

---

# MAUT Council Meeting

## MINUTES

TUESDAY, December 9, 2014  
McGill Faculty Club 12:00 noon

Present:	
Executive:	<i>B. Lennox, D. Lowther, K. Hastings, A. Shrier, A. van den Berg, A. Saroyan</i>
Council:	<i>T. Mawhinney, D. Covo, J. Cooperstock, E. Shor, T. Moore, R. Sieber, A. Kirk</i>
Regrets:	<i>C. Ragan, H. Durham, M. Nahon, N. Kamran, K. Siddiqi, K. GowriSankaran</i>
MAUT Staff:	<i>H. Kerwin-Borrelli, J. Varga</i>
Guests:	<i>A. Costopoulos, N. Acheson, C. Cumming Speirs</i>

B. Lennox called the meeting to order at 12:12 pm.

### 1. Adoption of Agenda and Minutes

There was one addition to the Agenda under Business Arising. K. Hastings and A. Saroyan will update Council on the MAUT Policy on Ad Hoc Consultation within the University. A. Van den Berg moved to adopt the Agenda. Seconded by A. Kirk. All in favor and the Agenda was adopted.

The Draft Minutes to the Council meetings on September 25/14, October 14/14 and November 06/14 were circulated. There was an initial suggestion to approve all three sets. K. Hastings proposed separating the bundle. K. Hastings moved to accept the Council Minutes for the meetings on September 25/14 and October 14/14. Seconded by A. Saroyan. Council approved.

Referring to the draft minutes for November 06/14, K. Hastings commented on the discrepancy between the projected document on the membership of MAUT's Standing Committees and the one circulated to Council. This concerned the membership of the Tenure and Mentoring Committee. It was agreed that this membership would be clarified in revisions to the Nov 06/14 Minutes. In addition, the following corrections were forwarded:

#### a) Concerning the **MAUT Policy on Consultation**

K. Hastings proposed that further discussion of the *MAUT Policy on Ad Hoc Consultation within the University* be postponed to the next meeting. A. Saroyan emphasized that the consultation process must be clearly stated and understood.

#### b) Concerning the **Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Draft Versions to (1) Sabbatic Leaves and (2) Leaves of Absence**, K. Hastings proposed that the report projected at the November 06/14 meeting be included in the Minutes.

K. Hastings moved, following the corrections to the text, that MAUT Council approve the Minutes of the November 06/14 Council Meeting. Seconded by E. Shor. Council agreed. [Note: Corrections were made to the Nov 06/14 Minutes and the revised document was circulated to Council.]

### 2. Business Arising

Bruce Lennox welcomed guest N. Acheson [SBAC Representative].

B. Lennox noted that the Dean of Students, [DOS] A. Costopoulos, would join the meeting at 1:00 pm and address how information concerning changes to the disciplinary code is distributed

to faculty members. Dean Costopoulos will also discuss the different areas of responsibility covered by the Office of the Dean of Students [ODOS] and the Provost's Office.

**a) *Mon Français Program***

Using information from the "*Mon Français Program*", B. Lennox updated Council on recent developments concerning the French language proficiency requirement [CSQ- Certificat de sélection du Québec] for permanent residency, which affects academics at McGill. He projected a document that outlined:

- (a) information on the program and enrollment details,
- (b) registration,
- (c) placement tests,
- (d) exemptions to the placement test,
- (e) study permits and student status affecting tenure track academic staff and their spouses,
- (f) attestation of completion and transcript, and required evaluation by the School of Continuing Studies for proof of proficiency in French,
- (g) costs and contact information.

The McGill program aims to facilitate faculty's entry into the system. The Provost's Office and HR have been working together to improve communications and clarify issues. Previously faculty would have to pay to take these courses. Now once academics are enrolled, the Provost pays for the classes, which are also free for spouses. It once happened that a faculty member had to obtain a student's visa in order to take courses; this is no longer an issue. The number of class hours per week is also specified.

E. Shor remarked he took three years of classes, which took an enormous amount of time, and that this requirement does not exist for other universities. He noted the plans that McGill has in place, including extending the tenure clock by one year are insufficient, as the time spent on taking courses could be used for research and publishing. He emphasized that the Association should seriously address this issue as it affects recruitment and retention within the University.

B. Lennox has spoken to O. Marcil (Vice-Principal, Communications and External Relations) and this is not only a McGill issue as it also affects many high-tech industries in the Montreal region. E. Shor proposed that academics who fall into this category be given:

- (a) one course release per year,
- (b) that the University adds one year to the tenure clock.

Andrew Kirk suggested that the hiring unit and the faculty develop a cost sharing initiative to address these issues. A. Saroyan noted the budget for hiring lectures is diminished and the real cost of this language proficiency requirement is being passed on to the units.

B. Lennox noted there are many academics within McGill, who are facing these issues. He suggested that Council move to bring these issues to the attention of the Principal and Provost at the next meeting scheduled for Jan 27/15. A. Shrier cautioned that new faculty should keep the offer of an extra year on the tenure clock.

E. Shor moved and J. Cooperstock seconded the following motion, the text of which was forwarded:

*That new faculty will receive an ADDITIONAL course release (one per year) from the university for both the second and the third year after coming to McGill;*

*That this is BEYOND whatever course releases were negotiated with department chairs before coming to McGill;*

*That this course release will only apply if the following three conditions are met:*

- 1. The faculty has already applied for permanent residency and can demonstrate that they have to go through the long route to receive it (meaning they have to take at least two French classes).*
- 2. The faculty takes at least one French class every semester.*
- 3. The faculty has not yet reached the level that enables her/him to pass the Quebec requirement for permanent residency.*
- 4. If a new faculty prefers a different method of compensation to course release (e.g. using the funds for a course buy-out to do research).*

Council discussed the following:

- (a) If pressure is on the departments, the cost factor can influence choices and the best candidate may be passed over;
- (b) New faculty should be able to have a definite McGill connection and not see the University as a temporary stop;
- (c) Should MAUT conduct a poll of its members to prioritize issues concerning language proficiency requirements?
- (d) Would course relief per term or its equivalence be the first choice?
- (e) Could extra funding for research be another choice?
- (f) Could faculty have course relief for three years?
- (g) Another option is to attend intensive French courses in Jonquière;
- (h) While concern is expressed for academics taking courses, Council asked about others who are fluent in French and have no relief time.

B. Lennox noted that McGill has hired an immigration lawyer and works with Montreal International on these issues. B. Lennox will attend the upcoming meeting in March 2015, organized by VP G. McClure and Montreal International, on the process to get a revised status and a work permit. More details will follow.

**b) Update on the MAUT Policy on Ad Hoc Consultation within the University**

K. Hastings and A. Saroyan discussed issues in the draft of the MAUT Consultation Policy. There was no document presented at this time. The main requirement for consultation with MAUT is an output. The document presented for consultation must be accepted initially by Council, an ad hoc committee struck to review the document, and the output, the complete document specifying MAUT's involvement as author, must be recorded in the Minutes. K. Hastings and A. Saroyan will bring a 2-page proposal on MAUT's Consultation Policy to the next meeting. R. Sieber emphasized that *timeliness* must be specified as a requirement in consultation.

K. Hastings referred to the recent document *Classroom Scheduling Parameters* which stated that MAUT had been “consulted” on the final version. This was challenged, as MAUT had not been formally consulted and none of the Association’s suggestions were present in the final document. The outcome, after Council’s meeting with O. Dyens [Deputy Provost, Student Life & Learning], were changes to the parameters.

**c) Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Review the draft Revisions to (1) Sabbatic Leaves and (2) Leaves of Absence**

The members of this ad hoc committee are A. Saroyan, D. Lowther and T. Moore. They interacted with Associate Provost L. White and on November 6<sup>th</sup>, 2014 Council meeting, a file with a description of the output of their consultation was distributed to Council who noted that the output would either be a Council motion or a final report. The distributed document, including A. Saroyan’s comments, has been included in the Minutes of the November 06/2014 Council meeting.

Council discussed the following:

- (a) Were people dealing with the Administration pleased with the Reports? The Reports including MAUT’s suggestions were presented at Senate.
- (b) When will Council get a final printed version?
- (c) Were the documents modified as per MAUT’s suggestions? MAUT would interfere if the final document was not what had been agreed to by the ad hoc Committee.
- (d) Were there substantive or small modifications?
- (e) Would there be a list of modifications?
- (f) Were there any of MAUT’s modifications not included in the final document or policy?

Bruce Lennox emphasized the importance of MAUT’s credibility stamp on all documents that request consultation.

**7. Visit by Andre Costopoulos, Dean of Students [DOS]**

Dean Costopoulos began with a comment on the different areas of responsibility between the Office of the Dean of Students [ODOS] and the Provost’s. The ODOS deals with students’ rights and responsibilities. The areas of responsibility include:

- (a) Advising and co-ordination: The ODOS coordinates advising throughout the University so that all faculties move in the same direction. He noted various processes are used for faculties which are as diverse as Music and Engineering. As DOS, he meets with faculties, associate deans, and unit directors.
- (b) Concerning Students’ Rights and Responsibilities, he coordinates the work of disciplinary officers [DOs].
- (c) The DOS coordinates responses to crises. The Office ensures that the right resources are involved. He emphasized the importance of creating a space where confidential information is kept and coordinated as all units need relevant information in order to respond appropriately.
- (d) He referred to the Student Affairs Policy and asked Council for its input on how it could be improved. The new Early Alert Tool [active since August 2014], a response to the

McGill community's input, runs on collegiality and aims to ensure that right person does the right thing. It specifies who to call and when to call. It is a means to contain a situation before it is out of control. A. Costopoulos emphasized that early intervention saves resources which are kept for dire circumstances. Situations can range from missing classes and assignments due to illness to *self-harm* attempts. The standard response is to pay attention to all crisis situations which may lead to nothing than to miss the one that is serious.

- (e) The Early Alert email goes to the DOS and remains anonymous. There is a way to reach the student without identifying the source. The recommended approach is to keep in touch with the student's advisor. For grad students, the supervisor is often involved.

The DOS referred to Early Alerts that have been sent to the Office:

A student may have had a difficult semester; the ODOS will intervene early with counselling. Decisions are made on a case-by-case basis. There is always a follow-up to the DOS. The undergrad chair is notified of the outcome of the meeting with the department advisor. There is always the question of the right level of intervention.

Dean Costopoulos emphasized the system must be kept agile. The Early Alert at McGill favors collegial interactions and getting the students the right tools to help in a crisis situations. He noted that retention issues are not as significant as students most often wish to graduate.

A. Saroyan noted that some individuals in distress are recent graduates who are out in the world without resources and have returned to the University for assistance and student aid for mental health issues. The focus now is on helping students transition out of the University. He gave an example of academically brilliant students who received support while at McGill and have graduated years ago but there is no on-going support as they are no longer eligible for student aid which provides medication, and counselling.

A. Saroyan asked about students who return to faculty for assistance. A. Costopoulos advised to send these students to his office where there is a triage system in place. Students are sent to the right resource.

J. Cooperstock asked about the details provided to professors in a crisis situation. The DOS noted that an acknowledgement is always sent and in some cases, the professor will send a report. The professor could be part of a plan that, for example, to grant an extension. Information is shared on a need-to-know basis within the University.

R. Sieber asked about plagiarism and commented on difficulties in the relationship between the DOSO and faculty. A. Costopoulos said the disciplinary process at McGill begins with an allegation. The student has the resource of the Code of Student Rights. If the allegation is taken at face value the first question is whether it a breach of the Code. The evidence related to the breach of the Code is presented. If there is no breach, the process stops.

In the case of plagiarism, the DOS receives the allegation, the source document and the plagiarized passages. The student is called in for an interview and the DO presents the evidence to the student and advisor. A. Costopoulos emphasized that evidence must be clear, convincing and reliable. The faculty will define the punishment. The DO can impose a reprimand such as a zero grade for the assignment or the course.

Students can be expelled for cheating. This is handled at the faculty level DO. Rules at the faculty level deal with (a) cheating on exams; (b) submitting duplicate assignments and (c) when whole pages are lifted from another source.

Andre Costopoulos discussed sanctions and transparency issues. Concerning transparency issues, instructors who catch students cheating on exams or plagiarizing are part of the need-to-know group. The appropriate sanction for cheating involves a judicial and pedagogical aspect and function. Is it a teachable moment or a criminal offense? The best indicator is that the recidivism rate is low at McGill. A standard case of plagiarism will mean a zero grade on the assignment and course and the student is placed on conduct probation. If there is a lapse, then the Committee on Student Discipline is involved. There are few re-offenders. The system is having an effect.

There are implications if the student is caught cheating and is intending to be part of a professional order. A reprimand is a serious sanction.

When imposing a penalty, the same sanction can have different results. While a freshman could get a zero grade on an elective course assignment, a zero grade for an international student is more severe as it has implications for visas, tuition and housing. It is important to find the appropriate sanction that is severe enough and proportional for the offense as well as fair to the community and the student.

J. Cooperstock asked about raising grades for students. A. Van den Berg asked about students who withdraw from the University during the process but the case remains and is opened when the student returns. He was informed that it goes to the Committee on Student Grievances [CSG]. A. Saroyan asked what happens when a student makes an allegation against a professor. She was told that this would go to the Office of the Secretary-General. If a student alleges that rights were violated, presents evidence, and asks for a remedy, then the Committee will meet with the Secretary-General. The professor is informed. The Committee will look at the issues. If the allegation is pursued, the professor is notified. There is a disclosure phase; the professor will write a defense, the student is present; and both sides are heard and within a reasonable time. The issue may be fast-tracked if there is a material impact on the student.

Bruce Lennox proposed that the DOS speak at a MAUT Forum on the student/faculty relationships similar to what he presented at the New Faculty Orientation in August 2014. A. Costopoulos informed Council that he could be reached at: Tel (4990) and in Room 400 in the Brown building. A. Costopoulos left at 1:55 pm. B. Lennox suggested that Council create its list of Q & As for members and include R. Sieber's question about quality control for DOs.

#### **4. CASC**

Bruce Lennox referred to the projected document: *Merit Data for the past 4 years*. He presented an overview of the meetings of the MAUT caucus of the CASC. He noted that in 2014, 79% of academics were in Categories 1 and 2. He presented two scenarios for the academic salary policy for 2015:

- (a) with ATB at 0.75% and Merit at 4.95%
- (b) with ATB at 1% and Merit at 4.75%

In a summary document, he presented the scenarios for Categories 1 through 4 for academics who earn \$75K, \$100K and \$125K and remarked on the small differences. The conclusion reached by the MAUT caucus of the CASC was that 0.75% ATB was a better choice as it would be symbolically more favorable for younger staff. The premise in the *university Salary Policy* for the past ten years is that Category 4 merit plus the ATB increase equals the rate of inflation. He noted in 2014 inflation was 2.0 ±0.4% and goal for Category 4 recipients was achieved.

Bruce Lennox noted *ATB/merit splits* remain to be discussed for next year. The Administration has said it intends to keep the increases in year 3 of the current salary policy. The cuts to the University were \$4.8M and not the anticipated \$12-15M that might have occurred. B. Lennox reiterated the Administration's promise of providing the data distribution of Categories 1 through 5 per faculty and across ranks.

R. Sieber was not in favor of ATB and merit increases and instead proposed only a 2% ATB increase. She referred to the position taken by former Councilor A. Paré that only ATB increases would provide a better distribution. A. Saroyan noted the government sets the maximum ATB increase. A. Shrier noted that ATB alone would favor academics with higher salaries but not new professors. B. Lennox noted that a lower ATB would average out interfaculty differences.

In 2015, MAUT plans to have a Forum on Salary Policy [including ATB and Merit] and another on MOOCs.

#### **5. SBAC**

Alvin Shrier updated Council on an email from HR to the SBAC representatives [A. Shrier, N. Acheson and E. Zorychta] asking whether they would agree to a 10% increase in premiums, with no reduction to services or coverage. This would build up a surplus. A. Shrier referred to MUNACA's December 2011 agreement with the University that the SBAC become a decision-making body but there would no longer be a 50-50 liability sharing with the University.

#### **8. Membership Committee and Winterlude planning**

K. Hastings and T. Mawhinney, Membership Committee members, forwarded this Winterlude Event proposal to Council concerning a cap on attendance and possible budget scenarios.

***MAUT Winterlude Brunch Event, January 18 2015 at Faculty Club***

Query for Council: cap on attendance.  
 Financial plan is all kids free, MAUT members (and spouse) free, non-MAUT member and spouse, \$5 per head. Cost to us is ~\$30/head adult, and \$15/head kids.  
 We currently have (as of Friday afternoon) 49adults, 23kids = 72total.

Before we proceed with further publicity, we need to know where to cap attendance. There are three natural caps, which affect the costs:

	Cost (all adults)	Cost 1/3 kids
1. Ballroom / 126	3780	3156
2. Ballroom + Heritage / 156	4800	4000
3. Ballroom + Heritage + Dining Room / 236	7080	5900

He noted the Committee favors a higher cap with zero cost for members and children and a \$5/adult cost for non-members and zero cost for their children. R. Sieber emphasized that this event should be publicized as kid-friendly and that a follow-up survey be sent to guests.

Council agreed and recommended going with the higher attendance cap of 236 guests and using the Ballroom, Heritage and Dining Room, if needed.

**9. Citizen’s Council Survey Report**

K. Hastings noted that the Citizen’s Council sent out a four-question survey to its member associations asking them for their opinions on the Principal’s Plans that were announced in March 2014. The survey to MAUT members was sent on November 10/2014. The Citizen’s Council will meet with Principal Fortier and VP Di Grappa on January 6<sup>th</sup>, 2015 to discuss the survey results.

Following the Council meeting on December 09/14, K. Hastings sent a message to Council members asking for their opinions on the list of “concrete projects” related to the 5-fold Principal’s Plans from last March 2014. The link to this information is:  
<https://www.mcgill.ca/principal/five-priorities/>  
 Council members’ comments on these “concrete projects’ will be presented at the January 6<sup>th</sup>, 2015 meeting with Principal Fortier and VP Di Grappa.

At this point, as many Councilors had left the meeting, B. Lennox called for an adjournment. Unanimously approved. The meeting adjourned at 2:27pm.

[Note: Because of time constraints, the following Agenda items would be addressed at the next Council meeting:

- Item 6: Composition of Standing Committees
- Item 10: Planning for MAUT Fora on Salary Policy (Merit and ATB) and MOOCs and “Coffee and Conversation with the Principal” on January 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2015.