



York University  
Faculty of Liberal Arts & Professional Studies  
22<sup>nd</sup> Meeting of Faculty Council

NOTICE OF MEETING

Thursday, February 9, 2012  
3:00 pm – 5:00 pm

Senate Chamber, N949 Ross

Agenda

1. Call to Order and Approval of the Agenda
2. Chair of Council's Remarks
3. Minutes of the **January 12, 2012** meeting.....1
4. Business Arising from the Minutes
5. Item For Information
  - Written Report from the Faculty Representative on Senate.....4
6. **Committee of the Whole: Draft Amendments, Senate Policy on ORUs**.....6  
<http://www.yorku.ca/secretariat/senate/committees/APPR/ORU/ORUPolicyDraft20111206APPRC.pdf>.....10
7. Reports of Standing Committees of Council
  - a. Committee on Curriculum, Curricular Policy and Standards (item for information).....17
  - b. Consent Agenda (Committee on Curriculum, Curricular Policy and Standards).....18
  - c. Committee on Tenure and Promotions (items for information).....20
  - d. Committee on Research Policy and Planning (item for information).....23
8. Dean's Remarks
9. Question Period
10. **Special Presentation:** Patrick Monahan, Vice-President Academic and Provost, Progress Towards Academic Priorities
11. Other Business

2011 - 2012 Liberal Arts & Professional Studies Faculty Council Meetings are on the second Thursday of the month at 3:00pm in the Senate Chamber, N940 Ross:

March 8, 2012  
April 12, 2012

May 10, 2012  
June 14, 2012

*All are welcome and encouraged to attend!*



**York University  
Faculty of Liberal Arts & Professional Studies  
LA&PS Faculty Council**

Senate Chamber  
Minutes of the 21<sup>st</sup> Meeting of Council  
January 12, 2012  
#120112

**Attendance:** N. Adelson, M. Adriaen, D. Beausoleil, U. Best, K. Bird, M. Buccheri, S. Chen, D. Cohn, G. Comminel, R. Coombe, L. Cozzi, T. Das Gupta, M. Derayeh, R. Drummond, A. Durston, J. Edmondson, C. Ehrlich, K. Evans, I. Ferrara, M. Figueredo, D. Freake, A. Gazso, A. Gekas, M. Gilbert, P. Giordan, C. Greene, B. Heron, X. Huang, T. Hwong, C. Innes, M. Jacobs, N. Jazairi, W. Jenkins, E. Karpinski, J. Keeping, Y. Kong, A. Kulak, M. Lambert-Drache, A. Lee, K. Lehrer, D. Leyton-Brown, W. Little, L. Lo, J. Magee, C. Marjollet, K. Michasiw, H. Moghissi, R. Myers, P. Ng, K. Ogata, D. O'Neill, R. Ophir, N. Ota, S. Rahnema, N. Razack, A. Redding, D. Reed, C. Sanchez-Rodriguez, L. Sanders, G. Scardellato, A. Schrauwers, M. Schwartz, R. Sheese, J. Simeon, M. Singer, P. Singh, R. Sinyor, D. Skinner, G. Slowey, B. Smardon, J. Smith, B. Spotton Visano, A. Torres-Ruiz, S. Tufts, G. Vanstone, R. Wellen, R. Woodhouse, D. Woody, N. Yabuki-Soh, T. Hudson, A. Naipul, R. Udit, M. Bernholtz, P. Brienza, C. Ashton

**Guests:** V. Olender

**1. Call to order and approval of agenda**

The Chair of Council called the meeting to order.

It was moved, seconded and carried that the agenda be approved.

**2. Chair of Council's Remarks**

The Chair of Council wished everyone a very Happy New Year and noted that at the end of the meeting a celebration in honour of the New Year will take place.

The Chair announced that there are two very important items on the Council agenda. The first, for information, is the *Draft Amendments, Senate Policy on ORUs* consultation document. He noted that it has significant implications for research in our Faculty. This item will be presented by the Chair of the Academic Policy and Planning Committee and will be brought back to Council for a more robust discussion at the February meeting.

Secondly, on the agenda is the temporary arrangement for membership on the Tenure and Promotions Committee, which is being brought forward to Council for approval by the Executive Committee.

The Chair announced that the Tenure and Promotions Committee panels (constituted as the Senate Review Committee) have completed the backlog of files from 2010-2011 and have started on the new files for 2011-2012. A report from the Tenure and Promotions Committee will be made at the February Council meeting.

**3. Dean's Remarks**

Dean Singer thanked Council for the turnout at the meeting and wished everyone a Happy New Year!

Dean Singer provided an update on his trip to India. Specifically, he noted that he has prepared a trip report with five main activities including his visits to both universities and high schools, with alumni, and with government officials.

Dean Singer provided an update on the faculty retirements and the financial situation of the university.

Dean Singer discussed the status of the 16 tenure track searches which are currently underway. He noted the exceptional quality of the applications which have been received. In addition he discussed the 57 contractually limited appointments, which will be a mixture of re-appointments and newly appointed positions.

Dean Singer provided an update on space planning for the Faculty.

An update on student enrolment was given. On the international undergraduate enrolment the Faculty has increased by 300, about 10%. Dean Singer also noted that the Faculty has modestly fallen in the domestic undergraduate student numbers about 100 FTEs.

Dean Singer alerted Council to the proposal for the temporary amendments to the Tenure and Promotion Committee being brought forward by the Executive Committee for approval and encouraged full-time faculty members to nominate themselves for election to this Committee.

#### **4. Question Period**

There were none.

#### **5. Minutes of the November 10, 2011 meeting**

It was moved, seconded, and carried that the minutes of the November 10, 2011 meeting of Council be approved.

#### **6. Business Arising from the Minutes**

There was no business arising from the minutes.

#### **7. Reports of Standing Committees of Council**

##### **7.1 Executive Committee**

It was moved and seconded that, in view of the urgency associated with the processing of tenure and promotions applications in 2011-2012, Council from January 12, 2012 until June 30, 2012:

- *suspend the Council standing rules requiring that members of the Tenure and Promotions Committee elected at-large will not be from the same School/Department.*

- *amends the Council rule requiring that all panels of the Tenure and Promotions Committee include at least one member from the Social Sciences, Humanities, and Professional Studies such that, to the extent possible but without jeopardizing the timely processing of applications, panels will include members from the three areas.*
- *expand the membership on the Tenure and Promotions Committee to 20 full-time faculty members and eight student from 15 full-time faculty members and six students to create a fourth panel*

A friendly amendment was made that Council also:

- *suspends the Council rule passed in June 2011 that no individual shall serve simultaneously on more than one Council committee with the exception of ex-officio members until June 30, 2012.*

The motion carried.

It was moved seconded and carried that notwithstanding the modifications to the Tenure and Promotions Committee membership rules above, more generally:

- *that Council affirms the committee membership rules approved by Council in June 2011 (eg, non-succession on a committee, no multiple memberships on committees, conflict of interest) and*
- *that Council directs the Executive Committee of Council to conduct a further review of committee membership rules and report, with any recommendations, no later than December 2012.*

It was moved and seconded that the nominations for election to Council and its Standing Committees be closed. Nominations were also accepted from the floor of Council.

Additional nominations were made and accepted from the floor of Council.

The motion carried

### **7.2 Academic Policy and Planning Committee**

It was moved, seconded, and carried to change the name of Race, Ethnicity, and Indigeneity to Multicultural and Indigenous Studies.

It was moved, seconded, and carried to close the 90-credit BPA degree program option.

It was moved, seconded, and carried to close the Certificate in Proficiency in Russian Language.

It was moved, seconded and carried to create a Professional Certificate in Financial Planning.

It was moved, seconded and carried to create a Professional Certificate in Investment Management.

### **7.3 Committee on Curriculum, Curricular Policy and Standards**

The items were approved by consent.

### **8. Items for Information**

The Draft Amendments, Senate Policy on ORUs was received.

The Draft Policy of the Awarding of Degrees, Diplomas and Certificates in Extraordinary Circumstances was received.

The Written Report from the Faculty Representative on Senate was received.

The Written Report from the Chair of the Council of Masters was received.

### **9. Other Business**

There was no other business.

### **10. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned.

---

C. Innes, Chair of Council

---

L. Cozzi, Secretary of Council



**Item for Information:**

**Report on the January 26, 2012 Meeting of the York University Senate**

*Submitted by Maria Figueredo (FLA&PS Representative on Senate)*

**Chair's Remarks**

*William van Wijngaarden*

- The new Chair of Senate welcomed all Senators and espoused setting higher standards, international vision, leadership and service for our students.
- He urged all to be mindful of timelines for bringing forth items from Faculty Council to Senate; requested that use be made of the Secretariat to facilitate bringing proposals to Senate.

**Report of Academic Colleague to the Council of Ontario Universities**

*November and December COU updates; L. Sanders*

- The Provincial government is planning an audit of universities; 3-5 universities initially; concern over quantification of education; "value for money."
- Colleges are booming in developing degrees; they have started a research agenda ("applied research"), thus entering into competition for research funding.
- *Forming University Education* (2<sup>nd</sup> book by Don Drummond) argues for undergraduate teaching only as possible solutions; satellite campuses; emphasis on teaching and learning.

**Report of the Executive Committee**

*R. Mykitiuk*

- Nominations to Senate now closed.
- Prospective honorary degrees: it has been noted that there is a shortage of honourees with Science and Engineering backgrounds.

**Academic Standards, Curriculum and Pedagogy**

*A. Asif*

- Changes proposed to undergraduate program in Women's Studies to "Gender, Sexuality and Women's Studies", effective Winter 2012, reflects change to name of unit.
- As of January 2013, the start date of the Winter term will change from Wednesday, January 2<sup>nd</sup> to Monday, January 7<sup>th</sup>. The University will open on January 2<sup>nd</sup>, however, classes will resume on January 7<sup>th</sup>. The three-day turnaround period is planned for 2013 only. A question was raised regarding continuing this in subsequent years; the matter will be taken back to the committee for consideration.
- Motion approved: To change the name of the undergraduate program in Women's Studies, School of Women's Studies, LA&PS/Glendon.



## Academic Policy, Planning and Research

### A. Macpherson

- Motion approved: to change the name of the School of Women's Studies, LA&PS / Glendon.
- Motion approved: to transfer of Modes of Reasoning from the Department of Humanities to the Department of
- Philosophy, Liberal Arts and Professional Studies.
- Motion: Establishment in Principle of a Faculty of Engineering (Lassonde School of Engineering)  
This change "in principle" only is a preliminary motion to set in motion the process; this is helpful for setting up consultations, proposals and plans, and does not constitute a statutory motion.

### Vice-President Academic & Provost Patrick J. Monahan introduced the President's items:

- The preliminary numbers of overall applications show a 2-2.4% increase in number of applicants (390,000; 4 applications per applicant).
- York University: the number of 1<sup>st</sup> choice applications sent to York are down 5.2% from last year; there is a 1.8% decrease overall for of York for 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> choice.
- Ryerson: has an increase of 7.4% as 1<sup>st</sup> choice.
- University of Toronto: has an increase of 4.5% as 1<sup>st</sup> choice.
- The numbers are not spread evenly across the system: engineering shows an increase.
- LA&PS has the biggest decline in number of applications.
- Short-term measures are called for (98% of operating budget from undergraduate enrollment).
- Are creating an advisory council on "Academic Innovation" (to be a sounding board and provide advice in an informal way; new campuses are being opened; offering degrees online (such as done by MIT, for example).
- Advertising: not much is currently spent on it; one area to develop.
- Question arose from the report regarding the use of "subway ads" that could prove beneficial: could explore these simple solutions first.

### President Mamdouh Shoukri's remarks:

- Good news: York voted the greenest campus.
- Regarding the planned Provincial audit of universities: the scope of the audit will be decided as it proceeds; subsequently the decision will be made whether to extend it to other universities.
- This raises concerns about the university's autonomy.
- Don Drummond is in charge of the report; it is on the Liberal Party agenda.
- Satellite campuses have been removed from priorities for now.
- The government has announced \$1600 for students (grant) for lower income families; this will affect overall funding (e.g. supplements to government matching fund to bursaries and scholarship; infrastructure fund is also affected).
- Suggests the university looks at its budget; the President has created a Budget Committee (w/ Provost Monahan, CFO and Vice-President Finance and Administration G. Brewer).
- ST measures: some cuts will be made to budget; recommends evidence-based decisions.
- The system has grown overall in applications, yet York's share of 1st choice students has not.
- The President admits the effect of subway construction and also that attempts to improve publicity have not yet yielded important positive results; however, he is still willing to make investments.



## Report 1

January 2012

### 1. Draft Amendments, Senate Policy on ORUs

The Liberal Arts & Professional Studies Academic Policy and Planning Committee (APPC), in collaboration with the Committee on Research Policy and Planning (CRPP), have reviewed the ***Draft amendments to the Senate Policy on the Chartering and Review of Research Centres and Institutes*** (hereafter referred to as *Draft Amendments*) to provide feedback to the Academic Policy, Planning and Research Committee (APPRC) of Senate.

APPC and CRPP discussed at length the implications of the *Draft Amendments* on our Faculty, specifically noting the tiered Organized Research Units (ORUs) structure, Faculty and University resources implications, the proposed governance structure and the strategic direction of the Faculty and University in relation to the document. APPC recommended, and it was subsequently approved by the Executive Committee, that the *Draft Amendments* document along with both APPC's and CRPP's observations should be communicated to Faculty Council in February for a collegial discussion during a Committee of the Whole.

We encourage Council to participate fully in the discussion and would appreciate feedback on the questions and comments raised; as well we invite additional observations, questions, and comments which will be forwarded on to APPC following the meeting. Should Council members wish to provide their observations, questions, and/or comments in writing to APPC, please forward your communication by email to the Secretary of Council ([lcozzi@yorku.ca](mailto:lcozzi@yorku.ca)).

The following four overarching questions emerged from the discussions of both APPC and CRPP, with a number of related observations and questions under each.

#### 1. Why is there a distinction between University and Faculty based ORUs?

- Why is there a difference in the criteria for Faculty and University based ORUs?
- Faculty-Based ORUs only need to "at least aspire to be nationally leading and internationally recognized in their areas of research." The language used gives the impression that institutional-based units are more mature than Faculty-based units. Does the difference suggest a tiered research structure, and if so what would be the optics and impact internally and externally?
- How will research outside of an ORU be supported?

#### 2. What are the Resource Implications of the ORU policy proposal?

- It is difficult for us to respond to the *Draft Amendments* made to the Senate policy on ORUs without a clarification concerning the source of resources.
- What are the sources of resources for both Faculty and University based ORUs?
- How will resource decisions be made, and by whom?
- What are the resource implications for the Faculties, including for research/researchers not under an ORU?



- Should any Dean whose Faculty would be contributing resources be seen as a “Resource Dean”? Whose approval for the commitment of these resources is required ?
- Letters of support from all participating Faculties are required during the application process, including a statement and commitment from the Dean/Principal of the lead Faculty; does this also include a statement about the resource commitments of the Faculties?
- What are the main differences in funding and support for the two different types of ORUs?

### 3. Is the type of Governance Structure appropriate?

- How and on what basis are ORUs chartered, evaluated, and/or sustained.
- If an ORU is Faculty based, what is the role of the Faculty and/or Dean in decision-making?
- Are there different legislative pathways to seek approval for Faculty based ORUs than there is for University based ORUs?
- If Senate approval is always required to establish an ORU, Faculty based ORUs seem to confront hurdles on two levels although they seem also to have fewer criteria. Is this reasonable?
- Who will evaluate the success of an ORU? Who bears the costs of reviews?
- Are the evaluation timelines too short? What are the implications of the timelines not being met?
- Who is responsible for the oversight of an ORU?
- Should SPORT, a non-elected body, be in the document at all? Does SPORT have decision-making powers? If so, on what basis have these powers been conferred?
- Is it desirable to make SPORT an elected and constituted body of Senate with adequate representation?

### 4. What is the relationship of the Draft ORU Policy to the University Academic Plan and the Faculty Strategic Plan?

- The document does not appear to be linked to either the University Academic Plan or the Faculty’s Strategic Plan. Clearly articulated linkages to the priorities outlined in these two documents may help to strengthen the final document

Provided for your information is both a link to the *Draft Amendments* and the report prepared by CRPP (Appendix A) on their discussions.

#### Amendments to Senate's Policy on ORUs Consultation Documentation:

<http://www.yorku.ca/secretariat/senate/committees/apprc/documents/ORUPolicyDraft20111206APPRC.pdf>





Appendix A

**On Draft Amendments of Senate Policy on Organized Research Units  
Committee on Research Policy and Planning**

The Committee on Research Policy and Planning (CRPP) is pleased to share its comments on the draft amendments of Senate Policy on Organized Research Units (hereinafter the Draft) circulated for collegial consultation in December 2011. The CRPP's comments are presented under three themes -- building on social justice strengths at York, recognizing different ways of conducting research, and developing an administration framework nurturing all researchers.

**1. Building on social justice commitment at York University**

York University is committed to social justice. The CRPP recommends the Draft to build on that foundation of the University.

In the Draft, "social justice" is not mentioned. This is a departure from the strategic plans of the University and LA & PS. The Draft does use the term "greater benefit of society" as follows in section 2.2 [underlined for emphasis]:

They are expected to add value and promote quality in bringing together critical masses of scholars aspiring to national leadership and international recognition in clearly-identified areas of research opportunity that are in keeping with York's traditions of community engagement and the translation and mobilization of knowledge (broadly construed, and including the methods used in the Sciences, Social Sciences, Humanities, and Fine Arts) to the greater benefit of society.

However, "greater benefit of society" may or may not include social justice.

**2. Recognizing different kinds of research and different ways of conducting research**

The following language in section 2.2 may lead to uncertainty in terms of the kinds of research that will be deemed fit under the Draft.

Opportunities for strategic research development arise naturally amongst researchers who share common research and professional interests, are informed by the University and Faculty Strategic Research Plans and are responsive to Federal and Provincial research priorities.

What will happen to researchers whose work is not "responsive" to government priorities? What if the researchers are critiquing government priorities? The language needs to be clarified to avoid any misunderstanding.



At York there are many researchers who work outside Organized Research Units. To avoid the misunderstanding that they are not as good as researchers working at Organized Research Units, language similar to the text in italics below is recommended to be added in section 2.2:

*There are many modes of academic production ranging from scholars who work on their own, to those who work informally with a number of like-minded individuals, to those who collaborate on a formal basis. York University sees the Organized Research Unit (ORU) as an important formal mechanism through which it can work to achieve its aspirations of strategic research leadership and development. Thus Research Institutes and Centres chartered by Senate have the central purpose of ....*

### **3. Developing an administration framework nurturing all researchers**

The two-tier system proposed in the Draft may pit researchers against each other. For example, Institutional Organized Research Units are expected to “attain at least national recognition as leaders in the relevant area of research.” But Faculty-Based Organized Research Units only need to “at least aspire to be nationally leading and internationally recognized in their areas of research.” The language used gives the impression that institutional-based units are more mature than faculty-based units. So what will happen to faculty-based units that attain national standing? What are the main differences in funding and support for the two different types of Organized Research Units? The major-minor league division may not be productive in nurturing all researchers at York. If incubation is the objective behind the two-tier system, there are other ways to group organized research units. For example, all units can remain institutional-based but less-mature units can have a longer review cycle so they are given enough time to develop its strengths.

The Draft calls for reviews and (re)chartering but there is uncertainty about the relevant standards, timelines and the decision-making processes. The expectation on research deliverables and appropriate standards of review need to be clarified. One suggestion is to include societal benefits such as relationships and services to broader communities as part of the standards of review. Under the current draft, all Organized Research Units will come up for (re)chartering by 2015, and if that is deemed preferable than ORUs coming up under the current schedule, the rationale needs to be fully articulated. The question of whether all ORUs coming up for re-chartering within the same two-year period can be efficiently and effectively administered needs to be investigated. A three-year interim review and a five-year re-chartering are proposed, and whether such frequency of reviews will put undue burden on Organized Research Units to focus on preparing for reviews rather than pursuing their research objectives needs to be addressed. One suggestion is to lengthen the chartering period from five to six or seven years to provide a longer period of institutional stability that is important to both external funders and research participants. The workings of the sunset provisions need to be detailed. Finally, the governance of ORUs including the role of SPORT needs to be explained.

## Memo

To: Vice-President Research and Innovation  
Vice-President Academic and Provost  
Deans and Principal  
Associate Deans / Associate Principal Research  
Organized Research Unit Directors  
Chairs and Secretaries of Faculty Councils

From: Alison Macpherson, Chair, Academic Policy, Planning and  
Research Committee of Senate

Date: December 6, 2011

Re: **Draft Amendments, Senate Policy on ORUs**



An ad hoc working group composed of members of Senate's Academic Policy, Planning and Research Committee and ORU directors advises that it has completed draft amendments to the Senate *Policy on the Chartering and Review of Research Centres and Institutes* for the purpose of consultations. I am writing on behalf of APPRC to seek your views on the proposal, which is attached.

As many of you know, amendments to the Policy have been under consideration for some time. APPRC has advised Senate that amendments to the Policy are a priority for the year, and our Committee is planning to present a recommendation to Senate in February 2012. Accordingly, the Committee welcomes your feedback (which may take the form of questions, comments or endorsement) by **Friday, January 27**.

All members of the community are invited to share their thoughts, and the Committee hopes that the Deans/Principal and their research associates, Faculty Council research committees, and ORU Directors will make a special point of taking up this invitation. Vice-President Haché has agreed to facilitate discussion of the proposal at upcoming meetings of advisory bodies composed of Associate Deans and Directors.

A dedicated Website has been created for the purpose of providing relevant background documents. Comments on the draft may be transmitted to the Committee through its Secretary, Robert Everett ([beverett@yorku.ca](mailto:beverett@yorku.ca)) or via the e-mail link found on the Website

I am grateful to members of the ad hoc working group for their efforts, and APPRC looks forward to your views.

# **SENATE POLICY ON ORGANIZED RESEARCH UNITS**

## **(Has associated Procedures and Guidelines)<sup>1</sup>**

### **1. Policy Statement**

It shall be the policy of York University to provide for the establishment of Organized Research Units (ORUs) within the scope, terms and conditions of this Policy and its associated guidelines and procedures.

### **2. Vision, Principles and Objectives**

#### **2.1. Research in Academic Planning**

York's University Academic Plan identifies research intensification as a primary objective in the quest for York to ascend to the fore of Canada's leading comprehensive research intensive institutions. As an institution York engages in creative and scholarly endeavours including research with the expectation of providing an exciting and innovative environment for the development of our academic programs that will attract highly motivated students seeking innovative experiential and other high quality learning experiences.

#### **2.2 Collaborative Research and Organized Research Units**

While the promotion and encouragement of individual research excellence remains at the forefront of research development at York, in an increasingly complex research environment, the quest for excellence and leadership also depends on collaboration and interaction between researchers from often diverse backgrounds in pursuit of common goals. Indeed, collaboration and interdisciplinarity are hallmarks of the distinctiveness and leadership of York that provide the University with the expectation of a natural competitive advantage in realizing its research aspirations.

While collegial collaborative activity within and across disciplines occurs broadly and arises organically, there are many instances where the scope or scale of the research opportunity can best be developed through formal collaborative association and the strategic investment of resources. Further, as no academic institution can expect to provide leadership in all areas of research endeavours, it is important for the institution to develop appropriate mechanisms to enable it to invest strategically in the development of larger-scale research initiatives. Opportunities for strategic research development arise naturally amongst researchers who share common research and professional interests, are informed by the University and Faculty Strategic Research Plans and are responsive to Federal and Provincial research priorities. Each opportunity may be expected to follow a natural cycle of evolution whose timeline will vary according to the nature of the opportunity and evolution of the external research environment.

York University sees the Organized Research Unit (ORU) as an important formal mechanism through which it can work to achieve its aspirations of strategic research leadership and development. Thus Research Institutes and Centres chartered by Senate have the central purpose of fostering a vibrant and ongoing program of collaborative research as an explicit incorporation of York's tradition of interdisciplinary collegial scholarship. They provide communities to support individual researchers.

<sup>1</sup> Senate approves policies only. The relevant Senate committee reviews initial procedures and subsequent changes to ensure conformity with policies, and informs Senate of those changes.

They are expected to add value and promote quality in bringing together critical masses of scholars aspiring to national leadership and international recognition in clearly-identified areas of research opportunity that are in keeping with York's traditions of community engagement and the translation and mobilization of knowledge (broadly construed, and including the methods used in the Sciences, Social Sciences, Humanities, and Fine Arts) to the greater benefit of society. There is an expectation that ORUs will provide institutional platforms from which to apply for grant and infrastructure support for collaborative projects, and an institutional framework within which to administer them when granted. ORUs also provide a means and encouragement to co-operate with scholars at other universities and institutions, as well as with community and private-sector-based researchers. The research they conduct is expected to enhance and extend teaching, foster the training of future researchers, in a rich environment for graduate student learning and research.

### **3. Nature of Organized Research Units**

Research Centres/Institutes may be developed either within Faculties under the guidance of the Dean/Principal or through the office of the Vice President Research and Innovation (VPRI), as warranted by the size, degree of interdisciplinarity, and impact of the initiative. A Research Centre/Institute may also be established jointly with another university or institution (within Canada or internationally) through formal agreement.

### **4. Approval of Organized Research Unit Charters by Senate**

Organized Research Units are established by means of Charters approved by Senate on recommendations from its Academic Policy Planning and Research Committee (APPRC).<sup>2</sup>

### **5. Role of the Vice-President Research and Innovation**

York research is developed through the work of Units and Faculties, with overall responsibility for the research portfolio being with the office of the VPRI. Thus ORUs at both the Institutional and Faculty level are expected to be supported by the Faculties and normally reflect the strategic objectives of the Faculty as well as the Institution. The VPRI is responsible for issuing calls for ORU applications and overseeing their review, and is expected to play a major role in supporting the seeding and nucleating of Institutional ORUs and in providing the ORUs with access to the tools needed to reach their objectives and sustain their success for the duration of the opportunity. The Office of the VPRI also has a primary role in ensuring the accountability and sound management of ORUs.

### **6. Effective Date of this Policy / Transition Provisions<sup>3</sup>**

This Policy, and the operational changes that result there from, comes into effect on the date it is approved by Senate. In the interest of a gradual and orderly transition to the chartering model set out in this Policy, all current charters shall continue until each ORU's next scheduled review or June 30, 2015, whichever comes first.

<sup>2</sup> As of January 2012, the Academic Policy, Planning and Research Committee is advised on matters related to the approval of charters by its Sub-Committee on Organized Research Units, which also has the delegated authority to receive reviews and a general responsibility for the application of this Policy.

<sup>3</sup> This policy renames and amends the *Senate Policy on the Chartering and Renewal of Research Centres and Institutes* as of the date of approval by Senate.

## **GUIDELINES**

### **1. Institutional Organized Research Units**

Institutional Research Institutes and Centers are expected to:

- attract and support a large critical mass of researchers from across multiple Units and Faculties
- identify and/or create opportunities for focused research-related recruitment.
- attain at least national recognition as leaders in the relevant area of research.
- align with the strategic research objectives of the University and drive development of research at the Institution in their areas
- build around a single focus, or serve as a synergistic hub for convergent programmatic activities
- provide successful leadership in the pursuit of programmatic and infrastructure funding, while also taking advantage of opportunities to grow and develop their research programs and to sustain their operations
- provide an enhanced research and training environment for undergraduate and graduate students and postdoctoral fellows
- develop extensive relationships within the region, nationally and internationally and to actively engage in knowledge transfer and knowledge mobilization activities

### **2. Faculty-Based Organized Research Units**

Faculty-based Research Institutes and Centers are expected to:

- bring together a critical mass of researchers derived predominately from a single Faculty and to be a focus for research-related recruitment within the Faculty
- at least aspire to be nationally leading and internationally recognized in their areas of research
- normally align with the strategic research objectives of the lead Faculty and drive the development of research in their areas
- provide successful leadership in the pursuit of programmatic and infrastructure funding to build the Faculty's research enterprise
- provide an enhanced research training environment for graduate, postdoctoral and undergraduate trainees
- develop extensive relationships within the region, nationally and internationally and to actively engage in knowledge transfer and knowledge mobilization activities

### **3. Organized Research Service Units**

In some instances, the operations of an ORU may primarily involve the provision of service or

contract research products to internal or external clients. Such ORUs shall receive the designation of Organized Research Service Units (ORSUs). While excellence in scholarship and education remains an important goal of these units their evaluation places emphasis on the demonstrated excellence and the continuing relevance of the core services provided.

## **PROCEDURES**

### **1. Responsibility for Documents and Processes**

Responsibility for templates and processes with respect to the chartering, governance and review of York University Research Institutes and Centres lies with the office of the Vice President Research and Innovation (VPRI). Development and review of templates and processes is conducted in consultation with the Academic Policy, Planning and Research Committee, with input, as appropriate, from other relevant groups in the University community including the Associate Dean's Research Council, the Council of ORU Research Directors, and the Strategic Projects and Opportunities Review Team (SPORT).

### **2. Chartering**

No entity shall have or use the designation of Research Center/Research Institute unless it has been chartered by Senate. ORU charters are approved by Senate based on recommendations of its Academic Policy, Planning and Research Committee (APPRC) of Charter proposals brought for its consideration by the office of the VPRI. Charters are for a fixed term of 5 years. Applications for new charters may be requested at the end of each term as appropriate.

### **3. Call for New ORUs**

Proposals for new ORUs may be brought forward at any time or in response to a call for proposals by the VPRI in the case of (Institutional ORUs) or Faculty Research Office in the case of (Faculty-based ORUs). (For spontaneous proposals, prospective applicants are strongly advised that the viability of an application is contingent upon the availability of resources and other forms of support from the applicable Faculty/Faculties and/or the Division of the Vice-President Research and Innovation.)

### **4. Application Components**

All applications must conform to the prescribed templates. Applications for Institutional ORU status must be accompanied by letters of support from all participating Faculties. Applications for Faculty-based ORU status must be accompanied by a letter of support and commitment by the Dean/Principal of the lead Faculty, who may also provide the reports of any external peer reviews that they have requested, and-by letters of support from other participating Faculties.

The office of the VPRI shall ensure due diligence in the assessment of ORU charter applications. The VPRI will seek the advice of SPORT and/or other appropriate advisory bodies in developing its assessment. Applications for Institutional ORU status also may, at the discretion of the VPRI, be subject to external peer review in addition to internal consultation.

### **5. Final Stages of Consideration / Approval**

Charter requests and accompanying reviews shall be communicated to APPRC for information and

discussion. Meritorious applications with appropriate levels of resource support will be accompanied by a request from the VPRI for APPRC to recommend to Senate the approval of an ORU charter, as appropriate. All decisions by Senate are final and not subject to appeal.

## **6. Reporting**

ORUs are expected to maintain a sound financial footing and to comply in full with all applicable University policies and relevant external requirements. Institutional ORUs will report to the office of the VPRI, Faculty based ORUs to the Lead Faculty.

All ORUs shall file retrospective annual reports detailing progress and financial management over the past fiscal year and a prospective research and financial plan for the next fiscal year, both according to the prescribed templates. Institutional ORUs will report directly to the office of the VPRI with copies to participating Faculty Research Offices, while Faculty-based ORUs will report directly to the lead Faculty Research Office, with copies to the office of the VPRI and participating Faculties. Annual reports also shall be forwarded to APPRC for information.

## **7. Review and Re-Chartering**

### **7.1 Interim Review**

At the end of year 3 of their charter, ORUs shall undergo an interim review. The purpose of this review is to provide an interim assessment of the progress the ORU is making towards fulfilling its mandate and to make recommendations on how to address shortcomings that, if left untended, could imperil the long term prospects for success of the ORU.

The materials provided for the interim review will be comprised of a compilation of the Charter Application, Annual Reports and annual plans, minutes of executive meetings, and a cover letter by the ORU director of no more than 5 pages explaining progress against expectations. The VPRI will solicit comments from relevant Faculties and SPORT on the progress being made by the ORU and any steps that may be needed to improve the progress of an ORU towards achieving its mandate. Review findings and recommendations are communicated to the ORUs and forwarded to APPRC and participating Faculties for information. In the unusual event that progress is judged to fall below minimal expectations, the VPRI may make a recommendation to APPRC and Senate to revoke a charter.

### **7.2 Full Review**

One year before the end of their charter, interested ORUs may submit an application for a new charter. The application process will consist of two parts: a) a retrospective review of the past term and b) a proposal for the next term. Full Reviews are administered by the Office of the VPRI in consultation with APPRC and resources shall be made available through the office of the VPRI to support the review process. This will include a site visit of up to two days by an external review team of normally 3 members selected by the VPRI in consultation with APPRC on the basis of suggestions by the ORU itself, SPORT and the participating Faculties. Materials to be provided in advance of the site visit will include all annual reports and plans from the past term together with all documents from the interim review. They will also include a full application addressing the proposed next term of activities.



As part of the review process, the review team will receive an introduction to the philosophy, culture and expectations for ORUs at York so as to be able to appropriately appreciate the unique aspects of the York ORU environment. This introduction will include a welcome briefing by the VPRI, Senate orientation from a member of APPRC, and the opportunity to meet with other ORU directors in related areas (Institutional or Faculty, based on the individual review). While review visits are expected to follow a common protocol, time will also be provided to the team to allow them to appropriately explore issues that they may identify during the course of the review.

The review team will be mandated to report on ORU progress against expectations and to assess and report on the continuing opportunity for the ORU as well as the alignment of the ORU with ongoing internal Faculty/University strategic priorities and external priorities and opportunities. The Review Committee report will be communicated to the ORU and the ORU director will be provided with an opportunity to provide a written response to the report. The VPRI will also seek the advice of SPORT in developing its assessment of the review and ORU response. The findings of the review including ORU response and SPORT commentary will be forwarded to APPRC for information and discussion.

Meritorious files with appropriate levels of resource support will be accompanied in their presentation to APPRC by a request from the VPRI for APPRC to recommend to Senate the approval of a new ORU charter, as appropriate. All decisions by Senate are final and not subject to appeal.

In the absence a new Senate-approved charter, ORU funding will cease at the expiration date of the existing charter and ORU activity will cease no more than three months following the expiration of the Charter, at which time the designation of Research Centre / Research Institute shall no longer be used by the research group.

## **8. Sunset (Winding Up) Provisions**

All ORU assets are the property of the University in the absence of explicit agreements stating otherwise. All agreements with respect to ORU assets must be in compliance with University policies and procedures and must be approved by the affected Faculties and VPRI before execution.

It is recognized that during the course of their lifespan ORUs may accumulate assets dedicated to the areas of ORU activity. This may include physical assets as well as supports such as endowments.

In their accumulation such assets may be accompanied by a legacy clause that specifies their disposition within the Institution when the charter of the ORU expires and ORU activities cease. In the absence of a legacy clause or sunset agreement in the ORU charter, following the expiration of its charter the assets of an Institutional ORU revert to the VPRI, whereas assets of a Faculty ORU revert to the Faculty.



**Report 2  
January 2012**

**ITEMS FOR INFORMATION (2):**

**1. Last date to enrol with permission of the course instructor**

At the November 2011 meeting of the Faculty Council, a concern was raised during question period that the date by which students could enrol in a course with permission of the professor is too far into the term. In follow-up to this concern, the Committee on Curriculum, Curricular Policy and Standards (CCPS) discussed the matter at their most recent meeting.

As the permission for enrolment is at the discretion of the individual instructor (within the limitations of room capacity), and also allows flexibility for students who have been in regular attendance but may not have been able to secure a spot in the course prior to the closure of open enrolment, the Committee felt that the current practice is appropriate.

**2. Curriculum proposal submissions**

So far, during the 2011-12 academic year, CCPS has received more than 450 course-related proposals. This is a significant increase in the number of submissions from previous years.

(a) The Committee would like to remind their colleagues that consultation is an important element of curriculum submissions. In several cases this year, significant delays in being able to consider proposals were encountered as evidence of consultation (within LA&PS and/or with other Faculties) was not provided as part of the proposal submission.

CCPS asks that applicable consultations please take place through specific department/school-level curriculum designates (in most cases, the designate is usually the Undergraduate Program Director). Proponents may contact the Secretary to the Committee, Whitney L'Esperance ([whitneyl@yorku.ca](mailto:whitneyl@yorku.ca)), should they require assistance identifying the curriculum designate is for a particular department/school.

Additionally, CCPS would like to refer members to the course search tool available on the York Courses Website: <https://w2prod.sis.yorku.ca/Apps/WebObjects/cdm>. Here, proponents are able to search existing (and expired) courses by title. This may be helpful to proponents in identifying areas they may wish to consult with.

(b) As a friendly reminder, the Committee would also like to request that proponents please ensure course descriptions are written in the present tense and using proper grammar.

(c) In several units, the norm is to have no prerequisites and restrict enrolments using the CASing feature. The Committee noted that using prerequisites provides a better indication of what the progression should be for qualified students and indicating that courses are restricted in calendar copy is more transparent to students.

(d) Several units are creating one (or two) 3.00 credit versions of 6.00 credit courses (e.g. for summer), while leaving the 6.00 credit course on the books (sometimes only temporarily). The Committee is interested in this initiative and would be interested in feedback from faculty and students as these courses are offered.



## Consent Agenda

January 2012

### 1. Changes to Existing Degrees/Certificates

- Business and Society
- European Studies
- Social and Political Thought
- Urban Studies
- Work and Labour Studies

### 2. New Course Proposals

- AP/COMN 3220 6.00 Communication and Social Movements
- AP/COMN 4270 3.00 Cultural Industries and Work
- AP/COMN 4780 6.00 Registers of Memory
- AP/COMN 4790 6.00 Reflections on Consumer Culture: The Modern History and Analysis of Consumer Culture in the Western World
- AP/EN 4384 3.00 20th Century American Humour
- AP/HUMA 4607 3.00 Literature of Transgression: From Marquis de Sade to Jonathan Littel
- AP/SOCI 4310 3.00 Health, Modernity and Social Theory
- AP/SOCI 4370 3.00 Immigrant Youth In Canada - Settlement & Integration
- AP/SOSC 3982 3.00 States, Markets and Work-Life Balance: Canadian Employment and Labour Policies
- AP/SOSC 4047 6.00 The Business of Neoliberal Globalisation

### 3. Changes to Existing Courses

- AP/GER 3840 3.00 (cross-listed to: AP/EN 3460 3.00) German Romanticism
- AP/PHIL 2110 3.00 (cross-listed to: SC/STS 2110 3.00) Revolutions in Science: Philosophical Issues
- AP/PHIL 3020 3.00 Ethics
- AP/PHIL 3030 3.00 Metaphysics
- AP/PHIL 3035 3.00 Epistemology
- AP/PHIL 3110 3.00 Political Philosophy
- AP/PHIL 3120 3.00 Early Existentialism
- AP/PHIL 3125 3.00 Contemporary Existentialism
- AP/PHIL 3140 3.00 Russell and Logical Positivism
- AP/PHIL 3145 3.00 Wittgenstein's Philosophical Investigations
- AP/PHIL 3170 3.00 (cross-listed to: SC/STS 3170 3.00) Philosophy of Science
- AP/PHIL 3200 3.00 Philosophy of Language
- AP/PHIL 3220 3.00 Argumentation Theory
- AP/PHIL 3260 3.00 Philosophy of Psychology
- AP/PHIL 3265 3.00 Philosophy of Mind
- AP/PHIL 3270 3.00 Philosophy of Social Science
- AP/PHIL 3280 3.00 Mind and Nature: The Philosophy of Biology
- AP/PHIL 3510 3.00 Feminist Approaches to Ethics and Politics
- AP/PHIL 3519 3.00 Feminist Approaches to Epistemology
- AP/PHIL 3595 3.00 (cross-listed to: AP/HREQ 3595 3.00) International Ethics
- AP/PHIL 3635 3.00 Philosophy of Neuroscience
- AP/PHIL 3750 3.00 (cross-listed to: AP/COGS 3750 3.00) Philosophy of Artificial Intelligence
- AP/PHIL 4011 3.00 Seminar in the History of Modern Philosophy
- AP/PHIL 4070 3.00 Seminar in Moral Philosophy

- AP/PHIL 4071 3.00 Seminar in Moral Philosophy: Kant's Moral Theory
- AP/PHIL 4072 3.00 Seminar in Ethics: Ethical Theory
- AP/PHIL 4073 3.00 Seminar in Ethics: Metaethics
- AP/PHIL 4075 3.00 Life, Death, Absurdity, and Meaning
- AP/PHIL 4080 3.00 Seminar in the Philosophy of Mind
- AP/PHIL 4085 3.00 Seminar in the Philosophy of Psychiatry
- AP/PHIL 4110 3.00 (cross-listed to: AP/COGS 4110 3.00) Seminar in Philosophy of Science
- AP/PHIL 4140 3.00 Seminar in Aesthetics
- AP/PHIL 4150 3.00 Professional Ethics
- AP/PHIL 4160 3.00 Seminar in Business Ethics
- AP/PHIL 4180 3.00 Seminar in Political Philosophy
- AP/PHIL 4190 3.00 Seminar in the Philosophy of Law
- AP/PHIL 4200 3.00 Seminar in Semantics
- AP/PHIL 4260 3.00 Gender and Transgender Theory
- AP/PHIL 4500 3.00 Seminar in Feminist Philosophy
- AP/PHIL 4750 6.00 (cross-listed to: AP/COGS 4750 6.00) Honours Thesis in Cognitive Science
- AP/SOCI 3350 6.00 (cross-listed to: AP/REI 3350 6.00) Muslim Diasporas and the West
- AP/SOCI 3610 6.00 (cross-listed to: AP/AP/REI 3610 6.00) Global Migration and Diaspora Cultures
- AP/SOCI 3620 6.00 (cross-listed to: AP/REI 3620 6.00, AP/POLS 3565 6.00) Racism and Colonialism
- AP/SOCI 3624 6.00 (cross-listed to: AP/REI 3624 6.00) Canadian Immigration Policy and Settlement
- AP/SOCI 3645 6.00 (cross-listed to: AP/REI 3645 6.00) Women, Racism and 'Race'
- AP/SOCI 3680 6.00 (cross-listed to: AP/REI 3680 6.00) Racism in Canada
- AP/SOCI 3860 6.00 (cross-listed to: AP/HREQ 3860 6.00) Women, Work and Family
- AP/SOCI 4040 6.00 (cross-listed to: AP/REI 4040 6.00) Jewish Communities
- AP/SOCI 4050 6.00 (cross-listed to: AP/REI 4050 6.00) African Communities in the Americas
- AP/SOCI 4081 6.00 (cross-listed to: AP/REI 4081 6.00) Gender, Culture and Society in the Middle East
- AP/SOCI 4600 6.00 (cross-listed to: AP/HREQ 4600 6.00, AP/REI 4600 6.00) Research Seminar
- AP/SOWK 1011 6.00 Introduction to Critical Social Work

A consent agenda item does not involve new programs, significant new principles, or new policies. These proposals are clearly identified on the notice of the meeting as consent agenda items. Full proposal text is not reproduced in the hardcopy agenda package. Proposal text is available at the following URL:

[http://www.yorku.ca/laps/council/faculty/curr\\_consent.html](http://www.yorku.ca/laps/council/faculty/curr_consent.html).

A consent agenda item is deemed to be approved unless, prior to the commencement of a meeting, one or more members of Council advises the chair of a request to debate it.

Please contact the Secretary to the Committee, Whitney L'Esperance ([whitneyl@yorku.ca](mailto:whitneyl@yorku.ca)), if you have any questions regarding the changes to existing courses section.



Report 1  
January 2012

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION (3):

1. 2010 – 2011 Tenure and Promotion File Update

At the end of June 2011 there were a number of outstanding tenure and/or promotion files. We are pleased to report that the Senate Review Committee has now completed the backlog of files.

In addition to the applications for tenure and/or promotion reviewed prior to September, there were 11 files for promotion and six files for tenure and promotion considered between the months of October through to December at seven meetings of the review panels.

Overall, for the 2010-2011 academic year the Senate Review Committee referred back seven of the 57 tenure and/or promotion files to Adjudicating Committees. Two files were delayed. The remaining 2010-2011 outstanding files are with the President for his final decision, and will be reported on at the end of the academic year.

The following is the 2010 -2011 summary of applications for tenure and/or promotion processed by the Senate Review Committee:

27	applications for tenure and promotion from 2010-11
10	applications for promotion* from 2010-11
9	outstanding applications for tenure and promotion from 2009-10
11	outstanding applications for promotion* from 2009-10
----	
36	total applications for tenure and promotion
21	total applications for promotion*

\*Note: The number of promotion only files includes both promotion to Associate Professor (which tenure was previously granted) or promotion to Professor.

As noted each year, delays to the processing and timing of tenure and promotion files prior to consideration by the Senate Review Committee remain a key issue in the Committee’s ability to review applications in an efficient manner. The Committee would like to remind both the File Preparation and Adjudicating Committees that there are a number of resources available to assist with the process, and encourage Chairs of both to refer to the *Policy* at all stages of the process to ensure that the process and procedures are followed correctly and to avoid unnecessary delays.

The Committee wishes to extend its thanks to the many faculty members and administrators within the Schools/Departments for their diligent work in preparing tenure and promotion files for 2010-11. The Committee also extends its gratitude to the Dean for his exceptional letters of transmittal.



**The following faculty members have been granted tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor:**

Martin Breagh, Department of Political Science  
Wade Rowland, Department of Communication Studies  
Abdulaziz Alwathainani, School of Administrative Studies  
Marcia Blumberg, Department of English  
Simone Bohn, Department of Political Science  
Berta Esteve-Volart Department of Economics  
Amanda Glasbeek, Department of Social Science  
Verena Gottschling, Department of Philosophy  
Benjamin Kelly, Department of History  
Terry Maley, Department of Political Science  
Carlota McAllister, Department of Anthropology  
Karen Robson, Department of Sociology  
Andrew Weaver, Department of English  
Xiaohui Yu, School of Information Technology  
Brett Zimmerman, Department of English  
Philipp Angermeyer, Department of Languages, Literature, & Linguistics  
David Doorey, School of Human Resources Management  
David Etkin, School of Administrative Studies  
Carmela Murdocca, Department of Sociology  
Douglas Young, Department of Social Science

**The following faculty members have been promoted to the rank of Professor:**

Louise Ripley, School of Administrative Studies  
Andrea O'Reilly, School of Women's Studies  
Patricia Wood, Department of Geography  
Parbudyal Singh, School of Human Resources Management  
Joann Jasiak, Department of Economics  
Marc Stein, Department of History  
Susan McGrath, School of Social Work  
Jimmy Huang, School of Information Technology

*Please join us in congratulating our esteemed colleagues.*



## 2. Tenure and Promotion General Rules – Candidate’s Representative:

The Tenure and Promotions Committee would like to remind faculty of the general rules outlined in the Senate Tenure and Promotions Document, specifically they would like to draw to Council’s attention F.2.2. of the *Policy* which states:

*The candidate shall have the right to appear in person, with or without a **representative**, before any adjudicating or reviewing body in the tenure and promotion process, for the purpose of making a statement or providing clarification with respect to substantive or procedural matters concerning his or her file. A written record of the statement and/or information so obtained shall be added to the file and forwarded to the candidate.*

## 3. Unit Tenure and Promotion Standards

The Tenure and Promotions Committee met to discuss the status of the Tenure and Promotions Departmental/School Standards for each of the 21 academic units. In their deliberations, the Committee noted that some but not all units have submitted their final draft versions of their Standards. The Committee asks that each academic unit forward to the Secretary of Council their latest version of their Standards for Committee review. The Committee would like to have these in hand for **April 30, 2012** in order to complete their work on the outstanding Unit Tenure and Promotions Standards as soon the work associated with the review of the 2011-2012 tenure and/or promotion files has concluded.

**Please note:** *For those Academic Departments/Schools which have had their Tenure and Promotions Unit Standards positively reviewed by the Committee and/or Senate are asked to submit these to the Secretary of Council for information.*



Report 2  
January 2012

ITEM FOR INFORMATION (1):

1. Faculty of Liberal Arts and Professional Studies Minor Research Grant

The Faculty of Liberal Arts and Professional Studies Minor Research Grant was offered in Fall 2011. The Grant Adjudication Sub-Committee of the Committee on Research, Policy and Planning received a total of 18 applications from 10 departments and schools throughout the Faculty and awarded a total of 13 grants for \$49,243.15. The Committee would like to encourage full-time YUFA faculty colleagues to apply to the grant in the **Spring 2012 competition**, the deadline of which is **April 15**.

The Grant Adjudication Sub-Committee wishes to report that the following faculty members were awarded a Minor Research Grant:

Name	School/ Department	Project Title	Amount Granted
K. Birch	SOSC	Impact of the 2007+ financial crisis on the UK life sciences Sector	\$4,000.00
S. Brooke	HIST	City of Women and Children: London Street Photography, c.1930 to c.1970	\$3,695.34
S.A. Brown	HUMA	Art, Culture, and Propaganda: The Nazis and the Bayeux Tapestry 1939–45	\$4,000.00
C. Chapman	SOWK	Disability Incarcerated: Dis/ability and imprisonment in North America	\$4,000.00
B. Erickson	GEOG	Canoe Nation: Nature, Race and the Making of a Canadian Icon	\$2,570.00
W. Jenkins	GEOG	In search of Bridget in Ontario and Quebec: evidence from four cities	\$4,000.00
C. Murdocca	SOCI	Incarceration in an Age of Reparative Justice	\$3,958.41
R. Ricciardelli	SOCI	Masculinity and risk in Canadian prisons	\$3,988.40
A. Semenov	ECON	Background risk in consumption and the cross-section of expected stock returns	\$3,949.00
A. Stoyanov	ECON	Economic well-being, intellectual property rights protection, and Canadian justice system	\$3,420.00
N. Tahani	ADMS	Mathematics in Personal Finance	\$3,662.00
P. Uppal	EN	The Aesthetics of Sport: Summer Sport Poems	\$4,000.00
X. Yu	ITEC	Supporting Keyword Search in Business Intelligence Applications	\$4,000.00