

UNIVERSITY SENATEMINUTES OF THE OPEN SESSION MEETING OF JANUARY 19, 2001ATTENDANCE

- PRESENT: Dr. J.W. O'Brien (Speaker); Dr. F. Lowy; Prof. M. Danis; Mr. M. Di Grappa; Mr. L. English; Dr. J. Lightstone; Prof. A. Ahmad; Prof. A. Al-Khalili; Dean M. Anvari; Dean C. Bédard; Mr. P. Blais; Dr. D. Boisvert; Prof. W. Byers; Mr. M. Coker; Prof. C. Cupples; Dean N. Esmail; Ms. S. Friesinger; Prof. C. Giguère; Prof. M. Gourlay; Ms. S. Grewal; Dean C. Jackson; Prof. E. Jacobs; Ms. J. Landry; Ms. M. Mullarkey; Prof. S. Panet-Raymond; Ms. L. Prendergast; Prof. P. Rist; Prof. L. Roberge; Mr. R. Sebaaly; Dr. W. Sellers; Dean M. Singer; Prof. P. Thornton; Prof. J. Tomberlin, Prof. C. Vallejo
- ABSENT: Mr. C. Adam; Mr. O. Badawi; Prof. C. Bayne; Prof. W. Bukowski; Mr. W. Curran; Ms. J. Laberge; Ms. N. Sajnani; Mr. C. Schulz; Prof. H. Shulman; Prof. T. Stathopoulos; Prof. R. Tremblay; Mr. J. Woodrow
- GUEST: Dr. Fred Bird, Professor, Religion Department; Me Bram Freedman, Assistant Secretary-General and General Counsel

Documents associated with the minutes

- |                |  |
|----------------|--|
| US-2001-1-D1   | Appointments   |
| US-2001-1-D2   | Recommendations of the Academic Programs Committee   |
| US-2001-1-D3   | Major undergraduate curriculum changes: Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science  |
| US-2001-1-D4   | Outline of Graduate Certificate Program in Teaching and Learning   |
| US-2001-1-D5   | Steering Committee proposal regarding interim evaluation process for Faculty Deans and the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research |
| US-2001-1-D6   | General education graduation requirement proposal of the Faculty of Arts and Science   |
| US-2001-1-D7   | General education graduation requirement proposal of the Faculty of Fine Arts  |
| US-2001-1-D7.1 | General education graduation requirement proposal of the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science                             |
| US-2001-1-D8   | Background on the revisions to the Policy on the Ethical Review of Research involving Humans                                     |
| US-2001-1-D9   | Revised Policy on the Ethical Review of Research involving Humans  |

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 2:10 p.m. Dr. O'Brien referred to the package placed before each Senator and pointed out that the resolutions had been printed on yellow paper so that they could be readily identified.

2. Approval of the Agenda

R-2001-1-1 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Sebaaly, Esmail), it was unanimously resolved that the agenda be approved as submitted.*

3. Approval of the Minutes of the Open Session meeting held December 1, 2000

R-2001-1-2 *Upon motion made duly moved and seconded (Panet-Raymond, Vallejo), it was unanimously resolved that the minutes of the Open Session meeting of December 1, 2000 be approved as submitted.*

4. Business arising from the minutes

There was no business arising from the minutes.

5. Remarks from the Rector

Dr. Lowy informed Senators that, as reported in *The Thursday Report* and local newspapers, the Architectural Competition Jury had selected the Toronto-based firm *Kuwabara, Payne, McKenna, Blumberg* in association with the Montreal firm *Fichten Soiferman* to design the Fine Arts, John Molson School of Business and Engineering and Computer Science downtown buildings, in a specific area identified as *Le Quartier Concordia*. As for the Loyola campus, the project manager for the Science Building had been chosen. Dr. Lowy added that although fundraising was the most important obstacle, it was going reasonably well and he felt confident that the University should be breaking ground sometime this year.

The Rector then congratulated the Concordia Student Union on its recent accreditation by the Ministry of Education.

In closing, Dr. Lowy emphasized, as he did at last Wednesday's Board of Governors meeting, the importance of maintaining peaceful and civil relations between all groups regarding the ongoing Middle-East conflict.

6. Items for Information

Provost and Vice-Rector Research Jack Lightstone reported that the Senate Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities had completed its second major round of academic planning. Two Faculties have already submitted their academic plans, and the others will do so in the next few months. The major contextual factors to play into the elaboration or problems of the next phase of planning need to be determined. Money is slowly reappearing, albeit not through increased base budget funding for universities but rather through research support.

7. Question period

Referring to an advocacy case of an Engineering student, Student Mistie Mullarkey inquired if there was any written regulation regarding what

percentage was considered a passing grade, to which Dr. Lightstone responded that the only official University grades are letter grades and while individual professors may use numeric grades in grading assignments, Senate's policy is that only letter grades are considered to be official University grades.

8. Appointments

R-2001-1-3 *Upon motion made duly moved and seconded (Mullarkey, Lowy), it was unanimously resolved that the appointments to the Senate Appeals Committee on Academic Misconduct and the University Library Committee, as set out in Senate Document US-2001-1-D1, be approved.*

9. Recommendations of the Academic Programs Committee

9.1 Major Undergraduate curriculum changes for 2001-2002 - Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science

R-2001-1-4 *Upon motion made duly moved and seconded (Esmail, Al-Khalili), it was unanimously resolved that the major undergraduate curriculum changes in the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science, set out in Senate Document US-2001-1-D3, be approved as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Senate Document US-2001-1-D2.*

10. Fast track approval of the Graduate Certificate Program in Teaching and Learning

Dean Singer said that this Certificate relates to a CIDA funded program between Concordia and UNIQWA, intended to provide 20 South African educators with an advanced degree. At this point, the likelihood is that half of those 18 students still registered in the program will not be in a position to start or complete their thesis. The proposal is meant to provide a fall back position to those students. The fast track approval is imperative because the CIDA funding, already extended once, has basically run out. The certificate requirements have already been completed by all the students. Furthermore, there is no question of ever using this program again.

In response to a question by Prof. Panet-Raymond, Dean Singer replied that students who opt for the certificate cannot change their mind and write the thesis. Dean Bédard added that the School of Graduate Studies has received three formal thesis submissions up to now and that students have been told clearly that there is no turning back should they chose the certificate.

Prof. Al-Khalili commented that in his faculty many students have completed their course requirements but have not received their diplomas since they have not submitted theses. This situation is quite different, replied Dean Singer, since this university is located in a very rural northern area of South Africa, where electronic communications are extremely challenging for the students who are dispersed over the region. Over \$500,000 has been poured into this project. We should go an extra mile to help those students.

R-2001-1-5 *Upon motion made duly moved and seconded (Singer, Blais), it was unanimously resolved:*

*WHEREAS at its meeting of December 1, 2000, the Arts and Science Faculty Council approved the creation of the Graduate Certificate in Teaching and Learning;*

*WHEREAS there is an urgent need to have this Certificate in place as soon as possible and therefore that it follow the fast-track review process;*

*WHEREAS at its meeting of January 15, 2001, the Graduate Certificate Provisional Approval Subcommittee of Senate's Academic Programs Committee reviewed the Certificate;*

*THAT the Graduate Certificate Program in Teaching and Learning, as set out in Document US-2001-1-D4, be approved as recommended by the Graduate Certificate Provisional Approval Subcommittee.*

11. Interim Evaluation process for Faculty Deans and the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research

Provost Jack Lightstone apprised Senators that the Board of Governors had approved the Task Force recommendations and had incorporated Senate's suggestion that several Search Committees be augmented by one faculty member. While the Board has struck a new task force to propose a permanent evaluation process, it stated that it would welcome Senate's input on the interim evaluation process, which could function as an experiment for the permanent process.

Further to an informal consultation with some of his colleagues, Dr. Lightstone reported that some expressed concerns about whether the composition of the committee for the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research should be closely modelled after that of the Faculty Deans.

Dr. Byers expressed the following concerns. Regarding the composition of the committee for Faculty Deans, he felt that the appointees should not be limited to Faculty Council members but that nominations should be at large within the Faculty. Secondly, should the external Dean be a formal member of the committee or only act in a consulting capacity? How would this person be chosen? Should not this person convey a written report? Dr. Byers also felt that the process should allow for department heads to personally appear before the committee should they wish to do so. Finally, he inquired whether the document should be sent to Councils for input.

Dr. Giguère explained that Steering Committee felt that Faculty Council members would have a better basis to evaluate the incumbents. He also added that this process seemed more expeditious, considering the time constraints.

Dean Anvari stressed that some thought should be given to ensure a smooth process avoiding unnecessary embarrassment to an incumbent and suggested that the evaluation method of department chairs could be considered. At some point, attention should be paid to the way the committee operates and how this would reflect on the incumbent.

Dr. Tomberlin raised concerns about the presence of an external Dean. He worried that this could turn into a highly politicised exercise because of

competition between schools and suggested that other ways of getting outside advice be looked into.

Dr. Lightstone emphasized that time was of the essence. If an interim evaluation process is not adopted soon, three Search Committees will have to be struck in April, rendering the interim evaluation process futile. Thus, there is no time to hold at large Faculty elections because this would take many weeks; there is also no time to send the proposed interim procedure to Councils for consultation.

As for the presence of external Deans, Dr. Lightstone agreed that this could turn into a touchy situation and therefore the presence of external Dean could be reconsidered. He added that the oral report had been suggested to lighten the burden of that person.

Referring to Prof. Panet-Raymond query about evaluation criteria, Dr. Lightstone pointed out the incumbent would be evaluated on explicit expectations that would have been set out in the beginning of the term.

At this point in the discussion, Dr. O'Brien reviewed the alternatives, and Dr. Lightstone reiterated that to avert a full search procedure, Senate's recommendation must be approved at the February 21 meeting of the Board of Governors.

Dr. Byers reminded Senators of the unhappy history of evaluation committees and suggested that the vote be deferred to the February 2 Senate meeting. Dr. Tomberlin mentioned that if the external Dean would be replaced by another external university administrator, he would feel more comfortable in recommending the adoption of the interim process.

Following this discussion, it was agreed to defer the adoption of the interim evaluation process to the next Senate meeting. However, Dr. O'Brien advised all Senators that their comments regarding the process should be submitted to the Provost no later than next Monday, January 22, 5 p.m. so that he may prepare a revised document. Dr. O'Brien also stressed that although Senators made comments this afternoon, they should nevertheless put them in writing and get them to Dr. Lightstone by Monday if they wish them to be included in the revised document.

## 12. General education graduation requirement

Dr. O'Brien referred to the documents produced by the Faculties of Arts and Science, Fine Arts and Engineering and Computer Science as well as the draft resolutions put before the Senators. He then asked Dr. Lightstone to introduce this subject.

Dr. Lightstone recalled that two pieces of legislation had been adopted by Senate since the Fall of 1997, the first being an agreement in principle that each Faculty have a general education graduation requirement, the second being a minimum default standard for general education. The Faculties proposals have now all been received.

Dr. Lightstone pointed out that the John Molson School of Business already has a requirement that adheres to much of the default and therefore did not put forth a

proposal. The Fine Arts Faculty has a similar requirement, but since visual arts have no relationship with performing arts, it has now proposed that the disciplinary categories be divided into seven by distinguishing the visual and performing arts.

The intent of the resolutions is, said the Provost, to recognize that all four Faculties have met the general education graduation requirement and to adopt the proposals, and, if so adopted, that a calendar copy text be submitted to the Registrar by March 2001, except the Faculty of Arts and Science.

Dr. Lightstone then invited each Dean to present its Faculty's proposal. Dean Singer and Dean Esmail commented extensively on their Faculty's proposal, as set out in Documents US-2001-1-D6 and D7.1, respectively. Dean Jackson mentioned that Dr. Lightstone's comments summed it up and added that his Faculty was looking forward to collaborating with the Faculty of Arts and Science. While having no additional comments, Dean Anvari would nonetheless be pleased to answer any questions.

A discussion ensued on the draft motion put before Senate, more particularly regarding the implementation deadlines for Arts and Science, considering the huge volume and phasing in period required. However, there were no implementation problems for the other Faculties. Following that discussion, the following resolutions were adopted.

R-2001-1-6      *Upon motion made duly moved and seconded (Lightstone, Singer), it was unanimously resolved:*

*Whereas in the previous round of academic planning (Fall 1997), Senate endorsed in principle the development of general education provisions for undergraduate studies at Concordia, and;*

*Whereas subsequently Senate adopted specific legislation which in effect set a minimum default standard for general education in the Faculties of Arts and Science, Fine Arts, and the John Molson School of Business for implementation for all incoming students as of September 2001; and*

*Whereas these three Faculties were invited to make alternate proposals to Senate that either "meet or exceed" the intent of the Senate-approved legislation, and*

*Whereas Senate, being cognizant of the special circumstances with respect to four-year engineering programmes and their accreditation, requested that the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science propose some programme requirements whereby undergraduate engineering students would be exposed to study outside their home Faculty, and;*

*Whereas all Faculties have now considered the form of general education requirement suitable for them;*

1.      *THAT Senate:*
  - (a) *approve the proposals of the Faculty of Arts and Science for a general education as "meeting or exceeding" the intent of Senate's earlier legislation;*

*(b) charge Arts and Science to commence immediately curriculum legislation which would permit the implementation at the earliest possible date;*  
*(c) further charge Arts and Science to propose to Senate such a date at the March meeting of Senate together with an implementation plan;*  
*(d) charge the Faculty to provide the Registrar with appropriate text regarding general education requirements for undergraduate students in Arts and Science for inclusion in the appropriate place in the Arts and Science section of the calendar and for distribution to all Arts and Science students entering at that date.*

2. THAT Senate:
  - (a) approve the proposal of Fine Arts that the six grand disciplinary sectors of the Senate approved legislation on general education be augmented by one by means of subdividing Fine Arts disciplines into the visual arts and the performing arts;*
  - (b) charge the Faculty by February 28, 2001 to provide the Registrar with appropriate text regarding general education requirements for undergraduate students in Fine Arts for inclusion eventually in the appropriate place in the Fine Arts section of the calendar and for distribution to all Fine Arts students entering in September 1, 2001, to whom this requirement shall apply.*
3. THAT Senate charge the John Molson School of Business by February 28, 2001 to provide the Registrar with appropriate text regarding general education requirements, as previously approved by Senate and revised by virtue of acceptance of the Fine Arts proposal to differentiate the visual and the performing arts, for undergraduate business students for inclusion eventually in the appropriate place in the School of Business section of the calendar and for distribution to all business students entering in September 1, 2001, to whom this requirement shall apply.
4. THAT Senate:
  - (a) endorse the proposal of the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science for a general education for undergraduate engineering and computer science programmes, as contained in document US-2001-1-D7.1 entitled, "General Education Requirement, Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science" (January 19, 2001) as "meeting or exceeding" the intent of earlier Senate-approved legislation for general education;*
  - (b) charge the Faculty by February 28, 2001 to provide the Registrar with any additional appropriate text required regarding general education requirements for undergraduate students in Engineering and Computer science for inclusion eventually in the appropriate place in the Engineering and Computer Science sections of the calendar and for distribution to all undergraduate Engineering and Computer Science students entering September 1, 2001, to whom any revised requirements shall apply.*

13. Motion concerning student attendance at the Free Trade Area of the Americas summit

Student Patrice Blais explained that some students plan to attend demonstrations that are being organized in Quebec City from April 20 to April 24, 2001.

However, this falls during the final exam period. Consequently, students want Senate to understand and recognize the importance of this event for many of them.

While being fully supportive of a student's right, Prof. Panet-Raymond mentioned that deferrals are not possible for some performing art students whose work involve public performance implicating a whole department. Dr. O'Brien concurred that the proposed motion refers specifically to written exams and does not cover the above example.

Registrar Lynne Prendergast pointed out that formal deferral procedures are in place. Should Senate approve this as an acceptable reason to grant a deferral, the proper documentation should be forwarded to the Examination Office of the Registrar.

Prof. Roberge reminded Senate that contracts for the part-time faculty members provide for remuneration for specific periods and therefore part-time faculty could not abide by this should it entail additional review of student work without compensation. Again, Dr. O'Brien restated that the intent of the motion was only for formal examinations.

Other Senators, such as Dean Singer and Prof. Ahmad, supported the motion since it encourages students to have a public role and conscience. However, Prof. Cupples was opposed to it stating that procedures are already in place, the difficulty in obtaining proof of attendance and the additional administrative burden which will be placed on the department chair.

Further to a question by Dean Anvari, Dr. Lightstone answered that an instructor or a department chair can refuse to grant the deferral, in which case the student will have to abide by that decision.

Although the final list of exam dates is not yet available, Ms. Pendergast will attempt to obtain such a list by the February 2 meeting.

R-2001-1-7      *Upon motion made duly moved and seconded (Blais, Mullarkey), it was resolved, with one opposed:*

*WHEREAS some students have expressed interest in attending the People's summit and the demonstrations occurring between April 20 and April 24, 2001 in conjunction with the Free Trade Area of the Americas meeting being held in Quebec City;*

*THAT Senate encourage departments and professors to be flexible, in so far as it is feasible, in making formal alternative arrangements for examination for non-graduating students attending the summit on these dates, on condition that these students express in writing to the department chair and professor, with a copy to the Registrar, their wish to attend the summit by March 15, 2001.*

14.      Revisions to the Policy for the Ethical Review of Research involving Humans

Dr. Lowy asked that speaking privileges be granted to Dr. Fred Bird, the author of the Policy and of the revisions. The revisions were indicated in bold.

The Policy was originally adopted by the Board of Governors in June 2000. It was then reviewed by the Tri-Council Office and comments were forwarded to the University. The revisions are basically of a procedural and technical nature and do not alter the substantive aspects of the Policy.

Dean Anvari questioned whether the revisions had been approved by the Faculty Councils, to which Dean Bédard answered that previous drafts had been approved by them. Furthermore, the revisions had been discussed at Senate Research Committee. Dr. Lightstone reiterated that the revisions were relatively minor. Dr. Bird gave the details regarding the revisions and answered questions put to him.

R-2001-1-8      *Upon motion duly made and seconded (Lowy, Bédard) it was unanimously resolved:*

*WHEREAS, on recommendation of Senate, the Policy for the Ethical Review of Research Involving Humans was adopted by the Board of Governors in June 2000;*

*WHEREAS, following certain comments formulated by the Tri-Council Office, certain revisions of a procedural and technical nature are proposed;*

*WHEREAS the revisions were reviewed by the Senate Research Committee at its meeting of January 18, 2001;*

*THAT Senate recommend that the Board of Governors approve the revised Policy for the Ethical Review of Research Involving Human, as set out in Document US-2001-1-D9.*

15.      Other business

There was no other business to discuss.

16.      Next meeting

Dr. O'Brien announced that the next meeting of Senate would be held on Friday, February 2, 2001, at 2 p.m.

17.      Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:20 p.m., on a motion moved by Mr. Blais and seconded by Ms. Friesinger.

Danielle Tessier  
Secretary of the Board of Governors and Senate