

MINUTES OF THE OPEN SESSION
OF THE MEETING OF SENATE

Held on Friday, February 12, 2010, at 2 p.m.
in the Norman D. Hébert, LLD Meeting Room
(Room EV 2.260) on the SGW Campus

PRESENT

Voting members: Mr. G. Beasley; Mr. N. Burke; Prof. M. Charland; Mr. E. Chevrier; Prof. R. Cross; Mr. A. Dabchy; Prof. M. Debbabi; Dean R. Drew; Prof. A. Dutkewych; Prof. M. Fritsch; Prof. J. Garfin; Prof. J. Garrido; Mr. G. Giannis; Dr. D. Graham; Prof. J. Grant; Ms. K. Gregor; Mr. R. Hafiz; Mr. G. Johannson; Prof. G. Leonard; Dean B. Lewis; Prof. W. Lynch; Prof. S. McSheffrey; Prof. S. Mudur; Prof. B. Nelson; Mr. P.R. Osei; Prof. M. Paraschivoiu; Prof. M. Peluso; Prof. H. Proppe; Prof. M. Pugh; Ms. D. Roldan; Prof. C. Ross; Prof. F. Shaver; Prof. W. Sims; Ms. S. Siriwardhana; Associate Dean T. Stathopoulos; Prof. P. Thornton; Ms. S. Turnin; Dr. J. Woodsworth

Non-voting members: Dr. D. Boisvert (*Speaker*); Me B. Freedman; Ms. L. Healey, Mr. P. Kelley

ABSENT

Voting members: Dr. L. Dandurand; Ms. S. Dolatshahi; Prof. D. Douglas; Prof. L. Dyer; Prof. A. English; Prof. M. Jamal; Mr. Z. Khan; Mr. Z. Ling; Mr. A. Oster; Prof. L. Ostiguy; Mr. D. Perera; Ms. E. Perkins; Dean S. Sharma; Prof. P. Stoett; Dean C. Wild

Non-voting members: Ms. K. Assayag; Mr. M. Di Grappa

1. Call to order

The Speaker called the meeting to order at 2:07 p.m.

2. Approval of the Agenda

Further to a request from Prof. Ross which was supported by Prof. Lynch, item 4.2 was moved from the Consent Agenda to the Regular Agenda.

R-2010-2-1 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Peluso, Garrido), it was unanimously resolved that the Agenda of the Open Session be approved, with the removal of item 4.2 from the Consent section to the Regular section, and that items 3 and 4 (not including item 4.2) be approved, confirmed, or received for information by consent.*

CONSENT

3. Approval of the Minutes of the Open Session meeting of January 15, 2010

R-2010-2-2 *The Minutes of the Open session meeting of January 15, 2010 were approved by consent.*

4. Reports from Senate Standing Committees

4.1 Academic Programs

4.3 Library

4.4 Research

The Academic Programs Committee had not met since the last Senate meeting, and the written reports of the Library and Research Committees will be provided at the next Senate meeting.

REGULAR

4.2 Finance (Document US-2010-1-D1)

Prof. Ross asked the Provost to elaborate on the statement in the last phrase of the third bullet of Document D1 to the effect that “*Enrolments would be only one indicator of success; others would be indicators of program quality and efficiency*”. Dr. Graham explained that, together with the Deans and the Director of Institutional Planning, work has been done on establishing a set of core indicators to measure and validate strategic priorities. The core indicators are still being worked on, and another iteration of the document will be vetted by the Academic Cabinet, with the intention of providing it to the Faculties and academic units for their own use. When asked, the Provost said he would be willing to give Senate the same presentation as the one he gave to the Finance Committee, subject to the agreement of the President and Steering Committee.

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

There was no business arising from the Minutes.

6. Report and recommendations from the Senate Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities (SCAPP) on Senate Standing Committees

6.1 SCAPP report and recommendations, including comparative chart of current and proposed memberships (Document US-2010-2-D2)

6.2 Marked version of “Membership and functions of Senate Standing Committees”, showing changes recommended by SCAPP (Document US-2010-2-D3)

6.3 Final version of “Membership and functions of Senate Standing Committees” (Document US-2010-2-D4)

Dr. Graham reminded Senators that SCAPP had been charged by Senate to bring forward recommendations concerning the composition, mandate and procedures of the Senate Standing Committees. An earlier version had been brought to Senate at its meeting of October 16, 2009, at which time several comments and suggestions were formulated with

Senate sitting in a committee of the whole. Those comments and suggestions were recorded in the Minutes, considered at length by SCAPP, and SCAPP's report under Document D2 lists its response to each of them. For ease of reference, a redlined version of the current wording is provided under Document D3 and a clean copy of SCAPP's final proposal is included under Document D4. Dr. Graham noted that SCAPP unanimously recommends that Senate approve all proposed changes, with the proviso that it will revisit the issue in one year and report back to Senate. A discussion ensued, during which the Provost responded to questions of clarification.

Prof. Grant acknowledged that the ratio of administrative to non-administrative voting members had been reviewed further to previous comments, except for APC which still has a majority of administrative voting members. Thus, he suggested that a mechanism be put in place whereby a certain number of administrative voting members would be assigned voting privileges for a specific meeting and that this be enshrined into the mandate. While understanding the rationale, Dr. Graham indicated his reluctance to entertain the proposal since such a way of proceeding would create a complicating factor. He added that APC typically functions by consensus rather than by vote. Moreover, Senate Standing Committees are only empowered to make recommendations and Senate has the final authority.

R-2010-2-3 Upon motion duly made and seconded (Graham, Johannson), it was approved by a majority that, upon recommendation of the Senate Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities, Senate approve the revisions to the Membership and functions of Senate Standing Committees, as detailed in Document US-2010-2-D4, and

That the revisions take effect as of the 2010/2011 academic year.

7. Update from the Advisory Search Committee for a Dean of Graduate Studies

In the absence of Dr. Dandurand, Dr. Woodsworth reported that open meetings to present the two candidates for the position of Dean of Graduate Studies were held on January 28 and 29. The Committee will be meeting on February 15, with a view of bringing a recommendation to the Board of Governors at its meeting of March 18.

8. Remarks from the President (Document US-2010-2-D5)

In addition to her written report, Dr. Woodsworth spoke of her recent three-city visit to India, during which the University entered into eight agreements extending across all four Faculties. She noted that new business in emerging fields has created opportunities for cooperation and exchange for faculty members and students.

9. Items for information

There were no items for information.

10. Question period

With respect to the indicators referred to by Provost Graham earlier and referring to a presentation on performance indicators given a few years ago, Prof. Leonard felt that more detailed information would be helpful and wondered if a document containing the core indicators could be provided on an annual basis. Dr. Woodsworth noted that while the Director of Institutional Planning had produced and presented "*Measuring Excellence*" which sets out very detailed information on performance indicators, we are working toward a more simplified version to measure quality and progress against ourselves as well as other institutions. This exercise will result in each sector of the University having a set of indicators that will be included in a document. The goal is to have this document finalized by the end of the year.

Further to a query from Prof. Ross, the Speaker clarified that items placed on the Consent Agenda, whether for approval, receipt, or information, are not discussed, because they are deemed routine or non controversial, with the proviso that any two Senators can have an item moved from the Consent Agenda onto the Regular Agenda. However, he opined that a mere question about a report included on the Consent Agenda does not usually warrant moving that item to the Regular Agenda, given that the question could be asked during Question Period.

Expressing disappointment with the trash left by students in the new MB building, Prof. Leonard suggested that instructors add to their course outlines a notation that students dispose of their trash. The Provost responded that he would communicate this suggestion to Vice-Provost Dyens.

Mr. Dabchy asked why tuition waivers for students sitting on various University bodies had been discontinued and expressed his discontentment with the handling of this matter. Me Freedman conveyed the background which led to the practice of tuition waivers, originally initiated by CCSL, specifying that the implementation of the program had never been formally approved by the Board or Senate. The amount of work required to monitor and administer the program was disproportionate to any advantage of the program, given that only two to three students had availed themselves of the program in the last number of years. As a result, the Dean of Students was informed at the end of the summer that the tuition waiver program was discontinued as of the fall term. Me Freedman agreed that perhaps this could have been better communicated to students, noting that any proposal to reinstate the program should come from CCSL to the Board.

In response to a question from Prof. Leonard, Mr. Kelley confirmed that the impact of the University's decision to cancel the credit card option to pay tuition fees had been satisfactory from a financial perspective.

Mr. Hafiz suggested that, in keeping with the efforts to reduce paper and promote a sustainable environment, a reprogramming should be done to eliminate the printing of the last page which shows ENCS students' quota.

Mr. Osei wondered why exams were no longer being held on the Loyola Campus and related some problems and challenges which had been communicated to him, namely with respect to two different exams being held in the same room, expensive parking and loss of time to travel downtown. As the CSU Vice-President responsible for promoting the Loyola Campus, this made him very uncomfortable, and he suggested that this decision be reconsidered.

Ms. Healey explained that in the past several complaints had been lodged with respect to the adequacy of holding exams in the Loyola Gym or the Guadagni Lounge. The opening of the new MB building created an opportunity to introduce about 1,100 new seats which could be used to hold examination in a more effective environment. The consolidation of exams on the SGW Campus was deemed more efficient for several reasons, including the overall facilities, easier wheelchair access, less traveling time between campus and better public transportation.

Prof. Peluso asked that in the future the exam schedule take into account the operating hours of the University. For example, while exams were held in the evening of December 23, all other services were closed, causing problems for grading, exam drop-offs, etc. Ms. Healey replied that this would be looked into.

11. Other business

There was no other business to bring before Senate.

12. Next meeting

The Speaker noted that the next meeting will be held on Friday, March 12, 2010, at 2 p.m., in Room EV 2.260.

13. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3 p.m.



Danielle Tessier
Secretary of Senate