

Item: Senate Minutes, July 2004
Call Number: Senate fonds, UA-5

Additional Notes:

This document is a compilation of Senate minutes, staff matters and miscellaneous documents for July 2004. 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 12, 2004 at 4:00 p.m., in the University Hall, Macdonald Building.

Present with Mr. M. El-Hawary in the Chair were the following: Barker, Barkow, Beazley, Breckenridge, Butler, Caley, Cercone, Cochrane, Coughlan, Coxon, Danielson, Das Gupta, Dauphinee, Earl, Evans, Farrell, Finley, Fraser, Hicks, Houlihan, Jost, Livingston, McGrath, McIntyre, McMullen, McNeil, Oppong, Pelzer, Richard, Scully, Sommerfeld (Recording Secretary), Stuttard, Swanston, Whyte, Zalezsak, Zuck.

Regrets: Binkley, Cleave, Corke, Dunphy, Hamilton, Jalilvand, Klein, Kwak, Phillips, Precious, Russell, Rutherford, Scrimger, Stroink (Sabbatical), Taylor, Traves, Wallace.

Absent: Ben-Abdullah, Bond, Camfield, Cook, Finbow, Horackova, MacDonald, Maes, Meagher-Stewart, Morgunov, Murphy, O'Brien, Pronk, Rajora, Satish, Scott, Stone, Sullivan, Taheri, Wanzel,

Invitees in attendance: L. Barnes, P. Cox, R. Hoffman, L. Maloney A. Power, M. Sullivan, L. Young.

2004:048

Adoption of the Agenda

Mr. El-Hawary called the meeting to order at 4:12 once quorum had been reached. The agenda was ADOPTED as circulated.

2004:49

Draft Minutes of Previous Meetings

i) Approval

Mr. Barker's name was added to those present; Ms. Earl was listed under Regrets.

Mr Farrell requested clarification regarding Item 2004:46 - Senate ad hoc Committee on Plagiarism, page 9, third paragraph "...no students with special needs had come before the Senate Discipline Committee". Ms. Barnes clarified that she had reported that the Senate Discipline Committee (SDC) did not keep statistics on students in terms of identifying those with "special needs". Mr. El-Hawary stated that the minutes would be revised to reflect this.

The minutes of the meeting of June 14, 2004 were ADOPTED as amended.

ii) Matters Arising

Mr. El-Hawary reported that further to discussion of the Report of the Senate *ad hoc* Committee on Plagiarism, he and Mr. Scully had met and, guided by the categorization of recommendations in six motions as presented to Senate at the June 14, 2004 meeting, most were referred to the Senate Committee on Academic Administration (SCAA) or to the Vice President Academic and the Dean's Council to discuss and return with recommendations. Regarding the recommendations of the Office of Academic Integrity, clarification had been sought with the Chair of the *ad hoc* Committee, Ms. Barnes. He stated that the recommendations in the Report regarding statistics were being referred to the Office of Institutional Affairs. He stated that he had invited the members of the *ad hoc* Committee to this meeting for further discussion. He invited Mr. Scully to comment.

Mr. Scully stated that in terms of Recommendations #1 and #2 of the Report regarding the Academic Integrity Survey, that a committee had been struck to conduct the detailed analysis of the Survey responses with a presentation to be made to the Dalhousie community in Fall 2004. The Committee would be chaired by the Associate Vice President Academic, Mr. Maloney, with the following members: F. Nowakoski (Killam Library), E. Lane (Office of Institutional Analysis), C. Field (Mathematics & Statistics), and N. Scrimger (Computer Science).

2004:50

Chair's Report

Mr. El-Hawary welcomed new members of Senate: Marcia Swanston (Department of Music), Patricia Cleve (School of Human Communications Disorders), Keith Sullivan (School of Public Administration), Carol Camfield (Department of Pediatrics), John Rutherford (Department of Anatomy & Neurobiology), John Coxon (Department of Chemistry), Raymond Klein (Department of Psychology), and Carmichael Wallace (Department of Biochemistry & Molecular Biology).

Mr. El-Hawary invited Mr. Whyte to present issues which he had raised in correspondence to him regarding the Report of the Senate *ad hoc* Committee on Plagiarism. Mr. Whyte complimented the *ad hoc* Committee particularly as regards the recommendations to place responsibility of disciplinary proceedings with Faculties. He stated that he believed policies for academic integrity for students should match those for faculty and commented on a section of the Senate Policy on Integrity in Scholarly Activity, a "one-pager" which he had accessed on the Senate website. He expressed concerns over the statement that plagiarism was described as a form of academic fraud, as stated on the Senate website, and that the Report's recommendation related to intent to deceive was not to be considered in determining guilt. He suggested that if plagiarism were to be considered as fraud, a clear definition of it as a dishonest activity would be needed. He added that if students "simply blunder" into plagiarism when not attempting to deceive, another term for the behaviour was needed along with a different set of penalties.

Mr. Stuttard recalled that there was a substantial Senate document on Integrity in Scholarly Activity. Mr. Scully confirmed that was the case, noting that the policy fundamentally addressed integrity within the context of research. He added that he had often heard the comment that faculty do not always model the standards expected of students in terms of acknowledging sources and perhaps that expectation for modelling acceptable behaviours to students should be part of that Senate policy for faculty. Mr. Farrell stated that the concept should be extended to academic administration as well, suggesting that sanctions should be imposed on Directors and Deans who interfered with the process of bringing cases forward as

noted in the Report. He expressed concerns over other points in the Report, for example, that there was no redress for faculty to appeal outcomes of plagiarism hearings. He stated that there was a professorial culture in place that needed changing.

Mr. Coughlan asked for clarification regarding the process for this discussion of the Report given that it had not been identified on the circulated agenda. Had it been an agenda item, he would have come to the meeting prepared to discuss feedback which he had received after early discussions with colleagues in the Faculty of Law, particularly regarding concerns about the recommendations for de-centralizing responsibilities for discipline to Faculties. Mr. El-Hawary stated that the discussion was an extension from the last Senate meeting when there was insufficient time for discussion and that on-going discussion will be held at future meetings particularly as the recommendations that have been “parcelled out” to Senate Committees, were returned to Senate with recommendations for Senate. He confirmed that there would be ample time in future for discussion. He stated that in order to encourage wide consideration of the Report, it had been posted on the Senate website with the notation that it had been presented to Senate but not approved.

Upon question, Mr. Scully stated that recommendations regarding de-centralizing discipline processes to Faculties would be on the September meeting of the Dean’s Council and he would Report to Senate back on the discussion, noting that as Senators, the Deans could be part of discussing the Report then as well.

Mr. McGrath stated that the student representatives to Senate were apprehensive about the recommendations to de-centralize discipline to Faculties. He inquired as to when he would have the opportunity to discuss the recommendations. Mr. El-Hawary stated that Mr. Scully would be bringing a recommendation from the Dean’s Council on the matter. Mr. Scully however, stated that he would be reporting back on the discussion amongst decanel colleagues from Dean’s Council but would not be bringing forward any recommendation as it was not a formal University body and had no authority. Mr. El-Hawary confirmed then that following that report from Dean’s Council, there would be further discussion at Senate.

Mr. Farrell asked to whom written feedback could be sent in the meantime. Mr. El-Hawary responded that it could be sent to him as Chair of Senate and he would distribute it. Mr. Stuttard suggested that the Senate Listserv would be an excellent vehicle for this purpose. In response to a question from Mr. Dauphinee, Mr. El-Hawary stated that he would send to the Senate Listserv, the final listing of the Report’s recommendations and the disposition of each in terms of Committee or group to which it was referred.

Regarding the discussion earlier, Ms. Barnes commented that while the mandate of the *ad hoc* Committee had been to assess issues related to academic integrity for students, information related to academic integrity issues for faculty had been received, adding that comments received had included the need for faculty to serve as role models for students in maintaining standards for academic integrity. Mr. Whyte noted that he had difficulty in finding information on academic integrity for faculty on the University website, and what he had found had seemed apologetic in tone and lacking in firmness as compared to the standards proposed for students. Ms. Sommerfeld suggested that Mr. Whyte might not have accessed the full Senate Policy on Integrity in Scholarly Activity which addressed the issues as related faculty including research. She suggested that examination of that document at this point in time, in conjunction with the Senate *ad hoc* Committee Report on Plagiarism might be helpful in determining if any gaps in expectation for students and faculty existed.

Mr. McGrath asked for clarification of the intent for de-centralization of the discipline process to Faculties and if it was intended as a means to deal with the increased workload for the current Senate Discipline Committee (SDC) members where three faculty and two student members sat on each hearing panel. He suggested that if that were the case, he would prefer to re-visit a proposal made at a previous Senate meeting and with which he had previously disagreed, where a proposal had been made to decrease (SDC) hearing panel size to two faculty and one student members. He asked if that proposal had been part of the *ad hoc* Committee's discussion. Ms. Barnes responded that the issue of workload had been raised but in a broad sense and the matter of reducing hearing panel size had not been part of that discussion. She added that, from inquiries made to other universities across Canada, none had a centralized system for discipline, and of those which reported the most success, responsibility for discipline was at the Faculty/Unit level, with some having informal processes of resolution in place.

Ms. Barnes added that in regards to the concern raised earlier regarding "intent" to plagiarize, it appeared that intent had not been part of a Discipline Hearing Panel determination of whether an offense had occurred but had been considered in terms of determining penalties and suggested that the Co-Chairs of the SDC could best respond to the issue. In terms of the issue of academic fraud that had been raised by Mr. Whyte, it was the *ad hoc* Committee's position that plagiarism as it was currently defined was appropriate, noting that the use of the word "fraud" may have a specific legal definition and clarity on that could be part of a future discussion of the Report.

Mr. El-Hawary stated discussion of the Report would continue at future Senate meetings.

2004:51

Question Period

Mr. Finley stated that he had been a victim of theft from his vehicle recently while it was parked at the Dalplex parking lot. He had learned since that such thefts were a frequent occurrence with requests for installation of video surveillance for that parking lot having been cut from the budget. Mr. Scully replied that he would make inquiries of the Vice President Finance and report back at the next meeting of Senate.

Mr. Stuttard inquired, in relation to the Senate Policy on Conflict of Interest, if President Traves had presented an annual summary for 2002-03 and for 2003-04, of decisions taken with respect to conflicts of interest and had presented it to the Committee of Chairs of which the Chair of Senate was a member, as was the Chair of the Board, and the Chairs of the Board Operations Committee and Audit Committee; if any conflicts had been identified regarding employment decisions concerning family members; how could interested members of the Dalhousie community be informed about specific decisions made so as to allay any concerns regarding conflicts of interest; and had any University members been non-compliant with the policy and if so had any disciplinary proceeding been undertaken in regards to that non-compliance. Mr. El-Hawary replied as Chair of Senate, that no Report had been filed over the past year and that he would formally request that the President provide a response to these questions.

2004:52

Senate Nominating Committee

As a member of the Senate Nominating Committee, Mr. Jost, on behalf of the Senate Nominating Committee, moved:

THAT the people listed in Ms. Woodman's July 5, 2004, memorandum to the Secretary of Senate, distributed with today's agenda, be elected to serve on the designated committees.

Mr. Stuttard noted that Paul Hoffman (Medicine), a continuing member of the Senate Library Committee, had resigned from the University as of June 30, 2004, and that the correct spelling of the name of Nominee for the University Security and Parking Committee was Lois Murray.

After the requisite three calls for further nominations, the nominees were declared elected to their respective committees.

2004:53

Senate Computing and Information Technology Planning Committee: 2003-04 Annual Report

Mr. El-Hawary invited the out-going Chair of the Senate Computing and Information Technology Planning Committee (SCITPC), Ron Hoffman to present the Report which had been circulated to Senators with the agenda. The incoming Chair, Michael O'Sullivan assisted with a *PowerPoint* presentation of the results of a survey conducted by SCITPC of faculty computing needs. Mr. O'Sullivan described the survey by SCITPC of office and research computers used by faculty on campus, sources of funding for these computers as well as ethernet and software costs. He noted that there were greater responses from some Faculties than others to the on-line survey and that the results were available on the protected Dalhousie website address as identified in the Report. Responses had been received from 267 faculty members, with no or little response received from the Faculties of Management, Law, or Dentistry. Mr. O'Sullivan highlighted the survey findings noting in particular that in some Faculties, there was significant reliance on research funding to support computer needs, and some reliance on personal funds to support Ethernet and software needs in particular.

Mr. Hoffman described qualitative findings indicating that some faculty were quite concerned that they were being expected to cover costs of "tools" required for their work. He summarized the background for the motions from SCITPC to Senate that were included in the Report.

Mr. El-Hawary, on behalf of the Senate Computing and Information Technology Planning Committee, moved:

That the Senate accept the 2003-04 Annual Report of the Senate Computing and Information Technology Planning Committee.

Mr. Stuttard advised that accepting the Report as stated in the motion, would mean accepting the entire Report including the recommendations in the Report and advised that it would be more appropriate to accept the Report excluding the recommendations which would be considered separately. Mr. El-Hawary stated that was his intent and withdrew the motion.

Mr. El-Hawary, on behalf of the Senate Computing and Information Technology Planning Committee, moved:

That the Senate accept the 2003-04 Annual Report of the Senate Computing and Information Technology Planning Committee excluding the recommendations in that Report.

Mr. Cercone commented that while a member of SCITPC, he had been able to attend only one meeting over the past year. He commended Mr. Hoffman on his work as Chair of SCITPC and the Report, adding however, that he did not see the Report as being as far-sighted as he would have preferred, particularly in its recommendations. He suggested that Dalhousie needed to be more “computer literate” as compared to the rest of Canada, and suggested that further comparisons with other Canadian Universities would help identify best practices for Dalhousie to emulate or to initiate. Mr. Cercone added that he would send further comments directly to the Chair of SCITPC.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

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

THAT Senate adopt a policy stating that every faculty member should be provided with a computer and Ethernet connection in their designated office. Individual employees should not be responsible for providing their own computers or paying for network connections, and

THAT within the next three years, a university-wide program be put in place to regularly upgrade computers to faculty.

Mr. El-Hawary advised that these motions (stated as appended to the Report), should they be adopted in the form as presented, would have budgetary implications.

Mr. Scully commented that he wondered if the intent language of the SCITPC was literally to “recommend” given that Senate had no formal authority over matters with budgetary implications. He advised that the motions should be prefaced with the phrase, “the Senate recommends to the Administration that .”. He added that the matter as identified in the second motion and as written in the body of the Report, that is: “ the Committee further recommends to Senate and to the Administration that within the next three years a university-wide program be put in place to regularly upgrade computers to faculty”, was currently under administrative review within the University, noting that the matter involved significant cost implications to the University. Mr. El-Hawary stated that when Senate adopted a policy, he understood it would be binding but if stated as a recommendation to the University, it would be interpreted as being voluntary. Mr. Stuttard suggested that by using the words “should” rather than “shall”, effectively left a loophole for Administration not to act. Mr. Scully disagreed stating that the thrust of the motion as worded left little room for the Administration not to respond. Mr. Whyte stated that the motion did not specify that it would be Dalhousie University who should provide the computers and so forth, but rather it could be another body. Ms. McIntyre concurred with the view that there should be a recommendation that faculty members, on being hired, be provided with an office computer and Ethernet connection. She added that, in terms of the second motion, the cost implications could be significant given the nature of an individual faculty member’s research work that for example, might require high-powered equipment and inter-university linkages and such. She suggested that the second motion should be struck as it could easily be mis-read in terms of responsibility for computing needs beyond the ‘norm’, and with the first motion reflecting the intent that faculty have basic equipment available to them. Mr. Scully clarified that his comments regarding expense had to do with the second motion.

Mr. El-Hawary stated that the meeting could continue to “word-smith” the motions, or they could be

referred back to the SCITPC for revision after having consulted with the various parties. Mr. Cercone stated that perhaps what was needed was a fully articulated comprehensive program. Mr. Finley stated that many faculty were not physically situated on the Dalhousie campus and that point would need to be taken into account in considering such a program.

Mr. Hoffman stated that, since the survey had been conducted, it had been noted that the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences for example, had made progress in meeting the intent of the first recommendation, adding that a Senate policy would provide significant support for continuing the progress.

Mr. Whyte moved, seconded by Mr. Stuttard:

THAT the motions be referred back to Senate Computing and Information Technology Planning Committee for further deliberation and re-wording in view of the Senate discussion.

Mr. Hoffman asked for clarity on exactly what was being requested. Mr. Whyte responded that clarity was needed about who would be providing the computers, to whom they would be provided, and to word the motions in a manner of recommendation rather than Senate policy statement. Mr. Scully stated that it was important not to lose sight of the point alluded to by Mr. Cercone in terms of the larger picture, and encouraged the Committee to work closely with the Deans and their fiscal resources to achieve the goals of the Committee in terms of faculty computer needs.

Mr. Evans returned to Mr. Scully's point about Senate's capacity to make decisions with monetary implications. He suggested that clarity on that fundamental point would likely be needed by the SCITPC as it revised the motions. Mr. Coxon suggested that, for equipment provided by the University to a faculty member, approval mechanisms might need to be developed to determine what can and can not be provided or be used on a University-provided computer. Ms. Pelzer stated concern for the recommendation that every faculty be provided with a computer and Ethernet connection, suggesting that it might be limiting in that every faculty member might not in fact need one.

The motion was CARRIED.

2004:54

Adjournment

At this point in the meeting, a count for the quorum was conducted. As there was no longer a quorum, the meeting was adjourned at 5:25 P.M.