



**MINUTES OF MEETING (2015-2016)
FACULTY BOARD**

Wednesday, October 21, 2015 in Sankey Chambers, St. Catharines Campus
(Video Conferenced, Hamilton Campus)

Members Present	S. Abbey, D. Armstrong, M. Bajovic, S. Bennett, S. Bosacki, L. Cherubini, D. Ciuffetelli-Parker, D. Collier, S. Denomme-Welch, S. Drake J. Engemann, X. Fazio, C. Figg, M. Fortune, T. Gallagher, C. Giles, J. Graham, S. Griffin, D. Harwood, R. Hill, D. Hutchison, K. Jaipal-Jamani, D. Karrow, S. Khan, J. Kitchen, R. Kuchapski, X. Li, C. Lu, K. Maich, R. McGray, R. McQuirter Scott, J. Mgombeo, T. Norris, M. O'Sullivan, L. Paul, K. Pelchat, J. Rowsell, M. Savage, D. Siegel, N. Simmons, S. Sydor, L. Taylor, S. Tilley, M-L. Vanderlee, P. Vietgen, L. Volante, K. Winters V. Woloshyn
Also Present	W. Burger, E. Bernat, D. Buchanan, B. Chambers. N. Contant, L. Jackson, K. Keir, M. MacDonald, S. Melanchuk, S. Plavinskis, S. Radovich, S. Reiger, M. Smyth, S. Spiece, K. Tuck
Regrets	H. Brown, T. Dipetta, R. Kumar, M. McGinn, C. Mitchell, N. Taber
Recorder	Joan Demontigny, Acting Secretary, Faculty Board
Absent	R. Beatty, A. DiBiase, S. Hooper, D. Mogadime, D. McLaughlan, S. Vansickle, S. Widrick
On Leave/Sabbatical	J. Barrett, F. Blaikie, C. Hands, G. Phillips, C. Rutherford

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

1. Approval of the Agenda

MOVED (VIETGEN/VANDERLEE)

CARRIED

2. Approval of the Minutes from the May 8, 2015, Faculty Board Meeting – ATTACHMENT #1

MOVED (HILL/SIMMONS)

CARRIED

3. Matters Arising from the Minutes

NONE

4. Report from the Restructuring Scenarios Committee – Joe Engemann

R. McGray asked whether centres will they have the same mandate as departments. J. Engemann suggested that they may not, but the status of a centre has yet to be determined.

R. McGray asked about the timeline and BUFA. D. Siegel answered that he has spoken to the Chair of Senate and no one can remember when there has been a restructuring like this and they are not sure how they want to deal with it. The Dean will keep everyone informed and we will comply with BUFA. When we have a specific proposal, we will get more formal. The joint committee that deals with the agreement (JCAA) has equal members of administration and we may have to speak to the committee about that.

N. Simmons asked about the four interconnected departments and whether the number may be amended as necessary. J. Engemann agreed that we will be able reconsider the number of interconnected departments.

R. Kuchapski asked whether we could flesh out one department model to make it less overwhelming. D. Siegel noted that the committee was reluctant to break down each department further because it is up to the department to organize what they would like to look like. J. Engemann mentioned that we will get into too much detail; we thought it would be better to flesh them out later. M. Savage noted that we don't know what the program committees are yet, we need to determine the broad strokes first so we don't get bogged down.

D. Karrow asked if Faculty Board (FB) would no longer exist in the one department model.

M. O'Sullivan answered that it would not exist, because it would be redundant. D. Karrow asked about FB removal and the effect that would have on our interaction with the Dean. M. O'Sullivan answered that we could invite the Dean to department meetings but that might not work. If model 3 is chosen, the question of FB will come up. There will be a lot of time to sort out the implications of this. J. Engemann noted that we can also choose to keep FB.

R. McGray asked what the group under the Innovative Pedagogies & Online Learning would do. C. Figg noted that most departments of teacher education Departments have Innovative Pedagogies & Online Learning. The only area close to that is adult education. Most education

departments have people who have expertise in multimedia, online learning, etc., and we need that kind of support. R. McGray mentioned that he thinks that the area should be imbedded within instead of outside. C. Figg clarified that we need specialized people to support enhanced technological teaching, it is outside of what's normally done. It will be tied to programs and departments.

S. Tilley asked about finances and program chairs and whether any of the models affect our relationships around the university. D. Siegel answered that the new model will have to work within the finance model we have now. We would have to have negotiations around associate chair or chair of a committee. There cannot be a difference in finances because we are restructuring. S. Tilley noted that we should be careful within the models because some might need more support than others. J. Engemann mentioned that we need to work on our structure first and then see how we connect with the rest of the university.

D. Karrow noted that transdisciplinary is something the university is looking at and we should be mindful of that. The interconnected department model would support that.

From the Restructuring Report:

We recommend moving forward with selecting a structure from three models. Based on discussions and feedback received during the Faculty Forum on September 16, 2015, these are the revised motions. Votes will be taken through secret ballot.

MOTION

THAT Faculty Board conducts a single transferable vote on Sakai about the three options to determine Faculty Board's preferred structure.

MOVED (J. Rowsell/M. Savage)

CARRIED

D. Hutchinson asked that we make an amendment to the motion, adding the word academic to read Faculty Board's preferred academic structure. He suggested that it be a choice, between the academic and administrative structure.

C. Figg noted that we need a direction to move forward. We have tried for 4 months to pull it apart and suggested to not amend the motion.

J. Kitchen agreed that we should not separate the academic and administrative models, but that we will figure out as we go along. He also opposed to changing the motion.

D. Siegel noted that we need to see this as a package. The idea is that we have a CAO but if we cannot, then the position under that section will report to the Dean.

D. Karrow asked whether someone could articulate the clear separation of administrative and academic parts of the report. Because we are voting to support the delineation of the two, what are the pros and cons?

M. Savage answered that we plan on having the two integrated at some point. There will be dialog between program committees and other bodies.

C. Figg suggested changing the date that the report go to Senate, if we are concerned. The motions are more important at this point. We need a direction to move forward.

D. Hutchinson suggested removing the date of the report going to Senate and ask that a timeline be proposed by the restructuring committee for submission to Senate. It was agreed that we should remove that line in the report.

MOTION (as amended to remove the word Academic and keep original motion)

MOVED (R. Hill/C. Figg)

4 opposed

7 abstained

CARRIED

MOTION

THAT Faculty Board conducts a single transferable vote on Sakai about the three options to determine Faculty Board's preferred structure.

MOVED (J. Engemann/R. Hill)

45 accepted

0 opposed

1 abstained

CARRIED

At the November 11 Faculty Board, the top ranked structure will be presented and voted on.

5. Question Period for Administrative Reports

(a) Dean's Report – D. Siegel – **ATTACHMENT #2**

The Dean welcomed the four new hires and asked if there any questions.

N. Simmons thanked the group who did the workload document and asked if some points could be amended:

1. ILTAs' normal workload would be 80% teaching and 20% service.
2. The graduate/undergrad department passed a motion that ITLAs are not required to supervise students (but may do so if they choose).
3. ILTAs teach 8 courses over 3 terms (and the terms point is an interesting one; we schedule based on 4 terms – where April-June is separate from July/August)
4. Point 10 may benefit from a statement that ILTAs may choose to supervise students but are not responsible to do so as part of their workload.

(b) Associate Dean's Report (SASC) – S. Sydor- **VERBAL REPORT**

There are financial implications to students moving from part time studies to full time students; it affects their OSAP and funding etc. We need to be aware of this issue and warn students, especially in Adult Education, that there will be financial implications. S. Sydor will talk to the department chairs about this. There have been a few recent cases of this issue coming through the AD's office.

A large group meeting is being organized to pull resources together to talk about recruitment and retention moving forward in the next few years. If you have insight or requests on this please go to your department chair, Dorothy, Joanne or Jessica, we're open to all of your ideas.

The University is asking Faculties to report Academic misconduct. Please discuss this with your area(s) and come back so we can have a response to the committee.

D. Hutchinson mentioned the Academic Integrity Policy of the University, should we share this with everyone?

S. Sydor will send out the link to the Policy to everyone.

(c) Associate Dean's Report (RII) – M. McGinn - **NO REPORT**

(d) Department of Graduate and Undergraduate Studies–M-L. Vanderlee–**ATTACHMENT #3**

No questions

(e) Department of Teacher Education – C. Figg – **ATTACHMENT #4**

No questions

(f) Centre for Adult Education and Community Outreach S. Abbey– **ATTACHMENT #5**

No questions

(g) Centre for Continuing Teacher Education – T. DiPetra – **NO REPORT**

(h) Centre for Multi-literacies – J. Rowsell – **ATTACHMENT # 6**

No questions

(i) Tecumseh Centre for Aboriginal Research and Education J. Kitchen **ATTACHMENT #7**

No questions

(j) Office of Concurrent Education Programs – S. Regier – **ATTACHMENT #8**

No questions

- (k) Office of Research – S. Ratkovic – **NO REPORT**
- (i) Diversity Advocacy Committee – D. Mogadime - **NO REPORT**

6. Question Period for Standing Committee Reports

- (a) Computer and Media Advisory Committee – T. DiPetta – **NO REPORT**
- (b) Faculty Awards Selection Committee – R. McQuirter Scott – **ATTACHMENT #9**

S. Bennett mentioned an award for Distinguished Research, there have been 22 awards given out across the University. Can everyone have a look at how these are given out? There may be a lack of applications, there are none in Education. How can what we do be considered for this award?

S. Tilley mentioned that it is geared towards those who have had international recognition. It goes to the Deans usually and we need to make sure we have representation. We need to ensure we put in applications.

J. Roswell was on the committee and if anyone has questions please ask her.

- (c) Fine Art Advocacy Committee – P. Vietgen – **ATTACHMENT #10**

No questions

- (d) Library Advisory Committee – K. Pelchat- **NO REPORT**
- (e) Planning and Priorities Committee – K. Jaipal-Jamani - **NO REPORT**
- (f) Professional Development Committee – **NO REPORT**
- (g) Publications Committee – S. Drake - **NO REPORT**
- (h) Research and Development Committee – J. Mgombelo - **NO REPORT**
- (i) Striking Committee – M. O’Sullivan - **NO REPORT**

7. O.T.F. Representative – T. Tkaczuk - NO REPORT

6. Other Business

Computer and Media Advisory Committee (CAMAC) – is anyone here on that committee? We should keep track of this especially with evolving needs for support in e-learning. Can we get an update?

T. Dipetta was the last Chair, K. Pelchat and R. Kumar will call a meeting next week to get another Chair.

K. Jaipal-Jamani noted that she is on the BUFA committee and Equity Committee, email suggestions for each.

Meeting adjourned: 11:25 a.m.