

UNIVERSITY SENATEMINUTES OF THE OPEN SESSION MEETING OF MAY 10, 2002ATTENDANCE

- PRESENT: Dr. J. W. O'Brien (Speaker); Dr. F. Lowy; Prof. M. Danis; Mr. M. Di Grappa, Dr. J. Lightstone; Prof. A. Al-Khalili; Dean C. Bédard; Mr. A. Beedassy; Mr. P. Blais; Dr. D. Boisvert; Prof. C. Cupples; Dean N. Esmail; Ms. S. Friesinger; Prof. M. Gourlay; L. Healey; Prof. V. S. Hoa; Dean C. Jackson; Prof. E. Jacobs; Ms. C. Leduc; Mr. A. McAusland; Prof. D. Morin; Mr. A. Munro; Mr. S. Nazzal; Dr. R. J. Oppenheimer; Prof. S. Panet-Raymond; Prof. P. Rist; Prof. L. Roberge; Prof. H. Shulman; Dean M. Singer; Prof. T. Stathopoulos; Prof. P. Thornton; Dean J. Tomberlin; Prof. R. Tremblay; Prof. C. Vallejo
- ABSENT: Ms. L. Accary; Prof. A. Ahmad; Ms. C. Basmaji; Prof. C. Bayne; Prof. W. Bukowski; Mr. W. Curran; Mr. B. Desgreniers; Prof. A. English; Mr. L. English; Mr. R. Luppicini; Ms. M. Mullarkey; Ms. S. Stea
- GUESTS: Me Bram Freedman

Documents associated with the Minutes

- US-2002-4-D4 Report from Academic Programs Committee  
 US-2002-4-D5 Major graduate curriculum changes – Faculty of Arts and Science  
 US-2002-4-D6 Major graduate curriculum changes – Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science  
 US-2002-4-D7  
 to D11 Major undergraduate curriculum changes – Faculty of Arts and Science  
 US-2002-4-D12 Minor undergraduate curriculum changes – Faculty of Arts and Science  
 US-2002-4-D13  
 to D16 Undergraduate accreditation documents regarding the teacher education programs  
 US-2002-4-D17 Review of University By-Laws  
 US-2002-2-D9 Steering Committee recommendation regarding the proposed amendments to the University Mission Statement

1. Call to order

The Speaker called the meeting to order at 2:25 p.m.

2. Approval of the Agenda

R-2002-4-6 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Leduc, Bédard), it was unanimously resolved that the agenda be approved as submitted.*

3. Approval of the Minutes of the Open Session meeting held April 5, 2002

R-2002-4-7 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Lowy, Stathopoulos), it was unanimously resolved that the Minutes of the Open Session meeting of April 5, 2002 be approved as submitted.*

4. Business arising from the Minutes

There was no business arising from the Minutes.

5. Report from the Academic Programs Committee

5.1 Major graduate curriculum changes – Faculty of Arts and Science

R-2002-4-8 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Bédard, Leduc), it was unanimously resolved that the major graduate curriculum changes in the Faculty of Arts and Science, as set out in Document US-2002-4-D5, be approved as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2002-4-D4.*

5.2 Major graduate curriculum changes – Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science

R-2002-4-9 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Bédard, Stathopoulos) it was unanimously resolved that the major graduate curriculum changes in the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science, as set out in Document US-2002-4-D6, be approved as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2002-4-D4.*

5.3 Major undergraduate curriculum changes – Faculty of Arts and Science

R-2002-4-10 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Singer, Vallejo), it was unanimously resolved that the major undergraduate curriculum changes in the Faculty of Arts and Science, as set out in Documents US-2002-4-D7 to D11, be approved as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2002-4-D4.*

5.4 Minor undergraduate curriculum changes - Faculty of Arts and Science

Dr. O'Brien apprised Senate that these minor curriculum changes were presented for information purposes only.

5.5 Undergraduate accreditation documents regarding the teacher education programs

R-2002-4-11 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Lightstone, Singer), it was unanimously resolved that the undergraduate accreditation dossiers from the Faculty of Arts and Science and the Faculty of Fine Arts relative to Concordia University's teacher education program, as set out in Documents US-2002-4-D13 to D16, be received by Senate as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2002-4-D4.*

6. Amendment to academic regulations regarding electronic communication devices during exams

Prof. Stathopoulos moved a motion, seconded by Prof. Al-Khalili, with respect to the use of electronic communication devices during exams. Prof. Stathopoulos summarized the discussion that had taken place at Steering Committee concerning this subject, in light of the proliferation of various electronic communication devices in recent year and their widespread use by students. He conveyed Steering Committee's recommendation that a university-wide policy be adopted to prohibit the use of such devices during examinations.

While most Senators were in agreement with such a policy, Dean Tomberlin pointed out that in some instances, the instructor does allow the use of laptop computer during examinations. It was suggested to amend the motion as presented to provide for such an exception. Both the mover and seconder of the motion agreed with this amendment, and as a result the following motion was adopted.

*R-2002-4-12 Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Stathopoulos, Al-Khalili), it was unanimously resolved that, upon recommendation of Senate Steering Committee, section 16.3.9 of the undergraduate calendar and the section pertaining to academic regulations of the graduate calendar be amended to add a provision to the effect that, unless expressly permitted by the instructor, the possession of electronic communication devices is prohibited during examinations.*

7. Remarks from the Rector

Given that Ms. Friesinger was absent from the last Senate meeting, Dr. Lowy reiterated his words of congratulations on her victory in the CSU elections. He informed Senate that the groundbreaking ceremony to inaugurate the Integrated Engineering, Computer Science and Visual Arts Complex will take place at the corner of Sainte-Catherine and Guy Streets on this upcoming Monday, May 13, at 10:30 a.m.

The Rector concluded by apprising Senators that the following persons will receive Honorary Doctorates at the June Convocation: Seamus Heaney, Julio Garcia Espinosa, Dr. Julia Levy, John Dobson, Assia Djebar and Dr. Ahmed Zewail.

8. Items for information

Dr. Lightstone had two items on which to report. First of all, he was pleased to announce that during Closed Session, Senate had approved that the title of Distinguished Professor Emeritus be bestowed on the following four most deserving individuals: Dr. Tannis Arbuckle-Maag, Dr. Patsy Lightbown, Dr. Oswald Tee, and Dr. Jeremiah Hayes.

Secondly, the Provost announced that the teaching enhancement annual budget of \$74,000, traditionally distributed in the form of teaching grants to a small percentage of faculty members, had been reallocated to the Centre for Teaching and Learning Services budget in order to reach the general faculty population, namely to fund orientation workshops for new faculty members.

Ms. Friesinger stated that during a CSU referendum, students had voted against war, imperialism and racism. As a result, an anti-war conference has been organized and will be held throughout the weekend. Ms. Friesinger welcomed all Senators to attend the conference.

9. Question period

No questions were asked.

10. Review of University By-Laws

Dr. O'Brien reminded Senators that the review of the editorial changes and those to reflect longstanding or current practices had been completed at the previous meeting. The substantive changes, as outlined in Document US-2002-4-D17, were now to be discussed.

Mr. Blais had advised the Secretary of Senate that he would arrive late since he was held up in court and had asked that the discussion surrounding student eligibility and representation be dealt with after the other proposed amendments. Senators had no comments on the proposed amendments to articles 11 and 22 (quorum), to articles 33 f) and 49 h) (modification to the names of academic units), nor to articles 33 i) and 49 b) (establishment of awards).

Regarding the proposed amendment of article 49 f), last paragraph, Dr. O'Brien explained that, under the current wording, Senate has the ultimate authority in academic matters, except that Senate cannot make a curriculum change unless it is approved by the Faculty concerned by that change. The proposed amendment would eliminate this exception and make Senate the final authority, allowing the latter to make a curriculum change, whether or not it had obtained the agreement of the Faculty.

A lengthy discussion ensued, during which the Faculty Deans and the Dean of Graduate Studies voiced their concern with the proposed amendment. They felt that the Faculties should have a say in the curricula and this amendment would be giving a license to Senate to make changes without the Faculties' consent, thereby creating a dangerous precedent.

Dr. Lightstone defended the amendment, stating that Senate must have the authority to close programs, especially in difficult times. He referred to the situation in 1995, when the University faced draconian budget cuts and Senate had to make decision about closing certain programs. Dean Tomberlin agreed that in trying times, Senate must have the authority to close programs. However, this is quite different from allowing Senate to rewrite the curricula of programs.

Given the foregoing, Prof. Shulman suggested that it might be useful that the Deans and the Provost meet to discuss the wording of such an amendment. In the meantime, status quo would prevail. The Provost and the Rector agreed with this approach, as did most Senators.

With regards to articles 6, 17 and 43, Dr. O'Brien explained that the text proposed in article 43 aims to enshrine into the By-Laws the current Senate eligibility regulations and extend those same rules to the Corporation and the Board of Governors (articles 6 and 17). While no one objected to the merit of having a common requirement for those three bodies, there was considerable discussion on what those requirements should be, and whether or not the University has the authority to set its requirements, given the student accreditation law.

Mr. Blais distributed a sheet of paper which set out the newly adopted CSU standing policy on Senate appointments. He opined that the current University eligibility requirements exclude 3000 independent students from holding office on various University bodies, in violation of the *Accreditation Act*. A discussion ensued during which Me Freedman reminded Senate that the discussion must focus on whether or not independent students should sit on Senate or the Board, and not on the CSU document. In response to a question, Me Freedman stated his disagreement with the CSU's position relating to independent students, affirming that the Board and Senate can set their eligibility requirements.

Divergent opinions were voiced regarding the appropriateness of having independent students sit on the University decision-making bodies. While most students felt it was critical to allow independent student representation on Senate, most faculty members disagreed. The Rector stated that he would be in favor of allowing one independent student representative on Senate.

Dr. Lightstone moved, seconded by Prof. Vallejo, that Senate recommend to the Board of Governors that it approve article 43 as proposed. However, Mr. Blais moved, seconded by Ms. Friesinger, that an amendment be brought to Dr. Lightstone's motion in order to allow for one student to be an independent student. Discussion continued, at which time the question was called on the amendment. Since the majority voted in favor of calling the question on the amendment, the vote was taken, and the amendment proposed by Mr. Blais was defeated with 9 in favor and 14 opposed. The question was then called on the main motion and the majority was in favor on taking the vote. Therefore, the aforementioned motion proposed by Dr. Lightstone, seconded by Prof. Vallejo, was voted on and passed with 16 in favor and 5 opposed.

The discussion moved on to article 41 of the By-Laws. Senators had no comments on the amendments proposed, except for those proposed to article 41 l) regarding undergraduate student representation. Dr. O'Brien referred to Ms. Basmaji's proposed wording, copy of which had been included in the mailing. However, no one was inclined to adopt Ms. Basmaji's wording. Moreover, further to a question by Mr. Blais to Me Freedman, the latter declared that specific seat attribution by Faculty could be problematic under the *Accreditation Act*. Another discussion ensued on the appropriateness of using the term "appropriate" (in the phrase "with appropriate representation from each Faculty"), given that such a word could be open to interpretation. An informal vote indicated that a majority of Senators were in agreement that the phrase should simply read "with representation from each Faculty".

Ms. Leduc's proposal to amend article 41 m) by adding two additional graduate seats, one reserved for a representative of the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science, the other for a representative of the John Molson School of Business, was well received by some Senators. Nonetheless, Dr. Lightstone cautioned that the By-Law review should not be used as a forum to initiate Senate reform. As a result, it was agreed that this issue should be referred to Senate Steering Committee.

Following this discussion, at 5:20 p.m., upon a motion moved by Dean Tomberlin and seconded by Prof. Tremblay, it was resolved with a majority to adjourn the meeting. As a result, item 11 on the agenda regarding the University Mission Statement was deferred to the next meeting of Senate, scheduled for May 24, 2002.

Danielle Tessier  
Secretary of the Board of Governors and Senate