

Joint Committee on the Administration of the Agreement Agenda and Minutes

Meeting Date: October 4, 2017

Location: UH 2 Boardroom

Host/Chair: Association

Recorder: Ashley McKay

Committee Membership:

Chris Goto-Jones, Dean of Humanities

Catherine Krull, Dean of Social Science

Michele Parkin, AVP Faculty Relations and Academic Administration

Judith Anne Clarke, Member-at-Large, UVic Faculty Association (regrets)

Helga Hallgrimsdottir, President, UVic Faculty Association

Patrick von Aderkas, UVic Faculty Association

1. Review and Approval of JCAA Record from last meeting

Record approved with amendments discussed.

2. Discussion of format for Agenda/Minutes

It was agreed to use a rolling agenda format. Items will be removed as they are completed and sections will be lettered to be easily distinguished on the agenda. Using new format starting at Item "I".

3. Progress of follow-up actions from prior meetings

a. Section(s) Discussed: CA27.18: Assignment of duties & responsibilities after consultation
Question:
Item raised by the Association regarding interpretation of "consultation".
Deliberation/Summary of Discussion:
It was agreed that consultation needed to be "meaningful", particularly more than just informing the member of duties and responsibilities. A lunch will be held for Chairs, at which representatives from the Association and Administration will hear from Chairs about "best practices".
Action Item(s):
Administration will ascertain whether there is an opportune lunchtime available in November, working with Chairs and the Association to set a date.
Follow up(s):
It was agreed that the March 28, 2018 date for the regular Chairs and Directors Meeting was appropriate timing to discuss best practices and consultation. FRAA to organize. Item resolved, remove from next agenda.

b. Section(s) Discussed: Annual Planning for JCAA
Question:
Setting of agendas, time frame, recording of minutes.
Deliberation/Summary of Discussion:
Options were discussed.
Action Item(s):
The AVP will organize a recorder from her office to establish the agenda and record the minutes using the template adopted. The agenda will be set one week before the meeting. Hosting will continue to alternate between MWB and UH2.
Follow up(s):
Christina from FRAA (Ashley as backup) will be JCAA support. Item resolved, remove from next agenda.

c. Section(s) Discussed: CA 27.6: Revision of unit's standards
Question:
The Association requested discussion on whether the old standards remain in force until new standards are in place.
Deliberation/Summary of Discussion:
Both sides agreed that the old standards remain in force until new standards are in place.
Action Item(s):
Inform Deans as needed on this interpretation.
Follow up(s):
Item resolved, remove from next agenda.

d. Section(s) Discussed: Workload and evaluation ratios, consistency in interpretations
Question:
The Association raised that there still seems to be misunderstandings regarding evaluating members for merit according to 40:40:20 (or other agreed to ratio) when a member's workload differs from the unit's normal standards (e.g., when a member has a course release for Administrative duties).
Deliberation/Summary of Discussion:
Discussion took place on this matter. The AVP informed the Association that the Administration continues to work on this, including with Deans.
Action Item(s):
It was agreed that a working group would be established consisting of two delegates from each side to consider best practices in evaluation and make recommendations to JCAA. The AVP and Association President would email regarding delegates. The Administration also agreed to raise this issue at the new Chairs orientation.
Follow up(s):
Judith and Helga have agreed to sit on this working group for the Association. The AVP will raise the issue at Deans Council and will report back with a Dean nomination.

e. Section(s) Discussed: CA14: Issues regarding interpretation
Question:
The Administration raised whether there would be merit in taking the article to an arbitrator for interpreting the scope of policies that fall under Article 14 as there are differences on this matter that continue to arise. Specifically, to address agreed upon questions such as “What is the meaning of “terms and conditions of this Agreement” under CA14.6, 14.7, 14.8 and 14.9?” and “What is meaning of “ <i>affect directly</i> the terms and conditions of employment” under CA14.7 and 14.9?”.
Deliberation/Summary of Discussion:
Discussion ensued, including as to whether the current arbitration regarding the Supervision policy from Graduate Studies would assist. The Administration felt that this current arbitration would only address that policy, not more generally.
Action Item(s):
The Association agreed to consult on this matter, and to return to it at the next JCAA meeting.
Follow up(s):
The Association wishes to wait until the outcome of the Graduate Supervision Policy to see if matters remain for determination.

f. Section(s) Discussed: CA59.15 & 59.19: Appointment of arbitrator
Question:
The Administration raised whether it would be more financially responsible if the sides used their own resources to schedule arbitration dates rather than to use lawyers for these tasks.
Deliberation/Summary of Discussion:
The AVP expressed uncertainty as to whether using lawyers in an admin capacity was a BC practice. The Association noted that this might be standard practice.
Action Item(s):
The Association agreed to take this to the ADRC and EC for discussion and the Administration agreed to check on BC practices with other unions. The matter will be discussed further at the next JCAA meeting.
Follow up(s):
It was noted that it seemed a common practice for lawyers to do the arbitration scheduling tasks but that it would be mutually beneficial to try to reduce the time lawyers on both sides charged. Item resolved, remove from next agenda.

g. Section(s) Discussed: CA Appendix D: Policy on Intellectual Property
Question:
Status of revisions?
Deliberation/Summary of Discussion:
Discussion ensued on the status of the revisions. The AVP believes that Research Services has responded to her queries. The Association noted that PEA had requested to comment on the working document.
Action Item(s):
The AVP will inform the Association of the status of revisions asap. The Association will discuss these with its appropriate representatives, including the membership when appropriate. The Administration agreed to share the working document with relevant PEA representatives once it is in a near final form.
Follow up(s):
The AVP is waiting to hear back from Research Services after some clarifying questions were sent. After response, AVP will set a meeting with the Association for discussion. The Administration also updated the group that Steve Gorham will give PEA the document once final draft is available. Keep item on the agenda.

h. Section(s) Discussed: CA 41.6.1 & 41.6.2 UAAC appointments
Question:
Appointment of Chair of UAAC and question regarding members continuing on UAAC
Deliberation/Summary of Discussion:
The AVP has yet to receive a nomination for Chair of the UAAC from the President of the University. The President of the Association noted that the Association's preference is to ask Mark Gillen, Law, to continue on as Chair. Other suggestions from the Association were Robert Howell, Law; Donna Greschner, Law; Colin Macleod, Philosophy. The AVP raised that she was concerned about continuing membership on the UAAC given that Faculties elect members each year – this maybe something to address in the next bargaining round to ensure rotating membership. She also mentioned that a conversation with Mark Gillen suggested that some tweaking with the guidelines might be needed to ensure that UAAC members were fully prepared for their role in handling files.
Action Item(s):
The Administration will inform the Association of the President of the University's nomination asap and will inform the Association of suggestions for the guidelines.
Follow up(s):
Mark Gillen has been appointed at the Chair of the UAAC. Mark has suggested changes and updated of best practices to the UAAC guidelines. It was decided that a working group comprised of Helga, Michele and Mark will work on the UAAC guidelines. Keep item on the agenda

i. Section(s) Discussed: CA 31: RPT committees
Question:
The Administration raised whether the Association would be interested in offering a joint session for those involved in RPT committees
Deliberation/Summary of Discussion:
Positive support from both sides for this suggestion.
Action Item(s):
The Administration will contact the Association regarding getting this setup.
Follow up(s):
It was agreed that the format for the session will be a panel of experts including a Chair, Dean, The Provost, and Mark Gillen. The Association and the Administration will act as resources during the session. Each panelist will give a short presentation regarding difficult files and issues and a Q&A will follow. The audience will be anyone who sits on a RPT Committee. A date will be discussed offline.

j. Section(s) Discussed: CA Appendix K (2): Formation of committee re Academic Administrators
Question:
The Administration raised about forming the committee that will explore options to address equity concerns for Academic Administrators as is required by Appendix K, Part 2.
Deliberation/Summary of Discussion:
Discussion ensued regarding the size of the committee and timing.
Action Item(s):
It was agreed that perhaps a committee of 8 would be reasonable beginning sometime in January with the view to being complete before the summer. The Administration and the Association will come back with delegates for the committee.
Follow up(s):
The AVP and FA will report back with their nominations.

k. Section(s) Discussed: IT services for the Faculty Association
Question:
The Administration suggested that a service contract be entered into with the Faculty Association with regard to the IT services required on a cost recovery basis.
Deliberation/Summary of Discussion:
Discussion regarding services took place.
Action Item(s):
It was agreed that the President of the Association would email the AVP with the list of required services. The AVP would then provide the Association with a draft service contract for review.
Follow up(s):
FA sent list of IT service requests. The AVP updated the group that Nav is working on a draft contract. Item resolved, remove from next agenda.

4. New items

l. Issue: Information for Retirees regarding engaging in ongoing research with UVic (Association)
Section(s) Discussed:
Question:
Could a joint document be produced to advise retiring members how they can retain research relationships after retirement?
Deliberation/Summary of Discussion:
Some faculty members are unaware as to what it means to retire in terms of the CA and “hallway agreements” have caused some inequalities and unrealistic expectations. There was agreement that this issue should be clarified for individuals who are considering retirement.
Action Item(s):
The Association will create high level document to discuss at the next meeting. It was also discussed that this may be useful to have this as a topic of discussion at a future Chairs and Directors sessions.
Follow up(s):

m. Issue: s. 19.17: Faculty Evaluation (Association)
Section(s) Discussed: s. 19.17
Question:
Do FEPs or department policies stipulate performance should be evaluated according to years of experience and rank per 19.17?
Deliberation/Summary of Discussion:
The CA was corrected to add language clarifying that years of experience are not to be counted for promotion as it creates reverse incentive for promotion. It was agreed that during merit evaluations, allowance should be made for years of experience as a protective function for early scholars. The Association raised that some Faculty Evaluation Polices use problematic language which runs counter to the new language.
Action Item(s):
It was agreed that the AVP and the Association President will discuss this issue and work on the language offline as it seems only one faculty’s evaluation policy is of concern (Engineering). The language of the evaluation will be discussed at the next meeting.
Follow up(s):

n. Issue: s. 43.15/43.16 Study Leave Credit Carry Forward for ATPs (Association)
Section(s) Discussed: 43.15, 43.16
Question:
How is this calculated for those who elect to take a half-leave during a term when T load is less than 3?
Deliberation/Summary of Discussion:
Language in the CA regarding ATPs is confusing and is creating inequities in faculties.

Action Item(s):

The Administration will look at the language and will report back at next meeting.

Follow up(s):