

MINUTES OF THE OPEN SESSION
OF THE MEETING OF SENATE

Held on Friday, September 12, 2014,
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: Dr. A. Shepard (*Chair*); Prof. A. Agarwal; Prof. M. O. Ahmad; Prof. A. Akgunduz; Dean A. Asif; Dr. B.-A. Bacon; Dr. G. Beaudry; Me P. Blais; Prof. P. Caignon; Prof. J. Capobianco; Prof. S. Carliner; Dr. G. Carr; Prof. S. Chlopan; Prof. J. Didur; Prof. I. Dostaler; Prof. D. Douglas; Prof. Marcie Frank; Prof. Mariana Frank; Prof. B. Gabrial; Prof. J. Grant; Prof. E. Griffiths; Dean S. Harvey; Prof. N. Ingram; Prof. L. Katsanis; Ms. H. Lee; Prof. G. Leonard; Dean B. Lewis; Ms. L. Marshall-Kiparissis; Prof. M. Mulrennan; Mr. M. Palynchuk; Mr. B. Prunty; Prof. R. Reilly; Dean A. Roy; Prof. J. Segovia; Prof. Y. Shayan; Prof. J. Sloan; Mr. T. Smith; Prof. M.-L. Wholey; Dean C. Wild; Mr. T. Wilkings; Dean P. Wood-Adams

Non-voting members: Ms. J. Beaudoin; Mr. P. Beauregard; Mr. R. Côté; Me B. Freedman; Ms. L. Ostiguy; Mr. B. Tucker

ABSENT

Voting members: Ms. A. Chevalier; Prof. R. Courtemanche; Prof. C. Jackson; Prof. C. Nikolenyi; Prof. T. Stathopoulos

Non-voting members: Mr. P. Kelley; Ms. R. Marion

1. Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 2:14 p.m.

1.1 Approval of Agenda

R-2014-6-5 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded, it was unanimously resolved that the Agenda of the Open Session be approved.*

1.2 Approval of the Minutes of the Open Session meeting of May 16, 2014

R-2014-6-6 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded, it was unanimously resolved that the Minutes of the Open Session meeting of May 16, 2014 be approved.*

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

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

3. President's remarks

Dr. Shepard welcomed new and returning Senate members.

He apprised Senators that during the summer the government announced budget compressions in the public sector across Quebec. For Concordia this represents a cut of approximately \$16 million for the 2014/2105 budget. A full update will be presented to the Board next week.

The President spoke of several prizes and events which have contributed to continue the enhancement of Concordia's reputation, one of his main focuses.

He also urged Senators to actively participate in next week's annual Shuffle, by either walking or sponsoring a shuffler, in order to raise money for student scholarships and bursaries.

4. Senate orientation (Document US-2014-6-D3)

Me Freedman presented the legal framework concerning the functioning of Senate, underlining the key duties, roles and responsibilities of Senators which are prescribed in the Code of Ethics. He provided an overview of the University's overall governance structure, the mandate of Senate and its standing committees and reviewed the meeting practices and procedures.

He urged Senators to read the [Senator's Handbook](#) which is posted on the Senate website and to contact the Secretary of Senate for any questions in relating to the operations of Senate. The full details of Me Freedman's presentation are included in orientation document which was included in the Senate mailing.

5. Standing Committee reports

5.1 Academic Planning and Priorities Committee

5.2 Finance Committee

5.3 Library Committee

These committees have not met since the last Senate meeting.

5.4. Research Committee (Document US-2014-6-D4)

Dr. Carr summarized the content of the report, specifying that he will be presenting draft revisions to the IP policy for input to each Faculty Council, further to which the Research Committee will make a final recommendation to Senate in due course.

He also updated Senators on recent grant results which are above the national average and are higher than the amounts at the same time last year, including two recent partnership grants totalling \$5.5 million from SSHRC (Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council), namely \$2.99 million to Kim Sawchuk for her project, Ageing, Communication, Technologies (ACT): Experiencing a Digital World In Later Life, and \$2.5 million to William Reimer to lead the Rural Policy Learning Commons.

6. Update on Academic Plan (Document US-2014-6-D5)

Dr. Bacon commented on some elements in his written report.

Following the annual report provided at the May Senate meeting, his main goal is to ensure the sustainability of the programs launched under the plan. However, this might involve some difficult decisions since some of the funding envelopes provided by the government have been terminated.

He was pleased to report that the 234 new silent study seats in the Grey Nuns' chapel as well as the adjacent 14 group study rooms have received a lot of kudos. The Student Success Centre, a one-stop shop for several resources, has been launched virtually but is still under development.

He invited Senators to participate in the third e.Scape conference, which will be held on October 1 and 2.

With respect to student enrolment, the growing reputation of the University and a faster and more joyful admission process have contributed to an overall increase in acceptances, representing just over 500 undergraduate students and just fewer than 300 graduate students more than as of September 8 of last year.

CONSENT

7. Committee appointments (Document US-2014-6-D6)

R-2014-6-7 *The committee appointments outlined in Document US-2014-6-D6 were approved.*

8. Academic Programs Committee: Report and recommendations (Document US-2014-6-D7)

8.1 Major undergraduate curriculum changes - Faculty of Arts and Science

8.1.1 Equivalents Index (Document US-2014-6-D8)

8.1.2 Department of English (Document US-2014-6-D9)

8.1.3 School of Canadian Irish Studies (Document US-2014-6-D10)

R-2014-6-8 *The major undergraduate curriculum changes in the Faculty of Arts and Science, outlined in Documents US-2014-6-D8 to D10, were approved, as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2014-6-D7.*

8.2 Major undergraduate curriculum changes – Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science – Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering (Document US-2014-6-D11)

R-2014-6-9 *The major undergraduate curriculum changes in the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science, outlined in Document US-2014-6-D11, were approved, as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2014-6-D7.*

8.3 Major undergraduate curriculum changes – Office of the Provost and Vice-President, Academic Affairs – Section 16 – Academic Information: Definitions and Regulations (Document US-2014-6-D12)

R-2014-6-10 *The major undergraduate curriculum changes in Section 16 of the undergraduate calendar, outlined in Document US-2014-6-D12 were approved, as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2014-6-D7.*

8.4 Major graduate curriculum changes – Faculty of Arts and Science

8.4.1 Department of Economics (Document US-2014-6-D13)

8.4.2 Département d'études françaises (Document US-2014-6-D14)

R-2014-6-11 *The major graduate curriculum changes in the Faculty of Arts and Science, outlined in Documents US-2014-6-D13 and D14, were approved, as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2014-6-D7.*

9. Major undergraduate curriculum changes – Faculty of Arts and Science – Department of History (Document US-2014-6-D15)

R-2014-6-12 *The major undergraduate curriculum changes in the Faculty of Arts and Science, outlined in Document US-2014-6-D15, were approved, as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2014-6-D7.*

REGULAR

10. Research Committee: Recommendation for University recognition of research units (Document US-2014-6-D16)

10.1 Centre for Clinical Research Health (CCRH)

R-2014-6-13 *Upon motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously resolved that, on recommendation of the Research Committee, Senate grant the university-recognized status, in the category of established research centre, to the Centre for Clinical Research in Health (CCRH), in accordance with the Policy on Research Units (VPRGS-8), as outlined in Document US-2014-6-D16.*

10.2 Centre for Microscopy and Cellular Imaging (CMCI)

R-2014-6-14 *Upon motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously resolved that, on recommendation of the Research Committee, Senate grant the university-recognized status, in the category of emerging research infrastructure platform, to the Centre for Microscopy and Cellular Imaging (CMCI), in accordance with the Policy on Research Units (VPRGS-8), as outlined in Document US-2014-6-D16.*

11. Strategic planning process

Dr. Shepard sought Senate's input on the strategic planning process. He outlined the background of the two current plans which will be merged into one single document to govern the direction of the University and be an expression of its aspirations, intentions and ambitions.

He proposed that we arrive at this new plan by holding a series of speakers' series and conversations across the University, including input from the alumni, to arrive at a high-level but short document that would reflect the collective view.

The President mapped out a timeline, beginning now, including preliminary input on the process, followed by some speakers' series on the future of higher education, conversations with the community and consultations, presentation of draft strategic directions to Senate and the Board in early 2015, continued conversations and consultations on those draft directions with a final proposed draft to Senate and the Board at their last meeting before the summer break.

In September 2015, the academic units could come up with their responses to the strategic directions, leaving room for individual initiatives, projects and directions. Dr. Bacon concurred that defining general directions is the best approach, since very precise objectives could hinder creativity.

A discussion ensued, during which Senators expressed a consensus with the President's approach and provided some suggestions, summarized as follows:

- the challenge is to find a creative way to engage members of the community rather than holding large town hall meetings where people have no voice
- from a logistics perspective, the final plan should be presented to Senate in April to allow for feedback before its final adoption at the May Senate meeting
- since students are at the core of the plan, there should be a clear understanding of its impact on students
- students should be engaged at the beginning of the process to ensure that they have meaningful input in the creation of the plan
- review former plans to arrive at a list to understand what worked and what did not work
- department appraisal committees have valuable information which could serve as a strong descriptive basis

- the GSA will be starting its own academic caucus and this can be broached at its first meeting
- consultative process is an excellent ideal but there is a risk that this exercise becomes political, the final product should be a result of the University's competitiveness strengths and weaknesses
- a brief document could be prepared as a starting point to the conversation
- begin with a few general questions for context to structure the conversation
- keep conversation at a general level as opposed to specific
- consider the stake of the alumni

12. Items for information

12.1 Annual report of the Academic Hearing Panel (Document US-2014-6-D17)

This report is presented for information in accordance with article 80 of the Academic Code of Conduct.

Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning, Cathy Bolton, was asked to address questions pertaining to the number of incident reports and their disposition which seem to vary between the Faculties and Schools. She noted that on average from year to year the numbers are pretty stable. However, she could not provide any detail because the information on the types of offences and sanctions are not collected by the Office of Student Tribunal which prepares the report. She specified, however, that overall the charges and sanctions are reflective of the type of assignments, the nature of work and how they are presented.

Together with Mebs Kanji, she has been working on a multi-stage project over the last two years, which includes research into the charges and offences per Faculty to identify the underlying data. Dr. Bolton added that the current wording of article 80 needs to be reviewed since it does not call for a detailed breakdown or analysis of the charges and the sanctions presented in the annual report. She stated that a review committee has finished drafting revisions to the Academic Code of Conduct.

Once the project will have been completed, the conclusions of their project, including proposed revisions to the Code, will be presented to Faculty Councils for input and then Senate for approval.

13. Question period

No question was posed.

14. Other business

Dr. Shepard congratulated the CSU for holding a successful, fun and respectful orientation.

With respect to the budget compressions referred to earlier under his remarks, he added that during the summer his team worked on different scenarios while always keeping the focus on preserving the University's academic mission, which means that hiring of full-time and part-time faculty members will continue.

He welcomed to Concordia: André Roy (Dean of Arts and Science), Amir Asif (Dean of Engineering and Computer Science), Kathleen Lizé (Director, Internal Audit), and Marcel Dupuis (Associate Vice-President, Development, Advancement and Alumni Relations).

He was pleased to report some traction on the advancement and donation front, with a few big gifts expected to close soon.

15. Next meeting

The next meeting will be held on Friday, October 3, 2014, exceptionally at 9 a.m.

16. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:53 p.m.



Danielle Tessier
Secretary of Senate