

Item: Senate Minutes, December 2003
Call Number: Senate fonds, UA-5

Additional Notes:

This document is a compilation of Senate minutes, staff matters and miscellaneous documents for December 2003. 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, December 8, 2003, at 4:00 p.m., in the University Hall, MacDonald Building.

Present with Mr. M. El-Hawary in the chair were the following: Barker, Beazley, Ben-Abdullah, Breckenridge, Caley, Campbell, Cercone, Cochrane, Cook, Coughlan, Das Gupta, Earl, Elliott, Finley, Fraser, Grantmyre, Hicks, Huebert, Jost, Kwak, Lahey, Leonard, Macrae, Maes, McGrath, McIntyre, McMullen, McNeil, Neumann, Oppong, Partridge, Pelzer, Phillips, Richard, Satish, Schroeder, Scrimger, Scully, Sommerfeld (recording secretary), Stone, Traves, Wanzel, Wasko, Zalezsak, Zuck.

Regrets: Barnes, Corke, Dunphy, Farrell, Jalilvand, Livingston, Loudon, Parpart, Precious, Pronk, Russell, Stroink, Stuttard, Taheri, Taylor, Whyte

Absent: Carroll, Finbow, Guy, Hamilton, Horackova, MacDonald, Meagher-Stewart, Morgunov, Murphy, Rajora, Rathwell

2003:102

Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was ADOPTED as circulated.

2003:103

Draft Minutes of Previous Meeting

i) Approval

The minutes of the meeting of November 10, 2003 were ADOPTED as circulated.

ii) Matters Arising

There were no matters arising.

2003:104Chair's Remarks

Mr. El-Hawary reported that the Maritime Provinces Higher Education Commission (MPHEC) had approved the Bachelor of Health Sciences in Diagnostic Cytology, Diagnostic Medical Ultrasound, Medical Laboratory Technology, Nuclear Medicine Technology, Radiological Technology, and Respiratory Therapy.

2003:105Question Period

Mr. McGrath stated that at a meeting of other student leaders and the Minister of Education for the Government of Nova Scotia on November 28, 2003, the Minister had indicated that he had entered preliminary discussions with the Council of Nova Scotia University Presidents (CONSUP) about long-term, multi-year funding arrangements and the development of memoranda of understanding (MOU) to achieve that end, noting that Dalhousie University would play a major role in the development of such MOU given that approximately half of the operating funding envelope goes to Dalhousie. Mr. McGrath asked if Mr. Traves would be keeping the maintenance of reasonable tuition levels at the forefront in such discussions MOU. Mr. Traves responded that he would, noting that there was a direct relationship between the level of government funding and the required levels of tuition increases. He added that those discussions had not yet begun.

Mr. Wasko commented that he had been approached by several students recently regarding the inadequacy of study space on campus, particularly late at night, given the increase of student enrollment this year. He noted that there had been a survey of the study space issue, completed in May 2003, that had made several recommendations. He asked what progress had been made on those recommendations as related to the identified inadequacies. Mr. Traves responded that he recalled the report had indicated that there was not a shortage of space but rather inadequate quality of some space in terms of lighting, furniture, and noise. He noted that steps had been taken over the summer to improve the quality of classroom and study space and that the process was an ongoing one. He stated that he would seek further information from the Vice-President of Student Services, Eric McKee, which he would circulate to Senators via memo.

2003:106Senate Academic Priorities and Budget Committee (SAPBC)

- i) Proposed Bachelor of Software Engineering Program

On behalf of SAPBC, Mr. El-Hawary moved:

THAT the Senate approve the proposed program for the establishment of a Bachelor of Software Engineering degree, with the condition that, in accordance with the Library Assessment, the Faculties of Computer Science and Engineering jointly transfer to the Library a total of \$5,500 for additional resources for year one of the program, with a base budget transfer of \$2,500 being implemented for year two and subsequent years.

Mr. El-HAwary invited Mr. Caley, Dean of Engineering, and Mr. Cercone, Dean of the Faculty of Computer Science, to speak to the proposal. Mr. Cercone stated clear support for the proposal stating that it was long overdue. Mr. Caley stated that the program was developed cooperatively within a strong working relationship between the two Faculties.

Ms. McIntyre noted that the program would be seeking accreditation from both professional bodies and questioned if it might not be more wise to seek accreditation from the professional association of the “lead Faculty” with consultation with the other Faculty, given that relationships may not continue to be as harmonious over time as seemed to be now. She noted that several of the logistics of implementation were yet to be determined, such as which convocation would be designated for the graduands of the program. Mr. Caley responded that the program had been developed to meet the accreditation standards of the Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board. Mr. Cercone stated that he anticipated no problem with the accreditation board for Computer Science, stating that there was no “lead Faculty” for the program, but rather all aspects have been developed and would be carried out jointly, adding that students would be expected to be part of both student bodies/societies. Mr. Cercone stated that the immediate priority was to get the academic program in place with the administrative details to be determined as the program evolved.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

- ii) Senate Review of Faculties–Revised Procedures and Revised Terms of Reference

On behalf of SAPBC, Mr. El-Hawary moved:

THAT the Senate approve the Revised Procedures and Terms of Reference for Committees Conducting Senate's Review of Faculties as recommended by the SAPBC December 1, 2003.

Mr. El-Hawary invited Mr. Fraser, Chair of the Sub-Committee to Review the Senate Review of Faculties Procedures and Terms of Reference, to comment. He noted that the Report of that Sub-Committee had been discussed at SAPBC where a few modifications had been made. Mr. Fraser stated that while many of the procedures continued to be satisfactory, areas had been identified where revisions were clearly needed. One issue was

related to improving the timeliness of the process from the beginning of the Review to its conclusions such that the recommendations would still have relevance for the Faculty, and also the length of the cycle for reviews throughout the University. Another issue was related to scope such that key issues would be identified and addressed without duplicating other review processes within the Faculties. Finally, procedures around reporting and follow-up were tightened such that SAPBC would report annually to the Senate on Reviews completed, in-progress or upcoming resulting in Senate having a better overview of the status of the review process within the University. Mr. Fraser added that the SAPBC's Review coincidentally occurred at the same time as a review of procedures by the Atlantic Association of Universities (AAU) and MPHEC. Feedback from those review processes was incorporated into the Sub-Committee's Review.

Mr. Maes asked about Procedure #1 where it stated: "Wherever possible, the schedule of Senate Reviews shall be coordinated with decanal and accreditation reviews", if there was a Schedule of Reviews prepared. Mr. Fraser stated that there was a draft schedule that would be discussed by SAPBC in January, adding that wherever possible the schedule would coincide with the end of the relevant Dean's appointed term. Mr. Schroeder noted in the Schedule as outlined in the Appendix of the Report, that in Year 2, there was a very brief time line specified between the receipt of the external reviewers' report and the Review Committee's final report. Mr. Fraser responded that while the schedule was tight, the principle of having more focussed reviews with adherence to such a time line would produce more concise and relevant reports in a timely manner. Mr. Kwak concurred adding that steps in the review process, such as scheduling site visits, could be done well ahead of the suggested times identified in that Schedule. Mr. Cercone stated agreement with a more focussed, concise approach for producing the reports.

Mr. Traves commented that the issue of quality assurance procedures had arisen on the national university scene as a result of a movement by governments toward globalization and internationalization of study opportunities, such that students going from one country to another, would be assured of consistency in quality. He stated that the AUCC had considered the issue with the result being the adoption of a policy that mirrors the practices of quality assurance within Atlantic Canada, for example, the MPHEC process of reviews of programs. He added that the AUCC had recommended to its member institutions that they move to a national process in which a website would be created and monitored by the AUCC, which would identify the different monitoring approaches used in various provinces or regions throughout Canada, with each institution publishing its own procedures and practices. Mr. Traves suggested that while such an initiative might appear cumbersome, it far outweighed the processes involved in a national review process for example, and at the same time had respect for an autonomous approach by institutions.

Mr. Huebert commented that self-scrutiny was a good thing and strategies to enable the process to be more concise yet maintaining relevance, would be beneficial. He noted that a danger might be that external reviewers might identify what is distinctive of an institution,

and rather than enhance that feature, might encourage change to conform with what other institutions might be doing elsewhere in the country. He suggested that reviews should be cautious of such recommendations. Mr. Fraser re-iterated that while the process incorporated external review, it included significant internal review at several stages, with the point being that it was a review process which belonged to Dalhousie and with the goals and objectives of Dalhousie in mind. Mr. Scully added that there were several stages identified throughout the process where discussion and debate by all parties was expected with the goal of collegial accountability in mind. He suggested that such reviews should be focussed on major issues within a Faculty rather than minor ones. Ms. Stone inquired if the review process at the Faculty level included interviews with such bodies as the Association Board Committee, particularly about matters such as human resource issues. Mr. Fraser responded that while no specific reference was made to the Association Board Committee, there was a process to identify key issues and if deemed appropriate by the Review Committee, consultation with such a body would be arranged.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

iii) Program Proposal Forms–Revised

Mr. El-Hawary stated that at its November 24, 2003, meeting, the SAPBC approved revised procedures and forms for the submission of new, modified and articulated academic program proposals. He noted that the forms were developed to conform with MPHEC's program approval processes, adding that the work was spearheaded by Kim Thomson in the President's Office in cooperation with Vice-President Scully and feedback from Mr. Fraser and Ms. Sommerfeld. Copies of the revised forms would be sent to the Deans and posted on the Senate web page.

2003:107

Senate Committee on Academic Administration (SCAA)

i) Classes Taken on Letter of Permission – Exemption for Faculty of Law

On behalf of SCAA, Mr. El-Hawary moved:

THAT the Senate approve the Faculty of Law's request for an exemption to the January 28, 2003, Recording of Results of Classes Taken on Letter of Permission (Domestic) Policy that results of classes taken on Letters of Permission would be recorded on a Pass/Fail basis.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

ii) Quorum for SCAA Meetings – Revision

On behalf of SCAA, Mr. El-Hawary MOVED:

THAT the Senate approve that in the terms of reference for its Committee on Academic Administration, composition # 4 be amended to read: Quorum for Committee meetings shall be seven members, including at least half of the seven elected faculty members.

As Chair of SCAA, Mr. Scully moved the following friendly amendment:

That the word “seven” be struck from the motion.

Mr. Scully described problems encountered by SCAA because of frequent faculty members' vacancies due to leaves, etc, in achieving a quorum under the current terms of reference which required “four of the seven elected faculty”. For example, this past spring and early fall there were two faculty member vacancies on SCAA with the result that three meetings were not held as the minimum of four faculty members was not available. The SCAA motion that had been considered by its members as a “secure” revision to its Terms of Reference was now seen as “insecure”. To correct this, the proposed amendment to the motion was designed to protect both the overall membership and composition in its meetings in such a way that would enable business to be conducted in a regular manner, and was in keeping with the SCAA’s intent in making the original motion.

Mr. El-Hawary reminded Senators that as the motion to amend the quorum for its meetings represented a proposed amendment to the *Constitutional Provisions Governing the Operations of Senate*, the motion required that two-thirds of members voting must be in favour to adopt the amendment.

The amended motion was **CARRIED**.

iii) Bachelor of Community Design – Hood Colour

On behalf of SCAA, Mr. El-Hawary moved:

THAT the Senate approve the proposed hood colour, green silk with peacock blue corded border, for the Bachelor of Community Design program.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

iv) Academic Dates 2004-2005

On behalf of SCAA, Mr. El-Hawary moved:

THAT in adherent of the Academic Schedule Principles approved by the Senate February 24, 2003, the Senate approve the proposed schedule of academic dates for 2004-2005.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

v) Conversion Scales for Grades Taken on Letter of Permission

Mr. El-Hawary stated that at its November 5, 2003, meeting, the Senate Committee on Academic Administration accepted the August 2003 report and recommendations of its Sub-committee to Review Conversion Scales for Grades Taken on Letter of Permission. A copy of the report was sent to Senators with the agenda for this meeting.

2003:108

Senate Steering Committee (SSC)

i) Panel of Student-Discipline Officers – Revision to Terms of Reference

On behalf of Senate Steering Committee, Mr. El-Hawary moved:

THAT the Senate approve that in the Panel of Student-Discipline Officers' Terms of Reference, under Composition #1, the words "when possible" be inserted in front of the words "at least one of whom shall be female".

Ms. Sommerfeld summarized the background to this revision as based on issues arising from the resources in the Faculty of Law given that as a smaller Faculty, it must juggle demands for gender-balance in Committee memberships with the realities of the limited number of female faculty available.

Ms. Stone suggested that rather than use the words, "when possible", that perhaps the usual phrase in such instances would be "normally". She acknowledged that there was often a tendency for female faculty members to become overloaded in attempts to achieve gender-balance. Mr. Lahey, as a member of the Panel of Student-Discipline Officers as well as member of the Faculty of Law, agreed that the word "normally" was appropriate to the intent.

Ms. Stone moved, seconded by Mr. Lahey the following amendment:

That the word “normally” replace the words “when possible”.

Ms. Macrae asked if the SSC had discussed changing the name of the Panel of Student Discipline Officers. She stated that she had participated in discussions at the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Plagiarism, for example, where it was pointed out that the matter of the Panel’s name might be misleading to faculty in that it did not clearly reflect that the Panel serves as a resource to faculty for advice on disciplinary matters. Ms. Sommerfeld responded that a change of name had not been part of the SSC’s discussion.

The amendment to the motion was **CARRIED**.

The amended motion was **CARRIED**.

ii) Meeting Time for October and May Senate Meetings

Mr. El-Hawary stated that on receipt of information from the Registrar, the Senate Steering Committee had agreed that the current practice of holding the October and May Senate meetings for approval of the list of graduands on the Thursday preceding the Thanksgiving and Victoria Day holidays, in the time period 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon, would continue.

Mr. Scully suggested that, from the excerpt of the SSC meeting of November 20, 2003, circulated with the agenda, it would have been possible to change the October meeting to the regular Senate meeting time of 4:00 p.m., thus enfranchising those Senators who teach classes in the morning hours. Mr. Traves responded that given that the time was so short for the Registrar’s Office between Senate approval of graduands and preparing details required for the convocation ceremony, that the morning time served to enable the process to proceed more efficiently from the perspective of the Registrar’s Office than would be the case if the meeting were held at 4:00 p.m. Mr. Traves added that the necessity of the approval process by Senate had been discussed at that SSC meeting and the matter would be pursued at a future SSC meeting.

iii) Annual Approval of “Schedule of Meetings for Senate, Standing Committees of Senate and Board of Governors”

Mr. El-Hawary informed Senate that at its November 20, 2003, meeting, the Senate Steering Committee considered Senate's practice of approving each year, usually in August or September, the "Schedule of Meetings for Senate and its Standing Committees". Committee members agreed that the traditional "Schedule of Meetings for Senate and its Standing Committees would continue to be prepared and distributed, but that it was not required to have the Schedule officially approved by the Senate on a yearly basis.

2003:109

Nominations to the University Tenure and Promotions Panel

On behalf of the Senate Nominating Committee, Mr. El-Hawary moved:

THAT the following people who have received the requisite approval of the President and the Dalhousie Faculty Associated be appointed to serve on the University Tenure and Promotions Panel, each for the term January 2004 to June 30, 2006: Stephen Parcell, Faculty of Architecture & Planning; Peter Gregson, Faculty of Engineering; Julio Militzer, Faculty of Engineering, Bruce Archibald, Faculty of Law, William Baldrige, Faculty of Medicine; and Barry Ruddick, Faculty of Science, who completed a three-year term June 30, 2003.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

2003:110

President's Report

Mr. Traves reported that, as a result of the latest distribution of Canada Research Chairs, Dalhousie had gained an additional two Chairs, one in the SHHRC category and one in the NSERC category, for a total of 49 Chairs. He noted that the number had grown from an original 43 Chairs and was a positive reflection of the research productivity of the University vis-a-vis other universities in Canada, as the number of Chairs overall was a fixed number.

Mr. Traves stated that in the aftermath of Hurricane Juan and its impact on the University, he had solicited feedback from a variety of academic and administrative sources in terms of preparedness of the University to deal with such emergencies. As a result, a Task Force had been struck to review the University's Emergency Response Policies, with the Committee being chaired by Dr. Bill Louch, Director of Environmental Health and Safety, and membership being representative of the University at large. He stated that the Report of the Task Force would be broadly circulated when available.

Mr. Traves announced that Dalhousie would be hosting an "Open House", noting that it had been several years since a University-wide open house had been held. He described it as an opportunity to showcase many of the activities at the University and hopefully would have a positive impact on community relations and student recruitment, for example. The dates would likely be a Friday-Saturday in late September or early October 2004. He stated that the coordinator of the event would be selected in the near future, noting that

there would be significant organizational work involved.

Mr. Traves reminded Senators that the Report XXVIII of the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) had been released recently, noting that the salient points were continued emphases on the priorities established in the BAC Report XXVII and the President's Strategic Focus (January 27, 2003) document. He stated that there would be continued substantial negotiations with the provincial government in terms of long-term funding support for universities.

Mr. Traves expressed his thanks to all for another successful academic term and extended his best wishes for the holiday season and new year.

2003:111

Other Business

Mr. El-Hawary stated that as Ms. Minnie Clements, Senate Office Manager, would be leaving for early retirement in December, a celebration of her service to the Senate would be held in January or February 2004 depending on her availability.

2003:112

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.