



COLLEGE
EMPLOYER
COUNCIL

CONSEIL DES
EMPLOYEURS
DES COLLÈGES

CEC Remarks at the table



Presented by:

The College Employer Council
(on behalf of the Colleges of Applied Arts and
Technology)

To:

The Ontario Public Service Employees Union
(for CAAT Academic Employees)

September 25, 2024

We have carefully reviewed and analyzed the proposals you have put forward in U1.

Today we are presenting our responses to your proposals, some counter-proposals, and some new CEC proposals.

Overall, our workload proposals aim to more accurately reflect the work that is attributed to full-time faculty and to respond to concerns that have been raised, while aligning with our guiding principles which were shared with you in our opening remarks and include our duty to ensure the fiscal sustainability of the Ontario college system. We've reviewed input from a variety of sources. These include consultations with managers, a review of relevant documentation (such as the CBIS data, the HESA Report, the Report from Blue-Ribbon Panel on *Postsecondary Education Financial Sustainability* (2023)¹, the Auditor General's 2021 Report *Value for Money Audit: Public Colleges Oversight* (2021)², to name a few), and a review of the [Flaherty Workload Task Force Report](#) and the full faculty workload survey data set. That combined input indicates that we need additional flexibility in workload provisions to effectively manage program delivery in areas such as Apprenticeship and Adult Upgrading and that we need to maintain the flexibility that is currently built into the collective agreement. Flexibility remains a critical consideration for colleges and students. The input also indicates that we need to address some workload issues reported by faculty through the workload task force survey process.

Our proposals are also reflective of the current fiscal challenge facing the college system. You will have seen [the announcement that Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada \(IRCC\)](#) made late last week. The changes that were announced compound those that were made by IRCC earlier this year. As a result of the previous IRCC and related provincial policy changes, colleges are already seeing a significant drop in international enrolments. For many colleges this negatively impacts the current fiscal year and for all colleges it will have a negative domino effect in future fiscal years. According to Colleges Ontario, the initial estimated impact of the most recent changes is a projected reduction of \$1.7 billion in annual revenue at the system level. The total impact will not be known with certainty until all the related implementation details are known and analyzed.

As indicated in this M12 document, we are presenting these proposals as a complete package in respect of Article 11. We remain available to discuss these proposals, however we want to be clear that individual responses/proposals are not subject to piecemeal acceptance.

You will also note that these workload proposals are subject to an implementation period to allow Colleges to upgrade their systems to implement the changes and to eliminate the need for SWFs to be reissued for an upcoming term. The implementation period is subject to negotiation and depends on the date of ratification of a renewal collective agreement.

¹ Blue Ribbon Panel (2023). Ensuring Financial Sustainability for Ontario's Postsecondary Sector.

<https://www.ontario.ca/page/ensuring-financial-sustainability-ontarios-postsecondary-sector>

² Office of the Auditor General of Ontario (2021). *Value-for-Money Audit: Public Colleges Oversight*.

https://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://www.auditor.on.ca/en/content/annualreports/arreports/en21/AR_Public_Colleges_en21.pdf

Finally, before presenting our submissions related to the SWF formula itself, we want to share the following observations which have guided our work. The working copy of the Flaherty Workload Task Force Report which was provided to both bargaining teams in July did not include analysis of the magnitude of the increase that was self-reported by Faculty in some areas of workload, nor did it include the York tables which would provide information related to those details. Our review of those tables (which were provided by York in mid-August and are now included in the final Flaherty Workload Task Force Report) indicates that the perceived time required for overall preparation and overall evaluation has “increased a little” for all modes of delivery except Hyflex. For Hyflex the table indicates that the perceived time required for preparation and overall evaluation has “increased a lot”.

The data also suggests that the perceived time required for overall ‘routine out of class assistance’ “increased a little” for all modes of delivery except Hyflex. For Hyflex the indication is that the perceived time required for ‘routine out of class assistance’ has ‘increased a lot’.

In addition, since York has still not provided the parties with their analysis of the responses to the text-based questions in the faculty survey, we have reviewed those responses. We note that many of the factors reported as contributing to an increase in workload are ‘one-time’ factors. For example, respondents reported that they were required to spend time adapting to online and hybrid learning environments. It is our position that, once that adaptation has taken place, that factor ceases to have an impact on workload. From the perspective of factors that have an ongoing impact on workload, respondents reported that providing personalized, constructive feedback took more time in asynchronous courses due to the absence of real-time interaction.

I’ll now move into an explanation of the specific responses and proposals we are putting forward.