

Humber Faculty Survey 2010

Comments

Q2 - How informed did you feel regarding the issues?

- 1 Should be able to select one of the choices for each issue
- 2 re: 1 information sent was not sent in a "short bites" needed to be clear & crisp- I believe folks often got lost and did not get the big picture messages
- 3 You can't fill this in and have more than one response in a column
- 4 There is something wrong with your questionnaire it does not allow me to select the same answer for different issues each line should allow for one of three answers it does not
- 5 Very informed about all
- 6 This survey is giving me trouble. I would like to express that I was adequately informed on all of the above issues, but this doesn't seem possible. As well, on question #1 there is no option for expressing that I felt the information was adequate.
- 7 These selections don't work
- 8 yes, well the above interface isn't working properly so: In general, the rhetoric from the union about the strike seemed hollow considering the current economy and the optics of a strike would have won the faculty no friends.
- 9 Changes to the CCBA were not highlighted or discussed. How did this legislation pass?
- 10 very informed about all - unable to choose that response
- 11 The workload issues were the executive issues; not the membership.
- 12 This question did not allow me to tick off more than one answer for each of the areas identified.
- 13 Your survey buttons don't work properly above.
- 14 Your survey is not properly set up, does not allow multiple selections (on iPhone at least) I was generally very informed as I looked directly to the contract. Although I do not understand the collegiality issue, do not see any lack of collegiality with my management / school mgmt
- 15 This question is not working So I will put information here. Modified Very Informed Salary Very Informed Academic Freedom Adequately Input Adequately Collegiality Adequately Partial Load Very
- 16 You messed up your setup on this question. These should be check boxes not radio buttons. For the record, I was very informed on all issues.
- 17 this is not allowing me to check off each of the issues!
- 18 why partial load can vote when they just join the college? Do they worry the long term effect of the contract? This is what I don't understand. This creates a big impact in what the votes turned out the way it is. These questions are not set up properly. Why all columns are mutually exclusive? It should only be on each row.
- 19 This section is not holding my choices...keeps wiping out the one above when I go to the next line.
- 20 Didn't trust the information

- 21 The survey won't let me click on more than two of the above choices. I also felt poorly informed on academic freedom, evaluation method, collegiality and partial load issues. One of the problems was that the union sent out conflicting info about why we were striking. Most of the communiques said it was about resolving issues from the last strike. At Humber, the letter addressed to students (in response to a letter from admin) said that it had to do with evaluation methods. A last minute communique said it was about collegiality. Another information bulletin highlighted the workload of part-time teachers but some of the union's positions seemed unworkable. The union didn't have a consistent argument about why we should strike. There was also a lot of jargon in the union's messaging. I'm a relatively new teacher and I had to do research on what a lot of things meant, especially regarding workload arrangements. Too much knowledge was presumed for someone like me.
- 22 Only allows one check in Very, Adequately or poorly- not more than one.
- 23 The material was not too complex or too little. It was contradictory, confusion, misleading and in several case incorrect. I asked for clarification but none was offered. P.S. this survey tool is defective. My chooses for this question are all poorly informed but I cannot click them all. This goes part and parcel with the union flow of info during this last negotiation. I lost complete faith in those who represent me!
- 24 I did not hear about partial load issues in this round of negotiations.
- 25 These links only allow me to click on one for the entire question when I want to give input about each issue
- 26 As a partial-load instructor I can tell you with confidence that most partial-loads opted not to vote out of fear of losing their jobs if they expressed an opinion against management. We hear stories of management being informed by HR when partial-loads express concerns and opposition which results in no contract being offered to them in the next session. Partial load feels abandoned by the union and management tells us that the union will only push for full-time and since many proven, hardworking partial-loads do not have the current academic requirements of a Ph.d we would not even be interviewed for full-time postings. We are trapped in the middle without adequate representation.
- 27 Please note: I couldn't help but to think there was some 'fear mongering" on the part of the union. In one memo placed in my mailbox, one of the reasons for rejecting management's offer read "no SWFs"; this gave me the impression I would lose my SWF. I had to dig and research to find out that was not true.
- 28 The survey won't allow me to complete all the check marks - I never felt informed enough about what the issue regarding academic freedom was and how it would impact me
- 29 The below would not let me choose what I wanted if I had chose it for another answer. Academic freedom - adequately informed choice of evaluation method - poorly informed partial load issues - adequately informed
- 30 The survey options aren't working properly, so I will clarify. I feel that I was adequately informed by the union in all of these areas.
- 31 The system only allows me to check one instead of many above. When I click on the fourth item, the click above disappears. I'm working on a Mac - could that be it?
- 32 Note: this part of the survey has an e-bug. Felt that the union did not respond to Management propaganda (which was often misleading) as well as other sources of misinformation throughout the negotiations.
- 33 I have only been able to choose 1 of the above choices. I wanted to choose adequately informed about all but when I chose the next option, the check mark moved to the next option. Also in question #1 it would have been helpful to have a column titled enough information.
- 34 I felt that management was more forthcoming with information than the union. In fact, I felt that the union did not have very compelling reasons to go on strike but was pushing its

members to vote in favour of a strike.

- 35 The website would not let me check off an answer for each question. Here are my answers: Modified Workload--poorly Salary--very Academic Freedom--poorly Input--poorly Collegiality--poorly Partial load--poorly
- 36 Informed about all. Survey does not allow for ticking off all options.
- 37 The application won't let me click multiple choices. In general, I could have had better information all around. Union output must present more than just slogans and blanket rejection of management proposals. The union needs to present detailed, and sophisticated information. It also needs to inform membership in more detail about management and union strategy in negotiating.
- 38 the survey will only allow me to check each column once so I have chosen the two most important issues to me
- 39 different degrees of information re above issues but on this survey I can only answer in one category. This research question format needs improvement Here are my answers for this question MWA = PI poorly informed Sal = VI AF = PI IICOEM = PI C=PI PLI = PI
- 40 The survey isn't working properly - I can only select from each of the categories once (in this case, I felt poorly informed about most issues).
- 41 Not allowing me to put poorly informed on all questions, however, that would be my accurate response for all parts of question 2 (poorly informed)
- 42 Do you know that the above questions will only take one check mark unless you vary the responses? Adequately informed for all the questions
- 43 Your checkmark survey tool doesn't work. When I try to select the same option in 2 rows, the first check mark disappears. In my opinion, I believe the union purposefully tried to mislead faculty in a number of areas to achieve the strike they seemed to want. I got more useful (and believable) information from the "stop the strike" alternative website.
- 44 I needed to ask about partial load issues. It obviously was not a priority.
- 45 I felt let down by my union and the bargaining committee in particular. No information about the change to the colleges act in 2008, jargon based statements, limited information regarding the changes to the workload agreement sent out at the last minute. Very poor PR with the world at large and worst with me your member. I heard no public contradiction of management's contention that the offer addressed all the arbitrated concerns fairly. Until I aggressively sought information about the changes to the workload agreement neither I nor my colleges understood what was happening to us. You know I still don't really understand what was voted on!
- 46 I felt that we were asked to vote on things that we knew little about. To need to read a 45+ page document in order to get the top-line facts was just too much. There was much rhetoric and little detail from both sides.
- 47 As a new union member and a new partial load faculty member it was a very busy time and I did not read all of the information or attend any meetings. My lack of knowledge was mostly my own fault. It seemed overwhelming to read everything that was sent and the meetings were on days when I did not go to campus and worked elsewhere.
- 48 Status updates were poorly written and not analytical. I would have liked to see a side by side comparison of the two positions.
- 49 There were many grand statements but little detail on why these things, especially modified workload were even being discussed. Which local had that in their demand setting list. Modified Workload was totally against everything we ever went on strike for and undermined the SWF as no other contract demand ever has. Whose idea was it to let this concept into the negotiations? They should not be back on the union negotiating team come the next round of negotiations.

- 50 it's very difficult to try to get the gist of what happens during negotiations. Union info at times seems very polemic and one-sided.
- 51 I found the information from each side contradictory. When I read closer, I found partial truths or revised truths. An example of this was all the information prior to the 1st vote which clearly stated that this was not a vote on the contract offer. After this I heard the head of our bargaining committee say of CBC that the first contract offer had been rejected, this was not the case. I supported the mandate to strike because of managements tactics, not because I disagreed with their offer. I voted for the offer. These were two separate issues for me. I lost a significant amount of trust in our bargaining team after I heard this distortion of the truth.
- 52 It was a tactical blunder to allow the salary become an issue.
- 53 Program coordinator issues (workload, etc) - poor
- 54 When does a Partial load move to a full time position?
- 55 I obtained the majority of my information from the OPSEU and colleges website.
- 56 I really do believe that partial load issues will never really be resolved. It is not a top priority. I would like to see a real fight for more job security, dental & vision benefits and at least one hour per week for office hours.
- 57 too little too late! did not get student/public buy in and can't consider all schools equal in work load.
- 58 The union seemed to exaggerate the issues and dramatize outcomes.
- 59 Would have benefited from more succinct "1 page" type of handouts on the key aspects, similar to what management sent out from Deb McCarthy.
- 60 I would have liked to know (fill in the blank -- this is just a trial, right?)
- 61 I felt the material I received from the union was very antagonistic and inflammatory rather than providing informative and detailed information. Some of the material was a little better than the others, but still biased. I didn't feel I could trust it. I did my own research comparing the original task force report and the union and management's claims about the proposed work terms. As expected, the truth was somewhere in the middle (between the two sides).
- 62 Information came too late, then all at once. It should have gone out well before the strike vote. Also, concern that the union did not accurately anticipate Management's actions and had no game plan.
- 63 I feel that my negotiating team was not relaying sufficient information to me. This left me uninformed when voting on accepting the contract.
- 64 You cast off the partial load people as stakeholders. I won't forget that!
- 65 As a partial-load, I had little to gain by striking
- 66 Needed more *facts* and less skewing. Needed a more neutral--and much less pro-union, anti-College--viewpoint. The Union's position, unfortunately, seemed unbalanced and unrealistic.
- 67 I learned more in the face-to-face meeting with T. Montgomery. The gentleman with the French accent should not have been a speaker. He was confusing and contradictory in what he said. (Lakeshore meeting just before vote.) More people needed to be present at the meeting. We are not lawyers and interpreting the legal language of a contract is a problem. I thought, initially, that the contract was livable. My mind changed when I heard the terms being explained in plain English. More face-to-face meetings would have been better. Sending information through emails is ineffective. Some people do not check emails everyday; some did not see the significance of the information being sent. Some faculty member was putting out all kinds of biased information in favour of the contract and maybe some people bought into what he was advocating.
- 68 material sent was too slanted toward union executives perspectives and did not reflect the

constituents.

- 69 I attended all the local meetings which helped me understand the issues much more than I would have from just reading the distributed documents.
- 70 Until the VERY END, uninformed. The last few days, there was better info.
- 71 The information was presented with bias, so it could not be read on it's own to truly understand issues.
- 72 --I find the material and information sent is inflammatory and confrontational (disrespectful to those who we are negotiating with) --because your information is so biased I don't believe it
- 73 Class scheduling should be an issue. Re modified workload, who's likely to be impacted and how?
- 74 The information was not sent objectively, but with a clear bias to support the union, and the info was misleading and threatening in nature.
- 75 It was a surprise to me that the rules for bargaining had changed. There was NO communication on this leading up to the government's decision to change the rules. Furthermore, I took the time to offer some feedback to OPSEU after the vote. I told our local president recently that I had not had a reply. He passed on the word and said OPSEU would reply. I am still waiting. Instead, I received bulk email today from Smokey addressed to brothers and sisters about Child Care. I am not his sister and I do not have young children! OPSEU appears to be % incompetent as far as I'm concerned.
- 76 Information from the union was often misleading or just plain wrong - appeared to be trying to cause problems not solve them
- 77 I didn't feel the information provided by the union was fair and honest. It was biased and misleading.
- 78 The information was too late, and too reactive ... there was no impartial source evident
- 79 Need to aim material in terms of education to staff with little to know knowledge of union work and the 'issues'
- 80 I found the information from Administration more timely and helpful than Union communications.
- 81 As partial load, I felt the issues regarding our situation were not clarified until right before the vote. The late information then felt like a last-ditch attempt to convince us to vote in a way that benefited full-time faculty.
- 82 I have no problems with my work load
- 83 The union was late with the information.
- 84 Initially, the information provided by union was unclear, too complex, too many details. Later on the memos became much better but it was somehow late.
- 85 Stop sending totally biased information! We can read the CCRA (council)'s publications and compare. The union stuff doesn't come off well! inaccurate sometimes