

MINUTES OF THE OPEN SESSION
OF THE MEETING OF SENATE

Held on Friday, April 16, 2010, immediately
following the Closed Session
in the Norman D. Hébert, LL.D. Meeting Room
(Room EV 2.260) on the SGW Campus

PRESENT

Voting members: Mr. G. Beasley; Mr. N. Burke; Prof. M. Charland; Prof. R. Cross; Dr. L. Dandurand; Prof. M. Debbabi; Prof. D. Douglas; Dean R. Drew; Prof. L. Dyer; Prof. A. English; Prof. J. Garrido; Dr. D. Graham; Prof. J. Grant; Prof. M. Jamal; 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; Mr. A. Oster; Prof. L. Ostiguy; Prof. M. Paraschivoiu; Prof. M. Peluso; Prof. H. Proppe; Prof. M. Pugh; Prof. C. Ross; Dean S. Sharma; Prof. F. Shaver; Ms. S. Siriwardhana; Associate Dean T. Stathopoulos; Prof. P. Stoett; Prof. P. Thornton; Dean C. Wild

Non-voting members: Ms. K. Assayag; Dr. D. Boisvert (*Speaker*); Mr. M. Di Grappa; Me B. Freedman; Ms. L. Healey; Mr. P. Kelley

ABSENT

Voting members: Mr. E. Chevrier; Mr. A. Dabchy; Ms. S. Dolatshahi; Prof. A. Dutkewych; Prof. M. Fritsch; Prof. J. Garfin; Mr. G. Giannis; Ms. K. Gregor; Mr. R. Hafiz; Mr. Z. Khan; Mr. Z. Ling; Mr. D. Perera; Ms. E. Perkins; Ms. D. Roldan; Prof. W. Sims; Ms. S. Turnin; Dr. J. Woodsworth

1. **Call to order**

The Speaker called the meeting to order at 2:12 p.m. He apprised Senators that Dr. Woodsworth was suffering from laryngitis and was therefore not in attendance.

2. **Approval of the Agenda**

R-2010-4-5 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Graham, Stathopoulos), it was unanimously resolved that Senate approve the Agenda of the Open Session, and that items 3 to 5 be approved, confirmed, or received for information by consent.*

CONSENT

3. Approval of the Minutes of the Open Session meeting of March 12, 2010

R-2010-4-6 *The Minutes of the Open session meeting of March 12, 2010 were approved by consent.*

4. Reports from Senate Standing Committees

4.1 Academic Planning and Priorities (Document US-2010-4-D3)

4.2 Finance

4.3 Library

The report of the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee was provided for information. Written reports of the Finance and Library Committees will be provided at the May meeting.

5. Report and recommendations from the Academic Programs Committee (Document US-2010-4-D4)

5.1 Major undergraduate curriculum changes – John Molson School of Business

5.1.1 Department of Management (Document US-2010-4-D8)

R-2010-4-D7 *The major undergraduate curriculum changes in the Department of Management, set out in Document US-2010-4-D8, were approved by consent, as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2010-4-D4.*

5.2 Major graduate curriculum changes – Faculty of Arts and Science

5.2.1 Department of Sociology and Anthropology (Document US-2010-4-D9)

R-2010-4-D8 *The major graduate curriculum changes in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, set out in Document US-2010-4-D9, were approved by consent, as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2010-4-D4.*

5.2.2 Department of Sociology and Anthropology (Document US-2010-4-D10)

R-2010-4-D9 *The major graduate curriculum changes in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, set out in Document US-2010-4-D10, were approved by consent, as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2010-4-D4.*

REGULAR

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

There was no business arising from the Minutes not included on the Agenda.

7. Report and recommendations from the Academic Programs Committee (Document US-2010-4-D4)

7.1 Major undergraduate curriculum changes – School of Extended Learning

7.1.1 Student Transition Centre (Document US-2010-4-D5)

Dean Burke apprised Senators of the proposal to offer the *Skills for Success in University Study* 4-credit course, offered twice as a slot course, on a permanent basis. This course will contribute to improve retention and success rates in a proactive rather than reactive manner. Moreover, students have expressed their appreciation of this course.

While initially designed as a 3-credit course, the incorporation of the information literacy component required additional hours and therefore an additional credit. The results of students taking the course in the fall were not tracked at that time, but this will be monitored via their GPA at the end of the year. In a growing number of institutions, the study skills inventory is being used for all students.

R-2010-4-10 Upon motion duly made and seconded (Burke, Peluso), it was resolved by a majority that the undergraduate curriculum changes in the Student Transition, outlined in Document US-2010-4-D5, be approved as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2010-4-D4.

7.1.2 Institute for Community Development (Documents US-2010-4-D6 and D7)

Dean Burke conveyed the recommendation that the complementary university credit courses *Problem-based Service Learning: Introduction* and *Problem-based Service Learning: Practicum*, both offered twice as slot courses, become permanent. He noted the strong support from faculty members who use service learning in their practice.

A discussion ensued, during which Dean Burke responded to questions. He specified that these courses are geared toward a different student population than those registered in the coop programs and explained how service learning is distinct from the coop experience. Nonetheless, some Senators expressed concerns that these courses could affect enrolment in the coop programs or could flood the market, while others were troubled by the fact that students could take a complementary credit course and a regular credit course at the same time dealing with a similar topic. With respect to the latter issue, Vice-Provost Dyens said that the Academic Programs Committee had not discussed that aspect because only three courses are currently being offered but that this could be looked at down the line.

R-2010-4-11 Upon motion duly made and seconded (Burke, Wild), it was resolved by a majority that the undergraduate curriculum changes in the Institute for Community Development, outlined in Documents US-2010-4-D6 and D7, be approved as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2010-4-D4.

8. Report and recommendations from the Research Committee (Document US-2010-4-D11)

Dr. Dandurand summarized the context in which the Policy on Research Chairs and the Policy on Research Units were developed and drafted, specifying that both had undergone a cross-university consultation process leading up to their presentation for Senate's approval.

8.1 Approval of Policy on Research Chairs (Document US-2010-4-D12)

Dr. Dandurand apprised Senators that the proposed policy was similar to the interim framework. Its goals are to ensure transparency in the allocation and adjudication of research chairs across the University, equity among the Faculties as well as consistency across the University in the allocation, appointment, funding and termination of research chairs.

With respect to the University Research Committee (URC), Prof. Lynch indicated that it acts occasionally as a personnel committee when it considers the renewal of existing research chairs. He felt that only members of the URC should attend those meetings. Dr. Dandurand responded that some staff members attend URC meetings as resource persons, but they do not take part in the decision nor do they vote. The main role of the URC is to strategically allocate the research chairs. It makes strictly strategic decisions and while it does look at the renewal dossier, the prior part of the process provides for the review and recommendation by the Faculties. Prof. Lynch also pointed out that normally committees of Senate have only powers to recommend to Senate and therefore it was an anomaly that the Research Committee of Senate would appoint the URC membership. Dr. Dandurand explained that she was trying to simplify the process. Me Freedman indicated that the policy would be tweaked to provide for ratification of the URC membership by Senate.

R-2010-4-12 Upon motion duly made and seconded (Dandurand, Wild), it was resolved by a majority that, upon the recommendation of the Research Committee, Senate approve the Policy on Research Chairs, as set out in Document US-2010-4-D12.

8.2 Approval of Policy on Research Units (Document US-2010-4-D13)

Dr. Dandurand noted that the purpose of this policy and its related procedures is to ensure consistency and transparency in the recognition, evaluation and funding of research units. It supersedes the previous dormant policy, adopted in 1997. The policy moves away from the traditional terminology regarding research centres and identifies research units by grouping and interests. Three levels of funding will enable the University to modulate the level of funding and requirements while ensuring a University-wide consistent practice.

R-2010-4-13 Upon motion duly made and seconded (Dandurand, Wild), it was unanimously resolved that, upon the recommendation of the Research Committee, Senate approve the Policy on Research Units, as set out in Document US-2010-4-D13.

9. Senate resolution on Open Access (Document US-2010-4-D14)

Mr. Beasley thanked everyone who had engaged in the consultation process. He indicated that the Councils of JMSB and ENCS had recently met and have recommended the adoption of the motion, adding that the proposal has therefore now received strong support of all four Faculty Councils and the Council of the School of Graduate Studies. Responses to the major concerns raised at the March Senate meeting were addressed in Document D14.

A discussion ensued, during which some Senators expressed reservations summarized as follows:

- While not against the principle, there is confusion with the wording of the motion as it stands, more specifically as the use of the words “encourages” and “required”.
- Referring to “voluntarily” and then “required” is contradictory.
- What are the penalties for those who do not deposit?
- What are the issues in relation to copyright?
- The factors than one can invoke to opt out need to be clarified, and the fact that one can opt out rather than opt in is unusual.
- The language of the motion is unclear. How do we know that the department chair will not consider the deposit in his/her evaluation of a faculty member?
- The University is creating a requirement but doing very little to make it easy for faculty members to comply.
- Perhaps the Library could deposit in lieu of the faculty member?

Other Senators spoke in favor of the motion for the following reasons:

- Other universities, such as Harvard, have a requirement to deposit with no opt-out clause; the proposal before us is an advance.
- The requirement is pretty straightforward, faculty members just have to decide whether to deposit or opt out.
- The concerns stated at the last meeting have been addressed. The Spectrum Advisory Committee could submit a report to Senate in a year or so, and an explanatory pamphlet could be created for each faculty member to assist them.
- We should not nitpick about this. Open Access is very beneficial since it allows for the dissemination of knowledge outside the academy.

In response to the above comments, Mr. Beasley agreed that this is a much debated topic. The full range of Concordia University's research and creative output should be captured. Peer-reviewed scholarly articles, which are the focus of every Open Access policy in other universities, represent a subset of this output and a special effort is made to capture them through Spectrum. There is no penalty for not depositing, and the University Librarian has no additional powers, so would likely just send a polite reminder if necessary.

Mr. Beasley reiterated that the experience of other universities shows deposit rates remain low if there is only a policy of encouragement, and faculty members can convey whatever reasons they want for not depositing without prejudice. Faculty members who deposit retain copyright. The Library does not have the right to download and deposit articles directly from the journals. There will be explicit assistance from the library staff, but the responsibility remains with the faculty member/author. While there is exposure for legal pursuit, it is an extremely unlikely scenario. With respect to the comment regarding the onerous nature of depositing, Dr. Graham noted this was minimal compared to the amount of time it takes to complete the work itself.

Given that the engagement with Open Access is to promote research and remove economic barriers, Mr. Beasley opined that Concordia University should show leadership in this regard.

Further to the debate, the question was called, and the majority of Senators were in favor of voting on the main motion as follows:

R-2010-4-14 *Upon motion duly made and seconded (Beasley, Johannson), it was resolved by a majority that:*

Whereas Open access makes the results of publicly funded academic research and creative work accessible to everyone via the internet and succeeds by supplementing but not replacing peer-reviewed journals and other established publishing venues, and

Whereas Concordia University wishes to take a leadership role in Canada and exemplify social responsibility by supporting the principles of open access and has recently launched Spectrum, an open access repository freely available to receive the refereed academic research output and creative work voluntarily deposited by Concordia faculty and others, with assistance from librarians and other library staff as required, thereby satisfying the requirements of a number of funding agencies in Canada and elsewhere without affecting the intellectual property rights, responsibilities and academic freedom of faculty members;

Be it resolved that Senate recommends that Concordia University:

- from now on encourages all its faculty members to deposit an electronic copy of their refereed research output and creative work in Spectrum, along with nonexclusive permission to preserve and freely disseminate it; and*
- furthermore, in the specific case of any scholarly article accepted for publication in a peer-reviewed journal, from now on requires all faculty members to deposit an electronic copy in Spectrum along with non-exclusive permission to preserve and freely disseminate it. This requirement is not binding in cases where publishers, co-authors or other rights holders disallow such a deposit. Faculty members may also, without prejudice, opt out of the requirement by notifying the University Librarian in writing that their work has appeared, or will appear in another Open Access format; or by citing other factors that currently discourage them from depositing their work in an Open Access repository.*

10. Remarks from the President

The Speaker noted that a copy of Dr. Woodsworth's report to the Board of Governors had been distributed at the meeting.

11. Question period

Prof. Ross conveyed that during Question Period a few years ago he had asked about the difference in the length of time between classes taught during the day and those taught in the evening, the latter being 15 minutes shorter, which affects pedagogy. At the time he had been told that this was being investigated but he never received a response.

The Provost answered that this issue is being looked into by a larger group in the context of the academic class schedule and the use of existing classroom facilities. The preliminary outcome of the working group will be reviewed by Mr. Di Grappa and himself, further to

which a number of principles will be reviewed by the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee. Dr. Graham is determined to make changes in time for the next round of class scheduling in the Fall.

11.1 Written question (Document US-2010-4-D15)

As a follow-up to his written question, Mr. Oster asked about the best way to encourage faculty members to use double-sided printing for their syllabus or course material. Dr. Graham responded that students should express this directly to their professors, most of whom are very well-intended and who probably do not resort to this practice due to an oversight rather than a conscious decision.

12. Other business

In light of Dr. Graham Carr's appointment as Dean of Graduate Studies as of May 1, Dr. Dandurand pointed out that Associate Dean Stathopoulos was attending his last Senate meeting. Senators echoed Dr. Dandurand's appreciation of his contribution.

13. Next meeting

The Speaker noted that the next meeting will be held on Friday, May 21, 2010, at 2 p.m., the location to be confirmed in due course.

14. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:08 p.m.



Danielle Tessier
Secretary of Senate