Appendix III: Consultations
September 24, 2019

Dean Alice Hovorka  
Faculty of Environmental Studies  
Health, Nursing and Environmental Studies Building, 139J

Dear Dean Hovorka,

I am writing to convey my strong support for the proposal to establish a Faculty of Urban and Environmental Change at York University. The proposal responds to the opportunity to provide leadership and vision on our environment, encompassing natural and built, at a time when climate and planetary health present the world’s most pressing issues.

Several reasons have been advanced for the proposed new Faculty. The Institutional Integrated Resource Plan called upon Faculties and units to seek ways to enhance the quality and sustainability of their programs and identified harmonization, rationalization and streamlining of program offerings as potential activities. More specifically, the recent Cyclical Program Reviews of both units and an environmental scan of cognate programs at Ontario universities commissioned from Higher Education Strategy Associates (HESA) identified a need for more coherence and focus in programs with an environmental core.

FES and Geography have both experienced enrolment declines in their undergraduate programs (and to a lesser extent at the graduate level) in recent years. Both internal and external research suggests that the array of program and course options offered across these two units and others presents a confusing array of programs to potential students and likely decreases our competitive advantage in terms of applications and enrolments with programs offered by other universities. A merger will enable a more coordinated approach to curriculum planning and, importantly, to the presentation of program options in a clear and integrated way that conveys to potential students the opportunities available to them. A new vision for the programs involved will reduce duplication, identify career and graduate education opportunities, and create opportunities for cross-disciplinary projects and practices.

The Faculty of Urban and Environmental Change will bring together scholars that exemplify research excellence, interdisciplinarity, and impact at York. The establishment of thematic clusters will further provide opportunity for collaboration around environmental change, urbanization, sustainability and justice, sustainable transitions, and other connected and pressing issues.
I have been fully involved in discussions around the development of the proposal for a Faculty of Urban and Environmental Change. This proposal is the result of more than two and a half years of work and consultations led by colleagues within the Department of Geography and the Faculty of Environmental Studies, by APPRC and ASCP, and by the Dean of FES. My office has been an active participant in various processes designed to support this initiative: we have been members of the Facilitating Group, established under the leadership of the APPRC and ASCP Chairs to work on this initiative, the Vice provost Academic has facilitated the revision of curriculum, and we have provided project management and other resource supports. My office has also actively participated in the sub-group of ASCP mandated to consult with the wider York community on collaborative curriculum.

I concur with the proposal’s analysis that this initiative aligns with the University vision, values and strategic research and academic priorities. New curricular proposals include signature elements that exemplify and enhance university goals around student experience and academic excellence:

- The revisioned cross-Faculty Environmental Science program will help to strengthen natural sciences course and program offerings within the new Faculty.
- Prospective consolidation of the urban and planning-related programming at York, means prospective students are presented with a single, unified gateway into all urban studies offerings.
- There is an articulation of experiential education and transferrable skills components within every undergraduate program.
- There is a vision for a one-year, course-based professional masters degree, and streamlining of existing successful graduate programs.
- Graduate career maps based on labour market needs analysis and known alumni career paths will be developed.

All curricular changes will of course follow the required approvals processes. Collectively and once complete, they present tremendous opportunity for teaching, learning, research and student engagement within the new Faculty.

Resource planning is based on a non-departmentalized Faculty with a unified workload agreement, on existing expenses, and on the understanding that the undergraduate curriculum revisioning included in the proposal will be prioritized and move forward at the earliest opportunity. Intensive recruitment efforts, informed by market research and other data, will be key in supporting the new Faculty’s achievements of ambitious enrolment targets within a short time. Given annual expenses, it will be essential for the new Faculty’s enrolment to climb significantly within three years from the formal launch date of July 1, 2020. The resource plan assumes that as activities move to the new Faculty, the budget supporting those activities will also move, as will expenses. These include existing faculty and staff salaries, operational budgets, and existing space allocations.
It is acknowledged that there will be some additional supports required to ensure a successful transition to a Faculty of Urban and Environmental Change. My office is prepared to offer support and resources where existing resources and personnel are not able to meet transition period needs.

I wish to acknowledge the significant time and energy that colleagues have invested in this process and signal my enthusiastic support for their continued efforts around curricular reform and establishment of the new Faculty. I believe that the establishment of the Faculty of Urban and Environmental Change is an essential step for research, teaching, community engagement, and the global impact of York University. I am pleased to record my strong support for this proposal.

Yours truly,

Lisa Philipps
Provost & Vice-President Academic
September 30, 2019

Dr. Alice J. Hovorka  
Dean & Professor  
Faculty of Environmental Studies  
York University

Dear Dean Hovorka:

I am pleased to write in support of the proposal to create a new Faculty of Urban and Environmental Change (FUEC). I fully support the objectives detailed in this proposal; namely to integrate and consolidate programs with shared foci on urban and environmental issues, broadly defined, into a single faculty. The proposal offers a compelling rationale for the new faculty and clear objectives for programs within it. These timely programs seem well-positioned build upon historic institutional strengths and to capitalize upon the distinct capabilities of the existing faculty complement in both FES and Geography.

As Dean of the School of the Arts, Media, Performance and Design (AMPD), I also note and appreciate the consultations and incorporation of feedback from AMPD within this proposal. The resulting revisions mitigate our concerns regarding the potential duplication of arts programs between the proposed FUEC and AMPD and the potential for confusion in what students in the new faculty will receive as aspiring artists. The proposal to launch the BES in Environmental Arts and Justice as a minor seems to be a moderate and prudent course as does the description of how creativity is mobilised in these specific contexts. I appreciate the repeated emphasis on interdisciplinarity expressed throughout this proposal and the “hub and spoke” approach seems likely to yield new opportunities. I remain enthusiastic about the potential for collaboration with growing programs in Digital Media (AMPD & Lassonde) among other synergies with AMPD, in Theatre and Visual Art and Art History, among others. I look forward to future conversations about how best to serve students invested in intersections between the urban and natural environments and art praxis.

I am therefore pleased to lend my support to the proposed new faculty. Congratulations to you and your colleagues on this significant achievement and I wish you continued success in your endeavour.

Sincerely,

Sarah Bay-Cheng, Ph.D.  
Dean, AMPD
20 September 2019

Dr. Alice Hovorka
Dean, Faculty of Environmental Studies
HNES Bldg. 139J
c/o bwells@yorku.ca

Dear Alice,

I write in support of the idea of a Faculty of Urban & Environmental Change as well as its creation. My support for the current proposal, however, is qualified. The purpose and aim of the Faculty, its new vision and description, are inspiring. The flow of energy invested in the planning has been great and it shows no sign of abating – which is crucial, because should Senate approve the proposal to create this new Faculty, renewed efforts at program restructuring need to occur, I think, in order for the Faculty to achieve sustainable viability. The truly new program ideas are compelling and make sense to me. The ensuing process of their development will require equally compelling analyses of student demand aligned to “market” need, the latter term capacious meaning all the career possibilities and lifelong learning that depend upon the learning outcomes and attributes which graduates of the Faculty’s programs will possess. The existing programs of both units have been experiencing continued decline in application numbers and acceptances since 2009 for a suite of similar and different reasons, and one of my concerns is that program structure (design and length) may be a contributing factor.

Within the context of LA&PS and FGS, the 24-credit total, program length, course sequencing and programmatic regulations (electives outside the program, directed readings, colloquium, etc.) of the master’s degrees of Geography were similar to those in other programs anchored in LA&PS. In its proposed new home, the context is now the 36-credit MES, with its individualized study plan and unique amount of faculty member supervision and mentorship, including 18 credits allowable of directed reading supervised by individual professors. Wonderfully, some of the 36 credits can be taken as experiential education (internships, placements). Suddenly, both programs will have new contexts with new optics to contend with as they engage in student recruitment. I have no crystal ball, and my comment arises in the context of the necessity for attentive and speedy analysis, once the new Faculty is launched.

The academic possibilities of the new Faculty – new programs, research, ORU involvement, etc. – are thrilling. I was one of the people who was precipitously giddy over the possibility of even more units and programs moving to form the new Faculty to educate a generation of students to address the emergency of environmental change. But the new Faculty rises or falls on, simply put, exponentially increasing enrolment quickly, mostly at the undergraduate level — necessarily at the undergraduate level, if it is to continue to invest in the academic-resource-intensive MES as the “backbone” of the Environmental unit in the Faculty.
The BA in Urbanization looks promising as a subject that hopefully will be as compelling to students as will be the possible 3+2 undergrad/grad degree fast track for those with A/A+ CGPAs. The proposed learning outcomes of a 3+2 degree structure will need to be articulated in light of those provided for an Honours and Specialised Honours in the same discipline. What are the outcomes of the “3,” which could be interpreted as tantamount to a 90-credit BA, such that with an A/A+ one is ready for the graduate-level “2”? Is one more ready than someone with a Specialised Honours or Honours or simply differently so for the graduate planning degree?

I appreciate the revised Faculty organization chart with, amongst other alterations, a GPD for Geography and Environmental [Studies]. Truly a super-person will fill the AD Research, Grad, International role, given that, based on both units currently, the new Faculty will be a powerhouse of research production, strongly involved in bi-directional internationalization, and with graduate programs of many moving parts. Similarly, I appreciate very much the proposed Interim Council and its tasks of continued planning as well as streamlining the governance structure of committees in the Faculty. The Pedagogy, Standards, and Awards committee will be a very busy one.

Regarding the Administrative Principles Guiding Implementation, FGS will be able to help, particularly in light of 7 and 8. I know relatively well the history and circumstances in response to which FES developed a type of mini-FGS of in-house graduate administrative services and an unique relationship with the Registrar’s Office, all of which were understood at the time as necessary to support FES’s graduate (and undergraduate) pedagogical model. The SHARP budget model is not the only driver, however, of the necessity of reducing administrative duplication. Since Faculties invest in certain centralized services as a function of the University’s organization, facilitated by the budget model, they must demand the type, quality, and level of service that they require for their programs. For example, during the time of the interim Council for the new Faculty, FGS will be developing with the Registrar’s Office, UIT, and OIPA a new student dashboard for all graduate programs to keep abreast of student progress, achievement of milestones, leaves of absence – in a phrase, all the events of the academic program life cycle – which will integrate with the new Student Information Service, when it arrives. The dashboard and new SIS will help Faculties with efficient administrative services shared effectively.

Given the dramatic increase in enrollment growth and prudent fiscal sustainability that this Faculty requires for future viability, then success, I worry that as a letter of support, this one is a bit of a wet blanket, which feels uncomfortable; no one likes it. But it’s still a blanket, which can’t but warm up and dry out eventually. I remain committed to the new Faculty’s success.

Best Regards,

Thomas Loebel, PhD
Dean & AVP Graduate,
York University
September 26, 2019

Alice Hovorka  
Dean and Professor  
Faculty of Environmental Studies  
York University

Dear Dean Hovorka:

Re: Establishment of a new Faculty of Urban and Environmental Change

Thank you for the invitation to comment on the proposal to create a new Faculty of Urban and Environmental Change. On behalf of my colleagues in the Faculty of Health, I am delighted to offer our enthusiastic and unequivocal support. This is a wonderful opportunity to build upon the impressive legacies of two academic units by creating new synergy and opportunities. We have no doubt that it will provide a solid foundation to address urbanization and environmental changes, two of the most profoundly important challenges of our time. The proposal nicely aligns with and advances the University mission and Academic Plan.

Congratulation on your ability to engage and consolidate the important views of multiple stakeholders. Reaching consensus in a manner which both respects the past but also creates a distinctive and value-added future is extremely difficult. All those involved should be highly commended. Your hard work and perseverance have created a coherent plan filled with possibilities.

Concerns about undergraduate enrolments left me increasingly concerned about the financial sustainability of Environmental Studies and Geography. Given all our many fiscal challenges, a student to faculty ratio more than 30% below the University average, and an UG to graduate student ratio of less than 2 to 1 is not sustainable. That said, I also could not imagine York University without a strong presence in environmental studies, urbanization, and geography, particularly at this important moment in human history. I am greatly relieved that your plan creates potential to grow your academic and research impact within a fiscally sustainable framework. While creating a bold new consolidated Faculty comes with some risk and uncertainty, it is my opinion that maintaining the status quo would represent a greater risk, and a lost opportunity for York to revitalize its impact in profoundly important fields.

If I had one disappointment is it that your current plan says very little about the opportunity to grow greater connections between the new Faculty and the Faculty of Health. Our mission is to improve human health, health equity, health care, and wellbeing. We recognize that physical, social, cultural and economic environments and geographic locations are profoundly important determinants of health, health equity and wellbeing. Therefore, we urgently need a new generation of people, partners, and ideas which utilize this broader understanding of the relationship between health and
the environment. Our disappointment that your proposal does not include more links to Health is not a criticism. We recognize all effective plans must start somewhere and that it may be unwise to do too much too soon. Rather, our disappointment is an indicator of your new Faculty’s future potential. It says something important about your proposal when others are already lining up to work with you. We believe your proposal lays a foundation which leaves the door open to working more closely with us to jointly develop new educational and research products in the future. In the interim, please let me know if there are ways we can support you and your colleagues as you launch this exciting new venture.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Paul McDonald, PhD, FRSPH, FCAHS
Professor and Dean
MEMO

TO: Alice J. Hovorka, Dean, Faculty of Environmental Studies

FROM: Jane Goodyer, Dean, Lassonde School of Engineering

SUBJECT: Proposal for the Creation of a Faculty of Urban & Environmental Change

DATE: September 30th, 2019

It gives me great pleasure to offer my support for the creation of the Faculty of Urban and Environmental Change at York University. The creation of this new Faculty is a significant step in the expansion and alignment of programming and resources offered at the institution to tackle two pressing challenges facing people and the planet: environmental change and urbanization. York is well positioned to be an international leader in these areas.

In particular, the five underlying outcomes for the creation of the new Faculty are grounded in creating linkages, synergies and knowledge mobilization between Research, and Teaching and Learning across the boundaries that comprise the critical and innovative urban, environmental, and geographic knowledge and skills in pursuit of sustainability and justice. Within this space, values centered on citizenship, activism, rights, diversity and inclusivity and respect are foundational in creating a space for interdisciplinary, field based and experiential learning, community engagement, and global perspectives to thrive.

The proposed governance structure is grounded in collegial decision making with a clear pathway laid out for interim and permanent Council oversight. At the same time, the implementation plan is thoughtful and clearly articulates the overarching goals guiding implementation and the administrative principles being adopted to achieve implementation seem reasonable. Thoughtful consideration has been made with respect to aligning resources with academic priorities within the new Faculty, and across related and interdisciplinary areas in the University.

In conclusion, I am pleased to offer my support for the creation of this new Faculty and look forward to future partnerships and collaborations in support of our students, faculty and community at large.
September 30, 2019

Re: Letter of Support - Proposal for Faculty of Urban & Environmental Change

Dear Dean Hovorka,

I have read the proposal to establish a Faculty of Urban & Environmental Change. The proposal is centered on bringing together scholars in Environmental Studies and Geography, and will revitalise the teaching and study of the environment, geography and urban studies at York University.

The Faculty of Science has collaborated with faculty members in Environmental Studies and the Lassonde School of Engineering to improve the curriculum in Environmental Science, and it will be an interdisciplinary program jointly administered by the three Faculties. In the past we have not succeeded in recruiting enough students to this program (in spite of a healthy demand) relative to other institutions. Underlying this was the existing fragmentation and confusion in environmental science programs spanning numerous Faculties. The new program is a consolidated, multiple pathway program and is being developed around issues of climate change, biodiversity conservation, and physical geography.

Former Dean Jayawardhana supported the motion in principle for the merger of Environmental Studies and Geography. My support for the formation of the Faculty of Urban & Environmental Change is in the same spirit expressed in his letter of May 31, 2017 to APPRC. Our understanding is that the Faculty of Science will remain engaged in shared science based programs and courses as a collaborative partner in managing the curriculum and delivery of courses.

I look forward to working with the academic leadership and faculty members in the new Faculty of Urban & Environmental Change on projects of joint interest to us both. With this mind, I am writing to endorse the establishment of the new Faculty of Urban and Environmental Change.

Sincerely,

EJ Janse van Rensburg
Interim Dean, Faculty of Science
Monday, September 30, 2019

Dr. Alice Hovorka,
Dean & Professor, Faculty of Environmental Studies

Faculty of Urban and Environmental Change - Letter of Support

The proposal to create this new Faculty represents a great deal of careful planning and consideration. The development of five exciting undergraduate programs, offering BA, BES and BSc options, with a range of experiential learning opportunities woven into the curriculum, pathways bridging undergraduate to graduate programs, degree to diploma studies, and academic studies to career outcomes, provides exciting ways for prospective and current students to prepare for success. Those involved in developing this proposal are to be commended for their leadership and innovation. Opportunities to establish a new Faculty are rare, and bold ideas such as those presented in this proposal are necessary.

This proposal lays out directions that will capture the imagination of prospective students and create opportunities for them to prepare for careers that align with their values and serve the public good. The five distinct undergraduate programs will provide entry points that will excite students and the ability for them to “mix and match” program options will support their desire to acquire career-ready knowledge and skills.

Students seek opportunities to lead meaningful lives but are also pragmatic when making choices of programs of study, partially influenced by their families. More than fifty percent of the population of the GTA were not born in Canada, and most came here to provide opportunities for their children to access higher education that will lead to meaningful careers.

Within this context, I would like to provide the following comments.

Throughout the proposal there are repeated references to urbanization, and it may be an option to consider the term in the title (such as Urbanization and The Environment). This aligns with the naming conventions of programs in other Canadian universities, such as McGill and Trent’s, School of the Environment, or Waterloo’s Faculty of Environment.

Urbanization, Sustainable Environmental Management and Environmental Science programs are self-explanatory within their titles and will attract student interest. The names of these programs are recognizable and heard daily in the news. Familiarity will help students gravitate towards these programs.
Urban Geography presents exciting and important approaches to studying and understanding the rapidly changing world. The four thematic areas provide students with a clear understanding of what this program entails.

Like Urban Geography, Environmental Arts and Justice may be less familiar as an area of study or in its connection to a career, but will be attractive to a specific cohort of student.

**Experiential Learning**

We are excited to see the extensive experiential learning opportunities woven throughout the undergraduate programs, critical for transformational learning. From field courses, community-based projects, placements, internships to global options, the opportunities presented in this proposal will enrich and support student learning. Our experience informs us that when these experiential learning opportunities are integrated into the curriculum, students expect and plan for their participation. When explicitly part of the curriculum, participation in these experiences increase dramatically. For example, where a mobility opportunity (academic or field course) is part of the degree pathway, with the necessary alignment facilitated within the curriculum (such as transfer credit), students pursuing this option can easily navigate their participation.

**BA/MES, Undergraduate Dual Credential Programs, Certificates**

The opportunities, such as the 3+2 option presented in the BA in Urbanization to the MES, or the 3+2 or 3+1 dual credential program with the Colleges, and undergraduate certificates provide breadth and the important guided pathways for students. As noted in our comments regarded experiential learning, opportunities embedded within the curriculum or pre-arranged pathway and certificate options allow and support seamless transitions throughout a student’s studies, expanding student options and participation.

**Entrepreneurship**

Entrepreneurship is captured in the proposal in the Research section. The Faculty may wish to consider a stronger focus on entrepreneurship within curricular opportunities and place it for consideration in the section addressing the cross-cutting approaches of: interdisciplinarity, field-based and experiential learning, community engagement, and global perspectives.

**Recruitment**

We support the many approaches to recruitment, both direct (OUF, High School Fairs) and indirect through participation and sponsorship of significant eco-conferences, lecture series and workshops. We would want to also work closely with the Faculty to consider the interests of these new programs for international students and find unique opportunities to highlight them.

This past weekend York was present at the Ontario Universities Fair where some 80,000 visitors attend to learn about the opportunities available at all Ontario universities. They visit each university booth to seek program-specific detailed information and compare what distinguishes one university’s offering from another. The exciting opportunities presented in this proposal will offer the components which students and their parents enquired about: excellence
in teaching, research opportunities, a student-centered approach, experiential learning and career pathways.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments.

[Signature]

Lucy Fromowitz
Vice-Provost, Students
September 30, 2019

Dr. Alice J. Hovorka  
Dean & Professor  
Faculty of Environmental Studies  
York University

Dear Alice,

Re: Faculty of Urban & Environmental Change

It is with pleasure that I offer my enthusiastic support for the proposed Faculty of Urban & Environmental Change, an inspiring new Faculty bringing together scholars from Geography and Environmental Studies in a united entity that will build upon existing synergies and excellence in the pursuit of sustainability and justice.

Building on a rich tradition of research excellence, this new Faculty will offer distinctively global perspectives by consolidating a critical mass of prominent scholars that will address the interconnected but diverse challenges of environmental change and urbanization. By taking on a highly collaborative and interdisciplinary approach, this new Faculty will most certainly amplify our existing research, scholarly and creative strengths and help to further broaden and accelerate our research impact through its well-established research clusters and stakeholder networks for knowledge mobilization and partnerships.

Further, the depth and breadth of the research that will be conducted in the Faculty of Urban & Environmental Change is very well aligned with York’s Strategic Research Plan (2018-2023) and strongly advances several of the thematic areas -- notably, research that advances critical inquiry and scientific discovery in the areas of:

- Environmental change, urbanization, sustainability and justice (*Forging a Just and Equitable World*);
- Health (*Building Healthy Lives, Communities and Environments*);
- The arts and performance (*Analyzing Cultures and Mobilizing Creativity*);
- Economics, labour market transformations (*Integrating Entrepreneurial Innovation and the Public Good*); and
- Biophysical sciences (*Exploring and Interrogating the Frontiers of Science and Technology*).

This proposed Faculty will undertake an engaged learning approach offering field-based experiential education and training as well as hands-on research, allowing for a rich learning environment for our students. This will be further augmented through expanded Indigenous curricular offerings, land-based learning and Indigenous knowledges, perspectives and experiences. Moreover, supporting, enhancing and
facilitating Indigenous research and Indigenous ways of knowing further affirms our commitment to enabling research in an Indigenous context, as emphasized within our Strategic Research Plan.

I am very encouraged and excited by the potential of the proposed Faculty of Urban & Environmental Change – both the impact created by the research synergies as well as the high-quality learning opportunities emerging from the new curricular approaches.

I would advocate for the full support of this proposal.

Yours sincerely,

Rui Wang, MD, PhD, FAHA
Interim Vice-President Research and Innovation
Record of Consultation

Date
Wednesday, July 10, 2019

Attendees
Linda Peake, Director, The CITY Institute

Sub-Committee Members
Kim Michasiw, Chair of ASCP, Chair
Liette Gilbert, Co-Coordinator (FES)
Philip Kelly, Chair Geography
Alice Pitt, Vice-Provost Academic
Tarmo Remmel, Co-Coordinator (Geography)
Robert Everett, Secretary

Summary

This meeting marked the first formal consultation involving The CITY Institute, but the Director is expecting to explore opportunities with the Dean of FES soon. In particular, the creation of a new Faculty has the potential to enhance urban research at York. In reciprocal fashion, it would also augment CITY’s profile.

All of Toronto’s downtown universities are organizing to capitalize on their urban expertise:

- the University of Toronto has recently established its university-wide School of Cities, and has a Presidential Advisor on Urban Engagement
- Ryerson University has added to its School of Urban and Regional Planning with a number of proliferating research centers: the Centre for Urban Energy, Centre for Urban Research and Land Development, Ryerson City Building Institute, and Ryerson Urban Water
- OCADu has a new focus on the urban in its Environmental Design program.

Yet there remain considerable opportunities for York, which already possesses a strong international reputation. The new Faculty that will emerge at York through the amalgamation of FES and the Department of Geography is York’s opportunity to enhance its urban profile. Participants also discussed specific curriculum possibilities, such as a BA / BSc combination.

Professor Peake described the evolution of The CITY Institute and its aspirations to widen membership. She also stressed the value of research – along with experiential education -- that supports and complements undergraduate and graduate teaching and learning.
Further and Next Steps

The Sub-Committee will re-engage with those consulted in September, and the Director will be invited to participate at that time.

This record of consultation will be forwarded to the FES-Geography curriculum working group, shared with CITY, and posted on the Sub-Committee’s Website.
Academic Standards Curriculum and Pedagogy Committee of Senate  
Special Sub-Committee on New Faculty Curriculum

Record of Consultation

Date: Tuesday, August 13, 2019

Attendees:
- Sarah Bay-Cheng, Dean, AMPD  
- Andrea Davis, Chair, Humanities (LA&PS)  
- Leslie Sanders, University Professor, Humanities

Sub-Committee Members:
- Kim Michasiw, Chair of ASCP, Chair  
- Alice Hovorka, Dean FES  
- Alice Pitt, Vice-Provost Academic  
- Tarmo Remmel, Co-Coordinator (Geography)  
- Robert Everett, Secretary

Overall Focus of the Consultation

Participants were provided with a three-page overview of a proposed Bachelor of Arts in Environmental Arts and Justice. It is currently conceived as a minor but which may evolve. AMPD and Humanities courses are listed among the those satisfying requirements for the extant Certificate in Cultural and Artistic Practices for Environmental and Social Justice, although enrolments are not strong. Colleagues from Humanities described the nature and thrust of a major curriculum review under way, one which may result in re-naming the Department itself and which is likely to have a public humanities dimension. Culture and Expression will be a driver.

The new Faculty’s proponents described a critical mass of scholars who identify strongly with artistic praxis even if enrolments have not matched with this cohort. For them, the ordering of words in the name of the proposed minor reflects their commitment to cultural production, an aspect of scholarship that others are embedding in the curriculum.

There was a consensus that curriculum development must not result in competition or confusion for students. It is essential that no harm to reputation follow from curriculum reforms.

Specific Matters Addressed

Among the points that emerged were the following:

- it is imperative to provide students with a clear sense of the options available to them at York
• streams and programs be distinctive even when there is some curriculum in common
• as in other forms of collaboration discussed during this round of consultations, it was noted that MOUs can pave the way to appropriate resource sharing
• AMPD students have shown little interest in the current Certificate and it is also not clear how much the Faculty could contribute to collaborative programs
• collaborative options could include partnerships, shared core curriculum, cross-listings and the like
• the term media, used in the new Faculty curriculum overview, is a contested term and further discussion would be appropriate; the language of “hands on artistic creation” also needs greater clarity
• there is an emphasis on racism in the draft proposal; proponents should be aware that a focus on racism has been widely adopted by others at the University and needs to be developed with sensitivity to this

Outcomes and Further Steps

It was agreed that there should be sustained conversations about the curriculum given different mandates / shared interests and need to obviate risks associated with duplication and competition.

Colleagues from Humanities will provide additional information to the FES-Geography working group about the streams they are contemplating. Dean Bay-Cheng will forward the three-page overview to AMPD chairs in the first instance to provide feedback. It would be beneficial to invite an AMPD colleague to participate in discussions (a step that could lead to a smaller representative group to explore opportunities and issues).

By way of a follow up and in anticipation of a second round of consultations in September, the Sub-Committee itself will issue an open call to those interested in the broad topic areas covered by the minor.
Dean Hovorka provided an overview of the flagship program proposals in development with an emphasis on the incorporation of equity into the curriculum. Equity will be tied to the new Faculty’s mission and values. FES currently offers a course on Human Rights and Public Space and has, along with other units and programs, an interest in bringing equity more fully into the curriculum.

Professor Jacobs described the successful efforts of Equity Studies to re-focus the curriculum around a limited set of in-house critical human rights courses in response to CPR recommendations and a sense that too many courses previously recognized for credit were not sufficiently oriented to the program’s learning outcomes. A concern in this regard is the possibility that any new program might lead to the re-emergence of cross-listing or student requests for substitutions. Equity Studies does encourage students to do double majors.

It was agreed that the new Faculty and Equity Studies would explore opportunities for collaboration in the future. Curriculum design will be sensitive to the concerns expressed by Professor Jacobs.
Academic Standards Curriculum and Pedagogy Committee of Senate  
Special Sub-Committee on New Faculty Curriculum

Record of Consultation

Date Tuesday, June 18, 2019

Attendees  
Ruth Koleszar-Green, Co-Chair, Indigenous Council  
Bonita Lawrence, Chair of the Department of Equity Studies  
Coordinator of the Indigenous Studies Program

Sub-Committee Members  
Kim Michasiw, Chair of ASCP, Chair  
Liette Gilbert, Co-Coordinator (FES)  
Alice Hovorka, Dean, Environmental Studies  
Joseph Mensah, Chair, Geography  
Alice Pitt, Vice-Provost Academic  
Tarmo Remmel, Co-Coordinator (Geography)  
Robert Everett, Secretary

Nature of the Consultation

This consultation was preliminary in nature, and provided the Sub-Committee with an opportunity to learn about the landscape for Indigenization, Indigenous Studies program in LA&PS, and processes as the new Faculty’s proponents develop curriculum. There had been no formal consultations to date, but those designing the new Faculty have explicitly stated their intentions to advance Indigenization in partnership with others.

Process

An animating question turned on how to proceed mindfully, systematically, collaboratively and respectfully. To this it was answered that Indigenous people should not be tokenized or segmented. A well-rounded curriculum should enmesh given the responsibility of citizen-scholars to comprehend political, cultural and economic aspects in a deep engagement. A thoughtful approach is essential, and the conversation will necessarily be a lengthy and inclusive one. The Indigenous Council is taking up a proposal to have a curriculum sub-committee which, if established, would be a valuable aid. The Council itself is also a key resource, and will be able to provide ongoing advice.

Curriculum

Participants addressed many themes:
• the benefits that could flow from cooperation between the new Faculty and Indigenous Studies (but the importance of ensuring that Indigenous Studies thrives)
• land-based education
• an academic year that accommodates students who wish to participate in ceremonies
• the possibility of field schools and the desirability of a living lab on the Keele campus as part of working with the Indigenous Studies program
• the value of curriculum that focuses on the lived experiences of Indigenous peoples in urban settings (e.g. AP/INDG 3650 3.00 Urban Native Communities)
• placement opportunities for students and the opportunity to share resources
• individualized students with knowledge keepers and other ways of learning beyond the traditional university pedagogy
• the flexible Cross-Disciplinary Certificate in Indigenous Studies and its potential attractiveness to the new Faculty’s students along with the other programs (Indigenous Studies offers a three-year BA, a minor, major minor, double major and Specialized Honours) – explicit linkages should be considered between the new Faculty and Indigenous Studies
• promotion of AP/INDG 1050.6.0 Introduction to Indigenous Studies throughout the University

Outcomes and Next Steps

It was agreed that the new Faculty must not have a negative impact on Indigenous Studies. Opportunities for collaboration should be pursued.

The FES-Geography curriculum working group is preparing two-page overviews of innovative curriculum that will be highlighted in the proposal to establish the new Faculty that goes to Senate and the Board of Governors. These will be forwarded to Professor Ruth Koleszar-Green and Professor Lawrence for comment.

Proponents expressed their desire to connect with the Indigenous Council for ongoing advice and suggestions regarding curriculum and pedagogy.

The Sub-Committee is planning a second phase of consultations in September and will include the Indigenous Council in its canvassing.
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Focus of the Consultation

The discussion focused on curriculum reform in Lassonde (where a process of creating new streams in Climate Science, Atmospheric Science and Planetary Science is underway) and program proposals developed by colleagues in Environmental Studies and Geography. Colleagues from Lassonde described the nature of the re-visioning exercise and the broad thrust of the innovations under consideration.

A 2-page overview of a proposed Bachelor of Science in Environmental Science in the new Faculty was shared with participants. Climate Change is one of the streams in the proposed BSc. Its name was chosen to capture its nature in words familiar to prospective students.

Throughout the consultation there was an emphasis on the need to ensure curriculum coherence while projecting York’s collective strengths.

Specific Topics

Among the matters discussed were the following:

- opportunities for collaboration arising from the curriculum of the new Faculty’s intended BSc (which accentuates near-Earth climate change) and the strengths of EATS in upper-atmospheric research and teaching
- the possibility of explicit pathways between degrees and streams
- the desirability of including field work in the curriculum
- the need to construct degree requirements that are not unduly onerous and permit students to explore other interests
• issues associated with Calculus requirements (along with the possibility of rematriating instruction within programs and other ways to address high failure rates and resulting withdrawals)

Outcomes and Further Steps

The following were among the key outcomes:

• there will be further consultations, facilitated by Dean Hovorka; Lassonde colleagues will provide more detail about the proposed Atmospheric Stream to the FES-Geography curriculum working group
• it could be enriching for students, and promote their mobility, for the streams to have some curriculum in common
• over a longer term, it is critical to have a focused conversation about Geomatics at York (there are currently three separate programs)
• the Vice-Provost Academic will provide advice on the legislative pathway to approval of the changes under consideration by colleagues in EATS
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Focus of the Consultation

A wide-ranging discussion focused on potential curriculum synergies; specific programs in development (especially Environmental Science); emerging holistic approaches and methodologies that are orienting scholarship; curriculum reviews at Lassonde and Science that may impact on the new Faculty; and the desirability of enhancing student mobility and exposure to different ways of thinking about challenges and solutions.

Current State of Consultations

Although there were some initial concerns about ideas floated in the draft proposal of April, colleagues in Lassonde and Science have shown good will toward the new Faculty. It is widely recognized that York has the depth and breadth of expertise to be a global leader in environmental scholarship. There is an appetite among colleagues to participate in curriculum innovations. Territoriality should not be an issue; but it is imperative to develop programs that are distinctive and attractive. Consultation must be ongoing andpredicated on ensuring that programs are well aligned even if not offered in concert.

Curriculum Reviews and Reforms

Weak enrolments have resulted in reviews of the programs in Earth and Atmospheric Science (EATS) and Environmental Biology. Colleagues in EATS are working toward finalizing their recommendations by the early autumn. Reflections on Environmental Biology have begun with focused deliberations now underway.

Principles
The following were among the principles cited as the new Faculty takes shape and other programs are revised:

- York has strengths across a wide spectrum of environmental studies – science, engineering, policy, law, communications – and students should have opportunities to pursue a variety of interests
- at the same time, it would be beneficial to have a defining focus (for Queen’s it is water, for Guelph food); at York might it be populations?
- many students have both a science and liberal arts bent, and universities that have developed programs have seen positive results; there are many ways of catering to this, including major/minors along with certificates and diplomas, especially if they impart credentials; a consensus has formed around straightforward Honours degree programs that create the space to take more courses outside of the major
- York should aim for international prowess, and see global urbanization as a major focal point
- student mobility should be a priority, and it is essential to learn from students by tapping into their experiences
- curriculum planners should be aware of new, holistic approaches informing research and pedagogy, including Systems Analysis/Assessment, Systems Thinking and (Sustainability) Transition Studies
- students have expressed interest in gaining the tools necessary to make positive changes while preparing for careers, and this must be kept in mind

Outcomes and Further Steps

In the weeks ahead the specific curriculum proposals will be refined to add in evidence-based need and demand analysis. The curriculum working group will circle back to those who have discussed partnerships (e.g. a joint program with Urban Studies has been mooted). There will be assistance from the Provost’s Office and Teaching Commons in drafting formal proposal briefs. It will be essential to map out the legislative process for each proposal, for some will be wholly new and require approval right up to the Quality Council stage while others are major modifications.

It was agreed that there needs to be an ongoing dialogue to explore new opportunities for collaboration and avoid harm. The Sub-Committee is planning a second round of consultations in September and will invite Lassonde and Science to return to the table at that time. This record of consultation will be shared with the FES-Geography curriculum working group and forwarded to Dean Goodyer and Associate Dean Mills.
Perspectives on Opportunities

It was stressed at the outset and thereafter that the possibilities identified in the draft establishment proposal circulated in April were essentially placeholders that neither prescribed or precluded innovations. Colleagues in FES and Geography are keen to further explore and begin to refine ideas in an ongoing dialogue and the curriculum design phase. Out of the conversation emerged a set of options for collaboration between the new Faculty between the School of Administrative and the undergraduate and graduate programs of Disaster and Emergency Management. Shared interests and potential cross-Faculty synergies point to an array of possibilities:

- Double major and major / minor combinations (with distinctive descriptors)
- Certificates
- Single courses that may serve multiple programs
- Concentrations or streams that draw upon courses offered in the new Faculty and DEM
- Cooperative capstone, experiential and field work courses
- Program ladders, such as 4+1 or 3+2 pathways to graduate studies
- Areas in which strengths can be combined (such as policy or management)

Members of the Sub-Committee acknowledged concerns expressed by the School and program, and gave assurances that the new Faculty’s collaborative dimensions will be
wholly predicated on collegiality and respect. Entrepreneurship was referenced in the draft proposal, and participants worked toward an understanding of what that might entail. For example, SAS may contribute by a module that could be adapted to suit a number of programs at York that seek to provide students with skills.

**Other Matters to be Addressed**

The Sub-Committee agreed to the suggestion that it should be clearer about the goal of consultation sessions.

Regarding complement planning, there may be possibilities for cross appointments that enrich the curriculum and research cultures.

It was felt that there may be significant returns on a joint recruitment strategy and that student mobility should be promoted. Many students believe that many York programs do not lead to employment and accreditation. This misperception needs to be addressed and corrected, not least since FES, SAS and DEM have accredited courses of study.

**Outcomes and Next Steps**

It was understood that some initiatives may be pursued in the short-term while others would be taken up in a longer time frame. The proposal that comes to the Senate and the Board will highlight signature curriculum and other innovations given shape on a relatively fast track but may also identify modifications and innovations that are at a less advanced stage.

Colleagues from DEM will reflect on opportunities of the kind mooted at the meeting at a mid-June program meeting, and provide the Sub-Committee with a sense of the ideas that should be pursued.

DEM will nominate an individual to liaise with the Sub-Committee. The Sub-Committee will provide the FES-Geography working group with a record of the meeting.

Documentation on degree ladders will be shared with DEM and others involved in consultations that may lead to 4+1 or 2+3 models. Participants also discussed collaborations in the SHARP budget model context, and learned that the Provost’s Office continues work on a framework for sharing costs and revenues. Discussion raised the distinction between SHARP as a shadow model of how teaching (primarily undergraduate) that occurs as dedicated service or general/elective education cost sharing and the capacity to create new arrangements with cost-sharing and shared administrative elements.

The Sub-Committee will re-engage with the School and Program in September, and will respond promptly to requests for assistance before then. Members thanked colleagues from SAS and DEM for positive and productive contributions.
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Perspectives

The discussion opened with general impressions of the initiative and elements of the draft proposal circulated in April. SPPA is grateful for opportunities to consult on initiatives that touch on aspects of its curriculum and is open to exploring opportunities for collaboration. The School does not have strength in Environmental Policy per se but can imagine welcoming students from the new Faculty who wish to round off their education with generalist curriculum or courses in the areas of public administration, public policy and law that would complement interests.

The FES-Geography curriculum working group is currently focusing on five themes – which could be organized around streams or majors. The School's Director and Undergraduate Program Director offered advice based on recent experience. For example, it was noted that it can prove difficult to move from streams to degree programs (due to regulatory and administrative burdens of different degree programs, student retention when changing program v. changing streams within a program). However, it is possible to have streams included on the OUAC application forms for 101s and 105s. Too much choice in degree programs can lead to confusion and reduce retention rates. The ability to profile a suite of diverse streams has proven advantageous.

The SPPA undergraduate program – the Bachelor of Public Administration (BPA) - is structured in ways that encourage students to declare their stream early in order to track progress, but maximizes flexibility by having a common core curriculum for the first two years of study and making changes to the selection of stream easy for students. It was suggested that the new Faculty not have a major GPA, which is currently quite difficult to monitor. PPA courses are constructed on functional lines. Courses fill early but it is possible that space could be reserved for students from the new Faculty. Twenty-four
credit certificates are popular with non-PPA students, and could accommodate students from the new Faculty. There could also be articulation with the thirty-six credit minor in public administration.

On the graduate side, 1-2 students could be accommodated in courses under the GS/PPAL rubric, which is part of the Master of Public Policy, Administration and Law (MPPAL) program.

Participants discussed aspects of the School’s expertise in refugee and migration studies and its course offerings. This is a focus in FES and Geography (along with other units and programs) and suggested opportunity for cooperation.

As proponents work on academic standards at the graduate level, the Director and UPD commented that narrative evaluation (i.e. variations on pass/fail grading) would not be appropriate to the MPPAL for reasons specific to the program and as a general proposition.

Undergraduate students benefit greatly from structured networking with graduate students, alumni and professionals who offer practical advice and motivational leadership. Similarly, experiential learning, placements and courses with an explicit professional orientation are rewarding for students and conducive to the School’s mission and values.

One successful way of promoting certificate enrolment is to identify and contact students who have selected courses that put them on a path to attain the requirements. Generally speaking, students are more interested in certificates that are different in their subject area foci yet closely relate to their degree programs.

**Outcomes and Next Steps**

At the meeting’s conclusion, the Chair noted that the curriculum working group might make special note of the utility of minors and certificates as they design the overall curriculum schema. Co-ops and experiential education (the latter associated with priorities highlighted in the UAP and Strategic Mandate Agreements) should be built into the new Faculty curriculum. It was noted that Glendon and Health have policy-oriented curriculum. In this light the working group should review offerings there with a view to assessing opportunities.

Participants from the School expressed a desire to remain engaged and it was agreed that the Sub-Committee will invite the Director and others to return for further discussion in September at which point curriculum proposals will be further refined.

The record of consultation will be forwarded with the FES-Geography curriculum working group, shared with Professors Kimakova and Magee, and posted on the Sub-Committee’s Website.
In a more general vein, discussants observed the following:

- it would be appropriate to review the University’s migration and refugee-themed curriculum in a wide context.
- students should be made aware of offerings in other Faculties that complement or extend their interests.
Status of the April Proposal / Consultation History

The meeting began with clarifications about the status of the draft proposal circulated for feedback in April (which contained preliminary ideas about curriculum intended to stimulate thinking and open channels) and the history of consultations with the Department and its constituent programs. Past consultations had been both formal and informal in nature. They subsided abruptly and were inconclusive. It was somewhat surprising to colleagues to see that the proposal referenced possibilities that directly or indirectly impacted on Social Science activities and plans. Proponents confirmed that the draft proposal neither prescribed partnerships nor precluded other possibilities. Dean Hovorka stressed that the narrative has evolved from asking programs about their interest in joining the new Faculty to emphasizing opportunities for collaboration. Participants at the meeting had access to a “menu of options” that emerged from discussions with the School of Administrative Studies / Disaster and Emergency Management illustrating a range of possibilities – not exhaustive and not necessarily applicable in all situations – and this helped formed a backdrop as the meeting progressed. Colleagues in Social Science reiterated their commitment to the integrity of the current array of programs in the Department. There are already many curricular affinities and collegial interactions between Social Science and the new Faculty (cross-listings, summer courses, courses on extended lists, supervision, teaching and research) upon which to build relationships.
The Evolving Curriculum Context

The discussion touched on a variety of topics relevant to curriculum planners:

- the Provost’s Office is in the process of developing a new inter-Faculty framework for funding and administrative arrangements that will facilitate cooperation within the SHARP model.
- in general, there need to be focused conversations aimed at greater clarity for students along with facilitation of the kind of mobility that permits them to explore a rich, pan-University curriculum.

One way to imagine the overall curriculum structure and relationship between programs is an evolving series of clearly marked pathways that foster mobility and collaboration.

Focus on International Development Studies / Development Studies

Social Science is home to both an undergraduate and graduate degree. FES has a dual credential degree program in conjunction with Humber (although there are no current enrolments). Proponents of the new Faculty also place an accent on Global dimensions. Participants discussed how they might collaborate as a PhD program proposal emerging from Social Science. This resulted in agreement that there should be a focused, sustained discussion aimed at greater clarity of role and non-competition. It was suggested that it would be helpful to think in terms of pathways.

Focus on Business and Society

BUSO currently has an Environment Stream that relies almost exclusively on FES courses. The most recent CPR included a closure recommendation due to insufficient enrolments and curriculum deficiency. Faculty members attached to BUSO are, however, unwilling to abandon the stream and are willing to develop in house curriculum to sustain it. Even so, the stream could only prosper in cooperation with FES and BUSO, suggesting a timely moment for deeper conversations. BUSO has a well-developed practicum network that could encompass an eco-dimension. It was also suggested the new Faculty and BUSO consider major-minor combinations, service courses, multiple entry points to programs, and other connections.

Focus on Urban Studies

There will be a concentration of urbanists in the new Faculty, and there are worries about overlap, duplication and confusion among students. Bringing together urbanists in the new Faculty will stimulate interest in new programs and streams within the new Faculty and the urban at York more broadly. From the standpoint of Urban Studies, a recent curriculum refresh (for example, all new courses have Urban in their title) has revitalized interest. These and other facets argue in favour of a portal concept rather
than integration into the new Faculty. The following may be germane as consultations unfold:

- development of joint programming
- laddering degrees (a number of Urban Studies graduates already pursue higher degrees in FES and Geography)
- cluster hires
- purpose-build shared courses
- alignment of existing course offerings and resources

It was agreed that the program and new Faculty curriculum designers would explore scenarios. There was also agreement on how certain areas might be apportioned.

**Outcomes and Next Steps**

Urbanists should form a table at which ideas about ramping up this interdisciplinary area can be further developed. In the meantime, the FES-Geography curriculum working group can continue its development of ideas regarding urban planning, urban environments, global and the like. The discussions will be long term in nature but should be continuous. One question to be resolved is resource balancing and how the complement can be deployed with greater effectiveness.

It is expected that discussions involving BUSO will be scheduled for the autumn of 2019 and with IDS in 2019-2020.

Since strengthening and profiling the “Urban @ York” is a shared priority, planners should seek institutional backing for collegial efforts.

The Sub-Committee extended an invitation to Social Science colleagues to renew discussions when a proposal for the establishment of the new Faculty is refined (September). This was readily accepted.

Social Science agreed to designate a point person, likely the Chair, for liaison with the Sub-Committee.
As the follow-up consultation meeting opened, Dean Hovorka provided an update on developments as the formal proposal nears completion. A focus for the meeting was on the Environmental Arts and Justice proposal, but the conversation ranged over other matters including possibilities for the kind of collaboration that could result in a unique orientation and profile for the new Faculty and York. Further work on program proposals, including consultations, will be conducted in the autumn with a view toward meeting the January – February window for Senate approval. The new Faculty remains very much open to cooperation on programs and courses.

Dean Bay-Cheng provided feedback from AMPD chairs on the program, and relayed concerns about over-promising on the curriculum and misleading students about their learning outcomes (“professional artist” would not be among them, for example). Chairs were also concerned about duplication; but it was reported that AMPD is searching for appointees in community-based arts practice and computation art. These colleagues may be in a position to enrich the new Faculty’s offerings.

With all that is happening in the autumn, consultation time lines may be daunting. One possibility is for AMPD and Humanities individuals to be at the working group table. In general, there are anxieties about resources, but there are ways to address them (such as MOUs on equitable sharing).

Professor Sanders advised that Humanities had recently approved a departmental “makeover” (although there is still work to be done). Humanities will continue to feature cultural production through classroom pedagogy and experiential education. Documentation will be shared with the new Faculty’s curriculum designers.

It was agreed that three-way consultations would be scheduled. Proponents were encouraged to think of what makes related programs distinctive but also how they can contribute to a broader curriculum milieu.
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This follow-up meeting began with an update provided by Dean Hovorka on developments since the first consultation. Colleagues have determined that the program in Cities, Communities and Planning should be a BA in Urbanization. Consensus has also been reached to adopt the name of “Faculty of Urban and Environmental Change.” It was also reported that a follow-up meeting with colleagues from Social Science and Urban Studies had concluded with agreement to form a working group under the auspices of the Vice-Provost Academic to explore further cooperation.

The CITY Institute is deemed an important partner in helping to realize the vision for the new Faculty. This lead to a discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of moving to a Faculty-based charter. In any event, Director Peake agreed that it would be desirable to work closely together in the future in the cause of enhancing the Urban @ York.
As discussion opened, participants were reminded of the theme of “a marathon not a sprint” when it comes to working out relationships. Dean Hovorka provided an update on developments and confirmed that those who had been consulted will receive a copy of the proposal distributed to FES and Geography colleagues on September 19.

Professor Koleszar-Green had briefed FES colleagues on the broad picture at York, which lead them to reflect seriously on responsibilities and actions. There is agreement that engagement must be deep and meaningful and not be tokenism. A goal in curriculum development has been to address Indigeneity widely. One possibility consists in an explicitly linked major/minor (it was observed that the University does not do enough to profile minors).

A curriculum committee of the Indigenous Council has not yet been formed but a proposal is in train. In any event channels of communication must remain open. To that end Dean Hovorka will be invited to meet with the Council. Professor Lawrence will continue to be the liaison with Indigenous Studies.

There was interest in the possibility of a new course in land-based learning. It was noted that Associate Vice-President Research Haig-Brown has experience with this type of offering and would be a valuable resource.
Discussion at this follow up meeting focused on developments since the first consultation held in August. Participants paid particular attention to the EATS revisioning exercise underway and the curriculum emerging from FES and Geography with an emphasis on climate change.

It was agreed that there should be a widened, ongoing dialogue about Environmental Science. Participants were encouraged to suggest the names of individuals who should be at the table in an exploration of opportunities for collaboration. In the short term, colleagues from EATS and FES/Geography will share proposals as they are refined.
A meeting of the Environmental Science working group was held the week of September 9. A colleague from Atmospheric Chemistry had attended. The program overview will be incorporated into the text of the proposal slated for distribution on September 19. Text of the proposal will stress that the four Faculties are continuing to hone the proposal. The modified program will have a core and three streams, along with a wider space for students to choose electives.

One of the questions that was posed turned on the alignment of the Environmental Studies program proposal aligns with the revisioning exercise in EATS. Dean Goodyer confirmed that ideas will be presented soon. Associate Dean Mills confirmed that Environmental Biology will be closed but another environmental option will be developed.
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Dean Hovorka provided an update on curriculum developments during the summer, timelines for their review and approval, and consultation plans. The proposal drafted for Senate and Board consideration will be released to colleagues in FES and Geography on September 19. Those who have consulted with the Sub-Committee will also receive the document that day.

Colleagues from DEM helpfully prepared a paper on possible forms of collaboration which at once contextualized and animated the discussion. DEM saw this as a bridge-building exercise and not necessarily inclusive of all options. Participants offered preliminary thoughts on possibilities and shared perspectives on how, for example, a foundational science course could inform the curriculum of multiple programs by fostering basic science literacy without requiring students to have a robust background in a scientific discipline.

Given the intense curriculum development activity expected in the new Faculty in the months ahead, it was thought advisable for joint initiatives to emerge from DEM at the outset. There were opportunities for co-taught courses (which struck participants as promising, not least since colleagues in DEM and the new Faculty have overlapping research interests). Collaboration could start with a single course – such as “Climate and Catastrophe” -- to gauge student interest and set the stage for more ambitious arrangements. Initial points of contact between programs could also take the form of cross-listing, supervision, cross-membership in graduate programs, or new Faculty colleagues serving as second readers of research papers in the MDEM programs.
Promotional material could also express York’s strengths in curriculum spanning related programs.

It was agreed that the next step would be to think about co-taught courses, a model that may also be highly transportable to other joint curriculum ventures. DEM colleagues will be invited to attend meetings of the working group(s) tasked with fully developing curriculum.
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Discussion opened with expressions of gratitude to colleagues from SPPA for the advice given during the first consultation. Participants at this follow up meeting were provided with updates on the development of curriculum for the new Faculty, especially a proposal to establish a degree in Sustainable Environmental Management. Professor Kimakova and Professor Magee reiterated their interest in reviewing the program brief as it is fleshed out. Students enrolled in this program may round out their studies with courses offered by the School. Similarly, those pursuing a degree in Public Policy and Administration may be interested in courses that cover environmental management (as they do with Disaster and Emergency Management). The discussion also touched on topics such as designing programs that maintain flexibility for students as they progress and attracting enrolments through, for example, second degrees.
As discussion resumed at this follow-up meeting, members of the FES-Geography Curriculum Working Group provided an update on the development of proposals over the summer. Of particular importance were proposals of potential relevance to Business and Society, International Development Studies and Urban Studies.

**Outcomes and Next Steps**

The Sustainable Environmental Management program brief will be shared with BUSO colleagues as it is refined and well before a BUSO retreat scheduled for the end of October.

The development of a PhD in Development Studies proposal will be the subject of consultations led by Social Science.

The *Cites, Communities and Planning* program proposal that emerged responded to concerns raised by Social Science colleagues in June. However, FES and Geography faculty members felt strongly that the program should have the word urban in the title given the concentration of urbanists in the new Faculty and the curriculum orientation. The term “Urban Studies” will not be in the title. Other terminology will be used to express the strong urban orientation of the program.
Participants explored various models for collaboration and agreed on the importance of consultation. As a result, participants determined that:

- there is a consensus around the need to enhance the “Urban at York” in terms of research, curriculum, pedagogy, reputation and impact
- there should be great coherence in the University’s urban-oriented curriculum, together with a commitment to student mobility
- there should be direct connections between Urban Studies and the new Faculty’s curriculum designers
- an urban working group will be established under the auspices of the Vice-Provost Academica who will call for expressions of interest