Present:  

Regrets: J. Woo  

6.1 Minutes of the Meeting of February 8, 2011  
P. Delaney (moved) and S. Pagiatakis (seconded) that the minutes be accepted. Carried, with one abstention.  

6.2 Matters arising from the Minutes  
Nothing brought forward.  

6.3 Inquiries & Communications:  
Senate Meeting Synopsis for 27 January 2011 (for information)  

6.4 Dean’s Remarks  
Dan Kozinski congratulated all female faculty members on the occasion of International Women's Day  

The mission to India was quite a success with 18 institutions visited in total. A workshop was also held in Delhi and a practical outcome is expected. Our faculty will partner with India to complete a few projects; outcomes will be discussed later next week and institutions we are eager to partner with will be outlined.  

With regards to strategic hires, we are in the process of submitting offers and we should be hearing back soon and announcements will follow. All search committees were thanked for their work.  

There are some discussions in place concerning the extraction of FSE from FGS. Our Faculty will not continue the procedures we have had in place for our graduate students and will discuss options with Council and Faculty members. The intention is to remove all limits and quotas but to also make researchers more financially responsible to graduate students. We would like to administer this particular portfolio solely within the Faculty. This matter will be discussed with GPD in the next couple of days and then with the departments.  

Question: “With regards to the increased financially responsibility to graduate students, how much might that be?”
J. Kozinski: We don’t want to reinvent the wheel, graduate student salaries should not be paid for by the University but by the people who have hired them. In our case, that would be FSE.

Question: “How soon can we expect to see this happen?”
J. Kozinski: This will not be feasible for the upcoming academic year.

Question: “Do we have the administrative structure to support the new process?”
J. Kozinski: We would like to give freedom to all the departments but we have to have a level of verification which will be included in the portfolio of the Associate Dean, research.

The Dean made one final comment, in York University’s “Strategic Directions 2010-2020” pamphlet, expanding programs within the Faculty of Science and Engineering is featured front and centre.

In closing, M. De Robertis updated Council on the departure of Dean Peers on July 1, 2011.

6.5 Associate Deans’ and Bethune Master’s Remarks

P. Cribb, Associate Dean, Student Affairs

Academic Integrity Issues
The student services taskforce is responsible for reviewing which services the services and supports services in the faculty. A survey has been created and will be distributed to students soon with an additional survey to be developed for Faculty members. An open forum will be held next week and posters are available for members to take and post within their departments.

D. Hastie, Associate Dean, Faculty
Nothing to report.

R. Hornsey, Associate Dean, School of Engineering

Engineering Expansion Task Force – Terms of Reference
The terms of reference were intended to start the process of the engineering expansion. The main topics which need to be dealt with in the next little while are included and the current main priority is to populate the taskforce.

Question: “Considering university resources are quite scarce, will the taskforce also review the present status of concurrent programs?”
R. Hornsey clarified that the first task of the taskforce will be what the expanded school of engineering will look like which includes a review of current programs.

J. Amanatides, Master, Bethune College

Science, Teaching and Learning Conference
There will be a Teaching and Learning conference for science education at Western University in July and Bethune College is willing to subsidize faculty or fellows if they wish to attend.

6.6 Reports from Science and Engineering Representatives on Senate Committees
D. Bohme, APPRC
At the last meeting of APPRC, the committee put finishing touches on UAP and the document has since been approved by Senate. The next meeting will involve putting the finishing touches on the ORU document so there is still time for input from Council.

M. De Robertis (science representative on Senate Executive) added that next Tuesday’s discussion will concern the reappointment of the President.

6.7 Consent Agenda items:
Science Curriculum Committee: Item I
Deemed to be passed

6.8 Reports of Committees
None.

6.9 Other business:
Nomination of Vice-Chair of Council
As D. Hastie has assumed the position of Associate Dean, Faculty and P. Wilson has assumed the position of Chair of Council, the Vice-Chair of Council position is currently vacant and a replacement needs to be elected. J. Amanatides has already put forth his name and the floor was opened for additional names to be submitted. Since none were put forth, P. Cribb (moved) and P. Delaney (seconded) that J. Amanatides be elected the Vice-Chair of Council. Carried.

STS Proposal (revised)
The revised STS proposal is presented to Council as two separate motions. The first motion speaks to the creation of an STS department, without the transfer of the BAs. The second motion speaks to housing the division of Natural Science within the department of STS, essentially merging the two to form a department.
R. Jarrell (moved) and P. Delaney (seconded) that motion one be approved by Council. Discussion on the motion ensued.

Someone spoke against the motion, unsure of the member’s identity. He questioned how many colleagues would be in the core Science areas? Historically, units becoming a department in FSE have, at its core, Science, but these colleagues have backgrounds in History etc and their funding is SSHRC based.

Also, there are always costs involved, who will pay for these? And who will pay for the cross appointments? In creating another department are we not creating another silo?

P. Wilson: At a departmental meeting last week, the idea of STS becoming a department was supported; however, we do not have enough information before us today to make this decision. Perhaps there needs to be more planning prior to making this decision today.

Clarification concerning resource issues was requested. P. Delaney responded that there won’t be any changes so additional costs will not be incurred. The support for STS will continue as is and the same applies to NATS. In terms of space, the space requirement is currently nonexistent.
What would be the purpose of making STS a department? R. Jarrell clarified that currently, we do not have control over the curriculum except for what is done in-house. STS as a department will give our students security because we are now controlling our own curriculum.

Why put STS in FSE if the majority of students in the program are Faculty LA&PS based?

**Motion to extend the meeting by 15 minutes. Carried.**

W. van Wijngaarten referred motion one back to the committee. R. Jarrell requested clarification and specific details of what the motion needs.
The referral of motion one back to the committee was voted on
Voted in favour: 5
Voted against: couldn’t count actual number
The motion was defeated.

Second motion to extend the meeting by 15 minutes. Carried.

P. Cribb called the question.

Prior to voting, a motion was called to have a confidential which was denied by the Chair. Subsequently, the Chair was asked to defend his decision and the answer given was that confidential or secret voting was not part of Council rules. The motion to challenge the Chair's decision was raised:
Council voted on calling to support the Vice-Chairs ruling to not have a confidential vote.
Voted in favour: 37
Voted against: 16
The motion was defeated.

Motion one was voted on
Voted in favour: 39
Voted against: 13
Carried with 1 abstention.

P. Delaney brought motion two to the floor. With the adoption of motion one and the creation of the STS department, NATS would like to be housed within the department. P. Delaney (moved) and R. Jarrell (seconded). Discussions ensued.

P. Delaney spoke for the motion, and argued that the relationship with STS has been successful. He reminded Council members that 10,000 students are enrolled in Natural Science, in 55 courses, and that one third of the FFTEs are brought into FSE by Natural Science, and one third of the TAs deployed are also in Natural Science. He also noted that the proposal calls for a review in three years and that in large measure the success of the Natural Science division has been because of STS faculty.

**Motion to extend Council by 15 minutes: P. Cribb (moved) and P. Delaney (seconded). Carried.**
G. Tourlakis spoke against the motion. He argued that natural science was not previously under the jurisdiction of STS, but that STS faculty teach in the program. He questioned whether, with the creation of an STS department, they would not continue to teach natural science. He felt that the director of natural science should remain independent.

R. Webb spoke against the motion, questioning whether faculty wishing to teach natural science would have to become part of STS.

M. McCall pointed out that two alternative proposals had been put forward, one to strike a task force, and the other to have the natural science director reporting to an associate dean. These proposals had been rejected.

J. Rudolph spoke for the motion, saying that we need someone to take care of the natural science program, and to think about its future.

P. Wilson spoke against the motion, indicating that her department had voted against supporting the motion. She said the Biology Department had always supported the program, providing instructors, TAs, lab space, as well as technical support. She questioned why there is a need to restructure now, if there is to be a review in three years. She also noted that, given the previous motion, no member of STS could be the director of natural science. She hoped that discussions could continue in a spirit of collegiality.

Motion to extend to 5:30: P. Cribb (moved) and G. Tourlakis (seconded). Carried.

J. Kozinski said Natural Science brings in one third of the Faculty’s budget. He intends to set up a task force to provide recommendations on what to do with the program long term. Whatever Council decides today will be temporary.

RA Dyer called the question.

Votes – For 21, against 18, abstentions 2

Motion to adjourn: P. Wilson (moved) G. Tourlakis (seconded). Carried.