

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE
ADMINISTRATION OF THE AGREEMENT
(JCOAA)

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD

January 30, 2015

390 York Lanes

1:00-3:00 p.m.

Association: Miriam Smith, Alidad Amirfazli, Frances Latchford, Kean Birch, Richard Wellen, Andrea Harrington, Sheila Embleton

Employer: Barry Miller (Co-Chair), Alice Pitt, Harvey Skinner, Rhonda Lenton, John Belton

Chair: Miriam Smith

Minutes

Review and acceptance of Agenda

Review of November 14, 2014 and December 12, 2014 Minutes

The Association requested that one additional amendment be made to the subject matter under AAPR in the November 14, 2014 minutes; the suggested change will be forwarded to the Employer in advance of the next scheduled meeting.

The December 12, 2014 Minutes were approved.

JCOAA

Pan Am Games

The Employer indicated that it conveyed to the body responsible for security at the Games the importance of minimizing disruption of academic activities in establishing the location of the security cordon. While the location of the security cordon is yet to be finalized, the Employer understands that academic buildings will not be included in the final cordon.

In response to the Association's concerns regarding the impact of the security cordon on staff parking, the Employer indicated that employees with disabilities who are affected will be accommodated in the reassignment of their parking lot.

E-Learning

The Employer reported that a revised version of licensing options for faculty developing on-line courses for inclusion in course repositories is forthcoming.

Concur

The Employer updated the Association on the development of a communication clarifying the approval steps. The employer noted that a new screen format has been introduced to Concur and the draft communication will need to be updated to reflect the new format.

The Association queried whether faculty are required to submit credit card statements to support reimbursement claims on the basis of a case that had been brought to its attention. The Employer indicated that a credit card statement may be submitted as proof of purchase and that in such a circumstance, the expectation is that the credit statement will be redacted to include only the required information. There is no general requirement for submission of (redacted) credit card statements.

Inclusivity and Diversity

The Employer indicated that it is preparing a written response to the Taskforce Report recommendations for JCOAA. The Employer further indicated that it will provide a summary of the Affirmative Action training that is undertaken for hiring committees.

JCAA Report

The Association indicated that the report is accepted and this item can now be removed from the agenda.

Research Release Program

The Employer provided the Association with a package of information regarding the Article 18.15 Research Release Program for each applicable faculty that includes: a copy of the call for applications in the 2014/15 exercise, the number of applications received and a listing of recipients; copies of the application forms; any listed criteria for the acceptance/review and awarding of research release. The Association indicated that it would reserve on this issue pending review of the information provided. The Association raised as possible concerns apparent restrictions on eligibility to apply for a research release relating to the proximity of a sabbatical leave or previous research release to the timing of the newly applied for research release.

AODA

The Association expressed concern over what it has identified as a lack of information readily accessible to its members regarding accommodations for faculty. The Association also raised concerns about potential workload implications of AODA compliance requirements. The Employer indicated that it is presently turning its attention to the development of more accessible information for faculty regarding accommodations.

Leaves and Sabbaticals

This item will be carried over for further discussion at JCOAA Co chairs.

CV Exercise

This item will be carried over for further discussion at JCOAA Co chairs.

LRP

New Budgeting Model (SHARP)

The Association requested an update on the status of the completion of the SHARP model. The Employer indicated that the model may be prepared in time for the February, 2015 meeting. In addition, the Employer confirmed that it welcomes attendance of members of the FISC caucus for review and discussion of the new model. The Association requested any available documentation on the SHARP model (with or without numbers) in advance of the next meeting if possible. The Employer indicated that it would follow up with the Association (either through FISC or directly) on the expected timing of delivery of any documentation to them.

The Association raised a concern about information it received suggesting that Lassonde is currently using the SHARP model for its budget and asked the Employer for clarification on this point. The Employer indicated that SHARP is informing Lassonde's approach to budget planning but that the new SHARP model has not yet been implemented in Lassonde. The Association informed the Employer that it reserves its rights under the collective agreement in respect of any concerns it may have regarding SHARP regardless of how SHARP may be informing Lassonde's budget planning.

ISDD/AAPR

The Association expressed concerns about accounts coming out of LAPS alleging that the Dean has produced a discussion paper in conjunction with Chairs and UPDs that would feed into the ISDD without broader collegial input. The Association stated the position that Faculty Councils have the right to approve academic planning documents and further indicated faculty have the right to receive academic planning documents in a timely way to allow for appropriate unit- and Faculty-level collegial discussion. The Association also commented that there appeared to be a murkiness about what the Faculty response document will be for inclusion in the ISDD. The Association indicated that it believes that it would be a violation of the collective agreement if the Faculty response is not provided to Faculty Council. The Association further indicated that it believes that it would be a violation of academic freedom for colleagues not to have adequate opportunity for discussion of the document.

The Employer advised that it will follow up with the Dean on the disposition of the discussion paper and how it is envisaged to relate to the ISDD. The Employer noted that there are precedents in which framework documents, including the White Paper and LA&PS strategic framework document developed in 2009-10, were not brought to the applicable governing body (Senate and Faculty Council) for approval but for endorsement.

The Association expressed concerns that the processes of developing ISDD responses in other Faculties

may also involve limited opportunity for collegial discussion. H. Skinner described the types of collegial exercises undertaken in the Faculty of Health in the development of a 5 year academic plan for the Faculty and the ISDD response, which draws on the academic plan.

The Association raised concerns regarding what it described as the emerging narrative on the University's fiscal situation, specifically pointing to a recent article in Excalibur describing University's current fiscal situation as a "crisis." The Association expressed the view that the University is not in a financial crisis and is well within its means to cover its financial commitments, even amidst a trend of decreasing enrolments. The Association suggested that care be taken in the choice of descriptors and indicated that the narrative of a fiscal crisis was of particular concern given that negotiations would soon be under way between YUFA and the University.

The Employer responded that there are credible reasons to highlight the importance of closing the gap between revenue and expenses to resolve the structural deficit, and noted that the University's fiscal situation is exacerbated by the decline in student enrollment. The Employer noted that the concerns raised by the Association regarding the University's budget and description of the University's financial situation underscore the importance of FISC as a forum to clarify the University's finances. The Association questioned the validity of the projection of a nearly 50 million deficit occurring in the span of a single budget year. The Employer clarified that the projected deficit reflects the impact of year-over-year deficits combined with the impact of the enrolment decreases over the previous two years. The Employer reinforced its view of the urgency of tackling the budget deficit, noting that years of across-the-board budget cuts have not succeeded in addressing the deficit.

The Association raised a concern about what it sees as "ageist" commentary in the discourse relating to the AAPR and ISDD in references to pending retirements. Specific concern was raised that the issue of pending retirements was framed as a way of "clearing out" senior faculty, conveying a sense among senior faculty of being unwelcome.

Specifically in regard to the ISDD Guidelines Document, concern was raised that insufficient attention is paid to faculty and staff and that the reference to equity and social justice, while welcomed, may not be given sufficient weight to serve as one of the possible "lenses" in Faculty responses and development of the ISDD.

New Campus

The Employer updated the Association on the results of feedback it received from Deans on the consultations that were undertaken in regard to the new campus proposal. The Employer reported that discussions first occurred with the Deans about possible areas of interest for a new campus, with a view to new programs and program areas with a demonstrable unmet need, and that every Dean then had discussions with at least the Chairs of departments offering programs of possible interest. The focus of the exercise was to identify program areas and not to lock in commitments to specific programs. Discussions in AMPD may have been an exception; the Faculty has been developing new programs, and an interest was expressed in offering newly developed programs on the new campus as part of these discussions.

The Association asked about what the discussions with the Chairs "looked like," inquiring specifically whether they were treated as confidential. The Employer indicated that the discussions were likely confidential for the most part, though it noted that in at least one instance a discussion was undertaken

at the department level. The Association confirmed that it was not aware of any conversations occurring at the unit level. The Association asked whether the Government was aware that the proposed programs in the new campus submission were “aspirational” rather than fixed commitments. The Employer indicated that the Government understands that there may be variations in the programs to be offered on the new campus from the University’s submission and further noted that the University could find itself in negotiations with the Government over the programs to be included, as the Government may have preferences that are not necessarily among the programs proposed by the University. The Association requested that a written report be prepared by the Employer on the consultations that were undertaken by Deans.

The Employer indicated that collegial processes for new campus program planning will begin in earnest in the event that York’s proposal for a new campus is approved by the Government. The Association identified as one of the issues to discuss will be the intended basis by which the new campus will be “staffed” with academic employees . The Association specifically raised a concern about whether the Employer would contemplate involuntary redeployment of faculty to the new campus, and the Employer indicated that it does not intend to use obligatory redeployment to meet teaching needs on the new campus. The Employer indicated that it would propose to include planning for the new campus as a standing item for LRP if the new campus is approved and that it is committed to adhering to all relevant collective agreement provisions, including consultations with the Association anticipated in Article 18.