

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE  
ADMINISTRATION OF THE AGREEMENT  
(JCOAA)

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD

APRIL 4, 2014

390 York Lanes

1:30 – 3:30 p.m.

Association: John Amanatides, Brenda Spotton Visano (co-Chair), Leslie Sanders, Francis Latchford, Andrea Harrington, Sheila Embleton

Employer: Barry Miller (Co-Chair), Don Hastie, Alice Pitt, Harvey Skinner,

Chair: B. Miller

***Minutes***

Minutes of meeting of March 7 were approved.

**Appendix “P”**

**Update on proposed classification of director, Neuroimaging Laboratory**

The Association indicated that based on consultation with the member, a review of the responsibilities of the position set out in the Dean’s memo provided to JCOAA and consideration of comparable positions at other Universities, it proposes that the position be classified as Category 6. In addition the Association proposes that the member be retroactively awarded a one-time only 1.0 FCE release to recognise the heavy workload in setting up the facility. The Employer will consider the proposal and will respond.

**Copyright Compliance Update**

The Employer indicated that work required to implementing the declaration boxes was not yet complete. Written notification of the implementation will be provided once the timing of the implementation has been clarified. It was also confirmed that the “time-clock” will start once written notification has been issued.

**AODA**

As a follow-up to the Association’s raising of the item at the previous meeting of JCOAA, the Employer noted that the issue of communications and faculty support relating to website accessibility under the AODA will be discussed at the next meeting of the AODA Steering Committee. The Employer will update the Association at the next JCOAA meeting.

## **Course Evaluation Subcommittee**

The report of the Course Evaluation Subcommittee pursuant to 7.10 of the YUFA collective agreement was received by JCOAA. The report was introduced by Alice Pitt, who participated on the Subcommittee on behalf of the Employer. A. Pitt noted that the work of the Subcommittee was undertaken with enthusiasm and a high degree of commitment.

Following some questions of clarification relating to aspects of the report and some suggested editorial changes, the Association recommended the addition of an executive summary containing the final version of the questions recommended in the report.

It was agreed that the members of the Subcommittee will be invited to attend the next JCOAA meeting for discussion of the report.

## **Other Business**

### **Joint Committee on Affirmative Action**

F. Latchford advised that the Employer will be receiving a written request for a report from the Affirmative Action Committee under Article 12.22 of the collective agreement. The requested report will, include such information as the annual AA post-audit, a record of yearly meetings, the term and appointment process of the Affirmative Action Officer and the breakdown of teaching release allocation.

### **Academic Advisor (College) proposed name change**

The Association noted that a communication was distributed by the Vanier College Master seeking applications for a new College Life Coordinator prior to any discussion at JCOAA about the position. The employer indicated that the report that went out to faculty was distributed prematurely and that the Employer would be bringing forward notice of the intent to replace the existing title of Academic Advisor with College Life Coordinator. A. Amanatides noted, as a potential concern, that the Academic Advisor title would continue to be used in other Colleges.

### **Next meeting**

Given expected absences at the May JCOAA meeting, the co-chairs will seek to find an alternative date for the May meeting.

## **LRP**

### **Academic and Administrative Program Review Update**

The Vice President and Provost, R. Lenton, provided a brief update for the Committee on the status of AAPR.

R. Lenton advised that the Academic and Administrative Program information Forms (PIFs) have been posted and that the membership of the Task Forces has been established. R. Lenton also advised that data are being loaded into the Supplemental Information forms.

The Association reaffirmed its contention that the Employer can proceed with the pre-population of the Research Information Form with aggregate data based on faculty members' CVs can only with the explicit permission of the individual faculty. The Employer reaffirmed its disagreement with the Association's view.

The Association indicated that its members have expressed concerns about the potential for tensions to occur within units as a result of the units electing to populate the Research Information Form with aggregate data themselves.

R. Lenton clarified that there was no expectation that Chairs would review colleagues' CVs; rather, it was anticipated that the Chairs would solicit the numerical information from colleagues and populate the Research Information Form on the basis of the information provided.

The Association inquired about how the "two year" period for the aggregate research data (July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2013) would be administered, noting that many publications may indicate only the year of publication. R. Lenton indicated that the approach will be to err on the "inclusive" side, i.e., to allow inclusion of publications in the year in question without concern about whether the publication date fell specifically within the July 1 to June 30<sup>th</sup> period.

The discussion touched on a comparison between the AAPR and cyclic program reviews. The Association indicated that the AAPR is giving rise to greater anxiety because the AAPR could result in program closures whereas cyclic program reviews are based on established criteria and do not give rise to such an outcome.

R. Lenton noted that a critical component of the AAPR is the opportunity it provides for qualitative input; an alternative approach could have been taken based strictly on quantitative data.

### **Strategic Mandate Agreements Update**

The Provost updated the committee on the SMA, indicating that she believed that agreement has been reached with the Ministry on a final version of the SMA. The Special Advisor supports the final iteration, which has now gone to the Deputy Minister. The Agreement will then come back to the University for the President to sign.

R. Lenton highlighted that the SMA is a negotiated agreement and that the process of reaching agreement on the SMA has not been without frustration.

R. Lenton indicated that efforts were made to best capture the priorities and objectives in the University Academic Plan and related University documents. R. Lenton noted that while our graduate enrolment targets have been lowered under the SMA, there remains room for graduate enrolment growth within the revised targets. The University attempted to negotiate additional space for PhD students but the Ministry did not agree. R. Lenton noted that the SMA is for a three year period only.

The final agreement will be posted on the Provost's website, and a copy will be provided to the Association.

### **New Campus**

R. Lenton advised that the call for notices of intent has been issued by the Province and that the development of a new campus has been included in the SMA as an aspiration of the University. The obvious area for a York campus is in York Region and the President is committed to having a transparent process providing the opportunity for interested York Region municipalities to submit proposals.

The Association expressed concern that the President has indicated that a 'curriculum committee' has been established for a new campus without any discussion at JCOAA and noted the fact that there have been previous circumstances in which concerns were raised about the timeliness of opportunities for consultation over planning items. R. Lenton indicated that the timelines around the Government's program are challenging but reinforced that any issues with potential labour-relations implications will be brought forward to Long Range Planning in a timely manner.

The Association indicated that the universities were aware of the possibility of a Government program to develop new campuses over two years ago and queried why there have not been discussions earlier. R. Lenton responded that it was believed that the program had "died." The parties agreed that the New Campus will remain a standing LRP agenda item.

R. Lenton pointed out that the intent is for the new campus to have selected programs based in part on the interests of the Region and not to be a "mini university." As an example, R. Lenton noted that Markham is keen to have administrative studies at a York Region campus. More generally, interest has been expressed in applied, "jobs-ready" programs. Other possible programs include York-Seneca programs and foundational liberal arts programs.

The Association identified, as potential questions, whether a more applied "jobs-ready" focus represents a distinct vision from that of the University Academic Plan and whether the campus would be an "alternate stream" campus.

The Association asked who is on the curriculum committee. R. Lenton indicated that the referenced committee is chaired by A. Pitt and at present consists of deans or delegates from 6 Faculties. The committee will draw on the work of a Seneca-York steering committee, which has been working over the past 18 months on initiatives in areas of mutual interest.

It was agreed that in advance of each JCOAA/LPR Committee meeting items will be identified for discussion through the co-chairs.

### **Budget Model Update**

The Provost updated the committee on the status of the new budget model. The model has been signed off in principle by the Deans. The model including the shadow budget is now with the President for final approval. The President has requested a transition plan that keeps the Faculties whole over a

defined transition period. Once the Plan has been approved and a transition plan developed, the model with the actual budget figures and the transition plan will be shared with the Deans.

### **E-Learning Update**

B. Miller updated the committee on the e-learning innovation grant. 7 Faculties have participated in the program and some 20 applications have been received as of mid-week.

The Association raised a concern over whether the innovation grant meets CRA criteria. The Employer indicated that it would follow up on the question of CRA compliance.

Concern was also raised about whether there was sufficient clarity between the University's internal e-learning incentive program and the call for participation in the Province's On-line institute. In particular, the Association queried whether there was sufficient clarity for participating faculty as to which of the two programs they were participating in.

In order to better understand potential IP implications under the collective agreement of the requirement to place course materials in a repository, the Association requested copies of the agreements/contracts faculty were entering into under the two programs.