UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO  
FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCE  

ARTS AND SCIENCE COUNCIL MEETING  

MINUTES OF THE ARTS AND SCIENCE COUNCIL held on Monday, March 9, 2015 at 3:00 p.m.  
in room 3130, Sidney Smith Hall

Present  
David Cameron (Dean)  
Deborah Robinson (Acting Secretary)  
Derek Allen (Chair)  
Mounir AbouHaidar  
Donald Ainslie  
Ben Akriig  
Sharon Bang  
Charly Bank  
Dwayne Benjamin  
Nadine Borduas  
Deborah Cowen  
Hilary Cunningham  
Uzoma Esonwanne  
Miquel Faiq  
Adam Fox  
Harry Fox  
Susan Froom  
Lloyd Gerson  
Elaine Gold  
Corey Goldman  
Rodney Haddow  
Peter Hurley  
Danièle Issa-Sayegh  

Anwar Kazimi  
Deborah Knott  
Helen Lasthiotakis  
Meng Lem  
Kim Luke  
Douglas Macdonald  
Geoff MacDonald  
Bill Magee  
Lanor Mallon  
Tirzah Meacham  
Theresa Moritz  
Teresa Nicoletti  
Mirella Pasquarelli-Clivio  
Ana Perez Leroux  

Call to Order  
The meeting was called to order at 3:15 p.m.

1. Approval of the minutes of the February 2, 2015 Arts & Science Council meeting

  Approved

2. Business arising

  There was no business arising.

3. Report from the Dean
Dean David Cameron explained that the CPAD meetings had been moved to the History conference room to see whether this venue fostered more discussion. The Dean asked Council if they preferred a smaller conference room setting or the Governing Council Chamber. A member stated that although the conference room is more informal, it would be too small if guests were invited to the meeting. A show of hands demonstrated that members preferred the Governing Council Chamber.

4. Approval of proposed graduate major modifications

Dean Cameron explained that the Department of Economics is proposing to introduce a second option into their M.A. program for students whose undergraduate preparation does not fully meet the demands of the required courses of the theory-based PhD sequences needed to complete the program. The Department’s decision to introduce this new option primarily reflects the shift in economics research, which now places more emphasis on empirical analysis over theory. The addition of this option will address the change in practice in the discipline, while still allowing students who wish to pursue theory as a focus at the PhD level the opportunity to do so.

**MOTION**

THAT the proposed changes to M.A. program in the Department of Economics as described in the attached proposal, be approved effective for the academic year 2015-16.

The motion was moved and seconded and the floor was opened to discussion of which there was none. On the vote the motion was CARRIED.

The Department of History is introducing a Combined JD/MA Program with the Faculty of Law to provide students with an integrated interdisciplinary experience leading to both degrees. This program will further develop the already existing relationship between the two units.

**MOTION**

THAT the proposed new Combined Program, JD/M.A. in History, as described in the attached proposal, be approved effective for the academic year 2015-16.

The motion was moved and seconded and the floor was opened to discussion of which there was none. On the vote the motion was CARRIED.

The proposal from the Department of History is the result of a revision of the fields within the PhD program which have been the same for 30 years. The revisions are an attempt to better reflect the current disciplines as taught by the faculty members and to address both faculty and student demands. The new structure will see the closure of four fields and the introduction of fields that will fit into two main field structures: 1. Time/Geography and 2. Thematic.

**MOTION**
THAT the proposed changes to the M.A. and Ph.D. programs in the Department of History, as described in the attached proposal, be approved effective for the academic year 2015-16.

The motion was moved and seconded and the floor was opened to discussion of which there was none. On the vote the motion was CARRIED.

The Department of Spanish & Portuguese is proposing to the close two of three graduate fields: Spanish Peninsular Literature and Latin American Literature and proposes to create a new field. The Department is introducing a new field in Hispanic Literature and Cultures to better align it with their linguistic field: Hispanic Linguistics.

MOTION
THAT the proposed changes to the M.A. and Ph.D. programs in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese, as described in the attached proposal, be approved effective for the academic year 2015-16.

The motion was moved and seconded and the floor was opened to discussion of which there was none. On the vote the motion was CARRIED.

5. Unit name change, Department of Art

The change from the Department of Art to the Department of the History of Art was deemed necessary because of the confusion in applicants’ minds as to whether this was a studio program or history of art program. The Visual Studies programs have been transferred to the John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design which means the name change will better align the department with its current disciplinary focus.

MOTION
THAT the change in name from the Department of Art to the Department of the History of Art, be approved effective immediately pending approval of University governance.

The motion was moved and seconded and the floor was opened to discussion.

A member asked whether there was a difference between “History of Art” and “Art History.” Professor Elizabeth Legge replied that members of the department voted nine to four in favour of History of Art and consultation with students showed they were also in favour of this name. It was felt that “history” needed to be emphasized.

On the vote the motion was CARRIED.

6. Minor graduate modifications

A report of minor graduate modifications approved at the February 12, 2015 Graduate Curriculum Committee was posted with the meeting agenda. This item is being reported to Council for information.
7. **Arts & Science Council Constitution and By-Laws update**

Professor Donald Ainslie, Chair of the Working Group on the Arts & Science Council Constitution and By-Laws, explained that the updates had been undertaken for two reasons:

1. Governing Council wants to bring all Councils under a similar structure.
2. Introduction of the UTQAP process has resulted in some required updates.

There was not a desire to undertake a full constitutional review but instead to update the Constitution in light of these two considerations. In the course of the update, it became apparent that some items were very difficult to transfer to the new framework which will result in one substantive change and the consideration of another.

Constitutional changes must ultimately be approved by Governing Council and changes to by-laws are approved finally by Arts & Science Council. The current Constitution requires that the intention to make amendments requires the notice of 10 clear working days before the meeting. The vote on the amendment must take place at a regularly scheduled meeting and at least 2/3 of those present would have to vote affirmatively. The plan today is to discuss the proposed changes and take any feedback to the Working Group for any further changes that might be required. Under the current by-laws, any intention to amend to the rules of procedure must be posted in the agenda of the prior regular meeting.

A member asked if the intention of the University is to put everyone into a “one fits all” constitution. Professor Ainslie replied no, that Governing Council has a template to make sure all necessary areas are covered and includes recommended language. Each Council would adapt the template to suit them.

Professor Derek Allen informed Council that we would move through the Constitution and by-laws section by section and ask if there are any questions or comments. Substantive items would be discussed separately. A member asked if it is possible to discuss current items in the Constitution. Professor Ainslie replied that the intention is not to do a revision to the Constitution but there can still be discussions if needed.

Questions and comments arose in the following sections of the draft Constitution Update:

- **Section II-5:** Members asked for clarification of the addition of “post-secondary diploma or certificate”. Professor Ainslie replied that this is language from the template and that Governing Council recommended that be included so that if they are created in the future, they would already be in the Constitution.
- **Section VII-3:** A member asked what percentage of the total membership is 25? Professor Ainslie agreed that normally quorum is a percentage of the membership but since it is listed as 25 in the current Constitution and this is an update and not a review, it is being left as is.

Questions and comments arose in the following sections of the draft By-Laws Update:
Section V.4.4: A member saw this section as being vague, who decides if an item is so urgent that Council members could not be contacted to make a decision. Professor Ainslie explained that the current by-laws describe the Agenda Committee as having the power to act as an Executive Committee. This would be for situations that come up in the summer when Council does not have regular meetings. Helen Lastiotakis explained that this is the standard for Governing Council but it would be very rare for such a thing to occur as it is preferable for items to come to Council. Professor Ainslie stated that it is possible for Council to change the decision made by the Executive Committee.

Professor Ainslie spoke to the proposed substantive change in Section V.8.2 of the draft By-Laws Update. This request came from the current Academic Appeals Board members. It has become a challenge to ensure there is an undergraduate student available for the meeting. The change would allow for more flexibility in making sure a student is always available and ensure the Board operates more successfully.

A member expressed their concern for a situation where two students would be selected at the start of the year and a few months later the third student is contacted and asked to start attend meetings. This might be a challenge for the student. It might be a better idea to just add a third student position on the Board. This would ensure that all the students are participating and have an ongoing relationship with the Board. Professor Ainslie stated that he would consult with Professor Adrienne Hood, Acting Associate Dean, Undergraduate.

It was agreed that a substantive item should be introduced that states the Executive Committee must report its decisions to Council.

Professor Ainslie explained that Section IX-9 of the Constitution provides for the views of the entire teaching staff of the Faculty to be solicited through a referendum. This is an unusual provision in divisional councils and it is not very well worded. Further, it speaks only to the teaching staff and does not include administrative and technical staff and students who are also voting members of Council. There are also no restrictions on what the referendum could discuss which could potentially result on a binding decision on things that are outside of Council’s power, which would violate the U of T Act.

The Working Group proposed two options on how this can be handled:
1. Delete the final two sentences of the current section, thus eliminating the “binding” element of any referendum as being “out of order.”
2. Delete the entire section as addressing only one constituency of the Faculty, as there is nothing standing in the way of Council seeking the opinion of any group on matters within its delegated authority.

A member asked if there has ever been a referendum. Professor Ainslie replied that there has not been one under this current Constitution. Prior to this Constitution there was a General Committee which was composed of all faculty members and was required to meet one a year. It was a very broken process which ultimately resulted in a review and the current Constitution in the mid-2000s.
A member asked for clarification on the definition of teaching staff. It was recommended that the Working Group seek advice on whether the new ranks should be included in the update.

A member stated the referendum could be viewed as a tool. If there was a divisive issue that Council was uncomfortable making a decision on, they could go to the Faculty at large and check in with the opinions. It seems we should think about why it was put in there to begin with. Professor Rodney Haddow, a member of the Working Group, stated that they had considered the referendum being used as a tool. There is a fundamental incoherence in the current section. Even if it was re-drafted to be clearer it could only be used to adjust the decisions within the remit of this Council, and it would be charging only one particular constituency with that right. A re-written version would still be giving faculty members the right to overturn decisions made by this Council instead of having a broader consultative process that would involve the other constituencies. It is always a good idea to have fail-safe mechanism but it would have to be very complex. Professor Ainslie stated that if there ever was an issue that Council wanted to get people’s opinions on, there is nothing stopping it from doing so through a poll. This section seems to speak to the former General Committee format.

A member asked if a lawyer would look at the Constitution to ensure it is legal. Professor Ainslie and Anwar Kazimi from the Office of the Governing Council confirmed that the templates had been reviewed by legal counsel.

Dean Cameron stated that the University has many ways in which opinion can be brought to the attention of those who make decision. There is scope through the normal channels and processes for people to express their views to Council without the formal mechanism of a referendum which only relates to one constituency.

A member stated that the current provision allows for decision making rather than consultation which are two separate things. Professor Ainslie stated that Governing Council advised that the current provision is inconsistent with the U of T Act. We are required to remove “binding” which then leaves the referendum as something that seeks opinions.

Professor Allen called for a vote on how Council would like to proceed. The vote indicated that members wished to strike section IX-9 from the draft Constitution Update.

8. Notice of Motion for the April 17, 2015 meeting.

THAT the proposed changes to the Rules of Procedure in the By-Laws of Council, as described in the proposed Draft Council By-Laws, be approved.

9. Any other business
A member asked for an update on strike negotiations. Dean Cameron replied that he was not on the bargaining team and could not provide much information. He was not aware of any discussions currently taking place. A member asked if the Dean could send a message to both parties on behalf Council that they would like to see the discussions begin again. A straw vote was taken with a majority in support of Dean Cameron delivering the following message, “Arts & Science Council would encourage the two parties to be talking again.”

10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.