

FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA

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

Location: POD250

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

2) Land Acknowledgement

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

7.2 Associate Dean Reports

- Associate Dean RI, Janet Koprivnikar
- Presentation of Research Strategic Plan, Michael Kolios
- Associate Dean GPS, Russ Viirre

7.3 Equity outcomes in programs: further discussions

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?

8) Adjournment

FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

Date: September 29, 2022, 10:00 -12:00pm

Location: POD250

Members present:

Ex-officio:

A. McWilliams
D. Cramb
M. Kolios
K. Gilbride
R. Viirre

Faculty:

A. Johnson
C. Antonescu
D. Delic
E. Harley
K. Georgiou
K. Rohlf
K. Wilkie
M. Hausner
M. Mattiazzi -
Usaj
R. Suhring
R. Viirre
S. Impellizzeri
S. Sabatinos
S. Wylie
T. Antimirova
V. Toronov

Contract lecturers:

O. Falou

Staff:

L. Fortune
S.Saeed

Students:

Guests:

A. Nguyen
A. Valieva
E. Knight
M. Stewart
P. Wettlaufer
V. Farmer

Acting Secretary
of
Faculty Council:
V. Clark

Regrets:
I. Coe
R. Botelho

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

A. McWilliams notes that quorum requirements have not been met. He comments that there are not many items to vote on and that the meeting is in session.

He welcomes all to the very first FOS FC meeting as the Toronto Metropolitan University.

2) Land Acknowledgement

A. McWilliams notes that the Toronto Metropolitan University is located in the traditional territory known as the Dish with One Spoon territory, a treaty established between the Anishinabe, the

Hudanashane and the Mississaugas. The swath of land stretches from the Ottawa River valley to the tip of Lake Huron. It is a vast oversimplification to say that it is a treaty among just those three peoples. A. McWilliams says that he had the pleasure to be on the renaming committee for our institution and, while delivering the land acknowledgement at each meeting, the members retraced their path through the traditional territories. He notes that the stories were never the same as individual paths are not the same and comments that the land acknowledgement needs to be personal. He adds that the approach of the renaming committee was to do no harm in approaching new ways of knowing and acknowledging that these are old ways of knowing. He adds that the strategic plan for our Faculty needs to follow this thread. A. McWilliams reminds all present that September 30 is Truth and Reconciliation day and invites all to wear orange to acknowledge this.

He invites thoughts and stories. No stories offered.

3) Approval of Agenda

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

A. McWilliams notes that the meeting will proceed without the approval of the Agenda as there is no quorum.

4) Announcements

The meeting of *September 29, 2022* will be recorded for the purpose of complete and accurate minutes.

A. McWilliams notes that this meeting is recorded.

5) Approval of Minutes from the previous meeting

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

A. McWilliams notes that the meeting will proceed without the approval of the minutes from the previous meeting as there is no quorum. This item will be moved to the next meeting.

6) Matters arising from the minutes

None.

7) Reports

7.1 Dean's Report

D. Cramb says that it was great to see everyone conversing at the back of the room and notes that this is a pleasant sight. He introduces himself and notes that he has been the Dean of the Faculty of Science for over four years and comments that the previous two years have been lost time in a lot of ways. He notes that, with the Executive Committee's approval, the fact that this meeting is an in-person meeting has been his intent. D. Cramb comments that this group is always engaging and notes that this will be even more pertinent in in-person meetings. He adds that hybrid meetings of this size are awkward to manage and sustain engagement.

D. Cramb says that a number of things have evolved. He says that there have been departures and new arrivals. He thanks all those that served in leadership roles as well as those who are just stepping up into these roles. He says that there was an organizational assessment in the administration, front office staff across the departments and that this process has been longer than anticipated, but comments that this provided an opportunity for in-depth consultation. He hopes that the process has yielded clarity and better organization.

D. Cramb notes that this is the 10th anniversary of the Faculty of Science existing outside of FEAS. He says that this is a milestone worthy of celebration and notes that there have been celebratory events throughout the year. There are a number of events coming up: The Gairdner Lecture is on Oct 28, Alumni Week Science improv night, the FOS10 Community Concert in Lake Devo on Oct 6.

D. Cramb notes that things have evolved with respect to the Science Discovery Complex, our building. He says that this is still a capital priority for the University. The plan is to break ground in 2023. D. Cramb notes that the residence tower that was planned was an expensive feature, especially in light of construction cost escalations and that the University has decided to not build the tower part of the building. He comments that the original intention was for the tower to be rented and thus the cost of building to be offset through the income, but that has become a losing proposition. He comments that it was a building that was trying to solve too many problems. As things stand now, the SDC will be a building with classrooms and a little bit of food and beverage service.

D. Cramb says that the Faculty of Science is tasked with fund-raising for the costs of outfitting the building so that we can take occupancy of the space. He says that the University has taken out a \$250M bond and that the vast majority of that is going into the building. He says that UA has been able to get donations in the range of \$30-40M. D. Cramb notes that the fundraising activities will need to continue and he will continue to concentrate his efforts there. He says that the University will build the classrooms and the rest of the building will be shelled in and the Faculty can build out. He notes that he will look at our academic strategies and research priorities to decide what will be built first and adds that there we may not have complete agency over this as donors are involved.

D. Cramb comments that this was to be expected and notes that all of the University capital development funds are directed into this project. He says that he was aware that this was going to be a big fundraising effort for us. D. Cramb asks everyone to think about any potential donors.

D. Cramb invites questions. (*Question inaudible*) D. Cramb says that the basic design stays and there will be 14 floors. He notes that our footprint per floor is now bigger than originally planned. There will be a couple of 250-300 capacity theaters, eight to ten 50-100 capacity classrooms.

(*Question inaudible*) D. Cramb says that it is very expensive to do a redesign and the University will not go through that process. D. Cramb notes that in a sense there is no other option for the Faculty to build these floors.

A. Rubtsov asks what the donor gets for their investment. D. Cramb says that the donor can name a building costs in the order of \$50M. Donors cannot influence the operations or direction of the Faculty but is rather the case that they are aligned with it.

D. Cramb says that tuition fees have been frozen and the government grant has been frozen, but as the costs are increasing, this means we are moving towards a deficit budget. He notes that other Faculties are there already and that Science has been fortunate with a large nest egg that the

previous Dean, I. Coe, left behind after her term ended. He says that that money has been invested and the nest egg has been depleted to the point where we need to look at how we operate differently. He comments that there has already been a decrease in research funding support and more conversation will need to take place. He notes that this conversation needs to be driven by academic priorities nonetheless.

M. Adler asks for insights on the decision to cut research programs. D. Cramb notes that we always try to absorb the budget cuts at the Dean's Office level and says that we were able to do this up until this year. He notes that the base budget is a certain value largely driven by undergrad programs and enrollment in those and there is one-time and carry forward money that the University uses as incentive to keep our numbers up. The one-time money portion is not guaranteed and we have very little control over this. Budget cuts come in a few different ways, but it is a 2% decrease to the base which for us is \$650K. He notes that positions in the Dean's Office have been closed down and other cuts to absorb, but when that is not possible, the departments start to take hits as well. The rationale is that we will absorb as much as possible to avoid positions closing and people losing jobs. D. Cramb that the level of support of SRC programs became unsustainable and were cut strategically and equitably.

D. Cramb says that this is something that has been on his mind but warns against entering adversarial roles, as this is not a productive dynamic.

D. Cramb invites Associate Dean reports.

7.2 Associate Dean Reports

- Associate Dean RI, Janet Koprivnikar

J. Koprivnikar says that the budget cuts were not made lightly. She notes that the underlying philosophy was to keep as many programs intact to the greatest possible degree. She outlines the changes to programs (see details [here](#)).

M. Adler asks how much of the research budget was cut. J. Koprivnikar says that the cuts were substantial, but that they were distributed across the program and the guiding principle to have the least impact on the largest number of programs, with disproportionately costly programmes being proportionally cut.

D. Cramb says that the cut was close to 15%.

K. Wilkie says that she appreciates the introduction of the dependent care supplement and notes that it is a supportive move that matches what NSERC has done to support early career researchers. She asks how receipts are submitted. J. Koprivnikar asks K. Wilkie to contact D. Niculescu regarding all specifics.

- Associate Dean GPS, Russ Viirre

R. Viirre says that he would like to start focusing on setting goals for his office. He is aiming to complete the Graduate and Postdoctoral Strategic Plan over the course of this term. Details of this plan can be found [here](#).

R. Viirre invites feedback from the audience. The results can be found [here](#).

7.3 FoS Strategic Plan

- The Faculty of Science aims to have an academic strategic plan for January, 2023. Pre-pandemic, we had developed a set of values. Checking in to see if they remain appropriate and active today. These are: Engagement (-passion for everything we do), Diversity (of ideas and people), Community (connection between people within and outside science), Discovery, Excellence (-innovation in this?), Student experience (UG and G), Wellbeing (for all). In your groups discuss.

D. Cramb says that we need to keep coming back to our [values](#). He notes that these come to the forefront in the Departments as this is the set of ideas that we use to prioritize around. He notes that perhaps after the past two years, it may be time to see if these words are still the most relevant. He asks groups to discuss and report back. He notes that these values should be applicable to teaching as well as SRC, though M. Kolios will have a draft strategic plan possible at the next FOS Faculty Council.

D. Cramb invites feedback.

V. Toronov says that the idea of quality of education should be a leading value. D. Cramb says that it is not there directly but he feels that it falls under “student experience” and that is a very important value.

R. Suehring says that a lot of the value words are high level to the point of rendering them meaningless as there are many interpretations. She says that they need to be defined. D. Cramb says that there will typically be a phrase or two that defines the terms closely. He notes that these phrases need to be crafted collectively, as the values were.

A. Rubtsov says that the ranking of the priorities is key. He notes that student experience is certainly a big priority with some students being in person for the first time. D. Cramb comments that this is perhaps the reason these values need to be redefined. He agrees that ranking the values is practical and necessary in decision making as well.

J. Koprivnikar says that her group thought that “wellbeing” is aspirational, and that “balance” would be a better value. She says that training would be another good value, and it would need to encompass currency and experience. K. Wilkie says that “wellness” has gained a negative connotation.

V. Farmer says that “resources” may be a pertinent value, perhaps under “excellence”.

D. Cramb says that this is a great point. He notes that he delineates that these are academic goals and resources are there to support them.

S. Impellizzeri says that it is important to discover what “wellness” or “balance” means to people. She says that “engagement” has changed and the question is how it will be brought back.

D. Cramb says that things have changed a lot and some of these values have a slightly changed context. He agrees that “wellbeing” and “engagement” have changed.

C. Antonescu agrees that “engagement” is a priority and we need to recognize that it applies to all of us.

S.Saeed says that we need to take a bit of a stronger stance with the “diversity” piece. D. Cramb agrees.

7.4 EDI in the Strat Plan

- The Provost has a mandate for TMU to include equity outcomes in all programs. This is in response to the Anti Black Racism report and the Standing Strong Task Force report. In order for these reports to have deep meaning, actions must be taken. In groups, discuss your interpretation of equity outcomes for students in our programs and how that might be worked into the student experience.

D. Cramb says that the Provost has been encouraging the Deans to think about how to bring equity and diversity into programs with outcomes with equity and diversity learnings. He notes that this is quite challenging in science but is something that we should think about. He asks all to start to think about this.

D. Cramb asks all to discuss and make notes to be delivered at the beginning of the next Council meeting.

8) Adjournment

A. McWilliams thanks the attendees for their participation and adjourns the meeting.