

APSA Total Compensation Review Committee (TCRC)

Report for the 2019 Annual General Meeting

Prepared by: David Agosti (Chair)

The Total Compensation Review Committee was created after the 2014 negotiations. Tasked with making recommendations to the Joint Compensation Review Committee, created by the Colin Taylor Award, to “to consider and make recommendation(s) towards the development and implementation of a total compensation package”.

Immediately following our 2018 AGM this committee was able to work with SFU to finalize how we were to spend the “three pots of money” from the Colin Taylor Award. This included improvements to benefits effective January 1, 2019 as well as the payment of a one-time sum to APSA members.

Unfortunately, everything since then has gone downhill and APSA has had to refer the matters back to Colin Taylor for further arbitration. This includes:

Job Evaluation:

APSA has consistently maintained that Job evaluation (JE) is part of “a total compensation package” and that APSA should be jointly involved in considering and making recommendations towards the development and implementation of a JE system.

The University has consistently refused to do this. APSA has not been involved in the JE process, and our requests for involvement and input/suggestions have been refused. As part of going back to Colin Taylor, we are asking that:

- The system be more transparent, including: knowing how “points” are applied, what the point thresholds for moving to a different pay grade are, and having a system for appeals.
- That there be an acknowledgement that JE is part of “total compensation” and that APSA be involved in considering and making recommendations towards its development and implementation.

Market Survey:

We spent time working with the University to develop a Market Survey. The University chose the consulting firm Mercer to conduct this survey, and although we weren’t involved in that choice we agreed to proceed in the interests of timeliness. The University continually pressed the idea of timeliness, but then continually extended the timelines. We agreed to proceed based on the idea that the Survey would collect data and then we would jointly interpret that data.

When the Survey was completed we discovered that the University once again did not act in a joint matter. They kept hidden from APSA discussions with Mercer and produced a document with their own interpretation of the data – e.g:

they arbitrarily decided that if your salary was within +/- 10% it was at market without discussing this interpretation with APSA. To add insult to injury, we used Mercer to do the survey in conjunction with them doing the survey with UBC (e.g. the survey was done at the same time, with mostly the same positions, going to mostly the same comparator organizations), yet their UBC survey said you were at market if you were within +/- 5% of the median.

As part of going back to Colin Taylor we are asking that:

- The interpretation of the survey be discarded.
- Colin Taylor mandate that the interpretation of the survey and implementation of survey results be jointly developed.

There were many other issues related to the Market Survey, however; we have now notified the arbitrator that we wish to return to arbitration and are waiting for a date.