

MINUTES OF THE OPEN SESSION  
OF THE MEETING OF SENATE

Held on Friday, November 10, 2006, at 2 p.m.  
in Room EV 2.260, SGW Campus

PRESENT

Voting members: Prof. A. Al-Khalili; Prof. L. Blair; Mr. P. Blais; Ms. V. Braide; Ms. L. Del Vecchio; Prof. O. Dyens; Dean N. Esmail; Mr. Y. El Hamwi; Dean D. Graham; Prof. A. Hamalian; Mr. B. Hamideh; Ms. A. Henry; Prof. M. Jamal; Mr. K. Juma; Prof. R. Kilgour; Dr. C. Lajeunesse; Prof. W. Lynch; Prof. N. Nixon; Prof. M. Peluso; Prof. E. Regler; Ms. C. Reimer; Prof. C. Ross; Prof. R. Rudin; Dean E. Saccà; Mr. P. Schiefke; Prof. J. Segovia; Prof. F. Shaver; Dr. M. Singer; Prof. P. Stoett; Dean J. Tomberlin; Prof. C. Trueman; Dr. T. Vo-Van; Dean C. Wild; Prof. W. Zerges

Non-voting members: Mr. W. Curran; Prof. M. Danis; Me P. Frégeau; Ms. L. Healey; Dr. J. W. O'Brien (*Speaker*); Dr. R. J. Oppenheimer

Guest: Dr. L. Dandurand

ABSENT

Voting members: Mr. R. Daoud; Mr. S. Rosenshein; Ms. E. Silver

Non-voting members: Mr. M. Di Grappa; Mr. L. English; Mr. A. McAusland; Mr. K. Pruden

1. Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 2:07 p.m. Dr. O'Brien introduced Dr. Louise Dandurand, Vice-President, Research and Graduate Studies.

2. Approval of the Agenda

Prof. Ross requested an amendment to the Agenda to incorporate an item on the discussion on the role of Senate between items 8 and 9. Referring to the Minutes of the last Senate meeting, he reiterated the rationale for his request. Dr. O'Brien indicated that agenda items are normally routed through Steering Committee and that the latter had not had time to

discuss this at its last meeting. Therefore, as communicated to Prof. Ross in advance of today's meeting, Dr. O'Brien indicated that this matter had been deferred to the next meeting of Steering Committee.

The Speaker then outlined two options regarding the disposal of Prof. Ross' request, either to wait until next Steering Committee or to propose an amendment to the Agenda. Prof. Ross having elected the second option, the vote was taken, which resulted in the following resolution:

*R-2006-9-1 Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Ross, Peluso), it was resolved by a majority that the Agenda be approved, as amended.*

3. Approval of the Minutes of the Open Session meeting of October 20, 2006

In connection with page 2, item 4, Prof. Shaver asked that in the future the nature of the correction brought to Minutes should be clearly stated. In response to this comment, Prof. Hamalian outlined the change that she had requested to the Minutes of September 15.

Prof. Ross pointed out that on page 5, item 11, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph, second line, it should read consultation "of" and not "by" Senate.

*R-2006-9-2 Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Schiefke, Dyens), it was unanimously resolved that the Minutes of the Open Session meeting of October 20, 2006 be approved, as revised.*

4. Business arising from the Minutes not included on the Agenda

Dr. O'Brien apprised Senate that the discussion on the Finance Committee was unfinished and was to continue at the next Steering Committee meeting.

With respect to eConcordia, Prof. Peluso asked for clarification, more specifically whether eConcordia is included in the School of "General Studies" and under the purview of the transition committee. Dr. Singer replied that there had been an inaccurate depiction of the Senate document creating the School of "General Studies". He said that eConcordia is a separate entity which has no authority to offer credit courses other than those which will be assigned to it by the University. In other words, eConcordia is a vehicle to deliver credits courses which are under the purview of the University. Faculties have academic responsibility for credit courses, and all credit courses must be approved by Senate.

Prof. Ross cited the Minutes of the April JMSB Council in which Dr. Singer declared that eConcordia would cease to exist. The latter responded that he did not recall that specific exchange and that this could have been his view at the time. Nonetheless, he restated that the document produced at Senate specified that all web-based courses would be under the School of "General Studies" and that he still believes this to be the case.

In response to a question by Mr. Hamideh, Dr. Singer underlined that the transition committee will be composed of four faculty representatives, two of whom are Deans, the Director of the Centre for Mature Students, the Director of Continuing Education, the Registrar, the Executive Director of IITS, the President of CUCEPTFU and a student from a relevant unit. Ms. Henry indicated that the CSU would be interested in appointing a student to the transition committee. It was suggested that she contact Dr. Singer's office.

5. Recommendations from the Academic Programs Committee (Document US-2006-9-D1)

At the request of Dr. Singer, speaking privileges were granted to the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs, Dr. Danielle Morin, from this point on for all matters in connection with her portfolio.

5.1 Major undergraduate curriculum changes – Faculty of Arts and Science (Documents US-2006-9-D2 to D6)

R-2006-9-3 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Graham, Kilgour), it was unanimously resolved that the major undergraduate curriculum changes in the Faculty of Arts and Science, set out in Documents US-2006-9-D2 to D6, be approved as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2006-9-D1.*

5.2 Major undergraduate curriculum changes – Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science (Documents US-2006-9-D7 to D12)

R-2006-9-4 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Esmail, Lynch), it was unanimously resolved that the major undergraduate curriculum changes in the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science, set out in Documents US-2006-9-D7 to D12, be approved as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2006-9-D1.*

5.3 Major undergraduate curriculum changes – John Molson School of Business (Document US-2006-9-D13)

R-2006-9-5 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Tomberlin, Jamal), it was unanimously resolved that the major undergraduate curriculum changes in the John Molson School of Business, set out in Document US-2006-9-D13, be approved as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2006-9-D1.*

5.4 Minor undergraduate curriculum changes – Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science (Document US-2006-9-D14)

5.5. Minor undergraduate curriculum changes – Faculty of Arts and Science (Documents US-2006-9-D15 to D16)

The Speaker noted that minor undergraduate curriculum changes do not require approval since they are submitted strictly for information purposes.

5.6 Major graduate curriculum changes – Faculty of Arts and Science (Documents US-2006-9-D17 to D20)

R-2006-9-6 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Saccà, Graham), it was unanimously resolved that the major graduate curriculum changes in the Faculty of Arts and Science, set out in Documents US-2006-9-D17 to D20, be approved as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2006-9-D1.*

5.7 Major graduate curriculum changes – Faculty of Fine Arts (Document US-2006-9-D21)

R-2006-9-7 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Saccà, Wild), it was unanimously resolved that the major graduate curriculum changes in the Faculty of Fine Arts, set out in Document US-2006-9-D21, be approved as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2006-9-D1.*

5.8 Major graduate curriculum changes – John Molson School of Business (Documents US-2006-9-D22 to D24)

R-2006-9-8 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Saccà, Tomberlin), it was unanimously resolved that the major graduate curriculum changes in the John Molson School of Business, set out in Documents US-2006-9-D22 to D24, be approved as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2006-9-D1.*

6. Comments on draft profile for the position of Provost and Vice-President, Academic Affairs (Document US-2006-9-D25)

Dr. O'Brien specified that a motion is not required, in that Senate is not asked to recommend or to approve the profile but to comment on it, in accordance with the Search Procedures. Dr. Lajeunesse was appreciative of those members of the University community who had forwarded comments. The Search Committee will consider all comments received and forward a final draft to the Board for approval.

In response to a question from Prof. Ross, Dr. Lajeunesse noted that the text of the advertisement was different than that of the profile. The advertisement, which is not as detailed, has been published. The following comments were formulated by Prof. Ross:

- Item 2: Uneasy with the use of the word "drive" – find a more suitable alternative;
- Item 7 of the Qualifications: Add "the" before Ministry of Education; and
- Item 8 of the Qualifications: Add the words "and ability" after willingness.

7. Review of the Code of Conduct (Academic) (Documents US-2006-9-D26 and D27)

Dr. O'Brien proposed a process in order to have a structured discussion, further to which a motion was moved by Dr. Singer, seconded by Prof. Lynch, that the revisions to the Code of Conduct (Academic), outlined in Document US-2006-9-D27, be approved, effective for the Summer 2007 term (2007/1).

Dr. Singer apprised Senate of the various stages of the review process, beginning in the Fall 2004 with the establishment of a working group, followed by the filing of the working group's report, the review of the working group's report by APC, the formulation of recommendations by APC with respect to the working group's report, and ending with Steering Committee making its recommendation. He specified that Steering Committee had retained counsel to review seven areas where there was no agreement between the working group and APC in order to obtain the legal ramifications of moving one way or the other.

Dr. Morin added that all universities have some form of academic code of conduct. While some articles may vary from one institution to another, they all have the common objective of preserving academic integrity. She specified that the revised code presented today is not very different from the one currently in effect which works pretty well and basically needs some fine tuning. For those Senators who are unfamiliar with the Code, Dr. Morin conveyed

the process which is set in motion when students are suspected of academic misconduct and the various appeals, specifying that there are many steps to maintain the integrity of the University while ensuring a fair process for students. She concluded by indicating that student representatives had been involved in all stages of the Code review.

Stating that she was not in a position to approve or speak to the proposed revisions, Ms. Henry moved, seconded by Prof. Peluso, to table the motion in order to allow the CSU representatives some time to consult the students in their constituency on the proposed changes. Dr. O'Brien underlined that a motion to table is not debatable, but that he would allow some comments so that Senators understand the consequences of tabling the motion at today's meeting.

A discussion ensued, during which the pros (allow consultation of student body, faculty associations and other stakeholders) and cons (missing the publication deadline for the 2007/2008 calendars, two-year process which included student representation) of tabling were argued, further to which the vote was taken, resulting in 21 in favor and 2 opposed. The motion was therefore tabled.

In response to a question by Mr. Blais, Dr. Singer specified that the various working documents reviewed and discussed by Steering Committee were not part of the formal proposal and accordingly will not be circulated.

8. Revisions to the composition of Senate (Document US-2006-9-D28)

Dr. Singer moved, seconded by Dean Graham, that Senate recommend to the Board of Governors the revisions to the composition of Senate, as outlined in Document US-2006-9-D28.

Dr. O'Brien explained that the amendments proposed in the document are of a housekeeping nature in regards to the composition previously approved by Senate in 2005 and forwarded to the Board.

A discussion ensued during which objections were formulated regarding the way of proceeding. It was argued that the Board had voted down the 2005 proposal. Moreover, it was felt that the entire composition of Senate needed to be reopened to address the misgivings expressed in 2005 by various constituencies, such as the undergraduate students, members of the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science, etc. In response to that suggestion, it was specified that reopening the entire composition now would cause the compromises arrived at in 2005 to fall apart.

At this point, Ms. Henry moved an amendment to the composition, seconded by Mr. Juma, to add "nominated by the part-time faculty association" at the end of articles j, k, l and m. Dr. Singer asked if this amendment was in order, further to which Dr. O'Brien ruled that on technical grounds the proposed amendment was out of order. Discussion continued until such time that Prof. Lynch challenged Dr. O'Brien's ruling, resulting in 11 in favour of supporting the ruling and 14 opposed. Therefore, the ruling was overturned. However, immediately thereafter Dr. Singer moved to table the motion, seconded by Dean Tomberlin. The motion to table was adopted by a majority. Dr. O'Brien remarked that the issue is not dead and that Steering Committee will reflect on how best to deal with it.

## 9. Discussion on the role of Senate

Prof. Ross prefaced the discussion by stating that two situations during the last year prompted him to request this discussion, namely the increasing centralization and number of purely academic decisions that had not gone to Senate and the lack of meetings of its standing committees, such as the Finance Committee and SCAPP. In his view, Senate's role in academic decision-making is being atrophied and no one seems concerned.

He referred to the By-Laws which grant final authority to Senate in all academic matters and said that Senate was simply informed of decisions regarding the abolition of the position of Dean of Graduate Studies, despite article 49 h which stipulates that the establishment, discontinuance of Faculties, etc. must go to Senate. Moreover, the performance indicators were presented as a fait accompli and Senate's input should have been sought.

During recent meetings Senate seems to be rubber-stamping decisions that are already made. Prof. Ross read a statement by Prof. Harvey Shulman relating the latter's view about deeply rooted passivity, little concern and no engagement among faculty members. Prof. Ross suggested that Senate establish an ad hoc committee composed of four faculty members, two students and one senior academic administrator to look into the way we function and report back to the February Senate meeting.

In response to the above, the following comments were expressed:

- the majority of the measurements emanate from the Academic Plan which was unanimously approved by Senate;
- some of the apathy is partially the fault of the faculty members; individuals cannot be forced to speak or participate if they do not wish to;
- an examination of Senate's role and a review of its committee structure would be advisable;
- some tension between the Board and Senate can be creative; however, Senate is the most important academic body which needs to flourish rather than be railroaded; support was expressed in connection with the attempt to achieve a more enlightened body;
- discussions can be lengthy and intense but not always productive, must find a way to streamline routine business while allowing debates on more substantive issues.

Positing that Senators had not had time to give any serious thought to Prof. Ross' proposal, Dr. O'Brien felt that this matter should be referred to Steering Committee for a report at the next Senate meeting. However, in order for Steering Committee to do an effective job, Prof. Hamalian asked that Prof. Ross forward an outline of the ad hoc committee's mandate to Steering Committee.

## 10. Remarks from the President

### 10.1 Update on the search for a Provost and Vice-President, Academic Affairs

Dr. Lajeunesse stated that since the last Senate meeting, the Provost Search Committee has met once to finalize the advertisement published in several newspapers and academic journals and to discuss the timeline. Its next meeting will be held on November 18 to further discuss the requirements of the position in preparation for the interview process, to receive

an update on the recruitment activity from the search firm and to finalize the profile for Board approval.

#### 10.2 Update on the construction of the JMSB building

The President apprised Senators that the deadline for receipt of tenders is November 16, further to which a recommendation will be brought by the Real Estate Planning Committee to the Board of Governors at its meeting of November 23. The contract will be awarded in early December. Construction should commence shortly thereafter and should be complete by May 2009. Moving and start up is scheduled for summer 2009. The target date for the opening of the building is August 2009.

#### 11. Items for information

##### 11.1 Update on the search for a Dean of the John Molson School of Business

Dr. Singer reported that the three short-listed candidates had appeared on campus and met with the various constituents, further to which input was sought from the University community via written comments. The Committee is currently in the stage of considering comments and finalizing its recommendation.

##### 11.2 Update on the search for a Dean of the School of "General Studies"

The composition of the Search Committee is now complete, and its first meeting is scheduled to be held next week.

##### 11.3 Sabbatical leaves

The Provost informed Senate that he had received a record number of applications for sabbatical leaves, totaling 112. Each application will be reviewed by him and then the Personnel Committee of the Board which will make a recommendation to the Board of Governors at the December 14 meeting.

#### 12. Question period

In response to a question by Mr. Blais, Me Frégeau indicated that the negotiations between COPIBEC and CRÉPUQ have not yet begun and a committee is being currently being put together. This process is led by CRÉPUQ, and the committee is under its purview and not a University committee.

Referring to inadequate space in the library building with large parts of some floors remaining unoccupied because of budget shortfalls, Prof. Rudin asked for an update on the status of the renovations of the library building. Dr. Singer replied that this had only been brought to his attention this week. He agreed that this situation is unsatisfactory and will be discussing this issue with Mr. Di Grappa.

Further to a query by Prof. Shaver, the Speaker indicated that Senate follows Robert's Rules of Order, except in limited cases if there was a Senate rule or usage that was different.

A question by Prof. Regler with respect to on-line course evaluations prompted several other questions and/or comments. Dr. Morin indicated that the University was moving ahead with on-line course evaluations. A presentation had been done at the JMSB Faculty Council and on-line course evaluations will be conducted for graduate courses in the Fall semester. She emphasized that students will be encouraged but not obliged to complete them. Some concerns had been raised at the JMSB Faculty Council but students were fully supportive. She indicated that students must go through their portal, thereby ensuring that the evaluation is actually been done only by students registered in the course. She agreed to report back to Senate after the first trial run of the project.

Pursuant to a question by Mr. El-Hamwi, Dr. Singer and Dr. Morin explained that efforts and steps have been taken by the University, the CSU, and the student advocates to prevent plagiarism.

13. Other business

There was no other business to bring before Senate.

14. Next meeting

The next meeting will be held on Friday, December 8, 2006, in Room EV 2.260 on the SGW Campus.

15. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Danielle Tessier  
Secretary of Senate