

SENATE
Minutes of Meeting

Date: Friday, December 10, 2010

Time: 2:30pm – 4:33pm

PRESENT: Dr. Imran Ahmad, Dr. Brent Angell, Dr. Vladimir Bajic, Dr. Ram Balachandar, Dr. Lori Buchanan, Ms. Samantha Clarke, Mr. Ian Clough, Ms. Gwen Ebbett, Dr. Jamey Essex, Dr. Bob Gaspar, Dr. Martin Girash, Dr. Leo Groarke, Dr. Paul Henshaw, Dr. Kai Hildebrandt, Dr. Cecil Houston, Dr. Leslie Howsam, Dr. H. Jacobs, Mr. Tory James, Dr. Jennifer Johrendt, Dr. Ed King, Dr. Dietmar Lage, Dr. Anna Lanoszka, Dr. Brent Lee, Mr. Marty Lowman, Dr. Charles Macdonald, Mr. Greg Marcotte, Ms. Laine McGarragle, Dr. Pamela Milne, Ms. Sharon Munro, Ms. Zeina Nassereddine, Ms. K. Orr, Dr. Wansoo Park, Dr. Jagdish Pathak, Dr. Linda Patrick, Dr. Alan Phipps, Dr. Katherine Quinsey, Dr. Dale Rajacich, Ms. Ayesha Raza, Dr. Pat Rogers, Ms. Stephanie Saad, Mr. Birendra Sapkota, Ms. Mary Schisler, Dr. Robert Schurko, Dr. Frank Simpson, Dr. Jang Singh, Ms. G. Sivakumar, Dr. Clayton Smith, Dr. Edwin Tam, Dr. Bruce Tucker, Dr. Mike Weis, Dr. Alan Wildeman (Chair), Prof. Larry Wilson, Dr. James Winter, Dr. Nader Zamani, Dr. George Zhou.

REGRETS: Mr. Ahmed Abou Gharam, Dr. Philip Adamson, Dr. David Andrews, Mr. Abdel Babker, Prof. Jeffery Berryman, Dr. Ranjana Bird, Dr. Robert Boucher, Prof. Bruce Elman, Dr. Arunita Jaekel, Dr. Roman Maev, Dr. Kevin Milne, Dr. Bob Orr, Rev. Dr. Paul Rennick, Dr. Kara Smith.

ABSENT: Dr. Ejaz Ahmed, Dr. Talal Al-Hayale, Dr. Yunbi An, Dr. Robert Arnold, Dr. Abdul-Fattah Asfour, Dr. Allan Conway, Dr. Gordon Drake, Dr. Jim Frank, Mr. Elie Gharib, Dr. Alan Hall, Rev. Dr. BoJeong Kim, Dr. Marlyns Koschinsky, Prof. Emir Mohammed, Ms. Erin Plumb.

IN ATTENDANCE: Ms. A. Houser, Dr. W. Baylis, Prof. Brian. E. Brown, Mr. R. Dumala, Mr. S. Moriarty, Dr. Alan Wright, Ms. Renée Wintermute and Ms. Alison Zilli (University Secretariat).

1 Report of the Senate Steering Committee
1.1 Approval of the agenda (Unstarring agenda items)

MOTION: That the agenda be approved.

Gaspar/Rogers
CARRIED

2 Minutes of the meeting of November 12, 2010.

MOTION: That the minutes of the meeting of November 12, 2010 be approved.

Balachandar/Pathak
CARRIED

3 Business arising from the minutes
Nothing to report.

4 Outstanding Business/Action Items
Nothing to report.

5 Reports/New Business
5.1 Report from Student Caucus (UWSA, OPUS, GSS)

University of Windsor's Student Alliance (UWSA)

Senators were informed that the UWSA is continuing to work towards the goal of having solar panels installed on the roof of the CAW Centre. Senators were also informed that UWSA is pleased that the Board of Governors approved moving forward with a feasibility study on a proposed integrated parking/innovation centre which would improve parking on campus and provide services to enhance the campus experience for students.

Organization of Part-Time University Students (OPUS)

Nothing to report.

Graduate Student Society (GSS)

Members were informed that GSS has been receiving complaints from students in FASS who are disappointed that one of the graduate lounges has been closed due to health and safety issues and that an alternative space has not been designated to replace this lounge. It was also noted that the space at the GSS Grad House (located on Sunset Ave) is not quite large enough to conduct the regular business of GSS for their Council meetings and other activities and that discussions are underway to try to identify more suitable space.

5.2 Report of the President

Senators were informed that one of the topics of discussion during a recent meeting at the Council of Ontario Universities (COU), where Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities John Milloy was in attendance, was the issue of the recent Parliamentary vote to significantly increase university tuition fees in London, England. The Minister noted that there are no intentions for the Ontario government to move in this direction.

Members were informed that a great deal of feedback/concern has been expressed from various groups as a result of Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario (HEQCO) article entitled *The Benefits of Greater Differentiation of Ontario's University Sector*. It was noted that there is wide agreement that universities are already differentiated, each basing their goals and priorities on a variety of factors.

Information on the Campus Community Town Hall meeting which took place on December 7, 2010 in Erie Hall can be accessed online at the President's website at www.uwindsor.ca/president. Highlights of the meeting included a financial outlook, a discussion about the University's reputation, an overview of future actions, and a pocket-sized Strategic Plan.

5.3 Report of the Academic Colleague

Nothing to report.

5.4 Program Development Committee

Policy on the Deletion of Non-Offered Undergraduate Courses

In response to a question raised, it was noted that there is a *Senate Policy on the Deletion of Non-Offered Undergraduate Courses* which states that undergraduate courses which have not been offered in four or more consecutive years be deleted. Courses which have been marked for deletion from the undergraduate calendar and for which waivers have been sought and granted will be banked for a maximum of two years, after which time the courses will automatically be deleted if they have not been offered.

***5.4.1 Request for Waiver of Course Deletions (Ancient Christianity, Religion in the Ancient World, The Reformation) (See document Sa101210-5.4.1 for more details.)**

MOTION: That the Request for Waiver of Course Deletion for the following courses be approved:

07-229/11-229. Ancient Christianity
07-232/11-232. Religion in the Ancient World
07-360/15-360. The Reformation

***CARRIED**

5.4.2 The University of Windsor Institutional Quality Assurance Process

(See document Sa101210-5.4.2 for more details.)

MOTION: That the proposed University of Windsor's Institutional Quality Assurance Process be approved.

Ebbett/Angell

Members were reminded that COU has established a new Quality Assurance Framework for graduate programs, undergraduate programs and for-credit diploma/certificate programs. Under the new framework, each Ontario university is required to develop its own Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP) in line with its mission and the COU-approved Undergraduate and Graduate Degree Level Expectations and to submit them to the Quality Council for approval by December 2010. This framework will supplant the current Undergraduate Program Review and Ontario Council of Graduate Studies processes and, once implemented, the Ontario Universities' Quality Council will be responsible for reviewing, auditing and approving all new undergraduate and graduate programs beginning 2011-2012. This document ensures that our program review and proposal practices comply with the new provincial quality assurance framework.

In response to a question raised regarding the definition of "quality" in relationship to the new process, it was noted that it specifically relates to a degree of excellence in academic program and curriculum quality which will be monitored on an ongoing basis.

In response to a question raised regarding the reference to 'international quality assurance standards' (see pg 5 of 26) it was noted that this refers to the process being rigorous in comparison with other countries in the world that have lead the way in third party quality review and assessment.

In response to a question raised about the reference "Description and justification of proposed assessment methods in light of the intended learning outcomes" (see pg 12 of 26), it was noted that in 2006 the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) approved Undergraduate and Graduate Degree Level Expectations (UDLEs/GDLEs) in order to be able to compare the qualifications and degrees granted by Ontario universities with those from other educational institutions globally and to establish academic and professional equivalencies. Subsequently, the University of Windsor's Senate approved a template to align the Universities learning outcomes presented in the form of graduate attributes with the provincial UDLEs/GDLEs. There are nine attributes that all Windsor students will have acquired upon graduation and each academic area is required to articulate the learning outcomes for its program and courses and to link these to the nine "Characteristics".

In response to a question raised about the evaluation process, it was noted that there will be an eight year cyclical external review of all undergraduate programs and graduate programs as well as an internal university program review process in which programs will be reviewed biannually to monitor and evaluate progress made toward the external review recommendations.

In response to a question raised about whether there will be funding provided in support of this new framework, it was noted that although additional funding will not be provided, Faculties can look for cost and time savings by preparing combined documentation for graduate, undergraduate and accreditation reviews. In addition, the move from annual reviews to biannual reviews will reduce time and paperwork.

In response to a question raised about how the former UPR and OCGS process will transition into the new process, it was noted that there will be an adjustment period but all programs will be reviewed every eight years. It was further noted that a timeline is currently in the process of being created that will outline all of the programs in the current and new review cycle.

In response to a question raised about what constitutes a "diploma program" (see page 9 of 26), it was noted that, according to the information provided by the Quality Council, a diploma program can be for credit or not-for-credit at the undergraduate or graduate level. In response to a question raised regarding whether the 'Study Group' proposal would fit into this category, it was noted that the Study Group diploma programs are not University of Windsor programs. It was further noted that in Degree Completion models students cannot be granted a university degree until they complete the requirements of the University program.

In response to a question raised about what category a new 'option' would fit in terms of program proposal forms, it was noted that this would be determined internally depending on the nature of the program addition or proposed change. It was further noted that new program "option/field" in an existing program would be considered a major modification.

In response to a question raised about the timelines, it was noted the new framework will commence January 2011 for graduate programs (*i.e.*, any programs not approved by OCGS prior to December 31 will need to go through the new process), and new undergraduate programs that are not approved by Senate June 2011 will be subject to the new process.

In response to a question raised about the benefits of the new process, it was noted that the change is beneficial as it will streamline the undergraduate and graduate processes, helping to create a more efficient and effective system. Foremost, the new system will provide greater international recognition of credentials and enable greater degree mobility for students.

In response to a question raised about "the external reviewers recommendations" (see page 24 of 26) it was noted that the University is retaining the ability to have some flexibility regarding the reviewers report.

CARRIED

***5.4.3 Summary of Minor Course and Calendar Changes – Law**
(See document Sa101210-5.4.3 for more details.)

*The document was received for information.

5.5 Academic Policy Committee

***5.5.1 IT Steering Committee Annual Year-End Report**
(See document Sa101210-5.5.1 for more details.)

*The document was received for information.

5.6 Senate Student Committee

5.6.1 Report on the Governor General's Silver Medal
(See document Sa101210-5.6.1 for more details.)

MOTION: That the following recommendations for the awarding of the Governor General's Silver Medal be approved:

- 1. The Governor General's Silver Medal should be awarded to the graduating honors program student with the highest cumulative percentile score for his or her Faculty, using the cumulative graduation average and based on a normal distribution computed from the grade distributions of the principal Faculty in which the student is enrolled, taken over the most recent three-year period. This approach will address the concern regarding smaller programs not having an equal opportunity using the current process, and will provide the fairest and most reasonable distribution of awards over time.**
- 2. The requirement that only students having taken at least 30 courses at the University of Windsor can be considered should stand.**
- 3. A description of the basis for the award be placed on our website, and in any relevant publications including the convocation program.**

Tam/Clough

Members were informed that the selection process for the Governor General's Medal currently uses a mathematical z-score method which looks at graduating students' academic averages and also compares graduating students to their graduating peers over a three-year period. However, the current method eliminates entire programs from the possibility of even being eligible for the award if a high mean grade and large standard deviation places their maximum possible z-score below scores attained in other programs. The proposed change will provide the

fairest and most reasonable distribution of awards over time. It will also clarify to students and their parents/guardians how the award is calculated for recipients.

CARRIED

5.7 Committee Membership

***5.7.1 Program Development Committee**

(See document Sa101210-5.7.1 for more details.)

MOTION: That Senate accept the names of Dr. Tanja Collet-Najem and Dr. Hans Hansen, as a Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences representatives on the Program Development Committee.

***CARRIED**

5.8 Bylaw Business

5.8.1 Bylaw 2 – Rules of Procedure

(See document Sa101210-5.8.1 for more details.)

MOTION: That Bylaw 2, paragraph G, be revised as follows:

G. Change of Bylaws

[...] In order to change an appendix (or schedule) of a Senate Bylaw, the approval of the majority of the Senate members present is required, in a vote cast at a meeting. **Exceptions are appendices (or schedules) included in bylaws on senior administrative positions, which are provided for information.**

Lanoszka/McGarggle

There are a number of appendices and schedules appended to the bylaws. The proposed change is intended to clarify that schedules relating to duties and responsibilities are appended to bylaws by way of information, highlighting areas of responsibility that may be assigned.

CARRIED

5.8.2 Bylaw 1 – Senate Membership and Election Procedures – Electronic Mail Ballots

(See document Sa101210-5.8.2 for more details.)

MOTION: That Bylaw 1, paragraph 3.6, be revised as follows:

3.6 [...]

Nominations must be received within two weeks of the “call for nomination”. The election of the candidates shall take place during the week following the deadline date for submission of nominations. Elections will be conducted by **electronic or** mail ballot.

James/Angell

Members were informed that the on-line voting application was originally developed in collaboration with UWSA to mirror the voting process at a polling station. Once a voter enters their UWin ID and password, then the system will allow the voter to cast his/her vote and then tally the votes.

It was noted that in e-voting, the system will be able to identify if a voter has “logged-on” and his/her vote, but it will not be able to identify how the voter voted. The ballot is not linked to the voter.

This change will allow for flexibility of having an election conducted by either electronic or mail ballots (but not both during the same election).

CARRIED

5.8.3 Bylaw 22 – Committees and Procedures on Promotion, Renewal and Tenure
(See document Sa101210-5.8.3 for more details.)

MOTION: That Bylaw 22, 3.3, be revised as follows:

- 3.3 ~~Any member of the~~ Committee member who is on a probationary contract shall absent himself/herself from the discussions of the Committee while his or her case is being considered and voted upon.

Tucker/Quinsey

The change clarifies that Committee members shall recuse themselves from the discussions of the Committee while their case is being considered and voted upon. It was noted that members must also recuse themselves when they are in clear conflict of interest (*i.e.*, partner/spouse).

In response to a question raised regarding what the protocol should be when a student is on a Committee during the review of their Advisor's file or, if the student is a co-author to any of their Advisor's papers, it was agreed that this question should be further investigated in relation to the Senate Conflict of Interest Policy.

CARRIED

5.8.4 Discussion on Bylaw 22 – Committees and Procedures on Promotion, Renewal and Tenure (See document Sa101210-5.8.4 for more details.)

Members were informed that there has been some interest expressed in revising certain sections of bylaw 22.

In response to the issue that probationary faculty and librarian appointments must apply annually for renewal of their contracts until they obtain tenure (5 years) the following feedback was provided by Senators: 1) A good annual performance review is sufficient as the current requirement to apply annually for contract renewal is extremely time consuming and redundant; 2) Given that discipline-specific performance reviews are critical and helpful to probationary candidates, AAU heads should be provided with guidelines to help them clear and constructive reviews in a standardized manner; and, 3) probationary members who wish to submit to additional contract renewal reviews should be given the option to request such reviews.

In response to the question regarding whether the application for tenure be combined with the application for promotion to associate professor, the following feedback was provided by Senators: 1) a successful tenure applications should automatically result in promotion to associate professor, 2) a successful application for promotion should not be tied to tenure as candidates should be able to apply for promotion when they deem appropriate.

In response to the question as to whether renewal applications and applications for promotion to associate professor should be delegated to Faculties instead of UCAPT, concern was raised regarding the issue that if this was delegated to the Faculties, then there may be instances of inequality. It was argued that UCAPT ensures that all members are held to the same level of accountability, equality and fairness and that the Committee should remain intact. This provides an additional "safeguard" for candidates up for renewal, promotion and tenure. However, it was also suggested that a possible alternative would be to just have all 'negative' reviews (at the Faculty level) go to UCAPT for further review. The opinion was expressed that although it makes sense to have UCAPT in place to ensure that decisions at the Faculty level are equitable in all instances, it may be difficult to ensure that there are uniform standards for all disciplines at the UCAPT level, particularly given the nuances of varying fields and disciplines. However, it was stressed that it is extremely important to have an appeal process that is equitable and accessible.

The issue that the University of Windsor has a shorter probationary period (in comparison to other institutions) was flagged. The general consensus was that it would be helpful to extend the probationary period so that members have time to submit stronger applications.

In response to a question raised regarding what percentage of people who apply for tenure are denied, it was noted that most of the applicants are successful. It was noted that the tenure process supports career development demonstrated in various ways by applicants, through research, teaching, publications, etc.

In response to a question raised as to why members would be agreeable to the proposed changes to Bylaw 22, it was expressed that the changes were proposed to reduce the amount of time that applicants spend preparing documentation for submissions (*i.e.*, minimum of 2-3 weeks), to bring the university more in-line with other universities, and, to attempt to create a more effective and efficient ways to accelerate the overall process.

In summary, there was overwhelming support for 1) having only one or two renewal applications as long as annual performance reviews continue to be required and that clear guidelines are articulated to Heads to ensure good and constructive reviews, and 2) having applications for tenure be combined with promotion to associate professor. However, there was no consensus on delegating approval of renewal applications and applications for promotion to associate professor to the Faculties.

Based on the above comments and feedback, it was noted that a draft proposal will be brought to a future Senate meeting.

5.9 Report of the Provost

Rhodes Scholar

Congratulations were extended to Josh Chauvin, a double major in philosophy and psychology who was named as the University of Windsor's first Rhodes Scholar. It was noted that Josh is one of 11 Canadians who will be heading to England next year to pursue graduate studies at the University of Oxford.

Searches

Members were informed that Searches are in progress for the Dean of Education, the Dean of Engineering, the Dean of Human Kinetics, the Dean of Graduate Studies and the Dean of Law. Members were also informed that Dr. Bruce Tucker has accepted a renewal for the position of Associate Vice-President, Academic Affairs and Dr. Allan Conway will be serving another term as Dean of the Odette School of Business.

Strategic Priority Fund

Members were reminded that requests for funding for the 2011/2012 Strategic Priority Fund are due by January 17, 2011.

5.10 Report of Vice-President, Research

Nothing to report.

6 Question Period/Other Business

Nothing to report.

7 Adjournment

MOTION: That the meeting be adjourned.

Rogers/Quinsey
CARRIED