

**AGM 2013**  
**WMG REPORT**  
**September 2012 to May 2013**

---

**Members:**

Stephen Boaro, Chair  
Dr. David Silver  
Suzanne Tremblay

**Late SWF Formula Calculation.** A few Faculty Members were given late SWFs. The Union arrived at a Formula to duly compensate Faculty for the extra time required to fulfill their SWF requirements, particularly their Preparation Factor. The College has accepted this Formula.

**International Projects.** Some Faculty were asked to participate in International Work but the Work was not reflected on SWFs. The College was asked to rectify this situation. Hence, all International Work, if a Faculty Member wants to participate, will be recorded on the SWF.

**Multiple SWFs in One Semester.** Managers issued some Faculty up to nine (9) SWFs all at one time for the entire Semester and a few only lasting two working days!! The Union rejected this approach. Article 11 is very clear when it speaks in the **singular** "The SWF..."; "Each teacher shall have a workload..."; "...the supervisor shall discuss the proposed workload with the teacher and complete the SWF...." Article 11 does not refer to plurality when referring to SWF. This is an on-going issue.

**SWF and Non-Teaching Article 11.08.** The Union's position is that no SWF shall be issued during the non-teaching period. Some Managers did issue SWFs during this disputed time. The Union asked the College to cease and desist from this practice.

**Professional Development – Article 11.01 H1.** The College shall allow each teacher at least 10 working days of professional development. The College wanted to take control of these days and tell Faculty what they can and cannot do during this time. The Union vehemently opposed the College's perspective. The College has since not interfered with this Article.

**WRA Cases.** A few workload disputes went to the WRA for a final decision. The College is hesitant to go to the WRA because of the cost involved; however it is the Union's position that when a stalemate is reached at the WMG the workload case is

best sent to the WRA for a final outcome. This way the Union has served its complainant Member(s) to the full extent of Article 11.

**Workload Reassignment.** The College prides itself in being at the cutting edge of learning/delivery educational technology. Yet when there is a situation whereby a Faculty Member's workload is reassigned to another Campus, the College feels its cutting edge learning/delivery educational technology is inadequate causing the individual Member to have to move to the new Campus. The Union does not accept this situation. This situation is on-going.

Stephen Boaro, Chair