

FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA

Date: February 2, 2023, 12:00 -2:00pm

Location: Hybrid meeting

Physical location: POD250

Zoom link: ***please register in advance of the meeting***

<https://torontomu.zoom.us/joining/register/tJErcOChriIjHdYNiK1ND4WNVzqRAzD8YNPA>

Please note:

*As this is a hybrid meeting, members of the Faculty Council who are present in person have the option of voting on the motions by raising their hand **or** by logging their vote in the zoom polls. Those joining remotely are asked to vote in the polls presented on their screens.*

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

2) Land Acknowledgement

3) Approval of Agenda

Motion: *That Faculty Council approve the Agenda for the February 2, 2023 meeting.*

4) Announcements

The meeting of *February 2, 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 November 30, 2022.*

6) Matters arising from the minutes

Due to absence of quorum in the meeting of September 29, 2022 and November 30 2022,

Motion: *That Faculty Council approve the minutes from the meeting on April 21, 2022.*

7) Motions before Faculty Council

Following previous discussion on By-Law updates,

Motion: *That membership in the Executive Committee includes the following:*

- 1. FOS Dimensions Chair (ex officio), for the duration of the Dimensions program*
- 2. Faculty Council Chair (ex officio)*

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'

8) Reports

8.1 Dean's Report

8.2 Associate Dean Reports

- Associate Dean RI, Janet Koprivnikar
- Associate Dean GPS, Russ Viirre

8.3 Standing discussion item: EDI

Topic: Pandemic-related isolation with documented EDI components
Dimensions Chair, Dr. Costin Antonescu to lead the discussion.

Discussion questions:

- 1) Have you or your colleagues experienced a sense of isolation (professionally, socially, etc) during the pandemic that is persisting, and if so what do you think is contributing to this?
- 2) What could FoS do to help address this?

8.4 Discussion on [Strategic Research Plan](#)

Acting Associate Dean, Dr. Janet Koprivnikar, to lead the discussion.

Discussion questions:

- 1) Should any of the 6 [Strategic Research Themes](#) be considered a priority, and if so, why?
- 2) In addition, how should we begin implementation for the Theme(s)?

8) Adjournment

FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

Date: November 30, 2022, 10:00 -12:00pm

Location: POD250

Members present:

Ex-officio:

A. McWilliams
D. Cramb
E. Harley
J. Koprivnikar
R. Viirre

Faculty:

A. Ferworn
A. Johnson
A. Miranskyy
C. Antonescu
D. Delic
I. Coe
J. Tavakkoli
J.Chung
K. Georgiou
K. Nunes
K. Wilkie
M. Housner
M. Kolios
M. Santos
N. George
R. Botelho
R. Karshafian
R. Suehring
R. Viirre
S. Impellizzeri
T. Antimirova
V. Bostan

Contract lecturers:

M. Sauer
O. Falou

Staff:

S.Saeed

Students:

H. Melino
J. Mendez
P. De Lagrave-Cotina

Guests:

A. Velieva
B. Filsinger
C. Nguyen
E. Hyatt
M. Sauer

Acting Secretary of
Faculty Council:

V. Clark

Regrets:

K. Rohlf
L. Fortune
L. Kolasa

1) Call to Order/Establishment of Quorum (10:00 am)

A. McWilliams notes that quorum requirements have not been met. He says that the meeting will start, and any items requiring a vote will be moved to a point later in the meeting.

2) Land Acknowledgement

A. McWilliams notes that we are not the first peoples on these lands. The Toronto Metropolitan University is located in the Dish with One Spoon territory, the territory defined by a treaty between the Mississaugas, the Anabishinaabe and the Haudenosaunee, and it stretches from the Ottawa River valley, through southern Ontario and down to the tip of Lake Huron. Other Indigenous nations and the newcomers were invited to join in this treaty in the spirit of peace, friendship and respect and that is what we want to begin our discussions from today with the view of expanding our courses and making sure that everything is inclusive.

A. McWilliams notes that it is this forum's tradition to invite stories as part of the land acknowledgement. No stories offered.

He notes that items 3, 5 and 6 will be moved.

3) Approval of Agenda

Motion: *That Faculty Council approve the Agenda for the November 30, 2022 meeting.*

4) Announcements

The meeting of *November 30, 2022* 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 September 29, 2022.*

6) Matters arising from the minutes

Due to absence of quorum in the meeting of September 29, 2022,

Motion: *That Faculty Council approve the Agenda for the Sept 29, 2022 meeting.*

Motion: *That Faculty Council approve the minutes from the meeting on April 21, 2022.*

Following previous discussion on By-Law updates,

Motion: *That membership in the Executive Committee and the Undergraduate*

Curriculum Committee include in the membership the following:

- 1. FOS Dimensions Chair (ex officio)*
- 2. Faculty Council Chair (ex officio)*

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'

7) Reports

7.1 Dean's Report

D. Cramb thanks A. McWilliams. He notes that there are many things going on at the moment, but most will be addressed in the discussion part of this meeting.

He notes that the lack of quorum is a challenge that needs to be addressed. He acknowledges that the discussions that take place here are valuable, but adds that this body also needs to be able to vote on items. D. Cramb adds that we will likely need to establish a remote voting system, perhaps through email. He notes that, as this is not part of the bylaws regulating this body, we will still need quorum to vote that change in.

D. Cramb welcomes Brooke Filsinger, the Advisor to the Dean on Indigenization in STEM Education. He notes that there have been a few initial discussions and a call out to the faculty for participation. It has emerged that one of the most desirable outcomes is to build trust in this community. As that will involve a lot of communication, he invites all to be active and reach out.

D. Cramb notes that the new building continues to progress. There is a lot of activity around raising funds to outfit the entire building. Ground breaking is still slated to happen in 2023 and there have been funds set aside for Indigenous placemaking inside the building. A university-wide committee has been put together to consider these opportunities and there will be outreach to the community.

D. Cramb says that the term has been surprisingly quiet. He notes that the students are struggling somewhat and this will be a topic of discussion.

D. Cramb notes that AD on sabbatical, M. Kolios will join this meeting shortly and present the FOS Research Strategic Plan. AD, R. Viirre will not address the audience today.

D. Cramb invites questions.

R. Botelho offers an observation that the hybrid teaching model has not proven to be effective and notes that the University should start rethinking the approach. He feels that we need to shift and encourage people to come in. D. Cramb says that people were invited to come in at the beginning of the term and notes that we are in the middle of the first experiment.

T. Antimirova says that this meeting should be coordinated with teaching schedules. D. Cramb says that

this has been put into effect going forward. He adds that this will need to be coordinated with the Departments.

R. Karshafian notes that there have been comments from graduate students regarding the rising cost of living and he asks if there are plans at FOS level to address this. D. Cramb acknowledges this and says that we are ethically bound to provide appropriate, living wages. He says that this includes international students. He notes that it is not in anyone's interest for the graduate students to be forced to work long hours in part-time jobs. R. Karshafian notes that there is also a safety issue and suggests that having limits on the number of hours of outside work should be discussed. Discussion.

A. Ferworn says that this is a theoretically correct position to take, but he comments that the Faculty is not in the position to increase pay to graduate students. He says that existing funding will only be further cannibalized. He says that we need to be very careful and honest with the incoming graduate student about real world outcomes. D. Cramb agrees that we are currently not in a position to support international students. He adds that the University is being presented with this reality.

7.2 Associate Dean Reports

- Associate Dean RI, Janet Koprivnikar

J. Koprivnikar says that it has been business as usual for her office. She notes that the faculty feedback for the timing of the next cycle of the travel awards has been received and will be considered.

J. Koprivnikar notes that the library is hiring a statistical consultant meant to be a resource for graduate students. She encourages faculty to use this resource.

- Presentation of Research Strategic Plan, Michael Kolios

M. Kolios notes that the Research Strategic Plan has been completed. He thanks everyone on the steering committee. He shares [a presentation](#) recapping the process for identifying the themes and consulting on the emerging findings.

M. Kolios presents the [FOS Research Strategic Plan](#). He notes that the plan may in the future be available in print, but for the moment it can be found on the FOS website.

- Associate Dean GPS, Russ Viirre

No report.

7.3 Equity outcomes in programs: further discussions

D. Cramb says that a conversation was started in the last Faculty Council meeting about equity outcomes in undergrad programs and he would like to continue this discussion. He adds that he spoke to Jennifer Simpson who presented a clearer way of looking at this. She suggested setting the conversation within the context of a program from which a student will have just graduated from and considering how they will contribute to an equitable world when they go on to build a career that they have trained for. He says that if we can imagine that, we need to ask if we are helping students contribute and how can we do it better. This includes discussing equity and inclusion goals with students, addressing specific field-related considerations, etc.

D. Cramb asks participants to engage in discussion on this topic at their tables.

R. Botelho asks if this discussion is aimed at undergraduate programs only. D. Cramb says that it may be even more relevant to graduate students and encourages discussion along those lines.

Free discussion time - 15 minutes.

D. Cramb invites comments from the groups. He asks speakers to wait for a microphone to reach them before speaking.

A. Velieva says that a serious commitment to EDI, EDI should be a mandatory part of the curriculum. There should be a mandatory course in EDI, and it should include empathy and ethical thinking.

Another comment is that implementation of EDI should be resourced so that it is an experiential learning experience. Those resources could also cover other areas, such as subsidized lunch options in an effort at EDI. D. Cramb agrees.

P. Wetlaufer says that we can create community within the programs themselves, especially in programs where the work itself is not very collaborative and programs where there is a lack of diversity in composition.

R. Botelho says that a full course is probably not necessary, but integrating EDI materials within courses is important. He says that the key piece is educating and training people to be aware of diversity and EDI issues.

A. Miranskyy says that there has to be balance between theory and practice. *Comment inaudible.*

D. Cramb says that we have a strong coop program and the question is whether we are preparing these students for their workplace. He acknowledges that time is not infinite and that should be a consideration as well.

A. Ferworn says that we want an outcome that is measurable, and one such outcome would be the number of our students that we hire back as faculty. He notes that this is extremely rare at TMU.

K. Georgiou says that we need to teach our students to self-evaluate and that can start with evaluation of the things that we are doing that contribute to inequity. D. Cramb says that the Dimensions Chairs are a great resource.

M. Hausner says that we can have a seminar series to educate on how to incorporate EDI in courses. D. Cramb says that the discipline-based education faculty and the Centre for Excellence in Teaching and Learning are working on collaborations.

K. Wilkie says that we need to take a good look at what our current students are doing with this as they are actually leading the way. She says that she attended a panel discussion about EDI in STEM and says that she was the only faculty member there. She notes that we are disconnected from the students.

R. Karshafian says that in the Physics graduate program admissions committee is undergoing EDI training specifically for admission processes.

J. Mendez agrees that students are leading the way in EDI. She suggests a seminar series where everyone in FOS could work on specific concepts, perhaps through case studies.

R. Suhering says that students need to be at the center of this and that it is also important that there is a benefit for students in doing this. She notes that equity-deserving groups are usually the ones initiating these activities, with no compensation, and that represents a further discrepancy in equality.

7.4 Guided discussion on approaches to improving learning outcomes:

- From a quality of learning experience point of view, what are the net benefits/net negatives in offering parts of an undergraduate course or program (e.g., lectures, assessments) online/remotely as the standard versus the same components delivered in-person?
- If desirable, what would the logistical impediments be to providing portions of a course or program to our students as a remote/online experience? How might these be overcome?

D. Cramb says that there has been interest in considering hybrid scenarios with good pedagogic outcomes. He says that this is not based in a desire to shift online and that his personal as well as the inclination of this institution has been to reinforce hands-on education, but notes that we have to acknowledge that the world shifted under our feet.

D. Cramb asks all to think about which parts of the programs can potentially move online and which portions should never go online.

He notes that this is not the only time that this will be discussed, unless there is a resounding decision either way.

D. Cramb invites questions.

M. Kolios asks whether we know what is driving the interest in online from students. D. Cramb says we only have anecdotal evidence, but the commute is a big part of the problem where hours are spent on TTC. He adds that most students are used to online courses and prefer to have recorded lectures which they can watch multiple times.

R. Botelho argues that the students are also divided and there are surely students who are against anything going online. D. Cramb agrees and says that all evidence is anecdotal at this point.

C. Antonescu says that there is a lot of data missing. He says that it seems that students at other institutions are working more than previously and that presents a constraint. He says that more information is needed.

T. Antimirova says that her impression is that students are happy to be back in person. She notes that for physicists it does not make sense to move everything online, but she sees the practicality of having large classes online. She believes that testing should never be online.

A. Ferworn says that there is no systemic approach to this and teaching in-person is difficult and hybrid impossible. He notes that there does not appear to be a concerted effort to implement a systematic approach across the University. D. Cramb says that this will be addressed at the Dean level as there are so many cross-entanglements. He notes that he needs to understand the preferences of this group.

D. Cramb invites groups to discuss at their tables.

Free discussion time - 15 minutes.

D. Cramb asks if there is a sentiment that this conversation should continue. Consensus is that more data is needed to continue conversation.

R. Botelho says that there was no consensus at his table. He notes that data does not tell us about the consequences and notes that data on student preferences should be handled carefully.

M. Sauer says that the unintended consequences are overwhelmingly negative. She notes that students cheat on tests and multitask while listening to lectures, which all fosters negative habits and creates bad results.

J. Koprivnikar says that labs, tests and exams should never be online. Remote instruction may work if taught live and time-limiting the availability of recordings may be useful.

A. Velieva said that the students do not have the university experience and community feeling that we pride ourselves on. She notes that elements of curricula could go online and the core of the programs should remain in person.

H. Melino says that online testing fostered an inequitable situation where honest students were disadvantaged. She says that it would not be equitable to time-limit recordings as many students have to work to sustain themselves.

D. Cramb thanks everyone for coming out.

8) Adjournment