

**ACADEMIC COUNCIL
MINUTES**

Friday, February 16, 2007, 1:00 p.m., room N-186

- Present: T. Bell, S. Brunet, G. Bulgarea, S. Choksi, D. Gallagher, R. Herrera, S. Hervouet-Zeiber, P. Labrinos, J. Masterson, P. McCoy, J. McMahan, A. McManus, A. Mundiynamkal, G. Quinn, C. Rossignoli, I. Stavrianos
- Regrets: M.-H. Sabbagh, N. Wargny
- Non-members: G. Archer, G. Edwards, H. Erdogan, G. Héroux, D. Hetherington, D. Nyisztor, D. Tessier

I. Stavrianos introduced and welcomed the new professional representative on Academic Council, A. McManus, Academic Advisor.

1. Approval of the Agenda

I. Stavrianos suggested to move item 4.b) Academic Space Committee under Main Business as item 5. d) in order to remain consistent with the Joint Coordinators' Committee where this item was discussed as a main business item at the last meeting. G. Archer suggested to make it item c) as some non-members were attending the meeting specifically for this item.

A. Mundiynamkal asked to add "R Score" under Varia.

J. McMahan announced that he had two announcements to give under item 4. d) Others.

The agenda was approved by consensus with these modifications.

2. Approval of the Minutes of January 19, 2007

The minutes of January 19, 2007 were approved by consensus.

3. Business Arising from the Minutes

a) Policy on Course Outlines

J. McMahan reported that, as a follow-up to the suggestion brought up at the last meeting about distributing online course outlines to students, he had brought up the issue at the Anglophone Deans' meeting and at the *Fédération des cégeps* level. Among the Anglophone colleges, no public college does it online. Marianopolis College does distribute the course outlines online but the students have to sign a contract with the College which stipulates that they have to consult them. At the *Fédération* level, the Chair of CAP (*Commission des affaires pédagogiques*) thought this issue should be brought to the entire réseau and will proceed with a survey on this question among all

colleges. The MELS will also be consulted on this issue.

S. Hervouet-Zeiber reported that the item had been discussed at the FSSCAL meeting where there was a unanimous position that the course outlines for the time being should be distributed to students in hard copies. The arguments put forward were that course outlines served as contracts between teachers and students, that they can be used as pedagogical tools and that teachers in their classes often referred the students to the course outline's framework.

It was agreed to table the item until information from the Ministry on the legalities of the issue has been obtained.

b) 2007-2008 Academic Calendar

D. Tessier explained that this item was back to Council because of the recommendation made at the Joint Coordinators' meeting to move the mark update deadline from January 3rd to the 7th and to leave the date open for the February information evening because of some concerns raised.

It was moved by P. Labrinos and seconded by S Hervouet-Zeiber that Academic Council recommend that the Board of Directors approve the 2007-2008 Academic Calendar as modified.

Approved unanimously.

4. Reports, Announcements and Correspondence

a) Joint Coordinators

S. Hervouet-Zeiber reported the following on the Joint Coordinators' meeting of February 7, 2007:

- G. Héroux and A. Perout presented the Strategic Plan Review. A. Perout asked for volunteers to serve on the Coordinating Committee.
- G. Archer presented the Space Committee's report on planned relocations on campus.
- J. McMahon spoke of the 2007-2008 allocations process. The College is hoping to have a new, more efficient system in place that will allow the College to make up for the allocations' deficit without having a negative effect on pedagogy and allowing for smaller sections where they are absolutely necessary for a program to fulfill its mandate. J. McMahon called on all programs to examine how they can become more efficient in allocating their courses while addressing academic needs.
- D. Tessier reported on LÉA, the Omnivox course management module, and announced a workshop for February 14 during UB.

b) LRPC

J. McMahon reported that the current main item of discussion at the Long Range Planning Committee was the survey of non-returning students. Some adjustments were made at the last meeting and a semi-final document will be presented at the next meeting. This document will also be looked at by some Social Science faculty.

The draft survey will be brought to Council at its next meeting for consultation. The survey will be conducted mid-March.

c) Others

J. McMahon reported that the H07 Ped Day scheduled on Tuesday, March 13, 2007 will feature a very interesting keynote speaker and a wide variety of workshops. He stressed that the Ped Day was for all faculty and staff and that the managers will encourage staff participation while taking into account the service requirements of the College.

J. McMahon also reminded Council that the 2006-2007 Teaching Excellence Award competition had been launched. Nomination forms are available on the College website as well as in various areas of the College. J. McMahon stressed the importance to recognize the achievements of faculty at Vanier.

5. Main Business

a) Technology Transfer College Centre

G. Héroux distributed copies of an executive summary of the technology transfer college centre project. He briefly walked the committee through the document and answered several questions from the members.

G. Héroux reported that Vanier is applying to the MELS for the creation of a technology transfer centre designed “to assist small and medium size businesses in St-Laurent increase their competitiveness on the export market by facilitating technology transfer activities in information management systems.” There are now 31 such centres in Quebec, 5 of which in Montreal, and after a moratorium of 5 years, the Ministry is calling for new applications. The deadline to apply is March 1st and the College is presently collecting letters of support from the St-Laurent and Montreal businesses. In Montreal, five colleges out of twelve are applying, three of which renewing applications previously submitted. Vanier, if successful, would be the first Anglophone college to have such a centre.

G. Héroux gave more detailed information on how the project was based on a major survey conducted in the St-Laurent area that clearly showed that the difference between successful and less successful businesses was proper utilization of management systems; on the lack of accessibility of small and medium businesses to such management systems; on the three levels of activities proposed; on the numerous advantages for students and

staff and the possibility of providing, if successful, additional financial resources for programs; on the expertise available in the College where the Business Administration and Computer Science departments have already been approached with the possibility of involving others; on the lack of obligation for any staff member to participate in the project; on the structure of the centre which has to be a separate corporate reporting to the Board of Directors as per the Ministry's requirements; and on initial funding from the Ministry for the first three years after which the College has to be self-supporting. In answer to a concern raised, he clearly stated that the College's contribution would only be in-kind and would not be taking space away, except perhaps an office for a consultant. The idea is to use existing offices, facilities and equipment. G. Héroux also clearly stated the difference between this project which aims at businesses with some 25 employees and the training provided through Cont. Ed. to larger companies.

Several members expressed support for the project and the following motion was passed.

It was moved by G. Bulgarea and seconded by S. Brunet that Academic Council recommend the Vanier College Technology Transfer Centre project to the Board of Directors for approval.

In favour	-	10
Against	-	0
Abstentions	-	3

b) Romanian Project

The Director General introduced this topic by stating that this item was submitted to Council at this point only as information and did not require any decision from Council yet.

G. Héroux then gave a brief report on his December visit to Romania, the purpose of which was to explore the possibility of establishing partnerships with four academic institutions in Romania. He emphasized in particular how this project would increase the College's level of activity in international education and the student and staff mobility; the funding received for this exploratory stage; the type of institutions aimed at; the possibility of new linkages with European Union members since Romania has joined the EU in January; the contacts he and G. Bulgarea have in the country; and the advantage of linking up with a country belonging to the "francophonie". He clearly stated that nothing had been finalized and that the objective of this trip was to establish a first contact. There is sufficient funding available to support a visit from G. Bulgarea to Romania to meet with the institutions and discuss the project more in depth, and to come back to Council with ideas to be discussed at this forum.

G. Bulgarea gave further information on the project regarding negotiations with Romania and the European Union; the possibility of offering an AEC in Romania; the possibility of sending students in some institutions; and the possibility of welcoming students from

Romania at Vanier, maybe via The Language School to make admission easier. G. Bulgarea is preparing his trip to Romania.

It was agreed that an electronic copy of the Director General's trip to Romania would be sent to all Council members.

c) Academic Space Committee

G. Archer, Chair of the Space Committee, reported that at the December 11th, 2006 meeting, the committee passed a motion that "the Space Committee set as a high priority moving the office of the Director General and the Academic Dean to the F wing by the summer of 2007." This motion should have come to Council earlier and should be considered before the one presented at the last meeting.

T. Bell reported that the space issue was discussed at the Humanities Department meeting where a motion was unanimously approved whereby to put a moratorium on the project until college-wide consultation had been conducted. This motion was brought to the Joint Coordinators at the February 7th meeting. The motion was based on the lack of consultation, the need for a Cegep to ensure a proper mix of pre-university and technology programs and students and the risk that the N building returns to its old status.

G. Archer stated that there was nothing secretive nor casual about the renovations projected. The project to move ECE and SCC to the ground floor of the N building has been discussed for the past five to six years and the two programs were intimately involved in the discussion. The Academic Advisors who will move to the A wing as one of the domino effects have been involved in the project. The FSSCAL Dean has expressed her wish to move to the A wing location. The Committee is open for discussion to anyone having concerns with the projects proposed such as the relocation of the faculty lounge. G. Archer then stressed the obligation for the College as a teaching institution to give priority to student needs and to improving the facilities of two large programs which really need it. He also pointed out that the move of the ECE and SCC departments to the ground floor of the N building will solve the problem of this area being currently deserted at the end of the day by bringing in some 400 students there. The area could also be used by the AEC program in the evening. Other areas have been looked at, such as Cont. Ed., but there is a need for a large and contiguous area.

G. Edwards, as a member of the ad hoc committee on the N building, read a motion from the Liberal Arts Program to be considered by Council, asking the Director General for proper consultation with the community before proceeding with implementation of the plans. He also distributed copies of an email from G. Harilal addressed to G. Archer and the Director General deploring the lack of consultation of the users of the area and asking that the process be made more public. G. Edwards then spoke to the motion particularly stressing how the conference area of the N building had become over the years such a productive component of the academic life in the building and how the College should do its best to avoid that it reverts to the former fairly sterile environment. He added how

important a role this area played in the morale, motivation and spirit of the faculty and the numerous services it provided to faculty. He also spoke of the need to have complete detailed plans with all the possible implications for proper consultation before going ahead with the project. He then asked Council to consider passing a motion of the same nature to allow some time to stop and think before going ahead

S. Choksi, seconded by R. Herrera, moved the motion presented:

GIVEN that the Conference Area of the N building has evolved over the years into a vital component of academic life in the N building;

GIVEN that the changes currently planned to the Conference Area of the N building will be irreversible and have not been thought through in terms of impact on those with offices or classes in the N building.

GIVEN that these changes are partly predicated on a vision of Vanier College (vis-à-vis technologies) which would have significant College-wide academic implications;

THEREFORE be it resolved that Academic Council request the Director General of Vanier College to ensure that there is adequate time to stop and think and consult with all those in the Vanier community who will be affected by these plans, and to carefully consider alternatives, before proceeding to implementation.

A long debate followed. Several faculty members, although recognizing the needs of the ECE and SCC programs, spoke in favour of the motion “to take time to stop, think and consult” in light of the many concerns raised regarding the lack of consultation and the piecemeal aspect of the plans versus complete plans which would include all the domino effects of the project. Several faculty also spoke against the idea of possibly making the N building a “technology” building and of the importance in a Cegep to ensure that pre-university and technology programs and students mix together. Both G. Archer and G. Héroux stated this was the result of a misunderstanding and that it was not the intention of the College. The services provided in the Conference Area of the N building were also brought up and the need for the College to make some commitment that they would also be offered in a new area for the lounge. Finally, the lack of student consultation was also raised. G. Archer confirmed that students have always been on the Space Committee over the past 2-3 years he has chaired the committee. He added that the Space Committee meetings were open meetings and that the committee was always willing to listen to the concerns raised within the community with the plans projected.

S. Choksi suggested the following friendly amendment to the motion: to add “until the end of the semester” after “adequate time” in the fourth paragraph. The friendly amendment was agreed upon by the seconder of the motion, Ricardo Herrera.

D. Nyisztor, Coordinator of the ECE Department, made a brief presentation on the issue. She confirmed that the department had been waiting for a move for the past six to seven years and had been consulted throughout the process. Although recognizing the concerns raised, she stressed the needs of the department in terms of improving a nutrition lab that is temporary and not adequate, a nursery lab in need of renovations and an observing lab

that is not appropriate. She reported how embarrassing it was for the department to receive potential students on Open House in such outdated premises. Other areas, such as the A wing and Cont. Ed. had been considered, but the department felt that the N building ground floor area was the least disruptive one and the safest and most secure one for young children.

G. Héroux stated that, for the reasons just mentioned, he would not support a moratorium on moving the two programs although ready to delay his own move. He added that as a College, the priority had to be how to best accommodate as soon as possible the needs of these programs and of the students in these programs. Both G. Héroux and G. Archer spoke against delaying the process, explaining that the College needed to proceed with some preparatory work in the next two weeks in order to comply with the time line of the move. They also pointed out that consultation was already ongoing. The Space Committee meetings are open and those wishing to raise concerns are invited to attend the meetings. Also, G. Héroux and G. Archer have visited the ad hoc committee and the Director General is scheduled to meet with the N building people on February 21 or 28. P. McCoy added that moving programs and students to that area would be a positive step towards creating a sense of belonging among students and would solve the current problem of students not wanting to be in this building. It would also permit to increase security services in the building. J. McMahon spoke for moving ahead with the project: he reported that he had been shocked when first visiting the facilities of ECE and had made a commitment to support the relocation of the programs. He also noted that consultation was taking place, that the concerns raised were being heard and that he himself would also be pleased to meet with the N building users.

G. Edwards stated that the motion was not in contradiction to what was said. It just stressed the need for more formal consultation as the N building users did not receive any notice of the plans projected but rather heard of them through rumours. However, these plans can have long term implications for the College and need proper consultation. Although the Director General and G. Archer did visit the ad hoc committee and a meeting with G. Héroux is planned for February 21 or 28 - the latter being more of an informal meeting - there is a need for more formal consultation.

J. Masterson called the question. It was agreed not to include the friendly amendment in the motion and to vote on the original one.

In favour	-	10
Against	-	3
Abstention	-	1

d) PLAR (Prior Learning Assessment and Recognition)

D. Gallagher walked the members through the document prepared by her on The PLAR Evaluation Process and distributed to all members. She also stressed that the process at this point was applying only to AEC's and dealing with adults with experience. The

process is being presented to Council because Vanier College has been designated by Emploi-Québec as the Anglophone college in a major project - two years- designed to enable experienced educators to get college credit through the PLAR process for the learning they acquired through their work. The project does not involve any expenses only existing classroom and office space. This project would serve as a pilot project in PLAR at Vanier.

D. Gallagher then answered a few questions from the members. She confirmed in particular that faculty in ECE DEC and AEC programs had been involved in the project and that their response was very positive. She also stated that it could be possible that the process be made available to Vanier employees pending the results of the pilot project.

It was moved by R. Herrera and seconded by P. McCoy that Academic Council endorse the PLAR Evaluation Process as presented by D. Gallagher.

Approved unanimously.

S. Hervouet-Zeiber stated that, since documents are sent ahead of time to all Council members, the latter are expected to have read them and to come prepared to meetings so that the authors of the documents submitted need not go through them at meetings. He asked the Chair of the meeting to bring this up at the next meeting. I. Stavrianos added that his intention was also to inform Council of a time limit for interventions and of the rule about not using names in interventions.

6. Varia

a) R Score

A. Mundiymkal reported that several students had complained about having to pay to get a breakdown of their R score by class (\$5). A. McManus informed Council that D. Resnick had already approached the Registrar on this issue to make this information more accessible to students and free as of this summer.

It was moved by S. Hervouet-Zeiber and seconded by D. Gallagher that Academic Council recommend to the College that this fee be waived.

Approved unanimously.

7. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.