

Bargaining Update # 23

Workload Model

Crafting a new instructor workload model for the NASA Collective Agreement has been a major goal of the Bargaining Committee as well as a crucial component of our mandate. While nothing has been signed off yet, we have made significant progress toward completion of this goal and are pleased with what we have achieved. While we cannot share details at this stage about a document that is not signed off, we know members want as much information as possible and we'd like to share some generalities about our goals and what you can expect.

Threshold numbers

Fundamental differences in annual workload exist across NASA membership:

- Apprenticeship instruction (where there is little curriculum development and marking)
- Diploma instruction (where there is significant curriculum development and marking)
- Degree instruction (where there is significant curriculum development and marking, as well as an additional expectation of scholarly activity).

These differences will be reflected in different thresholds/limits of scheduled contact hours for the different groups.

Our goal has been to negotiate fair annual contact hour thresholds (maximums) for apprenticeship, diploma, and degree instructors, including those that teach a combination of diploma/degree and apprenticeship/diploma courses; and to ensure that these numbers are, for the first time, put into the Collective Agreement.

Factors that influence workload

The Bargaining Committee knows that workload is far more complex than simply the number of hours you are scheduled with students, regardless of what type of programming you teach.

Factors including modes of delivery (online, in person, blended), class sizes, number of courses taught at once, number of unique deliveries vs. multiple sections of the same course, and number and types of assessments in each course all impact workloads.

Other factors including administrative commitments, student support, accreditation, team teaching, professional development, and many more also impact workload. Our goal has been to create a workload model that identifies and acknowledges these factors and ensures they are taken into consideration when workloads are assigned, on an individual instructor by instructor basis.

We are working to embed language into the Collective Agreement that names and describes instructional duties included in annual workload, and that stipulates that all the above factors will be considered when individual workloads are assigned. In addition, we will have a workload review process that instructors can use if they feel their workload assignment has been unfair.

You might ask, why not quantify each factor with numerical limits? While this is something we looked at, the variability of program and course delivery at NAIT is so great that it is challenging - if not impossible -

to create metrics that are realistic and appropriate Institute-wide. For example, number of courses cannot be applied broadly since the size of a “course” varies so widely in different areas of NAIT.

We do have a goal of preserving concrete numerical limits on class sizes as they exist now.

Impact of Operational and Academic Changes on Workload

Changes to the way our programs run impact our workloads. For example, each time a program goes through the CCR process; the number of courses, program teaching hours, level and length of each course, assessment strategy, and curriculum can change. Changes made in CRR are approved by Academic Leadership in consultation with Program Advisory. These changes **cannot** be bargained or negotiated by NASA as they are program-specific academic changes, but we are aware of their impact on workload.

In addition to academic changes, changes to student/instructor ratios in labs and shops and changes to program enrollment have occurred and will continue to occur. In some cases, this happens with little Instructor input or consultation. Again, the Bargaining Committee is unable to negotiate these specifics on a program by program or course by course basis.

NASA encourages instructors to speak with their Academic Leaders about changes being made in their areas and the impact to workload.

Our strategy in Bargaining for mitigating the effect of these types of operational and academic changes is to add strong language in our Collective Agreement that clearly states that factors such as number of deliveries/courses, minor curriculum development, class size, assessments, and delivery mode will be considered for each individual instructor when workload is determined. This language does not currently exist in the Collective Agreement. Our goal is to add these details into our new Collective Agreement, ensuring that all existing variations and future changes to factors affecting workload will be accounted for equitably.

Final Thoughts

It is important to note that if we come to agreement on a new workload model there will be a delay of approximately one academic year before it can be implemented.

The Bargaining Committee is working hard to create a detailed, descriptive, more equitable workload model with language that recognizes factors that impact workload with threshold values embedded into the Collective Agreement. We know that many instructors are overworked, and we look forward to negotiating with NAIT a model that will provide workload relief and future protections to NASA members.

In Solidarity,

Jarret Serediak (jarrets@nait.ca)

Bernie Budinski (bernieb@nait.ca)

Christine Loo (christinel@nait.ca)

Steve Chattaroon (stevec@nait.ca)

Carmen Puchyr (CPUCHYR@nait.ca)

Shauna MacDonald (shaunam@nait.ca)

Peter Kamstra (pkamstra@nait.ca)

Katherine St. Laurent (katherines@nait.ca)

James Guthrie (jamesg@nait.ca)

Keep up to date by visiting the NASA Website's [Bargaining Update](#) page.