

Appendix C

The following is a summary of initial COVID-19 transition timeline and discussions between faculty associations and their institutes:

Camosun College

Camosun's three virtual gatherings with the College's Executive Team were short sessions and conducted at a high level. The live questions from faculty in the chat thread were curated by Camosun's administration.

In addition, while the CCFA and Camosun met to discuss pandemic-related issues, by May 2020, Camosun had indicated it could not acknowledge a workload problem.

Coast Mountain College

The Joint Management Meetings were informative, but they were not LOU discussions. The first LOU discussion occurred on April 23, 2020, five weeks after classes had been moved to online teaching.

College of the Rockies

Faculty's experience with the communication early in the pandemic was that it did not occur in a timely manner, and it was not detailed or specific. There were some initial messages on the website; however, they were not updated regularly, and messaging was misleading for students around lab courses. At the beginning, there were no daily updates or contacts from the Department Heads or Deans. Advisors felt very unsure of the college direction often until semesters were underway.

Faculty felt they were being left to fend for themselves. Faculty were working directly with stressed out students and felt they had little information to share with their classes.

The communication with faculty was so poor, the CMTN President had to tell management to communicate with faculty. Communication continues to be inadequate, with details often coming from students.

Faculty made the pivot to online teaching and assessments without adequate communication from CMTN. They were given two working days to develop contingency plans without clear parameters of what these should entail, then they had to implement these with immediate effect. Some trades instructors moved online in only one day. Faculty were left teaching from their kitchen tables and garages without guidance from management.

Examinations continue to be an area with poor communication and guidance from management. In the fall 2020 semester, after months of time to prepare, faculty were merely told to not rely on invigilation software and to try to use other means of assessments. For some subjects, such as math, good alternatives are not readily apparent, and it was faculty who had to shoulder this burden.

The meetings described in the Response¹ were not collaborative or consultative, as described. The meetings consisted of the Executive Director of Human Resources sharing decisions that were made.

Douglas College

Douglas convened their Pandemic Preparedness Response Team on January 27, 2020. The DCFA did not learn about the Pandemic Preparedness Response Team until March 9, 2020, in an email sent to all faculty members from the VP Academic and Provost. At no point was the DCFA ever invited to attend, despite requests from the DCFA asking to be included.

The first direct discussion between the DCFA and Douglas took place on March 12, 2020, at a scheduled LMRC meeting. There was no indication in that meeting that Douglas was considering going fully on-line for the remainder of the Winter semester nor that they planned to survey faculty members. The COVID-19 Survey, which asked faculty to indicate their ability to move classes on-line, was sent out to LLPA on 12 March 12, 2020, at 4:08 pm, after the LMRC meeting). This survey caused some consternation and faculty emailed the DCFA to ask if they should even respond to this survey.

The DCFA began crafting a draft LOU in preparation for negotiations with Douglas in mid-March, but this attempt to negotiate a LOU was rejected by the College Administration. Eventually the DFCA and Douglas met to discuss Collective Agreement violations and broader issues with the working conditions under COVID-19 restrictions; however, Douglas was determined to rely on a prior LOU while also refusing to honour all of its provisions. DCFA filed a grievance in response.

Nicola Valley Institute of Technology

Appendix C purports to identify “COVID-19 transition timelines and discussions with the faculty associations;”² however, in the case of NVIT, the majority of the summary is about one-way communications and open format discussions with employees, not discussions with NVITEA. It also says: “Since March 2020, the Institute has met with the NVITEA 24 times.”³ These

¹ PSEA Response, page 44.

² PSEA Response, page 42, emphasis added.

³ PSEA Response, page 45.

meetings were staff meetings for various purposes, and at times included staff and excluded employees. NVIT never had a dedicated and purposeful meeting with NVITEA about the COVID-19 changes. In fact, when NVITEA requested one, NVIT refused.

NVIT has a Joint Health and Welfare Committee, which includes employer and Union representatives. NVITEA requested that health related changes be brought to this committee; however, NVIT's Leadership Team decided on changes and reported it to the Committee. The Committee was not involved in any discussions or decision making.

North Island College

In mid-March, NIC created an ad hoc COVID-19 team to address current safety issues and protocols. Although NICFA was not initially invited to join, NICFA requested and were granted a representative at those meetings.

In a time when there were weekly updates from the prime minister and daily updates from the provincial health minister and officer, NIC president John Bowman was absent; faculty received an initial email from the president in April and then did not get another communication for more than four weeks. Mr. Bowman was also absent during the announcement of the largest reductions of faculty numbers in NICFA history.

NICFA met via Zoom with faculty weekly, in addition to executive meetings every morning throughout May and June, in an attempt to fill this gap in communication.

In May, NICFA noticed a complete absence of marketing from NIC. NICFA paid for advertising and radio spots to let students know faculty were busy preparing classes for summer and fall, and would be ready for them.

Faculty did meet with NIC to discuss planning for spring, but the overarching concern brought to NICFA by NIC in April was the plan for reductions of faculty.

University of the Fraser Valley

Although UFV may have sent lots of emails, faculty report that they have not been personally contacted for the entire duration of the pandemic. As a result, many faculty feel isolated and forgotten.

In some departments, information was not communicated in a timely manner nor was the input of affected faculty and departmental coordinators sought. For example, in nursing, at the beginning of the pandemic faculty were initially told the clinical rotations in hospitals would continue, then it was paused, and eventually, the clinical rotation was cancelled for the semester. Faculty members felt the safety of the nursing faculty and students was secondary to those in programs where face-to-face teaching had been suspended; nursing faculty were being told to provide patient care in hospitals when there was not enough Personal Protective Equipment

available. This caused immense stress for nursing faculty and students. No mention of mental health supports was made at that time.

While the meetings between UFVFSa and UFV did occur frequently, the substance of those meetings was inadequate. Faculty raised issues, such as increased workload, and management was not responsive to these concerns. Communicating about supports is not the same as actually providing supports. Even when UFVFSa offered non-compensatory mitigation options, management did not engage with these suggestions.

In the Human Resources check-in meetings, discussion centered around specific departments or employees, rather than systemic issues. For example, UFVFSa raised concerns about supervisor over-reach (e.g., increased accountability and attendance requirements; dress codes for online meetings), and HR resolved those individual problems; however, despite UFVFSa's advocacy, there was no indication from HR or management that they were interested in addressing it from a systemic standpoint.

Vancouver Community College

The meetings identified in the Response (April 27, May 8, May 11, May 25, June 8, June 17, September 14, October 5, and November 18)⁴ were all 3.11 meetings. The purpose of these meetings is to discuss issues where administration and VCCFA's interests intersect; the meetings were not caused by COVID-19, nor was COVID-19 the only item of discussion.

The communication from VCC was deficient in other ways as well. For example, on March 16, 2020, classes were suspended at VCC for the remainder of the week. On March 18, 2020, VCC sent out the Remote Working Guidelines Document and asked the faculty to sign and return it. VCCFA began to get calls from concerned members about what they were signing, and VCCFA advised members not to sign it until they had reached an understanding with VCC about the meaning and intent of the documents. VCC did not discuss or share the guidelines with VCCFA before sending out to all the members.

⁴ PSEA Response, Appendix C, page 47.

Appendix D

The following is the reply to the summary of discussions between faculty associations with respect to collective agreement variances:

Camosun College

The Executive Director, Human Resources, did not come up with the idea of a variance with respect to the regularization and right of first refusal.⁵

The CCFA offered to enter variance negotiations by letter to the employer on March 27, 2020. On April 23, 2020, the CCFA presented draft Art. 1.04(d) and Art. 1.02(g) variances, and scenarios to illustrate its application to Camosun.

May 28, 2020, five weeks later, Camosun rejected the proposal outright. The CCFA complained to Camosun's President, and only then did Camosun entertain a scaled-down version of the Union's proposed variance; however, this was also rejected without counterproposal. Camosun cited PSEA's authority, logistical challenges in implementation, and existing disagreement about the articles in question.

Camosun also stated there was no employer benefit to such a variance, and that it would not consider any variance without clear employer benefit. The only variance discussions that took place in Fall 2020 were when Camosun rejected CCFA's second variance proposal.

After a faculty member raised questions about faculty evaluations, the School of Arts and Science sought CCFA's agreement on the use of online student feedback. Despite CCFA's encouragement, no other school at Camosun responded similarly. The CCFA was told, initially, by VP Education John Boraas that to his knowledge no other school was pursuing faculty evaluations in the Winter 2020 semester. This turned out to be false.

Coast Mountain College

On March 20, 2020, the AWU asked CMTN to discuss a LOU. CMTN informed AWU that PSEA had informed them an LOU would be inappropriate as the parties were bargaining. On April 23, 2020, the parties met for the first time to discuss an LOU.

College of the Rockies

CORFA presented a draft variance agreement in June and raised concerns of faculty members throughout the summer. COR did not engage in discussions that could lead to any kind of

⁵ The PSEA Response, appendix D, page 48, states: "The idea of a potential variance with respect to the CCFA collective agreement originated from the Executive Director, Human Resources."

variances. Regularization could have been subject to a variance, because it is covered by the Collective Agreement and includes a lookback clause to ensure faculty are treated fairly when workload assignments are finalized in the fall.⁶

Douglas College

The “additional discussions were held between the parties in June 2020”⁷ was one LMRC meeting held on June 4 as part of the grievance process and a follow up email thread between the DCFA VP Negotiations and the Douglas College President.

North Island College

The variance described in the Response⁸ *increases* faculty workload from 4 sections/3 preps per semester, to 4 sections/4 preps per semester. During the spring conversations, NICFA asked repeatedly for lower section caps, smaller class sizes, and/or lower global student caps to ensure that faculty would be able to shoulder the extra work of getting their courses created online and preparing for the fall and winter semesters.

These requests for reduced workload for faculty members were dismissed outright; NIC stated student numbers would not be an issue in the next academic year. Many faculty were exceeding the maximum student load the first week of the fall semester and were not being paid for the overload. Faculty had to shift to a whole new digital delivery mode, while they also had a greater number of students than in previous years and more course preps as per the variance.

University of the Fraser Valley

Although the University and UFVFSAs were able to agree to three variances, UFV consistently refused to engage on the central issue of increased workload related to teaching.

⁶ Contrary the PSEA Response, Appendix D, page 48.

⁷ PSEA Response, Appendix D, page 48.

⁸ PSEA Response, Appendix D, page 49.

Appendix E

The following is a description of the conditions that faculty experienced which compelled them to work from home, and inadequate support provided to faculty who had to work from home.

These conditions effectively removed any “choice” about working from home. Even if some faculty could have worked on campus, the circumstances made it impossible for all or even most of faculty to work on campus.

Camosun College

On March 18, 2020, remote working was introduced in Special Camnews as follows:

Remote working, similar to the face-to-face transition of instruction and assessment, is a temporary measure and is in place until further notice.

Camosun cancelled the taxable benefit of the parking pass on April 21, 2020, as it was no longer applicable. In order to work on campus, faculty had to obtain permission from a Dean, fill out a form, and conduct a self-assessment.

Faculty working from home reported difficulty with procuring the necessary tools for teaching online, especially in the early stages.

Coast Mountain College

Although the campuses remained open, CMTN implemented several procedures to ensure safety of those on campus which had the effect of preventing faculty from working on campus.

For example, in both the March 17 and 18, 2020, COVID-19 updates, CMTN stated: “in the interest of promoting social distancing, CMTN employees are encouraged to discuss work-from-home options with their supervisors/managers to establish a work plan moving forward.”⁹

Faculty were instructed that to work on campus, they had to apply and justify the reason for doing so to a manager. This was reiterated in CMTN’s November 20, 2020 and January 11, 2021, COVID-19 updates, which both stated: “Our campuses remain closed to the public and are open only to staff and faculty approved to work on campus.”¹⁰

In addition, faculty also had to receive permission from a designated person (which depended on the program and campus) to be on campus. If that person could not be reached, faculty were told

⁹ <https://www.coastmountaincollege.ca/about-cmtn/news-media/news/covid-19-update-4;>
[https://www.coastmountaincollege.ca/about-cmtn/news-media/news/covid-19-update-5.](https://www.coastmountaincollege.ca/about-cmtn/news-media/news/covid-19-update-5;)

¹⁰ <https://www.coastmountaincollege.ca/about-cmtn/news-media/news/covid-19-update-16;>
<https://www.coastmountaincollege.ca/about-cmtn/news-media/news/covid-19-update-17-restrictions-on-gatherings-extended.>

to not come to campus. In fact, in the November 20, 2020, COVID-19 update, CMTN stated: “For CMTN employees and students, you should only be on campus if absolutely necessary.”¹¹

Lastly, faculty were not permitted to come to campus if the building was already at maximum capacity. The capacity of some buildings was reduced on the Prince Rupert and Terrace campuses when trades were on site completing renovations.

College of the Rockies

If working from home was optional, this was not communicated to faculty. For example, on Sunday, March 22, 2020, President David Walls sent an email stating COR would be closed to students, employees, and the public effective end of day Monday, March 23, 2020.

On June 1, 2020, President David Walls said in an email:

I understand the desire of some employees to return to campus to prepare for the fall. With approved safety protocols completed, we anticipate moving to Phase 3 mid-June (June 15), where we will begin a **controlled and partial re-entry for faculty** as well as re-establishing delivery of First Aid courses and assessments at our multiple-campus sites.

This unprecedented action of moving to alternative delivery combined with **employees working remotely**, will hopefully help to manage and lessen the pandemic as much as we can.

(emphasis added)

On August 18, 2020, President Paul Vogt stated the following in an email:

We’re significantly reducing the overall number of people in our buildings **by having employees work from home when possible**, restricting the general public’s access to our facilities, and delivering most courses online or via web-conferencing.

(emphasis added)

Faculty had to apply for limited access to campus.

Faculty were told they would only receive equipment for one work location. This meant that faculty who taught at home could not also work on campus, as they would have to move equipment back and forth.

At the beginning, COR was not permitting faculty to take chairs, desks, or monitors from campus. Faculty were told from IT that college work should be done on COR computers; however, COR computers were small and caused physical strain on instructors. Shannon Howe

¹¹ <https://www.coastmountaincollege.ca/about-cmtn/news-media/news/covid-19-update-16>

in Human Resources sent an email to faculty on June 30, 2020 regarding Ergo Equipment Toolkit and instructions on how to request computers, monitors, and chairs. Pick up days were scheduled to begin July 21, 2020. This delay in providing appropriate equipment made it difficult for faculty to complete all the work that needed to be done (e.g., marking online assignments, preparing class materials, completing PD activities). Proper equipment was only made available once the intensive work of teaching and marking was complete.

The ergonomic sessions included using boxes and ironing boards, which are not realistic for long term or shared workspaces.

Some faculty made requests for equipment, such as an ergonomic mice, but were denied and had to incur personal expenses to facilitate working from home. Many faculty had to upgrade their home internet at their own cost; however, some could not afford this extra expense or were otherwise unable to upgrade their home internet, and are still struggling with inadequate service.

Printing costs were not reimbursed.

Douglas College

From March 2020 until August 2020, there were no protocols in place for maintaining social distancing, and the supply of masks and hand sanitation stations were minimal. Masks were not mandated. Social distancing protocols were not in place for common areas such as mail rooms and photocopiers.

Faculty offices are almost all shared spaces and very small. It is common for an office of less than 120 square feet to accommodate two faculty members. Due to online teaching and student office hours faculty would be in close proximity with their office partner(s) for many hours per week. There was no, and continues to be no, effort made by Douglas to schedule classes, meeting times, etc. to accommodate social distancing in faculty offices.

The \$100 maximum for incidental expenses is inadequate. Faculty members were not allowed to use the Supplemental Professional Development for funding the needed equipment for offering online education from a home office. Douglas sent out an email stating that equipment purchased using this Fund could only be made for “classroom use” equipment. Applying for other funds “at the Dean’s discretion” has been done infrequently because faculty feel it is pointless to even ask when rejection is likely. There are no guidelines nor processes for accessing funding.

Nicola Valley Institute of Technology

The computer purchase plan initiative was a program whereby NVITEA could purchase computers, get reimbursed by NVIT, and NVIT would deduct the amount back in monthly instalments. NVIT charged a service fee to the employee. NVIT also refused to assist with WiFi at home.

This appendix proports to describe various supports to faculty who choose to work from home;¹² however, “communication of strategies for staying healthy while working from home,” is not a support. It shifts the responsibility for a healthy work environment onto the employee, while not providing any tangible support to achieve it.

North Island College

Many faculty have to work from home as the conditions on campus made online course delivery impossible, for example:

- The NIC computers were old, slow, and not sufficient to create and run the online and digitized programming faculty were expected to create;
- The NIC did not have the capacity on its server for all faculty to teach online at the same time; and,
- Many faculty share offices, and so safety was difficult to organize. The shared office space required faculty to work with colleagues to schedule when each would use the office.

Those faculty that had to work at home were not properly supported by the NIC. For example, although safe work practices and working from home guidelines were created, there was no follow up from NIC on a faculty’s home workspace to ensure safety or ergonomic considerations.

Early on, many faculty experienced an inability to access the NIC shared drive from their home computers. VPNs were given out by the IT department, but it was weeks before a resolution was found. Faculty had been putting in hours on their home computers to develop the necessary modules for their courses.

University of the Fraser Valley

UFVFSA suggesting using professional development funds, which may have otherwise gone unused, to support working from home. It was necessary because employees were not permitted to remove furniture (including ergonomic furniture) and equipment from their workspaces to use at home, unless it was related to an accommodation (e.g., disability).

Those who were able to use their professional development funds still did not have enough money for all the required equipment, such as scanners, printers, and proper desk chair; and then, they were left with no funds to attend virtual conferences or engage in other professional development activities.

¹² PSEA Response, page 50.

The professional development funds were not designed for transitioning to working from home, and employees who chose to use their professional development funds for professional development received no assistance from the employer related to home office setup.

Faculty had to pay out-of-pocket for faster internet connection, google home routing/extender devices, headset, and second monitors. UFV did not provide IT support for internet issues. Faculty relied on their spouses to troubleshoot.

Vancouver Community College

Between March and August 2020, 75% of faculty worked from home and 20% did a blend of working from home and working on campus. As of March 2021, 60% of faculty work from home, 12% work on campus, and 28% are doing a blend of at home and on campus.

When courses pivoted to online teaching at the beginning of the pandemic, there were a number of issues with VCC's deployment of technology, including:

- Faculty had only three days to move their classes online, with most of this transition happening in the middle of courses and programs. Faculty did not have time to wait for IT to respond to their equipment requests.
- Many faculty had to suddenly share computers with their children and other family members at home, and everyone needed a quick remedy.
- Faculty needed equipment that was zoom capable. Faculty who tried to use the computer labs at VCC found the computers did not have cameras, so zoom was not possible.

VCC did not ensure faculty had the proper equipment to work from home, and instead maintained that since faculty were teaching from home "voluntarily" they had no obligation to furnish faculty with the technology necessary to do their jobs remotely; however, faculty often share offices with two or more people, so the "option" to work in their office was not reasonable or safe based on PHO directives.

While some faculty were able to borrow equipment from VCC, many were not as there was simply not enough available. Faculty had to purchase webcams, modems, laptops, extra screens, printers, scanners, cameras, iPads, iPencils, software, microphones, and computer cables out-of-pocket, and many faculty have still not been reimbursed for these expenses. VCC did not issue T2200 forms so that faculty could claim work-from-home expenses on their taxes.

Some faculty, such as term instructors, do not have the financial stability or means to invest in technology for which they may not be reimbursed. As a result, they are forced to deliver courses on their iPads or personal laptops.

Faculty were unable to utilize the Adobe license through VCC because they were not on a VCC device. Faculty have spent countless hours learning to use software and revamping courses for online delivery without remuneration.

VCC did not provide adequate ergonomics support for faculty now working from a computer all day.

Appendix F

Non-instructional does not mean no workload. It simply means the faculty member is not in front of a student. There has always been ample work to do that is not a face-to-face lecture or lab in a normal academic year, but during the pandemic, this non-instructional workload exponentially increased.

Camosun College

- Non-regular (i.e., term) faculty members do not have scheduled development time, yet they have to perform the same work as continuing faculty members, such as moving courses online.
- Many faculty members found their scheduled development time insufficient to implement all of the changes required to put the ensuing year's instructional activities online.
- Many faculty reported they had to use part of the vacation in order to complete the necessary instructional development.
- The time between scheduled classes and semesters is already occupied by a myriad of other tasks, such as marking and submitting grades. These tasks did not disappear with the pandemic and faculty did not have the time to squeeze in online course development.

Coast Mountain College

- The 20 professional development days¹³ is a negotiated benefit of the Collective Agreement. The choice of activities for these days is intended to be employee-driven. Employees retain the right to allocate these days for other professional development opportunities.
- CMTN did provide three days after teaching was moved online; however, three days was not nearly sufficient for most faculty. Faculty had to complete the following tasks in those three days:
 - Learn how to use Bluejeans (the online course delivery system);
 - Convert in-person teaching materials to remote teaching materials;
 - Create new lesson plans appropriate for remote delivery; and
 - Create new assignments to replace in-class assignments and exams.

¹³ PSEA Response, Appendix F, page 54.

- Some faculty were able to complete all these tasks in the three days, or had completed more than 70% of the course and were able to take advantage of an early end to the semester; however, many other faculty had multiple classes that had to be moved online, or had no prior experience with online delivery. For those faculty it was impossible to complete all the required tasks in only three days.
- The three days did not account for the increase in student communications after moving to online teaching.

College of the Rockies

- The time in May and June was insufficient to prepare for online teaching. Many faculty had never taught online before and took advantage of the learning opportunities regarding best practices for online teaching. This learning was necessary before actual course development could occur. Some faculty reporting having to learn up to eight new programs in order to deliver their courses online. Many faculty spent May/June and into their July vacation time on professional development and learning activities, which left them adapting course delivery on a week-by-week basis all Fall.
- Faculty who had to teach spring courses, such as those in the Child, Youth, and Families department, were not afforded additional time to prepare for the fall semester. While teaching full-time loads, some faculty were required to design and create new courses, move courses to a new format, and provide extensive support to students who were stressed and traumatized by the COVID-19 realities that were emerging. They did not have professional development days to do any of this work.
- In addition to teaching and preparing, faculty were still required to attend numerous meetings and workshops.
- Many faculty did not have their average class sizes materially reduced from pre-pandemic to post-pandemic, and some programs increased enrolment.
- The amount of time needed to create alternative assessments, alternative lecture delivery methods, and attempting to use different communication technologies all takes more time. There were no adjustments made to workload to recognize the impact of teaching online versus face to face.
- Many courses could not just be adapted, but they had to be completely restructured due to the hands-on nature of face-to-face delivery.
- The 40 non-instructional days are already filled with other tasks, including:
 - marking exams, papers and finalizing grades;

- cleaning up each of the course materials and noting changes for the following year;
 - researching new/updated material to implement the next year;
 - responding to students questions/appeals/academic integrity reports, etc;
 - learning new technology for the upcoming term; and,
 - department meetings, articulation meetings, etc.
- Even with fewer students, more time is spent per student and has led to many faculty spending more time overall. This is exacerbated because students were in many different time zones (India, Japan, Vancouver, Québec, England, etc.) or had their own internet connectivity issues.

Douglas College

- Faculty's autonomy to organize their teaching responsibilities is constrained by the Curriculum Guidelines and Education Policy, both under the authority of Education Council. These contain constraints on faculty autonomy, such as how many evaluations to include and when they are conducted, and whether to provide final exams. The autonomy to arrange their teaching-related responsibilities is not as unlimited as is described.
- Some faculty members teach every semester with no non-teaching semester.
- The number of days available to faculty members to prepare for courses was not 50-55 business days in the 2020 year.¹⁴ That estimation assumes faculty members had no other duties beyond teaching. Faculty members have considerable other work, for example departmental responsibilities such as meetings, curriculum development, and departmental reviews; and faculty and college responsibilities including meetings, committees and council work, and projects. The employer has not reduced or removed this work to facilitate the additional time faculty members are committing to their teaching and student support work.

North Island College

- There is no language in the professional development article that states minor curriculum development is included in the 22 days of professional development.

¹⁴ PSEA Response, Appendix F, page 55.

- In the past, faculty have been assigned up to 25% release (120 hours) to create one online course. Faculty during COVID-19 were expected to create and build sometimes as many as four courses for work in the fall and winter – without time or monetary compensation, and often without familiarity with the platform and digital teaching tools.
- Some faculty did not carry over *any* professional development or vacation because there was no chance they would be able to access it in the following year either. No faculty was able to take their allocated 22 days of professional development and many faculty could not use any professional development last year because of the workload demands caused by COVID-19. As faculty can only carry over 12 days; they lost the rest.
- This year, it will be very difficult, if not impossible, for those who were able to carry over time to access their allotted 22 days of professional development in addition to the 12 extra days from the previous year. There is no provision for unused days to be paid out.
- Cancellation of the exam period did not add to the paid non-instructional time for faculty. Students still had to be assessed. Because the exam period was cancelled, faculty had to develop alternative ways to assess their students. Faculty who felt they needed to assess students using an exam had the added challenge of organizing a time with their students to write the exam synchronously online and then figuring out how to do this effectively. All of this added to faculty workload and work stress.
- During the pause of classes,¹⁵ Trades faculty were directed to take professional development in CTLI. The collective agreement states professional development is faculty directed; as a result, this was a mandated event from administration which goes against the language in the collective agreement.
- While it is true that most faculty did not have direct instruction from the end of April until fall classes in September, the workload demands over the summer were still very high. Faculty completed the following work over the summer:
 - Marking, entering grades, and supporting students that had been given extensions;
 - Creating curriculum for the fall and winter; and
 - Attending workshops to learn how to move curriculum and assessments to an online format, and switching from a final exam to a final project, or portfolio.
- Attending workshops and course design classes offered by CTLI not only required time for faculty to attend and learn, but faculty then had to take that learning and apply it to their course design. It has been a year of continuous and very challenging work for faculty members.

¹⁵ PSEA Response, Appendix F, page 56: “Several Trades programs were converted to online theory courses in March and April 2020 and instruction was paused for 4-6 weeks while safety planning took place. During the pause, many Trades faculty used formal professional development time and could have attended workshops organized by CTLI.”

- Most faculty did not get their 40 days of vacation in the summer months.

University of the Fraser Valley

- UFVFSA disputes that 30-40% of faculty workload is outside of instructional hours, as stated in the Response.¹⁶ The workload demands caused by the pandemic causes faculty to exceed this. Faculty engage in uncompensated, non-instructional labour to advance their professional growth during annual vacation leave.
- There was not enough time to take vacation and prepare for online courses. Faculty report working up to 70 hours, at the same time their childcare was cut; and that taking vacation or reducing course load would have left their departments and colleagues stranded.
- For those faculty who do not normally teach online (which is the majority of faculty), and for those faculty teaching courses online for the first time, they used their professional development time to put their fall courses online, when they would normally engage in course development, curriculum planning, and other forms of scholarship.
- Faculty teaching during the May-June summer term logically spent the one-week break between the Winter 2020 and Summer 2020 semesters preparing their summer courses for online delivery. They did not have the full 20 days of professional development to focus on fall course delivery.
- There was no extra preparation time provided between the Fall 2020 and Winter 2021 semesters. Faculty used their holiday to prepare and get courses online. At best, faculty had 25 days over the winter break, including weekends and holidays, to prepare 3-4 courses for online delivery for the following semester. Under normal circumstances, that might be enough time to prepare one course.
- Additionally, the grade submission deadline for Fall 2020 semester was extended to January 5. As a result, some faculty were still grading late assignments while trying to prepare courses for the Winter 2021 semester.
- Non-regular faculty (sessional and Limited Term Appointment faculty) who were teaching in the summer semester were especially strained:
 - Contracts are not issued until just before the start of the fall semester;
 - Courses may not be cancelled until after a faculty member has put substantial work into the course (with little expectation of reasonable compensation); and,

¹⁶ PSEA Response, Appendix F, page 57.

- Access to support resources such as Teaching & Learning must be done on their own time (uncompensated), and often while already teaching in the current semester.
- The library supports were not a significant source of support as this service was already available in a slightly different form, with little uptake, and faculty already had most of their course materials in digital format. Reports from the library affirm that there were almost no requests for this support. Some faculty did not know the library was available as a support. Faculty report feeling too demoralized and exhausted to make use of the workshops.
- Faculty report that the supports were not helpful as they do not address the extra time it takes to mark online assignments, develop new assignments and rubrics, or support panicking students. Requests for assistance putting material online was met with instructional videos.
- Because of the late start, faculty had to spend time redoing their courses for the new schedule. Some departments did not start late. For example, the BSN program started a week before the rest of the university. In any case, the late start was not so that faculty had more time to prepare. It was because some wanted to run a pilot set of 'CUBE' courses. Many faculty were against this move as it meant a very short time period in December for marking and preparing for January 2021.
- UFV changed email platforms mid-semester, which added extra hours to faculty workload at a time when they were already crushed with overwork.

Vancouver Community College

- The Response purports that “anywhere from 30-60% of faculty workload time is outside of instruction hours.”¹⁷ This is incorrect. Workload profiles vary from program to program and department to department, but the most non-instructional time an individual might get is 30% of their work hours, and this is rare. Most faculty teach 80 -90% of their time.
- Although it is true that faculty get professional development time on top their instruction time and that some faculty were able to use it to transition curriculum to an online format, when the “pivot” occurred, most faculty were in the middle of teaching courses at that time. Faculty were not able to suddenly stop what they were doing and take twenty days of professional development to get up to speed. They made the switch to online delivery in three days and then they carried on with their courses.

¹⁷ PSEA Response, Appendix F, page 57.

Most faculty worked through the summer and their winter break just to keep on top of what was for many, a completely new way of teaching.

Appendix G

The following is a reply to the summary of training and technological support provided to faculty by their institutions in response to the COVID-19 related transition to remote learning.

Every faculty association reported that faculty were not provided time to attend trainings, so attending training meant giving up breaks or working on the weekends and evenings. Faculty were also suffering from “zoom fatigue” which made it hard to attend more online workshops and trainings.

Camosun College

- The instructional designers who provided individual and group consultations were faculty who were already overworked.
- Instructors and CCFA non-teaching faculty provided technological support to students when they were in need.
- Some faculty members needing extensive training due to unfamiliarity with online methods and tools have not had their needs met well. Faculty that requested workload accommodation to make space for such training has been refused.
- In the Response, it states that two additional faculty were assigned to the Centre for Excellence in Teaching and Learning;¹⁸ however, these positions were only added in July 2020.
- In the Response, it states that a part-time, continuing faculty member was assigned a CETL position;¹⁹ however, this was actually a post-retirement position, not a part-time continuing position.

Coast Mountain College

Appendix G summarizes the “training and technological support provided to faculty;” however, the list provided for CMTN only describes training. There is no description of technological support.

In fact, the technological support was deficient in several ways:

¹⁸ PSEA Response, Appendix G, page 59.

¹⁹ PSEA Response, Appendix G, page 59.

- CMTN's Information Technology department does not provide tech support to employee-owned equipment. CMTN did not provide equipment to most faculty. As a result, most faculty did not have any tech support available;
- While faculty were teaching from home, it was their individual responsibility to maintain confidentiality and security of information. No resources were provided to support faculty to do this;
- Faculty had limited access to on-campus resources such as printers, scanners, faxes, and CMTN's portal.²⁰
- Faculty were instructed to use their professional development funds to purchase equipment required for online teaching, such as microphones and headphones;
- Reimbursement for technology expenses took an extremely long time to process.

College of the Rockies

- Allowing faculty to temporarily change the weight of each evaluation was not a significant support for faculty.
- Faculty do not feel like an adjustment plan was created nor communicated. They had to work from home, without adequate resources.
- Many faculty raised concerns about academic integrity and exams. Creating multiple exam versions was quite common and significantly increased preparation and marking time. This problem is not addressed simply by giving more assignments as many of the same issues are present. Faculty report not receiving adequate support for creating and delivering exams.
- Faculty felt overwhelmed with the overabundance of workshops, trainings, and webinars provided and with the proposed solutions. It was far too much to digest and figure out how or what to incorporate into course delivery. Faculty reported ignoring information because they did not have time to look at it.
- Furthermore, many of the resources were based on an assumption that faculty had the time to plan and develop programming, and they arrived much too late.
- Faculty reported the many resources were not helpful as they simply linked to the Moodle Docs site, which many faculty had already visited; or they focussed on how to teach but faculty needed technical instructions and resources on how to use programs.
- The level of online support for students and faculty was so far below what was needed. An already taxed system was put into absolute chaos. It took months to hire more

²⁰ See Appendix E for explanation of why faculty could not access the campuses.

employees which meant there were large back logs to get help with IT items. COTR did not provide enough hours for support staff or for the faculty who support curriculum design to provide resources in a timely way.

- Faculty reported feeling like they were left to figure things out for themselves or rely on others who had already figured things out. COTR does not offer support for Zoom to faculty.
- Advisors maintained student appointments but halted skills workshops due to workload. Not all advisors received College phones and internet bandwidth was a challenge for some. Faculty were left alone to figure out how to best serve students online.
- There were not enough zoom licenses for faculty. Some programs had only one license for each of the first- and second-year classes, and a coordinator had to schedule the classes so that licenses could be shared amongst the faculty.
- Some programs were inadequate for online teaching. For example, Teams did not help with class engagement activities until breakout rooms became available in November 2020.
- Faculty experienced delays by CotrOnline in getting course shells set up. The delay meant faculty were delayed starting to work on fall courses.

Douglas College

- The learning curve was so steep that many faculty had to give up their vacation time, and in the few instances where faculty were able to ask to move their vacation days forward there was no guarantee it would be approved. More importantly, the lack of vacation resulted in burn out.
- The summer 2020 time releases to the Facilitating Faculty Online (FFO) strategic initiative was last minute, which caused a number of problems:
 - Faculty had to suddenly create courses for their colleagues to take while they too were in the midst of handling teaching themselves. As a result, many of the training classes were offered too late in the semester to be of much use.
 - The positions went to who was available, or whose department had a contract person to fill that gap, as opposed to whom might have been best for the job.
- In addition, the FFO provided inadequate release time to the faculty:

- The faculty who did get released only got one section of time release for an incredibly demanding job. The faculty trainers had little time to create comprehensive materials.
 - Many faculty did not know if they would be given time release for the next term or the term after, so many simply “assisted” rather than creating planned sessions that could be reused.
 - In the following term, some of these faculty trainers did not do it again, and thus the next group faculty trainers had to create new training materials.
 - Some faculty received no time release so they volunteered to help their colleagues.
 - As this money for time release was provided at the last minute for the fall 2020 and winter 2021, there was not chance to put this towards regularization. They were offered after the end of the cut-off date for regularization, even though it was clear at that time that the fall teaching was going to be online.
- The increased in service requests reflect the struggles that faculty were experiencing. Even with the additional support staff, faculty reported that the wait time for this support was too long, and often emergency calls would be made during active class time and not responded to due to the volume of the calls.

Nicola Valley Institute of Technology

- NVIT allocated the one-time, \$100 technology stipend²¹ from the Professional Development fund; however, NVIT is responsible for technological changes. This was corrected after NVITEA grieved.²²

North Island College

- The additional CUPE staff hired in the Learning Commons was not helpful to faculty.²³ It did it alleviate the emails that faculty got from students.
- A pilot, which began in November 2020, embedded helpdesk staff into courses, and this worked well; however, the pilot was only with two instructors.

²¹ PSEA Response, page 63.

²² See PSEA Response, Appendix L – Grievances, page 88.

²³ PSEA Response, Appendix G, page 63.

- NIC created a survey asking faculty for input into the technology and equipment they would need for fall; however, many faculty did not know what equipment they would need. NICFA helped faculty identify what specific equipment they would need.
- Equipment and software were purchased but most arrived and were deployed to faculty over the summer months. This allowed little time for faculty to get the equipment set up, learn how to use it, and prepare for course delivery in September.
- CTLI has provided great resources and faculty are grateful to have this support; however, the workshops, classes, videos, links, and handouts all require faculty to devote time to attend, review, watch, read and apply this learning to their online courses. This is what most faculty were doing throughout the summer months – which are intended as vacation.

University of the Fraser Valley

- The numbers of personal consultations, emails, workshops, and course reviews demonstrate faculty had increased workloads and faculty were putting considerable time and effort into facilitating the shift to online teaching. Faculty did not receive additional compensation or relief from UFV for all the time they spent using these resources. For some faculty inexperienced with online teaching, the stress was incredible and impacted their health.
- For those who have never taught online, it is very challenging to determine the most efficient and effective way to prepare, and it takes a tremendous amount of time. Faculty have to, for example:
 - Review the available workshops and decide if workshops or one-on-one support would provide better learning;
 - Decide whether a course should be offered asynchronously, synchronously, or using a hybrid model;
 - Outline a method for identifying and responding to technological issues; and,
 - Review which programs are available, how the features compare against each other, and how they work before deciding which is best suited for their needs. Only then can faculty learn how to effectively use the program they have selected and deploy it.
- Faculty report losing many hours dealing with their printers, internet, and laptop tech support etc., and having to outsource support at their own expense. Faculty are not adequately compensated for internet costs.

- At times, recommendations from UFV conflicted, for example, the Exam Task Force's recommendations conflicted with the advice from the TLC. This led to confusion for faculty and students in terms of which guidelines "should" be followed.

Vancouver Community College

- The following supports mentioned in the Response were faculty led, and not college initiated:²⁴
 - CTLR training sessions;
 - Online classroom agreements;
 - Library developed videos (how to);
 - Online learning PD (zoom, Moodle, etc.);
 - Culinary purchase of go-pro cameras; and,
 - Training for zoom and Moodle.
- In April 2020, VCC advised faculty of a new process for reimbursements of costs incurred in the transition to remote work. Many of these claims were denied and VCCFA filed a grievance.
- Faculty experienced issues accessing Global, Banner, and Moodle courses. Faculty did not have resources and programs that would allow for seamless online marking, administration work and assembling documents, e.g., Kahoot to conduct tests/quizzes.
- Faculty had to use their own technical and space resources to provide online education, for example, Internet, home space, home computer, personal software, external hardware (camera, mic, etc.). Some faculty experienced issues with their home internet, and did not receive support to resolve it. There was no technical support on weekends and after hours, while teaching is still happening.
- Faculty paid out-of-pocket for laptops and other equipment, and reported that the procedure for getting reimbursement was too slow. Some faculty did not have a home computer with current software that would permit them to access their VCC files.
- Some office computers did not have cameras or adequate microphones, which is necessary for zoom sessions from their office desks. WIFI on campus was not sufficient for online course delivery.

²⁴ PSEA Response, Appendix G, page 65.

- The reliance on online resources and platforms was not supported by a proper commitment to full accessibility. For example:
 - The VCC Day event did not allow Deaf people to easily access interpreters and it took 2 hours for them to change their settings into the gallery view that put the interpreters in view.
 - The majority of the video/media contents do not have English captions and linked mental health resources also do not have captions. This leaves Deaf staff and students behind in being able to be kept up to date with VCC information and contents.
- Faculty also reported that students were not being adequately supported for online learning. As a result, faculty not only had to take on extra technological support work for students, but they also had to be mindful that these students would have the opportunity to complete their course work. The emotional labour of supporting these students and looking out for their wellbeing was significant. Faculty reported the following:
 - There are significant delays in students getting funded and registered. Access to and ability to use technology is still very uneven amongst students. Students do not necessarily have access to stable WiFi, adequate computers, private workspaces, or online study skills. These issues lead to inequities in the online classroom and exacerbates the struggles of students who are already barriered/marginalized.
 - There is no dedicated 24-hour tech support help line for students and as a result faculty had to provide tech support to students. Faculty report assisting students with:
 - Security settings;
 - OneDrive issues;
 - VPN connectivity and interference with Outlook; and,
 - Bandwidth activity causing freezing.
 - Faculty assisted students to resolve these issues on a variety of platforms (e.g., tablets, Mac, PC, Surface).

Appendix H

Appendix H of the Response purports to summarize the “different types of communications, supports, resources, benefits and programs provided by institutions to employees on issues of physical and mental health, and health and safety;” however, many of the listed items are not faculty supports at all.

For example, every single institute has listed the COVID-19 safety framework, and emails about the COVID-19 safety framework. These are not a faculty mental or physical health support. As noted in paragraph 92 of the Response:

As part of the Go-Forward Guidelines, all post-secondary institutes were **directed** to develop their own COVID-19 safety plans that outline the policies, guidelines and procedures they have put in place to reduce the risk of COVID-19 transmission.

(emphasis added)

These frameworks form part of the employer’s duty to provide a safe workplace and to stop the spread of COVID-19; they are not faculty supports.

Additionally, many institutions have listed communications or townhalls about resources, but these are also not health supports. A description of website and resources does not lessen workload, address childcare challenges, or reduce the number of emails from panicking students. Wellness email communications are just another item faculty must read online.

Similarly, workshops, challenges, and webinars are of limited use. Faculty are overburdened with the changes COVID-19 has brought to their workplaces, and while the content of the workshops may be valuable, to a degree, attending them requires faculty to add *another thing* to their already fully loaded schedules. There is no evidence of faculty being given relief time to attend workshops or participate in challenges. These are a not a faculty support, but additional stressors.

These types of programs also suggest that problems with mental and physical wellness are a result of faculty not trying hard enough. Workshops and programs merely treat the symptoms; they do not address the root causes of mental distress. Faculty are falling apart under the weight of the demands and student needs that have arisen. The conditions over the last year have cause feelings of despair, frustration, burnout, isolation, loneliness, exhaustion, and anger. Many faculty have been managing, but the conditions are unsustainable.

Wellness is not supported by a flurry of wellness activities or the dozens of emails about those activities, but by less work, more time with family, and appropriate support to help with online teaching.

Camosun College

- The free flu shots are a regular feature of Fall semester and not unique to the pandemic.

- By the time the Employee Mental Wellbeing Support Plan was launched in November 2020, faculty had been suffering under the burden of the pandemic for over seven months.

Coast Mountain College

- The EFAP benefits and counselling services are a bargained benefit that have been in place for years. The Employer is obligated to provide it.
- The safety training consisted of faculty being asked to upload content onto the learning management system and hosting it on their course shells. In any case, “safety training” is not a health support.

College of the Rockies

- The access to the campus gym with safety protocols was poorly communicated until the President did a weekly wander in November 2020.
- Union Representatives were not invited to join the Task Force until a PC meeting on May 29.
- Faculty reported that the questions in the Engagement Survey were worded to highlight what the organization was doing well and the responses were leading; it did not invite feedback on where faculty were struggling.
- Faculty report feeling exhausted and more stressed than ever.

Douglas College

- There were very few, if any, additional mental health supports provided by College to deal with the pandemic. Much of the list in Douglas response is simply a series of basic events that Douglas usually runs: a welcome event, a speaker’s series, awards, ambassadors, professional development days, etc.
- Some faculty felt added pressure to attend events, especially college wide professional development events, when they were already overwhelmed with the online work. Very few, if any, initiatives arose within the first year that specially addressed faculty needs for mental health support due to the pandemic.

North Island College

- The counselling services at NIC are only available for students, not faculty, and the EFAP benefits, listed in the Response have always been available. They are not a response to the impacts of the COVID-19 changes.
- NIC frequently suggested that any faculty who could not take on the added workload should take an unpaid leave. Unpaid leaves impact faculty adversely in several ways:
 - the much-needed wages that faculty rely on – especially during a pandemic, are reduced;
 - pensions are impacted, as faculty are not contributing as much into the plan – and that has future repercussions;
 - health benefits could be impacted depending on the faculty’s remaining work assignment.
- Unpaid leaves have left faculty feeling devalued and diminished, and are not an adequate response to the crisis of overwork facing faculty.

University of the Fraser Valley

- UFFVSA was not invited to participate in the Emergency Policy Group.
- UFFVSA suggested non-financial mitigation options to address workload that did not create additional burdens for faculty. UFV did not implement any mitigating relief at a systemic level.
- Faculty report that no one has called them for the duration of the pandemic to check on them to see if they are alright, leaving faculty feeling abandoned. Institute-wide emails and wellness workshops are not a replacement for a personal connection.
- On top of the immense workload burdens, faculty were dealing with the personal needs of elderly parents or children. Some faculty used their vacations to attend to critical family situations and have not had a restful moment in a year.

Vancouver Community College

- Faculty are providing many hours of unpaid labour every week to facilitate the shift to online teaching. Faculty have not received any compensation for the extra time involved of completely restructuring and changing their course curriculums and lesson plans to suit an online environment, nor has VCC provided enough time to complete these tasks.

- Faculty have also not received compensation for their home internet costs, despite the fact that many have had to purchase extra bandwidth in order to teach from home.
- Faculty are in a state of low morale. Some report that while their own departments have been amazing, they feel VCC does not care about them. They feel they the amount of work and dedication they have put in the last year has not been recognized, nor appreciated. The lack of support has been profound and disheartening. The working conditions are taking a toll on their lives, yet the recognition VCC has provided is hollow and completely out of context with what faculty are feeling. Some are considering leaving VCC.
- Faculty also report they are sitting in front of their computers for 10 hours a day or more due to back-to-back classes and the necessity of remote work. There is no break from sitting in front of their computer; to get any help involves sitting at the computer longer, and meetings or workshops are all online. It has negatively affected their fitness and physical health, causing back problems and other ailments. They feel tired, and are experiencing “Zoom fatigue.” In addition, many faculty do not have the privilege of a home office and have the added stress of coordinating long hours online in less than ideal offices.
- Faculty have experienced immense struggles with online course delivery and report that it is significantly more difficult than face-to-face teaching. In particular, they identified the following issues:
 - Unrealistic expectations that student must be engaged online for long periods of time;
 - No flexibility that to create lesson plans where students can complete work on their own time or splitting online time between office hours and class hours;
 - No support from VCC for the extensive course development efforts;
 - Not feeling equipped with curriculum to meet the needs online.
- Faculty report persistent and significant increases to their workload now that they are working from home, compared to when they worked on campus. Faculty report that performing the same work online takes much more time than it would face-to-face; what took 30 minutes in person can take three hours or more online. Yet faculty feel they are expected to provide the same as face-to-face course delivery. Faculty report that classes are too big to support students properly.
- Faculty routinely work both more hours each day and on the weekend. Some faculty report an extra 20-30 hours per week, but even those with fewer instructional hours report feeling they are on call 24/7 due to the demands on online teaching. Faculty are communicating more with other faculty and students outside of class time, and must complete extra COVID projects, such as COVID occupancy reports, room-booking, and safety quizzes. Faculty also have to do the repeat work because forms, processes and procedures keep changing.
- In addition to the typical tasks of preparing, teaching, and marking, faculty must also:

- create digital activities;
 - create alternate assessments;
 - shift content to online platforms;
 - redevelop course materials to suit online delivery;
 - monitor asynchronous learning
 - Support students who cannot always follow along or have troubles with technology;
 - keep students connected with each other.
- Faculty report feeling that teaching has taken over their entire lives, yet due to their professionalism and dedication to their students, they feel that working less would not be fair to students who are having a hard time passing or completing work. Students need a lot more attention in the current environment than previously. Faculty report the following issues with supporting students:
 - It is extremely challenging to teach students with learning disabilities over Zoom;
 - Students who may have disabilities are not being tested or adequately supported which makes class harder for faculty and may result in some less than nominal pass/repeat activity;
 - Classes are too big for students to receive the time and attention they require;
 - Limitations around assessing progress; and,
 - Faculty feel pressure to show how wonderful online teaching is despite that it is not wonderful.
- In particular, students have lots of additional stressors and mental health issues are growing. Faculty are sending more time directing students to appropriate resources on and off campus and providing day-to-day support for their overall mental health. Faculty report not receiving enough support in supporting students.

Appendix I

The following is reply to the summary of workload adjustments and supports provided to faculty by their institutions, in response to the COVID-19 pandemic:

Camosun College

- From early in the pandemic, it was made clear to the CCFA that there would be no workload reductions to accommodate online course development. It was framed as a sectoral issue without the local resources to effect change. CCFA is not aware of any case where excessive workload caused by online course development and delivery been addressed by actually reducing parts of their assignment.
- CCFA and the VP Education discussed ways in which workload could be lessened through minor operational changes. For example, by reducing the number of courses a member had to prepare for.
- Faculty reporting concerns about workload have had the very reality of their workload concern denied, proposals for alternative assignments rejected, and have felt forced to work overtime, take an unpaid leave, retire early, or work on vacation. This has very likely suppressed members reporting workload issues to their Deans/Directors.
- There were initially significant misunderstandings regarding the relevant terminology. There was inconsistency between upper management and Deans about how much room autonomy faculty had and the latitude has waned with time as Deans have asserted more authority over the format of course offerings. In some cases, Deans have imposed a change in format part-way through the semester. This is becoming an academic freedom concern.
- Communication to ensure vacation time was being taken is not a support or workload adjustment.

Coast Mountain College

- Most of the programs in the School of Nursing are BCGEU; the reduction in classes noted in the Response²⁵ therefore had limited impact on AWU.
- Many programs did not hire additional instructors or split classes, for example, this did not occur in the Social Service Worker or the University Credit programs.

²⁵ PSEA Response, Appendix I, at 74.

College of the Rockies

- CORFA is not aware of any workload adjustments.
- Many courses, including some practical education courses, continued to run through May and June. Despite that, faculty were not allotted additional time for planning and preparation. Many faculty used their professional development time or noninstructional time to develop their online delivery.
- For Fall 2020 development, faculty had to revise, adapt, and recreate every single assignment, learning activity, and clinical activity for online delivery.
- While enrolment was capped for face-to-face lab classrooms, extra sections were not added. There was a large variety of methods faculty used for their laboratory classrooms, for example, some faculty had both face-to-face labs and virtual simulation labs, others recorded all their demonstrations beforehand with students doing a focused activity in person. Face-to-face lab scenarios were incredibly time consuming for faculty to execute, yet faculty were committed to ensuring students received articulation. Faculty who taught labs this year had excessive workloads, especially during the first semester when limited face-to-face delivery could happen.
- Some faculty reported that their plans for laboratory courses were opposed by their deans or department heads, and that they did not receive IT support.
- Classes in the shop are limited in size, with students split into more groups. This creates pressures for shop time and imposes additional workload as instructors as they must perform twice the amount of shop activities.

Douglas College

- Many faculty gave up their vacation time in order to learn how to deliver online instruction. When faculty did request permission to move their vacation days, there was no guarantee it would be approved. Moving vacation forward did not provide a mental break from the stressors of the pandemic. The lack of vacation resulted in burn out and compounded the problem. It was not a workplace adjustment.
- In a regular term, faculty arrange practicum placements for their students. During COVID-19, whenever there was a COVID-19 exposure on a site, faculty had to try to find new practicum placements. This created a constant need to find new placements, move students, assist instructors, and provide reassurance all those involved, which greatly increased the workload of faculty.

North Island College

- The variance described in the Response benefited NIC – not faculty.²⁶ The variance allowed NIC to increase faculty course preps from 3 to 4 per semester. Any suggested ways to mitigate the increased workload faculty by NICFA were dismissed with little or no consideration from NIC. NIC refused to discuss reductions of class size, decreasing section caps and/or global student caps, increasing prep time, or hiring faculty support liaisons to assist colleagues with online courses.
- The Health and Human Service programs workload has increased to debilitating limits. Adjustments were made that significantly impacted the delivery of these courses and the timing of course delivery in both the spring and fall 2020 semesters, significantly impacting the work of faculty members throughout this division. Several faculty from this area have contacted NICFA to help address the stress and workload levels.
- No time or compensation was given to faculty in the spring to complete the curriculum development work needed (CD) for the new online delivery format. Fewer than 11% of faculty at NIC had completed any online teaching. There was no professional development (PD) time given for faculty to learn and practice online teaching. Rather, faculty were expected to engage in training workshops. Faculty were exhausted in the spring months – attending workshops, building online courses, prepping for fall – all with no extra compensation or time release.
- Many faculty have carried over the maximum allowable days of PD and vacation to use in this academic year as they did not use anywhere near their allocated days.
- The Spring Intersession had many sessional faculty teaching often new course materials for online learning. None of these sessional instructors were compensated for the significant amount of extra prep time and CD time they spent to get the courses ready for digital delivery, and many did not receive another contract in the fall for work. In some cases, the courses created by these sessional faculty on their own time were used in the fall semester with permission being given by NIC rather than the faculty member who created them.
- Faculty have been overwhelmed with the amount of work it has taken to prepare digital courses and with the increased workload of supporting a high number of students new to digital learning in their classes.

University of the Fraser Valley

- One week to prepare online courses was wholly inadequate. Unrealistic expectations for online and clinical course preparation continues.

²⁶ PSEA Response, Appendix I, page 76.

- In order to prepare for online course delivery in Fall 2020, many regular faculty spent at least a portion of their faculty vacation period to convert their courses.
- BSN faculty were required to restart their clinical work in mid-August. They were not compensated for this.
- Faculty were not compensated for increases to class sizes and this is subject to an ongoing grievance. The large class sizes also make it difficult for instructors to respond to all the large volume of emails from students. Students therefore have a more difficult time getting support which results in lower grades, and in some cases not completing the course successfully.
- Although practical placements were postponed or adjusted, UFV then attempted to recoup that time from faculty by claiming they were not working when in fact they were preparing courses for online delivery. This is subject to an ongoing grievance.
- At LAM meetings, UFVFSA raised the issue of workload and suggested non-financial mitigation strategies; however, UFV was not responsive to these suggestions.

Appendix J

The faculty associations are not able to access information about usage rates of physical and mental health benefits; however, the statistics provided in the Response do not mean faculty are not overworked, stressed out, depressed, or overwhelmed. The lack of increases to short term disability, WorkSafe claims or EFAP usages does not indicate lack of negative health effects; it only indicates a lack of accessing these programs.

Faculty reported not using these resources for a variety of reasons:

- Poor coverage for medical services;
- Their spouses or partners have better or complimentary benefit plans that faculty can access;
- Reduction in common non-pandemic illnesses;
- Lack of time to attend to medical appointments;
- Unavailability of medical services due to COVID-19;
- Stigma or lack of understanding of mental distress, which inhibits access to care; and,
- Short or discreet usage of sick time (i.e. shorter durations than STD), which is not reported and is likely the most common type of sick leave.

During this global pandemic, faculty are acutely aware of their important role in their institutions and to students. Faculty report they have not taken sick days or vacation days because they do not want to shift the burden other faculty or the administration, who are all struggling. They also do not want to let down their students; faculty are dedicated to doing the best job they can to help students be successful while maintaining high standards for academic integrity and professionalism. Cancelling classes was not an option for faculty who have seen the growing mental health crisis amongst their students.

Lastly, many faculty have been working excessively in the hopes that it would only be for a short time; it is too soon for the health fallout to be fully assessed.

Camosun College

CCFA conducted a workload survey which indicated that the mental state of faculty is deteriorating and many are feeling enormous strain. Also, the psychological services benefit usage rates are not reported here.

Coast Mountain College

Faculty stress and mental health was raised at the Joint Union Management meeting in October 2020.

College of the Rockies

Faculty report not accessing EFAP due to lack of local therapists, their personal therapist leaving the service, decreased quality of service, and not finding the service useful. In addition, at the beginning, the EFAP program would only permit faculty to meet someone based out of Vancouver and over zoom; some faculty did not want another zoom meeting, and preferred to speak to someone local, but that was not an option.

Faculty report that the increase of physiotherapy, massage therapy, acupuncture, and other therapeutic treatments are a common topic of conversation among faculty in department meetings, social media, or general conversation.

North Island College

The WorkSafeBC that is now proceeding as an STD claim, mentioned in the Response,²⁷ is now proceeding as an STD claim because NIC responded to WorkSafeBC, indicating that the faculty member was contracted to work only 30 hours a week, thus contradicting the faculty member's claim of the extra hours they put in to prepare their courses for digital delivery for the 2020-21 academic year. HR had also wrongly advised the faculty member to wait until WorkSafeBC responded to the claim before applying for STD, and as a result, the member had to use their 30 sick days and numerous vacation days.

There are few other WorkSafeBC claims because NIC has not had any oversight of home offices or ergonomics, claiming faculty are "voluntarily working from home."

²⁷ PSEA Response, Appendix J, page 80.

Appendix K

In reply to the allegation in the Response that most institutions have not laid off any faculty, and those that have laid off faculty have done so at an extremely low rate:

Camosun College

An unknown number of term faculty have lost work. This is not reflected in the layoff data in the Response,²⁸ which only pertains to regular faculty. Term work has been reduced in some departments since the pandemic began.

Faculty members set to regularize by clause 1.04(d) or to establish Rights of First Refusal by clause 1.02(g) have been unable to do so.

Coast Mountain College

The Response lists 62 total faculty at CMTN; however, only 27 of these are regular continuing faculty.²⁹ The remaining 35 are part-time or temporary and not subject to lay off.

Sections are used to calculate workloads. A full-time workload is 10 sections. Sections are defined in the Collective Agreement as either 45 hours of class contact or 140 hours of practicum. When the department heads submitted their section projections for the 2021-2022 academic year, they were told to eliminate 20 sections. The departments were able to spread this out by eliminating 10 sections in what remains in the 2020-2021 academic year, and eliminate the remaining 10 in the 2021-2022 academic year.

Because of the practice of averaging workloads over two years, some faculty will have to teach extra courses next year. This will reduce the available work for non-regular faculty. Faculty have expressed concerns these changes negatively affect job security.

College of the Rockies

Auxiliary teachers have had their course loads reduced.

²⁸ PSEA Response, Appendix K, page 82.

²⁹ Two of these are on long-term disability.

Douglas College

Many classes are not filling up and faculty are aware layoffs are looming, which increases mental health issues for faculty.

North Island College

The NIC description of layoffs in the Response is misleading.³⁰ It correctly states the approximately amount of total faculty (353); however, it only lists the layoffs of regular faculty and does not acknowledge the sessional (term) faculty who did not and likely will not receive another contract.

It does not state that the reductions last spring were the largest in NIC's 40+ year history. Thirty full-time-equivalent or about one-third of faculty members did not return to work. Eleven regular faculty were laid off and 30+ sessionals did not see any work in the coming fall or winter. At least 40 faculty members have been left without employment.

During these layoffs, NICFA asked to have faculty assigned as liaisons with Centre for Teaching & Learning Innovation to support and assist their colleagues with online delivery. NIC refused, and hired consultants to provide teaching support, including one person who was a former retired administrator.

Vancouver Community College

There are many auxiliary and term faculty who have not had work for most of the year due to faculty teaching mainly online. These non-regular faculty members are casualties of the pandemic, and it is unclear when there will be work for them.

³⁰ PSEA Response, Appendix K, page 82

Appendix L

Reply to summary of grievances:

University of the Fraser Valley

The Response claims that UFVFSAs has “allowed the filing of the instant Application to create delay in the grievance process by requesting that its grievance related to online learning technology³¹ be placed into abeyance pending a result from the Board on this Application.”³²

UFVFSAs did not request this grievance to be put into abeyance for the stated reason. This grievance was filed over a product called Blackboard Ally. Through the fall semester, UFV stated that this product was optional for faculty but that starting in January 2021, it would be turned on for all online courses using Blackboard. This created two issues for UFVFSAs.

Firstly, there had been no consultation about this important technological change. UFVFSAs filed a grievance over UFV’s failure to follow the requirement to consult.

Secondly, there were serious concerns about the product’s limitations and the impact this might have on faculty. This was addressed in a letter to Provost and VP Academic James Mandigo.

UFV’s response to the grievance was that the product would remain optional, and therefore there was no change that required consultation; consequently, UFVFSAs requested that the grievance be put into abeyance.

Vancouver Community College

The Remote Work Expenses grievance has now moved to Stage 3 arbitration.

³¹ This grievance can be found on page 89, in Appendix L, called “failure to consult.”

³² PSEA Response, page 17, footnote 5.