

Item: Senate Minutes, July 1996  
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 July 1996. 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 Monday, 08 July 1996 at 3:00 p.m. in the University Hall, Macdonald Building.

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

Apostle, Birdsall, Bleasdale, Bradfield, Camfield, Clark, Conrod, Dickson, Doolittle, Farmer, Fraser, Hartzman, Hobson, Hooper, Klein, Lee, Lydon, MacDonald, MacInnis, MacKay, McIntyre, Morrissey, Oore, Ricketts, Rosson, Russell, Scassa, Siddiq, Sutherland, Taylor, Traves, White, Wrixon, Yabsley.

Regrets: Andrews, Archibald, Brett, Egan, Kay Raining-Bird, Kiang, Kimmins, Lovely, Maloney, Moore, Morehouse, Patriquin, Pereira, Ruedy, Starnes, Tatton

**96:077**

**Call to Order and Welcome of New Members**

Mr. Stuttard called the meeting to order and welcomed the new members of Senate.

**96:078**

**Adoption of Agenda**

The Agenda was adopted as circulated.

**96:079**

**Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting**

Mr. Stuttard noted three errors in the draft minutes of June 24: the meeting day was Monday, not Thursday; in **96:067**, the date should be "16 May" rather than "10 June"; and in **96:072**, paragraph 2, line 2, "four recommendations" should read "several principles". In addition, Mr. Rosson corrected **96:071**, "Faculty of Management Appeals Procedures" to read "Faculty of Management Undergraduate Appeals Procedures", and Mr. Taylor requested another amendment in **96:072** to delete the words "meaning program elimination" from the first sentence of the final paragraph on page 4. With these amendments, the Minutes of the 24 June meeting were then approved (Camfield/Clark).

**96:080**

**Comments from the Chair**

Mr. Stuttard used a prepared text to address the meeting. He noted that when the "old" Senate voted to reform itself, it concentrated on approving new rules for membership, and had now adopted the principal features of its constitution in a consolidated document, including rules of procedure that specify a quorum of 50% +1. The quorum rule brings with it an unaccustomed Senate responsibility; that is, the responsibility of all members to attend Senate meetings and to participate in its business, and to extend to fellow members the courtesy of arriving on time or giving regrets in advance for unavoidable absences.

Mr. Stuttard also observed that University governance involves rules, regulations, and procedures for students and faculty; and when Senate spends time on these matters, no one should be surprised. However, some tasks bequeathed by the "old" Senate concerned questions of academic priorities; achievement standards for students; performance standards for faculty members; and procedures for appointment and reappointment of senior academic administrators. Should Senate set any or all of these, or should it continue to delegate most of these tasks to its Faculties? Should Faculties, themselves creatures of the Senate, continue to determine their own priorities and standards, but within general parameters set by Senate and approved by the Board of Governors? We are currently grappling with the question of academic priority setting, and a proposal to begin to address the faculty standards question via a review of Senate's regulations concerning appointments, tenure and promotion was included on the current agenda.

Finally, he reminded Senators that any member of Senate is free to raise issues, propose motions, lobby for specific actions, and all are encouraged to do so; he noted that specific proposals are much more productive than generalized complaints about Senate's supposed inactivity.

**96:081**

**Senate Standing Committees: Terms of Reference for the Library Committee, Discipline Committee, Committee on Committees and Committee on Academic Administration**

Ms. Conrod took the Chair for this item. She said that members would be asked to consider changes to the terms of reference of four Senate Committees in turn, and reminded members that motions to adopt the proposed changes required a two-thirds majority to pass; motions to amend any of the main motions required a simple majority to pass.

Senate Library Committee

On behalf of the Steering Committee, Mr. Stuttard moved:

**That amendments to the terms of reference of the Senate Library Committee as shown on the 27 June 1966 draft terms of reference be adopted.**

Mr. Stuttard referred to an excerpt from the Senate Library Committee's 1995-96 Annual Report which included a motion to change the membership composition of the Committee. Mr. Hartzman asked why "actively" had been struck from before "monitor" in the second item under Functions; his motion to restore the deleted adverb was not seconded.

The question was then called, and the motion **CARRIED** without dissent.

### Senate Discipline Committee

On behalf of the Steering Committee, Mr. Stuttard moved:

**That amendments to the terms of reference of the Senate Discipline Committee as shown on the 27 June 1996 draft terms of reference be adopted.**

Mr. Stuttard drew attention to the provision for an increase in the membership of the Committee which, without changing the composition of a panel hearing an individual case, would allow greater flexibility and accommodate the increased workload expected from dealing with breaches of the Code of Student Conduct. Further, he noted the elimination under Procedures (2), on page 7, of private adjudication of alleged first offences of plagiarism. Mr. Lydon, speaking from his own three years experience as a member of the Committee, supported the increase in membership as necessary to alleviate past difficulties in securing attendance of sufficient members for meetings.

Concerning the composition of a panel, Mr. Lydon moved, seconded by Ms. McIntyre, that "at least" be deleted from Item 4 under Functions. This amendment was **CARRIED**.

Ms. McIntyre expressed concern over the lingering lack of precision in important areas of the proposed terms of reference, citing in particular the need for a clear definition of "due notice" and a sharper delineation of the time frame for the processes outlined. She was also troubled by the lack of precise guidelines for the Committee's procedures, and the abbreviated nature of the process by which the Committee dealt with the question of procedures at the commencement of its hearings. Could the Committee have more guidance as to appropriate procedures which would be in line with Senate regulations? Ms. McIntyre also asked, and the meeting agreed, that "unfitness" be changed to "unsuitability" on page 2. Mr. Stuttard

noted that the procedures were based on the principles of natural justice. He acknowledged the desirability of greater precision in the terms of reference, and encouraged members to bring further specific amendments to future meetings. However, he pleaded with this meeting to adopt the changes in the terms of reference as presented to enable an enlarged committee to handle cases more effectively immediately.

Mr. Farmer supported Ms. McIntyre's points, in particular the need to spell out timelines. Ms. McIntyre acknowledged the pressing need for enlarged membership of the Committee, and suggested Senate adopt a motion approving the change in membership. Mr. Klein supported the motion to adopt the amended terms of reference now, and agreed that further modifications could be proposed at subsequent meetings.

Ms. Scassa suggested that under Functions, #6, another word be substituted for "offender", on the principle of "innocent until proven guilty", and on the assumption that a student might be exonerated. After some discussion, the word "student" was substituted for "offender" as a friendly amendment.

Mr. Taylor sought, and was given confirmation that future proposed changes would also require a two-thirds majority for adoption.

The question was called and the amended motion **CARRIED**.

Mr. Stuttard asked members to e-mail suggestions for further changes.

#### Senate Committee on Academic Administration

On behalf of the Steering Committee, Mr. Stuttard moved:

**That amendments to the terms of reference of the Senate Committee on Academic Administration as shown on the 27 June 1996 draft terms of reference be adopted.**

Mr. Stuttard highlighted here the provision for a change in quorum from 50% + 1 to 40%.

The question was called and the motion **CARRIED**.

#### Senate Committee on Committees

On behalf of the Steering Committee, Mr. Stuttard moved:

**That amendments to the terms of reference of the Senate Committee on Committees as shown on the 27 June 1996 draft terms of reference be adopted.**

Mr. Stuttard pointed out that Items #5 through #8 of the Procedures for Nominations reflected the practice of the committee, but previously had not been incorporated in the terms of reference. With apologies to those individuals who would have to make innumerable changes to multiple documents, Mr. Ricketts suggested that the name of the Committee on Committees be changed to the Nominating Committee to more accurately reflect the Committee's function and to remove a source of amusement for some of our colleagues elsewhere.

The motion (Ricketts/Farmer), that the Committee on Committees be renamed the Nominating Committee, **CARRIED**.

Mr. Klein asked whether the timing in #9 under Procedures for Nominations was unnecessarily restrictive. He was assured it was not.

The question was called, and the main motion, with amendment, was **CARRIED**.

**96:082**

**Senate Regulations Concerning Appointments, Tenure and Promotions: *ad hoc* Committee**

Mr. Stuttard resumed the chair and addressed the Steering Committee's proposals for a six-member ad-hoc Committee to review the Senate Regulations concerning Appointments, Tenure and Promotion (1987, Amended 1988). The proposed Committee would be chaired by the Vice-President (Academic and Research) with Mary Brooks (Management); Patricia DeMeo (French); Ray Klein (Psychology); David Yung (Pharmacy); and the Chair of Senate as members. In addition Brian Crocker, University Legal Counsel, and a DFA representative would attend to give advice. The ad-hoc Committee would report to Steering and, in due course, the Steering Committee would bring specific recommendations to Senate for adoption.

On behalf of the Steering Committee Mr. Stuttard moved:

**That Senate agrees with the Steering Committee's proposal to form an ad-hoc Committee to review Senate's Regulations concerning Appointments, Tenure and Promotion.**

Mr. Stuttard expressed the hope that the review process would be completed during this session, and ideally within nine months, before we take on three additional Faculties

with the TUNS merger. Ms. McIntyre thought this initiative was a good idea, but wondered about the absence of a serving Academic Administrator and recommended that someone now serving as an Academic Administrator be added to the Committee in order to provide an independent perspective. Mr. Stuttard pointed out that the Chair of the Committee would be the Vice-President (Academic and Research), one of the few individuals who has the pleasure of reading all of the relevant files and consequently could offer the perspective sought. Ms. Hobson also noted that one of the proposed ad-hoc Committee members, Ms. DeMeo, has administrative responsibilities as Chair of the French Department.

Mr. Ricketts asked whether under the Steering Committee's item (b) we will look at the current relevant regulations at TUNS. Mr. Stuttard assured him that this would be done, reminding members that one of the Committees to be appointed to oversee the Dal-TUNS merger was a Senate "Legislation" Committee. Mr. Lee spoke to the need for consistent standards and suggested the Committee was too small to achieve this consistency. A larger Committee might better accommodate the spread across the Faculties and ensure optimum input. Mr. Stuttard responded that the proposed Committee would be making recommendations to the Steering Committee, which would then make recommendations for Senate approval. Mr. Lee was concerned that the exercise be done right the first time. Mr. Stuttard cautioned that the larger the committee the harder it was to get requisite attendance. In response to Mr. Taylor, Mr. Stuttard gave assurance that the Committee would invite recommendations from across campus, with an eye to achieving the desired diverse and comprehensive input.

Ms. Sutherland addressed the implication that guidelines should be virtually the same across the University. She reminded members that the guidelines for Librarians for appointment without term are distinct, and asked that the ad-hoc Committee be sensitive to the need for diversity when revising the guidelines.

The motion was then **CARRIED**.

## **96:083**

### **President's Report**

The President began by congratulating the Vice-Chair, Joan Conrod, on her receipt of the AAU award for teaching excellence. He was also delighted to announce that Dalhousie had been chosen as one of five Centres of Excellence on Women's Health Issues, in a competition with 24 other institutions. More good news was the Premier's announcement during his visit to Dalhousie of the \$6,000,000 funding for a new building to house some departments of the Arts and Social Sciences Faculty and large, multi-media-equipped lecture halls.

Less encouraging was the recent news that the Faculty of Medicine's quest for \$2M in funding from the Department of Health had met rejection. A government committee comprising the Ministers of Health, Education, and Finance will delve into the issue, but action to remedy the shortfall was not imminent. The agreement to amalgamate Dalhousie and TUNS remained unsigned. At this point the terms and conditions of the transfer of the hospital lands was proving a somewhat more technical exercise than had been anticipated. The President continued to be optimistic, however, that the government remained committed to the land transfer, and that he would soon be in a position to report on a successful three-way agreement.

Concerning the Faculty of Medicine's funding problems, Mr. Farmer asked whether the Minister of Health was offering to leap into the process of academic planning on behalf of the University Senate. Mr. Traves suggested that this would be a very inaccurate interpretation of the Minister's comments. Ms. Morrissey asked whether faculty members could now engage in discussions with their colleagues at TUNS concerning some of the issues related to amalgamation. Mr. Traves asked members to sit patiently; once the major issues had been resolved we could get into the more detailed aspects of the merger. Mr. Bradfield asked whether members of Dalhousie could engage in fruitful discussions with members of TUNS over the summer, or whether there was a freeze on discussion. Mr. Traves alerted members to the difficulties of deciding who was speaking for whom in such interchanges, and cautioned that the delicate issues surrounding amalgamation opened up possibilities and opportunities for minor and serious misunderstandings. Mr. Bradfield suggested that academics understand the difference between official announcements and informal discussions that might break the ice. Mr. Traves recognized the importance of broad-ranging collegial interaction, but stressed that the more pressing issue is sensitivity to any comments, however innocent, which might be unfavourably construed as the Dalhousie position or view.

## **96:084**

### **Question Period**

Mr. Bradfield asked what was the minimum contribution required to establish an endowed chair. Mr. Traves indicated that in the context of the current capital campaign we talk about a \$2,000,000 contribution for a "fully endowed chair", a chair essentially paid for out of endowment earnings. Ms. Hobson suggested that Mr. Bradfield and others would find helpful the sheet concerning the cost of funding a wide range of items from cubicles to chairs. Turning to the issue of the funding of Wickwire Field, Mr. Bradfield asked for an update on the actual revenue from rentals and the capital fund campaign as compared with the revenue projected when the field was approved. Mr. Stuttard indicated that the question would be referred to Vice President (Finance and Administration) Mason.



**96:085**  
**Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 16:10.