

Item: Senate Minutes, September 1998

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 September 1998. 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, 14 September 1998 at 4:00 p.m. in the University Hall, Macdonald Building.

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

Apostle, Barnes, Belanger, Bell, Binkley, Bishop, Bleasdale, Bradfield, Carlson, Chiasson, Clements, Coffin, Cunningham, El-Hawary, Fooladi, Furrow, Galley, Giacomantonio, Girard, Ipson, Kimmins, Kipouros, Lalji, Lee, Lohmann, MacInnis, MacKenzie, Maes, Maloney, McConnell, McIntyre, McNiven, Pacey, Phillips, H. Powell, Rosson, Ruedy, Russell, Sastri, Scully, Shafai, Shepherd, Slonim, Starnes, Thiessen, Tindall, Traves, Treves, Ugursal, Wainwright, Wallace, White, Whyte, Woolf.

Regrets: Abi Daoud, Connolly, Crocker, Faulkner, Guppy, Hyndman, Johnston, C. Powell, Rathwell.

Mr. Stuttard welcomed Mr. Scully, the new Vice-President (Academic & Research) to his first meeting of Dalhousie's Senate.

**98:111.**

Adoption of Agenda

Mr. Stuttard noted that under Agenda item 3 only (a) was from the Senate Nominating Committee; (b) was from the Secretary of Senate. The amended agenda was then adopted.

**98:112.**

Minutes of Previous Meeting

At 98:103, page 3, line 13, "four" became "two"; and the minutes of the meeting of 27 July 1998 were adopted as amended.

**98:113.**

Matters Arising

On behalf of the Steering Committee, Mr. Stuttard announced that Dr. Peter Dolphin, Biochemistry, had been recruited to serve as the additional Senate representative on the Review/Search Committee for the Associate Vice-President (Research & International Relations). The Chair also reminded members of their ability to engage in e-mail discussions via [Senate-list@ac.dal.ca](mailto:Senate-list@ac.dal.ca) and invited members to visit the Senate Website at [www.dal.ca/senate](http://www.dal.ca/senate). Only the minutes of Senate appear on the Website, not those of other

Senate Committees as had been indicated at a previous meeting.

**98:114.**

Nominations for the Senate Representative to the Budget Advisory Committee

On behalf of the Senate Nominating Committee, Ms. Bleasdale moved:

**That Senate forward to the President the names of Joan Conrod (Management/Business Administration) and Frances Gregor (Health Professions/Nursing), as its nominees to serve on the President's Budget Advisory Committee.**

Ms. Bleasdale explained that the President would choose to appoint one of Senate's nominees to the Budget Advisory Committee.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

**98:115.**

Nominations to Senate Committees

On behalf of the Senate Nominating Committee, Ms. Bleasdale moved:

**That Senate approve the following nominations to the Senate Committee on the Environment: Carolyn Green, NSGEU Local 77) September 1998 - June 30, 1999; Terry Mitchell (Dentistry/Dental Hygiene) September 1998 - June 30, 1999; and Karolyn Waterson (Arts and Social Sciences/French) September 1998 - June 30, 2000.**

**That Senate approve the nomination of Ronald Tetreault (Arts and Social Sciences/English) to the Senate Committee on Instructional Development (September 1998 - June 30, 1999).**

**That Senate approve the nomination of Hans Runte (Arts and Social Sciences/French) to the Senate Library Committee (September 1998 - June 30, 2001).**

**That Senate approve the nomination of Marian Binkley (Arts and Social Sciences/Sociology and Social Anthropology) to the Lester Pearson International Advisory Board ).**

**That Senate approve the nomination of Kathy Russell (Dentistry/Dental Clinical Sciences) to the University Security & Parking Committee**

Ms. Bleasdale apologized for the error in the spelling of Mr. Tetreault's name on the Senate Nominating Committee memo.

The motions taken together were **CARRIED**.

**98:116.**

Nomination to Panel of Student-Discipline Officers

Ms. Bleasdale moved:

**That Senate, on the recommendation of the Dean of Law, appoint Bruce Wildsmith to serve on the Panel of Student-Discipline Officers for the term September 1998 to August 31, 2001.**

Mr. Stuttard noted that he would not call for further nominations because Mr. Wildsmith's name was forwarded on the recommendation of the Dean of the Law Faculty, and not from the Nominating Committee.

The motion was then **CARRIED**.

**98:117.**

Report of the Senate Committee on Instructional Development

The Chair put the following motion on behalf of the Senate Committee on Instructional Development:

**That Senate accept the Senate Committee on Instructional Development's 1997-98 Annual Report.**

The motion was **CARRIED**.

**98:118.**

Criteria for Establishing New Academic Units

On behalf of the Senate Academic Priorities and Budget Committee, Mr. Stuttard moved:

**That the criteria for establishing a new academic unit shall include the following:**

- 1. Responsibility for a distinct, academic program(s);**
- 2. Identification of sufficient full-time and possibly part-time academic and support staff to mount the proposed program(s), and identification of space for the new unit;**
- 3. Clear source(s) of committed funding to support the long-term operation of the new unit;**
- 4. Approval of the proposal and commitment by a Faculty(ies) to house and administer the new unit as a long-term component of the Faculty(ies).**

Mr. Ruedy realized that considerable discussion had already been devoted to the adjectives

in clause 2 used to describe the requisites for academic staffing of a new unit. However, the inclusion of “full-time and possibly part-time” would create problems for the Faculty of Medicine because on the clinical side those terms had been abandoned in order to reflect the existence of academic departments and divisions with no “full-time” staff. In the interests of maintaining greater flexibility in defining adequate staffing levels for new units, Mr. Ruedy moved:

**That “full-time and possibly part-time” be deleted from clause 2.**

Though Mr. Wainwright understood Mr. Ruedy’s concerns, he considered the adjectives important in order to ensure that a unit would not be mounted solely by part-time academic staff, but would have adequate full-time members. Ms. McIntyre agreed that an academic unit would require dedicated full-time staff to prove the necessary leadership. She spoke to the experience of the School of Health Services Administration, carved out of the School of Public Administration in 1985. That new unit had struggled with only three full-time and many part-time staff, until the appointment of another full-time faculty member. Mr. Bell supported the amendment on the grounds that we might at some point wish to start a new program, and ultimately give it a home unit. Initially part-time staff might be adequate, and as the program proved successful the unit could be filled out with full-time appointees, or members could be transferred from other units. Mr. Woolf noted we were in danger of blurring the distinction between creation of a program and the creation of a unit, and argued we would want to be assured of a body of full-time faculty before establishing a new unit. Ms. Binkley agreed, emphasizing the long-term, on-going nature of any commitment to creation of a new unit which would require a budget line and space, among other things. In contrast, a program, such as “Millennium Studies”, might enjoy a brief burst of popularity, but not warrant creation of a Department designed to carry the program for an extended period of time.

The amendment was **LOST**.

Mr. Ugursal suggested that clause 4 be amended to clarify that a unit associated with more than one Faculty would require the agreement of both Faculties before that unit could be approved. He suggested wording which stipulated the commitment to the unit of “a Faculty or Faculties associated with the new unit and a Faculty or Faculties which would house and administer the new unit.” Mr. Stuttard believed that intent was clear in the motion.

Mr. Shafai wished the motion to include a clause calling for the proposers of a new unit to demonstrate its necessity, and moved:

**That Senate insert a new clause 1 which would read, “Clear need or rationale for the new unit;” and that the subsequent clauses be renumbered accordingly.**

Mr. Bell saw a problem in that this would suggest that Senate would now make an independent assessment of the unit, after a Faculty had approved its creation. Mr. Wainwright saw the advantage of the amendment. He had always understood that Senate was responsible for more than rubber-stamping proposals such as those for the creation of a unit. He assumed that only a serious problem would stop Senate from approving a Faculty’s request, but Senate needed to have before it the materials, including the rationale on which

any request for creation of a new unit was based.

The amendment was **CARRIED**.

The amended motion was then **CARRIED**.

**98:119.**

Call for Honorary Degree Nominations

Mr. Traves gave his annual plea for the submission of names to be considered by the Honorary Degrees Committee. In recent years the Committee had felt that a relatively modest number of names were coming forward for the approximately ten honorary degrees conferred during each academic year. While the candidates were always outstanding, a larger base from which to choose would be helpful. Mr. Traves encouraged individuals, Departments, Faculties, and other groups to give this matter their serious consideration.

**98:120.**

Report of the President

President Traves described four broad areas of concern to Dalhousie which would be his personal priorities over the coming year: the building of external relations; the creation and support for academic programs; expansion of support for research; and community building within the University. Beginning with External Relations, an important aspect of his job description as President, Mr. Traves emphasized the need to do a better job of explaining what we did and how we actively enriched our community. Polling among Alumni, the community, and in-coming and out-going students, together with focus groups, had revealed that the public had a good appreciation of Dalhousie's efforts as an academic institution, but were uninformed or uncertain about how we served our region's needs. Dalhousie could be proud of tremendous accomplishments and initiatives in this area; however, we needed to develop a much better communications plan for the University, and develop a clearer appreciation of how many of us could contribute to this plan. At a future date Mr. Traves would share information collected concerning our community profile, and launch a discussion of Public Relations at Dalhousie.

The University also needed to persevere with its fund-raising campaign. We were in the last year of our five-year fund-raising campaign, but fund-raising would continue after this year and forever. At present we had raised close to \$70 million, and he hoped the total would climb as high as \$75 million. At the next Senate meeting he would make a fuller report, including a rough breakdown of the sources of funding. Together with other Nova Scotia University Presidents, Mr. Traves would continue to press for increased financial support from the government, in particular increased funding for capital improvements, information technology needs, and support for research. The issue of student assistance remained a priority, and Mr. Traves would provide Senate with more information at the next meeting.

In the area of academic programs, the President had received lots of feedback from faculty members who shared his belief that we needed to expand the range of interdisciplinary programs at Dalhousie, and to offer distinctive programs. As competition for new enrolments increased, and as social expectations for universities continued to grow, we had to ensure

that our curriculum addressed the learning needs of our society. This type of program expansion raised a number of budgetary and personnel issues that he would look to our Deans and our new Vice-President (Academic & Research) to address. Improvement of the information technology infrastructure, also a priority, would facilitate program delivery and create campus-wide access to our network, ensuring classroom capacity to use the technology wherever and whenever it was required. He looked forward to working with SCID on this.

The President announced a new initiative, the Dalhousie Career Portfolio project on which a number of individuals drawn particularly from the Faculties of Science and Arts and Social Sciences had been working for the past year. The Career Portfolio was based on learning by doing, and was intended to integrate career development experience and skills with our curriculum, and to enhance students' capacities to think constructively about their career prospects. Supported by a \$650,000 grant from Human Resources Development of Canada spread over the next two years, members would plan curriculum and deliver what would initially be a small number of classes. This was a unique program in Canada, and one with significant benefits to offer students in the core Faculties of Arts and Sciences in particular, where career paths were less clearly defined than in the professional and coop programs. During the 1998/99 academic year the Career Portfolio would be run on an experimental basis. The President distributed pamphlets for members' information.

Turning to related issues of space and physical plant, the President reminded members that last year a major portion of the alterations and renovations fund had been allocated to the necessary steam heating facility for DalTech, which would cost approximately \$2 million. He was delighted to announce that the University had received \$1.5 million towards that project from the Provincial Government. That would allow \$1.5 million to be used for other improvements to facilities on campus. In particular, Dalhousie was constructing a new elevator for the Architecture Building, at a cost of \$350,000, to make the last major building accessible. This project and our new buildings would significantly enhance physical accessibility on campus.

In the area of research support, the Task Force on Research Policy and Administration was now functioning under its Chair, Dr. Dennis Stairs. It had a huge agenda of concerns, and like any such enterprise, was struggling to define its boundaries. The President hoped it was realistic to look for a Report from the Task Force by the end of the current academic year. Turning to the CFI initiatives, Mr. Traves noted that in the first round of competition, the new opportunities grants for new faculty members, four of the six applications submitted by Dalhousie had been successful, though one of the successful applicants had since left Dalhousie for another University and that money was lost to Dalhousie and the individual, formerly a member of the Engineering Faculty. The three remaining successful applications were in Science and Medicine and totaled \$1.3 million. By the end of October the University hoped to have the initial responses to the seventeen major project proposals submitted from across the campus. In the meantime, plans were progressing for the creation of an Oil and Gas Institute, details of which would hopefully be released by the end of October.

The President took the opportunity to address the recent controversy at the University of Toronto, and the questions it had raised concerning the relationship between academic

freedom and research partnerships with a variety of external agencies. In light of Dalhousie's expanding partnerships with governments, corporations and private groups, Mr. Traves had asked the Vice-President (Academic & Research) and the Associate Vice-President (Research & International Relations) to review our procedures and policies to ensure we had suitable safeguards to avoid the type of problem confronted by the medical researcher at the University of Toronto. Members would be relieved to know that this would not have arisen at Dalhousie. The President would report back to Senate in greater detail in due course, and perhaps refer the issue to the Task Force on Research Policy and Administration.

Finally, in the area of community building within Dalhousie, the President reported on the extensive consultations which he and Vice-President Scully had had with Faculty Councils and a variety of individuals and constituencies at Dalhousie. That consultation would continue for a number of weeks, as an important means of ensuring that our strategic plan for institutional development was consistent with our internal needs and expectations. To date the process had revealed the need for fuller on-going consultation between the President's Office and the larger University community, as well as the need to draw the community into more active participation in decision-making on the one hand, and more information sharing and accountability on the other. One aspect of this information sharing would involve presentations to Senate by Senior Administrators. The Steering Committee and the President had drawn up a two-year cycle of presentations which included Vice-Presidents, the Registrar, and Deans. Mr. Mason, Vice-President (Finance & Administration), would make the first presentation at the September 28<sup>th</sup> Senate meeting.

In general, more communication and education about our institution was essential if we were to separate the myths from the facts about Dalhousie's priorities and practices. We needed to focus on our strengths as well as learn from our mistakes. In their consultations, he and the Vice-President had heard complaints about what some faculty members perceived as the pervasive negativity of our environment, or, as someone had put it, the "advanced Canadianitis" from which we suffered in our reluctance to celebrate our achievements. Dalhousie was a tremendous institution with great people working here, and many, many wonderful things were being achieved. We needed to know more about these achievements and celebrate them both inside and outside the campus.

#### **98:121.**

##### Question Period

Mr. Bradfield noted that the President's opening remarks about polling and Dalhousie's image, and his concluding comments concerning the need to celebrate our achievements, addressed issues which had been the focus of discussions in the old Senate Public Relations Committee, and then the Joint Board and Senate Public Relations Committee. At a previous meeting the President had indicated his desire to abolish the Joint Committee, but his comments suggested the need to revive the Committee instead.

On another matter, Mr. Bradfield indicated that the previous week the Senate Physical Planning Committee had learned that both the Computer Science building and the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences building were over budget. Because of the failure to factor in the HST, the Computer Science building was 15% over budget; the Arts and Social Sciences



building was 5% over budget, because the 10% rebate to the University was not included in the financial accounting for that project. Did the President know, or could he find out, where these items normally appear as line items in the University's budget?

Mr. Traves agreed to report back on this item, but wished to correct the erroneous description of the process given by Mr. Bradfield. The University had understood the need to factor in the HST and the rebate. However, in the case of the Arts and Social Sciences building, the architects' first estimate had been too large; their second estimate had not included the HST and the rebate. The error had been picked up by those with financial responsibilities at Dalhousie, and the architects had been asked to produce plans which did not increase the overall cost.

Mr. Bell was concerned about the extent to which the Province would contribute to the funding of the CFI proposals. Mr. Traves explained that the Province was committed to matching funds totaling \$10 million over a two-year period. A portion of this money, the amount as yet undisclosed, would be set aside for those universities which were not defined as "active" research institutions, which effectively meant all other universities within Nova Scotia. The President had worked closely with the Province's Education Department, the Ministry for Economic Development, and other key government officials in an attempt to draw them into the process and secure a level of commitment to the proposals going forward. Dalhousie had submitted 17 proposals. If many of those were approved that would put extraordinary pressure on the government to come up with funding, or lose the opportunity for more Federal funds. In general, Mr. Traves had hoped for greater support for research from the Provincial Government.

In response to Mr. Ugursal's request for clarification concerning the funding of the steam heating for DalTech, Mr. Traves explained that the Province had come up with \$1.5 million in addition to that provided for in the amalgamation process and agreement. In response to Ms. Binkley, the President announced that the Humanist on the Research Task Force was Ron Huebert of the English Department.

Ms. Bleasdale assured Mr. El-Hawary that the nominations for honorary degrees from DalTech, formerly TUNS, had been forwarded to the Honorary Degrees Committee. Mr. Traves noted that some parts of the University were more organized than others in putting together nominations for honorary degrees. That was helpful to the Committee. For example, when a Faculty put forward the name of an individual, that reflected some degree of acceptability within the Faculty, and guided the Committee members.

Mr. Bradfield asked for information concerning the number of individuals from other areas of the University who had been seconded to BANNER, and how many of them had been replaced. Could the President provide assurance that units from which individuals had been transferred had been compensated to enable them to carry out their normal functions effectively?

Mr. Wainwright asked whether a formal body was monitoring our research relationships with external bodies and agencies. Mr. Traves responded that last year he had asked Mr. Fournier, the Associate Vice-President (Research & International Relations) to bring together a group of individuals with Faculty-level responsibilities for research administration. The

group had no formal status, but Mr. Traves anticipated it would be on-going. Already it had identified some minor problems and inconsistencies in practice across the campus; it had acted as consultant on the CFI proposals; and it had been instrumental in the creation of the Task Force on Research Policy and Administration. Mr. Kimmins noted that at the Faculty level, as well as the University level, research committees operated to ensure that ethical guidelines were followed and standards maintained in research involving all species in the zoological kingdom. Mr. Traves asked members to please forward these types of concerns to the Task Force on Research Policy and Administration.

**98:122.**

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:18 p.m.

---

Secretary

---

Chair