

Item: Senate Minutes, October 2010

Call Number: Senate fonds, UA-5

Additional Notes:

This document is a compilation of Senate minutes, staff matters and miscellaneous documents for October 2010. 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, October 25, 2010 at 4:00 p.m., in University Hall, Macdonald Building.

Present with Lloyd A. Fraser in the chair were the following: Adshade, Amirault, Barker, Barkhouse, Bennett, Brooks, Campbell, Canning, Chen, Cochrane, Cox, Crago, Croll, Gantar, Garduno, Gassmann, Gilbert, Gorsky, Hewitt, Hughes, Karabanow, Lee, LeForte, Leon, Lovett, Mansour, Marche, Marrie, MacLaren, McClure, McConnell, Meynell, Milson, Moore, Nicholson, Noble, Pegg, Pinder, Rapaport, Ross, Sadek, Saulnier, Schellinck, Shukla, Smith, Summerby-Murray, Szumilas, Wach, Watters, Webster, Wedge, Westwood.

Regrets: Castleden, Couban, Gardner, Gilbert, MacLennan, Maes, McLarney, Pelot, Shepherd, Singleton, Thorburn, Thornhill, Tillotson, Traves.

Absent: Boran, Cunningham, El-Masry, Farina, Macy, Thomas.

Mr. Fraser welcomed a new Senator, Eric Rapaport from the Faculty of Architecture and Planning.

2010:088

Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was **ADOPTED** as circulated.

2010:089

Consent Agenda

Mr. Fraser reminded the Senate that a Consent Agenda is currently in use for items thought to be routine and non-controversial. The October 25th Consent Agenda was circulated with three items and it was requested that item 2.2 Senate Academic Priorities and Budget Committee: Name Change Request: Atlantic Region Magnetic Resonance Center (ARMRC) to the Nuclear Magnetic Resonance Research Resource (NMR3) be removed from the Consent Agenda and discussed immediately following approval of the consent items.

Approval of Draft Minutes of September 27, 2010 Senate Meeting

THAT the Senate approve the September 27, 2010 draft Senate meeting minutes, as circulated.

Approved by Consent.

Senate Nominating Committee: Nominations to Senate Standing Committees and the University Tenure and Promotions Panel

THAT the Senate approve the slate of nominations listed in the October 19, 2010 memo from the Chair, Senate Nominating Committee.

Approved by Consent.

2010:090

Senate Academic Priorities and Budget Committee: Name Change Request: Atlantic Region Magnetic Resonance Centre (ARMRC) to the Nuclear Magnetic Resonance Research Resource (NMR3)

THAT the Senate approve the name change of the Atlantic Magnetic Resonance Centre to the Nuclear Magnetic Resonance Research Resource (NMR3).

It was noted during the discussion of the motion that the name change, which was aimed to properly reflect the national instead of regional focus of the Centre, did not entail any changes to its fundamental operation.

The motion **CARRIED**.

2010:091

Matters Arising from the Draft Senate Meeting Minutes of September 27, 2010

During the discussion of the proposed Senate Standing Committee Structure & Draft Terms of Reference there was discussion on whether there was adequate faculty representation on each of the core committees of Senate. In particular, it was noted that the proposed Senate Planning and Governance Committee had only four elected faculty members, while the Senate Educational Experience Committee had six, and the Senate Academic Programs and Research Committee had twelve. Mr. Fraser responded that the proposed new committee structure reflected two views expressed within the ad hoc Governance Committee: first, that committees needed to be large enough to include a diversity of perspectives, but small enough to function efficiently; and second, that representation of the interests of faculty did not necessitate having a representative from each Faculty on every committee. The Planning and Governance Committee was, in part, patterned on the current Senate Steering Committee, which appeared to function effectively with four elected faculty members. In contrast, it was proposed to have one elected faculty member from each Faculty serve on the Senate Academic Programs & Research Committee, since this was thought to be beneficial for the consideration of new academic programs, program modifications, and terminations. Mr. Fraser encouraged feedback on the proposed committee structure. It was strongly suggested that, given the importance of the planning and governance roles, the number of elected faculty on the Planning and Governance Committee should be increased.

It was noted that the Minutes of the September 27th meeting, in reporting on the enrolment presentation, did not include the comments that had been made at that time about the need for increased support for international students.

2010:092

Chair's Report

Mr. Fraser extended condolences to family, friends, and colleagues of two members of the Dalhousie community who had passed away - Christopher Edwards, staff member; and Norman Horrocks, Professor Emeritus in the School of Information Management.

Mr. Fraser noted that the following 2009-2010 Annual Reports had been received and were available for review through the University Secretariat: Eco-Efficiency Centre, Atlantic Region Magnetic Resonance Centre, Centre for Comparative Genomics and Evolutionary Bioinformatics, and Trace Analysis Research Centre.

Mr. Fraser drew the attention of the Senate to the following items for information attached to the agenda:

- Honorary Degree Call for Nominations, Fall 2011 and Spring 2012
- AAU Survey of Preliminary Enrolments at October 1, 2010
- Dalhousie University Graduands, October 2010: Undergraduate degrees & diplomas: 387; Graduate degrees & diplomas: 497 (Total: 884); and honorary degrees: Keith Condon, Simon Winchester, and John McCall MacBain.

Mr. Fraser noted that at the last meeting of Senate he had reviewed the new Senate committee structure, proposed to take effect July 2011, and had pointed out that since this required a major rewriting of Senate's constitution, it had

provided an opportunity to modernize and strengthen the entire document. Over the years there had been piecemeal amendments and there were many aspects that were not consistent with current best practice. Mr. Fraser noted that apart from the changes in Senate Committees, in most matters the intent was to appropriately reflect and document current practice, but there are a few changes that are being proposed, which he wished to draw to the attention of Senate. He noted four key areas of proposed change:

- First, in terms of form, the plan was to separate the two main elements: the Constitution itself, which governed how Senate conducts its business; and the Terms of Reference for Senate Committees. This would enable adjustments to Committee Terms of Reference without the necessity of amending the Constitution.
- Second, many universities operate under modern legislation that specifies quite precisely the jurisdiction of both the University Senate and the Board of Governors. Dalhousie operated under the provincial statutes of 1863 (as amended), which specify simply that Senate has responsibility for the internal regulation of the University, subject to the approval of the Board. The proposal is to include in the new constitution a Jurisdiction section that codifies what the Senate had been doing 'in practice.' The Senate would then invite the Board to review and approve this section of the constitution so as to ensure that the mandate is clear.
- Third, the proposed committee structure seeks to strengthen the links between Senate and its committees and, as a result, the expectation is that, in future, many more Senators would be expected to sit on Senate Committees.
- Finally, there would be some changes in how Senate conducted its business—designed to make Senate deliberations more efficient and effective: e.g. a provision for conducting an email vote in limited circumstances if Senate was unable to meet but needed to deal with a particular matter.

Mr. Fraser noted that the suggested consultation and approval process involves:

- Circulation very soon to all Senators of a draft of the Constitution (still a work in progress) for questions, suggestions, or concerns. Mr. Fraser would relay feedback and attempt to answer questions, and would plan to circulate his responses to all Senators, where responses might be of general interest.
- Senate Steering Committee is overseeing the process, consulting, collecting feedback, considering issues, and ultimately will make a recommendation to Senate.
- The projected timeline would be to have Senators receive the draft Constitution and Committee Terms of Reference for discussion at the December meeting with, hopefully, approval following in January.

Mr. Fraser noted that the next regular meeting of the Senate would take place on November 22nd, as the Senate Steering Committee has decided that the November 8th Senate meeting would be cancelled due to insufficient business.

2010:093

Senate Steering Committee: Student Accommodation Policy

Mr. Fraser welcomed Karen Crombie, University Legal Counsel, to the discussion on the amendments to the Student Accommodation Policy. Mr. Fraser noted the background for the motion stating that the current Student Accommodation Policy, adopted by Senate in October 2009, introduced three significant changes: it broadened the ground for accommodation from disability to all areas of discrimination prohibited by the Nova Scotia Human Rights Act, it broadened the areas for accommodation from academic to also include other forms of accommodation, and it centralized what had previously been decentralized processes in order to provide efficient and consistent processing to all students. Mr. Fraser pointed out that in attempting to implement this policy for all students this past September, the administrative infrastructure was simply overwhelmed. All first year undergraduate students seeking accommodation have been dealt with in accordance with the new policy; in many cases, other students have continued to be dealt with using the previous policies and procedures. Senate Steering Committee had received a report on the current status of implementation, and proposed the following adjustments to the implementation process.

On behalf of the Senate Steering Committee, Mr. Fraser **MOVED**:

THAT the implementation schedule for the Dalhousie University Student Accommodation Policy adopted by Senate on October 26, 2009, be adjusted as follows:

- a) The policy is to remain in effect for all first year undergraduate students.
- b) Implementation of the policy for all other students will be suspended until June 30, 2011. Until that time, such students may request academic accommodation based on disability, under the Dalhousie University Policy on Accessibility for Students (approved by Senate on December 12, 1994) and the Procedures Regarding Students with Learning Disabilities (approved by Senate on January 8, 1996), following processes currently in place, as follows:

The Office of Student Accessibility and Accommodation (OSAA) will assess such requests and make a recommendation for accommodation which will then be taken by the individual students to the relevant faculty member(s). OSAA will also facilitate discussion with the faculty member(s) if requested by the students.

For accommodation requests from such students, based on other grounds, faculty members should consult with OSAA.

- c) Full implementation of the Student Accommodation Policy for all students is anticipated on July 1, 2011.
- d) The review of the policy, previously mandated by Senate, is to take place by July 1, 2012, Dalhousie University.

During the discussion of the motion, the following points were noted:

- A question was asked whether the university is able to meet the requirements of the Dalhousie University Policy on Accessibility for Students (approved by Senate on December 12, 1994). Ms. Crombie noted that there was nothing new to this policy, and in terms of dealing with extreme situations, the Registrar's Office would contact OSAA or Legal Counsel for advice. She also noted that cost would not be a reason not to accommodate a student. An example was given that there was a deaf student in the School of Medicine at another university, who was assigned three assistants. Ms. Crombie noted that students with disabilities tend to access external sources of funding to offset additional costs. She further pointed out that the obligations to accommodate have existed for some time, and the university has been managing them.
- In terms of what would be different on July 1, 2011 to accommodate students who the university was not able to accommodate now, Ms. Crombie pointed out that it was not that the university was not able to accommodate, but rather there are not enough resources to fully implement the new policy right now. The resources would be in place to manage the implementation of the policy by July 1, 2011.
- The Faculty of Engineering felt the new policy, centralizing processing and decision-making, was a tremendous improvement in both quality and consistency. Concern was expressed that this might constitute a step backwards and the Faculty of Engineering was concerned whether they could expect the same level of service as they had been receiving. It was noted that the one of the problems with the new policy was that all continuing students had to be re-assessed. The intent of the motion was such that everybody who had been assessed last year can be accommodated in the same manner as before, and only the new students would need to be evaluated at this time. It was noted that there was strong commitment by the senior administration to implementation of the new policy as quickly as possible.
- If Senate defeated this motion and the university did not have the resources to implement the policy then the University would be in violation of the policy, which could constitute a case of discrimination.
- It was noted that in order to ensure fairness in admission, the University did not ask for disclosure of disabilities prior to a student's registration.

The motion **CARRIED**.

2010:094

Senate Committee on Academic Administration:

**Faculty of Health Professions: Inter-Professional Education Courses & Program Requirement Proposal – IPHE 4900
“In-progress” Grade**

DEFERRED until the next meeting of Senate.

Draft Policy on Awarding a Posthumous Degree

DEFERRED until the next meeting of Senate.

2010:095

Faculty Discipline Process Quarterly Report (July 1 to September 30, 2010)

The report was received from Carl Canning, Senate Vice-Chair (Academic Administration).

2010:096

Campus Master Plan Presentation

Larry Sherman, IBI Group, provided an overview of the Campus Master Plan: Framework Plan (September 2010). During the discussion of the presentation, the following points were noted:

- The advice to the University was not to attempt to cost everything now, since individual decisions would be required on each potential project, as circumstances warranted in the future, and costs would need to be properly assessed at that time.
- The university’s planning process needed to articulate with the city’s planning process, and surprise was expressed that this was only a five to ten-year timeframe, versus a fifty-year one. Mr. Sherman noted that it was not only up to the University to decide how big it would like to be and it was not feasible to develop a fifty-year plan. There had not been planning direction from the Halifax Regional Municipality; the University had shared with HRM its planning directions. Mr. Sherman pointed out the dynamic nature of the matter, with both the hospitals and private sectors having their own plans. The Dalhousie plan recommended some organizational changes within the university, to better equip it to deal with the dynamics and scale of this kind of development. Some redirection of resources and relationship building with other organizations would be required. Mr. Sherman added that the five to ten-year plan was only a part of the planning that had been conducted, and there were also long-term forecasts.
- It was noted that the lack of adequate residence accommodation was a complex issue and the solution could be incorporated into vertical buildings. The university relied heavily upon the city to meet its housing demand, and it was left to the city to house its mature students. With more viable housing close to campus, more people could walk to work, thus reducing the dependence of automobiles.

2010:097

Question Period

There were no questions.

2010:098

Other Business

There was no other business

2010:099

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:49 p.m.