YORK UNIVERSITY
COUNCIL OF THE FACULTY OF SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING
February 8, 2011 Meeting Minutes

Present:

Regrets: M. Caplan, M. De Robertis, J. Saindon, J. Wang

5. 1 Minutes of the Meeting of January 11, 2011
   P. Cribb (moved) to accept the minutes and G. Tourlakis (seconded). Carried.

5.2 Matters arising from the Minutes
   Nothing brought forward.

5.3 Inquiries & Communications

5.4 Dean’s Remarks
   The Dean updated Council on the following initiatives:
   Coop Program for our Students: We are committed to making the Coop program available to all our students and realised in order to do so, we had to engage our partners, in particular, the Vice-President Students’ office. The program will be implemented by the target date of January 2012 and in the interim, we will expand on the internship program. While a portion of the funding will be applied to through AIF, we also require a base of companies that are willing to participate in the program and offer our students placements. Council was also reminded of the deadline to submit applications for AIF.

   Another initiative which will be announced is the development of CFI. This is an institutional grant and colleagues from outside this university may need to be invited. Further to this, the Leaders Opportunity Fund (LOF) program was announced. We are going to gain some more infrastructures and then offer some LOF to established researchers.

   Council was informed of the recent changes in the Dean’s Office. Michael De Robertis’ term has ended and his position has been divided in two: an associate dean, research and an associate dean, faculty.

   York Research will be holding two upcoming sessions: one on February 9 where some of our colleagues will discuss how to prepare a successful strategic grant; the second will be a partnership workshop on February 10 which includes colleagues from NSERC and will discuss funding partnerships.

   H. McLellan introduced Doug Reid the new Director of Information Technology Services. D. Reid is currently working on the computing plan to be submitted on February 18.

   H. McLellan also updated on the PRASE project which will focus on non-academic areas of the university and service enhancement within those areas. S. Mir inquired about student representation on the committee and while this was noted, the initiative is still too premature to include this representation.

   The Dean was asked if there will be some understanding of how things are decided with regards to CFI grants at York and the response was that strategic priorities need to be laid out beforehand and since the deadline is Fall 2011, we have ample time to implement this.

Associate Deans’ and Bethune Master’s Remarks
P. Cribb, Associate Dean, Student Affairs
There has been an increase of about 15% (compared to 2010) in first choice applicants to FSE; an increase of about 10% in second choice applicants, however, the quality of the applicants (i.e., high school grade 12 grades) is not known at this time. Moving ahead, the objective will be to make the best effort to convert the choices. The proposal for new activities targeting high achievers has been distributed to units and we will be working on implementing these.

R. Hornsey, Associate Dean, School of Engineering
The possibility of expanding Engineering has been a topic of relevant discussion for some years now. Excellent progress has been made on the academic side, but not much has been seen in terms of the actual expansion which seems set to change according to the following:
- Engineering is prominent in the White Paper and the draft UAP
- A Science & Engineering tower is slated to be the next building at York
- Signs from the government are still positive
- Progress is being made on the financial aspects
- Applicants to Engineering in Ontario are still rising - up 8% this year

The aforementioned is contingent on the funding amount which remains to be seen, however, with this encouragement, we are starting to think about how to implement a significant expansion of Engineering. While the impact this would have on FSE is evident, some early steps have been outlined:
- Decisions on what a new Engineering might look like -- programs, structure, fit with FSE, etc
- Consultations with units - firstly those already offering Engineering and then closely related departments such as Math and Physics and then subsequently brought to FSE for discussion.

Some questions were asked regarding the expansion:
D. Bohme: "Are there any plans to have a special meeting to discuss the expansion plan?"
J. Kozinski replied that engineering expansion issue is still quite sensitive and should be discussed at FSE Council prior to being disclosed outside our Faculty.

M. Organ: "What would the future, expanded Engineering look like: a department, a school, streams?"
R. Hornsey replied the task is to develop concepts and ideas which will then be discussed with departments etc prior to finalizing anything.

J. Amanatides, Master, Bethune College
Regrets.

5.5 Reports from Science and Engineering Representatives on Senate Committees
D. Bohme, APPRC: The last meeting was cancelled so there is nothing new to report, however, the committee is awaiting a response from FSE with regards to UAP and the new ORU policy.

5.6 Consent Agenda items:
Science Curriculum Committee: Items I, II and IV
These items are deemed to be passed.

5.7 Reports of Committees:
For Action
Science Curriculum Committee: Item III of attachment 5.7.1
P. Cribb (moved) the international program and G. Toulakis (seconded). Carried.
In brief, the program fosters a dual degree with student exchanges from Canada to Germany and vice versa.
5.8 Other business:

-- STS Proposal
The STS proposal presented today is for information and discussion and has been distributed to department chairs already. Following the next Executive and Planning meeting, the document will be edited to include the issues presented by the committee and will be presented to Council for voting/acceptance in March.

Proposal feedback included:

- Lack of research activities of the department
- Greater clarity on the implications of this pairing needs to be included
- Having NATS exist as an independent entity representing the interest of the Faculty
- Incorporating NATS into STS administratively is the best option with a review in 2014
- Why dismantle NATS, reinsert it in another department only to extrapolate it again in 2014
- Resource implications as a result of the merge and should be included in the updated proposal
- NATS and STS will run their own in house programs without asking FLA&PS for permission (which has involved more work and long delays in terms of course offerings and cross listings)
- STS influence over NATS and how its run

D. Hastie asked for a motion to extend the meeting by half an hour. P. Cribb (moved) and J. Rudolph (seconded). Carried.

-- UAP: for discussion
Dean Kozinski asked Council for any comments / feedback regarding the UAP. He also clarified that the ORU document is not yet complete and it is not being brought to Council yet for this reason. The Dean considers this document an excellent indicator of what pathways our Faculty should take in the future and how those pathways should be paved. The university is obviously quite willing to move forward, but how we move forward will be up to us.

D. Bohme had two points: it is not a coincidence that these three initiatives are happening at the same time.
With regards to the five year plan, the statement on engineering is a generic statement, and since this is a five year plan, can we be a little more definitive with our goals?

P. Cribb: there used to be a notion of rebalancing the university, to improve research, rebalancing being a code word for increasing the proportion of science and engineering which seems to be abandoned in this document. Is that the sense that other people have and if so, should we make an effort to re-insert it?
Helen McLellan clarified that the term currently in use is “selective diversification” and the UAP makes mention of this under the “Strengthening Interdisciplinarity and Comprehensiveness” section (p. 10). Specifically the plan states: “supporting the development of a more comprehensive university through selective diversification of enrolments especially in health, business, applied and professional programs”
The statement does not reference Science and Engineering specifically and P. Cribb feels this should be included.

P. Wilson: The role of graduate studies doesn’t figure at all in the document. The commitment to graduate studies is something that should be raised. R. Jarrell noted Bob Everett was approached to include graduate studies in the document which was included that morning.

Additional comments and feedback should be sent to the Dean directly.

D. Hastie (motioned) to adjourn the meeting, P. Cribb (moved). Carried.
The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.