



The UNIVERSITY of WESTERN ONTARIO

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF SENATE

JUNE 19, 1997

The meeting was held at 2:00 p.m. in Room 38 of the Law Building.

SENATORS: 59

J. Adams
M. Armstrong
D.E. Baer
D.R. Bellhouse
W.A. Bridger
R. Brooke
R.N. Bryan
G.S.P. Castle
P. Chandarana
M. Cheesman
W.R. Code
J.D. Cooke
R.P. Coulter
T.C. Craven
C. Cummins
P. Davenport
L. Dos Santos
C. Down
J. Erskine
D. Fairbairn

C. Farber
B. Forster
B.P. Frohmann
B. Garcia
T. Garrard
P.M. Gaudet
W. Gibson
E.E. Gillese
J.M. Good
R. Harris
K.H.W. Hilborn
R. Hudler
N. Huner
D. Jacobson
W. Kennedy
G. Killan
D. Kimura
R. Lipson
T.C.Y. Lo
S. Martin

R.M. Mathur
G. McCarthy
K. McQuillan
P.P. Mercer
G. Moran
P. Mueller
D. Muñoz
P. Neary
A. Oosterhoff
A. Osler
A. Pearson
C. Seligman
B. Singh
J.L. Stokes
J. Topolski
J.K. Van Fleet
C. Walsh
A. Weedon
L. Weiner

Observers: T. Kennedy, R. Parks, H. Roos

By Invitation: C. Baird, N.O. Petersen

S.97-129

Closed meeting of Senate

In compliance with the University Act [S.31(2)], Senate met in closed session to consider a personnel issue. Minutes for this portion of the meeting are provided to Senators only as **Appendix 1** to these minutes.

S.97-130

Minutes of the Previous Meeting

Mr. Armstrong expressed his opinion that the minutes of the meeting of May 15 reporting the debates on the issues of "honors vs honours" and "master/magisteriate" do not accurately reflect what happened during the meeting. He contended that the minutes do not contain some points which were germane to the debate, such as the comment he made about the term "technoculture", nor do they reflect the jocular tone of the debates. He stated that some visitors left the Senate meeting with the impression that Senate did not consider the motions seriously because they were supported by students.

The Secretary of Senate explained that the minutes are intended to be a summary of discussion, rather than a script, and that it is not standard practice to report in the minutes that Senators were amused at various points during discussion. Although Mr. Armstrong did not propose a specific amendment to the minutes, the Secretary agreed to take his concerns under advisement.

The minutes of the meeting of May 15, 1997, were approved as circulated.

S.97-131

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

The President's Report included information on the following topics:

- Progress Report - *Leadership in Learning* [tabled at the May 15, 1997, Senate Meeting]
- PACFED Report and Recommendations for Implementation: The Provost will hold an open meeting on Tuesday, June 24, 1997, to discuss the PACFED process.
- Discussion Paper - Expansion of Undergraduate Programs in the Summer Term: An open meeting will be held in September to discuss the issue of expansion of undergraduate programs in the summer term.

Dr. Davenport encouraged all Senators to contact the Provost with comments or concerns about the PACFED report and the Summer Term discussion paper.

Professor Seligman questioned the presentation to Senate of issues such as PACFED that at some point could become part of negotiations between the administration and the UWO Faculty Association. In his view, this scenario could be seen as premature Senate endorsement of the senior administration's position. The Provost disagreed, pointing out that the PACFED report is a discussion document. The President has asked Senators to provide their input because the Provost wants to improve his understanding of views on campus and to refine the report if warranted.

Professor Osler advised Senate that representatives of the Faculty Association and the administration are currently engaged in unprecedented discussion about restructuring the relationship between the Faculty Association and the University. It is recognized that there will be "fuzzy lines" about exactly where a given element of business should go and what aspects of business should be considered by which body. He added that the Faculty Association will hold an open forum to discuss the PACFED document on June 26, 1997, in Room 2020 of the Social Science Centre.

S.97-131a

Stakeholder Research Project

Mr. Garrard provided an update on the Stakeholder Research Project. The objectives of this project are: to provide an in-depth analysis of stakeholder views relating to the University and those aspects that are open to influence through communications; to identify employability patterns from 1992 and 1995; to identify the factors that are most important to potential students in the selection of a university and the extent to which Western is perceived to do well or poorly related to these factors; and to identify the factors that will enhance alumni interest in and financial support to the University. He highlighted his presentation with overheads, copies of which are attached to these minutes as *Appendix 2*.

S.97-131b

Research at Western: Industry Liaison and Technology Transfer

Dr. Bridger gave status report on research at Western, including industry liaison, technology transfer, and contract research. He also summarized features of an Intellectual Property Policy which is being developed. Dr. Bridger highlighted his presentation with overheads, copies of which are attached as *Appendix 3*.

ENQUIRIES

S.97-132

Department of Sociology Document [S.97-106]

At the request of the Provost, and in response to questions raised at the May 15 Senate meeting, Professor Neary, Dean of the Faculty of Social Science, informed Senate that the backdrop to recent activities in the Department of Sociology is a report by Professor Trish Fulton of Huron College. The report was commissioned by the Dean in response to several representations to him by faculty, staff, and students in Sociology on a number of issues. Professor Fulton did not undertake an enquiry or investigation. Rather, she acted as a facilitator and in this role she met with students, faculty and staff to help them discern the full extent of any problems that existed and to explore possible remedies.

Professor Fulton's report was submitted to the Dean in January and was subsequently distributed to faculty, staff, and students in the Department of Sociology. The Department then named an *ad hoc* committee, chaired by Professor Ingrid Connidis, to consider Professor Fulton's report. The documents about which questions were asked in the May meeting of Senate are the work of this *ad hoc* committee. These documents were considered by the Assembly of the Department of Sociology in mid-April and agreement was reached in principle on three recommendations. However, no final action was taken. Rather, the members of the Department were invited to provide, through the Chair, comments and suggestions for further debate at a meeting of the Assembly scheduled for May 29.

On May 28, Dean Neary wrote to Professor Ebanks, the Chair of the Department of Sociology as follows:

Thank you for sending me the documents, now being considered by the Departmental Assembly, from the ad hoc committee on Trish Fulton's report. I am indeed pleased that the Department is making a serious and determined effort to address the issues raised by Professor Fulton. I applaud this effort. I am concerned, however, that some of the language used in the documents you sent might give the appearance of limiting freedom of speech in the Department and therefore the Faculty and the University. I am sure that you and your colleagues will agree that freedom of speech is at the heart of the University's mission and that we must all defend it vigorously. Western cannot have a speech code and no University document should be misleading in this regard. In the circumstances, I recommend that your Department have a further round of consultation about the documents in question before giving them further consideration in the Assembly. I remain committed to addressing the issues raised in Professor Fulton's report and will continue to support the Department's efforts to do so. We cannot ignore troublesome workplace issues.

When the Department met the next day (May 29), it accepted this advice and passed the following motion: "Moved: The Assembly supports efforts to address the issues raised by the Fulton Report and instructs the Chair of the Department to consult with the appropriate persons in the University regarding the structure of the Committee on Equity and Professionalism and the Statement of Professional Ethics."

Dean Neary advised Senate that the Chair of the Department - Professor Ebanks, who will be succeeded by Professor Kevin McQuillan on July 1 - is now engaged in this effort. He stated that he, as Dean of the Faculty, will always defend vigorously freedom of speech and enquiry. At the same time, he will be working with the Department to ensure a good working environment for all its members. In the Dean's view, there is no fundamental clash of interest and that is the spirit in which he will act.

Professor Hilborn questioned the status of rules adopted by a particular Department if those rules overlap with the policies of the University as approved by Senate, but impose more severe restrictions on speech and conduct. Are such rules regarded by the University as enforceable through disciplinary action against individual faculty members -- disciplinary action that might be upheld by a Faculty or Senate grievance committee? In his view, such rules are not enforceable. The principles set forth in *Leadership in Learning* and other University policies approved by Senate both permit and protect academic freedom, along with normal freedom of expression. In view of concerns raised by some proposals in the Sociology Department, Dr. Hilborn asked that the senior administration put on record an assurance that members of all academic units have equal rights to those freedoms, and that no particular academic unit possesses the power to impose rules of its own restricting those rights.

Dr. Moran agreed with Professor Hilborn's interpretation, noting that there are levels of academic freedom and freedom of speech that the University guarantees to all of its members. No individual is in a position to reduce those levels of academic freedom and freedom of speech. He stressed, however, that freedom of speech also permits and encourages active debate and provides an atmosphere in which everyone feels free to express their opinions without fear of any kind of recrimination or consequence beyond those established by the University. However, there will be times when members of the University community say or do things that some will believe contravene the limits of the policies established by Senate. These individuals may choose to bring forward allegations under those policies. Such allegations will be dealt with according to established procedures.

Dr. Mercer stated that there is no right or principle more fundamental to a University than freedom of speech and enquiry. Any unit that purports to establish something called a "rule" which limits such freedoms beyond the limitations imposed by Senate would be unenforceable and therefore, in fact, not a "rule".

Mr. Jacobson asked if any body within the University, including Senate, that has authority to establish rules constraining freedom of speech, given that those rules may infringe upon rights guaranteed by the Canadian *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*. Dr. Mercer replied that if one begins with the principle that within a university freedom of speech is a fundamental right then one need not speculate on the jurisdiction to impose rules that might be subject to challenge under the Charter. Senate is the body that should debate any incursion on freedom of speech. In his view, the jurisdictional question obscures the fundamental issue which is that in the University freedom of speech and freedom of inquiry are not just principles but are part of the essence of what a university is.

Dr. Kimura asked to what extent administrators -- chairs, deans, or vice-presidents -- are empowered to concern themselves with private conversations between adults on campus, assuming that there is no behavior which would result in a charge under existing Senate policies.

Dr. Mercer replied that the element of publicity obviously becomes the issue. But insofar as purely private communications are concerned, that is, communication between the communicator and the recipient, the law generally is not intrusive. The principle of defamation in law involves an element of publicity that does not apply to private communications. On the other hand, people who believe

they are engaged in private conversations who are nonetheless overheard by others who are not otherwise privy to them may find that the view of privacy and publicity held by the respective parties changes. Because of the element of privacy, a truly private conversation is not one that the administration could act upon.

Dr. Kimura gave the example of a professor and her graduate students having a private conversation in the lab wherein the professor uses "colorful language". She asked whether she could assume that there would be no repercussions of any kind, providing the professor was not violating Senate policy. Dr. Mercer responded that if there is no policy that otherwise applies, her assumption is correct; however, the use of colorful language could attract attention and the pursuit of sanction through legal means.

S.97-133 **Academic Offerings of the University** [S.97-105c]

Dean Neary referred to discussion at the May meeting of Senate which focused on an article in the *London Free Press* that questioned the integrity of certain courses offered by the University, one of which was "Geography of Gender". Dean Neary defended the validity of the course, which was approved through the normal process. It will be offered for the first time in 1997-98 and will be taught by two highly qualified professors of Geography. He stated that the course deals with important and substantial subject matter and is based upon a significant body of scholarship. It is not a compulsory course and, like many other courses, "will rise or fall in the marketplace of ideas and student choice".

REPORT OF THE OPERATIONS/AGENDA COMMITTEE [Exhibit I]

S.97-134 **Senate Membership**

S.97-134a **Alternates and Filling of Vacancies**

On behalf of the Operations/Agenda Committee, it was moved by J.L. Stokes, seconded by L. Weiner,

That, pursuant to Senate regulations for the Filling of Vacancies, the following be approved:

Faculty of Arts

That the Senate seat held by V. Tumanov, elected representative for the Faculty of Arts constituency, be declared vacant as a result of his resignation, and that G.M. Eramian be elected to complete Professor Tumanov's term (to October 31, 1997), as recommended by the Faculty of Arts.

King's College

That the Senate seat held by G. Killan, elected representative of King's College, be declared vacant effective July 1, 1997, when he begins his term as Principal of King's College (at which time he will become an *ex officio* member of Senate), and that J. Snyder be elected to complete Professor Killan's term (to October 31, 1997), as recommended by King's College.

CARRIED

S.97-134b **New Seats on Senate**

It was moved by J.L. Stokes, seconded by R. Bryan,

That, subject to approval of the new seats on Senate by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, the following be elected to Senate to serve from July 1 (or as soon as LGIC approval is granted) to October 31, 1997:

Arts:	Richard Hillman (English)
Business:	Claude Lanfranconi
Communications & Open Learning:	(1) Tim Craven (2) Andrew Osler
Education:	Margaret McNay
Engineering Science:	J.M. Floryan (Mechanical and Materials Engineering)
Graduate Studies:	(1) Tilottama Rajan (Theory and Criticism) (2) John Sheasby (Mechanical and Materials Engineering)
Health Sciences:	(see S.97-134c below)
Law:	Robert Hawkins
Medicine & Dentistry:	(see S.97-134d below)

Music: Robert Toft (Music History)
Science: Rob Corless (Applied Mathematics)
Social Science: Stephen Lupker (Psychology)
Brescia College: Alicia Garcia (Home Economics)
Huron College: Mark Cole (Psychology)
King's College: Ken McKellar (Modern Languages)

Undergraduate _____ *
Students: _____ *
Graduate Students: _____ *

* *The nominees for the undergraduate and graduate seats will be brought to Senate in September.*

CARRIED

S.97-134c Faculty of Health Sciences

It was moved by J.L. Stokes, seconded by R. Bryan,

That the following members of faculty be elected to represent the Faculty of Health Sciences on the Senate for terms beginning July 1, 1997 (subject to LGIC approval by that date):

Margaret Cheesman (Comm. Sci. & Disorders) to October 31, 1998
Darwin Semotiuk (Kinesiology) to October 31, 1998
Carroll Iwasiw (Nursing) to October 31, 1998

and

That the fourth faculty position remain vacant until it is filled in the October 1997 election for a two-year term (to October 31, 1999).

CARRIED

S.97-134d Faculty of Medicine & Dentistry

It was moved by J.L. Stokes, seconded by B. Singh,

That the following members of faculty be elected to represent the Faculty of Medicine & Dentistry on the Senate for terms beginning July 1, 1997 (subject to LGIC approval by that date) and ending on the date indicated in each case:

Praful Chandarana (Psychiatry) to October 31, 1997
Gillian McCarthy (Dentistry) to October 31, 1997
David Muñoz (Pathology & Clin. Neur. Sci.) to October 31, 1997
Bertha Garcia (Pathology) to October 31, 1998
Ted Lo (Biochemistry) to October 31, 1998

CARRIED

S.97-135 Faculty of Graduate Studies Constitution

With the agreement of Senate, the following correction was made to the proposed constitution of the Faculty of Graduate Studies shown in Exhibit I, Appendix 1:

11.0(iv) changed to read: "seven senators representing the *programs* of the Faculty of Graduate Studies, ..."

It was moved by J.L. Stokes, seconded by A. Weedon,

That the constitution of the Faculty of Graduate Studies be revised as detailed in Exhibit I, Appendix 1 (including the above-noted correction), as recommended by the Council of the Faculty of Graduate Studies.

CARRIED

S.97-136 Senate Membership within Constituencies

S.97-136a Faculty of Graduate Studies

Referring to an Addendum to Exhibit I, it was moved by J.L. Stokes, seconded by D. Baer,

Pursuant to section 24.(1)(b) of the *University of Western Ontario Act* (1982), and subject to the approval by the LGIC that 10 members of the Faculty of Graduate Studies be elected to Senate, that, *starting with the Senate elections to be conducted in the fall of 1997*, Senate resolution S.3321.02 (July 1982) be rescinded and that the following constituencies comprise the Faculty of Graduate Studies representation on Senate, as recommended by the Council of the Faculty of Graduate Studies:

2 members elected by members of the Faculty of Graduate Studies holding faculty appointments in the Faculties of Music, Arts, Social Sciences

2 members elected by members of the Faculty of Graduate Studies holding faculty appointments in the Faculties of Medicine & Dentistry, Science, Health Sciences

2 members elected by members of the Faculty of Graduate Studies holding faculty appointments in the Faculties of Engineering Science, Education, Communications and Open Learning, and the Richard Ivey School of Business

1 elected by members of the Faculty of Graduate Studies who are members of interdisciplinary or collaborative graduate programs

3 elected by the members of the Faculty of Graduate Studies at large

and that the following incumbent Senators complete their terms on Senate representing the Faculty of Graduate Studies to October 31, 1998, in the constituencies outlined below:

C. Thomson (Arts) representing the constituency for members of the Faculty of Graduate Studies holding faculty appointments in the Faculties of Music, Arts, Social Sciences [Prof. Thomson was elected in the Fall 1996 elections to represent the Arts Division];

R.H. Lipson (Science) representing the constituency for members of the Faculty of Graduate Studies holding faculty appointments in the Faculties of Medicine & Dentistry, Science, Health Sciences [Prof. Lipson was elected in the Fall 1996 elections to represent the Physical Sciences Division];

K. McQuillan and **B. Singh** representing the Faculty of Graduate Studies at Large [both were elected in the Fall 1996 elections to represent the Faculty of Graduate Studies at Large].

Professor Baer expressed concern that the Faculty of Graduate Studies Council did not adequately consider the process that occurs as a result of having circumscribed constituencies. Frequently Senators from these constituencies are elected by acclamation and sometimes there are vacancies that must be filled later. In his view, reduction of the number of Graduate Studies At Large seats from four to three will not benefit the democratic process which affects the elected faculty.

The question was called and CARRIED.

S.97-136b Faculty of Medicine & Dentistry

It was moved by J.L. Stokes, seconded by R. Lipson,

Pursuant to section 24.(1)(b) of the *University of Western Ontario Act* (1982), and subject to the approval by the LGIC that 5 members of faculty be elected to Senate from the Faculty of Medicine & Dentistry, that the following constituencies comprise the Faculty of Medicine & Dentistry representation on Senate as approved by the Faculty's Merger Task Force:

1 member elected from and by the School of Dentistry

4 members elected from and by the Faculty of Medicine & Dentistry at large

CARRIED

S.97-137 **Senate Committees - Terms of Reference and Composition**

S.97-137a **Senate Committee on Academic Policy and Admission (SCAPA)**

It was moved by J.L. Stokes, seconded by A. Pearson,

That the composition of SCAPA be revised as follows:

- (a) eight members of Faculty, at least five of whom are members of Senate at the time elected. At least one member shall be from each of the Faculties of Arts, Science, and Social Science. No more than one of the members of faculty may be a Dean

CARRIED

S.97-137b **Subcommittee on Research Involving Human Subjects (SURIHS)**

It was moved by J.L. Stokes, seconded by R. Bryan,

That the terms of reference and composition of SURIHS be amended as shown below:

Terms of Reference:

To establish two review boards, *in the health sciences and in the humanities/social sciences*, for the purpose of reviewing *all* research involving human subjects

To oversee the operations of these review boards and amend their procedures and composition as necessary.

To report to the University Research Board as required, but at least annually, on the activities of the Subcommittee and its boards, and to bring forward to the University Research Board concerns and recommendations in regard to policy on research involving human subjects.

Composition:

Ex officio: Vice-President (Research)[who shall be Chair]
Dean of Social Science
Chairs of Review Boards
Director of Research Services (*non-voting*)

CARRIED

S.97-137c **Senate Committee on Information Technology and Services (SCITS)**

It was moved by J.L. Stokes, seconded by W. Gibson,

That the composition of SCITS be revised as follows:

FROM: Three Deans and three alternates appointed by the President

TO: Three persons, including at least one Dean, appointed by the President

CARRIED

S.97-137d **Subcommittee on Computing and Networking Services (SUCNS)**

It was moved by J.L. Stokes, seconded by C. Farber,

That the composition of SUCNS be revised as shown below:

Composition (elected/appointed):

Members of faculty are to be elected by the Faculty Council within the following constituencies for two-year terms:

Two members elected by the Faculty of Science
Two members elected by the Faculty of Social Science
One member elected by the Faculty of Engineering Science
Two members elected by the *Faculty of Communications and Open Learning*
Three other members elected by Faculties other than Science, Social Science, Engineering Science and *Communications and Open Learning* on a rotating basis defined by SCITS

One graduate and one undergraduate student are to be appointed by the Society of Graduate Students and the University Students' Council respectively for one-year terms.

CARRIED

S.97-138 **Nominating Committee - Membership**

T. Lo and M. Randall (terms to November 1998) were elected to the Senate Nominating Committee to replace B. Forster and P. Gaudet who have resigned.

S.97-139 **Procedures for Joint Appointments Within the University**

It was moved by J.L. Stokes, seconded by G. Moran,

That the Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors, through the Vice-Chancellor, the Procedures for Joint Appointments Within The University, detailed in Exhibit I, Appendix 2.

CARRIED

S.97-140 **Amendments to Conditions of Appointment Relating to Joint Appointments**

It was moved by J.L. Stokes, seconded by R. Bryan,

That the Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors, through the Vice-Chancellor, the following amendments to *Conditions of Appointment*:

1. Immediately preceding A.9 in the Joint Appointments section: (a) reproduce the sentence that appears in parentheses above B.15 [relating to Joint Faculty Committees on Promotion and Tenure]; (b) add a reference to Joint Appointments

Committees, Joint Department Committees on Promotion and Tenure and Joint Faculty Grievance Committees as follows:

"Joint Appointments

(Joint Appointments Committees and Joint Department Committees on Promotion and Tenure may be appropriate. Also, Joint Faculty Committees on Promotion and Tenure and Joint Faculty Grievance Committees may be appropriate if the appointments are across two or more Faculties.)"

2. Add the word "Joint" in front of "Appointments Committee" in A.10(d) as follows:

"Where it is proposed to alter an existing continuing joint appointment during its term by changing the defined designation of the proportion of responsibility to the Department (Faculty), such changes shall be considered by the *Joint Appointments Committee*. The appointee's consent to the proposed action of the *Joint Appointments Committee* shall be required before that Committee's recommendation is sent forward."

CARRIED

S.97-141 **Appointments Procedures**

S.97-141a **Directors, Faculty of Communications and Open Learning**

It was moved by J.L. Stokes, seconded by C. Farber,

That section R. of *Appointments Procedures*, dealing with selection committees for Directors of the Faculty of Part-Time and Continuing Education be replaced by a new section - Directors, Faculty of Communications and Open Learning - as detailed below.

DIRECTORS, FACULTY OF COMMUNICATIONS AND OPEN LEARNING

Composition of Selection Committees

A committee to select a **Director of Continuing Studies** shall consist of:

- (a) the Dean of the Faculty of Communications and Open Learning, who shall be Chair
- (b) the Provost & Vice-President (Academic)
- (c) 2 persons elected by the Council of the Faculty of Communications and Open Learning
- (d) 2 persons elected by Senate

A committee to select a **Resident Director of the Trois-Pistoles French Immersion School** shall consist of:

- (a) the Dean of the Faculty of Communications and Open Learning, who shall be Chair
- (b) the Chair of the Department of French
- (c) 2 persons elected by the Council of the Faculty of Communications and Open Learning

Director of Continuing Studies

If the proposed Director has an academic appointment with tenure, he/she shall be appointed for a term of five years, which may be renewed; if the proposed Director does not have an appointment with tenure, the term shall be for an indefinite period.

Resident Director of the Trois-Pistoles French Immersion School

Dependent upon the status and qualifications of the successful candidate, the Director of the Trois-Pistoles French Immersion School shall be either a tenured faculty member, appointed as a Director for a term of three to five years (renewable); a limited-term faculty member, teaching one course for the Department of French, with a term of three years (renewable); or a member of staff with an indefinite term, concurrently teaching one course for the Department of French on a part-time basis.

CARRIED

S.97-141b Director of Animal Care and Veterinary Services

It was moved by J.L. Stokes, seconded by W.A. Bridger,

That section X. of *Appointments Procedures*, dealing with the composition of a selection committee for a Director of Animal Care and Veterinary Services, be amended by deleting "the Vice-Provost Health Sciences". The Selection Committee would therefore consist of:

- (a) the Vice-President (Research), who shall be Chair
- (b) the Chair of the University Council on Animal Care
- (c) 4 persons elected by the University Council on Animal Care
- (d) 3 persons elected by Senate, who are not members of the University Council on Animal Care, and only one of whom may be a Dean.

CARRIED

S.97-142 Senate Election Procedures

S.97-142a Candidate and Voter Eligibility - Representatives of the Faculty

It was moved by J.L. Stokes, seconded by L. Weiner,

That the Senate Election Procedures for Representatives of the Faculties, Schools, and Affiliated Colleges [*Senate Manual, pp. 10-2 and 10-3*] be revised as shown below with respect to Candidate and Voter Eligibility for faculty members with joint appointments:

Candidate and Voter Eligibility

Pursuant to Section 25(1) and 25(2),

- 25.(1) The election of a member of the Senate under clause 24(1)(b) or (d) shall be by secret ballot of the members of the academic unit or affiliated college to be represented who hold the rank of assistant professor or higher, but in all other respects such an election shall be in accordance with the manner and procedures established and determined by the Senate.
- 25.(2) To be eligible for election to the Senate under clause 24(1)(b) or (d), a person must be a member of the academic unit or constituent parts thereof as designated by the Senate or affiliated college to be represented, must hold the rank of assistant professor or higher, and must have held an academic appointment in the University or affiliated college for at least two academic years.

Pursuant to Senate Resolution:

- (1) A member of faculty, holding an appointment in more than one academic unit (*or constituency within that unit*) other than the Faculty of Graduate Studies, may accept nomination only in that unit designated as the "Home Faculty/School" *Such member of faculty would, however, be eligible to vote in each academic unit in which he or she is a member.*
- (2) Persons holding part-time academic appointments with the rank of Assistant Professor or higher shall be eligible for election and to vote in their appropriate academic units (S.11.01, and as amended).
- (3) If, at any annual election, no nominations are received for a faculty constituency, Senate may appoint a member upon the recommendation of the constituency concerned. (S.88-154.1)

- (4) Emeritus Professors who are members of the Faculty of Graduate Studies are eligible to vote for representatives of the Faculty of Graduate Studies to the Senate. Ballots will be mailed to the Emeritus Professors' home Departments. (S.96-58)

CARRIED

S.97-142b Senate Election Procedures - Representatives of the Students

It was moved by J.L. Stokes, seconded by R. Bryan,

That the following sections of Senate Election Procedures - Representatives of the Students [*pp. 10-5 and 10-6 of the Senate Manual*] be amended as shown below:

In the case of part-time on-campus undergraduate students and full-time graduate and undergraduate students (except undergraduate students enrolled in the Faculty of Education), balloting will be conducted during a designated period at polling stations established on campus. The Secretary of Senate is authorized to delegate to the University Students' Council and the Society of Graduate Students and the MBA Association such authority as is necessary for the distribution and collection of ballots. *The Secretary of the Senate may employ the USC Election Committee to supervise campaigning by candidates, to conduct on-campus elections of students to the Senate and to count the poll, but any decision that a candidate be disqualified may be appealed to the Secretary of Senate by 4:00 p.m. of the second working day following the date of the letter notifying the candidate of the Election Committee's decision that the candidate be disqualified. Where there is inconsistency between the policies and procedures stated in USC Resolution Six and those of the Senate, the policies and procedures of the Senate shall take precedence and the final authority for resolving all disputes in such matters shall rest with the Secretary of the Senate.*

6. A recount requested by any candidate will be conducted if, in the opinion of the Secretary of Senate and the two Honorary Scrutineers, there are sufficient grounds. The request for a recount *together with a statement of grounds* must be received by the Secretary of Senate by 4:00 p.m. of the second working day following the closing of the polls.

CARRIED

S.97-143 Establishment of a Committee to Study the Impact of Academic Programs on the Public Image of the University (S.97-105c, S.97-128)

S.97-143a It was moved by J.L. Stokes, seconded by R. Bryan,

That the motion presented by Dr. D. Muñoz at the May 15, 1997, Senate meeting not be considered by the Senate.

Dean Stokes, Chair of the Operations/Agenda Committee (OAC), explained that when a Notice of Motion is given by a Senator, OAC normally determines an appropriate place on the next Senate agenda for the motion to be debated. Establishment of Senate committees is a matter that falls under OAC's terms of reference, and since Dr. Muñoz's motion directs the establishment of a new Senate committee, OAC considered the substance of the proposal. As noted in the Committee's report, it was the view of the OAC that the object of Dr. Muñoz's motion has been achieved and is a central concern of both the Senate and the University. General parliamentary procedure prescribes that the Senate not be asked to consider again a matter that it has already disposed. Although OAC recommends that Senate not consider Dr. Muñoz's motion, the Committee does not want to frustrate the desire of any Senator to have the matter debated. Should Senate not approve the recommendation that the motion not be considered, the Chair will recognize Dr. Muñoz who can then place his motion before Senate.

Comments in support of the motion not to consider the Muñoz motion:

- There are a number of ongoing initiatives that address, indirectly, the way in which Western's academic programs are regarded and the net effect of all the various activities at Western lead to improving its public image.
- The increased elements of accountability and openness relating to issues such as course evaluations and reporting procedures contained in the PACPRUP report result in a more transparent and accountable process of reporting on undergraduate offerings.

Comments opposing the motion not to consider the Muñoz motion:

- Western's public image as it relates to its academic programs has not been taken into consideration by any Senate or Board committee.
- Any Senator who wishes to propose a motion, provided another Senator is willing to second it, should be allowed to have a debate and a vote on the motion unless the motion relates to an issue that lies outside the scope of Senate's power and responsibilities.
- OAC's recommendation not to consider a Senator's motion can be interpreted as the Committee's desire to impose unnecessary restrictions on the role individual Senators can play. Such an approach cannot be justified even on the narrow grounds of saving time; less time

might be consumed if OAC had let the original motion be debated on its own merits.

The question was called and was DEFEATED.

S.97-143b It was therefore moved by D. Muñoz, seconded by C. Walsh,

That a committee be struck by Senate to study the impact of academic programs on the public image of this University. The committee would be expected to make recommendations to Senate aimed at improving UWO's public image while strengthening the academic quality of our programs.

Dr. Muñoz cited a recent article in the *London Free Press* where Ontario placed last among the provinces in the third International Mathematics and Science Study. He stated that these poor results must be traced to the cause and Western and its Faculty of Education bear a portion of the responsibility. He asserted that in the "real world" those responsible for such a disaster would have been fired. In support of his motion, Dr. Muñoz again cited an article by Rory Leishman¹ where the legitimacy of a number of courses was questioned. In his view, the consequences of offering courses such as "Ambiguous bodies: studies in female sexuality" detracts from "real courses". He suggested that if Western does not "correct" this situation, others will do so.

Mr. Topolski observed that the public has a negative image about some courses offered at all Ontario universities, not just Western, and for this reason a study of the impact of academic programs on Western's public image would be worthwhile.

Professor Gaudet spoke against the motion stating that Dr. Muñoz, in his supporting argument, appeals to the real world which he characterizes as being populated by materialist consumers. The real world is also populated by people who are interested in social issues, in questions of cultural heritage and in all those immaterial imponderables that constitute civilization. Professor Gaudet said he found it disturbing that Dr. Muñoz used specific columns from the *London Free Press* which are not necessarily linked to the editorial policy of the paper, but represent the particular agenda of one columnist. He stated that Dr. Muñoz uses an egalitarian rhetoric -- one that cites a concern with moral and social responsibility and fair process -- basically as a camouflage for the pursuit of particular ideological purposes. He urged that Senate be wary of passing a motion that seems to impose this on the University by allusion to the University's public image as a way of controlling what is taught.

Dr. Moran reminded Senate that at the last meeting the President gave an eloquent and pithy response to Dr. Muñoz's assertions (S.97-105c). The objective of the motion before Senate is that Western should improve its public image. Western can best improve its public image by asking if it is serving society in its intended way. The university is already and quite appropriately engaged in looking beyond itself to determine how it is perceived by the public and how to better communicate with the public.

Professor A. Pearson, Dean of Education, observed that academic freedom has been characterized as the freedom to express in public unpopular ideas which are essential to enquiry and knowledge. Academic freedom requires that the educational institution not be committed to any particular doctrine; it must remain sufficiently neutral with respect to political, religious, and ideological positions.

Dean Pearson concurred that Ontario's educators are distressed by the lack of performance of Ontario's children shown in recent tests. The Ontario Association of Deans of Education, working with the Education Quality and Accountability Office, have organized a group of researchers from five universities to investigate some of the issues using a variety of data such as teacher education, curriculum, and parental support given to children. The results of the report should provide a better understanding of the root cause of Ontario's relatively poor results in this setting. He reminded Senate that the Faculty of Education's proposal to lengthen the teacher education program arose from the concern that Ontario teachers need to be better prepared. Curriculum changes are an issue; the Minister of Education has proposed changes to the curriculum for grade one through eight.

Dr. Muñoz reiterated that Western should examine itself to determine if the programs that are offered are in the best interest of the students and of the citizens of Ontario who support the university.

The question was called and was DEFEATED.

¹ Rory Leishman, "Integrity of university scholarship corrupted", the *London Free Press*, May 15, 1997, B.11.

S.97-144

Senate Election Schedule

Senate received for information the Senate Election Schedule as follows:

Faculty and Administrative Staff Constituencies

Call for Nominations	September 11 (Western News)
Nominations Open	September 12
Nominations Close	4:00 p.m., September 25
Posting of Nominations	September 26
Distribution of Ballots	September 30
Balloting	October 1 - 16
Polls Close	4:00 p.m., Thursday, October 16
Posting of Results	October 17
Publication of Official Results	October 23 (Western News)

Student Constituencies

Call for Nominations Advertised	September 11 (Western News & Gazette)
Nominations Open	September 12
Nominations Close	
- All constituencies but At Large	4:00 p.m., September 25
- At Large constituency	4:00 p.m., October 2
Posting of Nominations and Mandatory All Candidates' Advisory Meeting	5:00 p.m., October 2
Distribution of Mail Ballots*	October 7
Campaign Period	October 6 - 20 (incl.)
On-Campus Polling	October 21 - 22
Deadline for Mail Ballots	4:00 p.m., October 22
Posting of Results	October 23
Publication of Official Results	October 30 (Western News)

* Mail Ballots will be sent to part-time graduate students, undergraduate students enrolled in Mediated Learning courses and undergraduate students in Education in those cases where the student has returned the Franchise Activation Form to the University Secretariat by October 2. The Franchise Activation Forms are distributed to these students with Fall registration materials.

S.97-145

Candidates for Degrees - Spring 1997

Senate was advised that the Provost approved the list of Candidates for Degrees for Spring 1997 as recommended by the Registrar. The list of Candidates is attached to the Official Minutes of the Senate meeting of June 19, 1997, as Appendix A. A copy may be obtained from the Secretary of the Senate on request.

S.97-146

Location of Senate Meetings Starting September 1997

Beginning in September 1997, Senate meetings will be held on Fridays at 1:00 p.m. (unless otherwise noted) in Convocation Hall, Room 224, University College.

The meeting dates for 1997-98 are as follows:

1997 September 19, October 17, November 14, December 5

1998 January 23, February 20, March 20, April 17, May 15, June 19, September 18, October 16, November 13, December 4

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP [Exhibit II]

S.97-147

Senate Committee on Information Technology Systems (SCITS)

The following were elected to SCITS: J. Deans and E. Tittley (terms to June 30, 1998), G. Gloor and I. Moore (terms to June 2000), and H. Lutfiyya and R. Eagleson (terms to June 30, 1999).

S.97-148

University Planning (SCUP)

R. Parks and R. Fahrig (terms July 1, 1997 - June 30, 1998), and J. McKay and A. Weedon (terms July 1, 1997 - June 30, 2000) were elected to SCUP.

R. Parks was elected to SCUP (term to June 30, 1997) to complete the term of D. Tompkins who has resigned.

S.97-149 **University Research Board (URB)**

M. Goodale and S. Singh were elected to the University Research Board (terms to June 30, 2000). I. Moore was elected for a one-year term to serve as an alternate to R.K. Rowe during his leave of absence (term July 1, 1997, to June 30, 1998).

S.97-150 **Senate Committee on Academic Policy and Admissions (SCAPA)**

R. Porter (term to December 31, 1997), A. Allahar, R. Coulter (terms to December 31, 1997), and D. Fairbairn (term to December 31, 1998) were elected to SCAPA.

S.97-151 **Teacher Education Advisory Committee**

A.E. Bode was re-elected to serve on the Teacher Education Advisory Committee for a three-year term (term to June 2000).

S.97-152 **Standing Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics**

D. Fairbairn was elected to the Standing Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics to complete the term of P. Gaudet who has resigned (term to November 1998).

S.97-153 **Selection Committee for the Director of Libraries**

P. Auksi, D. Baer, L. Busby, and K. Shapiro were elected to the Selection Committee for the Director of Libraries.

S.97-154 **Senate Review Board Academic (SRBA)**

R. Porter was appointed to serve as an alternate on SRBA for M. Berman (term to August 31, 1997) during her leave of absence. Mark Armstrong was appointed to serve as an alternate for L. Fishback (term July 14 to August 2) and S. McDonald (term August 2 - 31) during their leaves of absence.

ACADEMIC POLICY AND ADMISSIONS [Exhibit III]

S.97-155 **Procedures for the Review of Undergraduate Programs**

It was moved by G. Moran, seconded by W. Gibson,

That formal Undergraduate Program Reviews at The University of Western Ontario take place on the occasion of:

- a) "Faculty Reviews" in Faculties without department structure, or where programs are Faculty-based, such that only a more comprehensive "Faculty Review" is positioned to examine them;
- b) "Department/School Reviews" for programs which are departmentally- or School-based. In situations where programs are shared among departments, it is recommended that, unless specified otherwise by the Program Review Committee, the shared program be reviewed at each of the related "Department Reviews";
- c) "Accreditation Reviews" for programs where the unit so chooses and where it can satisfy the Program Review Committee that the Review meets the UPRAC criteria.

That a Provost's Undergraduate Program Review Committee (PRC) be formed to act with and for the Provost in the matter of undergraduate program review. It is recommended that this committee be composed of one tenured faculty member (or Sequential-Term Continuing in clinical departments), duly elected by the respective Faculty Council, from each Faculty with an undergraduate program. It is recommended that two undergraduate students be appointed by the Provost in consultation with the University Students' Council.

CARRIED

S.97-156 **Scholar's Electives Program**

Dr. C. Baird, was present to respond to questions concerning the Scholar's Electives Program.

It was moved by G. Moran, seconded by R. Harris,

That the Scholar's Electives Program be revised as outlined below:

CALENDAR COPY

SCHOLAR'S ELECTIVES PROGRAM

The Scholar's Electives Program allows students who have demonstrated outstanding academic potential to elect their own program of studies in consultation with the departments concerned and with the approval of the Deans' office(s) involved. The Dean(s) will also appoint a faculty advisor for each senior student in the program. Students enrolled in the Scholar's Electives Program are able to pursue one of the Theme Areas discussed below or a combination of two subjects for which a formal joint program is not generally available, or an interdisciplinary combination of courses from different subjects which constitutes an appropriate liberal education. The Educational Development Office facilitates the initial registration of students in the Scholar's Electives Programs, especially for students entering it in their First Year. However, admission to the program is granted by the Dean of the Faculty designated by the applicant, who is responsible for the academic counselling for the student.

Admission to the Program

The Western Scholar's Electives Program is open to all students who apply for full-time admission to the first year in the Faculties of Arts, Communications and Open Learning, Engineering, Health Science, Science or Social Science and who have achieved at least a 90% average in their incoming high school marks. Students whose incoming average lies between 85% and 89% may request special permission to enter the program.

Students entering their second, third, or fourth year may also apply to enter the Program, provided that they have been registered for five courses in each September-April session that meet the criteria for the program (e.g., no more than five 020-level courses for a three-year degree, and no more than five 020 + 100 level courses for the honors degree) and have maintained at least an 80% average in each year of university study. Exceptions to these requirements will only be approved by the Dean(s) of the Faculty in extraordinary circumstances.

Affiliated Colleges

Each Affiliated College may offer a Scholar's Electives Program leading to a BA degree under the same conditions. Admission to the program shall be granted by the Dean or by the Principal of an Affiliated College and, where appropriate, in consultation with the Dean(s) of the constituent university Faculties involved in the proposed course of study. See the Calendar of the appropriate Affiliated College for Theme Areas available at that institution.

Progression in the Program

The achievement of an average of at least 80% in a full course load (minimum of five courses per session of September - April) is necessary for progression to the next year of the Program. The privileges of the Program shall be withdrawn upon transfer to another undergraduate program or failure to meet the progression requirements. Exceptions to the full course load requirement will only be approved by the Dean(s) of the Faculty in extraordinary circumstances.

First Year of the Program

Scholar's Electives students in their First Year at Western can, with permission of their Dean, enrol in certain 100- and 200-level courses normally restricted to senior students, and/or enrol in more than one course in a given subject, and/or restrict their choice of courses to a single Faculty. Normally the choice of the Theme area or disciplinary combination is made during the First Year, although students will be counselled during registration for First Year of the likely prerequisites for their program(s) of choice.

Diploma Designations

The baccalaureate diploma awarded to students will record both the status of Scholar's Electives, and if appropriate the Theme Area or discipline(s) studied, as recommended by the Dean.

Honors Scholar's Electives Programs - Degree Requirements

Both BA and BSc Honors Programs are available, and require fifteen of the twenty courses counted for graduation to be honors courses, i.e., numbered 200-499. Combined Honors degrees between Scholar's Electives and those subjects in Arts and Social Sciences listed in the Combined Honors section of the Calendar are also available, subject to consultation with the appropriate department and Deans' offices. Students must enrol in a full course load of five courses, and maintain an average of 80%, in each year of study. Exceptions to the full honors course load requirement will normally only be approved in extraordinary circumstances.

3-Year Degree Scholar's Electives Programs

Both BA and BSc 3-year degree programs that involve one or more disciplinary-based areas are available, as are 3-year BA and BSc programs without a designated area. Of the fifteen courses counted for graduation, no more than five can be numbered 001-099. Students must enrol in five courses, and maintain an average of 80%, in each year of study.

Combinations of Two or More Subjects

The many programs that combine the study of two disciplines that have been established at Western are listed elsewhere in the Calendar. Students who wish to pursue the simultaneous study of two or more subjects for which no formal combined program has been established may be able to do so through the Scholar's Electives Program, after consultation with the appropriate departments and the approval of the Dean(s) concerned. In certain cases, it is possible to combine subjects from several different faculties, including those other than Arts, Science, and Social Science. The Educational Development Office will facilitate the initial counselling between the student and the Faculties concerned.

Theme Areas

The Theme Areas that have been established to date are listed below. Students should consult the appropriate Dean's office to determine the likely subjects from which courses will be chosen and the Faculty advisor for the Theme Area(s) of interest to them, and should consult with their advisor before deciding upon the course selection. In some cases, the creation of additional Theme Areas of interest to specific students may be possible; students should consult with the Educational Development Office or the appropriate Dean's Office for details. Many Theme Area programs are available as part of a 3-year degree as well as in the Honors and Combined Honors Scholar's Electives programs.

Theme Areas within Arts, Science, and Social Science

Archeology
Canadian Studies
Cognitive Neuroscience
Development Studies
Environmental Studies
The Family
Health, Ageing, & Social Policy
History and Philosophy of Science
Human Evolution
Human Population

International Relations
Linguistics
Mathematical Sciences
Medical Imaging
Medieval Studies
Organizational Behaviour
Pan-American Studies
Performing Arts Studies
Population Studies & Demography
Social & Political Thought

Theme Areas available in a 3-year BSc Concurrent Degree with Engineering Science

Computer Engineering and Computer Science
Neuroscience
Artificial Intelligence
Genetics (with Chemical/Biochemical Engineering only)
Medical Biophysics
Environmental Science

Professor Coulter asked when the change in the Scholar's Electives Program becomes effective and whether students currently in the program will be grandparented. Dr. Baird explained that information on the current program was never published and given that students enrolled in the program must maintain an 80% average throughout the year, there are very few students other than the 90%+ students who meet this requirement. There were 35 students enrolled in the program this year, most of whom entered under the 90%+ rule. Students whose average was between 85% and 90% received special permission.

The question was called and CARRIED.

S.97-157 **Scholarship/Prize/Award Conditions**

Senate was informed that SCAPA approved on behalf of the Senate the Terms of Reference for new scholarships, bursaries and awards shown in **Appendix 4**. These will be recommended to the Board of Governors through the Vice-Chancellor.

S.97-158 **Booklet to List Awards and Faculty Members**

Senate was advised that a booklet listing awards and faculty members which will be used as a reference book for current students and recruitment tool for prospective applicants is being prepared for circulation in August from the Offices of the Registrar and the Dean of Graduate Studies. Further information about the contents of the booklet are detailed in Exhibit III, page 11.

UNIVERSITY PLANNING

S.97-159 **Revisions to Academic Development Fund (Category A) Terms of Reference**

It was moved by G. Moran, seconded by M. Cheesman,

That Senate approve the following revisions to the Academic Development Fund (Category A) Terms of Reference:

- 3.0 Funds may be requested for equipment, supplies or services, or for the salaries of *research personnel*, but not for the salaries of faculty members or equivalent. The ADF will rarely provide support for persons involved in academic collaboration with the applicant (for example, postdoctoral fellows or *graduate students*). Applicant(s) requesting such support must present specific justification with respect to the project and to the particular individuals.

CARRIED

S.97-160 **Infrastructure Program - Proposed Projects**

Senate was advised that the proposed projects for the Infrastructure Program are renovations to Middlesex College, including those necessary to accommodate the new Faculty of Communications and Open Learning (\$3 million), and renovations to the main floor and basement of The D.B. Weldon Library (\$2.5 million). Details about the proposed projects including the anticipated funding scenario for the Infrastructure Program were provided in Exhibit IV. Dr. Moran advised that because Ministry regulations require that the funds be spent before the end of March 1998, the normal planning process will be accelerated to accommodate this deadline.

S.97-161 **New Graduate Fellowships and Awards**

Senate was informed that SCUP approved on behalf of the Senate the Fellowships and Awards for graduate study, shown in **Appendix 5**. These will be recommended to the Board of Governors through the Vice-Chancellor.

S.97-162 **REPORT OF THE ACADEMIC COLLEAGUE**

The Report of the Academic Colleague on the 236th meeting of the Council of Ontario Universities, detailed in Exhibit V, was received for information. Topics covered at the meeting included the President's Report, Ontario Universities' Application Centre - Application and Supplementary Fees, COU Budget for 1997-98, Report from the Committee on the Relationships between Universities and Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, Report from the Credit Transfer Implementation Committee, Report from the Ontario Commission on Interuniversity Athletics, Report from the Committee on Nominations and the AUCC Report.

[Dean Stokes assumed the chair.]

Dr. Davenport responded to Mr. Walsh's concerns about COU's position on the Income Contingent Loan Repayment Plan (ICLR) as the solution to the student aid problem. He stated that he was not comfortable characterizing COU's position because COU is at a phase where it is working with the provincial/federal authorities to institute a workable student loan program. He could provide only his own views because COU has not taken an official position on the AUCC document. There is strong support for the principles set out in the document which states that part of the solution for the student loan problems is additional, upfront, government grants. More money must be put into the system at an earlier stage. Supporters of the AUCC document believe that such principles are partly inconsistent with ICLR, but Dr. Davenport stated his belief that COU and the provincial government must work together by using the ICLR method to collect the loans and utilize other elements to ensure that a workable loan system is in place.

Mr. Walsh asked if it is the position of COU and Western that tuition deregulation should be allowed regardless of whether an appropriate student aid system is in place. Dr. Davenport stated that he would not speak on behalf of COU because there are many perspectives on this issue. He maintained that Western's Board of Governors has a responsibility to the students whether or not an ICLR system is in place.

Referring to the paragraph contained in the Report about the Ontario Universities' Application Centre application fee increase, Mr. Topolski asked for justification of the increase given that COU's planned operating deficit for 1997-98 will be funded by the accumulated carry-forward operating reserve from 1996-97. Dr. Kennedy explained that the increased application fee is needed to fund additional costs confronted by the Application Centre due to the expanded services it provides to universities. These costs include the need for additional staff, hardware and software services. Commenting on the accumulated carry-forward contained in COU's budget, Dr. Kennedy advised that there is always a planned carry-forward. The accumulated surplus is the result of considerable restructuring within the secretariat. He said that the Application Centre disperses funds to the universities but he could not confirm whether the costs incurred by the universities in term of sending out material to the applicant are covered.

Responding to Mr. Parks' question about the amount of funding Western receives from the Ontario Universities' Application Centre, Dr. Kennedy could not quote a definite figure because the Centre uses a very complex formula, but he agreed to provide the funding formula.

S.97-163 **ANNOUNCEMENTS & COMMUNICATIONS**

Announcements and communications appear in Exhibit VI.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.