

Item: Senate Minutes, April 1985
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 April 1985. 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 Monday, 8 April 1985 at 4:00 P.M.

Present with Mr. J. P. Welch in the chair were the following:

Andrews, Angelopoulos, Barkow, Betts, Birdsall, Blum, Bradfield, D.M. Cameron, A.D. Cohen, Cromwell, Cross, Dempster, Dunn, field, Fingard, P. Fraser, Gigeroff, Gold, Gratwick, B.K. Hall, Horrocks, Josenhans, Kennedy, Leffek, Lewis, MacKay, Manning, Martin, McLaren, Misick, Morrison, Myers, Nestman, D.W.P. O'Brien, O'Shea, Ozier, Parker, Paquet, Perey, Rodger, Rosenberg, L.R. Shaw, T. Shaw, Sherwin, Sinclair, Stern, Stewart, Stone, Stovel, Stuttard, K.K. Tan, Tindall, Tingley, vanFeggelen, Wangersky, Waterson, Welch, Yung.

Regrets: Caty, Friedrich, Fulton, W.E. Jones, Stern.

85:035

Notice of Motion -- Messrs. A. Kennedy and D. Wooton

A notice of motion from Mr. Kennedy had been precirculated:

The Senate of Dalhousie University deplores the decision of the Provincial government to impose higher differential fees on foreign students - fees much in excess even of those recommended by MPHEC -- and calls upon the President to make a strong public statement against any such policy.

Mr. Kennedy expressed his view that it was desirable that Senate take a stand on this issue, acknowledging that the presence of foreign students is of great importance to the quality of education. The International Student Coordinator, Mr. Karanja Njoroge contended that the question of differential fees was equivalent to a question of accessibility, and added that it has not been taxpayers who have raised concerns about costs. For the last few years, fees have been a problem in admitting students from abroad. Messrs. Gigeroff and T. Shaw spoke in support of the motion. The following amendment was proposed by T. Shaw/K. Leffek

and to implement that section of the AAU/MPHEC report on foreign students which exempts foreign students from the least developed countries from paying differential fees.

Mr. Leffek cited the major political reason for the differential fees as a desire to avoid having the Maritime Provinces "flooded" with foreign students, due to high fees in Ontario and Quebec. He noted that at Dalhousie, the numbers had dropped markedly over the past few years. Mr. Barkow conveyed the preliminary agreement of the Task Force on Foreign

Students Policy of the International Development Council, although the final report was not yet completed. He suggested that Dalhousie should relay its willingness to cooperate with government officials to "get to know visa students". Mr. Betts supported the amendment, noting that very few students from the 25 poorest countries were registered in the Faculty of Arts and Science.

The amendment passed.

Mr. Rodger suggested that it was the Council of Maritime Premiers, not the provincial government, who had made the "decision". Mr. Kennedy agreed that the **words "and the Council of Maritime Premiers"** be added after the word government.

The motion, as amended, carried.

85:036

Presidential Search Committee

Ms. Fingard reported on behalf of the committee, that Mr. Jones had been elected chairperson, that Mr. Andrews had been elected Secretary, and that the new President of the DSU, Catherine Blewett, would be serving on the committee. The three overlapping functions of the committee were considered to be consulting, searching and selecting. With respect to the initial function, the committee had sent letters to all members of the university community seeking written submissions, and were meeting with Faculties, senior administrators and leaders of employee groups. To facilitate the search component of the task, advertisements had been placed in major journals, letters had been sent to Presidents of Canadian universities, and the committee was seeking suggestions and nominations from the university community. Further, the committee was considering the use of an executive search firm. The final component, selection, was then addressed by Ms. Fingard. The committee hoped to have a short list by mid fall and to have a recommendation for the Board of Governors by January 1986. Further, the committee planned to report on a monthly basis to Senate. Ms. Fingard indicated that the committee would be consulting with metro presidents, in response to Mr. Gold's question about MSVU's concurrent search and that all committee members were voting members in reply to another query. Considerable discussion ensued, contributed to by Messrs. Kennedy, Warwick, and Ms. Waterson and Ms. Sherwin, regarding potential problems in using executive search "headhunter" firms. Ms. Sherwin was concerned about the apparent lack of a relevant university policy and requested that the Steering Committee consider the question of appropriate guidelines for policy on the use of "headhunter" firms at the university. Mr. Bradfield raised the question of the consultation process, once a short list had been developed. Ms. Fingard noted that this was still under consideration by the committee and Mr. Andrews added that substantive guidance from Senate as a body and the Board of Governors would be welcomed.

It was moved and seconded (Bradfield/Rodger)

that the Presidential Search Committee be requested to inform Senate as to their intentions with regard to the presentation of a short list of candidates to the university community.

Mr. D. Cameron believed that if the short list was presented to Senate for other than information, that a change in procedures (which was not possible at this stage) would be required. Messrs. Cross, Bradfield, Betts, Kennedy and Rodger sought to clarify the intent of the motion, that Senate ought not to decide how the committee should proceed with this process, but rather that the university community, including Senate, should simply be informed of their intentions regarding presentation of a short list when it was completed.

The motion carried.

85:037

President's 1983/84 Annual Report to Senate on the Policy for Increasing the Proportion of Female Faculty

This report, dated January 1985, and accompanied by 4 February 1985 correspondence from the President, had been distributed at two earlier Senate meetings. Mr. Sinclair introduced the report by stating that the President would welcome comments, in particular regarding the suggestions on page 13. Information regarding these key recommendations and efforts to seek qualified female candidates would be helpful. In addition, he noted, there had been some questions raised by Mr. Horrocks's committee regarding the report. Ms. Fingard, referring to Mr. Horrocks survey, queried whether all hiring units used appointment committees. Mr. Sinclair replied that in the context of the collective agreement, appointment committees are required, to which Ms. Fingard followed with a question regarding areas not covered by the Collective Agreement. Mr. Rodger referred to the figures on page 6. which indicated that Dentistry, Medicine and Management Studies did not note any particular initiatives. He pointed out that as of March 1985, there were only 22% women in the bargaining unit (28% if librarians were included). Mr. Dempster noted a small correction re: Management Studies on page 9, which should now read: "A total of two appointments were made in the School of Business Administration, one male and one female. For one position, there were no female applicants; for the position filled by a female, there were also five male applicants. The female was offered the position and was appointed."

Ms. Sherwin commented that the procedures had not been as effective as anticipated, and asked that the committee look at affirmative action procedures at other universities which were more effective (e.g. University of Western Ontario which designated a number of positions for women candidates). Mr. Betts suggested that an important factor was being in a position to make offers early in the academic year. Ms. Fingard, referring to the

"recommendation" regarding graduate education for preparation for academic careers at the bottom on page 11, asked if the Faculty of Graduate Studies had undertaken special initiatives in this regard. Mr. Leffek stated that the process was highly decentralized as each department made recommendations, although departments could perhaps be encouraged in this regard. Mr. Horrocks advised Senate that his committee had found that the report contained some minor inaccuracies and agreed with Mr. Rodger that additional interpretative detail regarding the statistics was required. He reported that the committee had asked to meet with the ad hoc committee in the President's Office regarding the initial request that a senior academic administrative officer report on these matters. He then clarified the reference to Management Studies in the report. Mr. Rodger pointed to the apparent misunderstanding of the affirmative action policy reflected in the quote from a Dean (page II, paragraph 5). Ms. Sherwin contended that the repeated suggestion of a senior academic officer who would monitor affirmative action should be seriously considered and implemented.

85:038.

Proposed M.A /M.Sc. in Computing Science

Mr. Horrocks took the chair to enable Mr. Welch to discuss the motion of the FPC tabled from the previous meetings

The Financial Planning Committee recommends that a decision to purchase the VAX 780 be made only if external funds are unequivocally identified for this purpose and that in the absence of such funds. the machine be returned to Digital Equipment at the termination of the free loan period. unless Digital Equipment are prepared to extend the lease until the final decision can be made on the Master's programme in Computing Science.

After some discussion by Messrs. Rodger, Welch, Bradfield, Andrews and Dempster, it was agreed that agenda item #7 (the FPC motion) be considered prior to the APC motion (agenda item #6). Mr. Rodger reminded members that it was hoped that NSERC monies would be forthcoming by the fall. Mr. D. Cameron believed it was unfortunate that the issue of acquisition of a computer had become associated with the approval of an academic programme, and thought that an obvious source of funding was the Capital Campaign. Mr. Rodger commented, in response to Mr. Welch's question, that the question of the source of lease money had not been discussed by the Senate Computer Advisory Committee. Mr. Andrews wished to have possible interim financial arrangements clarified for Senate. Mr. Welch agreed, and wondered if Mr. Cameron knew if Digital Equipment would be prepared to extend the free loan period or extend the lease. Mr. Cameron said that he had forcefully impressed Senate's concern to that company and that the discount was far in excess of the normal discount. Mr. Leffek also spoke against the motion, contending that it was essential to retain the VAX 780, and that funds such as the

Killam Residue income might be available for this purpose. He supported the M.A./M.Sc. in Computing Science as this is an essential discipline to develop for the future. Mr. R. Shaw maintained that there was clearly no room in the Arts and Science budget and that it had never been intended that funding for the equipment would come from the operating budget. However, this could be a priority item in the Capital Campaign, or, if absolutely necessary, from the Killam Residue or another source. Mr. Betts urged defeat of the motion arguing that if the VAX 780 was returned, the Computing Science programme would have to be closed down. Mr. Cross supported Mr. Leffek's comments and questioned the necessity of this lengthy difficult debate. Ms. Ozier also agreed with Mr. Leffek's remarks but remained puzzled as to how one could consider keeping equipment without someone saying where the money would come from. Mr. Sinclair stated that a variety of avenues, already indicated, would be pursued, if and when it was clear that NSERC monies would not be found. Mr. Shaw confirmed for Ms. Ozier that the VAX 780 would not be funded from the operating budget.

Mr. Welch believed that the discussion was not wasted, as it had clarified options. He added that the intended use of the Killam Residue in the 85-86 budget had already been stated. He proposed an amendment, seconded by Mr. Stuttard

Replace "until---computing science" with "for a period of not more than six months. any unavoidable costs of which are to be met from the Dalhousie Campaign Fund."

The amendment was defeated and the main motion was also defeated.

Mr. Welch returned to the chair and the APC motion

that approval be given for an M.A./H.Sc. in Computing Science under the following conditions:

1. That following approval from MPHEC, the proposal be referred back to Senate for final approval and Senate should then decide whether to implement the programme depending on the money available.

2. That there is clear evidence that money is available for:

a) required equipment

b) required faculty appointments

c) graduate student scholarships was raised from the table.

Mr. Gigeroff raised additional questions from the subcommittee regarding faculty, equipment and student scholarships which had remained unanswered. Mr. Dunn stated that currently there were ten faculty members and two more were proposed and that no substantial operating costs for equipment were foreseen. Mr. Leffek

further advised that Killam endowment funds were available for scholarship support.

The motion carried.

85:039

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:10 P.M.

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY

MINUTES OF

SENATE MEETING

Senate met in special session in the Board and Senate Room on Monday, 22 April 1985 at 4:00 P.M.

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

Andrews, Angelopoulos, Betts, Birdsall, Boyle, Bradfield, D.M. Cameron, Campbell, Caty, A.D. Cohen, Cromwell, Cross, Easterbrook, Ettlinger, Fingard, Friedenber, Gaede, Gigeroff, Godfrey, Gratwick, Holloway, Horrocks, Josenhans, Keast, Kindred, Leffek, Lewis, MacKay, Maloney, Manning, Mistck, Ozier, Perina, Rodger, Scheibelhut, Sherwin, Sinclair, Stern, Stone, Stovel, Tingley, vanFeggelen, Waterson, Welch, Wiktor, Zentilli.

Regrets: Chaytor, Friedrich, Munroe, Paquet, Sidorov, Stuttard, Wangersky.

The Chairman reminded members of the forthcoming meetings in May.

85:040.

Minutes of Meetings

The minutes of the meeting of 11 March 1985 were approved upon motion (Sinclair/Welch) pursuant to the Secretary ' s report that Mr. Tingley had requested the following revision to item 85:028, page 3, top 3 lines: "Messrs. Tingley and Betts noted that the Class Approval Session for the undergraduate faculties would be held during the last week of classes in response to Ms. Caty's query. "

The minutes of the meeting of 25 March 1985 were approved upon motion (Horrocks/Welch) with two minor typographical changes, after the Secretary noted that the date of the meeting was missing on page 1 (specifically page 5, paragraph 2, line 2, "machinery" and paragraph 1, line 5 "University Budget Advisory Committee".)

85:04.

Question Period

Mr. Bradfield again raised concerns about the implications of the

arrangements regarding restriction of student fees and sought clarification from FPC. Mr. Welch promised more detail for the next Senate meeting.

Mr. Rodger asked if the administration had looked at the funding level increases which were released by the provincial government on Friday. The President advised that the total revenue increase of 4.49% (2.44% non-restricted grants - sustenance; 1% restricted grants - non-space alterations and renovations; 1% special grants - new programme funding [e.g. dental expansion, occupational therapy, medical school, open access programmes]) was close to the preliminary budget planning estimates.

Ms. Fingard raised again the question of appointment committees and asked about plans for a new stairway for the Archives. The President stated that the preliminary plans had been to accommodate the Department of Mathematics and to assist in the relocation of the MacDonald Library. Ms. Ritchie confirmed that renovation of the Old Archives Building was recommended as a priority item by PPC and added that the reconstruction of stairways was intended to meet fire code regulations. Mr. Sinclair promised to examine the question of appointment committees.

Ms. Ozier referred to an item in the Vancouver Sun and the CAUT Bulletin which labelled Maritime Universities as "Mickey Mouse". The President agreed to write a letter of protest to the British Columbia Minister of Education on behalf of Dalhousie University.

85:042.

Report on Balloting -- Employee Benefits Committee

The Secretary reported that Mr. D.P. Kerans had been elected to serve on this committee as a result of mail balloting.

85:043.

Reports and Recommendations -- Committees of Senate

A Steering Committee

I. Status of NSAC Principal on Dalhousie Senate

On behalf of the Steering Committee, Mr. Horrocks moved

that the principal of the College be invited to membership in the Dalhousie University Senate.

The Chairman referred to relevant items I.B.5 and I.C.8 in the "Constitutional Provisions Governing the Operations of Senate" and Clause 7 of the Legal Agreement between Dalhousie University and the Nova Scotia Agricultural College.
The motion carried.

2. Frequency of Senate Meetings (SC Minute No. 85:022)

On behalf of the Steering Committee and in light of recent difficulties in completing agendas, Mr. Horrocks moved

that Senate hold meetings twice a month when required (on the second and fourth Monday of the month).

The motion carried.

3. Committee on Committee

The two suggestions incorporated within the SC excerpt, namely that (1) "those nominated could be advised of the option to prepare a brief addendum (25 words or less) which would address their relevant expertise and would accompany their one-page curriculum vitae", and that (2) "the Committee on Committees could send out a letter advising Senators of positions likely to be vacant on committees for the coming year and requesting members to suggest names for consideration and possible subsequent nomination by the Committee on Committees" were relayed by the Chairman as matters of information.

4. Report on Resolution of C. Power Appeal Case

The Chairman reported that discussions between the School of Business Administration and the Faculty of Graduate Studies resulted in a proposal that Ms. Power could complete her MBA requirements by April 30, 1988 through selected universities other than Dalhousie and in accordance with some other stipulations. This proposal had been accepted by Ms. Power, resulting in an out-of-court settlement.

B. Joint APC/FPC

1. Report on the University Budget

The document entitled "1985-86 University Operating Budget Status Report to Senate" dated 8 April 1985 had been precirculated. Four additional documents were distributed at the meeting:

(1) A motion from the Faculty Council of Arts and Science incorporated in a memo (18/4/85) from Mr. Andrews titled "Impending Closure of Dalhousie Art Gallery";

(2) The relevant draft minutes excerpt (18/4/85);

(3) A letter from Mern O'Brien, Director, Art Gallery dated 17 April 1985 and

(4) A motion passed by the Academic Planning Committee on 19 April 1985.

The Chairman pointed out that APC & FPC had not had the opportunity to prepare a formal

report and that the document, which he asked Mr. Sinclair to review briefly, was a status report to Senate from the University Budget Advisory Committee. Mr. Sinclair referred to Schedule A, summarizing the assumptions which resulted in a deficit of \$4.2 million and the policies aimed at reducing the deficit by 3.8 million which still left a deficit of \$400,000. Mr. Andrews asked for clarification of the last sentence in Schedule B wondering which proposals would require consideration by Senate, to which Mr. Sinclair and the Chairman responded by specifically identifying the Art Gallery. Ms. Waterson sought some assurance that increases in income potential (page 2 - paragraph 5) did not come from textbooks in the Bookstore which were not otherwise available to students. Messrs. Sinclair, Jones and Gigeroff asserted that this point referred to items other than textbooks. The President advised Mr. Bradfield that expenses included interest payments, and Mr. Welch stated that MPHEC had been asked for a ruling or definition (further to a query of Mr. Bradfield's, one year ago) but MPHEC had not yet responded.

Mr. Sinclair clarified for Ms. Ozier that the Development Office would represent less of a cost to the budget than before and that development funds would cover some of these costs. Mr. Andrews sought the rationale for the proposed closure of the Art Gallery. Mr. Sinclair replied that UBAC had attempted to identify areas in the university where budget cuts would impinge less on academic programmes than if academic base budgets were further cut (i.e. - from 3 1/2 %, which was a difficult exercise for Deans, to 5%). The Art Gallery was one of 6 areas in which reductions or cutbacks were believed to impinge less severely on academic programmes than cuts in other areas. Mr. Welch stated that more detailed academic rationale could be found in the 1982 report of the FPC which concluded that closure of the Art Gallery would be the first option if further financial problems occurred. Mr. Bradfield wondered whether probes had been made to Neptune or the Maritime Conservatory of Music to use the Cohn or to sell the Cohn to the city, if required. Mr. J. Wells clarified for Messrs. Bradfield and Sinclair that the costs to the university had decreased from \$600,000 five years ago to \$212,000. Ms. Treves-Gold asked what the projected cost to the university was of the operation of Dalplex. Mr. Sinclair did not have these figures on hand, although he noted that, like the Cohn, the costs had decreased considerably. Mr. Cross asked about the process which had led to the creation of Schedule B. Mr. Sinclair pointed out that there were very few options in the non-academic budget areas to increase revenue or decrease costs (through cuts).

Mr. Rodger wished to be reminded of the status of the 1982 FPC report referred to by Mr. Welch. The Chairman noted that this second report had been accepted with the exception of the priority list.

Mr. Andrews moved, on behalf of the Faculty Council of Arts and Science,

that given the academic nature of the Dalhousie Art Gallery and the academic contribution made by the Gallery to the University. and given at present the meager resources allocated to the arts in general and the visual arts in particular in the University, the Council of the Faculty of Arts and Science protests the categorization of the Gallery as a non-academic entity, and, deploring its proposed closure, request Senate to express its full support for the continued operation of the Gallery.

He introduced the motion by stating that the essence of the question was what kind of university did Senate want Dalhousie to be. The existence of the Art Gallery in his opinion

was crucial to the graduate and undergraduate students in the Arts. He contended that the Art Gallery continues to perform academic functions, including the organization of classes and film series, and carries out research, exhibitions and catalogues. He added that the Gallery played a role in Dalhousie funding, since some benefactors were attracted by the Art Gallery. He concluded by stating that another serious concern was the demoralizing effect on faculty, students and others interested in the Arts.

Mr. Godfrey seconded the motion.

Ms. O'Brien referred to her written statement emphasizing that the Art Gallery was the oldest and most prestigious university art gallery in Canada, that it had received \$213,000 from external funding and that it was an effective public relations tool through its high profile - exhibitions and well-researched catalogues which indeed represented academic contributions. She added that it would be a dangerous precedent for university art galleries across Canada if Dalhousie's gallery were to close.

She stressed the summary on the last 2 pages, which included the suggestion of an endowment fund. Mr. Perina strongly supported the motion, feeling it was absurd to eliminate the Art Gallery, as did Mr. vanFeggelen. Mr. Welch asked whether the Faculty Council of Arts and Science had considered a complementary motion to request that the maintenance of the Art Gallery be ensured through the budget envelope of that Faculty. , Mr. Betts cited statistics to illustrate the difficult financial straits of his Faculty by way of response, and contended that the Art Gallery served the total university community. Hence, funds should be sought from other Faculties as well and other areas of the university. The Chairman hoped that Senate would suggest sources of the required \$98,000 if the motion was supported, as well as discuss the academic qualities. Mr. Godfrey spoke as Chairman of the Art Gallery advisory committee, emphasizing the absence of a true cost-benefit analysis and the necessity to consider the potential impact on fund raising. Mr. Scheibelhut suggested that UBAC had considered this judgment in the light of total financial information from the university community and should be supported. Ms. Sherwin noted the time constraints on UBAC, and indicated that Senate could give guidance regarding the possibility of using the Redistribution Fund for this purpose. Mr. Welch wondered if someone was prepared to move a motion to this effect (i.e. that the costs of the Art Gallery be deducted from all academic envelopes). Mr. Andrews contended that pursuing the cost issue in Senate was potentially divisive and believed that UBAC had access to figures regarding the University Budget. He was more concerned about the fact that no one affected by this proposal had been consulted and about the question of the type of university desired. Ms. Ozier supported Messrs. Andrews and Betts, clarifying that the issue was whether Senate placed value on the Art Gallery as an adjunct to academic programmes and as a service to the Dalhousie community.

An amendment was moved and seconded (vanFeggelen/Misick)

that insofar as necessary, the Redistribution Fund be used to support the Art Gallery.

Mr. Ettliger considered that the amendment confused the issue. He contended that it was not the function of Senate to find financial alternatives but rather to debate whether this was a matter of academic importance. Mr. Rodger agreed that the debate should focus on the question of whether to close the Art Gallery or not, rather than a "rehash" of the budget. He argued in support of the motion, believing that this was not a case of "redoing" the budget, and that 600,000 was already awaited from the Redistribution Fund. Mr. Cross opposed the

amendment, feeling that in a budget of over 100 million dollars, there should be flexibility for an item which was approximately 1/10 of 1%. Mr. Betts suggested that the Public Relations, Development and Alumni Offices could share in the financial support of the Art Gallery. Ms. Waterson refocused Senate's attention on the critical question, voiced earlier by Mr. Andrews. Mr. D. Cameron thought it was impossible to vote on either the amendment or the motion without knowing the financial alternatives and having some clarification of the \$400,000 still to be cut. Mr. Welch urged Senate to consider the financial implications of the rhetoric to support the Art Gallery and contended that if the main motion passed, that this would constitute an indication of Senate's academic priorities, in which case, the Redistribution Fund was one possible source of funding. Mr. Gigeroff disagreed with speakers who said that it was not the function of Senate to consider where the monies would come from. He asked whether the approval of both the amendment and the motion would mean that the Art Gallery would be considered an academic unit. Further, he queried whether an emergency fund raising drive separate from the Capital Campaign had been considered. Ms. O'Brien reiterated that they had just learned of the proposal and that discussions with Vice-President Shaw regarding an endowment plan were underway. The Chairman interpreted that if monies came from the academic portion of the budget (i.e. the Redistribution Fund), that the Art Gallery would be considered to be an academic unit. However, this did not preclude Mr. Betts' argument that funds could also be derived from non-academic areas. Mr. Sinclair maintained that it would be inappropriate to further delay consideration of the Redistribution Fund as an alternative source of funding, and he agreed with Mr. Rodger that this could be a useful amendment. Mr. Gratwick also believed it would be helpful, particularly if it was qualified by a statement that the minimum possible amount would be funded from that source. Ms. Angelopoulos lamented the "piecemeal" consideration of the financial implications of proposals to Senate, adding that she could not vote with such insufficient information. Mr. Sinclair reminded members that there were substantial costs associated with operating the Art Gallery.

The amendment was defeated.

Ms. Fingard spoke in favour of the main motion based on her concern about the progressive erosion of the arts and her belief that the Art Gallery would be needed for the celebratory events of the Women's Centennial.

The main motion carried.

C. Physical Planning Committee

Correspondence, dated 25 March 1985, from the Chairperson, Ms. J. Ritchie, included recommendations regarding priorities among major and minor building requests which were academically related. These had been submitted because of Administration's (via Vice-President Shaw) request for early advice on priorities in light of the government announcement of a ten million dollar contribution. She stressed that these priorities would be subject to change as a result of the academic planning process presently being considered. Mr. Betts wondered if the \$10 million might fund two proposals which had been prepared in the past in the Faculty of Arts and Science but had not been submitted to the PPC, to which Ms. Ritchie responded that the \$10 million and the \$6 million extra anticipated from the Capital Campaign did not cover the current list of proposed projects.

D. Honorary Degrees Committee

1. Report on Balloting (IN CAMERA)

The Secretary reported on the results of the election which had taken place at the 11 February 1985 meeting.

Members agreed that the remaining agenda items would be discussed at the 3 May 1985 meeting and that the report of the Academic Appeals Committee should be considered first, if possible.

85:044.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:01 P.M.

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY

MINUTES OF

SENATE MEETING

Senate met in special session in the Board and Senate Room on Friday, 26 April 1985 at 12:30 P.M.

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

Aucoin, Betts, Birdsall, Bishop, Charles, Cross, Easterbrook, Friedrich, Hanson, Hennen, Holloway, Horrocks, Lewis, Hanning, Nestman, D.W.P. O'Brien, Ozier, Rodger, Ruf, Scheibelhut, T. Shaw, Sherwin, Stewart, Tingley, vanFeggelen, Waterson, Welch, Wien, Wiktor, Yung, Zentilli.

Regrets: A.D. Cohen, Tindall, Tonks.

85:045.

Approval of Graduands from the Nova Scotia Agricultural College

The Chairperson welcomed Dr. H.F. MacRae, President of the NSAC. Dr. MacRae reported that this was the first graduating class to receive B.Sc. (Agriculture) degrees. There were 43 names on the list, and four options were represented. He noted that this class included the highest proportion of students who received Honours and High Honours to date. He noted that Esben Earle Arnfast was the winner of the Governor General Gold Medal. President MacKay commented on the fact that 22 of the 43 graduands were women.

It was agreed upon motion (MacRae/MacKay)

that the B.Sc. (Agriculture) be granted to the students whose names were included on the list distributed at the meeting.

It was further agreed that the Registrar and President of NSAC be empowered to make any additions and alterations to the list of names as necessary to correct any errors.

Dr. MacRae assured Mr. Rodger that members of the Senate of Dalhousie University were welcome to attend the NSAC Convocation on 1 May 1985 at 2:00 P.M. The President hoped that Senate would agree that, in future, the Principal of NSAC could present the degrees if the President of Dalhousie University could not attend. Members concurred with this request, following which Dr. MacRae expressed sincere appreciation on behalf of NSAC to Senate, the President, Vice-President (Academic & Research) and all others at Dalhousie University who had helped to negotiate the agreement between the two institutions.

85:046. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12:45 P.M.

