

**MINUTES OF THE OPEN SESSION
OF THE MEETING OF SENATE**

Held on Friday, April 15, 2011, 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. G. Beasley; Prof. J. Camlot; Prof. J. Chaikelson; Mr. E. Chevrier; Prof. M. Debbabi; Prof. D. Douglas; Dean R. Drew; Prof. A. Dutkewych; Prof. L. Dyer; Dr. D. Graham, Mr. B. Hamideh; Prof. F. Khendek; Prof. G. Leonard; Dr. F. Lowy; Prof. W. Lynch; Prof. M. Magnan; Ms. R. Mehreen; Prof. S. Mudur; Prof. B. Nelson; Prof. M. Paraschivoiu; Prof. M. Peluso; Prof. G. Rail; Prof. C. Ross; Dean S. Sharma; Prof. W. Sims; Mr. R. Sonin; Prof. R. Staseson; Prof. P. Stoett; Mr. J. Suss; Prof. P. Thornton; Prof. J. Turnbull; Dean C. Wild

Non-voting members: Mr. P. Beauregard; Dr. D. Boisvert (*Speaker*); Mr. R. Côté; Me B. Freedman; Ms. L. Healey; Ms. D. McCaughey

ABSENT

Voting members: Mr. H. Abdullahi; Mr. N. Alatawneh; Mr. G. Alexandar; Mr. N. Burke; Dean G. Carr; Mr. M. Coleby; Dr. L. Dandurand; Mr. M. Freedman; Mr. D. Gal; Prof. J. Garfin; Prof. J. Garrido; Dean B. Lewis; Ms. H. Lucas; Mr. C. McKinnon; Prof. C. Nikolenyi; Prof. R. Reilly; Ms. T. Seminara; Mr. A. Severyns; Prof. F. Shaver; Prof. H. Wasson

Non-voting members: Mr. P. Kelley

1. **Call to order**

The meeting was called to order at 2:13 p.m.

2. **Approval of Agenda**

R-2011-4-5 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Stoett, Sharma), it was unanimously resolved that the Agenda be approved, and that items 3 to 5 be approved or received for information by consent.*

CONSENT3. Approval of the Minutes of the Open Session meeting of March 18, 2011

R-2011-4-6 *The Minutes of the Open session meeting of March 18, 2011 were approved by consent.*

4. Report from Senate Standing Committees4.1 Academic Planning and Priorities (Document US-2011-4-D3)4.2 Finance (Document US-2011-4-D4)

Those reports were provided for information purposes.

4.3 Library4.4 Research

Those committees have not met since the last Senate meeting.

5. Report and recommendations from Academic Programs Committee (Document US-2011-4-D5)5.1 Major undergraduate curriculum changes - Faculty of Arts and Science - Loyola International College (Document US-2011-4-D6)

R-2011-4-7 *The major undergraduate curriculum changes in the Faculty of Arts and Science, detailed in Document US-2011-4-D6, were approved by consent, as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2011-4-D5.*

5.2 Major undergraduate curriculum changes - Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science - Department of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering (Document US-2011-4-D7)

R-2011-4-8 *The major undergraduate curriculum changes in the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science, detailed in Document US-2011-4-D7, were approved by consent, as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2011-4-D5.*

5.3 Major undergraduate curriculum changes - Faculty of Fine Arts - Department of Art Education (Document US-2011-4-D8)

R-2011-4-9 *The major undergraduate curriculum changes in the Faculty of Fine Arts, detailed in Document US-2011-4-D8, were approved by consent, as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2011-4-D5.*

5.4 Major undergraduate curriculum changes – John Molson School of Business - Section 61.80 – International Business (Document US-2011-4-D9)

R-2011-4-10 *The major undergraduate curriculum changes in the John Molson School of Business, detailed in Document US-2011-4-D9, were approved by consent, as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2011-4-D5.*

5.5 Major graduate curriculum changes – Faculty of Arts and Science – Department of Religion (Documents US-2011-4-D10 and D11)

R-2011-4-11 *The major graduate curriculum changes in the Faculty of Arts and Science, detailed in Documents US-2011-4-D10 and D11, were approved by consent, as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2011-4-D5.*

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

5.6.1 Concordia Institute for Information Systems Engineering (Document US-2011-4-D12 and D13)

5.6.2 Department of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering (Document US-2011-4-D14)

5.6.3 Department of Computer Science and Software Engineering (Document US-2011-4-D15)

R-2011-4-12 *The major graduate curriculum changes in the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science, detailed in Documents US-2011-4-D12 to D15, were approved by consent, as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2011-4-D5.*

REGULAR

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

Dr. Graham indicated that, in light of the large volume of comments and suggestions received on the draft academic plan, and further to comments received from many colleagues and on recommendation of APPC, it would be preferable to defer the presentation of the final draft of the academic plan to the October Senate meeting. This would allow sufficient time for the working group to prepare a second draft, the University community to have an opportunity to comment on it during the Summer and Faculty and School Councils to discuss the plan at their first meeting in the Fall.

7. Remarks from the President

Dr. Lowy reported that a joint meeting of Steering Committee and the Executive Committee was held on April 4 and had been a beneficial exercise, in that it provided the opportunity for a frank exchange. There was recognition that this was a meaningful contact, and it was suggested that joint quarterly meetings could be held. The three Senate motions adopted at the January Senate meeting were discussed.

With respect to the status of the motion regarding the Board Chair, Mr. Kruyt gave a heartfelt statement during which he indicated that he would step down if this was the wish of the Board. As for the motion regarding the external review, Dr. Lowy noted that

the External Governance Review Committee had begun its work. He met with the Committee last evening and appreciated the sensitivity displayed by the members in questions that they asked of him.

During that meeting, it was noted that the lines of communication between the Board and Senate needed to be improved. Dr. Lowy undertook to report to the Board regarding important issues discussed at Senate, and vice-versa. Overall, it was a successful meeting and a step in the right direction.

Dr. Lowy continued his remarks by updating Senators on the status of two senior administrative searches. The search for the Vice-President, Advancement and Alumni Relations is underway and a recommendation is expected by June. The search for the Vice-President, Services has yet to formally begin but it is expected that a recommendation will be forthcoming in the Fall.

Dr. Lowy concluded his report by noting that discussions are ongoing regarding the best time to resume the comprehensive campaign and indicated that the public phase will resume in the Fall, pending Board approval.

Dr. Lowy responded to questions, during which he said that he could not venture as to why it took the Board so long to respond to the Senate motions. When asked for his thoughts about formalizing the suggestion of quarterly meetings between Steering Committee and the Executive Committee, Dr. Lowy said that he would favor this but that it was up to the Board and Senate.

When asked when the report of the External Governance Review Committee was expected, Ms. Tessier indicated that the Committee had its first meeting yesterday and was aiming to produce its report within the 60-day timeframe set out in the mandate. It was confirmed by Dr. Lowy that an opportunity would be provided for Senators to comment on said report.

8. Written response to question posed at last meeting (Document US-2011-4-D16)

Prof. Dyer indicated that she was satisfied with the written response received from Mr. Côté, adding that it had been followed-up by a telephone call by an IITS employee.

9. Question period

In response to concerns expressed by Prof. Douglas in connection with the effect of the CSU election crisis, Mr. Côté indicated that the University does provide some support services to students, including ongoing advice and assistance from the Dean of Students when asked for by the CSU. The CSU is an independent incorporated and accredited body governed by specific legislation, and therefore it conducts its election independently. The CSU's Chief Electoral Officer has the authority to render the decision he made, but the CSU by-laws provide prescribed guidelines to appeal the decision to their judicial board. As well, other external recourses are available. He added that the University is monitoring the issue but it is within the domain of the CSU.

Prof. Douglas then asked if he was correct in thinking the University was not offering advice to the students on this matter. Mr. Cote responded that, while the University does have an ongoing relationship with the CSU, it cannot interfere or be perceived as interfering in its affairs but can only offer advice or support which it does.

Prof. Peluso reiterated requests made at previous meetings which had remained unanswered with respect to information regarding amounts paid in connection with the departure of senior administrators and the cost of settlement of labor disputes. Responding on behalf of Mr. Kelley who was unable to attend today's meeting, Me Freedman indicated that the information is complex but is being compiled and a response will be provided for the next Senate meeting.

10. Items for information

There were no items for information.

11. Next meeting

Dr. Boisvert indicated that the next meeting will be held on Friday, May 20, 2011, at 2 p.m.

12. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 2:38 p.m.



Danielle Tessier
Secretary of Senate