

Item: Senate Minutes, October 1995

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 October 1995. 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

MINUTES OF

SENATE MEETING

Senate met in regular session on Friday, 6 October 1995 at 10:00 a.m. in the University Hall, Macdonald Building.

Present with Mr. Colin Stuttard in the chair were:

Andrews, Kay Raining-Bird, Birdsall, Brett, Cameron, Camfield, Conrod (Secretary pro tem), Cox, Cummings Doolittle, Egan, Farmer, Hartzman, Hooper, Kiang, Klein, Lee, MacDonald, MacInnis, Maloney, Marble, McIntyre, Morrissey, Pacey, Pereira, Ricketts, Rosson, Russell, Ruedy, Shafai, Sherwin, Siddiq, Starnes, Sutherland, Taylor, Thomas, Traves.

Observer: A. Wainwright

Regrets: Archibald, Binkley Dickson, Haley, Hobson, Kenny, Kimmins, Lovely, Tatton, Wrixon.

95:133.

Adoption of Agenda

Senate approved a motion to adopt the agenda as circulated (Lee/Starnes).

95:134.

a) Minutes of Previous Meeting

Mr. Lee requested that the minutes reflect, under 95:130, that the vote on quorum issues was twenty two in favour of the motion and thirteen opposed. The motion failed to get the necessary two-thirds majority support and so was lost.

With this amendment, a motion to approve the minutes (Cameron/Klein) was passed.

b) Matters Arising

Mr. Starnes requested the Senate Office verify that the agenda e-mail distribution list was correct; he noted that it appeared to have over one-hundred addresses. Mr. Stuttard was surprised to hear this, but agreed to investigate.

95:135.

Awarding of Degrees

College of Arts and Science

Mr. Taylor proposed that degrees, diplomas and certificates be awarded as follows:

Bachelor of Arts	106
(Distinction 6, Honours 9, First Class Honours 4, Advanced Major 20)	
Bachelor of Arts Advanced Major Certificate	2
Bachelor of Arts Honours Certificate	6
(Honours 6)	
Bachelor of Music	1
Bachelor of Education.....	6
Bachelor of Science.....	69
(Distinction 5, Honours 4, First Class Honours 4, Advanced Major 9)	
Bachelor of Science Advanced Major Certificate	4
(Honours 1)	
Bachelor of Science Honours Certificate	1
(Honours 1)	
Diploma in Engineering.....	10
	TOTAL 205

Faculty of Graduate Studies

Mr. Ricketts proposed that the degrees and diplomas be awarded as follows:

Doctor of Philosophy.....	34
Master of Arts	60
Master of Science	35
Master of Nursing	8
Master of Social Work	16
Master of Environmental Studies.....	5
Master of Business Administration	1
Master of Education.....	20
Master of Health Services Administration	3
Master of Laws	3
Master of Development Economics	2
Master of Library and Information Studies	1

Master of Marine Management.....	15
Master of Public Administration	2
Diploma in Public Administration	1
	TOTAL 206

Faculty of Health Professions

Ms. McIntyre proposed that degrees and diplomas be awarded as follows:

Bachelor of Social Work	8
(Distinction 2)	
Bachelor of Physical Education	3
Bachelor of Science (Health Education)	8
Bachelor of Science (Occupational Therapy)	1
Bachelor of Science (Outpost Nursing) (Post RN).....	7
Diploma in Outpost and Community Health Nursing	4
Diploma in Health Services Administration	5
	TOTAL 36

Faculty of Law

Ms. Russell proposed that degrees be awarded as follows:

Bachelor of Laws	1
	TOTAL 1

Faculty of Management

Mr. Rosson proposed that degrees be proposed as follows:

Bachelor of Commerce.....	9
	TOTAL 9
	TOTAL 457

The motion: **that Senate approves the awarding of degrees to the candidates identified in correspondence to the Secretary** (L. McIntyre/S. Sherwin) was carried.

It was moved (D. Russell/P. Ricketts):

that the Provost of the College of Arts and Science or the Dean of the appropriate Faculty, and the Registrar, in consultation with the Chair of Senate, he authorized to add to or remove from the list of graduands the names of any students omitted

from or included on that list through demonstrable errors by the University or one of its officers, and that any such additions or deletions be reported to Senate.

The motion carried.

95:136.

Nominations from the Senate Committee on Committees

Ms. Conrod, as Secretary (pro tem), reported that the following individuals had agreed to let their names stand for nomination to serve on the indicated committees:

Senate Physical Planning Committee

Peter Perina (Arts and Social Sciences) 1998
Bill Owen (Kellogg Health Sciences Library) 1997

Lester Pearson International Advisory Committee

David Vanderzwagg (Law)

Following the requisite three calls for further nominations, the individuals named were declared elected.

95:137.

Notice of Motion

At the **25** September 1995 Senate Meeting, notice of the following motion was given:

That Senate have an active role in the ongoing process of planning for a Consortium of Metro Universities.

(Hartzman/Sutherland)

Mr. Hartzman explained that the motion was motivated by his concern over the role that Senate would play in Consortium plans. While he now accepted that the current process was a feasibility study, he felt that subsequent planning should involve Senate in an active role.

Mr. Rosson noted it was hard to disagree with the sentiment of the motion, but

asked what it specifically meant. Mr. Hartzman replied that he wished Senate to play a role in planning, not just implementation.

Mr. Traves indicated his support for the motion. He described the current process as an implementation exercise to determine the feasibility of a framework business plan that would proceed if it had merit. The next step would be to plan a program of implementation which would involve consultation with a host of interests in the Dalhousie community, including groups with formal and legal interests and those who would be affected by the outcome. His expectation was that Senate would be fully engaged in the process as a major player.

Mr. Lee reminded Senate of past difficulties with planning exercises at Dalhousie, and expressed the resolve that Senate have input to planning, not just implementation. He spoke favourably of open communication from the president regarding the process to date. He indicated that Senate should avoid nitty-gritty details, as this would hamstring University negotiations, but wanted major items to come to Senate.

Mr. Hartzman expressed his continuing concern that Senate might just be consulted in the ongoing process, and not have a substantive role. Mr. Traves replied that Senate's jurisdiction over academic matters, its legislative power, precluded this. He assured Senate that the rights of Senate would not be abridged. Mr. Hartzman stated that Senate approval was more easily obtained if Senate were to help formulate plans. Mr. Pereira spoke to the history of prior planning exercises, noting that problems had arisen over the timing of items coming to Senate.

Ms. McIntyre said that Senate should be aware that the current process did involve consultation with academic units (Faculty Councils, etc.) that Senate authorized; Senate should not narrowly define involvement in the feasibility exercise; there was participation at all levels. Consultation within her academic unit had already begun.

Mr. Cameron stated that he saw no point in opposing the motion, but deplored its vagueness. He had no difficulty with the process so far; adding that anyone could comment at any time.

Mr. Wainwright was recognized as an observer and raised the concern that if a feasibility study were presented to the Minister of Education, and accepted, then it would be difficult to make any changes to this 'plan'; implementation would be the only task remaining.

Senate **approved the motion.**

Mr. Hartzman (seconded by Ms. Kay Raining-Bird) proposed:

That Senate establish an ad hoc sub-committee to participate in formulation of plans regarding the Metro Universities Consortium. The committee would report to Senate on its activities and ascertain the will of Senate in regards to planning.

Mr. Brett stated that he opposed the motion because the Senate APBC already has this mandate. Mr. Traves stated that Senate had an existing committee structure that regularly reviews proposals for change coming from academic units after due process at that level. He wondered how an ad *hoc* committee would affect existing structure. Mr. Cox asked if Senate could become actively involved in a process that was ongoing and involved other parties. He reminded Senate of public expectations for a restructuring of higher education, and expressed concern about the end result if the current process were derailed.

Mr. Lee also did not support the motion; he spoke to the level of involvement that was appropriate of Senate, favouring input to the large scale decisions, such as whether or not to offer a given program. He expected openness from Senate officers and committees, but believed that Senators felt under-informed. He worried that a plan might come forward that Senate could not support. Mr. Birdsall, also not supporting the motion, said that Senate needed to get involved soon in this fast-moving process; non-teaching and teaching units were being considered separately and at different speeds. Libraries and the Registrar's Office were non-teaching units, but were of concern to Senate. He told Senate that consultation in his (non-teaching) unit was constrained by the confidentiality required in that part of the feasibility exercise.

The question was called and was **lost**.

Mr. Brett moved, seconded by Mr. Hartzman:

That an active role in planning for a Consortium of Metro Universities be played by the Senate APBC.

Mr. Cox expressed his belief that further procedural discussions reduced the credibility of Senate. Ms. Kay Raining-Bird recorded her dismay that some previous debate implied that Senate inclusion in the process was an attempt to stall the process, or was needed as a sort of watchdog. Mr. Maloney said SAPBC should perform this function regardless of the motion.

The question was called.

Mr. Traves suggested that he and the Chair of Senate should meet to work out an agreeable plan for Senate involvement, with full acknowledgement of sentiments

expressed in the debate. As a result, issues would be properly assigned to appropriate committees and the role of Senate would be respected.

The motion was defeated, eleven votes in favour, nineteen opposed.

95:138.

Call for Honorary Degree Nominations

Ms. Conrod reminded Senators to submit Honorary Degree nominations to the Senate Secretary by early December.

95:139.

Report of the President

Mr. Traves voiced his appreciation and respect for the desire Senate expressed to be involved in the Consortium feasibility process. He expressed regret that some Senators were feeling under-informed, and promised to do what he could with the other six university presidents to address specific concerns.

Mr. Traves described the feasibility exercise undertaken by teaching units of the Metro area Universities. The exercise was based on the assumption that all existing programs would continue, and academic staff reductions would be by attrition only. Directors of academic programs were asked to clarify the financial and academic implications of this scenario, and provide a qualitative assessment of the effects (or harm) that would result. The next step was to consider how some of the harm could be offset by working in concert or cooperation with other Metro Universities. The process involved, in many cases, consultations between departmental units and Deans or Directors. The process also was meant to identify barriers to action. Mr. Traves urged senators with questions about specific programs to consult the appropriate Dean or Director.

Mr. Traves reported that the feasibility exercise would come to a head by the end of the month for both the teaching and non-teaching sections, and result in a range of solutions with dollar values. The group of Metro University presidents would then have to decide if the result was acceptable collectively and to individual communities. A plan that could not be supported by a given institution would not be feasible. Mr. Traves said that he hoped that the constraints on the teaching unit exercise - attrition, continuation of degree programs - would result in outcomes that provided as little disruption as possible to the academic community.

At the same time, he said, funding targets must be met.

Mr. Traves reiterated that any process would be predicated on input from those

directly involved in the given areas, and respect for existing decision-making mechanisms.

Mr. Cox raised concerns about comparable tuition levels at different institutions in an environment of shared classes; Mr. Traves said that a two-year agreement might be in place to ensure students paid tuition by home institution and not by class location; this agreement would be reconsidered in the future based on experience.

Ms. Sutherland asked about the non-teaching unit review, as it was more secretive than the teaching review and involved external consultants who challenged the participants to make hard decisions. She wondered why the teaching units were not subjected to this external challenge as well.

Mr. Traves acknowledged that significant academic support units were involved in the non-teaching review. Among the metro area university presidents, there seemed to be agreement that amalgamation of teaching units was not acceptable, but considerable consolidation or amalgamation of non-teaching units was acceptable. Thus, two distinct processes were created.

Mr. Traves reviewed the process established for the non-teaching units, and the role of the consultants in challenging what were perhaps conservative biases. He emphasized that confidentiality was deemed desirable since the plans were speculative. The university community would have to address the level of services needed.

Since budget cuts were needed, cuts could be made in teaching or non-teaching elements; the trade-off will have to be weighed. As a result, partial reports were considered less useful; both teaching and non-teaching proposals must be viewed together.

Mr. Siddiq asked if the consortium model would work in the face of deep funding cuts (30 - 40%). Mr. Traves replied that he believed not, but that the province supported cooperation and had been made aware that, if pressed too hard on the funding question, the consortium would not succeed.

Mr. Andrews addressed the level of federal transfers to Nova Scotia (including equalization payments, but excluding tax points) which did not show large declines. He also asked if negotiations had been started to request direct federal transfers to universities or groups of universities for areas such as indirect costs of research support, including libraries.

Mr. Traves indicated that the universities' discussions with provincial Ministers of Education and Finance led them to the understanding that the province itself was unsure about the level and direction of future federal funding, but that the universities were to plan for funding reductions.

Mr. Andrews expressed his belief that Senate expected that the APBC would have a major role in the process as it unfolds. The Chair indicated that he shared that understanding.

95:140.

Adjournment

Upon motion (Rosson/Ricketts) Senate adjourned at 12:02 p.m.

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY
MINUTES
OF
SENATE MEETING

SENATE met in regular session on Monday, 23 October 1995 at 4:00 p.m. in the University Hall, Macdonald Building.

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

Andrews, Archibald, Bleasdale, Brett, Cameron, Camfield, Campbell, Conrod (Secretary *pro tem*), Crowell, Cummings, Dickson, Doolittle, Egan, Farmer, Fraser, Hartzman (4:40 p.m.), Hobson, Hooper, Kay-Raining Bird, Klein, Lovely, Lydon, MacDonald, MacInnis, Marble, McIntyre, Pacey, Pereira, Ricketts, Rosson, Ruedy, Russell, Sherwin, Sutherland, Tatton, Taylor, Traves, Wrixon.

Observer: A. Wainwright

Regrets: Binkley, Birdsall, Cox, Haley, Kenny, Lee, Moore, Ruddick, Shafai, Siddiq, Starnes.

95:138.

Call to Order

The Chair called the meeting to order and welcomed and congratulated Mr. Campbell and Mr. Crowell as newly-elected student senators. Their election brought the total number of senators to 56, so the quorum was now 29 members.

95:139.

a) Minutes of Previous Meeting

Ms. McIntyre asked that the improper designation of the Bachelor of Science (Nursing) degree in 95:131 be corrected.

With this amendment, a motion to approve the minutes (Lovely/McIntyre) was passed.

b) Matters Arising

With reference to the question previously raised by Mr. Starnes, Mr. Stuttard reported that the e-mail distribution list for Senate minutes was accurate, it contained a few more

e-mail addresses than senators because certain administrative addresses were included for senators' convenience. Another e-mail list of over 100 addresses exists for information distributed to a broader group of people; very limited duplication in the two lists may have prompted Mr. Starnes' query.

Ms. Hobson gave statistics on faculty complement as requested by Mr. Andrews: The complement in 1993/94 was 982.73 (as of October 31) of which 58.85 positions were vacant; for 1994/95, there were 944.41 positions of which 60 were vacant. So the notional complement fell from 982.73 to 944.41, but the actual number of filled complement positions went from 923.88 to 884.41. Statistics given to Macleans showed the total number of full-time faculty as 846, professorial ranks only, at the fall count date for Statistics Canada. That figure was the same for 1993/94 and 1994/95.

95:140.

Steering Committee

On behalf of the Senate Steering Committee, the Chair reported for information only that an *ad hoc* committee has been established to examine the Faculty of Medicine's proposal for a new category of appointments in Clinical Medicine. The Committee consists of Alan Andrews (Theatre), Carol Camfield (Paediatrics), and John Connolly (Psychology & Psychiatry). The reporting deadline is 30 November 1995, with the suggestion that a 9 November report, if possible, would be gratefully received.

Mr. Ruedy expressed to Senate his Faculty's wish for an expeditious Senate review of this matter.

Mr. Stuttard also informed senators that annual reports of various Centres and Institutes were available in the Senate Office.

95:141.

Nominations from Senate Committee on Committees

Mr. Boran reported that the following individuals had agreed to let their names stand for nomination to serve on the indicated committees:

Senate Computing & Information Technology Planning Committee

Elizabeth Sutherland (1996)

Senate Committee on Instructional Development

Tim Lee (1996)

Following the requisite three calls for further nominations, the individuals named were declared elected.

9:142.

Panel of Student Discipline Officers

Ms. Conrod, as secretary pro tem, moved

***that on the recommendation of the Faculty of Law,
Senate appoints Innis Christie, Michael Deturbide
and Elaine Gibson as Student Discipline Officers.***

The motion carried.

95:143.

Report of the President

Mr. Traves expressed his appreciation to the members of Senate and the general academic community who were present at the Fall Convocation which included the ceremonial Installation of the President. He also commented favourably on the inauguration of the Wickwire Field, which passed the rain test with flying colours. Mr. Traves then addressed and updated various issues as outlined in his written report (appended); he noted that Metro University Presidents had met with Coopers and Lybrand representatives on October 18th to receive their report, and the Presidents were scheduled to meet again on October 24th to discuss that report.

95:144.

Question Period

Mr. Dickson asked for an update on the status of the "Scholarly Integrity" document, required by the major research funding agencies. Mr. Stuttard replied that, after being prepared by Brian Crocker (University Legal Counsel) with input from Mr. Dickson and Mr. Fournier, the document was reviewed by the DFA Professional Officer. The document and review notes were now back in Mr. Crocker's hands. A revised version is expected to emerge in the near future.

95:145.

Senate Academic Priorities and Budget Committee

(a) On behalf of SAPBC (Mr. Stuttard), it was moved

**that the Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Program should
continue as a regular graduate program.**

The motion carried.

(b) At its meeting on October 16, 1995, SAPBC agreed to inform Senate:

that the B.Sc.(N) program has been expanded to accommodate students at the Yarmouth Hospital (the Yarmouth Collaborative Nursing Program), and that credit for satisfactory completion of specified perinatal education classes (the Perinatal Education Partnership Project) can now be used by post-RN (diploma qualified) students in their B.Sc.(N) degree program.
(refer to SAPBC 95:22)

95:146.

Senate Committee on Academic Administration

Mr. Stuttard reported that there has been a motion from SCAA:

that the revised grading practices policy be approved.

Mr. Andrews asked if faculty members had been consulted. Ms. McIntyre, speaking as an SCAA member, indicated that this policy represented the last three pages of a broader grades review document that was circulated twice to Faculties. The first portion of the document was approved at an earlier Senate meeting. Mr. Egan reminded senators to view the two as a whole.

Mr. Andrews asked what force the document would have if approved by Senate, and whether it could be used as a basis for student appeals of grades. After brief discussion, senators agreed that it could. Mr. Egan noted that only the descriptors of two letter grades were modified from the document previously approved by Senate. Mr. Cameron indicated that all faculty members would have to be made aware of the definitions and their implications, especially the need for consistency between comments made by professors about a student's work and the grade given for that work.

The motion carried.

95:147.

Other Business

Mr. Wainwright, recognized from the floor, asked if the basis for the Metro Universities Business Plan had progressed beyond the 'attrition and non-replacement' scenario to encompass non-renewal of limited term instructors, or elimination of part-time faculty. Mr. Traves replied that the University as yet had no knowledge of the budget cut for this year, but was gathering information regarding a variety of options. The University would likely suffer drastic cuts; creativity and flexibility would be needed; academic integrity would have to be addressed in conjunction with financial concerns. However, no budget information had yet been received and no decisions on staffing have/had been made.

Mr. Stuttard added that no plan for non-renewal of contract instructors or elimination of part-time faculty had been discussed at any meetings he had attended (as Chair of Senate).

Mr. Wainwright asked for assurance that the fundamental basis of the Business Plan (attrition and non-replacement) would not change prior to presentation to the Minister of Education, without consultation. Mr. Traves agreed.

In his role as one of two Senate representatives on the Board of Governors, Mr. Lovely reported on the October 17th meeting which approved the BAC7 report (student assistance, and differential fee policies), and the Residency Program in Emergency Medicine.

Mr. Lydon wished to record a formal apology from the Dalhousie Student Union to Mr. W.R.S. Sutherland in the Department of Mathematics, who was erroneously reported as teaching Math 1110A in the course-evaluation booklet published by the DSU. Mr. Sutherland had informed the DSU VP (Academic) of the error prior to publication, but the error was not corrected before new DSU officers took office; the DSU has made appropriate structural changes to their process to ensure the error does not happen again; and sincerely regrets the error.

95:148.

Adjournment

There being no further business, Senate adjourned at 4:59 p.m.

Secretary

Chair