

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE  
ADMINISTRATION OF THE AGREEMENT  
(JCOAA)

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD

December 12, 2016

390 York Lanes

12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.

Association: Robert Tordoff (Co-Chair), Alidad Amirfazli, Sheila Embleton, Kristin Skinner, David Cabianca & Richard Wellen

Employer: Barry Miller (Co-Chair), Alice Pitt, Ananya Mukherjee-Reed, Shawn Brixey and Noura Shaw

Chair: Barry Miller

Regrets: Nick Mulé

**Minutes**

The minutes of the September 12<sup>th</sup>, 2016 meeting have been responded to by the Association with suggested minor edits. The Association will review the October 31<sup>st</sup>, 2016 meeting minutes and provide feedback.

**Third Party Provider for Faculty and Staff Email**

The Association indicated that it would like to be provided with a copy of the privacy impact statement, as well as a timeline for project implementation. The Employer indicated that it would share this information when available.

The Association mentioned that the faculty at two other Universities, University of Toronto and Rutgers University, have raised concerns about the email service selected by the University for faculty and staff and that, as a result, plans to implement the email service have been halted. Given this information, the Association indicated that it is felt that there may be grounds for concern. The Employer indicated that it would look into the circumstances at the two universities mentioned by the Association.

The Association expressed the desire that communications be provided to faculty members regarding the change in carriers. Faculty Relations indicated that it will share communications directed to faculty regarding the change in email service with the Association.

In response to a question from the Association, the Employer indicated that it is not aware of a plan or of the necessity to change the University's current policy on email privacy as a result of the planned change in email service. Faculty Relations will follow up with UIT to confirm.

### **Science, Health and Engineering Infrastructure Renewal Project**

In response to concerns regarding Engineering faculty members involved in the project, the Employer indicated that within the last week or two there was meeting with the affected Engineering faculty. The Employer indicated that it was advised that there have been continuous discussions between the three faculty members involved and the Associate Dean Research for the Faculty. The Employer reported that one of the three faculty members has signed off on his relocation plan and that a second faculty member is close to signing off. Discussions continue regarding the third faculty member's facility requirements in respect of the interim move and the final, permanent move. The Association indicated that faculty members have, nonetheless, expressed concerns about the process.

The Employer advised that there has been significant progress in the other Faculties involved in the project, which will be reflected in an updated version of the relocation report.

The Association indicated that there is a general concern that space in Lassonde and Science is not utilized optimally. For example, it has been reported that there are rooms reserved for needs that are expected to materialize three years down the road and, as a result, are not currently being used. A member of the Association caucus expressed the view that Lassonde does not have a vision for space for new appointments or for current faculty. The Association further suggested that the University is at risk of losing faculty members, if they feel that they are on a "slow path" to having the necessary facilities to undertake their research. The Association also made mention of the issue of commercialization of spaces on campus.

The Employer indicated that it was its understanding that there is a desire to consider a new model for space governance. The Association inquired about the overall plan for Farquharson around space usage. The Employer stated that the aim of the project is to create a more functional design for the space for teaching and research. It was noted that three faculty members are moving out of Farquharson permanently and that it was their choice to do so. These individuals will be going into the Life Sciences Building which will allow for a better fit for their facility needs.

The parties have agreed to keep the project as a standing item on the agenda and the Employer will continue to provide updates.

## **Update on Sexual Violence Policy and Procedures**

The Association stated that it had a very helpful meeting with R. Castle. In order to have further meaningful meetings in January, the Association would like to note the following specific issues that have come up:

1. Files created in the Sexual Violence Response Office – Where are they kept? Who will have access?
2. Appendix Q – How Appendix Q will be integrated into the policy?
3. Training for Administration – What training will members of the senior administration and investigators receive?
4. Training for YUFA members – Will there be specific training sessions? In addition to the basic training available for all faculty, will there be deeper or specialized training available for faculty who desire such?
5. Team coordination – There are multiple offices involved (e.g. CHR and Security), therefore, issues might find their way through different paths. What is happening in terms of coordination?

The parties agreed to keep this topic as a standing agenda item. YUFA emphasized, in its phrasing, “the need for timely, meaningful, and good-faith consultation in this as in all other matters.”

### **Article 18.15 Implementation – Dispute Resolution Panels**

The Association indicated that the preference is to work as swiftly as possible on the dispute resolution process. The Association also mentioned that it would like equal access to the information that the Employer may have in relation to the disputes, and it is currently working on a draft document on how the panels might work to propose to the Employer. Once the draft document is finalized, the Association will forward it to the Employer.

The Employer indicated that it was originally of the view that two Employer-appointed and two Association-appointed members for each panel would suffice. In view of the Association’s indication that it was considering a model in which the panels include three members appointed by each party, the Employer indicated that it is recruiting six members in total for two panels of three Employer-appointed members each. It is the Employer’s hope to be in a position to communicate the names of the six panel members to the Association by week’s end. The parties agreed to arrange a meeting on how they see the panel process working.

### **Home Internet Reimbursement**

The Association stated that it would like to see the continuation of home Internet reimbursement for faculty members through PER and other non Tri-Agency funds, and provided the following reasons:

1. There is a substantial precedent outside the University where other employers cover this expense, and the Association cannot see how the University sector is different.
2. There is no reason that York University must follow Tri-Council policy. Having home Internet is not necessarily just to perform research, it is an employment condition.
3. Faculty with accommodation needs might be required to Skype into meetings.
4. Having home Internet allows faculty members to be more available to students

The Employer will follow up on the Association's request.

### **Pay Statements**

The Association requested that a communication be sent out to faculty members advising them that their pay statement will be available electronically and will no longer be distributed in a paper format. The Association also requested that the pay statements be made in Excel format rather than or in addition to PDF. The Employer responded that it will double check whether this request can be accommodated, however, the understanding is that the system is set up to use PDF.

### **SSHRC Internal Grants**

The Association requested to have noted in the minutes that it reserves the right to grieve, on a case-by-case basis, if it feels that faculty members have been unreasonably denied funding. The Association noted that it believes there is wider scope for funding than encompassed by the institutional research themes and/or priorities in the University's Strategic Research Plan. It was also noted that the Association sees a potential issue with regard to academic freedom.

The Employer stated that each institution is required to set priorities, and that there is no larger set of research themes separate from those developed by the individual institutions. The Association suggested that the themes in the strategic research plan do not necessarily reflect the research interests and priorities of some faculty and raised concerns about the process by which the strategic research plan was developed. The Employer noted that there was a lengthy consultation process in the development of the University's Strategic Research Plan, which was approved by Senate.

### **Course Outcomes and Syllabus Reporting Requirements**

The Association distributed a document and indicated that it was important to clear up the definitions for the words "syllabus" and "outline", as faculty members have expressed concerns around Intellectual Property (IP).

The Employer replied stating that the words "outline" and "syllabus" are, in many circumstances, used interchangeably. The Association stated that there is a need to come to a clear and stable distinction between these terms because the interchangeable use of them creates confusion and it is an issue for faculty members with regard to IP. The Employer expressed interest in the Association's thoughts around the distinction between the two words and their usage. The Association stated that it is their view that an outline is a "sketch" or abbreviated version of something and a syllabus is more detailed. The Association also indicated that if the parties stick to the Senate approved definition of syllabus there would not be an issue. **[It appears that the reference is to the ASCP Basic Course Outline Model as suggested]**

The Employer stated that the full description of week-by-week topics and other information are considered individual intellectual property. The issue is the need for course outlines to identify learning outcomes for the course arising from the Quality Assurance Framework.

The Association requested to see the language of the directive and the Employer indicated that it is posted on the quality assurance website. The Employer also reminded the Association that the concern regarding IP could be mitigated if the faculty member states directly on their course material that the information contained therein is the property of the faculty member.

It was also discussed that course outlines would be available through student portals and that students would have to be logged in in order to access this information. This should mitigate concerns around the potential for appropriation of instructors' intellectual property.

### **ASCP Motion Re: Course Outline Availability**

A draft document was shared with the Association. The Employer indicated that it is still in consultation with faculties.

### **Commitments Arising from the Memorandum of Settlement for Renewal Collective Agreement**

#### **(a) Employment Equity Data Reporting**

The Employer will request an estimated timeline for the communication of the data that was due on 1 November from the Human Resources Department to be shared with the Association. The hope is to obtain the information in January.

#### **(b) Joint Appendix P Working Group**

The Employer shared that its four members will be A. Pitt (Vice-Provost Academic), B. Miller (Executive Director, Faculty Relations), K. McPherson (Associate Dean, LA&PS) and B. Janse van Rensburg (Associate Dean, Faculty of Science). The Association stated that it is working on nominees and will report back to the Employer as soon as possible.

### **Pension Calculation Issues**

The Employer stated that the Human Resources Department is looking into the issue of the pension contributions by faculty on Irrevocable Reduced Load and will respond accordingly.

The Employer will inquire about sharing the AON data set with the Association, with strict confidentiality.

### **CV Exercise**

The Association made the suggestion of limiting the length of CVs and questioned the request from faculties to highlight updates to the CVs.

The Employer noted that it would be difficult to arrive at an agreed upon length for CVs and indicated that it did not see the request to highlight updates as unreasonable. The Employer noted that the review of CVs provides the Deans with an opportunity to identify potential concerns about a faculty

member's fulfillment of his or her professional responsibilities and pointed out the Deans' obligation to ensure a fair and equitable workload distribution under Article 18.08.1.

### **Nursing Appendix P Concerns**

The Employer brought forward a proposal for the Appendix P categorization of two Associate Director positions in the School of Nursing. The positions are Associate Director for Undergraduate Education and Associate Director for Research. The Employer indicated that it was advised that the current arrangements for the Associate Director positions have been based on Category 6, which provide the stipends the Associate Directors are receiving and a 0.5 FCE teaching load reduction. The Employer noted that the incumbents are receiving an additional 0.5 FCE teaching load reduction for a total teaching load reduction of 1 FCE.

The Association asked why category 5 was not considered instead of category 6, as Category 5 appeared to be a better fit in terms of the other positions in this category and the teaching load reduction provided for the category (1 FCE). The Association indicated that it will follow up with the incumbents and the Employer will follow up with the Dean regarding the Association's categorization suggestion.

### **2015-16 Employment Equity Report**

The Employer will forward the report to the Association once received.

### **Plan to Restructure in the University Libraries**

The Employer informed the Association that a working group/committee was formed consisting of the following membership: Joy Kirchner (University Librarian), Andrea Kosavic (Acting AUL), Stephanie Quail (Librarian), Patti Ryan (Librarian), Ali Sadaquain (Application Programmer), Tom Scott (Acting AUL) and Adam Taves (Acting AUL). This committee met with the Consultants for the first time on December 8<sup>th</sup>.

The focus of this initiative is on achieving greater effectiveness in the services that the Libraries provide and effecting a reorganization that better reflects contemporary university librarianship.

The Association asked whether there was an intent to include faculty on the working group for input in regard to potential implications of the reorganization on the University Libraries' supports for the Faculties and indicated that it would like to see the Request for Proposal (RFP) for the consultants in order to understand the terms of reference for the exercise.

There was agreement that it would make sense to shift University Libraries restructuring to the agenda of the LRP Subcommittee. The Employer also stated that it would invite the UL to a meeting of the LRP Subcommittee.

### **New Bus Locations and Accessibility**

The Employer advised that it conveyed to Campus Services and Business Operations (CSBO) the Association's request that regular shuttle bus service be established on opening of the York subway stops and that the individuals involved in campus planning indicated that they would include the request

in their planning considerations. It was also noted that Go Transit has not made a final decision on whether to close the Downsview Go Station.

The Employer indicated that it will follow up with CSBO for any updates it may have on discussions among the Transit Agencies regarding fare harmonization.

### ***Other Business***

#### **Drug Benefits Card**

The Employer will follow up with the Human Resources Department regarding the implementation of a Drug card for faculty and librarians.

#### **SMA Performance Indicators at York University**

The Association asked whether this item would be coming to LRP in the New Year. The Employer will follow up with the Provost's Office.

#### **Sharp Budget Numbers**

The Employer indicated that the 2014-15 shadow budget numbers will be presented at the LRP meeting.

#### **Employee Engagement Survey**

The Association indicated that it would like an update on the Employer's response to the input provided by the Association regarding the Employee Engagement Survey. The Employer indicated that it would provide an update and noted that the necessary time would be taken to properly consider and incorporate the input.