

MINUTES of the Mount Royal Faculty Association

Meeting date: January 12, 2011

Call to order: An Executive Board meeting of the MRFA, was held in Mount Royal University, Calgary, Alberta on January 12, 2011. The meeting convened at 12:00pm, President Gerry Cross presiding, and Rod Corbett secretary.

Executive Board Submission to the MRFA Negotiating Committee

Article 1

- Based on all the changes last year Gerry is suggesting here to standardize terms in the CA
- “Contract Faculty”
 - This could go in the Part-time section of the negotiations survey
- As there is not consensus here it will go to the committee as a suggestion from Gerry

Article 1 point 1.

- To require the CA to specify what is the equivalent of a Dean (re: “Dean or equivalent administrator where there is no Dean”)
- Also, see note on Chair ADC: exec is passing this concern to NC but we do not have a recommendation
- Full Time and Limited Term faculty teaching labs
 - This is an issue that came up so the exec is passing it on without comment

Discussion:

- We have no language or mechanism for allowing or prohibiting deans to teach
 - They would get a free social membership but would not be full members of the Association
 - Article 1.1 will be revised to recommend to the NC to include provisions to allow Deans to teach

Article 4

4.4.4.1

- This recommendation will be revised for clarity

4.7.1 and 4.8.2

- There needs to be more clarity here

4.8.2

- Gerry is suggesting conflict of interest language that would enable such issues to be dealt with by the Dean
- PT faculty voting in appointment processes is in conflict with the universities conflict of interest policy: this needs to be discussed at negotiations
 - There is no conflict of interest in having Part-time faculty vote on the re-appointment criteria/process. Re-appointment allows you to get workload but how workload is allocated is a separate mechanism. PT faculty having a say in appointment processes does not affect how much workload they get and is not then a conflict of interest based on definitions in the University policy

4.9.2

- This article needs to be clarified: there is too much ambiguity in this article for the CA to be administered effectively
- The CA has to be clear on how seniority is to be applied. Grievances arise from the difference in interpretations across departments
 - Doling around the table brings in more faculty into the PT pool
 - We should have this under control with the re-appointment process
 - Having taught a course satisfactorily a faculty member can have first refusal on it
 - This is how other institutions have it
- For this we will change to say “this is Gerry’s understanding of the way it should work but we think it needs to be clarified one way or another”

4.8.2.

- Change this suggestion to provide Bill’s legal opinion on this, and include that concerns were brought to Gerry last fall and that this needs to be discussed in negotiations

4.11.2

- Reduction to 144 from 160 (based on issue that came up in Gen Ed) this would allow them to do 3, 4, 1. And they could do another course in addition to the FTPT appointment in the fall.

Article 11

- This submission will be changed to include a statement of MRFA’s supports of the APTC submission in criteria. This will make the CA congruent with the general criteria approved by GFC last year

11.3.2

- add something to the effect of general criteria for promotion (see points 4 and 5)
- Exec agrees on this

Article 14.15

- Increase max from 4 to 5

Gerry will write a cover letter that this have been discussed at exec and exec is in general agreement with these points and in particular we did agree to 14.15