

Item: Senate Minutes, March 2007
Call Number: Senate fonds, UA-5

Additional Notes:

This document is a compilation of Senate minutes, staff matters and miscellaneous documents for March 2007. 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, March 12, 2007, at 4:00 p.m. in University Hall, Macdonald Building.

Present with Mr. Mo El-Hawary in the chair were the following: Barker, Binkley, Breckenridge, Butler, Cleave, Cochrane, Cook, Dunphy (Recording Secretary), Fraser, Helland, Hicks, Hubert, Johnson, Jones, Kesselring, Khimji, Leon, LoRusso, Maes, McLarney, McNeil, Moukdad, Nowakowski, Pelzer, Persaud, Poulton, Saunders, Schroeder, Scrimger, Shaver, Simmonds, Singleton, Slonim, Smith, Spence Wach, Sutow, Swanston, Taylor, Tindall, Traves, Wanzel, Watters, Wheeler, Whyte.

Regrets: Camfield, Chowdhury, Edelstein, Geldenhuys, Haslam, Klein, Lane, Sheng, Sullivan, Tipping, Wallace.

Absent: Adshade, Allen, Bodorik, Croll, El-Masry, Gray, Grundy, McConnell, Mukhida, Pegg, Plug, Precious, Rutherford, Scherkoske, Webster, Yeung.

Invitees: P. Gardiner Barber, C. Murphy, A. Power, L. Wittstock.

2007:32

Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was **ADOPTED** as circulated.

2007:33

Question Period

There were no questions.

2007:34

Senate Academic Priorities and Budget Committee (SAPBC)

- a. Department of Comparative Religion Name changed to Religious Studies Program Embedded within the Department of Classics

On behalf of SAPBC, Mr. El-Hawary **MOVED:**

THAT the Senate approve the Department of Comparative Religion change to a Religious Studies Program embedded within the Department of Classics.

Mr. Schroeder explained that he and Dean Binkley had met with the Comparative Religion Student Society and Mr. Tipping, Dalhousie Student Union Senator. As a result of the meeting the students had written the document which was circulated to Senators for clarification. Mr. Schroeder believes that the students' questions have been answered. Mr. LoRusso expressed, on behalf of the Dalhousie Student Union, his appreciation for the time taken to clarify the situation with the students. Ms. Emily Duggan, President, Comparative Religion Society, spoke further to the letter of clarification that had been submitted noting that the Society is now asking the Senate to approve the proposal. The issues that were misunderstood from the previous Senate meeting have been clarified; however, members of the Society still have some concerns that she would like to have on record, which are presented in the letter of clarification. She also said that the Society would like to thank the Senate for their concerns being put on the Senate record, as if there are

problems in the future, this will provide them with a record to refer back to. The Society hope that when current majors and those who had difficulties with this proposal are gone, and decisions related to the new program are implemented, that there will be continued communication with the Student Society. The Society contact information is available on the DSU website.

The motion **CARRIED**.

b. New Program Proposal: Doctoral Degree in Social Anthropology

Mr. El-Hawary indicated that Ms. Pauline Gardiner Barber, Graduate Coordinator, Department of Sociology and Social Anthropology, Mr. Chris Murphy, Chair of the Department, Ms. Carolyn Watters, Dean, Faculty of Graduate Studies, and Ms. Marian Binkley, Dean, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, were present for this item.

On behalf of SAPBC, Mr. El-Hawary **MOVED**:

THAT the Senate approve the new program proposal for a Doctoral Degree in Social Anthropology.

Ms. Watters spoke to the proposal and explained that it had been approved by the Faculty Council of the Faculty of Graduate Studies, following a thorough review of the program including an external reviewer. A compelling case was presented that Social Anthropology is its own discipline and these students should be getting a degree that recognizes that. Mr. El-Hawary drew Senate's attention to the fact that excerpts from SAPBC's deliberations of March 5, 2007 were available for review.

The motion **CARRIED**.

c. Modified Program Proposal: Bachelor of Science (Nursing) for Registered Nurses

Mr. El-Hawary indicated that Ms. Lucille Wittstock, Associate Director for Graduate Student Affairs and Assistant Professor in the School of Nursing, had been invited for discussion of this item.

On behalf of SAPBC, Mr. El-Hawary **MOVED**:

THAT the Senate approve the Modified Program Proposal for a Bachelor of Science (Nursing) for Registered Nurses.

Ms. Wittstock provided background information for discussion of this proposal. For a number of years the School of Nursing had a Post RN Baccalaureate option for students who had a Diploma-level Education in Nursing, and subsequently wanted to complete a degree. Until approximately 12 years ago, individuals wanting to study nursing in Nova Scotia had the option of Diploma Education or Baccalaureate, but it has been 12 years since diploma programs ceased to exist. Over those 12 to 15 years the numbers in the Post RN program have been decreasing. The School of Nursing examined the program and wondered if it should continue or not, concluded that it should and then sought feedback from students. The school concluded that the current program is not competitive with those offered by other institutions. Most other schools across the country offer Post Diploma Education programs that are much shorter. Currently, the Dalhousie program offers 75 credit hours and most other institutions offer around 60 credit hours. Consequently, to remain competitive we would have to decrease the number of credit hours. Furthermore, students were asking for more flexibility in the types of courses that they could take, and therefore, changes to the curriculum have been made in order to make the program more flexible.

Mr. El-Hawary explained that Senators had the excerpt from the SAPBC meeting at which discussion on this matter took place. Mr. Hubert noted that 60 credit hours is consistent with the five other Post Diploma programs that are offered through the School of Health Sciences.

The motion **CARRIED**.

2007:35

Honorary Degrees Committee

The assembly moved in camera to consider and vote on one honorary degree candidate for the Nova Scotia Agricultural College following which the assembly returned to open session.

2007:36

Chair's Report

Mr. El-Hawary reported that the Honorary Degrees Committee will be sending the Call for Honorary Degree Nominations out to the community on April 9, 2007, with a closing date of June 11, 2007. This has been done to ensure there is ample time for the Committee to review the nominations and for the President's Office to do the follow up work.

In accordance with the Senate Constitution an annual statutory joint meeting of the President and six representatives of each of the Senate and Board of Governors is required. The meeting for 2006-07 is now scheduled for April 2, 2007. The Senate representatives are Mr. Mo El-Hawary, Chair of Senate; Mr. Peter Butler, Vice-Chair of Senate; Mr. Bruce Dunphy, Secretary of Senate; Mr. Lloyd Fraser, College of Continuing Education; Mr. Raymond Klein, Faculty of Science; and Mr. Ezra Edelstein, DSU President. Mr. El-Hawary invited Senators to send any suggested agenda topics for the joint meeting directly to himself.

2007:37

President's Report

Mr. Traves informed Senators that the student referendum that was held on March 6th and 7th voted against the proposal to create an auxiliary fee to fund improved student spaces at the University. Mr. Traves indicated that he was disappointed with the result, but noted that it is important to respect the students' decision. Mr. Helland inquired if some of the proposed projects will go forward despite the 'no' vote. Mr. Traves responded that there is no money to do any of the projects; however, some of them will remain long-term University priorities. Until the University has sufficient resources to address them, they cannot proceed.

2007:38

Other Business

There were no other matters of business.

2007:39

Adjournment

Ms. Jones **MOVED**, seconded by Mr. Shaver:

THAT the Senate meeting be adjourned.

The motion **CARRIED**.

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY

Approved Minutes of **Senate Meeting**

Senate met in regular session on Monday, March 26, 2007, at 4:00 p.m. in University Hall, Macdonald Building.

Present with Mr. Mo El-Hawary in the chair were the following: Binkley, Bodorik, Butler, Camfield, Chowdhury, Cleave, Cochrane, Dunphy (Recording Secretary), Edelstein, Fraser, Geldenhuys, Grundy, Haslam, Helland, Hicks, Kesselring, Khimji, Klein, LoRusso, Maes, McLarney, McNeil, Moukdad, Nowakowski, Scrimger, Shaver, Singleton, Slonim, Spence Wach, Sullivan, Sutow, Taylor, Tindall, Tipping, Watters, Webster, Wheeler, Whyte, Yeung.

Regrets: Jones, Lane, Leon, McConnell, Plug, Poulton, Precious, Saunders, Schroeder, Sheng, Smith, Swanston, Traves, Wallace, Wanzel.

Absent: Adshade, Allen, Barker, Breckenridge, Cook, Croll, El-Masry, Gray, Hubert, Johnson, Mukhida, Pegg, Pelzer, Persaud, Rutherford, Scherkoske, Simmonds.

Invitees: L. Barnes, K. Crombie, G. Curri, I. Flint, B. Neuman, A. Power, L. Taylor

2007:40

Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was **APPROVED** with the following modifications: Item #5 will not go forward and Item # 6 and 7 will be reversed.

2007:41

Draft Minutes of February 26, 2007 Senate Meeting

2.1 Approval

The minutes were **APPROVED** as circulated.

2.2 Matters Arising

There were no matters arising.

2007:42

Draft Minutes of March 12, 2007 Senate Meeting

3.1 Approval

The minutes were **APPROVED** as circulated.

3.2 Matters Arising

There were no matters arising.

2007:43

Question Period

Ms. Spence Wach inquired if a strategy, similar to the approach used for the Student Referendum, would be used in the future. Mr. Shaver responded and indicated that he could not speak for the President but noted that over the coming months there will be a lot of consideration dedicated to just how that kind of process

can be used effectively to work with the University community. Mr. El-Hawary added that this might be a good point for the upcoming Joint Senate Board meeting.

2007:44

Draft Faculty Discipline Procedures concerning Academic Dishonesty - Approval

Mr. Shaver introduced the draft Faculty Discipline Procedures concerning Academic Dishonesty and indicated that the document had been prepared by the Senate Discipline Work Group comprised of Mr. Mo El-Hawary, Chair of Senate, Mr. Bruce Dunphy, Secretary of Senate, Ms. Gudrun Curri, Interim Chair of the Senate Discipline Committee, Mr. Ian Flint, Chair of the Senate Academic Appeals Committee, Mr. Ezra Edelstein, President, Dalhousie Student Union, Mr. Lloyd Fraser, Manager, Student Relations, Mr. Peter Butler, Vice-Chair of Senate, and himself. Ms. Karen Crombie, University Legal Counsel, served as a resource person. All Work Group members were present at the Senate meeting.

On behalf of the Senate Steering Committee, Mr. El-Hawary **MOVED:**

THAT the Senate Steering Committee recommend to Senate adoption of the Faculty Discipline Procedures concerning Academic Dishonesty with amendments to Sections #3 and #4.

Mr. Shaver noted that there were numerous issues with the current Senate Discipline Committee (SDC) process some of which are the timeline for hearings, the delays for students and staff, and some instructors/faculties not bringing cases forward. Dalhousie University currently has a system that is not universal in its approach to an issue that goes to the very core of our institution - academic integrity. The Final Report of the Senate ad hoc Committee on Plagiarism dated May 13, 2004 has some similarities to the Procedures being presented today. The workload for the SDC has gone up enormously and in 1995/1996 there were sixteen cases and in 2003/2004 there were 209. It would therefore not be unreasonable to expect a lot of stress on the SDC process.

The Work Group did some benchmarking and as a part of this exercise, they looked at what the G-13 Universities were doing on this issue. There are a wide variety of approaches but many of them have a process which embeds the discipline process, at least in part, if not in whole, at the Faculty level. The proposed Faculty Discipline Procedures leaves the SDC intact, and it addresses the issue of trying to get some informal resolution at the Faculty level.

In outlining the Procedures Mr. Shaver noted several key areas: an Academic Integrity Officer (AIO) would be appointed for each Faculty, which in the first instance would be a Dean, but then could be delegated to other people within the Faculty and the Academic Integrity Officers would meet at least once a year to talk about their relevant policy issues, training requirements, et cetera, and compare notes. It has been suggested that the annual meeting should also involve the SDC and that amendment was made by the Senate Steering Committee. The AIO would work with the student and the instructor to deal with the issue at the Faculty level to try to find an informal solution within constraints.

Mr. Shaver highlighted the fact that academic integrity addresses three areas: education, detection and discipline. The draft Procedures deals with only the discipline section and there are a number of initiatives underway addressing education and detection. In addition, the penalties presently being used by the SDC are not fully reflected in the penalties that are in current use and there is a sentiment amongst the community that there should be more emphasis on an educational component within the penalties. One of the recommendations that will be coming forward to the Senate Steering Committee is that there be a review of penalties for academic dishonesty undertaken within the next 12 months. Another area to be addressed is the constant changing environment of technology which has to be looked at and put in some context.

The draft Procedures provide a specific timeline with the intent to promote a reasonably speedy resolution at the faculty level, but if that is not possible, the matter will go to the SDC. The kind of offences that can be

dealt with by the AIO go up to and include only those offences from 1-4. Offences which could possible have a penalty of #5 or higher would go directly to the SDC. Penalties #8 and #9 are perceived to be consequences of penalties and there will be a review as to how they should be dealt with. In the short term, they could be added to the penalties that are excluded for access by the AIO. There is provision for checking to see if it is a second offence for a student. If the student accepts the assessment by the AIO, then the penalty will be assessed and sent to Senate for ratification. If the student does not agree with the assessment the case will go to the SDC. Part of the intent of this policy is to try and establish a forum by embedding this issue partially at the Faculty level to start to generate ongoing discussion.

The meeting of the AIOs is envisioned to be at least once a year where we can identify issues and bring them to the proper committees of Senate to discuss and formulate responses. Academic integrity is a very complex, ever-changing issue and it is important to our institution that we take some steps.

Mr. Dunphy explained that the Senate Steering Committee convened the Work Group over a year ago because of a perception about the number of problems with the discipline process. The Work Group had representation from students, SDC, SAAC, Code of Student Conduct, the Vice-President, Academic, and the Senate Officers. It was a very constructive and collaborative process with very positive discussions. Feedback was sought from many constituency groups - Senate Standing Committees, Deans, and through the Deans, to the Faculties.

Mr. Whyte said that this is a very welcome and long overdue development; however, he feels that the role of the Dean should be separate from the role of the AIO as the Deans may find themselves in a conflict and this position should be appointed by Senate. In addition, the term "tenured academic staff" should be changed to "academic staff" as many of the staff in the Faculty of Medicine have lost the right to secure tenure. Ms. Binkley said that many of the staff, that would be delegated the duties of an AIO in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (FASS), would be the Assistant Dean for Students and that person is an academic staff, but is not tenured, and it is her understanding that this is a common practice across Faculties.

Mr. Slonim spoke about the need for education and values and the need for more than just punishment. Mr. Shaver agreed and stated that this is intended to be an integrated process of education, detection and discipline.

Ms. Binkley would like to see two edits to the document - removal of the word "tenured" in #3 and a modification to #6 where it speaks to a graduate thesis. The thesis and the course work are only part of a Ph.D. or an M.A. program. There are also other materials, such as exams, proposals, et cetera. The words "a graduate thesis" should be replaced with "non-course work materials such as thesis, exams, and proposals". Other areas Ms. Binkley addressed were the potential for unevenness of penalties. In the FASS, plagiarism is one of the biggest offences. FASS may tend to fail people in the course, and maybe if students are in their first year, fail the assignment, but some of the other penalties FASS wouldn't even consider. However, other Faculties may think plagiarism is not a terribly difficulty offence and therefore, give lower penalties. Ms. Binkley also felt that if the current discipline process was becoming too litigious the proposed process will create a two-tiered litigious process as the student is permitted to have an advocate attend at the first meeting with the AIO. The meeting between the AIO and the student should be a one on one. Ms. Binkley also felt that the timeframe of getting together a Faculty member, a student, the Dean's designate, and now, a third party in five days may be optimistic. Ms. Binkley lastly addressed the issue that this material goes beyond plagiarism and there are a large number of other student offences.

Mr. Shaver addressed the issue of unevenness of penalties and stated again that the Senate Steering Committee will ensure that a review of the penalties be conducted but noted that there is an even larger issue of great unevenness in reporting and detection throughout the University. Mr. Shaver agreed that the academic integrity issue is larger than plagiarism.

Ms. Watters spoke to the issue of the need for the components for Graduate Studies to be included in #6 of the draft procedures and, in addition, she looked for clarification on the fact that graduate students have an

appeal process and they have the right to appeal a faculty decision to Graduate Studies. She would like clarity as to whether or not graduate students will retain the right to appeal a decision by the faculty AIO and have an appeal at Graduate Studies on the way to Senate, or whether that is missing. Mr. Flint, Chair, SAAC, explained that there are two parallel processes going on; one is an appeal to a Faculty decision and the other is an appeal to the discipline process and this particular issue is just for the discipline process, which means the appeal will go to the SDC. Otherwise, the Faculty appeals would be retained within the Faculty of Graduate Studies and then appeals to that would come to the Senate Academic Appeals Committee.

Mr. Fraser said he would like to urge the acceptance of the proposal. The Work Group has worked very diligently to come up with a better system than the one we currently have and he believes the Work Group has made great progress. The document is not perfect and will need some refining but he would hope that the few amendments required could be accomplished at the meeting today with the procedure approved as well. There is an obvious need to actively monitor how this works with implementation and to do some fine tuning as we go along. Mr. Fraser highlighted three reasons why it is important to make these changes. The first is the backlog that we are currently experiencing results in delayed justice which results in justice denied and this highlights one important aspect of our system which is to be clear and prompt in dealing with the issues to ensure the process acts as a deterrent. The second reason is the inconsistency across the University. The third reason is that this will be a much more effective system for the future. It will lead to greater consistency, and it will lead to students getting their issues dealt with much more quickly if it is a first offence.

Mr. Tindall spoke to #8d of the Procedures where the student can request a delay, but there is no provision for the faculty member to request a delay. There could be situations where a faculty member is away from campus for a few days and Mr. Tindall would like to see something that is a bit more mutual in terms of agreement on extending that deadline. Mr. Edelstein pointed out that this was put in place to benefit the students. Mr. Edelstein also briefly responded to Ms. Binkley's comments regarding an advocate being present and noted that this is an important element of natural justice. The process is still 'formal' despite the fact that it is called 'informal', and there is an apparent and obvious in-balance of power between a meeting with a faculty member and a student.

Mr. Edelstein noted that the Faculty Procedures need to be clarified for item #8d, when the five-day deadline starts and he would like it to start once it can be certain that the student has received their notification in writing.

Mr. Tipping raised another point in regard to an advocate being present for students. In order to promote fairness across Faculties the Dalhousie Student Advocacy Service, as long as they are present at these meetings, can help the students to understand what should be fair and help the institution understand that there is fairness across the Faculties. Mr. Tipping said he would be interested to hear about the idea of the review of penalties and he would like to know, if the procedures are approved, when they will come into effect because there are students currently waiting to have their cases heard.

Ms. Crombie said she agrees that lawyers sometimes do 'ratchet up' the process unnecessarily; however, the student needs appropriate advice at the point in time when they're presenting information to the AIO. If they decide not to accept the assessment the same information will have to be presented to the SDC. It is a critical decision for students whether or not to accept the assessment given by the AIO. There is clear case law now that says you cannot cure a default in the process three steps up. If we deny students' legal counsel in the first step when critical decisions are being made, we cannot make them hold by giving them a lawyer the second time. She would also add that a good lawyer will provide good advice to the student which will benefit the student when they are making these decisions. In regard to the five-day period Ms. Crombie noted that the process does not have to be held hostage to a lawyer's schedule at that level.

Ms. Curri would like to urge Senators to approve this process as the status quo is not acceptable. At this point the SDC have 40 cases yet to be heard and anticipate more before the end of 2006-2007. Mr. Whyte

expressed concern that there have been so many issues discussed, with a list of potential amendments, and requested clarification if it is the Chair's intention that Senate go through these issues amendment by amendment. Mr. El-Hawary stated that the amendments have been diligently recorded and the amendments will be brought forward at the end of the discussion.

Mr. Tipping again asked for a response to his question regarding the effective date for the Procedures, if they are approved. Mr. Shaver said that this is a question for Senate but personally felt that it would be unreasonable to refer the current cases back to the faculties. Introducing a new process at this late date in the term would be a big risk and it would seem reasonable to target for the first of September.

Ms. Taylor, Director, Centre for Learning and Teaching, stated that she would like to speak in favor of the proposed change for our university community, and not because the SDC is back logged with cases but because policies that do not meet the needs of our academic community result in people finding underground practices and different ways of doing things that do not follow policy. The students are victimized by our failure to create policies that are driven by the needs of our community. Ms. Taylor suggested that Senate not refer to these two processes as 'informal' and 'formal' as informal sends a very bad message to our community and this is not truly an informal process. She would like to suggest using the word 'local' process which would indicate that it is systematic, rigorous and the process matters. Ms. Taylor also recommended that the role of the AIO be clarified in item #2 as she feels the AIO has two distinct roles: a primary role to administer on behalf of the Faculty the University's procedures with respect to responding to allegations of academic dishonesty and their secondary role is to assist in whatever ways are appropriate in the SDC process. She would also like to suggest providing much stronger guidance to the AIO. Ms. Taylor felt by integrating education, detection and discipline we will have a much better experience for students and a much better experience of equity from that process for them.

Ms. Newman, Vice-President, Student Services, reminded Senators that the SDC also receives referral of cases related to the Code of Student Conduct and those cases have been held up. Ms. Newman would very much like to speak in favor of this motion and would remind Senators that when a charge hangs over a student's head for months it is a completely unacceptable academic environment. A really important principle of justice is timeliness. Mr. Edelstein agreed with Ms. Newman's comments about timeliness and agreed that the changes to the SDC process cannot feasibly be implemented before September 1st. With that in mind, it appears that the SDC will be dealing with the cases that are in front of it right now and will be dealing with any cases that come forward as a result of this upcoming exam period at the end of school. Mr. Edelstein felt that the draft Procedures should go back to the Steering Committee to rework the amendments and come forward to a later Senate meeting for approval.

Mr. Shaver spoke to the need for Senate to approve the amendments and the Procedure at the meeting today. The Work Group should monitor the progress of the Procedures with a report submitted to Senate in 18 months addressing many of the issues that have been raised here, because some of them are predictions of what might or might not happen.

Mr. Shaver **MOVED** the amendments, seconded by Mr. Slonim:

THAT the following amendments be made to the draft Faculty Discipline Procedures concerning Academic Dishonesty.

1. Item #3 - remove the word 'tenured'.
2. Item #6 - insert 'and other non course materials' after 'graduate thesis'
3. Item #8d - after the word 'student' in the last line insert 'or instructor'.
4. Item #8d - after the word 'days' insert 'upon receipt of the allegation by the student'.
5. Item #11 - replace the number '7' with '9'.
6. Item #13 - replace the number '7' with '9'.

In discussion of the amendments the following were raised:

- The resolution of the policy, once adopted, could specify the beginning date of September 1st.
- Mr. Edelstein raised a point regarding #8c, that the student should be informed, as a part of the letter that they had potentially committed an academic offence, and that they should be informed that a meeting would be scheduled within five days and that they also have the ability to increase the five-day window of time; if required. Mr. Shaver stated that it would be easy to commit to that as part of the procedures. Under #8c a student is to be informed of the procedures to be followed and the Secretary of Senate should be charged to raise this under item #4.
- Ms. Spence Wach noted that the terms ‘policy’ and ‘procedure’ have been used interchangeably and asked for clarification. Mr. Shaver stated that it is his understanding that it is a policy that is going into a policy. Mr. Dunphy further added that this is part of the Constitution and if this is approved, Senate will then go on to review a Constitutional change in order for this to proceed. Ms. Crombie agreed that it is a bit confusing. Senate is given the power to discipline students under the University Statute through the Senate Constitution, which is where you will find all of the procedures for the Senate Discipline Committee. The Procedures will be inserted on top of or beneath the Senate Constitution. If you call this the Policy on Student Discipline then it also suggests that it is the only one and in fact, there are many pieces that come into play.
- Mr. Bodorik raised a point concerning the wording of the amendment that states it is five days upon receipt by the student and the delays that may ensue. Mr. Shaver responded that universities have as a policy that email is the official means of communication to students and there is a requirement by students to check their email. Ms. Crombie confirmed that Dalhousie University has such a policy. Mr. Whyte expressed serious reservations about including #8d and he would have to vote against the amendment just for the one issue. He thinks that section #8d requires quite a lot of consideration because theoretically it could be extended indefinitely by either party by the way it is written. Mr. Shaver said the use of the word “appropriate” introduces the concept of judgment and that is the judgment by the AIO.

Mr. Butler called the question and the motion on the amendments **CARRIED** unanimously.

Mr. El-Hawary then called for the vote on the main motion. Mr. Whyte stated that he had another amendment.

Mr. Whyte **MOVED**, seconded by Mr. Singleton,

THAT the Academic Integrity Officer is appointed by the Nominating Committee of the Faculties involved.

In discussion of the additional amendment the following was raised:

- Ms. Barnes, Chair of the former Senate *ad Hoc* Committee on Plagiarism, stated that she is delighted to see that there is consideration to moving procedures to the faculty level. However, there are a lot of differences that have been outlined here that have been suggested in the Senate Plagiarism Report. She commented that 13 universities were polled in regard to their discipline procedures. The ad hoc Committee did the same thing, but they also followed up to find out what the flaws were in those procedures. One of the issues was not having one person make any of the decisions even at the Faculty level. The ad hoc Committee recommended at least a team of three, which is consistent with appeals procedures for student appeals. It is also important to have a student representative on the faculty level committee. Ms. Barnes was concerned that there will be a real and perceived power in balance between faculty members and Deans and it would be better to have a faculty member appointed verses the Dean.

The amendment was **DEFEATED**.

The main motion **CARRIED** with one against (Binkley).

Mr. El-Hawary stated that the effective date for implementation, as discussed, will be September 1st, 2007. Mr. Edelstein inquired about the fact that the Calendar for 2007-08 had already been printed with the current discipline procedures. Mr. El-Hawary reminded Senators that the calendar is continually updated and the new procedures will be posted on the web version.

2007:45

Notice of Motion: *Draft Guidelines for Academic Evaluators regarding Violations of Academic Regulations by Students*

The Chair noted that the Secretary of Senate, Mr. Shaver and Ms. Crombie were present for the discussion of the amendments to the *Draft Guidelines for Academic Evaluators regarding Violations of Academic Regulations by Students*. He explained that the resolutions were designed as a sequel to the approval of the Faculty Discipline Procedures.

At this point in the meeting the quorum was called. The quorum was lost and the meeting **ADJOURNED**.

Mr. El-Hawary was pleased to inform Senators that April 1st, 2007 marks the tenth anniversary of the amalgamation of Dalhousie University and the Technical University of Nova Scotia.