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FACULTY FOCUS
A YEAR IN REVIEW  PRESIDENT’S MESSAGE

Nancy Langton, President

Welcome to summer, a time that brings quite a change of pace from the academic year. In this issue we have a number of articles highlighting some of the activities of the Association, giving you a sense of some of the projects we’ve tackled over the year. It also lets you meet some of your colleagues who have been working on your behalf to make sure that your voice is heard at UBC.

The major task of the past year, of course, was to reach a Collective Agreement with the University. The work is not done when the Agreement is ratified, however. The Association and the University must work together to implement that Agreement. Mark Mac Lean, Vice President, writes about issues facing the implementation of the new position of Professor of Teaching, as well as changes in the language (and expectations) for those holding Instructor 1 and Senior Instructor positions.

The Status of Women Committee (SWC) completed a nearly two-year study of pay equity at UBC. The SWC worked in conjunction with committee members appointed by the Provost’s office to determine the extent of pay inequity at UBC Vancouver and determine ways of preventing pay inequity going forward. Lara Boyd’s, Member-at-Large, article describes the findings of the DATA committee. Amongst those findings is that the average annual salaries of full-time professors in 2010 show a marked gender differential, with women earning on average $14,332.20 less than men. She discusses that even after accounting for differences in departmental location, rank and other factors, a notable gap still remains.

Margot Young, Chair, Status of Women Committee, writes a companion piece, examining some of the legal aspects of gender wage gaps and finding a gender gap is not necessarily surprising, but addressing it is essential. She highlights that the BC Human Rights Code dictates that employees doing similar or substantially similar work must receive the same pay.

Rick Gooding, Chair, Sessional Faculty Committee, discusses how tenure-stream faculty sometimes feel that they’re at odds with sessional faculty when it comes to improving the Collective Agreement. He rightly reminds us that the Association has the duty to represent all of its members in a balanced way.

Deena Rubuliak, Executive Director, discusses some of the implications of Income Replacement Plan’s current governance structure. Following extensive consultation with plan representatives, the Association will be presenting a new plan to members in the Fall.

Finally, Andrew Riseman, Member-at-Large, reviews the Association’s participation in UBC’s Land Use Planning discussions. In its submission, the Association raised some concerns about the allocation of housing, particularly with the intent of making sure that more affordable housing is available for our members.

I wish you a restful and productive summer, a time for reflections, and a time to catch up with friends and family. I will be spending August in Nairobi, doing volunteer work with some of my students, and helping to develop small businesses. I look forward to seeing you in the Fall.
INTRODUCING THE NEW PROFESSOR OF TEACHING

Mark Mac Lean, Vice President

Our new Collective Agreement introduces some major changes to the tenure-track teaching stream at UBC. During negotiations, the University proposed adding a new rank, Professor of Teaching, as well as aligning the criteria of all of the teaching ranks to add a new emphasis on “educational leadership” to the traditional teaching and service roles. Adding such a rank had been discussed in a joint UBC-FA committee on titles and ranks several years ago, but that committee had not reached a consensus on how to implement this idea. After careful consideration, our Negotiating Team felt that the new opportunities for our members in the teaching ranks outweighed any downsides to these changes. We are now working with the University to implement the first significant changes for Instructors since the introduction of tenure.

The first promotions to Professor of Teaching may take place in the coming academic year. One of the frequent questions we are hearing is “how will candidates for this new rank be assessed?” The Collective Agreement language on the Professor of Teaching says that promotion to this rank “requires evidence of outstanding achievement in teaching and educational leadership, distinction in the field of teaching and learning, and sustained and innovative contributions to curriculum development, course design and other initiatives that advance the University’s ability to excel in its teaching and learning mandate.” This sounds quite lofty and some current Senior Instructors may wonder if this rank is intended for them.

One idea that has been presented at our implementation meetings is that a Professor of Teaching should take a scholarly approach to teaching. Defining what is meant by “scholarly teaching” from the viewpoint of presenting evidence for a promotion case will take some care. In recent years the academy has come to understand how to assess the scholarship of teaching and learning within a discipline as part of the scholarly activities considered for promotion to Professor. However, given the nature of the roles that Instructors have played in teaching at UBC, we believe that an appropriate definition of “scholarly teaching” will recognize the importance of praxis. Of course, for promotion to Professor of Teaching, the assessment will be on more than how well the candidate does in the classroom, and we must learn how to document achievements in teaching and learning. There are a lot of questions about how this is accomplished.

It is important to the Association that Instructors participate in the process of determining how to interpret the new language for the teaching ranks. We will be hosting meetings in the fall to hear your ideas and concerns. Our goal is to ensure that we capture an interpretation of the new language that will best fit the needs of this group and support the teaching mission of the University.

PROMOTION & TENURE FOR INSTRUCTORS

If you are a Senior Instructor who is considering going up for promotion to Professor of Teaching this coming year, we invite you to contact the Faculty Association directly to talk about your individual case.

If you are an Instructor I and will be coming up for tenure in 2011/12 or 2012/13, you will have the choice of whether to go up under the language from the 2006-2010 Collective Agreements or the language of the 2010-2012 Agreement. We encourage you to discuss your case with the Faculty Association to help you make this decision.

faculty.association@ubc.ca
Pay equity for women faculty at UBC is a significant continuing issue. In 2006 and 2009, UBC’s Equity Office released two reports analyzing pay equity in salaries of full-time tenure track professors at UBC, focusing on differences due to sex or visible minority status. Both studies found a statistically significant salary pay gap between male and female faculty. As a result of such findings, the Faculty Association and Provost jointly sponsored the work of two new committees: the Pay Equity Analysis and Resolution (DATA) and the Structural Measures and Resolution Tactics (SMART) Working Groups. The DATA working group had a mandate to determine the actual average gender pay gap, whereas the SMART Working Group’s mandate was to recommend structural changes to reverse the current, and prevent future, gender pay inequities. Both groups have completed their reports, and can be read online at www.facultyassociation.ubc.ca. Below, we provide a summary of the findings of these reports.

The DATA Working Group determined that the average annual salaries of full-time professors employed at the Vancouver campus (excluding the Faculty of Medicine) as of 2010 show a marked gender differential, with women earning on average $14,332.20 less than men. About half of the average pay difference is accounted for by the underrepresentation of women at the Full Professor level (women account for about 38% of faculty members at the Associate and Assistant level, but only 21% of Full Professors). Another quarter of the average gender pay differential is accounted for by gender differences in the location of faculty members across departmental units. For example, 6.6% of male faculty members are in the high paying Faculty of Commerce versus 3.3% of female faculty members in Commerce.

However, after additionally accounting for other factors such as experience, Canada Research Chairs and Distinguished University Professors, there remains an unexplained female pay disadvantage of about $3,000. Further, analyses of the distribution of merit pay at UBC confirms that productivity levels do not differ between men and women faculty. The DATA Working Group concluded that the unexplained female pay disadvantage of about $3,000 can be considered discriminatory.

Working concurrently, the SMART Committee was tasked with designing mechanisms and processes to address some of the major causes of pay inequities. Its mandate was to examine and make recommendations regarding four issues: 1) starting salaries; 2) equity training; 3) mentoring; and 4) working climate studies.

Based on its analysis of ways of reducing gender-based inequities in starting salaries and
total compensation, the SMART Committee recommends that UBC develop and communicate principles and guidelines on how to set starting salaries to ensure they are free of gender bias.

Gender inequities are often rooted in historical systemic practices and procedures and perpetuated by unconscious bias. The working group, therefore, recommends a suite of equity training programs to provide decision-makers with a greater understanding of equity principles and procedural safeguards that can ensure fair and equitable employment practices.

Mentoring is the mechanism to give all faculty members the opportunity to benefit from the advice and experience of more senior colleagues. With specific reference to gender pay inequity, formal mentoring programs provide female faculty with opportunities to consult and learn from their peers about all aspects of their careers. Since mentoring is more effective when mentors are rewarded for and/or held accountable for the task, it is recommended that the UBC-CV is modified to include a new section on mentoring in which mentoring received and mentoring given can be documented as service to the University.

Working climate studies, similar to the one carried out in the Faculty of Science at UBC, provide useful data on equity, and assist with the design of processes to correct inequities. Indeed, working climate studies for women have been conducted at many other universities, including MIT, Harvard, Stanford, all of the campuses in the University of California system, the University of Toronto, and McGill University. It was therefore recommended that a new position of Senior Advisor on Women Faculty to the Provost be created.

It is to the credit of all parties involved in these committees that this process has been both transparent and constructively collaborative. Both the Faculty Association and the University have recognized the importance of pay equity and have jointly communicated a commitment to resolve the current pay inequity. To date, it has been clear that proactive, equity-based governance characterized by consultation, transparency, and fairness best promises to be the solution to this problem. The Faculty Association Status of Women Committee looks forward to continuing to work together with the University to correct the pay inequity and implement the recommended University-wide changes.

**Recommendations**

In addition to the 4 areas of focus for the SMART working group, the following recommendations were made to improve monitoring and accountability for gender equity at UBC.

- Comprehensive Annual Employment Equity Audits
- Periodic Pay Equity Audit
- Equity Reporting by AVP Equity to Dean’s Meetings
- Standing equity-related advisory body at the level of the Senate/Board.
- Review and revise, as appropriate, governance structures for faculty-related gender equity issues at UBC.


2. [http://www.science.ubc.ca/faculty/diversity](http://www.science.ubc.ca/faculty/diversity)
COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST

Rick Gooding, Chair, Sessional Faculty Committee

During the discussion of bargaining at the Fall General Meeting, one faculty member said that he didn't believe sessionals should be represented by the Faculty Association. This sentiment is common, though a little probing reveals that it can emerge from very different motives. Many faculty—sessionals and tenure track faculty alike—believe that contract faculty would be best served by a union that has the right to strike. Others—almost invariably members of the professoriate—believe that contract faculty (and sometimes instructors) are merely an inconvenience, a distraction from the Association's commitment to the interests of "real" faculty. While the first position is often generous, the second is not. Both, however, ignore the history of contract faculty at UBC.

More than a decade ago, full-time sessionals, who were members of the FA, and part-timers, who were not, held a CUPE union drive. Over the course of a rainy winter, we carded enough contract faculty for automatic certification as a separate “local” to represent sessional faculty. For different reasons, UBC and the Faculty Association opposed our drive. One response on the administration's part was to allow the Faculty Association to begin representing part-time sessionals, something the FA had long sought. The Association then successfully argued before the Labour Relations Board that the union drive constituted a raid on its members and, more importantly, that sessional and tenure-track faculty had a "community of interest"—an important term under labour law, signalling that members of the bargaining unit have similar skills, working conditions, interests, and relations with management.

In saying that all faculty—contract and tenure-track—had a community of interest, the Faculty Association not only said something, it did something: the claim had the force of what is known among language theorists as a ‘speech act.’ Speech acts do not merely state something, they transform and reconstitute reality. For example, in countries where citizenship is conferred through an official ceremony, a new citizen takes a citizenship oath in the presence of an official who in turn makes statements on behalf of the state. Citizenship, with its myriad of obligations between individual and state, emerges largely out of a speech act.

Speech acts are important. When the Faculty Association successfully argued its case for a community of interest among contract and tenure-track faculty, effectively closing off other routes to collective bargaining that sessionals might have preferred, it assumed a set of obligations towards its sessionals. Over the past decade, sessionals have responded in a variety of ways that confirm this community of interest—they have been elected to the Faculty Association Executive Committee, served on Association committees, and availed themselves of the FA's resources, including its grievance mechanisms.

Having a community of interest, of course, does not mean that our interests are always identical, but it does mean that the FA has a duty to represent all its members in a balanced way. Most of the bargaining proposals posted by the Association in February reflected concerns shared by all faculty. But one related explicitly to Heads and Directors, another to faculty at UBC Okanagan, and a third to sessional faculty. No one ever stands up in Association meetings to say that the FA shouldn’t represent the interests of Department Heads; yet sadly, where sessionals are concerned, the sentiment is trotted out with the painful and unreflecting frequency of a cliché.

Tell Us...
The SFC wants to hear from you. If you would like to meet with us to discuss your experiences, or join our committee, email Rick Gooding, Chair of the Sessional Faculty Committee at fa.sfc@ubc.ca.
Deena Rubuliak, Executive Director

The Income Replacement Plan (IRP), our long-term disability benefit, is one element of the benefits package provided to members of the Faculty Association. The IRP provides an income to members who are unable to work due to a long-term illness or injury. The IRP is a self-insured plan. As such, the benefit is tax-free and the members are responsible for ensuring that there are sufficient funds in the plan to pay for disability benefits for eligible members. Funding for the plan is through member contributions as well as through earnings on investments. Contribution rates are assessed on an annual basis following a valuation of the plans assets and liabilities.

Since its inception, UBC has managed the IRP and acted as the plan sponsor and administrator. Due to broader changes to the overall governance structure of long-term disability benefits at UBC, the Faculty Association, with the assistance of Pointbreak Consulting Group Ltd, is currently undertaking a comprehensive review of our Income Replacement Plan benefits. Some of the questions we are asking are:

- Does the plan provide adequate income replacement for our members?
- Is there appropriate coverage in the event of a partial disability?
- Are we paying a competitive price for our benefits?
- Are there new services available that will provide better coverage to fit our members’ unique needs?
- Is Sun Life (our current insurer) providing a competitive level of service or should the Association consider moving its IRP to another provider?
- Should the governance structure of the plan be changed, and if so, how?

As part of this review process, the Faculty Association put a formal Request for Proposals on BC Bids, in keeping with UBC’s policies on procurement, and we have received proposals from four prospective carriers: Great West Life, Pacific Blue Cross, Sun Life and SSQ Financial/Group Source.

The Faculty Association struck an IRP Review Committee to work with our consultants from Pointbreak on reviewing the quotes and analyzing the information. Over the summer months, the FA will be completing this detailed analysis and presenting information to the membership on the plan design and underwriting for the future direction of the Faculty Income Replacement Plan.

If you have any questions about the IRP or would like more information on this review, please contact Executive Director Deena Rubuliak at deena.rubuliak@ubc.ca.
GENDER PAY GAP AT UBC: SOME KEY QUESTIONS

Margot Young, Chair, Status of Women Committee

With the release of the report, An Analysis of the Gender Pay Gap in Professorial Salaries at UBC,1 (see Lara Boyd’s article on page 4) it has become clear that women faculty at UBC have a substantial salary disadvantage compared to their male colleagues. The Faculty Association and the University are set to work together to address some of these issues. This comment focuses on some of the legal aspects of gender wage gaps.

IS UBC ATYPICAL IN HAVING A GENDER PAY GAP AMONG TENURE-STREAM FACULTY?
The finding of a gender pay gap is not a unique or perhaps even surprising finding. Sex-based wage disparities (gender pay gaps) exist across a wide range of employment contexts, including, as recent studies document, at other universities.2 Several other universities—for example, Harvard, McGill, MIT, Stanford, and the University of Wisconsin—have responded with comprehensive, concrete, and sustained programmes to address both gender pay gaps and other issues of gender inequity.

Stubbornly persistent, gender pay gaps contribute to gender economic inequality in both the short and long-term, prevent women from achieving their maximum potential, and contribute to women’s disproportionate poverty. A number of factors typically contribute to gender pay gaps, including past or present discriminatory attitudes or practices.

WHAT ARE THE UNIVERSITY’S LEGAL OBLIGATIONS?
The reflection of gender discrimination in women’s pay rates is unfair and offends a commitment to gender equality. Substantive gender equality demands we work to eliminate the under-compensation of women’s work that flows from gender bias. Employers have both a moral and legal obligation to address this issue.

More specifically, Canada has committed itself to a number of international agreements that obligate governments in Canada to ensure equal pay for work of equal value without distinction on the basis of sex and to redress gender inequality in pay. For example, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, adopted by the United Nations in 1966 and ratified by Canada in 1976, recognizes the right of everyone, and women in particular, to equal pay for equal work.3 But for these rights to be of any force in Canadian law they need to be implemented in domestic legislation by Canadian governments.

All provinces and the federal government have legislative provisions that dictate equal pay for equal work. The British Columbia Human Rights Code in section 12 provides that:

An employer must not discriminate between employees by employing an employee of one sex for work at a rate of pay that is less than the rate of pay at which an employee of the other sex is employed by that employer for similar or substantially similar work.

Thus, the BC government establishes a legal obligation binding on employers of equal pay for equal work. This legislation applies to the University. Section 13 of the Code further prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex regarding employment or any term or condition of employment.

WHAT IS MEANT BY “EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK”?
“Equal pay for equal work” compares similar work performed by men and women. This policy seeks to ensure that work requiring the same skill, responsibility and effort under similar working conditions for the same employer attracts the same pay, regardless of the gender of the worker performing the job. Thus equal pay for equal work focuses on the substantial similarity of work performed and the obligation to ensure equal pay for such equal work. It is, in many ways, the most obvious, and simple, of the range of policies employed to deal with wage discrimination.
Rectifying gender inequity is both a legal and moral necessity. Legislation sets minimum legal obligations. Many employers go beyond such floors by recognizing broader ethical obligations to pay equality. Thus, employers across the country have also voluntarily implemented a variety of measures to promote and ensure economic equality and pay equity for their female workers.

With the release of the Gender Pay Gap report, the University Administration faces a number of tasks to address what is a human rights issue under the B.C. Human Rights Code. Most importantly, the convening of a joint Faculty Association and Administration working group is critical to effective and timely decision making about how to resolve existing gender pay gaps and to redress past pay inequalities. Further, the University Administration and Faculty Association have to ensure that starting salaries and provisions such as retention or market supplement pay are administered in a way that is gender equal. Current pay inequality must be remedied and redressed, and future pay inequality must be prevented. These are not simple issues. But responses from other universities to their own issues of a gender wage gap provide some concrete possibilities. The Faculty Association’s Status of Women Committee companion report to the Gender Pay Report, Preventing Gender Inequities: Structural Measures and Resolution Tactics (SMART) Working Group, sets out a number of mechanisms and processes for addressing the structural causes of pay inequalities, providing a key and valuable starting point for work on creating an inclusive and fair work environment for women and men faculty at UBC.

1 This report is available, along with its companion report, Preventing Gender Inequities: Structural Measures and Resolution Tactics (SMART) Working Group, at http://www.facultyassociation.ubc.ca/.
Andrew Riseman, Executive Committee

As a result of changes to provincial legislation, the responsibility for land use planning and approval on the UBCV campus has now been transferred to the Ministries of Community and Rural Development and Advanced Education from Metro Vancouver. Consistent with the University Act, UBC Policy 92 and The Municipalities Enabling and Validating Act, all new housing development at UBCV must be consistent with the UBC Land Use Governance Documents and Land Use Regulations. UBC is seeking approval to amend its LUP to create smaller housing unit sizes, build taller buildings, and encourage more commercial shops/services that would attract and sustain a larger population (target of 25-35,000). The changes would also re-designate the UBC Farm to “Green Academic” lands that would secure the future of the farm, as well as transfer housing density across the campus to facilitate a larger campus resident population. UBC is currently engaged in consultations with campus members to incorporate these changes into the UBC Land Use Plan (LUP).

Land use planning generally is a complex matter with multiple layers of political, technical and economic details. UBC’s LUP is no exception. Rather than trying to address all those various layers, the Faculty Association provided a submission to UBC’s Campus and Community Planning (CCP) office that focused on the following question: Does the Land Use Plan adequately address the issue of affordable housing in order to attract and retain high quality faculty members?

The submission raised the following concerns:

- The current LUP requires that “not less than 50% of new market and non-market housing serve households where one or more members work or attend university on the UBC campus.” The LUP targets 25% of on-campus housing to be designated for students. Why should a target meant for those working at UBC include a further reference to students? Moreover, UBC faculty members and staff are two distinct groups. We recommend the creation of unique targets for each group.
- Though UBC reports that the 50% target has been met, there appears to be no reliable data that can confirm the breakdown of population (i.e. how many of these are faculty, staff or students). Thus, it is impossible to know whether faculty members are getting their share of housing on campus. We recommend that specific mechanisms are developed to ensure that targets for faculty are met and plans created to address scenarios where allocation falls short of targets.
- The University has not yet provided a specific evaluation of existing housing stock at UBC in the context of CCP’s definition of affordability. Neither have they produced an assessment of the proposed LUP amendments and their specific impact on future housing stock in the context of the definition of affordability. We recommend that this analysis be undertaken for staff and faculty housing post haste.

Globally, we questioned whether the goal of 20% rental housing, with 50% of that stock offered at non-market rates, is adequate to address the needs of faculty members.
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NEW EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
The Faculty Association is pleased to announce that Deena Rubuliak has been appointed as our Executive Director, effective July 2011. Deena has been a Membership Services Officer with the Faculty Association for several years, representing members at both the UBC Okanagan as well as the Vancouver campus. Deena can be reached at deena.rubuliak@ubc.ca.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT REIMBURSEMENT FUND
We are pleased to confirm that under the 2010-2012 Collective Agreement between the University and the Faculty Association, a number of changes have been made to the PDR fund. First, PDR funds for Regular Faculty and Sessional Lecturers with continuing status will be increased by $600 per year, bringing the total amount available to $1,100 per year. Second, there is an increase to the accrual (also called the “carry forward” or “banked”) period from three to five years (note: this period includes the current academic year). Unchanged is the ability of faculty members with ongoing appointments to be able to “borrow” future entitlements, up to a maximum of five years, including the current year. Members with term appointments are not entitled to borrow ahead past the end date of their appointment. If you have questions or concerns about details of the PDR, please contact Debbie Cua (604.822.2044) or pdr@finance.ubc.ca.

EMAIL MIGRATIONS
UBC’s IT department is working closely with departments/units to migrate Interchange email accounts to the new Faculty and Staff (FAS) mail service. As your department/unit migrates to FASmail, we’d like to remind you to contact Human Resources to update your email address with the University to ensure you continue to receive electronic communications from UBC, as well as the Faculty Association.

ACHIEVING PAY EQUITY
In response to a number of requests, we’ve made available on our website (www.facultyassociation.ubc.ca) videos of the panel discussion on male/female faculty pay equity and other gender related issues at UBC, which was presented by the FA’s Status of Women Committee. Presentations include:

- Equity: Key Issues for Women Faculty at UBC
- Analysis of the Gender Pay Gap in Professional Salaries at UBC
- Fixing Pay Inequity at UBC: Recommendations from the Structural Measure and Resolution Tactics (SMART) Working Group
- The Science of Unconscious Bias

The website also has available the DATA and SMART reports, compiled by two Working Groups jointly sponsored by the Faculty Association and the Provost to examine pay equity in salaries of full-time tenure stream professors at UBCV.
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