

RFA Executive Committee
MINUTES
 By Zoom Meeting
August 25, 2020

ATTENDANCE:

<i>Office</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Yes/No/Regrets</i>
President	Ian Sakinofsky	Yes
Vice President Internal	Peter Danziger	Yes
Vice President External	Dave Mason	Yes
Treasurer	Anthony Francescucci	Yes
Secretary	David Naranjit	Yes
Health & Safety Officer	Habiba Bougherara	Yes
Chair, Grievance	Jesmen Mendoza	Regrets
Chair Negotiating	Brian Ceh	Regrets
Chair, Professional Affairs	Rachel Berman	Yes
Chair, Equity Issues	Lila Pine	Yes
Member at Large	Corinne Hart	Yes
Member at Large	Donna Koller	Yes
Staff	André Foucault	Yes
Staff	Shiraz Vally	Yes
Staff	Agnes Paje	Yes

1. Order/Establishment of Quorum
 - Meeting began with quorum at 10.08 AM
2. Approval of Agenda
 - Motion to adopt Agenda (Mason/Berman). Carried
3. Approval of Minutes
 - Motion to approve Minutes from July16 (Mason/Bougherara). Carried.
4. Matters Arising/Old business
5. Item for Discussion
 - Faculty Course Surveys and Teaching Assessments

Discussion took place of the fact that despite the fact that the RFA had indicated to the Administration that the RFA wished to propose the suspension of Faculty Course Surveys and Teaching Assessments for the 2020-21 academic year. the RFA had been discouraged from making a submission, and promised meetings had not been scheduled. At the same time there were reports that the VPFAs office had created a revised procedure for the Fall 2020 semester and was communicating these members of the senior academic administration.

It was decided that the RFA would submit its intended submission any way as soon as possible, and ask the VPFA to discuss this matter with the RFA before issuing any FCS announcement with respect to the Fall 2020 semester.

- Intellectual property

The Administration has still not agreed to the Intellectual Property MOU proposed by the RFA and RFA members intellectual property under emergency remote teaching was still not protected. RFA members were to be again advised of this.

- Chang School Virtualisation Contracts

RFA members who had refused to sign the (required) Chang School virtualisation contracts were still being assigned courses by the Chang School. RFA should be told by Chang that they do not need to sign these contracts. It was unknown whether CUPE faculty members were free not to sign these contracts if they wished not to be assigned courses at Chang.

- Safe Return to Campus

There is lack of information and concern about the measures being taken to protect faculty and staff and students at the time of the return to campus. Discussions were being initiated with the Campus Coalition at U of T in order to compare campus experiences.

- Faculty of Law Memorandum of Agreement

An update was provided on the drafting of an interim Memorandum of Agreement to provide for the appointment and assessment of faculty members in the Faculty of Law. Members of the Executive did acknowledge that, given the non-departmental nature of the Law Faculty, certain adjustments will need to be made with respect to how hiring and evaluation has traditionally been conducted in the existing Faculties at Ryerson. In this, they were clear that Ryerson needs to remain as faithful as possible to the provisions of the Collective Agreement. It is the consensus of the Executive that the terms presented by the RFA, in these Law Faculty MOU discussions, do allow the required degree of variance from other Faculties, while at the same time approximating the same spirit and approach,

There is general agreement within the Executive that what is at stake here, in determining these collegial governance and administrative practices, within the new Law Faculty, is Ryerson's culture and how these matters are dealt with at Ryerson, and how they continue to be dealt with.

One point, that the Executive did want to note, is that the parties are going to need to negotiate provisions that are not a function of a particular Dean's characteristics or particular role, or which will turn on the behaviour of a particular present or future Dean.

Rather these provisions should be principle based and enshrine ongoing collegial governance.

The Executive is of one mind that RFA needs to be strong on these last two points.

- The Ryerson Statue

The RFA Equity Committee is monitoring the ongoing discussion about the statue, and is aware of the range of views. This range of views is not only with respect to the future of the statue, but also what forum for discussion of the matter would be appropriate, if any. The Equity Committee will be contacting the Indigenous Council, and will determine whether or not to facilitate discussion of this matter within the Ryerson Community.

- Mask Policy Procedures

At the request of the Administration, the Executive reviewed the procedures that the Administration had prepared to accompany their earlier developed Mask Policy. The feedback that was provided related largely to the questions of accommodation and enforcement.

- Faculty Remote Teaching

Disappointment was expressed that the Administration had not introduced any adjustments or top-up to the PERF in order to deal with the situation.

The mental health threats posed by remote teaching were discussed.

In relation to the above it needed to be acknowledged that a large number of faculty, if not the majority, and been unable to take their vacation.

It appeared that faculty members with dependent care obligations continued to receive no meaningful support from the Administration, and the RFA's proposal in that regard had been disregarded.

- On whether DHCs can elect to include non-departmental appointees

It was concluded that if a department/School were to ever invite a non-department member to sit on their DHC it should be a department decision, not a Committee decision, and it should only be in very exceptional circumstances and tied very closely to very specific requirements of the position being filled.

6.. RFA Officer Reports

Equity (Pine) - Appointment of Presidential Expert Panel on Campus Safety and Security

Attention was drawn to the fact that the President of Ryerson had appointed this panel. It was questioned whether this is a redo of an earlier panel, and due to its external nature whether there would be an opportunity for community members to shape its outcome. Serious issues need to be raised with respect to the makeup of the Panel as there were concerns that some panel members may find themselves in a conflict of interest.

7. Adjournment. (1.09AM) (Francescucci/Danziger)