

MINUTES OF THE OPEN SESSION
OF THE MEETING OF SENATE

Held on Friday, January 20, 2012, at 2 p.m.
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; Dr. G. Carr; Mr. H. Cheikhzen; Prof. M. Debbabi; Prof. D. Douglas; Dean R. Drew; Mr. A. Filipowich; Prof. J. Garrido; Dr. D. Graham; Mr. B. Hamideh; Ms. M. Hotchkiss; Dean A. Hochstein; Prof. N. Ingram; Mr. J. Kelly; Prof. F. Khendek; Prof. B. Layne; Prof. G. Leonard; Dean B. Lewis; Dr. F. Lowy; Ms. M. Manson; Mr. K. McLoughlin; Mr. G. Morrow; Prof. B. Nelson; Prof. C. Nikolenyi; Prof. M. Peluso; Prof. G. Rail; Prof. R. Reilly; Prof. F. Shaver; Prof. W. Sims; Prof. M. R. Soleymani; Mr. R. Sonin; Prof. R. Staseson; Prof. T. Stathopoulos; Dean C. Wild; Mr. C. Wilson; Associate Dean P. Wood-Adams

Non-voting members: Mr. P. Beauregard; Dr. D. Boisvert (*Speaker*); Mr. R. Côté; Me B. Freedman; Ms. M. C. Morin; Mr. P. Kelley; Mr. T. Too

ABSENT

Voting members: Prof. J. Chaikelson; Prof. A. Dutkewych; Ms. L. Gill; Mr. P. Gill; Prof. J. Grant; Prof. J. Lewis; Prof. M. Magnan; Ms. H. Nazar; Mr. M. Nurujjaman; Ms. T. Salameh; Mr. D. Shakibaian; Prof. J. Turnbull

1. **Call to order**

The Speaker called the meeting to order at 2:06 p.m. He asked Senators to rise to observe a moment of silence in memory of Dr. John O'Brien.

He welcomed Ms. Marie Claire Morin, Vice-President, Advancement and Alumni Relations, who is attending her first Senate meeting.

2. **Approval of Agenda**

R-2012-1-1 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Wild, Douglas), it was unanimously resolved that the Agenda of the Open Session be approved, with the removal of items 5.3 and 5.4*

from the Consent section to the Regular section, and that items 3 to 7 (not including items 5.3 and 5.4) be approved or received by consent.

CONSENT

3. Approval of the Minutes of the Open Session meeting of December 9, 2011

R-2012-1-2 *The Minutes of the Open Session meeting of December 9, 2011 were approved by consent.*

4. Committee appointments (Document US-2012-1-D1)

R-2012-1-3 *The committee appointments, set out in Document US-2012-1-D1, were approved by consent.*

5. Reports of Senate Standing Committees

5.1 Academic Planning and Priorities

The report of the January 19 meeting will be submitted at next meeting.

5.2 Finance

The report of the January 12 meeting will be submitted at next meeting.

6. Report and recommendations of the Academic Programs Committee (Document US-2012-1-D4)

6.1 Major undergraduate curriculum changes – Faculty of Arts and Science -Department of Applied Human Sciences (Document US-2012-1-D5)

R-2012-1-4 *The major undergraduate curriculum changes in the Faculty of Arts and Science, detailed in Document US-2012-1-D5, were approved by consent, as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2012-1-D4.*

6.2 Major graduate curriculum changes – Faculty of Arts and Science

6.2.1 Department of Mathematics and Statistics (Document US-2012-1-D6)

6.2.2 Department of Physics (Document US-2012-1-D7)

6.2.3 Department of Psychology (Document US-2012-1-D8)

R-2012-1-5 *The major graduate curriculum changes in the Faculty of Arts and Science, detailed in Documents US-2012-1-D6 to D8, were approved by consent, as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2012-1-D4.*

6.3 Major graduate curriculum changes – Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science - Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering (Documents US-2012-1-D9 and D10)

R-2012-1-6 *The major graduate curriculum changes in the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science, detailed in Documents US-2012-1-D9 and D10, were approved by consent, as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2012-1-D4.*

6.4 Major graduate curriculum changes – Faculty of Fine Arts - Department of Creative Arts Therapies (Documents US-2012-1-D11 to D14)

R-2012-1-7 *The major graduate curriculum changes in the Faculty of Fine Arts, detailed in Documents US-2012-1-D11 to D14, were approved by consent, as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2012-1-D4.*

6.5 Major graduate curriculum changes – John Molson School of Business – Master of/Magisteriate in Business Administration (Document US-2012-1-D15)

R-2012-1-8 *The major graduate curriculum changes in the John Molson School of Business, detailed in Document US-2012-1-D15, were approved by consent, as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2012-1-D4.*

7. Graduate Studies representation on Senate (Document US-2012-1-D16)

R-2012-1-9 *The appointment of Associate Dean Paula Wood-Adams as the representative of the Dean of School of Graduate Studies on Senate as long as Dr. Graham Carr serves on Senate in his capacity as Interim Vice-President, Research and Graduate Studies was approved by consent.*

REGULAR

5.3 Report of the Library Committee (Document US-2012-1-D2)

In response to a query from Mr. Wilson, Mr. Beasley noted that Bill C-11, the proposed copyright legislation, will affect the libraries in many respects. He noted that this is a complex issue and agreed to send Mr. Wilson the link to the [Canadian Library Association's response to Bill C-11](#), which includes a good description of the difficulties libraries will face.

5.4 Report of the Research Committee (Document US-2012-1-D3)

Prof. Ingram asked for an update on the status of the *Policy on Computer Provisioning* (VPS-32). Dr. Carr responded that the moratorium on the application of the Policy to research related purchases was still in effect. Following consultations with researchers, IITS had addressed concerns about administrative locks and the installation of security software and was in continuing negotiations with suppliers with respect to price. Dr. Carr has asked Mr. Denoncourt to extend the moratorium until the price issue is resolved and there is a further opportunity to consult with researchers regarding the modifications to the original policy.

8. Business arising from the Minutes

Mr. Too confirmed the Registrar Office's commitment to have the 300 pages of modifications to the 2012/2013 undergraduate calendar completed no later than April 15 instead of March 15.

8.1 Follow-up regarding establishment of the Academic Plan Coordinating Committee

Dr. Graham noted that some Senators had not realized that one of the implications of establishing a new standing committee of Senate entailed an amendment to the University By-Laws which requires approval of the Board. While APPC has discussed a proposed mandate and composition of the Academic Plan Coordinating Committee with a view of bringing a recommendation to the February 17 Senate meeting, the first regularly scheduled Board meeting following that meeting is scheduled for April 19.

At last week's Steering Committee meeting, some members were concerned by the length of the process and felt that Senate should perhaps reconsider whether or not the Academic Plan Coordinating Committee should remain as a standing committee.

A discussion ensued, during which it was explained that a standing committee has an indefinite lifespan which is enshrined into the By-Laws while an ad hoc committee is normally created to fulfill a specific mandate during a specific timeframe. Some members felt that it is important to enhance the academic plan and thus it is preferable to have a standing committee. Others failed to see the point of creating another standing committee if its membership mirrors that of APPC.

In order to allow the work of the Academic Plan Coordinating Committee to begin without undue delay, it was suggested that it initially meet as an ad hoc committee, with the proposed composition and mandate that APPC will be recommending, until such time that it is enshrined into the By-Laws as a standing committee.

In the end, the discussion did not result in a motion to change the Academic Plan Coordinating Committee from a standing committee to an ad hoc committee, and the Speaker concluded this item by noting that APPC will be bringing a recommendation to Senate at an upcoming meeting with respect to the composition and mandate of the Academic Plan Coordinating Committee.

9. Remarks from the President

Specifying that in two weeks it will have been one year since his return to Concordia, Dr. Lowy shared some of his reflections with Senate about the state of the University. He noted that, despite the governance challenges of last year, teaching, learning and research continued to thrive at Concordia, referring namely to the recent passage of the Academic Plan and the inauguration of four projects funded under the Knowledge Infrastructure Program.

Last June, the External Governance Review Committee submitted a report which was endorsed in its entirety by both Senate and the Board of Governors. The majority of the changes to the By-Laws recommended in the report have been adopted. Dr. Lowy said that changes have been positive. Improved communication between the Senate and the Board has become a priority, including holding at least two annual meetings between the Senate Steering Committee and the Board of Governor's Executive Committee.

10. 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>)

Mr. Bradley Tucker, Director, Institutional Planning and Analysis, presented an overview of the 2011 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), its goals and results. The results are mixed but show a general increase in how undergraduate students describe their experience at Concordia in the benchmark categories of academic challenge and supportive campus environment over the 2006, 2008 and 2011 administrations. Concordia students reported experiences similar to respondents at other comprehensive Canadian universities and, in many cases, the results were on par with comparable institutions in the United States

In 2011, NESSE received responses from 537, 605 undergraduate students across North America, of which 109,532 were Canadian. Of the 751 institutions which participated, 68 were Canadian. The survey collects information from first and final year students via 71 questions which are tested and reviewed carefully and are designed to link effective educational practices with learning, personal development and other desired outcomes.

Mr. Tucker noted that the survey addresses both academic and extra-curricular opportunities. He presented the results under the survey's five benchmark categories, which include academic challenge, active and collaborative learning, student/faculty interaction, enriching student experience and supportive campus environment.

Following his presentation, Mr. Tucker responded to questions of clarification and indicated that a copy of his presentation would be sent to Senators by Ms. Tessier.

11. Election of the full-time faculty member representative on the Ad Hoc Committee to Propose a Code of Ethics to Senate (Document US-2012-1-D17)

Dr. Boisvert apprised Senate that Ms. Tessier had forwarded an email to all the full-time faculty Senators on January 10, with a reminder on January 16, asking them to express interest or nominate someone to sit as their representative on the Ad Hoc Committee to Propose a Code of Ethics to Senate.

As of the deadline of January 18, the sole nomination received by Ms. Tessier was that of Prof. Csaba Nikolenyi, nominated by Prof. Jason Camlot. As a result, Prof. Nikolenyi is acclaimed as the representative of the full-time faculty Senators on this committee. The names of the other members are included in Document US-2012-1-D17, to which can be

added the name of the undergraduate student representative, Mr. Gene Morrow. Therefore, the committee membership is now complete.

12. Major undergraduate curriculum changes – Program regulation changes in the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science (Documents US-2012-1-D18 and D19)

Dean Drew noted that the questions and concerns raised at the last Senate meeting with respect to the introduction of the C- rule for all 200-level courses within the program which are prerequisites for other courses had been addressed by Associate Dean Lata Narayanan. He reiterated that this rule benefits first year students since it prevents them from going into failed or conditional standing and improves their GPA as well as their overall academic experience.

Some Senators expressed their appreciation for the feedback and the additional work that was done to provide and explain the data. Speaking privileges were granted to Dr. Narayanan who confirmed that the rule will apply to all current and incoming students who are taking courses.

A motion was moved by Mr. Wilson and seconded by Mr. McLoughlin that measures be taken to ensure that potential students be informed of the C- rule and that the Faculty be compelled to offer 300-level courses which have the 200-level courses as prerequisites as often as possible. Dr. Narayanan said that an information blitz will be done to ensure that all current and potential students are aware of the rule, and Mr. Too confirmed that any curriculum item approved today will be included in the 2012/2013 calendar. Dr. Narayanan added that the Faculty will make every effort to offer those 300-level courses as often as possible. Further to the foregoing, the mover and the seconder agreed to withdraw the motion.

R-2012-1-10 Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Drew, Stathopoulos), it was resolved that the major undergraduate curriculum changes in the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science regarding to program regulation changes, detailed in Documents US-2012-1-D18 and D19, be approved as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee.

13. Recommendation regarding University recognition of research units (Document US-2012-1-D20)

R-2012-1-11 Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Carr, Stathopoulos), it was unanimously resolved that, on recommendation of the Research Committee, Senate grant the university-recognized status to the research units outlined in Document US-2012-1-D20, in accordance with the Policy on Research Units (VPRGS-8).

14. Responses to questions raised at the last Senate meeting under the Report of the Finance Committee

As a follow-up from the last Senate meeting, Mr. Kelley provided the following information in response and responded to questions of clarification.

1) Identification of where the money comes from to pay the amounts shown in the “autres éléments” column of the *État de traitement*

The monies come from the operating budget of the University and are budgeted for each year.

2) Details of what is included under “autres éléments” totalling \$1.8 M

The elements comprised in this column include items such as teaching contracts, stipends, taxable benefits such as car allowances and parking spaces, bonuses, vacation payout and severance payments.

3) Accounting of the expenditures for each Vice-President and Dean’s office, including the amount of money spent on litigation

Mr. Kelley showed a chart listing the amounts which attempt to capture this information, emphasizing that this is not an “apples to apples” comparison for the following reasons.

- In some cases, there is no separate line item for the Vice-President’s office. In the case of the Chief Financial Officer, the Chief Communications Officer and the Vice-President, Advancement and Alumni Relations, the number on the screen reflects the budget of the entire sector and not just for the Vice-President’s office, since these Vice-Presidents do have separate departments that report to them other than their own and therefore there is no purpose to separate the Vice-President’s office.
- Moreover, different Vice-Presidents and Deans have different units or functions that are rolled into their office budgets. For example, the Board and Senate unit and the External Relations unit are rolled into the Vice-President, Institutional Relations and Secretary-General’s office budget since both units are small and it does not make sense for them to have separate budgets.
- As well, different offices assume various institutional level expenses within their budgets, such as the Advancement Office which covers a number of institutional events and the President’s Office which includes the University’s membership in CREPUQ and other organizations.

With respect to money spent on litigation, a review was not done on each individual legal invoice to determine its nature. The total amount paid on external legal fees during 2010/2011 was just over \$500,000, which was an exceptional year and almost double the normal amount spent annually. The Vice-President, Institutional Relations and Secretary-General has confirmed that close to \$250,000 was spent on one single longstanding non labour-related civil case which went to trial and was won by the University. Of the remaining \$250,000, it is estimated that \$100,000 to \$150,000 was spent on labour-related litigation.

4) Presentation by the Chief Financial Officer on the historical trend of the administrative spending over academic spending for the last 10 years

Mr. Kelley presented a graph showing that from 2003 to 2011, the administrative spending varied between 13.1% and 13.8% of the total University expenses while that of the academic spending varied between 53.3% and 53.7% as well as a graph showing that the historical trend of administrative spending over academic spending varied between 24.5% and 25.7% for that same period. It was agreed that copies of those graphs be sent to Senators.

5) Confirmation of the percentage of cost of living adjustment paid to senior administrators this year for 2010/2011; was it 2.75%?

The cost of living adjustment paid to senior administrators for 2010/2011 was 2.5%. In accordance with Bill 100, the salary scale was increased by the level defined in the law, and any variances were assessed within that scale, similar to progression through the ranks and step increases under collective agreements.

15. Taping and filming Senate meetings (Document US-2012-1-D21)

At the suggestion of Steering Committee, the Speaker indicated that a 30-minute committee of the whole discussion would be held to gauge Senators' feelings about taping and filming Senate meetings and whether or not a policy should be adopted on this matter. Me Freedman outlined the context which led this matter to be brought before Senate.

The pros and cons are summarized as follows:

- Should the policy not be the same as that used for lectures and classrooms?
- The presence of a roving camera is distracting and inhibits frank discussion and debate by less extroverted individuals. It is intrusive and could enhance an overly exuberant Senatorial performance or encourage grandstanding.
- Comments can be taken out of context. The meetings are open to the public and the Minutes are also public so this is sufficient.
- This would be another way to engage and promote an ability to understand. Senate discussions are in the public interest. The report of the External Governance Review Committee calls for transparency, and giving access to meetings is a better way to build bridges with the community. With archived footage, the context could be clarified if taken out of context.
- The written media currently attend meetings, and there is also a danger that they take things out of context.
- The CSU Council currently does live broadcasts which are archived. This is considered a best practice.
- Guidelines could be established to minimize the distraction.
- Minutes document what we do, not what we say, so why not broadcast the meeting, especially since we allow for attendees in the room, several of whom could already be surreptitiously recording the meeting.
- Broadcasting is not sinister. Many deliberative bodies, such as the House of Commons, broadcast their sessions.

- This is a complex issue, perhaps Senators should be polled to determine the conditions under which they would feel comfortable being recorded.
- Perhaps a small committee should be established to discuss all the options.

It was agreed that the summary of the discussion would be referred to Steering Committee which will come back to Senate with a recommendation.

16. Items for information

16.1 Update on the upcoming changes to the official transcript (Document US-2012-1-D22)

Mr. Too invited Senators to familiarize themselves with the upcoming changes to the official transcript which will be implemented in February 2012 and which are more fully detailed on the [Office of Registrar's website](#).

17. Question period (maximum - 15 minutes)

Upon her return on campus in January, Ms. Manson noticed three advertisements for the School of Extended Learning, one of which stated "*Students not so really good in English wanted*". She said that this is demeaning, that the intended grammatical irony of the message might not be understood by the targeted audience and that it is insulting and alienating to all potential and current students. Emphasizing that her question was not meant to cast blame but to improve the student experience, she wondered who was responsible for the branding of the School.

Dean Burke shared Ms. Manson's concern and conveyed that this was part of a larger advertising campaign conducted by a marketing firm last summer whose objective was to create a young, edgy campaign. Its intention was to be tongue-in-cheek but turned out to be unsuccessful. The relationship with this firm has ended. In light of the lack of responsiveness to the campaign and concerns expressed similar to Ms. Manson's, Dean Burke assured Ms. Manson that the material has been removed also that the link to the domain "English not so good" will also be removed.

17.1 Response to written question submitted by Ms. Gill (Document US-2012-1-D23)

In the absence of Ms. Gill, the Speaker said that it would not be appropriate to comment on this response. However, further to Prof. Douglas' request that this be deferred to the next Senate meeting, Dr. Boisvert responded that this would be referred to Steering Committee.

18. Other business

There was no other business to bring before Senate.

19. Next meeting

The next meeting will be held on Friday, February 17, 2012, at 2 p.m.

20. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.



Danielle Tessier
Secretary of Senate