
Regrets: G. Bradshaw, B. Davetian, S. Jones, S. Lee, L. Miller, R. MacDonald, M. MacEachern, W. Peters, V. Timmons

Absent: H. Barkema, R. Gallant, F. Markham, M. MacKinnon, E. Spangler

Guests: W. Cutcliffe, C. Toombs

1. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

The Chair called the meeting to order. He asked that an item be added to the agenda: Under Item 3 - that section (ii) be added regarding the reassignment of duties of the Curriculum, Course Change, and Calendar Committee. He welcomed Suzanne Thomas, Education representative, to her first Senate meeting.

Moved (S. Coady/W. Rankaduwa): That the agenda be approved as amended.

Carried

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES from October 14, 2005

Moved (G. Pike/M. Doyle): That Senate approve the minutes of October 14, 2005.

Carried

3. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES of October 14, 2005

(i) UPEI Academic Plan 2005: Guiding Principles

D. Buck led the discussion on the Academic Plan. He reminded Senators that this is a fluid document intended to be revised and added to on a yearly basis. This is the first step and if we were to adopt this plan today it would set other processes in motion through the normal processes of the university. He indicated that the Academic Planning Facilitation Committee had a special meeting to consider a very thoughtful contribution from the English Department which had received wide support from Chairs in the Faculty of Arts. It raised a number of interesting questions and views. This submission will be considered along with the other feedback the committee received since the consultations, including valuable feedback from individual faculty members. The letter from the English Department was seen by the Facilitation Committee as a very good sign that the academic planning process is having the desired effect of prompting us to reflect on what we do and how we do it. It was noted that the academic plan guidelines and principles document was also used in a recent planning meeting of the Internationalization Committee to guide their discussions.

S. Coady noted that it is a draft document. He noted that students are very confident in the document, and support it as a base document on which to build for the future. He encouraged departments to contribute to the document as it will be reviewed each year at Senate. W. Rankaduwa queried at the time frame for implementation and incorporation into the plan of these questions, concerns, and issues: would it be each time something is brought
forward or once a year? It was stated that it would be once a year once the plan is adopted.

C. Keen stated that some of the comments were to the nature of the consultation. The Facilitation Committee could not read more into the report than they heard through the consultations. The nature of the entire process reflects what the University community has said.

W. Rankaduwa noted that one particular point should be looked at in order for this document to be complete. It is point 2 which outlines areas of strength and distinctiveness. This speaks to the mission of the university.

M. Murray noted that there are two issues which appear inconsistent. Regarding, Theme #8 - Technology - the report indicates that this theme did not receive significant attention during the facilitation process yet the committee included it as a separate theme. On the other hand, the report notes that everyone agreed that research was important and it is not included as a separate theme. He noted comments on a number of other themes. #3 - Student Success - we must be careful to ensure that we aren’t simply responding to paying customers. University is not a “kids camp”. Theme #6: Responsiveness to Community. We must ensure that we respond to all communities, not just industry and business. We must be attentive to the volunteer and non-profit community for example. Theme. #7 - Finding the Best Balance in Undergraduate Programming. Dr. Murray questioned the meaning of the phrase “market aware”. We should not suggest that the university experience is just about jobs.

M. Hughes expressed concern about theme #3: Improving Students Preparedness and Success, in that we don’t lower our standards for those who have marginal high school marks. R. Kurial noted that, on the contrary, the university is strongly considering raising admission standards. S. Coady stated that in regards to fostering the students and their education, the document shows that students are really the heart of this institution. It is not intended that students be spoon fed to ensure that everyone gets a degree. Rather, the document is making a commitment to students who wish to succeed, that they will be supported in their efforts.

G. Pike suggested that we accept this document as a base document and move on. To do otherwise would require us to open the process up once again to a broad consultation across campus, not just respond to individuals or concerns of various units.

J. Velaidum inquired as to how exactly the guiding principles would be translated into practical management terms. He used the example of an opening in his department and wondered how the guiding principles might be used in dealing with the issue.

D. Buck noted that it was the mandate of the Facilitation Committee to create the document. It was the role of Senior Management to determine how the document should be implemented and incorporated into the management structure and processes of the institution.

E. Coady stated that it is a broad enabling document to allow us to grow. She noted that concerns related to research had been incorporated and addressed in several of the themes. She noted that the report has been before Senate on several occasions, and in order to get to the next steps, we need to support it now.

D. Seeler noted the last sentence in theme 2 “The agreement that priority should be granted to certain academic areas must imply that other areas are not areas of priority.” He expressed curiosity as to how one would compare one academic program against another as to which one has priority.

C. Keen stated that the sentence could be deleted. It was not intended to mean that the university was going to prioritize academic programs or rate one against the other. In fact, much the opposite, it insists that this cannot be done.

D. Ryan questioned the role of the academic plan in budget development and justification. He asked if the academic plan was a plan or a vision, and stated that he would like to see a real vision before it is adopted.
K. Schultz brought Senators up to date on the work of the Research Advisory Committee (RAC). The Committee is in the process of determining where research fits in the overall plan. The Committee’s feeling is that research had been incorporated into the academic plan but the RAC’s responsibility for the strategic research plan for the university is already underway. It may be possible that the RAC provide a companion document that outlines the position and importance of research.

J. Sentance noted that he was less assured about the fact that we are not willing to establish priorities in the process. He expressed concern about the lack of a clear statement about the centrality of liberal arts and sciences to the core of the university. C. Keen expressed the thought that this was addressed in the introduction and background section of the document. J. Sentance noted that the tone of the rest of the document does not appear consistent with the more general statement about the importance of liberal arts and science in the opening paragraph.

R. Gordon noted that he was initially content to have the theme of research woven into the broader themes. But on hearing the discussion and on further reflection he now is convinced it must be referenced in its own theme. S. Coady suggested that this was not an appropriate time to reopen the document. He suggested that APFC had clearly received an expression of the concerns and the will of Senate, and that these concerns should be incorporated into the base document that should be approved by Senate.

C. Keen noted that the committee had heard the comments regarding liberal arts and science and research and he suggested that the minutes of Senate, reflecting this broad-ranging discussion, should accompany the document.

The Chair put forward several options to deal with the issues: (1) vote to adopt or not adopt the document today; with agreement that there would be revisions at a later date. (2) instruct the APFC to further revise the document and carry it forward to the next Senate meeting in December.

After some discussion it was Moved (J. Moran/D. Buck): That Senate approve the adoption of these guiding principles with the assumption that the concerns brought forward by Senate on research and on the focus of our academic vision on the arts and sciences core be reflected in the development of this document.

The Chair clarified that the expectation would be that Senate would see a revised document reflecting the points highlighted in the motion by January, if not by December.

Motion (R. Gordon/J. Sentance): That Senate table it for the next meeting, December 2.

The Chair called for a show of hands on the motion. The results indicated 14 for and 14 against. The Chair voted to continue the discussion at the December 2 meeting at which time the Committee will present a revised document reflecting the discussion today.

Tabled.

(ii) Curriculum, Course Change and Calendar Committee (4C’s)

The Chair asked the permission of Senate to invite Wayne Cutcliffe, Chairman of the Curriculum, Course Change and Calendar Committee to present this agenda item. W. Cutcliffe provided background information on the recent work of the 4C’s committee. It appears that much of the time and effort of the committee has been spent in editing calendar entries, and with the position of University Editor now in place, members of the committee feel much of their work is an ineffective use of resources. W. Cutcliffe presented a plan, developed in consultation with the Registrar’s Office and the VP Academic Development, for the disposition of future items that would normally come to the committee. Items will now come directly to the Registrar for appropriate final approval from ARPC or Senate. In the circumstance of a new or substantially changed program, the Registrar will assemble an Ad Hoc committee with representation from each faculty and the Library. The ad hoc committee will be empowered to review the program and ensure consistency.
Moved (D. Buck/T. Ogilvie): That the Curriculum, Course Change, and Calendar (4C’s) Committee of Senate be disbanded as of January 1, 2006.

4. REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT
In his report to Senate the President extended congratulations to colleagues on the occasion of UPEI again being ranked in the top 3 primarily undergraduate universities for research productivity by the Research Infosource Report. Among other achievements the President noted:
• Kevin Smith was recognized for a high rating for a submission in one of the premier journals in Chemistry
• Ryan Palmer, Christopher Gillis & Colin MacDonald were recognized recently by the Canadian Millennium Scholarship Foundation with an Excellence Award. The awards are given to students who demonstrate academic success and a significant contribution to the community, and who show leadership and commitment to innovation.
• Three UPEI soccer players were recently honored with regional awards: Male and female MVP’S for Ryan Anstey and Amy Connolly, and Rookie of the Year for Tessa Roche.
• UPEI Field Hockey Team recently won the regional championship
• The national Men’s Soccer Championship will be held at UPEI next weekend
• Through generous support we have been able to establish two new Scholarships:
  The Health Council of Canada has donated $20,000 for a full-tuition scholarship to acknowledge J. Camille Gallant. The scholarship will be granted to a full-time bilingual student entering UPEI’s School of Nursing.
  Through the estate of A. Nora Halloran MacDonald Wonnacott, a $60,000 donation to create the annual Lloyd B. MacDonald Memorial Bursary of approximately $2,500 to be granted to a deserving male student in financial need.
• Saturday, November 5th will mark the 8th annual Friends of Calgary event. Organizers are expecting 200 or more supporters
• On November 6th, the Maclean’s ranking will be released
• The Governor General, Michaelle Jean and her husband, Jean-Daniel Lafond will be visiting UPEI and are taking part in a seminar on Island Studies
• On November 30th, we will be having the annual Research Breakfast, 7:30 - 9:00 a.m. at the Charlottetown Hotel with presentations from Gary Evans, Business; and Wimal Rankaduwa, Economics.

5. REPORT OF SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES
(i) Third Report of the Nominating Committee

Moved (J. Moran/D. Seeler): that Senate approve the procedures for choosing a University Librarian

Procedures for Choosing a University Librarian
The Senate Nominating Committee has modeled the following proposed procedures for choosing a University Librarian from the standard document for decanal searches and brings them forward for the consideration of Senate:

When a candidate for the office of University Librarian must be sought, Senate shall cause to be set up a search Committee for the University Librarian consisting of the following:

1) The President or his/her nominee
2) Two full-time Librarians nominated and elected by full-time Librarians
3) One Library support staff member nominated and elected by Library support staff
4) Two full-time teaching Faculty members, not from the same Faculty, nominated and elected through Senate
5) Two students not from the same Faculty.

Elections for librarians and faculty members shall be overseen by the Chair of the Senate Nominating Committee and carried out through the appropriate librarian support staff.

Carried.

Moved (J. Moran/J. Velaidum): that Senate approve the following appointments to Senate Committees as contained in the nomination report:

Academic Review and Planning Committee
Shaun Coady (student)

Admission and Scholarships Committee
Lindsay Currie (student)
Sue MacDougall (student)

Honorary Degree Committee
Colin Burgoyne (student)
Mark O’Halloran (student)

Nominating Committee
David Seeler (AVC)

Senate Committee on the Enhancement of Teaching
Sarah Simpson (student)
Shawn Llewellyn (student)
Janelle Pitre (student)
Angela MacDonald (student)

Senate Research Advisory Committee
Faiz Ahmed (student)

University Writing Council
Ray Keating

Results of the Selection Committee for the Dean of Science Search

Debbie MacLellan
Dan Ryan
Derek Lawther
Cathy Ryan
Marcus Brookshaw
Evan O’Connor

There was a tie vote on the second chairperson. There will be another vote to determine this result.

Nomination for two full-time teaching faculty members, not from the same faculty, nominated and elected through Senate for two positions on the Search for University Librarian.
Ron Collins (Business)
Ray Doiron (Education)
John Burka (Biomedical Sciences)
Nebojsa Kujundzic (Arts)
Joseph Velaidum (Arts)
Carried.

At this point the Chair indicated he had to depart from the meeting and, in the absence of the Vice Chair, asked that Senate approve the Registrar, Alan Buchanan, to serve as Chair for the remainder of the meeting. There being no objection, A. Buchanan assumed the Chair.

J. Moran asked that a vote take place regarding the faculty representation on the Librarian Search Committee. C. Toombs distributed two ballots to each Senator. Senators were instructed to put one name on each ballot.

Moved (J. Moran/D. Seeler): (in keeping with the results of the vote) that Senate approve the following names to serve on the Search Committee for the University Librarian

Joe Velaidum (Arts)
Ron Collins (Business)

7. ADJOURNMENT

Moved (J. Sentence/W. Rankaduwa): that Senate adjourn.

Respectfully submitted,

Alan Buchanan
Secretary