
General Meeting Minutes

Room LB 322, 11:40 – 12:50 a.m., Tuesday, Sept 22, 2009

Proposed Common Scheduling Constraints Q & A

A. Agenda Approval

Moved by Nanci Lucas, seconded by Joanne Quirk

That the agenda be approved as circulated.

Carried.

B. Approval of Minutes for Sept 1, 2009

Moved by Sandra Seekins, seconded by Stephen Williams

That the minutes be approved as circulated.

Carried.

C. Introductions and meeting reminders.

New members were introduced and welcomed.

D. Schedule of Regular Meetings for 2009 - 2010

The president reminded people of meeting times and reviewed the current agenda. All meetings – general, steward, coordinator – are on Tuesdays from 11:40 to 12:50 in LB 322.

General meeting dates are as follows:

2009 – September 22, October 6 and 20, November 3 and 17, and December 1

2010 – January 19, February 2, March 2 and 16

AGM – May 4, 2010.

E. Reminder: Special Pension Meeting Sept 29, 2009, at 11:40 in LB 322

F. Timetable Scheduling Issues

Everyone recognizes that the generation of the fall timetable in the summer period was fraught with many problems. It required considerable additional effort by coordinators, faculty, staff, and administration to arrive at the final schedule. Out of this experience, the administration made changes to the process for creating the spring schedule.

1. Background

Chief steward Nanci Lucas explained the history and current situation, static blocks versus dynamic. Previously, when there were static blocks; departments would draft a schedule and negotiate, swap things around and work out conflicts within the department. The department's final draft would be passed on to scheduling. Then if



there were conflicts, they would be worked out between DDAs and coordinators. With expansion of cohort groups and an increase in programs, the static system was no longer working for space allotment. Programs were being pushed into early morning, late afternoon, or Friday blocks, which wasn't necessarily good for the program or the institution. That's when Infosilem was required. The University has acknowledged that the system could have been introduced more amicably, however, the dynamic system is here now, and we have to find ways to make it work for everyone while following the Collective Agreement.

One solution is to schedule the blocks as your dynamic department schedule and then in a department meeting move people around within your department. Then you end up with a schedule that will satisfy most people. Departments own the process and should be able to resolve needs and wants collegially within one's own functional area. As before, there may be some changes that involve other departments doing trades.

Perhaps more time is needed to complete the process, two weeks instead of one.

2. **Panel Presentation** by CFA elected representatives to the Ad Hoc Committee on Scheduling Evaluation.

The chair was passed to Denis Dubord, 2nd Vice President.

Panel members included John Wilson, Sandra Seekins, and Sue Gardner, who recently resigned from the committee. The fourth member, Cam Sylvester was unable to attend today.

Sue Gardner spoke first. She resigned because she didn't believe much real work was done by the scheduling committee and she felt the faculty welfare was not being sufficiently protected by that committee. Since resigning two weeks ago, she has met with members of the ad hoc committee and feels those meetings were more productive, due partly to the size of the committee and the candor that's possible when dealing with faculty only. Sue believes administration was not willing to negotiate and was not open to comment or input. Sue proposed an initial draft of common constraints that were reviewed and amended by the Executive and circulated prior to this meeting. In summation, she believes there should be, for candor's sake, a faculty-only committee, not a common committee. As an example of an area of concern, Sue mentioned the committee's draft "Essential process" considerations where faculty was not mentioned once in the eight items.

Sandra agreed that the committee did not always work effectively, but she is staying on the committee to get some accountability to ensure that the scheduling process accomplishes what it set out to do.

John, who is a co-chair of the committee, sees the committee meetings as a work in progress. He was committed to ensuring the committee received the data it had identified as necessary and debated some key questions.

Denis passed the chair back to the president.



3. Constraints

President John Wilson reviewed the Scheduling Constraints draft that was circulated prior to the meeting. Some suggestions were made for improvement. A revised document will be brought to the next meeting for consideration.

G. Bargaining Survey

Chief bargainer Nanci Lucas gave an overview of the proposed survey. She outlined major topic areas, discussed timing, and asked for member input. She noted that demographic info is optional.

H. Adjourn

Moved by Denis Dubord, seconded by Cameron Duder.
That the meeting be adjourned at 12:50 p.m.
Carried.