



Excellence • Innovation • Discovery

Senate

Senate Meeting
Rosaria Boardroom

December 10, 2012
7:30 p.m.

Special Meeting of Senate

MINUTES

Present: R. Lumpkin (Chair), S. Badali, K. Blotnicky, S. Brigham, E. Church, A. Cole, P. Crouse, M. Das, S. Drain, M. Forrest, J. Fraser-Arsenault, C. French, Z. Gallant, M.J. Harkins, J. Hollett, N. Kayhani, S. Kerr, K. Kienapple, B. MacInnes, P. Mombourquette, D. Norris, I. Pottie, M. Timm, S. Walsh, P. Watts, M. Whalen,

Regrets: M. Chaffey, R. Farmer, T. Harrison, B. Jessop, J. MacLeod, L. Neilsen, K. Skinner, C. Slumkoski, B. Taylor, A. Zederayko, R. Zuk

Guests: T. Franz-Odendaal, A. MacGillivray

1. Approval of Agenda

Moved by J. Hollett, seconded by K. Blotnicky to approve the agenda as presented.
CARRIED

2. CAPP Teaching Timetable Policy

Moved by E. Church, seconded by P. Mombourquette, that Senate approve the teaching timetable policy.

Moved by I. Pottie, seconded by P. Mombourquette, to amend the motion to read:
That Senate approve the teaching timetable policy with the understanding that the university will commit to students having access to a reasonable range of electives when compared with the old timetable. CARRIED

E. Church discussed consultations with the Science students who were concerned that they will not be able to get the elective courses they desire under the proposed timetable. She pointed out that the Deans are committed to ensuring that students will have reasonable access to elective courses.

K. Kienapple reviewed the proposed time slots.

M. Forrest read a message from R. Zuk who could not attend the meeting. R. Zuk commented that she felt the changes to be rushed and that more information should have been brought forward for consultation with both faculty and students. She noted that the proposed timeslots could create scheduling conflicts for students.

E. Church responded that the first step would be to have Department Chairs in Science and Applied Human Nutrition meet and discuss the coordination of their courses.

P. Mombourquette commented that he is in favor of the motion and noted it has been worked on over a period of 2 years. He stated that the proposed timetable opens up more spaces and timeslots at times when students want to take classes.

M. Timm commented that over 100 Science and Nutrition students have signed a petition because a lack of adequate information and openness in the discussions has left them unsure of how the changes will affect them.

I. Pottie noted his concern that the proposed time slots limit electives for students with labs and a number of requirements.

S. Drain noted her concern that schedules of smaller departments would be dictated by the needs of the other departments and programs.

S. Badali discussed the collective interest of the university as a whole. He noted that the proposed timetable will allow for greater flexibility for both departments and students.

M. Forrest spoke on behalf of Education students who are widely unaware of the proposed changes as they have been out on practicum placements. She noted that she does not feel that the process has been transparent.

S. Brigham wondered what students from other faculties were saying regarding the timetable changes as she has only heard about the concerns of science students.

K. Kienapple responded that the students who attended the three information sessions were concerned about the scheduling of required courses and of labs and the availability of electives.

J. Hollett noted that MSVU has not had a timetable policy, just Senate-approved time slots, and that this is an important step.

S. Kerr noted that the majority of students that she has spoken to are fine with the changes.

S. Walsh expressed concern about voting on the motion, noting the number of absences, and the existence of issues remaining to be addressed, such as students' concerns regarding child care.

E. Church responded that the issue of classes (particularly labs) extending into the evening had been clarified.

Z. Gallant expressed concern that the process had been rushed and had not allowed for adequate consultation with students.

B. MacInnes reiterated that the current timetable means there is no classroom space to accommodate the current demand for courses.

3. Strategic Planning

Moved by M. Whalen, seconded by J. Hollett, that Senate approve the strategic plan as presented without the vision statement. CARRIED

Moved by P. Mombourquette, seconded by Z. Gallant, that Senate approve the following as the vision statement: "We will be a university of the highest quality for all members of our community and will develop thoughtful, engaged citizens who make a positive impact on their world." DEFEATED

M. Forrest wondered how the strategic plan can be approved without a vision statement.

R. Lumpkin responded that the mission and values are being carried over from the old plan and there have been a number of discussions regarding the vision statement. She also noted that the plan can move forward without a vision statement as it is a secondary component to the strategic plan.

P. Watts commented that she appreciated the fact that comments made at town hall meetings were reflected in the document.

S. Walsh noted that the second value of accountability seemed very much a business paradigm.

R. Lumpkin discussed the purpose of the vision statement. She provided senators with some proposed vision statements from Lorri Neilsen. She then opened the floor for discussion on all versions of the vision statements. In order to move the discussion forward, P. Mombourquette offered to propose a motion.

D. Norris asked for clarification of the term “strategically focused”.

M. Whalen responded that one of the goals in the strategic plan would be to have a review of all programs. The university would then provide a focus on those programs that best serve the university moving forward.

N. Kayhani noted that there are pieces of each vision statement that could be utilized.

R. Lumpkin suggested that a sub-committee be formed to come back to Senate with a vision statement for the January meeting. M. Whalen and S. Brigham offered to serve: L. Neilsen may join the group.

N. Kayhani suggested that the committee consider different possibilities and include the phrase “social responsibility”.

4. Items for Communication

- Approval of the Teaching Timetable Policy
- Approval of the Strategic Plan awaiting the vision statement.

5. Adjournment

Moved by K. Kienapple, seconded by S. Brigham, that the meeting be adjourned.