

**JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE
ADMINISTRATION OF THE AGREEMENT
(JCOAA)**

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD

September 26, 2014

390 York Lanes

1:00-3:00 p.m.

Association: Andrea Harrington, Sheila Embleton, Miriam Smith (co-Chair), Alidad Amirfazli, Frances Latchford

Employer: Barry Miller (co-Chair), Alice Pitt, Harvey Skinner, John Belton

Chair: Miriam Smith

Regrets: Kean Birch

Guests: Simone Bohn, Diane Woody from the Course Evaluation Sub-Committee

Minutes

Review and acceptance of Agenda

Review of June 9, 2014 Minutes:

Regarding AODA on page 2 of the June 9, 2014 Minutes, the Association noted that it had raised a question about “what supports would be made available” and asked that this question be included in the Minutes. The minutes were approved subject to this amendment.

JCOAA

Course Evaluation Committee (Diane Woody and Simone Bohn attended from the Course Evaluation Committee)

The Association questioned whether the Committee had taken into account race and gender when developing the common set of questions. D. Woody noted that the perspective of the literature was that taking student race and gender into account was not necessary and further indicated that students reacted negatively to questions regarding race and gender. The Association queried whether instructor race and gender was taken into account, and D. Woody and A. Simone indicated that the focus of the questionnaire was on course organization and structure and not on issues related to the instructors themselves. A. Pitt, who also served on the Course Evaluation Committee, indicated that such considerations are important in discussions of the way in which course evaluation results are used.

The Association asked whether attention was given to having culturally and racially diverse instructors in the selection of the courses used to test the survey. S. Bohn indicated the courses were selected on the basis of format; the principal aim of the exercise was to confirm whether the evaluation questions worked well across all course formats, as the intent is to use the common set of course evaluation questions across the University. S. Bohn further commented that care will need to be given in the implementation of the course evaluation questions. The Association thanked the sub-committee for the work done to-date.

Copyright Compliance

The Employer indicated that it was not expecting the Association to respond to the written notice provided earlier in the week at the September meeting. The Association indicated that it would be consulting with members but had several preliminary questions. The first was whether the intent was for the drop-down “copyright “menu to be implemented only in the case of Moodle courses or whether the intent was to implement the drop down menu across all course management systems used at the University. The Association indicated that the intended scope of implementation was not clear from the reference in the written notice to “Moodle/on-line courses.”

The Association asked for clarification of an indication in the drop-down menu that posted information would be reviewed by copyright support staff. The Association noted that the drop-down menu tool was described as an alternative to a copyright compliance regime in which posted materials were reviewed on a regular basis and asked for clarification in view of this earlier description by the Employer.

A question was also asked about how materials posted prior to the implementation of the drop down menu will be dealt with.

The Association suggested that the implementation of the drop down menu might deter faculty from using course management systems and expressed a concern that faculty in need of guidance may have difficulty reaching the copyright officer or support staff in view of the volume of queries they receive.

The Employer indicated that it would follow up on the Association’s questions.

Concur

The Association reiterated a list of general concerns regarding the implementation and use of Concur that it had raised earlier at a meeting of the Co-Chairs. In particular, the Association reiterated that a communication should be provided to faculty reinforcing that use of Concur is optional and identifying who Concur approvers are depending on the type of fund against which expenses are being claimed (e.g., PER vs. Tri-Council). The Association also raised a concern that paper expense claims not be processed in a less timely fashion as a result of being given lower priority than claims processed through Concur and noted again its concern about the routing of claim approvals, by which claims are first approved by Finance prior to academic approval. The Association further reiterated its concern that Concur stores its information on servers in the United States and raised a concern about workload

concerns relating to the need of faculty to learn to use the system and the need to submit paper copies of receipts as well as digital copies.

The Employer noted that Finance is working on a communication that details the appropriate routing of claims and conveys that the use of Concur is optional. The Employer also confirmed that there is no provision to use other than the United States- based servers associated with Concur and noted that that the submission of paper as well as digital copies of receipts is required for audit/CRA purposes. The Employer also indicated that according to Finance, there was a prioritization of Department resources around the initial implementation of Concur but that there is no intent to treat paper-based expense claims with lower priority or in a less timely way.

The Employer indicated that it remains committed to ongoing discussion/updates on Concur.

Graduate Admissions

B. Miller reported on a discussion he had with the Associate Dean who has worked most closely with the new FGS graduate program application process. The Associate Dean indicated that three areas of concern emerged from the first use of the new process in 2013-14; these included the need for training of program staff, the workload involved in having to access several “levels” of information in the system, and accessibility of the applications to graduate students serving on the admission committees.

Based on follow up “de-briefing” sessions after the conclusion of the admission process, steps were put in place to address these areas of concerns. Steps have been provided to provide the necessary training, the system itself has been modified to enable to access information at a single location (“with a single click”) and FGS will undertake to provide hard copies of the applications to graduate student members of the admission committees. To avoid any delay in activation of accounts in the system, activation of accounts for use by faculty began in August. FGS will also be following up directly with a Program which has raised a specific set of concerns relating to the new application process.

Inclusivity and Diversity

B. Miller indicated that the Employer will be proceeding to add an LGBTQ question to the self-identification survey and will share the revised survey with the Association before implementing it through JCOAA. The Association asked whether the Employer had a timeline for moving forward on other possible initiatives relating to the recommendations of the Inclusivity and Diversity Survey Report, and the Employer indicated that it may be in a position to identify another initiative at the November meeting.

LRP

New Budgeting Model (SHARP)

A. Pitt reported that an analysis of the 2011/12 and 2012/13 “raw numbers” is underway to ensure that the drivers of the new model are correct. A. Pitt further indicated that she believes that a report on the new budget model should be available by November 1st.

The Association asked for a copy of the September 25, 2014 Senate Presentation; the Employer will provide a copy of the presentation to the Association before the next meeting.

Academic and Administrative Program Review

The Employer advised that a date was announced at the September meeting of Senate for community forum to discuss the Task Force Reports (November 13, 2014). The Association requested that any documents prepared for the forums should be forwarded to them.

The Association read the following statement concerning AAPR:

The Association reserves all rights under the Collective Agreement with regard to the implementation of any recommendations that may emerge from the AAPR exercise, particularly but not exclusively those pertaining to University governance, existing practices, workload, reassignments or transfers, restructuring and redeployment, and layoffs. Any proposals for significant academic restructuring of Faculties, units, programs, and the use of redeployments must be referred to the Joint Subcommittee on long Range Planning. Any decisions regarding restructuring must follow timely, meaningful, and good faith collegial consultation with members and with the relevant academic bodies, including the Senate.

eLearning

The Employer updated the Association indicating that Associate Vice President Sue Vail is having licensing options drafted. The options are modeled on Creative Commons licensing agreement options. The Employer will review the drafted options with the Association through JCOAA for possible collective agreement concerns prior to their implementation. The Employer distributed a document outlining a list of “possible Creative Commons licenses” for illustration.

The Association read the following statement concerning online courses:

The Association's position is that the use of externally sourced courses through the Ontario Online Centre of Excellence must not weaken academic and collegial oversight of the curriculum. The primary responsibility for determining policies around technologically mediated education must be exercised by faculty members, Senate, departments and schools, and the normal curriculum bodies of the university. The use of externally sourced instruction should not diminish the availability to students of qualified instructors working within the university's academic programs. York University's participation in Ontario Online must respect the provisions of the Collective Agreement, including but not limited to the provisions concerning academic freedom, professional responsibilities, workload, intellectual property, and employment of non-members of the bargaining unit.

The academic freedom and intellectual property rights of YUFA members who develop materials for online courses offered through the Ontario Online Centre of Excellence or York University's elearning

initiatives must be respected. In particular, copyright in materials developed for online courses is retained by the member and the materials may not be published, licensed, or released in any way, or amended, edited, cut, or in any way altered, without the written consent of the employee(s) holding the copyright. Notwithstanding the placement of materials in an online repository, materials can therefore not be used without attributing authorship and cannot be delivered, revised, distributed, exploited, or used in any way without the copyright holder's express written consent to that particular use. In particular, the online offering of a course must remain contingent on the availability of the author of the course material. If the Employer wishes to offer a course and the author who owns the copyright in the material is not available, another member of the academic staff must develop and teach the course and can use materials in the online repository to do so only with the express written permission of the copyright holder.

New Campus

The Association raised concerns about a September 25, 2014 AAPR Technical Sub-Committee report that mentions "innovative and unique programs" that will allegedly be made available at the new campus. The Association expressed that it has no knowledge of any such programs nor knowledge of how these programs were developed. The Association asked whether it could be provided with a copy of the University's submission, noting that it was the Association's understanding that the Government would be making submissions publically available within 30 days of the submission deadline. The Employer indicated that it would follow up on the Association's request.

The Association raised the more general concern that appropriate consultations be undertaken in the planning of the new campus and that it was reserving its collective agreement rights in respect of the University's submission to the Government.

Other Business

Student Accommodations

The Association expressed as a general principle its desire that there be opportunities to develop collaborative solutions to student accommodation needs that take into account both the accommodation needs themselves and considerations relating to the course and the instructor. The Association raised the specific issue of tape recording lectures and suggested that protocols should be developed for such accommodations, including the creation of a revised waiver setting out the terms and limitations for the recording lectures. The Employer indicated that it would follow up with the appropriate offices.

Continuing Education

The Association expressed concern about the notice of motion brought to the September meeting of Senate proposing to move Continuing Education to the Provost's Office. The Association was specifically concerned about what academic oversight would be in place following the move, noting that academic oversight has been provided by a subcommittee of the LA&PS Academic Policy and Planning Committee. The Association noted that the issue of academic oversight is particularly salient in view of the suggested plan to broaden the scope of Continuing Studies set out in the notice of motion's preamble. The Association also noted that it reserves its rights under the collective agreement to raise issues in the future.