



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

Wednesday, January 20, 2016 in Sankey Chambers, St. Catharines Campus
(Video Conferenced, Hamilton Campus)

Members Present	S. Abbey, D. Armstrong, S. Bennett, S. Bosacki, H. Brown, L. Cherubini, D. Collier, S. Drake, J. Engemann, C. Giles, S. Griffin, D. Harwood, D. Hutchison, K. Jaipal-Jamani, D. Karrow, S. Khan, J. Kitchen, R. Kuchapski, C. Lu, M. McGinn, R. McGray, R. McQuirter Scott, J. Mgombelo, D. Mogadime, T. Norris, L. Paul, J. Rowsell, C. Rutherford, M. Savage, D. Siegel, N. Simmons, L. Taylor, S. Tilley, ML Vanderlee, P. Vietgen, V. Woloshyn
Also Present	A. Arch, W. Burger, E. Bernat, B. Chambers, N. Contant, M. Davis, S. Melanchuk, S. Plavinskis, S. Regier, S. Spiece, K. Tuck
Regrets	D.Ciuffetelli-Parker; S. Dennone-Welch, X. Fazio, C. Figg; M. Fortune, T. Gallagher, R. Hill, R. Kumar, K. Maich, M. OSullivan, K. Pelchat, S. Sydor, N. Taber
Recorder	Joan Demontigny, Acting Secretary, Faculty Board
Absent	M. Bajovic, R. Beatty, A. DiBiase, T. Dipetta, J. Graham, S. Hooper, D. McLauchlan, S. Vansickle, S. Widrick
On Leave/Sabbatical	J. Barrett, X. Li, C. Mitchell, L. Volante, KL Winters

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

AGENDA

1. Approval of the Agenda

MOVED (ENGEMANN/MCGINN)

CARRIED

2. Appointment of Chair of Faculty Board

D. Mogadime noted that M. O'Sullivan has asked for a Chair of Faculty Board, Dolana is Vice Chair.

S. Bennett spoke to the benefits of being Chair.

No one put their name forward, D. Mogadime agreed to stay on as Chair for now.

3. Approval of the Minutes from the November 11, 2015 Faculty Board Meeting – ATTACHMENT #1

MOVED (ARMSTRONG/SIMMONS)

CARRIED

4. Matters Arising from the Minutes

None

5. Restructuring Scenarios Committee

D. Hutchison spoke about the report from the Committee. They are recommending four structures. The Dean will speak about timelines.

D. Siegel spoke about the search for the permanent Dean to replace him. The Provost noted that the process begins in April of this year there will be a committee struck to look for a new Dean. In September there would be advertisements for the position. The significance is that when you are searching for a new Dean you want to convey the feeling that we are in the process of restructuring and we are far down the road in the process. We should have something to Senate by May so that we can say that we are far down the road to restructuring.

D. Hutchinson noted that the committee is happy to answer questions about the report.

S. Abbey asked how the Task Force set up by Governance was formed?

D. Hutchinson noted that this is a Senate governance committee and they have come up with guidelines to form the work of the task force. V. Woloshyn is Senator and that is why she is on the task force. Linda Rose-Krasnor has provided the Restructuring Committee with a draft.

S. Abbey noted that CAECO would have a hard time dividing their time between the four departments and it would be detrimental.

D. Hutchison said that the programs would still be their own entity – the courses would be housed throughout the four departments.

D. Siegel commented on the process, the Restructuring Committee will report to FB but Senate is the ultimate body that determines academic protocol, as a faculty we have to produce an academic plan for the faculty. The Governance Committee is working on the idea of what is an academic plan, what it will look like. The Restructuring Committee will like to have the plan to Senate by May, if not, the next meeting is September because they take a break for the summer. We're anticipating that this will be a complex doc so it might not pass Senate in May and then we will have to present a revised plan in September.

K. Jaipal-Jamani noted that a niche clientele may not fit into the unique programs, she asked if there is a way to keep the unique programs, such as the AQ program and still have the four connected departments.

D. Armstrong has a similar concern about the higher education and how it fits in – i.e. Adult Ed, higher education are emerging areas, how are we looking at needs and market demands and how are we organizing ourselves.

N. Simmons mentioned the marketing portion and student focus and noted Adult Ed has done great work and there is work we haven't looked at, a lot of work has been done in the past five years in Adult Ed, it's an emerging stream and where would they sit in all of this. Was OISE looked at? How is this going to look from a student perspective? We seem to be married to the four departments could there be five? Educational Foundations – how is it different then Pedagogy?

C. Rutherford asked how the report addresses the concerns from the external review, the overall dysfunction and work load issues. How is this a solution to the problems that were raised in the review? How much will this cost? Echoing S. Abbey's concern about the centres and how unique they are and hope to have these questions and concerns addressed.

J. Kitchen noted that the model is only for faculty, the centres will be part of the programs, and the programs will matter to the students. As an example CAECO will belong to a program, when the program offices are determined then the student experience will be looked at. We don't have to all be part of the same department.

V. Woloshyn echoed all of the concerns brought forward thus far and asked if all the questions and decisions in the committee have been communicated. The departments will determine a lot and will be very powerful and are recognized under the collective agreement.

J. Engemann mentioned that four departments are recommended and there are bullet points underneath and are viable options, the committee has done a great job. If we have four departments, is that cost effective, what are they going to look like? We possibly need to have more presentations on what the departments will look like, the committee meets every Friday and do good work.

M. McGinn asked why we have four departments. What does it mean for the courses to be housed in the departments, who will establish the courses? CSSE was referenced and not the other two societies who are part of the national education associations, this is an issue.

R. Kuchapski noted that the board needs to understand that the programs will be fed from the department. The department level is where the faculty will go and this gives you an opportunity to respond. We're meeting with BUFA on January 21 to discuss. We need to get clarity from BUFA on how the programs will fit into departments.

C. Rutherford thanked R. Kuchapski for clarifying the new departments, but their actual functionality is still in question. We will increase meetings, head of department and head of programs and it seems counter intuitive.

D. Mogadime noted that fields of studies could be programs.

D. Siegel mentioned that the discussion has been good and wanted to mention what your committee needs from you. The committee has divided its role into two different steps – what the departments will be and what is the relationship between the department and programs. They need you to tell them what the department and programs will look like, before the meeting ends they need to know what you want.

N. Simmons is concerned that we are bringing up the same issues as before, from a higher education lense and is this continuing to separate research and teaching? The department names are not necessarily important at this point.

R. McGray noted that work load will be facilitated through the departments. Is there a policy to implement which gives us an opportunity to teach across the departments? How do we cross appoint?

J. Mgombelo asked that we change and shift our thinking as an example, programs and how they are organized, there is a worry about research interest, how do we organize research interest. We have to respect the field of study, equity and diversity are important.

J. Engemann asked how we are going to move forward with this, when do we have to make this decision, how many FB's do we have before May?

S. Bennett noted that information has been discussed a lot and echoed N. Simmons comment that the department names don't matter as much as all of our programs and all of the other details. The notion of why there are four, you have to have enough people in departments to be successful.

V. Woloshyn wanted to clarify that the departments need to carry these decisions not Faculty Board. The interplay of departments needs to be adhered to for BUFA.

M. Savage noted that the committee had grad students from another university and they came up with the four departments.

K. Jaipal-Jamani asked if the report can be posted.

S. Abbey suggested that CAECO be one of the departments. and we need to connect grad and undergrad courses.

ML. Vanderlee wanted to emphasize research and teaching – all of the work we do is informed by research. Research areas are our teaching as well. The outcome of the sorting so that we can see where the majority of courses will sit.

S. Drake asked if a faculty member joins a department do they have to stay in that department because of the courses they want to teach? Cross stream teaching is ideal. Is that the assumption?

D. Hutchison answered that all the courses in the FOE will be housed in all of the departments so there would be courses from all the different programs in all of the departments. Normal work load standards in each department will allow teaching outside the department. This should be part of the next steps.

D. Karrow reiterated that the committee asked where the members feel they belong, to self-identify. Please review the principles we have set out for the decision making. Are the principles satisfied?

D. Siegel noted that as was asked for earlier in the meeting, input is required from FB to the committee, at this point there is not a clear understanding of what this committee wants.

N. Simmons would like to see the data of the breakdown of the courses and where they will fit into the departments. The departments should look at the data and bring it forward.

S. Tilley noted that we need to understand other items, most important is the question of how you move across departments, the bigger issue that some of us see ourselves fitting across three departments. We need to know how is this going to work.

D. Hutchinson summarized points brought forward at today's Faculty Board;

- not have an Adult Ed department is of concern to some
- the importance of consulting the CSSHE association names
- concern that "Diversity and Equity" seems out of place with the other department names
- the need to preserve the integrity of each centre's programs
- will the N Connected Departments model allow faculty to teach across departments?
- ensuring that the Restructuring Committee's work is transparent by posting the committee's documents to Sakai

D. Hutchinson responded to a question about the disciplinary vs inter-disciplinary, this was previously discussed and the recommendation was that we should be disciplined based.

Break 10:56am

Meeting resumed at 11:10am

J. Engemann introduced a visiting scholar from India, Anjali Khirwadkir from MS the University of Baroda. She is here for the next 6 months. She has taught here before and has been well received. Her husband and children are here in Niagara as well.

R. Kuchapski noted that committee information is on the Sakai site, called FOE – Restructuring and there will be department meetings to discuss this as well.

6. Question Period for Administrative Reports

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

No questions

- (b) Associate Dean’s Report (SASC) – S. Sydor- **NO REPORT**

- (c) Associate Dean’s Report (RII) – M. McGinn - **ATTACHMENT #3**

M. McGinn spoke about her report and the Shirk connection grant, prepared to sign off, insight development grant – the site it working, let her know if there is anything else to do.

- (d) Department of Graduate and Undergraduate Studies–M-L. Vanderlee–**VERBAL REPORT**

M-L. Vanderlee gave a verbal report that for the PhD program there were 61 applicants across 3 Universities, large number, one of the most subscribed to across Brock. The admissions committee had a lot of work to cut this down to 8 people. Med ISP, 108 applicants, Feb 15 deadline, MEd domestic, 93 applicants, Feb 15 deadline. Numbers are really good.

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

No questions

- (f) ~~NO REPO~~ Centre for Adult Education and Community Outreach S. Abbey–**ATTACHMENT #5**

S. Abbey wanted to add two things, we hired 10 new facilitators this fall as per the BUFA agreement we had to cut them back. Sandra worked hard recruiting new people. N. Contant has been working hard to integrate the new facilitators to the online work.

4

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

(h) Centre for Multiliteracies – J. Rowsell – **ATTACHMENT #6**

No questions.

5

(i) Tecumseh Centre for Aboriginal Research and Education J. Kitchen **NO REPORT**

(j) Office of Concurrent Education Programs – S. Regier – **ATTACHMENT #7**

S. Regier noted the number of applicants for Concurrent were 1336 last year, right now we're at 1332, we are right on track and will likely go above.

6

(k) Office of Research – S. Ratkovic – **NO REPORT**

(i) Diversity Advocacy Committee – D. Mogadime – **VERBAL REPORT**

Report from the Diversity Advocacy Committee: A Standing Committee of Faculty Board

The committee is very pleased that the Dean has approved funding for a Research Assistant to work with the Diversity Advocacy Committee. The RA will assist in conducting a survey of the Faculty of Education on Diversity and Equity.

Over the past month DAC met:

- To discuss, conceptualize and plan the survey
- To discuss coalition building for Diversity and Equity in the FOE
- To discuss collaboration on Diversity and Equity through the Equity Engagement Teaching and Learning Conference, and the White Privilege Symposium Canada (which will be hosted at Brock University)

-----10 Minute Break-----

7. 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 #8**

No questions

7

(c) Fine Art Advocacy Committee – P. Vietgen – **NO REPORT**

(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**

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

7. Other Business

K. Jaipal-Jamani added that the Planning and Priorities committee has not called meetings because of the restructuring process. The committee has not been inactive but because it is informed by the Faculty Board, which has been pre-occupied by the restructuring, there is nothing to meet on currently.

S. Abbey mentioned the Trillium lifelong learning grant in relation to seniors and lifelong learning, there is a part time position that is posted for a coordinator.

Next Meeting will be February 24th in Sankey Chambers with Video Conferencing at the Hamilton Campus.

Meeting adjourned 11:30am