The ECUAD Faculty Association dates back to at least 1971, when what is now Emily Carr University of Art + Design was the Vancouver School of Art. The school had been founded in 1925 as the Vancouver School of Decorative and Applied Arts, and was located in the Vancouver School Board building at 590 Hamilton Street. In 1936, it was renamed as the Vancouver School of Art, and moved to a new facility on Hamilton Street. In 1960, the School moved to Dunsmuir Street, and in 1980 to its current location on Granville Island.

The earliest evidence of a faculty association dates to the early 1970s. This was a tumultuous decade for the school; it achieved independence from the Vancouver School Board and briefly became part of the Vancouver Vocational Institute before attaining full independence in 1978, when it was renamed the Emily Carr College of Art.

The surviving records from this period illustrate the Faculty Association's engagement, and its interest in the direction and future of the school. The Association monitored the administrative changes taking place within the School, particularly its relationship with the VVI, and took part in the ongoing dialogue over the future role of the school. In 1974, the Association decided to support a strike by the Vocational Instructors Association; throughout the decade it engaged with representatives of the School's students, conducted collective bargaining, and conducted research on topics of concern to its membership such as space allocation, teacher training, and pay scales at similar institutions.

Late in the decade, on May 8, 1979, the Association wrote an official platform into its minutes. It sought a more democratic and decentralized association with each member having an assigned task, a pay increase of ten percent or more, more professional evaluation procedures using outside neutral personnel, and a severance pay clause for the new contract. It also required "That the fine art majority recognize the minority rights of the design faculty and allow relevant changes in the contract."

In the early 1980s, the Faculty Association considered and implemented several administrative changes to the Association. The College and Institute Educator's Association was first invited to speak at a Faculty Association meeting in 1981, although the Faculty Association maintained its independence from this larger bargaining body for many years to come. In the same year, the Faculty Association decided to invite representatives of the Student Society to attend any meetings at which matters affecting the College's students were to be discussed. Also in 1981, a 1% monthly salary deduction for Association dues was approved,<sup>2</sup> and a Faculty Association budget

<sup>1</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, May 8, 1979.

<sup>2</sup> March 18, 1981.

committee consisting of the FA Executive was instituted. This was followed in 1982 by a decision to form a variety of working committees, including Professional Development, Faculty Evaluations, Procedures, and Contract Negotiations committees.<sup>3</sup>

During this period, the Faculty Association also made an important advance in terms of collective bargaining, receiving and accepting an offer from the College in 1981 to pay 100% of the premium costs of the Health and Welfare package.

In 1983, the Faculty Association took part in a major strike, Operation Solidarity, which was led by the BC Federation of Labour in response to the "Restraint Budget" of Premier W.A.C. Bennett. The budget contained a wide variety of measures that abolished watchdogs, undermined collective bargaining, and cut social services. Faculty Association members voted 79% in favour of the strike on October 31, and decided that there would be two four-hour blocks of picket duty. Operation Solidarity lasted for three months, and was called off on November 13<sup>th</sup>, 1983, after the BC Federation of Labour accepted a contract for the BC Government Employees Union.

Following the end of Operation Solidarity, the Faculty Association circulated a statement by Jack Finnbogason, President of CIEA, in which he stated that, "I am aware that there is considerable disappointment in the Solidarity Coalition with the results of the settlement as the parts of it dealing with the repressive social legislation lack any firm commitment by the government." However, he continued, "the first trigger for this action was Bill 3. Along with Bill 2, it robbed employees of basic rights. The Solidarity strike has restored due process to public sector collective agreements."

Throughout the rest of the decade, the Faculty Association continued to hone its structure and administrative procedures. In 1985, the Association addressed the growing dilemma over faculty roles and pay scales by passing a motion clarifying that "full time, part-time and temporary daytime faculty are eligible for membership in the Faculty Association and any other person as agreed by two thirds of the Faculty Association membership." In 1988, the Association increased membership dues from 1% to  $1\frac{1}{2}$  % and drew up guidelines for spending for the next three years, allocating 70% of association dues to savings, 15% to scholarships, 5% to the Faculty Art Show, and 10% to miscellaneous expenses. In the same year, the Association decided that "All gender references in the [Collective] Agreement will be changed so that there will be no reference to a specific sex." At the

<sup>3</sup> May 8, 1981 and October 6, 1982.

<sup>4</sup> Palmer, Bryan D. "Solidarity." The Canadian Encyclopedia. Accessed April 23, 2013. <a href="http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.com/articles/solidarity">http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.com/articles/solidarity</a>

<sup>5</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, October 30, 1985.

<sup>6</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, April 13, 1988.

same time, the Association confirmed that parenthood and adoption leave includes paternity leave.<sup>7</sup>

Some attempts to reform were unsuccessful. For instance, while the Association passed a motion allowing members of the Executive to be paid in 1984,8 as late as 1988 the Association's membership voted against supporting the President in a single course release in lieu of time spent of Association business.9 The Association also attempted to decrease quorum from 25% of its membership to five members, but this motion was defeated owing to a constitutional requirement that at least 66 2/3 % of the membership vote in approval of changes to the Association's constitution.10

An important development during the mid-1980s was the creation of the Faculty Art Show. Discussion regarding how to exhibit faculty work began in 1984, when a faculty member, Hugh Foulds, suggested that the Association "pursue the idea of providing a publication giving the students a more informative basis for choosing an artist to work with as a teacher." In April 1985, the Association approved in principle the idea of creating a Faculty Lounge Gallery, and soon afterwards Ron Eckert suggested that the Association put on "a yearly all inclusive Faculty Show to demonstrate, to the students, what we do."

During the late 1980s, issues began to emerge that would occupy the attention of the Faculty Association for years to come. One of the most important of these was the role of studio and technical assistants. The Association was first notified of the existence of problems studio and technical assistants December 3, 1986 when, it was reported in the minutes, "that the roles and responsibilities of the Studio Assistants in the College were being reviewed and reestablished by the Administration." In 1987, the President of the College, Alan Barkley, requested that faculty meet with studio assistants to discuss their respective roles, while the Faculty Association expressed concern about the possibility that the College's Administration might be altering job descriptions. 14

Relations between the Faculty Association and the College's administration exhibited some friction during this period. Early in 1988, the Association requested Alan Barkley to have regular meetings with Faculty, the Student Society, and support staff "to nurture"

<sup>7</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, March 16, 1988.

<sup>8</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, May 10, 1984.

<sup>9</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, October 12, 1988.

<sup>10</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, November 21, 1984.

<sup>11</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, September 26, 1984.

<sup>12</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, April 18, 1985.

<sup>13</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, May 1, 1985.

<sup>14</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, December 3, 1986 & April 28, 1987.

dialogue and openness within the College."15 In February, the Association noted that it had received a commitment from Barkley regarding faculty information meetings<sup>16</sup>, but a year later, the Faculty Association voted to compose a letter of censure, "and that the letter be sent to the President with copies to the Board members, Faculty Association members, part time faculty, VMREU shop steward, student society. The letter to include that we ask Alan Barkley to call a study day (Wednesday, February 22, 1989 as a forum to discuss 'How can the President and the College Community restore a positive and creative environment." Notes created during the drafting and revision of the motion include an expanded statement that "The Faculty Association of the Emily Carr College of Art and Design believes the management philosophy and style demonstrated by the President, Alan Barkley has been detrimental to the creative atmosphere of excellence we, the Faculty, are committed to maintaining." <sup>17</sup> Another important issues emerging during the late 1980s was the status of sessional faculty members. The possibility of creating an associate membership within the Faculty Association for part-time faculty was considered, but was deemed impossible under the present circumstances. Starting in February 1989, the Association therefore determined to consult with its lawyer regarding how it would be possible to form an associate membership, and what the benefits and disadvantages doing so would be. 18

Issues regarding sessional workload, regularization, and hiring continued to create work for the Faculty Association. In a 1991 meeting of the Association, the meeting was opened to the floor to allow current and prior faculty members on Temporary Appointments to share their views and experiences. The minutes of the meeting record that "After an hour of discussion the meeting was asked how they would proceed with correcting this poorly defined and articulated Position under which a large percentage of the Faculty are appointed." It was subsequently decided to strike a sub-committee of the Negotiating Committee that would recommend revisions to the classification of this category of faculty members. <sup>19</sup> The committee began its work by conducting a survey to determine the experiences and concerns of part-time and temporary faculty members, and by researching job classifications at other institutions. <sup>20</sup> The next year, faculty member Paul Hess "reported that he and Alan Barkley are

<sup>15</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, January 27, 1988.

<sup>16</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, February 17, 1988.

<sup>17</sup> See notes in "Minutes 1987-1989".

<sup>18</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, February 9, 1989.

<sup>19</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, March 13, 1991.

<sup>20</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, May 8, 1991.

putting together a handbook for sessional faculty. This will explain benefits and responsibilities."<sup>21</sup>

In 1993, sessional issues were an important bargaining point. Sessional representation was established on the Negotiating Committee in September, and specific reforms to sessional hiring policies were suggested. The Association resolved to demand that College administration "remove from the sessional contracts the phrase 'your appointment may be canceled if the course must be reassigned to a continuing faculty member" and that Maurice Yacowar, the College's Acting President, "provide as soon as possible the College's policy that justifies the present reassignment action, cancellations and increases to maximum enrollments and that clarification be made in writing to the Faculty Association." The Association also determined that it would initiate the creation of a grievance procedure concerning such course reassignments.<sup>22</sup> The following year, it was decided that, for that year, one member at large of the Faculty Association Executive should be a sessional faculty member.<sup>23</sup>

As well as addressing sessional issues, bargaining during this period focused on reducing workload contact hours, and on the question of how to reduce them in a way that wouldn't adversely affect the education of students.<sup>24</sup> In December 1990, the Association accepted in principle a workload reduction by one course per year for full time faculty (and an equivalent release for all continuing faculty), but stressed that this should only be a first step in reducing workload<sup>25</sup> and voted that "for the next negotiating period to consider further workload reductions for studio and academic teaching load to bring us in line with degree granting institutions in the province."<sup>26</sup>

The Association also successfully negotiated with administration on the matter of summer vacation time. Meeting with Alan Barkley, the Negotiations Committee explained that historically, faculty had been relieved of duties for a full three months over the summer, but that in recent years this time had been cut back to twelve weeks. The Committee reported that they had characterized this situation as either a "breach of contract or a misunderstanding in terms of new management/administration interpretation." Subsequently, "Alan said

<sup>21</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, September 9, 1992.

<sup>22</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, September 1, 1993.

<sup>23</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, May 20, 1994.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid.

<sup>25</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, December 12, 1990.

<sup>26</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, May 13, 1992.

he acknowledges the difference between 12 weeks and 3 months and restored the 90 day period to faculty as per the Collective Agreement."<sup>27</sup> In 1994, the Association had another disagreement with the College, this time over a request by the Board that faculty donate one day's payment to the college. The Association decided to write to the College's Administration and the Board stating that the request was "inappropriate in terms of negotiating process. Because it does infringe upon territory of the collective agreement."<sup>28</sup>

During the early 1990s, the Faculty Association managed to implement a number of structural and administrative changes. Temporary faculty members were asked to contribute \$1.00 per month as dues,<sup>29</sup> membership dues for continuing faculty were raised to a record 1 \(^{3}\)4 \(^{8}\) per month,<sup>30</sup> and the Association agreed to support a six-credit course release for the Association President. In 1995, the Association authorized the Executive the allocate funds on a discretionary basis, and to hire a secretary, although it is not clear that one was ever hired.<sup>31</sup> Association treasurer was requested to gather information on "green" funds and ethical investments.32 The Faculty Association admitted librarians into the Association for the first time in 1992,33 and also set a goal of achieving gender parity among the faculty. To this end, the Association determined that two thirds of candidates interviewed for any faculty position should be women.34 Beginning in late 1992, the Association also lent its support to the creation of a non-profit daycare centre for the College, provided funding for the initiative.<sup>35</sup> In February 1993, a daycare action committee was incorporated under the Societies Act as the Emily Carr Childcare Centre. The committee reported to the Faculty Administration that it had successfully requested facilities to install change tables in two washrooms and to put a highchair in the cafeteria. Facilities had also agreed to give "nursing mothers access to the medical room, which includes breast milk storage facilities."<sup>36</sup> A member of the Faculty Association offered office space for the committee's use.<sup>37</sup>

<sup>27</sup> Contract Negotiations Committee Minutes, March 8, 1992.

<sup>28</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, May 20, 1994.

<sup>29</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, October 16, 1991.

<sup>30</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, November 8, 1995

<sup>31</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, November 8, 1995

<sup>32</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, October 10, 1990; December 2, 1992.

<sup>33</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, May 13, 1992.

<sup>34</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, January 15, 1992.

<sup>35</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, December 2, 1992.

<sup>36</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, February 1993.

<sup>37</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, December 8, 1992.

During the first half of the 1990s, the Faculty Association was tangentially involved in two strikes. Early in 1992, the Faculty Association voted to respect the picket lines of the Vancouver Municipal and Regional Employees' Union (VMREU), but wrote to the College's Board of Directors noting "its concern over the present educational disruption" and urging the Board to "do everything in your power to get the Administration and the VMREU to resolve their differences." 38

In 1995, the ECIAD Student Society took part in a National Student Strike, and the Faculty Association voted to support the strike and respect the student picket line planned for January 25<sup>th</sup>. In a memorandum dated January 24<sup>th</sup>, the Faculty Association declared that, in consultation with the Institute's Administration and VMREU, it had reached an agreement with regard to the student strike action. Faculty would not be expected to formally make up for any lost class time on their days off, and would not be penalized for the loss of teaching time. However, they agreed that "individual faculty who lose contact hours resulting from this action will endeavor to make up any losses before the end of the semester." The Association proposed that classes would be cancelled during the day of February 25<sup>th</sup>, though evening classes would proceed as usual. Faculty could active support the striking students on a volunteer basis.

Late in 1995, the Faculty Association started to investigate a new course that would have profound implications for its activities over the next several years. For some time, the Association had been exploring the idea of joining a larger bargaining unit. In 1992, Ed Lavelle, a representative of the CIEA, had asked to speak to the Association regarding assimilation with his union, and had been given twenty minutes to present and answer questions at an Association meeting.<sup>39</sup> In November 1995, the Association also met with CUPE to discuss common interests.<sup>40</sup> There was a sense among faculty members, however, that being subsumed into a larger union would not be beneficial, and that the Association would lose autonomy and that its uniqueness would not be recognized.

The Faculty Association therefore decided to investigate the possibility of entering into a bargaining partnership with BCIT's Staff Society, then the province's only other higher education body categorized as an Institute. On December 6<sup>th</sup>, it was announced at a Faculty Association meeting that the Executive would meet with BCIT's Faculty and Staff Association Executive "to determine a strategy for independent lobbying/representation at provincial talks. Currently neither

<sup>38</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, March 13, 1992.

<sup>39</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, January 15, 1992.

<sup>40</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, November 8, 1995.

independent union has representation at the Ministry of Skills, Training and Labour's Strategic Planning Discussions going on in Victoria." By the beginning of the next year, the two Associations were in talks to form a provincial lobby association. The core purpose of the joint association would be to increase the stature of the two Associations at the provincial level. The joint association would seek to "ensure that any new legislation respects the mandates of the two Provincial Institutions" and would "foster political and bureaucratic understanding as well as promote our unique Institutional mandates. It is also an effort to become more pro-active and visible at the provincial level."

During this time, the Association was also taking part in the Joint Union Caucus's negotiations with the Post Secondary Employers Association on the development of the Multi-Institutional Framework Agreement. This Agreement, which was concluded on May 15, 1996, was a system-wide agreement on a number of issues generated by provincial spending cuts and changes to the higher education system. It set certain funding, employment, and teaching standards for higher education bodies and unions, and introduced "funding envelopes." Parties involved in the Agreement included the PSEA, the BCGEU, the CIEA, ECIAD FA, and BCIT SS.<sup>43</sup> The Faculty Association approved the Agreement on May 17<sup>th</sup>.

In the same year, the Ministry released Charting a New Course, a strategic plan for B.C. colleges, university colleges, and institutes. This strategic plan attached funding envelopes to performance.<sup>44</sup> With the Multi-Institutional Framework Agreement and Charting a New Course providing new provincial requirements, the President of the Faculty Association observed that "it was important for the members to realize that the contract could no longer be viewed at the local level but had to meet CCBOI/PSEA/PSEC and Ministry approval."<sup>45</sup>

In the meantime, ECIAD Faculty Association and the BCIT Staff Society had organized to form a collective bargaining association, the CAAE. The CAAE held its first meeting to establish objectives on September 18<sup>th</sup>, 1996, and by November, the Faculty Association reported that "The ministry [of Education, Skills and Training] is now recognizing

<sup>41</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, February 7, 1996

<sup>42</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, March 6, 1996

<sup>43</sup> Dorsey, James. E. "Facilitator's Recommendation for Multi-Institution Framework Agreement", May 15, 1996, Retrieved from:

http://www.psea.bc.ca/sites/default/files/agreements/Multi-Institutional%20Framework %20Agt%20Faculty%201996-98.pdf

<sup>44</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, April 16, 1997.

<sup>45</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, May 14, 1997.

ECIAD and BCIT as system partners. This favourable situation indicates the need for ECIAD to pursue legislation for our own act."<sup>46</sup> Early the following year, the Association made another update to its membership, declaring that "CAAE leaving its mark." There was, it was reported, a potential to gain seats on curricular advisory committees, and the CAAE had been communicating with MLAs and the Ministry and press through meetings and correspondence.<sup>47</sup>

In October 1996, the Faculty Association voted that continuing faculty would "apply retroactive pay from April 1, 1994 to March 31, 1996 and two days leave without pay... towards the Institute's deficit reduction." According to Deborah Shackleton past President of the Association, there were two occasions when the Faculty Association worked with the Institute to tackle budgetary shortfalls by salary donations from faculty, and on one occasion the Association also persuaded some administrators and support staff to donate a portion of their salaries. 49

In 1998, a major confrontation between ECIAD and the Institute's studio and technical assistants took place, involving the Faculty Association in an indirect role. Several studio and technical assistants, represented by CUPE, went to mediation with the Institute over their iob descriptions and responsibilities, claiming that they were effectively required to teach, and that this requirement was not in their contracts. In April, the Faculty Association met with the ECIAD lawyer to discuss the potential impact of the arbitration upon faculty, since testimony at the arbitration hearing related to the roles and activities of faculty. Subsequently, the Association reported that "[t]he executive had a meeting with the FA lawyers in order tog get advice on the matter. The lawyers suggested that it was imperative to become aware of the full breadth of the issue and recommended that the Association request that it be given a "Watcher Brief" status to attend the arbitration hearings as an observer with the option of producing a final brief at the conclusion of the proceedings. CUPE attempted to block participation and especially the FA's right to be present at a final brief."50 With the help of its new legal advisor, McCarthy Tetrault, the Faculty Association obtained a Watcher Brief, and John Wertschek, the new President of the Association, attended several of the hearings. According to the Faculty Association's update on the matter, he "described his frustration at not being able to respond upon hearing

<sup>46</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, November 20, 1996.

<sup>47</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, January 29, 1997.

<sup>48</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, October 9, 1996.

<sup>49</sup> Interview with Deborah Shackleton, Tom Becher, and John Wertschek, April 5, 2013.

<sup>50</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, April 15, 1998.

the nature of the testimony. His concern at the nature of the process as well as of the testimony being presented led him to seek further advice as to possibilities for our further input into the process." The Association therefore determined to request ECIAD to challenge the Arbitration on the basis that a third party, the Faculty Association, was also an integral party to the matter. It was hoped that such a challenge would "lead to the Labour Board mandating a Mediation process which would involve the FA in a less confrontational and more positive process." <sup>51</sup>

The Arbitrator reached a decision early in 1999. Subsequently, the Faculty Association reported that "John Wertschek thanked faculty who were involved and who gave testimony during the 21 days of hearing. This helped the arbitrator to focus and make a decision. No one really won, but this experience shows <u>we</u> need diligence in maintaining clarity about our certification."<sup>52</sup>

A number of changes to the Faculty Association's structure and policies were made or considered during the late 1990s and early 2000s. When the 1998/1999 Executive resigned, it was suggested that the Association implement a rotating Executive; members would remain for two years so that at the end of each year, half would resign and half would stay on to provide continuity. Implementing this would have required a bylaw change and it was felt that, with the workload of faculty increasing, such an arrangement would require too great a commitment, especially since, as one member reported, out of the 200 nomination forms he had distributed, he had only had three returned.53 Other attempts at reform were more successful. On January 5, 2000, the Counselor Amy Kheong was admitted into the Faculty Association, and on September 20<sup>th</sup>, a course release was approved for the Association secretary and a second course release was approved for the chair of the Negotiating Committee. In 2003, it was decided to amalgamate the positions of Faculty Association Vice President and Treasurer,<sup>54</sup> and guorum was reduced to 18.<sup>55</sup>

A major development during this period was the renewal of talks about the possibility of joining a larger bargaining unit. The ECIAD FA and BCIT SS had dissolved their partnership, following this there was discussion within the Faculty Association regarding the ramifications of joining the provincial bargaining body group without joining the CIEA. The Association recognized that it was experiencing problems owing to the fact that it was not part of a larger union, but it was felt that "we

<sup>51</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, April 15, 1998.

<sup>52</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, March 17, 1999.

<sup>53</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, April 26, 1999.

<sup>54</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, January 29, 2003.

<sup>55</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, April 23, 2003.

don't want to follow the policies of the other 7000 B.C. college instructors."56

In May 2000, CIEA and BCGEU had invited ECIAD FA to confer on the possibility of engaging in provincial negotiations, and in June Tom Becher and John Wertschek attended a conference with the two bodies where a joint protocol was drafted. In November, the Faculty Association discussed whether it should join the provincial Common Table at a cost of approximately \$10,000, and voted in favour of negotiating "at the Provincial table towards a common agreement as a member of the Provincial Bargaining Council." <sup>57</sup>

The following year, Chris Czartowyski, the new President of the Association, successfully proposed the creation of a Labour Affiliation Committee that would "study costs, benefits, and issues regarding the pros and cons of labour affiliation." In 2002, a CIEA delegation spoke again at a Faculty Association meeting, outlining "the history of CIEA, their mandate as an organization, the services they provided, resources, and how their organization could serve the FA's interests." Following discussion, it was agreed "that the ECIADFA apply for Regular membership in the College Institute Educators' Association and, upon the granting of membership, participate as Regular Members in the financial and membership commitments outlined in the CIEA Constitution and Bylaws." 59

In a newsletter distributed to faculty on January 10<sup>th</sup>, the Association wrote that "The benefits of CIEA membership will include the provision of trained staff representatives and legal counsel who provide assistance to the FA, free of charge, in matters ranging from personnel, benefit and pension issues to assistance at the bargaining table... Another major benefit provided is the lobbying voice and information source which this large and experienced organization has established within the BC political environment." The Faculty Association participated in its first CIEA conference, Facing Challenges Together, in May 2003, sending three members to Prince George to attend. 60 In 2002, the Faculty Association was again involved in two strike actions. On February 6, the ECIAD Student Union held a Day of Action, for which the Faculty Association granted students academic amnesty. Later in the year, on April 2, the Association served its own seventytwo hour strike notice to the Institute, but withdrew it two days later. 61 One issue the Faculty Association dealt with during 2003 was the restructuring of the Faculty Art Show. At a meeting in April, several

<sup>56</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, September 29, 1999.

<sup>57</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, November 8, 2000.

<sup>58</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, October 10, 2001.

<sup>59</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, January 2002.

<sup>60</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, April 23, 2003.

<sup>61</sup> Letter, dated April 2, 2002 and April 4, 2002.

problems were identified with the current structure of the show. The FA Exhibition Committee reported that the show "doesn't reflect the practices of the faculty; there is an obvious bias toward the gallery space which makes it difficult for time based work; the theme is always a problem; the exhibition is not inclusive of all faculty; budget restraints." The Committee therefore recommended abandoning the show and giving responsibility for it to the CHS gallery, which would ensure that there was still a faculty exhibition as established in the Faculty Association contract. Specific strategies for improving the show were proposed, including "an invited curator working in connection with the FA show committee; a smaller number of people showing on a rotating basis; discussion of the work by the artists for the institute members." 62

It was decided that the Exhibition Committee should be enlarged, and should return with a proposal later in the year. The Committee returned in November with a new model for the Exhibition. The Exhibition would have three components: "1) web presence to be up in September 2) the use of the concourse gallery in the 1<sup>st</sup> week of school to show all-faculty work 3) and a show in the Charles H. Scott Gallery in the month of January to exhibit curated work. The Charles H. Scott exhibition will be curated by an outside curator and will revolve yearly in terms of whose work is shown."<sup>63</sup>

In 2004, ECIAD administration requested that the Faculty Association roll over its prior contract, but it was voted to reject the request and go to the joint bargaining table.<sup>64</sup> There was a strong focus on issues relating to job categorization, regularization, workload, hiring equity, and the status of sessionals during this period. Attempts to resolve these problems were complicated by the fact that ECIAD was attempting to change its status and be recognized as a University. The ambiguity of the situation was discussed in May 2005, when the Faculty Association voiced its support for ECIAD's attempt to be recognized as a university, but stated that "however we are not up to standard in terms of pay equity, non-regular faculty issues, (ROFR, etc.) in the college system. Among other things, we need to focus on achieving equity in hiring and promotion. If we come under another category of different act later, we would have to change our collective agreement but until then we have to deal with what we have."65 Beginning in 2006, faculty members were invited to apply to teach in a Master's of Applied Arts program, which offers courses in design, visual art and media arts. To begin with, there was uncertainty about the requirements for this new role, and the Association sought clarity about

<sup>62</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, April 23, 2003.

<sup>63</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, November 19, 2003.

<sup>64</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, January 7, 2004.

<sup>65</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, May 16, 2005.

who was eligible to teach in the Master's Program and what the remuneration for doing so would be, since "although the Administration did request that faculty apply, there were no criteria." Another personnel issue that continued to draw the attention of the Faculty Association was the roles and status of sessionals. In April 2006, the Institute's administration addressed an Association meeting about problems with the Institute's sessional faculty pool. With 400 people in it, the pool was too large and unwieldy. Despite being so large, it often did not contain suitable instructors for particular courses. Moreover, the proper hiring procedures often went unused. The Institute's administration suggested eliminating the pool and allowing individuals to apply to an open call for applications on a case-by-case basis. 67

The Faculty Association was also having its own problems with the status of sessionals. In particular, the Association identified concerns about the idea of electing sessionals to the Association executive, since there was no guarantee that a sessional so elected would be able to serve a full term in office. Spurred on by this dilemma, the Association decided to undertake a full review of its bylaws, the first time this had been done since 1997.<sup>68</sup>

In 2008, the Faculty Association took the opportunity "at this time when we are not under any stress from a bargaining round" to establish a policy on strike pay. It was therefore decided that faculty members who actively participated in strike action would be paid \$200 per week following a five-day wait period.<sup>69</sup>

Later in the year, ECIAD was granted University status to become Emily Carr University of Art + Design. To prepare for the change, the Faculty Association struck a Transition Committee that consisted of sitting Senate members and any other interested faculty. The Association discussed what the change might mean for faculty, reporting that "Nationally there are concerns that the BC Legislation, multiplying the Universities, may dilute what 'University' means. There may be a national move to censure British Columbia Legislation. Most Senate compositions have a majority of Faculty as seated members. Emily Carr University is not acting like a university in relation to voting members and therefore may be censured."<sup>70</sup>

Recently, the Faculty Association has continued to develop ties with other unions and bargaining bodies, supporting the ECUAD Student

<sup>66</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, March 6, 2006.

<sup>67</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, April 5, 2006

<sup>68</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, April 24, 2006.

<sup>69</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, January 23, 2008.

<sup>70</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, September 24, 2008.

Union in its 2009 initiative to obtain the U-Pass $^{71}$  and hosting the Federation of Post Secondary Educators AGM at Harrison Hot Springs in  $2010.^{72}$ 

<sup>71</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, September 28, 2009.

<sup>72</sup> Faculty Association Minutes, March 25, 2010.