

University of Waterloo

SENATE

Minutes of the Monday, December 15, 2003 Meeting

Present: David Johnston (Chair), Lois Claxton (Secretary), Emma Bardon, Kieran Bonner, Graham Brown, Stephen Brown, Christopher Burris, Jane Buyers, Jeannette Byrne, Amit Chakma, Adrian Chin, John Crossley, Antero Da Silva, Mieke Delfgaauw, Ray Digby, George Dixon, Yolanda Dorrington, Chris Edey, Alan George, Len Guelke, Paul Guild, Simon Guthrie, Mark Haslett, Rick Helmes-Hayes, Conrad Hewitt, Michael Higgins, Keith Hipel, Dennis Huber, Igor Ivkovic, Ed Jernigan, Bob Kerton, George Labahn, Ken Lavigne, Robert Le Roy, David Matthews, Geoff McBoyle, Liam McHugh-Russell, Ray McLenaghan, Bruce Mitchell, Kirsten Morris, Heather Murray, Joseph Novak, Henry Paetkau, Alan Plumtree, Steve Prentice, Manoj Sachdev, Paul Schellenberg, Catherine Schryer, Adel Sedra, Thomas Seeborn, Mike Sharratt, James Skidmore, Alex Sloat, Lubomir Stanchev, Donna Strickland, Giuseppe Tenti, Tony Vannelli, Edward Vrscay, John Wainwright, Ian Williams

Gail Cuthbert Brandt, Lynn Judge (partial), Tina Roberts, Catharine Scott, Laura Talbot-Allan, Jay Thomson (partial), Bud Walker

Absent: Ranjana Bird*, Avi Caplan, Hsiao d'Ailly, Christian Dufournaud, Marlene Epp*, Brian Forrest, James Gollnick*, Bruce Greenberg*, Mariela Gutiérrez*, Bob Harding*, Jesse Helmer*, Laurie Hoffman-Goetz*, Suzanne Hubbard, Mike Lazaridis*, Siyan Li, Wing-Ki Liu*, Neil Malcolm*, Arokia Nathan*, John North*, Bill Power*, James Sloan, Ralph Smith*, Paul Wesson, Ross Willard, Johnny Wong

*regrets

After an uncertain start to the meeting due to the late day campus-wide power outage, the Chair offered Senate's congratulations to Dr. Michael Higgins on his re-appointment as President and Vice-Chancellor of St. Jerome's University for a second term. This was followed by a round of applause.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The November 17, 2003 minutes were approved as distributed with the deletion of two words ("improve and") in the third bullet under the discussion on recruiting on page 4.

Vrscay and Seeborn. Carried.

2. REPORTS FROM SENATE COMMITTEES AND COUNCILS

a. University Committee on Student Appeals (UCSA). The Chair of the Committee presented the report to Senate. The President expressed his gratitude to the Chair and members of UCSA on behalf of Senate for the important work they do.

3. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

a. Presentation -- Strategic Initiatives [Powerpoint slides available in the Secretariat.] Deferred from the November meeting of Senate. Following his *Progress Report #5: Building on Accomplishment* report presented at the October meeting, the Vice-President, Academic and Provost highlighted the important progress made on three of the current (and ongoing) ten institutional priorities (recruitment of the best faculty/students/staff, enhancement of co-op programs, and strategic resource allocation).

b. Maclean's Rankings - continued discussion. The Vice-President Academic prefaced his remarks by clarifying that he is not looking for a specific motion from Senate on each of the

four questions presented at the November meeting. The hope was to stimulate debate / feedback, receive support in principle for raising admission standards and consider offering "early admissions." It is recognized that each Faculty will respond to these principles as appropriate and that specific matters will be dealt with Faculty-by-Faculty in Faculty admissions committees, Faculty Councils, and in Senate Undergraduate Council. As well, the hope was to initiate an ongoing debate on longer term strategies with respect to re-examining and redesigning curriculum and reducing undergraduate enrollment in programs with low student demand, and focusing on graduate programs and service teaching.

Senators' attention was drawn to the Degree Completion Rate data at their places: about 50 percent of students admitted with an entering average below 75 percent do not graduate within seven years. A comment that the University should take a balanced approach between how many students to admit (this is related to budgetary concerns) and the quality of students admitted and the dilemma of implementing an increased standard when there is a potential 24 percent decrease in secondary school applicants next year. The Registrar noted that applicant evaluation criteria can be established according to individual Faculty specifications and that there is very little risk in making early conditional offers (based on grade 11 averages) to 5 - 10 percent of incoming students. The correlation between high-end grade 11 averages and grade 12 averages, on which university offers are based, is overwhelmingly positive.

The discussion which followed these opening comments included several motions and amendments to motions.

A motion:

That Senate supports in principle the following four guiding propositions (with a change in emphasis from a question to a statement format, i.e., *we are prepared, we should...*):

- We are prepared to raise our admission standards.
- We should change our traditional practices of relying on the complete applications packages and embrace the practice of offering "early admissions" along with scholarships based on Grade 11 standings [this was understood to be 10 percent of students that apply to Waterloo, based initially on grade 11 marks as reported to the University, not in every Faculty, and that not every "early admit" student would be offered a scholarship].
- We should re-examine and re-design curriculum in areas where we currently do not attract high quality students to make these programs attractive.
- We should reduce undergraduate enrollment in programs with low student demand and focus on graduate programs and service teaching.

Plumtree and Skidmore.

An amendment:

That the University of Waterloo will guarantee a scholarship of some form / funding to entering students with a 90 percent average or above.

Vannelli and Seebom.

In discussing the amendment, between 15 and 25 percent of the entering class has an average of 90 percent or more; that high school averages are not necessarily the best predictor of scholarship students since marks vary considerably from high school to high school within

the province; the observation that the many of the students with lower entering averages do successfully complete a university degree within seven years and benefit from a university education. Wonder how these guaranteed scholarships will be funded -- by each Faculty? centrally?

A vote on the amendment was called; the amendment failed.

A procedural motion:

To vote on the four propositions *in seriatim*.

Bonner and Edey. Carried

After further discussion, a vote on the first proposition was called; carried.

After further discussion, a vote on the second proposition was called; carried.

With the agreement of the mover and seconder, a friendly amendment to the third proposition so that it read "We should re-examine and, *if warranted*, re-design curriculum in areas where we currently do not attract high quality students to make these programs attractive."

In discussion, does this proposition mean deleting programs that do not attract high quality students *or* deleting programs with students with low averages? In the Faculty of Arts, lower averages are part and parcel of the Faculty. Approval of this proposition could possibly shift the balance of resources more toward programs where students can achieve higher grades (like the technical fields).

A vote on the third proposition was called; carried.

An amendment to the fourth proposition:

To parse the fourth proposition into three separate and logical sentences. Consequently, the first sentence of the fourth proposition would read "We should reduce undergraduate enrollment in programs with low student demand."

Schryer and Guthrie.

An amendment to the amendment:

That the word "reduce" be changed to "re-evaluate," i.e., "We should re-evaluate undergraduate enrollment in programs with low student demand."

Novak and Kerton. In a counted vote, the amendment to the amendment carried.

A counted vote was called on the amendment to the [revised] fourth proposition; the amendment failed.

A motion:

That the [revised] fourth proposition be tabled *sine die*.

Hipel and Guthrie. Carried.

In continued discussion on the issue of guaranteeing scholarships to entering students with averages above a certain threshold, while the spirit of the intent is understood, a minimum

average threshold cannot be specified...it would vary Faculty to Faculty. Agreement that Senate's Scholarships & Student Aid Committee be asked to review: the minimum threshold for scholarships offered in the various Faculties of the University in order to establish a minimum average; its previous discussion and exploration of this issue. Previous examination found that guaranteed scholarships would cost \$3-4 million per year depending on the amount offered and the entering average threshold; this would require an endowment of ~\$60 - \$80 million yielding a 5 percent return. Senate Scholarships & Student Aid Committee was asked to report back to Senate. (It was pointed out that the Scholarships & Student Aid Committee may not / chooses not to make recommendations with budgetary implications.) The view that the only way to increase funding for scholarships is to increase endowments.

- c. ***UW Naming Principles & Procedures.*** The President reported that in considering the suggested minimum endowment thresholds for named undergraduate and graduate student awards, he consulted with the Office of the Vice-President, University Relations. It was felt that the minima should stay as they are for endowed named funds (\$20,000 bursary and \$30,000 scholarship). At current 2.5 or the more traditional 5% investment yields these still do not produce significant awards. As well there is a resource cost to the University to manage and report on named endowments. However smaller annual gifts of \$1000 or more are still valuable and appreciated gifts to fund annual awards that are not named or to contribute to already established endowments.

4. REPORT OF THE CHAIR

Recognition and Commendation. The report was received for information.

Environmental Scan. Comments on the second annual report of the Task Force on Competitiveness, Productivity and Economic Progress was deferred in the interest of time.

5. REPORT OF THE VICE-PRESIDENT, ACADEMIC & PROVOST

No report was made.

6. REPORT FROM THE VICE-PRESIDENT, UNIVERSITY RESEARCH

In the interest of time, Senate moved to defer this report to the January meeting of Senate. Carried.

7. REPORTS FROM SENATE COMMITTEES AND COUNCILS (continued)

a. Undergraduate Council.

Senate moved the approval of the plan deletions as described in the agenda portfolio.

Williams and Sharratt. Carried.

Senate moved the approval of the new plan certificate as described in the agenda portfolio.

Vannelli and Sedra. Carried.

Senate received the remaining item in the report for information.

b. Long Range Planning Committee.

Senate heard a motion to approve the Framework for the Development of UW's Sixth Decade Plan and Planning Timetable as described in the agenda portfolio.

Plan and Planning Timetable as described in the agenda portfolio.

Chakma and Bonner.

In response to a question, the University is exploring various opportunities in the health field, for example with The Michener Institute, by possibly establishing a School of Pharmacy, establishing a presence in public health based in the Faculty of Applied Health Sciences, etc. General agreement that participating in the institution's planning process is important and leads to new ideas. It was noted that this planning document / guideline offers a more decentralized approach and the hope is that it will lead to better engagement of Faculties and faculty members.

An amendment:

Agreement of the mover and seconder to add the words "and reflective" to the first bullet ["Pursuit of new knowledge and scholarship through the vigorous promotion and encouragement of frontier *and reflective* research"].

The motion carried.

Senate received the remaining item in the report for information.

c. Graduate & Research Council.

Senate received the report for information.

8. REPORTS FROM THE FACULTIES

Senate received these reports for information.

9. OTHER BUSINESS

a. Appointments.

- Senate approved the following appointments to the *Distinguished Teacher Award Committee*:

Faculty (two-year terms - January 1, 2004 to December 31, 2005): Brent Hall (Planning) and Geoff Hayes (History); undergraduate students (one-year term - January 1 - December 31, 2004): Zarsheesh Divecha (Psychology), Milica Djeric (Recreation and Leisure Studies) and Paul Lehmann (Political Science); graduate students (one-year term - January 1 to December 31, 2004): Fauzia Ashraf (Health Studies & Gerontology) and Heather Murray (Biology); and alumnus (one-year term - January 1 to December 31, 2004): Antero Da Silva (BMath '93).

Le Roy and George. Carried

- Senate approved the following appointments to the *Distinguished Teaching by a Registered Student Selection Committee*:

All one-year terms -- faculty: Emanuel Carvalho (Economics/Applied Studies); undergraduate students: Jeff Henry (Electrical & Computer Engineering) and Laura Mooney (Systems Design Engineering); and graduate students: Simon Guthrie (Optometry) and Candace Newman (Geography).

Le Roy and George. Carried

- *University Committee on Student Appeals*. Senate approved the appointment of Michael Christie (Honours Co-op Geography) as a undergraduate student representative, term to August 31, 2004, and Julia Harries (Honours Arts - Social Development Studies) as the College undergraduate student representative, term to August 31, 2004.

Le Roy and George. Carried.

- b. COU Report* [at Senators' places]. Senate received this report for information.

10. CONFIDENTIAL SESSION

Senate convened in confidential session.

LC/rah
December 16, 2003

Lois Claxton
Secretary of the University