
MAUT Council Meeting

MINUTES

Friday, November 13, 2013
McGill Faculty Club 12:00 noon

Present:	
Executive:	K. Hastings, A. Shrier, B. Lennox, A. Saroyan, G. Mikkelson, B. Reed
Council:	H. Durham, L. Glass, A. Kirk, A. Paré, M. Nahon, K. Siddiqi, L. Kloda, A. Moores
Regrets:	C. Ragan, P. Caines, K. Hashimoto, K. GowriSankaran, R. Sieber
MAUT Staff:	H. Kerwin-Borrelli, J. Varga
Guests:	B. Fung, R. Jones

K. Hastings called the **Open Session** of the meeting to order at 12:10 pm.

1. Adoption of the Agenda

K. Hastings asked Council to review the proposed agenda. Under Business Arising, A. Saroyan requested discussion of the letter to Premier P. Marois, and B. Reed requested a discussion on communications at the Fall General Meeting. G. Mikkelson requested to propose an additional member for the Membership Committee, under Appointments to MAUT Standing Committees in the Closed Session. With these additions, the Agenda was accepted by consensus following motion by H. Durham, seconded by G. Mikkelson.

2. Approval of Minutes [May 08/13 Joint Council]

Bruce Reed noted that more details should be recorded concerning discussions on the Election 2013 issue and the Gillon/Galaty letter. K. Hastings proposed deferring approval of these minutes until the next meeting and Council approved by consensus.

3. Professional Licensing Issue

As noted in the annotated agenda for the November 8, 2013 Council meeting, the following draft letter had been circulated to Council by email for adoption following the October 23 meeting, but several Councilors requested further discussion of the issue before any vote to adopt the letter. This discussion was on the agenda for the November 8 2013 Council meeting, but due to lack of time, it was deferred to the November 13 meeting.

Oct 28 2013 draft letter

Dr Lydia White
Associate Provost (Policies, Procedures and Equity)
James Administration Building
McGill University

Dear Dr White,

I write to you on behalf of MAUT Council about an issue faced by several professors in the Counselling Psychology Program in the Faculty of Education.

The issue concerns professional licensing requirements. Several professors who did not require to be licensed when they were hired have, since the passage of Bill 21 (whose implementation dates to September 2012), been required to be licensed by the Order of Psychologists of Québec in order to continue to carry out their teaching duties in the supervision of professional clinical training.

The costs are significant. The initial cost of licensing is upwards of \$1,000, not including the costs of French language classes which may be required in some cases for requisite proficiency, there is an annual fee to maintain the license of at least \$700, and licensees are further required to complete a minimum of 90 hours of continuing education per 5-year period which is associated with additional costs.

The university apparently expects these professors to pay these licensing-related costs out of their own pockets.

We see it as unfair that McGill professors who are newly required to obtain professional licenses, due to changes in program accreditation requirements, be expected to pay for these licenses out of their own pockets without compensation. While people who are aware at the time of being hired that licensing is required for them to do the job can reasonably be expected to pay the costs, as they would be in a position to include that as an element of their starting salary requirements, it is not fair to have a costly licensing requirement imposed after hiring. Such cases should either be "grandfathered" out of the licensing requirement or, if this is not possible, the university should pay the licensing and associated costs directly, or indirectly by compensation, e.g., by a salary anomaly adjustment or other mechanism.

The question of the use of the professors' Professional Development funds for this purpose has been raised but not only are these inadequate to cover the actual costs, it is unfair to require that certain professors apply their funds to licensing requirements when others use the funds in various ways to advance their research.

We ask that you look into this matter, and that you consider means by which this unfair situation could be redressed.

I copy Dr Martin Drapeau, the professor who brought these issues to MAUT's attention, and Dr Marilyn Fitzpatrick (Program Director, Graduate Counselling Psychology).

Sincerely,

Ken Hastings
President MAUT

A. Kirk questioned why one program was singled out. He proposed that the University cover the costs of all professional licensing requirements imposed by accrediting bodies. He suggested getting an understanding of how many academics are affected. A. Saroyan noted the requirement regarding Counseling Psychologists requires academics, as members of their professional association, to pay also for obligatory French proficiency lessons. M. Nahon noted that practices regarding licensing fees vary among the faculties and among the departments. If a licensing is required, the University should inform academics and pay for it.

B. Lennox suggested two letters be prepared: one to be sent to Deputy Provost L. White outlining the problem for academics affected by post-hiring imposition of licensing requirements, and the second to MAUT members asking for information on practices and costs across the university. A. Moores proposed that rather than compensating the licensing costs by increasing salary that these costs simply be reimbursed. H. Durham emphasized that MAUT should specify the problem areas but not outline solutions for the University.

It was decided that K. Hastings will redraft the letter and circulate again to Council and that A. Saroyan will write to H. Richard, [Academic Planning Officer] for data on newly-hired and established academics and programs affected by professional licensing.

4. Process for Committee Selection

At the November 8, 2013 Council meeting, during discussion of the approach that ought to be taken to establish the membership of the MAUT Caucus of CASC (Committee on Academic Staff Compensation) an option arose with considerable support, which could be expressed as the following draft motion, which K. Hastings included in the annotated agenda for the November 13 Council meeting.

Draft: The MAUT membership of CASC includes the President (ex officio), Past-President, President-Elect, and the relevant number of additional members proposed by the President after appropriate consultation, and approved by Council.

At the November 13 meeting A. Saroyan suggested a change: *after consultation with and approval by Council* and moved that motion, as follows:

Motion: The MAUT membership of CASC includes the President (ex officio), Past-President, President-Elect, and the relevant number of additional members proposed by the President after consultation with, and approval by, Council.

Seconded by A. Kirk. Discussion followed.

G. Mikkelson argued that the proposed inclusion of the Past-President and President-Elect on CASC (in addition to the President who serves ex officio) has no natural rationale, and that Council should decide the composition of CASC by voting on a list of potential members drawn up by the Working Group on MAUT Nominees to University Committees.

A. Shrier argued that, subject to Council approval, the President should select an efficient and balanced team, which might not occur under a system of election, and that inclusion of the President-Elect and Past-President was important in order to ensure multi-year continuity and experience.

A. Paré commented that Council should choose the CASC members with the appropriate breadth of expertise.

A. Kirk commented on the importance of continuity and being *in the room* during discussions, and supported the inclusion of the three presidents.

B. Lennox supported the motion, reminding Council that CASC is a parity committee that advises the Provost, and the dynamics are such that the President has a significant responsibility requiring a well-matched team.

M. Nahon commented that the issue of continuity is important as regards the three presidents, but that other members should be elected by Council, such that each year approximately one-half of the CASC team would be new.

Discussion coming to close, a vote was held. Of the 14 members present 8 voted in favor, and 6 against. The Motion was passed.

5. Discussion: 2014 Merit vs. across-the-board

In advance of the November 28 2013 CASC meeting, K. Hastings requested that Councilors share their views on the distribution of the June 1, 2014 academic salary mass increase of 5.2% into merit vs. across-the-board (ATB) categories.

A. Paré proposed dropping merit for this year in favor of ATB. G. Mikkelson supported this proposal and stated that merit does not support but undermines excellence. *A. Paré said he will forward supporting data at a future date.*

B. Reed proposed, on the basis of calculations including inflation and pension deficit-reduction contributions that 2014 should be a special year with 4.2% ATB and 1% merit and this was supported by M. Nahon.

L. Glass said the merit system is crucial to support excellence and that younger academics would be disadvantaged if the whole increase were to be in the form of an ATB % increase for everyone. Audrey Moores also supported merit, in the form of the usual fixed-dollar amount increments, as being especially important to young faculty. She also suggested that a thorough modeling be done including alternative scenarios, e.g. the ATB and merit both as a percentage, and ATB as well as merit a fixed amount as opposed to a percentage. G. Mikkelson noted the latter approach would reduce inequalities across academics and faculties.

A. Kirk noted the importance of keeping the merit increase and that academics can make cases for anomaly adjustments, if relevant.

A. Shrier stressed that merit encourages top performers and is an important aspect of retention. B. Lennox expressed concern that if the merit exercise is not strengthened, what message will McGill be sending to mobile academics? The data does not account for people who left because remuneration was better elsewhere.

B. Lennox noted that 90% of members are in Merit categories 1, 2 and 3, and only ~3% in the zero merit category, category 5. K. Siddiqi asked to see the supporting data regarding the merit distribution, as his impression is that the merit exercise is stressful; not everyone gets merit increases, often only a token amount.

K. Hastings noted that Councilors did not share a consensus view on the question, with suggestions ranging from maximizing ATB to maximizing merit. He noted that the views of the membership have not frequently been assessed and referred to a survey conducted by M. Smith at the 2007 Spring General Meeting. The results indicated that MAUT members favored both significant ATB and significant merit. Given the division of opinion evident at today's Council discussion it could be informative to consult the current membership on this question.

6. Remote Participation in Council Meetings

Council discussed the issue of using a speakerphone polycom setup in order that Council members could participate remotely. There must be advanced notice for remote participation by Council members and this option would be reserved for out-of-town Council members. B. Lennox spoke about a physical quorum rule and the importance of physical presence. Committee members may phone in at the beginning but they do not count for quorum. There was a clear consensus to move forward with this initiative for the next Council meeting.

7. Business Arising

A. Saroyan inquired whether a copy of the letter to Premier P. Marois had also been sent to the offices of the Quebec political parties QS, CAQ and PLQ. [Note: This was done November 21, 2013]. B. Reed commented on the lack of attendance at the General Meeting and that more communication is needed. He proposed opening the ListServ for postings and holding one forum per month on topics such as: course scheduling, merit, academic freedom and MOOCs. K. Hastings suggested that Council forward a list of topics and that the website could be used to post areas of special interest, such as MOOCs, in addition to members' comments.

The meeting adjourned at 2:46 pm.