



COUNCIL OF THE FACULTY OF SCIENCE

Notice of Meeting

Tuesday, 10 November 2015

3:00pm – 4:30pm

306 Lumbers

Agenda

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda
2. Chair's Remarks
3. Approval of Minutes from October 13, 2015 meeting
4. Business Arising
5. Dean's Remarks
6. Associate Dean's and Bethune College Master's Remarks
7. Reports from Science Representatives on Senate Committees
8. Reports from Committees
 - 8.1 Executive Committee: 2015-2016 Vacancies Report on Senate and FSc Committees (item for action)
 - 8.2 Science Curriculum Committee (consent item)
9. Inquiries and Communications
 - 9.1 Senate Synopsis: 619th Meeting of Senate: October 22, 2015
10. Other Business
 - 10.1 Presentation: Provost Rhonda Lenton & Vice-President Gary Brewer: Sharp Budget Model and Institutional Integrated Resource Plan
 - 10.2 University Academic Plan 2015-2020 Consultation



COUNCIL OF THE FACULTY OF SCIENCE

Tuesday, 13 October 2015

3:30pm – 4:30pm

306 Lumbers

Minutes

Attendance: J. Amanatides, P. Cribb, E.J. Janse van Rensburg, W. Taylor, P. Delaney, D. Hastie, S. Morin, J. M. Heffernan, J. Steprans, R. Thai, P. Lakin-Thomas, Rajiv Nariani, Erica Shligold, Justice Obiahuha, Mitali Adhvaryu, Bastiaa Aiteeneyas, Zubin Chaudhary, P. Wilson, M. Zabrocki, T. Kelly, D. J. Wilson, M. Zabrocki, V. Tsoukanova (Chair), J. Sequeira (Recording Secretary)

Guests: S. Pinto, B. Sheeler

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda

The Chair of Council, Prof. Valeria Tsoukanova, called the meeting to order. Due to lack of quorum, the adoption of the Agenda was deferred.

2. Chair's Remarks

The Chair of Council, Dr. Tsoukanova welcomed Council members to the meeting and informed

members that since Dean Jayawardhan was away, AD – EJ Janse van Rensburg would present the Dean's report to Council.

3. Dean's report to Council

AD – EJ Janse van Rensburg provided the following report on behalf of Dean Jayawardhana:

- He congratulated Distinguished Research Professor Emeritus Barry Lever (Chemistry) elected Fellow of The Royal Society of Canada for his research and developments on physical and inorganic chemistry, which includes establishing an important synergism between electrochemistry and spectroscopy.
 - The Science of Science Fiction series with the Toronto Public Library kicked off with Juris Steprans (Mathematics & Statistics) at the Lillian H. Smith on September 22. The talk was well attend and was followed by a lively discussion. The next talk will be given by Michael Jenkin, titled 'I, For One, Welcome Our New Robot Overload' and is scheduled for October 20, 2015.
 - Derek Wilson (Chemistry) hosted the Mass Spectrometry Enabled Science and Engineering (MS-ESE) program's first Academic and Industry Workshops for graduate students, which gave them an understanding of mass spectrometry oriented research in both academia and industry.
 - The Faculty of Science, along with Lassonde School of Engineering, became a Founding Member of Nano Ontario.
 - Gino Lavoie (Chemistry) hosted an ACS event on Campus which was attended by over 115 people from FSc, Lassonde and Faculty of Health.
 - Special thanks went out to all the Students, Faculty and staff who volunteered at the Ontario Universities Fair from September 25 - 27, 2015.
 - The Astronomy Club at York University in conjunction with the York University Astronomical Observatory planned Luna Palooza to celebrate the eclipse on evening of Sunday, September 27 2015. Even though the weather conditions were not the best, the mood in the stadium was festive and everyone had a great time.
 - The second annual Science Literacy Week took place September 21 - 27 at institutions across Canada. At York, three events were organized by York University Libraries in collaboration with a number of groups both on- and off-campus.
 - The International Conference on Analysis, Applications and Computations: In Memory of Lee Lorch, 1915 – 2014 was held at the Fields Institute. September 28-30 more than 30 attendees came together to not only gain knowledge on a broad range of topics, but also celebrated Lee Lorch's mathematical contributions in classical analysis in general and special functions which coincided with his 100th birthday anniversary. The conference was organized by Mathematics & Statistics members: Man Wah Wong (chair), Martin Muldoon, and Jianhong Wu.
- The following FSc members were featured in the media:
- Dean Jayawardhana was on CBC morning that day commenting about the Nobel Prize in Physics for 2015.
 - John McDermott (Biology) was interviewed by the Toronto Star for his recent findings on the possible benefits of beta-blockers post heart attack.

- Laurence Packer (Biology) was interviewed by Today FM (Dublin, Ireland radio station) to talk about bees.
- Luna Palooza was mentioned on the CBC, as well Paul Delaney (Physics & Astronomy), Jesse Rogerson (working with Patrick Hall – Physics & Astronomy), Jen Zomederis, and Sophia Nasr were interviewed with Radio Canada International, CBC (separate article), Daily Planet, Global News TV, and York Region for the total lunar eclipse.
- NASA’s announcement - that liquid water flows on present-day Mars made the September 28 a bit more interesting (and busier) for Paul Delaney (Physics & Astronomy), Jesse Rogerson (Physics & Astronomy). They were on a number of media outlets including: CHML Radio, Globe and Mail, CTV National TV, CTV News Channel, Global TV, Toronto Star, CJAD Radio, Sirius XM Radio, Canada AM TV, CBC Here and Now, CP24, CFRB 1010, and CHML Hamilton.
- Matt Johnson (Physics & Astronomy) had a conversation on CBC Radio Ideas with Paul Kennedy exploring the about the vitality and centrality of the scientific imagination.

Upcoming Events:

- Oct 14 – Physics & Astronomy hosts High School Teachers & Students Night with the screening of The Martian
- Oct 20 – The Science of Science Fiction series, Michael Jenkins
- Oct 29 – The Ada Lovelace Day – Wikipedia Editathon
- Oct 29 – Physics and Astronomy Graduate Executive (PAGE) conference

4. Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved as presented.

5. Approval of Minutes from 6 September, 2015 meeting

Minutes of the 6 September, 2015, were approved.

6. Business Arising

There was no business arising from the Minutes.

7. Associate Deans’ and Bethune Master’s Remarks

AD – EJ Janse van Rensburg informed members about a Community Consultation regarding Mental health on Campus. The consultation is to get feedback on the recommendations document and to this end, an open forum is being held on September 30, 2015 from 10am –12pm. AD – van Rensburg encouraged all students, faculty and staff to attend this forum. Information with regards to the location will be published shortly on the University Events website.

The Centre of Human Rights have released their training and program schedule. AD – van Rensburg also informed members that the Centre will hold a conference titled – ‘Inclusion Day Conference 2016: Human Rights & the University – Progressive? Constrained? Connected?’ on January 27, 2016. All are encouraged to register for this conference.

He highlighted the ongoing faculty searches and urged members to use their networks to encourage potential candidates to apply to these positions.

Associate Dean (Research & Graduate Education) – S. Morin updated members of the following:

- The deadline to apply for a NSERC Discovery Grant is October 22, 2015 (to her office) and the university's deadline is October 26, 2015 for an internal review.
- Nominations are currently being accepted for the Early Research Award, Established Research Award and Graduate Mentorship Award. AD – Morin encouraged members to either self-nominate or nominate colleagues. The deadline for nominations is October 26, 2015.

Associate Dean (Students) – Prof. Cribb acknowledged and welcomed the student caucus who were attending their first Council meeting.

He presented to Council a statistical paper on the University's enrolment admission report and on the quality of the admit pool / cut off percentages of the admitted students for the 101 category within FSc in comparison to the other faculties within the University.

AD – Prof. Cribb concluded by informing members that there are ongoing discussion about the new Markham campus and that the two programs that were proposed and discussed related to programs in Medical Science & Biotechnology and Entrepreneurial Science, which are very distinct from what is offered at the Keele campus.

Bethune College Master - J. Amanatides updated members that a paper call for nominations to the FSc

Student Caucus was sent out during the first week of the Fall term classes to fill the 12 vacancies. This resulted in seven nominations who were acclaimed. A second online call was put out for the remaining five vacancies, for which 18 students have submitted their nominations. An eVote is currently being held on Oct. 13 – 15, 2015 to fill the remaining five vacancies.

This year, every incoming Science student was assigned a peer mentor from their respective program. Academic orientation was a great success with 88% students attending orientations. He further informed membered that there are 150+ peer leaders helping students in the first year, primarily with free peer tutoring for all first year courses in the life sciences study common's in the LSB building, facilitated study groups with PASS, class reps.

He reminded faculty members whose offices are in the LSB building, to please consider having their office hours in the LSB study common areas since students do not have access cards to use the elevators to reach the top floor offices.

8. **Reports from Science Representatives on Senate Committees**

Senator P. Delaney reported as follows:

- Nominations to the Presidential Search Committee are now closed, elections will be held in the last week of October and the composition of the Search committee will be announced in early November. Science is combined with the Faculty of Health for one position on the committee.
- APPRC has recommended to Senate to endorse the IIRP.

- There is an ongoing discussion on the proposal to adopt a new grading scheme. York currently has a 9 point grading scheme in use and the proposal is to adopt a 4.0 grading scheme. The decision whether to adopt this new grading schedule will be made in the of Spring 2016.
- A proposal is being brought to ASCP that course grading components be announced on the first week of class as opposed to the current stipulation which is within the first two weeks of classes.

9. **Reports from Committees**

Executive Committee: Vacancies Report on Senate and FSc Committees

Council moved, seconded and carried all proposed changes to the vacancies report on FSc Committees.

10. **Other Business**

Vice-Provost Academic – Alice Pitt presented to Council: Course Evaluations – core institutional question implementation. This presentation is available on YU-link.

FSc Student Caucus

2015 – 2016

Student	Committee
Aline Huynh	Appeals
Bastiaa Aiteeneyas	APPC
Emily Lioktsis	
Erica Shligold	Teaching and Learning
Gaddy Rakhaminov	CEAS & Senator
Jennifer Im	Petitions
Justice Obiahuba	Petitions
Mitali Adhvaryu	Curriculum & Chair of Student Caucus
Mohammad Kiumarsi	
Rebecca Sammy	Appeals
Sameer Safi	Research and Awards
Zubin Chaudhary	Executive & Senator

York University

COUNCIL OF THE FACULTY OF SCIENCE
Report of the Science Curriculum Committee

November 2015

The Faculty of Science Curriculum Committee has reviewed proposals for changes to course information and degree requirements and recommends to the Executive Committee that the following changes be submitted to Council for approval.

Details regarding these proposals (and regarding other minor changes to Calendar/Repository course descriptions and prerequisites which were approved by the Committee but are not reported here) are included in the working papers October 27, 2015, meeting of the Curriculum Committee, which are on file for your inspection in the Office of the Dean, with all members of the Curriculum Committee or by contacting the Secretary of the Committee at jpearson@yorku.ca

Course Changes

- 1.1 CHEM 4092 3.0 X-ray Crystallography, in pre-requisite(s)/co-requisite(s)
- 2.2 PHYS 1800 3.0 Engineering Mechanics, change in pre/co-requisite(s)
- 2.3 PHYS 1801 3.0 Electricity, Magnetism and Optics for Engineers, change in pre/co-requisite(s)
- 2.4 PHYS 2030 3.0 Computational Methods for Physicists & Engineers, change in pre/co-requisite(s)
- 2.5 PHYS 2030 Specialized Honours Physics and Astronomy, Space Sciences Stream, change in degree requirements

Changes to Existing Course

Faculty: Science

Department:

Chemistry

Date of Submission:

Oct. 20, 2015

Course Number:

4092 3.0

Effective Session:

F16

Course Title:

X-ray Crystallography

Type of Change:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> in pre-requisite(s)/co-requisite(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> in cross-listing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> in course number/level | <input type="checkbox"/> in degree credit exclusion(s) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> in credit value | <input type="checkbox"/> regularize course (from Special Topics) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> in title (max. 40 characters for short title) | <input type="checkbox"/> in course format/mode of delivery * |
| <input type="checkbox"/> in Calendar description (max. 40 words or 200 characters) | <input type="checkbox"/> retire/expire course |
| <input type="checkbox"/> other (please specify): | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Change From:

To:

Principles, practical details and computational methods of X-ray crystallographic structure determination. Students carry out an original structure determination from raw reflection data. One term. Three credits. Prerequisites: ~~SC/CHEM 3030 3.00 or SC/CHEM 3030 4.00.~~

Principles, practical details and computational methods of X-ray crystallographic structure determination. Students carry out an original structure determination from raw reflection data. One term. Three credits. Prerequisites: **SC/CHEM 2011 3.00 and SC/CHEM 3051 3.00.**

Rationale:

CHEM 3030 will no longer be teaching an introduction to X-ray crystallography, and CHEM 4092 will be teaching it from scratch with, in addition, consideration of both small-molecule and macromolecular structures. As such, the new prerequisites are appropriate replacements bringing the required basis in thermodynamics and in macromolecular structures. These new prerequisites will not significantly affect eligibility or enrollments.

Note: For course proposals involving cross-listings, integrations and degree credit exclusions, approval from all of the relevant Faculties/department is required.

Note: Since one change (such as a change in year level or credit value) may result in several other changes (e.g., to the course description, evaluation, instruction, bibliography, etc.), please submit as many details as possible. If there are several changes, please feel free to use a New Course Proposal Form in order to ensure that all the required information is included.

* Note: If there is a technology component to the course, a statement is required from ATS indicating whether resources are adequate to support the course. Courses converted from face-to-face to an on-line delivery mode should follow the instructions provided on page 4 of the New Course Proposal Form to provide revised 'Course Design' and 'Method of Instruction' information.

Changes to Existing Courses & Degree Programs

Department:

Date of Submission:

Course Number:

Effective Session:

Course Title:

Type of Change:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> in degree requirements | <input type="checkbox"/> in cross-listing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> in course number/level | <input type="checkbox"/> in degree credit exclusion(s) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> in credit value | <input type="checkbox"/> regularize course (from Special Topics) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> in title (max. 40 characters for short title) | <input type="checkbox"/> in course format/mode of delivery * |
| <input type="checkbox"/> in Calendar description (max. 40 words or 200 characters) | <input type="checkbox"/> retire/expire course |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> in pre/co-requisite(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> other (please specify): |

Change From:

To:

<p>Corequisite</p> <p>SC/MATH 1018 6.0 or equivalent.</p>	<p>Corequisite</p> <p>SC/MATH 1013 3.0 or SC/MATH 1018 6.0 or SC/MATH 1300 3.0 or SC/MATH 1505 6.0.</p>
--	---

Rationale:

The course SC/MATH 1018 6.0 has not yet been offered. This change in the corequisites makes it clear exactly which courses are acceptable substitutes.

Note: For course proposals involving cross-listings, integrations and degree credit exclusions, approval from all of the relevant Faculties/department/divisions is required. Note: Since one change (such as a change in year level or credit value) may result in several other changes (e.g., to the course description, evaluation, instruction, bibliography, etc.), please submit as many details as possible. If there are several changes, please feel free to use a New Course Proposal Form (Form 1) in order to ensure that all the required information is included. * Note: If there is a technology component to the course, a statement is required from ATSG indicating whether resources are adequate to support the course.

Changes to Existing Courses & Degree Programs

Department:

Date of Submission:

Course Number:

Effective Session:

Course Title:

Type of Change:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> in degree requirements | <input type="checkbox"/> in cross-listing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> in course number/level | <input type="checkbox"/> in degree credit exclusion(s) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> in credit value | <input type="checkbox"/> regularize course (from Special Topics) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> in title (max. 40 characters for short title) | <input type="checkbox"/> in course format/mode of delivery * |
| <input type="checkbox"/> in Calendar description (max. 40 words or 200 characters) | <input type="checkbox"/> retire/expire course |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> in pre/co-requisite(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> other (please specify): |

Change From:

To:

<p>Prerequisites</p> <p>SC/PHYS 1800 3.00.</p> <p>Corequisite</p> <p>SC/MATH 1018 6.0 or equivalent.</p>	<p>Prerequisites</p> <p>SC/PHYS 1800 3.00.</p> <p>Corequisite</p> <p>SC/MATH 1014 3.0 or SC/MATH 1310 3.0 or SC/MATH 1018 6.0 or SC/MATH 1505 6.0.</p>
--	---

Rationale:

Students who take SC/MATH 1013 3.0 along with SC/PHYS 1800 3.0 are expected to pass both and enrol in SC/MATH 1014 3.0 in order to enrol in SC/PHYS 1801 3.0. (And students who take SC/MATH 1300 3.0 with SC/PHYS 1800 3.0 should take SC/MATH 1310 3.0 along with SC/PHYS 1801 3.0.) The proposed change will make it clear to students that SC/MATH 1014 3.0 or SC/MATH 1310 3.0 are the recommended corequisites for SC/PHYS 1801 3.0, although we will continue our current policy that students who fail SC/MATH 1013 3.0 will be allowed to proceed in SC/PHYS 1801 3.0 at their own risk (in contrast to students who fail SC/PHYS 1800 3.0). This change also specifies that SC/MATH 1505 6.0 is an acceptable substitute for SC/MATH 1018 6.0.

Note: For course proposals involving cross-listings, integrations and degree credit exclusions, approval from all of the relevant Faculties/department/divisions is required. Note: Since one change (such as a change in year level or credit value) may result in several other changes (e.g., to the course description, evaluation, instruction, bibliography, etc.), please submit as many details as possible. If there are several changes, please feel free to use a New Course Proposal Form (Form 1) in order to ensure that all the required information is included. * Note: If there is a technology component to the course, a statement is required from ATSG indicating whether resources are adequate to support the course.

Changes to Existing Courses & Degree Programs

Department:	Physics and Astronomy	Date of Submission:	October 2015
Course Number:	PHYS 2030 3.0	Effective Session:	FW 2016-2017
Course Title:	Computational Methods for Physicists & Engineers		

Type of Change:

<input type="checkbox"/>	in degree requirements	<input type="checkbox"/>	in cross-listing
<input type="checkbox"/>	in course number/level	<input type="checkbox"/>	in degree credit exclusion(s)
<input type="checkbox"/>	in credit value	<input type="checkbox"/>	regularize course (from Special Topics)
<input type="checkbox"/>	in title (max. 40 characters for short title)	<input type="checkbox"/>	in course format/mode of delivery *
<input type="checkbox"/>	in Calendar description (max. 40 words or 200 characters)	<input type="checkbox"/>	retire/expire course
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	in pre/co-requisite(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	other (please specify):

Change From:

To:

<p>Prerequisites SC/PHYS 1010 6.0 or a minimum grade of C in SC/PHYS 1410 6.0 or SC/PHYS 1420 6.00; One of LE/CSE 1020 3.0 or LE/SC/CSE 4540 3.0; SC/MATH 1014 3.0 or equivalent. Corequisite: SC/MATH 2015 3.0 or equivalent.</p>	<p>Prerequisites: SC/PHYS 1010 6.0, or SC/PHYS 1800 3.0 and SC/PHYS 1801 3.0, or a minimum grade of C in SC/PHYS 1410 6.0 or SC/PHYS 1420 6.00; either LE/EECS 1011 3.0 or LE/EECS 1541 3.0; SC/MATH 1014 3.0 or equivalent. Prerequisite: SC/MATH 2015 3.0 or equivalent. Corequisite: SC/MATH 2271 3.0 or equivalent.</p>
---	---

Rationale:

This course utilizes Matlab to teach computational approaches to solving scientific & engineering problems. Familiarity with Matlab is critical for student learning in this course, so that students focus on learning new computing methods and not a new computer language. When this course was created, there were no Matlab courses at York; now, there are two (EECS 1011 3.0, Computational Thinking through Mechatronics, and EECS 1541 3.0, Introduction to Computing for the Physical Sciences). This proposal makes either of those courses prerequisite to this course, instead of EECS 1020 3.0 (Java) or 1540 3.0 (Fortran). [N.b.: the latter prerequisite should formally have been changed to EECS 1541 when it replaced EECS 1540 in all PHYS programs in 2013-2014.] This proposal also shifts MATH 2015 to a prerequisite and adds a corequisite of Differential Equations (MATH 2271 or equivalent). This change enables computational approaches to solving differential equations to be introduced in this course to reinforce student learning in the subject, thus increasing student preparation for the use of differential equations in 3rd- and 4th-year courses.

FSc Resource Implications Form Unit: Physics & Astronomy Date: _____

		Course(s) Created <input type="checkbox"/> or Modified to <input type="checkbox"/> (check one)		Course(s) Retired <input type="checkbox"/> or Modified from <input type="checkbox"/>
Complete Course Designation		PHYS 2030 3.0 [Modified]		PHYS 2030 3.0
Enrolment (Estimate or Last Offering)		50 (W term 2015-2016)		43 (W term 2014-2015)
Number of:	Lecture Sections:	1		1
	Lab Sections:	2		2
	Tutorial Sections:	0		0
Number of:	Course Coordinators (Tutor 1):	0		0
	Lab Demonstrators (Tutor 2):	2 positions @ 0.289 & 0.437 TAs		2 positions @ 0.289 & 0.437 TAs
	Mark/Graders (Tutor 3):	1 position @ 0.218 TAs		1 position @ 0.218 TAs
Prerequisites (P) Corequisites (C) Credit Exclusions (E)		P: PHYS 1010 6.0 + either EECS 1011 or EECS 1541 C: MATH 2015 3.0 and MATH 2271 3.0		P: PHYS 1010 6.0 + either EECS 1020 or EECS 1540 C: MATH 2015 3.0
For which degree program is this required (if applicable)?		Physics (BSc and Specialized Honours BSc)		Physics (BSc and Specialized Honours BSc)
Other resource implications (please specify)		None		
Reason(s) for creation/ modification/ retirement		We are modifying the prerequisites to ensure that students have taken a course in Matlab before they take this course that solves Physics problems using Matlab. We are also modifying the corequisites to include Math 2271 (Differential Equations). These changes have no resource implications.		

Changes to Existing
Courses & Degree
Programs**Department:**

Physics and Astronomy

Date of Submission:

October 2015

Course Number:**Effective Session:**

FW 2016-2017

Course Title:

Specialized Honours Physics and Astronomy, Space Sciences Stream

Type of Change:

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | in degree requirements | <input type="checkbox"/> | in cross-listing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | in course number/level | <input type="checkbox"/> | in degree credit exclusion(s) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | in credit value | <input type="checkbox"/> | regularize course (from Special Topics) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | in title (max. 40 characters for short title) | <input type="checkbox"/> | in course format/mode of delivery * |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | in Calendar description (max. 40 words or 200 characters) | <input type="checkbox"/> | retire/expire course |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | in pre/co-requisite(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> | other (please specify): |

Change From:**To:****Specialized Honours (BSc)**

A. General education:

- non-science requirement: 12 credits;
- mathematics: SC/MATH 1013 3.00; SC/MATH 1014 3.00;
- computer science: ~~LE/EECS 1020 3.00~~;
- foundational science: SC/PHYS 1010 6.00; and one of SC/CHEM 1000 3.00 or SC/CHEM 1001 3.00.

B. Major requirements:

Earth and Atmospheric Science stream

- the space science core as specified above;
- LE/ESSE 3030 3.00; LE/ESSE 3040 3.00; LE/ESSE 3280 3.00; LE/ESSE 3300 3.00; LE/ESSE 3610 3.00; SC/MATH 3241 3.00; SC/MATH 3271 3.00; SC/PHYS 4361 3.00;
- LE/ESSE 4020 3.00 or SC/PHYS 4250 3.00; LE/ESSE 4220 3.00; LE/ESSE 4230 3.00; LE/ESSE 4630 3.00;
- at least 12 credits from: LE/ESSE 4000 3.00; LE/ESSE 4130 3.00; LE/ESSE 4140 3.00; LE/ESSE 4160 3.00; LE/ESSE 4610 3.00; SC/PHYS 4110 3.00; SC/PHYS 4330 3.00; SC/PHYS 4360 3.00.

Physics and Astronomy stream

- the space science core as specified above;
- SC/PHYS 3020 3.00; SC/PHYS 3040 6.00; SC/PHYS 3050 3.00; SC/PHYS 3070 3.00; SC/PHYS 3150 3.00; SC/PHYS 3250 3.00; SC/PHYS 3280 3.00;
- three credits from: SC/PHYS 3010 3.00, SC/PHYS 3030 3.00, SC/PHYS 3080 3.00, SC/PHYS 3090 3.00, SC/PHYS 3220 3.00, SC/PHYS 4361 3.00, other courses approved by the Department of Physics and Astronomy;
- SC/PHYS 4110 3.00; SC/PHYS 4330 3.00; SC/PHYS 4350 6.00;

at least 11 credits from: LE/ESSE 4610 3.00; SC/PHYS 4010 3.00; SC/PHYS 4020 3.00; SC/PHYS 4040 3.00; SC/PHYS 4050 3.00; SC/PHYS 4070 3.00; SC/PHYS 4120 3.00; SC/PHYS 4270 4.00; SC/PHYS 4310 3.00; SC/PHYS 4360 3.00; SC/PHYS 4410 3.00.

Specialized Honours (BSc)

A. General education:

- non-science requirement: 12 credits;
- mathematics: SC/MATH 1013 3.00; SC/MATH 1014 3.00;
- computer science: LE/EECS 1541 3.00 or LE/EECS 1011 3.00;
- foundational science: SC/PHYS 1010 6.00; and one of SC/CHEM 1000 3.00 or SC/CHEM 1001 3.00.

B. Major requirements:

Earth and Atmospheric Science stream

- the space science core as specified above;
- LE/ESSE 3030 3.00; LE/ESSE 3040 3.00; LE/ESSE 3280 3.00; LE/ESSE 3300 3.00; LE/ESSE 3610 3.00; SC/MATH 3241 3.00; SC/MATH 3271 3.00; SC/PHYS 4361 3.00;
- LE/ESSE 4020 3.00 or SC/PHYS 4250 3.00; LE/ESSE 4220 3.00; LE/ESSE 4230 3.00; LE/ESSE 4630 3.00;
- at least 12 credits from: LE/ESSE 4000 3.00; LE/ESSE 4130 3.00; LE/ESSE 4140 3.00; LE/ESSE 4160 3.00; LE/ESSE 4610 3.00; SC/PHYS 4110 3.00; SC/PHYS 4330 3.00; SC/PHYS 4360 3.00.

Physics and Astronomy stream

- the space science core as specified above;
- SC/PHYS 3020 3.00; SC/PHYS 3040 6.00; SC/PHYS 3050 3.00; SC/PHYS 3070 3.00; SC/PHYS 3150 3.00; SC/PHYS 3250 3.00; SC/PHYS 3280 3.00;
- three credits from: SC/PHYS 3010 3.00, SC/PHYS 3030 3.00, SC/PHYS 3080 3.00, SC/PHYS 3090 3.00, SC/PHYS 3220 3.00, SC/PHYS 4361 3.00, other courses approved by the Department of Physics and Astronomy;
- SC/PHYS 4110 3.00; SC/PHYS 4330 3.00; SC/PHYS 4350 6.00;

at least 8 credits from: LE/ESSE 4610 3.00; SC/PHYS 4010 3.00; SC/PHYS 4020 3.00; SC/PHYS 4040 3.00; SC/PHYS 4050 3.00; SC/PHYS 4070 3.00; SC/PHYS 4120 3.00; SC/PHYS 4270 4.00; SC/PHYS 4310 3.00; SC/PHYS 4360 3.00; SC/PHYS 4410 3.00.

Rationale:

To optimize student learning about computational analysis, instead of taking a course in Java (EECS 1020 3.0), we now require students to take a course in Matlab (EECS 1541 3.0 or EECS 1011 3.0) to become familiar with it before they use it to simulate and analyze physical situations in PHYS 2030 3.0 (which is part of the 43-credit space science core). Also, we propose to fix an error in the official academic calendar for the Space Sciences Physics & Astronomy stream, which has listed a 123-credit degree instead of a 120-credit degree since 2011-2012 (Dept. calendar did not have this error).



The Senate of York University

Synopsis

The 619th Meeting of Senate held on Thursday, October 22, 2015

Remarks

The Chair of Senate, Professor George Comninel, thanked Senators for attending Autumn Convocation ceremonies. With the Equity Sub-Committee poised to consider the question of how aspects of mental health and well-being should be taken up by Senate, the Chair drew attention to an October 29 talk by Drew Dudley followed by an open forum. He advised that the Secretariat will establish a second listserv for Senators to exchange substantive views and Senators were reminded of the protocols for communicating business to Senate and its committees.

The President, Dr Mamdouh Shoukri, commented on Council of Ontario Universities matters, including the development of a common position on the funding formula review led by Suzanne Herbert. He urged Senators to nominate worthy individuals for honorary degrees, especially women candidates. A number of York alumni had been elected to the House of Commons, and there is optimism that universities will benefit from the new Liberal government's promise to invest in infrastructure and innovation. In response to an open letter that was circulated to Senators, the President, Provost and Vice-President Finance and Administration commented on Keele campus facilities, including the future of the bookstore, use of the York Room for dissertation defences, and the possibility of a revived Faculty Club.

The President's monthly "Kudos Report" can be accessed from the agenda package.

Reports

Senate's nominees on the Board of Governors, Professor David-Leyton-Brown and Professor Bernard Lightman, presented a synopsis of the Board's meeting of October 6, 2015. Professor George Turlakis, Academic Colleague to the Council of Ontario Universities, shared the COU Issues Update for October. In doing so he reported on discussions about experiential education involving colleagues and executive heads, and advised that university presidents have corresponded with the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities, and Research and Innovation on the postsecondary funding formula review (the communication will be shared with Senate if and when it becomes publically available).

Approvals

Senate approved a slate of candidates for designation as Senate's nominees to the Presidential Search Committee. Nominees will be determined by a ballot conducted by e-vote beginning the week of October 26.

Senate approved recommendations made by the Academic Standards, Curriculum and Pedagogy Committee to

- establish a Cross-Disciplinary Certificate in Aging

The Senate of York University

Synopsis

- amend admission requirements for the Second-Degree Entry BScN and Internationally Educated Nurses BScN Programs in the School of Nursing, Faculty of Health
- transform the Honours BSc Program in Science to a direct-entry option and establish appropriate admission requirements
- amend degree requirements for the PhD Program in Mathematics & Statistics, Graduate Program in Mathematics & Statistics, Faculty of Graduate Studies

University Academic Plan 2015-2020

The Academic Policy, Planning and Research Committee posed a series of questions of Senators that will inform the development of the next University Academic Plan and help guide wider community consultations leading to Senate approval in the winter of 2016. Input was obtained from Senators during the meeting. The Committee also provided timelines for the UAP renewal process.

Committee Information Reports

Senate Executive informed Senators of the following:

- its approval of committee members nominated by Faculty Councils and student Senators
- a review of changes to the Membership and Structure, Rules and Procedures of the Faculty of Graduate Studies Council which resulted in agreement that they were consistent with the principles of collegial governance and practices elsewhere at the University
- priorities for 2015-2016 established by APPRC, ASCP and Senate Executive itself

Academic Standards, Curriculum and Pedagogy reported that it had reviewed sessional dates for Summer 2016 and Fall-Winter 2016-2017 terms (posted online with the agenda package) and determined that they were in accordance with the *Senate Policy on Sessional Dates and the Scheduling of Examinations*. The Committee will take up a request from Senate Executive that it reflect on the impact of changes to the length of Fall Reading Days and advise if the allocation. ASCP also reported that it had approved proposals to effect the following minor changes:

- degree requirements for the MA Program in Mathematics & Statistics
- PhD and Master's Thesis and Dissertation Supervisory Committee Guidelines
- degree requirements for the BA Programs in Gender & Women's Studies
- degree requirements for the BA Programs in Sexuality Studies

For information on these items please refer to the full Senate agenda posted online.

University Secretariat: extension 55310

**Senate's 619th meeting is scheduled for 3:00 p.m., Thursday, November 26, 2015
in the Senate Chamber, Ross Building, Keele Campus**

Senate of York University
Academic Policy, Planning and Research Committee

Memorandum

To: Senate Committees
Faculty Councils

From: Rebecca Pillai Riddell, Chair, Academic Policy, Planning and Research
Committee of Senate

Date: October 7, 2015

Subject: **University Academic Plan 2015-2020 Consultations**

The process leading to approval of the next version of the University Academic Plan is now underway. As the most important bodies in collegial governance, Senate committees and Faculty Councils should have the first opportunity to provide advice on the focus of UAP 2015-2020, and APPRC seeks your responses to the five questions on the following page.

The overarching themes of the current University Academic Plan are

- academic quality
- student success
- engagement and outreach

We take it as axiomatic that these themes will remain central to academic planning, and that the goal of ensuring York is recognized for its excellence and global leadership in the nexus of research, teaching and learning will continue to infuse our plans and drive our efforts. The questions have been designed to solicit views on contexts, priorities and objectives, and the structure and thrust of the next UAP. APPRC also welcomes advice on any other aspect of the document.

Responses from Senate committees and Faculty Councils will help shape a wider phase of consultations in November. We ask, therefore, that responses from Senate Committees and Councils (or their appropriate committees) be transmitted by Monday, November 9.

A UAP 2015-2020 Website has been created to provide you with background material as you prepare a response. The documents listed below are particularly helpful as a

Senate of York University

Academic Policy, Planning and Research Committee

collective expression of the vision for York as a comprehensive, research intensive university committed to excellence, student success, outreach and partnership.

UAP 2010-2015
UAP 2010-2015 Summative Report on Objectives
Suggestions from the Deans, Principal and University Librarian
Provostial White Paper
Institutional Integrated Resource Plan
Strategic Research Plan
Strategic Mandate Agreement

These documents are housed on the APPRC pages under current initiatives / UAP 2015-2020 at

<http://secretariat.info.yorku.ca/senate/academic-policy-planning-and-research-committee/university-academic-plan-2015-2020-uap/>

Please submit your completed responses to Robert Everett of the University Secretariat (beverett@yorku.ca). We welcome broad engagement throughout the UAP renewal process and look forward to gathering members of the community at an open forum scheduled for Thursday, December 10. Thank you in advance for your vital assistance.

Questions

1. What sets York apart from other universities and how is this advantageous?
2. What should be York's academic priorities for the next five years? Please rank your priorities if possible.
3. What are the most pressing challenges facing York now and in the next five years that should be addressed in the next UAP?
4. What are the most compelling opportunities for York now and in the next five years?
5. Do you have any other advice about the University Academic Plan 2015-2020 in terms of its organization and structure, specificity of objectives, indicators of progress and the like?

FSc: UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC PLAN 2015 - 2020 CONSULTATIONS

1. What sets York apart from other universities and how is this advantageous?	2. What should be York's academic priorities for the next five years? Please rank your priorities if possible.	3. What are the most pressing challenges facing York now and in the next five years that should be addressed in the next UAP?	4. What are the most compelling opportunities for York now and in the next five years?	5. Do you have any other advice about the University Academic Plan 2015-2020 in terms of its organization and structure, specificity of objectives, indicators of progress and the like?
<p>What sets York apart is its access to campus, there are many ways to commute which is especially strong since most people take some form of transportation to reach campus.</p>	<p>From a science students perspective, adding more resources and information for those keen on grad school or professional school (dentistry, medicine). Provide more opportunities for students to do lab or research work. Maybe some form of co-op system like Waterloo.</p>	<p>Ensuring students continue education past first year. Continue preparing students for upper year course and life after graduation; going into careers not jobs.</p>		
<p>York has a much lower science focus (~ 10%, as measured by # of faculty, grad students and undergraduate students) compared to almost all other Canadian universities. This is NOT advantageous as science is typically the most research intensive discipline, bringing in the most amount of research infrastructure and research funding that pays for our graduate students (using external funds!), research labs, renovations, etc. Unfortunately the reality is that all sorts of other funding (CFI envelopes, CRC allocations, donor contributions, etc.) follows the external research \$, which allows us to intensify research and therefore specialize in research instead of just undergraduate teaching. The balance must be tipped in favor of science, or else we will become a teaching university in the not too distant future, with very little focus on research. We are fast approaching the tipping point. If we are serious about research intensification, increase the science complement!</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Research Intensification in Science, 2. Research Intensification in Engineering and Health Sciences 3. Increasing the research experience of graduate students. 4. Increasing retention of undergraduates, attracting better undergraduates, increasing enrolment standards. 5. Increasing the profile of York University. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - low or marginal external funding levels - the real danger of being allocated to the group of teaching only universities. - losing even more ground on our external public profile & image. <p>Q107 - "who the hell goes to York? laugh, laugh".</p>		<p>Decrease the rhetoric around wanting and encouraging all faculty to take part in the "planning process". I know it is the "York way", aka. process, but every hour spent on planning is one hour less spent on other things that matter more or just as much. Representatives from each department and faculty should participate in planning, but the majority should not be involved in this largely administrative task. Administrators should do their job, develop a plan, they should not download the task onto researchers. Be mindful that too much emphasis on indicators increases the administrative burden and takes away from research, either through increased university dollars flowing to the Faculty of Administration, or decreased faculty complement, or decreased faculty research output. Make it simple, do not make this another York "process". In everything you do, ask the question, what impact will this have on research.</p>
<p>It is a comprehensive University: Science, Arts, Humanities, etc. Collaborative and multidisciplinary</p>	<p>Build STEM to boost research and meet research intensification targets.</p>	<p>Infrastructure for grad and undergraduate students for research/ innovative programs across Faculties.</p>		<p>As the new budget model comes into place there has to be considerable thinning at the top as responsibility is transfer onto the Faculties. Otherwise, a balance budget will never be achieved.</p>

FSc: UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC PLAN 2015 - 2020 CONSULTATIONS

1.What sets York apart from other universities and how is this advantageous?	2.What should be York’s academic priorities for the next five years? Please rank your priorities if possible.	3.What are the most pressing challenges facing York now and in the next five years that should be addressed in the next UAP?	4.What are the most compelling opportunities for York now and in the next five years?	5.Do you have any other advice about the University Academic Plan 2015-2020 in terms of its organization and structure, specificity of objectives, indicators of progress and the like?
<p>York is huge. We have great people doing great things. Navigating a huge ship such as this is problematic, but it also gives us opportunities and critical mass to do things that little universities cannot. We need to harness these things. We need to put aside the internal administrative divides to simply allow us to get things done. We have a huge graduate program, but the integration with the departments is a mess; there's duplication in everything from administering these programs to having duplicated websites for undergraduate and graduate programs in the same department. None of these things should be the elements that define us or be the first things that the outside world sees (but they often are). Let's work to simplify getting down to doing research, teaching, and communicating across departments, faculties, and schools! Let the wonderful faculty and staff at York do what they are paid to do, and not spend untold hours disentangling administrative tangles.</p>	<p>Simplify administrative hurdles. Build a positive media image to reflect the true greatness of York. Mitigate internal competition and conflict. Reduce teaching loads and hire younger tenure-track faculty to bring new and fresh thinking into our institution. Really make our university (ugrad and grad) without borders - let's embrace people from outside Canada (students, hires, ...) rather than just pretending to. If we want to have more experiential education, then make it possible (\$); these things are not free or cheap; but you cannot squeeze blood from a stone.</p>	<p>Our students are saddled with substantial costs (e.g., tuition, housing in Toronto) and hence are working too much part-time (on average, over 17 hours per week in our program). Couple this with York being a primarily commuter campus, our students lose even more hours each week to sitting on a bus. While the subway may alleviate some of this, it is only part of the solution; the paradigm of a university education is shifting. If students cannot take the time to read, think, and synthesize or spend time in the lab trying, making errors, and learning, then they simply cannot build competency fast enough and knowledge retained is superficial and short-term. No matter how nice the facilities are or how great the instructors are or how impressive their research records may be, we rely on teaching undergraduates - and our ability to have consistent expectations with those from even 10 years ago are being eroded.</p>		<p>The labour disruptions on campus and the unfortunate geographic linking of our campus with every negative news report from the Jane-Finch region gives York a negative stigma. We need to really focus on getting the positive press to the people. We need to trumpet the good and the accomplishments of our institution! We do so much, but the popular media does not hear about these things. A dedicated campaign to distribute good news stories will help with our image and entice people to come here. We NEVER hear negative stories about Harvard, MIT, or other prestigious institutions, but we all know why they're great. That's not to believe that nothing ever goes wrong at those places or that there aren't problems - they just manage the media more effectively.</p>

FSc: UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC PLAN 2015 - 2020 CONSULTATIONS

1.What sets York apart from other universities and how is this advantageous?	2.What should be York’s academic priorities for the next five years? Please rank your priorities if possible.	3.What are the most pressing challenges facing York now and in the next five years that should be addressed in the next UAP?	4.What are the most compelling opportunities for York now and in the next five years?	5.Do you have any other advice about the University Academic Plan 2015-2020 in terms of its organization and structure, specificity of objectives, indicators of progress and the like?
Hands-on undergraduate research.	1) Expand the Student Financial Profile to link to more scholarship opportunities (if possible), but also implement third-party verification of SFP data through spot checking, to remove the possibility of the system being gamed. 2) End unpaid internships / co-ops for which students are nonetheless charged tuition.	Maintaining the current level of research and teaching with continual reductions in administrative support.		Specific and measurable indicators of progress are a must.

FSc: UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC PLAN 2015 - 2020 CONSULTATIONS

1. What sets York apart from other universities and how is this advantageous?	2. What should be York's academic priorities for the next five years? Please rank your priorities if possible.	3. What are the most pressing challenges facing York now and in the next five years that should be addressed in the next UAP?	4. What are the most compelling opportunities for York now and in the next five years?	5. Do you have any other advice about the University Academic Plan 2015-2020 in terms of its organization and structure, specificity of objectives, indicators of progress and the like?
<p>Speaking only about the programs that I know well, our middling size is advantageous in that it promotes better student-faculty interaction and allows so-so students to do better, whereas they would be left on their own to flounder or struggle in a larger institution. It also removes the competitiveness and sabotage among students that characterizes larger and more prestigious institutions. However, it remains necessary to maintain a healthy research enterprise that supplies the undergraduate program with competent, in-house TAs and provides ample opportunities for undergrads to work at the frontiers in research in a diversity of areas.</p>	<p>(1) To reduce our dependence on part-time teaching. By virtue of the contract with CUPE, instructor autonomy and seniority makes it onerous to ensure academic quality or take remedial measures. I also think that part-time teaching is too precarious to foster quality among candidate instructors. We have a very small pool of competent contract faculty in the GTA and are forced to take a chance with second-tier candidates.</p> <p>(2) Trim programs that are fragile, low-quality, poorly attractive or which require more resources than they are worth. The AAPR should have done this already. Redirect resources to those attractive and high-quality programs that require more resources to remain competitive among GTA institutions.</p> <p>(3) Consolidate the multiplicity of lower-year courses that are very similar in content and are mutual course credit exclusions, especially in service courses. I am thinking, for instance, of the plethora of first-year MATH, EECS, SOSC, NATS and HUMA courses (among those that I know about) that artificially boost the apparent teaching needs of programs.</p> <p>(4) Impose entrance testing for proper streaming according to preparation. This is already done for some language courses.</p>	<p>(1) The increasing desire among incoming students to get a well paying job, instead of an education, ethical grounding and professionalism.</p> <p>(2) The dumbing-down of academic expectations in response to the changing nature of high-school experiences.</p> <p>(3) The decreasing rigour of too many courses, coupled with an increase in academic dishonesty. Over my 30 years here, I have heard too many anecdotes of students cheating, which are largely a response to (1).</p>		<p>While it is all fine to identify strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats, the Academic Plans that I have seen have used such vague language in its objectives as to be pretty much useless, with such pie-in-the-sky objectives as internationalization and research intensification without any new resources. What is really needed is not so much an Academic Plan as an Academic Plan of Action, listing fully costed specific measures with their own milestones that Senate will enact.</p>

FSc: UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC PLAN 2015 - 2020 CONSULTATIONS

1.What sets York apart from other universities and how is this advantageous?	2.What should be York's academic priorities for the next five years? Please rank your priorities if possible.	3.What are the most pressing challenges facing York now and in the next five years that should be addressed in the next UAP?	4.What are the most compelling opportunities for York now and in the next five years?	5.Do you have any other advice about the University Academic Plan 2015-2020 in terms of its organization and structure, specificity of objectives, indicators of progress and the like?
<p>York is a university with small representation of scientists and engineers. We do not have enough faculty to teach enough courses at both undergraduate and (especially) graduate levels to have comprehensive programs. This is a disadvantage as it is difficult to develop strong academic programs in these areas. I see nothing that sets York apart and also advantageous.</p>	<p>Development of strong science/engineering academic programs in the following areas: 1) Biomedical 2) Quality of environment 3) Alternative energy Teaching in these areas will eventually improve the quality of life and health of Canadians</p>	<p>Out of date courses and labs. There should be a regular review of quality of every course and lab taught. Performance of faculty members should be evaluated on an annual basis and compensation should be dependent on performance.</p>		
<p>Its quality and achievements are the biggest secret in the Province. This is hardly advantageous.</p>	<p>Improving the reputation of York. This applies to teaching, research and outreach and equally to a wide target of influencers such as parents, professionals and decision makers. York has done a lot since its inception to move towards being a comprehensive University, and must continue to do so. We cannot regress to being a University defined by a small range of disciplines no matter how good the programs in them may be. Questions from the public such as "Does York have Engineering?", "Does York have Fine Arts?","Does York have Science?","Does York have Health?" must be consigned to the trash heap of history.</p>	<p>How to improve our reputation in the current fiscal climate. To support the necessary teaching development and the increased research activity in this environment will be challenging.</p>		<p>The students and alumni are engaged and visionary. They should be part of the development of the plan for the future.</p>

FSc: UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC PLAN 2015 - 2020 CONSULTATIONS

1. What sets York apart from other universities and how is this advantageous?	2. What should be York's academic priorities for the next five years? Please rank your priorities if possible.	3. What are the most pressing challenges facing York now and in the next five years that should be addressed in the next UAP?	4. What are the most compelling opportunities for York now and in the next five years?	5. Do you have any other advice about the University Academic Plan 2015-2020 in terms of its organization and structure, specificity of objectives, indicators of progress and the like?
<p>For York? I don't know. I can comment on Faculty and Department identities and comparative advantages and distinctions, and highly favourably (friendly, small, welcoming, underrated), but not at the University level.</p> <p>York's got a problem when its best-known distinctive faculties (Lassonde, Schulich, Osgoode) all intentionally cultivate a separate identity and name, and tend to omit York's name in their advertising.</p> <p>Ironically I think York should cut back on the top-down branding exercises and over-the-top marketing efforts and cultivate itself as a more decentralized group of institutions (bottom-up). Let complainers like me step up and work on York's overall reputational problem in our own individual ways. There is a huge amount of talent and idealism at the departmental levels.</p>	<p>Just one comes to mind: where incoming undergrads rank their preferred Ontario universities to attend, our goal (either at a Faculty or University level) should be to move up one (a single) place on the charts. I don't know what the current standings are but that's a discrete and hopefully attainable goal. If taken too seriously such a goal can lead to madness - see the problems at US universities regarding the *US News and World Report* rankings - but as a short-term pragmatic measure I think it would be quite useful.</p>	<p>Is it so bad if York becomes a teaching-centred university as the Ontario gov't moves to differentiate universities? If so, why? I think this assumption needs to be actually articulated.</p>		<p>Regarding progress indicators:</p> <p>The tendency of all administrators is to follow Kelvin's advice: "When you can measure what you are speaking about and express it in numbers, you know something about it, but when you cannot measure it, when you cannot express it in numbers, your knowledge is of a meagre, unsatisfactory kind." -William Thomson (Lord Kelvin). Today this sentiment is rephrased in an apocryphal comment by Peter Drucker (which I have never actually found the source): "That which gets measured, gets done."</p> <p>And to a certain extent this has to be true - how else would one know whether a new policy was working?</p> <p>But consider the following rejoinder too, from an MIT experimental physicist: "I thought that an appropriate counter to Lord Kelvin would be a famous quote from Daniel Yankelovich. The first time I saw it, I was so delighted with it I copied it out... 'The first step is to measure whatever can be easily measured. This is OK as far as it goes. The second step is to disregard that which can't be measured or give it an arbitrary quantitative value. This is artificial and misleading. The third step is to presume that which can't be measured easily isn't very important. This is</p>

FSc: UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC PLAN 2015 - 2020 CONSULTATIONS

1. What sets York apart from other universities and how is this advantageous?	2. What should be York's academic priorities for the next five years? Please rank your priorities if possible.	3. What are the most pressing challenges facing York now and in the next five years that should be addressed in the next UAP?	4. What are the most compelling opportunities for York now and in the next five years?	5. Do you have any other advice about the University Academic Plan 2015-2020 in terms of its organization and structure, specificity of objectives, indicators of progress and the like?
<p>It has access to what was called the 905-area belt, serving new immigrants, predominantly from Brampton, Maple, across towards Oshawa. York's reputation in the core GTA is not favourable compared to UT, and Ryerson. The latter has made inroads into our traditional student base from the GTA.</p>	<p>To serve the students from these immigrant families the focus should be on: engineering and sciences, and business-related education.</p>	<p>to move away from some of the traditional liberal-arts areas, so that engineering, physical and life sciences, mathematics, computational science and the business school will become more prominent.</p>		<p>York is perceived as doing poorly in student services, The Registrar's Office is a complete disaster. Room allocations is a nightmare (they keep changing things around from year to year, usually for the worse, students have unreasonable walking distances between classes). The exam schedule is often primitive: example: three midterm exams for our 3rd year class are on three subsequent days early in the schedule. When requested by our UPD to change at least one of them, the answer is 'cannot be done'. Incompetence and arrogance is what also rules UIT. With such poor services the students suffer, get angry, and tell their peers to stay away.</p>

FSc: UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC PLAN 2015 - 2020 CONSULTATIONS

1.What sets York apart from other universities and how is this advantageous?	2.What should be York’s academic priorities for the next five years? Please rank your priorities if possible.	3.What are the most pressing challenges facing York now and in the next five years that should be addressed in the next UAP?	4.What are the most compelling opportunities for York now and in the next five years?	5.Do you have any other advice about the University Academic Plan 2015-2020 in terms of its organization and structure, specificity of objectives, indicators of progress and the like?
<p>York is a big, and young, University. We are not hampered (or should not be) by the weight of tradition and conventional thinking. We can dare to do things differently, and do them on a big scale.</p>	<p>1. Science. For its size, York has a very small Science component. There are exciting fields of science where York could take a lead, including interdisciplinary subjects, for example: brain chemistry and artificial intelligence (chemistry/biology/computer science/psychology); nanotechnology and engineering at the nano scale (physics/chemistry/engineering and broadly speaking, materials science); "green" technologies (renewable sources of energy, environmental science, green chemistry).</p> <p>2. A School of Medecine. That would be transformative, on so many levels.</p>	<p>We are too slow to act, too bureaucratic, too conservative, and too concerned with pleasing everyone. It is hard for any big organization to be nimble and act quickly and decisively on priorities. But we must strive for that. A problem I see is the all too often adversarial relation between YUFA and the administration. The two groups should work more often together, and not only near collective agreement renewal. We need to build trust, so that people in positions to make decisions do not have to "consult widely" and build consensus each and every time a special opportunity comes up.</p> <p>Communication is important. As a simple practical measure, we could reduce the size of committees and eliminate redundant committees. For example: do we really need Faculty tenure and promotion committees whose only role is to cross the t's and dot the i's on the report produced by the unit level committee? The problem with useless committees is that people do not easily admit that *their committee* is useless: we are programmed to "work hard" at whatever task we are given. So,</p>		<p>No.</p>
<p>Location</p>	<p>try to lessens the amount of sexual assaults</p>	<p>Keeping enrolment numbers up</p>		<p>N/A</p>

FSc: UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC PLAN 2015 - 2020 CONSULTATIONS

1. What sets York apart from other universities and how is this advantageous?	2. What should be York's academic priorities for the next five years? Please rank your priorities if possible.	3. What are the most pressing challenges facing York now and in the next five years that should be addressed in the next UAP?	4. What are the most compelling opportunities for York now and in the next five years?	5. Do you have any other advice about the University Academic Plan 2015-2020 in terms of its organization and structure, specificity of objectives, indicators of progress and the like?
<p>- As long as I've been a faculty member at York University, some 30 years now, Presidents, Boards of Governors, Senate document after Senate document, etc., have referred to York's uniquenesses. These usually revolve around certain commitments; to social justice, equity, diversity, tolerance, community engagement, interdisciplinarity, etc. The truth is, all top-notch universities in Ontario have all of these and more. By "more," I refer, in part, to an established reputation for research and teaching excellence. One might refer to this loosely as institutional gravitas. To be sure, York University and the Faculty of Science, has islands of research and teaching excellence, but we need more excellence in each of these areas to secure "reputation" among parents, teachers and students. It will take a great deal of time and effort to become a first-tier institution broadly speaking, but there's no time like the present to begin the journey.</p>	<p>- It is important and essential that York remain a leader in diversity, social justice, equity, community engagement, etc. But these alone will never launch us into the first tier. To strive for excellence, York University must make a firm commitment to improve perceptibly the quality of its teaching and research. Nothing more, but nothing less.</p> <p>- In speaking with colleagues at other Ontario universities (and beyond), and in being aware of some of the pedagogical initiatives being undertaken there (particularly in Science), it is apparent to me that York University has considerable ground to make up if it is to be routinely considered a first- or second-choice by top high school students. Without an established reputation as a research institution, York must excel in curricular design and delivery using the best evidence-based methodologies if it is to be a serious competitor for the attention of prospective undergraduates going forward.</p>	<p>- Building up the quality of teaching in all units/Faculties.</p> <p>- Exploiting the advantages provided by subway access and identifying and fostering closer partnership with the emerging "905" region.</p> <p>- Launching the Markham campus and ensuring a smooth integration with the Keele campus</p> <p>- Attracting higher-quality undergraduate and graduate students, and postdocs (where appropriate).</p> <p>- Unless we move forward with all these, we'll lose ground to the other major universities in southern Ontario. The status quo is not an option.</p>		<p>- No doubt, person centuries of time will be expended in this exercise to identify the objectives and to flesh out how these might be achieved and assessed, etc. But the strategy is really simple: this institution needs more gravitas, period. We can achieve this through significantly enhancing out teaching in the near and intermediate terms (which would not necessarily require significantly more resources), and our research in the intermediate and longer terms. It would be a good sign internally and externally if we were to make the enhancement of teaching the first priority in the next five years, with the support and nurturing of research a close second. Clearly, we will need to advertise York's new (renewed?) commitment to teaching if we're to benefit in the short term.</p>
	<p>- York must be a recognized leader in teaching if it is to reach the next plateau. This requires both a collective will and the deployment of appropriate resources. This should be the UAP's first priority. We also need to enhance student support such as identifying at-risk students early on in the first year and to provide "curricular reinforcement" where necessary to decrease attrition rates and to enhance student perceptions.</p>			

FSc: UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC PLAN 2015 - 2020 CONSULTATIONS

1.What sets York apart from other universities and how is this advantageous?	2.What should be York’s academic priorities for the next five years? Please rank your priorities if possible.	3.What are the most pressing challenges facing York now and in the next five years that should be addressed in the next UAP?	4.What are the most compelling opportunities for York now and in the next five years?	5.Do you have any other advice about the University Academic Plan 2015-2020 in terms of its organization and structure, specificity of objectives, indicators of progress and the like?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · A complementary goal must be to enhance the student experience and therefore York’s attractiveness. Not through gimmicks and sleight of hand. We must ramp up the quality and quantity of experiential opportunities for our students. At this point, we are significantly behind most first-tier universities on this front and nearly every good student with whom I’ve chatted has indicated that these opportunities are critical for today’s student. · The other major priority is to enhance research at York. What does this really mean? Most deans seem to be of the opinion that faculty members hired in the last decade in their Faculties are top-notch researchers on paper. York must find a way of supporting these researchers and their teams by providing appropriate resources where necessary and to “get out of their way” where necessary. By the latter, I mean remove impediments to research that some first- rate researchers complain about at York University. Finally, we must collectively learn to celebrate research at York as among the highest institutional goods. 			