



# AGENDA of the 5th Meeting of the General Council

Claude T. Bissell Building, Room 705A  
12 December, 2018 | 6pm

## Attendance

### Executive Committee

Jamie Duncan, Co-President  
Emma Findlay-White, Co-President  
Matthew Innes, VP Finance  
Bronwyn Nisbet-Gray, VP Operations  
Jason Cheung, VP Communications  
Patty Facy, Executive VP

### Academic Affairs

Hugh Samson, Upper Year  
Gaurav Bamezai, First Year

### Social Committee

Christina Bondi, Co-Chair  
Ciara O'Kelly, Co-Chair

### Professional Development

Ritchie Singh, Upper Year  
Rebecca Jeong, First Year

### MISC-MUSSA Liaison

Evelyn Feldman

### Tech-Fund

Hussein Hashi, Upper Year  
Rooney Lee, First Year

### GSU

Nicholas Lindsay-Lewis

### Faculty Council

Danielle Crecca  
Susan Bond  
Stephanie Anagnostou  
Allen Kwan  
Andrew Micak  
Erin Ruth  
Calvin Won  
Rumman Ferdous  
Jason Battencarew  
McKinsey Manes  
Manda Vrkljan  
Rida Idrees  
Meagan Lau

### Mental Health Working Group

Marta Cooper Burt  
Robyn Forman

# AGENDA

## 1. Call to Order

*The meeting is called to order at 10:01 PM*

## 2. Land Acknowledgement

## 3. Approval of Agenda

### MOTION

MOVED: Manda                      SECONDED: Calvin

**Be it resolved that the agenda be approved as presented.**

**CARRIED/FAILED**

## 4. Approval of Minutes

### MOTION

MOVED:                                      SECONDED:

**Be it resolved that the minutes of the last meeting be approved as presented.**

**CARRIED/FAILED**

**Tabled to Jan meeting - Nov + Dec meetings to be presented together**

## 5. Discussion on Bissell Building Washrooms (10 min.)

**Guest: Chief Administrative Officer Glenn Cumming**

**Glenn:** last spring students surveyed and asked to comment on condition of Bissell facilities. Lot of feedback saying that washrooms to a degree were insufficient amongst other things, 2017-2018 year was difficult year for building. growth in enrolment. New elevators. Lots of pressure on building.

One thing that came through was that women in particular were not sufficient to serve demand, problems with using washroom between classes. wants to get a sense from us to know what we could/should do. what have done is refresh washrooms over past couple of years. admits things are not perfect but they are in good condition now compared to years ago. there are plans to revitalize the entire building - would probably be done in stages. Will take time and money to do this, in the meantime wants to know about how current state of washrooms can be improved. New this year is universal washroom on 4th floor - cost a lot of money [did not give numbers]. Approached by 2-3 MI students who identified as LGBTQ who stated that they had to leave the building in order to use washrooms before installation of universal washrooms. Also converted 3rd and 6th floor men's washrooms to universal washrooms. Wants to listen to see if we have feedback at this time. Is all ears. Washrooms or other building topics. gave UX studio (116) as example of a "prototype" to what can be done to the building over time.

**Emma:** We've spoken at length about washrooms and building wayfinding. want to say that i recognize signs are being put up next to washrooms giving alternate options throughout the building, Also whoever put wayfinding on 6th floor, that is helpful.

**Matthew:** That was Colin (Fergusson?) who did signs.

**Glenn:** launching project in Jan to fabricate and install signs to improve wayfinding around the building. Acknowledge that way finding in building is like you need a "Trail of breadcrumbs" to find your way around. Also will be discussing how we can improve exterior wayfinding as well. reports from UTL say that students walk around in the library trying to find Bissell building. Looking at ways to intuitively use tools to direct people from the library or Fisher through the breezeway over to us. We have major shortcomings in our building.

**Jamie:** wants to encourage people to share ideas if we have them, even if we don't have anything to say right now. On issue of inclusion, perhaps this can be raised or suggested to Diversity and Inclusion committee. Raised something seen on social media about placing pieces of paper over toilet sensors.

**G:** note on inclusion - we've asked Christina Park to work with us on exercise of trying to direct people through breezeway into our building. Looking at a variety of alternatives.

**Stephanie:** related to numbers - are there numbers on washroom traffic per each floor? For example basement washroom is huge, does it service traffic?

**Glenn:** revitalized building will have main floor (basement) entrance as main entrance. Will come in through what is now room 112/113. it would mean in

future this washroom will be a main floor washroom. If someone comes to a job interview or to talk to prof or to apply for RA, if they can find us in the building, that is good. The building has cool things to it to. No angles in the building are 90 degrees. Some love it some hate it. but washrooms and capacity of building right now is a problem. have tried to solve this with signage directing people to washrooms on other floors in cases of too much traffic. Possible issue of security for women - some people don't feel comfortable being alone in Bissell basement

**Emma:** has anyone here experienced between-class rush time in washrooms? anyone notice?

**Erin:** yes. don't notice it as much this term but last year if you had a class on other floors where class is in session, sometimes break time would overlap and that would cause lineups.

**Glenn:** what do you think if we installed light sensors

**Jamie:** 4th floor shuts lights off on you - something to keep in mind should be that sensors should be sensitive to movement

**Manda:** was in washroom and lights turned off. could not get them to turn them back on with movement.

**Jason:** automatic doors with washroom are so slow. wish there were more bathrooms on 4th floor because a lot of people spend time there [ in the inforum]

**Glenn:** struggled with where to put universal washrooms. looked at 4th floor as being halfway in the building. knew there would be even more traffic on 5th floor because of classrooms. and 3rd floor because of makerspace, classrooms. that's how we ended up on 4. realized it wasn't perfect solution, but there are no perfect solutions. Foresee many more universal washrooms being installed over next while.

**Jason:** is it possible to make doors optional to open automatically? only if needed?

**Glenn:** there are code requirements, very specific about universal washrooms. very complex and so many bells and whistles to design of those washrooms.

**Emma:** does anyone else have bathroom stories/recommendations? Also have experienced sensor lights shut off.

**Glenn:** Surveys made it seem like 5th floor was most troubled by washroom overcrowding.

**Emma:** have classes on 5th floor and don't notice lineups as much as 3rd floor.

**Glenn:** don't want to take up all our time but wants to say that if they want to talk about anything in the building, come see Glenn on the 2nd floor to talk.

**Gaurav:** for issue of directions from robarts in the building. have you considered collaborating with UX students?

**Glenn:** yes - we are talking to design student Christina Park. Has something on the 5th floor that he would like to discuss with UX students/Olivier. Not sure how complicated this would be, it's a hardware/software problem. Starting to lean heavily on student capability. People are looking for practicums and coop assignments, and we have a lot of challenges in the building that could translate to this. Funny we are information school but our building has a long way to go in terms of being a role model. Suggested that Gaurav come to talk to him about it.

**Emma:** to wrap up, emma will give us Glenn's email if we want to contact him.

## 6. Discussion on Faculty Council Constitution Amendments (25 min.)

**Guest: Associate Registrar Colin Anderson**

**Colin:** hi. thank you for having me. not sure how much you have all heard or seen discussions so far about faculty constitution and bylaw amendments coming forward this year. purpose for being here tonight is to gauge our feedback on this so far. generally these things are only revised twice a decade. not often. taking this opportunity this year with some revisions needed for incoming bachelor, and other areas as needed. to get started what is the level of knowledge about what our constitution entails? have you talked about this as a council yet?

**Emma:** with FC reps yes - not with all general council members

**Colin:** rules for how faculty council is conducted [missed parts]. certain things are missing from our framework that we need by the time next year's UG students come into the program. in particular 2 things: 1, R&A committee for UGs; 2, appeals committee for UG students. totally different framework for undergrad students. to complicate matters we had a proposed draft ready for faculty community over the summer. more info on how these things are modified: we do consultation (what we are in right now), then will send out proposal that's in more or less final form to provostial advisory group (central body at U of T). they give us feedback that they like and do not like or think we should change to fall in line with U of T act and other legal responsibilities.

then comes back to us and we make revisions. then January comes to faculty council. then 2 more months to consult and debate and talk about it. then finally goes to vote at march faculty council meeting. after that it still needs to go to governing council at U of T. long complicated process. to add more confusion - when we sent our initial ideas for what we wanted to the provost office for initial feedback, they came back and said in 2013 U of T moved to new constitution template that changed a lot of wording, location of info, document structure etc. for that reason we didn't want to come forward with totally new document nobody is used to, then asking people to vote. so we have delayed this and are now talking about it in great detail with as many constituencies as we can. here tonight to open convo to see how we want to be consulted over next month or so, what we want to see, and maybe more of nitty gritty about what could be controversial part of const. revisions which would be way we quantify membership on new council. one change between templates is old template is very formulaic, gives formula for how students are elected to council. new template asks us to name a fixed number of template. wants to state that as FC chair he has no agenda coming to us on this. just wants UG stuff to pass in Jan. wants to avoid having debate over this at the March council meeting. at this point everything in document is wide open for debate/discussion. [Brought printout of membership of council stuff in new constitution]. Brought printout of most controversial part of constitution - membership of council numbers.

**Emma:** when can we have a full document?

**Colin:** by holiday season. can distribute to Jamie/Emma to then further distribute.

**Emma:** sounds good.

**Colin:** wants us to know that comprehensive project has been carried out about constitutions and councils across u of t. of 20 or so faculty councils in the university, faculty of information has one of the largest numbers of student reps. Feels that pressure to make number smaller

**Jamie:** reason why our representation is so large on council is because of the size of the program. size of program is fine - can increase size of program while offering more to students. but reason we have so much representation is because of how much of a growth phase we're going through. which is fine but as someone like me who is representing 600 or so students, that we can still maintain quality. you haven't shown signs of not maintaining quality but the reason for size is because we are in the midst of giant growth period.

**Erin:** point of clarification. seem to be suggesting that the number is being changed because of this template. however if i remember correctly at oct

meeting in draft presented them, there was a number that was already in there before getting feedback.

**Emma:** we had spoken prior to this with Colin

**Erin:** wants to clarify whether reduced number is because of provost or because of FOI decision?

**Colin:** this feedback was given end of summer

**Emma:** taking chair hat off for a moment. a lot of issue with having large FC is difficulty in reaching quorum. has been mentioned that this is because of students in several meetings.

**Colin:** to be clear that is not an issue of student representation. wants to make clear that we are not accusing students of being cause for not reaching quorum on FC. one thing we are thinking of doing is reducing number of teaching staff on council as well because we of vast majority of UTM and UTSC teaching staff. something to notice is that student reps are only elected reps on council. everyone else is appointed. that's not necessarily unusual but something to take note of. perhaps utsc and utm teaching staff who technically don't fall under line 1 - all teaching staff - because they don't have primary appointments, only grad appointments, thinking of suggesting is that those UTM and UTSC profs become their own category of membership. perhaps several of them and perhaps selected.

**Erin:** would be useful to have this. think it's at the point where if everyone (faculty-wise) can go, then people will not go assuming that others will.

**Matthew:** with elected responsibility, then you have to hold people accountable.

**Alvin:** [???

**Colin:** follow Sturgis rules of order, so not allowed.

**Emma:** what about proxying?

**Colin:** Also not allowed, because of Sturgis rules of order

**Jamie:** clarification on membership for utsc and utm. more and more doctoral students here will be affiliated with satellite campuses. to what extent is support for or will to make these profs feel more included in our community? esp. if they will be integral to teaching at the school? for BI students too.

**Colin:** for sure a question for the dean. sensitivity too. we want them to feel included. it's essentially pro bono work - out of their research and pedagogical

interest. to be clear most if maybe not all have no budgetary appointments. work they do with us is purely out of interest in research, teaching, furthering knowledge. they don't owe us committee involvement, administration... so it's hard to get people to partake in council. at the same time we don't want them to feel like second-class teaching staff.

**Andrew:** will BI have concentrations like grad program?

**Colin:** not yet. could probably grow into number of diff majors, or major and minor options, but no plan at this time.

**Andrew:** feeding into satellite campus convo: what about having part-time student representation?

**COLIN:** initially was stipulation for international students, part time students, etc... but more specific we are with this, more it constrains electoral process for misc. would urge us not to be too prescriptive. if we as misc wanted to specify part time or international student, then we are free to do so.

**Jamie:** would suggest 'whereas' clause - so that if we can't find international student, or certain concentrations

**Colin:** in fact could see requirement for 1 student from each concentration to be constraining.

**Emma:** mixed messages. felt that it was good for council to decide each year how to do it

**matthew:** so it would basically be one student per concentration - doesn't necessarily have to be in a concentration

**Colin:** yes for example if there was a new concentration then one more student. Also call attention to idea to make student council presidents a ex-officio members on top of other student representation. on one hand it gets you extra representation.

**Emma:** historically one FC rep has always

**Jamie:** emma has set precedent this year for president as organizational force. organizer for leadership.

**Emma:** yes and have found that it's useful to get most out of faculty council meetings. there are some that have been there for years, some for not as long. would be good to have someone to get people together before meetings too.

**Robyn:** advantage to one student per concentration for MISC membership too. was also thinking what about spots for academic affairs misc, mrac person, PD person, etc... what if they had specific roles within faculty council?



**Colin:** that's a possibility. one issue i could see with that is that then forces you as MISC to have those roles without changing them year after year, until constitution is modified again,. keep in mind anything in the constitution cannot change then until the next revision.

**jamie:** this could be a conversation that could happen with MISC but inclination to keep things flexible is good.

**Colin:** can also change from being elected student positions to appointed positions within council. then we would have ability to send whoever we wanted to to council. depending on roles we come up with. elected specifies you have to elect them

**Robyn:** q in relation to that - because no proxies allowed to sit in for other FC council rep, would appointed mechanism allow this to happen? Thinks it would be great to have mechanism in place for proxying.

**Colin:** interesting point. proxy voting is not necessarily forbidden. how it works is our bylaws specify that Sturgis parliamentary rules dictate our council unless we specify a rule otherwise. that would go into the bylaws. could be something to ask for. interesting idea.

**Emma:** and it would probably be useful for faculty and admin staff.

**Colin:** should talk more about this though. proxy voting also has associated risks. especially with contentious issues. we want to be careful that whatever rules we adopt, will avoid misuse of rule. if someone comes into room with 25 proxy votes and dictates meetings, that's a problem,

**Emma:** was thinking more one proxy vote to one person

**Colin:** would need to specify this then.

**Alvin:** remote participation?

**Colin:** not recommended because of current technology capability and size of council. problems with being part of conversation. logistical challenge. we do it in committees because they are smaller - 5,6,8 people... more challenging with room of 100 people

**Emma:** how many eligible voters on FC?

**Colin:** 97.

**Emma:** will this be reduced? ideal number?

**Colin:** good question. varies widely cross campus. governing council at u of t has 50. engineering as over 400. absurd in my opinion. Our quorum is 33% of voting members. varies widely and no ideal number necessarily. probably the average is

between 50-100, so not too far off. Artsci has 65. also entirely 100% elected. many different ways to do this.

**Nicholas:** clarification on voting member numbers. what would number be next year.

**matthew:** 8 total

**Colin:** also should include GPO

**Jamie:** there are 8 concentrations + GPO. 9 total.

**Emma:** q from students - what about diploma of info studies - do they count as part of FC?

**Colin:** not now because current representation is worded as being people from degree programs

**Andrew:** what about TAs?

**Colin:** considered students. almost all TAs are PhD students.

**Alvin:** do phds who teach qualify as teaching staff?

**Colin:** no. teaching staff definition is very restrictive. 50% or greater appt within faculty who hold specific professor ranks. does not include sessionals. sessionals fall under other academic appointees.

**Alvin:** so social work profs don't qualify

**Colin:** yes and complicated. i.e. we have a prof who is 49% appointed with us. so that particular prof cannot qualify as a member of our teaching staff. which is not abnormal. instead she is on social work council.

**Manda:** what is current membership for MMST and PhD? Are any of those formula based?

**Evelyn:** MMST went up to 3 students this year

**Manda:** so what is highest number of MI reps on FC?

**Jamie:** this year - 18 this year.

**Colin:** reduction 30% or so - [in response to Nicholas' question] 55 teaching staff.

**Erin:** MI is only program with representation tied to concentrations. why are no other student programs like this?

**Colin:** correct... and in part due to fact that concentrations are not in other programs

**Erin:** thinking in future to make sure all of student body is represented in the future. e.g. what about years where 2 or 3 concentrations have the majority of MI students? what about issues of prop representation?

**Jamie:** having spots tied to number of concentrations and not specific concentrations is in our interest. having that stipulation in there at least lets us maintain at least a bit of proportional representation. would be included to have FC constitution loose so that we can specify in ours

**Erin:** clarification about how MMST works. What about PhDs who have concentrations.

**Colin:** PhD is unique. there are concentrations but they are not the same as MI concentrations because every PhD program is different. course of study is unique. you customize your study based on program, interests, supervisor etc. every program is different. if you read phd requirements that they are very loose. more or less define which methods course you should take. lots of flexibility. so it doesn't function the same way as MI concentrations.

**Alvin:** no other mechanisms to implement to better address proportional representation?

**Colin:** if anyone has ideas then please do suggest them. no other faculty uses formulas. may be an indication that governing council doesn't want us to be using them

**Nicholas:** Point of clar. numbers/percentage of student body voting for elected representatives

**Jamie:** numbers are not good. Would have had a better year this year if we didn't have admin problems that barred people from voting. [did not give number]

**matthew:** and we did actually get people to run for positions this year. last year not the same. last year i volunteered to come into my position

**Nicholas:** should amend our and FC constitution to protect MI representation on the council.

**Emma:** last minute question or thoughts anyone?

**Nicholas:** clarifying scheduling. this would be approved by sept?

**Colin:** yes. hoping to get full next draft of this doc out to wider community before holidays. if at all possible, if we have any formalized response to come back in very early january that would be helpful. because would like january to be time for provostial body to review. first week of january ideal. would help to be able to go to provost with informal draft to ask for advice. then will have at FC at end of Jan FC meeting. by that point wants to have a potential common ground on what we want

this to look like. month of Jan we have for sure to hash things out. will present to FOI at this point, then go on public record, will have 2 months to debate more. then end of march can come to a vote.

**Emma:** no further questions thank you colin

**Colin:** my door is always open, please feel free to come forward and let me know thoughts.

## **7. Break (10 min.) 7:10-7:20 pm**

## **8. Executive Reports (10 min.)**

### **MOTION**

MOVED: **Jason C.**                      SECONDED: **Jason B.**

**Be it resolved that the following be approved as presented:**

1. Report of the Presidents - below
2. Report of the EVP - none
3. Report of the VP-Operations - none
4. Report of the VP-Communications - below
5. Report of the VP-Finance - in drive

**CARRIED/FAILED**

## **9. Officer & Representative Reports (15 min.)**

### **MOTION**

MOVED: **Matthew**                      SECONDED: **Manda**

**Be it resolved that the following be approved as presented:**

1. Report of Social Committee - below
2. Report of Academic Affairs - in drive
3. Report of Professional Development - none
4. Mental Health Working Group - none

5. MISC-MUSSA Liaison - below
6. Graduate Students' Union - report will come in January

verbal report: MUSSA

- Student blog
- Dean duff came to last meeting to talk about Inforum
- 2 big social events: xmas party tomorrow night, panel in Feb which was done last year too, with museum professionals. Aligns with MMST 50
- Merchandise sales going well
- Early November field trip went all

verbal report: presidents

- Working on merchandise. hoodies in progress. about 20-25\$ off hoodies
- Meeting with steph rose re: survey, very supportive
- Wanting to plan retreat over feb reading week. overnight stay, activities and fun. booking that over winter break probably
- Update on Jude Park - brought forward to GSU, unanimously voted in favour of supporting Jude, working with GSU exec and Kelly Lyons to get letter going to Acting Dean of SGS

verbal report: VP comms

- Sent out information/invites for signing up for google calendar
- Waiting on a version of our mission statement to have ready for student review

verbal report: social committee

- Potluck took place this past sunday. nice relaxing event. MUSSA pub night something to look into for next term. possibility for january for sure
- Also thinking of doing an outdoorsy winter activity. maybe skating?
- February: helping out with itea for valentine's day event. will probably have cookie decorating, "speed friending" mingling event
- Thinking ahead to formal/semi-formal event in April: thinking of doing it at the Faculty club, but more research needed
  - Emma noted we have ~400 in credit to use toward faculty club
- Size of social committee right now is good

verbal report: GSU

- Internal commissioner position vacated. Discussion took place in camera. More detailed summary to come in January. EAL is acting IC in the meantime.
- AGM occurred.

**CARRIED/FAILED**

## **10. Inforum Yoga Sponsorship (10 min.)**

**MOTION**

MOVED:

SECONDED:

**Be it resolved that the MISC General Council approve a financial sponsorship of \$250 for weekly yoga sessions in the Inforum.**

**CARRIED/FAILED**

**Tabled - exec meeting to be called for this**

## **11. Mission Statement (25 min.)**

## **12. Other Business and Discussions**

- Headshots upcoming next term
- Jason: asked if we have a part time working group chair. No we don't. they haven't chosen to make it a thing. Chair is currently vacant until PT students choose to.

## **13. Adjournment**

**MOTION**

MOVED:

SECONDED:

**Be it resolved that meeting be adjourned.**

**CARRIED/FAILED**

*The meeting is adjourned at::*

Patty left at 8pm. Meeting was adjourned at 8pm (I think?) after reports approved, and yoga discussion ensued after. Not sure if mission statement discussion took place after. Sent this document for someone else to note when meeting officially ended or who moved/seconded but no one noted.





