

MINUTES

Faculty of Medicine & Dentistry
Faculty Council Meeting
September 19, 2017
4:00 - 5:30 pm
Classroom "D" Conferencing to
Classroom 2, Robbins Learning Center
Royal Alexandra Hospital

Present: As per attached list. *Attendance list may not reflect everyone in attendance*

1. CALL TO ORDER

Dr. Dennis Kunimoto called the meeting to order at 4:01 pm and welcomed everyone to the September 19, 2017 Faculty Council meeting. He acknowledged the video connection to RAH.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOVED by Dr. M. Lang and SECONDED by Dr. D. Emery that the Agenda be accepted as circulated. **CARRIED.**

3. APPROVAL OF THE MAY 23, 2017 MEETING MINUTES

MOVED by Dr. B. Ballermann and SECONDED by Dr. L. Sonneberg that the minutes for May 23, 2017 be approved as circulated. **CARRIED.**

4. INTRODUCTION OF NEW FACULTY & NEW LEADERSHIP POSITIONS

Dr. D. Kunimoto, Dr. B. Ballermann, Dr. C. Majaesic, Dr. C. Holmes and Dr. S. Schipper did introductions of new faculty and leadership positions. See attached, for complete list of new faculty & positions.



Dr. D. Kunimoto introduced Marion Haggarty-France, University Secretary, Dr. Wendy Rodgers, Deputy Provost and Donna Herman, Special Advisor.

5. BUSINESS ARISING

FEC Standards Dr. M. Lang

An open nomination was put out in early September to have two more representatives on the Faculty Evaluation Committee. Dr. William Dafoe and Dr. Pamela Brett-MacLean, are the newly elected members.

At the May Faculty Council Meeting, Version 22 of the FEC Standards were brought forward – 67 in favor and 70 opposed. . A review was completed as to why the motion defeated After focus meetings, group discussions, and survey data, possible explanations for the motion being defeated include:

- 1) Access to voting (in person voting problematic at 4:00, especially the Tuesday after a long weekend;
- 2) Communication from AASUA that expressed concerns about the Standards;
- 3) Referencing of the Academic Performance Guide in the Standards document; and
- 4) Not being able to vote on the Academic Performance Guide.

Feedback from the extensive consultation process used to create Version 23 that has been distributed to FoMD faculty members, Faculty Relations and AASUA for review. Faculty Relations have indicated that there is no breach in the Collective Agreement.

Some content from the Academic Performance Guide (APG) was moved into v 23 of the FEC Standards. The grids in the APG are on hold indefinitely. They will be reviewed to see how they can best help faculty members in the future, but will always be separate from the FEC Standards, and available only as a list of historical examples of possible academic activities.. The APG document is completely removed from the FEC Standards

Once the new Standards are approved – Faculty Council approval and then over to Provost for final approval –it will not come into effect until November 2019 FEC. The reporting period that it will first come into effect is July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019. A document that summarizes a comparison between the current FEC Guidelines and v 23 of the FEC has been emailed to all FoMD faculty members and was briefly reviewed by Dr. Lang.

The Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry has every plan to use and distribute the merit that is negotiated with AASUA. . Central allocates the number of merits to each Faculty based on the current Agreement. That is based on the number of Faculty members and interim it is the financial responsibility of each department to pay for the merit. We advocate that no change in what at 1.0 is. A 1.0 continues to be a 1.0.



Dr. Wendy Rodgers and Donna Herman – to answer any questions to merit.



Dr. Mia Lang – Version 23 of the FEC Standards – would like to put it forward for a vote in November –. From the feedback received it has been suggested that people would like to have an electronic vote.

How the electronic vote will proceed? Point #8 – this will be a confidential vote on FEC Standards. The CCID will be delinked, there will be no opportunity to identify voters.



Question: - Why such a short time to vote?

Dr. Dennis Kunimoto –amend the timeline to – 7 business days and change Point 7 to the Chair of Faculty Council.

Question: Announcement that the voting is on – announcements ending up in spam. Is there something that can be sent out – pre-notification that the vote is coming?

Question: What determines whether the vote is kept confidential or not?

Dr. Mia Lang responded – for high stake items, such as the FEC Standards, feel that it represents a confidential vote.

Dr. Dennis Kunimoto responded – Example: Changing the Terms of Reference of Faculty Council – that does not need to be confidential. Standing Committee votes are non-confidential – votes come in, they are linked to the CCID. Will determine at Faculty Council if the vote is confidential or non-confidential and have to make it clear before the voting starts.

Question: What makes quorum?

Marion Haggarty-France responded - goes back historically and the legislation prior to 2003 allowed quorum to say exactly what it is. If you look on the University website, some faculties say exactly what Medicine says, others have 10% quorum others have 25 faculty members make up quorum. General Faculty Council has approved this as quorum for the Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry.

The electronic voting process will be after the next FEC in November.

MOTION: Approve the electronic voting policy for faculty council with the changes noted above. **MOVED BY**: Dr. Barbara Ballermann **SECONDED BY**: Dr. Bill Sevcik. **ALL IN FAVOUR. CARRIED.**

MOTION: Voting on the new FoMD FEC Standards will occur via a secure, confidential electronic vote process as per the electronic voting policy. **MOVED BY:** Dr. Barbara Ballermann **SECONDED BY:** Dr. Bill Sevcik. **ALL IN FAVOUR. CARRIED.**

6. DEAN'S REPORT

No report

7. NEW BUSINESS:

Vice Dean, Education

Dr. Shirley Schipper

a. PGME Academic Appeals Policy Changes

Policy update changes – this is the part of the policy that deals with an informal appeal. Specifically when it comes to academic standings – it is on overall performance and overall standing – not specific to a rotation or a grade. There is no time limit on a resident being able to approach a program director for an informal appeal. At any time we would prefer for things to go to an informal appeal, rather than formal. Would like it to be as easy as possible for residents to be able to appeal for grades and for standings. Also believed that it was important to be able to name a delegate if a program director may want to have a designate review information.

Question: Who can be an advisor?

Dr. Shirley Schipper responded – Advisors can be a variety of sources – could be someone from Learner Advocacy and Wellness Office, lawyer or another type of advocate that could speak for them.



MOTION: To approve the proposed Post Graduate Medical Education Academic Appeals policy changes brought forward by the PGME Office. **MOVED BY:** Dr. Lyn Sonnenberg **SECONDED BY:** Dr. Shelley Ross. **All FAVOUR. CARRIED.**

Update – Dr. Tracey Hillier has stepped down as the MD Associate Dean for the MD program. Very thankful from the Office of Education and the Office of the Dean for the work and dedication of Dr. Tracey Hillier over the years. Dr. Peggy Sagle has stepped in as the Interim MD Associate Dean. The MD Program is going through an accreditation in

March. The process for this has not changed. Dr. Susan Andrew is leading the group towards and regular meetings about accreditation are being held.

The post graduate accreditation is coming up in November. Dr. Romana Kearney is leading the group. Post grad office is also being accredited at the same time by the Royal College and CFEC are sending survey teams to survey the school.

b. FoMD Expression of Opinion

Dr. Penny Smyth

As members of the Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry we are often asked for opinions on various subjects, in which we might or might not be experts and as such we are active members of society as well, who often contribute to things that may or may not be related to our professional positions.

Short document, not a policy, it is a guideline that is intended to provide some considerations as to when we might be providing personal opinions or views vs. when we are representing ourselves as experts or professionals representing our programs at the University.

The document outlines that all of us have the right to express our opinion and be free of censorship. This document is not intended to impact your right to academic freedom or student's rights to a discussion. When opinions are provided it should be made clear that expression might be a personal view or representation of ourselves as experts in professional roles.

A change has been made to the document that was sent out on September 5 and in addition, providing disclaimers to whether you are speaking personally or not. If you are expressing personal views in a written document, do not use the University logo or letterhead.

Clarity when your expressed opinion is personal vs expert, whether written, web based and verbal format. Consider not using your professional title when expressing your personal opinion and consider not using professional letterhead. Resources are available. Media training courses are available.

MOTION: To approve the proposed Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry Expression of Opinion Guidelines. **MOVED BY:** Dr. Mia Lang **SECONDED BY:** Dr. Shelley Ross. **All FAVOUR. CARRIED.**



c. Vice Dean, Research No repot

8. OTHER BUSINESS

No items.

9. ANNOUNCEMENTS

No items.

10. NEXT MEETING

The meeting was adjourned at 5:44 pm

The next meeting will be held on: **Tuesday**, **November 21**, **2017 from 4:00 - 5:30 PM** in L1 490 ECHA

For Information Only

Meeting document attachments went out September 5, 2017 via email, with an update September 8, 2017

ATTENDANCE LIST – September 19, 2017 (May not reflect everyone in attendance)

