

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE
ADMINISTRATION OF THE AGREEMENT
(JCOAA)

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD

MARCH 7, 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. Spotton Visano

Minutes

Minutes of meeting of February 7 were approved.

JCOAA

1. Appendix P -- Update on proposed classification of director, Neuroimaging Laboratory

As an update, the association confirmed that it is still consulting.

2. Alternate Stream

- (a) The Employer confirmed that its communicated intent to appoint new alternate stream faculty whose annual teaching load will be 3.5 FCEs specifically applies to those units which have not previously had alternate stream faculty.
- (b) In regard to concerns raised by the Faculty Association about the advertised expectation that the new alternate stream appointment to the Glendon School of Translation will be eligible for appointment to the Graduate Program in Conference Interpreting, the Employer indicated that it does not agree that there is necessarily an incompatibility between the terms and conditions of employment for alternate stream faculty and the appointment of alternate stream faculty to a professional graduate program. In particular, the Employer does not see a necessary incompatibility between the terms and conditions of employment for alternate stream faculty, including regular sabbaticals, and ongoing professional activity and maintenance of credentials as may be required for continuing membership in a professional graduate program.

3. Copyright Compliance Update

The Employer reported that it was intending to provide written notice of the intent to implement a copyright compliance regime as discussed at the February meeting but that details relating to the implementation were not yet complete. The Employer noted that the formal notice period under Article 17 would not begin until formal written notice has been provided.

LRP

4. Budget Model Update

A. Pitt updated the committee on the status of the new budget model. She noted that the Deans have signed off on the principles of the new model and that final approval of the model by the President and Vice Presidents is expected by end of March. A shadow budget for 2012-13 is expected to be completed by end of March, and a final shadow budget for 2013-14 is expected to be completed and approved in early July. A budget projection for 2015-16 is expected in January of 2015. It remains to determine when the transition to the new budget model will occur.

The Accountability Framework has not yet been completed and some details relating to the implementation of the budget model remain outstanding, including details regarding the operation of shared services, cross-subsidization and transition funding.

The Phase 2 Report, including the Accountability Framework, is expected to be released at end of April and information sessions will be held following the release of the Report.

5. Academic and Administrative Program Review Update

A. Pitt also provided an update on the AAPR. A draft Academic Program information Form (APIF), Faculty and staff Complement Supplemental Information Form, and Research Supplemental Information form for Faculties and ORUs were distributed for the meeting. There was discussion of the way in which the Research Supplemental Information Form for Faculties and ORUs would be populated with aggregate data. The Employer indicated its intent to pre-populate the Research Information Form for curricular programs with aggregate information based on the updated CVs submitted to Deans' Offices, noting that this approach was recommended by APPRC and the AAPR Academic Subcommittee. The Employer also indicated that aggregate data would not be provided for units with fewer than 7 members to ensure that no faculty members could be individually identified on the basis of the data.

L. Sanders indicated that it was the Association's position is that pre-populating the Research Form with aggregate data based on the CVs submitted to the Deans' Offices as planned by the Employer contravenes Article 22.07, describing the exercise as "data mining." L. Sanders indicated that in the Association's view, the pre-populating exercise would require the consent of the faculty members whose CVs would be involved. She indicated that the Association could not agree to the exercise because of the precedent it would set.

B. Miller noted that the parties disagree on the interpretation of Article 22.07 and raised the possibility of the parties reaching agreement for the exercise to proceed on a without prejudice basis to address the Association's concern about precedent as a possible way of moving forward.

L. Sanders indicated that the Employer could raise such an approach but that JCOAA could not agree to it at this point.

The Association raised a concern about equity in the AAPR process and outcomes. In particular, a concern was raised that certain small programs with a high concentration of faculty and students who are members of equity-seeking groups might be especially vulnerable and the Association recommended that consideration of equity be included in the coaching of the Taskforce members and in the assessment instructions and criteria. If

possible, it was also recommended that equity also be considered in the selection of the Taskforce members, and it was suggested that consideration of equity be included in PIF author training.

A. Pitt summarized next steps, which include pre-testing of the APIF and debriefing meetings based on the pre-testing, training sessions for PIF author coaches, training sessions for the authors and distribution of the APIF to authors with an intended distribution date no later than March 31st.

6. Strategic Mandate Agreement Update

The Employer provided an update on the current status of the SMA. It was reported that discussions between York University and the Province have taken place and that the Province has requested University-based metrics. A draft SMA will be brought forward for discussion at the March meeting of Senate, and the intent is to make the draft document available to senators 5 days ahead of the meeting. The Employer indicated that it was concerned over the possibility that the Government will “re-base” graduate enrolments based on actual enrolment experience, resulting in a significant decrease in the University’s targets for eligible graduate students over the period of the SMA.

7. New Campus

The Employer reported that the Government has not yet issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) but that an RFP could be expected in the next month with a submission date in the fall.

A. Amanatides asked whether the intent was to have a new 4 year campus or a 2 year campus, with students completing their degree on another campus. The Employer responded that the intent was for the new campus to offer degree programs (and not be a “two year” campus). H. Skinner indicated that one possibility was for the new campus to include professional programs, and A. Pitt indicated that there is an interest for the new campus to offer collaborative York-Seneca programs.

L. Sanders indicated that it will be important to consider possible collective agreement issues of close York-college program collaboration. L. Sanders also indicated that consideration should be given to the offering of day vs. evening classes and access for mature students. B. Miller noted that issues around transfers of faculty will need to be taken up in the event that programs currently taught on the existing campuses are relocated to the new campus.

It was agreed that the new campus should become a standing item on the agenda of Long Range Planning and that it will be important to identify issues early.

The Association raised the question of how universities will be selected to have a new campus and A. Pitt responded that the decisions will be criteria driven.

8. Other Business

(a) The Association drew attention to letters sent by the Dean of the Schulich School of Business to faculty members making reference to a University “mandate” to evaluate faculty. The Association noted that concerns about letters from the Dean to faculty relating to the annual submission of updated CVs was being taken up in another forum.

- (b) The Association indicated that it has received reports from members who have been sent reminders about the need to submit an updated CV though they have already submitted a CV. The Association expressed the view that PTR increments should not be withheld from any faculty unless the accuracy of the information on who has not yet submitted a CV has been confirmed.
- (c) The Association raised a concern about communications to faculty regarding the implementation of the AODA based on a communication that had been sent to faculty regarding website accessibility. In particular, the Association raised a concern about whether sufficient information was being provided to faculty about the AODA and its implications for them and about available supports.

The Employer indicated that it would follow up.