

Item: Senate Minutes, July 1997  
Call Number: Senate fonds, UA-5 Accession 2007-039 Box 6

Additional Notes:

This document is a compilation of Senate minutes, staff matters and miscellaneous documents for July 1997. The documents have been ordered chronologically and made OCR for ease of searching. The original documents and additional documents for this year which have not yet been digitized can be found in the Dalhousie University Senate fonds (UA-5) at the Dalhousie University Archives and Special Collections.

The original materials and additional materials which have not been digitized can be found in the Dalhousie University Archives and Special Collections using the call number referenced above.

In most cases, copyright is held by Dalhousie University. Some materials may be in the public domain or have copyright held by another party. It is your responsibility to ensure that you use all library materials in accordance with the Copyright Act of Canada. Please contact the Copyright Office if you have questions about copyright, fair dealing, and the public domain.

**DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY**  
**APPROVED MINUTES**  
**OF**  
**SENATE MEETING**

Senate met in regular session on Monday, July 14, 1997 at 3:00 p.m. in the University Hall, Macdonald Building.

Present with Mr. Stuttard in the chair were the following:

Adams, Archibald, Bell, Bleasdale, Bradfield, Cameron, Camfield, Coffin, Connolly, Crocker, Cunningham, Farmer, Gantar, Gupta Hartzman, Kay-Raining Bird, Iskandar, Kimmins, Lacey, Lee, MacDonald, MacInnis, McIntyre, Morehouse, Oore, C. Powell, H. Powell, Ricketts, Rosson, Ruedy, Taylor, Scassa, Thompson, Traves, Ugursal, Vohra, White.

Invitees: Tom Boran, Brian Christie, Michael Deturbide, Fran Gregor, Elizabeth Townsend.

Regrets: Apostle, Binkley, Bishop, Guppy, Russell, Tindall and about 6 others.

**97:088**

Welcome of New Members

Mr. Stuttard recognized and welcomed nine new members of Senate.

**97:089**

Adoption of Agenda

Mr. Stuttard requested that the Nominations for the Vice-Chair be considered before Nominations to the Standing Committees, and that item 6 be moved before item 5. The subsequent items were renumbered, and the agenda was adopted as amended.

**97:090**

Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting of 28 April, and of the meeting of 15 May, 1997 were adopted as circulated.

**97:091**

Matters Arising

Mr. Stuttard asked Mr. Mason to give a brief overview of the budgetary items which he had not as yet presented to Senate in person. In addition to addressing the specific item on the agenda, the handling of the accumulated deficit from the former Technical University, Mr. Mason offered to answer questions on the year-end budget performance for 1996-97 and on the new budget for 1997-98 which was approved by the Board of Governors at its June meeting. Last year's budget had ended with a small surplus of \$51,000, representing the ninth consecutive year that the University had achieved a balanced or surplus budget. In the University's Annual Financial Report (March 31, 1997), circulated at the meeting (in addition to copies of the 1997-98 budget and the 1996-97 budget vs. actual results distributed with the agenda), Mr. Mason asked Senators to note the section concerning the move towards reduction of the University's accumulated debt. He also drew attention to the overview of how spending in the University had changed over the past few years, and to the discussion of the endowment funds and the use of the pension surplus, items which had been prominent in discussions within the University community and in the minds of a number of Senators. The University had received a clean, unqualified Auditor's Report, which was now becoming the norm for Dalhousie. The circulated document described the fundamental features underlying the creation of the budget -- the tuition fee increases of 7.6%, the reduction in operating budgets by 0.9%, and the allowance for an increase in salary and wages of 2%, as of November 1, 1997, when wage restraint legislation would expire. The academic units at DalTech had had their budget developed in accordance with the Amalgamation Agreement, which was slightly different from the BAC11 report. Under the terms of the Amalgamation, the DalTech budget would be handled in a distinct way for the first three years following the merger. Merged support units such as Physical Plant (now Facilities Management) and the Registrar's Office, had been asked to produce business plans outlining how they would deliver services to the expanded campus. This would result in savings over a period of years.

Mr. Crocker thanked Mr. Mason for the opportunity to scrutinize what he found to be a very positive document. He asked for clarification as to whether money had been moved from the pension fund into the operating budget. Mr. Mason explained that, under the pension holiday, the employer's contribution to the pension fund, approximately \$5.5 million, had gone towards paying at least 50% of the buy-out cost for those who took early retirement, and the balance had gone to pay down the debt, so that the money had gone into the operating budget indirectly. Mr. Bradfield returned to the question he had raised at an earlier meeting concerning the theft from the University of \$125,000 by an employee: what procedures were now in place to prevent a repeat of such a theft. Mr. Mason explained that the fraud had been successful primarily because there had not been sufficient separation of duties. The employee in question had had considerable experience, had been used as a back-up in a number of areas in financial services, and consequently had been able to create cheque requisitions in one area, and then deal with the proceeds from those requisitions in another. As a result of the special audit to which Mr. Bradfield had

referred, greater separation of duties was now in place, sufficient, Mr. Mason believed, to prevent the recurrence of such fraud.

Mr. Bradfield then noted that the ancillary services had suffered a \$179,00 deficit which had been subsidized out of other parts of the budget. The Report noted this was a reduction from \$750,000 ten years ago; but he wondered whether he was correct that the CAUBO guidelines were that ancillary services were to be self-sufficient. Mr. Mason agreed that this was the objective, and most ancillary services were self-supporting, or returned money each year to the operating budget. Unfortunately, the Dalplex and the Arts Centre did not fall into that category, largely because they had to pay part of their capital costs, and could not generate enough revenue to both cover their operating expenditures and retire capital costs. In the 1997-98 budget that subsidy was again reduced to \$85,000. Concerning the Dalplex, Mr. Bradfield recalled that the University's \$10 million capital fund campaign had raised only \$2 million. Were the capital costs being paid by Dalplex intended to meet the difference, or were they for the depreciation charge against capital. Mr. Mason explained that Dalplex was divided into three notional components -- the teaching facility, the student services facility, and the ancillary operation, which was the area involved in selling memberships to the general community. The latter component was charged with the carrying costs on the unfunded capital debt, which was the interest charge, not a depreciation charge. As the capital debt was eliminated, hopefully that problem would take care of itself.

Mr. Stuttard thanked Mr. Mason for his report.

## **97:092**

### Report of the Nominating Committee

The Chair of the Nominating Committee, Tom Boran, reported that the Committee now included one representative from the student body and ten faculty members, representing all the Faculties, except the Faculty of Graduate Studies. The majority of their activity began in April or May of each year, when members sought the best suited and qualified candidates for the Officers of Senate, representatives for Senate Committees, and Senate nominees to the Board of Governors. The Committee made every effort to ensure the nominations provided broad representation from the University. In addition, the Committee was concerned to find specialist expertise where required for some Committees. From the candidates suggested by Committee members, two or more individuals were chosen for each available position. The Committee as a whole decided on the sequence in which those individuals would be contacted, and Committee members never approached a prospective nominee until the Committee as a whole had considered that individual and agreed to the nomination. With the completion of that process, the Committee Chair gave Senate Office a list of the nominees, which was then circulated for the next Senate meeting. Most of the vacancies were filled by September.

## **97:093**

### Nominations for Vice-Chair

On behalf of the Senate Nominating Committee, Mr. Boran presented Senate with two names for the position of Vice-Chair, July 1997 to June 2000: Mr. George Kipouros (Engineering) and Ms. Teresa Scassa (Law). After the requisite three calls for further nominations, Mr. Stuttard asked Senators to vote by ballot. Mr. Archibald and Mr. Ruedy acted as scrutineers for Ms. Scassa and Mr. Kipouros, respectively.

**97:094**

### Nominations to Senate Standing Committees

On behalf of the Senate Nominating Committee Mr. Boran moved:

**That Senate approve the nominations to the Senate Academic Appeals Committee of Paul Thomas (Law) July 1997-June 1999; Archibald Kaiser (Law) July 1997-June 2000; Chris Hawkins (Dentistry) July 1997-June 1999; Leslie Baikie (Engineering) July 1997-June 1998; Shirley Tillotson (Arts and Social Sciences) July 1997-June 2000; Kevin Moriarity (Computer Sc.) July 1997-June 1999.**

**That Senate approve the nominations to the Senate Discipline Committee of Joe Murphy (Dentistry) July 1997-June 2000; Robert Street (Management) Jan. 1998-June 1998; Paul Amyotte (Engineering) July 1997-June 2000; Joan Harbison (Health Professions) July 1997-June 2000; John Rutherford (Medicine) July 1997-June 1999; David Schroeder (Arts and Social Sciences) July 1997-June 1999.**

**That Senate approve the nominations to the Senate Academic Priorities and Budget Committee of Michael Shepherd (Computer Sc.) July 1997-June 1999; Helen Powell (Libraries) July 1997-June 1999.**

**That Senate approve the nominations to the Senate Committee on Academic Administration of Patricia De Meo (Arts and Social Sciences) July 1997-June 2000; Sampalli Srinivas (Computer Sc.) July 1997-June 1999; Chris Watts (Engineering) July 1997-June 2000.**

**That Senate approve the nominations to the Senate Computing & Information Technology Committee of John Connolly (Senator/Science) Senate Term; Art Sedgwick (Computer Sc.) July 1997-June 2000.**

**That Senate approve the nomination to the Senate Committee on Instructional Development of Norm Scrimger (Computer Sc.) July 1997-June 1998.**

**That Senate approve the nominations to the Senate Library Committee of Denis Riordan (Computer Sc.) July 1997-June 1998; Peter Gregson (Engineering) July 1997-June 1999; Denise Sommerfeld (Health Professions) July 1997-June 2000.**

**That Senate approve the nomination to the Senate Physical Planning Committee of Christine Macy (Architecture) July 1997-June 1998.**

**That Senate approve the nomination to the University Environment Committee of David VanderZwaag (Law) July 1997-June 2000.**

**That Senate approve the nomination of Kian Xu (Science) July 1997-June 2000 to serve as Senate Representative on the BOG Investment Committee/Dal Pension Trust Fund/Dal Retiree's Trust Fund.**

Mr. Stuttard reminded members of the constitutional limitations for membership on certain Committees. After the requisite three calls for further nominations, the question was called.

The motion **CARRIED**.

**97:095**

Nomination to the Panel of Student-Discipline Officers

On the recommendation of the Dean of Law, Mr. Stuttard moved:

**That Candace Malcolm of the Faculty of Law be appointed to serve on the Panel of Student-Discipline Officers for a second term, September 1997 to August 31, 2000.**

The motion **CARRIED**.

**97:096**

Proposal for M.Sc. (Occupational Therapy)

On behalf of SAPBC Ms. Bleasdale moved:

**That the proposed M.Sc. (Occupational Therapy) program be approved, subject to the two conditions put forward by Brian Christie in his May 30, 1997 Memo to SAPBC: (a) That a transfer of the equivalent of \$50 US be made from the base budget of the School of Occupational Therapy to the collections budget of the University Library to fund a subscription to the Journal of Occupational Science; and (b) That students in the program be limited to one full credit of courses taken outside Dalhousie under letter of permission arrangements.**

Mr. Ricketts congratulated the School of Occupational Therapy on an extremely well-presented and detailed proposal. He welcomed the proposal, as had the Faculty Council of Graduate Studies which had supported it unanimously. The Director of the School of Occupational Therapy, Ms. Elizabeth Townsend, appreciated the strong support for the proposal. Dalhousie's was the only School of Occupational Therapy in Atlantic Canada, and the addition of graduate studies would be of considerable benefit to the region, meeting the demand of both employers and potential students. The stipulation in the motion that the School transfer the equivalent of \$50(US) to the Library budget to fund the Journal of Occupational Science struck Mr. Ugursal as peculiar, both as a matter of principle, and because of the amount involved. In future, when other graduate and undergraduate programs were proposed, would the relevant Department, Faculty or School be expected to provide direct funding to the Library Budget for additions to the Library holdings? If so, he believed this should be discussed at some length.

Mr. Stuttard noted that this stipulation probably reflected the perilous state of library financing. Mr. Christie explained that it was a standing condition and Senate policy that the University Library review all new program proposals in order to establish the adequacy or inadequacy of library holdings for the program. Any deficit identified by the Library assessment was to be funded by the Department, School or Unit presenting the proposal. Mr. Ugursal asked whether proposals for new programs required a favourable Library review before they could be mounted, and whether existing programs were in jeopardy when money to support the Library resources was inadequate. Mr. Stuttard explained it was Senate policy that existing programs were to be supported, but new ones had to satisfy the conditions explained by Mr. Christie. Ms. Townsend noted that this one Journal had been identified as the only gap in the Library holdings for the proposed program. Mr. Cameron wished his abstention from the vote on this motion to be recorded, since he would be receiving the proposal in his capacity as Chair of the MPHEC.

The motion **CARRIED**.

**97:097**

Report on Election for New Vice-Chair

Mr. Archibald reported that the new Vice-Chair of Senate was Mr. Kipouros. Mr. Stuttard looked forward to working with him in Senate Office. Mr. Bradfield moved (seconded by Mr. Ricketts):

**That the ballots be destroyed.**

The motion **CARRIED**.

**97:098**

Annual Report of the Senate Discipline Committee

The Chair of Senate Discipline Committee, Mr. Deturbide, reported that the number of cases dealt with by the Committee during the past year was up significantly from the previous year. Most of those cases had to do with plagiarism. The Committee attributed the increase to the fewer number of cases being dealt with by individual faculty members because of the procedures passed by Senate on July 8, 1996. Mr. Deturbide requested that Senate adopt the Committee's Annual Report, together with the Addendum circulated at the meeting. Referring to the Addendum, Mr. Deturbide indicated that it had come to his attention that a section of the University Regulations, reproduced in the Calendar, was not in conformity with the Senate Discipline Committee procedures adopted by Senate on July 8, 1996. Specifically, under the heading INTELLECTUAL HONESTY, section 3 dealt with "Inaccurate or Inadequate Attribution" as an example of an academic offence, and suggested discretionary penalties that could be given by instructors or faculty members. For the purposes of clarity and consistency, Mr. Deturbide requested that Senate adopt the changes detailed in the Report's Addendum, such that the opening statement under INTELLECTUAL HONESTY would read:

**A University should epitomize the quest for intellectual honesty. Failure to measure up to the quest for such a standard can result in an academic offence. The seniority of the student concerned, the presence of a dishonest intent, and other circumstances may all be relevant to the seriousness with which the matter is viewed.**

Further, he requested that section 3. Inaccurate or Inadequate Attribution be amended and appended to section 1. Plagiarism and Self-Plagiarism, after "already received academic credit". Thus, the amended section 1 would include:

**The University attaches great importance to the contribution of original thought to scholarship. It attaches equal importance to the correct attribution of authorities from which facts and opinions have been derived.**



**The proper use of footnotes and other methods of attribution varies from discipline to discipline. Failure to abide by the attribution standards of the discipline concerned in the preparation of essays, term papers and dissertations or theses may, in some cases, constitute plagiarism.**

**Students who are in any doubt about the proper forms of citation and attribution of authorities and sources should discuss the matter in advance with the faculty member for whom they are preparing assignments. In many academic departments, written statements on matters of this kind are made available as a matter of routine or can be obtained on request.**

Ms. Bleasdale moved (seconded by Mr. Rosson):

**That Senate adopt the Report of the Senate Discipline Committee, including the proposed changes to the Calendar set out in the Addendum.**

Mr. Bradfield was surprised that a student referred to in the Report had been suspended after being found guilty of plagiarism for the third time. A second offence of this nature would seem to warrant suspension. Mr. Deturbide recalled that the Committee considering the second offence had not had notice that the student had already been found guilty of plagiarism. That underlined the need for one central body which oversaw discipline and kept records. Ms. Oore observed that in the Functions described in the terms of reference of the Committee, it appeared the Committee dealt with offences and with discipline, but there was no mention of the function to educate students as to what constituted an offence. One could argue it could actually reduce the workload of the Committee to have an education component built into its mandate. Further, the number of cases may have increased in part because professors could no longer privately adjudicate a first offence. On the other hand, there may in fact have been a decrease in the cases dealt with. Throughout the year many professors with whom she had spoken had expressed reluctance to start a formal procedure in some cases, and, rather than discuss the situation with the student and make him or her aware of a concern about or a perception of plagiarism, they had hidden their heads in the sand.

Mr. Deturbide shared Ms. Oore's concern that some faculty members and departments were not following the appropriate procedures. He believed professors and instructors should have the primary role in educating the students and making it evident what constituted plagiarism. Unfortunately, in many cases professors were not fulfilling this function. Ms. Bleasdale noted that at the November 1996 meeting of the Senate Discipline Committee, attended by Vice-President Student Services, Eric McKee, and a representative of the Registrar's Office, members had discussed the

importance of an educational program. But ultimately, the Committee had concluded that education of students concerning intellectual honesty could only be undertaken to a limited extent outside the classroom. Mr. Crocker noted that surveys indicated approximately 10% of students admitted to plagiarising, which suggested the Committee was only seeing a small fraction of the actual cases.

**97:099**

Revised Terms of Reference of the Senate Discipline Committee

Ms. Bleasdale thanked those who had responded with comments concerning the drafts of proposed changes to the terms of reference of the Senate Discipline Committee. In particular, she thanked Innis Christie, Lynn McIntyre, and Eric McKee. Tony Thompson, Teresa Scassa and Mike Deturbide deserved special thanks for their contributions to the revision process. On behalf of the Steering Committee, Ms. Bleasdale moved:

**That Senate adopt the July 4, 1997 Draft Revisions to the Terms of Reference of the Senate Discipline Committee.**

Mr. Ruedy was concerned that a clear separation be maintained between the appeal of a decision of the Senate Discipline Committee and appeal of a decision regarding the failure to meet performance standards in a profession and the unsuitability to practise a profession. Senate needed to define more carefully what was a matter of discipline and what was not. He was troubled by the highlighted second paragraph on page 5 which stipulated that "Actions available to an ad-hoc appeal committee shall be analogous to those available to a Senate Discipline Appeal Board." The five actions available to the Appeal Board were not relevant to an appeal of a decision to suspend a student on the basis of fitness or failure to meet behavioural or other standards to practise a profession. Three of the five actions could not be undertaken by an ad hoc Committee hearing an appeal concerning fitness to practise. Mr. Stuttard suggested the problem was apparent, but not real, and emphasised that an ad hoc committee made up of the appropriate professionals would be able to take the actions analogous to those outlined for the Senate Discipline Committee Appeal Board. He noted this section had been written with the Guidelines for Health Professions in mind, and the Dean of that Faculty had been satisfied with the final draft. Ms. Kay-Raining Bird asked for, and received from Mr. Stuttard, assurance that students dismissed for unethical conduct could appeal on the grounds of denial of natural justice where evidence of such denial existed.

Mr. Taylor questioned the meaning of "alternative process", in item (b) under procedures before the Senate Discipline Appeal Board. Was this referring back to "proceeding by written submissions", in (a). Ms. Scassa agreed this was intended to mean "proceeding by written submissions". If members found the wording ambiguous, this could be clarified. Mr. Crocker explained that one of the problems faced by the Health Professions was that no one wanted to see natural justice

denied, but at times the profession was clearly at risk, and members were faced with difficult choices. He cited the problem of a student winning an appeal at the Supreme Court on the basis of the denial of natural justice, or some other technicality. Mr. Stuttard explained that the intention was that Steering would consult with the Faculty involved and seek the appropriate professional individuals to be on an ad hoc Committee. He asked whether writing in "including appropriate professionals" after "ad hoc committee" would meet the concerns of Mr. Ruedy and Mr. Crocker. Mr. Powell noted the dilemma of individual members who were responsible to the University as a teacher, and also to the Professions. They had to sign a form certifying that a student performed ethically, before he or she was allowed to practise on the public at large. He could conceive of a situation in which a student might win an appeal to the Appeal Board, yet the individual teacher might still have to report that the student was unsuitable. Could he have guidance on this?

Mr. Deturbide emphasized that the idea of natural justice and professional unsuitability were not mutually exclusive. It was also important to understand that natural justice was not a technicality. The right to a hearing, to be notified of a hearing, and the right to be notified that one could have counsel were basic Canadian law and applied across the board. A faculty member who had a problem with a student's competence, and raised that with the appropriate authorities, had discharged his/her responsibility. To avoid problems, members needed to ensure that our processes did not violate natural justice. Mr. Stuttard found it unlikely that an Appeal Board hearing would entirely quash the decision of the Faculty Committee and release a student out into the world, without asking for a rehearing.

Mr. Bell gave an example in which a Faculty Committee in an Engineering School had found a student had not completed the requirements for his degree by substituting two other courses for two required courses. Through a sequence of appeals the Senate eventually found that he had completed the requirements for his degree. The Dean had felt his only recourse had been to notify the Canadian Council of Professional Engineers that this student had been graduated by the University, but was not a qualified Engineer. This was the type of situation the Senate should try to avoid. Mr. Traves suggested that the section be rewritten, since the language did not appear to cover the issues being presented. He did not hear any quarrel with the generality of the proposal. Mr. Stuttard suggested dealing with a series of minor amendments before returning to this section.

On behalf of the Steering Committee, Ms. Bleasdale moved four minor amendments to the July 4, 1997 Draft Revisions to the Terms of Reference of the Senate Discipline Committee:

**That on p. 3, at e) Record of Proceedings, line. 3, "appeals" become "appeal";**

**That on p. 5, at Appeals, line 2, "limited" be inserted before**

**"grounds";**

**That at p. 5, at Appeals, line 3, after "parties." the sentence be inserted: At the time of filing the appeal a student must specifically indicate the facts and allegations that will form the basis of the appeal. An appeal will be limited to matters so alleged."**

**That on p. 5, at SENATE DISCIPLINE APPEAL BOARD, under Function, "1. (c) absence of evidential basis for the Senate Discipline Committee's decision." be deleted.**

The amendments **CARRIED**.

Mr. Ruedy moved (seconded by Mr. Taylor):

**That the highlighted paragraph under Appeals, beginning "Where a Faculty, such as Health Professions" and ending "Appeal Board (see below)." be deleted.**

Ms. Kay-Raining Bird did not disagree with Mr. Ruedy's suggestions, but hoped that if a separate document were developed it would deal with the grounds for appeals. Mr. Cameron was concerned that the effect of this amendment was not to remove the issue until it had been dealt with but, in fact, to remain silent on the issue. He preferred not to approve the body of the document until this particular problem had been resolved. Mr. Traves preferred to pass the rest of the document.

The amendment **CARRIED**.

The main motion **CARRIED**.

## **97:100**

### Annual Report of the Senate Physical Planning Committee

The Chair of SPPC, Mr. Bradfield, invited members to ask questions concerning the Report. Mr. Ugursal noted the Committee's concern that it did not receive information on time, and even when it did receive it the information came from those individuals who were making the plans. What was the Committee doing about this? Mr. Bradfield responded that in the case of the large classroom facility, for example, the Committee had set up its own subcommittee to investigate. The numbers they had solicited from the University community had differed significantly from those given them by administrators. In other areas, he thought the Committee would have to anticipate issues, such as the Heat plant at DalTech, and do extra homework to make up for lack of cooperation.

The motion to adopt the Report **CARRIED**.

**97:101**

Annual Report of the Senate Library Committee

The Chair of the Senate Library Committee, Ms. Fran Gregor, reported that among the numerous matters dealt with by the Committee, and outlined in her Report, the issue of support for the Library continued to be the major concern. Ms Gregor asked the President if he would address the substance of the meeting he had held with the in-coming Chair, Mr. Morgan, late in June. Ms. Gregor had not attended the meeting, nor had she authored the memo arising from it. Mr. Traves said he would be happy to answer specific questions concerning issues raised in the e-mail he and Mr. Morgan had circulated to the University Community.

Mr. Farmer moved (seconded by Mr. Wright):

**That Senate adopt the Report of the Senate Library Committee.**

The motion **CARRIED**.

**97:102**

Annual Report of the Senate Computing and Information Technology Planning Committee

In addition to the individuals named in the covering letter to his Report, Mr. Christie wished to thank David Kaufman and Betty Sutherland for their contributions to the Committee's work. During the past year the Committee had concentrated largely on a planning initiative it hoped to present to the University Community in the near future. The Report would set out the means by which the Committee envisioned engaging groups and individuals in discussions of the future use of information technology in the University's academic endeavours. Section two of the Annual Report set out progress towards that goal. Section three laid out the principle items of routine business dealt with by the Committee.

Mr. Cunningham (seconded by Mr. Rosson) moved:

**That Senate adopt the Report of the Senate Computing and Information Technology Planning Committee.**

The motion **CARRIED**.

On behalf of Ms. McIntyre, Mr. Crocker moved (seconded by Mr. Rosson):

**That Senate thank the members of the Senate Computing and Information Planning Committee for their exceptional planning work on behalf of the University this year, in particular for the Information Technology Planning Initiative, assistance with the choice of Banner, and the World Wide Web support.**

The motion **CARRIED**.

**97:103**

Proposed 1997/98 Schedule of Meetings

Mr. Stuttard reminded members that he had sent out an e-mail concerning the possibility of changing the summer Senate meeting from 3 p.m. to 4 p.m. After some discussion Mr. Lee moved (seconded by Mr. Farmer):

**That all Senate meetings be scheduled for 4 p.m. on Mondays, with the exception of the first meeting in October, to be held at 4 p.m. Thursday, and the first meeting in May, to be held at 10 a.m. on Thursday, to facilitate consideration of the lists for the Fall and Spring Convocations.**

Mr. Taylor received reassurance that the practice of ending Senate meetings at 6 p.m. would continue.

The motion **CARRIED**.

Mr. Bradfield believed it would be appropriate for King's to send out a general notice of the time and place of their Encaenia, and to invite Dalhousie faculty to attend, given that many King's students took courses from Dalhousie faculty. Mr. Stuttard requested that Senators please plan to attend the next meeting, July 28, to enable Senate to consider important business.

**97:104**

Change to May Graduation List -- For Information

Mr. Stuttard reported that the name of Dawn Marie Ross had been omitted from the Spring 1997 Convocation list due to a clerical error; the Convocation list for the Bachelor of Science (Nursing) had now been corrected.

**97:105**

President's Report

The President gave an oral report. He congratulated Professor Sampalli Srinivas from the Faculty of Computer Science who had received the Dalhousie Alumni

Teacher of the Year Award, and now had been awarded the 1997 AAUT Teacher of the Year Award. He also notified Senators that plans were moving ahead to construct a new academic building on the DalTech campus, essentially to house some or all of those currently in the leased space at the Maritime Centre. A process for planning that building would be brought forward soon. He asked Senators to recall that as part of the Amalgamation the Province made the commitment that money allocated to TUNS to cover the cost of renting space, would be reallocated to the University. We would receive that money for 10 years, allowing for rental of new space. Because this funding would continue past the length of the lease, Dalhousie would be able to build up a financial base from which to construct new facilities to house those units requiring space. He wished to move forward with this project fairly quickly in order to minimize the amount of money going towards rental accommodation.

Mr. Traves updated Senators on the Strategic Directions Workshop recently attended by members of the Senior Academic Administrators group. In the fall, he hoped to have a draft document ready for consideration by Senate and the wider University community. He also reported on a visit to campus, earlier in the day, by Dr. George Connell, former President of the University of Toronto, and Dr. Robert Davidson of AUCC. Their purpose was to present background information on the new Canadian Foundation for Innovation, the federal initiative to direct \$900 million towards upgrading of the research infrastructure. This was one of the final stops in their cross-country tour. They anticipated circulating a green paper which would outline an operating plan for the Foundation. The enabling Federal legislation had been passed, but the Foundation was not yet formally in operation. The Board of Directors remained to be selected. We could expect a series of dates for planning purposes for the competition for available money. Major proposals would likely be requested for the summer of 1998; an earlier competition for much smaller sums of money to fund new faculty members' research would be in operation before the summer of 1998. In each case, members would need to find matching funds. From the considerable time he had spent discussing these initiatives with the Provincial Government, he believed the Government understood the need to attempt to find provincial funds to provide at least part of the matching funds.

Mr. Stuttard thanked Mr. Traves for his report and invited questions or comments.

As Chair of SPPC, Mr. Bradfield was surprised by the announcement of plans for a new academic building on the DalTech campus. This announcement struck him as another example of the failure to consult with Senate in a way which met the Statutes of Nova Scotia, 1935, c. 104. He asked the President when the conditions of the Statutes of the Province of Nova Scotia requiring a joint committee of the Board and Senate would be met. Mr. Traves thought an earlier discussion of this matter had revealed a difference of interpretation as to what the Statute required. His legal advice spoke to a more general process of consultation than Mr. Bradfield envisioned. Mr. Bradfield read the Statute into the minutes: "That the Board shall

from time to time when any new department, building, project, or policy arises for consideration appoint a Committee of its members to meet with a like Committee of the Senate, which joint Committee shall investigate the same, and recommend to the Board its findings thereon."

Mr. Ugursal asked the President to respond to Mr. Bradfield's question, in light of the clear wording of the Statute. Mr. Traves was not in a position to respond, but would take the question under consideration, and bring an appropriate answer to the next meeting of Senate. When asked a legal question, he needed to seek legal advice. He had asked in the past that Senators give written notice of questions which would require technical or legal advice, though he understood that could not have been done in this case.

Mr. Lee remembered that when the Canadian Foundation on Innovation had been first announced it was presented as an infrastructure to support research in hospitals and universities. Was the Foundation leaning toward a bio-medical infrastructure, or toward supporting any science research in the universities. Mr. Traves understood that they were open to all types of proposals.

Ms. Oore understood the excitement about the new Faculty of Arts and Science building, but needed to raise the point that the French and German houses would be destroyed next summer, and as yet she knew of no specific plan for housing those Departments. She urged one of the Committees involved in planning of the new building to devote at least one session to the issue.

Mr. Ugursal had understood that by July 1 the University community would have some indication of a new name for DalTech. Mr. Traves believed the DalTech Board would be meeting on the following day, and that the new name was on their agenda. Mr. Ugursal raised the issue of the recent appointments of an Acting Vice-President Academic, an Acting Dean, and an Acting Principal for DalTech. He knew in the case of the latter appointment there had been no consultation with DalTech members; and he wondered whether there were procedures regarding the appointment to Acting positions, and whether there was any stipulation concerning the length of such appointments. Mr. Traves reported that a Committee had been working on appointment procedures for certain academic offices at the University, though the issue of Acting senior appointments had not been discussed. He agreed that Committee should consider the appointment of Acting Principals and Acting Associate Principals. Mr. Stuttard noted that if the Report was ready it could be dealt with at the next Steering Committee meeting. It would then come to Senate. He explained that procedures for appointing Acting Vice-Presidents and Acting Presidents had never been considered in the past, but there were provisions for appointment of acting Deans.

Ms. Kay-Raining Bird asked whether there was a way in which Senate could become involved in the planning for future strategic directions. Could elected Senators be



brought into the process prior to the drafting of a document for Senate? She believed Senate could put forward names of Senators to assist in preparation of the discussion document. Mr. Traves believed it was useful to have a draft document on which to focus before beginning a broader consultative process. He did not intend to usurp the role of Senate or of the Board, but to assist those bodies in focussing on key issues. Mr. Traves indicated that the Chair of Senate had participated in the process. He agreed with a recent suggestion that additions to the group of participants, who were primarily members of SACADMIN, might have been in order. Mr. Stuttard concluded from Mr. Traves' comment that in such future exercises it would be appropriate to include a couple of elected Senators. Mr. Traves agreed.

**97:106**

Honorary Degrees

The meeting moved **in camera** to consider the matter of Honorary Degrees.

**97:107**

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 18:35h.

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY

APPROVED MINUTES

OF

SENATE MEETING

Senate met in regular session on Monday, July 28, 1997 at 4:00 p.m. in the University Hall, MacDonald Building.

Present with Mr. Stuttard in the chair were the following:

Adams, Apostle (Secretary pro tem), Bell, Bleasdale, Boychuk, Cameron, Camfield, Coffin, Crocker, Cunningham, Egan, Farmer, Furrow, Guppy, Gupta, Hartzman, Hooper, Hyndman, Lacey, Lee, McIntyre, Patriquin, Phillips, H. Powell, Rhodes, Rutherford (for Ricketts), Robertson, Rosson, Ruedy, Ryall, Scassa, Shafai, Siddiq, Sutherland (for Kimmins), Taylor, Tindall, Traves, Vohra, Wallace, White.

Invitees: B. Christie, T. Moran

Regrets: Archibald, Binkley, Bishop, Bradfield, Connolly, Hobson, Kimmins, Kipouros, MacInnis, Maloney, Moore, Morehouse, Oore, Russell, Shepherd, Wrixon.

97:108.

Adoption of Agenda

Mr. Stuttard noted the presence of two Associate Deans as voting members in the declared quorum in place of absent Deans. He asked whether there were changes or additions to the circulated agenda. Hearing none, Mr. Stuttard proceeded with the meeting.

97:109.

Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting of 14 July were adopted with Mr. Gupta's name among the attendees.

97:110.

Matters Arising

Mr. Stuttard informed Senate that Jane E. White's name had been omitted from the May 1997 list of graduands for the Nova Scotia agricultural College because she had not completed all requirements when the list was sent to Senate. However, her dossier was completed at graduation time, and her name was duly added to the list.

Mr. Stuttard pointed out that the revised 1997/1998 schedule of meetings for Senate, Standing Committees of Senate, and the Board of Governors included a Senate meeting for June 15 rather than June 8. This variation from custom would give Senate time to discuss the new budget materials before the Board of Governors' meeting on June 16. There was general acceptance of this alteration

and the consequent change of the prospective second meeting date to June 29, 1998.

Mr. Stuttard commented that there was little if any business likely for the scheduled August 11 meeting, and asked for general consent to cancel the meeting. He received unanimous approval.

Mr. Stuttard reported that he had had an e-mail conversation with Mr. Ruedy about appropriate procedures for dealing with student appeals from dismissal on the grounds of professional unsuitability. They had agreed that the best mechanism would probably be ad hoc committees established by the Steering Committee. Mr. Ruedy was consulting with other deans of professional schools, and Mr. Stuttard hoped that a recommendation would be ready for the Steering Committee in September.

Mr. Traves took the opportunity to respond to an earlier question from Mr. Bradfield about the approval procedures for new buildings. He stated that he had checked the provincial Universities Act, and agreed with Mr. Bradfield that proposals for new buildings must be approved by a joint committee of the Board and Senate. He believed that the Board of Governors' Operations Committee and the Senate Physical Planning Committee would be appropriate. As was the case for the new Arts and Social Sciences building, this procedure would be followed for a new academic building at DalTech. The proposed new DalTech building would house Dalhousie's faculty and staff currently occupying rented space in the Maritime Centre. Mr. Stuttard noted that an e-mail message to the same effect from Vice-President Mason had recently been forwarded to the Senate list.

97:111.

Nominations to Senate Committees

Mr. Boran presented a list of nominees for various Senate Committees. They were:

Senate Steering Committee

Bruce Archibald (Senator/Law) 1999

Senate Academic Appeals Committee

Ray Klapstein (Senator/Management) 2000

University Security and Parking Committee

Shirley Wong (Senator/Health Professions) 1998

Senate Academic Priorities and Budget Committee

Teresa Scassa (Senator/Law) 1999

Man Vohra (Senator/Medicine) 1998

University Environment Committee

Song Lee (Senator/Dentistry) 2000

Mr. Stuttard reiterated Mr. Boran's correction of the published list, namely that Mr. Vohra's proposed term would end on June 30, 1998. Mr. Stuttard then asked if there were any further nominations. Mr. Taylor, seconded by Ms. McIntyre, nominated Marian Binkley (Senator/Arts and Social Sciences) for the Senate Academic Priorities and Budget Committee. Mr. Stuttard announced

that Ms. Binkley's nomination would necessitate an election for the Senate Academic Priorities and Budget Committee which will be held at the next Senate meeting. In the absence of further nominations, Mr. Stuttard declared the nominees to the other committees elected by acclamation.

97:112.

Program Modification: Master of Public Administration (Management)

Mr. Stuttard introduced a motion from SABPC:

That the proposed Master of Public Administration (Management) program be approved.

Ms. McIntyre observed that both this program, as well as the proposed Master of Engineering (Internetworking), would involve projected student numbers which were based on oral agreements and another expressions of interest. Experience in Health Professions with such commitments had sometimes been negative. In particular, one program with a promise of over 20 students from another province had to be cancelled when only 8 students actually came forward.. For specialized programs aimed at mature students, proposers had to be concerned about the impact of competing obligations on potential students. Mr. Rutherford responded that this proposal had received careful consideration from both the Curriculum Committee and Faculty Council in Graduate Studies. Both groups unanimously approved the proposal after discussion of the very issue Ms. McIntyre was raising. Mr. Rosson added that the Faculty of Management would only bring a proposal forward after very careful research. They had secured very firm assurances from the provincial government about enrolments. The calculations included in the proposal were very conservative, and represented the very best estimates available. Further, the program involved very little risk because it required no additional faculty and little extra funding. The program would also be very beneficial for the School in question.

The motion CARRIED unopposed, with Mr. Cameron abstaining.

97:113.

New Program: Master of Engineering (Internetworking)

On behalf of SAPBC, Mr. Stuttard moved:

That the proposed program Master of Engineering (Internetworking) be approved with the following conditions: (1) the program would be exempt from ERBA; (2) the entire amount raised in fee revenues, save 5 percent retained for University administration, will be devoted to the new program; (3) a permanent transfer of \$5,000 will be made to the DalTech library in 1997/1998, with a further transfer of \$5,000 in 1999/2000; and (4) vigorous fundraising activities will be undertaken by participating units.

Ms. Scassa asked what was the rationale for charging differential fees to foreign students in full cost-recovery programs. Mr. Stuttard invited Mr. Christie to respond. Mr. Christie said that he was not clear whether the policy had been formally articulated and did seem redundant. The Master of Business Administration (Financial Services) program also had differential fees but, to date, had no foreign students. In any case, the University should be charging foreign student fees to recover amounts that the government would deduct from grants. Otherwise, in effect, foreign students would be subsidized. Mr. Christie suggested that explicit consideration should be given to this

matter before any foreign students were charged. He personally would be comfortable with a decision to waive differential fees after the program was fully implemented because there would then be sufficient revenue to do so.

Mr. Traves commented that the question was very useful and would be referred to BAC. There was no hurry to deal with this issue because BAC could bring in a recommendation for next year's budget. Mr. Traves indicated that this discussion touched at least two other important issues – full cost-recovery programming, and the market potential of carefully-designed specialized programs. Units might wish to consider this type of programming as a method to generate surplus revenue for other activities.

Ms. McIntyre inquired whether the 5 percent deduction for university administration represented a new standard annual levy for full cost-recovery programs. Mr. Christie replied that the MBA (Financial Services), which is setting the precedent for such programs, included this deduction.

The motion was CARRIED without dissent. Mr. Cameron again abstained.

97:114.

Annual Report: Senate Academic Appeals Committee

Mr. Stuttard directed Senate's attention to the brief annual report from the Senate Academic Appeals Committee. Mr. Ruedy stated that he had every confidence in the Committee's work, but would have appreciated more detail on the case the Committee had resolved. With the increased emphasis on public accountability, it would be useful to be informed about the substance of the claim and counter arguments involved. Mr. Crocker agreed, observing that reports should serve an educational function for all Senate members. Appeals were an important matter, and reports should be part of a learning process for individuals who may potentially be involved in committee activities.

97:115.

Report of the President

Mr. Traves stated that, in keeping with the hour and the season, he would keep his report brief. First, he anticipated that the University would see more specialized programs in the future. They would be carefully customized for special students or professional markets. Such programs would offer units new academic opportunities, as well as sources of revenue, at a time that traditional resources were shrinking. He commended the individuals who prepared the proposals which were approved at this meeting. Second, he acknowledged that the type of question Ms. Scassa raised about such programs was important to future discussions.

97:116.

Question Period

There were no questions.

97:117.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

