

MINUTES OF THE OPEN SESSION
OF THE MEETING OF SENATE

Held on Friday, November 5, 2010,
immediately following the Closed Session meeting
in the Norman D. Hébert, LL.D. Meeting Room
(Room EV 2.260) on the SGW Campus

PRESENT

Voting members: Mr. N. Alatawneh; Mr. G. Alexandar; Ms. O. Alsaieq; Mr. G. Beasley; Mr. N. Burke; Prof. J. Camlot; Prof. J. Chaikelson; Mr. E. Chevrier; Mr. M. Coleby; Dr. L. Dandurand; Prof. M. Debbabi; Prof. D. Douglas; Dean R. Drew; Prof. A. Dutkewych; Prof. L. Dyer; Mr. D. Gal; Prof. J. Garrido; Mr. P. Gillett; Dr. D. Graham; Prof. J. Grant; Prof. J. Hansen (*Acting Dean in the absence of Dean B. Lewis*); Prof. F. Khendek; Prof. G. Leonard; Ms. H. Lucas; Mr. C. McKinnon; Prof. S. Mudur; Prof. B. Nelson; Prof. L. Ostiguy; Prof. M. Paraschivoiu; Prof. M. Peluso; Prof. G. Rail; Ms. T. Seminara; Mr. A. Severyns; Dean S. Sharma; Prof. W. Sims; Mr. R. Sonin; Prof. P. Stoett; Mr. J. Suss; Prof. P. Thornton; Prof. J. Turnbull; Prof. H. Wasson; Dean C. Wild; Dr. J. Woodsworth

Non-voting members: Mr. P. Beauregard; Mr. R. Côté; Me B. Freedman; Ms. L. Healey; Mr. P. Kelley

ABSENT

Voting members: Mr. H. Abdullahi; Dean G. Carr; Prof. J. Garfin; Mr. Z. Ling; Prof. W. Lynch; Ms. R. Mehreen; Prof. C. Ross; Prof. F. Shaver; Prof. R. Staseson

Non-voting members: Dr. D. Boisvert (*Speaker*); Me D. McCaughey

1. Call to order

Me Freedman, appointed Speaker Pro Tem for this meeting in the absence of Dr. Boisvert, called the meeting to order at 2:15 p.m.

2. Approval of the Agenda

R-2010-8-4 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Peluso, Camlot), it was unanimously resolved that Senate approve the Agenda of the Open Session meeting, that items that items 3 to 6 be approved, ratified or received by consent.*

CONSENT

3. Approval of the Minutes of the Open Session meeting of October 8, 2010

R-2010-8-5 *The Minutes of the Open session meeting of October 8, 2010 were approved by consent.*

4. Report of Senate Standing Committees

4.1 Finance (Document US-2010-8-D2)

4.2 Library

4.3 Research

The report of the Finance Committee was provided for information. The Library and Research Committees have not met since the last Senate meeting.

5. Committee appointments (Document US-2010-8-D3)

R-2010-8-6 *The committee appointments, outlined in Document US-2010-8-D3, were approved by consent.*

6. Report and recommendations of the Academic Programs Committee (Document US-2010-8-D4)

6.1 Major undergraduate curriculum changes – Faculty of Arts and Science

6.1.1 Department of Biology (Document US-2010-8-D5)

6.1.2 Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry (Documents US-2010-8-D6 and D7)

6.1.3 Department of Classics, Modern Languages and Linguistics (Documents US-2010-8-D8 to D13)

6.1.4 Department of Communication Studies (US-2010-8-D14)

6.1.5 Department of Economics (Document US-2010-8-D15)

6.1.6 Department of Education (Documents US-2010-8-D16 and D17)

6.1.7 Department of English (Documents US-2010-8-D18 and D19)

6.1.8 Department of Geography, Planning and Environment (Document US-2010-8-D20)

6.1.9 Department of History (Document US-2010-8-D21)

6.1.10 Department of Political Science (Document US-2010-8-D22)

6.1.11 Department of Religion (Documents US-2010-8-D23 and D24)

6.1.12 Department of Sociology and Anthropology (Document US-2010-8-D25)

6.1.13 Simone de Beauvoir Institute (Document US-2010-8-D26)

R-2010-8-7 *The major undergraduate curriculum changes in the Faculty of Arts of Science, detailed in Documents US-2010-8-D5 to D26, were approved by consent, as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2010-8-D4.*

6.2 Major undergraduate curriculum changes – Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science

6.2.1 Regulation changes (Document US-2010-8-D27)

6.2.2 Department of Building, Civil and Environmental Engineering (Document US-2010-8-D28)

R-2010-8-8 *The major undergraduate curriculum changes in the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science, detailed in Documents US-2010-8-D27 and D28, were approved by consent, as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2010-8-D4.*

6.3 Major undergraduate curriculum changes – Faculty of Fine Arts

6.3.1 Department of Art Education (Document US-2010-8-D29)

R-2010-8-9 *The major undergraduate curriculum changes in the Faculty of Fine Arts, detailed in Document US-2010-8-D29, were approved by consent, as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2010-8-D4.*

6.4 Major undergraduate curriculum changes – John Molson School of Business

6.4.1 Department of Management (Documents US-2010-8-D30 and D31)

R-2010-8-10 *The major undergraduate curriculum changes in the John Molson School of Business, detailed in Documents US-2010-8-D30 and D31, were approved by consent, as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2010-8-D4.*

REGULAR

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

Further to Prof. Ross' question at the last Senate meeting regarding classroom use and timetabling, Provost Graham apprised Senators that he had recently received the report of the working group looking into this matter. The report will be discussed with the Academic Cabinet as well as APPC and will be treated as a priority item for next year's scheduling, as promised.

8. Brief presentation by Rev. Ellie Hummel, from the Multi-Faith Chaplaincy, on the Student Emergency and Food Fund

Rev. Ellie Hummel noted that societies are judged on how they treat their weakest members. Last year the Fund helped alleviate difficult situations for over 500 students. The support of the Fund can often make a difference between a student graduating or not and constitutes a societal safety net which matches the University's tradition and mission. Rev. Hummel encouraged Senators to feed the Fund by making personal donations, participating in fundraising events or spreading the word.

Mr. Gillett expressed great respect and appreciation for the Fund, having benefited from it at a time when he was experiencing financial difficulties and unable to find a job since he was new to Montreal and did not speak French.

9. Report and recommendations of the Academic Programs Committee (Document US-2010-8-D4)

9.1 Major graduate curriculum changes – Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science

9.1.1 Concordia Institute for Information Systems Engineering (Document US-2010-8-D32 – Revised)

9.1.2 Department of Computer Science and Software Engineering (Document US-2010-8-D33)

Further to concerns expressed about the resource allocation and revenue neutrality of these new programs, Dr. Dandurand indicated that these issues were raised at every level of examination of the proposal and that she was satisfied that they were dealt with appropriately.

R-2010-8-11 *Upon motion duly made and seconded (Dandurand, Debbabi), it was unanimously resolved that the major graduate curriculum changes in the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science, detailed in Documents US-2010-8-D32 (Revised) and D33, be approved as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2010-8-D4.*

10. Report of the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee (Document US-2010-8-D34)

Me Freedman apprised Senate that the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee (APPC) was seeking to gather feedback from Senators on the recommendations from both working groups. This would be achieved via a 30-minute committee of the whole discussion on each report.

Dr. Graham noted that APPC had drafted a fuller report than usual so as to frame the discussion at Senate and that two additional documents being circulated at the meeting included responses to frequently asked questions. The working group reports themselves contain a set of overarching principles regarding teaching and learning to delineate the responsibilities of students, faculty and administration.

Both reports aim to provide road maps to improvements which will flow into the Academic Plan. Dr. Graham noted that two Senators were members of the working groups, Jason Camlot (Core Competencies) and Bradley Nelson (Assessment of Teaching).

Dr. Graham added that APPC is not seeking information about details but rather high level responses to the working group reports, such as what appears to be problematic or difficult to implement, what may be missing, which recommendations need to be addressed first, etc.

In response to concerns about the time needed to review the reports and their dissemination to all faculty members, Provost Graham noted that their existence had been announced at the last Senate meeting and had been widely disseminated via two emails sent to all faculty members. Both reports have been available for about a month, are now posted on the Provost's website and are referred to in an article in the Journal which includes a link to a podcast. They have also been mentioned in the electronic newsletter NOW and have been sent to the Deans with a request that they be forwarded to academic units and discussed at Faculty Councils. He invited Senators to provide suggestions to him about ways in which this communication effort could be improved.

10.1 Senate feedback regarding the recommendations of the Core Competencies Working Group Report (Document US-2010-8-D35)

The majority of the comments and questions related to the use of placement tests and the need to integrate communication skills into core competencies, summarized as follows:

- we cannot afford to release faculty from research duties if we want to increase research
- who will conduct the assessment of the impact, costs and priority level of recommendations
- who will pay the costs of placement tests
- what about testing Francophone students
- approve and/or sympathetic to recommendations regarding writing skills
- emphasis should also be on oral skills but this is very expensive and labor-intensive
- would like to have seen survey of current practices at Concordia and to what extent they are taken into account
- sense that there is little recognition of current practices and work already been done
- what will real costs be since \$10 seems too optimistic
- is the writing requirement meant to engender a set of standards or to create a set of courses that would add credits for students
- would there be better support for writing-intensive courses than what is currently offered
- there is a need to integrate core competencies at the departmental level
- do we know how many students may end up in remedial or developmental courses
- these issues need to be discussed at department levels
- should find creative ways to teach writing and provide tips for teaching writing that do not require the hiring of additional TAs

10.2 Senate feedback regarding the recommendations of the Assessment of Teaching Working Group Report (Document US-2010-8-D36)

While some comments and questions arose regarding the creation of a teaching institute, for the most part they centered on the recommendation to adopt the IDEA Center's course evaluation, summarized as follows:

- all faculty members, not only new ones, should take advantage of teaching development opportunities
- do we really want to give incentives for teaching development
- how does the teaching institute differ from the Centre for Teaching and Learning Services
- this report is lighter in documenting assertions, would need more or better statistical analysis
- there is no consensus about the direction to take for course evaluations
- students worry about anonymity
- the report does not document what the current response rate is
- we do not send reminders to student that link back to the course evaluations
- we should not go back to paper evaluations
- do other universities include the results of course evaluations in their program appraisals
- are aggregate overviews of the results of course evaluations helpful
- would need to have more information on the connection between the response rates and student access to the course evaluation results

Dr. Graham thanked Senators for their input and reiterated that the comments will be conveyed to the members of APPC at its next meeting.

11. Remarks from the President

Dr. Woodsworth apprised Senators that about half of the 1,500 students who were graduating in the Fall had participated in the November 1 Convocation ceremony. She added that a small but touching ceremony was held on November 2 to commemorate the 10th year anniversary of the renaming of the John Molson School of Business.

The President concluded her remarks by underlining the work done by the University Communications Services in redesigning the *Journal* and in establishing new multi-media tools as well as the increased media coverage that the University is receiving on the national level.

12. Question period

12.1 Response to written question submitted by Prof. Lynch (Document US-2010-8-D37)

12.2 Responses to written questions submitted by Mr. Sonin (Document US-2010-8-D38)

12.3 Responses to written questions submitted by Prof. Goyal (Document US-2010-8-D39)

No follow-up questions were asked on the above responses, and no questions were asked from the floor on other topics.

13. Concordia Centraide Campaign 2010 (Document US-2010-8-D40)

Prof. Peluso spoke about the importance of Concordia's commitment to the Centraide Campaign as a component of its community involvement and urged everyone to participate. She referred Senators to the sheet which was included in the mailing and distributed at the meeting, which contains the information on how to make a donation.

14. Next meeting

Me Freedman noted that the next meeting is scheduled for December 10, 2010, at 2 p.m.

15. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:02 p.m.



Danielle Tessier
Secretary of Senate