

## **NOTES of the Mount Royal Faculty Association**

**Meeting date: September 27, 2010**

**Call to order:** A General meeting of the MRFA, was held in Mount Royal University, Calgary, Alberta on September 27, 2010. The meeting convened at 3:15 pm, President Gerry Cross presiding, and Rod Corbett secretary.

### **Members in attendance:**

See Sign in sheets

### **Announcement**

Fazal Muhammad from Chemistry & Biology passed away two weeks ago. We are holding a memorial for him in the faculty centre Sat Oct 2 from 1-4pm. Everyone who knew him would tell you that he made the world a better place and we will take a few moments to remember him.

### **Officers' reports:**

#### **President**

#### **Election Results**

Part Time Rep: Gerard Lucyshyn (1 year)

Social Events Committee: Christy Tomkins (1 year) and Jocelyn Rempel (2years)

Faculty Evaluation Committee: Carmen Nielson (1 year)

Committee for Review and Interpretation of the CA: Kelly Sundberg and Kit Dobson (2 years)

Third member of this committee is appointed from Negotiating: Lee Easton

Boards members: Manuel Mertin, Brenda Hendrickson and Marc Chikinda

Personal Harassment Standing Committee: Christine Brownell (4 years)

Planned Leave Committee: Janne Holmgren (acclaimed) Gerry Cross (appointed)

Board Members: Robin Fisher and Chad London

Copyright article Committee (to develop a revised copyright article, to be brought to the membership for approval and inclusion in the re-opener in the CA)

David Hyttenrauch (appointed)

Michael Truscello (appointed)

Cari Merkley (support Person)

## **Executive Retreat Report**

- The Executive board had its retreat on Saturday and have prepared a PowerPoint that documents what was discussed. It will be posted on the website as part of the President's report.
  - The retreat was held in room 1 in the faculty centre so there were no unnecessary expenses

## **MRU President Profile (att.)**

- It is important for us to present a clear and unified position on what we want in the next president
- The executive board presented the draft to one of the search consultants this morning
- The Executive proposes a discussion on the draft and then move to have any significant changes incorporated. Then, we will formally approve the document as adopted by the membership.
  - In the discussion we may make changes without a motion if they are in the spirit of the document others may be included as amendments
- The draft was developed based on input from faculty
  - August 25 the Executive sent out a request through department communicators for faculty to send all input/feedback on what the search consultants should look for in the next president.
  - The Executive went through the feedback at the retreat and developed the draft being presented
- Floor open to discussion:
  - Point of order: approve the agenda before going to business
    - No additions to the Agenda
    - Agenda approved.
  - I am pleased to see that most of what has been included was along the lines of what we talked about in our department. I commend the emphasis on teaching throughout the document. It speaks to the fact that we are in times of growth but we know where we are going and we need a leader to take us there (this is the time where we need to institutionalize our goals). I commend the Executive on articulating our needs in all dimensions.
    - We are going to be a teaching focused institution so it would be great as seen in the draft to have a President who has experience in teaching
  - A statement should be included that the candidate have excellence in scholarship as well as teaching (bullet 2 page 1)
    - Gerry: There are 2 reasons why we do not have a direct statement on wanting someone with a strong research record:
      1. This was not in the feedback that we got from our members
      2. We are acutely aware that we need to find the balance between teaching and

scholarship that is consistent with our values. We are aware that one of the dangers as we go forward is to be pushed too much toward a research trajectory. We thought by requiring a PhD in an academic discipline that there would be a sufficient record in research and an understanding of research that would come along with that. This is why we do not have any specific statement regarding research.

- This is something that you will have to bring forward as a formal amendment.
- (Second page third bullet) Can this clarify to include government and public policy experience “working with external agencies including government and public policy”
  - This change will be made as it is in the spirit of the document
- What was the reasoning behind requiring an external candidate
  - Internal candidates bring too much baggage for this position: we need someone with a clean slate
  - We do not want change we want stability and an infusion of ideas as of how to obtain our goals would be very beneficial
  - Then this means that if we have people excel in the institution, then for them to progress they have to go somewhere else?
  - The profile is only meant to provide direction to the search consultants: if there were an application from an exceptional candidate who does not match our profile perfectly they would bring the person to the search committee anyway (this would apply to an internal candidate)
- (last bullet page 2) “Industry” Why is this to be excluded and why is there no explanation of that in the document.
  - There is a trend at other institutions to look to industry to fill these admin positions, but based on our situation and what we are looking for regarding growth and focus we do not believe that selecting from industry would be beneficial to us.
    - We are working to establish ourselves as a credible undergraduate university. We have a unique model that needs to be sold to our peers and that requires an academic not a business person.
  - Some of this explanation needs to be included
    - It will be as it is still in the spirit of the document
- There needs to be some statement about the candidate having some research background. It is important for the person we get to help us move forward in promoting research. New universities in BC are facing difficulties in getting their research programs underway: we should

not underestimate the amount of support we need for both streams. Also, there has to be more emphasis on the ability of the president to get resources in this kind of climate. Finally, why did Ontario Colleges make the list? I do not perceive anything special about these institutions

- Change Ontario to Canadian Colleges
  - We do recognize that we do not want to exclude the college system.
  - This change can be made
- On first point: this is an important point, please consider wording for an amendment to add into this to the document
- Comments on getting resources: my understanding is that it is important for the president to develop relationships at the minister and deputy minister levels but in terms of fundraising and political interest there are other areas of the institution that have roles in this.
- We are not looking for a fundraiser to be the president which was why we did not emphasize this point
- Ontario has colleges that do extensive collaboration with universities and are not essentially colleges in the traditional sense but are satellites of universities. They are, thus, very good at brokering deals and making alliances. This would be very useful for us. I'm not sure that a US liberal arts college would understand our education models and government. If we have to go to the states then we have not fully looked at all Canadian options.
  - Someone can bring forward a motion for this as it is something that needs to be voted on
- I do not see any comments here on academic freedom
  - This is not on here but you can suggest that it should be on here
    - Commitment to diversity may impinge on academic freedom though
    - We expect that the president will expect to deal with conflicting priorities.
  - Adding this is consistent with the feedback
    - Add commitment to academic Freedom
- Perhaps add a preamble that indicates items are unranked and unweighted
  - This will be added

Resolved that the draft profile as revised by the preceding discussion be endorsed as the MRFA position to be taken forward by the MRFA appointee on the presidential search committee.

Moved Darlene Dawson

Seconded Mardy Roberts

### **Amendments:**

Moved by Jack Dobbs Strike small US liberal arts college

Seconded Lee Easton

Discussion

- This was added to the profile as there were a number of comments arguing for the importance of skill set over local context. We do not want to limit our search and remove people who have the skill set and adaptability: as such I would vote against the motion.
- Gerry out of chair speaking in favor of motion: the US system is very different than the Canadian system. And, again, if the search consultants find people that are exceptional through the process and they are at a small liberal arts college then that person will still be brought to the search committee. By striking it we do not prevent it but it is no longer a primary place to look
- If we had a preamble here to have requirement for understanding of Canadian context then this point could remain.
- I object to the notion of small institution. We are by no means a small institution

Vote

Carried: so stricken

Moved by Randy Genereux to add “acquiring resources” to bullet 2 on page 2

Seconded Qasim Syed

- Discussion
- I recognize that we have VPs for this we should have something on the management of resources.
  - This will have to come as a separate amendment

Vote on amendment

Carried

Moved by Randy Genereux to Strike Ontario colleges and replace with “colleges with a strong academic focus and a collegial governance model”

Seconded Stefan Sikora

Discussion

- This is to mean faculty have a large role in decision making
- Is this being redundant: is the intention here to say that we want Canadian, or certain

government structures etc.

- Colleges differ tremendously in these factors: those that are and really are not collegial. I would not be comfortable recruiting from the latter.
- Are we recruiting a person or the reputation of the college?
  - In this case we do not need this point at all regarding what college to come from

Vote

Carried

Moved by Don to Amend bullet 5 on page 1: “excellence in scholarship of teaching and learning as and/or in any other academic discipline would be an asset”

Seconded: Randy Genereux

Discussion

- Speaking against: the whole bullet is too prescriptive
- And/or would be better (Dawn Agrees to this change to his amendment)
- I am not comfortable with the focus of excellence for research: we need to send a clear message about what we want and that has to be excellence in teaching
  - If this is voted down we will have another amendment that will replace excellence with experience.
- Do we even need to have SoTL as a separate example?
  - Since SoTL is a major focus of Mount Royal it does merit special attention
- There are many other places in this doc that refer to teaching this one place should have research in it
- The search consultant said something similar this morning

Vote

Amendment defeated

Moved by Lee Easton to amend bullet 5 on page 1: “experience in scholarship of teaching and learning as and/or in any other academic discipline would be an asset”

Seconded Don

Discussion

- This makes the statement useless: if you have a PhD in an academic discipline then you have research experience.
- This institution puts a high premium on pedagogy and research. This is a statement of identity

we do not want to weaken it.

- It seems like all we are talking about is what kind of wording we use to get our point across could we not simply state that the candidate be able to support research and have excellence in teaching

Vote

Defeated

Wording change in the spirit of the document

Motion from Ivan Grabovac to add a bullet under SoTL Bullet: in essence “someone who supports scholarship appropriate for a teaching focused university”

Seconded: Kit Dobson

Discussion

- People said they wanted to develop research but not at the expense of the quality of teaching. We need to ensure that the development of our research culture is consistent with our values.
- Could we not have: an individual who understands scholarship in a teaching focused institution.

Vote

Carried

Moved by Beverley to strike must be an external candidate

Seconded: Brian Flemming

Discussion

- If we think that there is nobody good enough internally to be president then we are really excluding all the people who know most about our institution

Vote

Defeated

Moved by Trevor to add point on second page regarding proven record of effectively managing financial resources

Seconded: Lee Easton

- The job of the president is to hire people who do this for him. The president has to have a good VP of administrative services
- Still some experience in this would be useful in hiring these people
- Need to define well or poorly managing

Vote

Carried

Resolved that the draft profile as revised by the preceding amendments be endorsed as the MRFA position to be taken forward by the MRFA appointee on the presidential search committee.

Vote

Carried

The updated version will be sent out to the membership

The consultant requested that we pass the following message to our membership: if you, in your experience at another universities or colleges, worked with someone who you think would be a good candidate to please let them know of these people. This is an important step in their process of finding candidates. W-mail Cathy Williams or Gerry Cross with the information

## **2<sup>nd</sup> Vice president**

### **Robert's Rules Workshop September 1 2010**

This time we did it at the beginning of the year so people could apply what they learnt  
40 people attended

We made it more interactive with Mount Royal scenario motions

Using common set of course materials for multi-section courses

Presence on the campus

The idea was to make it more relevant so that people could learn more from it.

Evaluations received were very positive and all found the workshop useful

Impact on our meetings: we are bringing motions forward regarding our order of business and appointment of chair.

### **Board and committee reports:**

#### **Negotiating Committee, David Sabiston & Gerard Lucyshyn**

Updates

We ratified a two year agreement with a re-opener to look at non-monetary items

The new CA is on the MRFA website and hard copies will be avail shortly

They will still be addressing anomalies from the changes made to salary

### **Anomalies**

- Some faculty are receiving less under the new grid: all effected people will receive a letter by the end of this week (contact the Negotiating Team if you have not gotten this letter but think you should)
- The MRFA and the Board agreed that nobody would earn any less on the new grid than they did on the old grid.
- The MOU to correct these anomalies will be in effect until 2016. The people affected will receive at least as much as they did under the old grid until 2016.
- Payment schedule (this is in the CA on page 105)
  - These are the grid steps as of today : values displayed are what you will get
  - These members will get cheques on Nov 30 of each year (this was done for tax purposes)
  - You will get this unless you stop working here, acquire a new credential or move up a rank.

### **Part Time Update**

- Nothing has changed from previous report
- Fixed-term Part-time contracts
  - We are still waiting to find out the distribution of these positions among faculties and departments
  - There are 25 positions available
  - It is a guaranteed 384 SICH, pensionable and they are signed for up to 36 months
    - This means that you are guaranteeing 384 for three years but there is a provision to terminate the contract due to other concerns. It is modeled on the tenure system: similar dismissal policies as for FT faculty
  - The people that were invited to apply for these were those who worked 384 last year and had 192 coming into the fall. The goal of these contracts was to target the long term faculty. If you are at step 4 then you have taught for 20 semesters or more: the intent is to give the positions to these people. If long term Part-time faculty who are currently on step 4 do not use all of the positions then they will be given to faculty at step three
- Continuing Par-time Contracts
  - These are still available

- This is a minimum of 240 SICH per year
- This can go up to 24 months
- To qualify have to have done 4 semesters in last 36 months

### **Special Rules of Order**

These are based on feedback we heard last year from members. We want to try and run our meetings more effectively and efficiently

We run our meetings by Robert's Rules of Order which prescribes the order of our items. If we want to divert from the standard then we need to have a standing special rule of order. The rationale for diverting from the prescribed order is that we want to have the most important items at the beginning of meetings and we want the flexibility to do this. This may not always be possible but we will strive to make things move more efficiently whenever possible

Resolved, that the MRFA Executive Board is authorized to place New Business items at any place in the order of business of regular meetings for the remainder of the 2010-2011 academic year.

Moved Scott Murray

Seconded Martin Haworth

Vote

Carried Unanimously

Resolved, that the President of the MRFA is authorized to designate a regular member in good standing to chair any general or special meeting of the MRFA during the remainder of 2010-2011 academic year as a pilot project.

Moved Lee Easton

Seconded Margy MacMillan

Discussion:

- This will effectively be a speaker and it will enable the president to be partial
  - It was intended to be Qasim the parliamentarian
  - We have structured this so that at the beginning of any meeting if needed we appoint a speaker. This would not always be done but when needed
- This appears to be one of the responsibilities of the president to chair our meetings.
  - This is not in our bylaws it is past practice

- Would this be for the whole meeting?
  - Yes this would be for the entire meeting yes.
- In support of this due to how often the president has to recues himself from chair
- Since it is a pilot there will be feedback and a report solicited from Membership
  - Yes, there will be

Vote

Carried Unanimously

## **New Business**

### **1. MRFA Updates**

#### **A) Ethics Committee, Sinc MacRae**

- Background:
  - We have been going through a process of identifying the role of the committee
  - We want to bring to the membership a draft of our new ethics code: Sinclair drafted this in 07-08 and we have had some discussion (it will be posted on the website)
    - We have also drafted the processes to support this code
  - We will be opening this to discussion to our membership at the Oct meeting
    - This will be included in the bylaw change proposal for May 2011
  - Rationale for revision of the Bylaws:
    - The bylaws have been added to over time
    - Many members are unhappy with the limits we have presently
    - There is little recourse in the bylaws
    - The new bylaws make room for informal resolution of complaints
    - We want to maintain jurisdiction over our own professional conduct,
    - We found that codes are more effective if they are inspirational and educational, this will reduce the amount of complaints that go to the personal harassment policy.
- Other Considerations
  - This means that we will have to provide training in conflict resolution for our committee members, we will also propose that members have a four year term in the future so that there is more continuity.

- The draft will be sent to all members and we will facilitate consultation on the draft until the AGM
  - This will be an item open to discussion and revision at the October General Meeting
  - There will also be an opportunity to discuss the draft with the committee between now and then
- This is an entire overhaul and it is important that we have full consultation in this process.
  - One person cannot write it all. There has to be changes made
- We are hoping to have a second draft by November 15 so that there can be further discussion before spring

#### **B) PD Committee**

- The PD retreat is scheduled for May 10-11, 2011.
  - Please tell your chair that these are the dates
    - It is going to be in the delta lodge in Kananaskis
    - Call for proposals end of this term and registration will begin next term
- First get cracking is this Thursday: free breakfast and discuss teaching and research
- All day PD day scheduled in February

#### **C) MRFA 45<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Committee**

Save the Date: May 6, and May 13

May 6 is a wine and cheese in the faculty centre

May 13 is a dinner dance

As part of the centennial the MRFA is celebrating its 45<sup>th</sup> anniversary

If you know anyone who would like to come or have anything to contribute please contact Chantelle Anderson

The committee would appreciate any pictures or other memorabilia you may have. Please send to Chantelle Anderson.

#### **D) Faculty Centre Update**

It was reported last year that we were having problems with people stealing up to \$000 a

month from the centre

It has improved but we are still working on some measures to decrease this even further

## **2. Executive Goals for 2010-2011**

We wanted to present these to you so you could add or refine anything we have planned thus far

We will include the draft goals in the minutes and the executive will start working on them. We

can have a motion to postpone to October

Moved Lee Easton

Seconded Martin Haworth

Vote

Carried

**Adjourned 5:04 pm**