

# COLLÈGE UNIVERSITAIRE GLENDON COLLEGE

## CONSEIL DE LA FACULTÉ / FACULTY COUNCIL

---

Minutes of the Faculty Council meeting held on Friday, November 28, 1997 at 1:30 p.m. in the Board and Senate Chamber. This meeting of Council was attended by the following members:

J. Baker	A. Baudot	J. Benson
C. Besnard	P. Bourdin	C. Boyd
B. Bradbury	D. Carveth	D. Clipsham
J. Crozier	J. Drexler	M. Feliciano
E. P. Fowler	C. Fraser	Y. Frenette
R. Furguele	J. C. Garcia	I. Gentles
R. Gill	E. Gillis	M. Girard
J. Gonda (Chair)	A. Hopkins	J.-C. Jaubert
D. Joly	C. Klein-Lataud	M. Lesage
L. Lewin	M. Macaulay	G. MacDougall
A. Mandel	I. Martin	J. McDonald
R. Morris	F. Mougeon	G. Moyal
N. Naiman	D. Olin	E. Roventa
J. Savary	C. Séguinot	R. Sieburth
M.-F. Silver	R. Simmons	D. Spring
Y. Szmids	D. Tan	C. Therrien
S. Tweyman	J. Van Huyen	C. Zimmerman

### 1. Chair's Remarks

The meeting began at 1:42 p.m.

The Chair noted that the meeting would be picked up from where it was interrupted on November 21, 1997, starting by the motions from the Task Force.

The Chair noted that copy of documents pertaining to the items on the agenda were at the door for members who did not bring the one previously circulated.

He also reported that APPC, as part of their open consultation, would be circulating the "Background Report" together with their "Terms of Reference" on the issue of "Consideration of Options for Glendon" early next week. He invited all members of the Glendon Community to participate in this exercise which will be resolved by a Final Report to Senate at its meeting of March 26, 1998 and to the Board of Governors on April 20, 1998.

He also reminded members of Council that the next meeting of Council would be held on Friday, December 12, 1997.

**5. Motions from the Task Force elected on May 30, 1997**

**5.1. Academic and Financial Coordinators - [FC-97-98-13]**

The following motion was moved by T. Fowler and seconded by P. Bourdin:

**Whereas the central function of Faculty Council is to create and maintain a curriculum that is an expression of Glendon's identity and purpose, and whereas performance of this function requires representation of the views of, and participation by, the whole spectrum of Faculty Council's membership, and Whereas the current processes and structures of academic planning have not served us well in this regard, it is moved:**

**That Faculty Council create the following two positions as officers of Faculty Council:**

- **An Academic Coordinator, elected by Faculty Council, whose responsibility is to receive all Departments' program proposals for the following academic year and, after consultation with each Department, with the FC (see below), and with the Principal, to present to the Policy and Planning Committee (PPC) a provisional academic program for Glendon which is in harmony with the College's educational philosophy (as defined by Faculty Council) and which comes within budget.**
- **A Financial Coordinator, elected by Faculty Council, whose responsibilities are (i) to maintain a complete and accurate file of Glendon's accounts, of each Department, as well as of the Dean of Students<sup>1</sup>; (ii) to receive all Departments' budget proposals for the following academic year, and after consultations with each Department, with the AC, and with the Principal, present to the PPC a provisional budget for the proposed academic program. The files of the FC shall be accessible to all members of the Glendon community.**

T. Fowler spoke briefly about the motion, giving some background information on the present College structure. He reminded members of the general malaise felt by himself and many of his colleagues. He noted that the present structures have allowed the subversion of meaningful consultation in policymaking and that the structure of decision making has resulted in badly-thought-out and even dysfunctional policies for Glendon. He urged members of Council to vote in favour of the motion as the creation of the two positions would enable Faculty Council to take a more active part in the entire planning process of Glendon.

J.-C. Jaubert asked the mover of the motion to contextualize the statement that the "current processes and structures of academic planning have not served us well". He also queried about the remuneration, if there would be any, to be attached to these two new positions as well as the points raised about the provisional budget for academic program to be presented to PPC (last four line of the motion).

---

<sup>1</sup> Since the original motion was passed, the Principal has created the position of Associate Principal - Enrolment and Student Services; the FC's responsibilities can reflect this change.

In response to the above, T. Fowler reminded Council of the “Motion of Non-confidence” passed by Council in May 1997. He noted that the dissatisfaction with the planning process at Glendon has been felt on several occasions and quoted the redeployment within the Political Science Department. With regards to the remuneration, he noted that he was hoping that if the motion was to be approved, Faculty Council could propose some kind of arrangement in form stipends or course release time.

Y. Szmids supported T. Fowler’s point about the lack of consultation and communication and referred to the handling by the Principal of the most recent funding, valued \$226,000, secured by Glendon for new academic initiatives.

J. Crozier expressed his concerns about the creation of the two new positions. The “Academic Coordinator” could make the work of Faculty Council more difficult to complete, and the “Financial Coordinator” he believed was not a credible proposal. He reminded members of the crisis looming over Glendon, and the forthcoming re-examination by Senate APPC of Glendon’s mandate in the light of budget deficits, enrolment shortfalls, complement reductions and decreases in course offerings. He noted that the proposal would not help solve these problems, but could rather amplify them. He invited members to step back and reflect on the President’s recent observations.

I. McDonald strongly urged members of Council to vote in favour of the motion. He pointed out that it would be absolutely essential that the Financial Coordinator get access to all financial information of the University and that Council members be kept informed on a regular basis.

Several other members, namely P. Bourdin, D. Spring, A. Hopkins, D. Clipsham expressed their support in favour of the motion for the creation of the two new positions. The main highlights of their comments were as follows:

- the loss of confidence in the ability of Glendon’s administration to manage the affairs of the College in a collegial and democratic way;
- the lack of consultation pertaining to issues such as redeployments and restructuring;
- inadequate academic and financial planning at Glendon partly due to lack of participation from Faculty Council;
- the proposed positions of Academic Coordinator and Financial Coordinator would enable Faculty Council to take charge more fully of the planning process which create a focus for a collegial planning structure at Glendon;
- Glendon needs to have coordination and the creation of the two positions would assert Glendon’s commitment to the ongoing process set in motion by Senate APPC.

On the other hand, counter-arguments were received from Y. Frenette, B. Bradbury, E. Gillis, A. Baudot and C. Klein-Lataud:

- the college bureaucracy is currently heavy enough; there is no need need for an additional level which will create more negative effects;
- money is not available to pay for the two new positions - might need to cut more courses to support them;
- some liked the idea, but the new structure would not necessarily allow the Glendon Community to work together;
- it runs the risk of a complete shut-down of the process of governance of the College;

- initiative should come from the Committee of Chairs

Furthermore, A. Baudot observed that he was appalled by lack of courtesy he thought was shown towards the President by some Council members at the last Council's meeting. As he saw it, the latter had been cut short, and as a result members had no chance to raise the issue of the bilingual aspects of the College.

In his closing statement, T. Fowler assured Council that no additional money would be required in conjunction with the two new positions. He pointed out that these two positions would do away with the need for Associate Principals. (With regards to consultation with students, one student, namely C. Therrien sat on the Task Force over the summer meetings they had.) He concluded by saying that the motion was a way for them to express themselves as a body, and felt that this would be more workable than what has taken place in the past years.

M.-F. Silver, seconded by C. Klein-Lataud moved that given the absence of a great number of members, particularly the students, the vote be made by mail ballot. The question was called, and the motion was **defeated**. (16/22).

The question to approve the motion contained in document FC-97-98-13 was then called and the motion **carried** (22/14/5).

## 5.2. **Research Coordinator for PPC - [FC-97-98-14]**

The following motion was moved by T. Fowler and seconded by P. Bourdin:

**That PPC be provided with the services of a research associate responsible for collection and presentation to PPC of information on current enrolments and finances at Glendon.**

T. Fowler introduced the motion. He noted that one of the reasons why this motion had been forward was that on several occasions in the past few years, PPC had been provided with conflicting information, and in order for the Committee to provide a thorough input in the Academic Planning of the College, the services of a Research Associate was required.

J.-C. Jaubert expressed his concerns about additional cost involved due to this additional position.

J. Crozier informed Council that since he has taken over the position of Associate Principal, he had been making sure that PPC was provided with all the information pertaining to academic planning circulated to Chairs and Coordinators. Therefore, he wondered whether the new position was needed.

D. Clipsham and I. McDonald stressed on the importance of providing adequate and accurate financial information.

A discussion ensued mainly over the rationale as well as the financing of the position. It was also noted that the nature of the position had not been well defined.

Following the discussion, and given the Associate Principal's efforts to provide PPC all the necessary information, T. Fowler decided to withdraw the motion. He however stressed that should PPC not be satisfied with the arrangements mentioned by the Associate Principal with regards to the diffusion of information, he would come back with a similar motion in the future.

The withdrawal of the motion was ruled out of order by the Chair, but the latter was challenged and his ruling was defeated. The motion was therefore withdrawn.

### 5.3. **Information on Associate Principal's Role - [FC-97-98-15]**

The following motion was moved by T. Fowler and seconded by P. Bourdin:

**That Faculty Council request from the Principal's Office a description of the duties assigned to Associate Principals which have been clearly administrative - i.e., YUFA - exempt - and of those which pertain specifically to academic and financial planning and which could be performed by coordinators as defined in Motion 2.**

P. Bourdin spoke briefly about the motion and pointed out that the request for this information was important and purely factual.

Following a short debate, the question was called and the motion **carried** (16/0/10).

## 6. **Reports from Standing Committees**

### (c) **Committee on Enrolments 1996-97 Annual Report - [FC-97-98-23]**

G. Moyal presented the report contained in document FC-97-98-23. He then read the following statement:

*Because the impression was created in the minds of at least two colleagues that I was responsible for having leaked the Enrolments Committee Report, or parts of its contents, to the media (specifically to Radio-Canada), by Professor Yves Frenette's intervention immediately after the adjournment of Faculty Council last Friday; and because if the impression was created in the minds of two colleagues, the chances are that it was created in the minds of many others as well, I wish to deny categorically and unequivocally having had anything to do with this leak, whether directly or indirectly.*

*To suggest that I have would be the more odious since (a) this report had been in the hands of some 100 people over the past four or five weeks and since (b) there is - and could be - nothing that would single me out as the likely culprit among them.*

Comments on the report were then received.

L. Lewin noted that some of the data mentioned in the report were inaccurate and should not have been published. She gave as example the statement on page 2, section 3 (i) under paragraph (a) Enrolments - "Two years ago there were only 127 Franco-Ontarian high school graduates who registered in one of the three bilingual universities in Ontario. Of these, 23 came to Glendon." She also observed that some other statements should have been contextualized as they were misleading.

With reference to the number of Franco-Ontarian high school graduates who registered in one of the three bilingual universities in Ontario, G. Moyal stated that these figures were quoted by Y. Frenette at a meeting held two years ago and he, as well as some other colleagues, had effectively been puzzled by them at that time. With regards to other information throughout the report, he noted that they had been based on the information provided to the Committee at that time.

Some other members expressed concerns about the small number of Franco-Ontarian students coming at Glendon and felt that Y. Frenette should be given the opportunity to address the issue.

Speaking on behalf of students, Ed Gillis stressed on the importance of activities such as "Take Glendon Home" which had been undertaken during the Fall Reading week in the past few years. He also had doubts on the data and wished that they be verified.

C. Zimmerman gave some information about the role of York Liaison and Glendon Liaison in their recruiting assignment.

Among other issues raised were: (i) a new category of students, namely "allophones"; (ii) the need to revise Glendon's enrolment target; (iii) how to improve the enrolments (iv) should Faculty and students be encouraged to participate in the recruitment exercise by attending the presentation made the Liaison staff in the schools.

Council then endorsed the report.

At this point, it was almost 4:40 p.m. D. Spring noted that N. Naiman had to leave and had asked that the discussion of the motion re: Restructuring Process contained in document FC-97-98-24 be postponed to the next meeting. Council agreed and the meeting adjourned at 4:42 p.m.