

Item: Senate Minutes, May 1984
Call Number: UA-5, Accession 2007-039, Box 6

Additional Notes:

This document is a compilation of Senate minutes, staff matters and miscellaneous documents for May 1984. 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

MINUTES OF

SENATE MEETING

Senate met in regular session in the Board and Senate Room on Friday, 4 May 1984 at 10:00 A.M.

Present with Mr. W.E. Jones in the chair were the following:

Anderson, Bennett, Betts, Bishop, Bissett-Johnson, Blair, Boyle, Brett, Cameron D.M., Cameron T.S., Campbell, Chaytor, Cromwell, Doolittle, Evans, Friedenberg, Gigeroff, Gordon, Gray M., Hare, Holloway, Horrocks, James, Josenhans, Kind, Klassen, Knox, Kocourek, Laidlaw, Lee S.H.S., Leffek, Mahony, Maloney, Manos, McCann, McNulty, Myers, O'Shea, Ozier, Pross, Richards, Rodger, Rozee, Ruf, Shaw L.R., Sherwin, Sinclair, Sprott, Stairs, Stewart, Storey, Stovel, Stuttard, Thiessen, Tingley, Wainwright, Waterson, Welch, Williams, Wood, Young, Yung, Zinck.

Regrets: Belzer, Blecher, Caty, Cohen A.D., Gold, MacKay W.A., Munroe, O'Brien D.W. P., Pronych, Scheibelhut, Stern, Tindall.

84:39. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting of the 9 April 1984 meeting of Senate were accepted upon motion (Rodger/Betts).

84:40. Question Period

Mr. Manus posed the following question:

"Given the widespread opposition to the proposal by United Equities to demolish Hart House and the bad public relations voiced against Dalhousie University because of the plan, is the university prepared to take a public position in favour of the preservation of Hart House?"

Mr. Shaw responded that he was unsure whether the current plan included the preservation of Hart House, adding that he would follow up the matter.

84:41. Awarding of Degrees, Prizes and Medals Faculty of Arts and Science

It was moved and seconded (Betts/S. Cameron)

that the degrees, certificates and diplomas be presented to the students whose names had been provided to the Registrar.

Bachelor of Arts Honours Certificates (Honours 4, First Class Honours 2)	6
Bachelor of Science (Distinction 16, Honours 32, First Class Honours 19)	285
Bachelor of Science Honours Certificates (Honours 15, First Class Honours 1)	16
Bachelor of Science in Engineering Physics (Honours 1)	
Bachelor of Education	36
Bachelor of Music	6
Bachelor of Music Education	7
Diploma in Engineering	63
Diploma in Meteorology	4
Certificate in Costume Studies	6

The motion was approved.

It was agreed upon motion (Betts/S. Cameron) that the medals and prizes be awarded to those identified on the list.

It was moved and seconded (Betts/S. Cameron)

that Senate approve the establishment of three new University Medals in Computing Science, Medieval Studies and Marine Biology and that this be effective for Spring Convocation(s) 1984.

Mr. Rodger suggested that the motion be divided into two parts, keeping Medieval Studies separate as it was multi-departmental in nature. This was agreed to by the mover and seconder and the motion regarding Medieval Studies was put to a vote and passed.

Mr. Rodger then voiced his concern about moving precipitously in these matters, as there were numerous sections of department which could initiate a proliferation of honours programmes and university medals. Mr. Betts responded by stating that all new programmes must receive Senate, Board and MPHEC approval.

The motion **carried**.

It was then agreed upon motion (Betts/S. Cameron) that these new medals be awarded to those three students named.

On the recommendation of the Deans of the various faculties, the following degrees, diplomas and prizes were awarded upon motion.

Faculty of Dentistry (Bennett/Tonks)

Diploma in Dental Hygiene	26
Doctor of Dental Surgery	21

Faculty of Graduate Studies (Leffek/Horrocks)

Doctor of Philosophy	10
Master of Arts	15
(Distinction 1)	
Master of Business Administration	70
Master of Education	16
Master of Environmental Studies	3
(Distinction 1)	
Master of Laws	
Master of Library Service	33
Master of Nursing	
Master of Public Administration	30
Master of Science	31
Master of Social Work	
Master of Arts in Teaching (French)	
Diploma in Public Administration	5

Faculty of Health Professions (Tonks/James)

Bachelor of Nursing	74
(Distinction 6)	
Bachelor of Pharmacy	50
(Distinction 7)	
Bachelor of Physical Education	24
Bachelor of Recreation	14
(Distinction 1)	
Bachelor of Health Education	10
Bachelor of Science in Physiotherapy	27
(Distinction 3)	

Faculty of Administrative Studies (Horrocks/Tonks)

Bachelor of Commerce	123
(Honours 11, First Class Honours 4)	
Bachelor of Social Work	25
Certificate in Public Administration	3

In each case, it was agreed that the Dean and the Registrar be permitted to add the names of those students omitted in error.

4:42. Reports and Recommendations -- Committees of Senate

A. Academic Appeals Committee

The Chairman stated that Senate could not rehear the case and that the purpose of bringing them before Senate was to ratify the decisions of the Hearing Panels. If this could not be done, the case should be sent back to the same hearing panel or to a new one. He suggested that members of the department, the hearing panel and others closely involved with each case should not vote.

1. Appeal of Ms. Cindy Moore

Mr. Evans referred members to the twelve page report of the Hearing Panel of Professors Boyle, Evans and Laidlaw, dated March 9, 1984, in particular, the recommendations on pages 10 and 11.

It was moved and seconded (Evans/Laidlaw)

that recommendations 1, 2, 3 and 4 be adopted by Senate.

After some discussion between Messrs. Evans and Leffek regarding the time period identified in #3, agreement was reached that the original wording would stand. He added that the rationale for this recommendation was fully articulated in the report in response to a query from Mr. Stuttard.

The motion **carried**.

A jurisdictional question raised by recommendation 5 was then discussed. Following clarification from Dean Leffek that such students as referred to in the recommendations pay thesis only fees, Mr. Evans agreed to withdraw this recommendation.

Ms. Waterson suggested that the issue of who should be barred from voting at Senate meetings in cases of academic appeals be referred to the Steering Committee for discussion and delineation of rationale.

2. Appeal of Mr. Timothy Shoveller

Ms. Lambie introduced the recommendation of the Hearing Panel of Cromwell, Boyle and Lambie, incorporated in the final sentence on the last page of the report.

Mr. Horrocks relayed his acceptance of the recommendation. Mr. Friedenber

commented on the penultimate paragraph, which implied that the appellant could be eligible to graduate at this time and that it was unfair if he was not permitted to do so. He urged defeat of the recommendation and substitution of another one which reflected this sentiment. Mr. Horrocks replied that if the student met the requirements, his name would appear on the graduation list for the 1984 Spring Convocations. Ms. Ozier raised the question *of* precedent in such matters and queried whether Senate itself or another Senate committee should have the authority to register retroactively.

Ms. Boyle believed that this involved an issue of fairness rather than a question *of* precedent.

The motion was put to a vote and **carried**.

3. Appeal of Ms. Valerie Mann

The Chairman noted that Ms. Mann and her legal advisor, Mr. Fred Angus were in the Senate Chamber.

Mr. Storey, Chairperson of the Hearing Panel consisting of Ms. Laidlaw, Mr. Hill and himself, directed the attention of members to the decision cited on page 20 and the remedy which consisted of five recommendations listed on pages 20-21.

It was moved and seconded (Storey/Laidlaw)

that the five recommendations of the Hearing Panel which considered the case of Ms. Mann be adopted.

Ms. Waterson believed that there was some inconsistency between recommendations 1 and 4, adding that line 3 of recommendation 4 "and insofar as funds are available at this time" should be considered inappropriate and deleted.

Mr. Storey responded that the Hearing Panel would like *to* see the re-establishment of the original financial conditions if possible; however, they were not in a position to ensure that this was accomplished. Mr. Leffek assured Senate that funds could be found for this student.

Mr. Rozee noted the unhappiness of the department with the decision and indicated that there were errors of fact in the report. Mr. Crocker, when called upon by the Chairman, stated that Senate was requested to ratify recommendations without holding a hearing unless it met the demands of a fair hearing.

Mr. Evans added that all the hearing panel could do was to consider the case "without

bias or reasonable apprehension of bias, and to issue notice of hearing to all those entitled to attend." - the criteria were cited by Mr. Crocker for a fair hearing. Mr. Angus remarked that both parties had had an opportunity to be present and that a full and fair hearing had been conducted.

Mr. Rozee maintained that the points he wished to raise were in the undisputed category, in response to a question raised by Ms. Waterson.

Mr. Rodger wished to ask Mr. Rozee if he believed the facts in error, if corrected, would lead to a different decision. Mr. Bissett-Johnson then supported Messrs. Evans and Crocker's warning not to reopen grounds or consider questions of substance, but rather to consider only points of natural justice and fairness. Further to Ms. Ozier's query re specific intent, Mr. Rozee contended that he would prefer that the report be returned to the hearing panel for re-evaluation based on these "errors".

Following some discussion participated in by Messrs. Evans, Jones, Storey, Rozee, Crocker and Ms. Allen, Ms. Waterson, Ms. Laidlaw and Ms. Ozier, it was agreed that Mr. Angus and Mr. Crocker would meet with Mr. Rozee to determine whether these "errors in fact" should be referred back to the committee, considered by Senate as a whole or remain undisclosed. Their recommendation was to be reported back to Senate before the conclusion of the meeting.

B. Committee on Academic Administration

1. Proposed Dates for Convocations

The Secretary noted that in response to the Registrar's request that decisions regarding convocation dates be made sufficiently early to publish them accurately in the university calendar, the President recommended that the Secretary develop a tentative timetable for the next two years. In correspondence to the Secretary, Mr. Tingley relayed his approval of this schedule, noting that the dates were creeping forward.

It was moved and seconded (Stewart/Betts)

that the proposed dates for the Spring Convocations in 1984-85 and 1985-86 be accepted with changes only for the Faculty of Dentistry to Mat 22 and 21 respectively from May 8 and 7.

The motion carried.

2. Deletion of Names from Convocation List for Late Payment of Fees

The Secretary reminded members that Senate, on 16 May 1983, referred the matter of deletion of names from the Convocation list for late payment of fees to the C M for consideration and report. She outlined the major points from the committee's discussion (CAA 83:52 & CAA 84:21) which had recommended that a sub-committee had been struck. In the succeeding months however, a document prepared by Vice-President Sinclair entitled "Procedures for Payment of Fees" had been presented to the Deans Council and a relevant motion had been passed at the 21 February 1984 meeting of the Board of Governors. The latter had been reported to Senate by the elected observer, Mr. Rodger, on 12 March 1984. The Secretary then recommended, on behalf of the CAA, that the report be presented to Senate for information. Mr. Sinclair spoke briefly to the report.

3. Nominations to Senate Committee on Committees

The Secretary reported that on 30 April 1984, the CAA confirmed, upon motion, that the Committee on Committees shall be comprised of members of Senate only. She added that this had been spelled out in the 1966, amended 1978, Terms of Reference of the Committee and that although specific reference to this stipulation had not been incorporated in the 7 December 1979 Senate Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the University Constitution, the author(s) of the report indicated that the intent of total Senate membership on this committee was still appropriate. Accordingly a new nominee had to be proposed as a replacement for the representative from the Faculty of Medicine. On behalf of CM, it was moved and seconded (Stewart/Tonks)

that Kenneth James, Thomas White and George Zinck replace the three retiring members of the committee.

Following calls for further nominations, the Chairman declared these three elected.

C. Committee on Committees

1. Nominations to Statutory Committees of Senate

On behalf of the Committee on Committees, Mr. Easterbrook proposed the nomination of the following individuals to the Academic Planning Committee:

N. Treves-Gold (French)
F. Wien (Social Work)
A. Bissett-Johnson (Law)
F. Lovely (Dentistry)

Professor David Fraser was nominated (Gigeroff/Ruf) and he had relayed his consent in

writing. It was agreed that a mail ballot would be conducted by the Senate Office.

Mr. Easterbrook then proposed the nomination of the following individuals to the named committees:

I. MacLean (Biochemistry)
M.J.C. Martin (Business Administration)
B.K.E. Hennen (Family Medicine)

Steering Committee

D. T. Janigan (Pathology)

Financial Planning Committee

P. Thomas (Law)
A. Bonen (Recreation, Physical Health Education)

Physical Planning Committee

E. Patterson (Engineering)
D. R. Overton (Theatre)

There being no further nominations, these individuals were declared elected to these positions.

The student representatives on the Senate Committees had been communicated to the Senate Office by the President of the Student Council.

D. Academic Planning Committee

1. Regulations Concerning Appointments, Tenure and Promotion

The Secretary reported, on behalf of Mr. Rodger who had to leave, that Messrs. Rodger and McNulty had met and revised the proposal for changes in the Regulations. They had come to an agreement on everything except Section 5.5.1. However, Brian Crocker had been unable to meet with them, yet, on behalf of the President's Office. Members agreed with Mr. Rodger's suggestion that the item be deferred until 11 June 1984.

2. Report of the Special Committee on Part-Time Degrees

Mr. Cross had asked the Secretary that further consideration of this report be deferred until the meeting of the 14 May 1984 Senate, when he would have the opportunity to be present. Members agreed to this request.

3. FPC Motion re: Arts and Science Resolution

Mr. Welch introduced the background of the FPC motion, namely the referral of the second Arts and Science Resolution by Senate to the FPC for review and report back to Senate.

It was moved and seconded (Welch/storey)

In recent years the funding available for teaching materials and equipment to Dalhousie has been far below the levels necessary to maintain the quality of education at levels appropriate to the role and goals of Dalhousie University. We feel that attempts by individual faculties to remedy this deficiency within their own academic boundaries by appealing to Senate for special consideration would probably give rise to disruption and conflict within the University community. In addition, sequential decisions by Senate on a faculty by faculty basis would be desirable and unwise, as compared to a simultaneous decision by Senate on behalf of all faculties.

Accordingly, the FPC recommends that

- 1. The Senate urge the President to make every effort to ensure the restoration of non-space capital funds by the province of Nova Scotia for 1984-85 at the level required for teaching material and equipment needs.**
- 2. If funds for teaching material and equipment are not adequately restored for 1984-85, that such material and equipment be made one of the highest priorities for the Dalhousie fund raising drive.**

Mr. Betts did not oppose the motion, but maintained that teaching materials were part of the operating budget not non-space capital.

Upon motion (Waterson/Laidlaw) it was agreed that the motion be amended as follows by deleting the last five words and substituting **equipment and of the operating budget at the level required for teaching materials.**

Ms. Waterson raised some concerns about part 2 which, following clarification by the Chairman and Mr. Betts, were withdrawn. Further discussion ensued, participated in by

Messrs. Thiessen, Zinck, Welch and Storey, following which it was agreed by the mover and seconder of the original motion that the asterisks and associated footnote be removed from the FPC document.

The motion was approved upon vote.

84:42. Appeal of Ms. Valerie Mann (Continued)

Professor Crocker reported on his discussions with Mr. Angus and Dr. Rozee. He stated that some of the evidence was in the nature of interpretation of the decision of the committee and some of the dates appeared to be incorrect. The sole issue now was whether to ratify or not to ratify. Both parties admitted that there had been a full and fair hearing of the facts of the **case**. He added that if cogent evidence had not been available at the time of the hearing and disagreement occurred with the panel's understanding of the findings regarding the facts of the case, then a re-hearing might be required. He concluded that, based on the apparent consensus that a fair hearing had been granted, Mr. Rozee's comments regarding undisputed errors in times, etc., should not be heard by Senate.

Mr. Chambers inquired as to whether the Hearing Panel had sought opinions of members of the scientific community, as to how matters of this kind should be dealt with. He contended that while the rights of students were important, the rights of departments, Faculties and individual faculty members must be considered. Mr. Storey disagreed that a qualification or requirement of hearing panels or AAC, was to be a member of the scientific community or the discipline concerned. This would be too restrictive. In his view, the hearing did not address the grades or failures of the student, but rather whether the procedures and process was fair and consistent. Mr. Evans concurred with these comments. Mr. Friedenbergr interjected that the standards of the scientific community, would certainly be applied equally to all members of the community in comparable circumstances. The report addressed itself entirely to the question of whether the procedures applied were consistent in this student's case to others. At this point, he moved the question, seconded by Mr. Bissett-Johnson. The motion passed by the required 2/3 majority. The main motion to ratify the decision and remedy, including all the recommendations, was then put to a vote and carried.

Ms. Laidlaw sought assurance that the Presidential Advisory Committee on Sexual Harassment would appear early on the agenda of the 14 May 1984 meeting of Senate. Members concurred with this request.

84:43. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12:10 P.M.

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY

MINUTES OF

SENATE MEETING

Senate met in Special Session in the Board and Senate Room on Monday, 14 May 1984 at 10:00 A.M.

Present with Mr. W. E. Jones in the chair were the following:

Anderson, Belzer, Betts, Birdsall, Boyle, Cameron D.M., Cameron T.S., Campbell, Chambers, Caty, Chaytor, Courtney, Cromwell, Cross, Gesner, Haley, Hatcher, Hill, Holloway, Horrocks, Klassen, Laidlaw, Leffek, MacKay, Maloney, Manos, McCann, McNulty, Myers, O'Brien D.W.P., Ozier, Perina, Pooley, Richards, Rodger, Ruf, Shaw L.R., Sherwin, Sinclair, Stewart, Sprott, Stovel, Stuttard, Thiessen, Tingley, Treves-Gold, Van Feggelen, Wien, Wood, Zinck.

Regrets: Cohen A.D., Gold, Munroe, Stern.

84:44. Awarding of Degrees and Prizes -- Faculty of Medicine

Dean Hatcher presented 92 candidates for the degree of Doctor of Medicine and moved, seconded by Mr. Klassen

that the degree be awarded to them and that the awarding of prizes and medals also be approved.

It was moved and seconded (Hatcher/Chaytor)

that names of those left off the list in error may be added by the Dean and Registrar.

Upon vote, both motions carried.

84:45 Report of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Sexual Harassment

The President introduced the report by voicing his gratitude to Ms. Laidlaw, the Chairperson and her committee members and noting the support of various groups identified on the last page.

It was moved and seconded (MacKay/Laidlaw)

that Senate approve the Report of the Presidential Advisory Committee in principle and that the President be given the authority with the committee to determine arrangements to implement the recommendations and to present these to the Board of Governors.

Members were referred to a memorandum from Mr. Huber dated 1 May 1984 by the Chairman.

Mr. Belzer recommended insertion of the word "extrinsic" prior to reward in the second component of the definition such that it would read "implied or expressed promise of extrinsic reward for complying

with a sexually oriented request". Mr. Horrocks reported that the Faculty of Administrative Studies had approved the report in principle.

Ms. Boyle commented on Mr. Huber's memo, stating that the committee had considered the CAUT definition and had decided against it in favour of the committee's broader definition which did not accept guilt without personal fault. She classified the examples cited on page 2 of this correspondence into three categories, namely (1) 2, (2) 6 and 7 and (3) 1, 3, 4, and 5 and elaborated on the rationale for placement of each hypothetical case. She concluded by indicating that the committee was aware of the difficulty of anticipating all possible contingencies and of the danger of over and under inclusiveness, adding that the process of early review had been built in for that reason.

Upon vote, the motion passed.

84:46. Reports and Recommendations -- Committees of Senate

A. Academic Planning Committee

1. Proposed Changes in the B.Ed. Programmes

Mr. Haley outlined the reasons for the proposed changes, which had been approved both by the Faculty and APC.

It was agreed, upon motion (Haley/Maloney)

that in addition to the current integrated B.A./B.Ed. Dalhousie offer Integrated Programs in Physical Education or Health Education or Music Education and Education I.e. B.P.E./B.Ed., B.Sc. (H.E.)/B.Ed., B.Mus.Ed./B.Ed.)

It was moved and seconded (Haley/Maloney)

that students may complete a 4 year Bachelor's degree (or equivalent) plus a one year B.Ed. by completing a minimum of 25 classes (i.e. 20 for the Bachelor's and 5 for the B.Ed.) in either a sequential or an integrate program. (Students taking a 4 year Bachelor's and an elementary B.Ed. may have to complete 6 classes for the B.Ed., unless one full course in foundations is completed as an elective in the bachelor's program.)

Mr. Rodger expressed consternation at the fact that the Department of Education, who had gone on record as supporting increased standards did not distinguish between three and four year degrees. Messrs. Haley and Betts supported this contention. The motion was put to a vote and carried.

It was thereafter moved and seconded (Rodger/Betts)

that the President communicate to the Nova Scotia Department of Education concern regarding the failure of the new certification policy to distinguish between honours and non-honours degrees.

The motion carried.

2. Report of the Special Committee on Part-Time Degrees

The Chairman reminded members that a motion had been tabled at the April meeting (Senate Minute No. 84:37.A.3).

Mr. Betts reported that the Faculty of Arts and Science, on May 1, had passed the following motion without dissent:

Faculty request Senate to defer action on the Report of the Special Committee on Part-time Degree Programs until adequate time shall have been offered to the Faculty of Arts and Science to consider the report or until Christmas 1984 whichever is the sooner.

Mr. Cross believed that this motion had been passed in haste at a meeting which only 18 people attended and at a time when neither he nor any of the members of his committee could be present to argue against it.

He reminded members of Senate that the APC and the committee did not advocate delay, as the tabled Senate motion simply represented an attempt to establish a process by which the report could be considered in an orderly fashion and to put in place a structure which maintained continuing education as a priority. The motion did not call for a Faculty, but rather asked for an unnamed senior academic unit with a Dean. The Committee believed that it could support that level of action and commitment for July 1. In response to a query from Ms. Allen, Mr. Sinclair stated that the merger of IPA and Part-Time Studies could proceed independently, as it dealt with non-credit programmes. Mr. Myers contended that many other Canadian universities had taken this route long ago in adapting to cultural and social change, and that the real danger was undue lag not haste. This debate had spanned a decade at Dalhousie. He reviewed the historical evolution of the issue at length to support this statement, and urged Senate to adopt the Kennedy motion with deliberate speed.

Mr. Rodger maintained that the proposal had a major impact on the Faculty of Arts and Science, and that all the Faculty wanted was a deferral to provide them with an opportunity to study the document which should, in turn, ensure their cooperation.

Mr. McCann countered by relaying the support of the Dalhousie Student Union for prompt institution

of the recommended structure.

Ms. Sherwin urged a delay in consideration of the report and the tabled motion on the basis that it was unclear where funds would be derived from, the Faculty of Arts and Science had not yet had an opportunity to consider the recommendations in detail, that students would have to belong to two Faculties, that it could be unhealthy to have part-time degrees in separate programmes as other universities have done, and that some part-time students, in her experience, preferred day, not evening classes.

Ms. Allen, Ms. DeMeo and Messrs. D.M. Cameron, Horrocks and McNulty urged support of the tabled motion and reinforced Mr. Cross's earlier statements that a new Faculty was not being considered at this time, but rather, that a senior academic unit was proposed which would be headed by a Dean and would serve to facilitate a process of widespread, detailed consultation, and that classes would be conducted during the day as well as in the evening. There was a consensus that the Kennedy motion was indeed cautious. Discussion about the amalgamation of the IPA and Part-Time Studies ensued, further to a question of Ms. Laidlaw, who also requested that the Faculty of Arts and Science be given the opportunity to study the proposal further. Messrs. Antoft, Cross and Myers clarified the issue of amalgamation by reiterating Mr. Sinclair's earlier comments. Mr. Cross added that the current structure had not facilitated an effective consultation process.

Following introductory comments, Mr. Betts, on behalf of the Faculty of Arts and Science moved

that the tabled motion be referred to Faculties for comments no later than December 1984.

The motion, which was seconded by Mr. S. Cameron, was put to a vote and **defeated**.

Mr. Antoft indicated his support of the tabled motion, adding that the establishment of a senior academic unit would promote continuing education as a collaborative endeavour.

Mr. Campbell was impressed with many of the suggestions in the report, and inquired about the anticipated cost of the unit. Mr. Shaw commented that from the perspective of long term financial interest of the university, and the status in relationship to other Atlantic universities, the proposed unit was timely and cost effective. He estimated costs of approximately \$90,000/\$100,000 for the initial year. Ms. Ozier wondered what other alternatives had been considered by the committee and dismissed as less preferable than the proposed structure. Mr. Cross described some of the models which had been referred to at the April meeting and commented that the senior academic unit would need to be attractive and appropriate to the institution involved. The exact nature of the structure would need to be determined accordingly.

The tabled motion

that Senate approve the establishment by July 1, 1984 of a senior academic unit, to be

headed by a Dean.

was put to a vote and **carried**.

Following a point of order raised by Mr. Betts regarding the need to search for a Dean to fill this position, it was moved and seconded (Cross/Cameron)

that an Acting Dean be appointed by the President for a two-year period effective July 1, 1984, following full and appropriate consultation and a call for nominations.

The latter four words were accepted as a friendly amendment, pursuant to a query by Ms. Laidlaw and a recommendation by Ms. Ozier. An amendment to the effect that a senior official (rather than a Dean) be appointed was ruled out of order.

The motion **carried**.

B. Academic Appeals Committee

I.a) Revision of the Committee's Procedures and the Jurisdiction of the Committee

Mr. Cromwell spoke in Mr. Braybrooke's absence to a memo dated 20 March 1984. He referred members to the two questions of the AAC which had been directed to Senate on page one of the letter.

(1) Is it the intention of Senate that the Academic Appeals Committee exercise the same jurisdiction with respect to academic appeals as Senate itself could?

(2) If the answer to question (1) is in the negative, in what respects is the Academic Appeals Committee's jurisdiction to be restricted?

He added that there had been in the past year some difficulties with the language of the initial terms of reference and in the interpretation of the intent of Senate. He believed that the answers to these questions would be beneficial in terms of relationship between the AAC and Senate and would result in a broadly shared consensus about what the committee was supposed to do. He concluded by stating that it would be inappropriate for the committee to specify and review recommendations for revision of its terms of reference. Therefore, another committee should address this issue in the abstract without the pressures of considering specific cases. The MC recommended that this committee should be the CAA and indicated its willingness to cooperate with CAA.

It was moved and seconded (Cromwell/Evans)

that the two questions posed be referred to the CAA for report back to the September

meeting of Senate.

Mr. Evans supplemented Mr. Cromwell's comments by saying that the revised set of procedures for conduct of appeals was appended to the letter from Mr. Braybrooke. The feedback from Faculties indicated that some concerns centered around the question of jurisdiction, not rules and procedures.

Dean Hatcher spoke in support of the motion, adding that it was important for the committee to examine some of the special legal problems encountered by the Faculty of Medicine. Ms. Caty likewise supported the motion, with the comment that the Health Professions schools had similar difficulties with accountability and other issues.

Upon vote, the motion carried.

1.b) Procedures for Academic Appeals within Faculties

Mr. Evans introduced the document entitled "Dalhousie University Report of the Senate Academic Appeals Committee re: Academic Appeal Rules and Procedures at the Faculty Level". This had been accompanied by correspondence of 19 March 1984 from Mr. Braybrooke, Chairperson of the AAC. Mr. Evans remarked that the disparities across the university led the committee to address general principles and suggested minimum standards, rather than specific details.

In response to comments in the letter, Mr. Horrocks noted that the School of Business Administration had forwarded their procedures to the Chairman of the AAC, and Ms. Caty added that the School of Nursing was currently revising their procedures. There was some debate about the type of comments required and the timing of feedback on the document, (i.e. -before, at the same time or after the terms of reference of AAC had been considered by CAA) participated in by Messrs. Evans, Zinck, Hatcher, Jones, S. Cameron, Campbell, Rodger, Cross, and Chambers and Ms. Allen and Ms. Boyle. The document had not been sent to the Deans and Secretaries of the Faculties in any capacity other than by virtue of Senate membership.

It was agreed, upon motion

that feedback on the report prepared by AAC would be forwarded by Faculties by September 30, 1984.

It was noted that the Secretary would circulate the document to the Faculties and the Deans would be requested to distribute this to the Schools and Departments.

Specifically, the Faculties would be asked to comment on the appropriateness of the guidelines and principles and on the conformity of their own rules and regulations to these guidelines and principles. They would not necessarily have to have on hand a complete set of guidelines by this deadline.

84:47. Other Business

The Chairman advised members that the revised document on an academic planning framework would be presented for preliminary discussion at the 18 May 1984 meeting of Senate under 'Other Business'.

84:48. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 12:05 P.M.

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY

MINUTES OF

SENATE MEETING

Senate met in Special Session on in the Board and Senate Room on Friday, 18 May 1984 at 10:00 A.M.

Present with Mr. W.E. Jones in the chair were the following members:

Allen, Angelopoulos, Birdsall, Brett, Cameron T.S., Christie, Cohen A.D., Comeau, Cromwell, Cross, Friedenberg, Gordon, Hennen, Holloway, Horrocks, Jones D.W., Kamra, Klassen, MacKay, Manning, Myers, Ozier, Perina, Ruf, Scheibelhut, Stairs, Stuttard, Tingley, Treves-Gold, Vsn Feggelen, Welch, Wien, Zinck.

Regrets: Bennett, Blecher, Gold, Maloney, Stewart, Stern, Thiessen.

84:48. Awarding of Degrees, Prizes and Medals

Upon motion (Christie/Bissett-Johnson) the following degrees and prize were approved:

Bachelor of Laws 145

The University Meddal in Law was awarded to Larry Stordy.

Upon motion (D.W. Jones/W.A. MacKay) approval was given to the award of a D.D.S. to Mr. Edward Bayfield MacMurdo, who has successfully completed all the requirerents for the degree of Doctor of Dental Surgery.

84:49. Other Business

President MacKay commented on the funding for 1984-85 as reported by the Minister to the House. No official communication has yet been received from the Minister or the MPHEC, although the President has discussed matters with officials of the Department of Education. The Minister's statement to the House did not make clear that the non-space money is not new money for Dalhousie whose grant is in the order of 3.4%. Provincial Presidents are seeking to meet with the Premier and the Minister on the question of funding and how information on this comes to universities in the future. It seems that money expected by Dalhousie for assistance with Dentistry may not be forthcoming, nor is the hoped-for funding for Medicine now likely.

Acting Dean Christie raised, on behalf of the Faculty of Law, the matter of the use of the University Seal. Recently four students in the Faculty won the International Moot competition held in Washington, D.C. The Faculty wishes to honour them and their Faculty advisor by presenting them with a certificate bearing the University Seal. It was his understanding that Senate approval was needed for this and in view of the impending Law Convocation there

was not time to raise the matter first with the Senate Committee on Academic Administration. Mr. Friedenberg supported the use of the Seal on this occasion. The Chair raised the question of precedent for use of the Seal relative to its current restricted use. The President noted that the Seal was used on degree parchments, official transcripts issued by the Registrar, and on legal documents. It was agreed that the request from the Faculty of Law should be referred to the Keeper of the University Seal, i.e. the President .

84 :50. Document on the Academic Planning Process

In introducing discussion of the Document on the Academic Planning Process, dated 10 May 1984 entitled "What ' 8 All This Racket About Academic Planning?", the Chair noted that in addition to this meeting, further input would be sought from the Dalhousie Faculty Association and students. It was likely that there would be a special meeting of Senate called to take action on the document but today ' s meeting was for discussion purposes only. In response to a question from Mr. Stovel, the Chair said that eventually the document would be supplied to all members of faculty after Senate had formally discussed it. The newspaper format adopted for cther recent reports would be adopted. Ms. Allen asked that the Dalhousie Staff Association members also be consulted as the document mentions support staff.

On behalf of the Academic Planning Committee, Mr. Wien highlighted the major changes to be found in this version of the document. He concluded that the overall aim was to improve academic planning, make the process clearer and more participatory, with a stronger role for Senate and a more efficient allocation of resources.

Mr. Stairs found the entire process "crazy", "madness", calling for far too much work for what he felt would be achieved. He instanced the time spent on compiling the "Restraint and Renewal" response ag being an example of wasted effort cutting into the time available for teaching and research.

Mr. Wien said that the "Restraint and Renewal" process was not a good precedent because it was a one-off effort with no structures in place to follow through and implement recommendations. A more systematic approach is now being followed in the Faculty of Medicine which they find justifies the time and effort expended. Review processes may be every 5-7 years with annual updates. The aim is to decentralize so that in fact much information will not proceed beyond Faculty level. He believed Senate capable of making the hard decisions needed pointing out that this is done regularly in tenure considerations where there are clear guidelines.

President MacKay said that the comments of Mr. Stairs appealed to him and he felt that we were getting bogged down, but in these times this was perhaps inevitable. Nonetheless, he said that there had been planning at Dalhousie and cited the reports made to the MPHEC which Senate has not shown interest in discussing. The Board of Governors was interested

in the process and at its last meeting had inquired of the Chair of Senate as to when the Senate Plan would be ready. The President said that he has the "Restraint and Renewal" documents and is prepared to make specific recommendations to the Senate based on them for Senate consideration.

Mr. Stairs said he favoured the bringing forward of specific proposals, e.g.-the Cross Report on Continuing Education. Mr. Wien said that this Report was a good example of the process being advocated by the Senate Academic Planning Committee.

Mr. Friedenbergr found Mr. Stairs' comments sometimes misleading by default. In the pluralistic society, which is the university, we have to expect this sort of planning. There was the need to ensure that teaching and research do get support. One aspect of the document which particularly appealed to him was the prospect of teaching in another department; he would welcome an invitation to do this.

Mr. Scheibelhut said his faculty colleagues were tired of serving on committees, he found the time-frame proposed in the document unrealistic, and supported a concentration on teaching and research. Mr. Myers supported Mr. Stairs' passion, but also Mr. Friedenbergr's caveats. He likened the choice as being between democracy or the King and his Barons. He found the revised version of the document much improved.

Ms. Ozier said that the planning process originally had two aims: (1) units should look at themselves, where their discipline is going and how their needs might be met in the future; and (2) out of this could come a plan for rational decision making. She did not regard the present document as a final product, but the need for assessment as in point (1) was still valid. She thought that a review every, say, eight years, might be substituted for the annual review.

The President said there was clear evidence in the "Restraint and Renewal" documents that departments do plan. Maybe their plans were not always understood or synthesized at the level of faculties or Senate. The problem may therefore be one of improving communication, not of departmental planning.

Mr. Welch thought it was simplistic to say that teaching and research were "all". Planning has to be undertaken by someone. The dangers were that a small group or those with the loudest voices would win, or the university administrators would decide without our input. Mr. Scheibelhut said that even with plans prepared, a subjective decision had to be made and for him it came down to, who do I trust?

Mr. Klassen said that the process being followed in the Faculty of Medicine had not yet led to change and this should be the aim of planning.

Mr. Wien replied that the aim is to have decision-making one where the discipline is going at

the departmental level with the Faculty then deciding which of these programmes should be advanced. The Senate's role is to decide between Faculties. Thus the workload is spread across the University.

Mr. Zinck questioned some specifics of the budget-making process and the proposed timetable for preparation, e.g.-for March 1985, when, as this year, the financial situation of the University in mid-May was still in the President's words "as clear as mud". Mr. Wien said that we would have to make our best "guesstimates" as we did last August. The President agreed, but stated that the decisions would have to be made based on what we actually receive.

Mr. Ozier said that teaching and research were part of her duties, but she also included academic planning in this category. It cannot be left to chairpersons only. She asked that the document be revised to reduce the amount of paperwork involved at the departmental level. Mr. Stovel said that the proposed review by units would be new and helpful in his department. He asked whether the document's aim was to facilitate more dollars for some units. Mr. Wien said the aim was to determine academic priorities to assist in financial decision-making. It could help to reduce any anomalies and should be a participatory process.

The Chair said that the comments expressed above would be helpful to the Academic Planning Committee when it met to consider the document on the Academic Planning Process next week.

84:52. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:31 A.M.