

FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

Date: October 5, 2023, 12:00 -2:00pm

Hybrid meeting

Location: POD-250 & zoom

Members present:

<u>Ex-officio:</u>	<u>Faculty:</u>		<u>Guests:</u>
A. McWilliams	A. Abhari	M. Olson	A. Velieva
D. Mason	A. Brown	M. Santos	B. Filsinger
E. Harley	A. Douplik	M. Sauer	D. Niculescu
M. Kolios	A. Johnson	N. George	S. McFadden
R. Viirre	A. Miri	P. Goldman	
	C. Antonescu	P. Raman	
	C. Rebello	R. Botelho	<u>Students:</u>
	D. Delic	R. Karshafian	A. Pileggi
	D. Rackus	R. Suehring	C. Boateng Ameyaw
	D. Rousseau	R. Valenzano	M. Mahoney
	E. Harley	S. Cornelius	
	F. Duah	S. Impellizzeri	<u>Secretary of Faculty</u>
	G. Gupta	S. Melles	<u>Council:</u>
	G. Wang	S. Quigley	Luna Bogdanovic
	G. Wolfaardt	S. Wylie	
	I. Woungang	Y. Bahoo	<u>Regrets:</u>
	J. Koprovnikar		V. Clark
	J. Marshall	<u>Contract</u>	
	J. McPhee	<u>lecturers:</u>	
	K. Gilbride	M. Sauer	
	K. Nunes	O. Falou	
	K. Rohlf		
	K. Wilkie	<u>Staff:</u>	
	L. Campbell	S. Saeed	
	L. Kolasa		
	M. Mattiazzi Usaj		

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

D. Mason notes that this is a hybrid meeting and that quorum has been established. He calls the meeting to order. D. Mason thanks all present for attending.

2) Land Acknowledgement

D. Mason asks A. McWilliams to deliver the land acknowledgement.

A. McWilliams says that Toronto Metropolitan University is in the Dish with One Spoon territory, which is a large area of land that stretches from the Ottawa River Valley down to the tip of Lake Huron, on Turtle Island, which we in modern day know as southwestern Ontario.

The Dish with One Spoon is a treaty between the Anishinabe, the Haudenosaunee, and the Mississaugas that bound them to work together, to share the land's resources, and protect the land.

Subsequent peoples, including European newcomers, were invited into this treaty in the spirit of peace, friendship, and respect.

He encourages everybody to think on their own personal journeys across the land and notes that his personal path has taken him through the unceded territories of the Squamish, the Cree, the Lakota, the Blackfoot and the Mi'kmaq, in addition to being 20 years in the Dish with One Spoon.

A. McWilliams notes that the Thanksgiving holiday is drawing close and asks that everybody consider how romanticized the story is that we were taught in our schools, where the settlers and the indigenous people sat down together and the Wampanoag people shared the traditional agricultural learnings that allowed for that harvest. But in fact, there are many that would argue that the Indigenous people were not initially invited. They came to try and rescue the colony, who were shooting guns in the air in celebration, and they thought that that meant that they were in trouble. Only then were they invited to join in, and brought additional food to the table. A. McWilliams notes that there are many disagreements as to exactly how the resources were properly shared through that process and adds that he does not wish to discourage from giving thanks for all that we have.

3) Approval of Agenda

Motion: *That Faculty Council approve the Agenda for the October 5, 2023 meeting.*

D. Mason calls the motion to approve the agenda. M.Santos moves; L. Campbell seconds.

D. Mason invites discussion. No discussion.

Agenda approved.

4) Announcements

The meeting of *October 5, 2023* will be recorded for the purpose of complete and accurate minutes.

5) Approval of Minutes from the previous meeting

Motion: *That Faculty Council approve the minutes from the meeting on April 20, 2023.*

D. Mason calls the motion to approve the meeting minutes from the previous meeting. R. Botelho moves; K. Wilkie seconds.

Minutes approved.

6) Matters arising from the minutes

No business arising.

7) Reports

7.1 Dean's Report

A. McWilliams welcomes all to the first Faculty Council meeting of this academic year and notes that we will have three more meetings throughout the rest of the year. He introduces himself noting that he is the Interim Dean during the period of D. Cramb's administrative leave. He welcomes the new hires, Preeti Raman, Frances Wong and Gurpaul Kochhar.

A. McWilliams reminds all that Convocation is on October 15 at 9am. He invites all to support the students and join the ceremony.

A. McWilliams notes that, since the past Faculty Council meeting, there has been a pause in the construction of the Science Discovery Complex. He says that this pause was a result of the fundraising difficulties and rising costs of the project. He notes that the UA team continues to work to raise additional funds.

R. Botelho asks whether student residences can be reconsidered in light of the housing accelerator brought forward by the federal government and whether this might be a way to continue with the project.

A. McWilliams notes that he will share this idea with the Provost in an upcoming meeting and adds that the current approvals for the building do not include the residence tower.

P. Goldman suggests an additional floor for faculty offices. A. McWilliams notes that faculty offices are not a priority and that there most likely will not be enough space to accommodate all faculty.

A. McWilliams notes that he would like to comment on the modes of course delivery. He notes that individual faculty members are not able to unilaterally change the mode of delivery for an entire course. A. McWilliams reassures all that this does not apply to individual lectures that cannot be done in person. He notes that instructors are able to do anything that was done in the past when unable to teach in person. He underlines that it is important to communicate changes to the students and department chairs.

A. McWilliams says that the VPA is working to create a process to help to assess alternative modes of delivery. He says that this document will be available in the Winter term. He adds that it is ultimately the

departmental council which will decide on the mode of delivery.

7.2 Associate Dean Reports

7.2.1 Report of the Associate Dean Research, Innovation and External Partnerships

M. Kolios notes that he returned from his sabbatical in the summer and thanks J. Koprivnikar for the work she has done in his absence.

- Research security update

M. Kolios notes that there has been a significant change in practice compared to previous standards that have to do with national security guidelines for research partnerships. He notes that now national security considerations need to be taken into account in the development, evaluation and funding of research partnerships .

He notes that proposals for collaboration with individuals connected to institutions and countries that are on the list to be released this fall, will undergo additional scrutiny to assess the level of research security threat those proposals represent to the government. He adds that this additional level of scrutiny may result in a proposal that otherwise based on merit would be successful, not being funded.

M. Kolios highlights that a brown-bag seminar will be organized by the OVPRI Director of Research Security on this topic on November 22nd.

M. Kolios concludes that this policy is very new and that he continues to work with the OVPRI to help navigate the new policy.

- FOS Dean's Research Fund programs (internal funding) update

M. Kolios notes that budget cuts have resulted in a number of the funding programs to be reduced or eliminated.

M. Kolios notes that the PDF program has been cut.

He notes that the travel program for faculty has been reduced and is now much more competitive than it has been in the past. He comments that the success rate in this program is 44% this year.

Unknown speaker (*inaudible*) asks how travel program funds are awarded. M. Kolios explains that he is working with the Chairs on identifying criteria which will be used to evaluate applications with greater granularity.

M. Kolios notes that the equipment competition will be launched this year and that more information will be available in the next month.

M. Kolios notes that budgets will be evaluated and decisions on which programs will run will be made on a yearly basis, based on available funding.

- Research opportunities update

M. Kolios notes that there will be an announcement about the upcoming CFIs and invites all interested faculty to meet with him.

M. Kolios notes that there will be an announcement about three CRC positions. He reminds all that CRCs are not designated to Faculties and those not eligible for renewal revert to the central pool and a

competition ensues. He invites all interested faculty to be thinking about research areas and notes that he will be working with the Chairs as well.

K. Wilkie asks for clarification on the CRC selection process and whether this is an opportunity for existing or new faculty. M. Kolios explains that the OVPRI puts out a call for proposals and outlines the criteria. The Associate Deans then work with the Dean to identify a research area and a proposal is submitted. He notes that this opportunity is for areas of relatively well established research intensity, not for new research areas.

7.2.2 Report of the Associate Dean, Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies

No report.

7.2.3 Report of the Associate Dean, Undergraduate

- UCC report (available [here](#), for information only)

E. Harley notes that the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee has made recommendations for prerequisite changes and a change in the grading variance for Computer Science, which got approved and are going to Senate.

E. Harley notes that 9 courses from Computer Science have been approved to be used or be part of that Cyber Science program.

- Admissions report

E. Harley notes that the Fall target was 1,040, and the target was met with the domestic students. He notes that approximately 50 international students deferred to Winter and FOS is about 50 short over all.

- Reimagining Teaching and Learning Taskforce & Initial steps to address effect of Generative AI

E. Harley notes that a task force has been established to develop roles regarding what the Senate will consider major changes and what are the various modes of delivery and recommendations regarding generative AI. The Academic Integrity Office and the Center for Excellence and Learning are developing workshops to provide guidance going forward. He adds that FOS has a couple of representatives in that committee.

- Experiential Learning -- tagging of courses

E. Harley notes that program directors have completed the tagging of courses in the Faculty of Science in terms of whether or not they have an experiential learning component. This has been done across the University, and the results are that students can now obtain that information on MyServiceHub. He adds that this information will be included in the course calendar as well.

A. McWilliams notes that Winter admissions is no longer a pilot but has become standard practice. E. Harley notes that Winter admissions will be mostly for international students.

S. Quigley asks for clarification on the process of identifying courses with experiential components. She wonders why curriculum committees were not involved. E. Harley explains that these were courses that met a specific criterium of having a lab component, and that curriculum committees were not involved as there were no changes made.

M. Santos asks if there is a coordinated effort among post-secondary institutions to examine the impact of large language models, ChatGP, and these types of technologies on education at the undergraduate level. E. Harley notes that the above mentioned task force is working on this and that more information will be

available once our representatives bring back their learning. Discussion.

A. McWilliams notes that there are workshops already available through the [Centre for Excellence in Learning and Teaching](#) on the impact of AI and how to incorporate AI effectively. These can be found in the professional development learning modules that are up. He encourages everybody who has these concerns to try to register for one as demand is high.

J. Marshall comments that he is away for two weeks each term when he attends conferences and the Department hires a replacement to teach. He notes that this is 16.6% of the course and comments that approval to teach remotely would be a cost saving mechanism. A. McWilliams asks J. Marshall to discuss this with the Department Chair.

8) Discussion items

8.1 Standing item - EDI Equitable recognition of research accomplishments

C. Antonescu notes that this is a continuation of the conversation from the Faculty Council meeting in April, where feedback about how to talk about more inclusive recognition of research accomplishments was provided. He says that he would like to provide an update on how that feedback was integrated into a next step. He shares [this presentation](#).

Following the presentation, C. Antonescu invites discussion and contributions to a draft of a statement from FOS for more inclusive recognition of SRC contributions.

Following a 10-minute discussion at tables, C. Antonescu invites feedback.

M. Sauer notes that information about the different kinds of research opportunities should be more readily available to undergraduate students.

R. Suehring notes that implementation of these ideas is the important challenge. She notes that the onus of explaining the intangible research achievements places additional pressure on the person and that this is something that needs to be addressed.

K. Gilbride notes that the language of the draft document should be stronger. She suggests replacing the words “appreciate” and “recognize” with the word “acknowledge”.

K. Wilkie suggests including the finished version of the statement in the Faculty Awards process, so that contributions could be assessed equitably in that arena as well.

8.2 Graduate Studies funding and general discussion

R. Viirre notes that he would like to give an overview of graduate funding. He shares [this presentation](#).

Following the presentation, R. Viirre invites discussion in groups in response to the following questions:

- What do you see as problems and/or inequities in the graduate student funding landscape at TMU FOS?
- Should supervisor support be consistent from program-to-program? From

- supervisor-to-supervisor? If so, how would you ensure this happens?
- Could TAship allocation/hiring be done more equitably? How? Should supervisors be able to forbid TAship?
- If a student earns a competitive scholarship, should they receive less from other sources?
- Any other comments, questions, suggestions, concerns?

After a 10-minute discussion:

S. Quigley comments that the idea of disallowing supervisors to forbid TAships is paternalistic and outdated.

R. Viirre invites attendees to register their responses [here](#).

9) Adjournment

D. Mason thanks everyone for attending the meeting. He notes that future meeting agendas should provide opportunity for member issues to be raised.

D. Mason adjourns the meeting.