



School of Languages, Linguistics, Literatures and Cultures
Council Meeting 012 (Special meeting)
Wednesday, March 21, 2018, 15:00, CHE212

MINUTES

Voting Members

M. Conliffe, Chair
O. Amedegnato
A. Barber
M.-A. Bergeron
E. Bratishenko
K. Brown
E. Buonocore
C. Burian
F. Cadel
D. Flynn
R. Friedman
S. Gbanou
A. George
S. Hoenle

Y. Kodama
M. Li
O. Mladenova
E. Montes Garcés
M. O'Brien
A. Pounder
F. Sánchez
A. Sharp
I. Shilova
D. Skordos
D. Storoshenko
J. Süselbeck
L. Torres
D. Vijayan

M. Wagner
A. Wall
E. Wang
B. Whaley
S. Winters
X.Jie Yang
LLAC Grad Rep: Paul Frey
LING Grad Rep: L. Hracs
Sessional Rep #1: -
Sessional Rep #2: R. Ayala
Support Staff Rep #1: F. Gowen
Support Staff Rep #2: M. Lee Chick Ban
Undergraduate Rep #1 -
Undergraduate Rep #2: D. Tardecilla

Observers

A. Athanasopoulou
B. Arnautovic
A. Daniel

J. Meng
F. Pisicoli

Scribe: K. Guevara

1. Call to Order

The Chair confirmed quorum, called the meeting to order at 3:02pm and acknowledged the peoples of Treaty 7.

2. Approval of Agenda

MOTION That the Agenda for the March 21, 2018 special School Council meeting be approved. Barber/Winters
CARRIED

3. Remarks from the Chair

This is a special meeting therefore the minutes of last meeting will not be approved at this time but rather at the next regular school council meeting.

Updates from the Dean's Advisory Council meeting (based on notes of Mary O'Brien who attended the meeting in the Director's absence).

- The University awaits the arrival of Michael Hart, who has been appointed Vice-Provost (Indigenous Engagement) and who will begin on campus on June 1st. The University understands the Indigenous Strategy as the foundation for a journey with Indigenous populations, particularly as the University learns how it can serve the Indigenous communities. Michael Hart's office has begun to develop cultural protocol guidelines, which will be made available. In addition, the School needs to consider its roles and goals in this Strategy.
- There was some conversation about the timing of exams. It seems that about 75% of exams are at the beginning / end of day – that is, at 8 am or at 7 pm). Although this scheduling ensures that students don't have more than two exams per day, the 8 am exams can be problematic because of snow storms (and train delays), and they can be tough for students with children or who provide parental / elder care.

- Admissions are going well in graduate programs, in spite of budgeting constraints
- Associate Deans reports:
 - Gavin Cameron explained that Fulbright Canada recruitment has begun—> information will be circulated; grad students and faculty are encouraged to apply to go to the US (applications open May 15-November 15)
 - Dawn Johnston offered that a teaching awards nominations group will be struck; heads / directors should think about how such a group could be supportive of heads / directors in making nominations, what for some has been a remarkably labour-intensive process
 - Dawn also clarified that the new graduate student pedagogy course, ARTS 601, is not meant to replace the pedagogy courses that currently exist in other graduate programs
 - Virginia Tumas is working on a document that will provide guidelines for grade reappraisals and another one that offers guidelines for how to handle cheating during an exam
 - Vice-Dean Florentine Strzelczyk explained that the equity and diversity community will provide active bystander training, which will be made available to faculty and staff.
 - A bystander is a witness—someone who sees a harmful situation and has a choice to make: Do I do something? If so, what do I do? Training Active Bystanders (TAB) helps participants recognize when they are bystanders, analyze the situation in which they find themselves, and evaluate the consequences for everyone
 - Florentine added that Carla Bertsch (Sexual Violence Support Advocate) has been hired by the University to support students who have gone through sexual violence. She is not the person who receives reports, but there will be training / workshops for heads / directors to encourage more equity and diversity. Something will probably be run by an outside expert.
 - Dean Richard Sigurdson shared that they are finishing the tenure / promotion process. There will be debrief with heads after the fact.
 - He explained, too, that the external reviewers will write the review of the Faculty, and steps will need to be taken once the report has been received.
 - At the External Reviewers' meeting with students, a relatively large number of students expressed concerns about instructors' comments that are not supportive of equity and diversity. The reviewers acknowledged that this fact indicates that some colleagues NEED the workshops.
 - Finally, new finance partner Mick Fernier has arrived here. After a quick glance, it appears that the Faculty will end up the year well.
 - As we've learned before, we must be vigilant with IRNA: Internally Restricted Net Assets (restricted carry-over and start-up money that is not being spent).

Discussion followed. The Chair clarified that the Faculty would provide feedback on the External Review report but that he was not able to confirm what documentation would be made public.

4. Governance Committee (one hour)

5.1 Representation on Committees and Committee Chairs

The election system must be confidential and must ensure that the process does not allow for duplicate voting.

- The document makes reference to "the" student group however there would be more than one. A. Pounder will update.
- Those sitting on the Graduate Studies Committee may also sit on another committee because the Grad Committees are sub committees, not directly under the School.

A straw vote showed general agreement with the content of Section 5.1.

5.2 Standing Committees

Each committee will have its own terms of reference, including the Director's Advisory Committee.

The main focus of discussion revolved around equal representation on DirAC rather than over representation by some units. Concern was raised over the statement that the Graduate Program Directors and Directors of Centres would only be expected to speak in relation to their specific area of responsibility. It was suggested that the wording be tweaked to read more like “They are expected to provide input with respect to their area of expertise”.

It was suggested that this section could be revisited once the Terms of Reference for the committee are complete.

A straw vote showed general agreement with the content of Section 5.2.

5.2.2. Undergraduate Programs and Curriculum Committee

A couple of changes were made to the 2016 document from which this section was drawn:

- A member *must* send a substitute from the same Division...
- Added as a member: the Senior Programs Specialist (non-voting); the position was not in place when the membership was originally identified.
- Requirement that sections need to be represented was removed.

Discussion followed, including the following points:

- It may be onerous for students to sit on this committee.
- Students would like to be represented so this needs to be built in.
- Concern was raised that the requirement to have sections represented has been removed. The response was that it is the expectation that the Division will send a representative who is well informed and prepared for the meetings.
- The curriculum submissions must still pass through School Council so in both the case of students and the case of sections, they will still have an opportunity to review proposals before they are passed, even if they do not sit on the curriculum committee.
- A. Pounder committed to building something into the text to allow for a non-voting person to accompany the curriculum rep to CARC.
- Sessionals are not represented on committees because their contracts only allow for teaching, not for service. That being said, if courses are taught primarily by sessionals, consultation should occur with those teaching. This might be included in the divisions’ Terms of Reference documents.
- In Section 5.2.2.3 the first bullet was removed because it was too vague and the committee already has a big enough mandate. Removing this point does not mean that initiatives could be brought forward, it just wouldn’t necessarily be a shared goal of the committee.
- Editorial changes needed includes the abbreviation of the committee’s name throughout the section for consistency.

A straw vote showed general agreement with the content of Section 5.2.2.

5.2.3 Graduate Committees

Terms of reference are being developed.

5.3 Ad-hoc Committees

5.3.1. Academic Selection Committees

This section was previously approved, with the exception of a couple of organizational changes:

- In the Membership Section, the section on student consultation was removed from “Membership” and placed under “Process”.
- Added last bullet under “Process”

5.3.1.1.

Suggested edit: “The Academic Selection Committee is responsible for presenting a ranked recommendation of full-time...” since these are just recommendations; it is the Dean who makes the final decision.

5.3.1.2

Suggestion: Make clear that this is within the Faculty of Arts

Discussion followed in relation to the channels of communication for final decisions. For example, if the role of committee chair for a hiring committee is delegated by the Director, would the committee’s decision be communicated directly to the Dean or to the Director? Concern was expressed about the Director’s role in this situation (i.e. that it could carry decision making authority even though the committee was charged with making the decision). It was clarified that normally the Dean would delegate (“Dean or delegate”) however in the School there is sometimes further delegation, especially when the Director does not speak the language of the section into which the person is being hired.

A. Pounder committed to building in something related to communication channels with the Director, for information purposes.

A straw vote showed general agreement with the content of Section 5.3

Remaining sections:

6. *Centres – have their own terms of reference (being developed)*
7. *Interdisciplinary Programs*
8. *Ancillary Policies*

Discussion followed as to how names of potential adjuncts are put forward and whether divisions can propose adjunct candidates for divisions other than their own.

9. Values Conversation and Discussion

The Chair introduced the focus for the upcoming retreat: the values, mission and vision of the School.

The word VISION has been used already in connection with the School – that is, in the 30 March 2016 Document for the Creation of the School of Languages, Linguistics, Literatures and Cultures. In the Preamble to that document, its authors offer an Introductory Vision, an Introductory Mission Statement, and a Core Mission Statement, which provide instructive and broad foundational comments on academic attributes that members of the School value and some outcomes to which they aspire.

The Chair expressed his desire to move much more firmly into appraising SLLLC’s current position and the pressures that might influence its future development.

■ Questions to consider include:

- Why do we exist? That is, what are we here to do?
- Whom do we serve?
- What distinguishes us within our peer group or groups?
 - As we look at our internal and external environments, what are our
 - Strengths
 - Weaknesses
 - Opportunities
 - Threats

Answering these questions and others will help:

- To affirm the importance that we place on certain values and to move towards defining a mission
- To deliberately create a plan – to forge a path – that builds and capitalizes on our – on the School’s – perhaps, unique combination of strengths and values.

This plan should do at least four things:

1. Help us to create and execute strategies that generate a competitive advantage within our competitive environment;
2. Facilitate important and timely decisions about new areas of focus that the School wants to develop – and about areas of focus that we might want to eliminate;
3. Help academic and administrative colleagues to maximize the ways that all School activities, infrastructures, and technologies can support each other; and
4. Identify the resources (revenue generation, reallocation, fundraising) available and needed to support the strategies.

The Chair asked members to let him know what they will need to take part in the values conversation and discussion as fully as possible, both as individuals but also as a group that values inclusion and the fullest possible participation.

Feedback was requested on two parts: Form and Content

- What is needed with regard to form or structure, that is – how should the conversation and discussion be run in order to be most productive?
- And, what is needed content-wise?
 - Data?
 - Historical context?
 - Collective access to the University’s mission, plans, and strategies?
 - A copy of the 30 March 2016 document for the Creation of the School?

Members were asked to email the Director with thoughts in anticipation of the discussion.

10. Next Meeting

April 18, 2018 at 15:00 in CHE212 (last regular meeting of the year); retreat on May 1 (time TBC).

11. Adjournment

MOTION to adjourn at 4:32pm

Sanchez/Skordos

CARRIED