

Item: Senate Minutes, September 1997

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 1997. 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, 8 September 1997 at 4:00p.m. in the University Hall, Macdonald Building.

Present with Mr. C. Stuttard in the chair were the following: Adams, Apostle, Bell, Binkley, Bleasdale, Boychuk, Bradfield, Camfield, Connolly, Crocker, Cunningham, Egan, Emodi, Farmer, Fooladi, Furrow, Gantar, Guppy, Gupta, Hartzman, Hooper, Kay-Raining Bird, Kipouros, Lacey, Lee, MacDonald, MacInnis, Maloney, McNeil-Myers, Moore, Morehouse, Morrissey, Patriquin, Phillips, C.Powell, H. Powell, Rathwell, Ricketts, Robertson, Rosson, Ruedy, Russell, Ryall, Scassa, Shafai, Shepherd, Siddiq, Taylor, Tindall, Tomblin Murphy, Traves, Ugursal, Wallace, White, Wrixon.

Invitee: J. Eastman

Regrets: Bishop, Coffin, Hyndman, McIntyre, Oore, Vohra.

Mr. Stuttard welcomed members to the first meeting of the fall term.

97:118.

**Adoption of Agenda**

The agenda was adopted as circulated.

97:119.

**Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

The minutes of the meeting of 28 July, 1997 were adopted as circulated.

97:120.

**Matters Arising**

There were no matters arising.

97:121.

### **Nominations to Senate Committees**

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

That Senate approve the nomination to the Senate Steering Committee of Don Cunningham (Dentistry) 1999.

That Senate approve the nomination to the University Environment Committee of Dale Retallack (Engineering) 2000.

That Senate approve the nomination for Senate Representative on the Board of Governors of Phillip Saunders (Law) 2000.

That Senate approve the nomination to the Audit Committee of the Board of Governors of John O'Brien (Arts and Social Sciences).

After the requisite call for further nominations, Mr. Stuttard declared the nominees elected.

97:122.

### **Election to SAPBC**

Mr. Stuttard reminded members that there were three candidates for two positions, one for a two-year term and the other for a one-year term. As explained on the ballots, balloting would be by ranking, the so called preference method. Members could rank candidates one, two, or three, or rank two of them one and the third one three. The ranking numbers would be tallied, and the candidate with the smallest total ranking would be elected to the two-year term, and the candidate with the next smallest to the one-year term. Scrutineers were: Mr. Lee for Mr. Vohra, Mr. Apostle for Ms. Binkley, and Mr. Ricketts for Ms. Scassa. Ms. Bleasdale distributed the ballots.

Mr. Adams asked whether it would be appropriate at this time to ask the candidates to make a short comment on what they thought the SAPBC was, and what they perceived their role on it to be. Would this be unprecedented? If so, he wondered why it had never been done before, given that c.v.'s told only a limited amount about the candidates who were being elected to important committees. Mr. Stuttard indicated that as far as he knew this would be unprecedented, but asked members for their comments on the reasons for past practice in this area, and possible future practice. Mr. Bradfield suggested that a personal statement could be included with the information presently circulated to Senate. This was the practice of the Dalhousie Faculty Association, and seemed an effective method of conveying why candidates were interested in election to specific committees. Mr. Stuttard noted that the contested election for a Senate committee appeared to be a landmark in the history of Senate, and a reason for rejoicing. He was concerned that Senate not create too many hurdles for potential future candidates, but at the same time thought both suggestions might be useful. He interpreted Mr. Adams suggestion as a voluntary, optional way of proceeding which would not require a vote.

Ballots were then collected and given to the scrutineers for counting.

97:123.

### **Report of the President**

Given the outstanding turnout for the meeting, Mr. Traves felt some sense of obligation to inspire members while ballots were being counted. He trusted that members remembered his message e-mailed at the beginning of the week in which he reported on exciting developments and areas requiring members attention in the near future. Could members please treat that e-mail as his President's Report, and address to him questions arising from it, or concerning other issues facing the University.

Mr. Lacey understood that the University was still in the process of negotiating with the Nova Scotia Council about their final Report on university funding. Could the President report on any developments coming out of a recent meeting with Mr. Rans, or any other breaking news? Mr. Traves reminded members that last winter the Council had issued a simulation which addressed a number of principles they believed necessary to the crafting of a funding formula. The university community had responded on a number of occasions, had raised problems and concerns, and representatives met with Council. The Council was presently following up on many of the issues raised, and was attempting to come up with a new simulation. Mr. Traves noted that corrections to some of the original assumptions used in the first simulation had improved Dalhousie's position. However, he thought that the Council might not complete their work in time for the next budget distributions to the Universities; and they might not complete their work before a new provincial administration, perhaps with a different perspective, took over.

Mr. Bradfield thought a written report from the President for each meeting would be a valuable means of keeping Senators apprised not only of on-going issues, but also of important new matters requiring senators attention. Over the course of the year, the President could cover a number of different areas on Campus, reporting on issues such as the Capital Fund Campaign in some detail. This could provide information which was often lacking when Senators had to make important decisions. Mr. Traves assured Senate he would be happy to present more detailed information on specific issues, though a weekly or bi-weekly report might not always be the most effective way of disseminating information. Going one step further, the President suggested it would be useful to have University Administrators, directly active in key areas, present reports to Senate. Senior Administrative Officers would be able to address particular areas which were their immediate responsibility. He asked Senate to consider whether they would be interested in hearing a series of reports. If so, he would be delighted to help implement this proposal. At the Board of Governors, over the past year, this type of presentation has been welcomed. Following up on this suggestion, Mr. Stuttard asked Senators to please inform Senate Officers, anytime up to a week before a Senate meeting, of those issues which were of concern to them, and to indicate those individuals from whom they would like to hear. That would ensure a flow of information which reflected members' concerns at any particular point during the year. Mr. Ryall raised the issue of the difficulty students were experiencing in travelling from the Studley Campus to Sexton Campus within the ten-minute time frame dictated by the scheduling of classes. Colleagues, operating under the same time constraints, were also experiencing difficulty finding parking spots. Would it be possible to quickly implement a shuttle service? Mr. Traves acknowledged

the importance of this issue, and assured members that the Vice-President (Student Services) was attempting to determine the extent of the problem and the most effective means of addressing it. The President awaited the Vice-President's report. Mr. Ugursal noted the importance of looking at the issue over the long term, and not simply focussing on solving the immediate problem. Students will be discouraged from taking courses on the two campuses unless they know a long-term solution is forthcoming. Mr. Traves accepted Mr. Ugursal's advice.

97:124

### **Question Period**

In the context of the Chief Librarian's recent decision to step down and return to the professoriate, Mr. Bradfield wondered what was the current policy for individuals who went from administrative positions to positions in the professoriate. Did they take their administrative salary with them, and if so, whose envelope paid for that additional salary? Mr. Traves responded that they did not.

Mr. Bradfield then raised the problem of a current credit card fraud on campus. Apparently some individual had been applying for credit cards in the names of faculty members, using personal information such as members' income and social insurance numbers. The personal information appeared to come from University personnel records. Faculty members in different Departments were being billed, on cards which they did not possess, for goods which they had not solicited or received. In the light of the fraud recently perpetrated by an employee who had diverted \$125,000 from the University, Mr. Bradfield wondered whether procedures were in place to identify any individual or individuals making unauthorized use of personnel records. Mr. Traves thanked Mr. Bradfield for raising the issue, and undertook to look into the matter further and bring an answer to the next Senate meeting. He did not know how many individuals had been targeted to date.

Referring back to Mr. Bradfield's earlier question, Mr. Farmer wondered what impact might be felt in the Library as a result of the University Librarian's resignation. Mr. Traves was reluctant to respond to a personnel issue involving a particular individual. He requested time to consider the appropriate response to such question. Responding generally, Mr. Traves explained that when an administrative head was hired, from outside of the relevant Faculty or Administrative Department, funds were added to the budget, through the budget allocation process, or the unit absorbed the anticipated expenditure for the salary paid to the individual who was already in the unit's complement. When an individual ended their administrative role, but stayed in the relevant unit, the established complement was not changed. Basically, all administrative and academic units paid for all of their personnel out of their established budgets. The coming and going of individuals did not change their budget allocation.

Mr. Bradfield questioned whether there were three more positions to be filled on the University Environment Committee. Mr. Stuttard explained that the University Environment Committee was large, with even more ex officio or other members than Senate's elected members. The Committee had not met for two years. Indeed, a year ago he had asked Committee members to consider their *raison d'etre*. Since then, there had been one meeting, but that had not even approached the 50% quorum. The present Chair of the Committee, Mr. Louch, has been preparing materials for a

meeting in the near future. At that point the Committee will consider their terms of reference.

Mr. Stuttard asked members whether they wished to adjourn the meeting, and allow the scrutineers to continue their work in solitude. He reminded members that the 22 September meeting would consider important issues coming from the Steering Committee.

97:125.

**Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.[Shortly after adjournment the scrutineers reported the following total rankings from 53 ballots: Binkley, 108; Scassa, 88; Vohra, 109. These results were then communicated to all Senators by e-mail or fax.]

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY

APPROVED MINUTES

OF

SENATE MEETING

Senate met in regular session on Monday, September 22, 1997 at 4:00 p.m. in the University Hall, Macdonald Building.

Present with Mr. Stuttard in the chair were the following: Adams, Apostle, Archibald, Binkley, Bleasdale, Boychuk, Bradfield, Cameron, Connolly, Crocker, Cunningham, Egan, Emodi, Farmer, Gantar, Guppy, Hartzman, Hooper, Hyndman, Iskandar, Kay-Raining Bird, Kipouros, Lacey, Lee, B. MacDonald (for Coffin), McIntyre, Myers, Moore, Oore, Patriquin, Phillips, H. Powell, Rathwell, Rhodes, Ross, Ricketts, Robertson, Ross, Rosson, Ruedy, Russell, Ryall, Scassa, Shafai, Siddiq, Taylor, Thompson, Tindall, Traves, Ugursal, Wallace, White.

Invitees: A. Kaiser.

Regrets: Bell, Camfield, Kimmins, MacInnis, Morehouse, Morrissey, C. Powell, Vohra.

97:126.

Welcome of New Member

Mr. Stuttard welcomed the new student Senator from DalTech, Mr. Gordon Ross.

97:127.

Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as circulated. Mr. Stuttard advised members that Mr. Kaiser had been invited to attend the meeting at 5:15 to present the Report of the Hearing Panel of the Senate Academic Appeals Committee.

97:128.

Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting of 8 September, 1997 were adopted as circulated.

97:129.



### Matters Arising

Mr. Traves reported that he had investigated the credit card fraud about which Mr. Bradfield had asked at the last meeting. He understood that, for its victims, this scam had been distressing; however, not many members had been affected. It appeared that the fraud had been perpetrated some time ago, and had made use of the type of personnel information routinely available in faculty mailboxes around campus. Security and Personnel were continuing to investigate and monitor the situation.

97:130.

### Report of the Nominating Committee

On behalf of the Nominating Committee, Ms. Guppy moved:

That Senate approve the nomination of Eleftherios Zouros (Science) 1997-2000 to the Senate Committee on Academic Administration; Paul Brown (Management) 1997-2000; and Phil Acott (Medicine) 1997-2000 to the Senate Library Committee; and Mary Anne White (Science) 1997-2000 as the Senate representative on the University Hearing Committee.

After the requisite three calls for further nominations, the question was called.

The motion was CARRIED.

97:131.

### University Governance Document

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

That Senate adopt the revised University Governance Document on the Appointment, Review and Reappointment of the President and other senior administrators, dated September 11, 1997.

Mr. Stuttard suggested that members consider the document section by section. Mr. Rhodes remarked that the document did not include provisions for appointment of the Associate Principal for Graduate Studies and Research at DalTech. Mr. Stuttard responded that this omission had been noted earlier and he had consulted with individuals at DalTech; he invited Mr. Rhodes to submit appropriate wording which could be brought to the next meeting of Senate for inclusion in the document. Ms. Powell asked whether at section 2.2.5.1 the University Librarian could be specifically included as one of the "Representatives of the University Community". Mr. Crocker noted that some of the other categories which he thought would have warranted representation were not included in the list of proposed representatives; however, he did not think the University Librarian needed to be specified as a special category. Mr. Stuttard responded that the University Librarian and an elected representative from the Librarians were



members of Senate, and consequently would be included under the category "Members of the Board and Senate". Ms. Powell also asked that section 7.1 be revised to clarify the membership of the Presidential Review Committee.

Mr. Tindall was concerned that the provisions for confidentiality extended to the treatment of the short list. The process should be open at this stage in deliberations. Referring to 2.2.5.1 and 2.2.5.2, Mr. Bradfield asked for clarification as to how representation would work. How, for example, could representatives of the alumni association or a bargaining unit act as representatives, reflecting the concerns and opinions of their constituencies, if proceedings were conducted in secrecy? Ms. Bleasdale agreed that the provisions for confidentiality appeared to preclude meaningful representation and consultation outside the small group which would comprise any review or search committee set out in the document.

Mr. Crocker asked whether under 2.2.5.1 the President might be in a conflict of interest, given his role in reviewing, searching for, and appointing the Vice-Presidents and Deans who would subsequently review the performance of the President. Mr. Traves clarified that this was a list of representatives with whom the Review Committee would consult, not of individuals who would conduct the Review. Mr. Ugursal suggested it would be useful to consider explicitly limiting the number of terms an individual could serve in each position; it would be unhealthy to have one individual in the same position for an extended period. Mr. Stuttard noted that 1.3.4 made reference to "maximum terms of office as prescribed in the document," but the number of reappointments allowable was not specified. He believed the wisdom of the University community would prevent any unduly long tenure in office.

Mr. Bradfield saw nothing in the document which precluded or encouraged reporting back to Senate on issues such as the establishment of the criteria for a position, the arrival at a shortlist, and, in general, updates on progress and the types of issues under consideration. Mr. Stuttard stated members could assume reporting would be encouraged. At 1.2.2 Mr. Bradfield asked that the document specify that those incumbents holding appointments at the pleasure of the Board would be "reviewed explicitly whenever the President's performance was reviewed" at the end of his/her term. Mr. Traves noted that this would involve the simultaneous review of approximately thirty positions by one committee, a process which struck him as unwieldy. Mr. Stuttard said it was understood that the review of the President would cover the President's annual reviews of administrators appointed without term.

Mr. Ruedy found an ambiguity in the process for review of the President when he/she was not seeking reappointment. In the case of a Dean, a review committee undertook the same task whether or not the Dean was seeking reappointment. To maintain balance in the document, and in the interests of the University, the review of the President needed to be equally thorough. Mr. Ruedy was also concerned that the membership and functioning of a Presidential Search Committee remained undefined, and he asked Senators to look carefully at this.

Mr. Adams asked why there was no provision for a student on the Presidential Review Committee. Mr. Traves understood the desire of various constituencies to be represented; however he highlighted the need to maintain equality of representation for the Board and the



Senate on this Committee. To this end, the Board and Senate would each choose their own representatives, one of whom might be a student. Provision for a representative of the students, distinct from the representatives of the Board and Senate, would necessitate addition of another representative of the Board of Governors. The Board considered it their responsibility to appoint the President. Mr. Traves understood that the Board was completely unprepared to accept a Review Committee on which its representatives were not in a majority or at least had representation equal to that of all other members. Mr. Adams noted that there were different levels in the structure of the University, and among these levels the Student Union represented a crucial constituency. In the interests of ensuring representation of student interests, Mr. Adams moved (seconded by Mr. Bradfield/Lacey):

That the composition of the Presidential Review Committee be increased by the addition of one student representative.

Mr. Crocker requested clarification as to whose document this was, who had drafted it, and whether Senate had the right to propose amendments. Mr. Stuttard explained that the document was to replace the 1978 University Governance document dealing with senior administrative appointments. In 1991, the Senate Steering Committee drafted a revised document. This was discussed by the Statutory joint Committee of Senate and Board (the "Six and Six" Committee) but was never brought to Senate or the Board for adoption. One year ago, the Steering Committee resurrected the issue and an ad hoc joint committee was formed with Mr. Traves as chair and three Senate and three Board representatives [see SC96:060]. The current document is based on the 1991 draft and was prepared by Mr. Traves after two meetings of the ad hoc committee. The Senate Steering Committee reviewed Mr. Traves' draft and adopted a few relatively minor amendments before bringing it here today. Senate could make future amendments, but the final document would require Board approval before it could be implemented as a component of university governance.

Mr. Patriquin suggested that some of the nervousness over representation on review/search committees was related to the issue of confidentiality. Senators needed to search for the right trade-off between getting the best candidates to apply for positions, and maintaining confidence in the appointment and reappointment process. Opening up confidentiality at the level of the short list would allay some concerns over representation. Mr. Stuttard indicated that the drafters of the document had debated this issue vigorously. Those who had wanted total confidentiality and those supporting an open process had reached a compromise, set out in the third paragraph of 2.4: "With the permission of all the candidates, the committee may arrange for the candidates on the short list to meet with members of interested groups within the university, but this step is not required if the search committee deems it to be deleterious to the process of finding or selecting the best candidate for the position."

Returning to the specific issue of student representation on the presidential Review Committee, Ms. Bleasdale suggested a friendly amendment that the student representative be a non-voting member of the committee. Mr. Ricketts thought that even in its modified form the amendment proposed by the students represented a misunderstanding of the role of this Committee. In voting against the amendment he would not be voting against student participation in the process of



appointing a President; students would have input further along the line. This committee, however, was a committee of the Board and the Senate, the two governing bodies of the University. Adding a student, whether voting or non-voting, would open the door to arguments that other groups, such as staff, should be represented on the Committee also. Mr. Ryall argued that students were different from most other constituencies on campus since, at the end of the day, they were our employers. Ms. Bleasdale pointed out that the Student Union was a form of governing body at this University, and exercised jurisdiction over a key element of the institution. Mr. Traves found Mr. Ricketts' arguments compelling. He understood and accepted the political arguments that Mr. Ryall and Ms. Bleasdale were making. Nonetheless, the Board was the employer, and the student Union was not a governing body of Dalhousie.

Given Mr. Traves' argument concerning the legal powers of the Board, Ms. Kay Raining-Bird did not understand why the Board believed it was crucial to have as many or more representatives on this Committee as the other groups combined. The Committee appeared to have the power only to make a recommendation; the Board held the power to make whatever appointment it saw fit. Mr. Traves believed the Board would only wish or choose to exercise its power to reject a recommendation very carefully and in extraordinary circumstances. That made it all the more important that the Board have confidence in the Committee which submitted a recommendation and in the process by which that recommendation had been reached.

Mr. Siddiq proposed a different friendly amendment that was accepted by the mover and seconder:

That Senate elect a student member of Senate to serve as a non-voting member of the Presidential Review Committee.

He argued that this compromise, by restricting membership to Senators, would forestall attempts by other constituencies to put their representatives on this Committee.

The question was called and the amendment to the document was CARRIED.

Members discussed and agreed to other minor changes to the document. At the suggestion of Ms. Binkley and Mr. Bradfield the references to 2.4.1 in 2.2.2 and 2.2.7 were changed to 2.2.1. Mr. Emodi foresaw potential problems raised in Section 5.1, the last sentence of the first paragraph, and was unclear why it was there at all. Members agreed it was redundant, and it was struck.

Mr. Wallace asked Senators not to lose sight of Mr. Ruedy's points regarding 2.1, "Procedure for the reappointment review of the President". Whether or not a President was seeking reappointment, there would be important lessons to be learned during the review process which could assist a search committee. He suggested deletion of the first clause of 2.1.2, and insertion of "At that time", "that time" referring to 2.1.1 and the point at which the President informed the Chair of the Board of Governors whether he/she wished to be considered for reappointment. That would make the review process automatic, and not contingent on the President's desire to seek reappointment. It would also make explicit the need for a thorough review. In response, Mr. Traves drew attention to 2.4, the last sentence of the first paragraph, which contained an



implicit provision for review of the past. As envisioned in 2.4, the review would be more forward looking, and less concerned with agonizing over perceived difficulties in the past. This struck him as the most helpful and positive method of conducting assessments.

Ms. McIntyre shared Mr. Ruedy's concerns that the composition of a Presidential Search Committee was a blank slate. Senators needed greater clarity as to what a Search Committee might look like. At present, only the Chair was identified. Were the drafters foreseeing a bicameral, Board-Senate committee? Mr. Archibald also wondered why the lack of specificity concerning this Search Committee. Mr. Stuttard explained that the drafters had not wished to prejudge the conditions which might exist at the time a Search Committee was required. Some flexibility was needed to accommodate developments such as the recent merger with TUNS. Senators would recall that Presidential Search Committees had varied in composition in the past; the last was a relatively large committee of 14 members broadly representative of the University. Its composition had been decided by discussions in Senate and the Board.

Mr. Ruedy supported Ms. McIntyre's position, and also returned to his own concerns over the desirability of a thorough review at the end of a President's term. He moved (seconded by Ms. McIntyre):

That 2.4 be returned to Steering for further discussion in light of the comments made here today.

Mr. Traves was not hostile to referring this section back to Steering, but was unclear as to what Mr. Ruedy would add to the consultation process set out in the document, in order to achieve amore thorough review. Mr. Ruedy responded that, as 2.0 stood, some specific tasks of the Review Committee might not be adequately addressed when the incumbent was not seeking reappointment.

Mr. Ugursal questioned the value of specifying two processes. Why not strike a search committee whether or not the President wished to continue?

The question was called and the motion to refer 2.4 back to the Steering Committee was CARRIED.

Mr. Traves asked Senators to pass the remainder of the document, given the need to proceed with searches for a Vice-President(Academic), a University Librarian, and three Deans. Mr. Stuttard asked whether other parts of the document were of concern. Mr. Bradfield found 1.3.1 on process and 1.3.8 on Acting Appointments too vague. 2.1.2 needed to be reworked to clarify that Senate would choose its members for the Presidential Review Committee. Mr. Bradfield also wished a clearer final sentence for 1.3.10, and an explicit statement that the Board would be apprised of any disagreement between a committee and the President over a recommendation. In general, Mr. Bradfield found the document vague when referring to the President's role in taking a recommendation to the Board. Mr. Traves believed that, in the amended version of 1.3.10 presented in the document, the Steering Committee had addressed the issues Mr. Bradfield raised. Certainly, the Board would be in possession of all the documents relevant to a



recommendation.

Mr. Tindall noted that 5.1, "Appointment of Deans", made no provision for a short list. He believed this was a retrograde step in comparison with what he understood to have been actual practice. For some time Faculties had followed the practice of preparing a shortlist, and inviting interested groups to interview the candidates. He requested explicit recognition of what had become actual practice.

With specific reference to the final sentences of the second paragraphs 3.1 and 5.1, Ms. Binkley noted that the document made provision for information concerning appointments and reappointments to travel up the line, but not down the line. She argued it would make sense for a Faculty to receive information concerning the review of its Dean, and for Deans and Faculties to be given information concerning the review of the Vice- President(Academic Research). Mr. Traves cautioned against any changes which might undermine the confidentiality of the process. He believed that once a decision had been made it would not be helpful for the results of a confidential review to linger and haunt the subsequent term of an individual. Ms. Binkley responded that one of the problems with morale among faculty was the perception that their opinions were not taken into consideration seriously. It was important to maintain confidence in the system. Sometimes confidentiality could be as much a detriment as an advantage to the people concerned.

Mr. Stuttard noted that the meeting had stretched the rules of regular debate beyond the breaking point. In the process members appeared to be indicating that they might not be ready to approve the document. Mr. Bradfield moved (seconded by Mr. Tindall):

That the University Governance Document be referred back to the Steering Committee for further discussion, and brought to a subsequent meeting of Senate.

The motion was LOST.

Mr. Lee then moved (seconded by Mr. Crocker):

That Senate adopt the University Governance Document, with the exception of 2.0 to 2.5 inclusive, which would be referred back to the Steering Committee for additional work, before being brought back to Senate.

The motion was CARRIED.

97:132.

Student Appeals Against Findings of Professional Unsuitability

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

That the terms of reference of the Senate Steering Committee be revised at Function 6 to

include ad hoc committees to hear student appeals regarding suitability for the practice of a profession; and

that the terms of reference of the Senate Academic Appeals committee be amended as follows: under item 2 of "Functions", insert 2 (a) by student in professional programs regarding suitability for the practice of a profession; renumber the existing provisions under Function 2 and 2 (b) and 2 (c); and delete the second sentence of item 10 (c) in "Procedures".

That the proposed terms of reference of ad hoc appeal committees, dated September 4, 1997, be adopted.

Mr. Stuttard reminded members that these motions were the result of extensive consultation with the Deans of the appropriate Faculties. Ms. Scassa thought the proposed composition of an ad hoc Appeal committee appeared to reflect a defensive posture on the part of the faculties which would utilize this appeal process. The presence on an Appeal Committee of a member of the Faculty which was a party to an appeal could be interpreted as a violation of fairness. Ms. McIntyre explained that in dealing with a possible case of professional unsuitability, it was important to have representation from an individual knowledgeable in the field and familiar with professional ethics and standards. However, she assured Ms. Scassa that no individual with any relationship to a particular case would sit on an appeal committee considering that case.

The motion was CARRIED.

97:133.

Composition of the Senate Steering Committee

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

That the composition of the Senate Steering Committee be increased by the inclusion of one student member appointed by and from the student Senators.

Mr. Adams urged members to support this motion since it would provide student representation on one of the most important Committees of Senate. It would also mean students had representation on every Senate Committee.

The motion was CARRIED.

97:134.

Rescinding a Degree

Mr. Ricketts apologized for having to bring this request to Senate. As a result of a clerical error in the office of Graduate Studies, the name of Ms. Caitilin Mongey had not been removed from the May graduation list, even though she had not completed her thesis. Ms. Mongey had been good humoured and more than cooperative in facilitating correction of this error, and was



continuing to work on her thesis. Mr. Ricketts and his co-workers were concerned that this error had occurred, despite a rigorous process of checking and re-checking. They had commenced a careful review of their procedures, and were implementing some changes to ensure this type of error did not occur again.

Mr. Ricketts then moved (seconded Mr. Archibald):

That the Senate of Dalhousie University rescind the degree of Master of Arts awarded to Caitilin Mongey at the 1997 Spring Convocation.

The motion was CARRIED.

97:135.

Call for Honorary Degree Nominations - For Information

Ms. Bleasdale reminded members that the University community had already been asked to submit nominations for Honorary Degrees to the Secretary of Senate by November 28th. She urged members to help ensure that all supporting letters and documentation were in her hands by that date, since the Honorary Degrees Committee would be meeting earlier than usual this year. The date for the Committee's deliberation was December 8, 1997.

97:136.

Report of the Senate Academic Appeals Committee Hearing Panel

Senate considered this item in camera. The Chair then reported that the decision of the Hearing Panel had been adopted, and the recommendations had not.

97:137.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 18:05h.