

UNIVERSITY SENATEMinutes of the Meeting of March 11, 1977

PRESENT: Dr. J.W. O'Brien (Chairman) Mr. K.D. Adams; Dean I. Campbell; Dean R. Breen; Prof. J. Chaikelson; Dean R. Verschingel; Prof. G.D. Xistris; Prof. M. Osman; Prof. H. Encesco; Prof. G. Gross; Dean A. Pinsky; Dean A. Audet; Prof. L. Smith; Prof. J. Ornstein; Prof. C. Bertrand; Prof. S. McDonough; Prof. A. Jordan; Prof. D. Frost; Prof. M.N.S. Swamy; Prof. E.N. West; Prof. A. Deland; Prof. J.D. McLaughlin; Mr. M. Horgan; Prof. R. Smith; Prof. D. Sheps; Prof. J. Bordan; Rev. A. Graham; Prof. M. Hogben; Prof. S. McEvenue; Prof. L. Bessner; Dean J.C. Callaghan; Dr. M. Despland; Dean S. French; Prof. J.H. Whitelaw; Mr. J. Johnson; Mr. K. Quinn; Mr. J. Anderson; Ms. M. Sugden; Ms. R. Przestrzelski; Prof. J.D. Moore; Prof. K. Waters; Prof. G. Adams; Mr. J. Kubina; Prof. M. Cohen; Mr. G. Chryssomalis; Mr. G. Bushe; Prof. J. Locke; Mrs. F. Lowensteyn;

ABSENT WITH REGRETS: Ms. R. Parsons;

Call to order

77-4-1 The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m.

Graduate Fellowships

77-4-2 Dr. O'Brien explained that this item (DOC-US-77-4-D1) was being brought to Senate at this time because there was urgency about it. The University has received a gift which will permit the establishment of a sizeable number of Graduate Fellowships which can be established for next September provided we move quickly to advertise and properly implement such a scheme. The negotiations with the donor were recently concluded and the offer has gone to the Board of Governors which has tentatively accepted it, subject to examination and ruling on the acceptability of the gift by the Fellowships, Scholarships and Awards Committee and the Senate. The proposal went to the Fellowships, -Scholarships and Awards Committee on Monday, and the report of the Committee recommending that these scholarships be established is on the first page of document US-77-4-D1.

The conditions of the scholarships, which were agreed upon between the University and the donor, are on pages 2, 3, and 4 of the document. Dr. O'Brien suggested that what would be called for if we are to implement this is a motion from Senate approving the establishment of the programme for Fellowships described in document US-77-4-D1.

Responding to a question, Dr. O'Brien advised that ' this was something new. At present, we have a series of fellowships with a name that is essentially the same which is financed out of the Development Fund. That series will continue as at present. It is proposed to use the name Concordia

for the new series as well, because this will help to make the new name of the University better known across Canada.

Before accepting a motion to approve the proposal, Dr. O'Brien advised that a point of order has been raised as to whether or not Senate was still in "Committee of the Whole" as a result of the last meeting. He ruled that we were not in "Committee of the Whole"; the reason being that the normal procedure is that a body does not adjourn while in "Committee of the Whole," but rather goes back into session and then adjourns. Due to a certain tendency for these meetings to disintegrate at the last moment, Dr. O'Brien recognized that we did not go through that process, but since theoretically we could not have adjourned unless we did, he presumed that in spirit we did, since we obviously adjourned.

IT WAS MOVED BY PROF. XISTRIS, SECONDED BY DEAN FRENCH, THAT THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE PROGRAMME FOR FELLOWSHIPS AS DESCRIBED IN DOCUMENT US-77-4-D1 BE APPROVED.

- MOTION CARRIED -

At the suggestion of Prof. Bordan, Senate agreed that its pleasure and thanks to the donor, the Development Office, certain members of the University community and the Board of Governors who had a hand in this particular exercise, be recorded.

The Organization of Arts and Science

77-4-3

Dr. O'Brien explained that document US-77-4-D4 was a retyping of the resolution that was passed at the last meeting, with the amendment included; document US-77-4-D3 is a proposed revision of resolution 2 (DOC-US-77-3-D4) which we were debating last time and for the moment is being tabled for information since Senate had agreed that we would not have a discussion on "colleges" at this meeting; document US-77-4-D2 is a series of resolutions intended to bring the various issues surrounding implementation before Senate in a form which may aid in the debate. He emphasized that these sets of resolutions (DOC-US-77-4-D2) do not come as recommendations of the Steering Committee but rather as a formulation of the issues which Steering Committee believes may help to sort out the issues under debate. In the process of doing so, the Steering Committee has borrowed freely from various documents that are already before Senate.

Dr. O'Brien proposed to give a brief run through of document US-77-4-D2 following which Senators would be given five minutes to read the document which is rather complicated and interrelated. Unless Senators are aware of what is on the last page they may not fully appreciate what is on the first page. We should then resolve into "Committee of the Whole" and for the first period discuss the document as a whole before dealing with the resolutions in the order in which they appear.

Dr. O'Brien explained the resolutions in document US-77-4-D2. He suggested that if some variation of these resolutions is passed, Senate will have a viable system from the point of view of implementation, excluding the "colleges." That is, the document tends to tie together the various issues that must be decided one way or another to implement the reorganization of Arts and Science, apart from "colleges."

Dean Campbell felt that the approach proposed by the Steering Committee, segmenting the original recommendations as it does, ignores the fact that the original report had a unity. The various recommendations were there because other recommendations were there. For many, the merging of departments became a possibility because it was seen that the "colleges" would be enrolling all students and would carry all programme responsibility. He recognized that while there is a place for "colleges" in the motion that has already been adopted by Senate, it was an undefined place and he hoped that we would be able, before taking an absolutely definitive decision on the structures, to deal with the Deans' Report in its entirety and its interlocks.

Dean Callaghan stated that the approach we are taking at this point does not allow us to be able to distinguish whether we are in favour of combining the Arts and Science Faculty with or without a "college" system. He suggested that many Senators may feel that they would not support the joining of Arts and Science departments if the "college" system does not go into place.

Dr. O'Brien emphasized that Senate at its last meeting decided that it approved a system that involved the establishment of small units such as "colleges" and Senate will decide as its first decision today on the timing of the implementation of that.

Responding to a request for a progress report from the Deans on the cost implications of "colleges," Dean Breen advised that he had a report from Dean Berczi which was prepared, following a discussion with the Academic Deans, as a response to the report from the Vice-Rector, Administration and Finance, which was tabled at the last meeting. Dean Berczi will be arriving late for the Senate meeting today and has requested that if there is going to be any discussion on this, it be postponed until he arrives. Senate agreed to this.

IT WAS MOVED BY PROF. MCEVENUE, SECONDED BY PROF. BESSNER, THAT SENATE MOVE INTO "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE" TO DISCUSS DOCUMENT US-77-4-D2.

- MOTION CARRIED -

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

77-4-4

During the general discussion the feeling was expressed that the main issue for debate would be the roles and responsibilities of the Provost and Vice-Provosts as proposed by the Deans versus the proposals from the S.G.W. Arts Faculty, especially the responsibility of the Provost as

outlined in item 6, e') , in document US-77-4-D4. In addition to what was stated in 6, e') , the Provost should be responsible for chairing the Arts and Science Faculty Council in a continuous fashion. It was pointed out that Interdisciplinary Studies has been left out of the document and it was suggested that the Provost could be given immediate responsibility for the I.D.S. unit and possibly also for a "college" of Continuing Education.

It was suggested that the Deans and the Provost should share the responsibility for chairing the Arts and Science Faculty Council on a rotating basis.

Further discussion centered around the question of terminology other than "Vice-Provost /Dean"; the addition of Andragogy to the list of academic units; additional student representation on the Departmental Advisory Committees; the use of numbers rather than names for the Divisions; the separation of the Departments of Religion and Theological Studies; the participation of Academic Administrators in teaching; and three Divisions as opposed to four Divisions. Reservations were expressed about the alignment of departments, and in particular, the Department of Communication Studies. It was pointed out that the Task Force on Film has discovered that capital equipment, specialized space and library holdings are in many cases identical and also there are overlapping segments of the curriculum between the Communication Studies and the Cinema Section in the Faculty of Fine Arts. It was also felt that other reservations will surface when forthcoming Graduate proposals begin to emerge and it was argued that it might be better to think about aligning Communication Studies with the Faculty of Fine Arts so that those Graduate proposals can emerge in a unified way. Dean Breen advised that he and Dean Pinsky had recently discussed the issue of Communication Studies. He emphasized that this was not something that was going to be resolved at this particular session of Senate nor did he think that it should be resolved at this particular time.

The issue was too complicated to be resolved in a few weeks. There was much opposition among the members of the Communication Studies Department to the initial thought of placing the Department under the Social Sciences Division; they feel strongly that their home is in the Humanities Division. He did not rule out the possibility of some different type of structural arrangement for Communication Studies, but this was something that will necessitate much further discussion between the people in Fine Arts and the Department of Communication Studies.

During the discussion on resolution 4 a), (DOC-US-77-4-D2), the feeling was expressed that the implementation date should be changed from September 1, 1977 to July 1, 1977. It was suggested that rather than having the Interim Council of the Faculty of Arts and Science consider recommendations on "colleges" as proposed in resolution 4 b), Senate should strike its own committee to receive and consider such submissions. It was also suggested that the establishment of small units such as "colleges" should take place as soon as possible but no later than 1978/79.

Dean Campbell suggested that resolution 4 b) should be amended to include the statement that "these 'colleges' have the programme role as defined in the Deans' Report and responsibility for the registration of undergraduate students as set out in the Report (DOC-US-77-2-D1)."

However, it was argued that that issue was quite separate from what was being considered in resolution.4 b), and should be proposed as a separate motion.

Dr. O'Brien feared that Senate was about to resume the whole discussion of "colleges" because some members of Senate wish to know exactly what the "colleges" are before deciding on the question of implementation. It was clear to most Senators that many of the questions about "colleges" will take a good many hours of discussion to resolve. It will be an interesting and useful discussion and at the end of it we may have something which will be extremely valuable to Concordia. But it will take hours of discussion which means weeks of meetings. Also, we have the practical problems on the future of Science that were the initial cause of the reorganization. The hard decision that must be made by Senate is either to maintain the status quo in this-University for another year while "colleges" are clarified and take the disadvantages that will go with that form of immobilism, or to proceed with the merging of Science and Arts departments in order to get on with that aspect of matters, on the basis of a certain amount of faith that there is a commitment to "colleges" which will be followed through unless those hours of discussion to come convince everybody that the idea after all was not practical.

The question is, can we get ahead with the departmental and Divisional aspects and can we then proceed to try to work out the "college" matter. If the answer to that is yes we can basically proceed with other matters in these resolutions. If the answer is no, we might as well forget about these things and go back to debating the "colleges" for the next three months.

Dr. O'Brien suggested the following as a possible amendment to resolution 4 b), (DOC-US-77-4-D2):

"that paragraph C) of resolution 1 be implemented following consideration of recommendations by a committee of Senate, with the goal of establishing these small" units such as colleges by ..." and insert such date as may please Senate.

Senate agreed to the suggested amendment and a straw vote indicated that a majority of Senators were in favor of inserting "no later than 1978/79."

IT WAS MOVED BY PROF. BESSNER, SECONDED BY PROF. MCEVENUE, THAT SENATE MOVE OUT OF "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE."

- MOTION CARRIED -

REGULAR SESSION

77-4-5

IT WAS MOVED BY PROF. BESSNER, SECONDED BY MR. HORGAN, THAT RESOLUTION 4 b) (DOC-US-77-4-D2) BE APPROVED.

Dr. O'Brien pointed out that if the-motion is passed this does not commit the University to establishing "colleges" all across the board. What it actually means in detail will become a function of some resolutions that Senate may well pass a month or two from now when we get into discussion of "colleges".

AN AMENDMENT WAS MOVED BY MR. HORGAN, SECONDED BY PROF. COHEN, THAT RESOLUTION 4 b) (DOC-US-77-4-D2) BE CHANGED TO READ "PARAGRAPH c) OF RESOLUTION 1 BE IMPLEMENTED FOLLOWING CONSIDERATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS BY A COMMITTEE OF SENATE, WITH THE GOAL OF ESTABLISHING THESE SMALL UNITS SUCH AS 'COLLEGES' NO LATER THAN 1978/79." - THE AMENDMENT WAS CARRIED -

- THE MAIN MOTION, AS AMENDED, WAS VOTED ON AND WAS CARRIED -.

IT WAS MOVED BY PROF. MCEVENUE, SECONDED BY PROF. BESSNER, THAT RESOLUTION 4 a) (DOC-US-77-4-D2) BE APPROVED. AN AMENDMENT WAS MOVED BY MR. QUINN, SECONDED BY PROF. CHAIKELSON, THAT THE IMPLEMENTATION DATE BE CHANGED FROM SEPTEMBER 1, 1977 TO JULY 1, 1977.

- THE AMENDMENT WAS CARRIED -

- THE MAIN MOTION AS AMENDED WAS VOTED ON AND WAS CARRIED -

77-4-6 IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ANDERSON, SECONDED BY PROF. COHEN, THAT SENATE MOVE

INTO "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE" TO DISCUSS RESOLUTION 5 (DOC-US-77-4-D2).

- MOTION CARRIED -

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

77-4-7

During the discussion of resolution 5 (DOC-US-77-4-D2) it was pointed out that in line with the motion that was just passed the date in resolution 5 c) would have to be changed.

Suggested amendments included adding Andragogy to resolution 5 a), and that 5 e), iii), be changed to "two students from each of the founding departments elected by the students of the department concerned and that where possible one of those students be a graduate student." Responding to a question on resolution 5 b), concerning possible differences in responsibilities on the two campuses, Dr. O'Brien advised that in drafting this resolution something quite different was in mind. The fact is that the responsibilities of departments and other academic units are essentially set out by the University in official documents which simply won't change. Rather, the intention was to take note of the negative fact that in the light of resolution 4 having been passed it is not necessary to change the responsibilities of departments by taking away from them their responsibility for certain curricular matters and handing them over to the "colleges". He advised that frankly, he could not say whether there was a technical problem over different responsibilities on the two campuses but he was prepared to look into the issue and if there are difficulties, to present a proposal to Senate that would be a little more thought out than what we could do by way of amendments.

Senate was advised that on the S.G.W. campus there is a clause in the job description for departmental chairmen which says that the chairman is a member of the appropriate Faculty Council. This was being mentioned so that Senate, in voting on resolution 5 b), did not bind itself on the composition of the Arts and Science Faculty Council. Dr. O'Brien advised that the issue of Arts and Science involves rather far reaching structural changes, parts of which cannot be implemented without an amendment to the By-laws of Concordia University. There are a number of technical documents, terms of reference, etc., which will have to be inspected and which may indeed have to be amended.

What is being set out in document US-77-4-D2 is the general principle and we will undoubtedly find some problems which we will simply have to cope with at the detailed level. Even at the level of generalization of the resolutions presently before Senate, precise as they appear in comparison to resolution 1 (DOC-US-77-3-D3) there is a range of detail and if one accepts that basically the departmental structures, duties of departmental chairmen, etc., will stay as they are, then there will have to follow another stage in which that may not literally be true in every case because we will have discovered certain problems and conflicts.

It was agreed that resolution 5 b), (DOC-US-77-4-D2) be deleted.

IT WAS MOVED BY DEAN FRENCH, SECONDED BY PROF. XISTRIS, THAT SENATE MOVE OUT OF "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE."

- MOTION CARRIED -

REGULAR SESSION

77-4-8 IT WAS MOVED BY DEAN FRENCH, SECONDED BY PROF. XISTRIS, THAT RESOLUTION 5, a), (DOC-US-77-4-D2) BE APPROVED. AN AMENDMENT WAS MOVED BY MR. BUSHE, SECONDED BY PROF. COHEN, MAT ANDRAGOGY BE ADDED TO THE LIST OF PROGRAMME UNITS.

- THE AMENDMENT WAS CARRIED -

- THE MAIN MOTION AS AMENDED WAS VOTED ON AND WAS CARRIED -

77-4-9 IT WAS MOVED BY DEAN FRENCH, SECONDED BY PROF. XISTRIS, THAT RESOLUTION 5, b) (DOC-US-77-4-D2) BE DELETED.

- MOTION CARRIED -

77-4-10 IT WAS MOVED BY DEAN CAMPBELL, SECONDED BY MR. HORGAN, THAT RESOLUTION 5, c), (DOC-US-77-4-D2) BE APPROVED. AN AMENDMENT WAS MOVED BY DE&N CALLAMLAN, SECONDED BY PROF. MCEVENUE, THAT THE DATE OF SEPTEMBER. 1, 1977, BE CHANGED TO JULY 1, 1977.

- THE AMENDMENT WAS CARRIED -

Concern was expressed over the use of the word "chairman", but it was agreed to allow the document to go forward with the existing term "chairman" on the understanding that when we get to the point of dealing with terminology we will decide on the terminology for all of the positions. The sense of the discussion was that in Arts and Science we would find a term other than "chairman" for this position. It was suggested also that "sister departments" be changed to "parallel departments."

AN AMENDMENT WAS MOVED BY PROF. CHAIKELSON, SECONDED BY DEAN FRENCH, THAT THE WORDS "NO LATER THAN MAY 31, 1978" BE DELETED AND THE WORDS "AT THE TIME THE APPOINTMENT OF ONE CHAIRMAN FOR THE UNIFIED DEPARTMENT COMES INTO EFFECT BUT NO LATER THAN MAY 31, 1978." BE ADDED.

-THE AMENDMENT WAS CARRIED -

- THE MAIN MOTION AS AMENDED WAS VOTED ON AND WAS CARRIED -

77-4-11 IT WAS MOVED BY DEAN CALLAGHAN, SECONDED BY PROF. MCEVENUE, THAT RESOLUTION 5, d), (DOC-US-77-4-D2) BE APPROVED.

- MOTION CARRIED -

77-4-12 IT WAS MOVED BY PROF. MCEVENUE, SECONDED BY PROF. COHEN, THAT RESOLUTION 5, e), (DOC-US-77-4-D2) BE APPROVED.

AN AMENDMENT WAS MOVED BY MR. BUSHE, SECONDED BY MR. QUINN, THAT RESOLUTION 5, e), iii), (DOC-US-77-4-D2) BE CHANGED TO READ "TWO STUDENTS FROM EACH OF THE FOUNDING DEPARTMENTS ELECTED BY THE STUDENTS OF THE DEPARTMENT CONCERNED, AND THAT WHERE POSSIBLE ONE OF THE STUDENTS BE A GRADUATE STUDENT."

- THE AMENDMENT WAS CARRIED -

AN AMENDMENT WAS MOVED BY DEAN BREEN, SECONDED BY DEAN CALLAGHAN, THAP "VICE-PROVOST/DEAN", IN RESOLUTION 5, e), iv), BE CHANGED TO "THE DIVISIONAL HEAD".

- THE AMENDMENT WAS CARRIED -

- THE MAIN MOTION AS AMENDED WAS VOTED ON AND WAS CARRIED -

77-4-13 IT WAS MOVED BY DEAN CAMPBELL, SECONDED BY PROF. MCEVENUE, THAT RESOLUTION 6, a), (DOC-US-77-4-D2) BE APPROVED.

- MOTION CARRIED -

77-4-14 IT WAS MOVED BY PROF. MCEVENUE, SECONDED BY DEAN VERSCHINGEL, THAT RESOLUTION 6, b', (DOC7US-77-4-D2) BE APPROVED. AN AMENDMENT WAS MOVED BY MR. BUSHE, SECONDED BY M HORGAN, THAT ANDRAGOGY BE ADDED TO THE SOCIAL SCIENCES DIVISIONS.

- THE AMENDMENT WAS CARRIED -

AN AMENDMENT WAS MOVED BY PROF. CHAIKELSON, SECONDED BY DEAN BREEN, THAT THE NAMES OF THE DIVISIONS BE DELETED AND REPLACED BY NUMBERS 1, 2, AND 3.

It was explained that there were too many departments that crossed Divisional boundaries and that the names of the Divisions were artificial and did not truly reflect what was going on in the departments.

It was argued that there would be difficulty in determining which Division becomes number 1 as opposed to number 3 and it was suggested that Senate come up with more appropriate names for the Divisions at a later date.

Dr. O'Brien suggested that if Senate is prepared to accept the principle of doing away with the existing Divisional names it might be just as well to pass the amendment to call them 1, 2, and 3. This will not exclude the possibility of renaming them in due course.

- THE AMENDMENT WAS VOTED ON AND WAS CARRIED - (18 in favour; 15 against).

Dr. O'Brien noted that this was obviously something that should be restudied by the interested parties, but at this stage no particularly lasting harm is done either way.

An amendment was proposed by Prof. Gross that a Division of Communication Studies be created within the Faculty of Fine Arts. He explained that the essential ground for his motion was that since we are asking Senate to rationalize the Science components of the University as our permanent goal, and there are serious budgetary considerations associated with programmes, especially in film and related electronic media studies, we ought also to look at a rationalization of other components of the University. We either ought not to accept this or if we cannot proceed, to this kind of rationalization today we should set in motion post haste a device or instrument for that rationalization. He pointed out that the Faculty of Fine Arts includes studies which are certainly those within the tradition of the humanities such as Art History and areas of study in Drama. It was his intention that the integrity of the Communication Studies unit be maintained by proposing the creation of a fourth Division of Communication Studies within the Faculty of Fine Arts.

It was argued that as there seemed to be some disagreement in the University as to where Communication Studies should be pigeon-holed and since we are at the moment considering the regrouping of Arts and Science and not the rest of the University, it would be out of order to debate the above motion at this time without the members of the Communication Studies department having been notified of the impending change in their status, much less having a say in it.

Dr. O'Brien pointed out that on the one hand the proposed motion points to a real question of significance to the University that should be dealt with but he would be inclined to rule the motion out of order in the context of this particular debate. It would be well to note that the new Faculty of Arts and Science should be aware that the question, although in suspense at the moment, has been raised and should be dealt with.

AN AMENDMENT WAS MOVED BY PROF. McDonough, SECONDED BY DEAN CAMPBELL, THAT RELIGION BE CHANGED FROM DIVISION 1 TO DIVISION 2.

- THE AMENDMENT WAS CARRIED -

AN AMENDMENT WAS MOVED BY PROF. HOGBEN, SECONDED BY PROF. MCEVENUE, THAT AN APPROPRIATE PLACE FOR INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES BE FOUND WITHIN THE 5, b'), SECTION OF DOCUMENT US-77-4-D2, THE DETAILS TO BE DECIDED LATER.

It was pointed out that the combined Centre for Interdisciplinary Studies presently contains many programmes and the issue is sufficiently complicated that people are still wondering whether I.D.S. should be given College, Divisional, Departmental, or Centre status. It was argued that it was imperative that Interdisciplinary Studies be included under 5, b'), and that it should be given Divisional status.

It was emphasized again that the problems of I.D.S. were complex in that cross appointments must be arranged within the different Divisions, as well as cross listed courses and programmes and it was argued that in order to be able to work out the very serious problem which the proposed structure will give rise to, I.D.S. should be given Divisional status.

- THE AMENDMENT WAS VOTED ON AND WAS CARRIED -

It was suggested that a fourth Division of Applied Disciplines as outlined in resolution 5, b), (DOC-US-77-4-D2) should be added to resolution 5, b'), it being argued that the applied areas will not be able to grow and develop in the way they should within the proposed three Divisions.

- THE MAIN MOTION AS AMENDED WAS VOTED ON AND WAS CARRIED -

77-4-15

IT WAS MOVED BY PROF. MCEVENUE, SECONDED BY PROF. COHEN, THAT THE SENIOR ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATOR OF EACH DIVISION BE THE DEAN; THE DEANS REPORT TO A VICE-RECTOR ACADEMIC FOR ARTS AND SCIENCE; THE PROVOST, WHO SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR COORDINATING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF SMALL UNITS SUCH AS "COLLEGES". AND TO WHOM THE PRINCIPALS SHALL IN DUE COURSE REPORT, REPORTS TO THE VICE-RECTOR ACADEMIC FOR ARTS AND SCIENCE, (RESOLUTION 6, c'), d'), and e'), DOCUMENT US-77-4-D2). AN AMENDMENT WAS MOVED BY PROF. MCEVENUE, SECONDED BY PROF. COHEN, THAT THE PROVOST SHALL CHAIR THE ARTS AND SCIENCE FACULTY COUNCIL.

Prof. McEvenue emphasized that he was not prepared to support his own motion without the amendment.

Dr. O'Brien pointed out that technically Prof. McEvenue could vote against his own motion if the amendment fails. A further amendment was suggested that resolution 6, c') and d') be considered together without e') and worded that "each Division shall be headed by a senior academic administrative officer who shall report to a Vice-Rector for Arts and Science".

IT WAS MOVED BY DEAN BREEN, SECONDED BY PROF. BESSNER, THAT SENATE MOVE INTO "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE."

- MOTION CARRIED -

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

77-4-16

Prof. McEvenue understood that there was considerable concern on both campuses about having two levels of authority about departmental chairmen. The motion as he proposed it, with c'), d') and e) together, on the one hand gets rid of the two levels of authority above a chairperson and at the same time creates an office for someone who is responsible for the "colleges". Also, -the Provost, if he chairs the Arts and Science Faculty Council, gets rid of his objection to the proposal of having the three Deans rotate as Chairmen of the Council. If the three Deans did not get along with each other, had quite opposed philosophies of education, or quite opposed concepts of administration, they could very easily agree among themselves not to deal with each other and to have the Faculty Council discuss only very broad issues. The pressure of the Provost, as Chairman of the Council, on the three Deans would make that impossible.

It was argued that to ensure input from the three Divisions the chair-manship of the Arts and Science Faculty Council should be shared between the Provost And the three Divisional heads on a rotating basis.

It was suggested that the amendment should come up under r resolution 7, d), which deals with the chairmanship of the Council. This would provide yet another alternative where there is the possibility of having the Vice-Rector Academic for Arts and Science chair the Council. With respect to resolution 6, e'), (DOC-US-77-4-D2), it was argued that we should make sure that the Provost, apart from the responsibility for the animation of the "colleges", should have an immediate responsibility for I.D.S. and Continuing Education.

It was suggested that as an alternative to rotating the chairmanship of the Faculty Council, the Council could elect its own chairman. It was felt that the key element in the debate was whether we were going to have three levels of authority as opposed to two levels. The Deans' document clearly sets out the roles for the three levels. However, if Senate moves towards a two-level structure we would need a document which spells out the relationship, authority and responsibility, of the senior academic administrators.

It was stated that at this point Senate should not get hung up on titles and it was felt that everyone could agree with resolution 6, c') if it were changed to "that there be a senior academic administrative officer of each Division". The question that then arises under resolution 6, d') is whether that senior academic administrative officer reports directly to the Vice-Rector Academic for Arts and Science or, as spelled out in the Deans' document, he answers to a Provost.

Concerning the academic administrative structure, support was voiced for the proposal to have three Divisional heads or Deans and a Provost which would lead to a very different form of coordination in Arts and Science and is consistent with the spirit that currently exists, i.e. each Faculty now is in charge of its own business and its Dean reports to the Vice-Rector Academic, the-Faculty Council, and the Senate. In place of a single Dean or Provost for Arts and Science, the-new Faculty would be run by an Executive Committee consisting of the three Deans or Divisional heads and the Provost. In fact, this Executive Committee would be essential in such a new and large Faculty, which meeting frequently would augment the spirit of cooperation which this new Faculty is going to need desperately. Rather than having decisions being made by one Provost or one Vice-Rector Academic, the executive business of the Faculty would be carried out only after discussion and agreement among the four individuals. In this matter it can be guaranteed that the individual Deans or Divisional heads do not go off on their own and play the role of empire builders at the expense of others and the individual Divisions. The decision making would require each Dean and the Provost to consider the needs of the entire Faculty; the Departments, the ."colleges" and the undergraduate and graduate students.

With respect to the responsibilities of the various academic administrative officer, Dr. O'Brien presumed that the Steering Committee will attempt to obtain something by way of documentation that will help to pick up the discussion at the next Senate meeting.

He suggested that at the next meeting Senate attempt to finish-this document (US-77-4-D2) in whatever the amended form turns out to be, and it would then form the basis of an interim report to the Board of Governors. The Board could begin its consideration of this question and if it is favorably disposed could start in motion the processes which will be necessary in order that the deadlines that have already been adopted can be respected.

Concerning job descriptions, Dr. O'Brien suggested to Senate that what was important was not so much to try to concentrate on the descriptions with the item of responsibility neatly laid out, but rather, for Senate to come to some kind of consensus about how it is that the Faculty of Arts and Science is supposed to operate at these levels.

IT WAS MVED BY PROF. BORDAN, SECONDED BY DEAN FRENCH, THAT SENATE MOVE OUT OF "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE."

- MOTION CARRIED -

REGULAR SESSION

Adjournment

77-4-17

IT WAS MOVED BY PROF. BORDAN, SECONDED BY DEAN FRENCH, THAT THE MEETING BE ADJOURNED.

- MOTION CARRIED -

John Noonan
Secretary of Senate

JN/LB