
MAUT Council Meeting

Approved MINUTES

November 8, 2017

McGill Faculty Club Ballroom 12:00 noon

Present:

Executive: A. Saroyan, T. Hébert, K. Hasting, N. Hall, P. Rohrbach, A. van den Berg

Council: E. Shor, C. Riches, R. Sieber, J. Ruglis, S. Jordan, S. Severson, T. Duchaine, L. Gonnerman, S. Gaskin

Regrets: J. Mauzeroll, K. Zien, K. GowriSankaran, M. Richard

MAUT Staff: H. Kerwin-Borrelli, J-A Watier, J. Varga

Guests: Y. Beauchamp, C. Charlebois, R. Canuel, G. Mikkelson, P. Caines, J. Hobbins

A. Saroyan called the meeting to order at 12:12 pm. Speaking rights were granted to guests.

1. Approval of Agenda

Council reviewed the Agenda for the Council meeting on November 8, 2017. A. Saroyan noted the dissemination of these Council documents was on One Drive and a link was provided. The Agenda was modified to include a motion on divestment. K. Hastings moved to approve the Agenda. Seconded by T. Hébert. Council approved unanimously.

2. Approval of Minutes

T. Duchaine moved to adopt the Minutes of the October 18, 2017 Council meeting. Seconded by E. Shor. Council approved unanimously. The approved minutes are posted on MAUT's website.

3. Business Arising

There was no business arising from the minutes.

4. Fall General Meeting [FGM-November 1, 2017] Proposed Agenda

Council was asked to forward their proposals for the final FGM Agenda

5. Divestment [Motions]

Council discussed the proposed motion [#1 of 2] that will be presented as a discussion topic at the FGM. **Motion #1:** *"Be it resolved that the McGill Association of University Teachers divest its financial holdings from all direct investments in companies whose primary business is the extraction, distribution, and/or sale of fossil fuels; and from all mutual funds that directly invest in such companies."*

Council discussed the following:

- MAUT will first investigate its own investments in fossil fuels
- The Finance Committee will follow up with RBC Investment Advisors [RBC-IAs] concerning MAUT's investments, receive data on the Association's investments in fossil fuels, and explore options
- The Finance Committee and RBC-IAs will strategize on a process of divestment from fossil fuels
- The original motion was moved by T. Hébert and seconded by A. Saroyan
- Council noted this motion will be brought to the FGM for discussion
- Following the recommendations from members at the FGM, the discussion will continue at the next Council in December 2017

There was a friendly amendment proposed by K. Hastings and seconded by A. van den Berg: *“Be it further resolved following the discussion at the FGM that Council consider the FGM discussions at its next meeting in December 2017.”*

Council discussed the following;

- If the motion is passed at this Council meeting today and if members at the FGM were opposed to this action, then the motion would be brought back to Council.
- P. Caines asked about details involving the process with the Finance Committee
- K. Hastings withdrew his friendly amendment
- G. Mikkelson inquired about the recent performance of non fossil-free funds and a possible future financial “hit” for MAUT if Council voted in favor of this motion.

A vote was called on Motion #1

Results: At this point, there were 13 Executive and Council members in attendance. 12 members voted in favor; 1 against and there were no abstentions. The motion passed.

Motion #2 was discussed. **Motion #2:** *“Be it resolved that the McGill Association of University Teachers [MAUT] supports divestment of the McGill University pension Plan from all direct investments in companies whose primary business is the extraction, distribution, and/or sale of fossil fuels; and from all mutual funds that directly invest in such companies; and*

Be it further resolved that MAUT supports divestment of the McGill University endowment fund from these such companies.”

Council considered this motion as “moral encouragement” to the University. It was moved by T. Hébert and seconded by A. Saroyan. Council also commented this motion would be a proposal to “lead by example” and not to direct what other people should do.

A vote was called on Motion #2. 9 Executive and Council members voted in favor, 3 against and there was 1 abstention. The motion passed.

6. Follow up on MAUT’s Academic Freedom Forum of Oct 26/17 [A. Saroyan, K. Hastings, A. van den Berg]

30 academics attended the Forum. Prof. N. Guppy, [Professor of Sociology and Senior Advisor on Academic Freedom to the Provosts, UBC] delivered the Keynote Address: “Academic Freedom and the Modern Academy”

Council commented that McGill’s current Statement on Academic Freedom refers to “scholarly members”.

- There could be a procedure/body at the University that would deal with disputes concerning academic freedom
- This body could be established by Senate
- Another possibility would be to include this proposed body within existing grievance procedures
- Council was asked to forward their suggestions
- Academics, including those with administrative appointments, should be vigilant and carefully read the text of their letters of appointment as their mandates must be approved by Senate

- Council also asked whether there should be a Standing Sub-committee of Senate established to deal with these independent freedom issues or whether they should be handled by an independent body.
- The link to the video of this Forum is posted on MAUT's website.

A. Saroyan will follow up on these discussions with a letter to Secretary-General E. Rogowska. Council proposed setting up a working group, including J. Varga, Legal & Professional Officer, to compile data from sister universities as to what mechanisms are in place concerning academic freedom issues and how issues that have arisen have been resolved.

7. Survey of Administrative Overload: [A van den Berg, N. Hall, J. Mauzeroll, S. Severson & R. Sieber]

There is a meeting on November 10th to finalize the questions for the MAUT Survey. The main purpose is to compile members' top "irritants." A. van den Berg noted, from a report submitted by J. Mauzeroll [VP External], that the FQPPU has expressed interest in MAUT's survey results and may support similar initiatives.

8. Elections [T. Hébert]

T. Hébert, Chair, MAUT Nominating Committee for the 2018 Elections, asked Council to forward the names of potential candidates for Executive and Council positions.

9. Halt in Pay Equity Settlement [T. Duchaine]

T. Duchaine updated Council on the evolving issues with the pay equity settlement. He emphasized that MAUT should be represented on both the Administration and Employees sides. He also stressed that MAUT should be consulted and be part of the decision for Implementation Plan of the Pay Equity settlement. This Plan will involve negotiations with unions, in particular AMURE. He forwarded this link:

<https://www.mcgill.ca/hr/channels/news/pay-equity-update-282320>

T. Duchaine also forwarded his summary of the CNEEST meeting held on November 3, 2017.

See Appendix I for T. Duchaine's Report on the Pay Equity Committee Meeting

J. Hobbins was the co-chair of the Pay Equity committee in 2000. She noted all groups were well represented and that the current committee should get back to that kind of representation.

10. Regulations on the Conduct of Research [P. Rohrbach]

P. Rohrbach reported the Working Group on the *Regulations on the Conduct of Research* included V. Talwar, P. Rohrbach, T. Hébert, M. Nahon, D. Titone, and A. Saroyan. The complainants could be students or faculty. If a claim comes forward, the regulations state that the researcher must be kept informed throughout the process. An assessor will be assigned. The OSR checklist stipulates research must be beneficial and not harmful. Council also discussed the definition of "harmful" and that substantive and specific reasons for an investigation must be provided. A second document, *Procedures Related to the Regulations on the Conduct of Research*, was also examined. A. Saroyan asked Council to read both documents together and forward their insights to the Working Group

11. Updates on Committees and Working Group Meetings

a. MAUT-MURA Entente [T. Hébert]

There has been a final offer to MURA for a contribution of \$6.50 per active member. The discussions are on-going. MAUT will provide financial support for both groups based on a funding formula.

b. Service Portfolio [P. Rohrbach, R. Canuel]

The document was formerly considered as “other contributions to the university and scholarly communities”. This Portfolio now provides advice as it is considered an essential component of academics’ applications for reappointment, tenure and promotion. The headings below are followed by bulleted suggestions of specific examples. These include but are not limited to:

- A General Statement of Service Contributions
- Contributions to the Department and Faculty
- Contributions to the University
- Contributions to the Wider Scholarly Community

c) Employment Regulations

A. Saroyan reported that meetings of the Working Group for the Regulations Relating to the Employment of Academic Staff [RREAS] are ongoing. These Regulations deal with dismissal procedures and the necessity for a review by a committee of peers.

d) CASC [T. Hébert, K. Hastings, A. van den Berg, A. Saroyan]

Council was advised that currently in the second year of a three-year agreement, the expected raise for 2018 is 2.5%, which includes 0.75% ATB and Merit. The increase in year three is scheduled to be 2.0%, but this percentage is considered open for discussion if the financial situation improves.

There is yet to be established a CASC Working Group that would provide data and suggest strategies to bring up McGill’s current 11th position among the U-15.

12. MCC and Employee groups’ meeting/Pay Equity and Impending Legislation [K. Hastings]

a) MUNACA letter regarding HMB

Due to time constraints, this agenda item was not discussed.

At 1:30 pm

13. Campus Development Plan [VP Y. Beauchamp (Administration & Finance) and C. Charlebois (Executive Director, Campus Planning & Development Office)]

A. Saroyan introduced C. Charlebois and Y. Beauchamp who discussed McGill’s Master Plan which dates back to 2008. The principles in this document have been maintained and focus on McGill’s real estate including the future of the Royal Victoria Hospital. Referring to the campus, C. Charlebois noted that spaces and landscapes have been mapped to include their relationship. He commented the Plan was a work in progress and incorporated the categories of buildings that would be disposed of. He noted the Strathcona Building requires serious renovations to the tune of \$80 million. The Master Plan will report on how the space is used, information required by the government. The connection between land use and the movement of people will be analyzed and improvements proposed. The Plan and Project are expected to work out the allocation of space, stewardship, primary use and the allocation as to which projects are prioritized. He commented that McGill will use its own buildings, within the campus, instead of renting space.

R. Sieber asked about the block of buildings on Peel Street, one of which houses MAUT's Offices. She emphasized the faculty must be actively engaged in decisions concerning construction and deconstruction. MAUT must be involved in a bottom up approach. C. Charlebois commented that buildings on Peel Street are listed for disposal. However no current tenants will be put out without discussion of the Implementation Plan. No one from the lower campus will be affected until 2025 and the tenants will be consulted. Y. Beauchamp stressed that maintenance costs for "unsuitable" buildings are high and keeping these assets, even if they are converted, will be costly. A. Saroyan proposed organizing a future Workshop/ Information Meeting on McGill's Master Plan.

14. Campus Security [VP Y. Beauchamp]

A. Saroyan spoke about the inefficiency of Security services and exceptionally slow response time to an emergency in an elevator in the Education Building. She waited for half an hour before the fire chief could release her. The technician never arrived. Even though a request was made to decommission the elevator, this did not happen and the same situation was repeated a few days later.

Another incident involved a casual employee at MAUT who suffered an allergic reaction and was going into anaphylactic shock. MAUT called 911 and Campus Security. The First Responders came, the epi pen administered and the worker was taken to hospital. It was later confirmed that only three epi pens were available on McGill's campus.

Y. Beauchamp responded there is one technician on campus to respond to elevator malfunctions and the response time is insufficient, people should call the fire department. T. Hébert commented on the huge community in the McIntyre Medical Building and one technician is not sufficient to handle elevator breakdowns on the downtown campus. R. Sieber emphasized that MAUT does not have to accept that only one technician is available. J. Ruglis commented that a 20-30 minute response time could mean death in some emergency situations. Council expressed its concern and commented that investment in security is worthwhile. Y. Beauchamp will convey MAUT's concerns to P. Barbarie, Director, Campus Public Safety.

15. Other Business

There was no other business.

16. Adjournment

A. Saroyan called for a motion to adjourn. R. Sieber moved to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by S. Gaskin. The meeting adjourned at 2:00 pm.

Appendix I

T. Duchaine's Report on the Pay Equity Committee Meeting

Summary of Pay Equity Committee meeting held on November 3 2017.

The meeting was called by David Roseman VP (Labour Relations/Relations de travail) MUNACA/PSAC-AFPC, upon recommendation by Francois Beaubien, conciliator of CNESST.

François Beaubien, conciliator and agent assigned to McGill pay equity file by the CNESST chaired the session. Unfortunately, he announced has taken a new job as judge, and a new conciliator will be assigned to this dossier, continuity was discussed.

The goal of this meeting was to assemble the new employee representation group that will undertake a joint exercise (with McGill reps) to re-do the 2010 and 2015 audits to orient the pay equity settlement. Beside CNESST conciliation, only employee groups were represented in this meeting.

To be clear, the object of the committee is not the initial exercise which were carried out in early 2000's, but the mandatory audits that have to follow every 5 years afterward. The 2010 and 2015 exercises had been done before single-handedly by McGill, at on their own choice, and instead of through a multi-part committee. The audits had been published in 2016, and since then, 30+ complaints had been filed from unions, and individuals. In the course of conciliation that followed, CNESST realized that there were several major mistakes and omissions to the audits realized by McGill. This left the conciliation exercise in an untenable situation; flawed audits on one hand, and too many complaints, many with no substance or erroneous as well, filed on another. The audits were deemed too erroneous to carry on with, and CNESST sent McGill back to the drawing board for the audits, which would cancel the complaints (becomes no-object). CNESST strongly suggested that this time McGill works through a committee, and consulted with the worker groups, Unionized and non-unionized. McGill finally agreed to work through a Committee. During the meeting, many associations and unions openly questioned the Bonne Foi of McGill, and stated that there no clear incentive to reach a final agreement promptly and to move forward with implementation. The chair instead postulated that McGill may have underestimated the resources necessary to properly complete the audits. He also pointed out that 5% interest is adding up to the point of settlement, which is substantial incentive.

The composition of the workers representation group to the committee is the matter at hand. Precisely, the committee's role is to audit the groups of workers with similar job descriptions, to determine if they are in majority female, and to compare with salary of similar, non-gender biased groups to determine if they are entitled to equity payment. Chair: this is a major job, a lot of data to be gathered. Importantly: by taking part to committee format of Audit, Unions and associations give up their right to complaints, they become co-authors. Committee votes should come from at least 50% female reps. Law proposes the following VOTING committee composition (Me: not 100% sure of how strict law is on composition, seemed to be negotiable): 4 from McGill/Admin, 11 members on audit committee from certified associations/unionized + 1 non-unionized. The Chair pointed out that McGill is in a unique situation, with many, many associations not unionized, and that should be represented for the consultation to work. Strongly suggested that Unions and non-unionized negotiate to ensure good representation. This ended up being a major issue for the rest of the discussions.

AMURE (Sean Cory) and MUNACA (David Roseman) stated on several occasions that they do not wish the process to be 'biased' by groups that do not represent the employee's interest. Hinted to MAUT, others. I pointed out that Profs ARE still employees for all I know, but that salaries of several groups were actually coming from grants, not company profits. Ultimately, profs will have to be consulted if implementation to work. MUNACA and AMURE started by proposing bundling all of non-unionized associations into the 1 vote. Next they stressed that MAUT really represent McGill admin and not employees, and they should be limited to observer, and next Shaun stated that we should instead negotiate to obtain Voting position from McGill/admin side instead. Rest of the meeting essentially revolved around MUNACA and AMURE representatives limiting others/holding to their 11 votes. I openly questioned why AMURE/MUNACA should be the ones to decide how the committee should be constituted, and why they should be allowed to limit non-unionized employee representation. Law apparently states Unions have a right to more voting seats on committee, did not want to let non-unionized obtain any more vote, else than 1 identified for non-unionized groups, even though those

associations represent large groups at McGill. Law seem to favour Unionized group representation for PE settlement, Sean repeated that he wished to stick to what law entitled them. They did not show any sign that they would leave voting representation to non-unionized groups in McGill.

Major point of contention, as large groups RAD, MCLIU, others, around the table voiced concerns they would not be properly represented, and was against CNESST conciliation representation advice.