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*regrets

OPEN SESSION

Consent Agenda
Senate heard an omnibus motion to approve or receive for information by consent items 1-4 below.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
The minutes of the October 18, 2010 meeting were approved as distributed.

2. REPORT OF THE CHAIR
Recognition and Commendation. Senate received this report for information.

3. REPORTS FROM THE FACULTIES AND CONRAD GREBEL UNIVERSITY COLLEGE
Senate received these reports for information.

4. OTHER BUSINESS
Conferral of Degrees. Senate received this list of graduates for information.

COU Report. Senate received this report for information.

Graduate & Research Council Appointment. Senate approved the appointment of Raymond Legge (chemical engineering), replacing Fue-Sang Lien, as engineering faculty representative, term to April 30, 2012.

Freeman and Shah. Carried.

Before proceeding with the regular agenda, in response to the president’s inquiry whether there were additions/changes to the agenda, from George Freeman, president of FAUW, the addition under item 13 (Other Business) of the Balsille School/Findlay Report.

Regular Agenda
5. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES
Annual Performance Indicators [www.secretariat.uwaterloo.ca/20101115pi.pdf]. The director of institutional analysis & planning focused her remarks on: (1) fall 2010 undergraduate class (quality is
not eroding; gender distribution is steady overall though some areas are showing female decline; geographic distribution remains generally constant but with a decline in students from Toronto; (2) international profile (since 2004-05 undergraduate enrolment has increased by 1000 students and graduate by 380; China, Pakistan, South Korea and India represent the top four countries of origin for new undergraduates and China, Iran, India and the U.S. for new graduates); (3) teaching (re: 100-level courses, 52 percent are taught by lecturers, 22 percent by associate professors, 16 percent by professors and 10 percent by assistant professors; re: 400-level courses, 43 percent are taught by associate professors, 21 percent by professors, 15 percent by lecturers and 10 percent by assistant professors; lecturer status is derived from employee ID/faculty file; 2009 data continues to have 42 percent of instructors listed as “TBA” and IAP suggests they are TAs or graduate TAs; the FTE student to FTE faculty ratio can be manipulated depending on the teaching categories used for the denominator); (4) female faculty (remains at ~25 percent of total faculty complement; female faculty targets are set out as a ten-year plan, based on the PhD pool in the discipline and the open positions expected over the decade).

In discussion, senators heard: the desirability of expressing the female faculty complement as a percentage rather than absolute numbers since proportions provide better indication of relative gains [PI 2010, p. 79]; the percentage of new female hires should be juxtaposed with the percentage females in the pool [PI 2010, p. 79]; IAP currently does not have recruitment data re: number of female faculty applicants; concern that universities are “playing games” with student:faculty ratios and that a standard should be agreed upon; an undertaking to advise Senate on progress in addressing the 2002 Welcoming Women Faculty task force report and, further to that report’s recommendations/observations: three on-campus day cares (140 spots) are being amalgamated, new spots added and an estimate is being sought for construction of a new facility on the north campus; with respect to lecturers teaching ~50 percent of 100-level courses, from the provost, that engagement of sessionals is required given space constraints and number of students; a suggestion that other metrics such as citation analysis, number of peer-reviewed publications and number of grants per faculty member can be used to measure research performance, and acknowledgement that no single metric provides an equitable measure across disciplines.

6. REVIEW OF THE FUAC/UW RELATIONSHIP

[www.secretariat.uwaterloo.ca/20101115fuac.pdf]

Professor Glenn Cartwright, principal of Renison University College, provided an overview demonstrating how the colleges are integral to Waterloo academically, how they work together with Waterloo, their community-based focus, how they foster student success, the nature of student financial support, recent/planned capital expansion, overall growth (academic programs, graduate teaching, research, publications, physical facilities, development and reputation), success in development initiatives and the new development agreement put in place between the colleges and Waterloo.

In discussion, senators heard: IAP will attempt to segregate data to show academic success rates of college students; with respect to the report: (1) St. Jerome’s appoints a Waterloo faculty member to its board [p. 7, #2], (2) classes rather than number of students taught were identified since the agreement between Waterloo and SJU provides that mathematics determines the sections SJU teaches while the numbers of students in these sections is at SJU’s discretion [p. 8, #1.a], (3) contributions made by the colleges re: global outreach [p. 10, #3] are selectively identified and (4) with respect to the equity agreement [pp. 14 and 15, #3], a clarification that Waterloo will reacquaint itself with the details; the new development agreement sets out a cooperative approach to advancement; opportunities for college and Waterloo dons to work together/share information are being put in place; the current, often ad hoc arrangements between the colleges and Waterloo with respect to academic matters at both the undergraduate and graduate level need to be reviewed with a view to developing protocols.
7. UNDERGRADUATE SCHOLARSHIPS AND FINANCIAL AID
[www.secretariat.uwaterloo.ca/20101115usfa.pdf]
The registrar spoke to his report, providing details on the requirements (six grade 12 courses including courses required by the program)/value of entrance scholarships, the funding Waterloo and FUAC make available for entrance scholarships, Waterloo’s guarantee of financial support and OSAP/set-aside bursaries. He advised that his office works aggressively to make students aware/have them apply for scholarships offered by external parties and he is not aware of any that are unclaimed.

8. REPORT OF THE CHAIR
National Philanthropy Day. Established to recognize gifts of time, talents and treasures. Last year 16,000 donors made gifts to Waterloo ranging from $100 to $1 million. Campaign Waterloo saw the generosity of more than 60,000 donors contribute to its success and, on behalf of Waterloo, the chair recognized and expressed gratitude to all donors, including faculty, staff, students and alumni.

Christie Blatchford. The chair provided a brief synopsis of the circumstances which led to the cancellation of the event, expressed his regret that the university’s basic tenet of freedom of speech had, in this instance, been compromised and advised that Blatchford will be invited back.

Environmental Scan [www.secretariat.uwaterloo.ca/20101115es.pdf]

• National. According to the Globe and Mail National University Report Card (35,000 responses for a response rate of three percent; 2800 Waterloo responses for a response rate of 11 percent), Waterloo ranks first in career preparation and ties for 2nd place in quality of teaching. The next federal budget is not anticipated to be granting councils/CFI friendly, though a review of previous budgets reveals that there has always been “something” included for research; colleges are now aggressively pursuing/accessing research funding and are presenting serious competition for universities. According to the Maclean’s 2010 rankings, Waterloo captured first place in best overall, most innovative and leaders of tomorrow categories and 2nd place in highest quality.

• Provincial. Waterloo has secured six of the 75 new Ontario Trillium Scholarships; the HEQCO report Benefits of Greater Differentiation of Ontario’s University Sector has been adopted by the province.

• Local. The Town Hall was held November 2; co-op employment rate hit 99.5 percent in the fall 2010 term. At fall convocation in October, His Excellency, the Right Honourable David Johnston was awarded an LLD and was accorded the title president emeritus.

9. REPORT OF THE VICE-PRESIDENT, ACADEMIC & PROVOST
[www.secretariat.uwaterloo.ca/20101115vpap.pdf]
The provost drew attention to two figures: full-time registered students as of November 1, 2010 was 109 percent of target (positive) and the reason for some of the issues raised above; 221 full-time registered OSS students with averages of 77 percent and below and the need to reduce these numbers with a concomitant increase in those with 80 percent + averages.

10. REPORT OF THE VICE-PRESIDENT, EXTERNAL RELATIONS
The VP did not report.

11. REPORT OF THE VICE-PRESIDENT, UNIVERSITY RESEARCH
Numbers of research grant applications are increasing: 154 NSERC discovery grant applications have been submitted; the higher percentage of new, first grant applications over last year – the result
of recent recruitment efforts; 69 standard SSHRC research grants and 12 “other category” have been submitted.

12. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS

Graduate & Research

- Games Institute. The vice-president, university research advised that, subsequent to concerns raised by the Senate Executive Committee, in particular about the governance of the institute, revisions had been made and that the document, as presented, was unanimously approved earlier in the day by SGRC.

Senate heard a motion to approve the establishment of the Games Institute for an initial period of five years (December 1, 2010 to November 30, 2015) as described in the report [enclosed with the Senate agenda].

Dixon and Coates.

Speaking on behalf of FAUW, the president of FAUW drew senators’ attention to what FAUW posits as issues that remain:

(1) The descriptions of “Director” and “Associate Director” [p. 13, #5.1] lack clarity re: the role of the provost; “with cause” (defined, for example, per Policy 40, The Chair) should replace “in exceptional cases”; appointment/reappointment to these positions should include a collegial process with faculty membership playing a role.

(2) “Executive Council” is not collegially constituted (each member is appointed by Waterloo administration) and members need not be tenured faculty. FAUW suggests that five “Core Members” should be regular faculty members, chosen by the faculty membership in a collegial fashion.

(3) “Industry” and “Affiliate” membership categories are confusing: “Industry” includes government and NGOs and the main difference between the two categories appears to be that “Affiliate” members pay while “Industry” members don’t – which may have the unintended consequence of giving the appearance of a mechanism to funnel public dollars to private interests. A claimed benefit of membership [p. 14, #5.2] is “participation in the governance of the Institute” but, in fact, only administration-picked “Executive Council” members have any real say.

(4) Policy 33 (Ethical Behaviour) (set out as the single point of reference on academic freedom) should be coupled with Article 6 (defined academic freedom) in the University of Waterloo/FAUW Memorandum of Agreement.

(5) Changes to the constitution should require Senate approval, as does the original document.

Senate heard an amendment to the main motion: That Senate conditionally approve the creation of the Games Institute as proposed, subject to section 5.0 (Constitution) being rewritten to address the above concerns and brought back for approval at the February 2011 meeting. Further, that the governance provisions of the Games Institute be subject to re-evaluation by Senate in the event new policies are established with respect to the governance of research institutes at the University of Waterloo.

Freeman and Dea. Carried.

In discussion, senators heard: concerns about governance of centres/institutes have been raised by FAUW for the last two years and have also been raised by other faculty. From the president, the VPUR is establishing a review process which should identify and provide resolutions to the
matters raised by the president of FAUW; the review/recommendations will be discussed with FAUW and recommendations, as appropriate, formalized. From the VPUR, the review panel is expected to be constituted in November and its report anticipated by the end of March 2011 with the hope that all will be in place by summer 2011. The VPUR advised that the scope of the review includes how to address implementing governance changes, as may be recommended/approved, in Waterloo’s 38 current centres and institutes.

In response to questions re: funding, senators heard: the dean of arts’ commitment to provide grant overhead of ~$60,000 to $100,000 annually for the administration of the institute; funding from current grants/expected grants will generate ~$400,000 annually; this arts initiative is designed to be multi-disciplinary/collaborative and such collaboration is already occurring between arts and engineering with computer science imminent.

Senate heard the main motion, as amended: To approve conditionally the establishment of the Games Institute for an initial period of five years (December 1, 2010 to November 30, 2015) as described in the report [enclosed with the Senate agenda], subject to Section 5.0 (Constitution) being rewritten to address the concerns noted above and brought back for approval at the February 2011 meeting. Further, that the governance provisions of the Games Institute be subject to re-evaluation by Senate in the event new policies are established with respect to the governance of research institutes at the University of Waterloo.

The main motion, as amended, carried.

- **Waterloo Institute for Social Innovation and Resilience.** Senators heard a motion to approve the establishment of the Waterloo Institute for Social Innovation and Resilience for an initial period of five years (December 1, 2010 to November 30, 2015) as described in the report.

  Dixon and Mawhinney.

  Senators heard a “friendly amendment” [Freeman and Dea] that would see the following added as the second sentence to the main motion: Further, that the governance provisions of WISIR be subject to re-evaluation by Senate in the event new policies are established with respect to the governance of research institutes at the University of Waterloo.

  In discussion, senators heard concerns expressed that the election of the Executive Committee would be by a membership currently comprised of 30 non-academics and 19 academics of which only 13 were Waterloo faculty. In response, from the VPUR, that where the purpose of an institute is to be collaborative with organizations outside Waterloo, those members have to be accorded full rights/access; further, that the individuals standing for seats on the Executive Committee are, in his view, more important than the electing body. In sum, governance structures for centres/institutes are in flux and the structure set out for WISIR is similar to constitutions of other institutes; various models for collaborative institutes exist, including separate incorporation, which is not seen as in the best interests of Waterloo.

  The motion, as amended, carried.

- **Certificate in University Teaching, Centre for Teaching Excellence and Graduate Studies Office.** Senate heard a motion to approve changes to the CUT section of the graduate studies calendar to refocus the program on doctoral students as described in the report.

  Horton and Brown. Carried.

- **English Language Proficiency Requirements**
  - Senate heard a motion to approve acceptance of the Pearson Test of English and the Renison
University College English for Academic Success program for application and admission requirements to graduate studies, effective January 2011.

Horton and Dea. Carried.

- Senate heard a motion to approve standard minimum English language proficiency test scores and alternative scores in the graduate studies calendar as described in the report.

Horton and Dea. Carried.

The remaining items in the report were received for information.

**Undergraduate**

- **Calendar Dates.** Senate heard a motion to approve the 2011-12 calendar dates as provided in the report.

  McBoyle and Dea. Carried.

- **Undergraduate Admission Requirements.** Senate heard a motion to approve the undergraduate admission requirements for 2012 as detailed in the report.

  McBoyle and Eagles. Carried.

- **Renaming Operations Research to Mathematical Optimization and Revisions to Plan Requirements, Mathematics.** Senate heard a motion to approve the recommended name change and revisions to the plan requirements.

  McBoyle and Kasper. Carried.

- **Operations Research Specialization and Business Specialization, Mathematical Optimization.** Senate heard a motion to approve these two new specializations as provided in the report.

  McBoyle and Freeman. Carried.

- **Promotion, BASc and BSE Specific Degree Requirements, Engineering.** Having heard that engineering is working on a communication plan for first-year students and that first-year advisors and officers are attentive to mid-term results, senators heard a motion to approve the recommended changes to the requirements of these degree plans.

  McBoyle and Shah. Carried.

- **Management Engineering.** Senate heard a motion to approve the changes to this degree plan as provided in the report.

  McBoyle and Sedra. Carried.

- **Joint Honours Academic Plans with Science.** Senate heard a motion to approve the changes to the science faculty’s joint honours plans as provided in the report.

  McBoyle and Eagles. Carried.
- **Course Load Policy, Mathematics.** Senate heard a motion to approve the deletion of the mathematics course load policy.

  McBoyle and Kasper. Carried.

- **Grade Appeals, Mathematics.** Senate heard a motion to approve the deletion of the mathematics grade appeals policy.

  McBoyle and Dea. Carried.

The remaining items in the report were received for information.

13. **OTHER BUSINESS**

**Delegation of Authority to the Executive Committee.** In the event that Senate does not meet in December, Senate heard a motion to delegate authority to its Executive Committee to approve at its December 6 meeting the following new graduate programs on behalf of Senate: Master of Development Practice in International Development; Diploma in Social Innovation; Master of Digital Innovation.

Hamdullahpur and Horton. Carried.

**December Meeting of Senate.** Since there currently appears to be insufficient agenda to call for a December meeting of Senate, it was understood that the secretary would advise the Senate Executive Committee within a week of its December meeting whether a meeting of Senate is warranted and that Senate would be so advised.

**Balsillie School/Findlay Report.** The matter discussed on the floor of Senate comprises three parts:

- **Findlay Report.** The president of FAUW drew attention to four items in the report which he posited should concern senators and which served to inform his motion [1, below.] These items are: (1) “lack of appropriate policy and other governance problems [which] led Professor Findlay to finding that a ‘purge’ scenario is the most likely interpretation of what occurred with respect to’ the termination of English (CIGI) and Thakur (as director of BSIA); (2) “lack of commitment to institutional autonomy, academic integrity, due process and natural justice by both UW and WLU, and that both institutions were seriously remiss because they failed to educate the donor about its proper role in such a school”; (3) “Findlay describes an ‘atmosphere of intimidation and fear such as I have rarely encountered in my more than thirty years on faculty in the Canadian academy’”; (4) “the report describes some of the conditions of the donor agreement that established the Balsillie School [that are] deeply troubling: in particular, that the agreement puts the donor in a position to withdraw financial support after 10 years if the school’s activities do not meet with the donor’s approval.”¹

¹quotes are from Freeman’s presentation

The president of FAUW then suggested that two recommendations in the Findlay report should interest Senate:

- **Recommendation 6:** “The Director’s term of appointment should be five years, and procedures for performance review should be consistent with the formative and summative practices followed in comparable entities elsewhere.”

- **Recommendation 7:** “UW and WLU should develop clear and comprehensive guidelines for dealing with current or potential donors and for collaborative initiatives such as BSIA, so as to ensure the academic autonomy and integrity of all university-associated institutes, centres, or schools.”
In response, from the dean of arts, Waterloo and WLU responded jointly and formally to the CAUT report which was not based on a full investigation, in part because, for reasons of privacy/confidentiality, Findlay was not privy to all information. Waterloo Policy 40 (The Chair) was used in dealing with the administrative matter which saw the removal of the director of the school, a decision made after thought, with care and for which the dean took full responsibility. Further, the dean advised that in the course of the last two and a half years, he [the dean] has had no conversation with the donor and the donor played no role whatsoever in the decisions taken re: the director of BSIA. He concluded by advising that BSIA and its governance are works in progress and that the governance structure established for the school should be congruent with the structure that Senate determines.

From the president, the action taken by CIGI re: English was totally unrelated to the action re: the BSIA director. Reiteration that the donor had nothing to do with the decision to remove the BSIA director and that FAUW had been so assured and was involved in conversations re: the director’s removal. Further, that Findlay was making large assumptions with respect to Waterloo’s failing to educate the donor re: the role (and re-emphasis that the donor was in no way involved in this matter) and that Findlay’s assertion of intimidation was speculative absent facts.

From the provost, it would be reasonable to receive the centres/institutes report which the VPUR is commissioning before addressing policy. And a question: whether Policy 7 (Approaches for Donations and Gifts-in-Kind) [adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy7.htm] addresses the concerns raised.

[Note as well the provostial statement on naming guidelines: secretariat.uwaterloo.ca/guidelines/donations.htm]

From the president of FAUW, these points in response: Findlay based his report on the information he had available; while FAUW was assured by the administration that there was no donor interference, what was going on “in the trenches or inside BSIA” is not known; Policy 1 (Initiation and Review of University Policies) vests policy development in FRC and while Office of Research input re: centres and institutes will be useful, FRC, which provides a forum for faculty and administration to work collaboratively, as has been the practice, should be the locus for development. Policy 7 is silent about donor relations and should specifically address university independence in these transactions.

In response to concerns expressed about transparency/the need for greater transparency from administration (viz. the removal of the Findlay report from the web, its not being addressed at the Town Hall, Waterloo’s minimal response), from the president, that Waterloo and WLU issued a release and chose not to give credibility to a report that, from administration’s perception, lacked credibility (viz. though Waterloo specifically asked CAUT/Findlay to provide evidence that the director’s academic freedom was compromised, they failed to do so). And the president emphasized the points previously made: this was an administrative matter dealt with under Policy 40 which provided the most appropriate process available; FAUW was kept informed throughout; there was no donor interference; there was no compromising of Waterloo’s integrity nor of the academic freedom of the director. In response to a specific suggestion/allegation that Waterloo should itself strike an investigative committee to review the matter and that administration’s actions give the appearance of “hiding something,” from the president, that he takes exception to the allegation and that nothing was hidden. From the provost, that moving forward re: governance and donations is not a matter of whether but of how, and a suggestion that Waterloo might wish to follow Toronto’s model of guidelines (not policy) on donor agreements [see motion below]; in response, from the president of FAUW, that this approach was inappropriate as it would take development from the faculty domain and put it with administration.
Motions:

(1) That Senate direct the Faculty Relations Committee to develop a process, consistent with the procedures in Policy 1 on Initiation and Review of University Policies but ensuring broad consultation with Waterloo faculty, that will lead to two new policies on (1) donor agreements and (2) governance of centres, institutes, and schools which are not academic units. Terms of reference, membership on any committees formed, and timelines should be reported to Senate at the February 2011 meeting for approval. Regular progress reports should be made to Senate, with the first to occur no later than the November 2011 meeting.

Freeman and Dea.

(2) That Senate table the main motion.


(3) That Senate request the provost to develop a set of guidelines governing donor agreements.


(4) A motion to split the main motion.

Kasper and Freeman. Carried.

(5) A friendly amendment to the main motion:

- That Senate directs the Faculty Relations Committee to develop a process, consistent with the procedures in Policy 1 on Initiation and Review of University Policies but ensuring broad consultation with Waterloo faculty, that will lead to a new or revised policy on donor agreements. Terms of reference, membership on any committees formed, and timelines should be reported to Senate at the February 2011 meeting for approval. Regular progress reports should be made to Senate, with the first to occur no later than the November 2011 meeting.

The main motion, as amended, carried.

- That Senate directs the Faculty Relations Committee to develop a process, consistent with the procedures in Policy 1 on Initiation and Review of University Policies but ensuring broad consultation with Waterloo faculty, that will lead to a new or revised policy on governance of centres, institutes, and schools which are not academic units. Terms of reference, membership on any committees formed, and timelines should be reported to Senate at the February 2011 meeting for approval. Regular progress reports should be made to Senate, with the first to occur no later than the November 2011 meeting.

The main motion, as amended, carried.

Process. Concerns expressed re: lack of notice re: motion; no written copy of motion provided; retaining quorum; length of meeting.