FACULTY COUNCIL
First Meeting, 2004-05 Session
Tuesday, October 26, 2004
4:10–6:00 p.m.

PRESENT:

Members (ex officio): Brian Cantwell Smith

Teaching Staff: Ethel Auster, Clare Beghtol, Nadia Caidi, Joan Cherry, Chun Wei Choo, Andrew Clement, Barbara Craig, Juris Dilevko, Lynne Howarth, Paulette Rothbauer, Keith Thomas, Eric Yu

Associated Instructor: Vicki Whitmell

Administrative Staff: Karen Melville

Library Professional Staff: Joe Cox (Chair of Council), Marte Misiek, Nalini Singh

Doctoral Students: Jennifer Trant


Alumni Association: Helen Katz, Karen A. Wierucki

The Professions-at-Large: Kimberly Silk

U of T Faculty Member: —

Recorder: Dace Veinberga

Assessors: Susan Brown, Wendy Newman, Kathy Shyjak

Observers: Justyna Berzowski, Jean Dryden, Nadia Moro

ABSENT:
The President of the University of Toronto; Chief Librarian of the University; The Dean of the School of Graduate Studies; Wendy Duff, Patricia Fleming, Luanne Freund, Pam Hawes, Mary Ann Mavrinac, Dave Davis
MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 4:10 p.m., a quorum having been established.

1. **Introduction**
   a) Dean Brian Cantwell Smith welcomed those present and asked them to introduce themselves. The Dean also asked Joe Cox to chair the meeting.
   
   b) Minutes of the Meeting of March 26, 2004, as they appear on the FIS website, were accepted with one minor correction:
      
      • Page 1, Doctoral Students: K. Boa, T. Miller
   
   c) Business Arising From the Minutes
      
      None

2. **Message from the Dean**

   Last year—which the Dean characterized as the “year of the talk”—FIS was involved with a great deal of planning, convening, and discussing which eventuated in the Academic Plan (available on the FIS website). This year should be a shift to a “year of the walk”, taking steps to implement the future painted in that document. This will not be a short process, since the Plan contains many ambitious goals. In the meantime there have been changes to the working context as well: President Robert Birgeneau left for Berkeley, Frank Iacobucci was appointed Interim President, while Vivek Goel was appointed Vice-President and Provost. By this time next year we should have a new president.

   However the most important fact currently facing the University is the Rae Commission.

   The financial context of this Faculty involves two lines of reporting: between FIS and the centre of the University, and between the centre of the University and Queen’s Park. It is the second of these that the Rae Commission is addressing. In the next 6 months both of these relationships will be completely rethought. Both are currently based on obscure agreements whose reasoning is no longer clear. There is considerable interest in clarifying both.
a) Relationship between the University and Queen’s Park:

Two compelling statistics illustrate the financial situation of the University. When GDP, expenditure on health care, expenditure on K-12 education, and expenditure on post-secondary education are plotted, from 1989 to the present, the first three all go up by 20% in real dollars, during that period, whereas the amount spent on post-secondary education goes down by 20%. Secondly, in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences over the same period of time, the number of students has gone up by 40% and the number of faculty employed has decreased by 15%. The Rae Commission recognizes that the fate of higher education in the province is dire, and speaks of Ontario universities being on the edge of greatness or decline. The Commission has issued a strong call for the universities to provide material to discuss this issue in public dialogue.

The financial structure of the University is vulnerable. When previous provincial reviews are plotted against allocations to universities no noticeable differences in funding at these junctures is seen except for the Smith report (1996?) —when funding decreased. There is a great deal of commitment that things must be different this time, but it is important for everyone involved in public debate to get this message out.

b) Relationship between the University and the Faculty:

The second most important financial relationship for FIS is that between the centre of the University and the Faculty. A committee chaired by Safwat Zaky, Vice Provost, Planning and Budget, is looking at academic and financial models of funding faculties. The University is pressing for a “revenue based” budgeting model, which treats faculties as cost centres. On the face of it, this does not seem to augur well for FIS. If you look at what “we earn” and how much “we spend”, our “earnings” are off our “expenditures” by about 30%. To continue in our present fashion, we need substantial cross-subsidization from the University, which is a challenging circumstance. Indeed, FIS’s entire modus operandi is challenging: we can’t continue doing what we were doing before. To survive and flourish, we must stake out an imaginative ground and grab the imagination of the University, the profession, and the public.

What to do in that regard?

i) The immediate mechanism for new and novel initiatives is the Academic Initiatives Fund (AIF), 0.5% of the University budget, which comes to about $5 million/year over 6 years. That means that over 6 years, a total of approximately 3% of the University Budget will be dedicated to new initiatives. This money is to be used for genuine interdisciplinary and interdivisional collaborations, novel ideas, and projects of importance that can be argued for by multiple constituencies.

The Dean decided that FIS was not ready to submit a proposal in the first round (which was due in early October) without yet having the backing of other, larger partners. We did put a “stake in the ground,” however, by submitting ten one-page summaries of potential projects—projects we may pursue with other partners for the spring round.
Nevertheless, we have reason to be pleased so far. The FIS Academic Plan was singled out as exemplary at the last retreat of the Principals and Deans of the University, as a model of collaboration and innovative thinking about structuring possibilities.

ii) The Provost is in the process of distilling the U of T Academic Plan into a six page summary planning document—identifying a small number of goals, priorities, and areas that the University will concentrate on over the next five years (perhaps five of each). There is a chance that information and media may be once such concentration. But even if it does get chosen as a primary focus, that by no means that FIS alone will be its target. Rather, such a development would pave the way for us to be able to capture a part of the AI Fund, but we must do so collaboratively. So our plan is to work with other partners, to build on the initiatives laid out in the FIS Plan, and collaboratively to develop proposals, with them, that all of us can endorse. Second round AIF proposals are due in early February, so we are working on that as a target date.

c) Governance

In the Plan we talked about reorganizing Faculty Council, but this year we will continue to operate with the existing Constitution. Standing committees will continue to exist, for the time being; we will appoint people to them shortly.

Prof. Wendy Duff has been appointed Director of Graduate Studies, and a job announcement has been posted for the Director of the Professional Learning Centre [At the time of the Council meeting, the Dean mistakenly said ‘Assistant Dean’ instead of ‘Director of the Professional Learning Centre’; the job announcement for the Assistant Dean was not posted until November 29, 2004].

d) Curriculum and Hiring

A major review of the curriculum will be put off until next year (05-06), because we have been given permission to hire five new faculty members to replace the two faculty members who have already left and the three who may be retiring in the next few years. The reason for asking permission for this five-position, open rank, open area hire is so that we will be ready to go ahead and hire if we receive AIF money. This hiring/search process is a tremendously important activity; and nothing will matter to the future of this Faculty as much as those who are hired.

Because of the dramatic changes in the personnel at Simcoe Hall and the need for relational partners, the future of the McLuhan Program, KMDI, the Knowledge Translation Project in HPME, the Global Centre for eHealth Innovation, several management initiatives being developed at UTM and Rotman, and a number of other initiatives around the University will need to be part of any plan put forth. In the spring it is hoped to put together an advisory panel for this purpose.
Jean Dryden asked how do we know what areas we are hiring in when the curriculum has not been looked at?

The Dean answered that we do have the Academic Plan, which specifies areas to focus on. It is not that we do not have a profile of the intellectual territory. The draft job ad identifies a number of areas of strategic importance, for instance: medical informatics; information interaction, HCI, and retrieval; security, privacy, and intellectual property; culture, communication, and media; and documentary and information practices. These are areas of interest because they tie into the areas in the Academic Plan.

The Dean’s strategy for hiring is not to narrow these foci into a specific, staged set of positions—but rather to attract absolutely first-rate people who will commit energy and leadership to help transform FIS.

3. **Reports**

   a) **Executive Committee**

      (Report attached to the original of these minutes).

      Vice-Dean Joan Cherry discussed the Report.

   b) **Standing Committees**

      i) **Academic Appeals**

         No report.

      ii) **Awards**

         No report.

      iii) **Degree**

         No report.

      iv) **Doctoral Studies**

         (Report attached to the original of these minutes).

         Prof. Ethel Auster, Chair of the Committee, presented the Report.

         After serving as chair since 1989 Ethel Auster is stepping down. On behalf of the FIS community the Dean extended an enormous vote of thanks for the depth and generosity of her service. She has been an anchor of this Faculty, having served it with wit, wisdom, and dedication.

      v) **Inforum and Information Technology**

         No report.

   vi) **Master’s Studies**

      (Report attached to the original of these minutes.)
Prof. Joan Cherry, Chair of the Committee, presented the Report.

**New Courses:**

1. FIS2199H Special Topics in Knowledge Translation and Information Behaviour in Health Care: Theoretical, Conceptual and Methodological Issues  
   Instructor: Anu MacIntosh Murray  
   Faculty Sponsor: Prof. Chun Wei Choo

2. FIS2185H Database Techniques for Managing Structured Documents  
   Instructor: Keith Thomas

3. FIS21x1H Information Innovations Design Studio I  
   FIS21x2H Information Innovations Design Studio II  
   Instructor: Keith Thomas

4. FIS21xxH Metadata Schemas and Applications  
   Instructor: Prof. Lynne Howarth

MOVED by William O’Higgins to approve the above new courses

The Dean thanked the Committee for its work on these new courses and noted that they have come in response to requests from the student body.

**Discussion ensued:**

William Denton observed that the amount of group work ranges from 0 to 50% in the Master’s courses and asked whether there are guidelines as to the maximum percentage that can be assigned to group work. Joan Cherry responded that the Dean has been working on a proposal with respect to group work. The Dean noted that there are two issues. One is the portion of the overall work, in any given course, that is group work; the second is, of that portion, what fraction of the grade that a student receives is a homogeneous grade assigned to the group overall, and what fraction is assigned to that student in particular. These are not the same thing. Our understanding of and policies for group work are still evolving, but there is an understanding of the frustration when too high a fraction of a student’s grade is obtained by a single grade being uniformly assigned to all members of a group. The Dean proposes that not more than 25% of the grade for a given student come from uniformly assigned grades for group work. We don’t restrict the assignment of more group work, in toto than that because, for example, in studio work projects, the goal is to develop expertise in group work. In such cases, however—i.e., when a course consists of a major portion of group work—students should be given individual grades for the part of the group work that they did. Groups should also not be very large and they need stewardship.
Prof. Lynne Howarth, in relation to her new course FIS21xxH, noted that coursework assignments are divided equally between individual work (50%) and a team project (50%) to ensure assessment on both accounts. The latter will be structured to ensure individual accountability and shared responsibility within the group.

Motion to approve new courses was CARRIED unanimously.

Course title and description change:
From: FIS2173H Archives and Records Management Practicum
To: FIS2173H Information Professional Practicum
[The new title in the distributed Committee report is wrongly titled: ‘Information Professional Internship’. Subsequently corrected]

MOVED by Prof. Barbara Craig that FIS2173H Archives and Records Management Practicum be retitled “Information Professional Practicum” and that the description be amended accordingly.

Discussion ensued:
Prof. Ethel Auster asked for further elaboration on how FIS2173H will work: previously this course was a practicum in archives but is now much broader. Joan Cherry replied that the intention was to broaden the course and make it more inclusive. There will be practicum placements that will be suitable for students in LIS, Archives, or Information Systems streams. Joe Cox and Barbara Craig already have many contacts and will continue to develop the pool. The change in the course title is intended to reflect on transcripts the actual student experience.

Kim Silk asked whether students ask for specific placements and whether employers are then sought out or vice versa? Joe Cox replied that placements usually originate with employers. This year more placements were available than there were students, but he asked that he be made aware of any potential placements anyone might know of.

Helen Katz asked whether the entire course is devoted to the practicum or whether it is only a component. Barbara Craig explained it is a 13-week course and that the students spend a minimum of 105 hours at their placement. Classes are oriented to issues that cross boundaries, such as ethics, project planning, and a variety of things that are common to all environments. Students also present a seminar on their placement.

Helen Katz noted that this is different from other courses where the time spent at a placement is only 40 hours and suggests there may be a need to differentiate the two. Many of the placements last year in the special libraries course were not true library placements. Perhaps some differentiation between projects and practica is needed.
Joan Cherry noted that Keith Thomas and Barbara Craig have developed a statement, which differentiates practica and projects.

Edward White said on behalf of FIS students that courses such as the Design Studio course address a very common and frequently stated desire of students for professional experience. The students are very glad this has been opened up to provide a wide variety of experience.

The Dean noted that part of the Assistant Dean’s job description entails dealing with issues of communication, perhaps developing a brochure on practicum experiences at FIS, both for students and employers. The variation across students, employers, and time, indicates that course descriptions should be broad, so that we can be nimble in addressing this variability and not have to continually change course descriptions.

Marte Misiek suggested that page1 of the Master’s Studies Committee Report should include both the old and new title for FIS2173.

Jennifer Trant noted that most placements are external, but taking into account the Dean’s emphasis on the need to build connections within the University, asked whether some thought might be put to how students might be integrated into the activities of the University – could placements be sought with departments where interdivisional relationships are being developed?

Joe Cox replied there are placements at the University but they tend to be in libraries and archives as opposed to departments.

The Dean replied that this is great idea. For example, he was talking to MacKenzie Smith, who runs the D-Space Project at MIT, who has 20 people working in the institutional archive. He noted that she is reluctant to hire librarians because they typically do not have the requisite skills. It is very important that we place people at other faculties, both for our own benefit, but also for them to understand that the kinds of skills we have are relevant to their activities.

Joe Cox noted that a FIS2173 practicum student is working on the U of T’s incarnation of MIT’s D-Space, called T-Space at U of T.

Motion to approve title change and description of FIS2173 was CARRIED unanimously.

a) Other Reports

i) Centre for Research in Information Studies
No report, but the function of this Committee will be deferred to the Life and Times Committee, discussed later in the meeting.

ii) Registrar
(Report attached to the original of these minutes.)
Report distributed for information only.

The Dean called on Prof. Eric Yu, who chairs the FIS Admissions Committee to address this Report. The intent was to admit a smaller group of students but securing ATOPS funding meant meeting certain admission levels to make that funding permanent.

Eric Yu reported that admission figures are down from last year because we are in a transitional period with admissions having been limited. Planning is taking place for a more streamlined process with earlier deadlines and it looks like we will meet the ATOPS bar.

iii) Professional Learning Centre
(Report attached to the original of these minutes.)
Karen Melville discussed the Report.

The Dean noted that Karen Melville will be retiring and commends her for PLC’s really extraordinary success. PLC is five times larger than its nearest competitor among library and information schools in North America.

iv) Academic Board
The Dean remarked that the Academic Board is the highest academic group in the University governance process prior to Governing Council. Some of the current discussions at Academic Board centre on:

Student experience:
The University is becoming more customer centred, in that the next billion dollars of the Advancement campaign and the organizational changes being considered at the University are now being dedicated to the student experience. Performance indicators show that the calibre of the faculty and the intellectual environment of the University have been maintained but the calibre of the student experience has not. This is now being made a priority.

Mandatory retirement:
There is also much discussion of mandatory retirement: the expectation is that the University will pre-empt the law and bring in changes. Interestingly, the Faculty Association is resisting because they believe the law will provide a better deal.

SGS review:
The School of Graduate Studies is undergoing a review with a committee chaired by Susan Pfeiffer, Dean of SGS, and Vivek Goel. FIS and KMDI also report to SGS. It is striking that the terms of reference of the review do not mention centres and institutes at all – the terms of reference are just about graduate education. Rather, the Provost is planning to strike a panel on interdisciplinarity and interdivisional collaboration, which is probably where this issue will be discussed. The Dean also noted that there is some chance that SGS will be restructured so as not to be home to any centres or institutes. Museum Studies is also under review; Wendy Duff is on this review committee, which is chaired by Susan Pfeiffer.

4 Plan for 2004/05

a) Overview
The Dean asked whether Council members would prefer Council to be simply a review body, for example like, Academic Board, which does not make decisions—it only reviews items which come up from review committees below it; or, whether Council should be a body where work is actually done. This would matter if, for instance, we did a curriculum review and wanted to do integrated training with the Dept. of Public Health Sciences. We could wrestle with this problem elsewhere and simply present the results to Council, or, we could actually bring issues to this Council. The Dean would like feedback from Council members on this.

Karen Melville suggested submitting reasoned responses to the Dean on this issue.

b) Election of Executive Committee
• Nominations for two full-time faculty members on the Executive Committee were invited. Professors Pat Fleming and Joan Cherry were nominated. As no other nominations were forthcoming, Professors Fleming and Cherry were acclaimed.

(The Dean took over chairing the meeting for this item.)
• Nominations for one librarian on the Executive Committee were invited. Joe Cox was nominated. As no other nominations were forthcoming, Joe Cox was acclaimed.

(Joe Cox resumed chairing the meeting.)

• Nominations for one master’s studies student on the Executive Committee were invited. Edward White was nominated. As no other nominations were forthcoming, Edward White was acclaimed.

• Nominations for one doctoral studies student on the Executive Committee were invited. The Dean noted that the Constitution requires only one student representative on the Executive Committee. This means the doctoral student can be an assessor but the Dean indicated that he would accept this person as a full member of the Committee. Luanne Freund was nominated. As no other nominations were forthcoming, Luanne Freund was acclaimed.
Nominations for one staff member on the Executive Committee were invited. Susan Brown was nominated. As no other nominations were forthcoming, Susan Brown was acclaimed.

c) New Memberships on FIS Council Committees
(Roster attached to the original of these minutes.)

Some doctoral students positions on Committees were still open. Joe Cox asked whether the Doctoral Students Association would fill these positions. Jean Dryden responded that they would do so.

Edward White noted that the Student Council Constitution requires two student representatives on faculty committees in contrast to the Faculty Constitution which requires only one. The Dean agreed that this should be referred to both the Executive Committee and the FIS Student Council to work out. In the meantime, the FIS Council Constitution would prevail.

Joe Cox asked for approval of standing committees up to point G on the Committees’ roster.

MOVED by Lynne Howarth to accept these committees as constituted. CARRIED.

d) Life and Times Committee
The Dean spoke of this as being a very important committee. There was a working group last year, which worked through the planning process. A lot of the working group’s responsibilities must now be shouldered in a place where there is full stakeholder representation.

MOVED by Brian Cantwell Smith to establish an ad hoc committee called the Life and Times Committee, which will operate with members as listed on the roster in the same way other Council committees operate. (The expectation is that it will become a Council committee like others in the future). CARRIED.

The Life and Times Committee also requires a second staff person from the Inforum; this will be addressed at the next Inforum staff meeting.

e) Constitutional Review
The Dean stated that consideration of and discussion about the Constitution will be taking place.

Jean Dryden noted that, similar to the FIS Student Council Constitution, there are also some disconnects between the Council Constitution and the Doctoral Students Association Constitution.
The Dean replied that the Executive Committee will be responsible for the task of reviewing the Constitution and will work to resolve conflicts with student associations.

5. **Question Period**

No questions.

6. **Other Business**

   a) Edward White reported that the Student Council sees an urgent need for a Professional Development Officer, there not having been one for 8 or 9 months. He asked that Council commit to advancing FIS students and fill such a position.

   The Dean noted that this will be one of the responsibilities of the Assistant Dean and that the financial situation of the Faculty does not allow for a full-time position of this type.

   Edward White would like to see a commitment from Faculty Council on this issue but would also be amenable to discussing it at the next Council meeting.

   b) Another issue of concern to students is course timetables: students would like assurances from Council that in the future the timetables will be available well in advance.

   Joe Cox noted that this should be taken under advisement and for possible discussion at another Council meeting.

   The Dean replied that stewardship of the timetables has not been located in any one place. The agenda for next meeting will include a report from Wendy Duff, as Director of Graduate Studies, on this issue.

7. **Adjournment**

   MOVED by Karen Melville that Council adjourn at 6:00.

November 25, 2004