

Item: Senate Minutes, September 2000

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 September 2000. 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, September 11, 2000, 4:00 p.m., in University Hall, Macdonald Building.

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

Ben-Abdallah, Binkley, Bleasdale, Bradfield, Brett, Caley, Cochrane, Coffin, Coté, Devlin, Downe-Wamboldt, Eaton, El-Hawary, Emodi, Girard, Guppy, Gupta, Ipson, Jalilvand, Johnston, Kay-Raining Bird, Kemp, Kimmins, MacAulay, B. MacDonald, N. MacDonald, R. MacDonald, MacInnis, Maes, McIntyre, Murphy, Neves, Pacey, Phillips, Poel, Roberts, Rowe, Russell, Rutherford, Savoy, Scully, Slonim, Starnes, Tindall, Traves, Treves, Ugursal, Wainwright, Watters.

Regrets: Caldwell, Connolly, Cunningham, Farrell, Fraser, Lohmann, McAlister, Sastri, Workman.

**2000:83.**

Adoption of Agenda

Mr. Stuttard reminded members that because a quorum was lacking on July 24, items from the agenda of that Senate meeting were included in the agenda for this meeting. Also, at item 5, the Senate Review of the Faculty of Graduate Studies, Mr. Stuttard would suggest that members have an initial informal discussion of the Review as if in Committee of the Whole.

The agenda was then **ADOPTED** as circulated.

**2000:84.**

Minutes of Previous Meeting

Mr. Farrell was included among those in attendance, and Mr. Richard Devlin among the new members of Senate. The minutes of the meeting of July 10, 2000, were then **ADOPTED** as amended.

**2000:85.**

The Science Library

Mr. Stuttard reported that the Chair of the Senate Library Committee's Ad-Hoc Committee to investigate the new arrangements for the Science Library hoped to be able to report to the next

meeting of Senate.

**2000:86.**

Question Period

Ms. Binkley requested any available information concerning enrolments for this academic year. Mr. Scully believed numbers would be available for the Deans' Council the following day. Those numbers appeared to include some surprises, but it was not clear whether the comparisons with enrolments for the same time last year were valid. Some students may not have been attributed to the appropriate Faculties and Programs. Mr. Wainwright had been told by numerous students in his main undergraduate class that when they had attempted to register using Banner they had been told the class was full, though in fact many spaces had been available. For another class, information concerning the term in which it would be offered had been incorrect. In light of such problems, Mr. Wainwright wondered how many students had chosen to and had been able to register by Banner, and how many had registered in person because of difficulties with on-line registration. Mr. Traves would attempt to secure a report on this matter. He believed that approximately 80% of those eligible to enroll using Banner had done so, and that the process had been problem-free. The Registrar's Office thought it had gone remarkably smoothly. The 20% of students who used the Registrar's Office once they arrived on campus had done so in order to be put on line. Mr. Wainwright was the first person to bring to Mr. Traves' attention the type of problems he had described; however, Mr. Traves would be surprised had there been no glitches in the process. Mr. Scully had had a number of problems brought to his attention concerning departments in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. He asked Mr. Wainwright to provide information concerning the problems to which he had referred.

Ms. Bleasdale asked for information concerning the process by which Dalhousie had reached an agreement with Adidas. Mr. Traves did not know. He had first learned about the agreement through a local newspaper. Questions of process concerning the capacity of units within the University to proceed without authorization needed to be explored, and the President would report back once he had secured the necessary information.

Mr. Bradfield noted that the President's memorandum of September 1, 2000, to the University community indicated that the plan relating to the Canada Research Chairs program, due September 1, 2000, would be brought to Senate and the Board for review. When would that plan be brought to Senate? Also, the memorandum made reference to these Chairs, in combination "with the new appointments funded through our recent Capital Campaign." Mr. Bradfield's understanding of the Capital Campaign Chairs list was that most of the Chairs had been secured by faculty members through their research activities, and not through the efforts of the Capital Campaign. He understood the desire of the University to advertise to the public the success of the Capital Campaign, but he considered the statement an insult to the academics who had secured the Chairs on the strength of their research. Mr. Traves responded that members of Dalhousie tended to think of the University as made up of disconnected individuals and departments, when it suited them, and at other times to attribute everything, including the actions of individuals and departments, to Dalhousie as a whole. He suggested that in general this was one institution and that we all contributed to its success through our individual and our collective

endeavours. When the cheques came in and went out they said Dalhousie, which struck him as the point relevant to building up of our faculty complement. Consequently, he did not understand the point of the question. Further, the Capital Campaign had been over for almost two years, which made the question seem irrelevant.

To the question concerning the Canada Research Chairs, Mr. Traves responded that Mr. Scully had explained earlier that Dalhousie, like all universities in Canada, had been obliged to submit a plan to the Secretariat managing the Chairs program by September 1, 2000. As a result, all the work on the program had had to be carried out during the summer when many of the individuals and bodies within the University were not in active session. As a result the Vice-President Academic & Provost and the incoming Vice-President Research had consulted with the Deans and as many individuals as they could to secure information about the shape of the plan. The document had been submitted with that explanation, and with the statement that the submission had not yet been reviewed by the Senate or approved by the Board. Under the rules and regulations of the program, this was not a problem since it was an on-going program and institutions were expected to amend their plans from time to time. Mr. Scully noted that summary of the plan and the full text had been filed with the Office of Senate Office. He understood it would be available to SAPBC for its September 18, 2000, meeting, and then come forward to Senate for a full debate. He anticipated that it would be revised as we worked through the program.

#### **2000:87.**

##### Nominations to Senate Committees

On behalf of the Senate Nominating Committee, Mr. Stuttard moved:

#### **That the following nominations be approved:**

- To the Senate Academic Priorities and Budget Committee, Dale Poel (Management/Public Administration), September 2000-June 30, 2001;**
- To the Senate Academic Appeals Committee, Fiona Bergin (Law), September 2000-June 30, 2003;**
- To the Senate Committee on Academic Administration, Catherine Too (Medicine/Biochemistry & Molecular Biology), September 2000-June 30, 2003;**
- To the Senate Computing & Information Technology Planning, Peter Schotch (FASS/Philosophy), January 2001 to June 30, 2002;**
- To the Senate Committee on the Environment, Ken Renton (Medicine/Pharmacology), September 2000-June 30, 2002;**
- To the Senate Physical Planning Committee, Michael Poulton (Architecture), September 2000-June 30, 2001;**
- To the Senate Discipline Committee, David Mahony (Medicine/Microbiology & Immunology), September 2000-June 30, 2002, and David Blaikie (Law), September 2000-June 30, 2003;**
- To the Senate Library Committee, Susan Guppy (Architecture/Urban & Rural Planning), September 2000-June 30, 2003, and Roger McLeod (Medicine/Biochemistry & Molecular Biology), September 2000-June 30, 2003;**

**To the Senate Steering Committee, Barbara Downe-Wamboldt (Health Professions/Nursing), September 2000-June 30, 2002, and Robert Blunden (Management/Business Administration), September 2000-June 30, 2002;**  
**To the Board of Governors, Phillip Saunders (Law), September 2000-June 30, 2003 (re-appointment), and David Precious (Dentistry), September 2000-June 30, 2002;**  
**To the Board of Governors' Audit Committee, Phillip Saunders (Law), September 2000-June 30, 2003 (re-appointment);**  
**To the Board of Governors' Student Relations & Residence Committee, Luch Ellen Canary (BOG Member), September 2000-June 30, 2003.**

After the requisite three calls for further nominations, the nominees were declared elected to their respective Committees.

**2000:88.**

Senate Review of the Faculty of Graduate Studies

The meeting agreed to discuss the Report of the Senate Committee to Review the Faculty of Graduate Studies for one hour. After the hour of discussion the Chair reported that the discussion would be continued at the next Senate meeting, and encouraged senators and others in the meantime to use the e-mail address <senate-list@ac.dal.ca> to exchange opinions and information.

**2000:89.**

Schedule of Meetings for 2000/2001

Mr. Stuttard asked members to bring to Senate's attention any problems with the proposed Schedule of Meetings for 2000/2001.

**2000:90.**

Annual Report of the Senate Committee on Instructional Development

On behalf of the Senate Committee on Instructional Development, Mr. Stuttard moved:

**That Senate adopt the Annual Report of the Senate Committee on Instructional Development.**

The motion was **CARRIED**.

**2000:91.**

President's Report

The President reminded members of his e-mail memorandum of September 1, 2000, which he had circulated to all members of the University on a number of noteworthy items including: questions concerning on-going research opportunities and new programs which offered significant research scope for a number of faculty members; new appointments; the issue of managing enrolments; efforts to renew facilities at the University; and a number of administrative arrangements which were completed or in the process of being brought forward. Mr. Traves welcomed questions and comments on these and other issues of concern to Senators.

In response to Mr. Slonim's question concerning enrolment, Mr. Traves noted that we would not have a definite sense of enrolment until the end of September. As applications and offers had been monitored through the summer months, the University had appeared to be running on target with respect to most of the Faculties. Some Faculties had shown a modest increase in offers made and some a modest decrease. The Faculty of Science seemed to be running more significantly behind last year's offers. Questions as to whether the offers had translated into admissions remained to be answered. Enrolment and what that signaled about the attractiveness of our programs warranted considerable attention from the University. We needed to look at enrolments as a symptom of success or failure and any problems in creating quality programs which could draw students.

The President's memorandum of September 1, 2000, had indicated that the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences building was several months behind schedule. Mr. Brett asked Mr. Traves whether he could be more specific. In light of the need for some academic departments to know where they would be located, and also the need to identify whether classroom space would be available in the new building for the coming year, Mr. Traves had asked for a conservative estimate as to when the building would be ready. The report had indicated that the building would be available for occupation late in the winter term. Rather than disrupt the academic term, we would plan to move in when classes were finished or when it was timely.

Ms. MacDonald raised the issue of the across-the-board 1.44% increase in student bursaries for this year, despite the 15% increase in tuition for some Faculties, and other Faculties a 6% increase. In light of the extremely onerous tuition increases for students in some Faculties, the 1.44% increase in available funding seemed to be another slap in the face to students. They had assumed that the BAC's reference to a substantial increase in bursaries would be just that -- a substantial increase in bursary support. The 1.44% increase did not even match the increase in the cost of living. Mr. Traves would secure future information on this issue and bring it back to Senate either at the next meeting or through email.

#### **2000:92.**

##### Ratification of informal Senate decisions taken July 24, 2000

While In Camera, three nominations for Honorary Degrees for the Fall Convocation were approved, and the awarding of the D.D.S. to Ms. Lynda M. Fitzpatrick was approved.

#### **2000:93.**

##### Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

**DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY**

**APPROVED MINUTES**

**OF**

**SENATE MEETING**

SENATE met in regular session on Monday, September 25, 2000, 4:00 p.m., in University Hall, Macdonald Building.

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

Binkley, Bleasdale, Blunden, Bradfield, Brett, Caley, Connolly, Coté, Cunningham, Devlin, Downe-Wamboldt, Emodi, Fraser, Gupta, Harvey, Ipson, Jalilvand, Johnston, Kay-Raining Bird, Kemp, Kimmins, Lee, Lohmann, MacAulay, B. MacDonald, R. MacDonald, MacInnis, MacLean, Maes, McAlister, McIntyre, Murphy, Neves, Pacey, Phillips, Poel, Roberts, Rowe, Rutherford, Sastri, Savoy, Scott, Scully, Slonim, Tindall, Traves, Ugursal, Wainwright, Watters, Whyte, Workman.

Regrets: Ben-Abdallah, Caldwell, Coffin, El-Hawary, Guppy, Russell, Starnes.

**2000:93.**

Adoption of Agenda

Mr. Stuttard noted that item 4 was the continuation from the previous meeting of the informal discussion of the Senate Review of the Faculty of Graduate Studies as if in Committee of the Whole.

The agenda was then **ADOPTED** as circulated.

**2000:94.**

Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting of September 25, 2000, were **ADOPTED** as circulated.

**2000:95.**

Question Period

Mr. Wainwright asked the President whether his understanding was correct that for each student who went through the Knowledge House program Dalhousie would receive \$1300. Vice-President Scully responded yes. Mr. Wainwright had been given to understand that the program was to serve students who might not otherwise be eligible for admission to Dalhousie, and that the program would prepare them for admission. What about the students who were eligible for admission to Dalhousie and could afford to pay more than

\$1300? Would they choose to enroll at Knowledge House in order to avoid paying the significantly higher tuition for first year at Dalhousie? How did Knowledge House intend to differentiate between those they accepted and those they did not accept on the basis of need and/or grades and any other criteria? Mr. Stuttard informed Senators that the Senate Academic Priorities and Budget Committee was in the middle of discussing these questions, as well as many others which had arisen concerning the Memorandum of Understanding. Any members with questions about the Memorandum of Understanding were once again reminded to forward them to Mr. Stuttard, Chair of SAPBC. Mr. Wainwright might receive answers to his questions today, but they might differ from the answers which ultimately came out of SAPBC's deliberations. Mr. Traves considered it important to appreciate that under this program students would pay fairly substantial tuition fees for two years. Any student eligible for admission to Dalhousie would most likely choose to come to Dalhousie directly. If a narrow financial calculation were the only variable, then attending Dalhousie clearly would be the student's better option.

Mr. Brett asked whether further information on enrolment was available. Mr. Traves anticipated an update from the Registrar in the very near future. Figures last week suggested we were down slightly less than 1% in total enrolment, but members would appreciate that at this time of the year numbers could change fairly significantly. Past experience indicated enrolments could rise by as much as 300 or 400 in the final weeks of September.

Mr. Brett also asked what Dalhousie University was considering in the area of advertising. Over the summer he had noticed the University of Alberta's regular advertising on the CBC, and Saint Mary's offered the top ten songs of the week on a local radio station. Mr. Traves responded that we were establishing an Enrolment Management Committee which would be tackling questions such as how to attract and retain students, and how to satisfy their needs more effectively. That committee would be considering the cost and efficiency of advertising.

Mr. Scully anticipated that the Enrolment Management Committee would report to Senate at least twice a year through the Senate Committee on Academic Administration. Once the committee had done an initial exploration of some of the issues it would clarify for Senate and the University what its purpose and function would be. Concerning enrolments, Mr. Scully reminded members that one of the difficulties was distinguishing between head counts and class enrolments. The past one or two years had witnessed changes in the timing of student enrolments in second term classes. In FASS, for example, first and second term classes did not appear to jibe. We would need at least another year to appreciate the impact on enrolment patterns of the move to a fee-per-class payment system.

## **2000:96.**

### Senate Review of the Faculty of Graduate Studies

The meeting agreed to continue informal discussion of the Report of the Senate Committee to Review the Faculty of Graduate Studies as if in Committee of the Whole until 5:20 p.m.

At the agreed time, the Chair reported that Mr. Caley and others wished to propose a motion which had been circulated to all senators by e-mail.

Mr. Caley moved:



**That the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate Studies delegate admissions decisions to programs that request this authority, and that an audit and monitoring mechanism, to be approved by the Senate, be developed by the SAPBC in consultation with the FGS and the Deans concerned, that can result in the rescinding of this authority by the Faculty of Graduate Studies if, on the basis of objective evidence and well-defined criteria, demonstrably poor admissions decisions threaten program quality.**

Mr. Caley noted that this motion was supported by six of the Deans of the line Faculties.

Mr. Devlin thanked Mr. Rutherford for providing by e-mail some of the further information he had requested at the previous meeting. He spoke against the motion for two reasons. There appeared to be a problem with admissions; however, he was not convinced they required the extreme solution being proposed – essentially the gutting of the Faculty of Graduate Studies' role in reviewing admissions. Secondly, the second part of the motion called for an ex post facto audit mechanism. Without a clear understanding of the mechanism and criteria which would be used in such a review, the Faculties would be handed a blank cheque on admissions.

The discussion reminded him of some provinces which threatened to secede when they did not always get their way. He preferred that we try to work through our problems.

Ms. MacAulay also spoke against the motion, which appeared to her to be internally inconsistent. If the FGS were to be considered incapable of deciding on appropriate admissions criteria, how could they then be trusted to oversee after-the-fact reviews to determine whether other criteria were acceptable and whether quality was being jeopardised? During the informal discussion some members had suggested that the Faculty of Graduate Studies had not been working effectively in the face of the changes confronting the individual ("line") Faculties, with the result that the Faculties were left to deal with the ensuing problems. That raised the question, for whom was the FGS working? If they were not working for individual Faculties, they must be working to uphold standards of excellence for the whole University; standards, she trusted, that all of us were committed to upholding. Ms. MacAulay agreed with Dean Binkley's earlier statement that we needed a universal set of minimum admission standards to which all students were held. If FGS were to lose its power of oversight in the area of admissions, Ms. MacAulay was concerned that we would be heading down a slippery slope. She apologized if any members were offended by her comments, but FGS served as a buffer for students, and she perceived a selfish attitude among the line Faculties. She did not accept the logic of that position. What would be the consequences for the students should the line Faculties assume some of the powers being sought? Finally, how would the line Faculties find the financial and staff resources necessary to undertake additional and considerable admissions responsibilities? Like the former Dean of FGS, she did not think that senators would settle for mediocrity, but we simply had different ideas as to how to achieve excellence. Personally, she favoured the approach in which the Faculty of Graduate Studies applied a set of minimum standards to all students fairly. The lack of a universal minimum standard would prove detrimental to all Faculties.

Mr. Gupta thought the previous speakers had spoken well to important points, he, too, would oppose the

motion. His concern was that standards would not be uniform throughout the University. He also worried about process within the smaller units which lacked admissions committees and relied on one member for decisions concerning admissions.

Mr. Pacey thanked Mr. Kimmins for helping to clarify the issues with his informal comment that six of the line Deans would be in favour of eliminating the Faculty of Graduate Studies. They had been unable to convince the Review Committee to recommend this and the present motion appeared to be a step towards incrementally weakening the Faculty of Graduate Studies. As such, this approach struck him as an attempt by the Deans to increase their own power. The motion also appeared to be an unwarranted attempt to micro-manage the Faculty of Graduate Studies. He asked Deans to consider the implications of such micro-management for their own Faculties and for the University. In response to a member's earlier comment that the expertise to judge admissions and programs was in the line Faculties, Mr. Pacey reminded Senators that the supervisors of all of the graduate students and those who taught graduate courses were all members of the Faculty of Graduate Studies. Students were also represented in that Faculty. That gave the Faculty the greatest body of expertise in the University. It was also a more broadly representative and democratic body than the Senate; any members could call for a meeting of the Faculty of Graduate Studies and could move a motion.

He believed it would have been more appropriate for the movers of this motion to have attended the FGS annual meeting or called a special meeting of FGS where all of the interested parties would have been represented. He believed the motion was primarily in the interests of those Deans who had moved it, but not in the interests of the faculty or students of Graduate Studies, and not in the interests of the University as a whole.

Mr. Blunden understood the frustration Deans sometimes experienced in getting program changes through FGS. However, over the past ten years as a member of the MBA Admissions Committee, he had frequently appreciated Graduate Studies' oversight of admissions. Program coordinators could be placed under very serious pressure to generate numbers by increasing admissions, and he considered FGS's oversight a salutary check on any inclination to boost enrolments at the expense of quality.

Mr. Jalilvand noted that examples could be used selectively, and consequently he did not choose to address some of the points made informally by the former Dean of Graduate Studies. He believed the evidence spoke for itself. He did not believe the Deans were attempting to take from FGS the power to make decisions and to maintain standards. They wished to create a different model and role for FGS which could better reflect changes within and outside the University. It was logical for the line Faculties to share decision-making in the area of admissions; and the Deans advocated creation of a mechanism by which both FGS and the line Faculties had power in this area. If this were not a problem we would not be spending our time discussing it. Some decisions taken by FGS were not appropriate, and arbitrary power was being exercised at the students' expense. Mr. Jalilvand reminded members that the Report of the Review Committee had recommended action along the lines put forward in this motion.

Ms. Downe-Wamboldt spoke in favour of the motion. Some of the arguments made in the last meeting concerning recommendation 2(e), admissions, were being made again concerning new program reviews. Much had been said about the issue of timeliness, but she did not believe that was the real issue. In her

department she had only heard positive statements about the timeliness of FGS's actions. The major issue was quality control and how we achieved and maintained that. She found convincing the argument that the individual departments could best determine quality control, though if this motion passed it seemed unlikely that her department would take advantage of the option it would provide. Ms. Downe-Wamboldt agreed with the Report and those speakers who had argued that we needed to maintain FGS. However, the matter of duplication in the areas of both program review and admissions needed to be addressed.

Ms. Binkley wished to clear up any confusion arising from her earlier comments. At present, the University specified general criteria and minimum standards for student admissions and each of the line Faculties set out further criteria for students entering at the undergraduate level. Those criteria differed from Faculty to Faculty, and were clear and transparent. They were arrived at through consultation within each Faculty focussed on finding acceptable Faculty-wide standards. Her perception of the problem with Graduate Studies was that one size did not fit all. Also, the criteria for specific graduate programs needed to be more transparent. A broad minimum standard which was not appropriate to all Faculties and programs could disadvantage prospective graduate students in two ways: it could raise false hopes or it could generate unnecessary discouragement. The particular criteria for each program needed to be negotiated between the line Faculties and the Faculty of Graduate Studies. For some, the current standards were too low; for others they were appropriate; and for others additional criteria needed to be worked out. Ms. Binkley thought she heard the Deans asking not to administer the program but to have a greater role in establishing the criteria for admission to graduate programs. She believed further discussion and compromises were necessary. She would abstain from voting on the motion.

Mr. Stuttard noted the time, and asked Senators whether they wished to continue the discussion at this meeting or move on to the next item on the agenda.

Mr. Cunningham moved:

**That the motion be laid on the table.**

Mr. Stuttard clarified that the motion could be taken up again at the next meeting of Senate.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

**2000:97.**

DalTech Administrative Review

Mr. Traves apologised to Senators for the delay in bringing this matter forward. Additional time had been needed to sort through some of the difficulties, but the President believed the University was now in a position to move forward. Two years ago provisional changes had been made in the administrative structure at DalTech, on the understanding that those changes and the model on which they were based would be reassessed this year. The President had consulted actively with the Deans of Architecture, Computer Science and Engineering, who had spoken to their colleagues, and with the alumni association and other bodies in order to secure feedback from those external to the University community. He was now prepared to recommend:

**That the Vice-President Academic and Provost shall assume any responsibilities associated with the former office of Principal of DalTech;  
That the Deans of Architecture, Computer Science and Engineering may constitute an**

**informal Academic Council focused on areas of joint interest. They shall meet as often as they wish, to whatever purpose they deem appropriate within the existing academic, administrative and legislative structures of the University, and they may enlarge their number as they see fit; and**

**That the former TUNS campus shall be identified as the Sexton Campus of Dalhousie University in a manner similar to, and with the same purpose as, the University's labeling of the Studley Campus and the Carleton Campus.**

The President reminded Senators that the key issue had been the nature of the College structure originally adopted at the time of the merger between Dalhousie and TUNS. The merger agreement established the conventional Faculty structure for the Faculties of Engineering and Architecture, and for a new Faculty of Computer Science, created from units within the amalgamated institutions. In recognition of the unique history within TUNS, and in order to facilitate expression of the collective interests and goals of faculty members, students and alumni, the agreement also created a College which would house the three Faculties and be an intermediary body between the Faculties and Senate.

However, over the intervening years, the individual Faculties had grown stronger and had created new connections and new types of partnerships with other units within the University. Those connections appeared to have transcended and superseded the relationship among the three Faculties which comprised DalTech. In the process, the College had fared less well. The demise of the College reflected the fact that Dalhousie was Faculty-based, and any body intermediary between the Senate and the Faculty had a tenuous role – and grasp on reality – at best. For example, the College of Arts and Science brought the Faculties of Science and Arts and Social Sciences together in an umbrella organization with its own Provost. But for all practical purposes that College had limited responsibilities and no significant presence within the University.

Nothing precluded the Faculties of Architecture, Computer Science and Engineering from working together to pursue common interests, and nothing prevented them from combining with other Faculties as they considered appropriate to develop projects and programs. They might also continue to share some administrative services.

Though this was not directly the business of Senate, Senators would be interested in knowing that from his consultations with the DalTech Alumni Association he could report that they were comfortable with this evolution. The Association had comprised primarily Engineers, and they could move into the model of the alumni associations for the Faculties of Law and Medicine.

The last clause of the motion concerned nomenclature. The name DalTech had been adopted provisionally but used extensively since the merger, and he believed it enjoyed some community recognition; however, as one individual he had consulted put it, DalTech was essentially a place not an organic body. If DalTech were thought of as a place, a campus similar to the Studley and Carleton Campuses, an argument could be made that an appropriate name for it would be the Sexton Campus. That would recognize the importance to the Nova Scotia Technical College (subsequently the Technical University of Nova Scotia) of Dr. Sexton, the first principal of the Technical College. Dr. Sexton had also been the first Professor of Engineering at Dalhousie University.

The President believed there were two choices: DalTech Campus or Sexton Campus. He would feel

comfortable recommending either name to the Board of Governors, though personally he favored the latter as it would maintain important connections with the history of TUNS at the same time that it would promote greater clarity in the broader community and maintain the focus on the name of Dalhousie. In the post-merger period, he knew first hand the level of confusion generated by the similarity between the names DalTech and Dalhousie, having at times been addressed as the President of DalTech. But he would accept the opinion of the majority on this matter.

From his canvassing, Mr. Caley reported that while the name Sexton had been preferred by some, DalTech had been the overwhelming favorite. It combined “Dal” with “Tech” which had linked back to the Technical University of Nova Scotia. The brand name “DalTech” also appeared to have caught on with the broader community. Mr. Caley requested, and the President agreed to, a friendly amendment to the motion:

**That “Sexton” be replaced by “DalTech”.**

At the President’s request Dean Emodi reported that the Faculty of Architecture had no objection to the name DalTech, and had discussed alternative ways of recognizing Dr. Sexton, such as putting his name on a sign on the main driveway. Ms. Guppy pointed out that she had found a reference to DalTech in some architectural material for the year 1974 when the institution was called the Nova Scotia Technical College.

Mr. Brett thought some members might wish to discuss this very significant administrative change. Perhaps more time should be allotted to raise and consider questions concerning this matter. The College of Arts and Science, for example, might be largely dysfunctional. Yet it provided an opportunity for members of the Faculties of Arts and Social Sciences and Science to consider common issues in a democratic body, rather than as administrators. The same might be true for those at the DalTech or Sexton Campus.

Mr. MacLean believed that the motion would take an institutional administrative body, DalTech, and convert it into a piece of turf. Ms. Ipson was concerned about the need for clarity in choosing a name and the subsequent signage. Mr. Caley believed the items contained in the motion had been discussed thoroughly by the three Deans. Mr. Slonim added that the Deans had been discussing the substance of the motion for 18 months.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

**2000:98.**

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:16 p.m.

---

Secretary

---

Chair