

B - 3 BENEFITS

Benefits

Similar Benefit Coverage for Retired and Active Employees

UTFA proposal:

Retired and active faculty and librarians shall have the same benefit coverage (excluding only those benefits (e.g., long-term disability) that might be of no value to one party) and the same premium charge and co-pay policy.

This is the existing practice and the purpose of this proposal is simply to have this existing practice formally acknowledged.

Benefits

(i) *Massage Therapy, Physiotherapy, Chiropractic Care and Optometrist Benefit*

UTFA proposal:

The current benefit for massage therapy, physiotherapy, and chiropractic care shall be increased to \$1,000 maximum annually and shall be extended to include the services of a licensed optometrist.

The benefits system currently applicable to faculty and librarians at the University of Toronto provides coverage for named services: massage therapy; physiotherapy; and chiropractic treatment. Coverage is limited to a maximum (for all three services combined) of \$500 per person per plan year.

The Association's proposal is to add optometrist services to the list of additional services provided under this envelope and to increase the annual maximum to \$1,000.

This proposal is driven by two key factors:

- Reductions over recent years in the services covered by the Ontario Health Insurance Plan (OHIP) and/or in the amounts covered under those services that continue to be covered; and
- The existence of a substantial gap between the coverage offered by the benefit plan at the University of Toronto and the coverage offered at other universities in the Province of Ontario.

In its May 18, 2004 Budget, the Provincial Government removed chiropractic services, physiotherapy and optometry examinations from the list of services covered under OHIP. (See Book of Documents, Volume III, Tab 1.)

The delisting of these services has had a negative impact on the coverage enjoyed by faculty and librarians at the University of Toronto in two respects. First, the delisting of chiropractic services and physiotherapy which had formerly been partially funded through OHIP increased the financial load on the benefit provided through the University

of Toronto plan. Second, the delisting of optometry created a medical services funding and coverage issue that did not exist prior to these delisting decisions.

Because these delisting decisions were announced in May 2004, during the life of the previous agreement between the faculty and librarians and the Administration, this round of negotiations and in particular this arbitration is the Association's first opportunity to address the coverage gap that has emerged.

Despite the fact that many faculty associations and unions are in the same position as UTFA in that they have not yet had the opportunity to respond to these specific funding cuts, it is clear that both the limits and the services covered under the University of Toronto plans fall far short of the norm for the university sector in Ontario and unacceptably short of what would be expected from a university that prides itself as the leading academic institution in Canada.

Paraprofessional coverage limits

First, with respect to coverage limits for paraprofessional services, Table No. 1 presents the results of a survey of the benefits provisions of the 16 leading universities in Ontario.

Table No. 1

Institution	In EH Plan	EH Limits	Specified additional	Additional limits	Premiums
Carleton	Physiotherapists, psychologists, osteopaths, chiroprodists, naturopaths, Christian Science practitioners	80%; \$25 deductible per person, maximum \$50 per family	Speech pathologists, masseurs, chiropractors	\$200 per service per covered person	Employer pays 100% of costs as of 1 May 98; 50% of increases from that base
Ottawa	Psychologist	\$50 max per visit, annual maximum \$1,000 per covered person	Chiropractor, naturopath, osteopath podiatrist, physiotherapy speech therapy massage therapy	\$300 per service per covered person	100% paid by employer
Queen's	Speech therapy, maximum \$1,000 / year / person; physiotherapy, \$55 initial visit; \$35 subsequent (private) \$40 / \$20 OHIP approved		Chiropractor, chiroprodist, osteopath, podiatrist, naturopath	50% of expense to maxim of \$300 per service per year	70% employer / 30% employee

Ryerson	Physiotherapist; Massage 20 treatments per year; psychologist maximum \$200 / year Speech therapy maximum \$200 / year	\$25 deductible	Chiropractor, osteopath, acupuncturist, naturopath, podiatrist for non-OHIP, 20 treatments per year per practitioner		100% paid by employer
York	Psychologist, 100% to \$10,000 annual maximum; Speech therapy, 100% to \$1,500 annual maximum; Athletic therapy, 100% to \$300 annual maximum Physiotherapy, 100% no specific maximum	\$25 / \$50 deductible individual / family	Chiropractor, massage, podiatrist, osteopath, naturopath, 100% of expense maximum \$500 per service per covered person		100% paid by employer
Toronto			Chiropractor, massage therapist and physiotherapy, maximum \$500 per person per year.		75% employer paid
Guelph	Physiotherapy Massage max \$30 / visit; 15 treatments / year		Speech language pathologist, psychologist, acupuncture, \$300 / year maximum per service Chiropractor, osteopath, naturopath, podiatrist, chiropractist max \$20 per visit, max \$300 / year per service		100% employer paid

McMaster	Speech therapy \$200 / year		Psychologist, physiotherapist, massage, osteopath, podiatrist, chiropractor, chiropracist, naturopath, Christian Science Practitioner max \$15 per visit, max \$225 per service per year		100% employer paid
Brock	Physiotherapist Psychologist \$20 co-pay (by plan member) maximum benefit \$1,000 per year.		Chiropractor, osteopath, podiatrist, chiropracist, naturopath, massage, acupuncture, \$20 co-pay (by plan member) per visit, maximum benefit \$500 / discipline / year	\$10 / \$20 deductible individual / family	100% employer paid
Trent	Physiotherapist		Speech therapist, psychologist, massage therapist, maximum \$200 / person / service; Osteopath, chiropractor, chiropracist, naturopath, podiatrist, maximum \$300 / discipline / year	\$25 / \$50 deductible individual / family	100% employer paid

Western	Psychologist: group therapy \$6 / hour; family therapy \$18 / half-hour, individual, \$15 / half-hour; others \$15 / visit		Chiropractor, osteopath, naturopath, chiropodist / podiatrist, acupuncturist, speech therapist, physiotherapist, massage therapist; up to \$15 per visit.		100% employer paid
Windsor	Chiropractor, maximum \$450 / year; Massage maximum \$600 / year; Physiotherapist; Psychologist 15 visits / year; \$50% co-payment Speech therapist \$800 / year				100% employer paid
Laurentian	Speech therapist, podiatrist, osteopath, naturopath, masseur, chiropractor, maximum \$225 per discipline per year		Psychologist max \$500 per year Physiotherapist (no maximum)		100% employer paid
Lakehead	Speech therapists, chiropractors, podiatrists, chiropodists, osteopaths, naturopaths, massage, \$8 per visit maximum \$200 / year		Psychologists \$10 / ½ hour initial assessment; \$10 per visit; maximum \$200		100% employer paid

Laurier	Speech therapist, massage therapist, physiotherapist, chiropractor, osteopath, podiatrist, naturopath, Christian Science Practitioner maximum \$400 / year / service		Psychologist / social worker \$500 maximum	\$25 / \$50 deductible individual / family	100% employer paid
Waterloo	Chiropractor, podiatrist, counselor, massage therapist, nutritionist, osteopath, physiotherapist, speech therapist, maximum \$555 per discipline per year				100% employer paid

A comparison of the benefit packages is complicated by differences in design. For example, some services that are included in the University of Toronto's paraprofessional package are covered in the basic extended health plans at some institutions. Other institutions have per-service limits rather than an overall limit for a group of services.

Having said that, however, it is unquestionably true that coverage is narrower, limits lower and the percentage of the premium paid by the employer is lower, by a substantial margin, at the University of Toronto than at any other university in the province.

Even without the need to broaden the range of services covered to include optometrists, it is clear that the \$500 per person limit at the University of Toronto is far below the norm in the sector and, indeed, that the Association's proposal for a limit of \$1,000 per person would still leave the University's coverage below the norm and significantly below that offered at Ryerson and York, the other two universities in the City of Toronto.

Optometrist and vision care coverage

All universities in the province – including the University of Toronto -- had coverage for services like massage therapy, chiropractic treatment and physiotherapy prior to the delisting of the services despite the fact that these services were covered under OHIP. The overlapping coverage was attributable to the fact that OHIP offered only partial coverage of the costs of these services.

With respect to coverage for optometrists, OHIP had previously covered the fee schedule cost of refractions, subject only to restrictions – tied to the age of the patient – on the frequency with which the service could be claimed. Because these services were only completely delisted in May 2004, many plans have only recently addressed the issue of coverage for refractions and others have not yet had the opportunity to do so in negotiations.

Despite that fact, our benefits survey reveals a significant gap between the University of Toronto and other institutions with respect to eye examinations and the related benefit of vision care.

Table No. 2

Institution	Vision care	Coverage	Limits	Premiums
Carleton	Family or individual	\$120 / 24 months	Eye examinations not covered	Employer pays 100% of costs as of 1 May 98; 50% of increases from that base
Ottawa	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Queen's	Family or individual	\$65 / 24 months for examinations; \$200 / 24 months for glasses, contacts or laser surgery; lifetime max of \$150 for visual training		70% employer / 30% employee
Ryerson	Family or individual	\$350 glasses per two years; \$350 contact lenses per two years; one eye examination / 24 months		100% paid by employer
York	Individual or family (optional)	\$375 per covered person	Eye examinations not covered	100% employer paid individual; optional family \$8.74 / month employee paid
Toronto	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Guelph	Family or individual	\$350 per person / 24 months (12 or over) ; / 12 months under 12; one eye examination / 24 months		

McMaster	Individual only	\$150 / 24 months or \$200 / 36 months	Eye examinations not covered	100% employer paid
Brock	Family or individual	\$300 / 24 months; contact lenses if medically necessary	Preferred providers; Eye examinations not covered	100% employer paid
Trent		\$200 / 23 months; \$25 / person / year for eye examination		100% employer paid
Western	Family or individual	\$150 / year cumulating to \$300 / 2 years	Eye examinations covered to \$25 per visit	100% employer paid
Windsor	Family or individual	\$350 / 24 months	Eye examinations max \$75 / 24 months	100% employer paid
Laurentian	Family or individual	\$200 / 24 months	Eye examinations not covered	100% employer paidch
Lakehead	Family or individual	\$120 / 12 months under 18; \$120 / 24 months 18 and over	Eye examinations not covered	100% employer paid
Laurier	Family or individual	\$350 / 24 months	Eye examinations fully covered	100% paid by employer
Waterloo	Family or individual	Discounts at School of Optometry	Discounts at faculty for eye examinations	n/a

The University of Toronto is one of only two major universities in the province that offers no coverage whatsoever for vision care and/or eye examinations. The other is the University of Ottawa.

Of the fourteen universities that offer vision care coverage, eight offer coverage for eye examinations.

It should be noted as well that the University of Toronto provides a vision care plan – one that includes eye examinations – for its administrative, technical and support staff who are represented by the United Steelworkers of America. As of January 1, 2006, that plan will provide coverage to a maximum of \$250 per covered person in any 24-month period. The premium cost is split 50/50 between the university and the employee. (See Book of Documents Volume III, Tab 2-J.)

In this arbitration, the Association is not asking for a vision care plan, a proposal that would reduce to one the number of major universities in the province without a plan. The Association is asking only that optometrist services be included as one of a basket of services subject to an overall annual expenditure limit.

Even with the coverage requested by the Association in this arbitration, vision care coverage at the University of Toronto would be behind what is typically available at Ontario universities and well behind what is provided at York and Ryerson, the other two universities in the City of Toronto.

Benefits

(ii) Claim Criteria Information

UTFA proposal:

UTFA shall receive full and complete access to the rules, regulations, and guidelines that Green Shield follows in determining whether or not to pay claims made through the medical and dental insurance plans.

The Association is seeking full and complete access to the rules, regulations, algorithms and guidelines that Green Shield follows in determining whether or not to pay claims made through the medical and dental insurance plans. Currently, the Association has access only to the general provisions of the benefits policies.

Frequently, when individuals have failed to obtain a satisfactory explanation from Green Shield, members contact the Association wanting to know why a particular claim was denied or only allowed to a limited extent. As an example, when a physician prescribes an expensive drug to treat a condition for which less expensive drugs are available, Green Shield often accepts the claim but sometimes agrees to pay for the drug for a brief period, after which the person is required to submit a statement and/or test results from the physician to establish that the new, expensive drug is working better than would a less expensive alternative. The Association would like to know what criteria Green Shield follows in determining whether or not to require these additional submissions from the physician.

Members of the Administration have indicated that Green Shield's criteria and algorithms are proprietary and that even the Administration does not have access to them. The Association believes that this situation is unsatisfactory and needs to be changed.

Benefits

(iii) LTD Flexibility

UTFA proposal:

The long-term disability plan shall be modified to enable disability pension recipients to return to work on a part-time basis for indefinite periods of time without financial penalty.

The University's long-term disability insurance seeks to rehabilitate people to the point that they are able to return to work full-time and perform all their duties (teaching, research, service).

However, in a some cases, although rehabilitation occurs to the extent that a person could return to work part-time or fulfill some of his or her responsibilities, full rehabilitation will never be attainable.

The Association submits that the long-term disability policy should be modified so as to permit these individuals to return to work on a part-time basis and receive both a pro-rated salary and a pro-rated disability benefit.

Because the University self-insures and thus does not rely on a third party except to administer the programme, the Association believes that the Administration ought to be able to change the policy to accommodate people who are partially rehabilitated in the way requested by the Association.

The Association submits that this proposal is more consistent with the Administration's (and the Association's) duty to accommodate disabled workers, than is the current all-or-nothing work arrangement. In many cases, by enhancing the physical and psychological well-being of the worker involved, it will contribute to the faculty member's rehabilitation, and thus will serve the interests of both the faculty member and the University. At the very least, it would permit the University to benefit from the involvement of the faculty member as he or she is able as opposed to the current all-or-nothing approach.

Benefits

(iv) Orthodontics Benefit

UTFA proposal:

Expenses shall be covered with the employer paying 50% of orthodontic expense costs up to \$3,000 per person per lifetime for active and retired faculty and librarians and their dependent children.

In the past 20 years, it has become common for dental coverage to be expanded to include limited coverage for orthodontic treatments. Indeed, such plans are a standard component of benefit packages for professional and white collar workers.

Because of the largely elective nature of orthodontic treatments, the coverage offered tends to be limited both in the percentage of the cost covered and in the overall amount that will be paid for such treatments for each covered person. These plans will typically pay no more than 50% to 60% of the cost of the treatment and are typically subject to maxima ranging from \$1,500 to \$4,000 or more.

Our survey of the sixteen major universities in the province reveals that the University of Toronto is an outlier in having no orthodontic coverage in its benefits system.

Table No. 3

Institution	Coverage	% covered	Lifetime max. benefit / insured	Premiums
Carleton	Family or individual	50%	\$1,000	Employer pays 100% of costs as of 1 May 98; 50% of increases from that base
Ottawa	Family or individual	50%	\$2,500	Employer pays full cost of basic plan; employee pays full cost of optional plan: \$10.22 / month single; \$34.62 / month family
Queen's	Family or	50%	\$2,000	75% employer /

	individual			25% employee
Ryerson	Family or individual	50%	[no maximum specified in summary]	100% paid by employer
York	Family or individual	75%	\$5,000	100% employer paid
Toronto	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Guelph	Family or individual	67%	2,500	100% employer paid
McMaster	Family or individual	50%	\$2,000	100% employer paid
Brock	Family or individual	50%	\$3,000	100% employer paid
Trent	Family or individual	50%	\$2,000	100% employer paid
Western	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Windsor	Family or individual	50%	\$3,000	100% employer paid
Laurentian	Family or individual	50%	\$1,500	50% employer paid
Lakehead	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Laurier	Family or individual	50%	\$2,000	100% employer paid
Waterloo	Family or individual	50%	\$2,630	100% employer paid

Only three of the sixteen Ontario universities surveyed – Western, Toronto and Lakehead -- offer no orthodontic coverage whatsoever. A fourth – Ottawa -- offers orthodontic coverage only as an employee-paid option. However, the University of Ottawa pays 100% of the premium cost for the rest of its dental plan.

The coverage rate is typically 50%, although York University leads in offering 75% coverage.

Lifetime coverage maxima typically range from \$2,000 to \$3,000. York's plan offers a maximum of \$5,000 per covered individual. Ryerson's plan has no specified limit, subject to the charges being reasonable.

Nine of the thirteen universities with orthodontic coverage pay 100% of the premium cost. One pays 75%. One pays 50%. One pays the full cost as of May 1, 1998 and 50% of the increase over that amount. And as noted above, the University of Ottawa offers orthodontic coverage only as an employee-paid option.

The Association's proposal for 50% coverage to a lifetime maximum of \$3,000 with premium cost sharing on the same basis as other University of Toronto plans (75% employer paid) is well within the norms of the Ontario university sector and indeed would still provide a plan which is significantly less generous than the plans offered by the other two universities in Toronto, Ryerson and York.

Benefits

(v) New Benefits Membership Group

UTFA proposal:

A new premium rate structure shall be introduced to provide the following options:

- Member
- Member plus 1
- Member plus 2 or more

At present, premiums for benefits are determined for two groups of faculty and retirees: those who have only single coverage; and those who have family coverage.

The Association believes that its proposal to divide the family coverage group into two subgroups for premium setting purposes would improve the fairness of the premium structure for faculty and librarians.

Faculty and librarians break down naturally into three categories: those who are single; those who are in couples with no children; and those who are in couples with children. Creating separate premium-setting groups would create a more reasonable relationship between premium costs and the costs of the services provided on behalf of a faculty member or librarian.

Because the University of Toronto is committed to pay 75% of the costs of the plans, regardless of the group to which the faculty member belongs, introducing this change will not alter the costs to the University of providing the coverage. It will merely alter the distribution of the employee's share of the costs.

Benefits

(vi) Professional Expense Reimbursement Allowance (PERA)

UTFA proposal:

The PERA shall be increased from \$775 to \$1,000 per year effective July 1, 2005.

The Association is seeking to have this benefit increased from \$775 per year to \$1,000 per year. First awarded during the Teplitsky round in 1999, this benefit is fundamental to members carrying out their duties at the University. As Canada's premier research university, the University of Toronto's PERA benefit should be the best in the country. Yet, it is currently the worst in the province (see Table No. 4 below). The Association's proposal, if granted, would still leave the University of Toronto tied with the bottom of Ontario universities.

Under the *Income Tax Act*, employees are not allowed to deduct expenses from their employment income because it is assumed – rightly – that an employee ought to be provided with the tools and training needed to do his or her work. But for faculty members, this tax policy does not work. The Administration does not provide them with new scholarly books, publications or computer related items; and travel/conference budgets have been steadily shrinking while the costs of travel and attending conferences have steadily increased. In addition, departmental budgets are typically insufficient to cover expenses for out of town conferences. Thus, faculty must often pay for these expenses in after tax dollars. The PERA, used at the discretion of each faculty member and librarian, provides non-taxable funding for travel, books, and other work-related expenses which are critical to the Association's members maintaining the excellent results for which they are known internationally but which the Administration does not pay in any other way.

Most Canadian universities currently provide much more generous PERAs. Concordia provides \$2,000, the University of Saskatchewan provides \$1,850, the University of Calgary provides \$1,500 per member, and the University of Alberta provides \$1,200 per member. Ontario comparators are provided in the table below.

**Professional Expense Reimbursements for
Full-Time Faculty at Ontario Universities**

University	Agreement Expiry Date	Annual Reimbursement Amount
Brock	June 30, 2006	\$1300, July 1, 2003:
Carleton	April 30, 2006	\$800
Guelph	June 30, 2007	\$1,400, 2005-06: \$1,475, 2006-07
Lakehead	June 30, 2006	\$1,100, 2003-04: \$1,200, 2004-05: \$1,300, 2005-06:
Laurentian	June 30, 2005	\$1,650, 2004-05:
McMaster	June 30, 2006	\$1,600, May 1, 2005:
Nipissing	April 30, 2006	\$1,600, 2003-04: (travel allowance) \$1,650, 2004-05: \$1,650, 2005-06:
Ottawa	April 30, 2004	\$1,000, 2002-03: \$1,000, 2003-04:
Queen's	April 30, 2008	\$1300, 2005-06 \$1400, 2006-07 \$1500, 2007-08
Ryerson	June 30, 2008	\$1000, 2002-03: \$1000, 2003-04: \$1100, 2004-05:
Toronto	June 30, 2003	\$775
Trent	June 30, 2005	\$900
Waterloo	April 30, 2006	\$1,425, May 1, 2003: \$1,425 May 1 st each year–indexed to CPI
Western	June 30, 2006	\$900
Wilfrid Laurier	June 30, 2006	\$1000 plus an annual travel expense fund of a minimum \$600 multiplied by number of full-time members
Windsor	June 30, 2008	Fund of a minimum \$1400 multiplied by number of full-time faculty members
York	April 30, 2006	\$1025 September 1, 2005: \$1250 plus extra \$200 one time only

Benefits

(vii) Librarian Research – Study Days

UTFA proposal:

The annual number of Research and Study Days for librarians shall be increased from 5 to 20.

The Association has proposed that the annual number of Research and Study Days for librarians ... be increased from 5 to 20.

- At no time during protracted negotiations with the Administration has this proposal been addressed.
- The Librarians' Annual Activity Report (the basis of annual PTR Awards) includes the following components:
 - **Professional achievements – Activities**
Contributions to conferences, (presentation of papers....)
 - **Academic Activities**
Teaching, research, publications, scholarly work in progress....
- No distinction, whatsoever, exists between faculty and librarians with respect to Research Sabbaticals, i.e. the same policies apply to each profession. A distinction exists, however, with respect to non-sabbatical research. Generally, faculty are free from teaching assignments between May – September, or an equivalent term, and they use this time for non-sabbatical research. In addition, faculty workloads are specifically calculated to include research. Librarians, on the other hand, are not freed from performing any aspect of their every day jobs. Librarians have only five days to conduct non-sabbatical research.
- The proposal for 20 Research and Study Days for librarians begins to address the disparity between faculty and librarians with respect to non-sabbatical research, while recognizing the difference in magnitude of faculty research by proposing only 20 days, rather than the underestimated time of approximately

120 days available to faculty for similar purposes, not including faculty members' daily time off from teaching.

- Librarians at the University of Toronto have the same research interests as their peers at other universities, yet are granted less time for research than their peers. For example, York University and Brock University have recognized the need for librarians to have the necessary time to conduct research by granting librarians 20 and 22.5 days for Research and Study leave respectively. Additionally, at the recent CAUT Conference held October 20-22, 2005, St. Mary's University announced their recent contract provides librarians with 12 research days.
- The silence of the Administration with respect to this proposal can only be speculated upon. Assuming the Administration values research, regardless of its source, and that it values its professional librarians for making a significant contribution to the University (the Library ranks No.1 in Canada in MacLean's Rankings and No. 3 in North America in ARL Rankings), it can only be assumed that the concern the Administration has with respect to this proposal is that of costs. The latter are minimal:
 - In a survey conducted on November 14, 2005, 20 of 166 librarians (12%) reported taking Research and Study Leave days during the past 2 years. Leaving aside whether 5 days was sufficient to do research, thus discouraging many librarians from taking advantage of this leave, the data indicate that a 100% take up cost is not in evidence for this item.
 - In the same survey it was noted that no replacement staff were hired to replace any librarian who took Research and Study Leave days. Again, a significant cost for this item is not evident.
 - The survey also revealed that there was no impact on services since the 12% take up rate was spread across four libraries, three campuses, and eight departments within the Central Library, with the result that no particular unit was negatively impacted. Extrapolating from this data, it is safe to say that "spread" will continue to provide an ameliorating effect on any deterioration of services which, *de facto*, is not evident based on data from the present survey.
 - Lastly, we have a deposition from a York University librarian that Research and Study Leave days for librarians are a "no-cost-item" at York University. This is due to an ethos favouring research among librarians at York University which culminates in flexible arrangements and workload redistribution to make this possible.

- Workload redistribution is normative to librarianship. For example, while faculty do not teach their courses or hold office hours when they take research sabbaticals, when librarians take research sabbaticals, or vacations, they do not close the library, or stop providing assistance with research whether in person, by telephone, email, or online chat. Their work is redistributed among colleagues, without any economic cost or diminution of services. Indeed, if there is a cost associated with the absence of a librarian from his or her normal duties, it is the cost of an increased workload for colleagues. This is not a psychological burden for the latter, however, since these arrangements are based on reciprocity. The dynamic of workload redistribution would prevail, indeed, it has prevailed, and will continue to prevail, with respect to Research and Study days – without economic cost or diminution of services – as outlined above.
- The Survey of Librarians conducted November 14, 2005 indicates that much of the research undertaken by librarians is comparable to faculty research. A small sample of the research undertaken by librarians follows:
 - research, and editing, for the following journals: *DA: A Journal of the Printing Arts, Canadian Notes and Queries*;
 - continuing research into pre-Confederation periodicals [librarian is co-author with a faculty member of: *Early Canadian printing : a supplement to Marie Tremaine's A bibliography of Canadian imprints, 1751-1800*, among other publications];
 - preparation of a paper which will be presented at an international conference to be held in Sydney, Australia;
 - participation in original research, with 2 faculty members, in a longitudinal research study; and
 - preparation of entries for the new edition of the *Encyclopedia of Islam*, as well as a long-term translation project of stories about Arabic women musicians from the 10th-century Arabic source, *Kitab al-Aghani* (Book of Songs).
- In two of the above examples librarians have conducted research *with faculty*, while others are engaged in activities similar to faculty, yet librarians receive only five days to accomplish similar research.
- The crux of the problem with respect to Librarians' Research Days is captured by this quotation from the aforementioned survey. Put simply, there are not enough days.

“All my Research Days were used for attending conferences. No days were left over to do actual research, or expand on things I picked up from the conferences.”

- In sum, the number of Research and Study days awarded to librarians is insufficient for the purposes of conducting meaningful research. The number is inferior in comparison to peer institutions. The number is insignificant for librarians’ professional development.

In conclusion, this proposal merits the question: *Cui bono* (who benefits)? The Association submits that its proposal will enhance the professional development of librarians at the University of Toronto, which will in turn accrue to the betterment of the University of Toronto, which will in turn accrue to the betterment of society. *Everyone benefits*. The Association urges, therefore, that librarians at the University of Toronto be given 20 days for Research and Study leave.

Benefits

(viii) Joint Working Group – Dependant Scholarship Program

UTFA proposal:

The parties agree to establish a Joint Working Group effective July 1, 2005 to review and report on the dependant scholarship program.

In March 1994, the University of Toronto's Governing Council enacted the "Scholarship Program for Dependants of Faculty Members and Librarians," which policy replaced, for full-time students, who are dependants of faculty members or librarians, the "tuition waiver program" previously in place.

According to the Governing Council document, located in the Book of Documents, Volume II at Tab 1-F, the Scholarship Program provides for each eligible dependant an amount "equal to one-half of the amount of the tuition for Arts and Science at the University of Toronto in that same year, excepting that, where the eligible faculty member or librarian holds an appointment of less than 76% FTE, but greater than 24% FTE, the ordinary amount shall be pro-rated to the actual FTE."

As a general matter, scholarship monies are taxed as part of the student's income. However, recent Revenue Canada rulings dealing with faculty at various universities across Canada, have concluded that, in the case of scholarships awarded as a result of being the dependant of a faculty member or librarian, this benefit should be taxed as part of the faculty member's or librarian's income.

The Association notes that, because the necessary academic eligibility requirements for the scholarship program for dependants is more stringent than the minimum requirement for admission to the University, it is arguable that this scholarship benefit should be taxed as part of the dependant's income, not the faculty member's or librarian's income.

The Association believes that a Joint Working Group should be formed to review and report on the dependant scholarship program, including a discussion of options with respect to the tax consequences of this program.