

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE  
ADMINISTRATION OF THE AGREEMENT  
(JCOAA)

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD  
January 25, 2013.

390 York Lanes

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

Employer: Barry Miller (Co-Chair), Alice Pitt, Hyacinth James

Chair: Brenda Spotton Visano

Recording Secretary: Hyacinth James

Regrets: Ida Ferrara, Don Hastie

---

## **JCOAA**

### **Change in Membership of JCOAA**

Barry Miller advised the JCOAA that Dean Martin Singer has stepped down from the Committee and he has been replaced by Dean Harvey Skinner who will attend the next meeting of the JCOAA.

## **PRASE**

### **New Budget Model**

Sarah Cantrell attended to assist Alice Pitt in presenting an update of the university's proposed new budget model.

A. Pitt noted that discussions about the University's budgeting processes have been going on for some time; the issue of the University's approach to budgeting was highlighted in the context of PRASE.

A project under the umbrella of PRASE was initiated with three phases. The first phase consisted of an exploration of various budget models, and a report of the work group's findings was completed in June, 2012. Based on the findings in the phase 1 report, the objective of phase 2 is to develop and consider implications of a new conceptual activity based budgeting model for the University. The acronym applied to the new budgeting model is Shared Accountability and Resource Planning (SHARP).

The principles underpinning the new budgeting model include pre-eminence of academic priorities, transparency, greater predictability, and sustainability. Budget allocations to Faculties will be based on revenue generation, and the Faculties will be accountable for the costs that

they incur. The budgeting model will also include a resource fund to respond to opportunities and a contingency fund. Under the model, oversight will be provided by a Budget Committee.

Four subgroups have been struck, each addressing different aspects of the budgeting model and its implications:

Revenue  
Costs  
Interfaculty  
Ancillary

The work group is expected to issue a report toward the end of March, with recommendations for phase 3. Following the completion of the report, the intent is to develop a shadow budgeting process based on the SHARP model by end of April.

The Faculty Association observed that a critical value of the budgeting model exercise is the opportunity it is providing to consciously reflect on the University's budgeting processes. The Association also observed that the current exercise is not novel in reviewing the University's budgeting processes and noted that the Davey model represents a different way of matching revenue to expenses. It was also noted the proposed timelines for the transition from phase 2 to 3 were ambitious.

A concern was raised about a focus on incentives around efficiencies and what could result in the absence of incentives for items not seen as cost efficient such as small class sizes. A. Pitt noted that the University's budget deficit is driving much of our considerations, and it was agreed the deficit will continue to do so regardless of the particular model adopted.

L. Saunders raised the question of how to avoid siloing under the new model. A. Pitt noted that there are significant disincentives to collaborations as matters stand. S. Cantrell briefly discussed the work of the Interfaculty Subgroup and indicated that much of its focus has been on how to ensure that interdisciplinarity is fostered. S. Cantrell noted that a major consideration is how to ensure that resource allocations align with institutional priorities. She indicated that the work group will be drawing on learnings from other institutions and from previous University administrations.

S. Embleton noted that no budgeting model will be "pure" but will involve bits of various models and subjective decision points.

There was agreement on having discussions concerning the practical impacts of the new budgeting model and a significant update in March/April. A. Pitt also indicated that materials will also be available on the website for the project and that the address of the website will be forwarded to the Association.

It was agreed that this item will be a standing item on the JCOAA agenda.

## **JCOAA**

### **Policies and Procedures Re Full-Time Faculty Teaching**

B. Spotton Visano reported that discussion of the document had taken place at the most recent meeting of the JCOAA co-chairs and that that discussion and the discussion at the full JCOAA are on a without prejudice basis and YUFA reserves the right to consult on the final version of the document. Before proceeding to a discussion of the document she indicated that YUFA has

been advised that discussion has occurred in LA&PS about the intent of the Faculty to increase the annual teaching load of alternate stream faculty to 4.0 FCEs effective in 2013-14.

B. Spotton Visano indicated that the introduction to the document should specify that the collective agreement is privileged. She also noted that to the extent that YUFA understands the intent of the document the use of “normally” in various clauses runs the risk of undermining the transparency and consistency which the document aims to achieve without an understanding of the types of circumstance which would be allowed as exceptional. YUFA hoped to hear commentary on the issues each item is intended to address.

B. Spotton Visano suggested that items 2 (annual teaching load normally not scheduled in one term) and 5 (normally no more than 1.0 FCE in an on-line format included in annual teaching load normally ), to the extent that their intent is to address faculty “presence” on campus, raises the question of what is meant by “reasonable presence” and the nature of faculty work in the context of current technology, including Skype, and the Government’s interest in an on-line institute. The question was also raised about why the changes in practice have been brought forward specifically in regard to LA&PS.

The Employer reiterated that document is not intended circumvent rights under the collective agreement and noted that the collective agreement anticipates the possibility of unit and Faculty level practices.

Further discussion of the document will occur at the co-chairs’ meeting.

### **York Research Chair (YRC) Program and Canada Research Chair (CRC) Program**

Robert Hache, Vice President Research and Innovation, provided a brief overview of the YRC program set out in a document circulated prior to the meeting. He indicated that the program is intended to be part of a suite of tools to assist researchers at York. The YRC program is intended to expand the number of CRC-like research chairs at the University.

The Association identified the four principles of transparency, equality of opportunity, maximum impact and collegiality and expressed the view that the YRC program does not meet the latter two. The Association made reference to recent collective agreement negotiations and the Employer’s arguments over limited resources in the context of the new research release program, expressing disappointment that the Employer was now coming forward with a program which would provide 20 FCEs on a much more limited basis and at a higher cost than the negotiated research release program.

The Association expressed the view that the objective of better supporting and attracting researchers is better achieved through an expansion of the research release program. The Association further indicated that the recent information they received about discussion of a 4 course teaching load for alternate stream faculty in LA&PS creates an additional challenge, as the costing for the research release program in negotiations was based on a 3 course teaching load.

The Association indicated that it objects to the YRC program and asked how the YRC program is better than the research release program.

In response, R. Hache indicated that the YRC program is not better but is another program intended to help retain and attract top researchers. He repeated the objective of developing multiple mechanisms to support researchers. He noted that an effort has been made to keep expenses for the YRC program as modest as possible and that VPRI Division funds will be

used to support the basic cost of the YRCs—the stipend and research funds. He further indicated that he was disappointed to the Association’s desire for a narrower approach to researcher support. He added that it would be a loss to the Institution if this program did not proceed and indicated that the CRC program has benefited the University in attracting and retaining faculty.

B. Miller responded in regard to the Association’s reference to negotiations, indicating that there was clarity in negotiations that research support monies in the Division of VPRI and the Faculties were excluded from the research release program. He reiterated that there is no inconsistency between the introduction of the YRC program and discussions in negotiations and further noted that there were a number of factors informing the negotiations over the research release program. He made reference to the unsuccessful negotiations over the development of a much broader research based teaching load reduction program in Appendix R in the previous collective agreement, noting that there was clarity at the time that the resources which the University was prepared to add to match the monies set aside for the program in the collective agreement would not similarly be available for later negotiations should agreement on the Appendix R framework not be reached.

Discussion turned to the CRC program document which had been distributed to JCOAA members along with the YRC document. The Association asked how this document related to the CRC hiring protocol agreed on in 2001 and indicated that under the intended practice of limiting CRCs to external appointments, York faculty would have to leave the University to receive a CRC. The Association also indicated that nationally, the CRC program has been divisive, and Affirmative Action concerns have also arisen.

R. Hache indicated that concerns about losing York faculty as a result of the CRC program are valid and emphasized the importance of the YRC program in providing an internal counterpart to the CRC program which researchers find attractive.

## **Other Business**

### *Timelines for submission of ORU proposals*

B. Miller indicated that he had followed up on concerns raised through the co-chairs’ meeting and reported that a number of ORU applications were incomplete, most as a result of missing one or more letters of support from associated Faculties, and that deadline extensions have been granted to provide time for the applications to be completed. In regard to the specific case raised by the Association, B. Miller noted that the letter of support from the lead Faculty was outstanding as a result of discussions with the VPRI about what would be required in a letter of support but was expected shortly. R. Hache reported that his Department had just received the letter of support that afternoon.

### *Internal Deadlines for External Grant Applications*

B. Miller reported that according to the Associate Dean of LA&PS, internal deadlines were met as required, and R. Hache similarly reported that according to the Office of Research Services, committed timelines have been met in his Division in the case of all applications.

The Association indicated that there seemed to be discrepancies in what the Employer has reported and what they have been told members and agreed to provide more detail.

## **Minutes**

The minutes of December 7 were approved and the meeting was adjourned.