



The UNIVERSITY of WESTERN ONTARIO

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF SENATE

October 17, 2003

The meeting was held at 1:30 p.m. in Room 1R40, Richard Ivey School of Business.

SENATORS: 70

T. Adams	R. Harris	R. Parks
P. Ashmore	C. Herbert	A. Pearson
M. Bartlett	V. Hollick	A. Percival-Smith
F. Berruti	I. Holloway	N. Petersen
C. Beynon	R. Howse	C. Piper
R. Bohay	M. Huston	A. Pitman
S. Brennan	W. Kennedy	N. Rhoden
L. Butler	G. Killan	K. Robineau
E. Cairns	D. Kneale	C. Ross
M. Carroll	M. Kreiswirth	C. Seto
K. Danylchuk	M. Lennon	N. Shupak
R. Darnell	F. Longstaffe	S. Siegner
P. Davenport	R. Lumpkin	E. Skarakis-Doyle
P. Dean	S. Majhanovich	P. Skidmore
J. Doerksen	A. Margaritis	C. Smart
D. Dutrizac	R. Martin	L. Ste. Marie
J. Etherington	D. McCarthy	B. Timney
C. Farber	L. Miller	S. Usprich
W. Flintoff	G. Nakhla	D. Vaillancourt
M. Fong	J. Nash	J. Van Fleet
A. Garcia	M. Ninness	L. Vaughan
J. Garland	K. Okruhlik	C. Ward-Griffith
J. Haywood-Farmer	S. Osborn	L. Williams
		B. Wood

Observers: D. Jameson

By Invitation: D. Jones

S.03-171

Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting of September 19, 2003, were approved as circulated.

S.03-172 **Privacy of University E-Mail** [S.03-140, S.03-167]

Ms. D. Jones, Director of Information Technology Services (ITS), attended the meeting to answer several questions concerning privacy of University e-mail which had been posed at the June Senate meeting. She provided the following information:

- One can describe an e-mail message as a “post card” that travels through many places where people can look at it.
- E-mail can reside on two different servers from the time the sender sends it to the time it is received. The e-mail can subsequently reside on a hard-drive depending upon how one’s e-mail is configured.
- When a file is deleted from the hard-drive it is not truly erased. The hard drive can be defragged or reformatted to ensure that files are absolutely gone, but in general, e-mails can be retrieved with certain tools.
- UWO’s main server is backed up every night. E-mails accidently deleted can be retrieved for up to two months.
- Western does not monitor e-mail. In September Western received about 5 million e-mails.
- If an individual receives a threatening email, ITS can provide assistance because e-mails can be tracked through netflows. Police have requested UWO e-mail netflows to track threatening e-mails.

S.03-173 **Farewell to Senators**

On behalf of Senate, Dr. Davenport thanked Senators whose terms on Senate end October 31st for their time and contributions to the work of Senate.

S.03-174 **REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT**

The President reported on the Ivey Hong Kong Convocation, election of the new Ontario government and key COU issues for the new Ontario government. Slides used to highlight his presentation are attached as [Appendix 1](#).

OPERATIONS/AGENDA COMMITTEE [Exhibit I]

S.03-175 **Structure of Senate Budget Meetings** [S.03146]

At the September 19, 2003, meeting, the Senate agreed to discontinue the special *in camera* budget information meetings, with the result that the budget will proceed from the Senate Committee on University Planning to the Senate without this intervening step [S.03-146]. As noted during that debate, the Operations/Agenda Committee agreed to consider additional measures with respect to the annual budget meeting of Senate held each April. The following adjustments to the April Senate meeting will be implemented, starting in 2004:

- A four-hour meeting time will be set – 1:30 to 5:30 p.m. (rather than the standard 1:30 - 4:30 p.m. meeting)
- The agenda will be ordered as follows:
 - Minutes of the previous meeting
 - Business Arising from the Minutes
 - Report of the President
 - Reports of Committees:
 - Senate Committee on University Planning (budget)

Operations/Agenda Committee (*unless the report includes the nomination of new Senator(s), in which case, this report will precede the SCUP report*)

Academic Policy and Awards

Other Committee Reports

Announcements and Communications

Enquiries and New Business

Adjournment

Senate was reminded that in the future, should a motion to close debate be presented at any meeting of Senate, the Chair of Senate should remind Senators of the alternatives available, such as limiting debate.¹

S.03-176 **Candidates for Degrees: Autumn Convocation 2003**

On behalf of the Senate (S.96-124), the Provost approved the list of candidates for degrees and diplomas to be awarded at Autumn Convocation 2003, as recommended by the Registrar. The list of candidates is appended of the Official Minutes of the October Senate meeting.

ACADEMIC POLICY AND AWARDS [Exhibit II]

S.03-177 **Undergraduate Program Reform: Regulations**

Prior to Senate considering the Undergraduate Program Reform: Regulations, Dean Timney asked that the following item on Breadth Requirements from Exhibit II, Appendix 2, page 3, be duplicated on the previous page and inserted after “Residency Requirements” and before “Additional Requirements for the Honors Bachelor of Science Degree”.

Breadth Requirements

At least 1.0 course from each of the Faculties of Arts, Science and one other faculty must be included.

No more than 14.0 courses in one subject may be counted among the 20.0 successfully completed courses used to fulfill graduation requirements.

On behalf of SCAPA, it was moved by B. Timney, seconded by R. Harris,

That Senate approve the policies on the structure of the undergraduate degree as outlined in Exhibit II, Appendixes 1 and 2, effective September 1, 2004.

Professor Percival-Smith spoke in support of the modular degree structure, but objected to the inclusion of breadth requirements for the following reasons:

- a) The breadth requirement is defined by the Faculty that offers the course, rather than by the content of the course. The placement of departments and their courses and disciplines into Faculties is more historical than intellectual. For example, the disciplines of psychology [in Social Science] and physiology [in Medicine] are more similar than the disciplines of psychology and economics [both in Social Science]. As a result, students can meet the breadth requirements by taking courses in different Faculties without meeting the ideal of the breadth requirement.

¹ Senate Minutes, S.03-095 and Exhibit I, May 16, 2003, “Calling the Question vs Motion to Limit Debate.”

- b) Breadth requirements interfere with students taking a Specialization and a Minor in the same Faculty. A combination of psychology and economics or biology and mathematics represents a greater breadth than mathematics and economics or biology and psychology. The breadth requirement negates some of the strength of the present modular structure.
- c) Given rising student debt and tuition, students should be allowed to keep their choices as broad as possible but meet the requirements of their discipline. Money spent on unwanted courses is unfair to the students because courses are so much more expensive today than they were 15 years ago.
- d) The increase in tuition has changed the financial environment of the University. When looking at the budget document, one can see that increased attention is paid to enrolment in various programs. The redistribution of students fulfilling the breadth requirements should not be a mechanism of redistribution of funds within the University. Student choice should not be sacrificed because of the present funding situation. Creating a pool of students looking for fulfillment of their breadth requirements does not increase the quality of education nor does it increase the quality of the degree they receive.

S.03-177a It was moved by A. Percival-Smith, seconded by M. Huston,

That "Breadth Requirements" be deleted from the Graduation Requirements for Honors Bachelor Degrees (Four-Year) and Graduation Requirements for Bachelor Degrees (Four-Year) and (Three-Year).

Dean Timney addressed Professor Percival-Smith's concerns:

- The introduction of the breadth requirements changes the current regulations in that they will now apply to students in all Faculties, whereas previously degrees taken through the Faculty of Science did not include the breadth requirements. Also, first year students were previously required to take a course from the Faculties of Arts, Science and Social Science and now these students will take a course from the Faculties of Arts, Science and one other Faculty.
- In response to the point that requiring students to take a course in different Faculties does not necessarily constitute increasing their intellectual breadth, in practical terms it is difficult to set breadth requirements in a way that would satisfy the intellectual breadth goal set by Western.
- It is not necessarily the case that breadth requirements might prevent students from completing a Major or a Specialization and a Minor within an individual faculty. In effect, in the courses taken to achieve their degree, students need only take two courses outside of their Faculty.
- The comment that students should have control over their courses because tuition fees are high is dependent upon a faculty member's view as an educator. If faculty see themselves as being in the business of higher education rather than just providing training programs, the University should expect its students to learn things that are outside their discipline.

- With respect to resource/funding implications, the way that the current breadth requirement is structured should not have an impact on the way that students take their courses. It may mean that more Science students will be taking courses outside the Faculty of Science.
- If breadth requirements are discontinued, Arts students would not have to take a Science course, FIMS students would not have to take a Science course, and Social Science students would not have to take a Science course. Possibly a large number of students would not take a Science courses which in ECF funding could amount to a difference of about \$0.5 million per year. One must consider this issue from both sides.

Professor Carroll stated that including a breadth requirement in the honors program is unusual because currently students who take a non-honors degree have a breadth requirement while students who take an honors degree do not. He agreed that students can achieve breadth within their own Faculty. The amendment would be more acceptable if it contained a counter-proposal ensuring that students do ultimately take a series of courses that represents a breadth requirement.

Professor Piper stated in the second sentence in breadth requirements it talks about no more than 14 courses in one subject. What is the definition of “subject”. Dean Timney stated that “subject” is defined in the calendar; each set of courses is under a heading, i.e., chemistry, biology, applied mathematics, etc. A “subject” is from one department.

Professor Smart asked why the Faculties of Arts and Science are specifically chosen; this implies that students in these Faculties are less constrained than students in other Faculties. Dean Timney replied that the simplest way to address the breadth requirement was to include Arts and Science because the subject areas are clearly defined, whereas courses in the Faculties of Social Science, IMS and Health Sciences include many courses that could be broadly defined as falling within a “social science” area. For simplicity’s sake, the Faculties of Arts and Science were selected and then “one other Faculty”.

Dean Okruhlik spoke in support of the breadth requirements but recognized that students in the Faculty of Arts are reluctant to take science courses. In her view, the University is obliged to ensure students obtain a sound education and if students pay higher tuition fees the obligation becomes stronger rather than weaker.

Ms. Robineau stated that from a student’s perspective it is difficult to fulfill the breadth requirements. Dean Timney commented that students must plan their program over the span of four years in order to fulfill the breadth requirements. Breadth requirements state that three separate courses must be taken over a twenty course degree, two of which can be fulfilled in first year of the four-year program.

Professor Lennon contended that the narrowness of the high school curriculum brings about the need for the breadth requirement. In her experience, high school students are relieved and surprised to see the wide range of courses available. The breadth requirement allows students to open their minds and broaden their education.

Dean Pearson stated part of what it means to be an educated person is to have an understanding of the world at large and to be a good citizen requires an understanding of a variety of disciplines. Three full courses over a four year program is a modest attempt at achieving the breadth requirement which is fundamental to higher education.

Dean Timney reported that discussions continue regarding the final resolution on exactly how Scholar’s Electives will be constructed but the current rule is that the breadth requirement does not apply.

Professor Piper asked if the third year transfer students admitted by Ivey will be held to the breadth requirements given that it is not that easy for students to take electives outside the Business School in their third or fourth year. Students entering professional programs should have their breadth requirements completed by second year, consequently appropriate academic counselling is imperative. Dean Timney stated that transfer students are expected to fulfill the requirements; however, a Dean has the power to waive the requirements in certain cases. With respect to current students, it would have less of an impact on those going into Ivey. Those students in first year in 2003-04 are under the old regulations, but those students entering first year in 2004-05 will fall under the new scheme which will be built into their academic counselling from the outset.

The question on the amendment [S.03-177a] was called and DEFEATED.

Professor Carroll asked if the PeopleSoft system will aid in the adjudication process. Dean Timney stated that the programs are set in such a way that they are compatible with the PeopleSoft system which will simplify the adjudication process. Automatic adjudication will be built into the system. Dr. Harris acknowledged that change is needed in the ways in which students are counseled to ensure that when interacting with students the focus is on the academic questions and not on the challenges associated with PeopleSoft. In addition, increasing the content provided in the “intent to register” period is under review to ensure that students will be contacted earlier on in the process of selecting their modules and courses.

Professor Carroll observed that the document allows Departments to set stricter standards for admission to a program. If a Department chooses to do so in a particular module, is Faculty approval required? Dean Timney stated the new regulations, which include the statement “entry into the honors program is limited”, gives Departments the flexibility to set stricter standards. Departments will not need approval on a year by year basis.

Professor Carroll referred to the two ways in which a student can obtain an honors degree – by taking an Honors Specialization or by taking two Majors. He asked if the document sets different progression requirements for the two groups. Dean Timney responded that Departments must ensure that the Major is constructed in such a way that it is worthy of an honors designation. Departments must think of the Major module as being equivalent to one-half of a combined honors program.

The question on the main motion was called and CARRIED

S.03-178 **Undergraduate Program Reform: Introduction of New Modules in September 2004**

Before considering the recommendation, Dean Timney asked that the following two modules be withdrawn: Honors Specialization in Geography -BSc and Honors Specialization in Geographic Information Science - BSc [Exhibit II, Appendix 5, pages 2-3].

It was moved by B. Timney, seconded by K. Robineau,

That Senate approve, effective September 1, 2004, the introduction of the Honors Specialization, Major, Specialization and Minor modules listed in Exhibit II, Appendix 5.

CARRIED

S.03-179 **Report on Scholarships and Awards**

SCAPA has approved on behalf of the Senate the terms of reference for the following new scholarships and awards for recommendation to the Board of Governors through the Vice-Chancellor:

Dr. P. C. (Raju) Shah Summer Clinical Training Experience in Pathology/Laboratory Medicine (Faculty of Medicine & Dentistry)
Gregory Purchase OSOTF MBA Award (Faculty of Graduate Studies, Business)
Hughes McKellar Rural Southwestern Ontario Medical Residency Award (Faculty of Medicine & Dentistry)

UNIVERSITY PLANNING [Exhibit III]

S.03-180 **Strategic Research Plan**

On behalf of the Senate Committee on University Planning, it was moved by B. Skarakis-Doyle, seconded by J. Haywood-Farmer,

That Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors, through the Vice-Chancellor, the Strategic Research Plan [August 2003] shown in Appendix 1 to Exhibit III.

CARRIED

S.03-181 **Report on Entering Grades and First-Year Grades**

Dean Skarakis-Doyle withdrew the report on the entering grades of students entering first year in the fall of 2003 and of grades obtained by first year students in 2002-03 because Dr. Moran could not be present at this meeting to give the oral report. The report will be presented at the November Senate meeting.

S.03-182 **Non-Discrimination / Harassment Policy**

The Non-Discrimination/Harassment Policy, discussed at the Senate meeting of September 19 [S.03-161], is under review and will be brought back to Senate in November.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND SERVICES [Exhibit IV]

S.03-183 **Western Home Page Policy**

It was moved by M. Huston, seconded by L. Ste. Marie,

That the policy on the UWO Home Page be revised, as shown in Exhibit IV, and recommended to the Board of Governors through the President & Vice-Chancellor.

CARRIED

S.03-184 **ANNOUNCEMENTS & COMMUNICATIONS** [Exhibit V]

Announcements & Communications, detailed in Exhibit V, were received for information.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 2:50 p.m.

P. Davenport
Chair

J.K. Van Fleet
Secretary

President's Report to Senate

- Ivey Hong Kong Convocation
- Election of New Ontario Government
- Key COU Issues for New Government

Dr. Paul Davenport
October 17, 2003

Ivey Hong Kong Convocation

- 43 MBA degrees awarded
- Convocation speakers: Drs. Richard and Beryl Ivey
- Valedictorians: John Benitz and Ross Chan

Ivey Hong Kong

- Dean Carol Stephenson
- Former Dean Larry Tapp
- Larry Wynant, Executive Director, Ivey Hong Kong
- Assoc. Dean Kathleen Slaughter, Ivey Asia
- Meeting of Ivey (Asia) Advisory Board, chaired by Henry Cheng

3

Ontario Election

- October 2, 2003
- Liberal Majority Government
 - Liberals 76
 - PC 24
 - NDP 7

4

Local Election Results

- Deb Matthews (Lib.) London North Centre
 - Chris Bentley (Lib.) London West
 - Khalil Ramal (Lib.) London-Fanshawe
 - Steve Peters (Lib.) Elgin-Middlesex-London
- ➔ Meeting with Deb Matthews on Oct. 20
with Albert Katz and Paul Yeoman

5

Liberal Party Platform

- Expand capacity: 50,000 new spaces
- Faculty recruitment: 800 new faculty
- Tuition freeze for 2 years
- Expand OSAP eligibility
- Increase graduate scholarships by 50%
- Research Commercialization Initiative

6

Advocacy Points for New Government

- Keep Operating Funding Commitments (increase of \$175 million by 2005-06)
- Quality Assurance Fund (rise to \$200 million by 2006-07)
- Student Assistance
 - OSOTF (\$400 million over 8 years)
 - OGSST (\$5 million annually)
- Increase funding to support graduate studies

7

Maintain Support for Research

- Research Performance Fund (indirect costs - \$32 million annually)
- OIT (\$300 million in 2003-04)
- PREA (\$85 million annually)
- Centres of Excellence (\$32 million annually)
- ORDCF-committed funding should be allocated
- Cancer Research Institute of Ontario (\$1 billion committed over 10 years)
- Need for new investment in OIT and ORDCF

8