

Prez Sez

By Heather Giardine-Tuck, President, OPSEU Local 240

Hello Local 240 Colleagues, I am going to wish you a Happy New Year in spite of us nearing the end of January. I feel like the more good wishes we give and receive right now, the better.

Thank you for your continued efforts with Work To Rule (WTR). Your Local 240 Exec team appreciates all you are doing and recognizes it has been challenging figuring out what to do and what not to do, while also trying to keep up with all the information flowing from the Bargaining Team. Oh yes, I would be remiss if I were to leave out trying to keep up with the ever-changing landscape of the pandemic and its regulations/restrictions. Honestly, once this is all behind us (and it WILL one day be in our rear view mirror!), we will heave a collective sigh of relief I am sure.

Since WTR began, Your Local 240 Stewards and Exec team have been flooded with questions from so many of you: our librarians, counsellors, non-teaching and teaching faculty. **THANK YOU FOR REACHING OUT!!** We sincerely appreciate your engagement, desire to understand, and willingness to participate. One of the things I am most proud of at Mohawk College is how beautifully our folks come together when the call to action is issued. None of this is easy but, together, we sure are making it a lot easier to do.

In my communications with many of you, I have shared that in 2017 it was easy to see precarity as the #1 reason to strike and all could get behind that (and the majority did). This round, the Bargaining Team recognizes that faculty do not want labour disruption for our students given all else that is happening, so striking (withdrawing all services) is not what anyone wants to see happen. That is why Work To Rule was employed for the first time ever. It is intended as a means of getting the two sides back to the table. We know that a strong rejection offer will do the same thing.

As you have seen through the communications so far this round, the faculty proposals are about better security for our non-FT faculty; intellectual property rights/consent practices; better-defined counselling and student supports; and, language to prevent the contracting out of jobs. These items do not cost the colleges money. They are about safety, dignity and respect. They are about making our working conditions and our students' learning conditions better. All of the benefits and protections that we enjoy as faculty (whether non FT or FT) came through

negotiated contracts. The imposition of Terms and Conditions by the CEC has taken our voice and our input out of shaping our working conditions. When faculty ask why we should vote No to the offer, it would be to ensure that our voices and the concerns we have for future contracts are heard.

The reason we are asking for a No vote to the offer is because we are stronger together. That is not simply a tag line or slogan...in my view, it is a proven fact. The solidarity among our faculty is my number one concern, but we also take a collegial approach in working with our college management team. We have strong labour relations at our college because we do work together. We sit on opposite sides of the table and have different interests, but it is the same table. At the end of the day, our students and improving their educational experience is at the centre of all we do.

Like many of you, I regard working at Mohawk College to be a great experience. I am blessed and grateful to have had the years I have in a profession I love. I want the system that I have had the privilege to work in to continue for those coming behind me. I want our strong post-secondary system to be made even stronger with better government funding, better working conditions for our faculty, and better learning conditions for our students. In a unionized environment, many of these changes come through negotiations and collective bargaining. That is why I will be rejecting the CEC's forced offer.

Folks, one thing I know for sure is we will get through this...together.

Take care, stay well, and keep in touch,

Heather

Making Sense of CEC Communication to Date

By Dan Popowich, Liberal Studies Professor, Steward, OPSEU Local 240

On December 9th, the CEC attempted to predict the implications of a strike mandate for faculty; they stated: "Historically if faculty give CAAT-A a strike mandate, most of the time, they use it." In fact, on December 7th, 2021 (before our vote), they tried to convince faculty members that a strike was likely and wrote: "The CAAT-A bargaining team has publicly stated that giving them a strike mandate will not lead to a strike. Is this true? No, it is not. . . . Although strike votes don't always lead to a strike, the demands that are on the

table precipitated a strike in 2017 and will again in 2021.” (See comments below regarding the possibility of a strike).

Interestingly, the first time that ‘Imposed Terms and Conditions of Employment’ was a legal option for Colleges, the CEC used it (2013/14) - they left this point out of their December 2021 “Fact Check” regarding CEC/CAAT-A labour relations since 1981. Despite the CAAT-A Bargaining Team’s request that the Collective Agreement be extended until January 2022, the CEC was quick to impose terms and conditions of employment in 2021. Importantly, the “imposed terms” followed another CEC letter, on December 7th, 2021, that expressed that they “would never agree to any of the CAAT-A’s demands” even if 100% of faculty rejected the offer. Put simply, this is why binding arbitration is necessary: *negotiation involves two parties and when one party refuses, arbitration is necessary.*

On December 13th, 2021, the CEC urged “the CAAT-A not to jeopardize student learning during the winter semester.” They claimed that it was “*in everyone’s best interest to conclude negotiations without a strike*” (emphasis added). We did just that: We rejected the CEC offer, obtained a strike mandate, and we didn’t walk out. We didn’t stop teaching. We continued to do the work that was listed on our Standardized Workload Formula (SWF). In other words, we adopted a position that benefited students and OPSEU CAAT-A members. We engaged in labour action that involved a transparent work-to-rule strategy, referring extra work to our immediate supervisors.

January 13th Letter

The January 13th letter from Lloyd (CEC, CEO) was upsetting - I’ve heard from a number of members who asked if they could opt out of CEC communication because of the threatening tone. The tactic (which induced stress for some members) wasn’t right. Lloyd wrote: “To be very clear, refusing to perform assigned duties is not work-to-rule, it is a partial walk-out, Employers do not pay employees who are not performing their duties” (01/13/22). Sadly, this threat regarding partial pay for partial work comes on the heels of our College President recognizing all faculty members at Mohawk with an award for going above and beyond during the pandemic. The CEC letter is insensitive and disregards what we know we have done to assist colleagues, students, and the College as an institution during the pandemic.

Interestingly, in that letter, Lloyd also explained that the “SWF is not designed to speak to the whole of the work individual teachers do to fulfill their responsibilities within the College” (01/13/22). According to Employer definitions, “the SWF is designed to measure

four different aspects of workload: (1) Teaching contact hours, (2) Preparation, (3) Evaluation, and (4) Complementary functions” (see Algonquin College Human Resources documents linked below). As explained, teaching contact hours represent hours spent in the classroom (and online), preparation refers to hours spent preparing for classroom activities, and evaluation accounts for time spent grading student work. As for complementary functions, procedurally, they need to be listed, described, and hours provided on the SWF by the Associate Dean. The completed SWF is either accepted or rejected by the faculty member because the SWF is a “personal contract with the College” (e.g., Mohawk College, CEDP).

In contrast to “complementary functions”, all professors are provided with a minimum of six hours defined as “complementary hours allowance” on their SWF. These hours provide professors with four hours of time for routine out-of-class student assistance and two hours for normal administrative tasks per week. “The keywords here are “routine” and “normal” - this means that these duties cannot be specifically directed by oral or written direction if they are not on an SWF or in a contract”, as explained by Rebecca Mills, our Chief Steward.

Take a look at your SWF and see if there is a description in the complementary function section of your SWF. If there is, you are required to do that work (as you already know). If not, “complementary functions” (extra duties, which need to be described on the SWF according to the Colleges) have not been assigned, compensated, or accounted for. (See <http://opseu562.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/SWF-Annotated-2019.pdf> for an annotated SWF).

According to Lloyd’s January 13th letter, “the SWF is not designed to speak to the whole of the work individual teachers do to fulfill their responsibilities within the College.” Human Resources at Algonquin College, however, contradict Lloyd; for example, they explain that “the Standard Workload Formula is a standardized and objective way to assign, measure, and monitor the workload of academic staff. *All aspects of workload monitoring and assignment are covered by Article 11 of the Academic Collective Agreement*” (Algonquin College, Human Resources; emphasis added - see <https://www.algonquincollege.com/hr/labour-relations/standard-workload-formula/>). Similarly, the Collective Agreement (11.02 A 2) explains that the “SWF shall include all details of the total workload.”

Wait: how is it that the SWF “doesn’t speak to the whole of the work teachers do to fulfill responsibilities” (Lloyd, 2022)? According to other official statement, the SWF “assigns,

measures, and monitors the workload of academic staff” (Human Resources, Algonquin College), is a “personal contract with the College” (CEDP), and “includes all details of the total workload” (Collective Agreement)? Three of these four statements are consistent in their definition of the SWF - one isn’t.

Based on my SWF, I have no assigned “complementary functions” - this section on my SWF is blank. In the past, any duties associated with being a course coordinator, attending meetings, or mentoring, appeared there. A few years ago, time was no longer provided for being a course coordinator but I decided to volunteer that time pre-work-to-rule. My SWF, then, says I have no assigned, measured, or monitored work other than teaching, prepping, evaluating, providing out-of-class assistance, and normal administrative duties to a maximum of 43.7 hours per week. Keeping this in mind, I’m working to rule - by definition - according to College, CEDP, and the Collective Agreement definitions.

CEC’s Forced Offer

The Local 240 LEC is now meeting every Monday rather than once a month so we can address questions and concerns that you have and provide updates. During last week’s meeting, Heather asked Stewards to present all of the possibilities to members as we consider the forced offer (note: the Union is looking for a strong vote of “No” to the CEC’s offer).

Keeping this in mind, it is a possibility that we are forced to walk a picket line even if we reject the offer. Our hope is that if members reject the offer, as we did when Wynn forced a CEC offer (~86% voted no in 2017), we will proceed into binding arbitration. As for what has been offered by the CEC, it is no different from the offer that we rejected back in December. This is odd, as from my experience a second offer, for example, when I’m negotiating the purchase of a house, involves adjusting the offer; i.e., if the seller rejected my first offer.

Summary

Throughout this process, I’ve seen a lot of contradictory communication from the CEC. For example, the CEC told faculty members that we would strike if a mandate was given to the CAAT-A bargaining team (12/07/21 and 12/09/21). That was an inaccurate assumption - we didn’t strike as they claimed we would. Moreover, although the CEC thought it was prudent to review the history of labour action over the last 30 plus years in the College system in an effort to persuade members, they excluded their own actions from that

history. They refused to extend the Collective Agreement until January 2022 as we requested and imposed terms. The CEC asked us not to strike (12/13/21), but that was already our strategy.

We've been careful to explain to faculty that the work that has been assigned on the SWF needs to be performed. In addition, we have also noted that any requests for work that is not accounted for on the SWF be referred to the Associate Dean, and if the AD provides written direction to complete the work, it is completed and a WMG filed. Partial work hasn't been endorsed, rather working to rule according to the SWF.

Your Stewards are here to answer any questions you have about the forced offer and WTR. We will bring your concerns to the LEC meeting every Monday and report back with all of the facts, even the possibilities that we would rather not think about. As Kevin has explained, if our Bargaining Team thought this was a good offer, they would recommend it to members, but the offer isn't any different from the previous CEC offer and the CAAT-A team is recommending we reject the offer.

In Solidarity,

Dan

Accessibility Counselling and Disability

By Annette Simms, Accessibility Counsellor

Disability is such a broad term, yet the first thing many people think of is the main symbol for accessibility; an individual in a wheelchair. And while the acceptance of visible and invisible disability has grown over the years, the main question still exists: what is disability?

Under the **Ontario Human Rights Code**, disability is defined as:

- any degree of physical disability, infirmity, malformation or disfigurement that is caused by bodily injury, birth defect or illness and, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, includes diabetes mellitus, epilepsy, a brain injury, any degree of paralysis, amputation, lack of physical co-ordination, blindness or visual impediment, deafness or hearing impediment, muteness or speech impediment, or physical reliance on a guide dog or other animal or on a wheelchair or other remedial appliance or device,

- a condition of mental impairment or a developmental disability,
- a learning disability, or a dysfunction in one or more of the processes involved in understanding or using symbols or spoken language,
- a mental disorder, or
- an injury or disability for which benefits were claimed or received under the insurance plan established under the **Workplace Safety and Insurance Act, 1997**

That seems pretty comprehensive, and given that this definition of disability is used by the **Ontario Human Rights Commission (OHRC)**, you'd think it would be the same across the province; think again... For many students in post-secondary, accessing OSAP plays a significant role in their ability to further their education. Yet OSAP's definition of disability acts as a barrier in itself for students needing to access additional resources to support their academic success.

For OSAP, disability is defined as a functional limitation:

- caused by a physical or mental impairment that restricts your ability to perform the daily activities necessary to participate in studies at a postsecondary level or in the labour force and
- that is expected to remain with you for your expected life

For a post-secondary institution, these are the most impactful definitions of disability, but when it comes to accessing Accessible Learning Services, it is so much more complex. Accessible Learning Services (ALS) is mandated under the OHRC and **Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA)** to support students with disabilities, but for many, that's not how they identify.

As Accessibility Counsellors, our role is not only to interpret documentation, navigate the world of accommodations and advocate for student need; one of the most important functions we hold is meeting students where they're at. Counsellors work with students from extremely diverse backgrounds, for which disabled may not even be in the realm of how they see themselves. A student may connect with us, sharing academic challenges that relate to labels frowned upon in their country of origin. They may enter our office with extensive medical labels, and just need a bit of additional support. They may have grown up in an environment where their challenges were never recognized, or they had a past traumatic experience from which hidden challenges had yet to surface.

The counsellor's job is to create a safe space for students to share the story of their past, and to write the story of their future. We work with students to develop a set of accommodations that are supportive for them, while also providing resources to build skills through their post-secondary experience. We connect students with ability, culturally, identity, academically appropriate supports and empower their own personal growth. We collaborate with teaching faculty to gain insights around important learning outcomes, and work one on one with students to develop complimentary skills, beneficial to their future success. We also work with medical institutions to support student transitions into post-secondary, and with external stakeholders to support student transition into the workplace.

We hold a unique role within the post-secondary environment, and have the privilege of supporting some amazingly strong, smart students that persevere through so much. And just like we share with them, we're here to help. Accessibility Counsellors can connect students with support around adaptive technologies, learning strategies, transitioning to employment, placement/co-op support and so much more!

Did you know we also have a Faculty Resource Page? If you haven't checked it out, contact the Front Desk at als@mohawkcollege.ca for information on how to enroll.

Hope you're all having a great semester start!

Cheers,

Annette Simms, M.ADS

Thoughts on Work to Rule

By Rebecca Mills, Chief Steward, OPSEU Local 240

WTR has been new and challenging for faculty, counselors, and librarians, much more nuanced than just withdrawing labour and hitting the picket line. However, the Bargaining Team (BT) chose this path to save students from significant disruption while endeavoring to get a fair contract. Local 240 has heard from many members over the last few weeks, so here is a synopsis of those communications.

At first many felt uneasy with WTR for a variety of reasons. Faculty tend to be collegial, so challenging unSWF'd AD requests made many uncomfortable. However, the BT offered

language that faculty could use to communicate respectfully about WTR and the limits of their SWFs. Once members knew where the appropriate line was, they felt more empowered.

Unfortunately, many coordinators have continued to struggle because their duties are nebulous and seemingly never-ending. For those who have attempted to get more specific direction from ADs, they have received messages quoting the new imposed Terms and Conditions that states only new coordinators will get a list. Thank the college presidents and the CEC for that. Despite that impediment, many coordinators have managed to strike a balance and are effectively working-to-rule by keeping to their time.

Even though WTR has been hard, especially with everything else going on in the world, there have been some bright spots:

1. Most members have followed the BT's instructions to the best of their ability/comfort level which includes things like adding an email signature in support of the strike action, learning how to use Toggl, keeping to their SWF time, posting a message in MyCanvas, attending union meetings, staying current, taking to social media, etc.
2. Faculty groups smaller in number (but not might!) have not been forgotten: the "all of us or none of us" message consistently includes non-teaching faculty, counsellors, and librarians as well as partial-load faculty.
3. Faculty have developed a much better understanding of their SWFs and are reading Article 11 in the Collective Agreement (CA).
4. Members using Toggl have realized just how much unpaid overtime they have been giving the College.
5. Faculty now know that the six mandatory complementary hours are for students and routine administrative work, not for departmental meetings, mentoring, projects, etc.
6. Faculty have a much clearer understanding that their lectures/presentations are their own intellectual property which they can record off site if they wish.

Finally, the CEC, who seemed to have the advantage at the start of negotiations, may have overplayed their hand, particularly with the recent threat to cut members' pay (Local 240 heard from many members who didn't appreciate that message). So please stay strong a little longer. The forced-offer vote is coming Feb. 15-17, 2022, and it is critical that members send a clear "No" vote to the CEC. A "No" vote will give leverage to the BT in the hope that the CEC will either come back to the table or agree to binding-interest arbitration. *Vote "No" to support the BT, to show solidarity for all of our members, and to try to get a better CA!*

Solidarity Miscellanies on Several Occasions

By Rebecca Mills, Chief Steward, OPSEU Local 240

During work-to-rule, to show solidarity for colleagues and students, I decided to revive my dormant Twitter account. I started by quoting some of my favourite authors, but then I began penning short polemical poems (triplets, quatrains, cinquains, haikus, etc.) under the hashtag *#BargainingforBetter*. I humbly share a few of them here:

Jan. 4

Gig hands/PL profs are the same,
But only differ in the name,
Value their work, and SWF their toil,
Free students from labour turmoil.
(Inspired by "To the Ladies," Mary, Lady Chudleigh, 1703)

Jan. 10

A rhyme for @ronmckerlie
With your silence, you do say,
What's been done is quite okay.
Take your team back to the table
Reverse course: make labour stable

Jan. 13

For the 70%:
Our colleagues who are non-full-time
They do the same job just as fine
But their return is less than mine
Precarity is by design

Jan. 14

The SWF, a form that does contrive

To capture all our labour
Unchanged since 1985
Please update it for our members

Jan. 19

A haiku for our librarians:
There are twenty four
Librarians: eleven
How is this okay?

Partial Load Registry Closing Early!

Local 240 announcement

With the imposition of Terms and Conditions by the CEC, the Partial Load Registry will be opening the first week in February, but closing April 30th , 2022 (NOT October 30th as stipulated in our negotiated Collective Agreement). As this is a transition year, our HR folks have assured us that this will be a one-time, short window for Partial Load to register themselves in the Registry. Going forward, the plan is to have the Registry open longer than this.

So, please be sure to register yourself as soon as the Partial Load Registry opens if you are interested in working Partial Load assignments in 2023. With such a short window this time, we want to ensure all Partial Load faculty who wish to be registered, are able to do so.

Bargaining Meeting for Students

CAAT-A Bargaining Team Announcement

On February 8 at 7pm, the faculty bargaining team, in conjunction with students, will be holding a LIVE Q&A Webinar to talk with students about what's happening in bargaining, what faculty are asking for in order to better support students, and to answer questions that students may have.

Faculty are fighting for:

- More time to support students
- Job protections for contract faculty, counsellors, and librarians
- Binding action on equity, Indigenization, and decolonization
- Faculty consent on the sale or reuse of their work

Here's the registration link for the live student webinar on Feb 8th (starts at 7pm)

When: Feb 8, 2022 07:00 PM Eastern Time

NOTE: French translation and ASL interpretation will be provided.

Register in advance for this webinar:

https://us02web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_FCyOkYe9QGG2Nke4aNEztA

After registering, you will receive a confirmation email containing information about joining the webinar.

Why Should We Vote NO on the CEC's Forced Offer?: Let's Hear it From the Team...

By Kevin MacKay, Vice President, OPSEU Local 240 and by the Faculty Bargaining Team

In the week of February 14 to 18, faculty will be voting on a forced offer from the College Employer Council (CEC). This offer is virtually unchanged from the offer that the CEC tabled on November 23, and which faculty clearly rejected by voting for a strike mandate. The forced offer vote is the last card that management can play in the bargaining process. It is the last delaying tactic before they have to either negotiate a contract that addresses faculty issues, or else send the outstanding issues to binding interest arbitration. We should recall that the faculty bargaining team made the offer of resolving all outstanding issues through arbitration back in November.

There are numerous reasons why the CEC's forced offer would be terrible for faculty and students. In the past week the faculty Bargaining Team has put out some excellent, succinct communications that break down the outstanding bargaining issues and the deficiencies of the CEC forced offer. The faculty Team has also addressed the CEC's campaign of "captive audience union-busting", in which management flood our inboxes with fear, propaganda and misinformation. Although I have a lot to say about these issues, I think this time it makes sense to let the faculty Team do the talking...

Five Reasons to Reject the CEC Forced Offer

The College Employer Council's forced offer fails. It's a terrible contract that fails faculty, fails students and threatens to harm the entire college system. All faculty should vote to reject the colleges' offer, because:

X It fails to stop contracting out of faculty work and offers no job protection for partial-load, counsellors, librarians and coordinators. While college sector revenues keep rising (\$1.6 billion surplus in last five years), conditions in our public colleges are worsening. While there are more managers, full-time faculty members are not keeping pace with

enrollment increases – and that gap is being filled by precarious employees who have few benefits and no job or workload protections. Three quarters of faculty are on 14-week contracts with little to no benefits or job security. The CEC’s latest offer fails because:

- It does nothing to improve employment stability
- It does not require coordinator workload assignments to be reasonable
- It does not allow partial-load faculty with seniority to teach the maximum number of hours
- It would allow the colleges to contract out counsellor work to for-profit companies

X It fails to address faculty’s never-ending, forever-growing, workload issues. It’s hard to believe that college faculty have a maximum of five minutes and 24 seconds per student, per week for evaluation, and that faculty are not provided enough time to make online learning engaging. Our workload keeps growing, but our workload factors for evaluation and preparation haven’t changed since 1985! Our students deserve better. The CEC’s proposed “Workload Taskforce” fails because:

- There is no dispute resolution process and its recommendations would be non-binding, meaning there wouldn’t be changes solidified in the next Collective Agreement
- Unlike every other Committee outlined in the Collective Agreement, it is not co-chaired by the union and employer. There is no such thing as a “neutral chair.”
- It looks to expand the two-tiering of faculty workload by explicitly naming programs such as Academic Upgrading, Aviation, and Apprenticeship as potentially having different workload formulas, such that preparation and evaluation time would be reduced.

X It fails to present a strong proposal for Equity, Diversity and Inclusion and Indigenization, Decolonization and Truth and Reconciliation. Instead, it offers processes with titles, but no teeth. These processes, as proposed by the CEC, would fail because:

- There are no dispute resolution mechanisms and their recommendations are non-binding, so they are unlikely to produce the changes that are needed
- The EDI taskforce would report only to the College President, not the Board of Governors
- The scope and mandate for the employer’s Decolonization process is vague and limited.
- Colleges can opt out of implementing any recommendations – in the employer’s words, the process “shall not” duplicate nor conflict with work some colleges may have undertaken.

✘ It fails to allow Partial-Load (PL) faculty to bridge their benefits. Currently, many PL faculty don't receive written contracts until midway through the semester when it's too late to bridge their benefits. As a result, many PL faculty and their families are without benefits during non-teaching periods. The employer's offer fails because:

- It won't permit PL faculty to bridge benefits between contracts unless their manager favours them enough to provide a written contract for the next semester, before the current semester ends.

✘ It fails to acknowledge that faculty consent is needed before the college can reuse or sell the course material created by faculty. According to the Auditor General, 11 public colleges have "partnership agreements" with private colleges as of June 2021. The colleges are giving away or selling faculty work and course materials to these institutions at a profit, and without faculty knowledge or consent. This offer fails because:

- It perpetuates the erosion of faculty work.
- It allows Ontario colleges to be one of the few jurisdictions where Intellectual Property rights are not enshrined in the Collective Agreement.

This forced offer fails on all counts. Let's vote to reject it so that we can keep fighting and bargaining for better - more time for our students, fairness for faculty, and quality education for all.

#Time4Students

#BargainingForBetter

#RejectForcedOffer

#OfferFail

Province Wide Faculty Town Hall: Register Now!

CAAT-A Bargaining Team Announcement

Just a reminder that tomorrow, February 2 at 6pm, the CAAT-A Divisional Executive will host a third provincewide Town Hall with the Bargaining Team. These town halls have proven extraordinarily popular so far; thousands of members have attended and hundreds of member questions have been answered.

You can attend by registering here (French translation and ASL interpretation will be provided). We urge you to bring a colleague who may not have attended a previous event:

When: Feb 2, 2022 06:30 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada)
Topic: Faculty Town Hall

Register in advance for this webinar:

https://us02web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_u4oEp5JLRC6OTqY0mayguA

Please register using a non-college (private) email address.

Three Short Videos on Bargaining and the CEC Forced Offer

CAAT-A Bargaining Team Announcement

In these short, informative videos, J.P. Hornick, Chair of the faculty Bargaining Team, addresses three important topics. These videos are also great to share with colleagues, family, and friends!

1. Deconstructing the CEC's fear-mongering about the "cost" of faculty demands

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8w-ucW0oCEU>

2. Why the CEC Forced Offer is completely insufficient and why we need to vote NO

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XGQ9TCjt8Qc>

3. The CEC's use of captive audience communication as a union-busting tactic

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=J2l1uPKU0vU>

**OPSEU Local 240 Mohawk College Faculty Area Stewards September 1, 2021 - August 31, 2022
OFFICERS**

President: Heather Giardine-Tuck
Vice President: Kevin MacKay
Chief Steward: Rebecca Mills
Treasurer: Gaspare Bonomo
Communications Officer: Robert Soulliere

AREA	STEWARD	Office & Phone Ext
Architectural, Civil, Urban, Planning, Math	Kevin Haluik	A209D x3994 kevin.haluik@mohawkcollege.ca
Aviation	Paul Sprentz	Airport paul.sprentz@mohawkcollege.ca
Business Management Studies	Robert Soulliere Communications Officer	H101A Library x3936 robert.soulliere@mohawkcollege.ca
Business Office Administration and Business Graduate Studies Programs	Gaspare Bonomo Treasurer	M-wing x3193 gaspare.bonomo@mohawkcollege.ca
Chemical & Mechanical Technology Programs	Monika Jungmann	E310C x3258 monika.jungmann@mohawkcollege.ca
Computer Science Technology	Sam Scott	Q-wing x3029 sam.scott1@mohawkcollege.ca
Electro-technology Programs	Vijay Khatri	E-238 B x3572 vijay.khatri@mohawkcollege.ca
Social Service work and Community Studies	Heather Giardine-Tuck President	A126 x4065 heather.giardine-tuck@mohawkcollege.ca
Social Service work and Community Studies	Shelley Rempel	A224 x3825 shelley.rempel@mohawkcollege.ca
Liberal Studies and Music	Kevin MacKay Vice President	F175 x3364 kevin.mackay@mohawkcollege.ca
Liberal Studies and Music	Dan Popowich	F175 x3690 dan.popowich@mohawkcollege.ca
Justice Studies	Steve Cook	C025 x3397 steve.cook@mohawkcollege.ca
Health, Wellness & Fitness; RMT; Recreation Therapy; Health Studies	Dan MacLennan	C041 x3641 dan.maclennan@mohawkcollege.ca
Liberal Studies, ESL, Academic Upgrading, DEP	Betti Sheldrick	A126 x3949 betti.sheldrick@mohawkcollege.ca
Library, Counseling & Accessibility, CTRL, Int'l	Kasey Waddell	The Square, Office 35 x3778 kasey.waddell@mohawkcollege.ca
Media & Entertainment Studies, Graphics and Design	Patrick Hanson	F108T x3175 patrick.hanson@mohawkcollege.ca
CVT, OTA-PTA, Pharm Tech	Michael Chan	IAHS 315 x6180 michael.chan4@mohawkcollege.ca

Nursing: Bachelor of Science in Nursing BScN, Practical Nursing, Personal Support Worker	Tracy Lickers	IAHS tracy.lickers@mohawkcollege.ca
Med/Rad/Science	Caryn Schaefer	IAHS caryn.schaefer@mohawkcollege.ca
Partial Load: IAHS	Andrea Christmas	IAHS andrea.christmas@mohawkcollege.ca
Partial Load: Fennell Campus	Rebecca Mills Chief Steward	A126 x4186 rebecca.mills@mohawkcollege.ca
Skilled Trades: Transportation & Industrial, Apprenticeship, Construction, Electrical, Fuels & Green Tech	Craig Cooper	Stoney Creek C114 x2520 craig.cooper@mohawkcollege.ca
Skilled Trades: Transportation & Industrial	Greg Neale	Fennell B106 x5278 greg.neale@mohawkcollege.ca
	TRUSTEES/AUDITORS	
	Carol Tristani & Cornel Fulop	M-wing
Union Office		A006 x3468