

MINUTES OF THE OPEN SESSION  
OF THE MEETING OF SENATE

Held on Friday, February 8, 2008, immediately  
following the Closed Session  
in the Norman D. Hébert, LLD Meeting Room  
(Room EV 2.260) on the SGW Campus

PRESENT

Voting members: Mr. W. Chan; Prof. R. Cross; Dr. L. Dandurand; Mr. B. Derisi; Mr. M. Di Grappa; Prof. C. Draimin; Prof. A. English; Prof. B. Gamoy; Dean D. Graham; Prof. A. Hamalian; Mr. B. Hamideh; Mr. S. Jack; Prof. M. Jamal; Ms. K. Kashfi; Prof. Prof. W. Lynch; Prof. E. Mongerson; Prof. B. Nelson; Prof. N. Nixon; Ms. A. Novoa; Ms. A. Peek; Prof. M. Peluso; Prof. M. Pugh; Ms. C. Reimer; Prof. J. Segovia; Prof. F. Shaver; Ms. M. Sheppard; Associate Dean T. Stathopoulos; Prof. C. Trueman; Dean C. Wild; Prof. W. Zerges

Non-voting members: Dr. D. Boisvert (*Speaker*); Mr. R. Côté; Mr. W. Curran; Mr. L. English; Me B. Freedman; Me P. Fréreau; Ms. L. Healey; Mr. A. McAusland

ABSENT

Voting members: Mr. M. Bani Baker; Prof. O. Dyens; Dean N. Esmail; Mr. A.D. Fernandes; Mr. J. Redler; Dean S. Sharma; Prof. P. Stoett

1. Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 2:11p.m.

2. Approval of the Agenda

Dr. Boisvert noted that the reports of the Standing Committees had been moved up on the Agenda to highlight their importance and to allow any issues arising therefrom to have an impact on Senate deliberations.

A motion, moved by Prof. Segovia and seconded by Prof. Draimin, to place Question Period immediately after the Remarks of the President was defeated.

R-2008-2-4 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Novoa, Graham), it was resolved that the Agenda be approved as submitted.*

3. Approval of the Minutes of the Open Session meeting of January 18, 2008

R-2008-2-5 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Peluso, Graham), it was unanimously resolved that the Minutes of the Open Session meeting of January 18, 2008 be approved.*

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

In response to a question from Prof. Segovia in connection with Dr. Lajeunesse's termination package, Mr. Di Grappa reiterated that he does not have that information.

5. Report of Senate Standing Committees

Dr. Boisvert apprised Senators that written reports will be requested as of the next Senate meeting. Ms. Tessier will send a notice to the Committee Chairs and Secretaries advising them accordingly.

5.1 Academic Planning and Priorities

Dr. Dandurand reported that the Committee will be meeting next week. Prof. Hamalian suggested that items 6, 7 and 8 on today's Agenda could have benefited from a discussion at SCAPP and that in the future Steering Committee should refer substantive items to the appropriate Standing Committee.

5.2 Academic Programs

The Committee Chair, Dr. Danielle Morin, reported that the Committee had met yesterday and reviewed several curriculum proposals. The Committee also discussed the creation of an undergraduate calendar editorial board and a task force to review the regulations regarding deferred exams.

5.3 Finance Committee

Mr. English indicated that the Committee had met last week, at which time it reviewed the formulation of last year's budget as well as the proposed budget principles which will be used to establish the budget for the upcoming year. The next meeting is in early March. Further to a request from Prof. Lynch, it was agreed that Mr. English will present the budget principle document at the March Senate meeting.

5.4 Library

Mr. Curran noted that the Committee will be meeting in early March.

5.5 Research

Dr. Dandurand mentioned that the Committee had met yesterday. She was pleased to announce that during Closed Session, Senate had approved the awarding of four university research awards to: Prof. Raymonde April (Established Award in the Fine Arts, Humanities and Social Science category); Dr. Ann English (Established Award in the Science and Engineering category); Dr. Erin Manning (Emerging Award in the Fine Arts, Humanities and

Social Science category); and Dr. Simon Bacon (Emerging Award in the Science and Engineering category).

Dr. Dandurand added that the Committee had also discussed preliminary drafts of the University strategic research plan which must be completed for the next CFI competition and of the policy on University research units.

6. Steering Committee's proposal with respect to the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Role of Senate in University Governance (Document US-2008-2-D1)

The Speaker noted that, pursuant to the discussion at the December 14 Senate meeting, Steering Committee had taken the comments formulated at that meeting and finalized a proposal. He specified that Senate could either adopt the document in principle to allow the work to begin or table it until such time that Senate gets a clear sense on the outcome of the joint Senate/ Board task force.

A discussion ensued, during which it was suggested that the obligation to produce written reports be added under item 5. Senators were amenable to that modification. However, some Senators felt that the document did not deal with the main reason for which the Ad Hoc Committee had been established, insofar as it does not address the malaise in the academic community with respect to internal governance issues and Board accountability. A motion was moved by Prof. Peluso and seconded by Prof. Segovia that the document be tabled until such time that the discussions on governance issues are completed, but the motion was defeated.

The discussion continued, during which it was pointed out that the Ad Hoc Committee had been created not only to review the role of Senate in university governance but also to gauge the effectiveness of Senate and its Standing Committees and the composition of Senate, and that the document does address the second concern. It was then suggested that the document be referred to SCAPP to establish the procedures to facilitate the changes outlined in the document.

R-2008-2-6 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Lynch, Jamal), it was resolved with one opposed that, subject to an amendment to item 5 to provide for monthly written reports, Senate approve in principle the recommendations of the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Role of Senate in University Governance as revised by Steering Committee, as set out in Appendix B of Document US-2008-2-D1; and that SCAPP be charged to draft implementation procedures to effect the changes outlined in the document, including the issue of Senate composition.*

7. Report of the Working Group on University Governance of the Institute for Governance of Private and Public Organizations (Document US-2008-2-D2)

The Speaker prefaced the discussion by querying Senate on its intent to provide comments to the Chair of the Board with respect to the above-captioned report. Mr. Di Grappa apprised Senate that the Board of Governors had held a session this morning to discuss the report, at which time Mr. Kruyt did reiterate that comments from Senate had been sought and would be appended to the Board's response.

Mr. Di Grappa added that Dr. Jean-Marie Toulouse, the author of the report, was present at that session to convey the rationale leading to the articulation of the twelve principles and to reply to Governors' questions in relation thereto. Further to Mr. Toulouse's presentation, Governors expressed their sentiments regarding the overall tone of the report as well as on some of its principles and the assumptions on which they are based. Pursuant to this discussion, the Executive Committee was charged with drafting the response in such a way that the focus would be placed on Concordia's compliance with the spirit of the principles rather than an itemized reply to each one.

Further to Mr. Di Grappa's report of the Board discussion, Senate was updated on the deliberations which had occurred up to now at the various Faculty Councils, student associations and union councils, pursuant to which it became clear that some common threads had permeated the discussions, such as:

- the importance of avoiding the modification of structures that would result in the concentration of power to a small group of individuals;
- the importance of maintaining the voice of the internal constituents;
- the recognition that universities are governed by a bi-cameral system; and
- that universities must preserve their autonomy.

While some Senators questioned the relevance of responding to the Minister, the majority was in favor of Senate submitting a reply to the Chair of the Board. Besides Senate, the councils or associations were invited to share the outcome of their discussions and forward same to Ms. Tessier no later than February 20.

Senators then dealt with the most appropriate manner to articulate their views and whether or not it should consider giving a principle-by-principle reply. It was generally felt that the best approach would be to adopt a motion placing emphasis on Senate's concerns in relation to some of the principles contained in the report as outlined hereinabove. Senate was amenable to this approach and the following motion was adopted:

R-2008-2-7 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Graham, Hamideh), it was unanimously resolved that Senate encourage the Chair of the Board of Governors to emphasize the following elements in his reply to the Education Minister:*

- *that alterations to the composition of the Board which would result in the concentration of power in the hands of a few should be avoided;*
- *that articulate and effective representation of the constituency having the largest stake in the University should be maintained; and*
- *that transparency and accountability of the governance system should be maintained and emphasized.*

8. Report of the Review Committee of the School of Graduate Studies (Document US-2008-2-D3)

Using a power point presentation, Dr. Dandurand highlighted the salient items contained in the report filed under Document US-2008-2-D3. She apprised Senators of the composition of

the Committee and of its mandate which was to review the roles and responsibilities of the School of Graduate Studies, including but not limited to its academic functions, interdisciplinary program development and administration and administrative functions. The Committee met several times during the past seven months, during which time it assessed the functions and mandate of the School.

Dr. Dandurand conveyed that the Committee's findings are the result of the input of the university at large as well as intensive Committee discussions. She underlined that while the Committee read and heard different views about the governance, roles and responsibilities of the School, there were also some recurrent themes. The persistent theme was that a strong School of Graduate Studies is essential if Concordia is to become one of the leading universities in Canada or in North America. Dr. Dandurand conveyed the overarching and specific recommendations arising from the review, noting that the report had been unanimously endorsed by the Council of the School of Graduate Studies at its meeting held earlier this week.

Dr. Dandurand specified that the only recommendation requiring a motion was the proposal to establish the position of Dean and Associate Vice-President, Graduate Studies, which ultimately needs Board approval. A discussion ensued, during which several Senators expressed their support for the creation of the position. However, some questions arose regarding the appropriateness of the position reporting to the Vice-President, Research and Graduate Studies rather than the Provost. Dr. Dandurand responded that a decision had been made to have a portfolio for research and graduate studies, and therefore the senior administrative position must report to the Vice-President. She added that the Provost and the Vice-President, Research and Graduate Studies will work closely and that this reporting structure does not challenge in any way the Provost's authority as the University's Chief Academic Officer.

Dr. Lynch opined that this document should be reviewed by SCAPP and the Faculty Councils. Dr. Dandurand replied that she would welcome any comments from the Faculty Councils or SCAPP, including any input or comments on the implementation. However, with respect to the creation of the position, she noted the urgency of having a clear leader heading the School by the summer. A discussion ensued, further to which it was agreed that the document should be referred to Faculty Councils for discussion but that the motion to create the position should proceed today.

R-2008-2-8     *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Dandurand, Stathopoulos), it was resolved with one abstention that, upon recommendation of the Review Committee of the School of Graduate Studies and the Council of the School of Graduate Studies, Senate recommend to the Board of Governors the approval of the establishment of the position of Dean and Associate Vice-President, Graduate Studies, reporting to the Vice-President, Research and Graduate Studies, and that said position be searched in accordance to the Rules and Procedures for Senior Administrative Appointments, Board Policy BD-5.*

9.     Discussion on the interim framework for research chairs (Document US-2008-2-D4)

On the one hand, Dr. Dandurand reiterated the same information that she had conveyed at the December and January Senate meetings, in that it was important and urgent to have a framework for research chairs. Prior to the establishment of the interim framework, there

were no University-wide guidelines, which resulted in inconsistencies in the allocation of research chairs. Allocations were done somewhat arbitrarily and randomly and there was no standard provision for mid-term review, etc. Many members of the University community felt that an interim framework was needed. Dr. Dandurand noted that glitches in the interim guidelines will be addressed, underlining that the point of having interim guidelines was precisely to identify all glitches during one cycle before seeking Senate approval of a formal policy.

On the other hand, Dr. Lynch restated the concerns he had previously expressed at the December and January meetings in connection with the consultation process and conveyed his concern relative to the approach proposed in the guidelines. He opined that the Academic Plan provided for the Concordia Research Chairs as a retention tool for outstanding professors and not as a mechanism to channel research efforts. The guidelines propose a change of direction. Research plans developed by committees are not as good as research plans devised by researchers themselves. The top down approach contained in the guidelines chips away at academic freedom.

Dr. Dandurand reiterated the consultation process which involved the Associate Deans of Research in each Faculty, the Faculty Research Committees and the Academic Cabinet. She added that the interim framework will not hinder retention nor is it incompatible with the Academic Plan. Other Senators shared Dr. Dandurand's sentiment in this respect.

10. Remarks from the President

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

Mr. Di Grappa apprised Senate that, further to the public meetings held in early January, the Committee has finalized its recommendation which will be presented for approval at the February 29 Board meeting.

11. Update on the search for a Dean of the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science

Dr. Dandurand indicated that the Committee reviewed the long list of candidates on February 5 and arrived at a medium list. Interviews will be conducted, and the Committee will be reconvening on February 28 to determine the short list.

12. Update on the search for a President and Vice-Chancellor

Ms. Tessier, in her capacity as Secretary to the Advisory Search Committee for a President and Vice-Chancellor, reported that since the last Senate meeting, the Committee met four times (February 1, 6, 7 and this morning). Interviews are being conducted and the Committee is in the process of determining the candidate whom it wishes to introduce to the University community.

13. Items for information

13.1 Update on exploratory committee regarding the Joint Senate/Board of Governors task force on university governance

Dr. Dandurand conveyed that the three Senate representatives had met with the Board representatives on January 28, at which Board Chair Peter Kruyt outlined his concept of good governance and stressed the fact that it was never the Board's intent to impinge on academic matters. The discussion did not go beyond that, and the Committee will meet again at a date to be determined.

13.2 Report on general academic matters

Dr. Stathopoulos was pleased to report that a reception had been held on January 31 to honor the recipients of the graduate student awards, specifying that the reception had been very well attended. He also apprised Senate that the School of Graduate Studies, at its most recent Council meeting, had adopted a motion to bring the TOEFL iBT score from 75 to 80 as of the 2008/2009 academic year with a review provided for in 2010, as well as a motion reaffirming the current GPA calculation for graduate students.

Speaking privileges were granted to Dr. Danielle Morin who encouraged Senators to attend the presentation featuring Dr. David Selby, an expert on sustainable practices at universities from the University of Plymouth, which will be held on February 14. She mentioned that there had been good attendance at two paraphrasing workshops held in early February and that she is consulting with Faculties to get their input on the setting up of a system with respect to nominations for the President's Award for Teaching Excellence.

14. Question period

No questions were asked.

15. Other business

There was no other business to bring before Senate.

16. Next meeting

The next meeting will be held on Friday, March 14, 2008, at 2 p.m.

17. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Danielle Tessier  
Secretary of Senate