



Brock University Senate

MINUTES OF MEETING #578 (2009-10)

**SENATE**

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 21, 2010, 3:15 PM

DR. CHARLES A. SANKEY CHAMBER, MACKENZIE CHOWN COMPLEX

**PRESENT:** Professor John Sivell (Chair), Professor Susan Sydor (Vice-Chair), Interim Dean Rick Cheel, Dean John Corlett, Ms. Barb Davis, Dr. Greg Finn, Ms. Margaret Grove, Mr. Rudi Kroeker, Mr. Rob Lanteigne, Dr. Jack Lightstone, Ms. Kim Meade, Dean Marilyn Rose, Dr. Philip Wright

Professors Tansu Barker, Christine Daigle, Nancy DeCourville, Tamara El-Hoss, Nota Klentrou, Renee Kuchapski, Maureen Lux, Dan Malleck, James Mandigo, Roberto Nickel, Richard Parker, Michael Plyley, Stan Sadava, Cristina Santos, Larry Savage, Astride Silis, R. Angus Smith, Mark Spencer, Paul Zelisko

Mr. Roland Acha, Mr. Sebastian Prins, Ms. Carly White

Mr. Bill Rickers, Mr. Bruce Wormald

Mr. Mike Farrell, Secretary, Ms. Margaret Thompson, Associate Secretary

**ALSO**

**PRESENT:** Mr. Patrick Beard, Associate Dean John Lye

**REGRETS:** Ms. Tabasum Akseer, Dr. Ian Brindle, Professor June Corman, Mr. Will Crothers, Dean Thomas Dunk, Professor Sandra Felton, Ms. Jessica Gallagher, Mr. Ned Goodman, Dean Rosemary Hale, Dean James Heap, Mr. Ryan Klamot, Dr. Murray Knuttila, Professors Murray Kropf, Kelly Lockwood, Diane Mack, Herb MacKenzie, Ingrid Makus, Tom O'Neil, Frances Owen, Interim Dean Barbara Sainty, Mr. Kevin Smith, Professors David Vivian, Michelle Webber, Barry Wright, Deborah Yeager-Woodhouse, Deborah Zinni

Professor Sivell welcomed members and called the meeting to order.

**1. Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of the 577<sup>th</sup> meeting of Senate held on March 24, 2010 had been posted with the meeting materials.

**MOVED** (Santos/Plyley)

**THAT the minutes of the 577<sup>th</sup> meeting of Senate held on March 24, 2010 be approved.**

**CARRIED**

**2. Business Arising from the Minutes - None**

**3. Communications – None**

**4. Report of the Chair**

[The Highlights for Senate 578 had been posted with the meeting materials.]

Professor Sivell referred members to the Senate Highlights which had been posted with the meeting materials. He highlighted several of the celebratory announcements, including the Ontario government's recent announcement of \$26.2 million in support of the Marilyn I. Walker School of Fine and Performing Arts, and encouraged members to view and share the information.

**5. Report of the President and Vice-Chancellor**

[The President's Report to Senate dated April 2010 had been posted with the meeting materials.]

Dr. Lightstone prefaced his report by noting that Dr. Knuttila was currently in a decanal search committee meeting and would be unable to attend the Senate meeting.

The President referred members to his written Report. During discussion, the President expanded on the implications of the recent announcement of the Ontario budget and responded to questions. In response to a question regarding the posting of budget cuts by department on the University's website, the President indicated that he anticipated that an analysis of the implications of the budget recommendations would be completed and shared with the University community after the budget had been finalized; however, he would bring the question forward to the University Budget Committee for consideration.

At the request of the President, and in response to a question, Dean Rose expanded on the discussions and initiatives underway to improve financial support for international graduate students.

**6. Report of the Provost and Vice-President, Academic - None**

**7. Report of the Academic Colleague – COU - None**

**8. Report of the Actions of the Board of Trustees**

There had been no Board of Trustees meeting held prior to this meeting of Senate.

**9. Unfinished Business from the Last Meeting - None****10. Reports of Standing Committees****10.1 Undergraduate Student Affairs Committee**

[The Report of the Undergraduate Student Affairs Committee dated April 21, 2010 had been posted with the meeting materials.]

Professor Parker presented the Report.

a) Amendments to FHB III 19.1.5 Distinguished Graduating Award and 19.5 Dean's Honour List

**MOVED** (Parker/Plyley)

**THAT Senate accept the amendments to FHB III: 19.1.5 Distinguished Graduating Award and FHB III: 19.5 Dean's Honours List as outlined in the Report.**

It was noted that references to "distinguished graduate student award" in Appendix 1 would be amended to "distinguished graduating student award".

**CARRIED**

**10.2 Graduate Studies Committee**

[The Report of the Graduate Studies Committee dated April 2010 had been posted with the meeting materials.]

Professor Klentrou presented the Report of the Graduate Studies Committee.

a) Amendments to Faculty Handbook 14.9 Evaluation

**MOVED** (Klentrou/El-Hoss)

**THAT Senate approve the changes to FHB III: 14.9 Evaluation as outlined in the Report.**

Professor Klentrou reviewed the rationale for the proposed changes. In response to a question from the Registrar, it was confirmed that changes regarding the A+ and the complete/incomplete would be effective for the 2011-12 academic year.

**CARRIED**

b) Amendments to FHB III: 14.8 Graduate Supervision, Exit Requirements and Thesis Defences

**MOVED** (Klentrou/Santos)

**THAT Senate approve the changes to FHB III: 14.8 Graduate Supervision, Exit Requirements and Thesis Defences as outlined in the Report.**

Professor Klentrou reviewed the rationale for the proposed changes and highlighted the addition of section L) regarding the deferral of a defence due to ill health. A **friendly amendment** to insert a comma prior to “for reasons of ill-health” was accepted by the mover and seconder.

During discussion, it was questioned if the supervisor’s role would continue should they retire and their status change to Professor Emeritus prior to the graduate student’s completion of their thesis. Professor Klentrou agreed to bring the matter forward for clarification to the Graduate Studies Committee and would report back to Senate.

With respect to the proposed amendments to section 14.8.1 H, it was suggested that clarification regarding the approval of a change in supervisor was required.

**MOVED** (Barker/Parker)

**That section 14.8.1. H be amended to read: “If either the graduate student or supervisor wishes to initiate a change in supervisor and the change cannot be resolved at the graduate program level, a request must be presented in writing, with explanation, to the Graduate Program Director, and approved by the ~~Faculty Dean and the Dean of Graduate Studies~~ in consultation with the ~~Faculty Dean~~ and the Graduate Program Director.”**

**CARRIED**

The Chair confirmed that Senators were ready to vote on the main motion.

**QUESTION on the motion, as amended**

**CARRIED**

c) Amendments to FHB III: 14.5 Admissions

**MOVED** (Klentrou/Mandigo)

**THAT Senate approve the changes to FHB III: 14.5 Admissions as outlined in the Report.**

Professor Klentrou reviewed the proposed amendments.

A comprehensive discussion ensued regarding the proposed addition to FHB III: 14.5.3 *Categories of Admission* with respect to the Admission to Doctoral Programs and the

following sentence: “In rare cases, a student may be admitted directly to Doctoral studies with a four-year honours Bachelor’s degree, or the equivalent; his or her academic standing and research potential should be unquestionably superior.”

Questions arose regarding the wording “In rare cases” and the phrase “research potential should be unquestionably superior”. A suggestion to change “research potential” to “research achievement” was presented.

Professor Klentrou expanded on the Committee’s careful consideration of the proposed changes to admission and the suggested language. She noted that the request for the direct admission to Doctoral studies had been forwarded to the Committee from the Department of Chemistry in order to better compete for exceptional students. The change had been proposed by the Department’s external reviewers.

During discussion, it was further clarified that should a student who had entered directly into the PhD program not complete the program, it was understood that a Master’s degree would not automatically be conferred. Senators discussed the implications of admitting students with a four-year honours Bachelor’s degree or equivalent directly into PhD programs.

A point of order was raised regarding the sequence of speakers and was well taken by the Chair.

Following further discussion, and in an effort to move forward to consider the remaining proposed amendments within FHB III: 14.5, it was

**MOVED** (Prins/Sadava)

**THAT the proposed amendments to the FHB III: 14.5.3 Categories of Admission - Admission to Doctoral Programs be severed from the main motion.**

**CARRIED**

In light of the discussion held and the suggested changes offered to the Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee from the floor of Senate, it was

**MOVED** (Sadava/Finn)

**THAT the proposed amendments to FHB III: 14.5.3 Categories of Admission - Admission to Doctoral Programs be referred back to the Graduate Studies Committee.**

**CARRIED**

Professor Sivell confirmed that Senators were ready to vote on the main motion.

**QUESTION on the motion as amended**

**CARRIED**

### **10.3 Undergraduate Program Committee**

[The Report of the Undergraduate Program Committee to Senate 578 had been posted with the meeting materials.]

Professor Mandigo presented the Report of the Undergraduate Program Committee.

a) Additions/Deletions/Changes to the Undergraduate Course Bank

Professor Mandigo referred members to the 8 motions as contained in items 1-7 of the Report.

The Chair questioned if Senate would prefer to consider all motions as an omnibus motion. It was requested by Mr. Lanteigne, and Senate concurred, that item 4 regarding Physical Education be considered separately.

**MOVED** (Mandigo/Nickel)

**That the motions as contained in items 1-3 and 5-7 of the Report be approved.**

**CARRIED**

Senators were referred to item 4 of the Report.

**MOVED** (Mandigo/Nickel)

**That Senate approve the changes in the course bank for the Department of Physical Education and Kinesiology as outlined in pages 12-13.**

Mr. Lanteigne noted that he would vote against the proposed changes as the deletion of the seminar was due to budgetary and not pedagogical reasons. As a student representative, this was one of the few opportunities he had to express support for the continuation of Brock's seminar system.

Professor Mandigo expanded on the strategic discussions held within the Department of Physical Education and Kinesiology and the feedback received from students regarding the most effective way to allocate the funds available. He emphasized that while the Department would like to keep seminars, the protection of labs has been identified as a priority under the current financial constraints. Moving forward, the development of the University's strategic plan would assist Departments in making informed decisions. In response to a question, Professor Klentrou noted that should the budget constraints begin to impact the offering of labs, the academic integrity and the accreditation of the program would be compromised.

**QUESTION on the motion**

**CARRIED**

**10.4 Information Technology and Infrastructure Committee**

[The Report of the Information Technology and Infrastructure Committee dated April 14, 2010 had been posted with the meeting materials.]

Professor Malleck presented the Report for the information of Senate which contained details regarding discussions held and initiatives underway with respect to information technology purchases and upgrades and the COU study on university space.

**10.5 Budget Advisory Committee**

[The Report of the Budget Advisory Committee dated April 16, 2010 had been posted with the meeting materials.]

Professor Parker presented the Report of the Budget Advisory Committee for the information of Senate. As outlined in the Report, the Committee documented the most salient concerns regarding the impact of the budget on the quality of academic programming and the alignment of the schedule of deliberations.

A discussion ensued regarding the potential ranking of the concerns outlined by the Budget Advisory Committee, the academic priorities of the University, and the mandate of the Budget Advisory Committee. Professor Parker invited Senators to provide comments and suggestions to him following the meeting. It was further confirmed that time would be allotted at the next Senate meeting for further discussion of the ranking of the concerns.

**11. Other Business - None****12. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 5:13 p.m.