Master of Information Student Council
University of Toronto, Faculty of Information
misc.ischool.utoronto.ca | misc.ischool@utoronto.ca

Claude Bissell Building, 7th Floor, Student Lounge
April 8th, 2015 at 6:00-8:00pm

MISC Meeting
Minutes

Present: Jessie Wionzek, Hilary Barlow, Chris Hogendoorn, Lucy Szczesniak, Mari Vihuri, Hannah Saunders, Leah Strudwick, Catherine Lamoureux, Mehreen Athar, David Mason, Karen Lees, Lillian Rigling, Emily Deere, Mia Clarkson, Sophia Kesik, Stephanie Abba, Nikita Johnston, Nuree Lee, Nicole Kuiper, Calvin Tennakoon, Peymon Montazeri, Junoh Kim, Diana Kulpa, Carolyn Dineen, Caeleigh Moffat, Julia King
Regrets: Katrina Cohen-Palacios, Janel Cheng, Maya Cruz, Amanda Chernawski, Akash Venkat, Haeleigh Fox

1. **Approval of the agenda**

   a. Seconded by Jessie; approved unanimously

2. **Reading and approval of the minutes**

   a. Seconded by Stephanie; approved unanimously

3. **Business arising from the minutes**

4. **Reports by Executives:**

   a. **President (Hilary Barlow)**

      i. Thank you for an amazing year!

        ii.   Supported CRO petition

       iii.   Exit reports

              1.   a.   Mari noted that she'll be removing access to MISConnect from outgoing members (who are not returning) on May 1st, 2015. Please upload your exit reports to the drive or email them to Chris Hogendoorn by then.

b. **Vice President (Chris Hogendoorn)**

        i.   Written report appended. Attended Faculty Council, the GSU General Council, and the Recruitment and Admissions Committee meeting. Also corresponded with the Chair of the ISC regarding the formation of *ad hoc* committees to proceed with the proposed Inforum renovations, and self-nominated to serve on the Advisory Committee for the Dean of the Faculty of Information.

c. **Secretary (Jessie Wionzek)**

        i.   Election results - vote count for both elections

d. **Treasurer (Lucy Szczesniak)**

e. **Webmaster (Mari Vihuri)**

        i.   Changes to MISConnect Google Drive based on feedback from card sorting exercise earlier in the year

       ii.   Returning and incoming members, please fill out the intake form

      iii.   Outgoing members will be unsubscribed from Google Group and Google Drive on May 1st, 2015, so please upload any & all documentation by then. If you need to submit files after this date, please send them to the new President, Christopher Hogendoorn

5. **Reports by Committee Chairs:**

a. **Academic Affairs (Carolyn Dineen)**

        i.   Class rep reports due Friday, April 10 at 11:59 pm. There will more than likely have to be an extended due date for another week, but I will finish up the documentation before my MISConnect access expires on May 1.

      ii.   Updated and expanded [Academic Affairs Handbook](#) for EC to review (input from all outgoing/incoming MISC members welcome!). Thanks to Mari for putting it together in the first place!

      iii.   Created a brief [Class Rep Guide](#) to send to class reps when they sign up, explaining duties and the use/sharing of class rep reports. Feedback welcome!

b. **Professional Development (Jessie Wionzek & Julia King)**

      i.   Unfortunately, we had to cancel the interview workshops (hosted by Kate Johnson) due to a lack of time for advertising and predicted low attendance. We're in talks with Kate to host four interview workshops next year (two in the fall and two in the winter/spring), which we believe will be more effective and useful for students.

c. **Social (Leah Strudwick & Hannah Saunders)**

      i.   The end-of-year-party went great! Thanks to all who attended.

d. **Merchandise (Mehreen Athar)**

      i.   Hoodie sale postmortem

6. **Reports by Representatives:**

a. **Alumni Association (Catherine Lamoureux)**

      i.   FIAA is still not sure what their budget will be for next year (awaiting word from the administration). This may affect how many conference and research grants they can offer to students next year.

      ii.   Last meeting included a discussion about the Bertha Bassam lecture, including a review of attendee feedback (from a survey).

b. **MISC-MUSSA Liaison (Haleigh Fox)**

c. **Admissions Committee (Karen Lees)**

      i.   Written report appended. The committee discussed an incoming student Meet and Greet event to be held on 25 April, and the MUSSA representative's student engagement initiative and ideas before they went *in camera* to conduct an admissions review.

d. **Faculty Council (Hilary Barlow et al.)**

i. A very vague document about renovations to the iSchool and the Inforum was submitted to FC from the ISC Committee. Stephanie, Hilary and Chris compiled questions beforehand in order to get clarification and try to figure out how the document was to be implemented. Luckily, many faculty members also found the document to be insufficient. A motion passed to receive the report but have the ISC decide how to implement the recommendations in the report down the road.

ii. The co-op program was approved.

iii. Hilary asked if the iSchool had received any instruction from U of T on how to handle students' grades in the absence of TAs. The response was similar to previous communications from the administration, and basically the iSchool did not receive any clarification. The strike ended not long after that, so Hilary did not send any message to the Provost.

iv. Summer representatives: All current Faculty Council reps keep their positions through the end of the summer. If you cannot commit to attend FC meetings over the summer, we kindly ask you to resign so we know how many student seats are unfilled.

e. **Graduate Students' Union (Lilly Rigling & Karen Lees) -** meeting 30 March

i. presentation from Dean Rowe about SGS changes - apparently working toward fewer regulations, integrating GPS program and increased collaboration with GSU

ii. administrative granting of COLA to health and dental, CFS, OPIRG, granting conference funding requests

iii. CRO Report - 1.89% turnout. Debate about the merits/limitations of online voting

iv. Created a subcommittee Re: graduate funding with momentum from CUPE strike

f. **Student Tech Fund (Akash Venkat, Junoh Kim & Nuree Lee)**

i. There will be a Tech Fund meeting closer to the end of the month. Tech Fund is going to be focusing more on outreach and closing the gap between Tech Fund & MI students going forward.

      ii.   Chris asked how much Tech Fund gets in funding each year. It's $100 per full-time student (from tuition fees) and an additional $50 from the Provost per full-time student.

      iii.   Chris brought up the idea of having a conversation regarding the fund for Tech Fund and the amount of money going towards it.

      iv.   Junoh asked how we would go about changing the structure of Tech Fund (ie. to take actions, they must go through a lengthy approval process, so actions can take 2-3 months to be completed). Mari said this would occur at the Referendum.

g. Information Services Committee (Janel Cheng)

h. Life and Times Committee (Amanda Chernawski)

i. Programs Committee (Catherine Lamoureux & Calvin Tennakoon)

      i.   April meeting cancelled. Next meeting will be May 7th.

      ii.   Diana asked if anything's been brought up about IPS. Catherine responded that they haven't really discussed it, but it is being reviewed. Calvin added that they're going to bring in other students (including those from other faculties) to discuss the program, but there's nothing concrete about this yet.

j. Committee on Standing (Diana Kulpa)

      i.   There was an email vote and there will be another meeting in May.

7. New business

   a.   Annual survey

      i.   Diana asked about who to send the details to. Chris said he'd pass the details on to whoever continues working on it.

      ii.   We need to keep promoting it. Currently our response rate is hovering around 40.

   b.   Constitutional Amendments

      i.   Chris summarized the constitutional amendments (4.6; see the minutes from the last meeting).

          1.   Motion to create a new Section 4.6.1

a. Seconded by Stephanie; approved unanimously

2. Motion to create a new Section 4.6.2

a. Seconded by Jessie; approved unanimously

3. Motion to change the wording to Section 4.1

a. Seconded by Caroline; approved unanimously

8. **Adjourn**

1. Seconded by Stephanie; approved unanimously

Appendix

Written reports

Vice President Report

I attended the Faculty Council meeting on 20 March. I asked what the $1200.00 "auxiliary fee" that all students in the co-op program will have to pay is for, as the proposed document did not specify. The Chair, Dr. Duff, informed us that the fee was to cover administrative costs involved with monitoring the program, particularly for the Careers Officer's time. Refer to the Faculty Council Report for further details on the meeting's proceedings.

I also attended the UTGSU's General Council meeting on 30 March. Refer to the Graduate Students' Union Representatives' Report for further details on the meeting's proceedings.

Furthermore, I attended the Recruitment & Admissions Committee meeting on 2 April in the regular representative's stead. My general impression from the meeting was that the committee is extremely open to any and all suggestions when it comes to recruitment and engagement initiatives, and I would encourage the incoming representative to bring ideas to the committee for consideration. Refer to the Recruitment & Admissions Committee Report for further details on the meeting's proceedings.

Finally, on behalf of students with concerns regarding the *ad hoc* committees being formed to proceed on the Inforum renovations, I reached out to Dr. Krmpotich, the Chair of the Information Services Committee, in order to receive some enlightenment. The two concerns were about the scope of student representation on the committee, or rather, lack-there-of, and about the transparency of the selection process.

To begin with, Dr. Krmpotich emphasized that the two committees were not in fact sub-committees of the ISC, as there is no requirement to have ISC members sit on them. The ISC is responsible for monitoring the progress of the committees and reporting back to Faculty Council, but it seems has no direct control over them.

To address the concern that there would be only one student on each committee, and thus the view of Information, Museum Studies, or doctoral students may not be equally represented, she posited that two students in the same concentration may also have divergent opinions. Furthermore, she said that the goal of the committees will be "to develop working strategies that enable the student body to be part of iterative, or agile, design processes." Therefore, the student who sits on the committee will not be the sole voice for students in the renovation process, but it will be open to outside input.

With regard to the concern over the selection process, Dr. Krmpotich indicated that she and Glen Cumming, the Chief Administrative Officer, would be selecting from the nominees whom they believe can make progress on the appointed task. The members of the committees are to be balanced in skills, strengths, program affiliations, and perspectives. Finally, she indicated that the next ISC

meeting was Friday, 10 April from 13:00-14:30, and welcomed any who wished to observe to attend the meeting.

Finally, building upon my experience this year, and with my role as President in mind for the upcoming academic year, I have put my name forward to sit on the Advisory Committee for the Dean of the Faculty of Information. I encourage anyone who believes this would be an interesting and enlightening process to also nominate themselves.

Submitted 4 April 2015 by Christopher Hogendoorn

Recruitment & Admissions Committee Report

The committee met on the afternoon of 2 April. The vice president attended the meeting in the regular representative's stead.

The recruitment officer briefed the committee on the details of the Meet and Greet event for incoming students to be held on 25 April. This would include a lunch for award winners, and potentially TALint students. A concern about CRO students was raised by Drs. Duff and Mihalache, namely that they tend to be disregarded as a unit at these events and forced to chose between events for Information students or for Museum Studies students, despite the fact that CRO students tend to identify as CRO students. It was decided that, should there be a sufficient number of CRO students in attendance at the event, there would be a separate question and answer session for them before they were to join the rest of the incoming students at the reception. It was also noted that Information Services would be reintegrated into these recruitment events, following the Inforum working group's recommendations to retain the staff in their present location. Finally, the recruitment officer mentioned that invitations for current students to attend the event would be sent out soon. Dr. Stevenson asked if there would be student government representation, and it was indicated that there would be.

The MUSSA representative brought forth a quiz that she had developed as an engagement exercise for incoming students to take over the summer, where the questions would result in an answer corresponding to a future exhibition done by Museum Studies students. The effort was lauded, but Dr. Mihalache was confused about the purpose and context of the quiz, and it was suggested that it be advertised using Faculty of Information social media platforms, and that MUSSA use it as a tool for organizing meetings of incoming students over the summer. It was also suggested that it may be used to match students through the mentor program. During this discussion, it was confirmed that *National Treasure* falls into the CRO realm, due to the documentary and thus archival nature of the Declaration of Independence, and not just the museum realm.

The MUSSA representative also brought forth the idea of sending out postcards to incoming students, friendly in nature, but also reminding them to pay their fees. The initial suggestion that students write them was dismissed because of perceived privacy reasons, and faculty members also felt uncomfortable with the idea of telling students to pay their fees. A general consensus was met that the dean's name on the postcards would be an appropriate compromise.

At this point, the committee went *in camera* for the remainder of the meeting in order to conduct an admissions review, and all non-reviewers left the room.

Submitted 2 April 2015 by Christopher Hogendoorn