



MAUT Council Meeting
Wednesday, November 20, 2024 at 12:00 pm
In-person meeting with hybrid option

Approved Agenda

1. Approval of Agenda
2. Approval of Council Minutes of 2024-10-23
3. Guest: [Kevin Skerrett](#), Director of the Financialization Research Lab Carleton University (30 minutes)
 - i. Pension Plan
4. McGill's Special Open Call for Canada Research Chairs (Tier 1 and Tier 2) for First Nations, Inuit and Métis Applicants [Y. Winter]
5. Business Arising from the Minutes (Action Items)
 - o Survey update (B. Forest)
 - o Feedback: Working Group - Review of Policy On Harassment and Discrimination and Procedures Related to the Policy on Harassment, Incivility, and Discrimination (R. Hill)
 - o Student Code of Conduct - Council to communicate a statement (M. Hendricks)
6. President's Report [N. Quitoriano]
 - i. Report on the General Meeting –Nov. 1, 2024
 - ii. Chair evaluations
 - iii. Hiring for Character update
 - iv. MAUT Membership Study - Feedback
 - v. CASC Joint-Statement
 - vi. Librarian Section meeting
 - vii. Emergency Operations Policy (comments will be solicited from Senate)
 - viii. UN speaker relocation (Steve)
 - ix. Appointment of the ad-hoc committee resulting from Motion 1 of the General meeting, Gerbern Oegema, Bill Coish, Bernard Robaire and Meyer Nahon with Tim Elrick volunteering as a resource person.
7. President-Elect [S. Jordan]
8. Past-President's Report [P. Grutter]
9. VP External [D. Guitton]
10. VP Finance [K. Bevan]
11. VP Communications [R. Sieber]
12. CAS [C. Riches]

13. Library Section [S. Hervieux]

14. Other Business

i. MAUT Revenue & Membership in a Post-Union Environment – [Estimates Table](#) (B. Forest)

15. Adjournment



MAUT Council Meeting
Wednesday, November 20, 2024 at 12:00 pm
In-person meeting with hybrid option

Attendees:	<u>Executive Officers</u>	<u>Council Members</u>
	Nate Quitarano, President	Miranda Hickman
	Steve Jordan, President-Elect	Ben Forest
	Peter Grutter, Past-President	Ipek Tureli
	Dan Guitton, VP External	Sandra Hyde
	Renee Sieber, VP Communications	Reghan Hill
	Kirk Bevan, VP Finance (virtual)	Catherine Lu
		Lisa Munter (virtual)
		Yves Winter
		Michael Hendricks
		Dominic Frigon
		Sandy Hervieux, LS (virtual)
		Caroline Riches, CAS (virtual)

Guest: Kevin Skerrett, Adjunct Research Professor, Carleton University, Institute of Political Economy

Members: In-person (4) and virtual (5)

MAUT Office: JA Watier, Administrative Officer and J. Varga, Professional and Legal Officer

Regrets: Jelena Ristic, VP Internal | Frank Ferrie, RAC

Approved Minutes

N. Quitarano called the meeting to order at 12:05 pm.

1. Approval of Agenda

R. Sieber moved to approve the agenda, seconded by Y. Winter. Council approved.

2. Approval of Council Minutes of 2024-10-23

B. Forest moved to approve the minutes, seconded by S. Jordan. Council approved.

3. Guest: [Kevin Skerrett](#), Director of the Financialization Research Lab Carleton University (30 minutes)

i. Pension Plan

Sandra introduced Kevin Skerrett, a Senior Research Officer for the Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE) for nearly 30 years, primarily in pension policy, collective bargaining, membership education and governance support work. He is an Adjunct Research Professor at Carleton University's Institute of Political Economy and currently the Director of the Financialization Research Lab there.

Kevin began by describing his past involvement with CUPE and said that he dealt mostly with the university sector where he found that single employer pension plans are subject to collective bargaining and unique across Canada and Quebec. He explained that while working on a project at Carleton, he was approached by someone from AMPL and was asked to look into McGill's pension plan hence his involvement. He found interesting and troubling history on the governance and decision making around

the McGill Pension Plan (MUPP). The conversation with the Executive from AMPL lead them to formally ask Kevin to provide support and to thoroughly analyse the pension plan. His [presentation](#) is as follows:

➤ **Pension Plan 101**

- **Two primary type plans: “Defined benefit” (DB) vs “Defined contribution” (DC) vs “hybrid”**
McGill had the hybrid up until 2009 – combines the two defined elements: benefit and contribution. Fund, secure and deliver a pension when you retire – calculated fund in accordance to your income = a life income at a fixed level. A defined contribution plan does not have the formula of the benefit and takes but the contribution rate from the member and employer (a certain percentage) and goes into an individual account, gets invested during the course of your employment, accumulates and the balance becomes the responsibility of the person to invest it so they have income when they retire.
- **Traditional DB model offered security to members, with uncertain liability borne by employer (U of T plan = 54.5% replacement rate on \$150K after 30 years...at 21% cost)**
The primary obligation from the university is promised to the employee and ensures the money is secured.
- **Employers in private sector began withdrawing from DB plans where possible (move to DC), and cutting costs and liabilities as an alternative - accelerated after 2008**
Withdrawing from the DB plan when they can and shutting them down for new hires (creating a two tier structure). To cut cost and lower liability (or eliminate).
- **DC plan fixes cost / liability to employer, all risks borne by plan member; makes contribution rate far more important**

➤ **Hybrid Plans**

- **Best of both worlds”**
Hybrid plans are common in the university sector. It is a guaranteed secure defined benefit formula. It follows you throughout your career (it will calculate of the contribution flow and what the level of your balance is with a defined contribution plan – when you a DC plan when you retire, you will have a guaranteed promise plus the value of your account – you will get the higher of the two). However, it is one of the lowest at McGill.
- **Provides fixed-cost DC contributions for members and employer at set rates**
- **Benefit protected by a “minimum guarantee” formula, which is effectively a guaranteed DB benefit formula**
- **Minimum Guarantee plan must be funded (by employer, calculated as “current service cost”)**
It is a defined benefit plan and guaranteed by the employer (plus contributions by the employee) but the value of that guarantee is traditionally an employer obligation in the plan at McGill up until 2009.
- **Minimum Guarantee can generate deficiencies, and if so, deficiencies must be funded, traditionally by employer alone**
On the actuarial side – when you have that guarantee and employer liability and there is enough money coming in, they do an asset liability comparison to make sure that the assets are close to or higher than the liability. When lower, you have a deficit and the pension lock kicks in and the employer has an obligation to fund it. Most universities have the one fixed formula (salary and years of service get calculated together and is different for everyone).

➤ **McGill plan as hybrid-hybrid (or “two-tier hybrid”)**

- **Up to Jan 1, 2009, McGill plan (MUPP) was a “hybrid” of DB & DC, which means it was structured like a DC with individual account tracking, but a “minimum guarantee” formula would apply if the DC account produces a pension that is lower**
The university administration amended the plan and terminated access to the minimum guaranteed formula for new hires appointed as of and after January 1, 2009.

- **MUPP Minimum Guarantee formula substantially lower than University of Toronto/Queen's DB = 46% replacement rate on \$150K after 30 years**

The McGill Part A members is an inferior plan compared to other universities.

- **MUPP minimum guarantee closed to new hires after Jan 1, 2009, with pre-2009 hires placed in "Part A" (DB) and post-2009 in "Part B" (DC only) [Such a "two-tier" orphan clause is no longer legal in Quebec]**

Approximately 40% are still with the Part A and 60% with Part B. Unless there is a change in the next 15 years but at some point when all Part A members eventually retire, the Part A plan will no longer exist.

- **Part B members' pensions entirely subject to market, with no certainty of pension outcome, and no indexation**

You will get the balance and will need to invest it accordingly – as stated in one of the points mentioned earlier.

➤ **Subsequent MUPP amendments**

Aside from the changes to Part A and B of the plan, Kevin shared the following amendments that also affected the plan.

- **In 2010, administration (Amendment 23) ended "internal annuity" option, meaning all post-2008 hired members must exit the plan at retirement and no longer receive**
- **In 2012, administration eliminated pension coverage for age 65 and over (to age 71), MAUT objected**

There was a complaint lodged from MAUT with MUPP when they no longer contributed to those over the age of 65.

- **In 2013, administration excluded stipends from pension entitlement**
- **In 2014, administration made a further amendment that established a new member "equal share" of additional contributions "necessary to offset funding deficiencies" - initially 2.2% of payroll (as of 2024 = 1.4%)**

The university introduced 'deficit sharing' for Part A plan members where the employer obligated members to share 50/50 with the employer to fund deficits. Part B members do not co-fund the employer funding obligation.

- **SAI comparative analysis underlines that the McGill plan - both Part A and Part B is substantively inferior to the pension plan standard**

AMPL hired an actuarial firm to make a comparative analysis with other university pension plans. Kevin encouraged Council to read the document provided in the link above.

➤ **Implications for pension governance and bargaining?**

Kevin alerted Council to note the important points below. He added that since the financial crisis, other universities launched a veracious attack on pension benefits (cut benefits, created two tier plans, reduce cost and share the employer liability). Working with CUPE group and defacto coalitions to defend pension plans that were under attack, they have successfully defended these groups to be part of the collective bargaining. However, at McGill, the unions have no bargaining rights but only have consultative rights giving the university the right to do what they want. It is possible that they have breached consultation rights and have gotten away with unilateral cuts to the pension plan and have taken advantage of those who don't have real power. Kevin suggested that with the new faculty unions on the rise at McGill to make the pension plan part of their collective bargaining and to coordinate a common goal as not to have several different types of pension plans.

- **McGill appears to be one of the only universities in Canada that has no obligation to negotiate cuts or changes to the primary pension plan in collective bargaining**
- **The Pension Administration Committee (PAC) is nominally a fiduciary body with powers to recommend amendments, but does not have independent governing power**

- **With the certification of multiple faculty groups (AMPL, AMPE, AMPFA, others?), and rising awareness of the weaknesses of MUPP, an opportunity to consider collective bargaining to *protect*, and possibly improve, the plan**
- **Question: Can campus unions coordinate their bargaining, given that the plan's history is one of common benefit and contribution provisions?**

Council discussed and asked how to get a state of the art pension plan. How do we go back to the old pension plan and get everyone back to Part A. The quick answer is it would create a liability when the plan's deficiency is shrinking but it would grow the liability (even if the university incurred the expense – it will be very difficult to have them revert and expensive). Another option that would be easier in resorting the previous plan, is to increase the current service cost (the employers cost to provide the pension that is being earned and accrued going forward would increase slightly). Less expensive and a viable strategy. If you compare Part A and Part B, (Part B is much inferior plan – but with Part A, they had a downgrade as they paid the fund deficiency which made it a worse plan) both Part A and B pay the same into the plan. Another question from Council is would we be allowed to know the pension plan from another group (AMPL) and that you can give to one union and not another? That would create inequity and could happen. It would be very difficult for one union to negotiate the pension plan (there is usually a clause in the collective bargaining). Kevin encouraged MAUT to speak with AMPL to get a sense of what they are negotiating.

4. McGill's Special Open Call for Canada Research Chairs (Tier 1 and Tier 2) for First Nations, Inuit and Métis Applicants [Y. Winter]

Ben spoke on behalf of Yves saying that he wanted to propose that MAUT raise these concerns at the next 3 P's meeting with the Provost and if everyone on Council feels the same about the new process on selecting new chairs. The Provost office, announced that they have set of Canada Research Chairs (tier 1 and tier 2), first nations scholarship. The process they described is that the Office for Indigenous Initiatives (Celeste Pedri-Spade) will recruit and vet candidate for these chairs, move them around to different units and departments to see who is interested in them. Question from Ben, does this seems to invert the usual process for the selection of Canada Research Chairs where the selection is initiated by the unit and continues up the chain for approval. The way these Canada Research Chairs are defined, it would appear that any candidate would require the approval of the Indigenous Affairs Office (a regulation that MAUT spent much time discussing last year). The issue is the order in which recruitment occurs, this puts the Provost office as the primary driver (controlling which candidates will be presented to certain units). Council discussed and one said that this 'call' has been open the last two weeks but it has not trickled down to his department. No one in Science knows about this and the process/structure seems odd and we should push back on this. Some groups might actually be seeking these types of chairs (there are four CRC chairs: governance, education, nutrition and sustainability). It seems to be an erosion on departmental normal processes. A Council member also mentioned the hiring freeze and joint appointments. Some indigenous faculty were not consulted and should have been and could be a good fit for the one on governance (it's created conflicting initiatives). Some departments are approached multiple times with requests to form committees to hire certain people. The CRC program requires four positions to be filled with indigenous chairs and that is fine but the process is questionable. This will be brought to the meeting with the 3 P's and Provost before it goes any further. Meanwhile a motion will be drawn up during the meeting.

Motion: Renee moved the motion, seconded by Ipek

MAUT Council is concerned at the recent open call for CRCs (1&2) for First Nations, Inuit and Metis that appears contrary to previous hiring practices and standard department hiring procedures for these positions. In particular, the posted 'selection and recruitment process' bypasses conventional/established hiring procedures in departments and faculties by placing primary authority/control over candidate selection with the Provost and Office of Indigenous Initiatives. Council discussed and a two friendly amendments were made by Ben and

Miranda. Renee and Ipek accepted these changes. No further questions or comments. **Council voted unanimously. The motion passed.**

5. Business Arising from the Minutes (Action Items)

- **Survey update (B. Forest)**
Ben reported that the survey was sent out (340 full responses to date) and will be sending a reminder soon.
- **Feedback: Working Group - Review of Policy On Harassment and Discrimination and Procedures Related to the Policy on Harassment, Incivility, and Discrimination (R. Hill)**
Reghan solicited feedback from Nate, Ben and Yves and thanked them for concrete input. He uploaded the documents to the MAUT shared drive (under governance folder) for everyone to access and will continue to update it as things progress. MAUT document was submitted to the Chair of the working group and will meet soon (perhaps on Monday). There were changes made to the document just before the Council meeting and will highlight the changes in an email to Council.
- **Student Code of Conduct - Council to communicate a statement (M. Hendricks)**
Nate communicated the motion to Angela Campbell and Tony Mittermaier – Angela said thank you. Nate had an informal conversation with Tony before Senate saying that he was aware of it and basically that the current policy is not designed for situations now (weaponization of the policy) and other aspects and so it needs to be updated. Michael added they are aware of the bigger picture issue but unable to proceed on the bigger scale.

6. President's Report [N. Quitoriano]

i. Report on the General Meeting –Nov. 1, 2024

Nate reported that he assigned four people on the ad hoc committee as result of Motion from the November 1st General Meeting (Gerbern Oegema, Meyer Nahon, Bill Coish and Bernard Robaire including Tim Elrick has a resource person). They are meeting tomorrow – Nate asked them to respect the April 1st deadline. They asked for support but Nate reminded them that they have \$15k that can be used if they need help. The parody committee will consist of two people who self identify as pro-association and two as pro-union.

MAUT member guest, J. Galaty had two questions: 1. Many professors are not aware that unionization is happening across campus and asked Council that a notice go out reporting on the General Meeting of November 1st along with the passed motions. Perhaps a more robust message be sent out to MAUT members so that people are alerted as part of MAUT's responsibilities. It was asked that Renee, VP Communications, write something for the newsletter as this is an important and pressing matter. J. Galaty offered to write a piece for the newsletter if it would be more helpful – the offer was accepted by Council. 2. Given the comments by J. Levy, at the General meeting, he said we have to make clear and be sure that people are not in conflict of interest and anyone who is part of a union and has signed their union card, should not be part of any decision process at MAUT. According to a Council member, you cannot ask people to declare themselves on whether or not they have signed a union card. It is private information and illegal in Quebec. The grey area in this situation is while there is no collective agreement, an MAUT member (any of the current three unions) may continue their MAUT membership but once a collective agreement is signed, the MAUT member will have to leave the association. At this time, J. Ristic, VP Internal is working on a Conflict of Interest Policy for this same type of situation but for those in leadership positions. Everyone agreed that the situation can be complex and perhaps unethical when it comes to voting on issues of interest for MAUT (what are the circumstances). What is the definition and what constitutes a conflict of interest? Everyone's idea of a conflict of interest is different. People would have to self

evaluate and make the right decisions until their union has fully unionized. Someone raised the abstract question, what would it take if someone wanted to be a member of both (association and union)? There would have to be changes made to the Constitution, review the different models and so on.

i. Chair evaluations

Nate would like to see more feedback from the university. Council thought two good places to pilot this would be chair evaluations and financial services. Nate sent a draft that he and Caroline Marchionni worked on over the summer to the Provost but has not heard back yet.

ii. Hiring for Character update

Not addressed at this time.

iii. MAUT Membership Study – Feedback

Nate reminded everyone that a draft was sent out and asked that everyone review it.

iv. CASC Joint-Statement

In the most recent CASC meeting, the Provost is continuing to support the current three year policy – there won't be any significant changes from last year. It was suggested we have a joint statement soon and waiting to hear back from the Provost. Peter suggested that a draft with short two liner, 1% across the board, plus the salary sum and merit will remain the same as last year and bring it to them.

v. Librarian Section meeting

Nate attended the LS Fall General Meeting (hybrid) on Monday. One of the things they are planning (in parallel to MAUT) is polling and obtaining information to understand more about unionization (benefits and drawbacks), etc. They will probably form a committee and may be helpful to keep us informed (perhaps consult with the ad hoc committee and work together).

vi. Emergency Operations Policy (comments will be solicited from Senate)

In a discussion with the President and Provost, Nate brought up the policy and thought it would be good and useful to have Senate at least approve the of the parts of the policy that affects the academic mission as we saw with the partial closure of the campus on Oct. 7th.

vii. UN speaker relocation (Steve)

Steve brought up the topic that Palestinian reporter, Francesca Albanese's talk (scheduled this earlier in the month) was cancelled due to security issues. SSMU organized something for her elsewhere instead. Steve brought this up at the meeting with the President and Provost and they accused her of being anti Semitic. Steve found this troubling as he had not experienced this at her past talks and felt it was a way to silence the talk (cancel culture). Someone said the cancellation was due to a security issue as they had only two exists and an emergency evacuation could be problematic.

viii. Appointment of the ad-hoc committee resulting form Motion 1 of the General meeting, Gerbern Oegema, Bill Coish, Bernard Robaire and Meyer Nahon with Tim Elrick volunteering as a resource person.

7. President-Elect [S. Jordan]

Nothing to report.

8. Past-President's Report [P. Grutter]

Nothing to report.

9. VP External [D. Guitton]

Nothing to report.

10. VP Finance [K. Bevan]

Kirk was pleased to report that all the RBC investment funds have been transferred to Scotiabank. The next step is how to allocate the investment money through a meeting with the Finance Committee.

11. VP Communications [R. Sieber]

Renee asked that anyone interested in submitting a report/article, to do so by the end of the first week in December 2024 (hope to have it sent out by the first week in January 2025).

12. CAS [C. Riches]

On behalf of C. Riches, Carolyn Samuel reported that the first CAS Session on Reappointment and Promotion (for ranked and unranked) went very well with over 60 registered (40 people showed). They conducted a survey at the end of the session to obtain feedback and the results will be reported when ready. It was a success and people expressed that they would like more.

Renee asked if we can get some reflection from CAS to standardize teaching, obligations, number of credits, working conditions across faculty and creating standards that apply to CAS. C. Samuel suggested that this be brought to the Chair of CAS (C. Riches).

13. Library Section [S. Hervieux]

Sandy reported about the fall AGM and said they had good conversations at their meeting. They want more information with what is happening with the different unionization efforts on campus and what it means for them. They are also concerned with losing their academic status and the postponement of the Fiat Flux renovation project that affects their work spaces and how some colleagues working environment is not appropriate for the work that they do.

14. Other Business

- i. **MAUT Revenue & Membership in a Post-Union Environment – [Estimates Table](#) (B. Forest)**
Calculations and estimates for everyone's information.

15. Adjournment

Nate called the meeting to adjourn. Renee moved, seconded by Dominic. The meeting adjourned at 2:01 pm.

Respectfully recorded and submitted by Jo-Anne Watier