



VICE-PRESIDENT, POLICY
AND SENIOR GRIEVANCE
OFFICER

REPORT FOR JANUARY 30, 2018

A decorative wavy line in a light green color, with a white shadow effect, runs vertically along the left side of the page. It starts at the top left and ends at the bottom left, curving slightly towards the right.

GRIEVANCES

GRIEVANCES—1

Grievance	Articles	Status
<p>STEP 2 Recreation Centre Access—Two Continuing term faculty were denied access to the Recreation Centre during summer 2017. They should have been granted access. MRFA asked that the computer system be reviewed and updated so that Continuing Appointment and Full-time faculty be ensured access, as is their right under the CA.</p>	<p>16.6 (Benefits and Insurance) and 4.10 (Continuing Appointment) “Employees . . . Shall be entitled to receive a MR Recreation membership free of charge.”</p>	<p>Resolved in the MRFA’s favour</p>

GRIEVANCES—2

Grievance	Articles	Status
<p>STEP 2 Faculty member commissioned to develop teaching materials. Article 19.5 was not properly followed.</p>	<p>19.5 “where an Employee is specifically commissioned . . .to create a work, that commission shall be recorded in a written agreement, and that agreement shall, at the minimum, define copyright ownership and license terms. The University shall provide the Association with a copy of any such agreement at least one week prior to its signing.</p>	<p>Notice of intent to grieve has been given. (20.2.2.3.1)</p>

GRIEVANCES—3

Grievance	Articles	Status
Step I Contract faculty members' pay was delayed	Article 13.4.2 “Employees shall be paid twice monthly on the 15 th day of the month and on the 3 rd to last banking day of the month.	Step I meeting scheduled
Step I Contract faculty member was not granted the workload they requested.	Article 4.7.1.1 “Normally, initial Sessional Appointments are initiated after the following reappointments and workload allocation has occurred.” (sessional reappointments)	Step I meeting scheduled



POLICY

- ❑ **PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH AND APPOINTMENT POLICY,**
- ❑ **DRAFT RESEARCH PLAN**

PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH AND APPOINTMENT POLICY

- Replaces current policy 912—“Selection of the President of the University”



- Suite of four documents
 - Presidential Search and Appointment Policy
 - Presidential Search Committee Terms of Reference
 - Procedures for the Comprehensive Assessment and Reappointment of the President
 - Procedure for the Search, Selection and Appointment of a New President

WHAT'S CHANGED?

- Policy and procedures for selecting a new president are separated from policies and procedures for renewing a president's term.
- Changes in appointment committee structure
- Development of a new document, "Procedure for the Annual Review of the President"

- Necessary work
- The current policy 912 doesn't provide enough guidance
- Concern that a related element of the policy is still under development. We need to see the Procedure for the Annual Review of the President

CHANGES—SELECTION OF A NEW PRESIDENT

Current Policy 912	Proposed new policy
Chair of BOG	same
Vice-Chair of BOG	same
Three members of the Board . . .To be appointed to the Committee by the Board	Three additional public members of the Board, appointed by the Board Chair
The academic staff member on the BOG	same
One academic staff member appointed by MRFA	Removed
--	Speaker, GFC
--	Chair, Chairs' Assembly
The student member of the Board	same
The staff member of the Board	same
Dean/Director of a Faculty/School (recommended by Provost)	Two members of University Strategic Council (incl. member of Deans' Council apt'd by USC)
--	Vice-President, University Advancement
--	One additional member of President's Executive Committee

WHY THESE CHANGES MATTER

Item	Policy 912	Proposed new policy
Number of members	10	14
Number of faculty	2 (academic BOG member and MRFA appointee)	3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • academic BOG member, • Chair from Chairs' Assembly, • Speaker, GFC (assuming this is a faculty member)
Public Board members	5 (app't by Board)	5 (app't by Board Chair)
Students	1	1
Staff	1	1
Administration	1 (Dean)	4 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dean (as member of USC) • 1 additional member of USC • VP University Advancement • member of PEC
Ratio: BOG and Admin/faculty, students and staff	4 out of 10	5 out of 14
<p>Overall, administrative voice is increased and the voice of faculty, staff, students has less weight, proportionally. Membership is more tightly controlled.</p>		

PROCEDURE FOR THE COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT AND REAPPOINTMENT OF THE PRESIDENT

- The “Procedure for the Annual Review of the President has not yet been developed, so it is unclear what information will be available to the reappointment committee. It’s important that the annual review include feedback from students, faculty, and staff.
- The document makes reference to “a Presidential Reappointment Committee” established by the Human Resources Committee of the Board. There is no indication that this committee will include faculty. In Policy 912, the initial appointment and reappointment committees have the same format.
- The document refers to “an agreed upon list of individuals and groups to be interviewed in confidence, and a fair, disciplined process for these interviews” (A.1.6.c). It is important that this process include faculty, but there is no indication that this will be the case.

TO SUMMARIZE

- Deadline for feedback is February 8
- Take a look at the policies and make comments as necessary
- I will post the MRFA feedback so that others can see what the MRFA thinks

- The appointment and reappointment of the President is of central interest to faculty, staff, and students, yet the policies and procedures tend to minimize this input.

STRATEGIC RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP PLAN, 2018-2023

- Asserts university's commitment to scholarship
- Asserts university's commitment to undergraduate research
- Identifies need for communications strategy to make MRU's research profile more visible
- Identifies need for more research infrastructure (physical space and additional staff)
- Identifies need for more funding for researchers, especially those who have a proven capacity to succeed
- Asserts the need to value research within disciplines
- Recommends support for new faculty
- Recommends "benchmarking exercise" to determine current levels of research, resources, grants, etc.

SOME CONCERNS

- The plan's title is "change-making through research and scholarship" but does all research promote change?
- Becoming a national leader in undergraduate research is a laudable goal. However, supports for faculty and students need to be in place. Will faculty who supervise students be rewarded for their work, either monetarily or with time? (See line 51)
- The plan highlights the need for new administrative positions and physical infrastructure. The plan is vague about corresponding increases in funding for faculty doing scholarship.
- The draft states that "this plan provides direction on the internal allocation of resources to facilitate continued growth and to direct those resources to institutional priorities." How will this impact on scholarship which does not align with institutional priorities? (See lines 121-23)
- The plan talks about "increasing the capacity of our professoriate." How will this be done? Will there be an acknowledgment that more resources are needed at the ground level?

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT?

- One goal is that “Every program includes the opportunity for students to participate in at least one senior level research or capstone project through individual or group work, or directly engaged with faculty (from ISP Strategy 3.3).” (Lines 318-20)
- The draft plan also says that “All Mount Royal degree programs will be asked to provide a summary of their intentional approaches to develop research and scholarship skills through their curriculum, including the implementation of senior-level opportunities (for completion at the end of 2018/19).”

Does the draft research plan have the potential to interfere in curriculum development?

RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

Faculty	Administration and Staff
Become a national leader in undergraduate research	Establish a Director of Undergraduate Research (349)
Faculty hire undergraduate research assistants (338-39)	Establish research chairs (382)
“Reassignment for scholarly intensification” (380) What does “a strategic use of reassigned time” mean for the distribution of reassigned time in general?	“Create a full-time position to provide grant support in ORS” (420)
Partial secondment of faculty members as mentors (410-17)	“Review the financial model and long-term operation of the Institute for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning to ensure that it best supports the ongoing development of this priority research area.”

Resources?

RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS— PHYSICAL AND FINANCIAL

- Infrastructure improvements (new space, more offices, etc.)
- “Ensure the ongoing financial requirements for the sustainability of institutes and centres are included in the priorities for institutional fund development.” (460) According to policy, institutes are self-sustaining.
- “Trico Changemaker Studio” (466)
- Establish an initial secondment supported by re-assignment at a 2-course equivalents in the 2018-19 academic year to develop a plan for an undergraduate research office.”(347)

DO MORE WITH LESS?

“Increase the quantity of peer-reviewed research dissemination by 5% per year.”

“Increase the quantity of professional and community-engaged dissemination activity by 5% per year as measured by the number of active projects.”

There need to be adequate new resources for these goals to be successful. We cannot be expected to do more with less.

POLICY CONSULTATION

- Email feedback to srspfeedback@mtroyal.ca
- Deadline for feedback on the first draft is February 16
- Goal to have the plan to GFC by May 2018