

FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

Date: April 20, 2023, 12:00 -2:00pm

Location: virtual meeting

Members present:

<p><u>Ex-officio:</u></p> <p>A. Pejovic-Milic D. Cramb E. Harley J. Koprivnikar R. Viirre</p>	<p><u>Faculty:</u></p> <p>A. Abhari A. Johnson A. Miri B. Koivisto C. Antonescu C. Beites C. Kumaradas C. Rebello D. Delic E. De Giuli F. Duah I. Coe J. Ghoshdastidar J. McPhee J. Tavakkoli K. Georgiou K. Gilbride K. Rohlf K. Wilkie L. Campbell L. Kolasa M. Alalfi M. Davoudpour M. Hausner</p>	<p>N. George P. Goldman R. Valenzano R. Wang S. Cornelius S. Impellizzeri S. Melles S. Mustafiz S. Quigley S. Wylie T. Antimirova Y. Bahoo Y. Xu</p> <p><u>Contract lecturers:</u></p> <p><u>Staff:</u></p>	<p><u>Guests:</u></p> <p>A. Cojita A. Velieva B. Filsinger D. Niculescu M. Sauer R. Tam V. Clark</p> <p><u>Students:</u></p> <p>H. Melino</p> <p><u>Secretary of Faculty Council:</u> Luna Bogdanovic</p> <p><u>Regrets:</u></p> <p>A. McWilliams D. Mason</p>
---	---	---	--

1) Call to Order/Establishment of Quorum (12:00pm)

A. Pejovic-Milic, Vice-Chair of Faculty Council, welcomes attendees and calls the meeting to order, stating that quorum has been attained.

She notes that the Chair of Faculty Council, A. McWilliams is not available to chair this final scheduled meeting in the 2022/23 academic year.

2) Land Acknowledgement

A. Pejovic-Milic invites D. Cramb to say the land acknowledgement.

D. Cramb notes that he has recently returned from a week-long trip to India and that he is still adjusting to the time difference and invites attendees' questions which he will answer here or follow up on.

D. Cramb states that It is an honor to be a visitor and a settler on the land that is part of Turtle Island, also known as the dish with one spoon territory. The dish with one spoon represents a treaty between the Mississaugas, Anishinaabe and Hudanashone that bound them to share the land and treat it with respect. All newcomers to the land are welcomed in that respect. He invites all to continue to remember that.

D. Cramb invites stories relating to the experience with the land or experience with decolonization or indigenization in STEM, acknowledging that this is a pressure-infused invitation. No stories are offered.

3) Approval of Agenda

Motion: *That Faculty Council approve the Agenda for the April 20, 2023 meeting.*

A. Pejovic-Milic calls the motion to approve the agenda. J. Tavakoli moves; E. De Guili seconds.

A. Pejovic-Milic invites discussion. No discussion.

Agenda approved.

4) Announcements

The meeting of *April 20, 2023* will be recorded for the purpose of complete and accurate minutes.

A. Pejovic-Milic notes that this meeting is being recorded for the purpose of creating accurate minutes and that the recording will not be shared.

A. Pejovic-Milic notes that the first meeting of the Faculty Council in the next academic year will be led by a newly-elected Chair. She adds that this Council will also elect new representatives in the following position: Vice-Chair, one staff member, two sessional instructors, two graduate students and four undergraduate students. She notes that there will be an announcement inviting nominations sometime in

May.

A. Pejovic-Milic notes that the Faculty Council is overdue with the revision of its bylaws and that this will be the first task in the next academic year.

S. Quigley asks for clarification on the timelines for Faculty Council meetings. A. Pejovic-Milic explains that this is the last scheduled meeting of this body, but that meetings can be called if the need arises. She notes that curricular matters are brought in front of Council for information only and invites AD, Undergraduate, E. Harley, to comment.

E. Harley states that the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee will meet in the month of May and that, with the exception of major category three changes which are due in May, all other changes are due in October.

5) Approval of Minutes from the previous meeting

Motion: *That Faculty Council approve the minutes from the meeting on February 2, 2023.*

A. Pejovic-Milic calls the motion to approve the meeting minutes from the previous meeting. A. Johnson moves; A. Miri seconds.

Minutes approved.

6) Matters arising from the minutes

A. Pejovic-Milic states that there are no matters arising from the minutes.

7) Motions before Faculty Council

Tabled motion:

Motion: *That Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Terms of Reference, in the section pertaining to membership, should change from:*

'The undergraduate program director from each of the Faculty programs'
to

'The undergraduate program director(s) from each of the Faculty programs'

The tabled motion is withdrawn.

Motion: *BIRT the membership rules in section 2 of the FOS UCC TOR be changed by replacing the item:*

"The undergraduate program director from each of the Faculty programs,"

with the 2 items:

"An undergraduate program director from each of the Faculty programs,

Any additional program directors of the Faculty programs, non-voting"

A. Pejovic-Milic states that, *following discussion, the Executive Committee has withdrawn the tabled motion. A reworded or restated motion that takes into consideration feedback from the membership is proposed.*

A. Pejovic-Milic asks for a mover and seconder. E. Harley moves; Y. Xu seconds.

A. Pejovic-Milic calls for discussion.

S. Quigley notes that she would like to raise the same issues that she raised with the tabled motion and that is the question of what constitutes a program and the fairness of representation between departments with different numbers of programs.

A. Pejovic-Milic says that the intention of replacing the 2 items is that this committee should include all undergraduate program directors, including the programs that have multiple undergraduate directors, but only one would have the right to vote. D. Cramb confirms.

S. Quigley says the issue is departmental representation. She points out that the wording of this motion indicates that an undergraduate program director from each of the faculty programs is eligible to vote and argues that if a department has more than one program, it is able to exert more influence than a program with only one.

A. Pejovic-Milic acknowledges S. Quigley's point and comments that the focus was on cases where the same program has multiple UPDs. She asks if S. Quigley would like to propose a friendly amendment.

S. Quigley says that an Undergraduate Program Director from each department, and not from each program, should be eligible to vote.

A. Johnson states that the UPDs who are not present in the meetings will not be represented if there is only one UPD per department. She warns against assumptions that one UPD from a department with multiple different programs can represent all of the programs offered by that department.

S. Quigley comments that this issue connects back to the question of how a program is defined.

A. Velieva states that the purpose of the involvement of UPDs in the UCC is to represent curricula of their programs and not to represent a department and argues that this is the reason every UPD should be involved in these decisions.

S. Quigley agrees that representation in discussions is important and clarifies that there is an issue of fairness when it comes to voting if the numbers of voting members are not balanced among the departments. She shares concerns that program changes can end up being rejected for programs which can be outvoted.

B. Koivisto acknowledges S. Quigley's concerns. He notes that the Department of Chemistry and Biology houses two very different disciplines and there is little possibility of having one voice even within the one department, which makes the friendly amendment unfair on the same grounds. He asks if the UCC votes on anything that is binding in any way.

E. Harley says that the UCC approves the curriculum modifications from the various departments and programs. He notes that there have never been any disagreements. He notes that this is mainly a discussion forum. E. Harley adds that the committee also agreed on and did not find any issues with the motion being discussed here.

S. Quigley states that her concerns are not alleviated by the fact that the UCC appears to be a consensus-led body. She notes that there are historical examples from the time when Computer Science was joined to Math and Physics, when decisions that affected Computer Science were overridden by the Math and Physics. She comments that things often get politicized and questions of fairness surface whenever there is a voting structure in place.

T. Antimirova says that she appreciates S. Quigley's concern. She notes that this is especially true if courses change considerably or if courses are eliminated.

S. Wylie states that he has served on this committee and that it is not a rubber stamp. He explains that its purpose is to review curriculum proposals for unanticipated curricular effects on the entire Faculty. He notes that it does not have the power to create curriculum. It can either send curriculum back to the department, in which case it would send it back with suggestions for modification because of concerns. The Departmental Council can do whatever it wants, and send it back. The other thing the committee does is it sends it forward. He notes that it functions by consensus and adds that he cannot imagine it being effective for its purpose if it came down to divided votes, and in a situation like that the Faculty Council could intervene and take action. S. Wylie concludes with the recommendation to avoid tampering with something that is working fine the way it is.

A. Abhari says that he has served on this committee and has wondered about the fairness of one large program such as the Computer Science program having only one representative. He underlines that he is concerned that the number of representatives in the UCC is not proportional to the proportion of students from that program in the Faculty.

S. Quigley states that she would like to bring forward more recent examples to illustrate her concerns. She says that there was a strong push in the past for all Science programs to join in Contemporary Science program which the department of Computer Science was strongly opposed to and wanted to keep their existing direct entry Computer Science Program. She notes that the department held their ground in spite of considerable pressure and adds that she is concerned that with the proposed bylaw change, the resistance would not be productive. S. Quigley argues that if decisions are reached by consensus in the UCC, that should be codified in the bylaws instead of having a voting structure. She concludes that she is opposed to the original motion.

C. Kumaradas notes that each program needs to have its own interests represented and states that he supports the change to bring in directors from each program as opposed to one from each department. He adds that he also agrees that the size of departments is a factor, since small departments can impact a lot of people with their vote.

S. Quigley calls for the following amendment:

BIRT the membership rules in section 2 of the FOS UCC TOR be changed by replacing the item:

"The undergraduate program director from each of the Faculty programs,"

with the 2 items:

"An undergraduate program director from each of the Faculty ~~programs~~ departments,

Any additional program directors of the Faculty programs, non-voting"

S. Quigley suggests that this should be discussed as a friendly amendment and notes that it may require more thought.

A. Pejovic-Milic asks D. Cramb to comment on the nature of this amendment. D. Cramb notes that all issues should be discussed and deems this a friendly amendment. He notes that there is likely no perfect solution and we need to look at an option that feels fair to all involved.

A. Pejovic-Milic notes that the friendly amendment is accepted.

R. Valenzano points out that proposed changes that are brought before the UCC have already been approved by the departments and argues that one representative per department is a fair distribution.

E. Harley notes that he is in agreement with the friendly amendment to this motion. He agrees with S. Quigley that the definition of what constitutes a program is unclear.

K. Gilbride notes that the curriculum is done in the department. This is where the Department makes sure that each one of their programs or program, if they only have one, are happy with the curriculum. All the decisions on curriculum are at the department level. She notes that the only thing that this committee does, and has only been doing this for the last 5 years, is to bring changes in front of all of the programs. She adds that she believes that each program needs their own vote as each program has their own curriculum to worry about.

D. Cramb notes that if the friendly amendment is approved, the decision on issues that the UCC is voting on will need to be discussed and decided within each department and one representative from each department will vote in the UCC. He notes that if one of the programs that is represented foresees a negative effect on their curriculum, that department's representative will be compelled to vote against the motion. He comments that passing this amended motion will result in some additional work on the part of

the department.

L. Campbell asks if a department can nominate different representatives to vote on different issues on a single agenda.

A. Pejovic-Milic states that the current bylaw allows for one person to be named as a voting member. She adds that the voting member can provide proxies for voting on certain issues, but the right to vote cannot be transferred within a single meeting.

D. Cramb comments that the representative chosen to vote on behalf of each department would have an understanding of the concerns of all the programs within that department and adds that this is something that will need to be decided by each individual department.

A. Pejovic- Milic calls the motion.

Motion approved.

8) Reports

8.1 Dean's Report

D. Cramb thanks Faculty Council members who have served on the Faculty Council and whose terms will be ending on June 30, 2023. He names Andy McWilliams, Ana Pejovic-Milic, Nagina Parmar, Omar Falou, Lori Fortune, Jocelyne Mendez-Guzman, Helen Melino, Paolo De Lagrave-Codina, Dibbyo Saha and thanks them for their service.

He notes that his report will be short.

D. Cramb notes that we are in the process of managing exams in the midst of a job action. He underlines that helping our students is our first priority and the primary objective, and he thanks everyone for their efforts.

D. Cramb notes that he has just returned from a trip to India where he met with international students who have applied to TMU or have accepted offers to enroll directly through TMU Global. He notes that a lot of indecisiveness for both the students and the parents centered account concerns about sending their children to a foreign country on a different continent. D. Cramb notes that we need to remember that international students will require additional efforts on our part to make sure that they are taken care of. He notes that the conversion rate on this trip was very high with most students signing their offers.

D. Cramb notes that he is looking forward to the next five years of being Dean of the Faculty of Science. He comments that he is grateful for good communication within the Faculty and notes that he will make an effort to continue to build communication channels in the future.

D. Cramb invites questions, both within this forum and any time via email.

A. Pejovic-Milic calls for the reports of the Associate Deans.

8.2 Associate Dean Reports

E. Harley, Interim Associate Dean, Undergraduate Programs and Student Affairs, notes that he has been contacted by students in relation to a Senate policy which states that there should not be any exams given in the final week of classes before exams. He reminds all faculty to be mindful of this policy.

K. Wilkie asks for a clarification of the policy. She says that the policy states that weekly assignments are permitted.

T. Antimirova asks if there is data on enrollment in undergraduate programs for next year. E. Harley says that the number of applications is down by 10%, but the number of confirms is about 50% of the target. He notes that confirms can be revoked so it is hard to make predictions at this point.

J. Tavakkoli asks for more information on the international initiatives. D. Cramb says that his trip to India was in relation to the direct entry group, not Navitas. He notes that we have agreed to the same number of international students as last year. He adds that we will not see any Navitas students this year. D. Cramb notes that there should not be any be changes.

R. Viirre, Associate Dean, Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies, says that he does not have a report at this time. He invites questions both in this forum and any time via email.

J. Koprivnikar, Acting Associate Dean of Research, Innovation, and External Partnerships, says that the Booster and Connector research funding programs will be launching as usual. She notes that faculty can apply to either program every two years, adding that the purpose of this change is to widen the pool of applicants and to spread the resources differently. She asks all to contact D. Niculescu if there are any questions.

J. Koprivnikar notes that the inaugural Faculty of Science research symposium and networking event is being organized on June 13. She thanks those who have indicated their interest in attending or participating as well as those who are interested in serving on the organizing committee. She notes that more information will be shared shortly. J. Koprivnikar notes that this event is conceived as a networking event and an opportunity to identify potential collaborations and interdisciplinary initiatives. She notes that it will feature graduate student and postdoctoral fellow posters.

A. Pejovic-Milic notes that M. Sauer has raised her hand. M. Sauer says that she has found the policy pertaining to assignments in the last week of classes and proceeds to read the policy. A. Pejovic-Milic thanks M. Sauer.

A. Pejovic-Milic announces that C. Antonescu, the Dimensions Chair will lead the discussion on EDI in SRC.

8.3 Standing discussion item: EDI
Discussion on EDI in SRC

C. Antonescu notes that this discussion is held within the framework of the Dimensions Pilot Program. He notes that Dimensions is an initiative of the three major funding agencies and universities and other institutions across Canada that aims to address obstacles and barriers faced by equity deserving groups. He adds that the conversation today will focus on addressing these barriers in research and SRC activities.

C. Antonescu shares [this presentation](#).

C. Antonescu asks for participant discussion in response to the following questions:

1. What type of SRC activity is not being effectively recognized and what could be done about it?
2. What other barriers to recognition of SRC or related activities have you experienced or observed?
3. Should we develop a statement in FOS to support the responsible use of biometrics statement and/or to further support inclusive recognition of research contributions?

Following 10 minutes of discussion in breakout rooms.

J. Koprivnikar notes that there is strong support for this initiative. She notes that in the group discussions, it was agreed that there is an important role for mentoring pre tenure faculty especially. The discussion centered around how to articulate these types of SRC activities in conjunction to our existing format for the annual report, realizing that these different parameters are combined under the category in a way diminishes it as being extra stuff you do outside of what is really SRC, rather than being a core part of Src.

L. Campbell states that her group discussed the functional process of doing SRC and the fact that there is a major equity issue around how faculty are reimbursed for SRC. She notes that it takes a very long time to get reimbursed through the current system. She notes that this is probably because our RASOs are oversubscribed and adds that more staff is needed to support this process. She notes that the current reimbursement system disproportionately affects younger faculty, who are already underpaid, who are dealing with small children and have daycare costs, She notes that they afford to carry a journal publication cost.

L. Campbell notes that the committees that do SRC awards have a pattern of favouring one gender in SRC awards. She adds that the group would like to see more diversity on the committees that do the job of evaluating.

L. Campbell comments that some of the disciplines in FOS are really not capable of being recognized for the kind of work that we typically want, like grants, and adds that there needs to be a balance.

I. Coe says that her group discussed the importance of noting both quantitative and qualitative metrics when counting HQP and considering the student experience. She notes that equal emphasis

should be put on undergraduate students, understanding that younger faculty may take on a lot of undergraduate students through a course such as SCI999, which affects research productivity.

I. Coe adds that another thing the group discussed was broadening of appreciation for research outputs to things like co-creation of research and co-owned research, particularly if working with community partners with indigenous partners. She comments that this is time-intensive and adds that implementing findings into activities is unconventional compared to traditional metrics, but is itself a really important research output. She notes that activities such as outreach, volunteer activities, span the boundary between research and service and adds that more clarity is needed in what is considered in evaluations.

R. Viirre notes that his group discussed the ways of measuring output or impact of SRC and including the supervision of students at all levels from postdocs, Ph.D., Masters, undergrads, undergrad thesis students, and even undergrad, you know smaller projects. He adds that it is also important to consider the impact on students, the student experience while at TMU, and the trajectory of their success after the program. He notes that it is important for these things to be included as one of the many things that we consider when we talk about, for instance, tenure and promotion or granting agencies awards. He concludes that qualitative measures will better serve this goal than quantitative metrics.

K. Georgiou notes that the discussion in his group started with acknowledging that the expansion of the criteria that indicate success is a great direction to take because it is a way of recognizing that people are different and that disciplines are different. He adds that the main obstacle they identified centered around having the ability to properly interpret success within the given criteria and disciplines other than one's own even if a new and revised list of criteria for success is created. He notes that proper training may be an appropriate measure as well as increasing collaboration and consultation with colleagues.

C. Antonescu thanks everyone for their contribution. He adds that he will compile the feedback just given into a more comprehensive draft which can serve as a basis for further discussion.

A. Pejovic-Milic thanks everyone for the great discussion. She reminds all to take time to recharge and prepare for the next academic year.

9) Adjournment

A. Pejovic-Milic calls for adjournment. Meeting adjourned.