

Item: Senate Minutes, February 2005
Call Number: Senate fonds, UA-5

Additional Notes:

This document is a compilation of Senate minutes, staff matters and miscellaneous documents for February 2005. 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, February 14, 2005 at 4:00 p.m. in the University Hall, Macdonald Building.

Present with Mr. Fraser in the Chair were the following: Barkow, Beazley, Ben-Abdullah, Binkley, Bond, Breckenridge, Caley, Cercone, Cleave, Cochrane, Cook, Corke, Coughlan, Coxon, Das Gupta, Dauphinee, Earl, Evans, Finbow, Finley, Houlihan, Jost, Kwak, Livingston, MacDonald, Maes, McGrath, McIntyre, McMullen, McNeil, Murphy, O'Brien, Oppong, Pelzer, Phillips, Russell, Scrimger, Scully, Smith, Stone, Stroink, Stuttard, Sullivan, Swanston, Taylor, Traves, Wallace, Whyte, Zuck.

Regrets: Barker, Camfield, Dunphy, El-Hawary, Hamilton, Jalilvand, Meagher-Stewart, Precious, Pronk, Richard, Rutherford, Sommerfeld, Taheri.

Absent: Butler, Hicks, Horackova, Klein, Morgunov, Satish, Scott, Wanzel.

Invitees in attendance: L. Barnes, M. O'Sullivan, A. Power (recording secretary *pro tem*), K. Thomson

2005:012

Adoption of the Agenda

The agenda was **ADOPTED** as circulated.

2005:013

Draft Minutes of the Previous Meeting

I) Approval

The minutes of the meeting of January 31, 2005 were **ADOPTED** as circulated.

ii) Matters Arising

Mr. Fraser stated that in reference to item **2005:005** - Follow-up Report on Reviews of the Report of the Senate ad hoc Committee on Plagiarism, the matter would be discussed as per the meeting agenda.

There were no other matters arising.

2005:014

Senate Steering Committee

Plan for Discussion of Recommendations of the Senate ad hoc Committee on Plagiarism

Mr Fraser stated that at the January 31, 2005 meeting of Senate, it was suggested that the Senate Steering Committee (SSC) be asked to assume responsibility for considering the Recommendations of the Senate ad hoc Committee on Plagiarism and to bring forth motions from those recommendations for consideration by the Senate. Mr. Fraser referred to a memorandum dated February 11, 2005 from Mr. El-Hawary, Chair of the SSC, and which had been circulated to Senators prior to the meeting via e-mail. That memorandum summarized the SSC's discussion at its meeting on February 9, 2005 and included two motions for Senate's consideration, one related to Calendar entries and one to discipline, and noted that further motions addressing recommendations of the Report related to a proposed Academic Integrity Office and Faculty responsibilities would be forthcoming at the February 28, 2005 meeting of Senate. Mr. Fraser noted that, in presenting these motions, the SSC was not endorsing nor opposing the motions, but rather presenting them for discussion, deliberation and decision by Senators.

Mr. Fraser reminded Senators that there were Discipline procedures in operation currently and that any changes that might be proposed at the meeting may require follow-up motions regarding revisions to those procedures.

On behalf of the Senate Steering Committee, Mr. Fraser **MOVED**:

THAT the Senate affirm the actions taken by the Senate Committee on Academic Administration (SCAA) concerning Calendar entries in accordance with the Recommendations of the Report of the Senate ad hoc Committee on Plagiarism—R5, R6, R7, R10, R15, R34, R35, R36, R37.

Mr. Fraser reminded Senators that at the January 31, 2005 meeting Mr. Scully had reported on this matter from SCAA. Mr. Scully commented that the identified Recommendations were in relation to current Calendar entries on academic honesty, noting that one of the recommendations was for the entries to be expressed in 'good but plain' English. He added that in his memorandum of December 15, 2004 to the Chair of Senate, which had been circulated to Senators, he had attached the revised calendar entry on academic honesty and that entry would appear in the 2005-2006 Calendar. Mr. Scully noted that the Senate Committee on Academic Administration was very supportive of these particular recommendations of the Report.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

On behalf of the Senate Steering Committee, Mr. Fraser **MOVED**:

THAT a Faculty Discipline Committee (FDC) shall be constituted within each Faculty, excluding the Faculty of Graduate Studies. The Chair of each FDC shall be recommended by the Faculty and appointed by Senate.

Mr. Scully reported that the unanimous consensus amongst the Deans was that this recommendation was inappropriate at this point in time. He noted that in his memorandum, dated December 15, 2004 to the Chair of Senate, which had been circulated to Senators, he had summarized the arguments of the Deans for non-support of the relevant Recommendations, adding that the Deans believed that the existing process served to ensure a very high standard of consistency regarding disciplinary processes and decisions, and the proposed devolution would place that standard at risk. There was a strongly held view amongst the Deans that the existing centralized process gave the decisions that emerged from the current

disciplinary process, significant authority.

Mr. McGrath stated that after a thorough review of the Report, the Dalhousie Student Union (DSU) was not in support of this motion. One concern of the DSU was the potential inconsistency amongst Faculties in the sanctions that would be levied amongst students who committed academic offences, noting that some Faculties might adopt a more aggressive approach to sanctions particularly in situations where ethical and professional considerations were involved. Another concern was the strong potential for both students involved in a discipline allegation and those faculty and students who would be part of a discipline hearing panel to find themselves in the same classes in subsequent terms whereas the current Senate processes excluded faculty and students from the same department from hearing such cases. A final concern was a possible dilemma in recruiting a sufficient number of students within a Faculty to be involved in the process so as to endure appropriate hearing panel representation. Mr. McGrath stated that the DSU was content with the current centralized disciplinary system, adding that though some process changes might be warranted, the current model in place at Dalhousie was the most desirable. He encouraged Senators to defeat the motion.

The Chair welcomed Ms. Lesley Barnes, Chair of the Senate *ad hoc* Committee on Plagiarism, to the Senate meeting. Ms. Barnes reviewed some of the background and rationales for the Report's recommendations. She noted that the Committee did believe that the consistency of the process and decision-making would in fact not be impacted, adding that several other institutions had devolved processes and with the appropriate infrastructures, had shown institution-wide consistency and fairness. Ms. Barnes stated that one of the most important findings in the Report was that more than 50% of Faculty members were so unhappy with the current process that they were in fact not prepared to send cases forward. Thus while on the surface it appeared that the current system worked effectively, the *ad hoc* Committee did not believe, based on the information gathered from students and faculty, that it in fact dealt with the wide-spread problem of plagiarism.

Ms. Barnes commented that in terms of privacy and confidentiality, the *ad hoc* Committee believed that the Dalhousie University campus was sufficiently large to address those concerns through the hearing infrastructure proposed by the *ad hoc* Committee. She noted that in responses from students in the Integrity Survey, many students were very concerned about the process with several suggesting a change that would allow for mediation at an earlier level. In regard to a potential for a potential increase in appeals of decisions, the *ad hoc* Committee had taken that concern into account with the proposed process. She added that while a decentralized process for discipline may seem cumbersome at first, other decentralized processes at Dalhousie have dealt with equally significant issues.

Ms. Bond commented that defeating the motion should not be seen as signaling complacency with the current system, noting that the DSU did not see the current system as being perfect but nor did it see that the decentralized Faculty-based system as being appropriate. She added that if the motion was defeated then it was incumbent on Senators to continue to discuss the issue further.

Ms. Binkley stated that at a recent meeting of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (FASS), the motion as proposed was fully discussed and was unanimously defeated. She stated that the issues of this Senate discussion were raised at that FASS meeting and several faculty had felt that rather than more disciplinary cases being brought forward, there would be fewer due to student confidentiality concerns. She added that devolving the process to the Faculty level could result in a "two-tiered" system that would need to include a centralized appeals process. Ms. Binkley stated that the FASS had passed a motion whereby the status quo would be maintained but with more resources in place to support the current

processes through the Senate Office. She added that as a former Secretary of Senate, she understood well the significant time and attention involved with disciplinary and appeal processes. Ms. Binkley noted that as society has become more litigious, there were increased concerns regarding constructing hearing panels of individuals with no legal training or understanding of the law, thus making it increasingly difficult for individuals, both faculty and students, to come forward to serve on the disciplinary and appeals committees. She noted that the present system which had some provision for individuals with legal training to be involved or available to oversee the process to be preferred over a more “amateur” approach. Ms. Binkley also noted that consistency of process and procedures was a major concern in devolving the process to the Faculties.

Ms. Barnes responded that over its eighteen months of work, the *ad hoc* Committee had examined many different systems and issues but that the primary underlying issue was that reluctance of faculty to bring cases forward. The Committee believed that the proposed new system was consistent for example, with other systems of law in the province. She noted that the training that would be provided to those involved in the proposed structure would supercede the training that was currently given to Discipline Committee members adding that currently, not all members of the Senate Discipline Committee have legal training; therefore access to the expertise from the Law School would continue to be required. In regards to smaller Faculties, Ms. Barnes noted that the *ad hoc* Committee had proposed that smaller Faculties could have combined discipline committees which would assist in addressing confidentiality issues. She concluded that the proposed system would be fair and consistent and with the requisite checks and balances so as to encourage individuals to bring cases forward and for those accused to be treated in a fair and reasonable manner. She added that the proposed structure did not recommend any change to the current appeal structure but rather, the current Senate Academic Appeals Committee would be maintained.

Ms. Russell stated that at its meeting in October 2004, the Faculty Council of the Faculty of Law had unanimously carried a resolution opposing the concept of devolving the discipline process to individual Faculties noting concerns for consistency in fairness, common standards, privacy, and confidentiality. She added that several members of the Faculty of Law had spoken on the issues from their experiences as members of the Senate Discipline Committee and the Senate Academic Appeals Committee, or as Student Discipline Officers.

Ms. McIntyre pointed out that in regards to the concept of a large versus small Faculty, the Faculty of Health Professions (FHP) was not a large faculty despite having being the third largest student body. The Faculty had two units that have more than 16 faculty members but several others with 8-10 members and thus would make it difficult to create and manage the proposed devolution which would likely fall upon the two large units as happens in such matters requiring Faculty representation.

Ms. Barnes reminded Senators that the SDC members had supported the recommendation to devolve the disciplinary process to the Faculty level.

Mr. Finley asked Ms. Barnes if there was evidence to support the assumption that by devolving the disciplinary process to the Faculty level, more faculty would be likely to bring cases forward. Ms. Barnes responded that the analysis of that issue was on-going, and though the question as posed by Mr. Finley had not been asked of respondents in that particular way, faculty surveyed had indicated reluctance to bring cases forward because of perceived complexity of the process and the time involved, noting that they would have preferred a range of less formal resolutions.

Mr. Dauphinee asked Ms. Barnes if the *ad hoc* Committee had explored the option of revising the current Senate Disciplinary process to include, for example an informal resolution process, rather than propose a new system. Ms. Barnes replied that the Committee did review that option extensively, particularly in relation to consistency and fairness.

Ms. Lynn Taylor, Director of the Centre for Learning and Teaching, and involved in a SSHRC funded project on plagiarism, spoke to the empirical evidence of the issues being raised. She suggested that the primary question had to do not with centralized versus de-centralized disciplinary processes, but with how within the University context, fair and consistent treatment of plagiarism allegations can be achieved. She noted that both faculty and students agreed that plagiarism was rampant in universities, but if people did not believe that a policy or a process supported the needs of those for whom it was designed to serve, then that policy and process would not be embraced or used. She stated that our disciplinary processes were not addressing the concerns of faculty who see themselves first as educators who want more educational options in the disciplinary process. Further, faculty perceived plagiarism as a workload issue. Ms. Taylor raised the question of how to establish a system that was manageable, fair and equitable and that would be embraced by both students and faculty as a resolution to a community issue, adding that it was essential to examine outcomes in terms of who was participating in the process or not, and to carefully examine the data on those who were not participating in the process.

Ms. Stone noted that she was hearing quite contradictory points of view in the discussion thus far and would appreciate hearing about comparisons from other institutions, for example.

Ms. Binkley commented that there seemed to be a fallacy in the link between having a devolved system of discipline in order to encourage more faculty to bring cases forward. She stated that the problem as identified by the *ad hoc* Committee, was how to bring cases forward. The solution was not necessarily to revise the structure of the disciplinary process but to consider the issue of workload. She suspected that in a devolved system, faculty might feel more pressured not to bring cases forward. Regarding the workload issue, she suggested that faculty might chose to deal with student plagiarism matters themselves rather than expend the time required to track down the evidence to sufficiently substantiate and document the allegation of plagiarism for forwarding to a Senate disciplinary hearing or in the proposed system, to a hearing at the Faculty level. Either way, faculty workload would remain the salient issue if other remedial strategies for preventing plagiarism were not put in place.

Mr. Cook stated that the Report had been discussed in a meeting of Department heads in the Faculty of Medicine, and there was disfavour with the recommendations as included in the motion under consideration. He noted though that the faculty had recognized that there was a great deal of thought and work which had gone into the Report and the recommendations contained therein. However, the conclusion from that meeting was that the existing Senate process was expedient and efficient, and that perhaps increased support for that process might be all that was needed to address concerns.

The motion **FAILED** unanimously.

Mr. Fraser thanked the *ad hoc* Committee for its work and its Chair, Ms. Barnes for being available for this discussion. He reminded Senators that there would be further motions from the Report for consideration at the February 28, 2005 meeting of Senate.

2005:015

President's Strategic Focus: A Progress Report (February 2005)

Mr. Traves summarized the history of the Strategic Focus strategy , which began approximately two years earlier. The purpose of the presentation at hand was to describe progress over the past five years towards identified Strategic Objectives through specific indicators or measures. Mr. Traves noted that the challenge in assessing progress on the core objectives had been was to determine relevant appropriate measures and welcomed input on determining what other indicators might be deemed relevant to enhance understanding of progress. Before proceeding with the slide presentation, Mr. Traves expressed his thanks to Kim Thomson of the Presidents' Office and Michael O'Sullivan from the Office of Instructional Analysis for their assistance in the preparation of the presentation. He noted that the slide presentation itself could be found on the Dalhousie Website at <http://www.dal.ca/~oia/strategicfocus/index.html>.

Mr Traves proceeded with his presentation following the identified Strategic Objectives and outcome measures over the past five years :

1. **To Strengthen Enrolment:**
 - Enrolment - steady growth (though more modest growth in last two years) in undergraduate and graduate students;
 - Geographic Sources of Students - substantial diversification of student body with 50:50 ratio of local to out-of-province students with significant increase in international students which is expected to continue; increase in numbers of students from Nova Scotia;
 - Average Entering Grade of First-year Students - entrance averages (range 83.9 - 84.4%) of first year classes maintained; percentage (range 90.4 -96.9%) of first year class with entering averages above 75 % increased;

2. **To Enhance Academic and Research Strength**
 - Sponsored Research Funding - substantial increase in research funding, approaching \$100 million currently with national ranking of 12th ; 47% of research funding in Nova Scotia;
 - Student Retention - steady increase of students entering from high school proceeding to year 2 (range 80.9 - 86.0%);
 - Proportion Who Graduate - graduation rates (~88%) above the national average;
 - Students with National Academic Awards - currently rate of 6.9 per 1000 students, national ranking of 6th;
 - National Reputation Survey for Highest Quality (source: McLean's) - currently ranked 12th.

3. **To Enrich Student Experience**
 - Class Size (source: McLean's) - currently 7th smallest (range 10th -7th) for 1st and 2nd year classes, and 4th smallest (range 8th - smallest) for 3rd and 4th classes;
 - Expenditures for Scholarships, Bursaries and Student Employment - steady increase in scholarships and bursaries to 10.16% operating budget with national average being 7.5%; steady increase in funding for student employment (range \$24,850,000 in 2000/01 - \$34,612,000 in 2003/04)
 - Measures of Student Satisfaction (Canadian Undergraduate Survey Consortium) - increased percentage of first year undergraduate students who agree (46% in 2004) or strongly agree (43% in 2004) that "*I am satisfied with my decision to attend this University*"; decreased percentage of first year undergraduate students who had *some or*

much success becoming involved in campus activities though percentage is higher than national average.

4. **To Sustain Campus Renewal**
 - Facilities Renewal Spending - increased from \$2,168,991 in 2000/01 to \$7 million in 2004/05, including \$500,000 per year in last two years for classroom renewal;
 - Dalhousie Space as percent of the Council of Ontario Universities Space Standards - overall space requirements for 2002/03 met to 95% of standard.

5. **To Build Human Resources**
 - Success in Recruiting Top Faculty - increase in tenure-track appoints from 59 in 2001/02 to 60 in 2003/04 with first choice candidates as percentages of new appointments increasing from 84.7% in 2001/02 to 93.3 % 2003/04;
 - Staff Appointments - substantial opportunities for career progress within, and ~5% turnover rate.
 - Labour Grievances - relatively small over the bargaining units, particularly those that go through to arbitration.

6. **To Advance Philanthropic Support**
 - Pledges and Gifts - significant increase in total gifts and pledges; significant increase in alumni as well as other donors;
 - Value of Endowment Funds - in 2003/04 valued at \$282.5 million ranking 7th in Canada;
 - Endowment Funds Investment Performance - over 10 years to December 31, 2003, 9.5 % (ranking 4th in Canada);
 - Endowment Expenditures - in 2003/04, \$6.2 million to student support, \$5.0 million to Academic Chairs and salaries; \$2.3 million to library, research , equipment and facilities, and \$1.4 million to administrative expenses.

7. **To Manage Financial Resources Effectively**
 - Operating Budget Revenue and Total Revenue - budgets balanced for last 13 years and no unfunded debt currently; steady increase in total revenue (from \$293.2 million to \$377.3 million in 2003/04) and steady increase in operating budget expenditure from \$159 million in 1999/2000 to 217.2 in 2004/05;
 - Percentage of Operating Expenditures by Functional Area - 68 % (vs. 59% nationally) on instruction, 5% (vs 6%) in libraries, 4% on computing, 8% (vs12%) on administration, 5%(vs 8%) on student services, and 10%(vs11%) on facilities.

In conclusion, Mr. Traves invited comment and suggestions on other measures of tracking performance outcomes that might be useful in addition to those presented.

Ms. Corke asked about future enrollment objectives for the next five years. Mr. Traves replied that the objective target was ~17,500 in 4-5 years, up from the current ~16,000. Ms Corke then asked about the percentage of faculty who had left the University in the past 5 years. Mr. Traves replied that he did not have that data at hand but would obtain it. Anecdotally he estimated that of 50 faculty members who had left the University, 49 would have been retiring.

Mr. Barkow commented that citation indices might be helpful measures of success. Mr. Traves that it would be useful although such indices often were discipline related versus university-wide.

2005:016

Chair's Report

Mr. Fraser stated that the Bachelor of Science Double Major in Environmental Science and Community Design and the Bachelor of Science Double Major in Environmental Science and International Development Studies had been approved by the Maritime Provinces Higher Education Commission.

2005:017

Question Period

No questions were posed.

2005:018

President's Report

Mr. Traves indicated that he had nothing further to report.

2005:019

Senate Honorary Degrees Committee

In Camera - Voting on Honorary Degree Candidates, Fall 2005 and Spring 2006

The assembly moved *in camera* to consider and vote on a slate of fourteen honorary degree candidates. On return to open session, the Chair reported that the slate of candidates had been approved.

2005:020

Other Business

There was no other business.

2005:021

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY

APPROVED MINUTES

OF

SENATE MEETING

SENATE met in regular session on Monday, February 28, 2005 at 4:00 p.m. in the University Hall, Macdonald Building.

Present with Mr. El-Hawary in the Chair were the following: Barker, Barkow, Beazley, Bond, Breckenridge, Butler, Caley, Cleave, Cochrane, Corke, Coxon, Das Gupta, Dauphinee, Dunphy, Earl, Evans, Finley, Fraser, Hamilton, Hicks, Houlihan, Jost, Klein, Kwak, Livingston, MacDonald, McNeil, Murphy, O'Brien, Oppong, Scrimger, Scully, Shelkovyy, Sommerfeld (Recording Secretary), Stone, Stroink, Stuttard, Sullivan, Swanston, Taheri, Traves, Wallace, Whyte, Zuck.

Regrets: Binkley, Camfield, Coughlan, Jalilvand, McGrath, McIntyre, McMullen, Phillips, Precious, Richard.

Absent: Ben-Abdullah, Cercone, Cook, Finbow, Horackova, Maes, Meagher-Stewart, Morgunov, Pelzer, Pronk, Russell, Rutherford, Satish, Smith, Taylor, Wanzel.

Invitees in attendance: L. Barnes, K. Crombie, P. Cox, E. McKee, J. Macrae, F. Nowakoski, A. Power.

2005:022

Adoption of the Agenda

Mr El-Hawary welcomed Mr. Yuri Shelkovyy as the new member to Senate for the Dalhousie Student Union.

The agenda was **ADOPTED** as circulated.

2005:023

Draft Minutes of the Previous Meeting

I) Approval

Mr. El-Hawary stated that in item **2005:019 Senate Honorary Degrees Committee**, the following sentence would be added: "*On return to open session, the Chair reported that the slate of candidates had been approved.*". The minutes of the meeting of February 14, 2005 were **ADOPTED** as amended.

ii) Matters Arising

There were no other matters arising.

2005:024

Senate Committee on Academic Administration

Revised Code of Student Conduct

Mr. El-Hawary invited Mr. E. McKee, Vice President Student Services, and Ms. K. Crombie, University Legal Counsel to present the revised Code of Student Conduct. Mr. Mc Kee stated that the process of review of the March 13, 1995 version of the Code of Student Conduct had begun in September 1998 with the appointment of a Senate *ad hoc* Committee. The Report of that *ad hoc* Committee had been discussed at the December 9, 2002 meeting of Senate, whereupon Senate approved the formation of a Senate *ad hoc* Committee to Consider Revisions to the Code of Student Conduct, using the Report of the *ad hoc* Committee to Review the Code of Student Conduct as a basis. Mr. McKee reported that the members of this *ad hoc* Committee, which began its deliberation in March, 2003 had been: himself as Chair; Ms. Susan Brousseau, University Sexual Harassment Officer; Ms. Jodi Gallagher followed by Chrystal McAuley, Directors, Student Advocacy Service; Ms. Joanne Macrae, Vice-President (Student Advocacy), Dalhousie Student Union, and Dr. Mysore Satish, then Assistant Dean, Student Affairs, Faculty of Engineering. The draft Revised Code of Student Conduct was presented to the Senate Committee on Academic Administration (SCAA) on December 1, 2004, and unanimously approved by SCAA at its meeting on February 2, 2005. Mr. McKee noted that the changes as indicated in the Revised Code, from the original code, both of which had been circulated to Senators. He stated that though the revised version was longer than the original, the language used was more straightforward, and many, though not all of the recommendations in the Report of the Committee to Review the Code of Student Conduct had been included.

On behalf of the Senate Committee on Academic Administration, Mr. El-Hawary **MOVED:**

THAT the Senate Approve the Revised Code of Student Conduct.

The motion was **CARRIED.**

2005:025

Annual Report of the Office of the Ombudsperson 2003-2004.

Mr. McKee, Chair of the Ombudsperson Advisory Committee, presented the Annual Report of the Ombudsperson 2003-2004 noting that it had been reviewed by the Ombudsperson Advisory Committee with the recommendation that it be presented to Senate for information.

Mr. El-Hawary **MOVED:**

THAT the Senate receive the Annual Report of the Ombudsperson 2003-2004.

Mr. Stuttard stated that, as he had pointed out on previous occasions, and according to Robert's Rules of Order, it was redundant for Senate to move that a report be received by Senate when that Report had already been circulated to Senate members. After brief exchange regarding what would be an appropriate substitute motion, Mr. El-Hawary called the question.

The motion was **CARRIED.**

Mr. Stuttard called a point of order stating that the motion just carried was not an appropriate motion. Mr.

Stuttard **MOVED**, seconded by Mr. Zuck:

THAT the Senate thank the Ombudsperson for the Annual Report of the Ombudsperson 2003-2004.

The motion **CARRIED**.

2005:026

Senate Steering Committee

Discussion of Recommendations of the Senate *ad hoc* Committee on Plagiarism

Mr. El-Hawary noted that this item was a continuation of the discussion of motions of the Senate *ad hoc* Committee on Plagiarism, which had taken place at the February 14, 2005 meeting of Senate.

On behalf of the Senate Steering Committee (SSC), Mr. El-Hawary **MOVED**:

THAT the Senate request that the Senate Committee on Academic Administration (SCAA) examine the recommendations of the Final Report of the Senate *ad hoc* Committee on Plagiarism concerning the establishment and function of an Academic Integrity Office (AIO) (Recommendations 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 19, 21, 25, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 41, 42, 43, 54, 55) and provide to Senate no later than the first meeting of June, 2005 its assessment of the most appropriate action for Senate to take in order to enhance the prevention and detection of academic dishonesty.

Mr. El-Hawary invited Ms. Barnes, Chair of the Senate *ad hoc* Committee on Plagiarism to address the assembly. Ms. Barnes stated that a specific concern about this motion by the *ad hoc* Committee, was the “piecemeal” approach of referral of recommendations from one Committee to another which might be seen as compromising the integrity of the recommendations. A preferred approach and one that had been anticipated by the *ad hoc* Committee was to have an open debate on all the recommendations at Senate. A second concern was the substance of the recommendations in regards to the proposed Academic Integrity Office. She reminded Senators that the *ad hoc* Committee had discussed the issues concerned with approximately 2200 members of Dalhousie who overwhelmingly concluded that there was significant need for coordination and visible promotion and support for academic integrity policies and procedures on campus. The *ad hoc* Committee thus had recommended the establishment of an Academic Integrity Office (AIO). Ms. Barnes noted that by not establishing an AIO, everyone would be seen to be responsible and though that was an important principle, in reality no one would be ultimately responsible. She suggested that the proposed AIO would enable critical coordination of academic integrity matters within Dalhousie, and enable the University to be seen as a leader in the field.

Mr. Traves stated that he had concerns with the recommendations regarding the establishment of an AIO, noting that when problems have emerged in the past, rather than dealing directly with the problem, establishing an ‘Office’ had been seen as the a solution which often ended up being

more symbolic of a solution rather than an effective solution. He suggested that all members of the academy were in fact responsible for dealing with the problem of plagiarism in the classroom, from the individual faculty member through to the Dean and Faculty level. He added that such a perspective would produce more effective results than a central office which easily could become bureaucratized. He encouraged defeat of the motion noting that the Deans had not supported the approach, and suggested instead that individual faculty apply the excellent ideas contained in the Report to academic practices, thus making Faculties as a whole responsible.

Ms. Bond disagreed, stating that an AIO would be seen to be meaningless only if it were made meaningless by those involved. She stated that without the visibility of the *ad hoc* Committee which had completed its work, and without the visibility of an AIO, the issue of plagiarism and academic integrity easily might get forgotten. She agreed that addressing the issues needed focus at the Faculty level but that some Faculties needed significant support for this, by an AIO for instance.

Ms. Nowakoski asked if, for example, how the idea of an Academic Integrity Week during the academic year would be implemented and coordinated in a regular manner year to year. She suggested that having an AIO would enable such an activity to occur effectively.

Mr Scully stated that in his understanding of the motion, he expected concrete points such as that raised by Ms. Nowakowski would be part of the SCAA's discussion. He added that copies of a document devoted entirely to plagiarism and produced by Dr. Lynn Taylor, Director of the Centre for Learning and Teaching, entitled Focus (Winter 2004, Vol 13, no. 1) were available by the door for Senators. Mr Scully noted that the establishment of an AIO was less of a symbolic issue than one of altering behavior within university settings, suggesting that having an AIO might in fact drive plagiarism further underground as such an Office would have no authority to change behaviors of university members without the regular assistance at the Dean or Vice President levels, for instance. He stated that the SCAA would be willing to consider the matter as identified in the motion noting that it would appreciate having a sense of support or non-support by Senate for an AIO, and regardless, the functions of an AIO could still be considered by the SCAA.

Ms. Macrae expressed support for the motion, noting that it would enable questions such as that raised by Ms. Nowakowski to be addressed. She added that to vote against the motion might send a message to the 2200 faculty, students and staff who had participated in the process that their input was not being valued.

Ms. Bond commented that plagiarism as an issue was already deep underground though brought to emerging light by the *ad hoc* Committee. She added that an AIO would facilitate faculty cohesiveness and assure that there was consistency in approach to plagiarism within and among Faculties.

Ms. Barnes stated that the AIO would be symbolic to some extent but would definitely be more than that, particularly in regards to the functions of the AIO as outlined in the Report in terms of

facilitating and encouraging the positive steps that were already in place and in promoting others. She added that, should the motion pass, that the SCAA be encouraged to invite the *ad hoc* Committee to a meeting to discuss the issues from its perspective. Mr. Scully gave assurance that such an invitation would be extended should the motion be carried.

Mr. Oppong inquired as to the financial costs that would be involved in the establishment of an AIO. Mr. Traves replied that such costs would depend on the scope that such an Office would entail but would at least include the hiring of personnel. He added that it was not necessarily the costs that should drive the decision, but the nature of the problem and the long-term effectiveness expected of any approach taken, noting that a funded central office quite likely may not make a difference.

Ms Barnes reminded Senators of the information in the Report which indicated that approximately 40% of undergraduate students engaged in activity that was deemed academically inappropriate and that even a reduction to at least 10-15 % would be satisfactory. She added that respondents to the *ad hoc* Committee's surveys had complained that there were no coordinated efforts within the University to curb plagiarism, and the AIO would provide that coordination.

Ms. Beazley asked if there was an alternative to propose should the motion be defeated. Mr. Klein suggested that the motion was intended to enable further study of the notion of an AIO and suggested passing the motion and await a report from SCAA,

The motion was **CARRIED**.

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

THAT the Senate request each Faculty to develop and implement appropriate policies and procedures to promote academic integrity within the Faculty. Such policies and procedures are to be developed in consultation with the Senate Committee on Academic Administration (SCAA) and in light of the recommendations on Faculty Responsibilities in the Final Report of the Senate *ad hoc* Committee on Plagiarism (Recommendations 3, 4, 17, 18, 20, 24, 33, 39, and 40). The SCAA is asked to provide to Senate by September, 2005, a progress report summarizing action taken by Faculties in this regard.

Mr. Scully voiced support for the motion but moved an amendment to the motion, seconded by Mr. Klein, to change the date in its last sentence of the motion as follows:

THAT the Senate request each Faculty to develop and implement appropriate policies and procedures to promote academic integrity within the Faculty. Such policies and procedures are to be developed in consultation with the Senate Committee on Academic Administration (SCAA) and in light of the recommendations on Faculty Responsibilities in the Final Report of the Senate *ad hoc* Committee on Plagiarism (Recommendations 3, 4, 17, 18, 20, 24, 33, 39,

and 40). The SCAA is asked to provide to Senate by October, 2005, a progress report summarizing action taken by Faculties in this regard.

The amendment to the motion was **CARRIED**.

The amended motion was **CARRIED**.

2005:027

Enrolment Planning and Management Report #7

Mr. Scully presented the Enrolment Planning and Management Report #7 which had been circulated to Senators. He summarized the background of the enrolment and planning management process since 2000, noting the issues which had led to the initiative. He indicated that the focus had been primarily on undergraduate enrolment and retention but more recently, graduate and international student enrolment was being incorporated as well.

Mr. Scully noted the following points noting that the details were in the Report itself:

- Enrolment numbers: There was a noticeable drop in the number of students registered in first year courses in 2004-05 which had not yet been explained; the goal of 600 new students in new students had not been met, partly as a result of a decline in numbers from high school from Ontario though the best retention rate was noted for students from Ontario; there was an increase in graduate students numbers and a decline in premium-fee students.
- Enrolments by Region: Fifty two percent of the entering class had come from outside Nova Scotia; the birth rate in Nova Scotia has been in decline, so it has been predicted that a comparable number of high school graduates who will attend university by 2015 also will decline; there will be increased competition for those graduates from community colleges, for example.
- Quality of Student Experience: Initiatives have included the Learning Connections projects; the Electronic Portfolio project; initiatives to strengthen the Academic Advising system; strategies for the development of information literacy skills and enhancing students' academic development while in residence; re-structuring of the Scholarship program; new entrance re-newable scholarships for indigenous black and aboriginal students.
- Sustaining enrolments: issues relating to recruiting and retaining students - locally, regionally and internationally.
- Future initiatives: enhancement of graduate and international student enrolment.

Mr Barkow inquired about active recruitment of students from the United States. Mr. Scully replied that initiatives had been targeted for the United States, particularly the New England states, but the problem was in gaining sufficient visibility in a very crowded market. Ms. Corke commented that actively recruiting American students might be timely given apparent differences in current political environments. She added that in relation to the revisions to the entrance renewable scholarships, that those scholarships would now be awarded on the basis of merit rather than distributed by Faculty and she was concerned that outcomes might be influenced by grading variances amongst Faculties. Mr. Scully replied that after lengthy debate by the Scholarship Committee, it was concluded that disparities in

grading was more perceived than real, adding that outstanding students tended to perform well in courses taken across Faculties.

Mr. Dauphinee inquired about Appendix A of the Report in regards to discrepancies in offers made and yield of registrants, particularly for the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and the Faculty of Science. Mr Scully replied that the factors involved seemed to be related to local students and competition from other local universities with faculties of arts and sciences. He suggested that our communication strategies for recruiting from local high schools needed improvement, for example in communicating information of new programs available in our Faculties.

Ms. Stone inquired about the new EduNova consortium described in the Report (p. 10), and which was intended to recruit international students. She wondered about which countries in addition to China were being targeted and if perhaps such recruitment was affecting the ability of those countries to retain its citizens who might be then inclined to emigrate. Mr. Scully offered to provide more information regarding EduNova at a future meeting. Mr. Traves commented that the original concept initiative was developed approximately six years earlier with funding provided by the province and ACOA to facilitate recruitment by Nova Scotia universities internationally with the result that recruitment had increased from the New England States. However the funding had decreased to continue this activity, but funding was currently available from government for marketing trade associations, and hence EduNova was developed to market Nova Scotia as well as the universities and their programs. The result for Dalhousie had been increasing success in recruiting international students.

Mr. Cochrane commented on recent trends reported of renewed interest in part-time study or reduction in full-time study, and in distance learning even when in-class learning were easily accessible and available. He asked if these trends were being considered within the enrolment planning strategies. Mr. Scully replied that these trends were considered within specific Faculties, adding that the Dalhousie experience had shown that there was an increase in students studying full-time rather than part-time.

2005:028

Retroactive Approval of Degree

Mr. El-Hawary reported that as per the memorandum circulated with the agenda, Mr. Kwak, the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate Studies had informed him that Mr. Jeffrey Gunn had completed the requirements for the Master of Science in Agriculture from the Nova Scotia Agricultural College and had received his parchment in May 1997. However, Mr. Gunn's name had been inadvertently omitted from the list of graduands for the May 1997 convocation. Mr El-Hawary stated that in consultation with the Registrar, on behalf of Senate, he had approved the awarding of the Master of Science in Agriculture to Jeffrey Gunn, retroactive to 1997. Mr. E-Hawary **MOVED:**

THAT Senate affirm the awarding of the Master of Science in Agriculture to Jeffrey Gunn, retroactive to May 1997.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

2005:029Chair's Report

Mr. El-Hawary reported that there were a number of new/modified program proposals to be considered by the Senate Academic Priorities and Budget Committee in the coming weeks, and that the Report of the Budget Advisory Committee would be on the agenda for the next Senate meeting.

2005:030Question Period

There were no questions.

2005:031Report of the President

Mr. Traves stated that the Report of the Budget Advisory Committee would be available later in the week and he looked forward to discussion of it at the next meeting of Senate. He noted that while the recent Memorandum of Understanding with the provincial government had enabled better prediction of tuition revenues, and positive news was expected regarding provincial re-investment in a Nova Scotia Research and Innovation Trust Fund, issues related to capital funding issues for Dalhousie remained outstanding, particularly in relation to building renovation and maintenance and in new building construction in response to growing enrolments and research activities. Mr. Traves stated that he has had many discussions on these issues with provincial and federal governments recently. He noted that the Atlantic Universities collectively had presented a paper to the federal government on the need for campus renewal and investment in Universities in the Atlantic region. He added that there was recognition by the federal government of the existing problems but there had been no response to date. Mr. Traves noted that there were significant space limitations for research being experienced in the Faculty of Medicine and in the Life Sciences. Discussions were on-going with local hospitals and with the provincial government to address alternative resources to meet these space limitations for research.

Mr. Traves commented that in relation to the recent federal budget, there had been no claw-back in funding with some forward momentum which would provide opportunities for advancing research agendas over the next few years. He noted for example, the increases in allotments to federal research granting agencies - 3.4% to NSERC, 3.9% to SSHRC, and 4.9% to CIHR., adding that funding to support the indirect costs of supporting that research had increased by 6.1%. He reported the renewal of the Atlantic Innovations Fund at \$300 million spread over five years.

Ms. Corke inquired if there had been any thought to specifically encouraging faculty to contribute to the University's Capital Campaign. Mr. Traves replied that such an approach had been in place in the last major Capital Campaign, and that likely, a similar approach would be used again.

Mr. Evans asked Mr. Traves to comment on the outcome of the recent arbitration ruling regarding the option of withdrawal of pension plan contributions versus leaving such funds in the pension plan. Mr. Traves summarized the background to the arbitration and the ruling that the University could not

eliminate the option of withdrawing pension plan contributions, though the arbitrator had noted other policies that the University had been permissive about which could be curtailed. Mr. Traves stated that a full study of the ruling was being done, and the financial impact of the ruling on the 2005-06 budget would be considered within the Budget Advisory Committee discussions, particularly as related to the operating budget of the University.

2005:032

Other Business

There was no other business raised.

2005:033

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.