

MAUT Council Meeting

MINUTES

Thursday, February 27, 2014
McGill Faculty Club 12:00 noon

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

Session with Provost Masi

K. Hastings called the meeting to order at 12:09 pm.

1. Discussion with the Provost

K. Hastings welcomed Provost Masi. He noted that the Provost would discuss the budget and also address several issues raised by Councilors, namely redeployment of admin/support staff following the successful Voluntary Retirement Program, heightened French language proficiency requirements for Permanent Residency, and evolution of academic staff salary inequality.

Budget

The Provost stated his PowerPoint presentation would touch on FY2014 (2013/14) but would be focused on the FY2015 Budget and Outlook for FY2016-FY2019. A similar presentation was made to Senate on February 19, 2014: http://www.mcgill.ca/senate/sites/mcgill.ca.senate/files/d13-46_budget_planning_report_ii_memo.pdf

In April, the Provost will present the Budget Book to the Board.

The Provost emphasized balancing revenues and expenses and stressed that McGill is not out of the woods. He spoke about relating budget planning objectives to the University's commitment to quality and excellence in teaching, research and service. Particular attention will be paid to compensation, academic renewal, and support both for new hires and established academics. Key Performance Indicators [KPIs] will be used in making decisions and the University will work on improving transparency and accountability. The Provost and Deans will sign agreements concerning the distribution of resources. These will focus on improving the quality of undergraduate education, in particular through hiring 50 new professors.

The University expects to maintain the budgetary gains from the Voluntary Retirement Program [VRP], pay back part of the deficit growth from 2012-2013, and reduce dependency on the Quebec government's operating grant by diversifying sources of funding. The Provost noted that the University is currently paying a low rate of interest on deficit-related loans but that it would have to carefully monitor spending in the event that interest rates rise.

The Provost stressed that McGill must be in line with other Québec universities and meet specific criteria when negotiating with the government. The goal is to run a balanced budget including deficit-reduction strategies. He noted while the details of the government's *Réinvestissement Stratégique* remain to be defined, the University must still provide a 5-year budget outlook.

He noted that the projected deficit for FY2014 is \$10M (more or less as expected). Looking ahead to FY2015-FY2019, Quebec's "reinvestment" in McGill is estimated to be \$250M over that period (\$27.1M in FY2015). This increased income will be balanced by increased expenditure including salary catch-up (\$287M over 5 years, \$17.2M in FY2015) and provisions to address major outstanding issues such as pension liability, pay equity, capital investments for information technology, deferred maintenance and new spaces. The goals are to end annual operating deficits and to pay down the recently-accumulated deficit over the next five years (~\$5M - \$6M in each year).

He referred to model assumptions on tuition-related revenue. These included a McGill commitment of 30% net new tuition to student aid and the possibility that tuition could grow to \$2,273/FTE/year [Full Time Equivalent student] in FY2015. The Canadian average is: \$6,500/FTE/year. Another model assumption was the complete deregulation of international students in Management, Law, Engineering and Science which could see 6% increases per year over the next 5 years. However, it remains unclear how Québec will move forward with deregulation. The current predictions for total enrolment growth of full-time equivalent students [FTEs] over the next 5 years range from 3.2% (bachelor's), to ~12.5% (graduate students), with substantially greater growth in deregulated international undergraduates, concentrated in science and engineering. Projections of enrolment-driven revenues reflect these factors.

B. Reed noted that Queen's University declined to increase enrolment during the Ontario "double cohort" program, and has not been hurt vis-à-vis other institutions that did so. He said that increased enrolment has caused stress at McGill. The Provost indicated that the Quebec government expects to see some enrollment growth and this must be there in McGill's budget plans or risk access to the student-based funding envelope.

Admin/support staff redeployment

The Provost noted that 340 staff took the VRP offer and these positions will not be automatically replaced. He presented a chart on administrative staff counts, the growth over the past 5 years, where this growth is located and what units they support. A. Shrier asked about the deregulation of 4 programs and whether revenue of \$7-\$8M would come in and suggested it would be more appropriate to give the funds to a unit and enable the unit to keep the services. He commented on reporting issues, since this is admin/support work that is passed on the Department Heads which in turn pass it on the professors.

L. Glass asked about the increase in the number of administrators in faculties and more levels of bureaucracy with associate deans and provosts and their staffs. The Provost replied that working out the right balance of effort at the various levels of administrative responsibility is an ongoing effort that must be continuously re-evaluated.

Heightened French language proficiency requirements for Permanent Residency

The Provost referred to the French language proficiency changes in Québec selection criteria for Permanent Residency. He noted that 10% of professors are here on work permits, including many who are tenured. He commented that if these academics have tenure, why would they not apply for Permanent Residency since Ottawa may one day deny reissuing working permits? The new French proficiency requirements could entail 600 hours of instruction, and McGill will pay for these courses. The proposal was to allow a delay for reappointment for academics showing progress by attending at least 200 hours of French instructions with the School of Continuing Studies. A. Paré asked about post-tenure people who are on work permits. The Provost noted while US citizens have fewer problems with work permit renewal, it would be very prudent for them to achieve proficiency in French.

Academic staff salary

The Provost discussed academic staff compensation and referred to the increases in the academic staff salary mass over the next three years of 5.2%, 5.7% and 6.2%. McGill's position among the U15 universities is currently 12th or 13th place. With the proposed increases McGill expects over the next three years to move academic staff salaries out from the bottom tier. The Provost referred to a proposal under development, for a national exchange of salary data among the U-15 institutions which would facilitate future comparisons.

The 5.2% increase in the 2014/15 year will be a 1% across-the-board (ATB) increase and 4.2% allocated for merit. A. Paré asked why McGill would not just have ATB increases, with no merit component. The Provost indicated that one reason is that Québec Government Salary Policy severely limits permissible ATB increases, but is less restrictive about merit-based increases, so that limiting salary increases to ATB only would mean smaller increases.

G. Mikkelson referred to a Gini index analysis he had done (see Minutes of the January 28, 2014 meeting) which shows increasing inequalities among academic staff salaries at McGill and mentioned

several possible causes. The Provost commented that salary distribution is an important and complex issue that deserves careful attention in order to identify trends and understand them and that further efforts along these lines by MAUT and by the administration would be useful.

K. Hastings concluded the discussion by saying that Council would look further into each of the important issues that had been discussed. He thanked Provost Masi who left at 1:25 pm.

Council Business Meeting 1:30 pm Open Session

1. Adoption of the Agenda

Council considered the previously-circulated (February 21, 2014) proposed agenda. A. Moores referred to a message she had circulated to Council on February 25 proposing that Council discussion of one of the proposed items – Member Discussion Forum – be tabled pending a written proposal that could be evaluated by Council. She moved to table discussion on the Member Discussion Forum, and this was seconded by A. Kirk. Council voted: Of the 14 Council members then present, 9 agreed, 2 disagreed, and 2 abstained. (The President did not vote.) The motion passed. B. Reed noted that the Discussion Forum had been announced at the Fall General Meeting on November 15, 2013. R. Sieber proposed moving this agenda item to the next Council meeting with the expectation that a motion proposing a specific Member Discussion Forum will be ready and the requested information be circulated ahead of time.

2. Adoption of Minutes

There were no Minutes presented for adoption.

3. MAUT Daycare Survey (A. Moores)

Council reviewed the questions on the Daycare survey previously circulated by A. Moore and provided their feedback. Council asked for definitions of acronyms, suggested adding a question regarding the acceptability of non-subsidized daycare if subsidized daycare were not available on campus, and citing approximate costs. Responding to a question about the survey format, A. Moores explained that the first question offered choices and depending on the respondent's answer, he/she would be directed along a five question pathway. M. Nahon suggested adding a 6th question: If subsidized daycare slots were not available within the McGill solution with the CPE, would the respondent consider partnerships with other daycares. Agreeing to implement this feedback, A. Moores moved *that the MAUT Survey on Daycare be sent to the membership*. Seconded by G. Mikkelson. Council voted: 13 agreed and 1 abstained. The motion passed. [Note: Using Lime survey software, the survey was sent to MAUT members on March 17 and by closing on March 31, 288 had responded.] The results will be presented at a future Council meeting and at the Spring General Meeting.

4. Report of the Nominating Committee (A. Shrier)

At this time, the Nominating Committee has received single nominations for the positions of VP Internal and VP Finance, and three nominations for Council positions. A. Shrier noted that members of the Nominating Committee will meet shortly and as the nominating period will end on March 13th, 2014, time is of the essence. A. Shrier will send a message to members encouraging them to nominate candidates or to stand for election. At this point, MAUT needs three candidates for positions on the Executive and three additional candidates for Council.

5. Business Arising

Report on Advisor Program (A. Paré)

A. Paré noted that many members of the Advisor Cohort are either retired or considering retirement. A. Paré and J. Varga have recently held training sessions for a new cohort of Advisors and at this point, two new Advisors have taken on cases. A. Paré commented that MAUT should be promoting its Advisors to both members and non-members. A. Paré will draft a notice for K. Hastings to circulate to academic staff

at the University emphasizing the availability of MAUT's Advisors and their achievements. A. Moores noted that MAUT should also publicize its efforts in dealing with the French language proficiency requirements, daycare initiatives, and that the Association is active in issues other than tenure and renewal. A. Kirk suggested sending the message to deans for distribution. A. Shrier mentioned that he had spoken about Advisors at the recent New Faculty Orientation Fair. B. Lennox suggested that small groups of Advisors meet to assess strategies. A. Paré complimented J. Varga on his work with Advisors. He suggested that MAUT survey academics who have used an MAUT Advisor and ask about their experiences. B. Lennox noted there should be a basis of reference when recommending an Advisor.

Update on Professional Licensing Issue (K. Hastings)

K. Hastings noted that Associate Provost L. White's letter of December 20 2013 in response to his initial November 20, 2013 letter on the subject of professional licensing costs indicated that the main point of the November 20 letter had not been clearly made. This was confirmed in discussion with L. White during her January 16, 2014 meeting with the MAUT Executive and it was there mutually agreed that K. Hastings would write a follow-up letter taking pains to show why the case of professors obliged to become licensed by events occurring after their employment differs from the more common situation in which professors are aware of any necessity for licensing before their employment. K. Hastings sent that follow-up letter on February 3, 2014 (appended to these minutes).

6. New Business

K. Hastings commented on a letter from a member who will be retiring on May 31st, 2014 and will just miss the salary increases to take effect June 1, 2014. (In 2013/14 there was a salary freeze for most academic staff and the increases to take effect June 1, 2014 included merit assessment over two years). The member felt that it was unfair that those retiring do not receive any merit reward for the last year (in this case two years) they worked. In a brief discussion several points were raised. One was that in addition to the merit issue, it should be considered that a pay increase during the final year before retirement has a positive impact on the calculated defined benefit minimum in the pension plan. In addition, although a variety of factors may affect the retirement date, these date-sensitive issues are most striking for those who retire immediately before the June 1 start of the salary year. [Note: this issue was revisited under Business Arising at the March 10, 2014 Council meeting].

A. Kirk commented on a presentation at an Academic Forum which documented academic staff satisfaction / dissatisfaction. He will forward a link to this report.

M. Nahon proposed, to general agreement, that Council charge J. Varga, who was also present and in agreement, to update the previously circulated document on comparative salary data and that the data be kept up to date.

There were no guests present. Council then moved into the Closed Session.

Closed Session

7. Adjournment

Adjournment was moved by A. Paré, seconded by R. Sieber and approved by consensus. The meeting adjourned at 2:18 pm.