

YUFA Response to New Campus Consultation Process

27 April 2015

Employer's Consultation Summary

Several meetings were held once the RFP had been circulated between the Provost's Office and Deans who expressed an interest in participating.

These included Environmental Studies (FES), Faculty of Science (FS), Health, Lassonde (FE), Liberal Arts and Professional Studies (LAPS), Education (ED), Arts, Media, Performance and Design (AMPD).

By the time the proposal was submitted, FE and Health were not responsible for any of the specific programs identified in the proposal, though both maintain a strong interest in having a presence at a York Region campus. Health was about to embark on a new 5 year plan and maintained a 'placeholder' position in the proposal.

FES: Took item to all-faculty meeting May 8, general orientation to process for identifying a location, etc, and signaled that 2 dual York Seneca credential programs and a Geomatics certificate as potential contributions. Further discussion with UPD revealed Urban ecologies Certificate as a possibility. Discussion emphasized that concrete plans would pass through discussion and normal governance processes if proposal is approved for funding.

LAPS: Dean's Office identified existing programs that met criteria (BAS and BHRM) and had discussions with academic leadership in those schools. The possibility of some kind of "Socio-Legal Studies" program area was discussed with Chair of Social Science, in which CRIM and LASO are housed. The potential for ESL offerings led to discussion with ESL co-ordinator.

Follow up meetings with these schools as well as IT (with Lassonde and AMPD) were hosted by the Provost after the proposal was finalized with very general program areas identified. Further follow up to latter and follow-up with those involved in what might develop into "Socio-Legal" are on hold as we approach the time for a decision. More generally, Chairs, Directors and Masters were informed of the developing proposal at September meeting in 2014. Emphasis on need to consult and follow governance procedures should new campus be approved was always emphasized.

ED: Normal procedures about offering programs at off campus locations are administrative and would be discussed at Faculty Council and the Curriculum Committee if the proposal is approved.

FS: Presentation to the Chairs in the Spring as part of planning discussion, but also discussed in Biology Department meetings. General consensus that Science needs to have a presence if there is to be a new campus. Awaiting confirmation that there was also a Faculty Council discussion.

AMPD: Programs identified by AMPD have been in discussion in any case and flowed to discussion about new campus possibility.

YUFA Response

Timeliness

The Employer sent YUFA the Consultation Summary (henceforth 'Summary') on 10 April 2015; YUFA had requested this consultation information at several meetings of the JCOAA and co-chairs over the last few months (reaching back to September 2014).

The Summary provides no timelines for the consultations undertaken by the Employer, but these must have happened before the new campus submission to government. Such a timeline indicates that consultations with Faculties and Deans happened *before* consultation with LRP/JCOAA, which is contrary to YUFA's expectations about consultative procedures. That is, consultations are supposed to come to JCOAA at the earliest opportunity, which evidently did not happen in this case. It is unacceptable that YUFA has to repeatedly request information from the Employer that should have been provided at the start of the new campus submission.

If relevant (i.e. the new campus is approved), future discussions of course offerings, faculty responsibilities, logistics, etc. relating to the new campus must be brought to the LRP/JCOAA at the *earliest* opportunity; this should not be an afterthought. These are issues that fall within the remit of LRP as outlined in Article 7.05 of the Collective Agreement.

Good faith

It is unacceptable that Deans, in this consultation process, acted as gatekeepers to faculty consultation, undertaking consultation as they and their offices saw fit. It is clear in some cases that Deans did not undertake forms of consultation that support collegial governance; for example, bringing proposals to or consulting with Faculty Councils (and then Senate). YUFA does not countenance, now or in the future, the idea that Deans can and should act as gatekeepers to faculty views; this is particularly important with the advent of broader administrative changes (e.g. SHARP).

Consultation has to be undertaken with all Faculties through transparent collegial governance processes (e.g. Faculty Councils), and faculty members must be able to decide on these issues. YUFA insists that the Employer and Deans take their responsibility to support collegial governance seriously in the future by requiring Chairs and Unit Administrators to consult actively with their faculty complement, before reporting back to Faculty Council (and Senate).

Meaningful

The Summary indicates that contributions were received from 'interested' Deans and not actively sought from all Faculties. It is not clear whether a Dean's lack of interest was the end of the consultation

process for that Faculty in question (e.g. Glendon, Schulich, Graduate Studies, Libraries). This implies that faculty members in some Faculties had no opportunity to respond to the consultation, and may not even have known about it. Moreover, it implies that there was limited consideration given to the library and information support needed for the proposed programs. From discussions in JCOAA, the Employer has indicated that the inclusion of specific courses in the new campus submission was “aspirational” rather than a firm commitment. YUFA insists that any commitments made by Deans cannot be construed as agreement by faculty members, units or YUFA to offering those courses included in the submission.

The Summary provided to YUFA is largely inadequate as presented. It provides a description of Deans and Faculties approached by the Provost’s Office, but no details about the content of those meetings or their outcomes/impacts.

Kean Birch, LRP Co-Chair