

Minutes of a Meeting
of the
Carleton University Senate
Held on Friday, 1 April 2005
at 2:00 p.m.
in the Senate Room, Robertson Hall
(Subject to Confirmation)

R.J. Van Loon presiding

Attendance

C. Arcand, J. Armitage, L. Bertossi, R.C. Blockley, J. Breakspear, M. Brown, C.H. Chan (Clerk), S. Dalby, G. Davis, V. Dehejia, S. Fai, L. Fontein, M. Foss, M. Fox, L. Frankel, T. Garvey, B. Gianni, B. Gillingham, K.A.H. Graham, R. Hafez, F. Hamdullahpur, A. Harrison, R. Holton, A. Jacobs, R. Jeffreys, Z. Khan, R. Laird, G. Larose, R. Lifeso, A. Loiselle, D. Long, G. MacIsaac, S.A. Mahmoud, K. March, A. Matrawy, G. McKnight, F. Michel, B. Mortimer, C. Neumann, M.H. Ogilvie, S. Pal, T. Phillips, A. Ramirez, P. Robinson, S. Robinson, C. Saab, J.J. Salinas, M. Shams, M. Smith, S. Solowski, A. Tierney, A Turcotte, D.R. Watt, C. Wienand, Y. Zhao.

Regrets

M. Atanya, P. Attallah, A. Brook, L. Cohen, L. de la Gorgendiere, R. Donaldson, C. Dornan, M. Garneau, J.-G. Godin, D. Howe, T. Jennissen, P. Kalyniak, R. Liu, L. Pal, K. Schwartz.

Absent

I. Marsland.

CLOSED SESSION

1. Confidential Minutes

The Confidential Senate Minutes of 18 February 2005 were approved, as circulated.

2. Business Arising from the Confidential Minutes

There was none.

3. Report on Executive Action re Appeal Cases

The Clerk reported on Executive action taken in this regard (see Executive minutes 2650 #1 and 2, and Confidential Appendices A and B to those minutes).

4. Establishment of a Tribunal

The Clerk reported the need to establish a Tribunal (see Executive minutes 2650-1 #3 and Appendix C to those minutes).

It was MOVED (Chan, McKnight)

that Senate ratify the membership of a Senate Tribunal.

CARRIED.

OPEN SESSION

5. Question Period

5.1 Administrative Leave for the President

Prof. R. Laird questioned the rumour of the President going on two years of paid administrative leave following his retirement. The President responded that as he has served one and four fifths terms as President he would be receiving the same in administrative leave.

6. Minutes

The following sets of minutes were approved (Graham, Smith):

Senate Minutes, 18 February 2005; and
Executive Minutes, 22 March 2005.

In connection with the Senate minutes of 18 February, p. 4789, #5, last paragraph, it was noted that the correct title is “Associate Vice-President (Enrolment Management)”.

7. Business Arising from the Minutes

7.1 Learning Commons

Senate considered the following documentation: Learning Commons Task Force Final Report, dated 10 January 2005 (Appendix A); a motion from the Senate Library Committee on this matter, dated 17 March 2005 (Appendix B), and a document on Learning Commons, First Phase for September 2005 (Appendix C).

Mr. M. Foss, University Librarian, gave the background on this matter, noting that many other universities have learning commons. He added that there are three components to the Learning

Commons: learning support, IT, and the Library itself. He drew attention to Appendix C, stressing that Phase I will have no impact on space currently assigned to library stacks.

Dr. A. Harrison, Provost and Vice-President (Academic), commented on the success of such commons at other institutions, stating that some institutions call them “information commons”, which tend to be more passive, while other call them “learning commons”, which are intended to encourage active learning. He commented on the review of the Library which was to review and assess its operation in the context of the establishment of the storage facility, an architectural space study, Mr. Foss’ retirement at the end of the year and the consequent need to appoint a new university librarian.

Concerns were expressed about the use of storage across campus for materials from the Library. Mr. Foss explained that many of the materials destined for storage were books from courses and programs that are no longer offered, as well as periodicals that are also in digital form. The storage facility will open in September, and this summer the library will begin the process of determining which library material will be shelved there. He noted that this is part of a longer-term project of collection management. He added that the Learning Commons and the storage facility began as two separate initiatives, stating that the former did not drive the latter; the reconfiguration of space in the library was also a separate initiative.

In response to a question as to who would have responsibility over the Learning Commons, Dr. Harrison stated that it would be a shared responsibility of the Dean of Student Affairs and the University Librarian.

In response to a question about Phase I of the learning commons, Dr. Harrison stated that he would be pleased, if senate felt it appropriate, to report to senate on both the learning commons and the storage facility in twelve to eighteen months. He added that the space study underway in the library would also be of relevance to both the learning commons and the storage facility.

It was MOVED (Neumann, Laird)

that Senate recommends that the University explore the physical expansion of the MacOdrum Library.

Prof. S. Dalby questioned what would happen in 10 to 15 years from now when we will be increasing our graduate student intake, and asked how this fits into the library plans. He suggested keeping the books where they are and putting the computers into the storage facility. Mr. Foss commented that there are a growing number of learners that use both books and computers, adding that there is great support for student learning outside the classroom, and this plan supports it in a central way. He added that there is a huge demand for group learning, and we are responding to that change.

Prof. R. Laird said that while he is a supporter of the Learning Commons, he feels that it does not belong in the Library, but rather in the about to be newly renovated Unicentre, as we need room for expansion in our Library.

Prof. A. Freedman, Co-Chair of the Learning Commons Task Force, clarified the intentions of the Committee. She emphasized that the learning commons is designed to bring more students to the library. There is a need to have learning support for both the print and electronic versions of the library and this will be provided through the Learning Commons in the library. She commented that during a tour of the library, she came to realize that it is initially more a case of bringing together the learning support facilities already in the library than creating a new facility.

The President then spoke to the jurisdiction of Senate and the Board of Governors, noting that this is a capital project, which therefore falls under the purview of the Board of Governors. He noted that Senate's advice is nonetheless useful and important.

In response to a question from Prof. G. McKnight as to whether there was any plans for an expansion of the library, Mr. Foss stated that the mandate of the architectural plan is to use the existing floor space, adding that much of the space in the library is currently not well used.

Prof. M. Ogilvie commented on the possible expansion of the existing Library. She suggested that Senate recommend to the Board that it make the expansion of the library a top priority with a possible capital campaign.

THE MOTION WAS CARRIED.

It was MOVED (Neumann, Laird)

that Senate recommends that the Learning Commons not be implemented beyond its first phase (September 2005) until an appropriate Committee of Senate fully explores and compares the Library Master Plan currently being undertaken and an alternative Library Master Plan that would incorporate physical expansion of the MacOdrum Library.

CARRIED.

It was MOVED (Ogilvie, Jeffreys)

that Senate recommends to the Board of Governors that it makes the expansion of the MacOdrum Library a high priority for the future development of the University.

CARRIED.

7.2 Class Scheduling Models

Dr. Harrison gave the background on the above-noted matter. He stated that there are four issues that affect class scheduling: programs (avoiding conflicts between courses within programs and also between courses across programs); classrooms (size and resources); which courses will be offered in any given year; and instructors (preferences and constraints). He stated that no decisions will be made about how to collect information about instructors' preferences and constraints until further discussion has taken place with CUASA at meetings of the Joint Committee to Administer the Agreement, adding that the Deans are also collecting information

from their Chairs and Directors. He noted that the new scheduling software will be used for the academic year 2006-07, and that the program will also help Carleton achieve its aim of beginning student registration earlier. For 2005-06, the program will be operated in parallel with the current scheduling system.

Mr. C. Neumann commented that we do not know what restrictions all professors might have. He also stated that no effort has been made to take students' preferences into account. Dr. Harrison stated that it was because we do not know instructor preferences that this information is being collected. He added that students' preferences would be addressed insofar as the registration by students would eventually be earlier than at present so that we would both have a clearer picture of the actual demand for courses and be in a position to do something about it. Prof. B. Mortimer, Assistant Provost, added that what is key to us is how we want to use the program.

Prof. Laird stated that the new program needs to take into account both faculty and students, adding that we cannot be simple slaves to a timetable. He commented on a motion unanimously passed by the Chairs and Directors of the Arts and Social Sciences Faculty Board the needs of students and the wishes of faculty are important.

It was MOVED (Laird, MacIsaac)

that the control of individual faculty and departments over course scheduling shall not be diminished by central timetabling.

Prof. G. McKnight noted that this is a complex computer system. Prof. Mortimer stated that all kinds of conditions could be put into the software.

Ms A. Tierney, Dean of Students, commented that this benefits students, as the timetable will be available earlier.

Mr. M. Brown asked if this system is compatible with Banner. Prof. Mortimer concurred.

Mr. Brown then asked if the examination schedule would also be available earlier. Prof. Mortimer stated that CUTV poses a problem for this, as there are a number of departments that teach multi-section courses at different times but want only one examination.

THE MOTION WAS NOT CARRIED.

7.3 Review of Grade with an Oral Presentation Component

Prof. Mortimer reported that the Academic and Research Committee has looked into the above-noted matter, and it is intended to develop a series of guidelines to deal with this. He noted that many universities are silent on this matter as it is hoped that these would be handled informally.

8. Motion to Adjourn

As it was late in the day, and many members of Senate had already left, it was MOVED
(Mortimer, Smith)

that the meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.