York University
Faculty of Health Council

Notice of Meeting

Wednesday, December 6, 2017
3:00 pm – 4:30 pm

Senate Chamber, N940 Ross Building

Agenda

1. Chair’s Remarks
2. Minutes of the Meeting of November 1, 2017
3. Business arising from the minutes
4. Dean’s Remarks
5. Report from the Executive and Planning Committee
6. Faculty Awards
7. Senator’s Report
8. Other Business

Faculty of Health meetings support our mission to provide an innovative and supportive environment for learning, discovery and engagement. To ensure our common value of diversity is fully reflected, our events, publications and meetings make every effort to be accessible to all.

2017-2018 Faculty of Health Council Meetings, 3:00pm–4:30pm, Senate Chamber, N940 Ross Building:
Wednesday, January 10, 2018
Wednesday, February 7, 2018
Wednesday, March 7, 2018
Wednesday, April 4, 2018
Wednesday, May 2, 2018

All are welcome and encouraged to attend!
Faculty of Health
FACULTY COUNCIL
Wednesday, November 1, 2017
Senate Chamber, N940 Ross Building

Minutes


Guests: R. Bishop, F. Clarke, S. Pereira, L. Sadhwani, S. Whitaker.

1. Chair’s remarks
Professor C. Ardern welcomed Council members. He noted that with assent from the Executive and Planning Committee he was filling in for Interim Chair H. Edgell. He highlighted that Chair N. Richardson will return to her position in December 2017.

Professor C. Ardern conveyed regrets from Dean McDonald.

He reminded Council members and guests to sign the attendance book and note dates and time of upcoming Council meetings.

Members of Council were encouraged to raise name cards when voting and use microphones when addressing Council. He encouraged faculty to contribute to future Media Briefs by informing F. Clarke of upcoming events, research, publications etc.

2. Minutes of the Meeting October 4, 2017
Professor L. Beagrie moved, seconded by Professor B. Pilkington, that the minutes of the October 4, 2017 meeting of Council be approved.

The motion carried.

3. Business Arising from the Minutes
There was no business arising from the minutes.

4. Faculty Input on the York University Strategic Research Plan
Professor J. Orbinski commenced his presentation by noting that all documents and questions were posted for review two weeks prior to this meeting. Faculty are being asked for input on the University Strategic Research Plan (SRP). This input will be sought in two phases. Today, Phase one, seeks faculty input on the existing Strategic Research Plan 2013-18, with comment on the existing Plan for the Intensification and Enhancement of Research (PIER) published in June 2016. In the winter term of 2018 Phase two will seek faculty input on the Draft Strategic Research Plan 2018-23 (not yet written).

He further explained that the following questions should be evaluated within the context of the broader University's planning process, which is in turn informed by the University's Strategic Mandate Agreement with the provincial government.

Professor J. Orbinski asked Council to comment on three questions:

1) Will the format of the current SRP continue to serve us well?
2) Should the identified areas of comprehensive research strength be adjusted? If so, how?

3) How should the University articulate research opportunities for the next 5 years?

In respect to the first question, “Will the format of the current SRP continue to serve us well?” Council provided the following feedback:

- Members noted that the SRP 2013-18 was created before the School of Engineering was officially launched, and when the Faculty of Health was only 5 years old.

- Members noted that strategies identified should continue to capture the comprehensive strengths and diversity of existing faculty research (including research topics, target populations and methodologies). Overall, the institution should continue to support the diverse strengths of faculty.

- The SRP should also acknowledge the integration of research into education. It should acknowledge that faculty supervise students who undertake different types of research activity under various degree options that can include research such as a major research paper, a capstone paper, original data collection, experimentation etc. These require different levels of time and intensity in terms of supervision by faculty. Additionally, students may be supervised for one to many years, and the type and intensity of supervision varies with the type of degree (i.e. a one or two year Masters’ Degree: professional or academic Masters degree). The work of supervision is intensive and should be realistically reflected in the next SRP. Secondly, the University needs to offer more targeted resources to support faculty who are supervising students across the range of degree types.

- Over the last 10 years the net amount of dollars to support research has decreased; however the demand on professors to support students through research funding has increased. Given the challenges of securing research funding and having the additional expectation of funding graduate students with secured research dollars, faculty asked that the University address how it can appropriately reconcile these challenges and expectations? It was recommended that the University adopt an appropriate strategy toward Tri—Council funding agencies (and other funding agencies) to address this challenge. It also recommended that the University consider increasing its support for faculty research and Research Chairs, so that this more appropriately addresses the identified challenges.

- Members noted that the SRP should identify the need for a specific strategy and resources for Research Services to support media relations so that faculty can respond more ably, and in a more timely manner to media requests, and continue to disseminate information to a wider audience.

- It was recommended that the SRP should also highlight creative professional activity and community or socially engaged scholarship, and that appropriate metrics be developed to fully capture these.

- In the arena of ‘support transition of research results into action’, members noted that the process is not linear and that greater care will be needed to accurately capture the nuances of the broad heading.

Relevant to the second question, “Should the areas of comprehensive research strength be adjusted? If so, how?”, Council members noted that:
Much greater detail is needed in the SRP to ensure clarity and understanding on the range of research activity taking place in the Faculty of Health. This is not simply clinical, but also primary, secondary and tertiary prevention. Research at the Faculty of Health also includes global health and its local implications; The School of Nursing and its PhD program; research into pedagogy and ways of learning; knowledge translation and research integration; health care and health systems; sex and gender based analysis, among other areas.

Members also noted the need for greater attention in the SRP to multi-method approaches to research.

Council members asked if all aspects of the SRP are being equally supported or are clinical/experimental aspects getting more support? Members stressed that non-clinical areas be acknowledged and be equally supported.

In respect to the third question, “How to articulate opportunities for the next 5 years?”, attendees suggested that:

- Greater detail should be provided such that the SRP captures full range of faculty research and interests.
- The identified areas of comprehensive research strengths lacked symbiosis and a relationship amongst the suggested headings.
- Future strategic research planning should expand on teaching releases to enable research. This has been successful.

Concluding his remarks, Professor J. Orbinski thanked faculty for their engagement and explained that comments will be shared with Vice-President Research & Innovation. Additionally, comments across the University will be fed into the Draft SRP 2018-23. Members were also encouraged to submit additional comments through the Vice-President Research & Innovation’s website.

5. Altmetrics for highlighting Academic Research

R. Nariani, Associate Librarian, presented “Altmetrics for highlighting Academic Research”. Altmetrics tracks various non-traditional platforms and records where a specific article/data-set has been mentioned.

R. Nariani noted that the academic community relies on various citations-based indices and may not have had an opportunity to measure that research was also being promoted in News media outlets and other social/non-traditional platforms.

He highlighted research which had garnered media attention and had been utilized in policy-based publications.

Concluding his remarks, R. Nariani noted that faculty could add a bookmarklet to their bookmark toolbar. The bookmarklet feature will highlight the Altmetric details associated with a publication.

Professor C. Ardern invited questions from the floor.

Members noted that Altmetrics is more likely to capture ‘news-worthy’ research and technical publications may not receive the same attention.

It was also noted that peer-reviewed and citation-based metrics continue to be valued in academia. However, Altmetrics could be mentioned when applying for grants to highlight societal impact.
Members pointed out that Open Access publications are accessible to all and thus may have higher citations compared to subscription-based articles.

In measuring scholarship productivity, non-traditional sources should not replace traditional metrics. Public engagement, although important, is not the only metric by which to measure output.

6. Motion to extend Council
Professor C. Ardern called for a motion to extend Council.

Professor L. Beagrie moved, seconded by Professor A. Belcastro, that the meeting be extended by 15 minutes.

The motion carried.

7. Senator’s Report
Professor C. Ardern called upon Senator M. Herbert to present the Senator’s Report.

Senator M. Herbert noted that the University received the largest CFI grant and that the institution has seen an increase in admission applications across all cohorts.

Concerns regarding security at the new Quad residence were raised as security is provided by a private firm. President Lenton confirmed that management of the Quad is working with York Security to ensure appropriate protocols are implemented and followed.

Senator M. Herbert highlighted that the Ministry of Advanced Education and Skill Development signed the Strategic Mandate Agreement II and she encouraged faculty members to be aware of related metrics such that the Faculty continues to promote its strengths.

She also noted that co-curricular days will be extended to 4 days. As of 2018, the Fall Reading Week will commence the day after Thanksgiving Monday.

Senator M. Herbert shared that the institution is expressing interest in exploring opportunities in the areas of Artificial Intelligence and STEM research.

She highlighted that Senate approved the establishment of a new field in Socio-Cultural and Policy Studies in Sport and Physical Activity in the Graduate Program in the School of Kinesiology and Health Science and Faculty of Graduate Studies.

She informed members that the Department of Psychology graduate stream in History and Theory of Psychology has been renamed to Historical, Theoretical and Critical Studies of Psychology.

Concluding her remarks, Senator M. Herbert stated that the Senate Academic Standards, Curriculum and Pedagogy Committee will be reviewing the Senate Policy on Sessional Dates and Scheduling of Examinations, specifically, Religious Observances.

Members were encouraged to review the October 26, 2017 Senate agenda package and synopsis, which is posted on the Senate website.

8. Other Business
Members noted that Council should discuss implementation of the recently amended Senate Policy on Academic Accommodation for Students with Disabilities at an upcoming Council meeting.
The meeting was adjourned.

2017-2018 Faculty of Health Council Meetings,
3:00pm – 4:30pm, Senate Chamber, N940 Ross Building:
Wednesday, December 6, 2017
Wednesday, January 10, 2018
Wednesday, February 7, 2018
Wednesday, March 7, 2018
Wednesday, April 4, 2018
Wednesday, May 2, 2018

_________________________________
R. Bishop, Secretary
ITEMS FOR ACTION:

1. Proposal to create a 3rd Panel (Panel C) to the Petitions Committee

The Committee requests the addition of a third adjudication panel (Panel C) on an ad hoc basis to expeditiously deal with overflow petitions during peak periods.

Panel C would be convened at the request of the Petitions Committee Chair. Panel membership would consist of 1) Associate Dean, Students, 2) one or both of Director, Student and Academic Services and Manager, Student Services.

Rationale: Panel C would provide for timely adjudication of overflow files during peak periods (mostly summer). This would serve to enhance student services by shortening peak period wait times and expeditiously solving more urgent cases. (From a retention and enrollment view, petitions related to academic decisions and honours standing are particularly important to adjudicate quickly so that students may make decisions in advance of the resumption of classes). As well, the creation of a Panel C would ease the burden for committee members during summer months when it can sometimes be more difficult to reach quorum.

Although unusual, this model is not without precedent on campus. The School of Arts, Media, Performance and Design also employs an overflow panel consisting of an AD and senior staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Committee Membership and Mandate</th>
<th>Proposed Committee Membership and Mandate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Petitions Committee shall receive and act upon student academic petitions and make recommendations on policy matters and procedures relating to student academic petitions. The Committee meets in panels for consideration of petitions and appeals against previous committee decisions.</td>
<td>The Petitions Committee shall receive and act upon student academic petitions and make recommendations on policy matters and procedures relating to student academic petitions. The Committee meets in panels for consideration of petitions and appeals against previous committee decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Petitions Committee shall consist of an associate dean (ex-officio), two members elected from each of the Faculty’s Schools/Departments, in addition to student members. There shall be two (2) at-large members.</td>
<td>The Petitions Committee shall consist of an associate dean (ex-officio), two members elected from each of the Faculty’s Schools/Departments, in addition to student members. There shall be two (2) at-large members.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A third panel may be convened at the request of the Petitions Committee Chair to deal with overflow petitions.
2. Proposal to request the creation of an Ad-Hoc Committee

The Executive and Planning Committee proposes to create an Ad-Hoc Committee on Graduate Affairs.

The Ad-Hoc Committee would assess the feasibility of adopting program specific responsibilities related to graduate studies and how the Faculty of Health could best incorporate graduate-related affairs within Health’s governance structure.

For guidance, the Committee may refer to the September 2016 IIRP Working Group: Revisioning Graduate Studies Report, as it works toward providing recommendations to Executive and Planning Committee in February 2018.

The Committee seeks broad representation. Graduate Program Directors and faculty teaching graduate courses are encouraged to serve.

Please email expressions of interest to Robert Bishop (rbishop@yorku.ca) by Wednesday, January 3, 2018.
Senator's report on the 639th meeting of Senate (Nov. 23, 2017)

1. Remarks from the President of York University Lenton focusing on the implementation of Institutional Integrated Resource Plan and local IRPs. Her personal priorities include enhancing York's reputation, supporting the University's vision, building strong communities, establishing the Markham Centre Campus as a city builder, and positioning Glendon. She also provided a status report on searches for the Vice-Provost Academic and Provost, Deputy Provost Markham, four Deans, and she mentioned consultations on the creation of a Vice-President Engagement and Equity portfolio.

2. The Senate approved revisions to the Senate's Common Grading Scheme for Undergraduate Faculties, the major element of the amendments being a change from the current 9-point letter scale to a 13-point one including minus grades. This will undergo further consultation before final approval is considered.

3. Vice-President Research and Innovation Robert Haché provided Senate with an annual report on research (accessible from the Senate website).

4. Information from the Committee for Academic Policy, Planning and Research (APPRC) regarding:
   - An updated report planned for January on the Institutional Integrated Research Plan,
   - A discussion of Markham Campus Planning at the APPRC meeting of Nov. 30, which should lead to a report made to Senate after.

5. Information from the Appeals Committee that efforts are underway to modernize the policy framework governing appeals.