

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE  
ADMINISTRATION OF THE AGREEMENT  
(JCOAA)

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD  
October 4, 2013.

390 York Lanes

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

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

Chair: Barry Miller

Regrets: Hyacinth James

---

**Minutes**

The Minutes of September 13, 2013 were approved with minor amendments

**Business Arising**

- *Welcoming statement in respect of gender and sexual diversity for inclusion in advertisements for full-time faculty appointments*  
The Employer indicated that it would bring a draft welcoming statement to the November meeting of JCOAA.
- *Call for updated CVs and outside professional activity reports and follow-up reminders*  
B. Miller advised that the distribution of the initial call for updated CVs and outside professional activity reports was imminent and that the stated deadline for submissions is November 1<sup>st</sup>. He noted that reminders were scheduled to be sent November 15<sup>th</sup> and January 1<sup>st</sup> and that an additional reminder advising of the implications of not submitting a CV for the PTR increment would be sent to those who have not submitted their CV by March 15<sup>th</sup> and again to those who have not submitted a CV by May 1<sup>st</sup>. B. Miller also noted that the initial call reminds faculty on sabbatical and paid research leave that they are also required to submit an updated CV and outside professional activity report.

The Association asked whether the employer would share the list of faculty who have not submitted their updated CV as of March 15<sup>th</sup> and May 1<sup>st</sup>. B. Miller will get back to the Association.

- *College restructuring*  
On behalf of the Association caucus L. Sanders expressed the view that the restructuring of Stong and Bethune should be removed from the LRP agenda. B. Miller indicated that he was intending to bring the item back for discussion at the November meeting and would discuss what was intended to be brought forward at the next co-chairs' meeting.

## JCOAA

### AODA Tips for Instructors

The Association asked whether it was the employer's intent to make the AODA Tips for Instructors mandatory. B. Miller confirmed that the Tips were not intended to be mandatory but to be "tips." A. Pitt added that it was the making of the Tips available to all instructors that meets AODA compliance and not strict adherence to the Tips.

The Association expressed concern that the Tips seemed to be oriented toward traditional teaching formats, including a lecture format. A. Pitt noted that a second series of tips has been developed with a focus on specific disabilities and that the Tips will undergo continual revisions.

The Association indicated that it will be important for there to be clarity in the presentation of the Tips that they are not mandatory or required practice.

### Copyright Compliance (Patricia Lynch attending)

A handout was distributed.

Patricia Lynch briefly spoke of the importance of observing the limits on the sharing of copyrighted materials and referred to the material on the Copyright @ York website including Fair Dealing guidelines. She also noted that copyright specialists are available to provide support for faculty in the Copyright Resource Centre located in TEL. For example, specialists in the Centre will assess instructors' materials in regard to the steps required for Fair Dealing compliance.

P. Lynch turned to the issue of the mechanisms that need to be in place ensure as much as possible that instructors comply with the Fair Dealing guidelines. She noted that the University is relying on materials developed by AUCC. She referred JCOAA members to item 6 on p. 3 of the handout for a description of the possible approaches to address compliance and identified two practical alternatives:

- (a) Random audits of 3-5% of all materials on learning management system (LMS) sites
- (b) A drop-down box requiring the instructor to attest to copyright compliance

P. Lynch characterized the first option as reactive and the second as proactive or preventative, and expressed preference for the second option. Among other reasons, the second option provides an ongoing education opportunity for instructors through information included in the drop-down box. P. Lynch also noted that any faculty concerned about compliance could seek the assistance of specialists in the Copyright Resource Centre or contact her office.

The Association asked whether random audits would occur if option (b) were selected and P. Lynch indicated that there is no plan to conduct random audits if option (b) is selected.

Further issues raised included the need to timely access to support for faculty with questions about their materials and the need for a resolution process in the event of copyright infringements. P. Lynch noted that support will be available for faculty and that her office, the bookstore and libraries have partnered to make holdings available. She also noted that there will be a period of transition.

B. Spotton Visano indicated that the YUFA caucus will consult and will report back in regard to the two options.

## Appendix P

B. Spotton Visano identified 3 issues that have been raised:

- 1) an apparent discrepancy between reports from members on lost course release following the negotiated changes to Appendix P and the data provided by the employer;
- 2) positions proposed by the employer for categorization (2 or 3);
- 3) proper placement of all academic administrative positions within the Appendix P schedule

B. Spotton Visano indicated that the Association has had a first look at the data provided by the employer and will examine it more closely. As a first observation, she noted that the data appear to confirm that the employer is meeting its Appendix P obligations..

B. Spotton Visano indicated that the Association will be looking closely at the overall allocation of course releases and stipends across Faculties and across departments/schools as a way of considering the appropriate distribution of Appendix P resources. In considering the classification of administrative positions, for example the classification of department chair and director positions, the parties have not systematically factored in the total Appendix P resources in the unit. B. Spotton Visano noted that there appear to be significant variations in the overall distribution of course releases and stipends, at least at the Faculty level.

B. Miller noted that the employer has also had some of its own discussions of this issue.

The Association responded to the employer's proposed classifications for the Research Data Centre (RDC) Director position and the Bridging Coordinator position in the School of Gender, Sexuality and Women Studies.

### RDC Director position

The employer proposed that the position be classified in category 8, which provides a \$4,000 stipend and no course release. The Association indicated that it conferred with the former director of the Institute of Social Research (ISR), who also took on the responsibilities of RDC director, and also looked at the support provided to directors of RDCs at other universities. Based on their review, their initial response is to propose that the position be classified in Category 6, which provides a 0.5 FCE course release in addition to a \$4,000 stipend.

B. Miller indicated that he would consult and would get back.

### Bridging Coordinator position

The Association noted that this position carried a 0.5 FCE release in the past and had no objection to the employer's proposed classification as a category 8 position but indicated that it would like clarification of why the employer did not bring forward a proposed classification for an advisor position as well before giving a final response.

The employer indicated that it will follow up.

At the end of the meeting, B. Spotton Visano returned to the topic of Appendix P and indicated that it is the Association's view that there are legitimate workload concerns among academic administrators in respect of the negotiated changes to the Appendix P course release schedule.

## LRP

### **New Budgeting Model**

The Association indicated that it had no further questions arising from the previous month's presentation or feedback to report from members.

### **Academic and Administrative Prioritization**

The Vice President Academic and Provost's senate presentation was distributed to JCOAA members in advance of the meeting.

B. Miller highlighted the change in the timelines in the Senate presentation, noting that the templates are not scheduled to be distributed until January. Initially, the thought was to distribute the templates to units as early as November.

L. Sanders noted the Vice President Academic and Provost's observation in Senate that as an outcome of the AAP the decision could be made to close a program but to continue offer courses within the discipline/subject area of the program. L. Sanders indicated that in this type of circumstance it would be difficult to recruit scholars in the area and expressed the concern that program closures could work against the University's desire to become more research intensive.

A. Pitt pointed out that there are no foregone conclusions about program closures going into the AAP exercise and that the aim will be to maintain the University's priority on research intensity.

B. Miller further reinforced the role of the taskforces, which is to rank the University's programs according to the evaluation criteria; their role is not to make recommendations about whether or not programs should be closed. Further, the program rankings themselves will not necessarily result in program closures.

The Association further expressed concern about how the AAP will intersect with the Government's differentiation framework and the University's Strategic Mandate Agreement (SMA).

B. Spotton Visano indicated that a major issue is what opportunities there will be for consultations regarding the evaluation template and the process.

The employer noted the Vice President Academic and Provost's remarks in Senate about the importance of having a transparent consultation process.

S. Embleton indicated that it will be important to have equity between academic and non-academic programs. It was noted that some non-academic programs are simply not cuttable.

The employer indicated that it would continue to try to provide information on the AAP in advance of LRP discussions and anticipated discussion of the template at the November meeting.

The Meeting was adjourned.