MINUTES OF MEETING  (2013-2014)
FACULTY BOARD

Friday, November 29, 2013 in Room 17, Hamilton Campus
(Video Conferencing, WH 147, St. Catharines Campus)


Also Present  D. Genkin, S. Hicks, M. Mukkar Ippolito, S. Plavinskis, S. Ratkovic, S. Regier, K. Tuck


Recorder  Michelle Smythe, Acting Secretary, Faculty Board


The meeting was called to order at 9:38 a.m.

PRESENTATION – B. Hutchings, VP Finance and Administration and B. Boles, Associate VP, Finance

The Dean introduced B. Hutchings and B. Boles to the faculty. B. Hutchings started his presentation by introducing himself and providing the faculty with a background on his position and what he did before he came to Brock.

B. Hutchings used a PowerPoint presentation which can be found on the Finance website (www.brocku.ca/webfm_send/28974). B. Boles said that he would also send this presentation to F. Blaikie to forward to the faculty.

Financial statements:
KPMG does our financial statements for Brock
GAP refers to generally accepted accounting practices.
B. Hutchings outlined our financial revenues/losses for the past 6 years
The university has lost almost 7 million dollars per year for the past 6 years
All of this information is taken from historical financial statements

Budget 13/14:
The budget report can be found online http://www.brocku.ca/finance/university-financial-information/budget-reports.

B. Hutchings referred to the interim mitigation measures and mitigation next steps in his presentation. We had a 14.5 million dollar deficit and we need to get it down to 7 million for this year.

B. Hutchings referred to an interactive budget forecast model that allows the user to see various alternative scenarios as you move the data in a variety of ways: www.brocku.ca/finance/university-financial-information/interactive-budget-forecast-model.

The presentation did not refer to the Faculty of Education directly. It referred to the university as a whole. It focused on the macro vs. the micro.

B. Hutchings also referred to: the status quo, board motion and provided time for questions.

It was asked, if all our creditors asked for their money to come due at once would we have the money to pay for it at that time? The answer was no we wouldn’t.

If we offer an online course would there be more funding from the government? Any new grad courses offered would not receive more funding. It would only run on tuition dollars

The Dean also added that there will be a cap on BIUs for Teacher Education students starting in 2015/16 but at this point there is not a cap on other undergrad programs. There is also a cap on grad BIUs.

There is a lot of work being put forward on online courses and hybrid courses. We are losing a lot of money from students taking online and Spring/Summer courses at other universities. We need to look more at this avenue. Online learning is important for us.

What are carry forward dollars? A unit may have thought that they saved money but with the whole university in debt that money is not really a savings because the debt owed by the university is higher than the savings.

B. Hutchings said that some universities in Canada do not use carry forward dollars. Using carry forward dollars is not a common practice in accounting.

B. Hutchings said that there is not just one thing that’s going to help us. There will be a number of events that need to happen. It’s not only cutting expenditures, we also need to look at revenues as well. At this point we are saying that there is a problem, that’s why we’re here. In a few months we will be back with other members of senior administration to say what the next steps will be.

M. O'Sullivan thanked B. Hutchings and B. Boles for their presentation.
1. Approval of the Agenda

2. Approval of the Minutes

3. Matters Arising from the Minutes
   (a) Approval of the Minutes from the May 24, 2013 Faculty Board Meeting
   (b) MOVED (Jaipal Jamani/Mogadime)
   THAT a Standing Committee be created consisting of five faculty board members
   (including representatives from departments and centres) to address issues of
   diversity in the FOE.

4. Question Period for Administrative Reports
   (a) Dean’s Report
   
   The Dean provided the faculty with more information from her OADE meeting last
   Friday.
   
   Peter Good from COU announced that new revised SMAs are due at the end of March.
   These are the elements of the SMA that we submitted:
   
   - 21st century learning
   - The transdisciplinary institutes
   - Community (reaching out to the community for partnerships).
   
   Executive heads have protested the unilateral drop in BIUs for teacher education
   programs. Combined with the enrollment cap and the extension of the program, the
   impact is huge. At a TCU meeting the Dean attended, it was said that tuition would not
   be increased as well.
   
   J. Kitchen and R. Beatty attended a meeting at OCT regarding accreditation guidelines.
   OAS is worried because it had a list of 280 requirements that needed to be met. Some of
   the bullet points were very prescriptive and the bullet points have been reduced down to
   2 or 3 bullets per point.
   
   Different faculties of education are moving forward in different ways. Some universities
   have cut Concurrent programs, some are reducing the number of teachables offered at
   the I/S level, others are suspending their technical programs.
The Dean is looking for ideas on how the OADE should spend $115,000 on publishing regarding “Research into Practice”. The Dean asked that ideas be submitted to her so she can take the ideas back to OADE.

The numbers at the border colleges have dropped.

OADe is beginning to examine grad studies and research more. And it is looking more thoroughly at the supervision of grad students.

S. Sydor referred to the restrictions that were put on medical schools a few years ago and how teacher education is going through the same process. The $115,000 from OADE could be used to research on what happened with the medical schools, how they dealt with it, and the impact.

M. McGinn said that the $115,000 could be used for Knowledge Mobilization Day at CSSE. The Dean asked M. McGinn to send her information on this.

The Dean was asked to confirm if it will be 1.5 BIUs per student, per year? Yes, that is correct.

The decrease in BIUs has made some teacher education programs at other universities vulnerable.

The Dean will send S. Bennett her notes on what changes other teacher education programs are making. There is a rumour that there is one program that will do a combined B.Ed./Masters program. Windsor is retaining concurrent education, looking at technical education and teachables are small it’s keeping its part-time program.

(b) Associate Dean’s Report (SACS)

S. Sydor asked I. McIntosh to send an email out to let everyone know about the talk by Rick Hill on Tuesday, December 3rd regarding aboriginal education.

M. McGinn mentioned that there is a meeting with DSBN next week and asked if there was anything that those involved in the meeting need to know for that meeting. Discussion ensued regarding the DSBN Academy. At one point conversations were taking place on how the Faculty of Education through the Department of Teacher Education could be partnered with the Academy. The partnership would have been similar to a lab school that OISE has. There did not seem to be support from the department for this partnership.

S. Sydor said that as Associate Dean she took this partnership to an Associate Dean meeting and there was interest from other Associate Deans. As of this past September some activities have taken place. One faculty member from Child and Youth Studies is doing research on recess. Another faculty member is working on an experiential course. As far as S. Sydor knows there are three people who are working with the Academy. When S. Sydor spoke to the Principal at the Academy about the level of activity, he
seemed happy with the work that was being done. S. Sydor brought it back to the Faculty of Education because it seems to be going well with other faculties.

It was asked how an MOU works. Does it require approval from senior administration? We already have an MOU with DSBN. Kim Meade was quite involved.

The Dean provided some history on the proposed partnership between the Department of Teacher Education and the Academy. There was the idea of placing a cohort on the 2nd floor of the Academy. To do this we would have had to invest about $200,000 to bring it up to Brock standards (i.e., technology). Due to the cost of these updates the Dean was advised by senior administration that they should not move forward with this plan.

M. McGinn is now working on a possible plan where a room would be rented at the Academy. The space would be used by researchers who could work with community partners (in technology). The lease would be for 1 year. There are some small companies that are interested in this partnership. The lease could be anywhere from 0 to $20,000. M. McGinn is waiting to find out more information. The cost and the amount of funds each partner is willing to provide is still being negotiated.

(c) Associate Dean’s Report (RII)

M. McGinn wanted to add one addition to her report:

Research is part of her portfolio. Our faculty was not represented in the applications put forward for the Brock SSHRC Institutional Grant (BSIG) and the Associate Dean is encouraging everyone to apply. People are asking for funds for international conferences and this would be a place to find that money. M. McGinn encouraged faculty to apply and informed the faculty that the next deadline is on March 20, 2014.

(d) Department of Graduate and Undergraduate Studies

The current Chair of the Graduate and Undergraduate Studies announced that the next Chair of the department will be Mary-Louise Vanderlee.

There were no questions.

(e) Department of Teacher Education

R. Beatty was available to answer any questions for the department.

A faculty member asked about the status of the Department of Teacher Education’s application for a Graduate Program.

D. Karrow said that the intention is to submit it early in the New Year. A report was submitted to the Department of Teacher Education in the Fall to bring them up to date on the work that is being done. This report would be attached to the department minutes for September or October’s department meetings.
(f) Centre for Adult Education and Community Outreach (CAECO)

No questions

(g) Centre for Continuing Teacher Education (CCTE)

No questions

(h) Centre for Multiliteracies

No questions

(i) Tecumseh Centre for Aboriginal Research and Education

No questions

(j) Office of Concurrent Education

It was asked what the status of the 2014 intake was? S. Regier said that we do not have the numbers yet.

There was some discussion about other faculties of education discontinuing their concurrent education programs. S. Regier said that she did not think that the faculty had any desire to drop the concurrent program, rather there is clear support for maintaining this program.

The Chair of the Department of Graduate and Undergraduate Studies Department said that most of the discussions (about the Concurrent Program) have taken place with the Concurrent Program Committee and with the Department of Teacher Education. She also said it would be important for the university to keep the program because it has an impact on other departments and faculties as well. The final decision about keeping the program will be made by senior administration. It was also mentioned that the university gets more funding for students with higher averages and the Concurrent students are also likely to contribute to Brock’s alumni contribution.

(k) Office of Research

No questions

5. Question Period for Standing Committee Reports

(a) Computer and Media Advisory Committee (CAMAC)

No Report

(b) Faculty Awards Selection Committee
R. McQuirter reminded everyone that the deadline dates are getting closer.

(c) Fine Arts Advocacy Committee

No Report

(d) Library Advisory Committee

No Questions

(e) Planning and Priorities Committee  NOTICE OF MOTION

THAT the recommendation to conduct a SWOT analysis through an email questionnaire to full-time faculty members which includes the questions outlined above is accepted in principle.

M. O’Sullivan said that since we do not have quorum we cannot deal with the motion but we can talk about it. The Dean said that this motion came out of the action plan that was spoken about in the May Faculty Board meeting.

D. Mogadime said that the committee did follow up on the request and increase the number to eight. It will be February when we have Faculty Board next so this motion won’t be voted on until then (if we have quorum).

It was asked that since we are having difficulty with quorum, can we put it on the website and then vote on it electronically? If we do this we have to have a conversation about putting the information online and that has to happen at a Faculty Board meeting that has quorum. The bigger issue is attendance at the meetings. If we lower quorum we have fewer people having a say in what happens in the faculty. How would lowering the number be good for the faculty? If people Skype into the meeting, that is considered the same as if people were video conferenced, and that may help with the quorum issue. If multiple people Skype in, how are we going to make sure that their voices are heard when they want to speak? It does not have to be Skype but we can look into a technical solution.

(f) Professional Development Committee

No Report

R. Kuchapski referred to the fact that the Speaker Series has been taking place in the David Howes theatre which can be expensive to rent. The turnout for the series has been low and she is wondering if it is still a worthwhile expense or should we turn it back into the Controversial Speaker Series like it was in the past.

It was suggested that maybe we could talk more about this issue in Faculty Board because people would not want to see the format go backwards. A discussion at Faculty Board would allow for a fuller conversation about any changes.
Someone mentioned that the last event was very poorly attended. The notice was sent out a week in advance and the dates in the advertisement were wrong. It needs to advertised better.

Across the university we have some very interesting speakers. Maybe we need to have a larger conversation with other faculties and other departments to share information about who is coming to speak?

The Dean said that M. McGinn needs to be kept in the discussions about the speaker series but it is important that Marc MacDonald know about the events as well.

(g) Publications Committee

No Report

(h) Research and Development Committee  (Addendum)

No Questions

(i) Striking Committee

M. O'Sullivan said that the faculty have holes to fill in the committee rosters. On the Striking Committee itself we need someone from each of the departments.

The Planning and Priorities Committee needs someone else from the Hamilton campus. D. Karrow put his name forward for this position.

There was discussion about the Professional Development Committee. It was resolved that K. Winters and D. Collier are on this committee as well as L. Paul and T. Norris.

There was discussion about the Vice-Chair of Faculty Board position. The Associate Dean cannot be the Vice-Chair.

6. OTF Representative

No Report

7. Other business

Today is the last day for voting for program review for Senate. The Faculty of Education does have a representative. It is Tony Dipetta. The Chair of Senate will hold a meeting soon to get that committee moving. There is no prediction on how quick the academic review will happen.

T. Dipetta is collecting funds for a memorial fund for M. Kompf.
The Dean officially thanked L. Cherubini for his work as Director of the Tecumseh Centre and a call is gone out for a new Director.

Adjourned – 12:06 p.m.