

Item: Senate Minutes, March 2006
Call Number: Senate fonds, UA-5

Additional Notes:

This document is a compilation of Senate minutes, staff matters and miscellaneous documents for March 2006. 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 13, 2006 at 4:00 p.m., in University Hall, Macdonald Building.

Present with Mr. El-Hawary in the chair: Beazley, Binkley, Bond, Breckenridge, Butler, Camfield, Caron, Cercone, Cochrane, Cook, Dunphy (Recording Secretary), El-Masry, Finbow, Fraser, Geldenhuys, Hicks, Horackova, Hubert, Johnson, Jordan, Klein, Kwak, Livingston, Maes, McNeil, Oppong, Plug, Rosson, Rutherford, Schroeder, Scrimger, Scully, Slonim, B. Smith, K.E. Smith, Stone, Stroink, Swanston, Thornhill, Traves, Urbanowski, Wallace, Wien, Whyte, Wright, Zuck.

Regrets: Adshade, Barker, Chowdhury, Cleave, Coughlan, Dawson, Edelstein, Lane, McMullen, Pegg, Phillips, Salmon, Sullivan, Taylor, Webster.

Absent: Ben-Abdallah, Gray, Leon, Morgunov, Murphy, Pelzer, Precious, Saunders, Wanzel, Yeung.

Invitees: J. Lamb, A. Power.

The Chair indicated that before Senate adopts the agenda he will be asking Ms. Jennifer Bond to report on the DSU elections during the Chair's Report..

2006:043

Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was **ADOPTED** as circulated.

2006:044

Draft Minutes of February 27, 2006 Meeting

a) Approval

Approval of the minutes of February 27, 2006 minutes was deferred to the next meeting as an earlier version of the minutes were posted to the Senate website.

b) Matters Arising

There were no matters arising.

2006:045

Question Period

There were no questions.

2006:046

Notice of Motion: Mr. Sam Scully

Mr. El-Hawary pointed out that there is a slight modification to the memo that was contained in the Senate package and that involves adding the words "review of" in the second line of the motion.

Mr. Scully, MOVED, seconded by Mr. Breckenridge:

THAT Senate of Dalhousie wishes to express its profound concern about the extended delay in reaching a conclusion to the review of clinical privileges involving two faculty members at Dalhousie University, Dr. Gabrielle Horne and Dr. Michael Goodyear. While members of Senate are not in a position to comment on the merits of either case, we believe that the inordinate delay in bringing closure to these matters raises serious concerns about the process itself. Insofar as the Board of the Capital District Health Authority seems unable to bring this matter to closure, we ask Premier Rodney MacDonald to review the matter and take the necessary steps, with the appropriate officials, to ensure that justice is done.

Mr. Scully pointed out that the review process involving two Dalhousie faculty members, Dr. Gabrielle Horne and Dr. Michael Goodyear, has been underway since the fall of 2002, both of whom hold Dalhousie appointments in the Department of Medicine, in the Faculty of Medicine. It is his opinion that “justice delayed is justice denied”. Therefore, Mr. Scully would like to propose this motion to Senate to be conveyed to the Board of Capital Health and beyond the Board to the Premier of the province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. Whyte stated his support for the motion and quoted from the motion “While members of Senate are not in a position to comment on the merits of either case” stating that he believes this to be true because the motion is addressing the review of clinical privileges which is outside the domain of the University. He added, however, that he thinks members of Senate are in a position to comment on the merits of the case with respect to the complaint that was made and to some of the academic issues that have arisen from it, he then asked whether members of Senate are in fact not in a position to comment on the merits, but rather just refer to the issue of clinical privilege. This was confirmed by Mr. Scully.

Mr. Cook indicated his strong support of the motion and its intent. He sees this as a tremendously difficult circumstance for two of Dalhousie’s faculty members. Mr. Cook felt that we can put forward our desire to see this come to a conclusion very quickly. Repeatedly he had been told that “next week a report from the Privilege Review Committee of Capital Health” and as each week passes, there is still no resolution.

The Chair recognized Ms. Helen Powell, President of the Dalhousie Faculty Association (DFA.) Ms. Powell spoke on behalf of the DFA supporting the motion, saying that the motion is an important public step to demonstrate that Dalhousie University supports two of its faculty members, Drs. Gabrielle Horne and Michael Goodyear. The academic freedom of these clinical/medical/faculty members to pursue their research programs has been severely curtailed by the failure of the Capital Health District authority’s privilege review process. This process according to Capital Health’s own bylaws should have been completed over three years ago. During those three years the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT) has been working with Drs. Horne and Goodyear as they struggled to obtain due process. She said that the Senators of Dalhousie are no doubt aware that last November the CAUT warned President Traves that Dalhousie University faces censure from the CAUT unless the University takes two actions: “The University administration must press actively, persistently and publicly in support of Drs. Horne and Goodyear”, and second, “The University must take timely action to mitigate the damage done to their careers while waiting for Capital Health to end its flawed process.” The adoption of this motion will show that this University supports the academic freedom of its faculty and it will help to dissuade the CAUT Council, which convenes this spring from initiating the censure procedure against Dalhousie University. Ms. Howell also noted that this motion speaks to the broad principle of academic freedom for all members of this University, regardless of their status in or outside a bargaining unit and she urged all Senators to vote in favor of the motion.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

Mr. Whyte asked if Senate is in a position to comment on the allegations which led to the interruption of those privileges, as these allegations were complaints with respect to misconduct in a scholarly activity. According to the Senate policy on Academic Integrity the University administration may take disciplinary action against those who make unfounded allegations of misconduct in relation to academic activity when those allegations are reckless, malicious, or in bad faith. In the case of Dr. Horne an independent peer review panel made up of our highest ranking scholars with access to all pertinent documents, has determined that unfounded allegations

were indeed made, and as a result, there have been very serious consequences to Dr. Horne's research. Furthermore the University has been brought into disrepute. Will the Vice-President, Academic, now take disciplinary action against those who have made those allegations, or acted unfairly in this matter? Mr. Scully agreed to take Mr. Whyte's statement under advisement. The Chair informed Mr. Whyte he could bring this forward under Matters Arising at the next meeting. Mr. Scully asked Mr. Whyte or the Secretary of Senate to provide him with the precise wording of his statement.

2006:047

Presentation on Undergraduate Education: Progress Report on Undergraduate Education

Mr. Scully explained that he was asked by the Chair of Senate and the Steering Committee earlier this term about the conversation that had been started between the undergraduate Deans, Mr. Maloney and himself which grew out of discussions, some of them in Senate, including the 2004 Senate Forum identifying the need to take a more panoramic view of undergraduate studies at Dalhousie University, and particularly raised some potentially awkward questions about issues pertaining to quality of education. Many of the issues identified here are very much alive and challenging in other university settings. The most embarrassing question that can be raised in the university is "What are we trying to do?" We just assume we know what we are trying to do and proceed in a determined and frequently aggressive manner to do what we are trying to do without having defined sometimes what we are trying to do.

Mr. Scully indicated there were three independent issues that he has identified for the Deans. Dalhousie University is facing an "enrolment crisis" due to a predicted drop in enrolments next year. This entirely involves the undergraduate level in terms of current projections which will prove to be a bigger drop than the one already identified. The undergraduate enrolment crisis speaks also to the viability of programs and classes where you get sudden shifts in registrations. Secondly, viability is a complex notion and thirdly, quality of programs. Dalhousie is appealing to Canadian and International students through two basic identifiers; one, the academic quality of what we do, and, secondly, our location – Halifax. Senate received a report on the enrolment crisis earlier this year and the integrated undergraduate enrolment management project. The Director of Communications and Marketing made a presentation to Senate about their work in this regard. The Budget Advisory Committee includes a very substantial allocation to fund work in that area.

The viability of programs and classes was a question that was posed to the President and Mr. Scully at the Board meetings. It is not just when we bring forward new programs but within a larger context. Mr. Scully noted that this is something that will be identified and become a very public issue when we get the report of the Long-Term Financial Planning Committee of the Board of Governors. Viability is a complex notion and there is no single definition that can work across all programs and classes. These three elements tie together, and they are clearly urgent issues for the Deans, Department Chairs, faculty, and students. The main issue is quality. Dalhousie branding contains a claim of academic quality based on what our students tell us attracted them to Dalhousie. The question of who teaches what, and in particular, the question of who teaches first year classes has been an important factor and in 2004/2005 barely half of Dalhousie's first year classes were taught by continuing faculty members. It has been agreed that we want to see an improvement on the 2004-05 number. The 2005-06 analysis has not been completed. Earlier this decade, over 60% of the first year classes were taught by continuing faculty members. The assumption is that many departments within faculties use this as their starting point. For example, when you look at a large first year Biology class – it is a distinction to be asked to teach in that class. It has often been said in recent years at Dalhousie that we don't do enough to promote teaching as a serious and prestigious activity. We have begun a conversation among the Deans to look at ways that address this issue. Mr. Scully suggested that we have to find ways to make teaching at Dalhousie something which carries prestige with it, that people in fact are lining up to teach those first-year classes, there be a need for a continuing celebration of teaching that we set alongside the continuing celebration of research. Much of the thinking in this regard has been organized and structured by Keith Taylor, Dean of Science. Mr. Scully said that Mr. Taylor and himself are trying to work out the actual logistics of doing something along the following lines: A one-credit hour class which would run over six weeks with a maximum of 15 students (for first-year students, & may be broadened to include the first two years). Broad themes, within which faculty members would identify, a seminar which they would be willing to offer for six weeks, for instance, the environment, health, human culture, and technology. If students want to go this route, they could elect three seminars, maybe first year, maybe first two years, drawn from the different themes, and all set up in way which

is to encourage interchange/exchange of ideas; to remove the whole pressure of grading, etc., done on a pass/fail basis. Mr. Taylor believes there is already significant support for doing something like this in the Faculty of Science and he would be looking for a complementary faculty, one of the professional faculties, in which they would also mount a pilot. It could also be the vehicle, in part, to address another challenge we have at the institution, which is around writing and oral communication. Mr. Scully and the Deans have been looking at various possibilities and we would welcome any advice that people have. He explained there are systems in other parts of Canada where there is entry testing to determine what a student's ability is in this regard. He believes there might be merit at looking to see where we would look at "exit" testing, for example, putting together a portfolio of writing whereby a student could submit to seek that kind of recognition that they have achieved a certain level of competence.

Dalhousie has a rigorous cycle of program reviews but this may not always ensure that programs are staying current, vibrant, challenging, and intellectual. This year Dalhousie University has signed on to the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), which many Canadian universities are now participating in. Students will be asked, "Were you actively engaged by the program? Were there "activities" which drew you in and became a vital part of the learning that you were doing, and that you appreciated this and felt that it was giving you the kinds of feedback, the kinds of engagement, that you sought when you signed on at Dalhousie?" We will have the first results later this year.

Mr. Scully reported that an external review has been done and it is now out with the programs and the Deans of the Faculties in which those programs are located, regarding core programs. It is raising many questions to the extent to which we have been successful in integrating the cooperative education program in the academic program. There has to be an academic value from engaging students in co-op education.

In regard to vitality, we are surveying the Deans and trying to assemble information about how much we are actually doing. With regard to taking advantage of available international possibilities, in a way a program is designed, its curriculum content, but also its delivery. Secondly, do we include appropriate opportunities to expose students to research which is a very broad array of things that can be brought into that consideration? One way of explaining interdisciplinary programs is that they emerge at the intersections of the disciplines. We have all of the disciplines here, with the obvious omission of Geography, so we have again, just by virtue of range, a greater capacity to respond in the interdisciplinary interstitial areas than other institutions would have that do not have our portfolio.

Scheduling is another area that needs to be addressed. A preliminary conversation has been largely around the May – August period where there are real opportunities for us to re-think how we are doing given the hybrid nature of activity in that period.

Mr. Scully also spoke of the work being done around academic integrity and the SCAA subcommittee that was formed this year. SCAA very shortly will have a white paper on fairness. Mr. Scully then asked Senators to send any comments or questions about undergraduate education directly to him via email.

Ms. Bond commended Mr. Scully for his presentation on undergraduate education and wanted to stress the importance of writing and oral communication for first year undergraduate students. Also, another area that is lacking is that of proper research methods and information literacy – how to use online journals, how to research properly. Mr. Scully added that another conversation that he has had had with the Deans is the whole issue of information literacy. There is a wide-spread assumption that we don't have to educate our students about how to use technology. It's an issue of navigational ability – how to "find" your way around. Mr. Scully said he suspects there are parts of Dalhousie University that are doing a terrific job because the work has been thought out and clearly included and incorporated into a curriculum.

Mr. Jordan complimented Mr. Scully on a wonderful presentation. He said he is a very active person in trying to cultivate first-year involvement from his own faculty, but the notion of best teacher is something that needs careful examination. It is not so much that we want our most worthy researchers or intellects; we want the teachers that have the most energy, the most motivated, that are the most passionate, they do not necessarily have to be the most principal authorities in their field, but they need to be the ones that are able to cultivate and

motivate students. Mr. Scully clarified that the best teachers for those first year classes, meaning that it may not be the best researcher, may not even be the best teacher, but it is the best person for that course.

Mr. Slonim complimented Mr. Scully for raising an issues thought to be very difficult for the institution. He said there are two things he suggests they look at as well; retention and why students are not fitting in. We need to find out why they are leaving. The other issue is that out students are not fitting well. The students are gaining weight during the four years of academia and students need to develop good health habits, and as a society, we are paying dearly for that later on. Mr. Scully responded that clearly there have been periods in modern educational history where that was a formal requirement of university-level physical education studies.

Mr. Scully emphasized that he thinks it absolutely essential that, because Dalhousie will be spending increasing amounts of money recruiting students, we should also be spending a bit more time and effort to make sure we retain them. Ms. Newman and her staff are looking at all kinds of ways to deal with two fundamental cohorts of students: students in residence, using the residence structure to connect them and help them to take full advantage of what the institution can offer, and a large number of commuter students. Dalhousie University has to come to terms with ways in which we can serve both cohorts of students.

Mr. Whyte suggested that the quality first-year students should be seeking in a teacher is someone who is charismatic.

Mr. Scully explained that it is his intention to come back and report, before he retires from the university on June 30, on the conclusion of the conversations that he and the Deans are having.

The Chair noted this and thanked Mr. Scully for his presentation.

2006:048

Report of the Chair

The Chair called upon Ms. Bond to provide the results of the DSU elections which were announced March 9, 2006. Ms. Bond reported that the DSU held its elections last Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, with a voter turnout of roughly 20%, which for a union and school this size is felt to be actually quite good. Filling the Presidential position once again is Ezra Edelstein; Vice-President, Internal is Chris Ide (Honours Biochemistry); Vice-President, Student Life is Chris McCluskey (Political Science); Vice-President, Education is Mike Tipping (Political Science); the two new senators are Justin Lerousseau and Hale Simmons, students for the other two Senate positions will be recruited in September. For Board of Governors, Natalie McLean, a first year medical student.

Mr. El-Hawary informed Senate that he has only two items to report. He is pleased to report that today he received notification that the Master of Science (Occupational Therapy – Post-Professional) has been approved by the Maritime Provinces Higher Education Commission. Secondly, the Senate Academic Priorities and Budget Committee have received the Report of the Review Committee for the Senate Review of the Faculty of Law. If any Senator would like to review a copy of the Report or the Response by the Faculty please contact the Senate Office.

2006:049

Report of the President

Mr. Traves commented that he is pleased to inform Senate that once again, in the *Scientist* magazine survey of best places to work, the category of post-doctoral fellows, Dalhousie has once again been recognized for being an outstanding location for post-doctoral fellows to work. Dalhousie finished ninth in the ranking.

Mr. Traves also commented on the issue of student engagement which fundamentally lies at the heart of many of the themes that Vice-President Scully addressed in terms of the questions and issues to the extent that students are engaged by their professors, by their work, by the issues that are engaged formally in classrooms and informally in terms of the range of extracurricular activities that surround students in the university. As

we go forward, it seems that the ideas and themes that were put on the table by Vice-President Scully are questions that go to the heart of what the university is about.

2006:050

Facilities Management Presentation

The Chair welcomed Mr. Jeff Lamb, Director, Facilities Management. Mr. Lamb explained that the presentation had been provided earlier to Senate Physical Planning Committee, SPPC, and is now available on the Senate website at http://senate.dal.ca//Files/presentations/Campus_Plan_Review_w_Univ_Ave.ppt. The Campus Plan was originally published in 1991 by Bryan McKay Lyons et al, entitled *A Collective Vision – A Campus Plan for Dalhousie*. The process for developing this plan was quite extensive; there was a Board committee, there were consultations, focus groups, and many various meetings conducted over a six months period. There were architects who were brought in from all over the world essentially who were experts in various types of planning. The results were that there were two public workshops where people were invited to take part and draw their vision of what the university should look like. There was an Art Gallery exhibit because people had done so well in drawing their visions of what the university should look like and in the end there was a published book which was distributed quite widely and identifies quite a number of plan elements. It was very important that the Plan “resonate with the physical character of the place”, because of the Cog design of the architecture here in the quadrangle, the traditional layout of some portions of the University, and the character of our surroundings all had to be taken into account. It was implemented through a strategy for natural growth, meaning that one part of that was organic, that is the planners knew that things are going to grow around here in fits and starts and not through some grand master detailed plan. The growth, therefore, would be organic in nature.

Mr. Lamb stated that he feels that the Campus Plan has not been sitting on the shelf for the last 15 years. The University had densified somewhat in the Studley area when it built Fountain House. It built two colleges along University Avenue that served to reinforce the academic use of the spine. The property that now houses a residence (Risley Hall), an apartment and includes the Dalhousie Day Care Centre has also been put into use as was proposed in the Plan.

The LSRI that has been currently designed and potentially, if the Life Sciences Development Association gets their long-term plan, a research village will be built on that site, which would reflect the densification that was planned. In overall terms, much of the space planning, the land use planning that was put into the Plan, has in fact been followed quite carefully over the last 15 years.

There are several current plans that would continue to follow, in some ways what we have in the Plan. The first is to apply the idea that University Avenue should be a spine, that it should look and feel like part of the campus, as opposed to what it currently is, so there are some plans to develop University Avenue. In conjunction with that, the quadrangle between Tupper and Forrest Buildings is also slated for some re-development to tie it in to the whole notion of green space and a unified campus. There is some planning work going on with regard to the Sexton campus. With respect to University Avenue, there are three major reasons why it is hoped to spend some money to improve connectiveness and cohesiveness by tying together the Studley and Carleton campuses. The second is to project quality, character and image of Dalhousie as put forward in the branding work. Not only should it be on our website and letterhead, but the campus itself should reflect the brand that Dalhousie is trying to project. Thirdly, and most importantly, the number of people going back and forth on University Avenue has grown considerably since it was first built. It was originally designed as a residential street in the late 1950s, with five feet- wide sidewalks, and because of the sheer growth and population, and facilities around University Avenue, it is hoped to bring that facility up to the requirement. It is a boulevard with two carriageways designed to bring people from Robie Street, or from further east, up to the centre of the campus. Pedestrians are not taken into account, and there is nothing on either side of it that would generate any movement.

The University commissioned a landscape architecture firm to look at improving University Avenue, and to giving that cohesion and improving the quality and the look of University Avenue; however, as the architects worked on it, they found a lot of technical issues that embellishing it with furnishings and trees would not solve the bigger problem. Those included the fact that pedestrian traffic has totally exceeded capacity. There

are few gathering areas so the students resort to sitting out in the middle of the boulevard. On most sidewalks you will see that the grass is worn down on either side because people are forced to walk on the grass and there is a sidewalk through the gathering areas in front of the Student Union Building, but you cannot see it because students are lined up for the Dawg Father. In front of the Arts Centre, they have given up on grass and the front of the Law Building butts up against the sidewalk, which is not designed as an institutional entrance to that building. The University has reviewed design and has come up with a proposal which addresses the area in front of the Student Union Building and the McCain building by getting rid of the two side carriageways and the carriageway down the middle of the road, which would provide a plaza in front of the McCain Building and a plaza in front of the Student Union Building. The area between LeMarchant and Seymour, in front of the McCain Building, would be redesigned with benches and generous walkways, and something similarly in front of the SUB. This describes the pedestrian problems we are trying to solve.

Another feature would be to identify the University site. Mr. Lamb displayed an example of some of the signage that could potentially be seen at the corner of University Avenue and Robie Street. The other aspect that is typical of some of the landscaping along the boulevard because the city is responsible for it. The intended plan for that corner as part of the whole boulevard concept is to create a sign that would tell people that part of Dalhousie University is up in that direction and we would use the types of architectural features that you see in the Cobb quadrangle, which would be clearly seen. In conjunction with that another feature, and some work was done last summer around the entrance to the Carleton quad, charged to the renewal/maintenance budget is going into improving the area between the Tupper and Forrest Buildings. Lighting and benches would be of the same motif as those along University Avenue to tie the entire piece together as one institution.

On Sexton campus the main issue right now is that HRM and the province are conducting a study of what they are calling the institutional land in the vicinity of Spring Garden Road and Queen Street. That includes the Library, the Infirmary site, the two parking lots along Clyde Street – those are all being looked at as “institutional lands”. Dalhousie University is represented on the Advisory Committee to that study as an interested party, and we do have, compared to some of the other “interested parties”, a direct interest because we have a 100-year lease on Gerrard Hall and the property surrounding it. We also have interest in the parking lot beside Architecture, while we do not own it, we do have what is called “administrative control” under a letter from the province and we have been trying to deal with that issue as well. Before we can do much in the way of planning at all on Sexton campus, we really need to know what is happening on the Infirmary site in particular. Mr. Lamb pointed out that the major obstacle to making improvements to University Avenue is that Dalhousie does not own it. The University has been talking with HRM for the last two years about negotiating an encroachment agreement. HRM sees there are definite advantages if they allow the University to fund the kind of renovations being projected in the drawings, and if we are willing to take on responsibility the maintenance of the special features that we install such as new lights, new roadway, furnishings, etc., which would be a win – win situation that we could incorporate University Avenue as part of the campus, and the HRM could reduce their costs and obtain a better looking street in return. Mr. Lamb described proposed lighting that would tie everything together such as that by the Rowe Building. The signage design is complete, although funding is not yet available for that particular project. The plan for University Avenue in total has been submitted for inclusion in the Capital Campaign and is under consideration with many other worthy projects. The University is looking at a summer implementation of part of the scope on Carleton campus and the Spring Garden/Queen Street study is due to be completed in May.

Mr. Jordan asked how Mr. Lamb envisioned the City Transit working in the Plan. Mr. Lamb explained that in conjunction with Metro Transit, Dalhousie University has put money toward a transit stop at the corner near the Grad House. He described plans to relocate both taxi and bus stops in the area to the side of the SUB in the future development.

It was noted that a lot could be done to the campus without any major costs which could help in terms of integration with some of the academic plans as well. The Chair thanked Mr. Lamb for an excellent presentation.

2006:051

Other Business

There were no other items of business.

2006:052

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:00p.m.