

Item: Senate Minutes, December 1986
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 December 1986. 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 Senate and Board Room on Monday, 8 December 1986 at 4:00 P.M.

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

Andrews, Angelopoulos, Betts, Binkley, Birdsall, Bishop, Bradfield, Byham, Cameron T.S., Chaytor, Clark, Cohen A.D , Comeau, Cromwell, Duff, Dykstra, Easterbrook, Ettlinger, Fingard, Fournier, George, Gesner, Gratwick, Haley, Harris, Hennen, Huber, Jones D.W., Lewis D., LoLordo, MacRae, MacMullin, Maloney-, Manning, Mason, O'Shea, Ogden, Oore, Ozier, Pooley, Pross, Retallack, Reynolds, Ritchie, Rodger, Schroeder, Sharp, Sherwin, Sinclair, Stern, Stewart M., Stone, Stuttard, Tonks, Varma, Walker, Waterson, Wien, Wood, Christie B.D. (invitee), MacDonald M. (invitee), Traversy (invitee).

Regrets: Egan, Graham, Jones J.V., Konok, Laidlaw, MacKay R.C , Ogden, Precious, Welch, Williams, Zakariasen.

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Jones who informed senators that items 5 and 10 had been placed on the agenda for information and that he would be inviting written comments. He then gained approval for his proposal to limit discussion on these items to twenty minutes and ten minutes respectively. He reminded senators that they had been informed of a request to discuss the removal of the Canadian Book Information Centre from its present location in the Killam Library. He then gained the agreement of the meeting to commence that discussion at 5:40 P.11.

86:161.

Minutes of Meeting of 10 November 1986

There being no recommendations for amendments or corrections, the minutes of the meeting of 10 November 1986 were approved upon motion (Rodger/Waterson)

86:162.

Welcome of New Members

Mr. Jones welcomed the following new members and invited them to stand and be recognized:

Professor David Lewis
Department of Engineering

Professor Marlon Lewis
Department of Oceanography

Professor Ruth C. MacKay
School of Nursing

Professor U.L. Gourango Rao
Department of Economics

Professor Peter Reynolds
Department of Geology

86:163.

Question Period

Mr. Rodger submitted the following questions in writing. They all related to the choice of a new mainframe computer for academic work. He asked that the questions be answered as soon as the choice is settled.

1. What were considered to be the two or three most suitable options at the time of choice?
2. What were the capital costs of each of the above, and in what time-frame?
3. What were the actual maintenance (or lease/maintenance) costs of each option and in what time-frame?
4. What staff costs to Dalhousie would the options have over the first three or four years?
5. How does 3 and 4 compare to costs for academic mainframe computing on the CYBER in 1986?
6. What were the Alteration and Renovation costs arising from the options?
7. Please distinguish hardware and software costs in replies to questions 2 and 3 (and possibly 4).
8. Which option was chosen and why?

Mr. Rodger added that he realizes that negotiations are probably underway for the purchase of the new mainframe and does not want to prejudice these negotiations. The Chair agreed that the questions will be recorded in the minutes with a view to them being answered at a future date.

Mr. Stuttard then addressed a question to the Vice-President (Academic and Research) regarding changes in the Drug Patent law. He inquired if the Vice-President endorsed

statements made by some researchers. Mr. Sinclair replied that he has looked at the matter as an interesting economic question but has not looked at it from the point of view of the Vice-President (Academic and Research). He said that he personally does not think it is wise to change the law but that he does not think it will be worthwhile for him as Vice-President to engage in a debate on the matter with his colleagues.

Mr. Bradfield quoted from the October Bulletin of the Campaign for Dalhousie. He quoted remarks attributed to the Dean of Law. It indicated that the Law Alumni had rallied in support of the re-building of the Library and the Weldon Law Building. Mr. Bradfield also stated that the report of the University Campaign Committee had stated that the allocation for the Law Building had been increased. He said that he was bothered that the emphasis now seemed to be placed on the building and not the Law Library. He asked if the project had been split into the Library and renovations projects, and has this been done in terms of donations received. The Vice-President (Finance and Administration) responded that the project has not been split. It is a two-phase project - the Library and the repair of the building. Mr. Cohen, Chair of the Physical Planning Committee, stated that the original allocation for the Capital Campaign Funds had been set before the Law Building fire. He said that funds were now expected to come from a combination of donations from various sources such as legal societies and government but that there had been no increase in the original allocation from the original campaign.

Mr. Bradfield again stated that he was bothered because the Library needs are pressing and that the project should be gotten on with so that the Killam use can be restored. The President then stated his hope that the sources of the funds required will be identified within the next few weeks.

Mr. T.S. Cameron referred to Senate Minute 86:142 and asked if any additional academic members had been appointed to the Microcomputer Subcommittee. Mr. Christie identified Mr. Mike Sheppard as having been added.

86:164.

Report of the President

The President had provided a written report and now commented on its main features.

1. Mr. R.S. Tonks had been re-appointed for an additional one-year term as Dean of the Faculty of Health Professions.
2. The President hopes for confirmation of additional funding for the Faculty of Medicine very soon and a position on future funding within the next few months.
3. Discussions, especially about funding, are proceeding regarding the proposal for the establishment of the centralized computer library system, NOVANET. Librarians had been asked to consider various policies such as the policy on acquisitions.

4. An advisory council on athletics is being established and invitations have been sent to potential initial members.

5. The President outlined in some detail changes in the budgeting system. He stated that the principal role of the Senate Financial Planning Committee will be long-term planning and the translation of Academic Planning Committee plans into financial plans. He reported that the University Budget Advisory Committee has been abolished and recommended that the student representative on the Financial Planning Committee become a voting member. He emphasized that the role of Senate includes the function of feeding information back to the university community.

Mr. Maloney congratulated the President for establishing the Advisory Council on Athletics. Expressing concern for access to facilities by the academic members of his School, he stated that he would be encouraged if there was an academic member from the School on the Council. The President stated that the Council would be broadly representative and does include some members of Mr. Maloney's School.

Ms. Sherwin stated that the University Budget Advisory Committee had learned that it is important for faculties to have preliminary working budgets by January 1 and asked if this will still be possible. The President replied yes, in the sense of a budget book. Mr. Bradfield observed that if the budget was not out until after the beginning of the fiscal year, it seems that the Financial Planning Committee should report assumptions in the fall. Mr. Jones stated that while the process is behind this year, the plan is to get back on schedule. Mr. Wien, Chairman of the Financial Planning Committee, stated that the preparation of a report to Senate is on the agenda of the Financial Planning Committee and that he expects this report to be ready for Senate in January.

86:165.

French as a Second Language

Mr. Jones reviewed the history of Senate's consideration of French as a Second Language. He made particular reference to the fact that Senate at its meeting of 11 October 1985 had approved in principle the preamble to the final report of the subcommittee on the Use of the French Language at Dalhousie, dated July 10, 1985, but had asked for an estimate of the costs and a timetable before considering implementation of the report. The current report provides that information and has been made available for comment. He said that the Academic Planning Committee would like to wait for next year's academic planning document before making any specific recommendation, however, it had expressed an interest in Senate's comments. He pointed out that by agreement the discussion will be limited to 20 minutes but that written submissions would be accepted by the Academic Planning Committee. He then called on Mr. Pross who dealt in more detail with the report covering costs and timetable for implementation. Mr. Pross emphasized that the appointment of a coordinator is essential. One responsibility of the coordinator would be the seeking of external funding. In response to a

question from Mr. Rodger, Mr. Pross stated that the duties of the coordinator will be partially under the Department of French and for other courses the person will report directly to the Vice-President (Academic and Research). Mr. Betts informed Senate of some experimentation in the Faculty of Arts and Science. Mr. Bishop, however, stated that it will be difficult to base conclusions on that activity because the course listings were late in appearing. He then expressed the interest of the Department in developing this programme and stated that it would enhance the activities of the Department. Mr. Betts reminded Senate of a somewhat similar proposal for a writing skills coordinator. He spoke for the need to balance proposals for worthy projects and not consider them in isolation. In response to comments from Ms. Ozier, Mr. Pross made it clear that the proposal is to prepare for the anticipated arrival of graduates of French immersion programmes and not necessarily to attract students from French Canada. Ms. Ozier had also spoken of a survey to determine the interest of Faculty in learning to teach in French. Mr. Pross said that he had thought that this material had been referred to in the Manicom report. In response to a question from Mr. Andrews, Mr. Jones stated that there is no intention to implement the recommendations of the report without Senate approval.

86:166.

Foreign Student Policy

The President, as Chair of the Committee on Academic Administration, referred to the circulated reports and minutes and suggested that the Vice-President (Academic and Research) speak to the Committee's recommendations concerning the report of the Task Force on Foreign Student Policy. Mr. Sinclair reviewed the history of the reports. Senate then proceeded to consider the motions submitted by the Committee on Academic Administration. The first differed from that of the original report in that it did not mention a specific percentage as an objective for foreign student enrolment.

It was moved (Clark/Ozier)

that Dalhousie should in principle seek a reasonable mix of domestic and visa student intake. The exact percentage of each faculty and/or program should be determined in keeping with the particular circumstances.

The motion carried.

Before the motion was passed Mr. Marriott responded to some questions and comments by senators. He stated that the university must provide opportunities for able students. He said that the retention of students may be a greater problem than recruitment of an incoming class. He said that he is happy with the stated commitment in this motion.

The second motion in the original report had called for visa students to pass a test of English

proficiency. The President stated that the CAA did not support this motion. There was no disagreement from the senators.

The third recommendation contained in the report had called for a rejection of the notion of differential fees. The Committee on Academic Administration in considering this had changed it to call for a rejection of differential grants, however, on presenting the motion to Senate, the President had used the word 'fees'. Following some discussion, this was amended by motion (Betts/Rodger) to read "**grants**". The amended motion therefore read (Clark)

"Dalhousie does in principle reject differential grants and should lobby actively for their removal."

The motion carried.

The next motion concerning assistance to students experiencing financial difficulties was modified only slightly by the Committee on Academic Administration (Clark/Sherwin)

that the University should establish a fund from which students who experience foreign exchange or other difficulties beyond their control can obtain loans from the university.

The motion carried.

The President then pointed out to senators that the minutes of the CAA report briefly that Committee's consideration of the remainder of the report. No other recommendations were made.

86:167.

Jurisdiction of Senate Academic Appeals Committee

The Chair of Senate, noting the absence of Mr. Christie, suggested that discussion be deferred until the January meeting.

Senate agreed.

86:168.

Admission of Students from Newfoundland Grade XII

Mr. Sinclair reviewed the background that led to the introduction of Newfoundland Grade XII. He stated that through inquiry the Committee on Academic Administration had established that Newfoundland students would encounter no difficulties in professional careers if they were accepted on the basis of having received credit for Newfoundland Grade XII. The CAA had also been informed that the Newfoundland Grade XII would be comparable to Nova

Scotia Grade XII. He did say that consideration of the question had been complicated by the fact that Memorial University of Newfoundland still has a four-year baccalaureate program.

It was moved (Clark/Sharp)

that Dalhousie University recognize Newfoundland Grade XII as equivalent to Nova Scotia Grade XII for purposes of admission.

The motion carried.

86:169.

School of Library Service -- Name Change

A proposal had been considered by the Committee on Academic Administration for a change in name of the School of Library Service and the name of the degree offered by that School. In response to a comment by Mr. Andrews, Ms. Dykstra clarified that this would lend emphasis to the School's efforts to incorporate the use the latest technologies.

It was moved (Clark/Dykstra)

that Senate approve the change in title of the School of Library Service to the School of Library and Information Studies and further that the name of the degree offered by that School be changed to Master of Library and Information Studies.

The motion carried.

86:170.

Areas of Special Emphasis

A draft report of a subcommittee of the Academic Planning Committee dealing with areas of special emphasis and dated November 20, 1986 had been circulated for information. Mr. Birdsall, the Chair of the subcommittee, introduced the report. He said that while "1986 and Beyond" identifies some priorities the areas of special emphasis would be fields of study that would transcend faculties. He drew attention to the criteria for identifying areas of special emphasis and to the section identifying sources of funding. He identified four significant issues that require particular attention, namely Accessibility, Information Technology, Research, and Cooperation. Mr. Rodger expressed concern once again seeing a Dalhousie report emphasizing phrases such as "world class" and "at the very forefront of knowledge". He suggested it might be better to address our responsibilities to the region. He said he can think of lots of benefits Nova Scotia needs. "It should not matter two whits whether the world needs them." Mr. D. Jones suggested that criteria #6 will allow such activities. Ms. Waterson stated that provision takes care of some of her concerns but suggests that the fifth significant issue

should be teaching. Mr. Kennedy

asked for clarification of an area of special emphasis and for the implications for reallocation of funding. Mr. W. Jones stated that this is an attempt to establish a few special areas but not to the detriment of others. Mr. T. Shaw expressed appreciation for the idea and asked when and how it will be implemented. Mr. W. Jones replied that the Deans have not been asked to identify such areas in the submission of academic plans this year but they will be asked at the time their plans are discussed with APC. The manner in which they are implemented will depend upon the nature of the area. Mr. Andrews expressed dissatisfaction at the lack of clarity of the process of identification and asked "Will the designation of areas of special emphasis be subject to Senate decision?" The Chair replied that he would certainly expect it to be. Ms. Binkley

expressed concern that Dalhousie is becoming very specialized and in so doing may lose its generalness. Mr. Wien pointed out the difference between an area of special interest and specialization, the latter being a greater differentiation of fields of study whereas the identification of an area of special emphasis would encourage broad study. Ms. Ozier stated that she has an apprehension about this approach. Dalhousie is an excellent graduate and undergraduate university in Atlantic Canada for general purpose use. Dalhousie needs to begin to appreciate its own competence. She suggested that as a caution academic planning should look to a solid, general base before recognizing areas of special emphasis. The Chair closed discussion by suggesting that senators write additional comments to himself or to the Secretary of Senate.

86:171.

Canadian Book Information Centre (CBIC)

As agreed upon earlier, discussion of the pending move of the Canadian Book Information Centre commenced at 5:40 P.M. Ms. Fingard spoke first and presented a two-part motion that was later considered as two separate motions. She read from a prepared statement. She spoke of the need to strengthen the commitment to Canadian Studies. She said the Centre had the ability to get access to books as soon as they are published and was therefore a much earlier source than the Library. She also stated concern about the manner in which the CBIC was evicted and felt that this reflected poorly on Dalhousie's public relations. Mr. Kennedy seconded Ms. Fingard's statements and said that the CBIC serves a good purpose. He expressed concern about the process by which it had been evicted.

The President then spoke to the issue. He said that three groups occupy this space, namely, the Canadian Learning Materials Centre, the Canadian Book Information Centre, and the Atlantic Publishers Association. They had been there since 1979 free of charge, but it was well understood that the space was provided as long as Dalhousie did not need it. He pointed out that of the four Canadian Book Information Centres in Canada, Dalhousie has the only one located on a campus. He said that Dalhousie has therefore provided considerable support and has benefitted from this. With regard to the process, he said the decision dates back to the summer and he therefore had no direct involvement in it. He did say that he would

have done some of it differently. He noted that in August alternative space was offered to the CBIC, which would have just accommodated books. They would have had to find other space for other functions. This was not acceptable to them. The President said that he knew of no concerns until he received a letter from the English Department protesting the move. He said arrangements have been made to accommodate the Canadian Learning Materials Centre in another room in the Killam Library, as an interim step. He then asked the Vice-President (Academic and Research) to outline the reasons for the move being requested. Mr. Sinclair stated that there are severe pressures on space in the university and that this has become particularly acute in the Library since the Law School fire. He said its strategy was to move the Public Relations Office to the Development Office and the Development Office to the CBIC space along with the Dean of Management Studies who has been homeless since reorganization of the Faculty. He stated that the original commitment to CBIC was 1159 sq. ft. which has since expanded to 2700 sq. ft. He stated that attempts have been made to accommodate all three units. He noted that letters had been written to an individual with no direct involvement in the decision-making process. Mr. Huber spoke against the motion because of the university's serious space problems. He illustrated this by saying that the University Bookstore has only one-third to one-half the space it should have. Mr. Andrews supported the motion and expressed concern that the views of colleagues had been ignored. Senior administrators should think about academic interests.

At 6:00 P.M. the Chair ruled that discussion would continue because of the importance of the issue. The President then reiterated that the decision had been made before his arrival and the first time he had any reason to question the decision had been twelve days ago. He again said that he would prefer to do it differently. Mr. Birdsall stated that there is an element of emergency in the move and would not like to see it delayed. He said he regrets that the Centre has to be moved but it is important to consider the priorities of the Library. He said that the burning of the Law Library created a major crisis which has had a major impact on space planning in the Library. For instance, they have been unable to move the Science Library into the Killam. Ms. Ritchie reported that the question of the move had come to the Physical Planning Committee as part of a series of changes in the Physical Plant. She recalled that discussion was brief but two questions had been asked: (1) Had departments been consulted? The answer to this had been yes, and (2) What process had gone on? The answer to this was that the process was then going on. She said, therefore, discussions had been going on as early as the spring but that it had not been presented to the Physical Planning Committee as a serious issue. Mr. Sinclair reiterated some of his earlier statements about the CBIC being offered alternative space. Mr. Myers then spoke identifying himself as a co-founder of the Canadian Learning Materials Centre. He said he appreciates the space problems at Dalhousie but regrets that the move has become necessary. He said that the Centre has made a unique contribution. He recognized that Dalhousie support has been generous. He said that he agrees with the President that there is not much point in examining the decision process but it was badly done. He said he would ask if there is any chance to explore alternative arrangements. He said that we are not distinguished at this university in Canadian Studies but in Canadianists. The President said he then wished to make it clear that he has asked Mr. Lord to investigate alternatives but noted that the CBIC and the APA are

committed to the move, however, he is willing to enter into discussions to bring them back. Ms. Ozier expressed concern about Ms. Ritchie's statement that Mr. Graham had said that departments had been consulted. She said that academic purposes should come first. Mr. Haley then said that it was clear last spring that the space need was acute. He said that the three groups did not respond to our difficulties or alternatives. Mr. Kwak then suggested the value of the space in terms of new building or rental and said that he would not support the motion. Other senators speaking included Ms. Waterson, Ms. Angelopoulos, Messrs. Betts, Wainwright, Sinclair, Stone, Rodger, Kennedy and Ms. Ritchie. It was established that there is no formal Canadian Studies program on campus but many students are interested in the field and study courses that normally would fall under that heading. More concern was expressed about the lack of consultation and Mr. Graham's reporting that concerned departments had been consulted. Mr. L. Vagianos was identified as the person to whom letters of concern had been addressed. Mr. Sinclair stated that he had no official capacity in this decision process. The motions were then put (Kennedy/Fingard)

that Senate calls upon the President to rescind the decision to remove the CBIC from its present location on Dalhousie campus.

The motion was defeated.

It was then moved (Kennedy/Fingard)

that Senate calls upon the President to inquire into the procedures that led to the decision to remove the CBIC in the absence of consultation with the academic community and in particular, scholars of Canadian Studies on campus and to report in writing to Senate at an early date.

The motion carried.

86:172.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:28 P.M.