities or evolving market pressures are addressed for existing faculty members, an advancement of CDIs and/or merit increments based on experience and qualifications can also occur for such individuals using the existing expedited salary review process. The same advancement process described above will apply in these cases.

This same logic will be applied to the new Teaching Salary Grids, and Librarian Grids, although the CDI and/or steps are somewhat different to reflect the differing career tracks.

Date of signing

1. Benefits Funding Cap:

The Faculty Association has proposed an increase to employer funding for health, dental and vision to the fixed dollar premium paid to Blue Cross for the 2007 academic year July 1, 2007.

The Employer will agree to increase the employer funding for health, dental and vision to the fixed dollar of premium paid to Blue Cross for the 2006 calendar year (\$1,837,403) for an ongoing cost of **\$167,821**. Research indicates that employees appreciate the value of their benefits and make better consumer choices if the cost of benefits are shared. Maintaining the current funding level shares the costs with the employees as the members must pay costs over the current levels. Also, the Joint Benefits Committee made some decisions to change benefit coverage that affected the costs, knowing that those costs would be transferred to the members. However; the Employer is willing to compromise on this issue and increase its contributions to offset the increased premiums to the members. Setting the cap as per the 2006 calendar year provides a combination of an increased cap and the use of the surplus to offset short term increases to the members.

- The effective date of the increase will be January 1, 2007.
- A calendar year must be used as the Blue Cross renewal is experience rated based on a calendar year.

2. Benefits Plan Design Changes:

The changes that USFA has proposed to benefit plan design changes will result in a 12.2% to 16.3% increase in Health Premiums and 23.9% increase in Dental premiums. (Source: Mercer Consulting Estimates) Additional funding of approximately \$550,000 above the current employer funding cap will be required to support these enhancements.

The Employer does not agree to these changes for the following reasons:

- The results of our most recent survey of plan design show that the current plan design is ranked in the top quartile. The U of S faculty plan is 4th on an employer-paid value basis. (Source: 2005 Strategic Benefits Analysis – Mercer Consulting).
- The proposed improvements are not necessary to support recruitment and retention initiatives. The improvements to the plan do not necessarily reflect the needs of a changing demographic employee profile which will result from upcoming retirements and recruitment of younger staff with young families. The principles underlying benefits design are sustainability, and improved focus on health & wellness, competitiveness, simplified administration, and employee satisfaction.
- Although there is currently a surplus held by Blue Cross in the Health and Dental Plan, even without plan enhancements it is likely that there will be a depletion of this surplus to cover increased plan expenses over time a period of time.

Given the complexity and significance of change contemplated by this proposal, it is made on a without prejudice basis with respect to errors, omissions or future revisions and changes.

- The surplus may be sufficient to cover the costs of enhanced benefits in the short-term but the effect of increased claims usage and plan change will continue into the long-term. As a result, premiums will eventually exceed the funding cap supported by the employer and costs will be borne by members. Additionally, it is very likely that there will be significant pressure on the employer in subsequent rounds of bargaining to increase the funding cap to support plan enhancements.

3. Introduce a Health/Wellness Account

- A Health/Wellness Flexible Spending Account, **fully employer paid**, will provide members the flexibility of additional health and dental coverage, directed in a manner which fits their personal and family needs, without the potential risk of increased costs for employees. **A Health/Wellness Flexible Spending Account provides the ability to use dollars before taxes to claim for medical and dental expenses eligible under CRA and for expenses not covered but deemed to support wellness related activities. As well, funds can be used to purchase third party coverage.**
- The design of the Health/Wellness Flexible Spending Account should hold defined parameters by which the plan is administered. The design parameters should support the objectives of the program to ensure its use as intended. Recommended administrative program parameters are:
 - To support a focus on Health and Wellness, require a minimum number of credits to be allocated to Health Spending each year (\$300). This portion of the benefit would be non-taxable. If credit allocation is not received by the beginning of the plan year, 100% of credits will automatically be allocated to the Health Spending (\$500). In addition to the top up of current coverage members can be reimbursed for any claimable expenses covered under CRA guidelines. (i.e. air filters needed by prescription; hair transplant; homeopathic services)
 - Members can allocate up to \$200 of their Health/Wellness Flexible Spending Account to support other wellness related activities. (i.e. PAC membership; spa treatments; weight loss program enrolments) This portion of the benefit would be taxable.
 - Choice of credit allocation is irrevocable; credits cannot be re-allocated throughout the plan year.
 - Carry forward credit provisions on both accounts for one year, with any unused credits for a given year forfeited at the end of the carry forward period and returned to the University.
 - *Spending Account claims must be received within 30 days of the end of the plan year, termination of employment *in the position*, or retirement. Unused credits are forfeited upon termination of employment *in the position* or retirement.

Given the complexity and significance of change contemplated by this proposal, it is made on a without prejudice basis with respect to errors, omissions or future revisions and changes.

4. Joint Benefits Committee:

Under the current language neither the University nor the Union appears bound to implement benefit plan changes recommended by the Committee.

The committee has the power to monitor existing benefits, consider new benefits, make recommendations and resolve complaints. The Employer is not interested in extending the power of the committee to allow for plan design changes during the life of the collective agreement.

5. Long-Term Disability

USFA has proposed changing the LTD eligibility rules from (>2 years to >1 year). The rationale for this change is to align with a benefit that ASPA employees have. We are in the process of negotiating a change in the ASPA collective agreement and recommending changes for other staff groups to reduce this to align with the USFA agreement for all plans. So we are not interested in making this change as it extends our risk, potential liability and bureaucratic complexity of plan administration.

6. Employee Assistance Program

Replace MOA number 7 with new language as per attached green paper on new Article 23.20.

7. Pension

The Employer agrees to provide a ½ % increase of July 1, 2006 payroll to the Employer's contributions to the pension plans, matched by employee contributions as required by current pension plans, effective date of signing.

8. Sabbatical Travel Grants

The Employer agrees to increase Sabbatical Travel Grants from the current \$2,100 to 4,000 per grant, effective date of signing.

9. Payment of Professional Fees and Insurance

The University of Saskatchewan currently provides one of the highest PEA amounts as compared to other institutions. The purpose of this account is to pay for fees, insurance and or any other expenses associated with teaching, research and related professional activities. In addition, the costs of the Union's proposal are prohibitive.

10. Compassionate Leave

The Employer is concerned that the Union is asking for language that may reduce and/or negatively affect the current practice. Currently paid compassionate leave is provided on a case by case basis depending on the needs of the individual. Language such as that

Given the complexity and significance of change contemplated by this proposal, it is made on a without prejudice basis with respect to errors, omissions or future revisions and changes.

proposed may be unduly restrictive. Employer proposes no change. It is not clear what problem we are trying to fix.

11. Sabbatical Leave

The Employer is not interested in any changes to sabbatical leave provisions. The costs of doing this are prohibitive and the University of Saskatchewan's current provisions are well within the range of competitive benchmarks. Changing this will not increase our competitive advantage.

12. Requests for Information and Copies of Letters

In an ongoing effort to address the Faculty Association's requests for information, reports and copies of offer letters etc. the Employer proposes a creative solution to provide access to parts of the data through About-Us (People Soft). A draft MOA is attached.

13. Pay Equity and Employment Equity

Delete MOAs Number 8 and Number 12.

To be discussed at next bargaining session.

14. Workload

The Employer is not interested in further discussions about language in the Collective Agreement related to workload as per previous conversations and we are not interested in striking a committee to discuss workloads, that will in fact only serve to increase the work of administrators and faculty. It is suggested that the revisions to Article 11 are intended to address some of the concerns raised by the Union, and that time should be given to allow the changes to Article 11 to lead to positive outcomes.

15. Governance

Representatives of the Board of Governors are bound by the rules of confidentiality as determined by the Board. The faculty member on the Board may discuss matters with the Faculty Association as per the terms of his or her appointment to the Board.

Given the complexity and significance of change contemplated by this proposal, it is made on a without prejudice basis with respect to errors, omissions or future revisions and changes.

COST OF THE UNIVERSITY'S PROPOSALS / AVERAGE INCREASES

Senior Administration salaries.

The Faculty Association has published information about Senior Administration salary increases since 2000 by stating that on average, Senior Administration salaries have grown by approximately 7.5 percent per year since 2000.

Senior Administration salaries on average increased by 42.03%, or 7 % per year from July 1, 2000 to July 1, 2006.¹

- Prior to July 1, 2005, Senior Administration salaries generally followed faculty association salary adjustments.
- There were no base salary adjustments or one time payments to senior administrators on July 1, 2005 for 2005/2006 and no plans to pay any such sums no matter what the outcome of faculty bargaining. The only salary increases for Senior Administrators in 2005/2006 were for merit and on average ranged from 0 to 2 CDIs based on the full Professor CDI amounts in the faculty agreement.
- On July 1, 2006 the compensation strategy for Senior Administrators was changed to a lead pay strategy (75th percentile) using the same benchmark universities that have been used in the proposal for faculty salaries.
- Turnover rates are higher for Senior Administrators than any other staff group on campus due to competitive pressures
- As of July 1, 2006 salary ranges were set for Senior Administrators based on 75th percentile matches for their positions at the benchmark universities. Adjustments were applied to reflect the 75th percentile. These adjustments affected the average annual increase.
- Salary increases from July 1 2006 forward will be based solely on an annual assessment of salaries against market data and/or merit pay. Senior Administrators do not receive regular or automatic career development increments.

In-scope faculty:

- With this proposal, faculty salaries will have increased by **42.8 %, or 7.12% per year** from July 1, 2000 to July 1, 2006. These numbers do not include the effects of merit increases in either 2005 or 2006.
- By 2007 that number increases to 49.02%, and to 54.55% by July 1, 2008 which is an average of 6.82% per year not including the effects of merit pay.

General Summary and Concerns to be noted for the Record

This proposal also continues to reflect our commitment to the academic culture and traditions of individual input to academic planning, debate and discussion which is fundamental to a University.

¹ The President's salary is not included. It is set separately by the Board. The President's salary continues to lag the 75th percentile of comparison Universities. Sr. Admin includes VPs, AVPs, Deans and others. Source information from actual data.

Given the complexity and significance of change contemplated by this proposal, it is made on a without prejudice basis with respect to errors, omissions or future revisions and changes.

While we appreciate the Union's "willingness to compromise on our priority issues to reach a contract settlement and avert possible job action" we believe it is important to note a few things for the record:

For the record, the University of Saskatchewan takes great objection to the directions provided by the CAUT as summarized in the Faculty Associations' "Response to Human Resources" of February 21, 2007 on page 4 which states:

"To make the argument that certain issues such as faculty workload, faculty complement and representation on the Board of Governors are solely within the domain of self-governance and are thus outside the scope of employment negotiations borders on the absurd. In fact, the failure of faculty to seriously assume their self governance roles in Universities throughout Canada and relinquishing these decisions to University administrations has led the Canadian Association of University Teachers to suggest that faculty unions should negotiate self-governance procedures into their respective collective agreements."

- 1) The University is concerned first that the inclusion of this information in a document provided to its membership in the "Response to Human Resources" posted on its web-site but not actually provided to Human Resources, contradicts statements in its February 21, 2007 proposal on page 8 where it states: The USFA strongly supports academic and collegial governance and in particular the role of Council".
- 2) We do not accept that the faculty at the University of Saskatchewan have "failed to seriously assume their self-governance roles and relinquished those decisions to University administrators, and do not accept that the Faculty Association has a role in negotiating self-governance procedures into its collective agreement, and in fact believe there are already too many restrictions to self-governance in the collective agreement.
- 3) The "workload" of faculty is determined through academic planning processes. It is not possible for such academic planning to occur through the inherently adversarial collective bargaining process between the union and the team of Administrators representing the Board of Governors. Issues involving academic workload must proceed through the collegial governance process contemplated by the University of Saskatchewan Act, 1995. Contrary to the expressed opinion of the CAUT, we believe it would be an unfair labour practice to demand that such issues be negotiated through the labor relations process.
- 4) The collegial nature of academic decision making is incompatible with the exclusivity of the employer/union bargaining relationship.

In summary, we want to be clear that we are not interested in further unionizing the academic agenda and discussions of the University of Saskatchewan by moving away from open debates at Council, Committees of Council, Colleges, Departments and/or other academic bodies to collective bargaining discussions. Our interest is in preserving open and transparent academic governance. We will, of course, continue to negotiate salaries and other terms and conditions of employment as appropriate and are committed to reaching a Collective Agreement based on these principles.

Given the complexity and significance of change contemplated by this proposal, it is made on a without prejudice basis with respect to errors, omissions or future revisions and changes.

Record of Paper Exchanged

Attached Blue Paper:

- 13.1.4 Special Lecturers
 - 13.3.2 Limited Term Appointments
 - 13.3.2.2 Limited Term Appointments
 - 15.10 Tenure
 - 16.5 Promotion
 - 18.4 Library Search Committee
 - 19
 - 22.7 Parental Leave
 - 23.14 to 19 Benefits
 - 23.20 Employee Assistance Program, re-number to 23.19 based on above
 - 25.4.1 Special Lecturer – retired
-
- MOA People Soft Access
 - MOA Computer Use – Memorandum of Agreement (note – don't think language is needed if covered by policy)

For Salary Reform, promotion etc

- 13.1.1 Appointments
- 16.1 Promotion
- 16.2
- 16.3
- 16.6.1
- 16.6.2
- 16.6.4
- 17.1 Salary Review Procedures
- 17.1.1
- 17.1.2
- 17.1.2.1
- 18.3.3
- 19 Ranks and Salaries (Salary Schedules will be provided later)
- MOA Related to Teaching Ranks
- MOA Dentistry and Law Market Supplements (to be developed)

Attached Green Paper:

- 9.3 Picket lines
- 23.1.3 Sabbatical Travel
- MOA on Intellectual Property
- MOA Article 10.8 Methodology
- Housekeeping Language (subject to final revisions after TA reached)

Given the complexity and significance of change contemplated by this proposal, it is made on a without prejudice basis with respect to errors, omissions or future revisions and changes.

Agreed (Signed) or in Principle

Definitions:

Academic Unit

School

Article 10.1.1 - Signed

Article 10.6.1 (vi) - Signed

Article 10.10 - Signed

Article 13.6.3 - Signed

Article 13.9.1

Article 13.10

Article 23.3 - Signed

Article 23.8 - Signed

Article 23.9 - Signed

Article 35.2.2 - Signed

Article 35.4.5 - Signed

Article 21.3 - Signed

Article 11

Article 16.4.5.1 - Signed

Delete:

Letter of Understanding 2 - Signed

Memorandum of Agreement 14 - Signed

Memorandum of Agreement 13 - Signed

Memorandum of Agreement 9 - Signed

Memorandum of Agreement 2 - Signed