



## Concordia Faculty and Librarian Salaries Continue to Lag Behind

by Ian Rakita

The current collective agreement ends on May 31, 2012. Talks with the Employer on a new Collective Agreement are now underway. In November, both sides exchanged the non-monetary articles we intend to open during this round of negotiations (See CUFA Bulletin #1 for complete list). While these non-monetary issues are important and deserve our attention, during our consultations with faculty members over the past year, salary was cited as one of the top three concerns of faculty members, the others being workload and benefits. It is for this reason that we notified the Employer that the CUFA negotiating team is aiming to start discussions on salaries on March 2, 2012.

From the point of view of CUFA members, it does not make much sense to spend well over a year negotiating non-monetary articles as was done in the last round of talks. CUFA members need not have a degree in finance to understand that the two year delay in salary adjustments that occurred during the previous round of negotiations meant that the Employer was holding onto a substantial amount of faculty money without paying interest for the privilege. This no-interest arrangement, which should be seen as free financing for the university at the expense of CUFA members, may explain the University's penchant for lengthy negotiations.

A flyer outlining the enviable salary position enjoyed by Concordia University senior administrators was recently released by CUFA ([http://cufa.net/flyers/Concordia\\_Senior\\_Administrators\\_Among\\_Top\\_Paid.pdf](http://cufa.net/flyers/Concordia_Senior_Administrators_Among_Top_Paid.pdf)). If CUFA members were fortunate enough to be as well paid on a relative basis as our Administrators, there would be little need for this report. Sadly, this is not the case. In its well-known annual fall issue devoted to Canadian Universities, Maclean's magazine lumps Concordia University in the "Comprehensive" category along with fourteen other non-medical universities across the country. A table displaying salary comparisons by rank for the remaining twelve universities to that of Concordia, appears on the next page (At time of writing, salary data for the University of Regina and for UQAM were not available).

Apart from the weighted averages at the bottom of the table and the last two columns on the right (weighted average totals for each university), table data are weighted (by number in each of nine age ranges for each rank) averages of median salaries. What is most startling is the fact that leaving aside the University of New Brunswick (UNB) for now, salaries in every rank for the remaining eleven universities exceed similar Concordia University ranks by as little as 2.89% (Wilfrid Laurier, Assistant Professor) to as much as 28.51% (University of

### In this issue

<i>Concordia Faculty and Librarian Salaries Continue to Lag Behind</i>	1
<i>Do You Really Want To Go On Strike?</i>	4
<i>Save Library and Archives Canada</i>	6
<i>CUFA seeks Trustee for the Defense Fund</i>	6
<i>Contacting the Executive</i>	7

*Continued on page 3*

- This table compares weighted average median salaries for twelve comprehensive Canadian universities in 2009-2010 versus Concordia University (data from September, 2009)

- Percentages are ratios of dollar amounts for each university/rank compared to Concordia. For example, at \$138,450 the weighted average median salary for University of Guelph Full Professors is 113.38% of the \$122,111 weighted average median salary for Concordia University Full Professors.

- The last two major columns represent overall weighted average median salaries for each university and for each university when age 65 and older professors are excluded.

- The cells at the bottom of the table represent combined weighted averages (with and without 65+ faculty members) for the twelve comprehensive universities in dollar terms and as a percentage compared to Concordia University.

University	Full Prof	Full Prof Exclude 65+	Associate	Associate Exclude 65+	Assistant	Weighted Avg Total	Weighted Avg Total Ex 65+
Brock \$ % of Concordia	138,506 113.43%	134,288 113.27%	115,807 121.81%	113,803 122.07%	89,725 114.79%	113,670 114.20%	110,990 115.51%
Carleton \$ % of Concordia	135,050 110.60%	131,850 111.21%	114,200 120.12%	110,954 119.02%	89,125 114.02%	113,053 113.58%	110,010 114.49%
Memorial \$ % of Concordia	128,050 104.86%	124,060 104.64%	104,500 109.92%	103,052 110.54%	82,725 105.83%	105,958 106.45%	102,768 106.95%
Ryerson \$ % of Concordia	138,850 113.71%	136,913 115.48%	115,575 121.57%	115,127 123.49%	97,375 124.57%	115,337 115.88%	113,839 118.47%
Simon Fraser \$ % of Concordia	133,050 108.96%	131,021 110.51%	105,885 111.38%	104,746 112.36%	89,000 113.86%	110,999 111.52%	109,149 113.59%
Guelph \$ % of Concordia	138,450 113.38%	137,907 116.32%	115,607 121.60%	115,219 123.59%	95,325 121.95%	117,882 118.43%	117,235 122.01%
UNB \$ % of Concordia	123,520 101.15%	122,751 103.54%	95,061 99.99%	95,061 101.97%	72,950 93.33%	103,038 103.52%	102,249 106.41%
Victoria \$ % of Concordia	125,925 103.12%	125,535 105.88%	99,388 104.54%	99,600 106.84%	80,600 103.11%	104,142 104.63%	103,490 107.70%
Waterloo \$ % of Concordia	148,525 121.63%	147,985 124.82%	122,175 128.51%	120,778 129.56%	94,325 120.67%	124,497 125.08%	123,045 128.05%
Windsor \$ % of Concordia	138,700 113.59%	138,191 116.56%	112,966 118.83%	110,898 118.96%	89,200 114.12%	113,383 113.91%	111,198 115.72%
York \$ % of Concordia	142,475 116.68%	136,947 115.51%	119,350 125.54%	115,723 124.13%	93,650 119.81%	118,500 119.06%	114,098 118.74%
Wilfrid Laurier \$ % of Concordia	135,744 111.16%	132,928 112.12%	107,352 112.92%	107,352 115.15%	80,425 102.89%	104,881 105.37%	102,811 106.99%
<b>Concordia \$</b>	<b>122,111</b>	<b>118,558</b>	<b>95,068</b>	<b>93,224</b>	<b>78,167</b>	<b>99,533</b>	<b>96,090</b>

Weighted Avg Total 12 Comp	Weighted Avg Total 12 Comp Ex 65+
\$113,267 113.80%	\$111,084 115.60%

Source: Human Resource Information System (HRIS) for Concordia University, Statistics Canada (from CAUT) for remaining university data  
Data for the University of Regina and for UQAM were not available at the time this table was created

IR November 2011

*Continued from page 1*

Waterloo, Associate Professor). The salary differential increases to 29.56% (University of Waterloo, Associate Professor) when faculty aged 65 and over (65+) are excluded.

Even in the case of UNB, where Associate Professors are paid almost the same (\$95,061 vs. \$95,068 at Concordia) and Assistant Professors are paid less on the whole (\$72,950 vs. \$78,167 at Concordia), the Weighted Average Total Salary for the three ranks combined is 3.52% higher than that of Concordia and is 6.41% higher when 65+ faculty are excluded. At first glance this may seem to be inconsistent since Full Professors at UNB are paid only 1.15% more than their Concordia counterparts, Associate Professors are paid virtually the same and Assistant Professors are paid 93.33% of what Concordia Assistant Professors earn.

The explanation for this apparently anomalous finding lies in the fact that UNB's complement of relatively well paid Full Professors represents a higher proportion of their professoriate while Concordia's professoriate is made up of a higher proportion of lower paid Associate Professors.

It is particularly difficult to accept the reality that on the whole, each of the twelve Canadian universities in the same comprehensive category as Concordia has a weighted average median salary that exceeds Concordia's by as little as 3.52% (UNB, already noted) to as much as 25.08% (University of Waterloo). When 65+ professors are excluded (Concordia has a significantly higher proportion of these more highly paid professors than other universities in the category), the remaining UNB professors are paid 6.41% more and University of Waterloo professors are paid a hefty 28.05% more. It is also likely that librarian salaries are generally lower given that they are a fixed percentage of faculty salaries at Concordia.

Additionally, the weighted average total salaries (weighted by total number of professors in the three

ranks at each of the twelve Canadian institutions) are shown at the bottom of the table, for the twelve Canadian universities combined and similarly when 65+ professors are excluded. On the whole, the weighted average of salaries earned by professors at these twelve universities is 13.8% higher than the level earned by professors at Concordia. The differential in average salaries rises to 15.6% when 65+ professors are excluded. In this case, being average looks pretty good.

Something else that should be considered as salary talks loom is that salary differentials were of the same order of magnitude the last time this analysis was undertaken. In October, 2009 the overall salary differential (based on 2007 data) was 9.5% higher in favour of the Comprehensive Universities. At the time there were ten other universities in the comparison group (the University of Regina was

included and recently added Brock, Ryerson and Wilfrid Laurier Universities were excluded). It appears that at a minimum the gap has been

maintained and may in fact have widened.

Regardless of whether one looks at the data by rank, institution or category, the clear message is that Concordia professors and librarians are underpaid relative to their peers at institutions across Canada. There are some who would suggest that the only true comparators are institutions within Quebec. This is a convenient way of ignoring an "inconvenient truth," since extensive data for Quebec universities are rarely released in a timely fashion, thereby inhibiting the comparison of recent salary levels for faculty and librarians. On the other hand it is very apparent from older data that McGill faculty are significantly better paid and it would not be unreasonable to make a similar claim were data available from the University of Montreal.

We cannot expect to reduce the gap that exists between Concordia and comparable universities in

*"the clear message is that Concordia professors and librarians are underpaid"*

*Continued on page 4*

*Continued from page 3*

Canada if we continue to limp along with tiny scale increases and paltry “catch up” payments. The negotiating team has been given a mandate from CUFA’s Executive for more substantial demands when it comes time to discuss salary. But without the strong support of our CUFA membership, these demands will remain just empty words or meaningless numbers on a piece of paper. If the bulk of CUFA members are not sufficiently upset with a situation in which Concordia administrators continue to garner top level compensation in Canadian (not simply Quebec) terms, while we languish at the back of the Canadian university pack, then it appears we may be getting what we deserve. It is only through our collective resolve that we can reasonably expect to effect significant change. When the time comes for action, each CUFA member will have to look deep within him or herself to find the courage to oppose the inequity that persists at Concordia. We sincerely hope that we can count on each CUFA member when that time comes.

---

## **Do you really want to go on strike?**

*by Charles Draimin*

**T**his was a question I heard often when I was the president of CUFA during the last negotiations. In the fall term of 2008 we had raised the possibility of a strike as negotiations dragged on with little progress on salary and other important outstanding items. It wasn’t just talk. Strike committees were formed and preparations were being made. So my answer then was: No one wants to go on strike. But if a strike is necessary, yes, that is what we have to do. In the end, conciliation succeeded where direct talks were failing and after one all-night session at the labour ministry we and the employer came to an agreement without a strike. I cannot say how much of a difference our strike preparations made, but for the first time in CUFA’s history we had strength outside the negotiating room that we had never had before. The settlement we obtained was better than the “best

offer” the employer had made public.

But even if ultimately we didn’t call for a strike vote in those dark winter days of 2008-09, it was never very far from our minds. This was new for us at CUFA and its possibility added another dimension to negotiations, one with which we had no previous experience. Up until the fall of 2008, calling a strike was never a real possibility: under the provisions of our constitution, the threshold for achieving a successful strike vote was simply far too high. This changed only in the fall of 2008 when the constitution was amended so that the percentage to ratify a strike mandate was based on the number of members voting rather than the total membership.

Even though we have yet to exercise our newly won ability to strike, we now can and must think about this seriously whenever we enter into contract negotiations.

In my view, our inability to strike limited our power at the bargaining table and cost us in resulting settlements. In the early years of a more collegial university the cost was probably very low. But in more recent bargaining, the culture has changed and Concordia’s administration—like those at most other universities—has become more corporate-minded. Even more important, the Board of Governors has become more involved in the running of the university, where previously this task was left largely to the administration whose background and values were academic. As a consequence, relatively speaking, our power to resist the employer’s demands has diminished. These days, when push comes to shove, we have really little beyond our power of persuasion at the table.

Although the two sides, union and employer, sit at one table in negotiations, there is considerable asymmetry of power as the talks play out. Information is one example. When we come to the table, we do so having discussed our position with our members, discussions that cannot be kept under wraps. We have to assume that the Employer has a good idea about the distribution of our members’

---

*Continued on page 5*

Continued from page 4

views on the various demands proposed and discussed, and they can guess which are priorities for our members and which are not. Their having that knowledge is important at the table as it is in any other form of bargaining. We of course receive the employer's demands at the outset of negotiations—as they do ours—but the discussions that led up to them were with a small group of administrators and Board members, and they took place behind closed doors. As a result, CUFA doesn't have a comparable sense of the order of priority of the employer's various proposals. This can make a difference at the table and in this respect negotiations do not play out on a level field.

The employer has another very important advantage—time. For example, at Concordia, negotiations typically extend for well over a year and sometimes much longer. At our last round of negotiations I recall the two sides sitting down just before Christmas 2006 to formally begin the process. At that point it was six months before the then-current contract was to expire. Martin Singer, the Provost at the time, predicted—one could almost say promised—that the negotiations would result in a settlement by the following summer, July-August 2007, just two or three months after the current contract was to expire. In the end we got an agreement two and one half years from the beginning of negotiations before we finished, two years after the previous one had expired.

Negotiations in the past were not all this long, but they were too long. Most other universities don't have this problem and I don't think that this is a coincidence. As negotiations extend beyond the old contract's expiration date, no scale increases are paid. (Scale or cost of living increases are the largest component of salary increases.) This reduces the employer's cash outflow. As the payment is deferred until after the settlement, there is an

interest saving for the employer. And for us, there is a corresponding interest cost (or interest income foregone); this is especially painful for those members, typically the newest scholars, who are in a vulnerable financial position. Why does this happen? It is because we have no options. As long as the employer can push the limits of the Labour Code and still demonstrate that it is not negotiating in bad faith – a very difficult charge to prove—it can maintain the pace of negotiations that serves its interests. This is what is known as moral hazard—the employer has an incentive in the negotiation process to delay. Up until now we have not had the power to change this.

Our power to strike can change this. A strike or even a credible threat of a strike is a blunt instrument but it is the only way that our union can

balance the natural advantages of the employer. For example, at some universities, if negotiations continue beyond three months they are considered to be too long and

the union takes some action, typically by calling a strike vote, to demonstrate that the employer is not alone in having options. With the recent amendment to our constitution, we are now finally in a position to take such action and even the scales.

Of course, sometimes it is not a question of delay. The employer simply says no, or “that is our best offer” on salary increases, where “best” doesn't mean good or even acceptable. Take it or leave it they say, do your worst. In the past, without the power of strike, our worst was not much of a threat.

The next step is up to the executive, but I think that we should seriously consider how to use the power of a strike. If negotiations do not move very quickly to a satisfactory conclusion, the executive should move to get a strike mandate. Such a call, confirmed by Council and ratified by the entire membership, then puts the power of a strike call in the

*“Our power to strike  
can change this”*

Continued on page 6

## *Continued from page 5*

hands of the Executive. The threat is often enough. What this does is to make clear to the Employer that we are serious, thus changing the dynamics at the table. I believe that we would be quite surprised at its effectiveness.

So to return to the question I posed at the start: Do you really want to go on strike? If I were asked this question today, my answer would be unchanged: No one wants to go on strike. But if a strike is necessary, yes, that is what we have to do. I would however add a lesson we have learned in our last negotiations, one that bears out what we have seen in the successful tactics of other academic unions: You should be ready, sooner rather than later, to exercise your right to strike and so plan to take your strike vote early, before your back is against the wall. We didn't really have that choice last time and it cost us, in time if nothing else.

---

## **Save Library and Archives Canada**

**L**ibrary and Archives Canada (LAC), the federal institution responsible for preserving Canada's history and cultural heritage, is under threat. Badly conceived restructuring, a redefinition of its mandate, and financial cutbacks are undermining LAC's ability to acquire, preserve and make publicly available Canada's full documentary heritage.

The Canadian Association of University Teachers is launching a campaign to "Save Library and Archives Canada" and is encouraging Canadians to act decisively now to prevent the demise of this vital national institution.

CAUT is asking Canadians to join in ensuring our history and heritage is preserved by Library and Archives Canada - the only national institution with the mandate and capability to fill this role.

We are calling for:

- Amendments to the *Library and Archives of Canada Act* to more clearly specify LAC's obligation to maintain a comprehensive collection of Canada's documentary heritage
- The funding required to fulfill this obligation
- Restoration of LAC's comprehensive

acquisition of published material and archival records

- Restoration of public services, including access to archivists and librarians; access to the general reference collection; and re-establishment of specialist archivist positions
- End fragmentation of collections resulting from decentralization

For more information on the Save Library and Archives Canada campaign, go to [www.savelibraryarchives.ca](http://www.savelibraryarchives.ca) or contact:: Rosa Barker, [barker@caut.ca](mailto:barker@caut.ca) or Angela Regnier, [regnier@caut.ca](mailto:regnier@caut.ca).

*Editors' note: The foregoing was extracted from the CAUT November 2011 Council meeting, document number 16(2) (2011-11)*

---

## **CUFA seeks Trustee for the Defence Fund**

**C**UFA is a member of the CAUT Defence Fund. The Fund which has assets of several million dollars is used to assist member unions during periods of strike. This academic year, the Fund assisted colleagues from Western Ontario University (librarian staff) and from Brandon University (Faculty and Librarians).

Members unions of the Fund nominate trustees. CUFA has three trustees; two regular members and one alternate member. Currently, the regular members are Dr. Charles Draimin and Dr. Françoise Naudillon. Dr. Shelley Reuter is the alternate member. Dr. Draimin has been a trustee for almost eight years. He is now going on sabbatical and he has indicated that he does not wish to continue when he returns. CUFA is searching for a replacement. The work of a trustee involves attending an annual meeting of trustees. It also entails being present on picket lines whenever possible or finding someone to attend as a flying picket.

The work of a trustee is extremely important and rewarding. Member academic staff unions all benefit from the assistance provided by the Fund.

*Continued on page 7*

Continued from page 6

Moreover, the support that member unions provide to striking unions is invaluable. For example, over the years, gains in workload, sabbatical, early tenure emanate from gains obtained elsewhere, often as a result of a strike. With respect to salary (*see the article by Ian Rakita starting on page 1*), we are lagging behind and should a strike ever become a reality, it is reassuring to know that we can count on our sister universities and the Defence Fund for support.

The next annual trustee meeting will take place in Toronto. CAUT covers the travel expenses of all trustees.

If you are interested in serving as a trustee, please contact CUFA by email at [cufa@alcor.concordia.ca](mailto:cufa@alcor.concordia.ca).

*CUFA extends  
warm holiday  
greetings  
to its members  
and their families*

## Contacting the Executive

Lucie Lequin, *President* (Etudes françaises, 7505) **Lucie.Lequin@concordia.ca**

Ted Stathopoulos, *Vice-President* (BCEE, 3186) **statho@bcee.concordia.ca**

Aaron Brauer, *Secretary* (Sociology & Anthropology, 7333) **Aaron.Brauer@concordia.ca**

William Sims, *Treasurer* (Economics, 3938) **William.Sims@concordia.ca**

June Chaikelson, *Member-at-Large* (Psychology, 7539) **June.Chaikelson@concordia.ca**

Shelley Reuter, *Member-at-Large* (Sociology & Anthropology, 2174) **sreuter@alcor**

Francesca Scala, *Member-at-Large* (Political Science, 4074) **Francesca.Scala@concordia.ca**

The Executive can also be reached collectively by email at **cufaexec@concordia.ca**

### CUFA Staff

Geneviève Robichaud, Professional & Legal Officer (3984) **robichg@alcor**

Chantal Bohbot, Executive Assistant (3999) **bohbot@alcor**

The CUFA offices are located at the Loyola Campus in Hingston Hall, HB 109

CUFA Report is published by the Concordia University Faculty Association

Editorial Board: Aaron Brauer, Francesca Scala, William Sims