



Bishop's University

MINUTES OF THE 519th MEETING OF SENATE

The 519th meeting of Senate took place on Monday, October 19, 2009 at 7:00 p.m. in McGreer 100.

Present: Mr. M. Goldbloom was in the Chair, Ms. K. Allen, Dr. C. Beauchamp, Dr. C. Charpentier, Dr. J. Crooks, Ms. S. Faria, Dr. G. Gagné, Dr. R. Harries, Dr. S. Harvey, Mr. S. Ho, Mr. Y. Holton, Dr. K. Hull, Mr. Y. Jodoin, Dr. J.A. Kingsley, Dr. E. Levac, Dr. R. Osmun, Dr. C. Rutihinda, Ms. R. Sheeran, Dr. J. Savage, Mr. S. Taylor, Ms. S. Wuite

Regrets: Dr. M. Childs, Prof. L. McRae, Dr. W. Marcantoni.

1/519 AGENDA

The agenda was approved after moving item 3.1 to be the last item on the agenda.
(Crooks/Kingsley) **Motion Carried**

2/519 MINUTES

The Minutes of the 518th meeting of Senate were approved as circulated.
(Harries/Charpentier) **Motion Carried**

3/519 COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE CHAIR

The Principal, Mr. M. Goldbloom, said communications from the Chair would be at the end of the meeting.

4/519 BUSINESS ARISING

There was no business arising.

5/519 COMMITTEE ITEMS

5.1 Senate Nominating Committee (document 519/5.1)

Ms. Ruth Sheeran presented a motion to follow up on the previous report to Senate.

It was moved (Sheeran/Hull) that Senate approve the appointment of the following faculty to the various Senate Committees for two year terms:

Dr. Jim Benson (Humanities) - Continuing Education Committee
Dr. Rebecca Harries (Humanities) – Academic Review Committee
Dr. Trevor Gulliver (Education) – Classroom Renovation Committee
Prof. Betty Kreuger (Education) – Experiential Learning Committee
Dr. Cheryl Gosselin – Ombudsperson Selection Committee
Dr. Kerry Hull and Dr. Glibert Gagné – Research Ethics Committee
Dr. Andrew MacDonald (Humanities) – Graduate Studies

Carried

5.2 Senate Planning Committee (SPC) (document 519/5.2)

Dr. G. Gagné presented a report from the SPC. The Senate Planning Committee has met on two occasions this academic year. The main item of business has been an extended discussion of the principles and criteria which should actuate its work of bringing forward well-founded, equitable and effective recommendations to Senate in regard to the allocation of faculty resources. He also added that SPC schedule needed to be amended so that departments and schools know by mid-December at the latest whether a tenure stream position is to be recommended for the following year.

It was moved (Gagné/Faria) that Senate approves the following schedule, with the understanding that changes may be made to this schedule, if necessary:

1. Program changes in November, plus course changes/new courses for the following Winter semester
2. Part time, sessional and tenure stream recommendations in December
3. Course changes and new courses, including any Calendar copy changes, at the January meeting of Senate.

Carried

The Registrar added that early course approval is essential for students who want to register in those courses in a Winter semester.

Dr. Gagné added that SPC believes that the criteria adopted by Senate in 2007-08 imposed a welcome discipline on departments and programs; that they continue to serve the purposes they were laid out to accomplish and that they should continue to be adhered to as guidelines. Nonetheless, they should be modified slightly to allow some other criteria to come into play. He moved the following from the SPC report:

Whereas the SPC would move that the ratios laid out in the November 2007 planning guidelines be amended to 'Allow SPC to take into account program viability and program integrity issues as well as the numerical ratios when constructing tenure stream recommendations to Senate.'

Whereas there was considerable dissatisfaction last year in regard to the part time allocations and that the replacement of courses for externally funded research should not penalize the departments of faculty who win external grants.

Whereas these objections were sufficiently vociferous to be recorded in the Minutes of Senate 513/5/a of January 19, 2009.

It was moved (Gagné/Faria) that Senate approve the following:

- That the ratios be regarded as guidelines rather than absolute parameters
- That SPC be guided also by program viability/integrity criteria when constructing recommendations for resource allocations
- That within the above constraints, external research grant course reliefs be funded as close to 100% as possible.

Carried

5.3 a. Senate Program Review Committee (SPARC) Report (document 519/5.3.a)

Dr. E. Levac presented the SPARC report to Senate.

Physics

It was moved (Levac/Hull) that Senate approve the review panel for the Physics Department:

Dr. Stuart Crampton, Williams College

Dr. Calvin Kalman, Concordia University

Alternates:

Dr. Susan Watson, Middlebury College

Dr. Robert Hawkes, Mount Allison University

Carried

Fine Arts

There have been delays in obtaining names of qualified reviewers for the Fine Arts Program Review from the units concerned, a list will be brought forward in November.

Drama (document 519/5.3.b)

Dr. Levac also briefly presented the external Report of the Program Review Committee on the Department of Drama. It was a positive report with a number of useful recommendations. Senate received the report.

5.4 Proposed Clusters (document 519/5.4)

Dean S. Harvey presented the research clusters proposed by the Senate Research Committee (SRC). Of the six clusters considered, four clusters are proposed by the SRC:

- Multi-Scale Climate and Environmental Change Research Cluster
- Crossing Borders
- Cosmology and Astrophysics
- Psychological Health and Well-being

and a fifth cluster is suggested as an emerging cluster:

- Powerful Learning and Teaching for a changing world

There was discussion amongst Senators. Dr. Harvey moved the following motions on behalf of the Senate Research Committee. Members of the SRC are:

Dr. Benoit Bacon, Social Sciences
Dr. Eva Bures, School of Education
Mr. Daniel Bromby, Library
Dr. Shawn Malley, Humanities
Dr. Robert Palmer, Williams School of Business
Dr. Jade Savage, Natural Sciences and Mathematics
Mrs. Sylvie Cote, Director of Research
Dr. Steve Harvey, SRC Chair

It was moved (Harvey/Harries) that Senate approve the four clusters as presented by the SRC. Carried

It was moved (Harvey/Charpentier) that there be progress reports from clusters every three years that describes their activities, achievements (e.g., funding, grants, publications, productions etc.), new membership, future plans and any additional information deemed necessary to the SRC for periodic evaluation and recommendations. Carried

It was moved (Harvey/Charpentier) that the SRC should develop the evaluation criteria for the cluster's periodic evaluation and that these are reported back to the Senate by its September 2010 meeting. **Carried**

6/519 OTHER MATTERS

6.1 Process for allocating Canada Research Chairs (document 519/6.1)

In the course of the next several months, Bishop's will undertake a process of allocating the three Tier II Canada Research Chairs that it has available. Dean J. Crooks presented a series of principles (3) and criteria (8) by which the CRCs will be allocated which takes into account research priorities, but integrates some teaching factors, and disciplinary distribution:

Foundational Principles:

1. Canada Research Chairs should be allocated so that, as far as possible, their distribution is spread among the various departments and divisions of the University.
2. Canada Research Chairs must be linked to one or more of the research clusters approved by Senate and should be of demonstrable use to other objectives of our Strategic Research Plan.
3. Canada Research Chairs should be of some value to the teaching function by connection to programs which are close to, or fall within SPC guidelines for additional resources. This connection might be direct (through an appointment to a department) or indirect (through delivering courses which have cognate possibilities with other programs).

Criteria proposed:

1. Interdisciplinarity; ability to fertilize research beyond one's department, program or discipline.
2. Ability to attract significant funding for both research activities and infrastructure.
3. Linkage to departments, programs and research clusters which contain existing personnel with strong research records
4. Linkage to programs with large numbers of students
5. Linkage to programs with strong record of producing graduate students
6. Linkage to programs which presently have graduate programs or have the potential to develop these
7. Potential to form research links with other institutions in Qc, Canada or internationally
8. Consonance with Bishop's specific educational mission as a liberal arts university with a limited number of high quality professional programs.

Then Dr. Crooks spoke of the process of allocating Canada Research Chairs. The allocation of Canada Research Chairs be undertaken by a committee using the principles and criteria listed above and consisting of:

- The Vice-Principal
- The Deans

- The Director of Research Services

Following the identification of the research clusters by Senate, a call will go out to those clusters chosen by the University to further elaborate on how a Canada Research Chair in their area met the criteria above. The advertisements for the Chairs would then closely follow the profile submitted by the successful clusters. Since these would in most cases be ones which spanned various programs, the University and Association would need to come to an agreement about the size and composition of a hiring committee. It is suggested that the basis for hiring would be a combination of various factors

1. Strength of the research record of the candidate
2. Grant (including infrastructure grant) potential
3. Fit with the researchers within the cluster
4. Departmental or interdepartmental fit
5. Utility and need to the teaching function of program/s within the cluster.

Dr. Crooks moved the following:

It is moved (Crooks/Harvey) that Senate endorses the proposed principles, criteria and process for allocating Canada Research Chairs. **Carried**

6.2 Plagiarism

(documents 519/6.1a and b)

Mr. Y Jodoin, the Registrar, presented his annual report about instances of Academic Dishonesty. He noted a decline in the number of cases reported. He said that Chairs and Deans should remind faculty to report cases. A Senator said the reporting process needed to be streamlined to make it easier for faculty to report cases. Another Senator said it was difficult for a professor to invigilate an exam when students are allowed to step out of a classroom during an exam. It was agreed that the report from the Committee on Academic Integrity created in 2005-06 should be re-examined by Senate.

7/519 RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Williams School of Business

7.2 Arts & Science

7.2.1 Division of Humanities

7.2.2 Division of Natural Sciences and Mathematics

7.2.3 Division of Social Sciences

7.3 School of Education

7.4 Continuing Education

3/519 COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE CHAIR

3.1 Consultation – Vice-Principal Finance Administration (in camera)

This part of the meeting was held in camera. As provided in the ROR's, the Principal consulted Senate on the appointee for Vice-Principal Finance Administration he wanted to bring to the Corporation meeting of October 24, 2009. Mr. Goldbloom explained the process and procedures followed by the Search Committee.

A motion (Sheeran/Harvey) of support for the appointee was voted by Senate, one abstention.

8/519 BRIEF INFORMATION

8.1 Sabbatical Reports available for consultation at the Vice-Principal's office from:
A. de Man, C. Lacroix, A. Johnson, N. Khouzam, R. Palmer, D. Seale, V. Stroeher,
G. Tucker / S. Harvey

8.2 Changes in the May 2009 list of graduates approved by Senate / Y. Jodoin

The meeting adjourned at 8:43 pm

Mr. Michael Goldbloom, Chair

Mr. Yves Jodoin, Secretary