

## **New College Council**

*Meeting of Thursday, December 12, 2024, 12:10 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.*

---

### **AGENDA:**

1. Minutes of the Meeting of Nov. 13, 2024 ([attached](#))
2. Business Arising from the Minutes
  - i) Motion to establish a committee to examine the program closure recommendation of the Buddhism, Psychology and Mental Health Minor.
3. Report from the Writing Centre – M. Prescott-Brown
4. Report from the Librarian – M. Redden
5. Report of the Chief Administrative Officer – R. Vander Kraats
6. Report from Student Councils
  - i) NCSC
  - ii) NCRC
  - iii) Course Unions
7. Report from Standing Committees
8. Report of the Principal – R. Gazzale
9. Report from the Registrar's Office – K. Huffman
10. Report from the Office of Residence and Student Life – L. McCormack-Smith
11. Other Business

## **NEW COLLEGE COUNCIL**

Minutes of the meeting of Wednesday, November 13, 2024,  
12:10 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.

Present: R. Gazzale, K. Huffman, A. Guerson, T. Seburn, B. Russell, D. Chang, L. McCormack-Smith, R. Buiani, A. Stone, A. McGuire, S. Trimble, F. Garrett, M. Prescott-Brown, W. Tran, T. Walkland, N. Siddiqui, A. Trotz, D. Williamson, M. Redden, K. Edmonds, C. Ramsaroop, S. Aidid, A. Rodrigues Magalhaes, Sheila Stewart, Janet Pham (BPSU), Nicolas Violet (BPSU), Maya Gangji (BPSU), Sophia Shkodzinsky (BPSU), Esther Wing (BPSU), Helena Choi (WGSSU), Erin Moo-Penn (HBSU)

Regrets: E. Weisbaum

### Introduction

T. Seburn gave the University of Toronto [Land Acknowledgement](#).

### Minutes of the Meeting of September 23, 2024

K. Huffman provided membership updates on the various New College subcommittees. Please see [attached](#).

K. Edmonds asked if a representative from the 45 Willcocks building could be added to the Building Committee.

K. Huffman replied that it would be possible to co-opt individuals and added that the subcommittees typically only meet when there are enough agenda and action items to warrant a full meeting.

B. Russell motioned to approve the minutes.

T. Walkland seconded. The motion opened for discussion and voting.

All in favour of approving the minutes. The motion carried with all in favour and the minutes from the September 23, 2024 meeting were approved.

### Business Arising from the Minutes

No business arose from the minutes.

### Agenda

A. Guerson motioned to approve the agenda.

B. Russell seconded. The motion opened for discussion and voting.

The motion carried and the agenda was approved.

### Report from Student Councils

*NCSC – N. Siddiqui:*

General updates

- Fall elections have concluded smoothly and without any grievances.
  - NCSC will put together a report for the elections review committee summarizing this year's elections.
  - There is now a full council with 34 participants.
  - There will be more NCSC attendance in future New College Council meetings.

R. Buiani observed the cabinets in the basement of the 45 Willcocks building have been populated with items and asked for context of what they were.

N. Siddiqui explained the cabinets are currently being used as trophy cabinets to display the achievements by New College student organizations recognized by NCSC. Currently, the Dragon Boat team, New Dragons, have some items displayed. There were also plans to display trophies from previous years and other organizations.

*NCRC:*

No representatives in attendance.

### Course Unions:

*BPSU – Janet Pham:*

BPSU had follow-up questions for R. Gazzale regarding the Buddhism, Psychology and Mental Health (BPMH) student consultation that occurred a couple weeks ago. These questions were deferred to the Report from the Principal.

### Report from Standing Committees

*Academic Affairs – A. Guerson:*

A. Guerson shared updates from the October 2, 2024 Academic Affairs meeting.

- Curriculum Changes for Governance
  - BPM381H1 and JNR301H1 were proposed to be added to the BPMH Minor's list of Core Group courses on the Academic Calendar as they were not previously listed.

- BPM381H1 was previously a Special Topics course that became its own permanent course, but at the time of its creation it was not added to the list of Core Group courses. This resulted in the course not counting towards completion of the BPMH Minor whenever students enrolled in it and required manual additions via Degree Explorer.
- Updates from the first Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and Principals, Deans, Academic Directors and Chairs meetings.
  - These updates were deferred to the Report of the Vice-Principal.
- Expanding the New College Senior Doctoral Fellowship Program.
  - In the past, this was a fellowship that would bring in a University of Toronto senior doctoral student, grant them \$1,500 for the year, and affiliate them with one of New College's academic programs to – at the minimum – give a presentation at the end of the year.
  - There were discussions about creating a Teaching Fellowship that will have a senior doctoral student teach at the College.
  - A. Trotz proposed that an idea for a course they could teach would be a new series of 199/First-Year Foundations courses that could serve as a bridge between STEM and the Social Sciences as well as the Humanities given the former's representation amongst the New College student base.
    - An example of the theme for these courses would be a math and social justice course given the prevalence of the latter in New College programs.
    - Proposal to create focus groups of students to crowdsource a list of their needs in their first year to assist with course topic ideation.
    - Will also require a meeting with Labour Relations and the CUPE 3902 Unit 1 Union to discuss limitations within and adjustments to the current Collective Agreement.
      - A. Guerson and R. Gazzale will meet with them shortly.
    - The goal will be to make these courses as flexible as possible as it is impossible to know who would be teaching them year-to-year. Essentially, they will function as Special Topics courses.
- Ongoing conversations around Accessible Classrooms.
  - This is especially important given the range of disability studies courses in the Critical Studies in Equity and Solidarity program.
  - Many classrooms are labelled as “accessible”, but this usually just refers to the classroom being accessible via elevator and may not actually meet the accessibility needs of the students in the course
  - R. Gazzale has been meeting with leadership from Learning Space Management to discuss coming to an agreement that would allow us to at least prioritize certain types of classrooms for certain courses.
    - Ideally the changes would be implemented by next Fall.

C. Ramsaroop asked what type of mentorship and support would be provided to the Senior Doctoral Fellow.

A. Guerson agreed that mentorship would be important as these fellows would be teaching first year students, which is a demographic which may have particular needs. The fellow could be connected with New College Faculty who would be able to act as mentors. Additional Faculty may be contacted depending on the fellow's needs and field of study. Also, due to the large gap in time

between a course being scheduled and the term in which it will be taught, there is ample time and opportunity for mentorship and to discuss support.

A. Trotz provided additional context to the origins of the Senior Doctoral Fellow program. Originally, it was intended to allow more junior or local students who were starting their careers to obtain research support and potentially teach one or two courses. A. Trotz also added that there are other models and precedents for Senior Doctoral Fellowships in other departments that it may be prudent to draw upon. For example, in Women and Gender Studies all the senior students have the opportunity to teach before they complete their studies. Lastly, A. Trotz proposed the idea of having a two-year teaching fellowship instead of one as it would be unfair to the fellow to prepare as well as refine a course for one year and go through the troubles of familiarizing themselves with the team, policies, and so on only to then leave the program.

A. Guerson responded that this can be discussed at the next Academic Affairs meeting and then brought back to the New College Council.

No other Standing Committees had a report for this meeting.

#### Report from the Principal – R. Gazzale

- R. Gazzale prompted professors, program directors, and other academics to participate in and engage with the Artificial Intelligence (AI) Task Force's Teaching and Learning Working Group's town halls due to the prevalence of AI in the current pedagogical landscape.
- A new Advancement Director has been hired internally. They will start on December 8, 2024.
- Update on Writing Centre with respect to Arts and Science policy.
  - The Faculty of Arts and Science has made the decision that they will not support having a full faculty position for the Writing Centre Director for the constituent Colleges (i.e., University, New, Innis, and Woodsworth). Instead, the Writing Centre Director will be no different from a Program Director in that the latter receives a course teaching reduction in exchange for their service.
    - This change will be going into effect, at earliest, in the 2025-2026 session. As such, M. Prescott-Brown will remain the Writing Centre Director for at least one more year.
    - R. Gazzale shared that this change will not lead to a reduction in the level of services provided by the New College Writing Centre as it will continue to improve the breadth of coverage of its services and offerings (e.g., M. Prescott-Brown had started to hire STEM specialists who can provide writing instruction that is more tailored towards the fields of studies New College students are typically enrolled in). However, this does mean that the individual who eventually becomes the Writing Centre Director is going to move from a role where they are expected to deliver services to a role of more leadership.
- BPMH Program updates.
  - R. Gazzale met with the BPSU to discuss the current state of the program.

- It was helpful to hear directly from the student union and to also provide current understanding of why it was that the Faculty of Arts and Science has recommended closure of the BPMH program.
- Also discussed what options are available to the College presently with respect to supporting the program.
- R. Gazzale met with other programs that have undergone a similar closure recommendation but were ultimately preserved to review what actions they took.
  - Found that these programs were either absorbed or supported by an Academic Unit.
    - E.g., Health Sciences program was reconfigured as the Public Health program in conjunction with the Dalla Lana School of Public Health.
- R. Gazzale met with more potential cognate units.
  - The Department of Philosophy is currently uninterested in providing material support to the BPMH program.
  - The Department for the Study of Religion continues to share that supporting BPMH is not in their academic plan.

At this point, T. Seburn opened the floor for questions.

- Questions about the Advancement Director.
  - R. Buiani asked who should be sent donor reports while the Advancement Director has yet to start their role.
    - R. Gazzale responded that it should be sent to the Principal at [nc.principal@utoronto.ca](mailto:nc.principal@utoronto.ca).
- Questions about the Writing Centre update.
  - S. Trimble expressed concerns about the future of the Writing Centre given the upcoming changes to the Director role.
    - As a faculty member that receives a course release to be in a leadership role, S. Trimble emphasized that Writing Centre offerings will be substantially reduced should this policy pass as the new Director will not have enough time to adequately allocate to the betterment of the Centre.
    - Highlighted that many students are facing multiple stressors, such as economic pressures and lingering effects of the pandemic. These factors contribute to underdeveloped academic skills, particularly writing, which lead to things such as improper AI usage out of desperation.
      - Reported that in one of their large courses, 40% of students used AI to generate large components of their assignments.
    - Observed that this decision would be detrimental to student mental health and academic success, especially when the University claims to prioritize student well-being and, as such, urged the New College Council to oppose this policy.
  - Sheila Stewart (current New College Writing Instructor), who has experience in both a Faculty and administrative roles, agreed with S. Trimble's concerns about the link between student mental health and writing support.
    - Elaborated that the services of the Writing Centre, such as its one-on-one appointments and many initiatives, promotes and fosters students' key intellectual growth.

- Highlighted that the New College Writing Centre, which has been known for its consistent leadership and innovation among Writing Centres, is already in a challenging situation due to the removal of one of its Faculty positions.
- Shared that M. Prescott-Brown has a large role in how the Writing Instructors are currently mentored, supported, and continue to professional develop,
- A. Trotz expressed concern about the lack of clarity and process behind this decision.
  - Shared that the Faculty of Arts and Science have made many decisions in the recent past that have not come as a result of genuine and meaningful consultation, which ultimately led to problems. Expressed that the decision also devalues and underestimates the actual work that Writing Centres do, as the workload would not be possible to accommodate via a course release.
  - Emphasized the historical significance of the Writing Centre, noting its roots in the Transitional Year Program (TYP), which was developed through the efforts of the Black, Indigenous, and working-class communities in Toronto to establish alternative pathways to higher education.
    - Alongside TYP, intensive writing programs were designed to help these student populations transition into higher education, which laid the foundation for the University of Toronto Writing Centres, with the New College Writing Centre in particular having a long-standing commitment to supporting students who face structural disadvantages via initiatives such as the Caribbean, African, Equity and Solidarity Studies (CAESS) Writing Group.
  - Asked if there was evidence or data supporting the decision, such as a report from the Writing Centre about their services and the number of students they support.
  - Agreed that the STEM-specific writing supports are important but also shared that these changes should not sacrifice the essence of these writing programs.
- A. McGuire provided data points to support the Writing Centre.
  - 87% of students who access the CAESS Writing Group find it “extremely helpful” or “very helpful” in their academic success.
    - However, over 50% of students do not access these programs, which underscores the need to increase, rather than decrease, Writing Centre offerings to improve student access.
  - Shared the current model being considered for the Writing Centre could not replicate the depth, innovation, and effectiveness that have defined the New College Writing Centre for decades as it is short-sighted.
  - Highlighted the ongoing impact of pandemic-related learning losses, exacerbated by deficits in the public education system.
    - Cautioned that writing skill gaps are not a temporary issue but rather are part of a longer-term trend that universities must be prepared to face.
- R. Buiani asked if the Faculty of Arts and Science were aware that New College is both the biggest College and that it also serves the greatest number of international students.

- Given this, shared that New College should be granted some exceptions or additional support as these changes would disproportionately impact the New College Writing Centre and especially the international students who require greater access to language and writing support.
- K. Edmonds agreed with R. Buiani's points about New College's size, diversity, and the specific needs of its student body.
  - Shared how invaluable the Writing Centre's workshops are for student success and retention as students have noted they would have either quit their studies or not graduated without the Centre's support.
    - Expressed that outreach and visibility for writing services should be scaled up, ensuring that students are aware of and can access these vital resources early into their studies.
      - R. Buiani added that there was a significant and observable difference in the writing between New One (i.e., first-year students) students who have accessed Writing Centre resources versus those who have not.
    - Highlighted M. Prescott-Brown's unique and specialized support and contributions that go beyond expectations of Faculty members.
  - Observed the importance of Writing Centre resources for the professional and pedagogical development for Faculty members.
- C. Ramsaroop expressed concerns that the current decisions being made about the Writing Centre are for the purposes of efficiency, which contradicts the need to invest in students' long-term development.
  - Shared that supporting students, especially in their first year, is the key to preparing them for graduate and professional schools as well as their future careers. This is especially the case for those in the humanities, social sciences, law, and public service.
  - Reiterated the importance of the Writing Centre for marginalized students, who often lack support on campus.
  - Also observed noticeable improvements in first-year students' writing skills once they began to utilize Writing Centre resources.
  - Emphasized that the Writing Centre and its staff should not be treated as a supplementary or precarious service, especially when given their impact, but instead should be funded properly and dedicated sufficient resources for it to succeed.
- M. Redden emphasized the need for New College to align its actions with its values and advocate for the preservation of the Writing Centre.
  - Shared that M. Prescott-Brown stepped into the position on very short notice, due to the sudden departure of the previous Writing Centre Director and managed to excel. They were also the first Black Writing Centre Instructor at the University and represent much of the leadership in diversity that the College historically values.
- R. Gazzale clarified that this change is not a proposed one but rather was a decision made sometime last year, which seems to have not been communicated to the Council.
  - It appears that one of the reasons for the decision is advancement criteria. There is currently no way for a permanent Writing Centre Director, if they are in a Faculty position, to satisfy the teaching stream criteria for



- advancement as it requires official classroom presence (i.e., teaching University of Toronto courses).
- T. Seburn proposed the idea of creating a working group to further explore the background behind this change and to determine next steps.
    - A. Trotz agreed and added that the actions of the working group should be more directed, starting with consulting with Dickson Eyoh and Bonnie McElhinny (the two most recent New College Principals) to receive more context about when the decision was initially made from the former and context about the development of the Writing Centre from the latter. Also, a formal request should be made to the Faculty of Arts and Science to provide the process and rationale behind their decision in the form of any minutes or design details that are relevant to the case.
      - Highlighted there have been instances where the Faculty of Arts and Science has backtracked policies or created new measures due to advocacy efforts from New College, such as how teaching stream Faculty were not originally allowed to apply for short grants or how the Hollenberg Report was created to evaluate creative contributions of tenure stream Faculty despite initial confusion surrounding it.
    - A. Trotz called for R. Gazzale to formally communicate to the Faculty of Arts and Science that New College is strongly opposed to this change.
  - T. Seburn motioned to create a small committee to investigate and communicate with the past New College Principals as well as the Faculty of Arts and Science regarding the background and processes involved in making the decision to eliminate the full-time Writing Centre Director role.
    - R. Buiani seconded. Motion opened for discussion and voting.
    - Motion carried with majority in favour.
  - Questions about the status of the BPMH program.
    - Janet Pham (BPSU President) raised several questions and concerns.
      - Asked if R. Gazzale knows with complete confidence that they cannot reverse the current administrative enrolment suspension on the BPMH Minor.
        - R. Gazzale responded that they do not have any unilateral ability to remove this suspension.
      - Shared that the Arts and Science Student Union said the Faculty of Arts and Science makes recommendations but do not make the final decision. As such, the BPSU believes the Principal can advocate for the reversal of the enrolment suspension to provide more time for the BPMH program to find solutions to the problems the Faculty are concerned about as it is currently implied that the program will be inevitably closed.
        - R. Gazzale said unless there is a material change in the ability to find cognate units that readily express willingness to materially support the BPMH program, this does appear to be the current trajectory.
      - Asked for clarification on the Faculty of Arts and Science's main concern about the lack of tenured Faculty members in the BPMH program.
        - R. Gazzale shared that the criteria in which the Faculty of Arts and Science has decided upon is that students in a program should have structural access to permanent Faculty, with it would seem like some

privilege towards research stream (i.e., tenured) Faculty and not solely teaching stream (i.e., continuing status) Faculty. This does not count Faculty members who choose to teach on an overload contract.

- Asked if there has been a precedent of tenured Faculty members teaching within the BPMH program and if it would be the role of the Principal to hire new Faculty members.
  - R. Gazzale responded that they are uncertain if there have previously been permanent Faculty members who have been officially assigned to the BPMH program. Also shared that the allocation of professorial lines is decided by the Faculty of Arts and Science in concentration with the entire University. If there were to be a Memoranda of Understanding between a program and a cognate unit, it would be between the program, the cognate unit, and at least the Faculty of Arts and Science if not a higher governing body. In this case, the College would be a signatory. However, this is all assuming that a cognate unit agrees to provide Faculty support to a program in the first place.
    - Janet Pham commented that the consultation process as well as the process of forming relationships with cognate units requires time.
- Asked if potential cognate units were consulted before the recommendation to close the BPMH program was made.
  - R. Gazzale shared that the College had previously consulted with the Department for the Study of Religion, the Department of Psychology. Subsequently, consultations have been conducted with the School of the Environment and the Department of Philosophy. None of these units have communicated willingness to support the BPMH program.
- Asked if all potential cognate units will be exhausted before continuing with the recommendation to close the program as well as if more time could be given before moving along with the process.
  - R. Gazzale responded that they would be willing to speak with any cognate unit that is willing to have a conversation about the program and to bring attention to the Faculty of Arts and Science that more time would be warranted. However, also shared that their understanding is the Faculty of Arts and Science will not give the program more time unless one or more cognate units have expressed interest in materially supporting the program.
  - R. Gazzale reiterated that while they have not looked at all the cases where a program was preserved after a program closure recommendation, the ones that were preserved so far have all been cases where a cognate unit already were inclined to provide material support. As such, they were not cases where a program needed time to find a cognate unit as there was already interest.
- F. Garrett observed that conversations pertaining to the BPMH program are not being allocated sufficient time and space during meetings, such as the New College Council, given the importance of the program to both New College and students.

- Called for the Council to dedicate time and resources to adequately discuss and brainstorm next steps pertaining to the BPMH program's status.
  - C. Ramsaroop and R. Buiani both agreed and shared there has not been enough transparency in the decision-making process for both the proposal of BPMH's closure and changes to the Writing Centre Director position as both proposals seem misaligned with the current realities and success of the program and Centre respectively.
    - R. Gazzale responded that while the level of consultation pertaining to the BPMH program could have been different, the Council was made aware of the reasons for the recommendation to close the program through the March 7, 2024 meeting. They also shared they have connected with various Governance and University officials and the reason for the closure recommendation does seem to be, in essence, a concern about long-term access to permanent Faculty members.
  - F. Garrett also observed that there has been inconsistent communication and language surrounding the BPMH proposals, as previously the recommendation to close the program came from a three-person committee consisting of the previous Principal and the Program Directors of two cognate units. However, now there is information being shared that the program is being closed upon a recommendation by other parties when it has not yet undergone any of the formal steps for program closure, such as a written academic rationale or a review by Governance. F. Garrett highlighted this miscommunication is a large component of unease, especially for the students in the program.
    - R. Gazzale responded that the minutes of the March 7, 2024 New College Council meeting indicate that there are plans to proceed with the program closure process for the BPMH program.
- K. Edmonds asked if it would be possible for New College to offer professorial lines given the demand for the BPMH program.
  - R. Gazzale answered that any line would need to come from the Faculty of Arts and Science, which is currently planning on recommending to close the program. It is not possible for the College to unilaterally create a position.
- F. Garrett asked if it would be possible for a new review committee to be formed to evaluate the BPMH program, given the previous one had little knowledge of the program and did not adequately fulfill the requirements of the consultation process.
  - R. Gazzale responded that a new review committee would not change the outcome at this point in time as the Faculty of Arts and Science convened the initial committee.
- Nicolas Violet (BPSU) asked if there exist any specific numerical thresholds for the number of permanent Faculty associated with a program.
  - R. Gazzale shared that there does not seem to be an official outline of this. However, drawing upon the example of the Public Health program, they now have approximately 40% of their courses taught by permanent Faculty who are obligated to teach the course, as opposed to permanent Faculty who are

teaching on overload. As such, the approximate goal for a Cognate Unit materially supporting the BPMH program would be to have at least a third of the BPMH Core Group courses taught by their permanent Faculty.

- A. McGuire observed that the requirement for research-stream Faculty versus teaching-stream Faculty to be teaching courses is illogical when considering both their teaching capacities (one course versus 3.0 full-course equivalents respectively) and the number of each that would be required to meet any significant threshold.
- F. Garrett added that there are multiple individuals within the Department for Studies in Religion that would be willing to support the BPMH program.
  - R. Gazzale responded that they have spoken with the Chair of this department, on multiple occasions, who have shared supporting the BPMH program is not in their academic plans.

T. Seburn observed the time allotted to the New College Council meeting has concluded and motioned to move this meeting's reports that have not yet been shared to the next Council meeting. Further, they called for the reports that were not shared to be added to this meeting's minutes.

Seconded by T. Walkland. The motion opened for discussion and voting.

All in favour. Motion carried with all in favour.

[Report from the Vice-Principal.](#)

[Report from the Writing Centre.](#)

[Report from the Librarian.](#)

T. Seburn motioned to adjourn the meeting but offered for individuals who wish to continue their conversations to do so.

Seconded by B. Russell. The motion opened for discussion and voting.

All in favour. Meeting adjourned at 2:04 PM.

## **Report of the Vice-Principal – A. Guerson**

### **UTQAP Review of CSES**

- UTQAP review for CSES is going according to schedule.
- I would like to thank Anne McGuire for her superb work on the self-study; in the words from the Dean's office from someone who reads reports from across A & S, she produced one of the best first drafts she has ever seen. It was rich and insightful, and the challenge now is to trim it down. The final report will be submitted on November 20<sup>th</sup>.
- The visits are confirmed for February 10th and the program is very happy with the choice of reviewers.

### **Report from Committee on Standing**

- One of the meetings I attended since the last NCC and AA was the Arts & Science Council on October 16<sup>th</sup>.
- On that meeting Suzanne Wood, Associate Dean, Student Affairs, presented a report from the committee on standing and academic appeals board
- This was a presentation on the number of petitions students put through the system in 2023-24, how many were granted, how many denied, and how many undecideds.
- As we know the number of petitions greatly increased during the pandemic and these numbers have not decreased to pre-pandemic levels.
- The largest number of petitions are around exams - exam deferrals and re-deferrals. Most of those are approved.
- One issue that we have been observing is a change in the proportion of petitions granted for requests for Withdrawal without Academic Penalty. While the majority were granted when requests with supporting documentation was submitted, they are now denied more often than granted (575 granted and 959 denied out of 1,799 petitions in 2023-24)
- When I asked if there were any changes in policy that may explain why most of those requests are unsuccessful compared to in the past, Dean Wood said there was no change in policy. New College's Registrar's Office has been collecting data on the reasons for denial and we expect to have more information to present on this in the future.

### **AI Task force**

- One recurring issue in many of the Arts and Sciences meetings has been multiple reports from the AI Task Force led by Susan McCahon and Karen Reed. Principal Gazzale mentioned in his report at the last NCC. It came up at the PDAD&C meeting of Sept 26 and we discussed it at Academic Affairs.
- The larger question around this issue is what skills and competencies will students, faculty, and staff need to be able to use AI effectively; but also, how will changes to how people work and live in the future affect the way we learn and teach.
- I encourage all faculty to attend the town halls and monthly meetings of the AI Task Force if you have not already. There was a Town Hall held on October 29, from which came a small number of recommendations:

- 1. Framing instructors' responsibilities - and here the call was that we all need to get educated on the current AI landscape and how it might affect our own work and the work our students produce; this will be essential to maintain learning outcomes and meaningful assignments.
- 2. How the use of AI in unsupervised work during the term might create what they call a "false sense of mastery" leading to a potential "catastrophic failure" when asked to demonstrate the learning in a supervised assessment such as a final exam.
- A great deal of discussion ensued around needing to reconsider our fields in the age of AI and what are the essential critical skills we need to navigate this world and how to then have open conversations with our students so that they can see the value in doing certain types of tasks themselves
- For anyone who is interested in knowing what has been discussed, what are the resources currently available, please check out [ai.utoronto.ca](https://ai.utoronto.ca) which is the information hub created around the topic and on that page, there is a link to the AI Task Force which will take you to a SharePoint site with the latest updates from the Task Force as well as link to the monthly meetings - AI Roundup - in which they review AI advances and pick a few items to discuss in more detail. Recordings of previous meetings are available there.

## Writing Centre Report – M. Prescott-Brown

- Creating Knowledge: this year, Creating Knowledge (which prepares students for the research and writing skills needed in their senior years of study; students third year and higher can register for it etc.) was run virtually (via Zoom). 70 students attended the event. In the future, it will run as a 1 or 2-day event online—likely in September.
  - One of the Creating Knowledge workshops— [Preparing Graduate and Professional School Applications: A panel discussion](#) — **was open access** (all years of students could attend, not just year three of study and higher).
    - We had 46 unique student users at that panel alone. This could be a model for future years (a couple sessions where access is open to students at all levels).
  - Graduate school panel, only 6 of the students were in first year, and 4 students were in second year; all the rest were 3rd year and beyond.
- Writing Plus:
  - Going really well. Workshops about writing graduate school application materials are well attended.
- Write Night is back for students.
  - 6-9PM on November 27th
  - This event provides a hot meal to students as well as writing and librarian instruction as they finish up end of term assignments.

## Report from the Librarian – M. Redden

- 24-hour study space
  - The library will begin our 24-hour study space for the exam period on Saturday December 7th and wrap up at 5:00PM on Friday December 20th, at which time we will close for the break (reopening Monday January 6th at 9:00AM). The library will be open around the clock except for closures for cleaning Fridays at 5:00PM through Saturdays at 9:00AM.
  - Job posting for student 'Night Stewards' is live. Deadline to apply is November 15th at midnight.
- The deadline to submit Course Reading Lists for Term 2 (Y courses)/Winter 2025 (S courses) is December 4th, 2024. As usual, late hires should contact the library for extensions.
  - Course reading lists will be scanned, processed for copyright and accessibility, and uploaded to the Library Reading List application between December 5th and 20th while library staff are still available.
  - No work will be done on course reading lists between December 20th at 5:00PM and January 6th at 9:00AM
- Demand for one-on-one research consultations for students has increased substantially
  - Between September 3rd and today, librarians have completed nearly twice as many (i.e. 46% more) consultations than were completed last year during the same period.
  - Instructors for Term 2 and Winter 2025 are encouraged to schedule workshops to address student need for research instruction in class.
- The library is in process of developing a [webpage featuring the college's Woodland Art Collection](#). The collection was purchased in 1979
  - A TDSB co-op student completed an inventory of the art in April 2024. Their work also involved recording audio to accompany the collection, which will be added to the webpage.
  - A curator from the university Art Gallery is investigating copyright permissions to photograph each piece to add them to the webpage.



## Striking Committee – Nominations for 2024-25 NCC

Striking Committee 2024 Members: *Principal Gazzale, NCSC President, Kerri Huffman, Hong Si, Marci Prescott-Brown, Alexandra Guerson*

### **MEMBERSHIP OF COUNCIL**

#### ***Ex Officio members:***

- President (or designate)
- Vice-President and Provost (or designate)
- Principal
- Vice-Principal
- Assistant Principal & Registrar
- Dean of Students
- Chief Administrative Officer
- Associate Director, Advancement
- Alumni Development Officer
- Director, International Programs
- Librarian (Mikayla Redden)
- Director, Writing Centre
- One Associate Registrar (Donna Chang)
- Director of each academic program
- Director, WGSJ
- Director, Caribbean Studies
- Director, African Studies
- President, NCSC
- One Vice-President, NCSC (VP Admin)
- Two Presidents, NCRC
  
- **6 elected members of the teaching staff (2-year terms)**

#### ***Nomination -***

- *Serving the second of a two-year term:*

- Safia Aidid
- Trimble (WGSJ)
- Chris Ramsaroop

*Serving the first of a 2-year term*

- Stan Doyle Wood
- Ellie Weisbaum

**6 Student Reps:**

NCSC Reps (4)  
VP Finance  
VP Student Services

**Course Union Reps**

African Studies Student Union  
Buddhism, Psychology & Mental Health  
Student Union  
Caribbean Studies Student Union  
Equity Studies Student Union  
Women & Gender Studies Student Union

**Dons Rep**  
**TA/WC Instructors Rep**  
**4 Alumni Reps**

**AJ Stone**  
**Ty Walkland**

---

**USWA Rep**

**Tyson Seburn**

---

**CUPE Rep**

**Daniel Racelis**

## ***STANDING COMMITTEES OF COUNCIL:***

### **ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

*Ex Officio:* Bob Gazzale (Principal), Kerri Huffman (Asst. Principal & Registrar), Marieme Lo (African Studies), Conrad James (Caribbean Studies), Alexandra Guerson (VP), Anne McGuire (Equity Studies), Alissa Trotz (WGSI), Marci Prescott Brown (Writing Centre), Frances Garrett (BPMH), Bruce Russell (IFP), Mikayla Redden (Librarian) Roberta Buiani (New One)

*To be elected:* 5 members of Council

<p><b><i>Nominations:</i></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. NCSC rep</li> <li>2. CSES rep</li> <li>3. Ellie Weisbaum</li> <li>4. Tyson Seburn</li> <li>5. Catherine Argiropoulos</li> </ol>
---

### **BUILDING COMMITTEE**

*Ex Officio:* Bob Gazzale (Principal), Ron Vander Kraats (Chief Administrative Officer), Leah McCormack-Smith (Dean of Students), Rachel Tennant (Property Manager)

*To be elected:*

- 1 member of teaching staff
- 2 students
- 1 residence don
- 1 of head stewards

<p><b><i>Nominations :</i></b>          Alexandra Guerson          NCSC – 1 rep          NCRC – 1 rep  <b><i>Co-opt:</i></b> Hong Si, Karen Spence, Dylan Williamson (ADRL), Kerri Huffman</p>
--

### **LIBRARY COMMITTEE**

*Ex Officio:* Mikayla Redden (Librarian), Bob Gazzale (Principal)

*To be elected:* four members of Council

<p><b><i>Nominations:</i></b>          CSES rep          NCSC rep          Alexandra Guerson</p>
--

Kevin Edmonds

### **NEW STUDENT SERVICE**

*Ex officio:* Bob Gazzale (Principal), Kerri Huffman (Registrar), Donna Chang (Associate Registrar), Leah McCormack-Smith (Dean of Students), Mikayla Redden (Librarian), Marci Prescott Brown (Director, WC), Brenda Registe (ADO).

***Nominations:*** 4 NCSC Reps (including President, Orientation Co-ordinators, Commuter Rep)  
2 NCRC Reps

***Co-opted:*** Trish Starling  
Dylan Williamson  
Lily Kwiatkowski

### **PRIORITY, PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE**

*Ex Officio:* Bob Gazzale (Principal), Navya Siddiqui (President, NCSC), Kerri Huffman (Asst. Principal & Registrar), Ron Vander Kraats (Chief Administrative Officer), Leah McCormack-Smith (Dean of Students), Mikayla Redden (Librarian), Alissa Trotz (Director, WGS), Catherine Argiropoulos (ADO)

*To be elected:* 4 members of Council

Alexandra Guerson  
Anne McGuire  
Tyson Seburn  
NCRC Rep