

MINUTES OF THE OPEN SESSION
OF THE MEETING OF SENATE

Held on Friday, December 9, 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: Prof. A. Akgunduz; Mr. G. Beasley; Mr. N. Burke; Prof. J. Camlot; Prof. J. Chaikelson; Mr. H. Cheikhzen; Dr. L. Dandurand; Prof. M. Debbabi; Prof. D. Douglas; Dean R. Drew; Prof. L. Dyer; Mr. A. Filipowich; Ms. L. Gill; Dr. D. Graham; Prof. J. Grant; Mr. B. Hamideh; Ms. M. Hotchkiss; Dean A. Hochstein; Prof. N. Ingram; Prof. G. Leonard; Prof. J. Lewis; Prof. J. Locke (*Acting for Dean B. Lewis*); Dr. F. Lowy; Prof. M. Magnan; Ms. M. Manson; Mr. K. McLoughlin; Mr. G. Morrow; Ms. H. Nazar; Prof. C. Nikolenyi; Prof. M. Peluso; Prof. G. Rail; Prof. R. Reilly; Prof. F. Shaver; Prof. W. Sims; Dr. C. Skinner (*Acting for Dean G. Carr*); Mr. R. Sonin; Prof. R. Staseson; Prof. T. Stathopoulos; Prof. J. Turnbull; Dr. H. Wasson (*Acting for Dean C. Wild*); Mr. C. Wilson

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

ABSENT

Voting members: Prof. A. Dutkewych; Prof. J. Garrido; Mr. P. Gill; Mr. J. Kelly; Prof. F. Khendek; Prof. B. Layne; Prof. B. Nelson; Mr. M. Nurujjaman; Prof. C. Ross; Ms. T. Salameh; Mr. D. Shakibaian; Prof. M. R. Soleymani

Non-voting members: Mr. P. Kelley

1. Call to order

The Speaker called the meeting to order at 2:20 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

It was pointed out that document US-2011-9-D6 under item 7.1.1 was mislabelled and did not encompass the curriculum changes in the Department of Applied Human Sciences as stated. As a result, it was agreed that consideration of this item be deferred to the next meeting. In response to a query about whether this would permit inclusion of the item in

the *Calendar* for 2012-2013, the Registrar advised Senate that approval of the changes at the January meeting would indeed allow their inclusion.

R-2011-9-4 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Peluso, Douglas), it was unanimously resolved that the Agenda of the Open Session be approved, with the deferral of item 7.1.1 to the next meeting and the removal of items 6.1 and 7.2.1 from the Consent section to the Regular section, and that items 3 to 7 (not including items 6.1, 7.1.1. and 7.2.1) be approved or received by consent.*

CONSENT

3. Approval of the Minutes of the Open Session meeting of November 4, 2011

R-2011-9-5 *The Minutes of the Open Session meeting of November 4, 2011 were approved by consent.*

4. Committee appointments (Document US-2011-9-D2)

R-2011-9-6 *The committee appointments, set out in Document US-2011-9-D2, were approved by consent.*

5. Changes to non-voting membership of Council of the Faculty of Arts and Science
(Document US-2011-9-D3)

R-2011-9-7 *On recommendation of the Arts and Science Faculty Council, Senate's recommendation to the Board of Governors that it approve the changes to the non-voting membership of the Council of the Faculty of Arts and Science, set out in Document US-2011-9-D3, was approved by consent.*

6. Reports of Senate Standing Committees

6.2 Library

The report of December 5 meeting will be submitted at next meeting.

6.3 Research

The report of December 7 meeting will be submitted at next meeting.

7. Report and recommendations of the Academic Programs Committee (Document US-2011-9-D5)

7.1 Major undergraduate curriculum changes - Faculty of Arts and Science

7.1.2 Department of Education (Document US-2011-9-D7)

7.1.3 Department of Exercise Science (Document US-2011-9-D8)

7.1.4 Department of Political Science (Document US-2011-9-D9)

7.1.5 Department of Religion (Document US-2011-9-D10)

7.1.6 Department of Sociology and Anthropology (Document US-2011-9-D11)

7.1.7 School of Community and Public Affairs (Document US-2011-9-D12)

R-2011-9-8 *The major undergraduate curriculum changes in the Faculty of Arts and Science, detailed in Documents US-2011-9-D7 to D12, were approved by consent, as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2011-9-D5.*

7.2 Major undergraduate curriculum changes - Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science

7.2.2 Department of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering (Document US-2011-9-D14)

7.2.3 Department of Computer Science and Software Engineering (Document US-2011-9-D15)

R-2011-9-9 *The major undergraduate curriculum changes in the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science, detailed in Documents US-2011-9-D14 and D15, were approved by consent, as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2011-9-D5.*

7.3 Major undergraduate curriculum changes - Faculty of Fine Arts

7.3.1 Department of Design and Computation Arts (Document US-2011-9-D16)

7.3.2 Mel Hoppenheim School of Cinema (Document US-2011-9-D17)

7.3.3 Department of Creative Arts Therapies (Document US-2011-9-D18)

R-2011-9-10 *The major undergraduate curriculum changes in the Faculty of Fine Arts, detailed in Documents US-2011-9-D16 to D18, were approved by consent, as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2011-9-D5.*

7.4 Major undergraduate curriculum changes - Institute for Co-operative Education
(Document US-2011-9-D19)

R-2011-9-11 *The major undergraduate curriculum changes in the Institute for Co-operative Education, detailed in Document US-2011-9-D19, were approved by consent, as recommended by Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2011-9-D5.*

REGULAR

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

There was no business arising from the Minutes.

6.1 Report of the Finance Committee (Document US-2011-9-D4)

The Chair of the Finance Committee noted that the Committee had not seen or discussed either the audited financial statements or the *État de Traitement* for which a link was provided in the report, but she advised that she had wanted to make Senate aware that these had been approved by the Board. She stated that, in her opinion, more detailed information would be required for the Finance Committee to provide sound advice and indicated that the reports on enrolment forecasting and on full-time faculty member workload had been presented in this spirit to the Committee. She indicated that the

Committee had suggested some changes to the manner in which the workload for tenured professors was presented.

With respect to the financial statements and related documents, several questions and concerns were raised and requests were made for presentations, further to which Dr. Lowy agreed that the answers could be provided at the next Senate meeting to address the following:

- Identification of where the money comes from to pay the amounts shown in the “autres éléments” column of the *État de traitement*;
- Details of what is included under “autres éléments” totalling \$1.8 M;
- Accounting of the expenditures for each Vice-President and Dean’s office, including the amount of money spent on litigation;
- Presentation by the Chief Financial Officer on the historical trend of the administrative spending over academic spending for the last 10 years;
- Confirmation of the percentage of cost of living adjustment paid to senior administrators this year for 2010/2011; was it 2.75%?

7.2.1 Major undergraduate curriculum changes - Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science - Program regulation changes (Document US-2011-9-D13)

Ms. Gill noted that introducing the grade C- or higher rule in any 200-level course in the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science was a major change and that there is a multiplicity of reasons why students obtain lower grades in some courses which are not indicative of their capability of doing well in other courses. She felt that more information was needed and that this item should be deferred to allow for further study.

Dean Drew indicated this matter had been raised during the recent accreditation process in the context of maintaining standards and the quality of education. This is not a requirement in other programs. The 200-level courses cover a certain amount of metrics necessary for higher level courses. Moreover, this rule is advantageous for students in the long run.

A discussion ensued, during which the following points were made:

- This rule is advisable from a pedagogical point of view because it would allow students to address difficulties earlier on in their degree and ensure their success.
- This Senator checked with the engineering faculties at McGill and Université de Montréal and was told that they do not have this requirement. Will they lose their accreditation? There is a rule that only the last attempt at a course counts. Could this not be another way of proceeding?
- This was a major change which was discussed for over one year at the department level. The grading system at McGill is different. Grade D is only a marginal pass and experience has shown that a lot of problems ensue down the road in such cases.
- The impact of this rule on international students was raised.
- Clarification was sought regarding the statistics provided in the tables.
- It was also argued that the pedagogical argument could apply to other Faculties.

- Students are capable of making their own decisions and there must be a better way to formulate this proposal.
- While seeing the benefit of this rule, a question arose regarding the variance of grading between instructors. Also, what is the value of a grade F, and how does it differ from a grade D?

R-2011-9-12 Upon motion duly made and seconded (Gill, Filipowich), it was resolved that the proposal set out in Document US-2011-9-D13 with respect to the grade C- or higher rule be referred back to the Academic Programs Committee for further study.

9. Brief presentation from the Multi-Faith Chaplaincy on the Student Emergency and Food Fund (Document US-2011-9-D20)

Ms. Laura Gallo, Interfaith Facilitator, thanked Senators for the opportunity to speak about the Student Emergency and Food Fund. Contributions to the fund help many students in serious financial need whom she sees on a daily basis and which require financial assistance for a range of reasons. In 2011 the fund handed out almost \$33,000 to over 500 students. She conveyed the various ways that Senators can make donations.

10. Remarks from the President

Dr. Lowy provided the following information to Senate:

- Michael Noonan, who is completing a BSc in Honours Ecology and is a member of Concordia's varsity wrestling team, has been selected as one of two 2012 Rhodes Scholars from Quebec.
- The grand opening of the refurbished refectory, now called the Loyola Jesuit Hall and Conference Centre, was held on December 1.
- The appointment of Graham Carr as Interim Vice-President, Research and Graduate Studies to replace Louise Dandurand who is retiring; Justin Powlowski as Interim Associate Vice-President, Strategy and Operations, and Interim Director of the Office of Research to replace Carole Brabant who is leaving the University; and William Cheaib as Interim Vice-President International to replace Liselyn Adams whose second mandate ends at the end of December and who will be returning to a teaching position in the Department of Music.
- The appointment of Tony Meti as Interim President and CEO of eConcordia and KnowledgeOne to replace Andrew McAusland who has stepped down.
- The appointment of Joelle Berdugo Adler, Tim Brodhead and Jacques Lyrette as representatives of the external community to the Board of Governors.
- The meeting of Steering Committee and the Executive Committee, as recommended in the External Governance Review Committee report, is being planned and will be

held in the new year. The proposed topic of discussion will be the clarification of bicameralism in the Concordia context.

In response to comments and questions regarding the Board appointments, Dr. Lowy and Me Freedman noted that the process began with a university-wide call for nominations. All nominations were reviewed by the Governance and Ethics Committee, which made its recommendations to the Board taking into account the diversity of individuals based on the Board's needs as well as the skillsets required to serve on Board standing committees. The name of individuals who were nominated but not appointed will remain in a pool.

A concern was expressed regarding the consequences of the Board not considering the academic plan at its December meeting. The Provost explained that he had been scheduled to present the plan at the Executive Committee on November 28 but that the Committee had not been able to hear his presentation because the agenda was very heavy. The presentation has been deferred to the December 13 meeting in preparation for the January 12 Board meeting. However, this should not pose a problem since the Chief Financial Officer has built in the spending estimates in the budget assumptions and the Board Chair expressed his strong expectation that the Board would approve the plan.

11. Proposal regarding the establishment of an Academic Plan Coordinating Committee
(Document US-2011-9-D21)

Referring to article 5.6.1 of the Academic Plan which calls for the creation of Academic Plan Coordinating Committee, Dr. Chaikelson opined that it is incumbent upon Senate to keep a close watch on the implementation of the plan and that regular reporting should be provided on the development of the plan via a standing committee. While there was unanimity on the necessity of having a coordinating committee, there were diverging views of whether or not it should be a standing committee of Senate.

During the ensuing discussion, those in favor of the proposal noted that Senate had been disengaged in the past and thus it behooves it to be actively engaged in the implementation of the academic plan. It was also pointed out that there was too much distance between the Academic Plan Coordinating Committee and Senate in the structure as originally envisioned.

Those opposed to the motion felt that Senate as a whole should be engaged and not cordon off the responsibility to a standing committee. It was also argued that it was preferable to use existing committees and that in accordance with its mandate, the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee's role is to ensure that Senate is kept informed at each Senate meeting with respect to the academic plan.

R-2011-9-13 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Chaikelson, Douglas), it was resolved that the Academic Plan Coordinating Committee be established as a standing committee of Senate.*

12. Report to Senate of the Ad Hoc Committee (APPC/SJC) to consider the recommendations pertaining to Senate made by the External Governance Review Committee (Document US-2011-9-D22)

Senate was amenable to voting on the recommendations in groups according to the subject matters.

With respect to the APPC/SJC Recommendations 1, 2 and 3, some Senators preferred the current system and had some concerns of a potential conflict of interest and that a President could use his role as Chair of Senate to steer or stifle the discussion. Others noted that Senate had endorsed the report of the External Governance Review Committee, which included the President's chairing of Senate as a means to strengthen the President's role vis à vis the Board to carry the academic mission. Moreover, recommendation 3 provided for a mechanism to allow the President to speak on substance issues.

R-2011-9-14 Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Graham, Peluso), it was resolved that:

APPC/SJC Recommendation 1

That the position of elected Speaker be abolished effective May 31, 2012, and that the President and Vice-Chancellor henceforward serve as ex officio Speaker of Senate, voting only in the case of a tie.

APPC/SJC Recommendation 2

That the Provost and Vice-President, Academic Affairs act as Deputy Chair of Senate, and that in her or his absence, the Vice-President, Research and Graduate Studies serve in that capacity.

APPC/SJC Recommendation 3

That should the President wish or be required to speak to the substance of issues being debated on the floor of Senate, she or he will ask the Deputy Chair to assume the Chair pro tem, and will then resume it following the intervention.

R-2011-9-15 Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Graham, Douglas), it was unanimously resolved:

APPC/SJC Recommendation 4

That the Director of Board and Senate Administration produce an annual report of Senate's activities for submission to Steering Committee in time for consideration prior to the first Senate meeting of the academic year, following which the report will be posted on the Senate website, and Senators and the University community will be informed accordingly.

APPC/SJC Recommendation 5

That the annual report include the following material:

- *a brief overview of Senate's mandate and the role of its standing committees, an indication of the number of meetings held and of Senate's membership for the year;*

- *highlights of the main discussions having taken place during the year, together with a copy of the most important motions, with embedded links to documents when appropriate.*

R-2011-9-16 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Graham, Rail), it was unanimously resolved:*

APPC/SJC Recommendation 6

That Senate Steering Committee and the Executive Committee of the Board meet a minimum of two times per year as stated in the recommendation, with the object of facilitating effective communication on issues of mutual concern.

APPC/SJC Recommendation 7

That the Senate Steering Committee and the Executive Committee of the Board report jointly to Senate and Board regarding items discussed, and that they bring forward additional recommendations intended to promote effective and clear communication between the two bodies.

R-2011-9-17 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Graham, Peluso), it was unanimously resolved:*

APPC/SJC Recommendation 8

That two members of the Concordia University administrative staff be added to Senate as non-voting members, and that the process for choosing these members be consistent with that used to designate the staff member of the Board of Governors.

There was some discussion regarding APPC/SJC Recommendations 9 and 10, more specifically in relation to the proposed term limits, as follows:

- Previous service on Senate should not be counted and the term limits should only be effective as June 2012;
- Terms must be staggered to ensure renewal but also continuity;
- Terms are already staggered;
- Senate should replicate the Board terms (3 terms of three years);
- The idea of inequity between Senate and the Board misses the point since Senators have sabbatical leaves which create a natural break which allows them to come back to Senate;
- The Board had been ignoring its own guidelines, the proposal by the External Governance Review Committee regarding Senate was more of an afterthought;
- It takes a few years for Senators to become effective.

A motion to amend APPC/SJC Recommendation 9 to add “without retroactive effect”, moved by Prof. Rail and seconded by Prof. Peluso, was approved by the majority. However, the discussion continued, further to which a motion to table both recommendations was passed.

R-2011-9-18 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Burke, Magnan), it was resolved to table APPC/SJC Recommendations 9 and 10.*

R-2011-9-19 Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Graham, Sonin), it was unanimously resolved:

APPC/SJC Recommendation 11

That the first Senate meeting of each academic year include a minimum of business and that it consist primarily of an extended orientation session, with an agenda set by Senate Steering Committee and coordinated by the Director of Board and Senate Administration, to include the following components:

- *Provision of essential information, drawn from the Handbook, regarding the operating procedures of Senate, its rules of order, and its standing committees;*
- *Small group meetings, panel discussions, and presentations on “big picture issues” of importance to Senate, led by experienced Senators or former Senators, each having a cross-section of Senate membership, and kept short enough to allow Senators to attend two or three in the course of the orientation;*
- *An informal social gathering to encourage Senators to get to know one another.*

R-2011-9-20 Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Graham, Debbabi), it was unanimously resolved:

APPC/SJC Recommendation 12

That Senate strike an ad hoc committee to propose a Code of Ethics to Senate in time for consideration at the April 2012 meeting, with the intention of having the code in force for the 2012-2013 academic year and subsequent years.

APPC/SJC Recommendation 13

That the ad hoc Code of Ethics committee be composed of five Senators as follows: one full-time faculty member, one part-time faculty member, one undergraduate student, one graduate student and one academic administrator, each member to be appointed by her or his own constituency with the exception of the full-time faculty member, to be elected by the full-time faculty members of Senate, and that the Director of Board and Senate Administration be asked to support the committee as a resource person.

R-2011-9-21 Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Graham, Lewis), it was unanimously resolved:

APPC/SJC Recommendation 14

That following her or his appointment, Concordia’s next President should revisit this recommendation with the intention of creating a clear, forceful and succinct statement of our University’s academic mission that is in keeping with the Academic Plan.

In discussing APPC/SJC Recommendation 15, it was noted that APPC/SJC had not arrived at a consensus on this matter, some members feeling very strongly about the opening of the Charter as they wanted to see concrete action and ensure that this materialize. It was proposed that Steering Committee of Senate and Executive Committee of the Board should be asked to work together to achieve the bicameral structure. Other members were reluctant to name specific groups but agreed that an interim action could be included in the motion. Following further discussion, an amendment to the original motion was passed but withdrawn and subsequently moved and passed as a separate motion.

R-2011-9-22 Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Graham, McLoughlin), it was unanimously resolved:

APPC/SJC Recommendation 15

That Senate commit itself to support the reopening of the Charter as envisioned by EGRC recommendation 25;

That the timing of any such initiative be left to the discretion of the President, working with the Board and the Senate as envisioned by EGRC recommendation 1.

R-2011-9-23 Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Nazar, McLoughlin), it was unanimously resolved:

That in the interim, the By-Laws be revised to achieve bicameralism in practice.

13. Presentation on the results of the National Survey of Student Engagement by Mr. Bradley Tucker (based on the latest public report <http://ipo.concordia.ca/pdfcentre3/?folder=pdfs> which is accessible through the Québec data sharing site: <http://www.crepuq.qc.ca/educq/PCan.html>)

Given the late hour, this presentation was deferred to a future meeting.

14. Items for information

- 14.1 Update on timeline of review of the Academic Code of Conduct

Me Freedman reported that a committee had been established to conduct a complete review of the Academic Code of Conduct. A consultation will be held and it is envisaged that the proposed revisions which would result from this review will be presented to Senate in the Fall. He acknowledged the concerns raised by Mr. Filipowich about the delays of hearings and assured Senate that the Office of Student Tribunals is also very concerned with the delays and is doing everything in its powers to correct the situation. Mr. Filipowich reiterated his concern of the impact on some students of a six-month delay to obtain a hearing and urged Faculty Councils to replace the inactive members of the Faculty Tribunal Pool.

- 14.2 Update on ongoing senior administrative searches and evaluations (Document US-2011-9-D23)

This update was provided for information.

15. Question period (maximum – 15 minutes)

In response to a query from Prof. Chaikelson, Dr. Lowy confirmed his attendance at the meeting of the *Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada* during which university Presidents unanimously adopted a new statement on academic freedom.

When asked if the University had been approached by Google for an offer of service, Mr. Côté was unable to confirm if the University had been specifically approached by Google but will gladly follow up with IITS and provide clarification to Prof. Chaikelson later. However, he recognized that the IITS department does get approached regularly by service providers for a variety of IT-IS needs. The University has no plans and interest in migrating University e-mail to Google, and the short-term interests focus on consolidating a number of e-mail platforms within the University in order to improve efficiency and standardize the system environment. Several Senators expressed concerns that Google is based in the United States and therefore subject to the *Patriot Act*.

Mr. Gill noted that there is documentation in her security file at Concordia that she planned to attend the GSA's "Angry Week" demonstration, specifically including a screenshot of a Facebook page where she was listed as "attending" and requested a response to the following questions at the next Senate meeting:

- 1) Who, specifically, made the decision to seek out, monitor and document student participation in this specific event, and why?
- 2) In what circumstances does the University Security monitor the social media activity of students/staff/etc., and for what reasons? Are there policies applicable to this process?
- 3) How does the University justify this kind of online monitoring, and does it contravene Article 2 of Policy VPS-10? If not, why not?

15.1 Response to written question submitted by Prof. Nikolenyi (Document US-2011-9-D24)

There was no follow-up question to this written response.

16. Other business

On behalf of Senate, the Speaker expressed his appreciation to Dr. Dandurand, Ms. Stanbra and Ms. McCaughey who were attending their last Senate meeting.

17. Next meeting

The next meeting will be held on Friday, January 20, 2012, at 2 p.m.

18. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:37 p.m.



Danielle Tessier
Secretary of Senate