



## MINUTES OF MEETING (2014-2015)

### FACULTY BOARD

Friday, May 8, 2015 in Sankey Chambers, St. Catharines Campus  
(Video Conferenced, Hamilton Campus)

---

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

The meeting was called to order at 9:36 a.m.

#### 1. Approval of the Agenda

**MOVED (KUMAR / HILL)**

**CARRIED**

**Presentation** – Tony Dipetta will be presenting on TECO, The Technical Education Consortium of Ontario.

2. **Approval of the Minutes (as amended)** from the March 13, 2015, Faculty Board Meeting

**MOVED (HUTCHISON/BLAIKIE)**

**CARRIED**

M. McGinn – noted a change to the March 13<sup>th</sup> minutes on the last page of the minutes where the Dean was speaking about Research and Development. The Dean clarified that the context had to do with M. McGinn. M. McGinn would hear from the R & D committee.

The Dean asked that the entire paragraph be removed from the March 13<sup>th</sup> minutes.

**MOVED (HUTCHISON/MITCHELL)**

**CARRIED**

3. **Matters Arising from the Minutes**

None

4. **Report from the Restructuring Scenarios Committee**

**THAT** the 5-day rule be waived for the two motions brought forward by the committee at this meeting.

**MOVED (ENGEMANN/HUTCHISON)**

**CARRIED**

**THAT** the Faculty Board approve the *Faculty Response to the External Review* document drafted by the Restructuring Steering Committee as the Faculty of Education's formal response to the External Review.

**MOVED (JAIPAL-JAMANI/FIGG)**

**CARRIED**

#### General Discussion

- Small edits to be made to the document for consistency in language and format – committee will make these changes in their next meeting on Tuesday.

- Inclusion of scenario documents – how will this be perceived? Are we committing ourselves to something that we aren't quite sure about yet? This is not what the committee is trying to do – the committee is presenting the work that has been done so far – the next committee will be working on these scenarios.
- Proposed that the scenarios be removed from the document and instead state that the faculty is working on scenarios – if this is the wish of the faculty then it needs to be proposed as a motion to remove them.
- Need to remove “Appendix K” from last page of the document.
- Issue of the Four Connected Departments model and the fact that there are 4 departments, they are named, and then in the response on page 6 these names are listed as an example – this should be edited so that it is known that these are under consideration but tentative, and that there may not be 4 departments.
- Maybe add Scenario # 3, which is still under construction, to give us the option of having a third structure if it is decided that Scenario #1 and #2 aren't taking us to where we need to be – scenario #3 would be a “shell”. The two scenarios look to well planned, and that could become accountability metrics.
- VPA had mentioned that we do not need one scenario, but two would be good to have under consideration – caution over adding in a third that would need to be fleshed out over the next few months as this will be time consuming. As we start looking at budget lines, workload, etc., in these scenarios, it may become apparent that we need to change what we are doing, and maybe put the two together to create one that meets our needs best.
- When this is presented to the VPA, we want to showcase that we have put work into this and are moving forward, so removing the scenarios would be a mistake. We are not tied to the scenarios exactly as they are presented.
- Suggestion to remove some detail from the scenarios that are presented to the VPA, and keep the detailed versions for our own working purposes.
- Again, suggested that the scenarios need to be removed.
- Concern over considering a third scenario and repeating our history of talking and not coming to a reasonable conclusion about restructuring – the timeline put forward is quite lengthy already, so adding a third scenario will increase the length even further.
- Comment that the scenarios are in fact not very detailed – could change the wording in the response that states that these are under consideration (not that we are choosing one of these) – they are tentative structures.
- These scenarios represent our thinking – we have had several meetings with regard to these scenarios – presenting them to the VPA is what we should be doing at this point – if we do not, we are back to square one, with more meetings and input regarding another scenario.

- If we provide the scenarios to the VPA, there is nothing that states that we have to “fill all of the details into the boxes” – withholding information will not actually take us a step backwards.
- The Dean indicated that she will be presenting the scenarios to the VPA and interim Dean as not doing so would be very disrespectful as this has been a lot of work and has been ongoing for a year – not doing so would be a remiss on the part of the Dean – regardless of what comes out of this meeting, the Dean will be presenting the scenarios.
- Clarity around centralization – R. Kumar to suggest language regarding this.
- Addition of international to the scenarios – adding office of international initiatives.

## Amendments/Motions

### 1. K. Jaipal-Jamini

- “Disbanding of centres”
- Amendment to note (3) in graphics of Four Connected Departments and Modified Faculty of the whole structures, in parenthesis.
- (3) It is proposed that the restructuring occur in two phases. In Phase 1, the departments would be restructured. In Phase 2, (various options with respect to the centres will be deliberated and decided upon. )
- Reason for amendment: I believe it is important to make Centre roles clear to shape future decisions as I know that the few people I asked about centres had no idea what the role was.
- Clarification of Centre Role: (Do we include the first paragraph below as part of the response to clear any misconceptions arising from the external report among faculty and upper admin?)
- Statement: The role and responsibilities of centres as academic units at Brock University needs to be clarified. According to the BUFA agreement, Article 16, departments and centres are regarded as academic units having the same roles and responsibilities such as academic and long-term planning, student evaluations, program administration, and tenure and promotion of faculty, with directors having the same rights as chairs.
- The implication of this is that we cannot arbitrarily disband centres but need to consider a variety of options as to how we change/modify/integrate centre programs in ways that address legitimate concerns raised in the external review while maintaining the unique contributions and benefits of centres. Hence, centre restructuring will occur in phase 2.
- A statement such as the above in the preamble of the report also addresses the comments about where centres fit in the restructuring process

2. M. McGinn

- That the document be amended to include more tentative language regarding the two scenarios under active consideration. Language amendments to be on pages 5-6 and elsewhere in the documents, including the draft organizational charts.
- Draft Organizational Chart should be identified as Drafts in the document. Remove "four" from the heading "Four Connected Departments" title.
- See M. McGinn's suggested changes on pages 5 and 6 of the document.

Important edits:

1. General edit for consistency and language
2. Removal of Appendix K from the end of the document
3. Inputting the program flow through chart and scenarios into the document
4. Wording around centralization
5. Wording around names of the four departments
6. Wording in Note (3) of scenarios around disbanding centres
7. Wording around the scenarios – under consideration – tentative
8. Addition of office of international initiatives to the scenarios

**MOTION**

**THAT** Faculty Board approve the *Faculty Response to the External Review* document drafted by the Restructuring Steering Committee and as amended as the Faculty of Education's formal response to the External Review.

**MOVED (JAIPAL-JAMANI/FIGG)**

**CARRIED (as amended)**

**MOTION**

**THAT**

- a) Faculty Board reconstitute the existing Restructuring Steering Committee (RSC) with the mandate to conduct a feasibility study on both restructuring scenarios under consideration by the Faculty of Education.
- b) The RSC consult with stakeholders in the Faculty of Education and the wider university community as appropriate.
- c) This committee deliver a final report at the November, 2015 Faculty Board meeting.
- d) This committee be comprised of

- at least three faculty members from each department,
- at least one faculty member representative from each academic centre,
- an administrative staff representative,
- Interim Dean,
- the FOE budget officer
- the FOE research projects facilitator (nonvoting, to provide administrative support).

**MOVED (SAVAGE/HUTCHISON)**

**CARRIED**

Discussion:

- Open email invitation to invite members to the committee
- Weekly commitment over the summer
- Sub committees to deal with the different issues – workload, budget, governance, etc.
- Suggestion that Research Projects Facilitator be moved to (e) as this is a separate role
- Suggestion that on the committee, all staff be non-voting (not excluding their thinking)
- Out of caution, should be sure that we are following procedure of the university so that the work of the committee stands on a university level
- Suggestion that there needs to be equal representation on the committee from the departments, so “at least” should be removed

**MOTION**

**THAT**

- a) Faculty Board reconstitute the existing Restructuring Steering Committee (RSC) with the mandate to conduct a feasibility study on both restructuring scenarios under consideration by the Faculty of Education.
- b) The RSC consult with stakeholders in the Faculty of Education and the wider university community as appropriate.
- c) This committee deliver a final report at the November, 2015 Faculty Board meeting.
- d) This committee be comprised of
  - three faculty members from each department,
  - one faculty member representative from each academic centre,
  - an administrative staff representative (non-voting member),
  - Interim Dean,
  - the FOE budget officer (non-voting member)

e) the FOE research projects coordinator will serve as administrative support to the RSC

**MOVED (SAVAGE/HUTCHISON)**

**CARRIED (as amended)**

**5. Question Period for Administrative Reports**

**Dean's Report**

The Dean congratulated C. Rutherford and D. Hutchinson on receiving the Brock Chancellor Award.

The Canoe ceremony is coming up, please RSVP by June 1<sup>st</sup> to S. Spiece. J. Kitchen noted that the Sioux community gave Brock University canoe years ago and it is now going to be part of a display in the FOE. The ceremony will be June 9<sup>th</sup> at 4:30 in the atrium of the FOE. The grand chief will be coming as well as some VP's. S. Spiece will send out an invite.

M. MacDonald will be organizing the Alumni Awards happening at the June 10<sup>th</sup> convocation, please nominate someone. Please contact M. MacDonald with your nomination.

The Dean acknowledged and congratulated Mandeep Mukkar-Ippolito on her new appointment with the Brock Centre for the Arts and Hamilton Campus.

**Associate Dean's Report (SACS) –No Comments**

**Associate Dean's Report (RII) - No Comments**

**Department of Graduate and Undergraduate Studies - NO REPORT**

**Department of Teacher Education**

C. Figg noted that her retreat is also on June 9<sup>th</sup> but it will be done by 4:30. This will be about the new 2 year program.

**MOTIONS**

**THAT** the 5 day rule on motions be waived.

**MOVED (FIGG/XAVIER)**

**CARRIED**

**THAT** the Faculty Board meetings be moved from Fridays to Wednesdays starting September 2015.

**MOVED (FIGG/KARROW)**

**CARRIED**

**Centre for Adult Education and Community Outreach – No Comments**

**Centre for Continuing Teacher Education – NO REPORT**

**Centre for Multi-literacies – No Comments**

**Tecumseh Centre for Aboriginal Research and Education – NO REPORT**

**Office of Concurrent Education Programs – No Comments**

**Office of Research**

S. Ratkovic asked if everyone can send her external and Brock internal grants obtained, knowledge mobilization activities organized or facilitated, and academic work published in 2014-2015 to include this information in her report to Faculty Board. After receiving the information, S. Ratkovic will update the report and resend it to Faculty Board members.

R. Kumar asked S. Ratkovic to work with M. MacDonald on developing faculty profiles based on her report (i.e., on the Faculty of Education 2014-2015 Research Highlights).

**6. Question Period for Standing Committee Reports**

**Computer and Media Advisory Committee – NO REPORT**

**Diversity Advocacy Committee – NO REPORT**

**Faculty Awards Selection Committee**

Congratulations to Peter Vietgen who is the recipient of the Faculty of Education Award for Excellence in Teaching, and Dean Pilkington who is the winner of the Faculty of Education Sessional Award for Teaching. Both awards will be acknowledged at a reception prior to convocation.

**Fine Art Advocacy Committee – NO REPORT**

**Library Advisory Committee – NO REPORT**

**Planning and Priorities Committee – NO REPORT**

**Professional Development Committee - NO REPORT**

**Publications Committee – NO REPORT**

**Research and Development Committee – NO REPORT**

**Striking Committee - NO REPORT**

**O.T.F. Representative – T. Tkaczuk – NO REPORT**

**7. Other Business**

D. Hutchison presented a gift to the Dean and thanked her for her five years of service as Dean of the Faculty of Education.

**8. Motion to end the meeting**

**MOVED (KUMAR/PELCHAT)**

Meeting end: 11:30am

**CARRIED**

