

## FACULTY COUNCIL

March 25, 2021

**Minutes Approved April 29, 2021**

Via Microsoft Teams

Attending: Brenda Merritt, Kelly Lackie, Judy MacDonald, Jennifer Williams, Brenda Beagan, David Persaud, Judy MacDonald, Pat Cleave, Rebecca Moyer, Pollen Yeung, Laurene Rehman, Ruth Martin-Misener, Melanie Keats.

Guest: Thaissa Honda

Regrets: Rachel Ollivier, Marjorie Johnstone

## MINUTES

### DECISION

1. **Approval of Agenda** – no additions.

David P./Judy M.

2. **Consent Agenda** – approved as presented.

3. **Academic Review Committee Report** (Marion Brown):

**It was moved that:**

*“The ARC recommends approval to Faculty Council the amendment of the ARC Terms of Reference, to have a representative from CLT in the Committee as a voting member”*

**(S Price / H Framp)**

**All in favour**

**Motion carried**

**Discussion:**

- Concerns expressed regarding:
  - CLT’s understanding of accredited programs versus undergraduate programs
  - Potential budgetary implications of increasing CLT’s workload (as expressed in concerns around the University’s increasing CLT’s budget to handle the workload in opposition to increasing the schools’ budgets)
- It was noted that the current ARC membership does not currently have sufficient expertise in applying the EDI principles that are important to the University and to the Faculty; these are principles that are pursued actively by CLT. It is felt by the committee that they would be able to impart the certification knowledge to the CLT rep at the same time as the rep is bringing the EDI lens to the committee.

- Suggested compromise is to maintain the CLT representative, but as a non-voting or advisory member.

MOTION with Friendly Amendment:

**MOTION: That the Faculty Council for the Faculty of Health approves the recommendation received from the Academic Review committee that the ARC Terms of Reference be amended to include a member from the Centre for Learning and Teaching, who will be a NON-VOTING member.**

Moved: Marion Brown; Seconded: Judy MacDonald; Motion passed – unanimous.

#### **4. Matters Arising from February 25, 2021 Minutes:**

Student Code of Conduct (Senate documents included with February meeting materials) – this has not yet been approved by Senate; more meetings/consultations are occurring.

### **DISCUSSION**

#### **5. Senate Involvement in Faculty Councils:**

A list of recommendations from Senate around Faculty Council governance was sent to Dean’s Council. Kevin Hewitt, Chair of Senate, has been invited and will be attending the Faculty Council meeting in April to discuss.

The Deans were supportive of the EDI suggestions, less so about other suggestions regarding the Chair of Faculty Council, particularly the suggestion that the Chair of FC be a member of Senate, which could constitute a significant workload burden.

There is concern that having the Faculty Council Chair as a member of Senate takes away from the decision-making process, making each Faculty less independent of the University process.

It was raised that all Faculty Council terms of reference and policy documents are expected to go to a Senate committee for approval; that has not been done in the past. **Cheryl will assemble all policies/procedures, etc., in a package to be ready to send for review and approval.**

#### **6. Faculty Council Governance – DRAFT Document for Discussion: (Jennifer Williams)**

The DRAFT Governance document is the first go-around from the Governance Working Group, which consisted of Jennifer Williams, Brenda Beagan, Laurene Rehman and Cheryl Brown. The main change is that the Chair would be a faculty member, rather than the Dean, as well as the implementation of an Elections/Governance committee to oversee populating the committee.

#### Discussion:

- Check on non-voting members listed – if they were voting originally, they should be retained as such.

- If the school representative is the Chair, an additional rep will be needed from the school. This may be a strain on workloads and staff levels in smaller schools. Include in transition plan for Chair position.

Cheryl will email a word version of the document to Faculty Council representatives to use as discussion in School council meetings and to provide feedback to Cheryl/Jennifer for updating. It will be brought to the April meeting for further discussion.

#### **7. ARC – Improving Processes:**

The committee continues to try and improve and simplify its processes to make it easier for schools/faculty members to prepare proposals for presentation.

Concern was expressed that ARC approval is only required when a course is initially developed. The course can change from the template and after a number of years may not resemble the original template at all.

It was also noted that, while ARC provides a list of recommended changes to a proposal, it is not required of the faculty member making the proposal to implement these changes. This may result in delays or rejection at a higher University level. It was suggested that ARC include in their annual report/approval letters a list of the barriers that a unit may experience as they take the proposal further in the University system so that the proponents are prepared. A request for feedback on the process would also be useful for tracking issues and building or changing processes to assist adaptation.

Faculty Council members are asked to review the process with their school councils and provide feedback through the Opino Survey. A link to the survey was provided.

#### **8. Workload/Annual Report Documents:**

The workload guidelines document has been changed in recent years and is still under review; feedback is being received. It is an opportune time to also evaluate and revise, as needed, our annual reporting documents and processes as well as our workload documents and processes. SD5 is currently working on how to streamline the annual report with our integration into UniWeb.

Brenda Merritt proposed that a working group be founded with the goal of:

- Reviewing and updating/changing the current workload document / process
- Review and updating/changing the current annual report document / process
- Work on ways to implement and incorporate all faculty into UniWeb with the goal being to simplify processes and eliminate or reduce duplication.

Potential members on the working group:

- Dean
- Associate Dean Research/Director of Research

- Derek Rutherford (to provide UniWeb knowledge and understanding)
- Include different perspective from faculty members who have diverse programs of research & teaching (e.g., bench science, community engaged scholarship, Problem Based Learning, IPE/SIM)
- Include an early career faculty member

Suggestions:

- Build career development discussion into the process and ensure that all faculty are engage in annual report/career development meeting with the Director.
- Review the way percentages are currently used in workloading – find a better way to determine how diverse faculty roles are represented.
- Once developed, maintain the format for at least 3 years to relieve frustration on the part of faculty members who are filling it out.

Call for volunteers on the working group from Faculty Council:

- Kelly Lackie volunteered as an early career representative

Brenda will send out a call for volunteers to faculty members.

A project charter will be developed and brought back to Faculty Council for approval in April.

**MOTION to adjourn: 11:22 a.m. – Brenda Beagan**