

## **Academic Standards Curriculum and Pedagogy Committee of Senate Special Sub-Committee on New Faculty Curriculum**

### **Record of Consultation**

Date	Thursday, May 30, 2019
Unit and Programs	School of Administrative Studies Disaster and Emergency Management
Attendees	Adriano Solis, Director, School of Administrative Studies Marcela Porporato, UPD, SAS Nelson Waweru, incoming Director, SAS Cristobal Sanchez-Rodriguez, incoming UPD, SAS Aaida Mamuji, Area Coordinator, Disaster & Emergency Management Jack Rozdilsky, incoming GPD, Disaster & Emergency Management Eric Kennedy, Faculty Member, Disaster and Emergency Management
Sub-Committee Members	Kim Michasiw, Chair of ASCP, Chair Alice Horvoka, Dean, FES Alice Pitt, Vice-Provost Academic Tarmo Remmel, Co-Coordinator (Geography) Robert Everett, Secretary

### **Perspectives on Opportunities**

It was stressed at the outset and thereafter that the possibilities identified in the draft establishment proposal circulated in April were essentially placeholders that neither prescribed or precluded innovations. Colleagues in FES and Geography are keen to further explore and begin to refine ideas in an ongoing dialogue and the curriculum design phase. Out of the conversation emerged a set of options for collaboration between the new Faculty between the School of Administrative and the undergraduate and graduate programs of Disaster and Emergency Management. Shared interests and potential cross-Faculty synergies point to an array of possibilities:

- Double major and major / minor combinations (with distinctive descriptors)
- Certificates
- Single courses that may serve multiple programs
- Concentrations or streams that draw upon courses offered in the new Faculty and DEM
- Cooperative capstone, experiential and field work courses
- Program ladders, such as 4+1 or 3+2 pathways to graduate studies
- Areas in which strengths can be combined (such as policy or management)

Members of the Sub-Committee acknowledged concerns expressed by the School and program, and gave assurances that the new Faculty's collaborative dimensions will be

wholly predicated on collegiality and respect. Entrepreneurship was referenced in the draft proposal, and participants worked toward an understanding of what that might entail. For example, SAS may contribute by a module that could be adapted to suit a number of programs at York that seek to provide students with skills.

### **Other Matters to be Addressed**

The Sub-Committee agreed to the suggestion that it should be clearer about the goal of consultation sessions.

Regarding complement planning, there may be possibilities for cross appointments that enrich the curriculum and research cultures.

It was felt that there may be significant returns on a joint recruitment strategy and that student mobility should be promoted. Many students believe that many York programs do not lead to employment and accreditation. This misperception needs to be addressed and corrected, not least since FES, SAS and DEM have accredited courses of study.

### **Outcomes and Next Steps**

It was understood that some initiatives may be pursued in the short-term while others would be taken up in a longer time frame. The proposal that comes to the Senate and the Board will highlight signature curriculum and other innovations given shape on a relatively fast track but may also identify modifications and innovations that are at a less advanced stage.

Colleagues from DEM will reflect on opportunities of the kind mooted at the meeting at a mid-June program meeting, and provide the Sub-Committee with a sense of the ideas that should be pursued.

DEM will nominate an individual to liaise with the Sub-Committee. The Sub-Committee will provide the FES-Geography working group with a record of the meeting.

Documentation on degree ladders will be shared with DEM and others involved in consultations that may lead to 4+1 or 2+3 models. Participants also discussed collaborations in the SHARP budget model context, and learned that the Provost's Office continues work on a framework for sharing costs and revenues. Discussion raised the distinction between SHARP as a shadow model of how teaching (primarily undergraduate) that occurs as dedicated service or general/elective education cost sharing and the capacity to create new arrangements with cost-sharing and shared administrative elements

The Sub-Committee will re-engage with the School and Program in September, and will respond promptly to requests for assistance before then. Members thanked colleagues from SAS and DEM for positive and productive contributions.