

Notes of the Mount Royal Faculty Association
Meeting date: October 30, 2012

Call to order: A General Meeting of the MRFA was held in Mount Royal University, Calgary, Alberta on October 30, 2012. The meeting convened at 4:05pm, President Gerry Cross presiding and Kit Dobson, Communications Officer.

Members in attendance:

See attached Attendance Sheets

Agenda

Approval of minutes:

Motion was made by Gerry Cross, and seconded to approve the minutes of the September 26, 2012 meeting. **Motion carried.**

Order of the Day, 4:00pm

Child Care Task Force

The Discussion Paper and the Final Report of the Task force are available online

- We are prepared to accept motions on this
- At the AGM there was consensus that the survey should be redone because it was botched. The other thing the task team had in its charter was to do some research at other universities
 - Chantelle has done some research and we are not doing badly relative to other Universities if we eliminate the community spots
- Discussion:
 - Is the plan then to redo the survey?
 - We will push for this if that is what the members want
 - The task team is finished so if we redo the survey then the MRFA would have to do it. Moreover, if it is redone then it needs to be revamped

Motion THAT the MRFA conduct its own child care survey and invite other members of the university committee to participate

Moved: Mary Lee Mulholland

Seconded: Kari Roberts

Discussion

- We need to define parameters of the survey
- The next motion could be to establish an ad hoc committee to do this work so any concerns can be directed to that committee
- How do we ensure that students complete the survey?
 - Only 26 students responded previously
 - The MRFA Executive Board met with SAMRU and will be meeting with them again
 - The MRFA will work with the SAMRU to facilitate higher student response rate
 - Would the MRSA be involved
 - Yes

Mary Lee Mulholland Restated the Motion

Vote

1 opposed

1 abstention

Carried

Motion THAT the MRFA Executive Board establish and ad hoc child care task team to establish this survey.

Moved: Mary Lee Mulholland

Seconded: Irene Shankar

Vote

Carried Unanimously

Volunteers to sit on the MRFA's ad hoc Child Care Task Team

Mary Lee Mulholland

Gulberk Koc MacLean

Irene Shankar

David Bird

Kari Roberts

Officer's Reports

President

1. Academic Liaison Officer

Pat Kostouros, our Academic Liaison Officer from the Department of Child and Youth Studies, had a very serious case of pneumonia in September and was in the hospital for 3 weeks and most of that time she was in ICU. She is at home now recovering, and we expect her back in January.

In the meantime Al Fedoruk, a member of the Academic Liaison Committee, has taken over all of Pat's ALO duties except for sitting on the Executive Board. Al is continuing the work on Faculty Caucuses and making GFC more effective.

GFC is becoming more effective than it was in previously, David Docherty, being a parliamentarian has contributed to this improvement. At the last GFC meeting, David moved the written questions to occur at the end of the Officer's reports and there was some of the best discussion that has ever taken place at GFC. As a result, GFC actually did something for the first time: it modified a curriculum submission and postponed to the next meeting consideration of a new policy on the major review of academic programs.

2. President's Discussion Series

The first discussion in this series was on the budget development process and was held on Thursday October 4. The budget discussion was lightly attended but there was good discussion and some good suggestions on revenue generation

The second discussion in the series was on Access Copyright and was held on Friday October 26. It was very interesting and better attended. At the discussion, there was an update on Bill C11 which strengthens fair dealing. This is important for faculty as Fair Dealing includes the use of copyrighted materials for educational purposes. We also heard about Supreme Court decisions made over the summer that are expanding the provisions of fair dealing (e.g. course packs).

Gerry really encourages people to attend these discussions if you can: the primary purpose is to give you an opportunity to speak directly to the President and he listens and takes notes. The next discussion in the series will be on Wednesday November 28 at 3:00pm on the Value of Liberal Arts and General Education. The following discussion will be about Institutional Governance and will be held on Thursday January 10 at 3:00pm. Both discussions are being held in the Faculty Centre. Both have a panel making brief statements and there will be questions and discussion to follow.

Unfinished Business

Profile of the Provost and Vice President Academic

- The purpose of this is to direct Gerry as the MRFA Representative on the selection committee. The role of the MRFA Representative is to ensure the next Provost is the type of person the MRFA membership wants.
- There will be a motion to approve the draft profile and there can be amendments to it. This is the same process as we did for the president's profile. This is a draft and we are looking for modifications if there are any. Members can add delete or modify this draft.

Executive Motion THAT the MRFA membership approve the draft profile of the Provost and VP Academic for the purpose of directing the MRFA Representative on the selection committee.

Motion approved in principle based on subsequent amendments

Motion to amend: replace "PhD" with a "doctoral degree or terminal degree"

Moved: Reid Spencer

Seconded: Valerie Kinnear

Discussion

- Requiring a PhD in an academic discipline is problematic. There are a number of professional disciplines that have different designations. There are a number of academic areas that have an exit prior to the doctoral level: this is cutting off a lot of people with excellent academic qualifications. We don't want to see qualified candidates cut off.
- I don't agree with this amendment: having a PhD suggests the person has experience with a number of processes that are essential to understand if you are going to be a Provost in a University
- In favour of it as there are many disciplines in which it would be a doctoral degree you would get rather than a PhD: it is not sufficient to lock out these candidates for an undergraduate institution

Vote, 27 in favour and 19 against

Carried

- Point 1 changed to doctoral or terminal degree

Motion to Amend: delete point 4

Moved: Reid Spencer

Discussion

- Point 4 may cut off qualified candidates who may not have served at this level. There are members of the technical business community who may be qualified for the job. We want to make this more inclusive and not miss out on qualified candidates. We need a broad range of candidates and this should be allowed.
- Should the search committee then be looking in the business community?
 - We shouldn't ignore it or prevent it
 - The search consultant needs clear direction on where to look. The search consultant would find it very unusual to be directed to look in the business community.

Motion not Seconded

Motion Withdrawn

Motion to Amend point 6: That the candidate value teaching and scholarship equally

Moved: Antoine Eche

Second: David Bird

Discussion

- We should not set up antagonism between teaching and scholarship. Those on TSS see research as an integral part of their pedagogy but see that the TSS and TS be valued as a career paths
- Do we need the work equally here?
 - It could be removed but it is an integral part of the motion

- The way this was constructed was that both halves be mutually supportive: the two could be separated. The strength of the second statement is weakened by this amendment.
- Part of the intention here was to indicate value of both streams
- If we value scholarship and teaching equally then that devalues TS work pattern because those on TS do not do as much scholarship as those on TSS.
 - TS faculty do scholarly teaching
 - There is scholarship happening on the TS pattern
- First part of point 6 conflates two separate issues: individuals' career paths or the institution as a whole. We do not want to move away from teaching above scholarship as a university but for one individual they may be considered equal.
- Scholarship is part of your teaching so it is a false dichotomy to polarize these things
- values teaching and considers TS as valid and have a second point on scholarship

Call the Question

Vote

Carried by two thirds majority

Vote, 28 in favour, 18 against

Carried

Motion to Separate item 6 so it read values teaching and scholarship equally and a separate point on valuing TS as a career path

Moved: Scott Murray

Seconded: Antoine Eche

Discussion

- Can we clarify on the purpose of how these points will function in the selection process?
 - The selection committee will develop a much more detailed profile that will be used to guide the search consultant and in this process Gerry will be arguing for the points we pass here to be in that profile.
 - This is the same search consultant we used for the presidential search and they have a lot of candidates and need clear direction.
 - Once we get to the actual candidates then we are judging real people
 - These will be a set of points that go into developing of specific profile that will be passed onto the search consultant who will then determine if candidates meet the criteria.
 - It is valuable to determine ideal characteristics but is it needed or worthwhile to speak about the particular points and judgement can go either way for many of these points
 - This depends on the types of changes we make

Vote

Carried

Motion to remove last clause of point 7

Moved: Michael Truscello

Second: Ada Jaarsma

- Most candidates will be from a research intensive University and this is a very different perspective and it is very hard to break: having this stress here is very important
- By reading 6 and 7 we are not being encouraged to do research because it is repeatedly not made to be a big focus of the university. We should be comfortable to do teaching and research

- Understand concerns here but it would be taken care of if the candidate complies with educational experience at a teaching focused university and surely the TSS path is equally valid but it does not sound like it here
- The second half of this sentence captures the need to pick someone who will not do something in the future that we do not want and this is impossible to capture.

Vote

Carried, 3 opposed

Motion to Amend the new point 7: “considers TS and TSS work patterns be considered equally valid career paths”

Moved: Mary Lee Mulholland

Seconded: Carmen Nielson

- Teaching and scholarship are equal in the line above

Vote

Carried Unanimously

Motion to Amend point 8: add “and on scholarship” to the end of point 8

Moved: Anupam Das

Second: Michael Truscello

Discussion:

- This point was added because we are using the language in the path to full professor
- Why is 8 necessary if it is a CA issue
 - It is here because it is more difficult establish a national reputation in teaching if you are basing your application on teaching
 - Judgements need to be made and the VPA has a role in this and needs to have values aligned with ours
- Is there a parallel item for promotion based on research
 - Last year there were 16 promotions and only 5 of them were based on teaching
 - We do not need a parallel item for scholarship: promotion to professor is always based on scholarship. By not including this we are not in any way devaluing or diminishing the likelihood of people being promoted based on research
 - This is not a question of equity here
 - We need to ensure we look for a candidate that thinks it is possible to be a professor through teaching
- Would assume our default position is being misstated and 8 would be confusing. Should use language closer to the CA
- I am opposed to putting anything in here that contravenes the Collective Agreement
 - If we have both that is fine but not with the wording in this motion
- These points should not divide faculty over their streams: we should use language of solidarity not division
- is bullet 8 not necessary if we have decided that TS and TSS are valued equally as career paths?
- We should not be divisive
- It is not that we do not value teaching but there should be equity between the two

Vote

Defeated

Motion THAT point 8 be replaced with “Recognizes the value of promotion to full professor based on both categories in the Collective Agreement”

Moved: Gerry Cross
Seconded: Kit Dobson
Discussion

- This is irrelevant as the application form does not have anywhere that the applicant indicates the stream they are in
 - We need to make sure it is clear we are looking for valuing both
- While both streams are valued here we do need to foreground an academic atmosphere that values research over scholarship.
 - Reminded here of the fight to include women in the equity statement: they argued we already achieved equity for women. There is a need for this because the default has been so long against it.
- Given this list as it is adopted will direct the MRFA representative on the hiring committee: the original wording of 8 would be a good question for the interviewer
- It is a good idea to encourage the consultant to look for specific qualifications with a statement of the ideas we support. These personal beliefs should be probed at the interview level or public presentations. There will be opportunities to probe these issues later.

Vote, 5 opposed
Carried

Motion to amend point 13: add “including professional contributions outside the traditional academic realm”

Moved: Jane McNichol
Second: David Bird
Discussion

- This is particularly important in professional programs and faculty may be very involved and contributing in the community in a professional capacity
 - The intent here is that there is appreciation for those who work for academic affairs within MRU
- I am not opposed to the idea but it doesn't fit in this item could add another point

Vote
Defeated

Motion that the same wording be used as a separate item: “Genuinely appreciates and acknowledges the professional contributions of individuals outside the traditional academic realm”

Moved: Jane McNichol
Seconded: David Bird
Discussion

- We may know what this means but the candidates or search consultants may not. This does not need to be stated.
- This list is to guide our member of the selection committee and wordsmithing is not too important

Vote
Defeated

Motion to remove item 9

Moved: Ada Jaarsma
Seconded: Mary Lee Mulholland
Discussion

- This seems unnecessary and exclusionary
 - The reason for this is the uniqueness of MRU we do have an institute of SoTL and a number of faculty engaged in this

- This is only focusing on one particular area: the incumbents will know of SoTL at MRU
- This is not what makes MRU unique: that we do it is valid and valuable but this does not need to be here.
- In favour of leaving it in: this is a feature we have here though we may not be unique we do have a lot of scholars in the programs and a higher level of support for it than is common and someone may decide that it is a valid budget cut
- In favour of removing it. Based on five year plan of research services which includes SoTL and these documents support SoTL more than this single line does.

Vote, 6 opposed
Carried

Motion to Amend point 15: add “demonstrated”

Moved: Irene Shankar

Seconded: David Bird

Discussion

- We want to see evidence of this? It would be hard but it would be good. We want to find someone who has been able to demonstrate commitment to this
- Best predictor of how candidates will act is how they did act
- This is a good amendment

Vote
Carried

Motion to Amend point 10: remove second half of the point

Moved: David Bird

Seconded: Scott Murray

Discussion

- Privatisation and degradation of education: we need to discuss what ethical parameters we need around funding policies. The person should generate funding from ethical sources
 - This could be in the Five Year Plan
- Are we adding to number 10 or moving it?
- The provost is not involved in fundraising very much

Vote
Passed Unanimously

Motion to add a point to the section on where we want to be in five years: “A commitment to increasing funding and support for research.”

Moved: Emily Hutchison

Seconded: Kenna Olsen

Discussion:

- It should say scholarship not research
- The research plan is expanding the definition of research to include scholarship

Vote
Carried Unanimously

Quorum Challenged, 5:46 pm

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 5:46pm.

Communications Officer
Mount Royal Faculty Association

Date of approval

Unofficial Meeting of the MRFA

Discussion of Profile of the Provost and VP Academic and Tenure Restrictions for Service

Discussion:

- Gender and equity:
 - We should provide some indication to the consultants that there is a lack of women in the administration.
 - There has not been an effort to deal with this equity issue.
 - Gerry is fairly confident that there will be voices on the search committee that will want to instruct the search committee the importance of having diversity on the long list
 - We cannot make being female one of the qualifications.
- Integrity is an invalid characteristic to look at or prove
 - We should strike out item 12
 - Don't want someone fair want someone strategic in allocating resources
 - This is something that could be probed in the interview
 - This is redundant given the other points
 - Have faith in the selection committee
 - The membership has elected some good people

New Business

MRFA Position on Tenure Restrictions for Service

- The MRFA Executive cannot contravene what the Collective Agreement says

4.3.2 Prior to posting a position, the Chair of the academic unit shall meet with the tenured and tenurable employees of the academic unit or discipline to discuss fully the qualifications, areas of expertise, teaching responsibilities, work pattern, anticipated rank of the appointment, and the required academic credential or its equivalent for the position in accordance with Article

- This was added in 2008 same years as tenure system 2 and the rank and promotion system
- It was felt that tenurable faculty had an interest in the development of the department and hiring is a part of this. The type of person you are looking for is an important part of hiring.
 - Tenurable members are involved in the Department developing hiring criteria
 - The selection committee is an extension of the department and works on behalf of the department at the direction of the department

4.3.4 A selection committee shall be struck and normally shall be composed of:

- 4.3.4.1 the Chair of the academic unit, who shall be chair of the selection committee. When the Chair of the academic unit is unable to chair the selection committee, the Dean shall designate a chair for the committee;
- 4.3.4.2 two tenured employees of the academic unit where the vacancy occurs elected by the academic unit. In small academic units or disciplines, where necessary, tenured employees from a cognate department in the same Faculty or School may be elected;
- 4.3.4.3 the Dean or designate;
- 4.3.4.4 an employee, normally tenured, appointed by the Dean. "Normally"

- How does one interpret "normally"
 - Normally means that there can be an exception if there is a compelling reason
 - Who would determine if an exception can be made?
 - Matters of interpreting the Agreement

- We have joint committee on the review and interpretation of the Collective Agreement and it can authoritatively rule on an interpretation of the Agreement when a matter is referred to it by the MRFA President and the Provost
 - The MRFA President and the Provost can settle a grievance at step 2
 - Because the step 2 resolution is possible this gives them authority to interpret the Collective Agreement in situations that are not grievances or they can discuss it and refer to the joint committee or seek legal opinion on it
 - A grievance committee can settle at step three
- This issue came to the MRFA as there are differing practices in different academic units: there is a lack of clarity and uniformity in the interpretation of “normally.” This is also a concern in relation to constraints on tenurable members’ service.
 - 4.3.4.3 the Collective Agreement does not constrain the dean’s power to designate though according to 4.3.4.4 it is normally a tenured member
 - If the dean did not appoint a tenured member the decision is an exception and could be grieved
 - “Normally” does refer to tenured members
- Broader concern in terms of the role of tenurable members of the association on hiring committees
 - This was brought to the executive by members
 - We have two executive motions that will have to be deferred to the November Meeting

Notice of Motions

Motions deferred till November General Meeting.

Motion 1: Resolved, That Articles 4.3.2, 4.3.4, 4.5.5, 4.7.1, 6.2, 6.4.5, 9.3.7 and 9.3.9 be referred to the Negotiating Committee in the next round of collective bargaining and that the negotiations survey be used to determine whether to negotiate changes.

- In this motion we are seeking the direction of the membership
- This is a negotiations concern and needs to be considered and resolved at the table.

Motion 2: Resolved, That the ad-hoc Organization of the MRFA Sub-Committee of the MRFA Executive review and update the [document](#) listing tenure requirements for Executive Board and Standing Committee positions that it prepared last year and determine whether to recommend any changes to the membership.

- This is referring the tenure requirements for MRFA Executive Board and Committee positions