

662ND MEETING OF SENATE
FRIDAY, APRIL 12, 2024, 2:30 P.M.
MCGREER 100 AND BY VIDEOCONFERENCE

MINUTES

Chair: Principal Sébastien Lebel-Grenier

Present: Reena Atanasiadis, Martina Berkers, Julien Collin, Dr. Julie Desjardins, Dr. Anthony Di Mascio, Dr. Alexandre Drouin, Dr. Valerio Faraoni, Catherine Lavallée-Welch, Christina Lépine, Élodie Lescure, Dr. Jean Manore, Dr. Patrick McBrine, Dr. Matthew Peros, Dr. Jessica Riddell, Hans Rouleau, Dr. John Ruan, Chelsea Sheridan, Dr. Michael Teed, Dr. Jordan Tronsgard, Dr. Marianne Vigneault, Dr. Yanan Wang, Dr. Andrew Webster, Dr. Brad Willms, Dr. Dawn Wiseman, Cleo Wulder

Regrets: Dr. Hafid Agourram, Dr. Darren Bardati, Sonoma Brawley, Bruno Courtemanche, Sienna Longo

Guests: Leana Ceresoli, Fiona Gaombalet, Alex Mador, Roser Rise

Secretary: Denise Lauzière

Principal Sébastien Lebel-Grenier called the 662nd meeting to order at 2:35 p.m.

662/1 AGENDA

The agenda was approved as presented.

Moved by: Andrew Webster

Seconded by: Christina Lépine

Motion carried.

The Chair welcomed a number of incoming Student Senators to the meeting, who introduced themselves: Roser Rise, Alexandre Mador, Leana Ceresoli, Fiona Gaombalet.

662/2 MINUTES

The Minutes of the 661nd meeting of the Senate held on February 23, 2024 were approved as presented.

Moved by: Julien Collin

Seconded by: Cleo Wulder

Motion carried.

662/3 BUSINESS ARISING

The Chair noted one item under Business Arising, with respect to the Dean of the Williams School of Business: an announcement regarding the appointment of an Interim Dean of the Williams School of Business is forthcoming, and the Committee is being populated to begin the process for the search for the next Dean.

662/4 COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE CHAIR

The Principal began by informing Senators on the measures implemented by Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada (IRCC) with respect to international student study permits. The file has continued to evolve, with Quebec having been attributed a quota of international students it could accept. The quota itself is appropriate in that it does appear to account for the actual number of international students who come to Quebec. However, one of the outstanding questions related to the quota was whether it was to represent the actual number of study permits that were going to be used in Quebec by international students, or if it was a quota of permits that would be issued to international students. The distinction is important, as not every international student who receives a study permit is ultimately able to come to Quebec. The positive news that universities have received is that the Federal Government has clarified its position and adjusted its numbers. It will allow the province to issue up to 113,000 *Certificats d'attestation du Québec* (CAQ) which are then processed by IRCC who issue the study permits. The consensus is that this adjusted total does cover the number of international students Quebec typically receives in a year. Therefore, we do not believe there is a need to restrict the numbers of offers of admission to international students coming to Quebec.

A source of some preoccupation is that the Federal Government is asking the Quebec Government to allocate a specific number of study permits to each Quebec university. This could provide an opportunity for the Quebec Government to try to direct international students away from English-speaking universities. We will continue to follow this file closely. For the moment it does not appear that the federal quotas for international student study permits will have an impact on English-speaking universities in Quebec.

The Principal mentioned that Bishop's has recently been assigned a new Federal University Champion (a program that assigns a high-level civil servant as a liaison with each Canadian university). Our new University Champion is the Associate Deputy Minister at IRCC, so the

Principal has been able to highlight our specific concerns with regard to the assignment of quotas of international students to individual universities.

In its March 2024 budget, the Quebec Government announced a major deficit. They also announced there would be no new investment into universities. At the same time, a new funding formula for universities is being implemented and we have received more precise information about how this affects Bishop's. We had been cautiously optimistic during recent months that Bishop's would receive fair access to funding for small and regional universities; however, it appears that this is not the case.

As expected, there is a claw-back of \$1.8M for international students' tuition, and for now there is no new investment from Government. A "transitional measure" covers some shortfall created by this claw back, but it does not address ongoing underfunding of Bishop's nor long-term funding impacts. We have also not met enrolment targets this year (we are still lagging behind with respect to Canadian out-of-province students). In all likelihood we will therefore be in a deficit situation in 2024-25. Meetings were held with the Minister of Higher Education and the Deputy Ministers during which we asked for clarification, justification and explanation on a number of items, including with respect to funding for small and regional universities. We are awaiting responses in the next couple of weeks, but whatever additional funding we can secure will be very unlikely to compensate for our financial shortfall. The Principal also noted that the 2024-25 budget will be presented to the Board of Governors at its April 26 meeting.

If, as predicted, we are in a deficit situation in 2024-25, we will have an obligation to the Quebec Government to present a *plan de redressement* to balance the budget. Communications and discussions will be forthcoming on the budget.

Dr. Jean Manore asked if Bishop's had been harder hit than francophone universities in not receiving the funding envelope for small and regional universities. The Principal noted that the small and regional universities are all *Université du Québec* universities, save for Bishop's; contrary to Bishop's, *Université du Québec* member universities received additional funding in the current budget.

Dr. Brad Willms wondered if Quebec students studying in Ontario might come back to Quebec, based on recent comments by the Ontario Premier. The Principal noted that he had mentioned this possibility to the Premier and Minister in the Fall.

Dr. Patrick McBrine asked about the \$1.8M shortfall. The Principal confirmed this is the claw-back of tuition for international students. This changes the picture with respect to international students; since international student tuition deregulation in 2018, this has been a benefit to the University's financial bottom line, but it has also required significant investments to support these students.

Dr. Mike Teed noted that the Minister of Higher Education stated publicly on multiple occasions that Bishop's would be taken care of. The Principal agreed this was the position she stated publicly, which is why the budget has been disappointing.

Dr. Jean Manore asked whether there was any possibility of the Quebec Government offloading some expenses to the Federal Government. The Principal noted that the Federal Government provides funding for minority language education in the provinces but is unwilling to add constraints to its use as education is a provincial jurisdiction. The Principal did note that he has had multiple discussions with Federal ministers, including our local Member of Parliament Marie-Claude Bibeau, to share Bishop's concerns.

The Principal briefly discussed current enrolment numbers, noting that the numbers for Quebec are positive, as are potentially the international student numbers. We are lagging in applications from Canadian out-of-province students. He noted that the interview process for the AVP Recruitment, Marketing and Communications is nearing its end and the Recruitment team is still very much mobilized.

662/5 COMMITTEE ITEMS

5.1 SENATE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

Dean Reena Atanasiadis noted that significant work to finalize new content in the Academic Calendar pertaining to academic regulations on misconduct was carried out in the last month and a half. She commended the Committee on its collegiality as well as the work done by all to finalize the content. She noted that the PDF file provided to the Senate, entitled Proposed Academic Code of Conduct and Disciplinary Procedures, incorporated comments and suggestions from community, Senators, etc., while the Word version showed the changes from the previous version.

Dean Atanasiadis noted that the definitions in the document are now complete and uses the same terminology as the Student Code of Conduct. She also brought to the Senate's attention a late suggestion to convert any deadlines that are currently referred to in the document as 'weeks' or 'workweeks' to 'calendar days' to reduce the possibility for misinterpretation. As this change is not reflected in the document that was uploaded to the Senate portal for its April 12 meeting, Ms. Atanasiadis suggested she could submit a clean document for Senate's approval at its May 17 meeting. She also noted that the document is unpaginated as it will be inserted into and reflect the page numbering in the Academic Calendar.

Julien Collin inquired whether, if the remaining changes are not substantive in nature, the Senate could nonetheless vote on the document pending the inclusion of these minor changes. After a brief discussion, in which the Registrar agreed it would be preferable to proceed, it was decided to put a motion for discussion of approval at this meeting of the Senate.

MOTION:

Julien Collin moved that the Senate open the floor to further discussion as to the approval of the current document with possible minor revisions.

Dr. Jean Manore seconded the motion.

Motion carried

Ms. Atanasiadis stated that for clarity, any ensuing vote would be to approve the document submitted to the Senate on April 12, 2024, pending the conversion of time references to calendar days as well as minor corrections (typos, etc.). The corrected and published document would be brought back to the Senate at its May 17 meeting for information.

Dr. Dawn Wiseman noted that faculty members in the School of Education had questions about whether the document met the needs of the School of Education as a professional program and how the competencies required for the government are reflected in academic work (e.g. cases that do not appear as plagiarism but which could be interpreted as an integrity violation). Ms. Atanasiadis stated that the Committee had considered these concerns and concluded that the issue was one that fit more appropriately under the Student Code of Conduct. Dr. Wiseman noted that many faculty in the School of Education believe it is an academic matter and would appreciate more time to review the text.

Hans Rouleau noted there are windows within the sessional dates of the academic year at which time the digital Academic Calendar could be amended to include any substantive changes adopted as a result of further discussion. He recommended moving forward with the approval of the document with this in mind. Dr. Andrew Webster agreed.

Dr. Jean Manore wished to clarify that if the School of Education does suggest substantive changes that those should be brought back to the Senate for review and approval.

Dr. Julie Desjardins inquired whether changes made to the Academic Calendar during the course of the year apply to all students equally. The Principal confirmed this is the case. Dr. Jean Manore noted that the one exception would be relative to the assessment requirements for graduation, which are based on the calendar program in effect at the time a student entered the University.

MOTION:

THAT Senate approve the Proposed Academic Code of Conduct and Disciplinary Procedures pending the conversion of time references to calendar days as well as minor corrections (typos, etc.). The corrected and published document would be brought back to the Senate at its May 17 meeting for information.

Moved by: Reena Atanasiadis

Seconded by: Julien Collin

Motion carried.

One abstention

5.2 SENATE NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Dr. Dawn Wiseman, Chair of the Nominating Committee, presented membership updates for the Senate Research and Senate Teaching Evaluation Committee.

MOTION:

THAT Senate approve the new membership of the Senate Research Committee and Senate Teaching Evaluation Committee as presented on April 12, 2024.

Moved by: Dawn Wiseman

Seconded by: Andrew Webster

Motion carried.

ITEM 662/5.3 SENATE PROGRAM ACADEMIC REVIEW COMMITTEE

Vice-Principal Academic and Research Andrew Webster began by presenting item one of the Report which notes the timeline and status of ongoing reviews, to keep Senators apprised.

Dr. Webster proceeded to present the lists of proposed reviewers for the upcoming SPARC reviews for Philosophy, for Politics and International Studies, and for Chemistry and Brewing Science presented in Appendix 3.

MOTION:

That Senate approves the proposed reviewers as presented in Appendix 3 for the Departments of:

- Philosophy
- Politics and International Studies
- Chemistry and Brewing Science.

Moved by: Andrew Webster

Seconded by: Brad Willms

Motion carried.

Dr. Webster continued by referring to the report from the Williams School of Business which reflects the new reporting format to the Senate from SPARC to give Senators a better summary of the overall work that has been done in the review including an action plan from each area. In keeping with current practice this report is presented for information.

The intention under the new procedures is that the Review Report will be presented to the Senate for formal approval and adoption as we continue to add to a robust process that the University is continuing to develop.

Dr. Webster proceeded to the last item of the SPARC report and explained that the SPARC has revised its mandate and procedure to align with the *Bureau de Coopération interuniversitaire's (BCI)* new framework for the periodic evaluation of university programs which was adopted in December 2023 by its *Comité des Affaires académiques*. The proposed revisions deal mainly with process clarifications and the expectation that program review processes conclude with a detailed plan of action.

Dr. Willms raised the issue that the self-evaluation, the final report and the Dean's report are all now subject to being available to BCI. Dr. Webster did confirm that it is part of an agreement between the BCI and the government, so that the government does not do the auditing. Their expectation is not to audit the courses. The objective is to audit the robustness of the internal review process that the universities are employing.

Dr. Webster concluded by mentioning that this item is presented for discussion and will come back to the Senate in May for approval. Senators were invited to send any additional comments to Dr. Webster.

662/6 OTHER BUSINESS

ITEM 662/6.1 ACADEMIC REPORT

Vice-Principal Academic and Research Andrew Webster began by referring to an item brought before Senate earlier this year on a request for information to Chairs about the annual academic workflow. Progress has been made in developing an institutional annual academic program of work. Meetings with groups of Chairs will take place in the coming weeks to review it in this stress testing phase. The intent is to capture and incorporate all the elements of work that we already carry out each year, which includes academic activities as varied as new faculty onboarding, timetable scheduling, deadlines for submissions to the Evaluation committee and the Senate Planning Committee, etc.

Dr. Webster noted that a later item on the Senate agenda included the timing of the annual Senate Planning Committee tenure-stream appointment process. The process as it is currently scheduled means we are not able to advertise any positions until January. To move the timeline earlier, there are two options: 1) a 'split summer' approach, which commences before the summer and seeks approval by Senate at its meeting in September; 2) a 'pre-summer' approach, which would complete all of the steps in the Spring and seeks approval by Senate at its meeting in May.

Dr. Webster added that should we move away from the current model we would run a double process next year. We would run the July 2025 appointments process in fall 2024 as usual, and

then run the July 2026 appointments process as a 'split summer' approach from April to September 2025. A guideline document is being presented as part of the SPC report.

He concluded by mentioning that he is making progress on confirming an interim Dean for the Williams School of Business, and will report back at the next meeting.

ITEM 662/6.2 MANDATE OF THE SENATE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Vice-Principal Academic and Research Andrew Webster introduced the three documents put before Senate for discussion, one of which Senators have seen before, and two of which are new for Senate. The first is a draft revised Mandate which takes into account feedback received with regards to the relationship between a recommendation to Senate from the Senate Planning Committee (SPC) and the authority of the Board for all financial decisions.

The other two documents are respectively guidelines for the SPC for the allocation of tenure stream positions and for the allocation of part-time courses. A guideline document created in 2016 and revised in 2018 for tenure stream positions does exist but a guidelines document does not currently exist for part-time course allocation. Dr. Webster noted that these documents are being submitted by himself as Vice-Principal Academic and Research and not on behalf of the SPC. The documents have been developed following extensive consultation with the SPC and the Deans and also include feedback received from a number of other sources within the academic community. His intent is to submit them to the May meeting for approval.

Dr. Webster opened the floor for discussion and prefaced this by reiterating how important he felt the discussions on this topic and others have been over the past meetings this year. He thanked Senators for the robust, collegial discussions that have taken place given we are dealing with issues on which there may be very real disagreements. He continued by acknowledging that the Senate is made up of experienced academics and senior students who are here representing different elements of the University, and that we all carry equal standing as voting members of the Senate. He wanted to ensure therefore that when these robust disagreements naturally occur, they remain always within the context of professional and collegial academic debate, and that none of them are either personalized or pursued further outside Senate afterwards.

Dr. Webster added that throughout all these documents he has used the term 'academic area' as the terminology rather than program, department school, faculty and so on, as a means to simplify and make uniform the documents.

Dr. Willms asked to clarify if the intent to create a curricular committee to ensure the modification and additions to curricula was still on the table. Dr. Webster responded that the Senate committee reviewing committees will be assessing the committees and will report back in the Fall. An alternate process for curriculum review could be established. This document will be brought back for a vote at the May meeting.

Dr. Webster then presented the second document, on tenure stream guidelines, which makes clear that the SPC makes recommendations and the Senate at all times makes the final decision in terms of accepting those recommendations.

A discussion ensued on the sequence of approvals by the Senate and the Academic Joint Committee in cases where there may be a proposed variation to terms contained within the Collective Agreement regarding the length of Limited Term Appointments (LTA), and whether it is a subsequent or prior approval or a conditional approval by Senate. Dr. Webster would review the wording for this.

The issue of prioritization of requests was then discussed and the SPC's approach to this. An understanding of the academic needs of the University should be conveyed to the Senate to assist in the decision-making process. Dr. Webster paraphrased Point 7 of the guideline which states: *Will work collaboratively with academic areas and academic Deans to determine their long-term staffing plans which SPC will report transparently to the Senate.* This discussion occurs at the Division level with Chairs and the Dean first and then moves to the SPC and to the Senate. This should be considered an ongoing discussion and process for every academic area, and not simply an issue addressed once per year at the deadline for submissions to the SPC. The Vice-Principal Academic and Research, as is past practice, will continue to report to Senate on SPC activities. Some members expressed the view that they sense a lack of commitment to protect smaller programs and that under these guidelines the SPC recommendations will continue as in recent years to be driven primarily by an emphasis on growth and RAM scores.

Dr. Webster moved on to the third document on part-time course allocations, which will provide structure and guidelines to the allocation of part-time courses to academic areas and the ability to convert those part-time courses into limited-term appointments. A set of definitions had been created in the guidelines to assist in the process. Some criteria and overall statements with regards to how we allocate part time courses, course replacements and additional courses within the different areas were also included. He referenced the conversion rates for part-time courses to LTAs and the level of the University's subsidization of 10 month and 12-month contracts.

Dr. Webster concluded by once again thanking everyone for thoughtful deliberations and reiterated that as we incorporate these guidelines into the SPC and Senate processes it will allow the Senate to play its strategic role at the same time as allowing Departments and Divisions to take a more long-term planning approach.

ITEM 662/6.3 RESEARCH AND GRADUATE STUDIES REPORT

The Interim Associate Vice-Principal Research Matthew Peros referred to his written report and added that he wanted to highlight a new publication *Lean and Green Manufacturing Operations Strategy cases from the automotive industry* by Dr. Juan Francisco Nunez, who is teaching in the Department of Environment, Agriculture, and Geography, and previously has been working in the Williams School of Business.

He was informed, after the submission of his report, of the work being done by Dr. Sunny Lau from the School of Education. She is involved in a very interesting project and collaboration with Nord University in Norway, on a project titled *An English-language literature in depth training*.

Dr. Peros referred Senators to his report for more information on the work being accomplished by the Office of Research and Graduate Studies.

ITEM 662/6.4 SENATE MEETING DATES


Denise Lauzière presented the revised proposed Senate meeting dates for the 2024-25 academic year which now includes an additional meeting scheduled for October 2024.

662/8 CLOSED SESSION

The Principal began the Closed session at 4:55 p.m. and the Senate returned to Open Session at 4:59 p.m.

Principal Sébastien Lebel-Grenier thanked Senators for the thoughtful discussions.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.



Sébastien Lebel-Grenier, Chair
Vice-Chancellor and Principal



Denise Lauzière, Secretary General
(Interim)