

UNIVERSITY SENATE

Minutes of the Meeting of March 23, 1979

PRESENT: Dr. J.W. O'Brien (Chairman) Prof. J. Bordan; Rev. A. Graham; Dr. M. Despland; Dr. R. Breen; Dean M. Cohen; Prof. J.H. Whitelaw; Dean J. Chaikelson; Dr. P.E. Fillion; Prof. D. O'Connor; Prof. J.D. McLaughlin; Prof. K. Waters; Prof. R. Tittler; Prof. M. Farrell; Mr. W. Kan; Mr. A. Fahim; Ms. L. MacDonald; Mr. L. A. McLaughlin; Ms. E.B. Welt; Mr. M. Maher; Mr. P. Saskin; Dean P. Simon; Dr. W. Akin; Mr. K.D. Adams; Prof. J. Tresierra; Dean M.N.S. Swamy; Prof. J.C. Giguere; Prof. G.D. Xistris; Prof. A. Jordan; Prof. J. Stewart; Dean A. Pinsky; Prof. A. Crossman; Mr. J. Parks; Prof. H. Proppe; Prof. S. Morris; Prof. A. Deland; Prof. C. Potter; Prof. H.B. Ripstein; Prof. J.R. Goodwin

ABSENT WITH REGRETS: Dean M. Flynn; Prof. J. Bhatnagar; Prof. J. Locke; Dean S. French; Prof. T. Nogrady; Mr. R. Cannon; Prof. M. Douglass

Call to order

79-2-1 The meeting was called to order at 2:10 p.m.

Dr. O'Brien advised that the first item on the Agenda would be dealt with in "Closed Session" and he asked those present who were not members of Senate to leave the meeting.

OPEN SESSION

Approval of Minutes

79-2-3 IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MAHER, SECONDED BY MR. MCLAUGHLIN, THAT THE MINUTES OF THE SENATE MEETING OF JANUARY 26, 1979, BE APPROVED.

- MOTION CARRIED -

Chairman's Remarks

75-2-4 With respect to the matter of conditions in the Vanier Library which had been raised at an earlier meeting of Senate, Dr. O'Brien advised that Mr. Graham Martin, Vice-Rector, Administration and Finance, has asked to be invited to report at the April Senate meeting, by which time he hopes to have more definite indications of the extent of the problem and possible solutions.

Dr. O'Brien also advised that the minor things which Mr. Martin had signified in his earlier report, such as fixing windows so that they could be opened, etc., were either being proceeded with or would be proceeded with

following the end-of-term examinations. However, the problem, in terms of basic solutions, would rest on the outcome of the engineering study currently underway, which Mr. Martin hoped to be in a position to explain to Senate at the next meeting.

#### Question Period

79-2-5

It was stated that a rather elaborate Library, borrowing policy had been approved last Spring by Senate, much of which had been predicated on the assumption that the movement of books from one campus to the other might be regularly accomplished within forty-eight hours. However, observations throughout the year have indicated that the shortest time which one might reasonably expect to borrow a book from the Norris Library through the Vanier Library was six working days and on some occasions, this would take as many as twelve working days. It was wondered whether one could anticipate a reduction in the amount of time required to move books from one campus to the other, or whether Senate would have to rethink the borrowing policy. Dr. Filion advised that he had not previously been aware that there was a problem and that he was hearing about it for the first time. However, he agreed to look into the matter and report to Senate at its next meeting.

79-2-6

Prof. O'Connor stated that last year's document concerning "Contract Renewals, Promotion and Merit Increments: Full-time Faculty" was approved by Senate and subsequently adopted by the Board of Governors. He pointed out that a number of things were called for in the document, one of which being that the Deans were to articulate the criteria which they intended to use in making contractual decisions. He also stated that a number of Deans have not done so or if they have, they have not informed either CUFA or Senate. Also, some of the Deans have articulated criteria which are so obscure as to tie the hands of the Appeals Board which must decide, among other things, whether or not the criteria were justly and equitably applied to members in a given Division or Faculty.

Prof. O'Connor explained that there was another difficulty which centered on something that was the most contentious item in the document, at least insofar as the Senate discussion was concerned, which had to do with some ensuring some student input. He stated that the Faculty of Engineering seemed to be having considerable difficulty with ensuring some form of formal student input. Also, there appears to have been some rather unfortunate suggestions to the effect that the mechanisms for ensuring formal student input shall be whatever the chairmen of the various departments in the Faculty of Engineering see as being necessary or appropriate. He hoped that that indeed was not the considered wisdom of the Faculty of Engineering insofar as ensuring formal student input was concerned.

Prof. O'Connor expressed the feeling that since the item came up in Senate and Senate was obviously very concerned about it, there should be some clarification on the matter for the members of Senate.

Dr. O'Brien advised that the matters which are dealt with in the document referred to above were not part of the responsibility of Senate. He pointed out that the ' document was debated last spring at Senate when not everyone present today was a member of Senate and it may therefore not be familiar to everybody at this meeting. He explained that the document had to do with personnel matters relating to promotion, etc., where it was provided that when a major new policy document was to be adopted by the University, the Board of Governors would seek the advice of Senate on the academic implications of the document. It was in that context that the Senate debate took place and Senate sent whatever message it sent to the Board of Governors at that time, which subsequently adopted the document. He emphasized that once adopted, it-was not a matter that comes back to Senate for review.

However, he explained that under the Question Period, Senate has adopted the practice that anyone could ask a question about anything and receive whatever answers may happen to be available at the moment.

Prof. Bordan explained that the matter of student input, and indeed some other elements of that policy document, were left to the Faculties to sort out and a good deal of sorting out did in fact take place. Departmental procedures were sorted out in accordance with the procedures laid out in the document, for all Faculties and Divisions. Insofar as additional criteria were concerned, i.e. in addition to those circulated by the Vice-Rectors, Academic, he advised that some of the Deans have issued statements.

In the case of Engineering, he explained that there was a paradox around the question of student evaluation, as observed by himself from the outside. Until this year there has in fact, by wish of the faculty members in Engineering, been a formal evaluation procedure in place. However, triggered by whatever set of events, whether it was the document itself or other things, the Faculty this year voted against the formal procedure, much to the surprise of the Faculty administrative officers. This was distinctly a faculty vote, as opposed to an administrative imposition.

Dean Swamy confirmed that the clarification of additional criteria to be applied in the Faculty of Engineering had not yet been circulated by the Dean's Office. However, he explained that he had requested all department chairmen to discuss the matter, in each of the departments, so that he could have input from the various departments before circulating his statement . He received the information about three weeks ago from the different departments, as to whether or not clarification really was needed and if so, where, and also whatever additional criteria that the Faculty of Engineering might have.

He also advised that a referendum was held within the Faculty in November, concerning the question of evaluation of faculty members by the students. At that time, the faculty voted to have compulsory evaluation. However, over two-thirds of the faculty requested that the question be re-asked because they were confused with the question even though it had been formulated by the faculty at an open meeting and not by the Dean's

Office. Because of the wording of the question, there was some degree of doubt or confusion in the minds of the faculty members and he therefore agreed to have it reworded in a more direct form, asking if the faculty wanted an evaluation that would be compulsory or not. This time the Faculty of Engineering voted against compulsory evaluations.

He further advised that he circulated a note last week, which had also been circulated along with the referendum ballot, to the effect that if course evaluations were not compulsory, professors were free to take any number of evaluations, using any evaluation form, for the benefit of improving their own teaching. It would not require them to go through a particular procedure which already exists within the departments, nor were they required to submit the evaluation to the Chairman, Dean, or anybody for that matter. However, if the faculty members wanted the evaluations to be used for the purpose of contract renewals, promotions, merit increments, etc., they should follow the set of procedures that exists within the departments for evaluations to be carried out, and in which case the evaluation would become part of the teaching dossier.

Dean Swamy stated that he has re-edited his document clearly indicating if there are any extra criteria or clarification of some of the criteria that already exist in the Vice-Rector's document, based on input from the department chairmen as a result of discussions with them which he had last week and that document is expected to be circulated next week and a copy would be sent to the President of CUFA for information.

Prof. O'Connor explained that it was not his intention to charge that the Deans were responsible for the lack of formal mechanisms for ensuring student input being established. Whether the Deans act promptly or not was another matter. However, he expressed the feeling that the Board of Governors seems to have acted in such a way as to mandate, not request, departments or faculties to ensure formal student input. What one has heard so far, from the Faculty of Engineering, was that it was their collective wisdom that the chairmen shall acting individually or collectively, do whatever they think is appropriate and one was not sure that that meets the mandate set by the Board of Governors. Also, it certainly did not address the kinds of questions that arose at Senate over the academic implications of the document.

Dean Swamy stated that he was not sure that this was the proper forum in which to debate the issue. He advised however, that he knew what the input was going to be in other Faculties and he did not see any difference in the Faculty of Engineering with regards to student input and how it was going to be taken in other Faculties.

Dr. O'Brien advised that this was not a question that was before Senate for debate. However, the question had been asked and responses have been given and for purposes of the meeting, the matter had been covered.

Reports from Councils, etc.

79-2-7 Prof. Whitelaw presented the report from U.C.C.C. concerning Guidelines for Multiple Listing of Courses in the Undergraduate Calendar (DOC-US-79-2-D1). He explained that the main purpose in bringing the document to Senate was simply to show that this particular item of business, which had been listed in the Addendum to the Senate Agenda for quite some time, had been disposed of.

79-2-8 Mr. Ken Adams presented a statistical breakdown of applications for re-evaluations for first-term examinations for the last two academic years (DOC-US-79-2-D2), as requested by Prof. Giguere at the last meeting of Senate. He stated that he could now understand Prof. Giguere's concern because the figures indicate that while there has been a slight decline in the number of requests in all other Faculties, there has been a substantial increase in the Faculty of Engineering. The only reasons that he could think of at the moment to explain what was happening in the Faculty of Engineering, were that either the Engineering students could not afford to pay the re-read fee which was previously required, or that the students were not following the first part of procedures and endeavoring to meet with the instructor before applying formally for re-evaluation.

Dean Swamy stated that he did not feel that the re-read fee was a factor, pointing out that the Engineering students had urged that the fee be retained. He advised also that the students were in fact following the first part of the procedures and were meeting with the professors, who were going through the examination papers with the students, showing why the grades could not be changed. He did not know why there was a decrease in the number of requests in the other Faculties, but he suggested that perhaps the grades were being changed, thereby removing the need for formal re-evaluation.

Prof. Giguere explained that he had asked the question originally in order to find out, as had been perceived, whether there was an increase in the number of requests for re-evaluation in the Faculty of Engineering. He simply wanted to know whether this was a University-wide phenomenon or whether it was limited to Engineering. Obviously, it was limited to the Faculty of Engineering and the situation would have to be looked into to see what could be done about it.

79-2-9 With respect to the date of implementation of the new Library Loans Policy, Dr. Fillion advised that it would begin with the 1979 Summer Session, which has been interpreted, for purposes of implementation, as beginning on March 30 and ending on August 31, 1979.

79-2-10 Reminding Senate of the B.Eng./M.Eng. programme in Building Engineering which was approved in October 1977 and which, at that time, represented a new departure in the Canadian scene, Prof. Bordan advised that it has been reported in the A.U.C.C. bulletin that Waterloo University would be offering combined B.Eng. and M.Eng. degrees, not just for a particular programme, but for all of their Engineering curricula. He noted that while the mechanisms were not exactly the same, they were remarkably

similar. This meant that there were now two Canadian Universities using that particular innovation.

- 79-2-11 Prof. Whitelaw reported that the proposal for a bachelor's programme in Industrial Engineering which had been approved last Spring by Senate for forwarding to the Conseil des Universités, had not been approved. He noted that a similar programme which was submitted by another university, had also not been approved. However, he advised that there was some indication that alternatives might be explored, in terms of possible options within existing programmes.

It was emphasized that the reasons for the programme having been turned down were not in any way related to the quality of the programme, but rather for reasons of "opportunité" in the Province of Quebec, there will be no additional Industrial Engineering degree programmes.

- 79-2-12 Dr. Breen advised that the 1979/80 NSERC awards have been announced and he informed Senate that the Arts and Science Faculty had received over four hundred thousand dollars in grants, which represented approximately a fifteen percent increase over last year. He singled out the Department of Biological Sciences, which has experienced a thirty-three percent increase over last year, and the Department of Mathematics which has received a thirty-four percent increase over last year.

Prof. Bordan advised that the NSERC grants to the University as a whole increased by a considerable percentage over last year. He noted also that the Faculty of Engineering had experienced an overall increase of between twenty-two and twenty-three percent, with some rather startling increases in individual departments, which, in some cases, was over thirty percent.

#### Appointments

- 79-2-13 IT WAS MOVED BY MR. SASKIN, SECONDED BY DEAN SWAMY, THAT THE APPOINTMENTS TO THE SENATE LIBRARY COMMITTEE (DOC-US-79-2-D3), BE APPROVED.

- MOTION CARRIED -

#### Supplemental Examinations - Regulations

- 79-2-14 With respect to the Supplemental Examination Regulations (DOC-US-79-2-D4), Dr. O'Brien explained that this was a revision of the document discussed at the last Senate meeting, incorporating the various revisions which were made at that time. He further explained that what was before Senate for debate was the first two pages of document US-79-2-D4. The third page of the document related to Faculty regulations which were being presented simply for information rather than approval. The Steering Committee has asked the Faculties to confirm that these were indeed the regulations which they wished to see in effect for the next round.

The feeling was expressed that the word "Additionally" in the second sentence in item 1 (DOC-US-79-2-D4) was unnecessary and in fact diverted from the meaning and it was agreed that the word be deleted. It was stated also that although the meaning of item 6, b), on page 2 of the document was clear, it was nonetheless expressed in an unnecessarily negative way. That was, the word "failed" did not really belong in the sentence and it was suggested that it should be replaced by a more positive set of words to the effect that the student is 'not considered to have "sat, tried, attempted, or registered for, etc.," the examination.

Mr. Adams, University Registrar, explained that part of the reason for using the word "failed" was that the present grading system requires an entry of "F" or "FF" in the grade column beside the designation "Abs", which is used to clarify the fact that the student has not failed even though the "F" grade appeared on the record. He advised that he has written to Fr. Graham, Vice-Rector and Principal of Loyola Campus, concerning corrections to this particular situation of the "F" appearing as a grade.

Mr. Adams advised that several students have asked that the "F", be removed from the record and he had indicated that if they wrote the supplemental examination and subsequently passed the course, the "F" would be replaced by the new grade which they would receive. However, the students have indicated that, for reasons of health, it was not their intention to write the supplemental. His recommendation was that in such cases another administrative notation could appear, allowing him to substitute the "F" on the record with the designation "Med".

Dr. O'Brien suggested that if Senate was favorably disposed towards that idea, item 6. b), page 2, document US-79-2-D4, could be redrafted accordingly, along with a draft of a change in the grading system, and bring them back to Senate for formal approval at the next meeting.

It was agreed that it would be appropriate to approve such a motion in principle, subject to ratification at the next meeting.

79-2-15

IT WAS MOVED BY PROF. GIGUERE, SECONDED BY PROF. O'CONNOR, THAT IT BE APPROVED IN PRINCIPLE THAT THE DESIGNATION "MED" WILL REPLACE THE "F" GRADE FOR THOSE STUDENTS WHO ARE ABSENT FROM EXAMINATIONS DUE TO MEDICAL REASONS.

Dr. O'Brien explained that the motion was to approve in principle and that the precise wording would be presented at the next meeting of Senate. Also, the motion was quite independent from the document now before Senate.

- THE MOTION WAS CARRIED -

79-2-16

The feeling was expressed that the position of the words "for that course" in the second sentence, item 2, page 1, document US-79-2-D4, was somewhat awkward and it was suggested that the words be placed at the end of the sentence. It was agreed that the sentence be changed to read "However, a

supplemental may be written for a course being repeated if the student has not written one previously for that course."

With respect to item 7, page 2, it was stated that there have been occasions when the Health Centre was closed during examination periods, particularly during the summer and it was wondered whether it could be assumed that the Health Centre would in fact be open when examinations were being written.

Mr. Adams conceded that that was a difficulty that did indeed exist. On occasions when the Health Centre happened to be closed, decisions have been taken by the Director or Assistant Director of Examinations, who have accepted the fact that a student was sick, if that student really looked sick.

Responding to a suggestion that perhaps the St. John's Ambulance Corps could be used, Mr. Adams advised that on various occasions he has written to them for assistance but they have not always come through. He reiterated that in practice such matters were handled by the Director or Assistant Director of Examinations in such a way as to ensure that the student would not have to suffer.

It was agreed that the document be tabled and that the various changes which have been proposed at today's meeting be incorporated into a final version, to be presented for approval at the next Senate meeting.

79-2-17

With respect to the date of implementation of the Supplemental Examinations Regulations (DOC-US-79-2-D4), Mr. K. Adams, University Registrar, explained that there was very little difference between the Regulations as written in document US-79-2-D4 and what appeared in the 1978/79 Calendar under Campus-Identified Regulations, except that in the case of the Loyola Campus, the Regulations were not spelled out, although in practice the procedures which were followed were the same on both campuses. He also advised that his assumption was that the Regulations which were approved last October by Senate, and which were published in the 1979/80 Calendar, would be in force for both campuses. There was no substantial difference, except for differences in wording, between what was printed in the 1979/80 Calendar and what was written in document US-79-2-D4.

He suggested that when the final version of the Supplemental Examinations Regulations (DOC-US-79-2-D4) was approved, they should officially become effective a year from now and that in the interim the procedures to be followed would be those which appeared in the 1979/80 Calendar.

It was agreed that when the final version of the Supplemental Examinations Regulations (DOC-US-79-2-D4) was formally approved, hopefully at the next meeting, Senate would also be asked to formally pass a motion that the effective date for implementation would be the 1980 Summer Session and that in the interim, the procedures to be followed would be those which appeared in the 1979/80 Calendar.

## Curriculum Changes - Courses for Special Summer Session

### Faculty of Fine Arts

79-2-18 In presenting the two three-credit courses in dance to be offered by the Faculty of Fine Arts during the Special Summer Session 1979, (DOC-US-79-2-D5), Dean Pinsky emphasized that they were in fact inseparable and were to be considered as being joined together for the purposes of marking. That was, it would be impossible to fail in one course and not in the other or to pass in one and not the other. This meant in effect that the final grade submitted for the second three-credit course would also apply to the first course. In fact, this would be a team-teaching situation in which the marking, etc., would be done jointly by the two teachers involved.

IT WAS MOVED BY DEAN PINSKY, SECONDED BY DR. BREEN, THAT THE COURSES DANCE C231 AND C232, TO BE OFFERED BY THE FACULTY OF FINE ARTS DURING THE 1979 SPECIAL SUMMER SESSION (DOC-US-79-2-D5), BE APPROVED. - MOTION CARRIED -

### Faculty of Arts and Science

79-2-19 IT WAS MOVED BY DEAN AKIN, SECONDED BY PROF. XISTRIS, THAT THE COURSES TO BE OFFERED BY THE FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCE DURING THE 1979 SPECIAL SUMMER SESSION (DOC-US-79-2-D6 AND ADDENDUM), BE APPROVED.

Concern was voiced over the credit loads-connected with the French Institute courses listed on pages 2 and 3 of document US-79-2-D6. Citing French C224 and 226 as examples, it was pointed out that these were two six-credit courses and the intent was that a student would register for both of them. That was, the student would be registering for a twelve-credit load over a six-week period. Considering that one credit was supposed to represent forty-five hours of work, it was argued that mathematically this would mean that a student taking French C224 and C226 would, theoretically, be working ninety hours per week. It was suggested that the number of credits attached to these courses was over-rated and that the French Department should look into the matter before next summer.

Concerning the U.C.C.C. Report (DOC-US-79-2-D7), Prof. Whitelaw explained that in the past, courses which were approved by Faculty Councils for offering on a "one-shot" basis during the Summer Session were presented to Senate simply for information. Now, because of the importance which the Ministry of Education attaches to the Regular Session Calendars as official publications of the University, such special summer offerings have to be listed in the subsequent year's Calendar, to ensure that teachers will have them recognized for scholarly purposes. It was therefore necessary to have formal Senate approval for such offerings. He stated also, that there were considerable concerns in U.C.C.C. about some aspects of summer offerings, concerns which he felt were shared by a lot of people

within Concordia and no doubt some recommendations would come forward in due course.

- THE MOTION WAS CARRIED -

Next meeting

79-2-20 Dr. O'Brien announced that the next Senate meeting would be held on April 27, 1979.

Adjournment

79-2-21 The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

John Noonan  
Secretary of Senate