

Item: Senate Minutes, September 1984
Call Number: UA-5, Accession 2007-039, Box 6

Additional Notes:

This document is a compilation of Senate minutes, staff matters and miscellaneous documents for September 1984. 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 in the Board and Senate Room on Monday, 10 September 1984 at 4:00 P.M.

Present with Mr. W.E. Jones in the chair were the following:

Andrews, Bakvis, Belzer, Bennett, Betts, Birkett, Bishop, Bradfield, Braybrooke, Brookbank, Cameron D.M., Caty, Chaytor, Cromwell, Cross, Cunningham, Duff, Egan, Evans, Fraser P., Friedenberg, Gibbling, Gigeroff, Hall B.K., Hennen, Holloway, Horrocks, Josenhans, Klein, Lee J., Lewis, MacKay W.A., Maloney, Manning, Martin, Mayer, McCann, McFarlane, Misick, Morrison, O'Brien D.W.P., O'Shea, Ozier, Paquet, Pereira, Rodger, Ruf, Semple, Shaw L.R., Sherwin, Sinclair, Sprott, Stairs, Stewart, Stern, Stovel, Stuttard, Thiessen, Tingley, Treves-Gold, Wall, Waterson, Welch, Wien, Wood, Young, Zatzman, Zinck.

Regrets: Badley, Ettliger, Fulton, Gold, Jones J.V., Laidlaw, MacLeod, Mezei, Murphy, Yung.

84:77. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting of 13 August 1984 were approved upon motion, with one correction noted by the Secretary, namely, that the name "Misick" replace "Cunningham" on page 6, item 84:74, line 5.

84:78. New Members of Senate

The Chairperson welcomed the following new members to Senate by virtue of promotion to the rank of full professor:

John Phillips
George Konok
Bernard Badley
Brian M.D. Chandler
Alan MacLeod
Meng Hee Tan
Christopher Williams
Daniel A. Gillis
David A. Murphy
Stevens T. Norvell

84:79. Question Period

Ms. Allen, referring to a recent issue of the Gazette, asked the President whether he was aware of comments made by Mr. McInnes revealing his ignorance of university finances. She wondered how widespread this problem was among Board members. President MacKay noted that this individual was no longer a member of the Board of Governors. He was certain that some other Board members, like some members of Senate, might not be familiar with the details of the financial situation. He added that some Board members, including the individual in question, had not attended the special "orientation" or "updating" meeting last spring.

Mr. Rodger queried whether the university would close on 14 September 1984 in anticipation of the extensive "crush" of vehicles and people during the Papal visit, to which the President replied that although some classes were suspended, there were no plans to close the university. Mr. Rodger requested confirmation or otherwise of the rumour that the academic vice-presidents in Nova Scotia would be examining the issue of programme review. Mr. Sinclair stated that this was indeed true, and the mandate had evolved from the Royal Commission on Post-Secondary Education's questions about duplication and redundancy. The academic vice-presidents would be suggesting a process by which programmes could be reviewed. This document, when complete, could be circulated to members. The President added that only some vice-presidents would be involved in discussion of mechanisms for programme review.

Mr. Bradfield recorded his concern that he had not yet received information requested at an earlier meeting about the date of receipt of the first million dollars in the Fund Campaign.

Mr. Gigeroff raised again his question about forthcoming equalization payments. The President clarified that 1.35 million dollars was expected, much of which was restricted for expansion in Dentistry. This did increase the funding modestly but less than anticipated. Vice-President Shaw supplemented these comments by reporting that the total operating assistance almost met original budget figures. However, assistance to Medicine and Dentistry was less than hoped for and the major problem was the complete absence of non-space operating capital for this year.

84:80. Reports and Recommendations -- Committees of Senate

A. Academic Planning Committee

1. Academic Planning Process

The Chairperson reported on behalf of the APC. He indicated that the Academic Planning Committee has sought feedback from a number of sources, and in particular, comments from the Dalhousie Student Union and the Dalhousie Faculty Association. The APC received feedback from the students and understood that the DFA would have their

comments available shortly. At its last meeting, the APC discussed the document and decided that there were two areas that needed to be addressed urgently:

- (1) the definition of University Goals;
- (2) the process of reviews and how they will fit in with the overall process of academic planning.

As a result two APC sub-committees have been struck:

- (1) Sub-Committee on University Goals and Objectives
- (2) Sub-Committee on the Programme Review Process

The sub-committee which drafted the document has been asked to begin revision in light of the feedback which has already been received and to prepare a shorter document containing the major substance of the proposals and process. A fourth subcommittee of the APC was also established to begin to formulate the criteria and process for decisions regarding redistribution monies. It was felt that this information would fit in with the process of Academic Planning and would be required for the 1985-86 budget since a redistribution fund has been recommended for that budget. He asked that members of Senate make their concerns known to the committees.

The Chairperson noted that the timetable in the original document no longer applied in response to Mr. McCann's inquiry as to whether the timetable was being adhered to. He concluded by indicating that this was a matter of report and that individuals could relay their comments to the chairperson of the sub-committees identified.

B. Committee on Academic Administration

1. Student Grievance re: Awarding of Degree

On behalf of the CAA, Mr. Sinclair moved, seconded by Mr. Gigeroff

that Senate rescind the B.Sc. degree and award a B.A. degree to Allison Dysart.

Mr. Sinclair, responding to the question raised by Ms. Allen, indicated that the general issue would be discussed by the Registrar and himself. The Registrar provided "historical" details about the specific case, further to Mr. Rodger's question.

The motion carried.

C. Steering Committee

1. Conflict of Interest Ruling

Senate, at its 4 May meeting, referred the question of who should be barred from voting at Senate meetings in cases of academic appeals to the Steering Committee. The committee discussed the matter with the Legal Advisor to the President and received, at its request, correspondence dated 8 August 1984 from Brian Crocker, labelled "Student Appeals to Senate - Eligibility to Vote". The excerpt, precirculated to Senate members, was, in the committee's view, the desirable procedure to be followed. It was moved and seconded (MacKay/Josenhans)

that Senate accept this excerpt as the ruling on the "conflict of interest" question to be followed in future cases.

Two friendly amendments were suggested, one by Mr. Rodger,

that the motion only refer to "In the case of an academic appeal this would include, at a minimum, the individual Faculty member whose mark is being appealed, any departmental or Faculty committee member who has previously cast a vote with respect to the student's appeal and members of the Senate Academic Appeals Committee that have previously heard the appeal. Additionally, I think it would be useful for the Secretary of Senate to record the names of those persons who were presented the meeting at which the student appeal was being considered but did not vote. Such a procedure would be demonstrable evidence that the decision of Senate was reached free of bias and that there existed no reasonable ground to believe that bias might have influenced the decision".

The second friendly amendment (recommended by Ms. Waterson), accepted, was

that the word "mark" in the first sentence be changed to "action"

Upon vote, the motion **carried**.

2. Policy Regarding Academic Appointments

Upon motion (MacKay/Ozier) it was agreed

that Senate confirms that the principle of academic freedom dictates

unanimity of opinion shall not be a criterion in consideration for appointment to Dalhousie University.

D. Academic Appeals Committee

1. Case of Thompson et al (and the MSSW)

The Chairman reminded members that it was not proper for Senate to rehear a case, and that the purpose was to ratify or not ratify the recommendations of a hearing panel. If Senate did not ratify the recommendations, then the case should be referred back to the same hearing panel for a rehearing or another hearing panel should be struck. Mr. Evans, chairperson of the hearing panel which considered this case, referred members to the precirculated document and to the summary of recommendations on page 14, which had been arrived at after referral to written submissions and 1 1/2 days of hearing. It was agreed that Senate should consider each recommendation separately.

It was moved and seconded (Evans/Gigeroff)

that Senate should proceed immediately to examine by whatever means it considers appropriate General Faculty Regulations, and in particular to examine provisions dealing with "Methods of Assessment", with a view to clarifying their impact for the general benefit of the University community. Student representatives should be involved in the process.

Mr. Rodger concurred with Mr. Evans' suggestion that the CAA was the appropriate committee to undertake this task and recommended that the faculties be contacted to determine how widespread these problems were. Ms. Cummings indicated that she found the recommendations in the report acceptable but wished the CAA to address several policy issues.

(1) A definition of method of assessment is required;

(2) There is a need to identify specifically what is governed by Regulation 2.3 and to identify disclaimers.

She referred the CAA to the position paper which she had developed earlier. Mr. Andrews suggested that the CAA also consider whether it was desirable to have a general university or Faculty specific regulation.

The motion **carried**.

The following members did not vote: Messrs. Evans, Horrocks, Gigeroff, Tingley, Cromwell and Ms. Cummings.

Upon motion (Evans/Gigeroff) it was **agreed**

that the appeal of the B.S.W. students (Coombes, Fearon, Kell, Nyer, Osborne, Roberts, Stewart, Thompson) with respect to B.S.W. course 4010R in the 1982-83 academic year be dismissed.

Messrs. Evans, Horrocks, Gigeroff, Tingley, Cromwell, Martin and Ms. Cummings did not vote.

It was moved and seconded (Evans/Gigeroff)

that the grade of Greg Lambert in B.S.W. course 4010R in the 1982-83 academic year be changed from a D to a C and that this change be recorded on his official transcript.

Ms. Cummings believed that the substance was satisfactory but was very concerned that there were procedural problems in Senate changing a grade. She thought that Senate could take permissive, not prescriptive, action and permit a waiver, in this instance, of the regulation that a grade not be changed. Mr. Betts warned that Senate should not set a precedent of changing grades and should make it possible for Ms. Cummings to institute a change in grade or ask the CAA to consider the general implications of this recommendation. Mr. Gigeroff and Mr. Friedenberg could foresee a situation, when, unlike this case, the professor would not agree with a request to change a grade. Mr. Friedenberg added that he interpreted this situation as Senate ratifying a recommendation of its committee, not changing a grade. Ms Cummings suggested that the circumstances should be clarified under which Senate could reasonably undertake changing of a grade without contravening existing policy. Mr. Evans noted that the hearing panel had heard the specific case, which it is empowered to do by Senate, and had provided detailed rationale for this recommendation, which arose from a simple question of enforcement of a penalty. The panel had taken into account these general matters of concern, but in this particular case felt there was no other alternative.

It was moved and seconded (Betts/Bennett)

that the third recommendation be amended by prefacing it with the words "inasmuch as agreed by the instructor of the course."

Mr. Friedenberg spoke against the amendment, indicating that the report was laboriously and elaborately reasoned, and added that the Senate should assume responsibility for proposing a remedy in such cases.

Ms. Allen was concerned that the amendment Could be interpreted to mean that Senate

had no authority without the approval of the professor concerned. Mr. Martin and Mr. Gigeroff were uncertain whether the amendment was critical and were unsure whether a dangerous precedent would be set. Mr. Wien suggested that the CAA could examine the regulation(s) governing change in grades and query how this could occur through academic grievance.

Mr. Braybrooke proposed that an alternative amendment might be "Without implying any readiness on Senate's part to change grades in other cases."

The Chairman recommended that Recommendation 3 should be considered in the context of the report. The amendment was defeated and the main motion carried.

Messrs. Evans, Horrocks, Duff, Gigeroff, Tingley, Cromwell and Ms. Cummings did not vote.

Ms. Cummings expressed her considerable concerns as an individual professor and wished the CAA to conscientiously examine the general question of academic freedom and the rights of handicapped professors which were raised by such cases.

E. Committee on Committees

1. Election to Senate Committees

Subsequent to three calls for further nominations from the floor, the following individuals were declared elected:

Academic Appeals Committee (Cunningham/Maloney)

Mr. Denis W. Stairs (Political Science)

Ms. Marcia Ozier (Psychology)

Financial Planning Committee (Cunningham/Zinck)

Mr. Peter E. Dresel (Pharmacology)

Security and Parking (Cunningham/Zinck)

Mr. K. W. Renton (Pharmacology)

The Tenure Panel nomination will require approval by the DFA and the President before it is proposed at the next meeting of Senate.

Ms. Sherwin noted that a member of the President's Council was on leave this year and a replacement is required.

84:81. Schedule of Meetings

Upon motion (Gigeroff/McCann) the proposed schedule of meetings 1984-85 was approved. There was some question about whether November 12 was in fact an official holiday.

84:82. Report of the President

The President reported verbally on several recent events, which, he indicated would be relayed later in writing. Reacting to one item mentioned by the President, Ms. Sherwin asked how many students are currently enrolled and how many more were expected. Mr. Tingley replied that specific figures would be available by next week, but that admission to some classes in some departments had been a major problem this year.

84:83. Other Business

(1) The Secretary to the Board of Governors had advised the Secretary of Senate that correspondence classes in the School of Business,(offered in cooperation with the Advanced Management Centre)and the implementation of the programme leading to a Ph.D. in Philosophy were approved by the Board.

(2) The Chairman reported that the President's Office had received notification from Mr. Terry that M.P.H.E.C. approval of the Bachelor of Science with Honours in Microbiology, previously approved by Senate and the Board, was not required ("since the programme represents a subset of an existing programme and requires no additional resources"). He noted that the department was anxious to initiate the programme this fall.

Upon motion (Sinclair/Betts)

it was agreed that implementation of this programme be approved.

Mr. Andrews noted that this item had come to the meeting without prior notice.

(3) After considerable discussion, it was agreed, upon motion,

that in accordance with Collective Agreement 17:16 faculty may cancel or

postpone instruction scheduled for Friday, 14 October 1984.

84-84 Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:55 P.M.