

FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

Date: April 21, 2022, 10:30-12:00pm

Meeting was held virtually, via Zoom.

Members present:

| | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| <u>Ex-officio:</u> A. McWilliams D. Cramb M. Kolios K. Gilbride R. Viirre <u>Faculty:</u> A. Abhari A. Brown A. Douplik A. Ferworn A. Johnson A. Pejovic-Milic B. Koivisto B. Buzon C. Antonescu C. Beauchemin C. Kim C. Kumaradas C. Wong D. Delic D. Little D. Mason D. Rousseau | D. Rackus E. Fussner E. Harley E. Lugez F. Duah G. Wang G. Wolfaardt H. Noyan I. Coe I. Woungang J. Ghoshdastidar J. Koprivnikar J. Matejovic J. McPhee J. Tanguy K. Georgiou K. Gilbride K. Nunes K. Rohlff K. Wilkie L. Campbell(?) L. Kolasa L. McCarthy M. Alalfi M. Hausner M. Mattiazzzi Usaj M. Olson | N. Yu P. Shirani R. Suehring R. Valenzano R. Viirre S. Melles S. Quigley S. Sabatinos S. Wylie T. Antimirova V. Bostan V. Toronov Y. Bahoo <u>Contract lecturers:</u> M. Sauer | <u>Guests:</u> A. Blake A. Cojita A. Hashem D. Niculescu E. Hyatt E. Thomas J. Paul K. Kiarash Peter(?) M. Fernandes M. Stewart M.S. Thomson S. Kovacs S. McFadden S. Saeed R. Tam <u>Acting Secretary of Faculty Council:</u> V. Clark |
| | | | <u>Regrets:</u> M. Santos L. Fortune |

1) Call to Order/Establishment of Quorum (10:30am)

A. McWilliams notes that quorum has been established. He welcomes JP. Foxe.

2) Land Acknowledgement

A. McWilliams reiterates the University's land acknowledgement statement. He notes that there are potentially participants from other territories.

A. McWilliams invites stories. None are offered.

3) Approval of Agenda

Motion: *That Faculty Council approved the Agenda for the April 21, 2022 meeting.*

A. McWilliams asks for a motion to approve the Agenda.

C. Kim. moves. S. Sanayhie seconds the motion.

A. McWilliams calls for discussion; no discussion.

Agenda approved with 34 out of 34 votes in favor, 100% approval rate.

4) Announcements

The meeting of *April 21, 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 February 16, 2022*

A. McWilliams asks for a motion to approve the minutes from the meeting on February 16th, 2022. J. Matejovic moves. A. Johnson seconds.

A. McWilliams calls for discussion; no discussion

Minutes approved with 48 out of 48 votes in favor, 100% approval rate.

6) Matters arising from the minutes

None.

7) A. McWilliams welcomes the guests and briefly introduces the discussion topics.

7.1 Guest John Paul Foxe, Director, Academic Integrity Office

- Discussion on Designated Decision Makers (DDM)

JP. Foxe thanks the committee for the opportunity and says he has no slides to present. He notes that the

reason he is here today is to talk about the Designated Decision Maker committee, what it is and why he hopes that the members of the FoS Faculty Council can help.

JP. Foxe clarifies, as it is outlined in the academic integrity policy -Policy 16, if a faculty member has a suspicion of academic misconduct that they have registered at academic integrity office through policy 16, the academic integrity office has a Designated Decision Maker model built into this process. That means that faculty members who are unable or unwilling to bring their suspicions forward can refer the to somebody else. At the moment, this is only available for contract lecturers. He notes the reason it is not available to all faculty members is because the academic integrity office does not have enough personnel on this designated decision maker council. The Designated Decision Makers are faculty members who are trained with this service role. Then the referring faculty member defines the nature of the suspicion and makes a decision whether to proceed with an investigation and having a facilitated discussion with the student or not, and makes a decision as to whether they feel the misconduct has or has not occurred. JP. Foxe says he is trying to recruit new members to the Designated Decision Maker committee as there are not enough members acting in this service role. He also says that there is a need for the right type of decision maker who has appropriate background skills and knowledge to be able to take a given suspicion forward in a meaningful way. He notes that the Designated Decision Maker committee has only one faculty member from science and recently two more recruited who are awaiting training.

At this point he asks if anybody has any questions regarding this matter.

D. Rackus asks (chat) J. Paul if he can clarify if it is the DDM who goes through the facilitated discussion and not the instructor.

J. Paul says when there is a case it goes to the Chair of the Designated Decision Maker council and he decides who takes on each particular case, who is appropriate to assign this and whose turn is this..

K. Gilbride asks how this service can be extended to actually help regular faculty members because most members in this are regular faculty members. J. Paul says it depends on a case by case basis. Right now the DDM council doesn't have the capacity to accommodate more people if it is not an emergency. Only way they can do it is by getting more people on board.

A.Johnson asks if JP. Foxe can speak about eligibility criteria to be a DDM. JP. Foxe says many faculty members like to do this as part of their service requirements and all faculty members and contract lecturers are eligible for this role. He adds that he does not recommend newly hired faculty to take part before they gain institutional experience.

K. Wilkie asks whether the DDM committee will be available to all faculty with more involvement from faculty. JP. Foxe says that is exactly what they want to do but the only way to do it is to have enough people to share the load.

K. Wilkie says there is also a big issue with consistency because there are many people who have to deal with misconduct issues during the two years of virtual learning and navigating through the process without any guidance is hard. She says that she believes there should be decision makers who will take this load off of faculty members. JP. Foxe says that there were a lot of discussions about whose responsibility this would be and there was significant pushback from faculty across the University to a move to make the Academic Integrity Office the decision maker. He agrees that it is important to be consistent in this process and reminds all that penalty guidelines exist.

J. Koprivnikar mentions that she has collaborators from other institutions where they do this a little differently and view this not as service but as a responsibility of the faculty. She notes that this works well because then cases go to someone who is knowledgeable in this area. The faculty makes the first pass at the decision.

JP. Foxe says it is time to have those conversations again because so much has changed over the last couple of years and there is also an increase in the number of cases. C. Beauchemin suggests making the service optional, having a fully equipped office that can take care of it and allow faculty members who want to take it on themselves be allowed to do so.

S. Quigley agrees, points out that it depends on what the accusation is, and notes that one size fits guideline is not appropriate.

A. McWilliams asks JP. Foxe if he has anything to send to the faculty members who might be interested. J. Paul says he will send a brief description of the DDM role and what they are looking for. Interested parties can email him directly.

7.2 Associate Dean Report

- Research Strategic Plan Update

A. McWilliams notes that we are moving to our second discussion item and invites M. Kolios present an update on the Research Strategic plan. M. Kolios shares a slide about the timeline and says that they have completed all town hall meetings and had their first steering committee meeting. Now they are in the process of developing draft themes for the Research Strategic plan that will be circulated to all the members by Friday. He also says that they have another town hall meeting coming Monday where they should solicit the impact on the draft themes that have been identified. Input can also be provided through appropriate google form. M. Kolios wants to thank all members that have been involved in the process and provided feedback. He asks if anybody has any questions for him.

D. Mason says as it is exam time and people are busy marking so he suspects that there will be less time to provide feedback. M Kolios says it is just a few page drafts.

7.3 Crafting, Executing and Measuring ECI Statements

- Part 1: Research Labs

A. McWilliams says that the next topic is about Crafting, Executing and Measuring ECI Statements, in particular in the context of research labs. He says he would like to acknowledge as the Chair of the FoS council that they have a domination of white male majority in their discussion. He believes that we need to work better to ensure that everybody has a voice in our discussion. He invites Dr. A. Blake who is the Director of the Dimensions Pilot Program at Ryerson.

A. Blake along with the Dimensions Faculty Chair at FoS Dr. Imogen Coe thanks everyone and says they have come to the end of the pilot stage. The dimensions team plus library and the 8 school of graduate studies have been holding various town halls, sending out surveys and the Dimensions Faculty chairs inviting their colleagues for one on one conversation about the ways that might come under the umbrella of things that are covered by concerns around equity, diversity, inclusion and accessibility. He says D. Cramb and A. McWilliams talked to him and I. Coe about forming a new research team to work during summer and to give the undergraduates work opportunities on that research team. One of the things that would come under addressing EDI within the FoS, ideas about how to best approach equity, diversity, inclusion and accessibility within those teams so that the faculty member or the principal investigator is able to make sure that they are conducting the research in ways that live up to the dimension charter. He says facilitating those discussions with the research team through crafting is usually referred to as a code of conduct. The code of conduct is something that writes together, raises together and reflects together.

A. Blake asks I. Coe to share some examples. I. Coe says she will share some stories in the shared drive and recommends people to talk with colleagues. These shared stories are just the starting point, it can be used as templates to craft your own. A. Blake says based on the town halls and other ways that trainees, grad students and undergraduate students have reached out to the dimension team it is clear that there are things that make people uncomfortable. Facilitating those conversations perhaps picking one of these documents that I. Coe will share.

D. Cramb says nurturing the safe culture in research groups is critical to provide space for all ideas to be heard. He notes that the more the ideas there are, the better the science.

J. Ghoshdastidar asks what can faculty members do to make sure that people who are marginalized and equity seeking groups will not feel that by raising an issue they are putting their professional and academic opportunities in jeopardy.

I. Coe says that we have to be honest to admit that we have racism, sexism, homophobia, ableism and colonialism in science and we all have the shared responsibility to really learn about that. She also says the effective change must be done by those who have prime privilege and those who have prime privilege are typically the dominant group. As we don't talk about these things in science, this limits our ability. The onus is on the prime privileged people to break the silence and act on that.

R. Valenzano asks if there are any opportunities to meet with the faculty in a small group to bring forward someone's own code of conduct. He says he likes the idea of developing own code of conduct with your group and getting peer feedback as well. I. Coe says although they have run workshops on how to embed EDI into your research program, there is no specific code of conduct.

A. Blake says he would encourage people to get in touch with one another. He asks if there is anybody from the school who does have a code of conduct and has tried to facilitate a conversation with the research team that led to a code of conduct that should be shared with the members. He also encourages the members to write here that they would like to be a part of a small group.

D. Cramb says this is exactly what they are hoping to promote, small groups of similar research context.

A. McWilliams says that Chemistry and Biology would be happy to set up one or more such groups. He notes that if anybody has a comment that they don't want to be public, the Faculty of Science can leave names anonymous.

A. Blake asks everyone to read the link that has been provided, he will also direct everyone to the Dimensions website.

B. Buzon says that she is happy to discuss the review code of conduct with all the FoS members

A. Blake says cocreation is the only way it should happen.

Lab Code of Conduct [examples](#) provided by A. McWilliams.

8) Adjournment

A. McWilliams thanks participants for attending this meeting.