

## Schulich School of Business

### Minutes of a Special Meeting of Faculty Council

A Special Meeting of Faculty Council for the 1997-98 academic year was held on Friday, January 16, 1998 at 11:30 in Room 032 SSB.

**In Attendance:** R. Peterson Chair  
C. Trussler Recording Secretary

#### **Voting Members of Faculty Council Present:**

E. Auster	T. Beechy	P. Bradshaw	A. Campbell
D. Dimick	I. Fenwick	E. Fischer	R. Heeler
D. Horvath	R. Irving	J. McKellar	P. O'Brien
D. Thompson	S. Weiss	B. Wolf	C. Courtis
R. LeBlanc	L. Rothschild	I. Little	

#### **Voting Members of Faculty Council Absent:**

D. Brewer	R. Burke	J. Buzacott	W. Cook
R. Cuff	J. Dermer	D. Johnston	R. Karambayya
F. Lazar	I.A.Litvak	R. Lucas	E. Maynes
S. Mazumdar	R. McClean	C. McMillan	M. Milevsky
G. Morgan	C. Oliver	T. Peridis	P. Phan
E. Prisman	M. Rice	L. Rosen	H. Rosin
S. Roy	J. Smithin	P. Tryfos	T. Wesson
H.T. Wilson	S. Yeomans	M. Szaki	L. Wasser
E. Shapiro	S. Robinson	J. Rudkowski	G. Tsialtas
M. Illes	M. Palombi	M. Tabbara	R. Sharma
E. Weintraub	P. Barnes	D. Ferguson	F. Karp
D. Leighton	M. MacKenzie	G. McClure	C. Ritchie
J. Wleugel			

#### **Regrets, Leaves, Sabbaticals:**

A. Bhanich-Supapol	W. Cragg	D. Daly	J. Darroch
D. Fowler	J. Friedlan	B. Gainer	J. Gillies
J. Green	I. Henriques	I. Macdonald	G. McKechnie
D. Nath	G. Roberts	C. Robinson	P. Sadorsky
T. Wesson	A.J. Sirsi	D. Thomassin	L. Thorne
B. Zimmerman	D. Flanagan		

#### **Non-Voting Members of Faculty Council Present:**

K. Feiler	S. Firth	C. Pattenden	L. Smith
S. Tenn	S. Bell	T. Spence	

#### **Non-Voting Members of Faculty Council Absent:**

B. Dea	J. Foy	E. Gutmacher	D. Krakovsky
J. Palumbo	T. Pursell	M. Rittinger	P. Zarry
D. Barrows	P. Audley	A. Zohar	J. Zemans

Professor R. Peterson opened the meeting and advised that this Special Meeting of Faculty Council is a continuation of the December Faculty Council. He noted that there are only two items on the agenda, Teaching Awards and Committee of the Whole discussion.

### **Seymour Schulich Awards for Teaching Excellence**

Professor R. Peterson advised that in addition to the GBC motion, Professor D. Dimick had submitted a motion and Professor B. Gainer had submitted a Comment. It was agreed that both the GBC and Professor D. Dimick's proposals be discussed together, as they were not competing proposals. The Comment received from Professor B. Gainer would also be included.

Lisa Rothschild, on behalf of the GBC moved

The following process is recommended for the Seymour Schulich Awards for Teaching Quality. The proposed process ensures participation of faculty, staff, alumni and students as well as enabling the true consumers of teaching to assess the level of quality in a fair and anonymous way. The process is divided into three simple steps: nomination, publication and voting.

Seconded by Professor D. Dimick.

Lisa Rothschild outlined the three steps:

The Nomination process will ensure there is a body of support for the person  
Publication - the Insider will publish a special edition containing all letters of reference.  
Voting - Only students are eligible to vote. There will be a first and second place award.

Professor D. Dimick suggested that once we vote on the process, it will remain with the students to update the process and make any changes necessary. It would not come back to Faculty Council for revision.

Professor R. Heeler offered congratulations to everyone involved in bringing this proposal forward.

Professor E. Fischer, on behalf of Professor B. Gainer who was ill, moved a friendly amendment to incorporate Professor B. Gainer's comment into the proposal. This was accepted by Lisa Rothschild.

Professor D. Dimick advised that the Comment substantially changes the purpose of the Seymour Schulich award.

The following comments and suggestions were made:

- require a report be made available of how the money was spent;
- if the proposal included full time and part time faculty, then the Comment would not be valid as part time faculty do not have "4" (PEA) accounts;
- the Comment be amended to delete references to "departmental";
- the Comment depersonalizes the award;
- the Comment attaches too many strings to the award;
- if students are given a choice they will always choose classroom improvement;
- a certain percentage could be reinvested;
- the award be divided between a bonus and research money;
- the money be put into "4" (PEA) account and therefore be tax protected;
- it is not possible to give award recipients the choice of what to do with the money.

While faculty members agreed with the spirit of the Comment, other comments and suggestions were:

- there be recognition of the recipient of the award within SSB;
- the award process should be reviewed after one year;

Professor D. Thompson commented that perhaps only in Canada could a successful entrepreneur donate a prize to reward past excellence in an activity, and then have peers of the intended recipient debate in all seriousness how the recipient should spend the prize money.

Professor D. Horvath advised that Seymour Schulich envisioned this as an individual award.

Professor E. Auster advised that the original proposal suggested that the award be given at Convocation.

Professor R. Irving suggested that a vote be taken to accept the proposal in principle. Then the GBC could take these suggestions for advice on how to modify the proposal.

Lisa Rothschild suggested that the students be empowered to come up with the rules, subject to suggestions arising from this meeting. She summarized the discussion and proposed the following:

- The GBC review this award after the first year
- Part time faculty be included
- A limit be set as to the number of times a professor can receive the award
- Separate the Comment from the proposal and use the Comment as a suggestion
- GBC will liaise with the Director of Teaching Quality to implement the award

Professor E. Fischer rescinded her offer to amend the proposal to include the Comment.

A vote was taken on the proposal made by Lisa Rothschild.

- In favour - 19
- Abstain - 2

A straw vote was taken on whether the award should be given as a cheque to the individual, or put into their "4" (PEA) account.

Given as a cheque - 6

Put into "4" account - 7

Abstain - 7

A straw vote was taken to determine if the award should include all full time, part time and CLAs, or be restricted to Full Time and CLAs only.

Everyone be included - 12

Restrict - 6

Professor E. Auster, on behalf of the faculty, expressed how grateful we are for Seymour Schulich's most generous donation.

### **Committee of the Whole Discussion**

#### **MBA Requirements for Business Undergraduate Degree Holders**

At this point in the meeting, Professor I. Fenwick moved that the meeting move to Committee of the Whole, seconded by Professor T. Beechy. Professor D. Dimick replaced Professor R. Peterson as chair.

Professor D. Dimick advised that the outcome of this discussion is advisory. Conclusions will be brought to the MBA/MPA Program Committee where a formal motion to Faculty Council will be formulated.

Professor I. Fenwick advised that this proposal would make it possible for an MBA to be completed in two semesters. He noted that there were three issues for discussion.

#### **1. Advanced Standing 5-Year Rule**

At present, for Advanced Standing we only look at course work taken in the last 5 years. Should this 5-year rule for advanced standing be eliminated?

The rationale behind this rule is that theoretically courses and business practices change over five years.

At the present time, individuals are assessed by the Associate Dean with help from Area Coordinators to determine Advanced Standing. It is a judgment process. Advanced Standing is automatic for certain courses from certain universities.

Currently, it appears that if you have 5 years work experience you are penalized, however the 5 year rule can be waived by the Associate Dean. It is difficult to prove the student is ineligible for Advanced Standing and it was noted that students are reluctant to request waivers.

The question arose as to where the demand for a 1 year MBA will come from?

Suggestions made were:

Exams be used to replace the Advanced Standing decision making process;  
If you are beyond the 5 year rule, then you must write an exam;  
Other degree holders should have experience in the field;  
Suggested reading list for those who are beyond the 5 year rule;  
Eliminate this requirement and revisit this rule in two years.

A straw vote was taken. Eliminate 5 year rule?

Yes - 14;

Abstain - 2

## 2. Experience Requirement for Advanced Standing

At present, we require 2 years full time work experience for advanced standing.

What do we mean by "full-time work experience", e.g. volunteer work, etc.

Should the 2-year full-time work experience for advanced standing be eliminated?

If eliminated a 4 year BBA + 1 year MBA = 5 years, with no work experience would result.

If eliminated, our publications should state that work experience would be an asset to receive admission; or preference will be given to students who have work experience.

The Admissions Officer and Associate Dean work very closely in decisionmaking, but the diversity of students in the classroom appears to be the real problem and major obstacle to service quality.

Life and work experience needs to be included, along with the GMAT score.

Suggestions made were:

Require non-credit introductory courses for people who have been out for a long time.

A straw vote was taken. Eliminate 2 year full time work experience?

Yes - 13;

Abstain - 3

## 3. Possible Substitutions

At present we do not give Advanced Standing for SGMT 6000 or ACTG 5100. Can we offer a substitute for these courses rather than requiring the students to retake these courses? Should students with a business undergraduate degree be permitted to replace certain core requirements with specific approved alternative courses?

A straw vote was taken. Substitute should be offered?

Yes - 14;

Abstain - 2

Professor B. Wolf moved the Committee of the Whole rise and report, seconded by Professor R. Heeler.

The MBA/MPA Program Committee will take this advice and bring back a motion to Faculty Council.

At this point in the meeting, Professor R. Peterson returned as Chair.

### **Other Business**

#### **Glendon Issue**

Dean Horvath advised that the university evaluation of Glendon is being done through APPC. December 19 was the deadline for suggestions, with February 2 being the final deadline for input.

The Dean advised that in all meetings regarding Glendon he has advised that SSB will not participate in forcing Glendon out.

However we must let APPC know by February 2 if SSB is at all interested in Glendon. Therefore the Dean has formulated a conceptual proposal to APPC which is necessary to keep the Glendon door open. The Dean emphasized that this will put us on the table only. He requested feedback from all faculty members. A copy of this memo was distributed to those present.

It was noted that APPC will circulate updated information and it was suggested that the decision on the future of Glendon will be known by the end of April.

A straw vote was taken on Dean Horvath's memo. In favour - Unanimous

Professor R. Irving moved the meeting be adjourned, seconded by Professor E. Fischer.