

NOTES of the Mount Royal Faculty Association

Meeting date: May 13, 2011

Call to order: An Annual General Meeting of the MRFA, was held in Mount Royal University, Calgary, Alberta on May 13, 2011. The meeting convened at 9:07am, President Gerry Cross presiding, and Rod Corbett secretary.

Members in attendance:

See Attendance sheets

Approval of minutes:

Motion was made by Gerry Cross, and seconded, to approve the minutes of the May 7, 2010 Annual General Meeting. **Motion carried.**

Motion was made by Gerry Cross, and seconded, to approve the minutes of the April 6, 2011 General Meeting. **Motion carried**

Agenda

Change: under Treasurer's report

"Financial Statements" to "Discussion of Operating Results for the year ended April 30, 2011"

Orders of the Day

Special Order: 10:30am

1. Election of Officers [yes/no vote if one candidate]

There is only one contested position and that is the Academic Liaison Officer. There are three nominees for this position which speaks to the importance on academic governance.

Vote Sitters: Rod Corbett, David Hyttenrauch, Cari Merkley, and Kelly Hewson

a) Appointment of Vote Auditor

Motion THAT we appoint Rafik Kurji to be the Vote auditor

Moved: Cari Merkley

Seconded: Joe Anderson

Vote

Carried

b) Appointment of Scrutineers

No candidates chose to appoint a scrutineer

c) Motion THAT Ballots be destroyed

Moved: Carol Jefferies

Seconded: Margy MacMillan

Vote

Carried Unanimously

2. Committee Elections

a) Nominations to MRFA Committee positions

- o In our bylaws we have an article on committee accountability (article 11): all committee members should become familiar with this article.
- o We ask all candidates for committees to submit a brief campaign statement to Chantelle for posting on the website. We found that worked very well in the fall so we have incorporated that into the bylaw changes

-Ed Grants

No additional nominees

-Ethics

The size of committee is going from 5 to 6 and the terms to 3 years

Paula nominates Aida Patient (English)

Sinc nominates Jack Dobbs (Counselling)

Gerry nominates Sinc MacRae (Humanities)

Darlene Asquith (Nursing)

-Faculty Evaluation

Now involved in changes to the annual report

No additional nominees

-Professional Development

-The PD committee does a fantastic job and it is a tremendous amount of work

- Announcement: in the draw for recycling the nametags from the Spring

Retreat Ben Kusi-Sekyere won \$50 off his registration for the next Spring retreat.

Michael Huston (Counselling)

Naomi Grant (Psychology)

Elaine Rose (Nursing)

Eric Roettger (Gen-Ed and Math)

Jodi Nickle (Education and Schooling)

Jennifer Petit (Humanities)

Alice Swabey (Library)

-Professional Affairs

Jack Dobbs (Counselling)

-Social Events

No additional nominees

-Negotiating Committee

-Cannot take nominations from the floor for this committee

-Of the three members elected directly to the Negotiating Committee two have to be tenured. The two continuing members of the committee are tenured so the person elected this year does not have to be tenured. It is nice to see that both candidates are untenured

-Bylaws

-We need 2 for a one year term and only have 1 nominee

-The committee meets infrequently

Jocelyn Lehman (Nursing)

Paula Dozois (Interior Design)

-Academic Liaison

-There will now be one more member, membership will be representative of all faculties, and we removed the requirement that three members be tenured. We also added into the bylaws an expectation that if you are on ALC and not GFC you should attend the open part of GFC meetings as a guest.

Alan Fedoruk for Science and Technology

Carlton Osakwe for Bissett

Jennifer Boman for Teaching and Learning

-Communications

Maria Jesus Plaza (Languages and Cultures)

-Diversity

Liza Choi (Nursing)

Frances Widdowson (Policy Studies)

Kimberly Williams (Humanities)

-Faculty Tenure Committee

-This committee will be in its second last real year of existence next year.

Mark Gardiner (Humanities)

Margy MacMillan (Library)

Kelly Hewson (English)

-Faculty Leave Committee

Cecilia Sessarago (Languages and Cultures)

Miriam Carey (Policy Studies & Gen-Ed)

Kelly Hewson (English)

-Transportation Advisory Committee

Brett McCollum (Chemistry & Biology)

-Accessibility Committee

Kimberly Williams (Humanities)

-Effective Team

Dawn Rault (Justice Studies)

-Academic Plan Implementation

Darlene Dawson (Nursing)

Michael Truscello (English and Gen -Ed)

-This committee did not meet once last time I, Paula, was a member of it. Could you clarify on this?

-We will have a new academic plan so it is likely that the committee will become active again. As it has not been disbanded we still need to fill the position.

-This position is not related to the development of the current

academic plan

Nominations closed

b) Motion to Establish Dates and Times for Voting

Typically we do this two days next week; for example, Tuesday and Wednesday.

Motion THAT Committee voting take place Tuesday May 17 and Wednesday May 18 from 9:00am - 4:30pm

Moved: Darlene Dawson

Seconded: David Clemis

Vote

Carried Unanimously

c) Motion THAT committee election ballots be destroyed following tabulation of Results

Moved: Richard Harrison

Seconded: Randy Genereux

Vote

Carried Unanimously

Reports off Officers and Standing Committees:

1. President's Report, Gerry Cross

Executive Board Goals 2010-2011

In the Fall the Executive set goals for the year we are reporting to you on those goals and providing an opportunity for you to ask questions about or discuss these goals.

- Presentation of the Vision Statement Review Committee Report (see [April 6 general meeting](#) reference)
 - The intent was to approve a new vision statement at this AGM, but we have delayed this to next fall.
 - Members of the committee: Gerry Cross, Elaine Mullen, Jeremy Berry, Jim Fischer, Mohammed El Hussein, and Reid Spencer
 - Current “the MRFA is a proud community of dynamic and progressive

professionals”

- This statement was established in 2002
- Process
 - We considered doing a survey as that is the standard way to do this type of thing but we figured people have had enough surveys so we developed some drafts that members can respond to.
 - We hope that people will tell us what they want from the MRFA
 - We want to use this as a means of engaging our members in the Association: some departments are very involved and others are much less so.
 - The drafts will be sent out through department Communicators in the Fall to discuss at department meetings. Members can suggest changes to the drafts, which draft is preferred and / or provide a completely new vision statement
 - Presentation of [Draft Vision Statements](#)
- MRFA visits to departments
 - We did this in the fall. We compiled and addressed a list of concerns that came up in these department meetings.
- Assist in the integration of New faculty
 - PAC has been and is working on this
- Strategies to engage and communicate with PT members
 - Gerard has been doing a lot of work in this regard including his successful Grub n Gab sessions and his monthly reports to them.
- Communicate more effectively with our members using Communicators and other means
 - The Department Communicators have worked quite well in some departments
 - Other means has not worked so well
 - We are trying with the Weekly Bulletin to, in a concise way, keep members up to date on what is coming up. The Monthly Report is meant to review what has happened in the past month. We are

doing this to reduce the number of emails but not enough faculty members are reading them; for instance, we had an all candidates' forum on May 12 and many did not know of it even though it was in the newsletter twice.

- Review the role of the Academic Liaison Committee and Academic Liaison Officer
 - We did this and have a restructuring of the committee in the proposed bylaw changes
- Ethics Bylaws
 - We are bringing the new ethics bylaws to the membership later in the meeting for approval
 - Also, We are proposing a restructuring of the Ethics Committee as well.
- Review of Voting Procedures
 - We have a proposed change here also with respect to committee elections
- Hold a Q & A on the Collective Agreement
 - We did this in the Department Meetings: people were invited to ask any questions they had
- Incorporate the criteria for tenure and promotion in the Collective Agreement
 - The Negotiating Committee has done this
- Ensure new faculty understand the processes and expectations
 - We met with ISP groups to clarify some misunderstanding re: expectations
- Interests of members represented in selection committees for administrative personnel
 - Rod Corbett sat on the selection committee for the Dean of Business
 - Cari Merkley sat on the selection committee for the Dean of Health and Community
 - Gerry sat on the selection committee for the AVP enrollment management
 - Gerry sat on the President search committee
 - Gerry sat on the selection committee for the Dean of Science and

Technology

- Gerry is on the selection committee for the AVP Academic
- Academic plan submission
 - The Executive did this in the Fall
- Provide advice on reforming ACIFA to our two reps on ACIFA
 - Gerry is the External VP of ACIFA and David Hyttenrauch is ACIFA's President
 - We are a member of CAUT through the ACIFA federated membership
 - The External VP of ACIFA is the ACIFA representative too CAUT
 - CAUT Council
 - Gerry presented on behalf of membership of MRFA the \$5,000 donation to the Academic Freedom fund and took the opportunity to make short speech. One of things said is that we are currently part of the federated membership but we expect that, in the not too distant future, we will make an application for individual membership
 - Five years ago our application was denied due to a strong and unprincipled opposition from some universities in Alberta.
 - Gerry expects for next year to have an executive goal to prepare for the 2012 AGM a paper outlining our options in terms of our national and provincial affiliations and, perhaps, this may also include some recommendations
- Establish a relationship with the MRSSA and SAMRU
 - We have done this quite effectively

Grievance Report

Referring to President's Report in the [AGM Package](#)

The first five grievances were part-time issues, the only grievance that was not was the policy grievance on scheduling. The final listed grievance is the one that went to arbitration last year

Discussion

- The Arbitration report was expected in February: why the delay?

- Our lawyer Bill Johnson told Gerry it would take a long time as the arbitrator is really thorough but also very active: dismissal arbitrations take priority. This arbitrator has just given him a ruling on an arbitration that occurred three months before ours. We can expect the ruling in September: if we do not hear by then Gerry will ask the lawyer to inquire.
- Because most of our grievances are part-time this is something we need to focus on.
 - In the article in the Collective Agreement on Part-time appointment and re-appointment there is less process than for full-time: in the March monthly report Gerry wrote an article encouraging part-time selection committees to use the tenure process model when considering the decision to re-appoint with conditions and the decision not to re-appoint. The Collective Agreement states that the Part-time member needs to be advised in writing of the decisions. Due process would be to present the written report as a draft, meet with the member and allow the member to respond (this is what we do for tenure decisions--tenurable members get the report three days before the meeting and they get to present additional evidence and make a response)

MRFA Composition

- This is something we are going to have to think about over the next few years.
- Many Associations have an Executive Director that would do some of the president's work. Many also have Grievance officers. Some also have staff positions for labour relations officers involved in contract administration.
- Windsor Faculty Association has a governing council: 33-34 representative elected council and the executive is a part of the council. The idea is that the council makes policy recommendations to the executive but in practice the executive gets feedback on policies from the council
- Relationship between the Executive board and the Negotiating Committee: what we have is not the relationship that CAUT recommends

Discussion

- What relationship does CAUT recommend?
 - Here the members elect the Negotiating Committee and the 1st Vice President and the Part-time Member Representative are on it as well
 - CAUT recommends a model wherein the Negotiating Committee reports to the membership through the executive.

2. Treasurer's Report, Rafik Kurji

i. Discussion of Operating Results for the Year Ended April 30, 2011

- We have had a very good year again.
- We hope to have an audit Report in time for December or January of coming year
- Revenues
 - Total: 650,000 budgeted the actual was 682,000
 - We under budgeted for our dues: mainly as we were not sure about our Part-time faculty. (excess in revenues of 45,000 under dues)
 - 65,000 for renovation dues and we collected 59,000
 - We will not be collecting anymore special dues on renovations as of July 1, as we have paid off our entire loan.
 - Food and Beverage sales Decreased
 - Budget cutbacks for various departments so we did not have much in terms of catering. And, another reason, we are too busy in our offices and do not have time to go to the faculty centre.
 - The rest of the items in the revenues are close to budget so the main reason for the difference in revenue is the underestimation of member dues
- Expenditures
 - Large surplus but most of it is allocated
 - Loan Repayment: used surplus from the Operating and Building Funds from 2009-2010 to pay off the loan faster.
 - Budgeted 40,000 but with the surplus payment we did not use all

of this

- Salaries: this is slightly higher due to raises for our staff
- Release: this was on par though slightly under spent
- Professional Fees: budgeted 18,000 and we have 2,700 under pent but we also have 11,000 that has to be paid to contingency fund from arbitration costs
- ACIFA dues: we are expecting a slight increase
- CAUT: 8,000 budgeted and the actual is 0 this is not because we are not paying the dues but we have not been invoiced on it yet.
- PD Committee: a large portion of the PD retreat expenses are yet to come in for this. This committee will not be under spent
- ACIFA Conference Attendance: 700 difference this is not a major difference
- Scholarships and Gifts overspent 400 this is very close to budgeted amount
- MRFA Admin Exec: hardly any difference here
- 45th anniversary: budgeted 5,000 and only 850 has been spent: most of the expenses here will be coming in after the AGM
- PAC: There events also accrued payables
- NC: this was not an intense round of negotiations
- Political action and advocacy: budgeted 2,000 and the actual is 5,000. We discussed this previously: this is the donation to CAUT's Academic Freedom Fund
- FC food and beverages: total budgeted was 26,500 the underspent amount here will be covered by accruals also
- MRFA Events and SEC: 25,000 budgeted and 23,100 spent: this is very close
- Compassionate Fund: this should always be available to our members. It is a good thing that we are under spent. We will have a similar amount budgeted for next year.
- Conference expense: we budgeted 6,000 not knowing that since Gerry is Vice President External of ACIFA the expenses of his conferences are

covered by ACIFA. We will need this line in the future so we are maintaining it, and the Travel line, at current amounts.

o Overall Results:

Surplus Lines	
\$ 11,000.00	Contingency Fund to be paid back
\$ 8,000.00	CAUT Dues (not invoiced yet)
\$ 30,000.00	PDC: to be paid out when exp are invoiced for retreat 2011
\$ 3,500.00	Travel: G. Cross is VP External of ACIFA (travel paid for by ACIFA)
\$ 5,400.00	Conference: same
\$ 3,500.00	NC: No Fall Negotiations
\$ 3,500.00	PAC: Events carried forward to 11-12
\$ 4,000.00	45th: Events carried forward to 11-12
\$ 6,000.00	Food and Liquor: less demand
<u>\$ 13,000.00</u>	Compassionate Fund
\$ 87,900.00	

Excess Surplus	Excess Revenue	Total Difference
\$ 87,900.00	\$ 31,000.00	\$ 118,900.00

- o We are wanting to look forward to establishing some stability for our faculty centre. We plan to do this by establishing a larger contingency fund and a Building fund
- o With great conservatism and accuracy our financials are prepared: Thank you Chantelle for all your hard work.

ii. Executive motion: Dues Bylaw Change, Gerry Cross

This and the next motion are part of the bylaw changes but, as they are financial, we separated them from the rest of the bylaw changes for individual approval.

- o Presentation of current dues structure in the bylaws: 1% of step C13 that no longer exists (it was from the old grid). The motion here is to change that structure (6.2) to a dues rate of 1% of gross pay.
- o This is an executive motion that does not require to be moved or seconded at the meeting.
- o Discussion:
 - o What is the rational for moving from a flat fee to a progressive fee based on salary?
 - 1% of salary is the norm for other universities and colleges
 - 1% of salary rather than fixed amount means those lower on grid

- pay less and those higher on the grid pay more
- How does 1% compare to comparable institutions?
 - At 1% we are comparable to other institutions
 - Dues at Peer Institutions:
 - Nippising: 1% of gross salary
 - Grant MacEwan: 1.1264% of gross salary
 - Lakehead: 10.5 mils (1.05% of salary)
 - Thompson Rivers: 1.5% of salary
 - New Brunswick: 1% of salary
 - SAIT: 1.2% of salary
 - ACAD: 1.25% of salary
 - NAIT: 0.7% of salary
 - Medicine Hat: 1.1% of salary
 - Lethbridge: \$100/month & Part time \$90/month
 - U of C: 0.55 % of salary
 - If we approve this, will we be at similar revenue position?
 - In doing our revenue projections we looked at the average salary of all faculty. The average salary is close to C13 so it will be basically revenue neutral. We are making it equitable for everyone.
 - Does gross pay include the lump sum payments?
 - It will be 1% of your *gross* pay: so, yes.

Call the question

Vote

Carried, 1 abstention

iii. Executive Motion: Contingency Fund Increase

We want to increase this from 50,000 to 200,000

Rationale: we are not expecting denial of tenure grievances but we have to be in a financial position to respond to them if they occur. Denial of tenure grievances that go to arbitration cost up to 60,000 each

This increase can be easily done with our surpluses and with 4% of our

operating budget each year

Discussion:

- How long will it take to reach the 200,000?
 - At 4% a year it would take 5 years but we expect to get there in three years by allocating our surpluses to the fund
- Is this where the surplus from this year will go?
 - Yes this is where the surplus will go (thus it is a minimum of 4% per year)
- Would we be funding the legal costs regardless of reasons behind denial of tenure?
 - No. We have the responsibility to represent our members and to spend our members' money responsibly. In any grievance the executive has the decision whether to take it to arbitration
- Is it possible to grieve denial of promotion to full professor?
 - The Negotiating Committee is dealing with this matter now and it will be discussed later.
- Where is the money going to come from?
 - It is going to come from the surplus and a budget line.
- If this fund is tapped into, how is it topped up?
 - It is always kept at the level it is to be at. If we were to spend 60,000 from it then we would have to increase it back as quickly as we could (same process: budgeted and/or surplus)

Call the Question

Carried 2 abstentions

- Did we ever do anything for conservatory members: is that why we have higher social membership dues?
 - We did have an arrangement with the conservatory at one point where they were using the faculty centre. This was mostly non-credit music instructors. We had some issues from this: the revenue was very minimal and we uninvited them on a permanent basis.

- The only difference in member dues arises from the associate member dues.

iv. Preliminary Budget, 2011 - 2012

We have used the numbers from 2010-11 to project a budget for 2011-12

- Revenues
 - Regular member dues: we collected 520,000 and plan to collect 527,000 for next year (this is relatively the same)
 - Renovation dues: we have paid of the renovation loan so this revenue item in much lower as we will only be collecting for May and June
 - Food and Beverages: 25,000 this is roughly the same, though it reflects the decrease in revenue seen in 2010-2011
 - The rest of the revenue items are no change and based on 2010-11
 - Total projected revenue for 2011-2012: 644,000
- Expenditures
 - Contingency Fund: 4% of revenues
 - Salaries: in line with 2010-11
 - Have you taken cost of living increases into account: is this line high enough?
 - We have been conservative with this budget and it should be sufficient.
 - Release time: this remains the same
 - Professional Fees: 18,000 (same)
 - ACIFA: Same (though we will see a slight increase)
 - CAUT: Same
 - New Item: Ethics Committee Training
 - We budgeted 3,500 for the members of this committee to get some training in conflict resolution
 - Scholarships: we increased the MRFA Faculty Scholarships from 500 to 750 per faculty so this has increased from 3,000 to 4,500
 - Retirement contributions: this is difficult to gage so we budgeted the same amount

- Compassionate Gifts and Gifts for Service remain the same
- Admin/Exec, Travel, PAC, NC all remain the same
- 45th not budgeted as it has the accrued amount from 2010-11
- New Item: CAUT Academic freedom: 1,000 per year for five years
- Office expenses are remaining the same as last year with a very slight increase
- FC Maintenance and Supplies: staying the same
- FC food and beverage expenses: this is staying in line with last year
- The other major categories
 - Insurance: kept at 2,000
 - Compassionate Fund: kept at 20,000
 - Ed Grants: 64,000 as stipulated in Collective Agreement
 - The rest are based on last year's numbers
- Total expenditures budgeted: 640,500
 - Small surplus of 4,000 budgeted
- Discussion:
 - Why is there just a token amount for political action and advocacy and only 1,000 spent on the Academic Freedom Fund?
 - The 1,000 amount for the freedom fund was passed by the members at the March General Meeting. We made an initial donation of 5,000 and 1,000 over the next five years. This is budgeted based on what the membership decided.
 - Why is there 2,000 on mileage
 - Darlene shops and this, overall, saves us money

Gerry Moves that we accept this budget in principle

Seconded: Martin Haworth

No discussion

Carried unanimously

v. Executive Motion: Spending Authorization for the Summer

Authorization for the executive to spend up to 5,000\$ over the summer (like we always do)

No discussion

Vote

Carried Unanimously

vi. Executive Motion: Spending Authorization for the Summer

We have looked at the services we get from our current auditors and there are some new rules for us to abide by. Rafik has looked at the possibility of saving costs in terms of audits by going to a new auditor, but this would increase our costs substantially. We have received fairly good, timely, cooperative and helpful service: we have no reason to not carry on with the current firm Rafik moves THAT we maintain Buchanan and Barry as our auditing firm for our current audit

Vote

Carried Unanimously

3. 2nd Vice President's report

I present today with a sense of admiration in all that faculty do here and a sense of appreciation for the trust our members have placed in me.

Mount Royal is in motion: there are many changes with promotion & tenure.

With these changes there are newly emerging needs and PAC is trying to address these by fostering professional excellence.

- Work of the Committee this year
 - Meet and greet pizza party: meeting and welcoming new faculty in collaboration with SEC. Sept 17, 2010
 - ISP individual meetings: developed relationships and friendships with new faculty and answered their questions
 - “Inviting Robert into the Process” we have done these for several years. They are very instructive and facilitate the democratic process in our meetings. These sessions are getting more hands on and are improving based on evaluations submitted. Those on GFC and similar bodies would benefit greatly from these seminars.
 - “Committee (A)fair” we focus on the needs of new faculty to get service

and to introduce them to the committees of the MRFA. This program always generates many nominations for our committees

- “Dynamics of Human Interaction in the University Setting” the better we can interact with each other the better our university environment will be. There were two events on this theme and both were very successful.
 - “Communication conflict and Change in the Academic Workplace” this was a very dynamic and interactive workshop and we learnt about communication styles etc. The report will soon be available on the website and the reviews were either very good or good.
 - “Why can’t we all just get along? Incivility and Hostility within Academia” this was very well received and some said that all faculty members should attend such a session
 - Both sessions were open to faculty and administration
 - It was co-sponsored by Robin Fisher and Academic Affairs
- As we are moving and becoming a best university in Canada we need to be proactive and solve problems before they arise. Participation in these kinds of workshops is beneficial in reducing conflict and promoting harmonious relations.
- Coming Soon:
 - “Learning from Each Others’ Craft” this will be a workshop on peer evaluation
- Through co-sponsorship we have been able to accomplish twice as much as we could have and the administration has benefited also.

CRO Announcement of election Results, David Hyttenrauch

Elected: David Sabiston as 1st Vice President

Kit Dobson as Secretary

Elaine Mullen as Faculty Representative to the Board of Governors

Cliff Werier as Member at Large

Pat Kostouros as Academic Liaison Officer

Congratulations and thanks to all of you.

4. Secretary's Report, Rod Corbbet

The bulk of the Secretary's Report is in the AGM package, but the Communications Committee wanted to highlight our private Facebook group. We picked Facebook because more members have accounts on it than any other social networking site. This is a private group: we can share things with each other in this group and nobody else can see them. We currently have 53 members.

- Michele Holmgren a member of the committee demonstrates how it works.
 - Go to website (mrfa.net)→ click on the Facebook button→log in and it will take you to the group page→click on the “ask to join the group” in the upper right corner→a member of Communications Committee will approve your request.
- How to use the group:
 - View MRFA posts (including a is video from the skit at the retreat and other fun things)
 - We want members to post things and make the page whatever they want it to be. Some have already posted articles, pictures/video etc.
- Discussion:
 - Do you have to have a Facebook account to join?
 - Yes but the Communications Committee can help you create one
 - As someone who has no interest in joining Facebook, there would be nothing important that I would need to know?
 - This is more social it may include important things but the important things will still be housed on mrfa.net
- Thank you Rod for your report and your fine work on the committee over the past four years.

5. Negotiations Report, David Sabiston

- This is less of a report and more of an update: we will do a full report when we have the special meeting on ratification of the Collective Agreement
- Updates:
 - The copyright article is currently with the lawyer, Bill Johnson, and we

look forward to this coming back to the committee next week

- The final package we hope to have signed off on by the end of May.
- Article 1. Definitions.
 - This was an MOU from the previous group. We noticed that we have all definitions as “employee” and on top of that we have definitions of instructor and faculty member. We wanted to simplify this, and we were able to for the most part.
 - This will be a twenty page green sheet.
 - We had a problem with “instructor” as we have part-time laboratory instructors and part-time credit music instructors etc.: so, we had to retain “instructor.” This would have been simpler if we had a title for part-time instructors.
- Article 4 Appointments
 - This is meant to deal with some of the part-time issues.
 - 4.7: The current language suggests that every part-time appointment that needs to be filled required the criteria to be established every time.
 - We do not need to do this and/or hire new people every semester.
 - 4.8: Re-appointment is more contentious and we have had a lot of consultation on this.
 - The issue here was that many academic units discussed this in terms of a vote and there was some discussion on who should vote (“all MRFA members” means *all members*: Part-time and Full-time get to vote)
 - There was concern from many academic units who never went through this process because of perceived conflict of interest in allowing Part-time members to vote; however, this conflict does not exist since the ultimate decision is made by the dean.
 - The board was also very hesitant to let Part-time members vote
 - We all felt that it would be important that Full-time faculty should have input in the criteria because they are the ones that develop the programs. Since criteria needs to be set at the academic level, we really see consensus as the way to do this.

- Consensus: this is not about agreeing it is really about “can you live with this decision”
 - The teams have gotten rid of voting and replaced it with consensus and it still goes back to the dean for approval
- 4.11 Fixed Term Part-time
 - We are exploring the process to put them back into the Part-time pool once the Fixed Term appointment is done
 - Clarification: 385 guaranteed SICH is a minimum not a maximum
- Discussion:
 - I do not see continuing part-time appointment in this report.
 - We are working on Fixed term and Continuing Part-time wording
 - Are re-appointment criteria in 4.8 annually adjusted or are they to remain in effect over a period of years?
 - We made sure there was a viable avenue for part-time members to give their input on an ongoing basis if it is deemed necessary
 - There is to be a meeting annually with, at least, a consent agenda that gives the opportunity to redress the criteria in place.
 - Will Part-time members be invited to the meetings?
 - They are to be invited, they need to have their input heard and they are to be part of the consensus.
 - Have you been looking at what other Universities are doing
 - Yes we have been but you also need to get the context for why they went a certain route, and sometimes what others do does not fit our model. Moreover, we do not want to be exactly like other Universities.
- Article 6. Lab Instructor
 - Looked at definitions and making annual report in line with the other annual reports
- MOU Committees:
 - Part-time employee title
 - Counsellor’s Annual Report
 - Counselling, ADC and the Library are not the exact same as

traditional instructors: so their annual reporting should recognize the difference

- Intellectual Property.
 - The IP will be discussed in the special meeting
- Article 11 Appeals of Denial of Promotion
 - We did look at other institutions to see what they do.
 - 11.5.2 UTPC process for promotion. Right now we have the TPC making a recommendation, then the dean and then UTPC. Following final review, the UPTC will recommend to the president approval or denial and the employee will be advised about the decision in writing
 - If a department does not recommend promotion to full professor the process still goes through each level. UTPC has the final decision unless it goes to appeal.
 - We are looking at having a University Appeal Committee: if UTPC denies promotion the employee goes to the appeal committee and their decision will be binding. You can always re-apply.
 - We also looked at the grounds for appeal: misinterpretation of criteria, due process issues and differences of opinion (if dean and department say yes and the UTPC says no that would indicate need to appeal)
 - The University Appeal Committee will have 5 members and President is its Chair. Two faculty chosen by board and two chosen by MRFA (preferably with full professors). There will, also, be external reviewers with expertise in the appellant's subject area.
- Discussion:
 - Why is the president the final arbiter?
 - He is not the UPTC is
 - Is it not a financial decision: shouldn't the board have final say?
 - The way it is now both for tenure and promotion: UTPC makes recommendations to the president not to the board. The board is not involved in tenure and promotion any longer
 - But, at GFC last night the president seemed to imply that these decisions to lie with the Board.

- This is for approval of criteria not of applicants
 - How can administration give up this power to determine such important terms and conditions of employment?
 - Maybe they feel the UTPC is the proper venue to make this decision unless of course it goes to appeal which will, in fact, have the final say.
 - This cannot go through grievance the appeal committee is the final step. This is an advantage to the board.
- Why do members of appeals committee need to be full professors?
 - The reason, right or wrong, is that, when we do have full professors, they will have gone through the process and could better judge if there was a breach of process. We use the word “normally” which of course allows us to not have them.
 - It is not imperative but it is a good idea.
- Has there been discussion about the serial application and withdrawal without prejudice?
 - We have discussed this at length but, no, we have not set limits on the number of times you can apply
 - Do you see this as an important issue?
 - This is not likely an issue
 - You cannot apply and appeal in the same year. You cannot apply again until you appeal the denial.
 - Denials will come with justification and feedback
- Article 10 appeal of denial of tenure
 - We are still in discussions. There may be a role for the university appeals committee to come in before it goes to arbitration but there will still be the ability to go too arbitration
- Discussion
 - When the TPC has worked for five years with the individual and makes a denial and the dean makes a denial but the UTPC says goes against these decisions what happens?
 - Before the UTPC makes a contrary decision they need to discuss it

with the TPC.

- If the appeal committee is going to be handling tenure appeals also then this is even more reason to allow associate professors on the University Appeal Committee (i.e. not restricting this to full professors).
 - Yes that is true.
- What does “permanency” apply to? Where would permanent faculty exist who were not tenured?
 - Full-time lab instructors become permanent after two years so it is the equivalent of tenure but we do not refer to it as tenure.

Any reports to be removed from the Consent Agenda?

None

Reports Approved by Consent

New Business:

1. Executive Motion: Proposed Bylaw Changes

- Presentation of the main changes and there will be a motion at the end to approve the whole package. As we go through any member can make a motion to separate an item: 2/3 majority vote is needed to separate. If this does not happen we will vote on the whole package
 - We distributed the bylaw changes with the tracked changes and we can look at that too
 - We have already approved the Dues change and Contingency fund increase: these were separated as they were financial motions.

Main Changes to the Bylaws

- Added some definitions, modified the definition of member in good standing: if you are not a member in good standing you cannot vote or stand in election but your still a member, have representation and pay dues.
- Changed 3 hours release to 48 reassigned SICH to be in line with CA
- Added provision that enables deans to teach: they would pay dues but only have privileges of associate membership which is the same as social membership

- Added PD activities to associate member privileges
 - Right now we have 5 associate members in the Student Learning Services.
- Guest policy: now allow for larger groups of students to be approved as guests
- Extend the term of the PT rep to two years
 - The rationale here is that we have a large group of ‘full time part time members’ and the Part-time Representative is usually from this group. So, it makes sense to make this a two year term to make it same as all other executive positions.
 - Other rationale: it requires a two year term to actually accomplish things and function as an equal member of the executive. We are trying to equalize the role.
- Adding a one year exception: it is proposed that in the September 2011 election for the Part-time member representative a third consecutive term shall be allowed.
 - Because of the staggering of the terms on the executive the election in September will just be a one year term: it will be a by-election. We are doing this to alternate the 1st Vice President and Part-time Member representatives’ terms. We now elect the 1st Vice President in odd numbered years and we will elect the Part-time Member Rep in even numbered years
 - This is the same as when we moved the AGM date last year to accommodate the retreat
 - What would happen if the Part-time Member Rep was then without a Part-time appointment?
 - Then the exec would appoint or there would be an election.
 - We are keeping the election in the third week of September
- Part-time Member Representative Compensation:
 - Increase compensation from E3 to E6: principle is that it is the top of the grid.
 - Increase 60 SICH to 64SICH which is equal to four hour course. Reason here is that full time members have service as part of workload and

part-time members do not, so the compensation for the part-time member should be greater than for full time members.

- 48 SICH of reassigned time to Negotiating Committee Members added to the bylaws as it has moved from an MOU to the body of the Collective Agreement
- Committee Changes:
 - Ethics Committee Changes: terms increased to three years and the membership of the committee increased to six members. A list of training courses is to be maintained and first year members are recommended to take a course. We, also, added a ethics reporting to the membership on the general nature of the ethics complaints that were heard.
 - Faculty Evaluation Committee now has a role in changes to the annual report (acting on behalf of Association)
 - Academic Liaison Committee: one more member, representative, tenure not required.
- Changes to the Election Process
 - Change the “right” to submit a campaign statement to a requirement
 - Added: All Candidates’ Forum for Executive Board positions
- Change: fiscal year end to March 31 this will match the University’s and will ensure our expenses are kept in correct years
- Added: Special rules of order which allow us to put new business at the beginning of the agenda so the most substantial items will be at a known time. We also added the ability for the President to designate speaker.
- Ethics bylaws: major revision
 - The ethics bylaws are grouped with the rest?

Motion THAT we separate out section 16, 17 and 18 for a separate vote of approval.

Moved: Scott Murray

Seconded: Qasim Syed

Non-debatable motion

Vote

Carried

Code of Ethics:

This was presented on at the April General Meeting. The revised bylaws are based on underlying principles of what one should do rather than what one should not do. The question was raised should we publicize the names of those who have violated the ethics bylaws. We do not do this but the membership could direct the Executive to consider it.

Major Changes:

- A new right: Academic Freedom with respect to choice of teaching materials and pedagogy
- Third Party complaints
 - These can be made by a member on behalf of someone who is not a member of the association with the written and informed consent
- Decision Making: a case can be found to have merit only if the committee decides so by consensus
- Removed 16.1.2.10 that restricts members from acting on their legal constitutional rights
- For more detailed review of the ethics bylaw changes see the presentation online

Discussion:

- Could you clarify on third party complaints?
 - For example, a member being abusive to an admin assistant and another member observes it: the other member could file an ethics complaint on behalf of the assistant.
 - We have things in our ethics bylaws that govern our behavior toward students and staff and having third party complaints gives us a way to enforce those bylaws.
- Why the change to decisions by consensus?
 - This requires all to agree
 - Sinc has a very good memory and has been on the committee for a long time and in his memory the decisions have always been made with consensus
- Can you review the change to the article on academic freedom (16.3.5.2). Can

you clarify on the language used here “Autonomy over curriculum”? When there is a framework for the whole program, how much leeway does this allow for a member to change curriculum?

- This is meant to give members the freedom to achieve the objectives of a course or program not to change or ignore them.
- Can this be misinterpreted though?
 - This likely needs some adjustment “autonomy over courses we teach...”
 - We can have a motion to amend this clause or a motion to delete it
- Many thanks to the ethics committee for its thoughtful revision of our ethics bylaws

Motion THAT we move article 16.3.5.2 back to the ethics committee for reconsideration to consider the impact on course outcomes.

Moved: Marc Schroeder

Seconded: Margy MacMillan

Vote

Carried (3 opposed, 2 abstentions)

Resolved THAT the proposed ethics bylaws presented in the agenda package and as modified by the previous motion be approved.

No Discussion

Vote

Carried Unanimously

Resolved THAT all other changes to the bylaws as presented in the agenda package be approved

Vote

Carried (1 Opposed)

2. Daycare Discussion Paper

- Review of Possible Strategies (discussed also at the April General Meeting).
These strategies are slightly revised after consultation with the daycare

executive: Joan Baxter, Kari Roberts and Janne Holmgren

- The MRFA Executive is looking for direction based on the Discussion Paper
 - The item most actionable at this point is establishing a joint committee
- Discussion:
 - Subsidizing Childcare
 - Item 3. We do not subsidize holding parking over the summer so we should not subsidize this
 - Putting childcare benefits into the CA would be very beneficial and great for all of our younger/new faculty
 - Having children is a faculty members choice and we need to be cognizant of this: it may not be fair for faculty who choose not to have children to subsidize those that do.
 - We currently allow for faculty to apply for Scholarships for Dependents so this would be similar but point taken
 - This and other forms of dependency care should be supported: there may be a broader scope the committee could look at.
 - If you want to have lots of spots and have them subsidized then it would be costly.
 - Improving Access
 - Opening more spots is more important than making them more affordable
 - We know for a fact that access to childcare, or lack thereof, has a significant impact on faculty. It becomes an issue of gender discrimination when childcare is not available
 - Daycare at MRU and elsewhere:
 - Items 3 and 4: are these specific to MRU daycare or any daycare?
 - In the package it is referring just to MRU
 - It should be for all faculty who have daycare elsewhere
 - MRU daycare is part of the community and it is something we have more leverage over but have none over other facilities.
 - The initiative for this came from the MRU daycare that is

why these solutions pertain to that facility

- Item 7, establishing a joint committee, is a good base point to start
 - This is a Recruitment and Retention issue and we need to get others involved

Resolved THAT the MRFA Executive Board propose to the university administration that a joint child care committee with representation from all stakeholders be established;

Resolved THAT the committee's mandate be to make recommendations on expanding day care access at MRU and on the other issues raised in the MRFA Child Care Discussion paper by the end of the 2011-2012 academic year.

- Discussion
 - Some of these matters are Negotiating, we do not want to restrict to committee's mandate.
 - This does not reflect the other considerations of dependence care.
 - If other forms of care are to be considered that should come as a separate motion
 - The wording of the second clause is unclear: "at MRU"
 - This is intended to mean for MRU faculty staff and students at MRU

Motion to amend: replace "at MRU" with "for MRU Faculty, Staff and Students"

Moved: Marc Schroeder

Seconded: Ricardo Hoar

Discussion:

- This is not about expanding it here it is for wherever these groups choose to put their students
 - There is little precedent for this type of action of the MRFA and MRU and it would be wise to maintain our focus on MRU
 - The joint committee may well come to this conclusion
- As a matter of Recruitment and Retention I would urge the Negotiating Committee to be alert to this issue. Negotiations is where this ought to take place.
- The original wording is better: the MRU daycare has served and

continues to serve a really important part of our lives and it strengthens the family connection to MRU. This is a really important part of the MRU community.

- It has historically served our faculty well and we should focus efforts on improving it.
- The intent of the motion is to not be restrictive.
 - The original or changed wording is not going to change the work of the committee: we need to determine if we want to have a joint committee.
 - We do not need to broaden the work of this committee. We need to improve circumstances here and establishing the rights of employees here.
- We are trying to do the work of the committee now and all we need to do is decide if we want the committee

Call the question (terminate debate on amendment to move to the vote on the amendment)

Moved by Gerry Cross

Vote

Carried, 1 abstention and 1 opposed

Vote on amendment

Defeated

Motion to amend: remove “and on the other issues raised on the child care discussion paper”

Moved: Ricardo Hoar

Seconded: Mary-Lee Mulholland

Discussion:

- We do not need to do the work of the committee
 - By giving them a narrower mandate then we have a better chance of having the thing we want achieved.

Vote

Defeated

Carol Jefferies moved previous question

Seconded: Pat Roome

Carried, 6 opposed, 1 abstention

Vote on motion as stated to establish a joint committee

Carried, Opposed 7 and 5 abstentions

That was very efficient and controlled: thank you Gerry for taking us through that.

3. Executive Motion to Explore Electronic Voting Procedures for Committee Elections

The idea here, or potentiality, is to have an online form with links to descriptions of committees and campaign statements, with checkboxes and a submission button.

Vote

Carried, 1 Opposed and 2 Abstentions

4. ACIFA Report: David Hyttenrauch

I am here as a guest and speaking as President of ACIFA

Thank you for the leadership that the MRFA provides throughout the Province: it is a leader in labor relations, academic governance and professional conduct: our documents often become the basis of theirs (i.e. ethics and IP)

- o ACIFA Overview:
 - o ACIFA represents 5500 academic staff
 - o Mission: through the collective action and resources of its members, ACIFA promotes the professional and economic well-being of college and technical institute faculty in the interest of advancing the quality of post-secondary education in Alberta

- Key activities:
 - Strong Professional Development focus: Spring Conference with sessions on pedagogy and professional affairs
 - Full-time labour relations officer who gives direct advice to associations.
 - Political advocacy: this is an area that is identified as a priority as there has been a gap in it in the past
 - Liaison with other Organizations: CAUT at national level and CAFA at the provincial level.
 - Committees:
 - President's Council: meets three times a year,
 - Negotiations Advisory: meets twice a year,
 - PAC: Professional development, and
 - The Executive: runs the daily business of ACIFA
 - Government relations:
 - The political climate is very uncertain in the province and we do not know the date of the next election or where it might go. This leads to uncertainty for faculty and the ministry.
 - There are concerns about federal transfers: there is the chance that if we ask for a single pot for PSE it will be smaller than otherwise and it could be delimited.
 - We are getting close to where we can expect a 3-5 billion expenditure cut if the royalties do not change. This means significant cuts to come and the province will not look at changing the revenue streams.
 - The government will not listen to students or faculty groups but they will listen to the public. We need to move toward indirect lobbying and ACIFA is looking at this.
- Major projects this year:
 - Refining vision statement: aligning activities with preferences of members
 - June 2 Symposium: students, faculty, and admin across Alberta, someone from PIA (public interest Alberta) and a member of government

- Budget review
- Enhancing Presence: David visited all member organizations. ACIFA has to be a partnership and connection of faculty across the province is important in fostering this partnership.
- Current Challenges:
 - The website does not work.
 - Not enough people know everything ACIFA does.
- Moving Forward:
 - ACIFA needs to become the argument for its own relevance
 - ACIFA wants to enhance the professional association: do similar work that PAC does here for other institutions
 - Expand capacity for Advocacy
 - ACIFA is heading in strong new directions
 - Across the province people are very baffled about what MRU and MacEwan are and if they are going to quit ACIFA to join CAFA.
 - ACIFA is serving us well and we are moving it in directions we want to take it. We have federated membership with CAUT at a huge cost savings and get the same service.

5. Executive Motion THAT the MRFA donate \$10,000 to the ACIFA Defense fund

Sixteen months ago we approved this contribution in principle to what then was the SAIT Faculty Association Charter Challenge on Designation. Under the PLSA, the board has the right to designate and de-designate credit faculty. The Board at SAIT has converted programs to non-credit. They are the same size as NAIT but have half the number of faculty positions.

- Bill Johnson advised that this is a winnable case
- This affects us as we move to tight budget times: last time we were in similar circumstances the board at MRU de-designated high school upgrading courses and they could do so with other courses.
- The reason for the delay in bring this motion was because ACIFA had to establish a process for administering these funds and including criteria on

making forgivable loans from this fund.

- o The motion here is to now make the donation from our professional fees contingency fund

Discussion:

This is the original amount that was approved in principle.

Vote

Carried

1 abstention

Announcements: Lunch in the FC.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 1:34pm.

Secretary
Mount Royal Faculty Association

Date of approval