

UNIVERSITY SENATEMINUTES OF THE OPEN SESSION MEETING OF APRIL 6, 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. Al-Khalili; Dean M. Anvari; Dean C. Bédard; Mr. P. Blais; Prof. W. Bukowski; Mr. M. Coker; Prof. C. Cupples; Mr. W. Curran; Dean N. Esmail; Prof. C. Giguère; Prof. M. Gourlay; Dean C. Jackson; Ms. J. Laberge; Mr. A. McAusland; Ms. M. Mullarkey; Prof. S. Panet-Raymond; Ms. L. Prendergast; Prof. L. Roberge; Mr. C. Schulz; Mr. R. Sebaaly; Dr. W. Sellers; 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. C. Bayne; Dr. D. Boisvert; Prof. W. Byers; Ms. S. Friesinger; Ms. S. Grewal; Prof. E. Jacobs; Ms. J. Landry; Mr. S. Nazzal; Prof. P. Rist; Ms. N. Sajjani

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

Documents associated with the minutes

US-2001-4-D1	Recommendations of the Academic Programs Committee
US-2001-4-D2	Major undergraduate curriculum changes: Faculty of Arts & Science
US-2001-4-D3	Major graduate curriculum changes: John Molson School of Business
US-2001-4-D4	Major graduate curriculum changes: Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science
US-2001-4-D5	Entente de réinvestissement intervenue entre le ministère de l'Éducation et l'Université Concordia
US-2001-4-D6	Background document on per credit administrative fees
US-2001-4-D7	Report of the Senate Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities regarding the planning mandate
US-2001-4-D8	Recommendation of the Senate Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities regarding the planning mandate

1. Call to Order

The Speaker called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m.

2. Approval of the Agenda

R-2001-4-1 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Esmail, Roberge), it was unanimously resolved that the agenda be approved as submitted.*

3. Approval of the Minutes of the Open Session meeting held March 9, 2001

R-2001-4-2 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Panet-Raymond, Bédard), it was unanimously resolved that the minutes of the Open Session meeting of March 9, 2001 be approved as submitted.*

4. Business arising from the minutes

Mr. Blais noticed that an amendment to the Academic Re-Evaluation Procedures regarding expedited delivery of notices at the appeal level, which had been adopted by Senate at its May 19, 2000 meeting, did not appear to be included in the document which was reviewed by the Arts and Science Faculty Council meeting of this day. Me Freedman, who is responsible for the review of the policies of the University, agreed to look into the matter.

5. Remarks from the Rector

The Rector began by congratulating the Access Team for winning the CSU election and asked Mr. Blais, a member of its executive, to convey his best wishes to all members of the Team.

He then informed Senate that the Real Estate Planning Committee will recommend to the Board of Governors, at its April 18 meeting, the approval of the construction of the Loyola Science Complex. If approval is given, ground should be broken in the Spring. Dr. Lowy reiterated the strong academic arguments in favour of this \$85 million project. A cogent financing and cash flow plan will also be presented to the Board. The Loyola plan raised few zoning problems, and neighbours' concerns were considered and addressed. However, with respect to the downtown SGW site, negotiations are ongoing with municipal authorities. One of the key stumbling blocks is to persuade the authorities to allow the demolition of the York Theatre.

6. Items for Information

Referring to a recent article in *The Gazette* in which he was quoted as saying that he did not care whether students come to his class, Dr. Lightstone specified that what he meant was that students have the choice to attend his lectures in person, in the classroom, or via a streaming video clip on the internet.

Dean Esmail was pleased to announce that the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science had received one of 25 special prestigious awards from NSERC, enabling the hiring of Dr. Paula Wood-Adams, an assistant professor at McGill University. Dr. Wood Adams will be joining the Mechanical Engineering Department as of May 1.

Further, Dean Esmail informed Senators that the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) has recently posted its course material for the year 2000 on the internet, a decision that will have a significant impact on all universities.

Dean Bédard mentioned that the start-up phase of the Faculty Research Development Program was under review. The start-up phase was originally intended to serve 20 new faculty members per year. However, this year 54 new faculty members required start-up funding with the same budgetary envelope.

A new formula is currently being studied and a proposal will be put forth to the Senate Research Committee.

7. Question period

Considering the increased enrolments and the projected hiring of 20 new faculty members in the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science, additional space for offices, classrooms, laboratories, etc. will be imperative. Consequently, Dr. Giguère enquired as to the Real Estate Planning Committee's time line regarding the new Engineering building. Funding for the Engineering building depends on private donations but also relies on government grants and infrastructure programs. We have reason to believe that Concordia will receive between \$20 and \$25 million dollars in government funds, responded Dr. Lowy. The major obstacle to the beginning of the construction is the unexpected difficulty from the City of Montreal regarding the demolition of the York Theatre. Thus, the construction work should start once permission to go ahead is obtained and the necessary funding arrangements are in place. The University is working at several levels (Ministry of Education, Ministry of Culture, Treasury Board) to overcome this problem.

Mr. Blais indicated that students support the part-time faculty members' campaign against the "TBA" designation on class postings and asked Dr. Lightstone if there had been any dialogue on this issue. This needs to be sorted out, answered the Provost. Courses are assigned to part-time faculty members only after all courses have been assigned to the full time faculty members, and there is a timing problem between these processes and the publication date of the course schedule.

8. Recommendations of the Academic Programs Committee

8.1 Major undergraduate curriculum changes - Faculty of Arts and Sciences

R-2001-4-3 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Singer, Thornton), it was unanimously resolved that the major undergraduate curriculum changes in the Faculty of Arts and Science, as set out in Senate Document US-2001-4-D2, be approved as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Senate Document US-2001-4-D1.*

8.2 Minor graduate curriculum changes - John Molson School of Business

R-2001-4-4 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Bédard, Anvari), it was unanimously resolved that the major graduate curriculum changes in the John Molson School of Business, set out in Senate Document US-2001-4-D3, be approved as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Senate Document US-2001-4-D1.*

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

Registrar Prendergast reported that at least one course, ENCS-582, outlined in the proposal had not been approved by Senate but is being taught this semester. She suggested that it be approved retroactively so that students not be penalized.

R-2001-4-5 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Bédard, Esmail), it was unanimously resolved:*

That, as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Senate Document US 2001-4-D1, Senate give its final approval to the major graduate curriculum changes in the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science set out in Senate Document US-2001-4-D4. These curriculum changes were approved in principle by Senate at its February 2, 2001 meeting.

That Senate's approval with respect to course number ENCS-582 be effective for the Winter 2001 semester (2001/4).

9. Performance contract update

Dr. Lowy explained that the performance contract is the undertaking by which Concordia establishes its objectives and the government agrees to allocate funds according to the attainment of those objectives. The Rector summarized Concordia's five major commitments as follows:

1. *Increase in the graduation rate.* The overall graduation rate for full-time students has been set at 80% by 2010, with each major sector having a minimum graduation rate of 70%.
2. *Improvement of the full-time faculty to student ratio.* This will be achieved by hiring 150 full-time professors over the next five years.
3. *Rationalization of programs.* The verification of the relevance of programs, their revamping and rationalization are ongoing processes.
4. *Efficiency.* Concordia remains committed to run an efficient operation and to maintaining a balanced budget.
5. *Improvement in research performance.* On a per capita basis, Concordia's research performance is not as successful as it should be. Emphasis will be placed on improving research performance.

In return, the government has agreed to increase the University's budget over the next three years by \$51 million, as general and specific financing. This formula allows less leeway to the University in the use of these funds. Dr. Lowy underlined his disappointment that Concordia is not getting retroactive recognition for having achieved a balanced budget nor for having instituted certain programs recommended by the government, such as the multimedia and computer science fields. Concordia has incurred start-up costs for those programs for which it is not receiving retroactive reimbursement.

While some Senators expressed skepticism on attaining such unrealistic graduation rates for individual disciplinary sectors, they did specify their continued commitment toward improving them.

Dr. Lightstone pointed out that every Quebec university is having the same problem with the mono-dimensionality of Mr. Legault's graduation rate goals.

Above all, we have an obligation to make a concerted effort so that students graduate, without lowering our standards, and to identify areas that impede students in completing their degrees, stated the Provost.

10. Discussion on per-credit administrative fees

Dr. O'Brien mentioned that to ease discussion, a copy of the proposed motion is set out in Document US-2001-4-D6, which was included in the mailing.

Dr. Lightstone referred to the agreement reached between the administration and the CSU in early 2000 concerning the allocation of new government funds toward eliminating the implementation of the scheduled \$3.00 per credit administrative fee increase and reducing or eliminating the existing \$9.00 per credit administrative fee. He noted that the implementation of the \$3.00 increase had been deferred twice already and was not due to be collected until the 2002-2003 academic year. This issue had been postponed until today because of the uncertainty regarding the funding.

Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Lightstone, Stathopoulos), the following motion was submitted for Senate's consideration:

WHEREAS at its meeting of December 1, 2000, Senate adopted resolution R-2000-9-8 thereby recommending to the Board of Governors that the implementation of the approved, but deferred, additional \$3.00 per credit administrative fee be further deferred for the year 2001-2002 and postponing the discussion on the application of 20% of new monies toward reducing and/or eliminating the deferred per-credit administrative fee to a subsequent meeting;

WHEREAS at its meeting of December 13, 2000, the Board of Governors, pursuant to Senate's recommendation, resolved that the implementation of the approved, but deferred, additional \$3.00 per credit administrative fee be further deferred for the year 2001-2002.

CONSEQUENTLY, BE IT RESOLVED THAT Senate recommend to the Board of Governors that 20% of \$X be applied to reducing the approved, but deferred, additional \$3.00 per credit administrative fee, thereby reducing the latter by \$Y per credit so that the total per credit administrative fee to be collected beginning with the 2002-2003 academic year be \$Z per credit.

Dr. Lightstone went on to review the 2000-2001 new government funds versus the University's commitments. He presented a slide showing that out of the \$12,238,300 MEQ funds, \$6,366,300 were targeted by the government for seven specific areas, leaving \$5,872,000 in the general operating budget. From this amount, \$1,250,000 were clawed back by the government because of the transition, thereby reducing the net new funds to \$4,622,000. The government had promised to pay the "coûts de système", which encompasses the indexation of costs and salaries, to the tune of \$3,500,000. However, the Chief Financial Officer has confirmed that no such money has been received for this item, and, therefore, the University must also defray those costs from the \$5,872,000, leaving a net amount of \$1,122,000 available as new un-targeted funds. Consequently, according to the formula proposed in the motion, 20% of \$1,122,000 (value of X) equals roughly \$227,000, which would translate into a reduction 0.42\$ (value of Y) of the presently deferred \$3.00 per credit fee so that

the total fee to be collected in 2002-2003 would be \$11.58 (value of Z) per credit instead of \$12.00.

Chief Financial Officer English projected another slide showing that, from a budgetary point of view, it could be argued that the University has no new un-targeted money because certain items, such as the \$3,000,000 deficit, were not accounted for.

A spirited discussion resulted during which Mr. Blais said that passing the motion, as presented, would be tantamount to declaring total war on the students. Such a minuscule decrease was ridiculous. The agreement with the CSU provides for "20% of new additional un-targeted money" and the administration is trying to circumvent this issue, he protested. Mr. Blais agreed that the government must fund the "coûts de système". However, this must not be achieved by renegeing on promises made to the students, but rather by the administration and students working together.

In light of the above, Mr. Blais, supported by Ms. Mullarkey, proposed that the value of X be \$4,622,000 rather than \$1,122,000, in which case the presently deferred \$3.00 per credit fee be decreased by \$1.74 (value of Y), and thus the total fee to be collected in 2002-2003 would be \$10.26 (value of Z) per credit instead of \$12.00.

The discussion continued with Senators proposing various alternatives. However, it became quite clear that the debate was theoretical since it concerned decreasing a fee that had been deferred until September 2002. Dr. Lightstone suggested that the per credit administrative fee matter be dealt with according to the financial needs of the University and revenues from the government rather than a preset formula. He was prepared to ask Senate to recommend to the Board the elimination of the deferred \$3.00 increase altogether, provided that the agreement between the administration and students be put to rest. Any further increase or decrease of the per credit administrative fee would be argued based on the University's financial situation at that time. Consequently, Dr. Lightstone asked permission to withdraw the motion before the assembly. Since no one objected, the Speaker declared the motion withdrawn. Thereafter, the following new motion was proposed and voted on:

R-2001-4-6 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Lightstone, Blais), it was unanimously resolved:*

That Senate recommend to the Board of Governors that the additional \$3.00 per credit administrative fee, the implementation of which had been deferred to the 2002-2003 academic year by the Board of Governors at its December 13, 2000 meeting, be completely eliminated;

That the third paragraph of the agreement entered into on February 1, 2000 between the Concordia Student Union and the Concordia University Administration, with respect to the administration's commitment to recommend to Senate and the Board of Governors that "20% of additional, new, un-targeted, recurring operating monies [be applied] towards eliminating, initially, the scheduled \$3.00 per credit increase for the 2000-2001 academic year, and subsequently, to eliminating the existing \$9.00 per credit administrative fee", is considered satisfied and therefore retired; and

That any future discussion regarding the increase or decrease of the existing \$9.00 per credit administrative fee must be argued on the basis of the financial situation of the University at that time.

11. Report of the Senate Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities regarding the planning mandate

According to its mandate, the Senate Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities (SCAPP) is responsible for the ongoing planning process, and more particularly, for the review the University's academic plan when necessary. Consequently, at its meeting of April 5, 2001, SCAPP approved the academic planning mandate for the next several years. Dr. Lightstone reported briefly on the four crucial issues which the plan must effectively address over the next several years, the details of which are set out in Document US-2001 4-D7.

1. Hiring and retaining sufficient full-time faculty members with increased emphasis placed on faculty development;
2. Enhancing our competitiveness in securing research funds in general, and more particularly federal grants;
3. Successfully integrating new information technology into faculty members' pedagogical skills by providing access, infrastructure and support; and
4. Ensuring the optimal success of all students.

12. Other business

There was no other business to report.

13. Next meeting

Dr. O'Brien announced that the next meeting of Senate would be held on Friday, May 11, 2001, at 2 p.m.

14. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m., on a motion moved by Dean Singer and seconded by Prof. Roberge.

Danielle Tessier
Secretary of the Board of Governors and Senate