

Item: Senate Minutes, May 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 May 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 special session on Friday, 3 May 1985 at 10:00 A.M. in the Board and Senate Room.

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

Aucoin, Blewett, Bradfield, Caty, Duff, Keast, Leffek, Lewis, Maloney, D.W.P. O'Brien, O'Shea, Ogden, Ozier, Rodger, Scheibelhut, R. Shaw, Sherwin, Stewart, Stone, Thiessen, Tindall, Tingley, Tonks, vanFeggelen, Welch, Yung.

Regrets: A.D. Cohen, Gratwick, J.V. Jones, Klein, Konok, Munroe, Waterson, C. Williams, K. Wood.

85:047.

Approval of Graduands

On the recommendation of the Deans or their delegates of the various faculties, the following degrees, diplomas and prizes were awarded upon motion:

Faculty of Arts and Science (Andrews/Rodger)

Bachelor of Arts	231
(Distinction 4, Honours 29, First Class Honours 17)	
Bachelor of Arts Honours Certificates	13
(Honours 12, First Class Honours 1)	
Bachelor of Science	315
(Distinction 18, Honours 42, First Class Honours 21)	
Bachelor of Science Honours Certificate	16
(Honours 16)	
Bachelor of Education	26
Bachelor of Music	3
Diploma in Engineering	57
Diploma in Meteorology	4
Certificate in Costume Studies	13
Diploma in Costume Studies	1
TOTAL	679

The prizes and medals were listed by Mr. Andrews and approved upon motion (Andrews/vanFeggelen) following an explanation of the joint award of a University Medal in English.

Faculty of Health Professions (Tonks/Stern)

Bachelor of Nursing (University Medal 1, Distinction 10)	72
Bachelor of Science (Pharmacy) (University Medal 1, Distinction 8)	55
Bachelor of Science (Physiotherapy) (Distinction 2)	29
Bachelor of Recreation (University Medal 1, Distinction 1)	16
Bachelor of Physical Education	23
Bachelor of Science (Health Education)	2
Bachelor of Science (Occupational Therapy)	23
Bachelor of Social Work	46
TOTAL	266

Faculty of Management Studies (Aucoin/Scheilbelhut)

Certificate in Public Administration	6
Bachelor of Commerce (Distinction 1, Honours 8, First Class Honours 2)	139
TOTAL	145

Faculty of Graduate Studies (Leffek/vanFeggelen)

Doctor of Philosophy (Distinction 1)	7
Master of Arts	5
Master of Science	18
Master of Business Administration	74
Master of Public Administration	22
Diploma in Public Administration	6
Master of Education	19
Master of Environmental Studies	3
Master of Library Service	27
Master of Nursing	3
TOTAL	184

Mr. Rodger noted as a matter of information that this would be the last occasion for graduate level degrees to be awarded with Distinction.

There was a final consensus upon motion (Leffek/Andrews)

that the Registrar, in consultation with the appropriate Dean, should be empowered to make such additions to the list of names as were necessary to correct any errors that may have been made by any agent of the University.

85:048.

Reports and Recommendations -- Committees of Senate

A. Academic Appeals Committee

1. Case of Mr. John Russell

The report of the hearing panel of the Senate Academic Appeals Committee, appointed to consider this appeal (dated 14 March 1985) had been precirculated. The members, Josenhans, Lambie and Cromwell (Chair) had unanimously recommended that the appeal be dismissed.

It was moved and seconded (Rodger/Scheibelhut)

that Senate ratify the recommendation of the hearing panel.

Mr. Rodger reminded members of the conclusions reached by the panel, delineated on page 12 of the report. Mr. Andrews supported the motion and recommended that the general observations, to which Mr. Rodger made reference, should be drawn to the attention of faculty members. The Secretary was directed to convey this request to Deans.

The motion carried.

B. Committee on Committees

There was agreement upon motion (Bradfield/Ozier)

that permission be given to the Committee on Committees to appoint a temporary replacement for John Yogis, Chairperson of the Senate Discipline Committee, during his brief absence for a few months.

Mr. Andrews suggested that the Steering Committee should recommend a general provision for the Committee on Committees to make such temporary appointments rather than bring them on an individual basis before Senate.

The Chairperson advised members that the only way in which a recommendation to dissolve the Institute of Oceanography (85:030) could be made would be through the regular review process. Hence, the two names nominated to Senate earlier were considered. It was moved and seconded (Sinclair/Rodger)

that Gordon Ogden III and Mary Anne White serve on the Review Committee for the Institute for Oceanography.

Following a call for further nominations, it was agreed upon motion that nominations cease.

The motion carried and the two individuals were declared elected.

85: 049 -

Report of the President

The President referred to specific items in his April 1985 Report to Senate and the Board of Governor (including the list of convocations and the invited speakers, meetings with the Minister of Education, etc. This report will be distributed and placed on the agenda of the 13 May 1985 meeting for discussion. Dr. MacKay confirmed for Mr. Welch that it was his expectation that the extra monies received from the province by the Faculty of Medicine would be built into the base budget in the future. Mr. Welch thought it might be advisable for the university to receive notification of this intent in writing.

Mr. Welch wondered if the President intended to bring the recent recommendation of Senate to waive the differential fee for students from the least developed countries, to the attention of other Maritime universities. The President said that he had corresponded with MPHEC and AAU and would relay this information to the Presidents of the other universities.

Mr. Bradfield inquired as to whether an increase in the cost of living had been discussed with the Minister of Education when the 2.44% increase to the operating budget was proposed. Dr. MacKay said that this had not been raised specifically, adding that the total revenue increase to individual universities in the province ranged from 2.7% to 9.4%, with Dalhousie at 4.5%. This was the first year in which the support to universities in the province exceeded that awarded to the public school system.

The President responded to a further query from Mr. Bradfield, by indicating that he planned to notify the Advisory Committee to Appoint a Vice-President (Planning and Resources) of his decision (which he had reported to APC) not to make an appointment at this time .

85: 050-

Adjournment

The meeting ad adjourned at 10:55 A.M.

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY

MINUTES

OF

SENATE MEETING

Senate met in regular session in the Board and Senate Room on Monday, 13 May 1985 at 10:00 A.M.

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

Andrews, Betts, Birdsall, Blewett, Bradfield, D.M. Cameron, A.D. Cohen, Duff, Easterbrook, Egan, Fentress, Hatcher, Holloway, Huber, Jeffrey, P. Jones, Josenhans, Kennedy, Lewis, O'Shea, Ozier, Rautaharju, Rodger, Rosen, Ruf, Rutherford, L.R. Shaw, Sinclair, Stone, Stuttard, Tingley, Tonks, Wolf, Christie (invitee).

Regrets: Elgeneidy, Fulton, Gold, Horrocks, Larder, MacIntosh, W.A. MacKay, D.W.P. O'Brien, Scheibelhut, Tan, Tindall, Wood.

85:051.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the meetings of 8 April, 22 April and 26 April 1985 were approved upon motions (Rodger/Sinclair) with the following changes recommended:

85:038 (page 5), line 15 - "to" to replace "on". 85:043, B.I (page 5), line 24 - "carries out", not "the preparation of".

line 31 - "university art gallery" after "prestigious".

85:052.

New Members

The Chairperson introduced several new members of Senate:

Student Representatives

Catherine Blewett (President, Student Union)
Ava Czapalay
David Ferguson
William Jeffery
Kamleh Nicola Jarle Pedersen

Faculty of Arts and Science Elected Representative

Ms. Jane Parpart

New DFA President

Mr. John Rutherford

85:053-

Question Period

Mr. Andrews wondered if figures regarding the cost of Dalplex could be produced (a question raised previously by Ms. Treves-Gold). Mr. Shaw promised to comply with this request.

Mr. Sinclair responded verbally to queries posed at past meetings (1) There was no intention to change the profit margin in textbooks in the Bookstore; (2) The Collective Agreement with the Dalhousie Faculty Association requires that those hiring units which employ members of the bargaining unit establish appointment committees. Some academic units, including some Centres and Institutes, have appointment procedures which do not include committees as specified in the Affirmative Action programme and we will be moving to establish such committees in accord with the provisions of the Collective Agreement.

Mr. Kennedy asked if Mr. Bowman would file with the Senate Office the President's response(s) to the question of differential fees for foreign students.

Mr. Bradfield wondered how the university responded to the 2.44% increase in the operating budget. Mr. Shaw stated that although there had been no public reaction, the President individually and collectively, with other Presidents in the province, met with the Minister of Education to outline the kinds of financial problems faced by Dalhousie. Mr. Shaw commented, in response to a followup question from Mr. Bradfield, that the newspaper coverage was an accurate reproduction, and that Dalhousie, recipient of the second lowest amount, faced the problem of other large Canadian universities with proportionately lower enrolment increases.

Mr. Andrews asked the representatives of Senate to the Board of Governors (e.g. Mr. Huber on the Investment Committee) to clarify and prepare a report re 'Investment in South Africa' by Dalhousie University.

85:054-

Approval of Graduands

It was agreed upon motion (Hatcher/James)

that the 90 individuals listed be awarded the degree of M.D. and that the prizes listed also be awarded.

There was a consensus upon motion (Hatcher/Stuttard)

that the Dean of the Faculty and the Registrar be given the authority to add any name(s) that have been omitted from the list of those approved for the award of degrees due to an error on the part of the university.

85:055

Reports and Recommendations -- Committees of Senate A. Physical Planning Committee 1. Annual Report to Senate

Ms. Ritchie, Chairperson of the PPC, introduced the report dated May 1985. The increased committee activity was attributed to the 10 million dollar grant from the provincial government and the 5 million dollars anticipated from the Capital Campaign. Several uncertainties remained, including whether a portion of the 10 million could be used for maintenance or student housing. The committee planned to look at the minor priorities to see how they could be interspersed with the six major priorities. It was moved and seconded (Stern/Cohen)

that the report of the PPC be accepted.

Ms. Ritchie clarified for Ms. Ozier that the difficulty associated with Student Housing arose from the fact that the 10 million dollars originally fell under the University Assistance Act which excludes housing. The question of whether \$9.5 million could come under this Act and \$.5 million for student housing could be derived from another source remains unanswered by the government. Mr. Shaw added that both the Minister of Education and students considered housing to be a high priority. The provincial government should decide in the next few weeks if the \$1/2 million could be allocated from the 10 million dollars. The earliest that improvement might be seen would be the fall of 1986 as a 9 - 10 months time period is required for building purposes.

Mr. Stuttard asked if there were any estimates of the source and amount of operating and maintenance costs of the new buildings. Ms. Ritchie replied that this was not specified, however, with the exception of the extension to Chemistry and at the back of Continuing Education, all changes were within existing space. Decreased ongoing maintenance costs

were anticipated because of improved heating and insulation. Messrs. Jones and Shaw responded to Mr. Kennedy's query by stating that student housing would pay for its own upkeep and that a capital grant of 1/2 million dollars was required for the building itself.

The motion carried.

At this point in the meeting, Mr. Rosen from the Department of Physiology/Biophysics put forward the following motion (with the permission of the Chairperson), seconded by Mr. Rautaharju

that there be an immediate moratorium on the expropriation for the space occupied by Biomathematics until the propriety of the situation could be determined and

that the appropriate committees of Senate address the larger issue of executive preemption of academic prerogatives (acute and chronic).

By way of introduction he noted that he had recently been informed by the Dean of Medicine that the building would be disposed of on the 31 May 1985, that the division would have to relocate and that there was no alternate space. He believed that there was no physical or academic justification for this action and charged that the matter had been handled in an irregular fashion. He commented that the research was one of the most, if not the most prestigious, in the Faculty and University and that this was done at virtually no cost to the University.

The chairperson suggested referral of the motion to the Senate Physical Planning Committee and Academic Planning Committee. Messrs. Kennedy and Andrews noted the urgency of the matter, as the locks were to be changed by 31 May. It was agreed that an extra meeting of Senate should be held on the 27 May 1985, at which time the recommendations from the PPC could be considered. Mr. Hatcher stated that he would be pleased if Senate pushed ahead with alacrity in view of the interlocking economic changes in the physical plant. Mr. Rodger recommended that the President asked to place a moratorium on the proposed alterations until Senate resolved the matter. Mr. Hatcher thought that the most imminent changes were not major and Mr. Shaw asked what form of decision making process should take place. Mr. Ruf spoke of the difficulty department heads faced in attempting to judge the academic implications of economic measures when there was no well defined mechanism to assess and grade academic priorities. Mr. D. Cameron contended that it was inappropriate to consider this matter with so little information. Mr. Hatcher wished to avoid acrimonious debates in the Senate chamber by having the matter referred to the Senate committee which would be provided with extensive written documentation.

The motion to

**refer and to impose a moratorium until Senate heard the report of the
PPC on 27 May 1985**

carried.

B. Academic Planning Committee

1. Redistribution and Development Fund

The Chairman briefly referred to the summary of allocations from each fund in the report dated 3 May 1985. He added that many of the cost centres appeared to have attempted to recoup the 3 1/2% lost to the budget in their application for redistribution monies and that recommendations for allocation of both funds had been forwarded to the Vice-President (Academic and Research) for final approval.

Mr. Rodger asked whether there was second and third annual installments of the Development Fund to which Mr. Jones replied that this was true in most instances, although there were one or two one-time awards. Mr. Rodger wondered if there was an understanding that the monies allocated, for example in Arts and Science, would go to the items specified by the committee. The Chairperson stated that this would be difficult to do this year, as more than one Faculty had not prioritized requests and in some instances, the rationale was not clear.

Mr. Betts objected to the "one shot process" and to the brief and unclear guidelines which might be included. He would have liked to have been consulted about the fact that his first priority was not regarded as "suitable". He maintained that the process should be altered to give Deans the opportunity to respond.

The Chairperson recognized this as a problem but pointed to the very large sums originally requested and the difficult time frame which did not allow time for consultation this year.

Dean Tonks noted that the development grants were reduced by 1/3 in each of the second and third years and asked if there would be a change in tuition fees if programs were jeopardized by these gradually reduced allocations. Mr. Jones stated that the Development Fund was set up to develop new areas which should be supported by revenue within the Faculty (e.g. through Redistribution Fund) and be self funding in three years. He (the Dean) should take up the question of tuition fees with Vice-Presidents Shaw and Sinclair. However, the Development Fund was not intended to be tied in with tuition fees or to be used as a means to raise fees. The last question of Dean Tonks, regarding 1/6 of the Redistribution Fund allocation being given back to the Art Gallery, remained with the University Budget Advisory Committee.

Mr. Andrews expressed his concerns regarding this "elaborate game" whereby 1% was taken out and put back in different ratios. He maintained that time constraints were felt by both APC and the applicants and the principles should be announced well in advance. The Chairperson stated that the committee had solid rationale for its recommendations and added that patience was

required with this new process. Mr. Hatcher noted that indeed there were priorities this year, as the Faculty of Medicine had contributed twice the amount it had received from the Redistribution Fund. Dean Betts contended that the deans had to have freedom to work within the envelope to adjust the priority listing of the committee. Mr. Kennedy wished to have an idea of the units which "lost" money. He believed that the APC had actively attempted to adhere to Senate established priorities (e.g. continuing education, library). Mr. Betts queried whether the committee had considered the fact that the Faculties of Medicine and Dentistry had received large grants from the government. Mr. Cameron recalled that the Redistribution Fund was established as a means of reallocating the operating budget at the margin between Faculties not within Faculties.

2. Guidelines for Unit Reviews

Following an explanation that the Mission Statement and the Guidelines for Academic Plans were being revised and would be available for consideration at the June meeting, the Chairperson called upon Mr. Stuttard to introduce and move acceptance of the document entitled **Guidelines for Unit Review**. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cohen. Mr. Stuttard stated that each Faculty would determine the details of its review process, rather there was a suggestion put forward regarding the composition of the individual review committee. He pointed out that representatives from the Faculty of Graduate Studies were included to eliminate overlap and redundancy. The major source of costs would be the external reviewers.

Mr. Kennedy considered the notion of self-analysis good but believed it would be useful if conceived of as directed to some outside group. The major flaw was in the belief that a sequential hierarchy of committees might arrive at more accurate judgements. It would be unfortunate if the bureaucratic structure led to lessened confidence in the professional unit's ability to run itself. In his view, clear results would be difficult to obtain. Mr. Andrews understood the desirability of sharpening review processes at Dalhousie. He was wary of the beginning assumption of standardization and comparability when dealing with academic reviews, because of the strength lying in the considerable diversity among and within Faculties.

Mr. Betts believed this was an improved document but was concerned that 1(f) specified separate reports from the internal and external reviewers. The Chairperson suggested a preamble "It is recommended that". Mr. Hatcher urged that a copy of the report be sent to

every individual member of the department/unit under review. Mr. Stuttard noted that this was already part of sentence one in I(f). Mr. Huber was concerned that the document was unclear about how an external reviewer would be selected and how cooperation throughout the process would be ensured. These would be among the details which each Faculty would determine according to Mr. Stuttard. Mr. Stovel welcomed this kind of academic review but had a minor reservation regarding page 3. He suggested submission to the Faculty committee of a report regarding the unit's progress toward the plan and also separation of graduate and undergraduate reviews. Mr. Jones noted that some Faculties already had well established plans and he was not sure that a detailed annual report was necessary. Mr. Stuttard indicated that the report would simply respond briefly to the specific recommendations in the previous review. Mr. Rodger wondered how the review process would fit within existing review processes (e.g. accreditation, graduate studies, chairperson reviews). Mr. Stuttard stated that the reviews would be interrelated but that information on specific cycles rested with the Faculties. Mr. Rodger believed that the document should be referred to Faculties before voting on it in Senate to perceive how it fits with already existing procedures. The Chairperson noted that the original document was already referred to Deans, DFA and some chairpersons and that the authors had taken account of recommended revisions.

Mr. Tonks suggested a change in the section on Health Professions and presumed that there was sufficient license in the document to coordinate with both graduate studies and accreditation reviews. Mr. Andrews was concerned about the principle of confidentiality and secrecy with respect to I(f) to which Mr. Rodger suggested that it might be desirable to delete "undesirable". Mr. Hatcher wondered how personal references could be removed, rather litigious comments.

It was agreed upon motion (Kennedy/Huber)

that this section be amended to read

"it was recommended that the internal review committee and external reviewer(s) would compile separate reports and submit them to the overseeing committee which would then seek responses from all members of the unit under review. The review committee would then compile a final report in light of the departmental response andgroups.

The main motion carried.

C. Financial Planning Committee

Mr. Welch was out of town. However, a copy of his 23 October 1984 letter to President

MacKay concerning student fees and donations to the Capital Campaign was circulated. Administration was put on notice that Senators would raise questions about the letter on 27 May 1985.

D. Steering Committee

1. Issue Agenda

The Secretary reported on the five issues identified by the Steering Committee and their recommended disposition as outlined in the Steering Committee minutes. She noted that the subcommittee on French as a Second Language would be reporting to the APC in June and she invited members of Senate to provide feedback regarding the proposed issues and input regarding other unresolved university-wide issues. With respect to the issue of recognition of faculty achievement. Mr. Kennedy suggested that this had nothing to do with salaries. He contended that a stronger course of action should be taken regarding women in senior administrative posts, such as the President being advised to create a training group around himself to facilitate this process. Mr. Huber believed that the Steering Committee should examine the reward structure for students and thought that the pension implication should be addressed directly to Mr. George. Mr. Betts indicated that some statistics on the aging of Faculty were available in his office.

Members agreed with the Chairperson's suggestion that continuation of the discussion of the agenda take place on Friday, 17 May 1985.

85:056.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12:05 P.M.

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY

MINUTES

OF

SENATE MEETING

Senate met in special session in the Board and Senate Room on Friday, 17 May 1985 at 2:00 P.M.

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

Bennett, Blewett, Charles, Chaytor, Elgeneidy, Tingley, TrevesGold, Sinclair, Stewart.

Regrets: Andrews, Callaghan, Cohen, Friedrich, Gold, Munroe, O'Shea, Tindall, Wood.

85:057.

Awarding of Degrees, Prizes and Medals

On the recommendation of the Deans of the two faculties of Dentistry and Law, degrees, diplomas and prizes named in lists provided to the Secretary were awarded upon motion.

Faculty of Dentistry (Bennett/Chaytor)

Doctor of Dental Surgery	32
Diploma in Dental Hygiene	0

Faculty of Law (Charles/Chaytor)

Bachelor of Laws	146
------------------	-----

It was agreed upon motion (Charles/Bennett)

that the Registrar, in consultation with the appropriate Dean, should be empowered to make such additions to the list of names as were necessary to correct any errors caused by the university.

Discussion of the unfinished agenda items from the 13 May 1985 meeting will take place at the 27 May 1985 meeting and members will be advised of this postponement.

85:058.

Adjournment The meeting adjourned at 2:12 P.M.

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY

MINUTES

OF

SENATE MEETING

Senate met in special session in the Board and Senate Room on Monday, 27 May 1985 at 4:00 P.M.

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

Andrews, Angelopoulos, Armour, Betts, Birdsall, Bishop, Braybrooke, A.D. Cohen, Dresel, Easterbrook, Ettliger, Friedenberg, Holloway, Huber, Klassen, i'ocourek, Leffek, Ilanning, Martin, Ozier, Parpart, Rautahar ju, Rodger, Rosen, Ruf, Rutherford, Sinclair, Stovel, Stuttard, Szerb, Thiessen, Tindall, vanFegge I en, Wo I f.

Regrets: Chaytor, IlackKay, Semple, Tindall, Wood.

85: 059 -

Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of the May 3, 1985 meeting of Senate were approved upon motion (Klassen/vanFeggelen).

85 :060.

Reports and Recommendations -- Committees of Senate

A. Financial Planning Committee

1. Report on 1985-86 Budget

Vice-President Shaw spoke to the document which was distributed at the meeting entitled "Dalhousie University 1985-86 Budget with Comparative Operating Information". He commented ~hat UBAC had provided a valuable broad perspective, that it had met with Deans and management, and had held several public meetings. The committee would produce a lengthy analytical document on the 1985-86 budget which would address in detail questions of policy and procedure. He clarified the use of the terms "submitted", "preliminary" and "approved", and provided elaborative details on the "Operating Budget Pressures" (e.g. in Management Studies and Arts and Science). Subsequently, he made reference to Schedule B - "Specified Savings in Non-Academic Budgets" in an earlier UBAC report - "1985-86 Unlversity Operating Budget Status Report to Senate" .

Lastly, he detailed "further measures to balance" the budget listed in the "1985-86 Budget Outlook".

The Chairperson anticipated that the FPC would review the budget and ask Deans about the effect on their programmes. Mr. Huber asked what the current prime interest rate was. Mr. Andrews sought information about the rules which apply to carry forward deficits from 1985-86 to 1986-87 to which Mr. Shaw replied that any deficit remaining would be carried forward. Mr. Shaw, in answer to Mr. Birdsall's question, noted that it was unfair to have savings in some envelopes which helped the deficit in other envelopes. The Vice-President (Finance) then clarified for Mr. Huber that operating budget expense figures on Salaries and Bursaries were decreased precisely because of increased Canelco monies.

The Chairperson made reference to the letter from P. Welch related to the agreement with students. Vice-President Shaw brought Senators up to date on the matter by reporting that there had been an exchange of letters between the Board of Governors and the Dalhousie Student Union which served as a legal agreement and answered most of the details referred to. However, the question of decreased income flexibility remained. Mr. Welch suggested that the FPC review the agreement and report their conclusions at a later date.

The "Interim Report on the 1985-86 Budget", submitted by Mr. Welch, Chairperson of FPC, was addressed. Mr. Rodger asked what (# 1) "Computer Advisory Services" referred to, to which Mr. Nason answered - "University Computing and Information Services" or the "Computer Centre".

Mr. Schofield thought that the Chief Librarian should be given the opportunity to respond to the 3 1/2% cut, as the Deans had been invited to do (#5).

Mr. Andrews referred to the resolution of Senate regarding the Art Gallery and to point #4 of the interim report, contending that a confrontation situation between FPC and its parent body over a policy of Senate should be avoided. He suggested that Senate committees should be bound by resolutions of Senate. Mr. Welch stated that the motion passed in Senate was one of principle and did not include finances which the FPC could not wholeheartedly support. Mr. Shaw reported that there would be publicity in the near future about layoffs of non-academic staff. Also, some sessional academic positions not protected by the Collective Agreement would not be renewed.

B. Committee on Academic Administration

1. General Undergraduate Regulation B.11.(d)

Mr. Betts spoke on behalf of CAA about the CAA motion forwarded to Senate (agenda attachment) which proposed that the words "as full-time students" be deleted from General Undergraduate Regulation B.11.(d) in the Calendar. He remarked that the Committee on Studies almost routinely excused students in Honours programmes who were required to complete ten credits at Dalhousie from being full-time students in their last two years. He reported that since the time the CAA approved this motion (CAA 85:029), the regulation had been modified in the 1985-86 Calendar.

He moved, seconded by Mr. Braybrooke

that Senate approve retroactively the wording of this regulation in the 1985-86 Calendar.

Mr. Betts thought that this regulation applied to all undergraduate honours programmes.

After considerable discussion about the impact on other Faculties and the questionable value of a process of approving content after the Calendar is finalized, contributed to by Messrs. Betts, Martin, Ettliger, Rodger and Huber, it was agreed upon motion (Rodger)

that consideration of the new motion be deferred until the Deans of the Faculties of Management Studies and Health Professions could be consulted (although they had been contacted about the earlier motion - CAA 85:029)

Mr. Betts commented that it was only recently that Senate concerned itself with the wording of the Calendar and added that Mr. Tingley as Calendar Editor consulted widely regarding proposed changes.

C. Academic Planning Committee

1. Implementation of Ph.D. in French Programme

Precirculated correspondence from A.M. Sinclair of 8 April 1985 sought Senate approval for implementation of the proposed doctoral programme in French and raised the question of the sources of start-up funding for the programme. Additional letters from K.T. Leffek, M. Bishop and A.M. Sinclair were distributed at the meeting. The necessity to secure \$30,000 of start-up funding for acquisitions for the library was raised in the correspondence. Mr. Sinclair identified possible future alternative sources such as the University Campaign Fund and the Development Fund. However, there had not been an opportunity to explore these options.

It was moved and seconded (Sinclair/Leffek)

that the implementation of the Ph.D. programme in French be approved subject to clarification of provisions made for start up funding for the library before being forwarded to the Board of Governors.

The Chairperson noted that both APC and FPC had considered the proposal before it was forwarded to Senate, the Board and MPHEC.

Mr. Ettliger sought assurance that start up funding for the library would be referred to in the motion. Mr. Birdsall remarked that the French Department had been supportive of the library, but contended that it was crucial to acquire funds in support of this programme. He maintained that the Senate Library Committee, rather than the University Campaign Committee would be the appropriate body to consider library-related priorities for the fund. Mr. Dresel clarified that the University Campaign Committee made policy decisions

but that the individual standing committees would make recommendations regarding specific priority distributions. He was opposed to assigning specific priorities at this stage, when the general policy to best benefit the entire university was not yet decided. Mr. Braybrooke contended that information was required from the specific committees referred to. It was moved and seconded (Huber/Blewett)

that the motion be referred to the APC, FPC, UCC and other appropriate committee(s) with a request to report back to Senate as soon as possible.

The Chairperson stated that normally, had the question of funds not been involved, the implementation of a programme would have been included as a "For Action" item on the APC agenda. Mr. Rodger supported Messrs. Birdsall and Dresel's earlier opinions that the Senate Library Committee, not the UCC would be the appropriate body to decide about specific funds in this case. He raised the more basic question of concentrating on whether this was a good programme which required consideration, in addition to funds available.

The motion to refer carried.

85:061.

Presidential Search Committee -- Report of Chairman

Mr. Jones reported that the closing date for applications and nominations was August 31. The Committee had met with Deans, Senior Administration, Faculties and others, had received nominations and suggestions, and had appointed Mr. D. Chaytor as Executive Secretary. He urged Senators to consider possible nominations. He commented, in response to Mr. Huber's question, that the Presidential Search Committee had hired an executive search firm which would serve as a research gathering instrument and would not take part in the decision-making process.

Mr. Huber raised the long-standing question of the relationship between the President and Senate. The Joint Board-Senate Committee on Restraint and Renewal had recommended that this be examined. Mr. Jones stated that the Steering Committee had discussed the matter with the President on several occasions and that it had also been addressed at the meeting of "6 and 6" (which appeared as Senate agenda item #5).

85:062.

Question Period

Mr. Braybrooke was concerned that the recent allocation of monies from the Bank of Nova Scotia (\$700,000) had never been discussed by Senate committees (APC & FPC) or the University Campaign Committee. He expressed serious misgivings about whether there was, in reality, a firm connection between the academic planning process and the fund-raising process. Mr. Sinclair reported that the Faculty of Management Studies and the School of Business Administration had been consulted as had the Senate

Computer Advisory Committee on 13 March. He thought that in the future the academic planning guidelines and the operating budget would be used as the framework for decisions regarding special funding priorities. Mr. Shaw added that the project funded was clearly designated as a number one priority in the Faculty of Management Studies. The University Campaign Committee had not held their initial meeting until the previous week, and hence could not be consulted. However, some major corporations insist on designated gifts and this must be honoured unless it clearly contradicts academic priorities according to Vice-President Shaw. Mr. Huber hoped that offered money would not be rejected out of hand but that the "wish list" might be expanded to include these designated items.

85:063.

Physical Planning Committee

As agreed at the start of the meeting, at 5:45 P.M. Mr. Cohen read a report on behalf of the committee chairperson, Ms. J. Ritchie (attached as Appendix A). Ms. Angelopoulos inquired about the price of the moves to which Mr. Shaw replied that the renovations cost over one million dollars but the moves alone cost between \$2,000 - \$3,000. Mr. Rosen did not believe that the proposed move out of the "Red House" would be cost effective in the long run and raised an objection that, in his view, the department had not participated in the relocation plans. The Chairman suggested that the alternative solutions recently proposed to PPC by the Administration, which would be shared with the department, might well be suitable and satisfy academic requirements. Mr. Cohen, in response to Messrs. Stuttard's and Andrews' queries, concluded that the PPC had dealt briefly with the academic implications of the square footage question and that APC would deal with any other major/broad academic concerns. Mr. Andrews believed that it would not be appropriate to receive the report until the report was completed.

Members agreed with the Chairperson that as the PPC had reported as requested, and as the proposed solutions would be discussed by the individuals concerned, the current critical issue was resolved.

85:064.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:05 P.M.