

**SCHOOL COUNCIL MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING**  
**2:00-3:30 PM/ FEBRUARY 26, 2019**  
**HSB ROOM 208**

Zoom: <https://zoom.us/j/108656044>

**Attendance:**

*Chair and Co-Chair:* Mark Dobrow-Chair, Sue Bondy, Co-Chair

*Ex-Officio Members:* Chris Kim (Library) Steini Brown, Rhonda Cockerill, Robin Hurst, Arleen Morrin, Lauren della Mora (for PHAA), Mavic Galicia (Secretary)

*Teaching Staff:* Anita Benoit, Whitney Berta (virtual), Paul Bozek, Jennifer Brooks, Pierrette Buklis (virtual), Michael Chaiton, Andrea Cortinois (virtual), Raisa Deber, David Fisman, Dionne Gesink, Daniel Grace, Tracy Kirkham, Laura Rosella, Rob Schwartz (virtual), James Scott, Emily Seto (virtual), Arjumand Siddiqi, Suzanne Stewart, Carole Strike, Kevin Thorpe, Julia Zarb

*Other Academic Appointees:* Ray Copes, Heather Manson (virtual), Jason Pole (virtual), Valerie Rackow (virtual), Victoria Arrandale (virtual)

*Graduate Students/Trainees:* Arlinda Ruco, Crystal Milligan, Alyssa Darden, Tessy Vattaparambil, Ntombi Nkiwane (virtual)

*Administrative Staff:* Sarah Ko, Ellen Sokoloff

Guests: Daniella Mallinick, Konstantina Kollias

- 
1. Chair Mark Dobrow called the meeting to order at 2:06 pm.
  2. Mark Dobrow started the meeting by stating that there is only one agenda item for the meeting. The review of proposed amendments to the DLSPH School Council Constitution and By-Laws. Mark proposed to walk through the timeline, Sue Bondy to discuss the revision details. Mark also acknowledged the presence of Daniella Mallinick (Director, Academic Program, Planning and Quality Assurance, VPAP) invited to address questions. There were no questions nor objections to the agenda.
  3. Mark also noted for the Council that the proceedings are being recorded for minute taking. No one objected.
  4. Mark recalled that this meeting was proposed at the 21 November 2019 School Council meeting and the requirement to have the amendments accepted by the Council to be submitted to the Provostial Advisory Group/Daniella Mallinick for review/feedback. The hope is to receive feedback and come up with a version to be voted on at the April meeting of School Council. The output from the ensuing exchange will be forwarded to Academic Board for final approval. If approved, the constitution and bylaws will be made effective and in use for the election of members in the June 2019 meeting of the School Council

Mark mentioned that the current draft is a result of consultation/feedback from both the PHS and IHPME faculty meetings held in February. The Council members have until March 5 to provide more input electronically to be considered for inclusion in the revised version that will be submitted to PAG for their March 7 meeting.

There were no comments to the timeline.

5. Sue Bondy described the distinction of approval for the Constitution and By-Laws. The Constitution is approved by the University which sets the foundation for the By-Laws fleshed out and approved by the Council.

There are two sections where fundamental changes have to be made as a result of change of policy and where amendments are proposed.

- a) Definitions – of faculty as it pertains to School Council

Teaching Staff definition has been adapted to align with the definition used across the University.

- b) “Other academic appointees” modified to now include Status-Only and Adjunct appointments with the School given that DLSPH is different from the rest of the University with regards to HR needs and given the long-standing involvement of Status-Only and Adjunct faculty. It was also noted that the Status Only and Adjunct faculty are not mentioned in the Constitutions of councils across the university.

It was also mentioned that the operations of SC committees will also be impacted if Status-Only and Adjunct faculty were not engaged. Details for this item will be in the By-Laws.

Some comments/questions:

Ellen Sokoloff note that ‘graduate student’ definition was included twice (sections e and i).

Raisa Deber asked how do we differ from how Faculty of Medicine does it? There are people in DLSPH who are not paid through the School but by other organizations. They supervise students and serve in committees.

Sue responded that the Faculty of Medicine has a large number of constituencies so that there is representation for TAHSN, Graduate, Undergraduate departments, etc. The Provost’s office indicates that our constitution needs to be largely consistent with those across the university, but they have also acknowledged with respect that we have a distinct structure. For specific wording, we have borrowed from other faculty constitutions but none, overall, is an exact model to follow. Steini added that the reality is that the university has trouble understanding how DLSPH relates to Status-Only and Adjunct faculty. That is because in most of the other big faculties, these types

of faculty do not exist. Even in Medicine, while PHS was part of it, Status-Only and Adjunct faculty were probably the single highest percentage in the faculty; whereas the other clinicians had clinical appointments. Sue noted that there is recognition of the need to continue with the conversation regarding the involvement and role of unpaid members of the School community in the School Council as the School evolves.

Daniella Mallinick asked what are you trying to do by having different representation on committees? You can still be engaged and aware but perhaps not have voting status. What is the goal of voting participation? Other academic appointees is unique to allow for differences in how faculties deliver their programs. But generally, that is typically a small percentage of the faculty membership. Sue added that we need a clear roster of teaching staff and that proportionality of membership groups is relevant...

James Scott added that he liked some ambiguity in cases like this; is there another way to come at this, to define the striking committee definitions. Laura Rosella asked if the striking committee members have terms. She added that we may be conflating feedback with voting status; we can get important stakeholders. Sue encouraged feedback from members on this.

6. Mark closed with a reminder that folks have until March 5 to send their feedback. The meeting was adjourned at 3:00.