

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE
ADMINISTRATION OF THE AGREEMENT
(JCOAA)

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD
November 8, 2013.

390 York Lanes

Association: John Amanatides, Brenda Spotton Visano (Co-Chair), Leslie Sanders, Frances Latchford, Heidi Bishop, Andrea Harrington

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

Chair: Barry Miller

Regrets: Hyacinth James, Harvey Skinner, Sheila Embleton

Minutes

The Minutes of October 4, 2013 were approved.

JCOAA

**Integrated E-Learning Strategy – Incentives for faculty to develop e-learning courses
(Associate Vice President Teaching and Learning Susan Vail attending)**

As context, S. Vail briefly reviewed the high level recommendations of the E-Learning Work Group set out in a discussion paper provided to the Deans and Provost. S. Vail provided a handout ahead of the meeting (*E-Learning Integration at York: Progress against Recommendations*) that summarized the recommendations. At the Association's request, the Employer committed to providing the Faculty Association the most recent versions of the E-Learning documents developed by the Work Group.

The handout provided by S. Vail included the details of an incentive initiative to encourage faculty to develop e-learning courses. This incentive initiative falls under the 4th recommendation from the Work Group—elevating the culture of teaching and learning through e-learning.

A core element of the incentive initiative is an E-Learning Curricular Innovation Grant; faculty who participate in the program are eligible to receive a grant, consisting of a specified amount money provided through a generic research grant that will be subject to the standard reimbursement policies governing eligibility of expenses. The Association asked what the grant is intended for, and the Employer indicated that it was left to the discretion of grant recipients (subject to expense eligibility criteria).

B. Spotton Visano noted that this program was not raised in negotiations. The Employer indicated that there are precedents for making funds available for research/professional development expenditures and that this program is responding to a specific context and is not necessarily intended to be an on-going program.

The discussion turned to more general issues relating to E-Learning and the University's objective of expanding E-Learning. An Association representative expressed a concern about the lack of options in regard to E-Learning platforms, and a more general question was raised about what the University's overall E-Learning Strategy was. The Employer noted that the intent is to explore how best use can be made of E-Learning, with much remaining to be decided at local levels. The Employer also indicated that it would give consideration to whether there is sufficient clarity in its presentation of the University's E-Learning Strategy and supporting rationale.

B. Spotton Visano

The Association identified as a possible area of concern intellectual property ownership and it was agreed that attention will have to be given to this issue.

The Committee thanked S. Vail for her presentation and participation in the discussion.

Draft Employer Welcoming Statement

The Employer forwarded to the Association ahead of the meeting a proposed revision of the current Affirmative Action statement in ads for full-time appointments that includes a statement of the University's commitment to diversity, "including gender and sexual diversity."

The Association members of the Committee indicated that they would consult on the Employer's proposed revision to the current Affirmative Action statement. The Association indicated that it will consider the proposed language in terms of whether it fully includes those individuals it is intended to include, and the Association also indicated that there may be a concern that the proposed language does not explicitly identify each of the four Affirmative Action Categories.

In response to the Employer's stated objective of avoiding any confounding between the inclusion of a statement of commitment to gender and sexual diversity in the welcoming statement and the Affirmative Action Program, the Association raised the question of why the Employer was disinclined to expand the Affirmative Action Program to include gender/sexuality. The Employer responded that it has remained unpersuaded that such an expansion of the Program is merited/needed.

The Employer indicated that looks forward to the Association's response.

New Budget Model (SHARP)

A. Pitt provided an update on the SHARP project. She reported that a full round of consultations with the Deans, Principal and University Librarian has been completed, with a deadline of 8 November for comments from the Deans/Principal/University Librarian. Meetings were also underway with University administrative offices and departments to provide an update on the project and the new budget model was scheduled to be brought back for discussion with the Deans at a December Deans' meeting.

Academic and Administrative Program Review (AAPR)

A draft template for the information gathering exercise was provided to the Association in advance of the meeting and was posted on the University Website.

The Association indicated that the draft template was not acceptable and has the look of coming directly from B. Dickeson's book. The Association further expressed the view that the template does not map back to the Academic Plan and is all about efficiencies. The Association also indicated that

although the template was described as a draft, it had the appearance of a final document and suggested a top-down process with little opportunity for input from the community.

A. Pitt noted that the kinds of questions included in the template are also asked in cyclical program reviews in one form or another. D. Hastie indicated that he was struck by the fact that only two items deal specifically with costs and represent 20% of the point weighting in the template.

The Association noted that different programs will have very different views with respect to various of the questions and that the Dickeson model significantly narrows the scope of the values by which programs may be assessed.

A. Pitt commented that many universities have attempted to develop their own templates/criteria and have ended up with criteria very similar to those proposed by Dickeson.

Other Business

The Association indicated that the taskforce set out in Article 7.09 will be raised as an agenda item at the December meeting of JCOAA.

The Meeting was adjourned.