

Item: Senate Minutes, November 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 November 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  
APPROVED MINUTES  
OF  
SENATE MEETING

SENATE met in special session on Monday, 18 November 1996 at 4:00 p.m. in the University Hall, Macdonald Building.

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

Adams, Andrews, Apostle, Archibald, Birdsall, Bleasdale (Secretary), Brett, Cameron, Camfield, Clark, Conrod, Dickson, Egan, Farmer, Fraser, Hartzman, Hobson, Hooper, Kiang, Kimmins, Lee, Lovely, Lydon, MacDonald, MacKay, Maloney, Moore, Morehouse, Patriquin, Ricketts, Scassa, Siddiq, Starnes, Sutherland, Taylor, Tomblin Murphy, Traves, White, Wrixon.

Regrets: Bradfield, Doolittle, Klein, MacInnis, McIntyre, Oore, Pereira, Rosson, Ruedy, Russell, Shafai.

96:126.

Adoption of the Agenda

The agenda was adopted as circulated

96:127.

Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting

At item 96:120, p. 2, line 15, "Mr." was inserted before "Boran" and at item 96:121, p. 3, line 18, "with" was deleted; and Mr. Hartzman was added to the attendance list. The minutes of October 28, 1996 were adopted as amended.

96:128.

Nominations to the University Tenure Panel

Ms. Bleasdale moved:

that Senate approve the nomination of Lorne Amey, Michael Bishop, Morris Givner, Kevin Grundy, Ronald Huebert, and David Overton to the University Tenure Panel.

The motion CARRIED.

96:129.

University Governance

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

that Senate appoint to the joint Ad Hoc Committee on Appointments, Reviews, and Reappointments of Senior Administrators the following members: Colin Stuttard, Chair of Senate; Tom Cromwell, Faculty of Law; and Melissa Furrow, Department of English.

The motion CARRIED.

96:130.

Dal-TUNS Amalgamation

Mr. Stuttard suggested that discussion of the preliminary draft proposal for legislation to effect the amalgamation of Dalhousie and TUNS be considered as if in Committee of the Whole. Any motions formulated during that discussion would be debated when the meeting returned to formal session. This was agreed.

After considerable discussion, the meeting resumed its formal deliberations.

Mr. Kimmins (seconded by Mr. Cameron) moved:

that Senate approve "An Act to Amalgamate the Governors of Dalhousie College and University and the Technical University of Nova Scotia as Dalhousie University" in the form as presented to Senate on November 18, 1996.

Mr. Andrews moved an amendment (seconded Bleasdale):

that Senate withhold approval of clauses 3 (2) - (5).

Mr. Andrews was not opposed to what was intended by 3 (2) - (5) of the draft proposal. He simply believed it was inappropriate to include it in the legislation that dealt with the merger. As the Chair had earlier indicated via email, these objectives could be achieved easily by other means; and it was unfortunate that these words were here not because the Government wished them included, but because Dalhousie was telling the Government that we wished them included. This was an

invitation to government to behave in ways which would violate the traditional autonomy of the university in its relationship to the government. If the amendment did not pass, he trusted Section 3 of the motion could still be amended to reflect a change which, he understood, was being proposed by the TUNS Senate, was supported by the Dalhousie Faculty Association, and which the President of Dalhousie had indicated was not objectionable to him.

The amendment was LOST.

The main motion CARRIED.

96:131

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 18:05h.

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY  
APPROVED MINUTES  
OF  
SENATE MEETING

SENATE met in regular session on Monday, 25 November 1996 at 4:00 p.m. in the University Hall, Macdonald Building.

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

Adams, Andrews, Apostle, Archibald, Birdsall, Bleasdale (Secretary), Bradfield, Brett, Camfield, Clark, Conrod, Dickson, Doolittle, Egan, Farmer, Fraser, Hartzman, Hobson, Hooper, Kay-Raining Bird, Klein, Lydon, MacInnis, MacKay, Maloney, O'Shea (for McIntyre), Moore, Oore, Patriquin, Ricketts, Scassa, Siddiq, Sutherland, White.

Regrets: Kiang, Kimmins, Lovely, McIntyre, Morrissey, Pereira, Ruedy, Starnes, Traves.

96:132.

Adoption of the Agenda

Mr. Stuttard indicated that Mr. Andrews wished to raise a matter under other business. The agenda was then adopted.

96:133.

Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting

Approval of the minutes of the meeting of November 18 was deferred to the next meeting.

96:134.

Report of the President

Mr. Traves reported that according to the University's legal counsel, agreement had been reached on the text of the Dal-TUNS legislation, and that the various concerns expressed by members had been incorporated into the text, to the extent that that had been possible. Most of the changes were of a technical nature, and included wording which the lawyer for the Legislative Assembly had wished to add to make the legislation consistent with wording appropriate to other

business before the Legislature. One matter unrelated to the proposed legislation remained to be sorted out; and once that was done he would circulate the text to all members of the University community, possibly as early as during the next few days.

Mr. Traves also put forward for comments and questions the planning process for the proposed building for the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. Material circulated at the last Senate meeting had proposed the striking of a Planning Committee with a broad base of representation from most, if not all the interested parties on campus, and the creation of three subcommittees which would report to this Planning Committee. These subcommittees would be known as the Arts and Social Sciences Advisory Subcommittee, the Teaching Facilities Subcommittee, and the Accessibility and Environmental Subcommittee. The project would have to be approved by the Board of Governors in detail, but in drafting the terms of reference and the membership proposed for each of these Committees, the President had been concerned to create a Committee which would have the practical responsibility for planning, and at the same time could ensure broad consultation and significant representation from the different community groups involved. This was reflected in the proposed membership for these Committees, also circulated. In an attempt to facilitate good communication with the members of Dalhousie, and the larger community, particularly those in the immediate neighbourhood of the University, the Planning Committee would include, as observers, the Director of Public Relations and a representative from one of the neighbourhood organizations.

Mr. Bradfield asked whether the proposed Committee corresponded to the requirement in the Dalhousie Statutes that proposals for any new buildings be considered by a joint Board and Senate Committee. Mr. Traves had looked into this question after it had been raised in a recent Committee meeting. His understanding was that Mr. Bradfield's concern had been addressed three years ago when the University was considering its capital campaign priorities. The joint meeting between the Senate Physical Planning Committee and the Board's Building and Grounds Committee had considered and approved the idea for a building to house all or part of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and to increase accommodation for classes. Particular details concerning offices and lecture halls were not properly the subject of a joint Board and Senate Committee.

Ms. Sutherland appreciated that the proposal was primarily for a teaching and office building for the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, but wondered whether consideration had been given to the need at Dalhousie for space to accommodate a medium-size conference,

with both meeting rooms and facilities which could attract exhibitors who would help defray the cost of academic conferences. Mr. Traves responded that no consideration had been given to any of the details of the proposed building, but suggested forwarding the idea to the Director of Physical Plant and Planning who will be reviewing a wide range of submissions for space use. Mr. Maloney recognized that this would be primarily a building for the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, but hoped the Committee would also investigate the pressing needs of other units at this end of the campus, in particular the need for space to accommodate large classes. Mr. Traves noted that it was intended to build a number of large lecture halls, with the expectation they would be available to the entire campus, not exclusively to the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. To ensure broad-based input in this area, a number of Faculties would be represented on the subcommittee responsible for teaching facilities.

Mr. Andrews did not think that the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences had as yet discussed the particular proposal to which the President referred. But his own view was the broader the discussion the better, provided those who led the discussion kept clearly in view that this was a Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences building, and not a general purpose building whose focus would be continually shifting. Mr. Andrews also wondered whether minutes of the joint committee meeting of three years ago, to which the President had referred, were, or could be made, available, so that Senators could see what, if any, resolutions the Board and Senate had agreed to at the time. Mr. Stuttard indicated the Senate Office would investigate the record. Mr. Bradfield, who had been a member of SPPC for a number of years in the last four or five, characterized the joint meetings with the Board as somewhat formal and uninformative, and would be surprised if the minutes revealed a substantive debate about the specific needs the building would meet, and what and who would be housed in it. As the President had indicated to Ms. Sutherland, discussion and planning had not moved beyond the rather vague setting of priorities. If Senate was to give more than a peremptory nod to the Dalhousie Statutes, some joint Board and Senate discussion was still necessary.

Given the nature of the discussion at their last meeting, Mr. Traves did not believe Board members shared Mr. Bradfield's feeling. The Board recognized its general responsibility to authorize construction of the project and the planning process, but details as to whether to have an exhibition space and the number and nature of classrooms were matters properly before the Planning Committee and those who would be the primary users of the building. Mr. Andrews thought that at some point we would need a process which could weigh the different proposals already being advanced for the building, and tackle the

potentially contentious issues which will arise. A joint Board and Senate Committee could resolve disputes more effectively than the process being proposed here, and guide the project through to a reasonably amicable conclusion.

Mr. Ricketts was pleased to see that a neighbourhood representative was proposed as an observer, and suggested that in light of some of the problems we have had between neighbours and buildings at Dalhousie it might be even better to include a number of neighbourhood representatives, and perhaps have a neighbourhood representative actually sit on the Planning Committee.

96:135.

Question Period

Mr. Patriquin regretted that the subject of his first speech was hamburgers; however, he felt compelled to address the problem of odours emanating from Harvey's in the Life Sciences Centre. He had written the President in early October concerning this matter, and Physical Plant had indicated they were aware of the situation, and expected to have it remedied within a couple of weeks. More than five weeks later the problem remained, and in some areas of the building had worsened. Mr Patriquin outlined the extent of the problem. It had a severe impact on working conditions in the AV unit, and on general morale. Faculty and staff were seriously disturbed, and felt the problem was not being taken seriously, an impression which seemed to be confirmed by the fact that they had not been asked for feedback on the present situation. Would it be appropriate for Senate and the Administrative Officers of the affected units to receive reports on the status of the problem and what is to be done? Could they also have information on the nature of the contract covering the Harvey's facility, specifically, the length of the contract? Mr. Traves indicated that others had also expressed concern, and asked whether Mr. Patriquin wanted him to speak personally with Mr. Lord and he promised to investigate the matter. Mr. Stuttard recollected that when the plan had been first revealed, the question of odour had been raised, and assurances had been given that odour would not be a problem.

Mr. Clark began discussion of the recently released Maclean's ranking of universities by expressing disappointment with Dalhousie's position on the scale. Although the process was flawed and the results inaccurate, Dalhousie had to live with them, and he was concerned about the damage the ranking could do to a university like Dalhousie which thrived on attracting students from outside the province. Was there a way to counteract the effect this type of publicity had on the



University, and to spread a more positive image of Dalhousie across Canada? Mr. Traves attempted to put the ranking in context: the weighting of the various factors in the survey worked against Dalhousie; excellent results in the areas of quality of students and faculty could be easily offset by the heavy weight attached to reputation; universities in a major population centre would naturally score higher in the area of reputation; larger institutions have more alumni filling out the survey, and Dalhousie is the smallest in its classification group; and there were two new entrants into the process this year, one of which would inevitably be ranked higher than Dalhousie. The President had already started assembling material to address these precise matters, and he would bring that to Senate when his report was complete. On a very positive side, Dalhousie could be pleased that its ranking had improved in fifteen of about sixteen categories, and that we had scored extremely well in a number of crucial categories. We had a lower ranking for the size of classes available to students in first and second year courses, and that needed to be addressed. In general, anything related to resources puts Dalhousie at a disadvantage.

Mr. Apostle noted that we ranked with McGill in our capacity to attract students from out of province. This made us specially vulnerable to national trends and to this type of ranking process, and he trusted we would stay alert to this vulnerability. Mr. Andrews hoped the President would emphasize the problem concerning Dalhousie's lack of resources in any discussions with the Government of Nova Scotia.

On another matter, Mr. Andrews wanted to ask about the impact of the Dal-TUNS merger on important policies here at Dalhousie, such as our Sexual Harassment and Employment Equity Policies, for which TUNS perhaps had no counterpart. How would these policies be extended after the amalgamation. Mr. Traves indicated that any administrative efforts and Senate policies in such areas would become University-wide. He noted that both Universities were signatories to the Federal Contractors Programme, and recently TUNS had received an award in this area. Committees working on the merger process have identified what may be differences in approach to some policies, and we have suggested a few should become matters for future consideration. There will remain one Senate, and its policies will not have been altered by the organizational change.

Mr. Bradfield's question was about the Wickwire Field. He remembered that SPPC had been asked to rubber-stamp this initiative after the fact. In that discussion concerns were expressed about the potential hazard that projectiles from the playing field posed to cars (& other traffic) on South Street. Had the assurances given then been

implemented, that is, did we have liability insurance in this area, and were we intending to build a higher fence? The Chair agreed that his question would be passed to the appropriate authorities.

96:136.

#### Titles of Honorary Appointments

Mr. Stuttard asked members to consider the motion from SAPBC, dated November 4, 1996, and distributed with the November 18 agenda. Ms. O'Shea, Acting Dean of Health Professions, indicated that her Faculty frequently used honorary appointments to recognize individuals in the community and the professions who contributed to the units and the work of the units, perhaps not in teaching and research, but in other ways. This involved no monetary cost to the units. Individuals given this designation usually did not have the qualifications that would normally be expected of someone in a professorial rank at a university. In the context of this proposal, how could the valuable and often crucial contributions of such individuals be recognized, and consequently retained? It was Ms. O'Shea's understanding that these were Board appointments, but she stood to be corrected. Ms. Hobson explained that the motion was an attempt to eliminate the infinite variety of combinations of titles which were essentially meaningless, and to bring order to the titles which were processed by Personnel Services on Faculty Payroll Information Profile forms (FPIPs). Essentially, this meant doing away with the distinction between honorary and adjunct, since adjunct was the only officially recognized word in a title which indicated that an individual was not an employee of the University. This motion would also eliminate paper work and free up the time of individuals in Personnel Services for other activities. A Faculty could continue to honour individuals in whatever way it chose, but those individuals would not be in a formal relationship with the University, in the way that an adjunct appointment would be.

Mr. Klein was concerned about the possibility that we were giving people titles for which they might or might not have appropriate credentials. Adjunct appointments should be awarded with care. Psychology appointed individuals as adjuncts because the Department valued their contributions to the Graduate programme, but they were either at another university or in the community, or had left and still had students here. Psychology also had other categories, such as clinical associates who supervised students in their practica, and received nominal remuneration; but he was unclear about the formal processing required for such appointments. In addition there were Post-Doctoral Fellows and Research Associates, who he would hate to see eliminated simply because they required paper work.

Mr. Ricketts noted that the great majority of honorary appointments made in the University were probably through the Faculty of Graduate Studies, and all those appointments required Board approval. He explained the three categories of membership in the Faculty, including honorary appointments, and the three subcategories of honorary appointments. He did not believe that the formal offer of appointment from the Board included the word "honorary". Consequently, he did not have a problem with dropping the use of the term. He was concerned, however, with the second sentence in the motion which specified that adjuncts held paid positions outside the University. This would have the effect of excluding from adjunct status a number of individuals such as writers, artists, and the self-employed, who are valuable to the Faculty of Graduate Studies, but do not hold paid positions anywhere. Mr. Ricketts moved (seconded by Mr. Archibald):

that the second sentence be amended to read "such appointments may be given to qualified individuals who are outside the University or who have retired from the University and who . . ."

After discussion of alternative deletions and additions, the mover and seconder agreed to the friendly amendment:

"that the second sentence be removed."

Mr. Ricketts noted that this was important because in a few instances individuals who were employed within one department at the University had adjunct appointments to another department. Mr. Stuttard and Ms. Hobson suggested that the norm would be to give such individuals cross appointments. However, a number of members cited instances of the type raised by Mr. Ricketts.

Mr. Klein was concerned that if we struck the entire sentence we would be left with no definition of the conditions under which one might secure an adjunct position. Ms. Kay-Raining Bird pointed out that Mr. Ricketts' amended amendment might not cover the individuals he wished to include, and might also exclude the individuals who held the types of relationship with the University described by Ms. O'Shea, particularly those involved in clinical supervision. She also saw considerable variation in practice from unit to unit.

The question was called and the amendment CARRIED.

Mr. Moore felt it was unfortunate that members had not been given more information as to why these changes were necessary, and as to why we should not have honorary appointments in future. Mr. Maloney

requested clarification. Was it correct that the only appointments that would require Board approval would be those with the prefix "adjunct"; but under certain circumstances Faculties could add to the Calendar entries a variety of titles, such as honorary clinical associate, honorary research associate, or simply research associate? Mr. Stuttard responded that technically Mr. Maloney was correct. What we were doing here was reaffirming Senate regulation 3.1.2 which says that only the prefix "adjunct" is to be used for Board appointments. The intent was also to discourage the informal appointments of individuals under various titles, when they do not have Board appointments.

Ms. Conrod reiterated the various reasons behind the motion which were set out in the preamble, and summarized the concerns expressed about excess administration, protection of the integrity of our degrees, and the need to be careful not to confuse individuals external to Dalhousie. Adoption of the motion might mean some units have to do things slightly differently, but they would still have some leeway within the non-Board appointment areas. Ms. Conrod also encouraged members to read the minutes of the committees which were circulated by email, in order to keep abreast of the issues coming before Senate, and hopefully participate in deliberations over those issues before they come to Senate, by entering into an email discussion. In general, Senate functioned more effectively when members got involved in debates earlier in the process; and the Committees could engage in more profitable debate also, when they had the comments and concerns of members before them.

Mr. Brett, and a number of other members, were still a little confused as to what impact passing this motion would have. Mr. Bradfield believed that the motion was asking members to stop using the term "honorary", and use the other specific titles with greater precision and uniformity. Ms. O'Shea favoured decreasing administration, but wondered if Senate could find another method of achieving this end. The issues related to Health Professions had not been addressed. The unpaid contributions of a range of individuals to Dalhousie warranted adequate formal recognition by the University, not simply informal recognition by a Faculty or unit. Mr. Ricketts professed some attachment to the term "honorary", because it clearly states that the University is honoured to have the service of an individual, and the individual is honoured to be part of Dalhousie. Perhaps Senate could write to all Deans and ask them to ensure that proper procedures and adequate quality controls are in place for this type of appointment.

Ms. Hobson was concerned that as the discussion progressed the list of titles and categories of appointments used within the University was

growing. Perhaps further debate should proceed only when members had adequate information on which to proceed. Ms. Hobson moved that the motion be tabled. The motion to table CARRIED.

Ms. Hobson asked that members attempt to raise serious concerns over agenda items prior to the meeting of Senate, if at all possible. We would be in a better position to discuss the issue of professor emeritus at our next meeting, for example, if members emailed their thoughts and queries in advance of the meeting. Mr. Andrews suggested it would be helpful if Committees bringing recommendations to Senate attached references to the relevant meeting minutes, but he cautioned that electronic mail was not always a reasonable and dependable method of communication for everyone.

96:137.

Dal-TUNS Amalgamation

Mr. Stuttard reported that the joint meetings of the Dalhousie and TUNS Steering Committees were presently defining the terms of reference for the Academic Council of the new College. Dalhousie Steering Committee had met last Friday to review the draft terms of reference presented by TUNS Steering November 14, and had produced a slightly amended version, which it returned to TUNS Steering. The two Steering Committees were very close to agreement. As the Senate representative on the Academic Coordinating Committee, Mr. Stuttard also reported on the deliberations of that body. Computing Science members would be meeting with the Registrar, or her delegate, and a student or students, to look at a large range of issues, including what form the new Faculty of Computer or Computing Science will take. A second subcommittee was bringing together a group of four individuals to address academic administration, or academic affairs, as they were called at TUNS. The Registrar or her/his delegate from each Institution would be working with a representative from Dalhousie's SCAA and a representative from the equivalent body at TUNS. That subcommittee would meet for the first time this Thursday.

Mr. Hartzman asked whether the subcommittee on Computing Science had been set up. Ms. Hobson assumed that the existing working group, the Joint Computing Science Transition Committee, had already been meeting. Ms. Hobson and Mr. Hartzman agreed to meet to clarify the membership of that subcommittee. Mr. Bradfield assumed that Senators concerned about aspects of the coordination process should communicate with Ms. Hobson. Ms. Hobson reported that the Search Committee for the Dean of the new Faculty of Computing Science had met twice, and had hired Landmark Consultants to assist in its search. Anyone wishing to offer opinions on the drafting of the job description should contact

the Committee. The Committee was interested in hearing about Dalhousie members' perspective on the qualities desirable in the future Dean and on the future orientation of the new Faculty. Mr. Andrews asked what fee would be paid for Landmark Consulting's services, and what part of that fee would be Dalhousie's liability. Ms. Hobson did not know whether it was customary to discuss fees at Senate; however, she would find out what part of the fee was Dalhousie's liability.

96:138.

Matters for Information.

Mr. Stuttard noted two items for information. The Faculty of Science Co-op Report had been received, and could be consulted in the Senate Office. The second item concerned the composition of the SAPBC. The minutes of SAPBC, circulated for the November 18th Senate Meeting, indicated that SAPBC did not recommend a change in the membership of SAPBC.

96:139.

Other Business.

Mr. Andrews circulated a notice of motion concerning Bill C-32, which addressed the second phase of Canada's copyright revision, presently under consideration by the House of Commons in Committee. He apologized for springing this on Senators, but was anxious that if we delayed action until the next Senate meeting it would be too late to influence the Heritage Committee. Given the importance of Bill C-32 to academics, and the urgency of the issue, would Senate agree to consider this matter now. The motion was jointly sponsored by CAUT and AUCC, and Mr. Andrews had been assured of support from the President's Office. Ms. Sutherland indicated that email had been circulating frantically on this issue. The Committee had heard its last address by Margaret Atwood, who had strongly opposed the Bill. If Senate wished to have any influence, it should vote on this motion now. The meeting agreed to consider Mr. Andrews' motion (seconded by Mr. Lydon):

Whereas Phase I of the copyright revision process dealt with the rights of creators, and

Whereas successive federal governments, including the current Liberal government, have promised Phase II to deal with the rights of educators, researchers, educational institutions, and libraries,

Be it resolved that the Senate of Dalhousie urges the House of

Commons Heritage Committee to adopt the proposals of the government for Phase II along with the amendments suggested by the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada and the Canadian Association of University Teachers.

Mr. Andrews reminded members that Phase I of copyright reform had addressed the needs of creators, and Phase II was intended to address the needs of users. Representing both creators and users, CAUT and AUCC had participated in this process in the hopes of finding a compromise between creators and users. AUCC and CAUT had proposed an amendment concerning parallel importation of books which would allow Canadian book sellers to use non-Canadian suppliers if a Canadian supplier holding the rights to a book could not provide it in a timely fashion. This was particularly important to those of us wishing to get books to our students within a reasonable length of time. Though the Bill does not deal effectively with issues such as the use of film and video in teaching, CAUT and AUCC have agreed it represents a compromise they can support.

The motion was PASSED.

Ms. Conrod advised members that SAPBC is currently looking at the subject of Centres and Institutes, and asked those in charge of a Centre or Institute, or those who knew of anyone with information concerning a Centre or Institute, to please read the SAPBC minutes and contact the Committee.

96:140.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 17:50h.