

NOTICE OF MEETING

61st Meeting of Faculty Council
Thursday February 9th, 2017
3:00 pm – 5:00 pm, Senate Chamber, N940 Ross

Agenda

1. Call to Order and Approval of the Agenda
2. Chair's Remarks
3. Minutes of the **January 12, 2017** meeting..... 1
4. Business Arising from the Minutes
5. Dean's Report to Council
6. Question Period
7. Reports from Standing Committees of Council
 - Executive Committee.....5
 - Item for Information: Request for Nominations – Standing Committees of Council
 - Item for Information: Request for Nominations – Full-Time Faculty Representatives on Senate
 - Item for Information: Request for Nominations – Faculty Representative on Senate: Academic Policy, Planning and Research Committee
 - Curriculum, Curricular Policy and Standards.....13
 - Consent Agenda
8. Feedback on Research Indicators..... 15
 - Committee on Research Policy and Planning
 - Academic Policy and Planning Committee
9. Collegial Conversations: Research Indicators
10. Other Business

2016- 2017 Liberal Arts & Professional Studies Faculty Council Meetings are normally on the second Thursday of the month at 3:00pm in the Senate Chamber, N940 Ross.

March 9, 2017
April 13, 2017
May 11, 2017
June 8, 2017

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

Senate Chamber
Minutes of the 60th Meeting of Council
January 12, 2017
#170112

M. Adriaen, A. Asgary, R. Asghar, P. Avery, N. Bhatti, A. Blake, H. Campbell, S. Carolina, R. Coombe, A. Daley, M. Davies, A. Davis, M. Derayah, N. Dood-Persaud, M. Ducharme, A. Duncan, J. Edmondson, C. Ehrlich, P. Evans, I. Ferrara, J. Fogel, E. Fresco, G. Georgopoulos, E. Haque, M. Harper, T. Hudson, R. Iannacito-Provenzano, R. Kenedy, M. Khalidi, M. Khan, A. Khandwala, E. Kiryusjoma, R. Koleszar-Green, H. Lam, A. Mah, S. Maitra, T. Maley, V. Malhotra, J. Marcus, C. Marjollet, K. McPherson, N. Mebrahtu, A. Medovarski, J. Mensah, J. Michaud, A. Mukherjee-Reed, D. Mutimer, R. Ophir, J. Petropoulos, A. Ramjattan, N. Razack, J. Rozdilsky, L. Sanders, M. Schotte, A. Schrauwers, M. Schwartz, A. Solis, B. Spotton-Visano, J. Stakic, T. Starr, A. Theodore, K. Thomson, R. Wellen, E. Winslow, M. Zito

Guests: Z. DiFranco

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda

The Chair called the meeting to order.

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

2. Chair of Council's Remarks

The Chair welcomed members to the 60th meeting of Council. The Chair informed members that feedback on the e-voting discussed at the last Faculty Council meeting will be reviewed by the Executive Committee and an update will be provided at the February Faculty Council meeting.

The Chair noted that there will be two presentations taking place. Provost Rhonda Lenton and Vice-President Gary Brewer will give a presentation on the Institutional Integrated Resource Plan (IIRP),

followed by a discussion. The second presentation will be given by Alison Collins-Mrakas from Research Ethics.

The Chair mentioned that as noted on the agenda, the assigned topic for the collegial conversation is the IIRP.

3. Minutes of the December 8, 2016 Meeting

H. Campbell moved, seconded by A. Blake that the minutes of the December 8, 2016 meeting be approved. The motion carried.

4. Business Arising from the Minutes

There was none.

5. Presentation: Update from Provost Rhonda Lenton & Vice-President Gary Brewer

R. Lenton explained that they are seeking input from Councilors on Pan-University initiatives that would be beneficial in the context of action items IIRP working groups have come forward with. She touched on a few topics such as:

- The government's approval of the status quo of 3% tuition increase over the next three years;
- The government's special committee regarding the possibility of a French-only university in Toronto. They are working to ensure it does not negatively affect York's Glendon Campus;
- There has been significant development in the new funding model, which is not finalized yet;
- The importance of discussing metrics and how we can shape it to the best of our abilities to benefit York and ensure it aligns with York's values;
- York has needed to stabilize enrolment over the last few years since we were not meeting our targets.

G. Brewer outlined a number of principles the government will be using in the new funding model and explained that they will be implementing it over a multi-year period. He mentioned that from a budget planning point of view, there is not going to be any immediate re-distribution of money under this new framework.

R. Lenton concluded the presentation by asking Councilors for feedback on action priority items for the university in regards to the following:

- Advancement in research intensification
- Student success
- Campus experience
- Enhancing cyclical program review
- Internationalization of programs
- Teaching and learning
- Classroom experience
- High impact learning

The Dean asked what the greatest risk for York is in relation to the new performance funding formula.

A Councilor discussed research performance metrics. He noted there is a growing credible body of evidence that shows that there are a number of problems implementing research performance metrics. He noted that tying funding to performance increases the number of publications but it does not increase the value of that research. He suggested that York and other institutions should have a dialogue with the government regarding the problem with crude models of research performance metrics.

A Councilor noted that enhancing classroom technology to enhance campus experience sounds great, but if students choose not to come to class in the first place then this is not helpful. What way can we do to ensure sure these projects help us reach our goals?

G. Brewer explained that they are working on the current state of our classroom and learning environments. He explained that they have a multi-year plan that will reinvigorate our classrooms.

A Councilor commented on classroom spaces in Colleges, explaining they need new furniture. She also highlighted the current state of washrooms around campus, particularly in Colleges and explained that the condition washrooms are in right now contributes to students not wanting to be here.

G. Brewer replied by noting that he has done an inventory on the washrooms. He explained that on their list, they have allocated \$500,000.00 to updating these areas. He also mentioned that out of

date lecture halls, furniture and technology are also schedule to be updated.

6. Dean's Report to Council

Dean Mukherjee Reed explained that she would like to continue the discussion and identify concrete items in terms of a pan-university approach. She mentioned that she thinks that LA&PS is well prepared for the SHARP budget model implementation in May. She made note of some things that concern her:

- **Student space:** Space is a very difficult issue to address under the new budget model. She asked if Councilors can agree that as the largest Faculty, with 23,000 students, there is a need for common space, and noted that we need a better understanding as to how space is audited.
- **Student scholarships:** Students scholarships will remain in central funding, particularly the entrance scholarships. York entrance scholarships perform fairly well in comparison to comparator universities. She asked Councilors if there is a need for more scholarships for access and research.
- **Pan-university approach:** In relation to campus experience/campus safety, when looking at how SHARP will unfold, these are costs that are well beyond our reach with our budget. Paying into central contributions will benefit us and our students.

The Dean mentioned that the final numbers on high school applications are not in yet. She noted that she will report on this at the February meeting of Faculty Council. She noted that winter enrolments have closed and the target was met.

7. Question Period

S. Whitworth stated that she hopes we can communicate to the Provost the seriousness of graduate issues. She noted that there are a number of graduate programs that depend on interdisciplinary. She spoke of a presentation by Faculty of Graduate Studies and how there is a pool of money to support interdisciplinarity and how to facilitate that. She noted that hearing more about that is something she hopes we can communicate to the Provost. She noted that the province is being more attentive to international students. Graduate programs would like to admit more international students, which

affects all of our graduate programs. She hopes that we can be communicating these priorities to the Provost.

The Dean noted that it is difficult for Faculties to support funding for international graduate students since the government is more interested in international undergraduate students. The Dean also indicated that in the context of SHARP, we need to be clear if we mean interdisciplinarity, or inter-Faculty teaching. She explained that under SHARP as Faculties are trying to hold onto their graduate teaching resources, resources for inter-faculty teaching may be limited, but that does not necessarily affect interdisciplinarity. She noted that the sharing of resources and how to collectively access resources can be added to our list of priorities.

A Councilor asked what happens if we want students to take a course in another Faculty, and if that is that affected by the SHARP model. The Dean replied that there is a clear formula for under SHARP: the student's Home Faculty gets a certain portion of the revenue and the Faculty where course is taught gets a portion as well.

8. Presentation: Research Ethics

Allison Collins-Mrakas gave a presentation on the updated ethics protocol form, streamlined reporting templates, increased training and new ethics resources.

9. Committee on the Whole

The Chair noted that in response to the presentation given earlier, the IIRP has been assigned as the collegial conversation topic.

Council moved into Committee of the Whole for an open discussion about the IIRP.

A Councilor asked if the Dean can elaborate more about university space and how it will affect us.

The Dean noted that it is unclear what kind of property rights LA&PS will hold once SHARP is implemented. Right now we are operating on the maintenance of the space. There is some central funding carrying on from before and going forward we do not know if there is actually going to be a costing of space. She suggested that what could work is some kind of access to space and then we could at the

most be responsible for maintaining that space. The details will need to be ironed out.

The Dean noted that we still do not have enough common space for students, and that we have not thought about having our own building, as there is currently no building that would accommodate 23,000 students.

The Dean commented on metrics, and asked Councilors what metrics they think we should be focusing on.

A Councilor stated that internationally, there is over utilization of research metrics being critically addressed by people who do research in bibliometrics. They noted that major journals are critical of simplified use of research metrics, and there is concrete evidence in literature that interdisciplinary work is not captured well by research metrics. They suggested that York is a good institution to take on this issue of simplified research metrics.

A Councilor mentioned that when approaching negotiations with the government it would be a good strategy to emphasize our diversity.

A Councilor asked if metrics can measure how employable our students are here in LA&PS. It was noted that we should emphasize that Liberal Arts education provides a whole host of other benefits and we need to defend the humanities for all the other benefits it brings.

A Councilor commented on enrolments. She stated that she continuously hears we are missing enrolment targets and that retention is not great. She believes these are causally linked, and noted that if we keep admitting as many students as we can to meet targets that are not realistic, it is not surprising that students are not as successful as we would hope. She suggested that the targets be re-examined. She also commented on research metrics. She noted that in Administrative Studies looked at ways they could make it easier for faculty to do their research. For example, they had faculty do their teaching all in the same term, so they could focus on their research the next term. They also had faculty teach all of the same courses, or teach courses related to their research.

Moving out of the Committee of the Whole, the Chair noted that if there are any further thoughts on this topic they can be communicated in a number of ways. Comments can be sent to the Dean, as well as directly to the Provost and Vice President Finance and Administration. Additionally, faculty can make submissions

directly to their Chairs, as well as to the Executive Committee, care of Faculty Council. She noted that the Executive Committee will try to bring together a summary of the issues heard at this meeting.

10. Other Business

There is no other business.

The meeting adjourned.

B. Spotton Visano, Chair of Council

B. Tuer, Secretary of Council

Executive Committee Report to Council

February 2017

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION (3)

1. Request for Nominations – Liberal Arts & Professional Studies Standing Committees

The Executive Committee would like to announce that there is request for nominations for faculty members to serve on the Liberal Arts & Professional Studies Faculty Council, and its standing committees **effective July 1, 2017**.

Please be reminded that, where applicable, members elected-at-large will not be from the same School/Department. For detailed information on standing committee compositions please review Appendix A.

Vice-Chair of Council

(one vacancy, full-time faculty member)

- The Vice-Chair of the Council shall be elected from the members of the Council for a one-year term. The Vice-Chair is the Chief Teller and Chief Returning Officer for all elections..
- The Vice-Chair normally assumes the Chair in the following year.
- Should the position of Vice-Chair become vacant prior to the end of the normal term, an election shall be called.
- Should the Vice-Chair-elect resign prior to the beginning of her/his term of office, an election for Vice-Chair shall be called.
- The Vice-Chair presides over meetings of the Committee of the Whole.
- <http://laps.yorku.ca/office-of-the-faculty-council/rules-and-procedures-of-council/>

There are currently **30** vacancies on the Standing Committees of Council for 2017 – 2018 as follows:

Executive Committee

(four vacancies, at least one from the Professional Studies area)

- Three (3) Year Term
- Normally meet on the last Wednesday of each month from 12:00pm – 2:00pm
- <http://www.yorku.ca/laps/council/faculty/exec.html>

Continuing Members:

*Ida Ferrara, Department of Economics
Leslie Sanders, Writing Department*

Academic Policy and Planning Committee
(two vacancies)

- Three (3) Year Term
- Normally meet on the third Wednesday of each month from 1:00pm – 3:00pm
- http://www.yorku.ca/laps/council/faculty/policy_planning.html

Continuing Members:

Merle Jacobs, Department of Equity Studies
Peter Khaiteh, School of Information Technology
Sean Kheraj, Department of History
David Szablowski, Department of Social Science
David Mutimer, Department of Political Science

Committee on Curriculum, Curricular Policy and Standards
(two vacancies)

- Three (3) Year Term
- Normally meet on the first Wednesday of each month from 1:00pm – 3:00pm
- http://www.yorku.ca/laps/council/faculty/policy_planning.html

Continuing Members:

Roberta Iannacito-Provenzano, Department of Languages, Literatures & Linguistics
Christian Marjollet, Department of French Studies
Allan Weiss, Department of English
Marcela Porporato, School of Administrative Studies
Maggie Quirt, Department of Equity Studies

Tenure and Promotions Committee
(eight vacancies, tenured faculty)

- Three (3) Year Term
- Will meet several times during the months November to June in three rotating panels, usually Wednesdays or Thursdays. The Committee of the Whole normally meets on Thursdays four to five times a year.
- <http://www.yorku.ca/laps/council/faculty/tenure.html>

Continuing Members:

Steve Bailey, Department of Humanities
David Goldstein, Department of English
Nick Mule, School of Social Work
Shobna Nijhawan, Department of Languages, Literatures & Linguistics
Matthew Brzozowski, Department of Economics
Uwafiokun Idemudia, Department of Social Science
Niru Nirupama, School of Administrative Studies

Committee on Teaching and Learning and Student Success
(four vacancies, full-time faculty)

Membership:

- Nine full-time faculty members elected-at large for a three-year term
- Two graduate teaching assistants elected at-large on an annual basis
- One contract faculty member elected at-large on an annual basis

Continuing Members:

Simone Bohn, Department of Political Science
Stephen Chen, School of Information Technology
Tsvetanka Karagyzova, Department of Economics
Jodi Letkiweicz, School of Administrative Studies
Kiyoko Toratani, Department of Languages, Literatures and Linguistics

Committee on Research Policy and Planning
(three vacancies, one from the Social Sciences area)

- Three vacancies for a three (3) Year Term, **one from the Social Sciences area effective immediately**
- Normally meet on the fourth Monday of each month from 12:00pm - 2:00pm
- <http://www.yorku.ca/laps/council/faculty/research.html>

Continuing Members:

Maria Liegghio, School of Social Work
Joel Marcus, School of Administrative Studies
Antonio Ricci, Department of Languages, Literatures and Linguistics
Jelena Zikic, School of Human Resource Management

Committee on Student Academic Petitions and Appeals
(six vacancies)

- Two (2) year term
- Normally meet every Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday & Thursday in four rotating panels. This Committee meets during the summer months.
- http://www.yorku.ca/laps/council/faculty/petitions_com.html

Continuing Members:

Mary Goitom, School of Social Work
Kwok Ho, School of Administrative Studies
Jon Sufrin, Writing Department
Lykke de la Cour, Department of Social Science
Rob Heynen, Department of Communication Studies
Jeremy Trevett, Department of History
Alla Lileeva, Department of Economics

Alexandru Manafu, Department of Philosophy
Cael Cohen, Department of Philosophy
Gordana Colby, Department of Economics

At the April meeting of Council, nominations will be approved. For detailed information on standing committee compositions, please review Appendix A.

2. Request for Nominations - Liberal Arts & Professional Studies Full-Time Faculty Representatives on Senate

The Executive Committee would like to announce that there is a request for nominations for members to serve as Liberal Arts & Professional Studies representatives on Senate, **effective July 1, 2017**.

- **Two (2) Vacancies** for Full-time Faculty for a Three (3) Year Term
- Details regarding meeting dates and times are posted on the Senate Website: <http://www.yorku.ca/secretariat/senate/index-senate.html>.

Continuing elected at-large members:

Kym Bird, Department of Humanities
Kean Birch, Department of Social Science
Ricardo Grinspun, Department of Economics
Merle Jacobs, Department of Equity Studies
Leslie Sanders, Department of Humanities
David Leyton-Brown, Department of Political Science
Carl Ehrlich, Department of Humanities
George Georgopoulos, Department of Economics
Christopher Innes, Department of English
Robert Kenedy, Department of Sociology
Merouan Mekouar, Department of Social Science
Antonio Ricci, Department of Languages, Literatures and Linguistics
Kelly Thomson, School of Administrative Studies
Gail Vanstone, Department of Humanities

At the March meeting of Council, nominations will be approved. For information on the full composition of the Liberal Arts & Professional Studies seats on Senate, please review Appendix A.

3. Request for Nominations: Liberal Arts & Professional Studies Faculty Representative on Senate: Academic Policy, Planning and Research Committee (*one vacancy*)

The Executive Committee would like to announce that there will be a request for nominations for members to serve as Liberal Arts & Professional Studies full-time faculty representative on the Academic Policy, Planning and Research Committee **effective immediately**, for a three-year term. Details regarding meeting dates and times are posted on the Senate Website: <http://www.yorku.ca/secretariat/senate/index-senate.html>

Executive Committee Report to Council

Appendix A

Faculty Council Standing Committee membership and Representatives on Senate Committees

2017-2018 Faculty Council Committees and LA&PS Representative on Senate Compositions

Chair of Council (1)

Last Name	First Name	Department/School	Area	Term Start	Term End
Ehrlich	Carl	HUMA	Humanities	July 1, 2017	June 30, 2018

Vice Chair of Council (1)

Last Name	First Name	Department/School	Area	Term Start	Term End
Vacancy				July 1, 2017	June 30, 2018

Executive Committee (6)

Last Name	First Name	Department/School	Area	Term Start	Term End
Ferrara	Ida	ECON	Social Sciences	July 1, 2016	June 30, 2019
Sanders	Leslie	WRIT	Humanities	July 1, 2016	June 30, 2019
Vacancy				July 1, 2017	June 30, 2020
Vacancy				July 1, 2017	June 30, 2020
Vacancy				July 1, 2017	June 30, 2020
Vacancy				July 1, 2017	June 30, 2020

Academic Policy and Planning Committee (7)

Last Name	First Name	Department/School	Area	Term Start	Term End
Jacobs	Merle	HREQ	Social Sciences	July 1, 2015	June 30, 2018
Khaiter	Peter	ITEC	Professional Studies	July 1, 2015	June 30, 2018
Kheraj	Sean	HIST	Humanities	July 1, 2015	June 30, 2018
Szablowski	David	SOSC	Social Sciences	July 1, 2015	June 30, 2018
Mutimer	David	POLS	Social Sciences	July 1, 2016	June 30, 2019
Vacancy				July 1, 2017	June 30, 2020
Vacancy				July 1, 2017	June 30, 2020

Committee on Curriculum, Curricular Policy and Standards (7)

Last Name	First Name	Department/School	Area	Term Start	Term End
Iannacito-Provenzano	Roberta	DLLL	Humanities	July 1, 2015	June 30, 2018
Marjollet	Christian	FR	Humanities	July 1, 2015	June 30, 2018
Weiss	Allan	EN	Humanities	July 1, 2015	June 30, 2018

Porporato	Marcela	ADMS	Professional Studies	July 1, 2016	June 30, 2019
Quirt	Maggie	DES	Social Sciences	July 1, 2016	June 30, 2019
Vacancy				July 1, 2017	June 30, 2020
Vacancy				July 1, 2017	June 30, 2020

Tenure and Promotions Committee (15)

Last Name	First Name	Department/School	Area	Term Start	Term End
Bailey	Steven	HUMA	Humanities	July 1, 2015	June 30, 2018
Goldstein	David	EN	Humanities	July 1, 2015	June 30, 2018
Mule	Nick	SOWK	Professional Studies	July 1, 2015	June 30, 2018
Nijhawan	Shobna	DLLL	Humanities	July 1, 2015	June 30, 2018
Brzozowski	Matthew	ECON	Social Sciences	July 1, 2016	June 30, 2019
Idemudia	Uwafiokun	SOSC	Social Sciences	July 1, 2016	June 30, 2019
Nirupama	Niru	ADMS	Professional Studies	July 1, 2016	June 30, 2019
Vacancy				July 1, 2017	June 30, 2020
Vacancy				July 1, 2017	June 30, 2020
Vacancy				July 1, 2017	June 30, 2020
Vacancy				July 1, 2017	June 30, 2020
Vacancy				July 1, 2017	June 30, 2020
Vacancy				July 1, 2017	June 30, 2020
Vacancy				July 1, 2017	June 30, 2020
Vacancy				July 1, 2017	June 30, 2020

Committee on Teaching, Learning and Student Success (9 full-time faculty + 1 contract faculty + 2 teaching assistants)

Last Name	First Name	Department/School	Area	Term Start	Term End
Bohn	Simone	POLS	Social Sciences	July 1, 2016	June 30, 2019
Chen	Stephen	ITEC	Professional Studies	July 1, 2016	June 30, 2019
Karagyozyova	Tsvetanka	ECON	Social Sciences	July 1, 2016	June 30, 2019
Letkiewicz	Jodi	ADMS	Professional Studies	July 1, 2016	June 30, 2018
Toratani	Kiyoko	DLLL	Humanities	July 1, 2016	June 30, 2018
Vacancy				July 1, 2017	June 30, 2020
Vacancy				July 1, 2017	June 30, 2020
Vacancy				July 1, 2017	June 30, 2020
Vacancy				July 1, 2017	June 30, 2020
Vacancy		Contract Faculty		Sep 1, 2017	June 30, 2018
Vacancy		Teaching Assistant		Sep 1, 2017	June 30, 2018
Vacancy		Teaching Assistant		Sep 1, 2017	June 30, 2018

Committee on Research Policy and Planning (7)

Last Name	First Name	Department/School	Area	Term Start	Term End
Lieghio	Maria	SOWK	Professional Studies	July 1, 2015	June 30, 2018
Marcus	Joel	ADMS	Professional Studies	July 1, 2016	June 30, 2019
Ricci	Antonio	DLLL	Humanities	July 1, 2016	June 30, 2019
Zikic	Jelena	HRM	Professional Studies	July 1, 2016	June 30, 2019
Vacancy			Social Sciences	Effective Immediately	June 30, 2020
Vacancy				July 1, 2017	June 30, 2020
Vacancy				July 1, 2017	June 30, 2020

Committee on Student Academic Petitions and Appeals (16)

Last Name	First Name	Department/School	Area	Term Start	Term End
Goitom	Mary	SOWK	Professional Studies	July 1, 2016	June 30, 2018
Ho	Kwok	ADMS	Professional Studies	July 1, 2016	June 30, 2018
Sufrin	Jon	WRIT	Humanities	July 1, 2016	June 30, 2018
de la Cour	Lykke	SOSC	Social Sciences	July 1, 2016	June 30, 2018
Heynen	Rob	COMN	Social Sciences	July 1, 2016	June 30, 2018
Trevett	Jeremy	HIST	Humanities	July 1, 2016	June 30, 2018
Lileeva	Alla	ECON	Social Sciences	July 1, 2016	June 30, 2018
Manafu	Alexandru	PHIL	Humanities	July 1, 2016	June 30, 2018
Cohen	Cael	PHIL	Humanities	July 1, 2016	June 30, 2018
Colby	Gordana	ECON	Social Sciences	July 1, 2016	June 30, 2018
Vacancy				July 1, 2017	June 20, 2019
Vacancy				July 1, 2017	June 20, 2019
Vacancy				July 1, 2017	June 20, 2019
Vacancy				July 1, 2017	June 20, 2019
Vacancy				July 1, 2017	June 20, 2019
Vacancy				July 1, 2017	June 20, 2019

Elected-At-Large LA&PS Faculty Representatives on Senate (16 full-time faculty + 2 contract faculty)*

Last Name	First Name	Department	Term Start	Term End
Grinspun	Ricardo	Economics	July 1, 2015	June 30, 2018
Jacobs	Merle	Equity Studies	July 1, 2015	June 30, 2018
Sanders	Leslie	Humanities	July 1, 2015	June 30, 2018
Birch	Kean	Social Science	July 1, 2015	June 30, 2018
Leyton-Brown	David	Political Science	July 1, 2015	June 30, 2018
Bird	Kym	Humanities	July 1, 2015	June 30, 2018
Ehrlich	Carl	Humanities	July 1, 2016	June 30, 2019
Georgopoulos	George	Economics	July 1, 2016	June 30, 2019

Innes	Christopher	English	July 1, 2016	June 30, 2019
Kenedy	Robert	Sociology	July 1, 2016	June 30, 2019
Mekouar	Merouan	Social Science	July 1, 2016	June 30, 2019
Ricci	Antonio	Languages, Literatures and Linguistics	July 1, 2016	June 30, 2019
Thomson	Kelly	Administrative Studies	July 1, 2016	June 30, 2019
Vanstone	Gail	Humanities	July 1, 2016	June 30, 2019
Vacancy			July 1, 2017	June 30, 2020
Vacancy			July 1, 2017	June 30, 2020
Vacancy		Contract Faculty	July 1, 2017	June 30, 2018
Vacancy		Contract Faculty	July 1, 2017	June 30, 2018

*Chairs/Directors of each academic department/school are automatically LA&PS Senators

Faculty-Based Representatives on Senate Committees

Committee of Senate	Name	Department/School	Term Start	Term End
APPRC	Vacancy		Effective Immediately	June 30, 2020
Honorary Degrees	Caroline Hossein	Social Science	July 1, 2015	June 30, 2018
Executive	Carl Ehrlich	Humanities	July 1, 2016	June 30, 2019

**Committee on Curriculum, Curricular Policy and Standards
Report to Faculty Council**

**Consent Agenda
January 2017**

New Course Proposals

AP ANTH 2200 6.00 Culture Wars: The Anthropology of Science & the Sacred
AP ESL 1200 6.00 Society and Culture
AP GWST 2516 6.00 Critical Theory: Trans and Disability
AP HIST 1030 6.00 Imperialism and Nationalism in Modern Asia
AP HIST 1777 6.00 Disasters and History: How Humans and Nature Make Disasters
AP HIST 2501 3.00 Canada 101: A History of Canada since 1850
AP HIST 3326 3.00 Europe's Ottoman History, 1400s-1912
AP HIST 3773 3.00 Opium, Rebellion, and the Woman Question in China 1800-1911
AP HIST 3781 3.00 Boom and Bust: A History of Economic Crisis
AP HIST 3825 3.00 Indigenous People and the Law: Treaties, Dispossession and Murder, 1713-1886
AP HIST 3835 3.00 Dressing Up: Fashion, Identity and Resistance in Twentieth Century North America
AP HIST 3843 3.00 Occupation, Collaboration and Death: A Social and Military History of the Second World War to 1944
AP HIST 3844 3.00 Liberation, Violence, and Reconstruction: A History of the Second World War & its Aftermath, 1944-1949
AP HUMA 1844 6.00 Muslim Travel Narratives: Journeys through the Muslim World
AP SP 1200 6.00 Film and Social Change in Spain & Latin America
AP SOSC 3122 3.00 Childhood and Health
AP SXST 2600 6.00 Critical Foundations in Sexuality Studies

Changes to Existing Courses

AP FR 2100 6.00 Introduction to the Linguistic Study of French
AP FR 2200 6.00 Approaches to French Literature: An Introduction
AP HIST 1100 6.00 Gladiators, Gods, Gigolos, and Goths: Reading Roman Society c.200 BCE-c.500 CE
AP HIST 1180 6.00 Making Money
AP HIST 3555 6.00 Canadian Jewish History
AP HIST 1083 6.00 Mass Media and Popular Culture in the Americas, 1820-1980

Retired

AP SOCI 2070 6.00 Social Order and Social Organization

AP SOSC/HUMA 4501 3.00 Seminar in Science & Technology Studies

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://laps.yorku.ca/office-of-the-faculty-council/council-agenda/>.

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 (apccps@yorku.ca) if you have any questions regarding the changes to existing courses section.

The Senate of York University Academic Policy, Planning and Research Committee

Memorandum

To: Faculty Council Chairs

From: David Leyton-Brown, Acting Chair, Academic Policy, Planning and Research Committee of Senate
George Comninel, Chair of Senate

Date: January 16, 2017

Subject: **Tracking Success through Indicators**

This communication requests responses from Faculty Councils by February 10, 2017.

We are writing on behalf of Senate's Academic Policy, Planning and Research Committee to invite your Faculty Council to participate in an important consultation concerning performance indicators, especially those related to scholarly, research and creative activities.¹

As the year begins, Ontario universities are gearing up for negotiations with the provincial government culminating with the signing of new Strategic Mandate Agreements. The *University Academic Plan 2015-2020*, approved by Senate in early 2016, anticipates the development of more performance-based funding based on a range of indicators. APPRC understands that some metrics emerging from the next SMA exercise will apply to the system as a whole while others will be university-specific.

Over the years, members of the York community have frequently expressed dissatisfaction with the limited array of metrics most frequently utilized because they do not fully or accurately capture York's strengths, or fairly represent the kind, quality and impact of our contributions. This moment brings an opportunity to expand and refine metrics in ways that will better serve York along with other universities.

Through its approval of the University Academic Plan, Senate has made commitments to

- significantly increase the number and proportion of reportable research outcomes [and activities] by our scholars and enhance the means through which we can measure and articulate the full range of our scholarly outcomes from our work and their impact; and to

¹Commonly employed indicators include research income (overall and per faculty member), publication and citations.

- collegially develop and confirm measures to be used for monitoring and reporting on our progress for all priorities taking advantage of repositories of best practice

APPRC is now in the process of engaging Senators in a discussion of research indicators. In doing we have signaled our intention to consult with colleagues throughout the University. With SMA negotiations in the offing, it is timely and beneficial to broaden the discussion now, and to seek the views of your Council on the following key questions:

How can York improve its tracking of progress and how can it use indicators to greatest advantage?

What specific indicators do you employ or should be employed to create the most inclusive possible set of indicators across the spectrum of scholarly, research and creative activities? Please provide concrete examples.

In making this request we want to emphasize that responses are intended to launch a sustained collegial dialogue as we work toward realizing UAP objectives and to complement rather than supplant other processes (such as consultations on the Plan for Intensification of Research) and to . In that light, we ask that you respond by **February 10, 2017**. APPRC would welcome input from the appropriate committee(s) and / or Council itself. Feel free to comment on other measures of academic achievement you think relevant.

Please submit your responses to Robert Everett of the University Secretariat (beverett@yorku.ca). You may also transmit questions for APPRC to him.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

cc: Faculty Council Secretaries

University Academic Plan 2015-2020

<http://secretariat.info.yorku.ca/files/UAP-2015-2016-Final.pdf>

APPRC Report to Senate, November 2016 pp. 57-59

<http://secretariat.info.yorku.ca/files/Agenda-Package-20161124-FINAL.pdf>

Date: February 2, 2017

To: David Leyton-Brown, Acting Chair, Academic Policy Planning and Research
Committee of Senate
George Connell, Chair of Senate

From: Sandra Whitworth, Associate Dean Graduate Studies & Research, LA&PS

Re: Tracking Success through Indicators

**FACULTY OF
LIBERAL ARTS &
PROFESSIONAL
STUDIES**

Office of the Dean

S900 ROSS BLDG.
4700 KEELE ST
TORONTO ON
CANADA M3J 1P3
T 416 736 5220
F 416 736 5750

www.yorku.ca/laps

Thank you for the opportunity to contribute to the APPRC's Senate discussion of research indicators. As noted in your January 16, 2017 Memorandum, members of the York community have frequently expressed dissatisfaction with the limited array of metrics most frequently utilized as indicators related to scholarly, research and creative activities. This is a concern that very much impacts researchers within LA&PS.

It is worth addressing in the first instance the challenges of using traditional metrics within the Social Sciences, Humanities and Professional Studies. My predecessor Naomi Adelson worked with York's Institute for Social Research on a pilot study examining journal counts in two standard academic databases, Elsevier (Scopus/SciVal) and Thomson Reuters (Web of Science/Incites) as compared to journal publications reported in the CVs of 55 LA&PS faculty members (who volunteered their CVs for the purposes of the study). These types of databases are used by outside entities and some university offices to capture data on research output. The overall coverage for Scopus was 33% of the York authors' publications while for Thomson Reuters the average was 25%. In some but not all instances, coverage in the databases increased for more recent publications, but never exceeded 58% (and more commonly averaged 48%, even where coverage increased). The study also revealed an inconsistency in journal coverage, particular journals were 'captured' by the databases in some years but not others and there was no discernible pattern in that coverage.

Some examples illustrate the impact of this: of 3 articles that appeared in the Canadian Journal of Political Science by LA&PS authors, 0 were captured by Scopus and 1 by Thomson Reuters; of 5 articles that appeared in Middle East Focus by LA&PS authors, 0 were captured by both Scopus and Thomson Reuters; of 3 articles that appeared in the Canadian Journal of Philosophy by LA&PS authors, 1 appeared in Scopus and 2 in Thomson Reuters; of 3 articles that appeared in the Journal of Environmental Economics and Management by LA&PS authors, 1 appeared in Scopus and 1 appeared in Thomson Reuters; of 3 articles that appeared in Canadian Women's Studies by LA&PS authors, 0 appeared in either Scopus or Thomson Reuters; of 4 articles that appeared in Criminal Law and Philosophy, all 4 appeared in Scopus but 0 appeared in Thomson Reuters.

The ISR study may be limited insofar as it compares only a small portion of the LA&PS faculty complement to these traditional databases, but it nonetheless signals the ways in which traditional academic indices are unreliable indicators of the scholarly output of LA&PS researchers. And it is critically important to underline here: academic indices primarily capture journal articles, which are but one part of the typical LA&PS faculty member's scholarly work. That work can also include sole-authored, multi-authored and edited books, chapters in edited anthologies, textbooks, government and NGO reports and consultancies, corporate reports or contracts, encyclopedia entries, journal



editorships, conference presentations, media appearances, newspaper and magazine articles, social media engagement, audio-visual material, creative works, works of translation, participation on advisory groups, expert panels, and board memberships or serving as expert witnesses, and more activities, most of which will not be captured by these indices.

Research funding is another common indicator of research performance, and it can signal the level of engagement of some researchers, especially those who require support for field research, labs or who develop multi-collaborator research projects or partnerships. The absence of research income, however, is not in itself a measure of low output or performance. A great many of our researchers have minimal funding needs— they may conduct research in local archives, for example, or be engaged in scholarly readings of theoretical works, which requires little or no support from external agencies.

Determining the impact of scholarly work is an even more complex endeavour than measuring quantity of output. In a 2014 Working Paper (<http://www.ideas-ideas.ca/sites/default/files/2014-10-03-impact-project-draft-report-english-version-final2.pdf>) the Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences outlines different ways to measure impact and cautions against an over-reliance on single quantitative measures. Citation indices, for example, are a traditional measure of impact but are usually dependent on the same databases which inconsistently capture the kind of work done by LA&PS researchers, as described above. Other measures of scholarly impact can include: downloads from open access repositories, citations or references in grant applications, published acknowledgements, prizes and awards, reputational measures (for example as determined by discipline surveys among appropriate expert cohorts), post publication peer review such as book reviews, impacts on teaching within disciplines (ie. via the regular appearance of publications in doctoral core courses), and the number and career trajectories of completed graduate students. In addition to scholarly impacts, the Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences also recommends measures of economic, social and public policy impacts which should be included in addition to scholarly impacts (these can include media coverage, attendance at public events, citations in government or NGO documents, etc).

While measures such as these will provide a more complete picture of the kind of scholarship our faculty members are conducting and the impact it is having, the work to collect this kind of information is itself complex. The traditional commercial indices are attractive precisely because they promise data collection conducted with relative ease, but as already noted, that data is incomplete in conveying the range of work conducted by researchers in LA&PS. The converse of this - more complex, more inclusive and potentially more accurate measures of scholarly output and impact - will require an investment of time and labour to collect and cannot be carried by individual researchers or by existing research offices alone, without appropriate levels of support.

Finally, in your discussions it will be helpful to remain attentive to the question of whether measures or indices can ever completely capture the impact of the academic enterprise. There is a qualitative dimension to our work that does not readily conform to metrics, no matter how sophisticated. There has to be a place in these discussions where we continue to value and defend the single book or article that has inspired awe and utterly transformed ways of thinking. There may not be straightforward ways to measure this but many of us pursued scholarly careers because of those transformative moments and they are worth recalling when we are engaged in these types of discussions.

Committee on Research Policy and Planning Report

January 2017

To: Academic Policy, Planning and Research Committee (APPRC)

Feedback re: APPRC's request for input on research indicators

The LA&PS Faculty's Committee on Research Policy and Planning (CRPP) would like to offer the following response to the Senate's Academic Policy, Planning and Research Committee's request for feedback regarding performance indicators.

As we see it, there are two key items to consider: (i) how to determine which scholarly outputs to track; (ii) how to collect information on alternative research outputs from our faculty.

We first emphasize that, more so than in other faculties, LA&PS scholars produce a wide range of outputs that are not counted in traditional metrics based on ranked journal publications or large federal grants. These outputs include books, book chapters, reports to government, and activist work, to name a few examples. We also emphasize that there is substantial variation in the types of scholarly outputs that departments in LA&PS consider important. Thus, it is necessary to solicit lists of important outputs from individual units. Some LA&PS units have already approved standards for the new research release program, which may serve as helpful guides.

However, we note that the approval process for research release standards has been contentious in many departments, and the coincidence of these two processes may impede APPRC's ability to collect this information from individual units.

One specific recommendation is to develop a discipline-specific list of outputs in consultation with other universities. York is not the only institution with a large social sciences and humanities faculty, which may benefit from such a list. If a collection of Ontario universities could agree on a way of evaluating output from social sciences and humanities departments, the provincial government may take it more seriously.

We would like to draw the APPRC's attention to the excellent work on the logistics of collecting and analysing data on research outputs that Naomi Adelson undertook as Associate Dean of Research.

We also suggest that York (or York in conjunction with other Ontario universities) consider developing its own proprietary database of research outputs for LA&PS faculty.

We recognize that collecting information from individual faculty members is challenging. In principle, York's (public) faculty research profiles should be a useful source of data. However, these profiles are maintained by individual faculty, and the participation rate is low. In our opinion, there are two reasons for this: (i) some faculty members are unwilling to disclose their research activities; (ii) the faculty research profiles are not terribly user-friendly, and some faculty members cannot be bothered to update them. The first item is difficult to address; however, we believe the university should invest resources in addressing the second. The online system should be made more user-friendly. In addition, the university should actively solicit participation in these research profiles. If the university clearly communicates to faculty members that their participation will help the university or their individual units, we believe the participation rate will increase.

Thank you for the opportunity to engage in this important discussion.

This document was drafted by Merle Jacobs and Sean Kheraj on behalf of APPC for consideration by Faculty Council. Because APPC does not meet until February 8, the full committee has not yet had the opportunity to confer on this matter.

As the Faculty of Liberal Arts and Professional Studies considers its response to these questions it is important that we assert our understanding of the problems with research metrics as a tool for transforming evaluative frameworks and the incentive systems influencing academic and scholarly endeavor. We therefore offer the following observations.

The use of metrics may be relatively uncontroversial in some organizations or business enterprises where products and outcomes are very tangible and where specific contributions by participants to those outputs are easily measurable. It is well recognized, however, that many areas of academic work and types of research activities deal with goals, processes and outputs that can't easily be captured by metrics. The authors of the "Leiden Manifesto" found that research metrics run the risk of "false precision," perverse incentives and the abandonment of qualitative judgement (Hicks, Wouters, Waltman, Rijcke, & Rafols, 2015). A recent report at Western University found support for this conclusion through extensive surveys and interviews involving faculty members in the social sciences and humanities disciplines (URB Task Force, 2016). Indeed there is evidence that increased emphasis on metrics encourages "goal displacement.(De Rijcke, Wouters, Rushforth, Franssen, & Hammarfelt, 2016)." One example is that researchers in fields in which books are highly valued have begun to react strategically by publishing more journal articles which are more favourably recognized by research indicators (The Expert Panel on Science Performance and REsearch Funding, 2012). When research metrics are used in performance evaluation (of institutions or individuals) then academic activities that are not captured by metrics may be devalued, such as teaching, mentoring, graduate supervision, reviewing and non-traditional academic dissemination and impact.

The unintended consequences of metrification may be felt within the larger research ecosystem as well. For example, authors under pressure to publish more to meet the standards set by quantitative metrics have less time to contribute as peer reviewers for journals. Competition to publish in the most highly ranked journals adds to the burden placed on the "reviewer commons" as it creates an escalation in the number of submissions and reviewing instances (Hochberg, Chase, Gotelli, Hastings, & Naeem, 2009). In this connection Nobel Laureate Randy Schekman has pointed to the fact that many publishers increasingly hire professional journal editors rather than "working scientists" to boost the journal's standing. As a result, competition for prestige and high impact factors in the journal industry has arguably compromised scientific quality in favour of what is topical, "eye-catching" or what can produce the greatest number of citations (Shekman, 2013). Large institutions such as York have a responsibility to be aware of the system-wide consequences of an overreliance on research metrics.

Peer review is the basis for academic recruitment and promotion processes, as well as most of the procedures for allocating research grants. Whatever its faults, peer review, with its

irreducible focus on qualitative judgement, lies at the core of the governance of the research process. It is indispensable for understanding the value of what we do as researchers, and how to encourage and promote new kinds of research contributions. The process of peer review can make use of metrics, but not as independent criteria of evaluation. Quantitative metrics are intended to provide more 'accountability', but when they are used as independent measures of value they have the effect of displacing peer review (The Expert Panel on Science Performance and REsearch Funding, 2012). They also give managers and external stakeholders of the research process greater influence over its direction (Hasselberg, 2013). Justification of hiring decisions by citing metrics can be used by administrators to question or overturn subsequent hiring decisions when the latter is not based on the same metrics. This can even reinforce the dangerous (often implicit) assumption that hiring decisions themselves should increasingly come under the control of administrators rather than experts in the field (Werner, 2015). While peer review itself is not perfect, it does place a greater emphasis on qualitative judgement and provides a basis for recognizing aspects of research and scholarship that are hard to quantify such as whether a work or a project is unique, interesting or adds an alternative perspective to a field of inquiry.

There are many other shortcomings of quantitative research metrics which have been established in the literature. For example, there is strong evidence that standard research metrics fail to capture the value of interdisciplinary work and heterodox perspectives. (Rafols, Leydesdorff, O'Hare, Nightingale, & Stirling, 2012) Studies by Canadian economists have shown that the pressure to publish in high impact journals (typically from the U.S.) has diminished the amount of Canadian focused work done by Canadian economists. (Simpson & Emery, 2012). Researchers experiencing intense pressure to raise publication counts often engage in strategic behaviour such as "salami slicing" (producing more publications to express the same number of findings or ideas) and risk aversion where researchers select proven pathways and frameworks of inquiry that can create a quick payoff at the expense of potential innovation. (Fry & Osterloh, 2011) The competition for publications in top journals, or the competition to write and produce the most in the shortest period of time can have perverse effects including, in the worst cases, results that can't be replicated, "honourary authorship," careless research and even fraud.(Haustein & Larivière, 2015)

Given the strong evidence of the shortcomings and often perverse incentives associated with research metrics it is of the utmost importance that our Faculty, and York University as a whole resist the trend towards over simplistic and compulsory metrification. Our university has a strong tradition of research innovation and the promotion of critical and heterodox scholarship, both of which can be threatened by the dangerous reductionism inherent in metrics-driven approaches to research evaluation.

De Rijcke, S., Wouters, P. F., Rushforth, A. D., Franssen, T. P., & Hammarfelt, B. (2016). Evaluation practices and effects of indicator use-a literature review. *Research Evaluation*, 25(2), 161–169. <http://doi.org/10.1093/reseval/rvv038>

- Fry, B., & Osterloh, M. (2011). Rankings Games.
- Hasselberg, Y. (2013). In Defense of Discretion. In S. Rider, Y. Hasselberg, & A. Waluszewski (Eds.), *Transformations in Research, Higher Education and the Academic Market* (Vol. 39, pp. 137–144). Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands. <http://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-5249-8>
- Haustein, S., & Larivière, V. (2015). The use of bibliometrics for assessing research: Possibilities, limitations and adverse effects. *Incentives and Performance: Governance of Research Organizations*, 121–139. http://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-09785-5_8
- Hicks, D., Wouters, P., Waltman, L., Rijcke, S. de, & Rafols, & I. (2015). The Leiden Manifesto on Research Metrics. *Nature*, 520, 429–431.
- Hochberg, M. E., Chase, J. M., Gotelli, N. J., Hastings, A., & Naeem, S. (2009). The tragedy of the reviewer commons. *Ecology Letters*, 12(1), 2–4. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2008.01276.x>
- Rafols, I., Leydesdorff, L., O’Hare, A., Nightingale, P., & Stirling, A. (2012). How journal rankings can suppress interdisciplinary research: A comparison between Innovation Studies and Business & Management. *Research Policy*, 41(7), 1262–1282. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2012.03.015>
- Shekman, R. (2013). How Journals like Nature, Cell and Science are damaging science. *The Guardian*. Dec 9, 2013. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2013/dec/09/how-journals-nature-science-cell-damage-science>
- Simpson, W. & Emery, J.C.H. (2012) Canadian Economics in Decline: Implications for Canada's Economics Journals. *Canadian Public Policy*, Vol. 38. No. 4, pp. 445-470.
- The Expert Panel on Science Performance and REsearch Funding. (2012). *Informing Research Choices: Indicators and Judgement*. Ottawa. Retrieved from [http://www.scienceadvice.ca/uploads/eng/assessments and publications and news releases/science performance/scienceperformance_fullreport_en_web.pdf](http://www.scienceadvice.ca/uploads/eng/assessments%20and%20publications%20and%20news%20releases/science%20performance/scienceperformance_fullreport_en_web.pdf)
- URB Task Force Steering Committee. (2016) Support for Research in SOcial Science, Artys, and Humanities at Western. University Research Board. Western Univeristy
- Werner, R., The focus on bibliometrics makes papers less useful. *Nature*, January 13, 2015 Retrieved from <http://www.nature.com/news/the-focus-on-bibliometrics-makes-papers-less-useful-1.16706>

Additional Notes and Remarks from Chair of APPC (Sean Kheraj)

The limits of quantitative research metric (standard bibliometrics and altmetrics) as indicators:

- Current tools available for measuring standard bibliometrics and altmetrics do not accurately or adequately quantify research output or impact, especially in social sciences and humanities disciplines
- Current tools exclude books
- AltMetrics are currently non-standardized; limited comparative value
- The development of custom metrics at York is inadvisable:
 - Costly and time consuming
 - Non-standard - offers limited comparative value to other systems of measurement
- Quantitative systems of measuring research uncommon in social sciences and humanities disciplines - not part of research culture or practice
- Quantitative systems of measuring research output can produce unintended disruptions to or distortions of research processes
- Quantitative systems fail to capture influence of scholarship on communities outside of academia; community-engaged research; public scholarship; popular dissemination; contributions to public discourse and debate
- Quantitative systems do not measure application of research findings in policy development

How to measure and evaluate research:

- Peer review has been the customary process of evaluating research output and impact
- Third party peer reviewers with field-relevant expertise consider the research output and impact of colleagues in our current tenure and promotion process
- Employing a qualitative peer-review approach to the analysis of scholarship is the optimal method of developing research indicators