

Item: Senate Minutes, September 2001  
Call Number: Senate fonds, UA-5

Additional Notes:

This document is a compilation of Senate minutes, staff matters and miscellaneous documents for September 2001. 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, 10 September 2001, at 4:00 p.m., in University Hall, MacDonald Building.

Present with Mr. El-Hawary in the chair were the following:

Ben-Abdallah, Binkley, Bleasdale, Blunden, Bowie, Bradfield, Brett, Coughlan, Cunningham, Downie, Egan, Elder, Emodi, Fraser, Guppy, Gupta, Guy, Hart, Harvey, Huebert, Kwak, B. MacDonald, N. MacDonald, MacInnis, McGrath, McIntyre, Moore, Murphy, Neumann, Neves, O'Mara, Phillips, Poel, Rajora, Sastri, Saunders, Schroeder, Schwarz, Scott, Scully, Slonim, Sommerfeld, Starnes, Tindall, Tracey, Traves, Ugursal, Watters, Whyte.

Regrets: Alexander, Caldwell, Caley, Corm, Downe-Wamboldt, Elder, Galarneau, Jalilvand, Powell, Rowe.

**2001:95.**

Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as circulated.

**2001:96.**

Welcome to New Senators

Mr. El-Hawary welcomed the following new Senators: Hubert Morgan (FASS/English), Evangelos Miliotis (Computer Science), David Egan (Health Professions/Physiotherapy).

**2001:97.**

Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of July 9, 2001

At p. 7, 1.29, "The amendment was "CARRIED" was added; at p. 7, 1.30, "amended" was inserted before "motion"; and Ms. Bowie and Mr. Cunningham were added to those in attendance. The minutes of the meeting of July 9, 2001, were then adopted as AMENDED.

**2001:98.**

Matters Arising

In response to questions raised at the previous meeting, Mr. Scully reported that he had contacted Mr. Potter of Knowledge House Inc. who had agreed that the information in the *Mail-Star* concerning a relationship between Dalhousie and Knowledge House Inc. was inaccurate. Mr. Potter had undertaken to contact the *Mail-Star*.

**2001:99.**

Question Period

Ms. Bowie was concerned that the Advanced Studies Program which Dalhousie was discussing with the Department of Education was a step in the wrong direction. As an Arts student, she would have been disadvantaged by the lack of Arts components in the program. Had those involved discussed the need to broaden the curriculum so that it could benefit Arts students? Mr. Scully reminded Senate that this year the Department of Education was offering the Advanced Studies Program as a pilot project to approximately 200 students in five Nova Scotia high schools. It was an integrated program that combined Biology, Chemistry, English, Management, Mathematics, and Statistics. He agreed the program was lean in Arts and Humanities subjects. This issue had been raised at meetings between representatives of the Department of Education and faculty members and administrators from Dalhousie, and the Department had accepted that criticism and expressed its intention to elaborate on the program should it prove successful. The Department had taken the pragmatic position that they had to start somewhere, and had decided to build on the existing strengths of curriculum in the provincial high schools. In its current form, the program also reflected, for the most part, the choices made by many high school students. Personally, Mr. Scully agreed with the criticism, but he also accepted the argument that the Department needed to begin to enhance the quality of programs in provincial high schools, even if that meant starting with a limited number of disciplines.

Mr. Bradfield had a question concerning those Dalhousie Institutes and Centres which were partly funded by private partners. Did the private partners have any proprietary claim on the research of those Institutes or Centres? It was Mr. Traves' understanding that the University had only contractual relationships, arrangements by which individual professors contracted with companies that provided research grants and made arrangements under the terms of those contracts with respect to the intellectual property involved. He did not believe Dalhousie had a comprehensive arrangement with any individual or group in the private sector with respect to any single-purpose Institute or Centre that transferred intellectual property in the method Mr. Bradfield had described. However, Mr. Traves would check with the Vice-President Research.

Referring specifically to the problems encountered by ITI and to Knowledge House's declining stocks, Mr. McGrath raised concerns about the University's relationships with the private sector. The students at ITI had been in limbo as that Institute had floundered. What would be the fixture of students enrolled in the program created by Knowledge House, which now also had an uncertain future? In general, what could Dalhousie learn from and how should it respond to the problems encountered by private sector partners? Mr. Scully explained the fundamental difference between Dalhousie's relationship with ITI and its involvement with the Department of Education in the Advanced Studies Program which Knowledge House had been retained by the province to create. The relationship with ITI had involved a Masters program offered by Dalhousie, and the University had learned a great deal from that venture. In contrast, Dalhousie had no formal and no informal relationship of any kind with Knowledge House Inc.

Mr. White asked how the university interacted with high schools in order to help students understand the implications of their graduating marks and qualifications with respect to university entry. Was a University committee dedicated to this interface? Mr. Scully responded that there was no mechanism or structure to meet the need for this type of interaction, and he hoped Dalhousie's current work with the Department would begin to remedy that. In all the meetings with the Faculties of Arts and Social Sciences, Science, and Engineering, a consistent thread in his comments and in the response of the representatives of the Department of Education had been the necessity of engaging the Universities in curriculum development and in other aspects of the school system within the province. It was in the Universities' interests, and some would argue it was their public responsibility, to become much more involved in the curriculum of the K to 12 system, particularly at the high school level.

#### **2001:100.**

##### Nominations to the Senate Nominating Committee

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

**That the following be appointed to the Senate Nominating Committee: Allan Jost (Computer Science), January 2002 to August 31, 2003; Christine Barnes (Medicine), September 2001 to August 31, 2004; Frank Palermo (Architecture) for a second term, September 2001 to August 31, 2004.**

The motion was CARRIED.

#### **2001:101.**

##### Nomination for Vice-Chair of Senate

On behalf of the Senate Nominating Committee, Mr. El-Hawary reminded Senate that Mr. Lloyd Fraser of Henson College had been nominated to serve as Vice-Chair of Senate for the term September 2001 to June 30, 2003. After the requisite three calls for further nominations, the Chair declared Mr. Fraser the new Vice-Chair of Senate. Mr. El-Hawary congratulated Mr. Fraser.

**2001:102.**

Proposed Change in Name of the Physics Department

On behalf of the Senate Academic Priorities and Budget Committee, Mr. El-Hawary moved:

**That the proposed change in the name of the Department of Physics to the Department of Physics and Atmospheric Science be approved.**

The motion was CARRIED.

**2001:103.**

Proposed Residency Program in Palliative Medicine

On behalf of the Senate Academic Priorities and Budget Committee, Mr. El-Hawary moved:

**That the proposed Residency Program in Palliative Medicine be approved.**

The motion was CARRIED.

**2001:104.**

Annual Report of the Senate Committee on the Environment

Ms. Bleasdale reminded members that the Annual Report of the Senate Committee on the Environment had been circulated with the agenda for the June meeting. Members agreed to postpone formal consideration of the Report until the next meeting, by which time they would have received another copy of the Report. Hopefully a Committee member would be available to address the Report. [A representative of the Committee, Ms. Carolyn Green, arrived later in the meeting to answer questions and to convey the apologies of the Committee Chair, Mr. Cote, for his inability to be in attendance.]

**2001:105.**

Senate Discipline Committee

Mr. El-Hawary welcomed Mr. Deturbide, Chair of the Senate Discipline Committee. Mr. Deturbide drew members' attention to the increase in the number of cases coming before the Committee. The ninety-five cases dealt with during the 2000/2001 academic year represented an 18% increase over the previous year, which in turn had represented a 40% increase over the year 1998/99. Most cases involved plagiarism, in particular plagiarism from the Internet. At a recent meeting, the Committee had agreed to address this steady increase by increasing the normal penalty for a finding of a first instance of plagiarism to a failure in the class. Extenuating circumstances would continue to be considered, but generally the panel would give an outright failure in the class. This information needed to be communicated to students as broadly as possible. Consequently, the Discipline Committee was recommending that all faculty be apprised of this change in policy, and that all students also receive notice of this change, together with the excerpts from the University Calendar relating to plagiarism. The Committee also recommended that Senate help faculty members to catch plagiarism, perhaps through seminars offered by University librarians or by investigating types of software that were now available to assist in identifying plagiarism.

The request for an increase in the membership of the Discipline Committee was directly related to the rise in the number of cases being considered each year. To assist in the immediate task of hearing cases expeditiously, the Committee requested that two faculty members and one student be added to their numbers. That would bring the membership of the Committee to ten faculty members and five students.

Mr. El-Hawary asked Senators to consider the proposed increase in Committee membership as a second motion, separate from the adoption of the Annual Report. On behalf of the Senate Discipline Committee, Mr. El-Hawary moved the first motion:

**That the Annual Report of the Senate Discipline Committee for 2000/2001 be adopted.**

Mr. Whyte requested clarification concerning the role of the Internet in the increase in plagiarism. Did students not understand that plagiarism from the Internet was the same as plagiarism from any other source, or were they unfairly taking advantage of the sources made available by the Internet. Mr. Deturbide indicated that both were a problem. Committee members were surprised by the number of first-year students who were not aware of what constituted plagiarism, with or without the Internet. A fair number of students also plagiarized from the Internet in an attempt to hide the source of the material they were using.

Mr. Fraser wondered whether the Committee had considered additional steps that might help to reduce the instances of plagiarism. Could more be done to educate students and faculty? Mr. Deturbide responded that Committee members

encouraged professors with a substantial writing component in their classes to take the time at the beginning of term to explain plagiarism. For example, students in first and second year in particular needed to be clear that self-plagiarism was plagiarism, and that words copied directly from a text needed to be put in quotation marks, even when their source was cited. In response to a question from Mr. Bradfield concerning the breakdown of offences in the table, Mr. Deturbide agreed that the distinction between the sharing of assignments and plagiarism was artificial. Sharing of assignments had been separated out from other forms of plagiarism because sometimes students were unaware that other students were copying their assignments. That was reflected in the number of cases in this category that had been dismissed.

Mr. Slonim noted that at the beginning of the year the Faculty of Computer Science had decided to tackle the problem by providing first-year students with a seminar in which a librarian took time to give detailed descriptions of the forms plagiarism could take. Graduate students were asked to sign a statement indicating that they understood what the various forms were.

Mr. Huebert spoke from his experience teaching English classes which had considerable writing components. Whenever he had taught a first-year class he had raised the issue of plagiarism and asked whether any student did not understand what it was. Invariably, students did not raise their hands. That did not stop him from taking the time to explain it and to warn that it was a serious offence; and he supported whatever steps could be taken to prevent plagiarism. However, his experience made him skeptical about data which was reported to suggest that a large number of students did not know what constituted plagiarism. He wondered how this information had been collected and whether it could withstand careful scrutiny. Mr. Huebert also wished to know how the Committee dealt with second-time offenders. Mr. Deturbide noted that panel decisions were in part based on the circumstances of each case; however, a second offence was taken very seriously. The Senate Office kept records of each decision and informed panel members any time a student came before the Committee for a second time. Students had been suspended for a second offence, but in his experience this did not happen more than once or twice a year.

Mr. Sastri found the numbers reported by the Committee much smaller than he would have expected. In his experience in the Department of Mathematics and Statistics, the sharing of assignments was extremely common and very hard to police and identify, particularly when all the answers on the assignments were correct. As a result, some teachers allowed students to collaborate, provided they wrote up their own solutions. Procedures for invigilating tests were very strict, and consequently cheating during a formal examination was easier to identify. But assignments prepared outside the classroom and the examination hall were much more difficult to police.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

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

**That the number of faculty members on the Senate Discipline Committee be increased from eight to ten and that the number of students be increased from four to five.**

Mr. El-Hawary reminded members that this was a Constitutional amendment and would require the support of two-thirds of members present and voting.

Mr. Coughlan asked whether the size of the panels could be cut back to two faculty members and one student in order to conserve the Committee's resources. Mr. Deturbide agreed to raise the suggestion with the Senate Discipline Committee, though he thought students might have some concerns over smaller panels and those would need to be heard and addressed. Mr. McGrath believed that five-member panels were more likely to maintain the desirable level of consistency across the hearings and decisions.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

Mr. El-Hawary thanked Mr. Deturbide for his service as Chair of the Senate Discipline Committee. Mr. David Blaikie had assumed the responsibilities of Chair as of July 2001.

#### **2001:106.**

##### Annual Report of the Senate Library Committee for 2000/2001

Ms. Sommerfeld presented the Senate Library Committee's Report on behalf of the Committee Chair, Mr. Frank Smith, currently on sabbatical. She began with two editorial changes to the Report: at p. 2, seven lines from bottom, "Health Professions" was changed to "Dentistry"; and at p. 3, item 6,1. 9, the Senate Committee on Learning and Technology was changed to the Senate Committee on Learning and Teaching.

On behalf of the Senate Library Committee, Ms. Sommerfeld moved:

**That the Annual Report of the Senate Library Committee be adopted as amended.**

Ms. Binkley addressed item 3, the Canadian National Site Licencing Project, reiterating a number of problems which this project had created for the Arts and Social Sciences, particularly in the Humanities. Proportionately, very few journals in these areas were available in big packages, with the result that a number of journals were no longer available. Secondly, Arts and Social Sciences were monograph-based, many disciplines only using books or edited volumes. Very few of these were on line, and the amount of money being absorbed by the



purchase of large packages meant that significantly less was being devoted to the purchase of monographs and small journals, some electronic and some still in hard copy. Ms. Binkley encouraged the Senate Library Committee to explore this problem further. The large packages represented wonderful research and teaching tools, but they benefitted some areas of the academy much more than.

Ms. Sommerfeld noted that representatives had brought these concerns to the Committee and the Committee was engaged in an on-going discussion of ways to address them. Mr. Slonim thought the money for the Site Licencing Project had come from the CFI, in which case it was money that the government had added to the Library's funds. Ms. Binkley responded that any money freed up had disappeared very quickly and had not been available to be used for other resources. Also, she understood that the funding was for a three-year period, with the possibility of renewal, which meant the University might be required to pick up some of the costs.

Mr. Tindall spoke to item 1 of the Report, the Amalgamation of Science Services with Social Sciences and Humanities Services. He was disappointed by the second last sentence which indicated that "little in the way of formal interaction between the Faculty of Science and the Library Administration had been achieved." This suggested that the Report and recommendations accepted by Senate early in 2001 had not been implemented. He was also troubled by the conclusion that "Senate . . . would be the appropriate body to assume a pro-active role" in this area. He did not think it was Senate's responsibility to take over the nitty-gritty of implementing the recommendations it had adopted. Senate should call on the University Librarian to bring forward a full report on the implementation of its recommendations. Ms. Sommerfeld noted that the Senate Library Committee had not met during the summer months, but as temporary acting Chair for the first meeting she would put this on the agenda so Committee members could begin to discuss it. As Mr. Smith had indicated in the Report, the recommendations had been made and needed to be acted on sooner rather than later.

Mr. Emodi referred to the section of the Report in which the Committee described access to on-line materials in some Faculties as "spotty or not available." How had that information been determined? Mr. Emodi was not aware of any systematic survey at Dalhousie which could provide this type of information concerning access. Ms. Sommerfeld clarified that the information had not been based on a formal survey but had been provided by members representing the various disciplines on the SLC, as well as by the librarians who attended *ex officio*. Representatives on the Committee described problems such as the difficulty of securing reliable access because of the nature of their computer infrastructure. Some disciplines and Faculties appeared to be more hi-tech than others. Mr. Emodi thought this type of comment was unfortunate, at least from the perspective of his Faculty where students had been working hard to get very reasonable access and high quality computing. In Architecture the faculty and

students were involved in a collaborative enterprise to improve the computing system for the whole Faculty. The system was comparable to the access available in other Faculties of Architecture of which he was aware. He wished to see this comment qualified. Mr. Emodi also noted the work being done in this area by those investigating instructional technology. A systematic review of access should build on and expand that work. Ms. Sommerfeld asked that Mr. Emodi forward his comments to the Committee.

Mr. Whyte wondered whether access through the proxy server was considered complete or spotty. Ms. Sommerfeld thought the Committee had been considering on-campus access, not the proxy server. Mr. Whyte observed that those large Faculties which depended on the proxy server suffered from "spotty access."

In conclusion, Ms. Sommerfeld agreed with the suggestion that it was time for a survey. She would convey Senators' concerns to the Committee.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

#### **2001:107.**

##### Nominations to Senate Committees

The Chair of the Senate Nominating Committee, Ms. Woodman, presented the nominations for Senate Committees. She drew members' attention to the need to secure Senators to serve on some Committees, such as the Senate Committee on Academic Administration. The Nominating Committee understood the sometimes onerous responsibilities of Senators; however, it asked that members think very seriously before refusing to serve on those Committees which required their participation.

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

**That the following nominations be approved: Larry Hughes (Graduate Studies/Electrical & Computer Engineering) to serve on the Senate Computing & Information Technology Planning Committee for the period September 2001 to June 30, 2004;**

**Kit Bowen (Science) to serve on the Senate Discipline Committee for the period September 2001 to June 30, 2004;**

**Anne Taylor (Instructional Media Services) to serve on the Senate Committee on the Environment for the period September 2001 to June 30, 2003;**

**Lou Ramaley (Science) to serve on the Senate Committee on Learning and Teaching for the period September 2001 to June 30, 2004;**

**Michael Shepherd (Computer Science) to serve on the Board of Governors for the period September 2001 to June 30, 2003;**

**Teresa Cyrus (Science) to serve on the Ombudsperson's Advisory Committee for the period September 2001 to June 30, 2004;**

**John O'Brien (FASS) to serve on the University Hearing Committee for the period September 2001 to June 30, 2003.**

After the requisite three calls for further nominations, the motion was **CARRIED**.

**2001:108.**

Call for Honorary Degree Nominations

Mr. Traves reminded Senators of the call for honorary degree nominations which had been circulated to the University community on September 13, 2001. He was pleased that the number of submissions had been increasing over the past few years, and encouraged members to continue providing the Committee with a broad base from which candidates could be selected.

**2001:109.**

President's Report

Mr. Traves spoke to and expanded on his recent communication to the University community.

All Faculties had been active in improving their recruitment efforts over the past year, and he was happy to report that enrolment for the present year appeared to have increased substantially. He thanked those in every part of the University's operations who had helped to ensure that recruitment and registration had gone well, and who were welcoming increased numbers of students into their departments and faculties. A final count would not be available until the beginning of October, but it appeared that most of the increase had come from outside Halifax.

Students coming from outside the municipality represented a growing demand for residence space, and the University had been working to meet this demand through major projects such as the Howe Hall extension, the conversion of houses from homes for offices and departments to homes for students, and the arrangement with the province for the use of Gerard Hall. Other campus renewal projects had focused on increasing and improving laboratory, classroom and office space.

Over the summer Dalhousie had engaged in discussions which had resulted in the movement of the small Planning Department at NSCAD to Dalhousie's Faculty of Architecture. The equivalent of two and a half full-time faculty members had been transferred into the Department of Urban and Rural Planning. Also, the provincial government had agreed to transfer the relevant portion of the operating grant to Dalhousie. That, together with tuition fees, was expected to cover the cost of this addition to the University. In sum, the transfer represented an opportunity to add faculty resources, expand Dalhousie's academic programming, and potentially attract additional students into this area of study.

Most members would have noted the major research initiatives under way in the University. At present approximately \$100 mil worth of Dalhousie proposals had been submitted to the Atlantic Innovation Fund for the competition which would close on September 28, 2001. Of the approximately \$900 mil in proposals expected to be submitted from throughout the region, approximately \$100 mil would likely be distributed. The President had been encouraged by the creativity and energy which had gone into preparing the proposals from Dalhousie.

A new CFI competition had commenced and Dalhousie had once again made numerous submissions. The long-standing problem of finding resources to match successful CFI applications remained cause for concern; however, during the past spring the Nova Scotia government had earmarked \$15 mil for the creation of a soon to be established new trust fund, the Nova Scotia Research and Innovation Trust, which would create a pool of matching funds for CFI-approved projects.

Other efforts to secure specific allocations for the University continued. The Federal Minister of Finance had recently indicated a willingness to spend considerable federal money in the region. Through the Atlantic Association of Universities, Dalhousie was participating in the preparation of a submission to the federal government calling for a number of new projects which could represent both savings in the area of operating expenditures and substantial investments in campus renewal. At the provincial level, the President would continue to lobby for more funds for the University, and in particular for a multi-year funding commitment which would allow for a more rational planning process.

Mr. McGrath thought the new residence houses and Gerard Hall looked wonderful, but he was concerned about the new residence being constructed by private developers at the corner of South and LeMarchant Streets. The projected opening date of September 2001 had passed, and construction continued. Was there appropriate accommodation for those students who might have expected to be housed in that facility? Mr. Traves noted that the University had known for some time that the project was behind schedule, as a result of difficulties in securing both materials and building trades people. He expected completion of the project in a month. It was his understanding that students who had approached the developer had been advised that they would need to make arrangements until the project was open. Mr. McGrath was concerned that some

students would find accommodation elsewhere; then when the developers were unable to fill the units they would take in non-students. Since the project was intended for students, could the President report back to Senate with further details on the progress of construction and on the occupants of the building?

Mr. Bradfield wondered why, during the previous week, there had been long line-ups of students stretching from the Registrar's Office down to the President's Office? Had they run into problems registering? On the Banner project specifically, Mr. Bradfield referred to the messages from the Vice President Finance & Administration about completion of the new module. In the near future, could Senate have a report on the projects which were now occupying the staff working out of the two Banner Manors, and on the number of individuals still working on the Banner system? Mr. Traves agreed to ask Mr. Mason to prepare an appropriate response as time permitted. Concerning the lineups, the University had allowed government officers to use the ground floor of the Arts and Administration Building for the provincial student aid program, a government, not a Dalhousie program.

**2001:110.**

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:25 p.m.