

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE
ADMINISTRATION OF THE AGREEMENT
(JCOAA)

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD

June 28, 2017

390 York Lanes

3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Association: Richard Wellen, Alidad Amirfazli, Sheila Embleton (Acting Co-Chair), Sonja Killoran-McKibbin, Nick Mulé, David Cabianca

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

Regrets: R. Tordoff (Association Co-Chair), N. Shaw (Employer)

Chair: Barry Miller

Minutesx

Presentation of Employee Engagement Survey Results for Faculty in YUFA

D. Coward, Assistant Vice-President Human Resources, and L. Philipps, Interim Vice-President Academic and Provost, attended. D. Coward provided an overview of the University-wide results and the results for faculty in YUFA. As part of the overview, D. Coward noted that a score of 50% or lower for a given driver signals a need for improvement and a score of 75% or above signals an area of strength.

A member of the YUFA JCOAA caucus queried whether 50% was the best threshold for indicating need of improvement. The member noted that there are greater drops between scores above 50% than the drop crossing over the 50% threshold. The Association further queried why “Relationship within your Work Unit” was identified as an area for improvement when that indicator was well above 50% and why “Senior University Leadership” was identified as an area of institutional strength when it had a score under 50%. The Association further queried how the presentation had been prepared and who determined which indicators were identified as strengths or weaknesses. The Employer agreed to follow up on these specific questions.

The Association noted its concern about the use of “school” in the survey, indicating that it may have been open to being interpreted to refer to a Faculty or department. The Association pointed out that *School* is used to refer to Faculties (Schulich School of Business, School of Arts, Media, Performance & Design, e.g.) and departments (School of Administrative Studies, School of Human Resource Management, School of Health Policy and Management, e.g.) and expressed concern that respondents to the survey may have given the wrong interpretation to “School” in answering various questions. For example, a respondent may have interpreted “School” to refer to a department where it was intended to refer to Faculty. The Association indicated this potential for ambiguity may have led to a “skewing” of the results for questions aimed at Faculty and department contexts. The Association further indicated that it raised this issue when it provided feedback on the survey prior to its launch and expressed concern that it was not corrected. The Employer indicated that it did not necessarily see the same potential for ambiguity in the use of the term and possible skewing of results.

The Association queried the process by which the results will be reviewed with faculty and decisions will be made about the follow up actions that might be taken to address the survey results. The Association indicated that it will be important for follow up steps to occur, and a YUFA caucus member observed that it was the member’s experience that no actions were taken in the departments. A representative of the Employer indicated the intention to share the information at the Faculty meeting of Chairs and Directors.

The Employer indicated that there would be follow up with the Deans regarding discussions and possible follow up steps to address particular items based on the survey results in the individual Faculties. The Employer further indicated that discussions with the faculty about the survey results would begin in September.

Pension Calculation Issues

At the request of the Association, D. Coward remained following discussion of the Employee Engagement Survey results to discuss the data to be used for analysis of the pension calculation issues. He indicated that there was a miscommunication between his office and Faculty Relations, leading to the delay and that that he would follow up for an update on where matters stood and would advise of the outcome of his follow up. The Employer committed working with a comprehensive dataset to assess the errors in pension contributions.

Proposed FES Affirmative Action Plan

The Employer indicated that it intended to provide the YUFA JCOAA co-chair with a draft communication to FES regarding the outcome of JCOAA’s discussion of their proposed AA Plan revisions soon.

Equity Reporting Data and Gender Gap Analysis

The Employer indicated that there was no objection to carrying out an analysis of salary differentials with respect to gender and expected that this exercise could be carried out through the Office of Institutional Planning and Analysis.

The Association inquired about the status of the self-identification survey. The Employer reported that there was currently only a 30% response rate. The Association expressed concerns about the email submission and suggested that a more secure format for response would likely increase the response rate. The Employer agreed to investigate options for a portal or link based submission format. The Parties agreed in the importance of bolstering the response rate. The Employer indicated that JCAA intended to release a joint memo to encourage participation in the survey.

Update on Sexual Violence Policy and Procedures

The Employer provided the Association with materials developed by the Sexual Violence Response Office which the Office is intending to make available to employees in the Fall as part of its approach to orient employees to the new Sexual Violence Policy and Procedures. D. Hansen, the Executive Director of the Sexual Violence Response Office, will attend the September meeting of JCOAA to provide an update on training that will be provided to Faculty.

Article 18.15 Implementation

The Employer confirmed that releases had been approved for all units in LA&PS and committed to following up with respect to Glendon and AMPD. The Association requested a report on the recommended candidates for each participating unit (Department, School, Faculty) and information on any faculty member that were recommended for releases but were denied. The Employer indicated that it would follow up to provide the information.

Science, Health and Engineering Infrastructure Renewal Project

The Employer indicated that it did not have an updated version of the spreadsheet report on the progress of the project but would provide one when available. The Employer committed to providing a letter from the Dean of Environmental Studies regarding the option of a stop-out for the affected pre-tenure faculty member.

Course Outlines and Syllabus Reporting Requirements

The Employer indicated that Associate Dean Fisher-Stitt was sending a follow-up communication (if it had not already been sent) to clarify that the course outline template distributed in Summer of 2016 and sent again recently was part of a pilot and its completion was optional. The Association indicated that it had not seen the

communication and requested a copy.

Anomalies Calculations

The Employer conveyed to the Association that it has decided to eliminate the possibility of decanal discretion to award anomaly adjustments to faculty whose salaries are lower than but are closer to the regression line than a standard deviation of 0.5. The Association previously expressed concern about the exercising of such discretion in recent anomalies exercises, which it considered to be at variance with the past administration of the anomalies exercise.

New Bus Locations and Accessibility

The Employer mentioned that there were no updates.

Home Internet

The Employer reported that a decision has not yet been made about whether home internet use would be allowed as an eligible expense through PER.

Third Party Provider for Faculty and Staff Email

The Association inquired whether there was any information to report on an initiative that P. Lynch mentioned she is planning in regard to on-line confidentiality and security. The Employer indicated that it would follow up with P. Lynch.

The Association further inquired about the timelines for the project and support and training for faculty members in the transition to the new server.

Provostial Search

The Association requested information and the Employer provided an update on the search for a new Vice-President Academic and Provost. The Employer communicated that the search committee would consist of the following representative positions:

President, an Associate Vice-President, Senior Executive Officer, Provost's Office, Dean, graduate and undergraduate student, 6 faculty members and a librarian/archivist.

The Association inquired how faculty members would be selected and the Employer identified that the University President would seek recommendations for appointments from Deans. The Employer identified that a search firm had been contracted and indicated that more information would be communicated when the membership on the committee is confirmed.

The Employer advised that the committee is expected to begin its work in September and a recommendation from the committee is anticipated in March, 2018. The Employer also

indicated the University President will look to advise the committee about input and consultation and that the committee's consultation process would be decided through the committee. The Association inquired whether there would be public recommendations and the Employer indicated that the intent was to proceed with a closed search.

Computer Renewal Program at Glendon

The Employer confirmed that the issues raised by the Association in regard to computer support for a new faculty member at Glendon were particular to that case and do not reflect a change in the Glendon Computer Renewal Program. The Employer indicated that according to the Principal, the terms of the Program in regard to the level of support for a computer remain the same, though the Principal is considering a change with respect to the frequency of computer replacement but the program itself would not change.

YUFA Consultations with Candidates for Full-Time Faculty Appointments

The Employer initiated the discussion, expressing a desire to share with the Association concerns it had over recent negotiations between the Deans and faculty candidates. The Employer identified that Deans are mindful regarding salary structure and that the University has an interest in avoiding salary compression and maintaining pay equity. The concern centred on cases in which, in the Employer's view, candidates appeared to have an unrealistic expectation about the starting salary and/or other aspects of compensation. The Employer inquired about consultations between candidates and the Association regarding the candidates' negotiations with the Dean, indicating that it is in no one's interest for candidates to have unrealistic expectations of what they might be able to negotiate. The Association indicated that they have no interest in creating unrealistic expectations. The Association raised a concern about the number of members whose salaries were found to be anomalous in their second year of employment, raising concerns about the rate of starting salaries.