

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE
ADMINISTRATION OF THE AGREEMENT
(JCOAA)

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD

October 2, 2017

390 York Lanes

2:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Association: Robert Tordoff (Co-Chair), Richard Wellen, Alidad Amirfazli, Sheila Embleton, Sonja Killoran-McKibbin

Employer: Leanne De Filippis (Co-Chair), Norma Sue Fisher-Stitt, Noura Shaw

Chair: Leanne De Filippis

Canada 150 Chairs

The parties have entered into a Memorandum of Agreement concerning the Canada 150 Research Chairs Program and this item is now resolved.

Teaching Load Document

The Employer considers the Chemistry teaching load document to be an information item for the JCOAA committee, as per Article 18.08.1; because the document was drafted by the colleagues in the department and submitted to the Dean for approval.

The Association indicated that it believes that Article 18.09 is the relevant clause in this scenario, and as a result, the document needs to be approved by the JCOAA committee. The Employer noted its view that Article 18.09 would not apply because the document was drafted by way of a collegial process and was not initiated by the Dean's office. The Employer referred to the memo from the Dean dated August 31, 2017 which makes reference to the collegial process and that the document is consistent with current practice. In addition to this, the minutes of the departmental meeting also state that the colleagues approved the document and it was following this vote that the document was sent to the Dean for his approval.

The Association indicated that it disagrees with the Employer's interpretation of the collective agreement. The Association stated that it is of the view that it is not the case that the document is simply documenting current practice. The Association mentioned

that the unit had a teaching load document on file from 1999/2000 and that it is of the view that this is the only relevant teaching load document. The new document indicates a teaching load of 2.5 FCEs whereas the previous document states that the teaching load is an average of 1.5 FCEs. The current document offers the possibility of a 1.0 release for research active faculty members but the March 15 teaching load reports for the unit show no evidence of the 1.0 release. The Association is also of the view that credits for project supervision, tutorial credit and credit for laboratory components have been reduced. It is possible that the load of some members may change under the proposed document, which the Association suggests is not merely codifying existing practice.

It was also asserted that there was “heavy editing” by the Dean’s office and by the Department of Faculty Relations, who came back with “harsher” terms. The Employer stated that it is the first time that this information has been presented and that it would follow up on this. The Employer also noted that barring any new information, it remains of the view that the colleagues drafted the agreement and that it was approved by the Dean’s office. The Employer also reiterated the fact that both the Dean’s memo and the minutes of the department meeting document that this is the case.

The Association also stated its position that the department had two (2) votes with regards to the approval of the new document. According to the Association, the first vote was a closed vote and the document was not approved. The second vote was an open one and it was at that time that the document was approved by the unit.

The Employer reiterated that it will look into the new information provided by the Association and would follow up at the next meeting. The Association sought confirmation that the new teaching load would not be in force until it was approved by JCOAA. The Employer indicated that would be the case until the discussions at JCOAA had concluded.

Accommodations

The Association stated that it has two (2) principal concerns with the accommodation process. First, it has requested a copy of any relevant policies regarding marker/grader support for graduate level courses. The Association indicated that in the absence of such policy, it considers the Employer’s position of not providing marker/grader support for graduate level courses to be a change in practice. The second concern is regarding the funding of accommodations. The Association asserted that budgetary concerns have been raised at accommodation meetings and it also noted the existing Senate policy and procedure with regards to accommodations, which references that costs above \$500 will be borne centrally. The Association requested confirmation that this remained the relevant policy and that there had been no change in practice with respect to paying the costs associated with accommodations.

The Employer stated that it recognizes its duty under the Ontario Human Rights Code (OHRC) to accommodate employees who have restrictions and limitations up to the

point of undue hardship, provided that the Employee can perform the essential duties of the job. It recognized that it is the Employer writ large that has the duty to accommodate rather than an individual faculty or department. The Collective Agreement and relevant Senate policy also reflect this consideration. The Employer stated that the OHRC and the Commission characterize an accommodation as a shared responsibility.

Accommodations are assessed on an individual basis and there are usually multiple ways of accommodating restrictions and limitations. The Employer indicated its view that, in the case of marker/grader support for graduate courses, the issue at hand is one of academic integrity and that such support would mediate the relationship between students and faculty members. The Association noted that marker/grader support has been provided in other graduate courses and that it need not mediate the interaction between students and faculty members but instead allow a faculty member to evaluate students.

The Employer indicated that there are guidelines in the Faculty of Graduate Studies (FGS) on how faculty qualify to teach graduate level courses. The Association requested any guidelines that would impact or limit the use of marker/grader support in graduate courses.

JCAA

The Employer informed the Association that R. Haché, Vice President, Research & Innovation will be attending the next LRP meeting to discuss CRC requirements.

The enhanced Affirmative Action training will include unconscious bias training. There were very tight timelines put in place by the steering committee of the CRC program. The Employer indicated that further documentation and information would be forthcoming.

The Association noted seeing a reminder email from the Employer urging participation in the self-id surveys and indicated that it is in everyone's best interest to have a high response rate. The Employer noted that this is a shared interest and that it believes that a memo will be issued by the JCAA committee to encourage a higher response rate.

Provostial Search

The Association stated that it heard that there is a consultation being held for the provostial search and stated that YUFA did not have this brought to its attention. It also noted that a survey was sent out electronically to the community that they had no prior knowledge of.

