

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

Additional Notes:

This document is a compilation of Senate minutes, staff matters and miscellaneous documents for July 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, July 9, 2001, at 4:00 p.m., in University Hall, Macdonald Building.

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

Ben-Abdallah, Binkley, Bleasdale, Bowie, Bradfield, Breckenridge, Brett, Corke, Coughlan, Cunningham, Downe-Wamboldt, Elder, Fraser, Galarneau, Gupta, Guy, Hart, Huebert, Kwak, N. MacDonald, MacInnis, MacLean, Maes, McGrath, McIntyre, Mobbs, Moore, Neumann, Powell, Rajora, Rowe, Sastri, Savoy, Schroeder, Scott, Scully, Slonim, Sommerfield, Starnes, Tindall, Tracey, Whyte.

Regrets: Alexander, Blunden, Bowie, Caldwell, Caley, Coffin, Connolly, Cox, Downie, Emodi, Guppy, Harvey, Jalilvand, Loudon, B. MacDonald, Murphy, Neves, O'Mara, Phillips, Saunders, Traves, Ugursal, Watters.

2001:80.

Welcome to New Senators

Mr. El-Hawary welcomed the following new Senators: Sarah-Jane Corke (History); Ronald Huebert (English); David Schroeder (Music); Geoffrey Elder (Health and Human Performance); Denise Sommerfield (Nursing); Stephen Coughlan (Law); Jocelyn Downey (Law); Paul Neumann (Anatomy & Neurobiology); Colin Powell (Medicine/Division of Geriatric Medicine); Robert Guy (Chemistry); Keith Loudon (Oceanography); Om Rajora (Biology); Jan Kwak (Dean of Faculty of Graduate Studies); Phillip Saunders (Acting Dean of Faculty of Law); and Chris Moore (Acting Dean of Faculty of Science).

2001:81.

Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as circulated.

2001:82.

Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of June 11, 2001

The minutes of the meeting of June 11, 2001, were adopted as circulated.

2001:83.

Statutory Meeting of 6 + 6

Mr. El-Hawary reported that the Statutory Meeting of six members of the Board and six members of

Senate had been held on June 26, 2001. The meeting had been productive; many issues had been discussed; and those in attendance had considered it desirable to continue the dialogue between Board and Senate.

2001:84.

Question Period

Mr. Tindall had yet to receive an answer to his question circulated to the Senate list concerning an article in the June 28th issue of the *Mail-Star*. The CEO of Knowledge House, Mr. Potter, had been quoted as saying: "Knowledge House is working with Dalhousie University in Halifax to help attract Well Spring Students to enroll in Nova Scotia's largest university." Mr. Tindall interpreted the Well Spring initiative as another reincarnation of the Global Baccalaureate™, and he wished to know how the President's Office intended to respond to this latest announcement. Mr. Scully responded that he had first learned of this matter from Mr. Tindall's email. To the best of his knowledge, there were no formal or informal relationships between Dalhousie and Knowledge House in place at this time. Mr. Scully would contact Mr. Potter, find out whether he had made the comments attributed to him, and then report back to Senate. Since Senate would not meet for two months, Ms. Bleasdale thought it advisable to clarify what action Mr. Scully proposed taking in the event that Mr. Potter was linking Knowledge House to Dalhousie. Mr. Scully undertook to explain to Mr. Potter that the statement was not true and suggest that he contact the *Mail-Star*.

2001:85.

Nomination to the Panel of Student Discipline Officers

Ms. Bleasdale moved:

That, on the recommendation of the Dean of Law, John Yogis be appointed to serve on the Panel of Student Discipline Officers for the term September 2001 to August 31, 2004.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

2001:86.

Nominations to the University Tenure and Promotions Panel

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

That the following individuals, who have received the requisite approval of the University President and the Dalhousie Faculty Association, be reappointed to serve on the University Tenure and Promotions Panel, each for the term July 2001 to June 30, 2004: Christina Luckyj (Arts and Social Sciences); Peter Allen (Engineering); and Grace Johnston (Health Professions);

And that the following individuals, who have received the requisite approval of the University President and the Dalhousie Faculty Association, be appointed to serve on the University Tenure and Promotions Panel, each for the term July 2001 to June 30, 2004: Joanne Clovis (Dentistry); Stephen Coughlan (Law); Jeff Dahn (Science).

The motion was **CARRIED**.

2001:87.

Appointment to the Senate Nominating Committee

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

That Ramon Baltazar be reappointed to the Senate Nominating Committee for the term September 2001 to August 31, 2004.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

2001:88.

Bachelor of Arts with a Minor in Journalism

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

That the proposed B.A. Major or Honours with a Minor in Journalism be approved.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

2001:89.

Proposed Revisions to the Terms of Reference of the Senate Committee on Instructional Development

Mr. El-Hawary asked members to consider two motions from the Senate Committee on Instructional Development (SCID): the proposed revisions to the terms of reference of the Committee, dated June 11, 2001; and the proposed change in the name of the Committee, circulated by the previous Chair of Senate, Mr. Stuttard, by email and contained in the draft revisions before Senate, dated July 5, 2001. Mr. El-Hawary reminded members that amendments to the Senate Constitution required the approval of two-thirds of members present and voting. On behalf of the Senate Committee on Instructional Development, Mr. El-Hawary moved:

That Senate approve the revised terms of reference for the Senate Committee on Instructional Development.

Mr. El-Hawary invited Mr. Lee, the Chair of the Committee for 2000/2001, to address the motion.

Mr. Lee provided background to the proposed revisions. At a day-long retreat in December 2000, SCID had discussed its mandate and what it hoped to achieve over the coming five years. Committee members had expressed a desire to deal with issues broader than instructional development. Unlike many Canadian universities, Dalhousie did not have at present a committee focusing specifically on the larger questions concerning teaching and learning. SCID's deliberations had included the possibility of changing the Office of Instructional Development and Technology into a Centre of Teaching and Learning, along the lines of Centres at many North American institutions. An example of the type of issue the Committee wished to explore was e-learning. At the request of Senate, a subcommittee of SCID was already compiling material which addressed questions concerning the advantages and/or disadvantages of on-line learning, and the most effective ways it could be integrated into the University's

teaching mission. Committee members were concerned that SCID had degenerated into a rubber stamp, simply reviewing the work of the Office of Instructional Development and Technology. The proposed revisions called for a broader mandate which would reinvigorate the Committee and enable it to move forward productively.

Ms. McIntyre expressed her admiration for the very fine work of the Committee in the past, and raised serious objections to the proposed revisions to its terms of reference. No one Committee could oversee such an enormous component of the University's mission as teaching and learning. More importantly, Ms. McIntyre thought items 6 and 7, in particular, represented a significant departure from SCID's existing mandate. Advising Senate on University policy could provide the Committee with an inappropriate and intrusive window into operations and administration. The covering letter made that clear when it suggested the Committee would examine issues of class size, individual teaching responsibilities, and hiring and promotion practices, areas of teaching presently dealt with under the Collective Agreement, individual Faculties' hiring processes, and in other aspects of University governance beyond the scope of Senate. Ms. McIntyre also preferred that the Committee act as a resource for, not advise, the Office of Instructional Development and Technology. The Deans had looked at the mandate of that Office, and had concluded that it should maintain its present focus, with some modifications. The Committee would have more than enough to occupy its time and energies were it to restrict itself to the other important areas of instructional development set out in the terms of reference, such as new programs and new methodologies. Also, Ms. McIntyre did not think a discussion of whether or not Dalhousie should pursue e-education would be appropriate. The Faculty of Health Professions was already heavily committed to this type of learning, and had graduated students from programs with substantial e-learning components. In sum, she recommended deleting items 6 and 7, and maintaining the Committee's present name.

Mr. Lee noted that deleting item 7 would amount to eliminating the Committee's existing mandate, given that advising the OIAT was its primary function. In general, it was important to remember that this was an advisory committee, and nothing in the proposed revisions suggested it assume the power to mandate policy. For example, the Committee recognized that Health Professions, and other Faculties perhaps to a lesser extent, were moving into e-learning full force; but that did not preclude analysis and discussion of that method of pedagogy. It had always been Mr. Lee's understanding that the purpose of Senate and its Committees was to deliberate and advise on a whole range of issues relating to the University's mission. The Committee would not attempt to dictate to the Deans, the President's Office, or the DFA, but rather to reflect on issues and suggest possible changes. In the area of tenure and promotion, Mr. Lee thought it appropriate that the University consider whether the structures presently in place facilitated teaching excellence at Dalhousie.

Mr. Powell wondered if one amendment might bring the two positions together. The potential for stepping on administrative toes might be minimized were item 6 amended to read "monitor and advise Senate, at its request, on administrative issues that have direct impact on teaching and learning." Such an amendment would clarify that the Committee did not have a license to pry. Mr. Lee thought that he and the other Committee members would be willing to consider that change.

Mr. Slonim was concerned about the monetary considerations which were usually attached to the issues being discussed. Monitoring and advising on policies was one thing, but applying them was another. Suggestions would be of little use if money was not available for their implementation. Mr. Lee agreed that it would be foolish for any Committee to come forward with impractical ideas. The proposed terms

of reference would enable the Committee to adopt a more global perspective by collecting and analyzing information concerning developments across the continent, for example in the use of sessional appointments. Item 4 stipulated that the Committee would consult with Faculties and Departments "at their request." With respect to the OI DT, Mr. Lee suspected Senators were aware that Office had wanted to broaden its mandate to deal with issues bigger than teaching faculty how to be better teachers. That was part of the reason the Director and the Assistant Director had resigned within the last six months.

Mr. Brett hoped Mr. Lee would not be too quick to agree to the suggested amendment to item 6, since it would deflate the Committee's mandate. He would expect initiatives to come from a Committee on teaching and learning. If it only acted at the request of Senate, it probably would not act. Mr. Huebert returned to the question of accountability and responsibility raised earlier. While it was difficult to construct a hypothetical case, he wondered how the University would deal with an individual in the OI DT who clearly was not performing adequately. Mr. Lee and Mr. Scully clarified that the current Director held a term academic administrative appointment and reported directly to the Senior Administration. During the previous academic year the Director had been reviewed using a process similar to that adopted for reviewing individuals holding other academic administrative positions. At least one member of SCID, Mr. Lee, had been involved in that review.

Ms. Binkley spoke to the complexities of dealing with teaching and learning across the fifteen units within the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences alone. On questions relating to teaching effectiveness, those units could be divided into four to six different types of teaching groups for administrative purposes. When that diversity was extended to the whole institution, it became clear that one Committee could not and should not try to micro-manage teaching and learning. On another level, attempts to make comparisons with other institutions across the country ran up against the uniqueness of Dalhousie. Its position on the coast and as the only large university in the province made valid comparisons difficult on a number of issues, such as the use of sessionals. The Collective Agreement posed another set of problems and Ms. Binkley was surprised representatives of the DFA were not raising those. Under the Collective Agreement, workload was set within the Departments and tenure and promotion was related to departmental and unit cultures. The Committee would be working long and hard fulfilling the functions set out in items 1 to 5 and in item 7, without taking on the additional problematic mandate proposed in item 6. Ms. Binkley moved an amendment:

That item 6 be excluded from the proposed revisions to the terms of reference.

Ms. Bleasdale was not concerned that item 6 would take the Committee into territory beyond Senate's jurisdiction. In the area of tenure and promotion, for example, members of a Senate-appointed panel already exercised authority above the level of the Faculty. She thought members were really debating two conflicting visions of Senate. During her time on Senate, this conflict had surfaced in a number of lively discussions over administrative issues that had a direct impact on teaching and learning. In that context, the differences of opinion were understandable; however, from her perspective nothing in the proposed terms of reference was outside the purview of Senate. The proposed revisions did not strike her as a dramatic departure, but as a rewriting of the old terms of reference in the form of a broad vision statement. They would make the Committee a more valuable resource.

Mr. Lee agreed with much of what Ms. Binkley had said about what SCID should not be doing, though not with her proposal to delete item 6. The Committee would not be attempting to micro-manage but to look at broad strokes. Item 6 addressed broad administrative issues on which SCID would reflect and

hopefully advise Senate. The groups of individuals who formed subcommittees would be a resource for the whole University.

Ms. McIntyre reiterated her concern that the proposed revisions represented a clear departure from SCID's present mandate. In the past, SCID had focused on promoting and encouraging teaching excellence. Item 5 in the existing terms of reference talked about the "administration of processes," something markedly different from the proposal that the Committee advise on administrative issues. The covering letter underscored the difference, in singling out matters for consideration which were not within the purview of Senate, but rather were covered under the Collective Agreement and other policies such as that concerning employment equity. Item 6 might lead to needless conflict and misunderstanding.

Mr. Scully agreed that the new terms of reference were a radical recasting of the Committee's role. As a member of SCID, Mr. Scully had encouraged the revisiting of the Committee's mandate. Like other institutions, Dalhousie had been struggling to find a rewarding and appropriate role for this Committee. The proposed revisions would shift the emphasis from the development and the enhancement of teaching towards the larger questions related to learning and teaching. That was why the Deans were raising concerns. Item 6 was not the only major departure; item 1 was enormously broad. Item 2 raised another question: would this Committee overlap with the work of SCITPC? Mr. Lee clarified that SCITPC had been consulted on the revisions, and that the subcommittees that dealt with new educational technologies were intended to be joint subcommittees. Ms. Bleasdale conceded that her vision of the old SCID had been too grand, perhaps partly because she still focused on teachers when she thought about "instructional resources."

Responding to those raising concerns about the role of the Collective Agreement in addressing questions of teaching and learning, Mr. Bradfield pointed out that the Collective Agreement described teaching as a major responsibility that needed to be assessed in tenure and promotion decisions. Too often Dalhousie had seen excellent teachers treated badly and denied tenure if they had not met someone's criteria for publishing. He would welcome a Committee which focused on the broader issues of teaching and learning, because teaching was not just about instructional development. The existence of such a Committee would mean the Collective Agreement was more likely to be respected.

Mr. Coughlan was much clearer on what the Committee would not be than on what it would be. What did the Committee want to do that it would be unable to do were item 6 removed? Mr. Lee thought the answer depended on one's interpretation of "University policy." If University policy were interpreted in its broadest sense, item 6 would be unnecessary because it would be covered in item 1 which called for the Committee to advise Senate on policy, and propose revised policy. Mr. Lee offered an example of the type of administrative issue that had a direct impact on teaching and learning: an initiative taken by Dean Ruedy of the Faculty of Medicine a number of years back. Dean Ruedy had introduced into the Faculty a document which provided a general sense of what would be considered effective teaching, research and administration for purposes of tenure and promotion. Up until that point, the general rule had been that it was impossible to be promoted from Associate to full Professor on the basis of teaching. But the document had clarified how faculty members could advance to full Professor based on their contributions to teaching, demonstrated in a number of ways. Suddenly, teaching had become more valued in the Faculty of Medicine. The Committee could encourage this type of shift in attitude across the University simply by sharing ideas and information.

The amendment was **LOST**.

Ms. MacDonald was concerned that the terms of reference did not mention "excellence". Would it be possible to have a preamble which clarified that "excellence" was the goal? Mr. Lee noted that the original version had included a preamble that mentioned excellence, but the previous Chair of Senate, Mr. Stuttard, in addition to others who had reviewed various drafts of the proposed changes, had suggested that the term excellence was dated.

Mr. El-Hawary clarified that members were voting on the terms of reference, dated June 11, 2001. The change to the Committee's name would be voted on in a separate motion. Mr. Lee noted that members seemed torn over item 6; he would be disappointed if the new terms of reference were defeated because of that one item. Ms. Binkley suggested that were the motion lost she would immediately move adoption of the terms of reference, minus item 6.

The main motion was **CARRIED**.

On behalf of the Senate Committee on Instructional Development, Mr. El-Hawary moved:

That the Committee be renamed the Senate Committee on Teaching and Learning.

Mr. Scully noted that the Committee had considered various possibilities for the new name. His personal bias was to put learning ahead of teaching. This had the symbolic value of placing learning at the heart of the enterprise. It was also a more accurate reflection of modern views about pedagogy which held that fundamentally the students were responsible for their learning. Placing teaching before learning reflected an older, paternalistic view, and a very different model than the one currently being adopted throughout most of Dalhousie.

Mr. Scully moved an amendment:

That the proposed name of the Committee become the Senate Committee on Learning and Teaching.

The amendment was **CARRIED**.

Mr. McGrath observed that if the environment was not conducive, the student could not learn. Mr. Lee pointed out that SCID had been evenly split on whether to put teaching or learning first. He personally had come down on the side of teaching and learning because approximately 90% of similar committees at institutions across North America used the name Teaching and Learning. Mr. Lee added that Committee member Karen Mann, who was very much involved in medical education and educational issues, had favoured the title Learning and Teaching.

The amended motion was **CARRIED**.

2001:90.

Proposed Change to the Composition of the Honorary Degrees Committee.

Ms. Bleasdale reminded members that the proposed change in the composition of the Honorary Degrees Committee had been necessitated by changes in the composition of the Senate Committee on Academic

Administration. She asked members to accept a correction to the motion circulated by email. The Steering Committee had intended that the Faculty of Graduate Studies be excluded from representation on this body. Accordingly, "(except the Faculty of Graduate Studies)" should be inserted after "each Faculty". On behalf of the Steering Committee, Ms. Bleasdale moved:

That the composition of the Honorary Degrees Committee be revised to include one faculty member from each Faculty (except the Faculty of Graduate Studies), as well as Henson College, elected by Senate for staggered three-year terms; one student elected by the Dalhousie Student Union; two members of the Board of Governors; and four ex-officio members: the University President, the University Chancellor, the Secretary of Senate, and the President of the Dalhousie Student Union. The Committee shall be chaired by the President of the University.

Mr. El-Hawary reminded members that this was an amendment to the Constitution and therefore required the support of two-thirds of those present and voting.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

2001:91.

Annual Report of the Senate Committee on the Environment for 2000/2001

Since a representative of the Senate Committee on the Environment was not available, the Annual Report of that Committee was postponed until the next meeting of Senate.

2001:92.

Annual Report of the Senate Academic Appeals Committee for 2000/2001

Mr. Coughlan, Chair of the Senate Academic Appeals Committee, moved:

That the Annual Report of the Senate Academic Appeals Committee for 2000/2001 be adopted.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

2001:93.

Proposed Schedule of Meetings for 2001/2002

Mr. El-Hawary advised Senators that they would be receiving by mail a copy of the Proposed Schedule of Meetings for 2001/2002. He asked members to consult the Schedule and note the dates of meetings in their calendars. Any perceived problems with the Schedule should be brought to the attention of the Senate Office.

2001:94.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:25 p.m.