

**SENATE  
Minutes of Meeting**

**Date:** Friday, December 9, 2011

**Time:** 2:30pm-4:45pm

**PRESENT:** Dr. Brent Angell, Dr. Ranjana Bird, Dr. Pierre Boulos, Dr. Lori Buchanan, Mr. Andre Capaldi, Dr. Rick Caron, Dr. Irene Carter, Dr. Allan Conway, Dr. Beth Daly, Dr. Gordon Drake, Dr. Philip Dutton, Ms. Gwen Ebbett, Ms. Hagar Elsayed, Ms. Marilyn Farrough, Dr. Joel Gagnon, Dr. Leo Groarke, Dr. Paul Henshaw, Dr. Leslie Howsam, Mr. Tory James, Dr. Ed King, Dr. Dietmar Lage, Dr. George Lan, Dr. Anna Lanoszka, Dr. Martha Lee, Mr. Marty Lowman, Dr. Charles Macdonald, Prof. Cyndra MacDowall, Dr. Roman Maev, Mr. Greg Marcotte, Dr. Pamela Milne, Ms. Sharon Munro, Dr. Radu Neculau, Mr. Abdulkadir Omar, Ms. Kimberley Orr, Dr. Katherine Quinsey, Dr. Dale Rajacich, Dr. Mehrdad Saif, Ms. Mary Schisler, Dr. Rajesh Seth, Dr. Victor Sevilano, Dr. Jang Singh, Dr. Clayton Smith, Dr. Sang-Chul Suh, Dr. Marijke Taks, Dr. Edwin Tam, Mr. Kannappan Thiagarajan, Dr. Bruce Tucker, Prof. Lionel Walsh, Dr. Robert Weaver, Dr. Patricia Weir, Dr. Mike Weis, Dr. Alan Wildeman (Chair), Prof. Larry Wilson, Mr. Omar Zghal.

**REGRETS:** Mr. Ahmed Abou Gharam, Ms. Krystal Chan, Dr. Carol Davison, Dr. Maureen Irish, Dr. Arunita Jaekel, Dr. Michael Khan, Dr. Marlys Koschinsky, Dr. Brent Lee, Mr. Anthony Meloche, Dr. Kevin Milne, Dr. Derek Northwood, Dr. Chike Okechuku, Rev. Thomas Rosica, Dr. Esaignani Selvarajah, Ms. Jennifer Soutter, Mr. Vajo Stajic, Mr. Tareq Mohammad Supon, Prof. Myra Tawfik, Dr. Shelagh Towson, Dr. Shuzhen Zhao.

**ABSENT:** Mr. Hassan Chaudhry, Dr. John Deukmedjian, Dr. Cecil Houston, Dr. Norman King, Dr. Linda Patrick, Dr. James Winter, Dr. Shijing Xu, Dr. Nader Zamani.

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Prof. Brian E. Brown, Mr. Ed Drouillard, Dr. Thecla Damianakis, Ms. Beverly Hamilton, Dr. Lois Smedick, Dr. Alan Wright, Ms. Renée Wintermute and Ms. Alison Zilli (University Secretariat).

**1 Report of the Senate Steering Committee**

**1.1 Approval of the agenda**

**MOTION:** That the agenda be approved.

Boulos/Capaldi  
**CARRIED**

**2 Minutes of the meeting of October 14, 2011**

Editorial corrections were made to the minutes.

**MOTION:** That the minutes of meeting of October 14, 2011 be approved.

King/Dutton  
**CARRIED, as amended**

**3 Business arising from the minutes**

Members were informed that the "Need for Speed" group has met and it has been determined that there are only a few items on the PDC forms that the University has some control over. It was noted that a great deal of information on the forms is either required by the Ministry of Training Colleges and Universities (MTCU) or by the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance.

**4 Outstanding Business/Action Items**

Nothing to report.

## Reports/New Business

### 5.1 Report from Student Caucus (UWSA, OPUS, GSS)

#### University of Windsor's Student Alliance (UWSA)

Members were informed that representatives from the three student alliances at Windsor were in attendance at a meeting hosted by Wilfred Laurier University to discuss the topic of student engagement. Students also participated in a memorial in remembrance of victims of the 1989 Montreal Massacre at the École Polytechnique in Montréal, Québec.

The UWSA President and Vice-President University Affairs were both in attendance at Queen's Park in Ottawa to participate in discussion pertaining to various student issues such as tuition fees and the proposed tuition grant. It was noted that although it has not been determined what will replace the current tuition framework (which soon expire), HEQCO president Harvey Weingarten, Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities Glenn Murray and West Windsor MPP Teresa Piruzza have all echoed the sentiment that post-secondary education is an important priority for the provincial government.

#### Organization of Part-Time University Students (OPUS)

It was expressed that the proposed tuition grant which is claimed to be worth 30% of the average tuition fees is a bit misleading as it is based on a fee of \$5400 which is well below the average tuition fee at universities in Ontario. It was also expressed that since part-time students are not eligible for the Grant it would be more advantageous to have a tuition decrease for all students.

In response to a question raised regarding whether the criteria are the same for college students, it was noted that the college Grant is set at a different amounts based on lower tuition fees.

#### Graduate Student Society (GSS)

Members were reminded that GSS is offering \$12,000 in scholarships to graduate students who are in financial need and in good academic standing. Any donations from Faculties and Departments to support the scholarship program would be greatly appreciated.

Members were informed that GSS is working on a five-year strategic plan as well as looking at creating new framework for the Graduate House.

### 5.2 Report of the President

At a recent COU meeting the Presidents' met with Minister Glenn Murray and there was discussion regarding the issue that the government will be looking for a radical change in terms of educational ideas as there is a need to generate an increase in productivity by approximately 20%. Although there is a strong commitment to the educational sector there is also a need to do more with less funding. There have been a lot of ideas related to new methods of teaching but the real issue is that the system is already strained and as a result the system may need to transform in an innovative manner to attain this goal.

Senators were informed that there is still great uncertainty regarding the new tuition framework. However, it was expressed that it would be very difficult for universities if there was another tuition freeze.

Members were reminded that the Auditor General is embarking on an audit on how universities evaluate teaching. It was noted that the report is very detailed and filled with questions that may be out-of-context, but it is anticipated that the audit will be done on a pilot basis with only a few institutions to start. The sense is that the audit may create a cascade of information that may not be truly reflective of what is really going on at institutions across Ontario in terms of teaching.

The floor was open for comments.

It was noted that the University has consistently been working towards productivity assessment over the past few years through the annual budget realignment process of 2-3% cuts each year. It was further noted that these reductions need to be recognized and taken into consideration by the government.

Strong concern was expressed regarding the term “productivity” being used in relationship to students. It was strongly expressed that measuring productivity in terms of what happens in the classroom is not in line with what universities do in terms of teaching and learning. It was also expressed that there appears to be a “disconnect” between the rhetoric and the funding.

**5.3 Report of the Academic Colleague**

Nothing to report.

**5.4 Program Development Committee**

**\*5.4.1 Program/ Course Changes**

**\*a) FASS**

*(See document Sa111209-5.4.1a for more details.)*

**MOTION: That the FASS Program/Course Changes be approved.**

**\*CARRIED**

**\*b) FASS - Graduate**

*(See document Sa111209-5.4.1b for more details.)*

**MOTION: That the FASS – Graduate - Program/Course Changes be approved.**

**\*CARRIED**

**\*c) Nursing**

*(See document Sa111209-5.4.1c for more details.)*

**MOTION: That the Nursing Program/Course Changes be approved.**

**\*CARRIED**

**\*d) Science**

*(See document Sa111209-5.4.1d for more details.)*

**MOTION: That the Science Program/Course Changes be approved.**

**\*CARRIED**

**\*5.4.2 Summary of Minor Course and Calendar Changes**

**\*a) Biological Sciences**

*(See document Sa111209-5.4.2a for more details.)*

The document was received for information.\*

**\*b) Languages, Literatures and Cultures**

*(See document Sa111209-5.4.2b for more details.)*

The document was received for information.\*

**\*c) Nursing**

*(See document Sa111209-5.4.2c for more details.)*

The document was received for information.\*

**\*d) Philosophy**

*(See document Sa111209-5.4.2d for more details.)*

The document was received for information.\*

- \*e) Social Work/Law**  
(See document Sa111209-5.4.2e for more details.)

The document was received for information.\*

**\*5.4.3 Request for Waiver of Course Deletion Form - Social Work**  
(See document Sa111209-5.5.2 for more details.)

**MOTION: That the Request for Waiver of Course Deletion Form - Social Work course be approved.**

**\*CARRIED**

**5.5 Academic Policy Committee**

**5.5.1 Completing SET Forms Online for all University of Windsor Courses**  
(See document Sa111209-5.5.1 for more details.)

A presentation was provided to Senators that highlighted the advantages and disadvantages of moving the Student Evaluations of Teaching (SET) forms online for all students. Senators were reminded that only students in distance education courses complete SET forms online. All other students complete a hard copy version of the form in class.

Some of the advantages of online ratings are that it reduces turnaround time for results, standardizes reporting function, supports custom analyses and provides secure archiving. In addition, an online system offers every student equal access to the evaluation process, it reduces the workload for administrative staff and is more cost effective (*i.e.*, reduces paper consumption, more environmentally friendly, *etc*). One of the main disadvantages is that it might lower the response rate due to a decrease in participation. However, if low response rates are an issue, they could be increased by communicating the importance of the SET on campus, providing incentives to students, providing easy access to online evaluations. Either way it was stressed that the ratings process should reflect what is important within the institution and be based on research which provides useful data.

It was noted that teaching can be improved by giving open-ended questionnaires at the end of the course. It was also noted that there should be a regular review of instruments and evaluations.

In conclusion it was noted that if the University moves to an online system for SET then it was suggested that they continue reviewing the practices of other universities and draw on the experience of other institutions alongside reviewing the relevant scholarly literature to modify current practices prior to implementation.

The floor was open for comments.

It was noted that the aspect of online evaluations being more secure and environmentally-friendly is a compelling reason to move to an online survey. However concern was expressed regarding the following issues: 1) Professors who normally do not allow students to fill out SET evaluation forms if they don't attend classes, will no longer be able to restrict these students from filling out the form; and, 2) the student response rate may be significantly lower.

In response to the suggestion that a hybrid system be put into place to allow students to use an online tool or some type of mobile device in class, it was noted that this idea was also suggested by Academic Policy Committee, but the logistics of this model may be a challenging obstacle.

In response to question raised regarding the administering of the SET form after the final exam, rather than during the last two week of classes (as per the Senate policy), it was noted that research and literature has indicated that it is best to implement during the last two week of the term.

In response to a question raised, it was noted that it was noted that feedback is not really considered to be meaningful and shouldn't be used if there is an absolute number of ten or less.

Concern was raised regarding the issue that a lower response rate may have an effect on instructors who use the feedback on teaching for the Promotion Tenure and Renewal process.

A question was raised regarding the issue that moving to an online module may change the nature of the results. For example, once the professor leaves the room to be evaluated students may discuss what type of ratings that they want to put on the form as a collective **group**. In response, it was noted that although this is always possible, the SET forms should be completed individually in a quiet forum. Nevertheless, the notion of group-assessment has not been researched.

Concern was raised regarding the issue that currently departmental secretaries often type the hand written responses and give them to the professors who are being evaluated whereas this information should be given to instructors in its original raw format signed and sealed in an envelope to the instructor.

It was expressed that the SET instrument be reviewed every three years or so.

In light of the feedback, it was agreed that the issue of online SET forms be referred back to Academic Policy Committee with consultation from Student Committee for consideration of a proposed plan. (*i.e.*, further research around participation rates, pilot project in a few classrooms, revising the questionnaire, *etc.*).

The document was received for information.

#### **5.5.2 IT Steering Committee Annual Year-End Report**

*(See document Sa111209-5.5.2 for more details.)*

It was noted that the University will be moving all student email over to Google email which will provide students with features such as web based applications, additional storage space and increased support for mobile devices. Faculty email will remain in Lotus Notes.

A Senator raised some concern regarding the issue that it is not clear as to whether the US government will have the power to access any of the information for research purposes.

Senators provide a round of applause to IT services for their ongoing support and hard work.

The document was received for information.

#### **\*5.5.3 College of Applied Arts and Technology Transfer Policy – Reinstate**

*(See document Sa111209-5.5.3 for more details.)*

**MOTION: That the College of Applied Arts and Technology Transfer Policy – Reinstate be approved.**

**\*CARRIED**

#### **5.6 Senate Student Committee** Nothing to report.

## **5.7 Report of the Provost**

Members were informed that Decanal searches for the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, the Faculty of Education and the Faculty of Graduate Studies are in various stages of the search process. It is anticipated that there will be public presentations for some of the final candidates early in the New Year.

Members were also informed that Dr. Alan Wright, Vice Provost Teaching and Learning has agreed to the renewal of his position for another five year term.

## **5.8 Report of Vice-President, Research**

Members were informed that there is a new Tri-Council Policy framework in place that pertains to integrity in research and scholarship. It was noted that the new framework specifies and defines responsibilities of researchers. There is much debate around the policy issue of the Tri-Council wanting to publish the names of people who have performed acts of misconduct.

### **5.8.1 Draft Strategic Research Plan**

*(See document Sa111209-5.8.1 for more detail.)*

A comprehensive overview was provided by the Vice-Provost Research on the University of Windsor' Draft Strategic Plan.

Members were informed that the beginning of the draft Strategic Research Plan arose when the Canadian Federation of Innovation (CFI) required eligible institutions requesting support to submit a summary of its strategic research plan. Although the University did not have a formal Strategic Research Plan at the time, a document was provided to CFI to meet its requirements in 2006. The CFI Strategic Research Plan summary noted that an institution should: outline the major objectives of the strategic research plan; outline the priority areas of research and research training; focus on those areas for which it intends to request support from the CFI; describe past and planned institutional support to priority areas; describe planned inter-institutional and inter-sectoral collaborations; describe how it will measure success in meeting its objectives; and, describe the planning and approval process.

Members were informed that in August 2010 the Vice-President, Research was given the mandate to prepare a Strategic Research Plan. The process of drafting the plan was one that actively engaged the University's leadership, research and creative activity communities. It was noted that a Strategic Research Planning Committee was established to help in the development of the plan. The draft plan incorporated a vision statement, a mission statement, seven major research objectives and sub-goals, key performance metrics, areas of strategic research priority and action steps for implementation.

It was stressed that the plan should be considered to be a dynamic plan that will evolve and enhance as appropriate during its life cycle.

The floor was open for feedback/comments and a discussion ensued regarding various aspects of the proposal. Clarification and answers were provided by the Vice-President Research, where applicable.

It was agreed that the following amendments be made:

1. That the statement about discipline-specific metrics be added under the "Faculty Member Oriented Metrics" heading.
2. That a statement be added recognizing that not all areas of research specializations are noted in the SRP given that the SRP provides a broad framework. However, it is understood that there are many areas of research strength on campus, all of which should be able to link to one of the thematic research areas.

3. That the notion of internationalization as it relates to the SRP be expanded upon, perhaps under Objective 1. It was suggested that the importance of forming strategic alliances with regard to research by, for instance, combining research initiatives with student mobility be stressed.
4. Under appendix C, "2012 Implementation Action Steps", remove item #2 as this is a budget matter and remove item #9, since this does not fall under the purview of the President.
5. Under appendix C, item #12, change "Executive Director of Information Technology Services (ITS)" to "IT Steering Committee".

Senators were informed that any additional questions or comments can be forwarded to the Dr. Ranjana Bird, Vice-President Research.

It was noted that the final proposal will be placed on a future Senate agenda for approval.

The document was received for information.

**6 Question Period/Other Business**

Nothing to report.

**7 Adjournment**

**MOTION: That the meeting be adjourned.**

Quinsey/King  
**CARRIED**