

UNIVERSITY SENATEMINUTES OF THE OPEN SESSION MEETING OF MARCH 9, 2001ATTENDANCE

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

Documents associated with the minutes

- | | |
|--------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| US-2001-2-D5 | Document from the Senate Committee for Academic Planning and Priorities regarding guiding principles for future operating budget allocations |
| US-2001-2-D6 | Discussion on per-credit administrative fees |
| US-2001-3-D1 | Recommendations of the Academic Programs Committee |
| US-2001-3-D2 | Major Undergraduate curriculum changes: Faculty of Fine Arts |
| US-2001-3-D3 | Minor Undergraduate curriculum changes: Faculty of Fine Arts |
| US-2001-3-D4 | Document regarding General Education requirement in the Faculty of Arts and Science |
| US-2001-3-D5 | Memo from the Provost setting out possible general principles concerning internal budgeting in light of MEQ's financing policies |
| US-2001-3-D6 | Senate policy for accrediting courses or blocks of courses |
| US-2001-3-D7 | Background document on Professor Emeritus Status |
| US-2001-3-D8 | Draft procedure for conferring the status of "Distinguished Professor Emeritus" |

1. Call to Order

The Speaker called the meeting to order at 2:15 p.m., when he apprised Senate of the following situation. Yesterday morning, the Secretary of Senate was informed by the Vice President Academic of the Concordia Student Union ("CSU") that two student Senators, duly named by the CSU, had been deemed to have resigned from Senate by the CSU Council of Representatives. She was also given the names of two individuals that the CSU was naming to replace the two incumbent senators.

Since this method of proceeding has raised several legal questions concerning the right of the CSU Council to deem student representatives to have resigned from Senate, the Rector has referred this question to the General Counsel for a legal opinion and has asked that this opinion be provided for Steering Committee's consideration at its next meeting. Because of these legal concerns and because the Secretary of Senate has not received resignation notices from the two individuals named, these two individuals will remain as members of Senate pending receipt of a legal opinion by Steering Committee and their recommendation to Senate concerning this matter.

Given the unusual nature of this situation, Dr. Lowy has indicated that he is prepared to recommend to Senate that the two individuals proposed by the CSU as replacements be granted speaking rights for today's meeting.

In response to Mr. Blais' question concerning who will have the final say in this matter, Dr. O'Brien responded that the legal opinion will clarify this matter.

Dr. Byers was not inclined to change current procedures regarding speaking privileges. In his opinion, such privileges should not be granted at large but only when someone has something to say on a specific topic. Further to this comment, Dr. O'Brien proposed that Senate allow those two individuals to speak on specific subjects, should they join the meeting. Senators were agreeable to this approach.

2. Approval of the Agenda

R-2001-3-1 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Stathopoulos, Tremblay), it was unanimously resolved that the agenda be approved as submitted.*

3. Approval of the Minutes of the Open Session meeting held February 2, 2001

R-2001-3-2 *Upon motion made duly moved and seconded (Jackson, Lowy), it was unanimously resolved that the minutes of the Open Session meeting of February 2, 2001 be approved as submitted.*

4. Business arising from the minutes

There was no business arising from the minutes.

5. Remarks from the Rector

Because of changes in the Quebec Government cabinet, there had been much uncertainty surrounding the contrat de performance and the funding related thereto. However, François Legault has now been reconfirmed as Minister of Education. No date has yet been set to sign the contrat de performance but the government proposal is expected over the next few weeks. Since the funding issue relates closely to the discussion on the per-credit administrative fee, Dr. Lowy will propose that item 11 be tabled until the budget situation is known.

Dr. Lowy then reported on his recent trip to China, the outcome of which had been very successful. He gave an overview of the eight new agreements signed with various Chinese institutions. Referring to comments in the student press regarding human rights issues, Dr. Lowy emphasized that the aforementioned

were not trade agreements with the Chinese Government but rather bilateral academic cooperation agreements with institutions that are beneficial both for Concordia and China.

Dr. Lowy also informed Senators that the Federal Government had announced an additional \$750 million commitment toward research. There is a strong likelihood that costs of indirect research will be funded. We will do our best to capitalize on this structure, stated Dr. Lowy, although our needs are primarily in terms of core funding which flows through the Quebec Government.

In closing, Dr. Lowy was pleased to apprise Senate that its Speaker, Dr. John O'Brien, will be awarded an Honorary Life Membership in the Concordia University Alumni Association at the Eleventh Annual Alumni Recognition Awards Banquet to be held on April 5, 2001.

6. Items for Information

Provost Jack Lightstone recalled that further to Senate Steering Committee's request, a joint collaboration proposal by the Centre for Mature Students and the New Student Programme had previously been circulated to and commented on by the Faculty Councils and the Council of the School of Graduate Studies. However, since Dr. Lightstone had recently received a memo from the Dean of Students office informing him that the New Student Programme was no longer interested in collaborating with the Centre for Mature Students, this project has been withdrawn and will not come forward to Senate.

Vice-Rector Services Di Grappa advised that the City of Montreal's Urban Development Committee had met and will recommend the approval of the Loyola Campus Master Space Plan. Although the recommendation included five reservations and three comments, those are relatively minor and compatible with the Plan.

On that same note, Dean Singer informed Senators that Vice-Dean Bob Roy had been interviewed regarding the impact of the new Science Complex on students. The interview will be airing on this evening's edition of *Global News*.

Dean Bédard apprised Senate of two proposals currently under consultation that will eventually be presented for Senate's approval. First, the Award for Graduate Mentoring is being proposed in order to recognize excellence in mentoring since the involvement of professors in graduate studies goes far beyond the classroom. Dean Bédard added that many universities have granted a similar award. The proposal was approved by the Council of the School of Graduate Studies in March 2000 and was forwarded to Faculty Councils for their comments. The timeline was set for the beginning of this year; however, it has been put on hold until the proposal is adopted by Senate.

The second document under consultation is the Policy on Postdoctoral Fellows. The federal granting councils have requested that all Canadian universities develop or update a policy for Postdoctoral Fellows incorporating a number of principles enunciated by the councils. A draft proposal was forwarded to Faculty Councils last Summer for their feedback. Once all comments will have been received, this document will also be presented to Senate for its approval.

With regard to the Award in Graduate Mentoring, Dean Singer informed Senate that at its meeting of March 2, the members of the Arts and Science Faculty Council overwhelmingly decided not to participate in the award.

Registrar Lynne Prendergast reminded Senate that the selection committee for the non academic awards is still accepting nominations. She encouraged all students, faculty members and employees to make nominations. The five medals will be awarded at the Spring Convocation ceremonies.

7. Question period

Student Mistie Mullarkey asked Provost Jack Lightstone for his interpretation of article 16.3 of the Undergraduate calendar regarding the evaluation scheme. Dr. Lightstone responded that according to rules passed by Senate a few years ago, professors are required to supply an appropriate description of the work load and of its evaluation so that students know in advance the requirements to complete the course. Any midterm changes should be clearly stated and communicated in a timely manner so that students not be penalized.

Dr. Lightstone reiterated that the grading system which was approved by Senate is a letter system. A percentage system was explicitly rejected by Senate as an official grading system. However, that does not preclude a professor from using a percentage methodology in establishing his letter grades. Dr. Lightstone concluded by stating that students must be advised in advance when professors mark on a curve, since target grades may shift.

In response to a question by Student Sami Nazzal, Dr. Giguère indicated that the changes to the graduate curriculum in the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science are effective upon Senate's approval. However, they will be implemented only in the Fall. He assured Senate that the appropriate adjustments will be made for those students currently registered in the graduate program.

While specifying that his question is not related to the competence of the person occupying the Dean's position, Prof. Shulman raised the relevance of the School of Graduate Studies and Research and enquired if another structure could be considered. This issue is one most universities grapple with, responded Dr. Lowy. There is a natural tension between the administration of Faculties and the School of Graduate Studies because of the overlapping of responsibilities. Different universities have different models. The School is the guardian of standards and a promoter of research. There is no doubt that the federal granting councils prefer to deal with one spokesperson instead of many. The present structure at Concordia is the one that best suits our needs. Dean Bédard pointed out that all Canadian universities offering graduate programs have a school of graduate studies and in each case where a review had been done, the mandate of the school has been reinforced.

As moved by Mr. Blais, and seconded by Ms. Friesinger, it was agreed that question period be extended for ten minutes.

While fully understanding the principle of marking of a curve, Student Patrice Blais felt this way of marking can be very unfair in cases where students have all performed very well. Dr. Lightstone responded that most faculty members

know what circumstances justify the use of marking on a curve. In the same vein, Student Rabih Sebaaly expressed that this type of marking is a serious student concern. Passing requirements should specifically be written in the course outline. Again, Dr. Lightstone reaffirmed that Senate rules provide that students must be informed about the level of performance required to succeed in exams and courses from the outset.

8. Recommendations of the Academic Programs Committee

8.1 Major Undergraduate curriculum changes - Faculty of Fine Arts

R-2001-3-3 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Jackson, Panet-Raymond), it was unanimously resolved that the major undergraduate curriculum changes in the Faculty of Fine Arts, set out in Senate Document US-2001-3-D2, be approved as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Senate Document US-2001-3-D1.*

8.2 Minor Undergraduate curriculum changes - Faculty of Fine Arts

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

9. General Education in the Faculty of Arts and Science

R-2001-3-4 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Byers, Shulman), it was unanimously resolved:*

WHEREAS at its January 19, 2001 meeting, Senate approved document US-2001-1-D6 outlining a general education proposal for the Faculty of Arts and Science;

WHEREAS at that meeting it was also agreed that further information pertaining to the implementation plan and date would be proposed in March;

THAT the general education requirement passed by Senate at its meeting of January 19, 2001 apply to all undergraduate students entering the Faculty of Arts and Sciences in September 2002.

10. General principles for internal budgeting in light of MEQ's new funding policies

This document was presented for discussion purposes since budgeting falls under the Board of Governors' purview. However, it is the Faculties and Senate's responsibility to model the financial effects of academic decisions upon the academic units which must implement and sustain these decisions.

Dr. Lightstone explained that the academic budgeting and planning processes are different but convergent. During the planning process it will be helpful to know the budget since this will provide a sense of predictability. The document put before Senate attempts to enunciate the same principles as contained in the new funding formula while providing the necessary flexibility to financial matters of high priority that are not well served by the government's formula.

Dr. Byers' understanding of the new guiding principles is that the base budget would reflect internally the new funding formula while allowing us to be conscious of our variations from it. In doing so, the major implications of the academic operations of the University will be far more transparent. Dr. Lightstone confirmed Dr. Byers' understanding and added that the element of the budget called "historical" was not transparent. We will now understand how every dollar is generated for the University, said Dr. Lightstone. Dean Singer applauded the move toward greater transparency since it will show that the Faculty of Arts and Science is the financial engine of the University.

Dr. Lightstone said that under the previous protocol, Faculties knew what would happen financially if their enrolment went up or down whereas according to the new guiding principles, everybody in the University will understand the consequences of a variation in enrolments on their budget. Every unit of the University will have a role in ensuring that students want to be at Concordia since their budget will fluctuate according to enrolment.

11. Discussion on per-credit administrative fees

As mentioned earlier by Dr. Lowy, since the budgetary situation is still unknown, it was agreed to table this matter until the next Senate meeting.

12. Senate policy on accrediting of courses or blocks of courses

Referring to document US-2001-3-D6, Dr. Lightstone explained why this policy was necessary and how it differed from the practice of attributing credit for courses completed at another university on a student by student and course by course basis. Indeed, this new policy aims to establish principles involving inter-university agreements to offer one another's courses and/or to use one another's courses in satisfying program requirements at the respective universities. Under such circumstances, it is necessary to accredit not single courses for a single student at a time, but rather blocks of courses to be offered to many students at once.

A lengthy discussion ensued, at which time Dean Anvari explained why he strongly felt that courses from another university should only be accredited within the program in which the student was originally enrolled. Dr. Lightstone suggested that a fourth paragraph be added to the motion to cover this aspect. Ms. Prendergast supported Dr. Anvari's suggestion, adding that the courses included in this policy follow the same process as other Concordia courses. Dr. Lightstone responded that we are not dealing with the creation of courses nor programs but rather with existing courses and partnerships with other institutions. After further discussion, the question was called.

R-2001-3-5 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Lightstone, Lowy), it was resolved with two opposed:*

THAT in cases involving inter-institutional partnership agreements whereby another institution would in effect offer on Concordia's behalf credit-courses which would satisfy program requirements of Concordia University, the relevant departmental program committee (in the case of department-based programs) or Faculty program committee (in the case of Faculty-based programs) have the mandate:

- a) *to accredit such courses as the equivalent of Concordia courses and to determine that the successful completion of these courses may count toward completion of the Concordia program in question, should the student be enrolled or accepted into the relevant program at Concordia; and*
- b) *to establish and monitor academic standards and protocols for grading for these courses consistent with Concordia's policies and practices, so that these standards and protocols may become integral parts of such inter-institutional partnership agreements.*

THAT the Provost, together with the Dean(s) concerned and the Registrar, be responsible for the administrative matters pertaining to such courses that have been so accredited, including, among other things, ensuring that these matters are included as necessary in such inter-institutional partnership agreements;

THAT when the aforementioned have been satisfied, the normal limitation on the number of pro tanto credits not apply to accredited courses under the aegis of such an agreement and that the course grade as well as the course credit be transferred to the Concordia student record, should the student be enrolled in or accepted into a Concordia program.

THAT the above-mentioned accreditation of courses apply solely toward the completion of the program in which a student was initially enrolled or accepted in.

13. Professor Emeritus Status - Procedure and title for retirees in good standing

Dr. Lightstone recalled that, at last April's meeting, Senate had passed all aspects of this matter, except that it had not come up with a title satisfactory to Senators for all faculty retiring in good standing, it being agreed that the title "Professor Emeritus" be awarded to those having made an outstanding contribution. The Provost consulted the Faculty Deans one last time, and at the suggestion of Dean Singer and upon consensus of the other Faculty Deans, it is now proposed that "Distinguished Professor Emeritus" be the extraordinary title while "Professor Emeritus" be granted to all faculty members retiring in good standing. Further, a procedure for conferring the status of "Distinguished Professor Emeritus" was proposed under document US-2001-3-D8. Dr. Lightstone responded to the questions or concerns raised concerning the perception of granting of the title of "Professor Emeritus" to all faculty retiring in good standing.

In relation to the draft procedure set out in document US-2001-3-D8, more specifically to the composition of the selection committee, it was Dean Singer's opinion that Arts and Sciences ought to have three representatives to be proportional, more specifically one from each discipline (social sciences, humanities and sciences). Dr. Lightstone commented there was a will to dissociate the composition of this committee from that of the committee for promotion of professors. Consequently, it was more or less modeled on the honorary doctorate's committee.

A debate followed at which time Dean Anvari called the question. However, a point of order was raised by Patrice Blais to the effect that according to Robert's

Rules of Order, since an amendment was on table, Senate would have to dispose of the amendment before voting on the main motion. Therefore, a vote was called on the amendment put by Dean Singer.

R-2001-3-6 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Singer, Giguère), it was resolved with twelve in favor and seven opposed that the procedure for conferring the status of "Distinguished Professor Emeritus", set out in document US-2001-3-D8, be amended to read "three Full professors from the Faculty of Arts and Science, one each from the Social Sciences, Humanities and Sciences disciplines" regarding the composition of the Distinguished Professor Emeritus Committee.*

Senators then voted on the main motion.

R-2001-3-7 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Lightstone, Stathopoulos), it was resolved with two opposed:*

Whereas at its meeting of April 7, 2000, Senate adopted resolution 2000-3-12 establishing that an appropriate designation be given to all faculty retiring in good standing together with the criteria to be applied to the selection of candidates nominated for recognition as "Professor Emeritus".

Whereas discussions have taken place between the Provost and the Faculty Deans concerning (i) the appropriate designation for faculty retiring in good standing, (ii) the title to be awarded to those deemed having made outstanding contribution as well as the selection procedure of candidates;

Whereas, further to discussion and review of same, Steering Committee recommends to Senate:

That the designation to be given to all faculty members retiring in good standing be that of "Professor Emeritus";

That the title to be awarded to a retiring faculty member deemed to have made an outstanding contribution to the academic life of the University be that of "Distinguished Professor Emeritus";

That the title of all persons having received the title of "Professor Emeritus" in the past be amended to that of "Distinguished Professor Emeritus" and that such persons be advised thereof in writing;

That all other faculty members retired in good standing be advised in writing that they can use the title of "Professor Emeritus";

That the first line of paragraph 2 of the motion passed by Senate on April 7, 2000 be amended to read "To be eligible for nomination for the status of "Distinguished Professor Emeritus";

That the procedure for conferring the status of "Distinguished Professor Emeritus", set out in document US-2001-3-D8, be approved as amended.

14. Other business

In keeping with the spirit of the University's "greening" project, Prof. Thorton pointed out that no recycling bins were made available for Senate meetings and she therefore requested that such facilities be provided for in the future.

15. Next meeting

Dr. O'Brien announced that the next meeting of Senate would be held on Friday, April 6, 2001, at 2 p.m.

16. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m., on a motion moved by Mr. Blais and seconded by Dean Anvari.

Danielle Tessier
Secretary of the Board of Governors and Senate