

MINUTES OF THE OPEN SESSION
OF THE MEETING OF SENATE

Held on Friday, January 16, 2009, at 2 p.m.
In Room H 767 on the SGW Campus

PRESENT

Voting members: Prof. L. Blair; Prof. J. Chaikelson; Dr. L. Dandurand; Mr. K. Diaz; Dean R. Drew; Prof. B. Gamoy; Prof. J. Garrido; Mr. C. Goldfinch; Dr. D. Graham; Prof. A. Hamalian; Mr. S. Jack; Ms. K. Kashfi; Prof. S. Lister; Dean J. Locke; Prof. W. Lynch; Prof. S. McSheffrey; Prof. N. Nixon; Mr. P.R. Osei; Ms. A. Peek; Prof. M. Peluso; Prof. M. Pugh; Prof. C. Ross; Dean S. Sharma; Ms. M. Sheppard; Prof. P. Stoett; Associate Dean T. Stathopoulos; Prof. C. Trueman; Ms. R. Wilcox; Dean C. Wild; Dr. J. Woodsworth

Non-voting members: Mr. G. Beasley; Dr. D. Boisvert (*Speaker*); Mr. L. English; Me B. Freedman; Ms. L. Healey

ABSENT

Voting members: Mr. S. Bellemare; Mr. R. Doucet; Prof. L. Dyer; Prof. A. English; Prof. M. Jamal; Prof. F. Shaver; Mr. M.F. Uddin

Non-voting members: Mr. M. Di Grappa; Ms. E. Morey

1. Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 2:03 p.m.

2. Approval of the Agenda

R-2009-1-1 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Graham, Stathopoulos), it was unanimously resolved that the Agenda be approved.*

3. Approval of the Minutes of the Open Session meeting of December 5, 2008

R-2009-1-2 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Chaikelson, Stoett), it was unanimously resolved that the Minutes of the Open Session meeting of December 5, 2008 be approved.*

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

Further to a query regarding the number of students assisted by the Student Emergency and Food Fund, Dr. Boisvert conveyed information provided by Ms. Hummel that between January and the date of the Senate meeting, Multi-Faith Chaplaincy had received 635 student visits, some of which could be repeat visits, about half of which occurred since September.

Noticing that her request to Dr. Dandurand formulated at the last meeting had not been recorded into the Minutes, Prof. Peluso reiterated her wish that Dr. Dandurand report to Senate on international programs.

5. Committee appointment (Document US-2009-1-D1)

R-2009-1-3 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Graham, Stathopoulos), it was unanimously resolved that the committee appointment, outlined in Document US-2009-1-D1, be approved.*

6. Report and recommendations from the Academic Programs Committee (Document US-2009-1-D2)

6.1 Major graduate curriculum changes – Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science (Document US-2009-1-D3 and D4)

R-2009-1-4 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Stathopoulos, Lynch), it was unanimously resolved that the major graduate curriculum changes in the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science, set out in Documents US-2009-1-D3 and D4, be approved as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2009-1-D2.*

6.2 Major graduate curriculum changes – Faculty of Arts and Science (Documents US-2009-1-D5 and D6)

R-2009-1-5 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Stathopoulos, Locke), it was unanimously resolved that the major graduate curriculum changes in the Faculty of Arts and Science, set out in Documents US-2009-1-D5 and D6, be approved as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2009-1-D2.*

6.3 Major graduate curriculum changes – Faculty of Fine Arts (Document US-2009-1-D7)

Speaking privileges were granted to Prof. Sandi Curtis of the Creative Arts Therapies Department. The latter responded to questions regarding the difference between 1 and 3 credit courses and the registration issues with respect to prerequisite courses in Psychology. Dean Wild specified that the Graduate Certificate in Music Therapy is an innovative program which will attract students and will allow them direct entry into the Master's program which is currently under development, noting that the Certificate will remain once the Master's is in place.

Dean Wild and Provost Graham answered queries regarding the projected net profit in the first year of the program. When asked if a committee of Senate comments on budgetary implications of new programs, Provost Graham indicated that these matters are discussed at

length by the Academic Programs Committee (APC) which also reviews the budgetary table attached to the full proposal. He added that APC has launched a sub-committee to evaluate resources and that resource claims will be studied more formally in the future to understand the potential net implementation costs of new programs.

R-2009-1-6 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Stathopoulos, Blair), it was unanimously resolved that the major graduate curriculum changes in the Faculty of Fine Arts, set out in Document US-2009-1-D7, be approved as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2009-1-D2.*

6.4 Major undergraduate curriculum changes – Faculty of Arts and Science (Document US-2009-D8)

R-2009-1-7 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Locke, Stathopoulos), it was unanimously resolved that the major undergraduate curriculum changes in the Faculty of Arts and Science, set out in Document US-2009-1-D8, be approved as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2009-1-D2.*

6.5 Major undergraduate curriculum changes – Institute for Co-operative Education (Document US-2009-1-D9)

R-2009-1-8 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Graham, Lynch), it was unanimously resolved that the major undergraduate curriculum changes in the Institute for Co-operative Education, set out in Document US-2009-1-D9, be approved as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2009-1-D2.*

6.6 Major undergraduate curriculum changes – Policy on ADD and DNE deadlines (Document US-2009-1-D10)

While Senators were supportive of the proposed changes, some concerns were expressed, summarized as follows:

- In certain cases it can be disruptive to allow students to join during the second week of classes. Accordingly, departments should have some discretion with respect to the ADD deadline and the flexibility to close registration in a course based on pedagogical concerns;
- The importance for students to have clear information regarding the actual deadlines was emphasized so that they can effectively manage their course registrations. This would not be possible if individual departments have the ability to close sections unilaterally;
- The proposal does not allow students to exchange a course, only to add a course. A provision to allow students to exchange one course for another should be allowed;
- Several of the dates will fall on weekends in future years. This could be quite problematic for students because not all issues can be resolved online and the assistance of a resource person is often necessary.

With respect to the issue raised about the course exchange, Dr. Graham noted that the Central DNE Committee reviews these matters. He will ask Vice-Provost Dyens to ensure that the Committee is aware of exceptional cases so that students not be penalized.

It was noted that the deadlines were changed to calendar days because students have online access. Nonetheless, the need for students to have access to help outside normal working hours was recognized. The proposal, as formulated, allows for two full weeks of classes in every case. It was agreed that students must have clear information regarding deadlines and that the information should be posted on the student portal. Dr. Graham noted that the issues raised today have been noted by Dr. Dyens and will be looked into.

R-2009-1-9 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Graham, Lynch), it was unanimously resolved that the major undergraduate curriculum changes regarding the policy on ADD and DNE deadlines, set out in Document US-2009-1-D10, be approved as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2009-1-D2.*

6.7 Major undergraduate curriculum changes – Repetition of Courses (Document US-2009-1-D11)

Speaking privileges were granted to Dr. Dyens who provided the details on how many students per Faculty have repeated a course for a second, third, fourth and fifth time.

Some student Senators spoke against the proposal, more specifically in connection with the requirement which calls for the repeating of a prerequisite course to be done before any course following in the sequence. They provided examples in support of their argument that this requirement could have negative ramifications because of their program requirements and could hinder their study options or employment opportunities. While acknowledging that the examples provided constituted exceptional reasons which could be petitioned, the Provost conveyed APC's view that overall it was disruptive to have advanced students in lower level courses.

R-2009-1-10 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Graham, Lynch), it was resolved by a majority that the major undergraduate curriculum changes regarding the repetition of courses, set out in Document US-2009-1-D11, be approved as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2009-1-D2.*

6.8 Major undergraduate curriculum changes – Grade Submission Deadlines (Document US-2009-1-D12)

Dr. Graham noted that the document with respect to grade submission deadlines was revised in accordance to Senate's request at the last meeting. He apprised Senate that as of January 12, 4,806 grades for last semester were still outstanding for 243 course sections, representing 5% of all grades and 9% of all course sections.

When asked about the repercussions for those who do not submit grades on time, Dr. Graham conveyed his expectation that, with a campaign and education together with the work of the Deans with their colleagues, great improvements will be achieved to ensure the timeliness of grade submissions.

R-2009-1-11 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Graham, Lynch), it was resolved by a majority that the major undergraduate curriculum changes concerning grade submission deadlines, set out in Document US-2009-1-D12, be approved as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2009-1-D2.*

7. Report and recommendations of the Senate Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities regarding proposed changes to Senate Operating Procedures (Document US-2009-1-D13)

A motion was moved by Dr. Graham, seconded by Prof. Stoett, that the report and recommendation of the Senate Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities (SCAPP) regarding the proposed changes to Senate Operating Procedures, outlined in Document US-2009-1-D13, be approved, with an implementation date effective for the 2009/2010 academic year.

Dr. Graham explained that the proposed changes fall broadly into two main categories, those which are stylistic or cosmetic in nature and essentially sharpen, refine or clarify existing wording, and those which are substantive additions reflecting either new practices, such as set out in sections D, E and F, or formalizing current practices, such as set out in sections G and J. The Speaker directed Senate to focus its discussion on the more substantive changes in a systematic manner.

D. Consent Agenda

Prof. Ross surmised that all curriculum items might be included on the Consent Agenda and therefore expressed the view that all new Ph.D. programs should not form part of the Consent Agenda. Dr. Graham indicated that the items placed on the Consent Agenda are only those deemed routine and uncontroversial. Any new program would not be viewed as routine, and thus Steering Committee would not place this item on the Consent Agenda. Me Freedman pointed out that to form part of the Consent Agenda, all documents in relation to the Agenda item must be sent beforehand and, as stated in the proposal, items can be removed from the Consent Agenda upon the request of two Senators. Dr. Graham added that the institution of a Consent Agenda arose precisely from Prof. Ross' concern regarding stimulating discussions at Senate, in that it was the view of SCAPP that Senate's time should not be unduly taken up by routine items thereby reserving more time for discussion on substantive issues.

Dr. Graham indicated that he understood the points made but suggested that Senate trust the good judgment of Steering Committee. However, some Senators felt it would be difficult for members of Steering Committee to determine what is routine or not. Others felt that specifically excluding one item from the Consent Agenda was not appropriate.

An amendment to the text was moved by Prof. Ross, seconded by Ms. Peek, to add "*with the proviso that proposals for new academic programs shall not be placed on the Consent Agenda*" immediately after the word "discussion" in the first phrase. The amendment was approved by a majority.

E. Duration of meetings

A discussion ensued, further to which it was agreed that that Senate act as a committee of the whole, thereby removing the motion to approve the SCAPP report from the table. An extract of the discussion relative to this entire item will be forwarded to SCAPP for its consideration and resubmission to Senate.

The main comments and concerns voiced against this item can be summarized as follows:

- Question period could frequently fall outside the proposed two-hour limit;
- Setting a time limit might suppress discussion. What is the necessity?

- There should be no limit. Senate meets once a month and should feel free to have extended discussion as long as the meetings are guided by an effective Speaker;
- Other ways could be found to ensure that meetings are efficiently conducted;
- Fifteen minutes is too short; the extension period should be set for 30 minutes;
- The entire item should be removed from the proposal.

The principal arguments expressed in favor of this item were:

- The main objective is to ensure effectiveness. The setting of a time limit, like the adoption of a Consent Agenda, is being proposed as a tool so that Senators focus on the important issues;
- Meetings over two hours are ineffective. If more time is required, special meetings can be convened to deal with specific items;
- A democratic procedure is provided to ensure that meetings be extended when necessary.

In response to the above comments, Dr. Graham reiterated that the spirit of the proposal was not to stifle debate but to use the time limit as a device to focus Senators' attention on the passage of time to ensure that it is used wisely and efficiently.

Aside from a couple of questions of clarification, there were no comments or discussion on items F (Question period), G (Committee reports), I (Voting at meetings of Senate) or J (Rules of order).

8. Report of other Senate Standing Committees

8.1 Finance

The Finance Committee has not met since the last Senate meeting.

8.2 Library (Document US-2009-1-D14)

Further to a query, Mr. Beasley clarified that the Committee took the view that the broader general reference requests should be funded on a priority basis by the Library Development Fund. The needs for other requests, such as those for specific topics or programs, would be met by other budgets.

When asked whether double-sided printings would cost the same as single-sided printings, Mr. Beasley indicated that he has asked that the situation be monitored. He noted that paper is a small percentage of cost recovery and assured Senate that the Library would not be making money on this initiative. The vast majority of the printing cost is attributable to ink, maintenance and replacement of the equipment.

8.3 Research (Document US-2009-1-D15)

In response to a query, Dr. Dandurand apprised Senate that the experimental stage of the interim framework on research chairs had taken longer than originally expected. However, it is now in the process of being revised and once completed, the policy will be forwarded to the Councils for comments and Senate for final approval.

9. Update of the Advisory Search Committee for a Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science

Dr. Graham apprised Senate that the Search Committee had met on December 17 to review the long list of candidates, further to which it reduced the list to a smaller number. The consultants are currently conducting preliminary interviews. The Committee is scheduled to meet on January 27, at which time it is expected to review a short-list of three or four candidates.

10. Remarks from the President (Document US-2009-1-D16)

The President spoke of her recent meetings with new faculty members and new students. She underlined the series of small get-togethers that she will be hosting over the next weeks, entitled "*Conversations with the President*", which will provide opportunities for faculty, students and staff to chat with her in an informal setting. Dr. Woodsworth pointed out that places are filled for all three meetings, except for those places reserved for students. She also encouraged Senators to visit the website or pick up a copy of the *Concordia Journal* for information on the upcoming phases of the strategic planning process.

11. Items for information

Prof. Pugh was proud to inform Senators that Dr. George Vatistas' research into the stability of vortex rings was chosen as one of the top ten discoveries in 2008 by the magazine *Québec Science*.

12. Question period

In response to problems underlined by Mr. Osei in connection with the availability of student advisors, Prof. Stoett responded that the Department of Political Science is aware of this and is making its best efforts to solve the problem.

Mr. Osei was concerned that students would incur penalties due to the long lineups to return laptops within the two-hour loan period at the new drop-off location. Mr. Beasley replied that he was unaware of any student having been penalized because of the waiting time in the queue, emphasizing that the two-hour limit is set by the life of the battery. Nonetheless, he assured Mr. Osei that solutions are being discussed to address this situation.

Prof. Ross asked the President if a decision had been taken about the appointment of a Dean of Graduate Studies. Dr. Woodsworth indicated that given the University's current financial situation, prudence must be exercised before adding senior administrative positions. She noted that in Dr. Dandurand the University has a high caliber administrator for the School of Graduate Studies, together with two Associate Deans, and one Associate Dean with some responsibility for graduate studies within each Faculty. Thus, no plans are made for this year but the position could be considered for next year, budget permitting. While she agreed that

the core mission of the University is academic, the economic situation must be kept in mind and accordingly, priorities must be weighed and decisions must be made responsibly and prudently.

13. Other business

There was no other business to bring before the meeting.

14. Next meeting

The Speaker noted that the next meeting of Senate will be held on Friday, February 13, 2009, at 2 p.m., in Room EV 2.260.

15. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Danielle Tessier
Secretary of Senate