

(NEW) ARTICLE 28: ASSOCIATE CHAIRS

PROPOSAL

1. The TFA proposes the following new article in order to:
 - i. Create an appointment process for Assistant/Associate Chairs/Directors, Program Directors, First-Year Directors, Practicum Directors, Zone-Practicum Directors, Co-Op Directors and Graduate Program Directors;
 - ii. Set out a clear description of these roles; and
 - iii. Formalize the compensation, term, and evaluation for each.

ARTICLE 28: DUTIES, CONDITIONS OF APPOINTMENT, EVALUATION AND APPOINTMENT OF ASSISTANT/ASSOCIATE CHAIRS/DIRECTORS, PROGRAM DIRECTORS, FIRST YEAR PROGRAM DIRECTOR, PRACTICUM DIRECTOR, ZONE-PRACTICUM DIRECTOR, CO-OP DIRECTOR, GRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTORS

A. Where there are governance positions, within Departments/Schools or programs, which need to be filled, including those that carry with them a stipend and/or course release, the provisions of this article shall be followed to define the duties and responsibilities, minimum qualifications, selection criteria, term, and evaluation of the position. These positions include, but are not limited to, Assistant/Associate Chair/Director, Program Director, First Year Program Director, Practicum Director, Zone-Practicum Director, Co-op Director, Graduate Program Director, Continuing Education Coordinator, Department Head (library), and Counsellor Coordinator.

B. For all these positions the faculty of the Department/School, or program, as appropriate, shall determine and approve the selection process, duties and responsibilities, minimum qualifications, selection criteria, evaluation process, and term of the position, to a maximum of three years. Only tenured members may be appointed to these proposed positions. A proposal for such a position shall be brought to a meeting of the faculty of the Department/School, or program, as appropriate, by the Chair/Director.

C. The position will be posted within the Academic Unit or units, in the case of interdisciplinary programs, and shall describe the duties and responsibilities of the position, as well as applicable stipend, reduced workload and/or course release. The appointment to the position is made by the appropriate Dean, subject to, and on the advice of, any process developed in accordance with 28.B above. When an appointment is made, a copy of the letter of appointment will be provided to the Department/School and to the TFA.

D. The compensation for these positions will be at least \$3000 per annum. Notwithstanding any course releases that accompany such an appointment, where the compensation is sufficient the appointee may elect to utilize a portion of their stipend to purchase an additional course release and/or research support.

E. In addition to the above compensation, these positions will be accompanied by at least one course release or reduced workload for each year that the incumbent occupies the position.

F. Faculty members who are currently occupying these positions will continue to occupy their current position under their current terms of appointment. When their term expires or they resign from these roles the process described above in this article above will ensue, including the assessment of the need for the position.

RATIONALE

2. Currently, there are no rules governing the positions of Assistant/Associate Chairs/Directors, Program Directors, First-Year Directors, Practicum Directors, Zone-Practicum Directors, Co-Op Directors and Graduate Program Directors (hereafter, “Article 28 positions”), including the relevant duties and responsibilities, how the positions are advertised or filled, or associated compensation. The TFA proposes introducing a transparent, collegial process for the appointment of these leadership positions.
3. The TFA’s proposal responds to repeated concerns expressed by its members about the lack of transparency and collegiality with respect to appointment processes and the inequities in compensation for Article 28 positions.

Lack of Open, Transparent, and Collegial Processes for Appointment

4. Members have indicated that they often find out about the existence of Article 28 positions via emails announcing the names of individuals who have been appointed by the Chair/Director, without an open, transparent, or equitable process, or consultation of the Department/School. One member indicated that their Chair/Director emailed them individually to act as Program Director. Another indicated that a colleague was appointed to be Program Director of a program in which they were not appointed as a Faculty member.
5. Many have expressed concerns that the same individuals tend to rotate through these positions, and that the positions are disproportionately held by men and Canadian-born individuals with a corresponding lack of opportunity for racialized Faculty members to take up such positions.
6. There is a deep-rooted view in many units that favouritism and secrecy (i.e., side-deals, behind-the-scene promises, and hidden long-term agreements) inform appointments for Article 28 positions, and that such dynamics lead to the

creation of toxic work environments in units. Multiple members have expressed concerns that the Dean plays a role in these decisions and handpicks candidates out of favouritism and similarly rejects candidates that they find unacceptable. As such, members feel that Article 28 positions appointment processes are “anti-democratic”, “a mystery”, and about “who you know, not what you know”.

7. Along with the lack of collegial processes for appointment, members are concerned about the lack of accountability for how individuals in Article 28 positions perform their roles and exercise their authority. One member has indicated that the individual appointed to an Article 28 position went directly to the Dean and asked for something that the unit as a whole had voted against.
8. There is also a concern about the lack clear terms of appointment, including duration of appointment, and inequity as between different individuals appointed to the same role. For example, a racialized Faculty member appointed to an Article 28 position was given a one-year appointment, whereas all other colleagues (who were white), received three-year appointments for the same position. When the incumbent expressed interest in staying on for another two years, the Dean appointed a white colleague for a three-year term.

Inequity and Unfairness in Compensation

9. Based on disclosure from the Employer received by the Association in accordance with MOU – 8 Chair/Director Stipends, in 2023-2024, there were 147 such leadership positions across the University. Notably, the disclosed data reveals, *inter alia*, the following:
 - Course releases:
 - TFA members in leadership positions may be variably compensated with 0-3 course releases;
 - In total, 166 course releases were provided;
 - Two individuals were granted 3 course releases and sixteen individuals were granted none; and
 - The average course release granted is 1.13 and the median is 1.
 - Stipends:
 - TFA members in leadership positions may be compensated anywhere between \$0-\$30,000 per annum;
 - In total, \$1,051,500 in stipends were issued;
 - Three individuals were paid a \$30,000 annual stipend and eleven received no stipend at all;
 - The average stipend is \$7,153.06, and the median is \$6,000.00.
 - Duration:

- Appointments can range anywhere between 6 months to 6 years.
10. Notably, this data is consistent with experiences of TFA members on the ground, who have expressed concerns about the lack of transparency, fairness, and equity in compensation as between different Article 28 positions in the same Department/School, and as between different Departments/Schools at TMU (including on the basis of varying numbers of students, and relatedly, workload). Members have also expressed concern about inequities in compensation as between different individuals appointed to the same Article 28 position in the same Department/School. For example, one member indicated that they served as a Program Director and received no compensation, but the individual appointed after them – who was considered a “favourite” in their unit – was compensated.
 11. The lack of transparent information about compensation and the disparities in compensation has led to a sense of “cronyism”. More than one Faculty member has reported checking the Ontario sunshine list in order to ascertain how much colleagues holding Article 28 positions are compensated. The absence of information about compensation also breeds disparities for members of equity-seeking groups that are unable to negotiate as strongly as other colleagues.
 12. In addition to concerns about fairness, Faculty members have also described the sense of discouragement they have felt when they learn about colleagues performing the same job but receiving comparatively higher levels of compensation.

For clarity, the Association does not dispute that it may be appropriate to have differential levels of administrative stipend or course release for different positions, for example depending on the size of the Department/School. Nevertheless, clear, consistent, and transparent processes are necessary to support accountability and collegiality within Departments/Schools, and to ensure fairness and equity in compensation across units. In the absence of such guidance, at present there are a wide variety of practices when it comes to appointment of these roles and the provision of course releases and stipends across the University. TFA members have expressed concern about the disparities in appointment process, level of remuneration, and the lack of sufficient information provided on the outset of taking on the significant and time-consuming responsibilities associated with these positions.