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Budgetary Analysis Chair

The Budgetary Analysis position on the VIUFA Executive has, this year, involved a wide range of committee work as well as the evolving regular duties of the position.

Foremost among the responsibilities of the position is to maintain data as it relates to the financial position of the Employer vis-à-vis its responsibilities as laid out in the Collective Agreement Article 6.6; to assist the VIUFA Executive in the case where the Employer declares the University to be in a situation of budgetary shortfall that necessitates layoffs; and, when required, to assist the Chief Steward in finding alternatives to layoff and presenting these options to the University, as outlined in Article 6.6. This year I developed, with the help of the VIUFA Executive, terms of reference for the BA Chair position. The terms lay out the responsibilities of the Chair and the purpose and structure of the Budgetary Analysis Committee (to consist of the Chair and at least two other people, to meet at least twice a year).

This past October, as in each October of the past few years, the Employer gave official notice that layoffs for budgetary reasons might be indicated; each year in December, the Employer fails to give notice of budgetary layoffs. The good news is that there are no budgetary layoffs this year. Meanwhile, VIUFA continues to work on ensuring the process is as effective as possible; to this end, Chris and I have met with University CFO Shelley Legin to try to work out a process; this is an ongoing effort.

Should there be budgetary layoffs in future years, it will be incumbent on the BA Chair to provide analysis supporting VIUFA’s position on whether the layoffs are necessary and/or whether there are other remedies to the financial emergency. To that end, I collect and examine various data that illuminates the financial position of the University.

For example, below I have graphed the total compensation to excluded employees at VIU (i.e., administrators) as a percentage of the total compensation costs of the VIUFA faculty. I also calculated the same ratio for all the FPSE faculty unions combined (minus VIU and minus the Justice Institute, which is an outlier in most things). The trend over the years from 2005 to 2015 (the last year for which data is provided by PSEA) is graphed below. It appears that administration at VIU is growing significantly faster than faculty, at least as measured by compensation. In fact, growth in total compensation, FTE count, and average compensation (total compensation/total FTE count) from 2005 to 2015 is given in a table below. Furthermore, it is growing faster than at the other PSEA institutions. (See graph, below.)

In spite of the wage-freeze that administrators have withstood, average compensation to administrators has increased at a greater rate than compensation to faculty in the same period. The growth in administrators (47.5% over the decade) is not immediately ascribable to a growth in the business of the University: overall enrolment grew by only 14.3% between 2006 and 2016 (data for 2005 was unavailable). Data regarding compensation is from the Human Resources DataBase (HRDB) at PSEA; enrolment data is in the enrolment reports at https://www2.viu.ca/upa/keydocuments.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Increase in number of FTE (2005-2015) | Increase in total compensation (2005-2015) | Increase in average compensation (per FTE) 2005-2015 |
| Excluded Employees | 47.5% | 84.5% | 25.1% |
| VIUFA | 17.6% | 43.3% | 21.9% |

Other Committee Work:

I serve on the Labour/Management Committee on Workload, with the Bargainer Laura Suski and Chief Steward Colleen Price. We have met approximately five times this year with the Provost and have been joined by experts from HR and from the University Analysis Office.

I also sit on the committee on Self-Directed Evaluation, charged with initiating the development of infrastructure to support the new Collective Agreement provisions for faculty to engage in Self-Directed Formative Evaluation. We are working towards facilitating faculty members in their effort to undertake evaluation that will help them develop as teachers, scholars, and academics. The evaluations under this new provision are to be undertaken every three to five years by faculty; the selection of the evaluation tools, and the results of the evaluation, stay with the faculty member.

Respectfully submitted,

Gara Pruesse

Chair, Budgetary Analysis Committee, April 2017