

**Minutes of a Meeting
of the
Carleton University Senate
Held on Friday, 4 December, 1998
at 2:00 p.m.
in the Senate Room, Robertson Hall**

R.J. Van Loon presiding

Attendance

F. Abele, G.S. Adam, K.S. Andonian, J.W. ApSimon, J.C. Armitage, P. Attallah, M. Bienefeld, C. Betts, R. Bird, R.C. Blockley, C.H. Chan (Clerk), J.W. Chinneck, J. Clarkson, I. Craig, J. DeBardleben, F. Dehne, M. de Leeuw, M. Foss, D. Foreman, L. Frankel, B. Gillingham, S. Godfrey, R.A. Goubran, G. Haider, A.S. Haydon, R. Jeffreys, W.D. Jones, E. Kranakis, V. Kumar, L. Librande, C. Lundy, M. Mac Neil, S.A. Mahmoud, R. Marlin, A.M. Maslove, L.T.R. McDonald, S.E. Mills, B.C. Mortimer, G. Mutton, I.W.V. Pringle, S. Robinson, M.W. Smith, T.M. Smy, C.L. Stanford, C.L. Tan, D.R. Thomas, D. Thomson, R.S. Ward, D.R. Watt.

Regrets

R. Benner, T.B. Dawson, B.S. Elliott, A. Kroeger, M. Langer, K. Matheson, M.J. McDill, R.J. Mesley, D. Rosse, P.N. Rowe, P.J.S. Watson.

Absent

J. Belfontaine, G.R. Carmody, S. Lipsett-Rivera, G. Park, T. Wilson.

For Action

1. Question Period

1.1 Budgetary Matters

The President reported that the Finance Committee of the Board of Governors, and subsequently the Board, had discussed the budget framework for the next year, and following years. We had been operating under the elimination of the accumulated deficit by 2007, with a required payback of \$4.5 M per year. The Board has now stated that, in 1999-2000, we are required to have an operating surplus of \$525,000. and then not less than \$1 M annually which will make it easier than it would have otherwise been.

1.2 Program Closures

Prof. R. Marlin questioned whether the procedures leading to the closing of the Ph.D. program in Comparative Literary Studies were appropriate, i.e., was the "bottom-up" process followed. The

President stated that Senate decided, last year, that the procedures were appropriate, and he, too, believes they were.

Prof. R. Jeffrey questioned why, when Senate approves the establishment of new programs, does it not have a similar role in the programs being closed. Dean W.D. Jones commented that the University Act allows Senate to open and create new programs, but not close. Prof. Marlin replied that the Carleton University Act stated, under section 22 (a), that unless determined by the Board, the Senate shall "consider and determine all courses of study, including requirements for admission," and wondered on what basis Dean Jones claimed Senate lacked the power to close programs. Dean Blockley stated that the closure of programs in the context of the appraisal process is not the same as it is a requirement to cease admitting students. Dr. Adam added that what has happened to the Ph.D. program in Comparative Literary Studies has been fully explained to the questioners. The current policy continues for the Ph.D. program in Comparative Literary Studies; the question is whether or not, when OCGS gives notice for review, a new proposal should be submitted or use the old one. We will submit a new proposal, and this is an administrative decision and it expresses what Senate was interested in in the first place.

Prof. Jeffrey continued to question why Senate is not consulted in the closure of programs, stating that just because it is not addressed in the Act is not a good enough reason. The President stated that you can freeze admission to a program for a period of time and this is different to closing a program. The Senate was asked to vote to close programs and it did. This matter was brought before Senate. The closure of admission to the program was a judgement made by the Administration, and this was done because the resources were not there.

Prof. Jeffrey then questioned if Senate should be consulted when admissions are stopped.

Mr. J. Clarkson then asked if OCGS was sending appraisers in to look at the M.A. and Ph.D. programs. Dean Blockley then outlined the OCGS appraisal process. In Ontario all graduate programs are subject to periodic appraisal every seven years. All new programs have to pass standard appraisal. If the appraisal committee has any concerns about the program at periodic appraisal it appoints expert consultants to give it advice; for new programs, consultants are appointed as a matter of course. If the appraisal is "unsatisfactory", the University cannot admit students. All Ontario universities are subject to these rules. The time for the periodic appraisal of the Comparative Literary Studies programs was the academic year 1997-98, with the brief due in the summer of 1997. It was clear that the doctoral program as it stood could not be defended at appraisal. Two committees were, therefore, established; one charged with developing the doctoral programs so that there would be broader participation, and the other charged with emending the brief. In order to give the committees time to work, a year's grace was sought and received from OCGS followed by another extension until mid-October 1998. Nevertheless, the Appraisal Committee was hostile to the emended brief when it was submitted, regarding the proposal as a new program. We asked that they permit us to withdraw the list of consultants and replace it with a list of new consultants for the new Ph.D.--their answer was "no"--hence, a new Ph.D. with consultants from the old list. As it was over 90% likely that we would get a "not approved" and therefore no new brief for two years, Dean Blockley and Dean Jones agreed to withdraw the doctoral brief, and continue the freeze on admissions. This permits us to submit a

standard appraisal brief immediately and we have a very good change of getting this approved. We did not withdraw the M.A. and therefore the consultants will be coming in.

The President stated that there are circumstances when the administration wants to talk to Senate about reducing or stopping admissions to programs and, last year, Senate was involved in the process. In December 1996, Senate set out criteria for program review. Some reports are still to come in. All programs were reviewed and many units were asked to report back to Senate in the Fall of 1997. The decision to halt admission was made by the Administration based on the observations of the Academic and Research Committee and the Senate Academic Planning Committee. Senate was then consulted and voted to close the program. He is not willing to say that there will be a circumstance where Senate would not be consulted but, last year, Senate was consulted.

1.3 "Confirmation of Registration" Form

Mr. R. Ward questioned the use of this above-noted form. Dean L. Librande commented that while this is a very old form, it is still used because it contains additional information to permit students the opportunity to validate the accuracy of data of a personal nature. He noted that this information is used in an aggregate form.

1.4 Year 2003 and Grade 12/OAC University Entrants

In connection with this matter, discussed at the last Senate meeting, Mr. Ward asked for an update on the meeting of the Ontario Academic Vice-Presidents (see Senate minutes 4388 #1.4).

Dr. Adam reported that there were developments made at that meeting; we have been part of the process of appointing a Secondary School Liaison Committee with Prof. B.C. Mortimer as our institutional co-ordinator. They have been charged with the process of looking at the curriculum committee of the Ministry of Education of Training's version of OAC substitutes. Universities have been invited to comment on these courses and also the double cohort.

Dr. ApSimon then reported on a subsequent meeting he attend in Dr. Adam's stead, stating that the sense of the members was "bafflement". He stated that there are a lot of procedures at the Ministry level; the Province would assign student numbers in the system, however, each university wants to do what it wants; there are political activities to get more money into the universities; developing relationships between colleges and universities; it is more strategic than academic as an issue; there is a COU task force looking into this; faculty renewal and infrastructure is needed.

2. Minutes

The following sets of minutes were approved, as circulated (Maslove, Chinneck):

Senate Minutes, 30 October 1998;

Executive Minutes, 26 November 1998.

3. Business Arising from the Minutes

There was none.

4. Committees

The Clerk reported on additional nominations made by the Executive for several Committee vacancies.

It was MOVED (Chan, Mortimer)

that Senate ratify the appointments of the following persons to Senate Committees: student representatives Thomas Robbins (PAM) and Peter Wright (Science/Computer Science) to the Integrative Review Committee; and Stephen Ferris on the Technology, Society, Environment Committee.

CARRIED.

5. Amendment to the FASS Constitution

Senate considered documentation on this matter (Appendix A).

It was MOVED (Jones, Stanford)

that Senate approve the Amendment to the FASS Constitution, Section I.1, to include the Centre for Initiatives in Education.

Dean Jones noted that FASS is the appropriate "home" for this Centre.

Prof. M.W. Smith questioned the absence of "Environmental Studies" in connection with the listing for "Geography". Senate AGREED to amend the Constitution to include "Geography and Environmental Studies".

THE MOTION, with the above-noted change, WAS CARRIED.

6. Reports of the Senate Academic Planning Committee

The President then took this opportunity to outline the division of labour between the Senate Academic Planning Committee (SAPC) and the Senate Curriculum Committee (program and curricular issues), and the Senate Committee on Admission and Studies Policy (regulation and policy issues). For the most part, the Executive approves minor changes and reports them to Senate for information and comment, and Senate considers and approves major changes. Additionally, the Integrative Review Committee, a sub-committee of the Senate Academic Planning Committee, reviews existing undergraduate programs and reports to Senate through SAPC.

6.1 Program Changes for 1999-2000, Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

Senate then considered this Report, dated 18 November 1998 (Appendix B).

6.1.1 School of Architecture

It was MOVED (Adam, Haider)

that Senate approve the program changes for the School of Architecture, as outlined in the Report (Appendix B).

Prof. G. Haider, Acting Director of the School of Architecture, noted that they currently have 27 students in two post-professional streams. When recruiting students into the proposed graduate program, they have to explain that it is a total of six years to completion and to qualify for professional registration (four at the undergraduate level, and two at the Master's). The President noted that this fulfils Senate's mandate of 25 March 1997.

Mr. C.L. Stanford, in commenting on an excellent proposal, felt somewhat confused by the nomenclature used, viz., "post-professional". Dean Blockley commented that OCGS might want to comment on the fact that we are using the degree title of "Master of Architecture" for both professional and post-professional degrees. We have permission to give the Master of Architecture, so they may want us to change it.

Prof. Haider noted that a lot of people are thinking of coming back to upgrade their skills, and we cannot get them back into the professional programs because they are already practising professional architects. He noted that both streams are very popular, adding that the Royal Architectural Institute of Canada is requiring professionals to carry on continuing their education. He noted that the Bachelor of Architectural Studies is a pre-professional degree followed by the Master of Architecture program.

THE MOTION WAS CARRIED.

6.1.2 School of Public Administration

It was MOVED (Adam, Abele)

that Senate approve the program changes to the Ph.D. in Public Policy from the School of Public Administration, as outlined in the Report (Appendix B).

Prof. F. Abele, Director of the School of Public Administration, commented that their Ph.D. program has been in operation for five years, and was therefore due for review. They are reducing the number of courses outside of the core by one-half credit and eliminating the second comprehensive examination and prerequisites for courses.

In response to a question from Prof. J. DeBardeleben on the effect of these changes to students currently registered in their Ph.D. program, Prof. Abele stated that they will have a choice--to

continue under the old regulations or opt for the new ones, depending on where they are in their program.

Dean Blockley commented that science and engineering graduate programs, compared to arts and social sciences, are less brutal. OCGS did a study and found that the most common obstacle faced by students was times to completion.

THE MOTION WAS CARRIED.

6.2 Report of the Integrative Review Committee re General Assessments of the Schools of Business, Canadian Studies and Social Work

Senate considered this Report, dated 7 November 1998 (Appendix C).

Dr. Adam, Chair of the Committee, noted its recommendation to Senate for postponement of the review for the Institute of European and Russian Studies.

Prof. C.H. Chan, Secretary of the Committee, commented that while the documentation before Senate is brief, the Committee itself requires full set of documentation of the process of the review. He invited interested members of Senate to peruse the full documentation in the Senate Office.

It was MOVED (Adam, Chan)

that Senate receive the Report of the Integrative Review Committee (Appendix C, items #1-3).

Prof. P. Attallah noted that the three Schools all received "good quality", and questioned what other categories existed. Dr. Adam stated that the other ranking would be "good quality with a report".

Mr. Stanford questioned whether external reviewers were used in the process, and if so are they different for each review in so far as they would be subject specialists. The Clerk stated that OCAV requires one external reviewer, but we are using two.

Prof. Smith asked what accountability or responsibility exists for reporting back by the units on issues raised by the Committee. Dr. Adam stated that it is more the case of taking note of these issues. They might, on occasion, report back to Senate. In the case of "good quality with a report", the report would come back to the Committee and then to Senate.

Ms Foreman, noting that undergraduate students have an input into undergraduate program review, questioned if graduate students have a voice in graduate appraisal. Dean Blockley explained that they do, but only if consultants are sent in, then student input is required for construction of the brief to OCGS.

THE MOTION, to receive the Report, WAS CARRIED.

It was MOVED (Adam, Jones)

that Senate approve the revised Schedule for the integrative review of undergraduate programs (Appendix C, Attachment #1).

CARRIED.

7. Report of the Senate Curriculum Committee re Curricular and Related Proposals for 1999-2000, Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

Senate considered this Report, dated 18 November 1998 (Appendix D).

It was MOVED (Chan, Blockley)

that Senate approve the major course changes, as outlined in the Report (Appendix D).

The Clerk, as Chair of the Curriculum Committee, noted that the Executive, at its meeting of 26 November 1998, had approved the minor course changes summarized in the Report (see Executive minutes 2461 #6). He went on to explain the electronic process undertaken this year by the Committee in dealing with Calendar changes, emphasizing the fact that the Calendar would eventually, and almost exclusively, be published on the University's website. Prof. S. Godfrey expressed concern about the apparent lack of "hard" copies of the Calendars. The Clerk explained that hard copies would still be made available.

THE MOTION WAS CARRIED.

It was MOVED (Chan, Blockley)

that Senate approve the minor program changes, as outlined in the Report (Appendix D).

Prof. J.W. Chinneck expressed concern over the large number of "piggyback" courses listed in the Report, noting that OCGS is also concerned. Prof. Chan noted that he had checked with the Programs and Planning Committee of the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, who in turn, checked with the units concerned, and these numbers are consistent with the OCGS guidelines, viz., one-third. Dean Blockley commented that OCGS is more concerned about the number of piggybacked courses taken within a student's program and, in particular, core courses. He noted that Graduate Studies and Research requires a statement about any additional requirements for piggybacked courses. Prof. Attallah commented that OCGS is concerned more on a discipline than a university-wide basis.

Prof. D.R. Thomas asked if Graduate Studies and Research have any rules or guidelines about occasional piggybacking. Dean Blockley stated that they would not be concerned about an occasional practice, however, if it were not recognized in the course outline, then it would be concerned.

The Clerk drew Senate's attention to an omission on p. 6 of the Report, for European and Russian Studies, 55.502F1 and W1 should be listed as piggybacked with 55.402*.

THE MOTION WAS CARRIED.

8. Graduate and Undergraduate Awards

The Clerk reported that the Executive, at its last meeting, approved new awards: two graduate, and 18 undergraduate (see Executive minutes 2461 #8 and Appendices E and F to those minutes).

It was AGREED that, in future, copies of the new awards would be circulated to members of Senate for information and comment.

9. Report on the Activities of the Board of Governors

Senate received this Report as an item for information and comment (Appendix E).

There were no comments.

10. Report of the Academic Colleague on the COU Meeting of 23 October 1998

Senate received this Report, dated 24 November 1998, as an item for information and comment (Appendix F).

There were no comments.

11. Other Business

11.1 Letter from the Canadian Association of University Teachers of German

At the request of Prof. Jeffreys, Senate noted receipt, for information and comment, a letter from the Canadian Association of University Teachers of German (Appendix G).

At this point in the meeting, Senate went into Closed Session to consider the following matters.

12. Confidential Minutes

The following Confidential minutes were approved, as circulated (Mortimer, Jones):

Senate Minutes, 30 October 1998;

Executive Minutes, 9 November 1998.

13. Business Arising from the Confidential Minutes

There was none.

14. Report on Executive Action re Candidates Presented Late for Graduation

See Executive minutes 2458 #1 and Confidential Appendix A.

15. Report on Executive Action re Post-Graduation Change to an Academic Record

See Executive minutes 2459 #1 and Confidential Appendix A.

16. Tribunal into the Matter of an Instructional Offence

The Clerk reported on this matter (see Executive minutes 2459 #2; see also Executive minutes 2439 #12 and Confidential Appendix H, and Senate minutes 4349-50 #6).

It was MOVED (Chan, Maslove)

that the Tribunal be disbanded.

CARRIED.

17. Other Business

There was none.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.