

UNIVERSITY SENATEMINUTES OF THE OPEN SESSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 2, 2001ATTENDANCE

PRESENT: Dr. J. W. O'Brien (Speaker); Dr. F. Lowy; Prof. M. Danis; Mr. M. Di Grappa; Mr. L. English; Dr. J. Lightstone; Mr. C. Adam; Prof. A. Ahmad; Prof. A. Al-Khalili; Prof. C. Bayne; Dean C. Bédard; Mr. P. Blais; Prof. W. Byers; Mr. W. Curran; Dean N. Esmail; Ms. S. Friesinger; Prof. C. Giguère; Prof. M. Gourlay; Ms. J. Landry; Ms. M. Mullarkey; Mr. S. Nazzal; Prof. S. Panet-Raymond; Ms. L. Prendergast; Mr. C. Schulz; Mr. R. Sebaaly; Dr. W. Sellers; Dean M. Singer; Prof. T. Stathopoulos; Prof. P. Thornton; Prof. J. Tomberlin, Prof. C. Vallejo

ABSENT: Dean M. Anvari; Dr. D. Boisvert; Prof. W. Bukowski; Mr. M. Coker; Prof. C. Cupples; Ms. S. Grewal; Dean C. Jackson; Prof. E. Jacobs; Ms. J. Laberge; Prof. P. Rist; Prof. L. Roberge; Ms. N. Sajnani; Prof. H. Shulman; Prof. R. Tremblay; Mr. J. Woodrow

GUEST: Me Bram Freedman, Assistant Secretary-General and General Counsel

Documents associated with the minutes

US-2001-2-D1	Recommendations of the Academic Programs Committee
US-2001-2-D2	Major Graduate curriculum changes: John Molson School of Business
US-2001-2-D3	Minor Graduate curriculum changes: Faculty of Arts and Science
US-2001-2-D4	Interim Evaluation Process for Faculty Deans and the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research
US-2001-2-D5	Guiding principles for future operating budget allocations
US-2001-2-D6	Discussion on per-credit administrative fees
US-2001-2-D7	Accrediting of courses offered by other institutions
US-2001-2-D8	Major Graduate curriculum changes: Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order informally at 2:15 p.m. by the Speaker, who mentioned that the main business of the meeting would be delayed until quorum was reached.

5. Remarks from the Rector

Dr. Lowy signaled the potential problem facing all Quebec Universities following so-called leaks from government officials regarding education budget cuts, reportedly around \$400 million, according to *La Presse*. Although all universities have attempted to obtain further information, no precise answers have been given. CREPUQ has informally been advised that performance contracts not yet signed are suspended for the moment. For those contracts already signed, Dr. Lowy said that the Minister of Education had included a clause in the contracts stipulating that their implementation depends on the

availability of funds. The worst scenario would be that the promise made by the government at the Youth Summit may be changed. While Dr. Lowy is very disturbed by this news, he pointed out that acting on rumors would be counterproductive. He invited Dr. Lightstone, who had attended a CREPUQ meeting the day before, to comment on this subject. Dr. Lightstone added that the Federation of Quebec University Students has met with the president of CREPUQ. Should action be required, it will be done in a concerted effort between both bodies. He emphasized that the stance of the rectors is that no cut to commitments made over the next three years is acceptable.

6. Items for Information

There were no items for information to bring before Senate.

7. Question period

Dr. Giguère inquired if the primary, secondary and CEGEP sectors are also targeted by the rumored cuts, to which Dr. Lowy answered that, according to *La Presse*, all sectors are included.

2. Approval of the Agenda

Dr. O'Brien mentioned that item 8.3 regarding the approval of Major Graduate Curriculum changes to the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science should be added to the agenda.

R-2001-2-1 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Giguère, Stathopoulos), it was unanimously resolved that the agenda be approved as amended.*

3. Approval of the Minutes of the Open Session meeting held January 19, 2001

Prof. Panet-Raymond queried Dr. Lightstone about his statement in the third paragraph of item 12 to the effect that "visual arts have no relationship with performing arts". Dr. Lightstone answered that, upon the recommendation of the Fine Arts Faculty, visual arts and performing arts had been divided into two distinct disciplinary categories because students in visual arts seldom take courses in performing arts, and vice versa. The minutes of this meeting will stand as clarification.

R-2001-2-2 *Upon motion made duly moved and seconded (Byers, Bédard), it was unanimously resolved that the minutes of the Open Session meeting of January 19, 2001 be approved as submitted.*

4. Business arising from the minutes

R-2001-2-3 *Upon motion made duly moved and seconded (Lowy, Lightstone), it was unanimously resolved:*

WHEREAS at its meeting of January 19, 2001, Senate adopted resolution R-2001-1-7 to the effect 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 Free Trade Area of the Americas summit in Quebec City on April 20 to 24, 2001, 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;

WHEREAS the Registrar has determined that the final examination schedule will only be available to students in the week of March 12, 2001;

THAT non-graduating students have until March 23, 2001, instead of March 15, 2001, to express in writing to their department chair and professor, with a copy to the Registrar, their wish to attend the aforementioned summit.

8. Recommendations of the Academic Programs Committee

- 8.1 Major Graduate curriculum changes - John Molson School of Business
- R-2001-2-4 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Bédard, Tomberlin), it was unanimously resolved that the major graduate curriculum changes in the John Molson School of Business, set out in Senate Document US-2001-2-D2, be approved as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Senate Document US-2001-2-D1, as revised.*

8.2 Minor Graduate curriculum changes - Faculty of Arts and Science

Dr. O'Brien recalled that minor curriculum changes do not require Senate's approval and are therefore submitted for information purposes only.

8.3 Major Graduate curriculum changes- Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science

Speaking privileges were granted to Dr. Elizabeth Saccá and Dr. James Jans, Associate Deans of Graduate Studies who have coordinated graduate curriculum review as well as to Dr. Osama Moselhi, Executive Advisor to Dean Esmail regarding Graduate Programs.

At the request of the Speaker, Dean Bédard explained that the unusual wording of the resolution was attributable to an agreement reached between the Rector, the Provost, the Dean of Engineering and Computer Science and himself to the effect that the proposal be submitted to the Council of the School of Graduate Studies (CSGS) for consideration at its January 29 meeting in spite of the fact that modifications to the proposal requested by the Graduate Curriculum Committee (GCC) had not been submitted by the faculty in time for the meeting of CSGS. The proposal was presented verbally, supported by an executive summary, but the complete documentation was not ready. Therefore, in order to allow the Faculty to function, the aforementioned compromise was arrived at.

Dean Esmail pointed out that the proposal had been in the works for two years. The issues had been debated in depth at various Faculty committees and councils, resulting in a 500-page document. The proposal had gone to the Graduate Curriculum Committee a few times. A lengthy debate and a very healthy academic collegial process had gone through all the appropriate stages until the proposal was sent to Dean Bedard's office on December 7. As of today, it was Dean Esmail's opinion

that the proposal had been dealt with inefficiently by the School of Graduate Studies (SGS) and that the process had arrived at a complete halt. Great effort was made to deliver the proposal by December 8. However, the December meeting of CSGS had been cancelled. Dean Esmail informed Senate of the negative ramifications of delaying the proposal on the students and professors.

Dr. Byers found this situation to be anomalous, stating that this debate raised the question of the role of Steering Committee. He was further preoccupied by the fact that he was to vote on a document placed before him at this meeting, the contents of which he was unfamiliar with.

Dr. Lightstone explained that the document had been put before Senators just today since the CSGS's meeting had been held on Monday. However, the 500-page document had been reviewed by the Academic programs Committee as well as the GCC. The nature of the curriculum changes are such that over 100 pages of the Graduate Calendar will have to be amended. The practice of the University is that everything be letter perfect before being presented to Senate for approval. It is a huge task in this case. The Dean and Faculty must be allowed to proceed with the changes since these affect workloads, scheduling and room allocations. To wait one more year would greatly disadvantage students entering next September.

In response to Dean Esmail's comments regarding the handling of the proposal by the SGS, Dr. Saccá gave some clarifications including the fact that the last portion of the document was received for the first time on December 14 when it was tabled at GCC. She also indicated that the SGS had spent many hours assisting Engineering and Computer Science in addressing the problems of the proposal. She indicated that the modifications requested in the first GCC meeting had not been completed as yet. Dr. Moselhi confirmed that SGS had assisted the Faculty in revising the document, and that the SGS effort was appreciated. He explained that at the CSGS January 29 meeting, no comments were made regarding two of the four sections of the proposal, and only a few editorial comments had been made on the two other sections, requiring a couple of hours of work.

Dean Esmail explained that the principal change consisted in raising the credit value of most 600-level courses from 3 to 4 and the rationale behind this modification. Dr. Giguère gave further details, noting that the raising of credits resulted in a modification in the number of courses and entailed a major restructuring of the graduate programs.

Dr. Bayne expressed concerns about how this process was being presented to Senate. As a member of the GCC and CSGS, he had worked hard and did not want any impression given that the GCC had not done its job properly. The GCC acted in good faith and in a collaborative manner. To this end, Dean Esmail stated that he did not mean to imply that GCC had not done its job, his complaint relating more to the slow pace of the process.

Following various comments from Senators and further discussion, Dr. O'Brien summarized the situation as follows:

- the role of the SGS is not germane to the present debate;
- the motion is being presented as a result of special circumstances;
- the overriding purpose of the changes relates to reducing the number of courses in the course-based Master's programs in Engineering and Computer Science
- a considerable number of details related thereto will have to be worked out;
- Senate is asked to endorse the changes in principle, not in detail.

Pursuant to Dean Singer calling the question, Dr. O'Brien re-read the motion put before Senate.

R-2001-5 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Bédard, Esmail), it was unanimously resolved that the major graduate curriculum changes in the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science, set out in Senate Document US-2001-2-D8, be approved in principle as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Senate Document US-2001-2-D1 as revised, on the condition that the complete curriculum proposal be submitted to the regular review process and approved by the Council of the School of Graduate Studies at a subsequent meeting before May 31, 2001 and thereafter by Senate.*

9. Interim Evaluation Process for Faculty Deans and the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research

Dr. Lightstone recalled that at the January 19 meeting, it was agreed that Senators would send their written comments to him by the following Monday at the latest so that he could incorporate them into a new draft interim evaluation process to be presented at the present meeting. In accordance with the feedback received, where he felt that there was general consensus to a change, he had incorporated it, such as in paragraph III.4 regarding the role of the external dean. However, where he had received contrary suggestions, he stated alternatives, such as in paragraphs I.2 and I.8 pertaining to the election mode of faculty representatives.

Dean Singer mentioned that he had refrained from participating in the discussion up to now considering that his position is encompassed in this process. However, he reiterated his feelings about the standing of the School of Graduate Studies and that all Faculties should have a voice in selecting its Dean. Thus, he urged Senators to vote against the second alternative in paragraph I.8.

R-2001-6 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Lightstone, Lowy), the resolution proposing that Document US-2001-2-D4 be amended in section I.8 in order to specify that the membership of the evaluation committee include four full-time faculty members nominated by the Council of the School of Graduate Studies was defeated with a majority.*

R-2001-7 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Lightstone, Blais), it was unanimously resolved that Document US-2001-2-D4 be amended in sections I.2 and I.8 in order to specify that each council elect faculty-member nominees for the*

evaluation committee from among a list of candidates resulting from a call for nominations made on behalf of Council.

Dr. Byers argued that paragraphs I.6 and I.12 should be dropped since in his view, the presence of a senior administrator was unnecessary and would render the committee "top heavy". Mr. Blais was in favour of amending the document accordingly.

R-2001-8 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Byers, Mullarkey), it was resolved with a majority that Document US-2001-2-D4 be amended in order to remove sections I.6 and I.12.*

In the opinion of Mr. Blais, another student should be added to the composition of the Evaluation Committee for Faculty Deans and he proposed that paragraph I.3 be amended to reflect that modification. Ms. Landry, Mr. Nazzal and Dr. Lowy all concurred with Mr. Blais.

R-2001-9 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Blais, Nazzal), it was resolved with a majority that Document US-2001-2-D4 be amended in section I.3 to replace "one student" by "one undergraduate student and one graduate student".*

Mr. Blais then suggested that paragraph I.3 be further amended to provide that students be elected by their respective student associations, thereby avoiding a potential situation where a Faculty Council would elect a student against the will of the majority of the students sitting on the Council.

A discussion ensued on this topic, at which time Dean Singer, Dr. Lowy, Dr. Byers and Mr. Sebaaly manifested their disagreement with this amendment while Mr. Nazzal, Ms. Friesinger and Ms. Mullarkey agreed with it.

R-2001-10 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Blais, Friesinger), the resolution proposing that Document US-2001-2-D4 be amended in section I.3 in order to provide for the election of students by their respective student association was defeated with a majority.*

Pursuant to the foregoing discussion, the vote was called on the main motion.

R-2001-11 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Lightstone, Bayne), it was unanimously resolved that Document US-2001-2-D4 (as amended) be approved and recommended to the Board of Governors.*

10. Guiding principles for future operating budget allocations
11. Discussion on per-credit administrative fees
12. Accrediting of courses offered by other institutions

Due to the lateness of the hour, it was agreed to defer these items to the next Senate meeting.

13. Other business

There was no other business to discuss.

14. Next meeting

Dr. O'Brien announced that the next meeting of Senate would be held on Friday, March 9, 2001, at 2 p.m.

15. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m., on a motion moved by Mr. Blais and seconded by Prof. Thornton.

Danielle Tessier
Secretary of the Board of Governors and Senate