

Item: Senate Minutes, July 2000
Call Number: Senate fonds, UA-5 Accession 2007-039 Box 6

Additional Notes:

This document is a compilation of Senate minutes, staff matters and miscellaneous documents for July 2000. 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

DRAFT MINUTES

OF

SENATE MEETING

SENATE met in regular session on Monday, July 10, 2000, at 4:00 p.m. in University Hall, Macdonald Building.

Present with Mr. Stuttard in the chair were the following: Ben-Abdallah, Binkley, Bleasdale, Blunden, Bradfield, Brett, Caldwell, Caley, Coffin, Connolly, Cunningham, Devlin, Eaton, El-Hawary, Farrell, Fraser, Giacomantonio, Guppy, Gupta, Harvey, Johnston, Kemp, Kimmins, Lee, MacAulay, B. MacDonald, N. MacDonald, MacInnis, Maes, McIntyre, Murphy, Neves, Pacey, Phillips, Rowe, Russell, Rutherford, Sastri, Scott, Scully, Tindall, Traves, Workman.

Absent: Alexander, Clairmont, Emodi, Girard, Hart, Harvey, Ipson, Lawen, R. MacDonald, MacLean, McAlister, Roberts, Treves, Wainwright, Watters.

Regrets: Coté, Cox, Downe-Wamboldt, Jalilvand, Kay-Raining Bird, Lohmann, Poel, Savoy, Slonim, Starnes, Ugursal, Whyte.

Invitees: Michael Deturbide, Marcia Ozier, and Tom Boran.

2000:65.

Welcome of New Members

Mr. Stuttard welcomed the new members to the new session of Senate: Susan Guppy (Architecture), Frank Harvey (Arts & Social Sciences), Philip Cox and Carolyn Watters (Computer Science), Don Cunningham (Dentistry), Lloyd Fraser (Henson College), Nori Ben-Abdallah (Engineering), Barbara Downe-Wamboldt, Rita Caldwell, Carolyn Savoy, and Nigel Kemp (Health Professions), Richard Devlin (Law), Karen Neves (Libraries), Robert Blunden and Leonard MacLean (Management), Paul Murphy, Richard Rowe, and Stephen Workman (Medicine), David Scott (Science). Two new administrators joining this session were John Rutherford, Acting Dean of the Faculty of Graduate Studies, and William Caley, Dean of the Faculty of Engineering.

Mr. Stuttard thanked John Barry for his long-standing service as the Senate's audio-technician. Mr. Barry had now retired.

The Chair advised Senators it would be necessary to hold a second meeting in July, on 24 July, 2000, in order to approve Honorary Degrees for the Fall Convocations.

2000:66.

Adoption of the Agenda

Mr. Stuttard had received a request that item 9, the motion from the Faculty of Science concerning Science Library Services, be moved up to accommodate the many visitors in attendance. He suggested

that item 8, approval of the proposed Master of Engineering (Petroleum Engineering), and 9 become items 5 and 6. Under Matters Arising, Senators would be asked to consider two additional items, rescinding of a degree from the Faculty of Graduate Studies, and the approval of two degrees from the Faculty of Medicine. However, Ms. Bleasdale had received a request that item 9 not be considered until after 5 o'clock to enable two librarians to attend. To accommodate both the visitors already here and those yet to come, she moved:

That item 9 become an order of the day for 5:05 p.m.

The agenda was adopted as amended.

2000:67.

Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting of June 12, 2000, were adopted as circulated.

2000:68.

Pension Contribution Savings

Mr. Stuttard drew members' attention to the memorandum from Mr. Mason dated 19 June, 2000, in which the Vice-President (Finance & Administration) responded to the question raised at the previous meeting concerning the planned use of the Board's share of pension contribution savings.

2000:69.

Knowledge House Memorandum of Understanding

Ms. Bleasdale reported that following the Senate meeting of June 12, 2000, she had secured from one of the Faculties a copy of the Memorandum of Understanding between Dalhousie University and Knowledge House Inc. and Knowledge House Limited Partnership, and she had referred it to the SAPBC which would consider the partnership and any program proposals arising from it. The Memorandum was confused in a number of key areas, and it would be necessary to establish exactly what was being proposed. Two examples of confusion were inappropriate reference to advanced standing at Dalhousie and questionable validity of transfer credits from a non-university institution. These were not simply questions of terminology involving tidying up after the fact. They were questions involving fundamental concepts, the big picture, and the nature of Dalhousie's relationship with an external corporation. She would welcome any additional information on this matter.

2000:70.

Rescission of a Degree

With the approval of the Graduate Studies Faculty Council, Mr. Rutherford moved:

That Senate rescind the doctoral degree conferred on Mr. Oonsivilai at the Convocation of May 27, 2000.

Mr. Rutherford reported that through no fault of the student the degree had been conferred *in absentia* due to a clerical error. Mr. Oonsivilai had submitted his intent to graduate and had passed his thesis defence, but had not completed the necessary revisions in time for the May Convocation. It was anticipated that he would receive his degree at the appropriate Convocation once his thesis revisions were completed.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

2000:71.

Approval of Degrees

On behalf of the Faculty of Medicine, Ms. MacDonald confirmed that two students had now completed all the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Medicine, and therefore moved:

That Senate approve the awarding of the degree of Doctor of Medicine to Mr. Shane Douglas Neilson and Ms. Erin Therese McDonough.

Ms. McIntyre thought that only the Maxillofacial Surgery group received degrees outside of the normal cycle. Mr. Stuttard clarified Senate's rule that degrees not be conferred outside of the Spring and Fall Convocations, with provision for special conditions in Dentistry. Were Senate to adopt this motion it would be expanding the exception to include Medicine along with Dentistry. Ms. MacDonald explained that these individuals would not be able to secure licences until they actually had their degrees in hand, which meant they would not be able to begin practice until November, as opposed to August. As with Dentistry, a letter from a university was no longer sufficient to secure a license to practice Medicine.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

2000:72.

Question Period

Mr. Bradfield noted that to be complete the memorandum from Mr. Mason should note that by the end of July 2000 we would already have completed one third of the fiscal year, and consequently would have saved \$1 mil that was not recorded in the budget. That sum represented two-thirds of the amount that had been cut back from units. At the same time, the budget under which we were operating assessed academic departments a total of \$430,000 to pay for the continuation of the capital campaign under a new name, the Major Names Campaign. This appeared to him similar to assessing departments for basic services such as electricity, which was not our policy. Was charging departments for fund-raising a change in policy? Also, why were we not charging non-academic units? Mr. Traves responded that this was simply a reorganization of the University budget in an attempt to find resources to pay for what was an on-going expense. Since the principal beneficiaries almost exclusively would be the Faculties, it seemed reasonable to assign the costs against the Faculties' on-going budgets. This had been discussed for a number of months with the Deans, and a variety of proposals and formulae had been developed. The formula employed had been approved by the Deans and implemented by the Vice President (Finance & Administration).

2000:73.

Election of the Vice-Chair of Senate

Mr. Stuttard reminded Senators that Mr. Mo El-Hawary (Engineering) and Mr. Dale Poel (Management) had agreed to stand for the position of Vice-Chair of Senate. Mr. Cunningham and Mr. Workman agreed to assist in distributing the ballots and counting the vote. Subsequently, Mr. Stuttard congratulated Mr. El-Hawary on his election to the position of Vice-Chair of Senate.

2000:74.

Nominations to Senate Committees.

On behalf of the Senate Nominating Committee, Mr. Boran moved:

That the following nominations be approved:

To the Senate Academic and Priorities Budget Committee, Richard Rowe (Medicine), July 2000-June 30, 2002; Rita Caldwell (Health Professions), July 2000-June 30, 2002; Richard Devlin (Law), July 2000-June 30, 2001;

To the Senate Academic Appeals Committee, David Black (Arts & Social Sciences), July 2000-June 30, 2003;

To the Senate Committee on Academic Administration, Teresa Scassa (Law), July 2000-June 30, 2002;

To the Senate Committee on the Environment, Daniel Labrie (Science), July 2000-June 30, 2002;

To the Senate Committee on Instructional Development, Heidi Julien (Management), July 2000-June 30, 2003;

To the Senate Library Committee, Victor Li (Arts & Social Sciences), July 2000-June 30, 2001; Gwyneth Pace (Librarian), July 2000-June 30, 2003; Ian Folkes (Science), July 2000-June 30, 2002;

To the Senate Physical Planning Committee, William Phillips (Engineering), July 2000-June 30, 2003;

To the Joint Board of Governors/University Investment Committee/Dalhousie Pension Trust Fund/Dalhousie Retirees' Trust Fund, Iraj Fooladi (Management), July 2000-June 30, 2003.

Mr. Stuttard reminded members that it was still possible to make nominations from the floor. In response to the request for further nominations, Mr. Tindall nominated Mr. Bradfield (Science) to serve on the Senate Academic Priorities and Budget Committee. Mr. Bradfield agreed to serve and his name was added to the list of nominees.

After the requisite further two calls for nominations, the nominees were declared elected to their respective Committees.

2000:75.

Nominations to the University Tenure and Promotions Panel

Mr. Stuttard moved:

That Senate approve the re-appointment of the following to serve on the University Tenure and Promotions Panel: Michael Poulton (Architecture), Robin Howell (Dentistry), Ezz I. El-Masrt (Engineering), Esmeralda Thornhill (Law), Paul Brown (Management), and Barry Ruddick (Science), for the term July 1, 2000 to June 30, 2003.

The individuals had received the approval of the University President and the Dalhousie Faculty Association.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

2000:76.

Report of the Senate Discipline Committee

Mr. Deturbide, Co-Chair of the Senate Discipline Committee for the year 1999-2000, moved:

That the Senate Discipline Committee's 1999-2000 Annual Report be adopted.

Mr. Deturbide reminded members that the Committee was charged by Senate with hearing alleged academic offences brought by professors and instructors, as well as offences under the University's Code of Student Conduct. The Committee had heard 78 cases over the academic year 1999-2000, which represented a 40% increase over the previous year, most of which resulted from the increase in plagiarism cases, in particular plagiarism involving the internet. That continued to be the largest category of cases heard by the Senate Discipline Committee. The Committee's decisions could be appealed on the limited grounds related to the denial of principles of fundamental justice. There had been no appeals of the Committee's decisions over the past year.

Mr. Bradfield thought the penalties for plagiarism cases might have become less severe over the past few years. Mr. Deturbide responded that over the past three years the penalties had not decreased to a significant extent. The penalty depended on the circumstances, the degree of plagiarism, and the seniority of the student; but in cases where plagiarism had been found the penalty for a first offence by a student in their first or second year, for example, was typically a "0" on the assignment and an academic notation on their transcript.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

Ms. Binkley moved:

That Senate thank the Senate Discipline Committee for their work on behalf of the University.

Ms. Binkley noted the inordinate amount of personal and professional time Committee members devoted to their work.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

2000:77.

Report of the Senate Physical Planning Committee

On behalf of the Senate Physical Planning Committee, Mr. Bradfield, Committee chair, moved:

That the Senate Physical Planning Committee's 1999-2000 Annual Report be adopted.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

2000:78.

Master of Engineering (Petroleum Engineering)

That the proposed program, Master of Engineering (Petroleum Engineering), be approved on condition that the Faculty of Engineering makes a one-time contribution of \$5,000 and a base-budget transfer of \$1500 to the Library for identified expenditures.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

2000:79.

Agreement with NSAC

Mr. Stuttard reported that the Consolidated Agreement between Dalhousie and the Nova Scotia Agricultural College was now available to Senators, from the Senate Office, the Vice-President (Academic) & Provost, or Mr. Coffin, Principal of the College. Mr. Scully noted that the Agreement was primarily a consolidation of previous agreements and there had been no substantive change in the nature of the relationship.

2000:80.

Report of the President

Mr. Traves had circulated to the University community an Annual Report indicating a number of areas in which the President and the Office of the President had been working, including the major issues before the University and an outline of important forth-coming issues. In the area of research activity, the President noted that we were moving forward, through extensive consultations with the Deans and through the Deans their colleagues, on the Strategic Plan for the Canada Research Chairs. The University was obliged to present that plan to the federal government by September 1, 2000. The plan covered five years and would continue to evolve over time. He intended to circulate the plan broadly and to consult with Senate and the Board; however, timing was a difficulty. If serious concerns surfaced at the beginning of the fall term, after the document had been submitted, it could be amended and resubmitted.

The Atlantic Investment Fund recently announced by the federal government would make available an additional \$300 mil for innovation and economic development in Atlantic Canada. The plan anticipated substantial university involvement in enhancing the innovative capacity of the region. At present, plans for disbursing the funds, details concerning eligibility of programs, and expectations for those programs, had not been established. The President anticipated that in the early fall the University would be asked to submit proposals to this Fund. The focus would be on economic development, not on the Universities in the region; however, Universities were important to that development and Dalhousie had a number of on-going and planned activities which might be advanced in this area. Members of the community should think creatively about projects for which large sums would be available without the necessity of finding matching sums. Projects should be broadly conceived, multi-institutional and likely multi-provincial. Those with substantial on-going projects should work to expand potential links with other institutions. The Vice-President (Research), Mr. Breckenridge, would be interested in meeting with individuals concerning this program. The fund would likely also be the source of matching funds for CFI proposals.

Mr. Bradfield observed that the President's annual report had noted that we should attempt to increase enrolments by twenty percent. How much did the President think we should increase faculty members

over the same period? Mr. Traves referred to the on-going program to secure additional funds to increase faculty numbers; it was one of the major priorities for the Capital Campaign which had achieved a substantial number of endowed or funded chairs. In addition, the Canada Research Chairs for which we had lobbied extensively would represent another infusion of new faculty members. If a significant increase in enrolments resulted in an increase in tuition revenue, we would have additional resources for further appointments. It was obvious that increased enrolments would necessitate additional faculty and support staff to handle the entire workload.

2000:81.

Faculty of Science Motion Re: Science Library Services

Mr. Stuttard invited the Dean of the Faculty of Science to move the Faculty's motion concerning Science Library Services. Dean Kimmins moved:

That in accordance with the 1989 promise and commitment made by the University Library that the Science Library would be kept as a distinct unit, for reasons which are equally valid today, the University Library shall cease immediately all work relating to the integration of Science Services with those of the Social Sciences and Humanities Services, and any change in the status of the Science Services and the Science Library shall occur only with the agreement of the Faculty of Science and the Senate.

Mr. Kimmins reminded Senators that in 1989 when the Science Library had moved from the MacDonald Building to its present location, a document prepared by the then University Librarian, William Birdsall, had assured the University and the Faculty of Science that the move would preserve the Science Library "as a distinct unit on the second floor of the Killam: "By maintaining Science Services and collections as a distinct unit the expertise developed among the Science Library staff and the relationship they had established with users will be maintained."

The proposal from the current University Librarian stood in sharp contrast to that assurance in that it would integrate the Science Library Services with those of the Social Sciences and Humanities Services. The effect on students and professors would be analogous to rearranging one's house by moving the dining room to the basement and the kitchen to the attic, and putting the bathroom in an outhouse. The disassembling of Science Services would represent a separation of unbound periodicals, reference materials, indices, and weekly periodicals, and there was no doubt that in the view of the professors and students it would result in a loss in the quality of instruction and research, and a deterioration in the delivery of services.

Speaking to process, Mr. Kimmins noted that the Faculty had heard about this reorganization serendipitously in November 1999 when the University Librarian had called for an urgent meeting with the Dean of Science. In the absence of Dean Kimmins the University Librarian had met with the Associate Dean. On his return to campus Mr. Kimmins had secured a copy of the proposed changes and distributed it to all staff and student societies, enclosing a neutral covering letter asking whether or not individuals and groups supported the reorganization. To date, he had not heard from one professor or student favouring the proposal. As a result, Faculty Council had unanimously passed a motion, forwarded to the University Librarian on November 30th, asking that Science Services remain as a distinct Science Library in accord with University policy. The University Librarian had not agreed to that request, and on June 1, 2000, the Faculty as a whole had passed the motion included with the agenda for this meeting.

Mr. Kimmins quoted from the memorandum attached to a feasibility study which had argued that the reorganization would give Librarians more time to keep up with changes in their profession and to interact more directly with more faculty and departments. Unfortunately, neither professors nor students within the Science Faculty saw these benefits as a necessary outcome of the proposed reorganization; and if they were benefits, were they compelling enough, given the complete opposition from the Science Library's users? Members of the Faculty of Science were not obdurate, and had the changes been presented as necessary because of restrictions on space or the budget, or as beneficial to the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, their response might have been different. But the University Librarian had indicated that the disassembly was not driven by such circumstances; he had advised the Faculty of Science that they needed to move on, though it did not seem clear where.

Mr. Kimmins noted that students in both the Dalhousie Science Society and the Dalhousie Arts and Social Sciences Society strongly supported the position of the Faculty of Science. Mr. Gupta believed that all faculty members and post-doctoral fellows in the Faculty of Science and all the departmental graduate student societies were against the proposed amalgamation. Mr. Gupta could not understand why the University Librarian appeared bent on disrupting the teaching and research of the Science Library's primary constituents. He understood that the Science Librarians were also against the move.

Mr. Maes reminded Senators that Mr. Birdsall had written the piece quoted by Mr. Kimmins in response to the need to accommodate expanding collections by moving the Science Library into the Killam Library. He did not believe Mr. Birdsall had intended that the Science Library continue as it was in perpetuity, irrespective of the many changes over the succeeding years. As a result of the move, the Killam Library had taken over services such as circulation, document delivery, cataloguing, acquisitions, systems support, and serials control. What remained of the Science Library were the collections and the reference service. Science Services still existed, as did Social Sciences and Humanities Services. Now they were simply located on the same floor. This co-location had been recommended by a review committee, members of which the Faculty of Science had assisted in choosing. Mr. Maes had concurred with the recommendation for a number of reasons. Like other units at Dalhousie, the Library's resources and staff were under pressure; and as University Librarian he was obliged to use resources most effectively and efficiently. All librarians recognized that their workload was extraordinarily heavy, and co-location was a way to decant that workload. More librarians would be freed to undertake library work, instead of routine clerical tasks such as handing out debit and copy cards and directing users to the latest issue of a journal. Moving the current Science journals/serials onto the same floor with Social Sciences and Humanities serials also created the opportunity for users to move more easily through a broader collection. The arrangement of Science's non-current journals remained as it had been on the second floor.

As Mr. Maes had mentioned in the last meeting, approximately 60% or more of the questions that came to the reference desk were not subject specific, but general questions about the Library's organization and material. For example, questions concerning the Web for Science or the Citation Index, both of which included Science and Social Sciences and Humanities, could be effectively handled by Social Sciences and Humanities librarians. Also, there were many periods when the desks on two floors had no customers. Consolidation could free up time when there was no demand. Reference and circulation services had seen a decline, in part because students and faculty operated independently on the Web, and in part because of the successful promotion of delivery to the desktop and direct work with faculty in preparation for teaching, projects, and research grants. Concerns had been expressed that moving Science reference librarians to the main floor represented a dumbing down, and that faculty would not receive appropriate assistance. However, as in the past, a librarian could refer a question to another librarian.

Mr. Maes pointed out that space was also a problem. At present, additions to the Science collections would need to be moved to another floor. The proposed move of the Science serials and journals would ease the pressure for a few years while that problem was solved. Mr. Maes also clarified that the collections were not being spread about. The reference material had been moved, but the collections remained and would remain intact as long as we used the Library of Congress system. The Science collection had been integrated from the point at which it had left the Macdonald Building, though he believed it had been poorly integrated. Members also needed to consider that it was easier to manage a system in which facilities such as computers and printers were all on the same floor. Finally, Mr. Maes reported that a survey of twenty-seven Canadian associate research libraries had revealed that eight had combined reference service desks; others operated on the principle of one desk for one building; the Killam was one building.

Mr. Scott recalled that in a previous meeting, when asked to find the comments in the review supporting the proposed move, Mr. Maes had been unable to do so. Those comments were in the terms of reference of the review, not in the Committee's Report. Mr. Scott also noted that the University of Regina, where Mr. Maes had previously initiated similar changes, was now attempting to undo them. Returning to the issue of student support, Ms. MacAulay observed that the Dalhousie Science Society had been opposed to this proposed reorganization from the outset. In addition, the Arts and Social Sciences students had never supported the reorganization or the idea behind it, and the current executive of that Society had passed a motion supporting the Dalhousie Science Society.

Mr. Pacey encouraged Senators to read the letter from Professor Grossert (Chemistry) and the petition organized by Professor Wentzel in the Chemistry Department. He understood that within twenty-four hours forty-eight persons had signed the petition. Mr. Pacey wished Senators to understand that in Science it was extremely important to be able to move from one part of the collection to another with great frequency, given the need to consult the very large number of references cited in any one article in order to simply establish the key articles. He explained the need to move back and forth between current journals, bound journals and reference materials, including both computer and paper indices, and repeatedly cross-check references. Reorganization of the collection would create considerable additional work for both students and faculty. Mr. Pacey also noted that even after the Faculty of Science had passed its unanimous motion at a very well attended meeting more than a month ago, the University Librarian had not waited to see what action Senate might take, but unfortunately had proceeded with the move. Some had suggested this was not the business of Senate, but Mr. Pacey believed this problem had implications for other Faculties, and this matter was certainly of very great importance to members of the Science Faculty. It was crucial that we maintain a collegial system of government at Dalhousie, and attempt to proceed by consensus. Members of other Faculties should be concerned about the process by which decisions had been taken.

Ms. Binkley approached the problem from a different perspective. For years members of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences had faced the types of problems which Mr. Pacey had described, and in the process had come to refer to the Killam Library as the Stair Master. Part of the reason they had been forced to run up and down stairs was that the journals were not all located in one space, and the specialists for Science and Social Sciences and Humanities were on different floors. The reorganization might be a situation in which a benefit for members of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences would be a disadvantage for Science. For the increasing number in both Faculties who were engaged in interdisciplinary work this reorganization was welcome. Consequently, members needed to weigh the advantages to themselves against the disadvantages to others. As for co-locating reference services, under the two desk system the Social Sciences and Humanities librarians at the ground floor desk had handled the general, as well as discipline-specific questions. They would benefit from more equitable sharing of

this load. On a less partisan note, we needed to take advantage of the opportunities for cross-fertilization which the new arrangement would open up.

From Mr. Traves' perspective, Senate did not have the power to do what the motion asked. Only the Board could establish these matters. Secondly, he believed this was fundamentally a matter of the internal administration of the Library. While the University Librarian should not be immune from comment or criticism, the University Senate spoke on policy matters, but did not speak directly to administrative minutia, though from time to time it had attempted to do so, ineffectively, he believed. Given the diversity of views of this issue, the sensible thing to do would be to ask the University Librarian to review and report on the progress of these matters in approximately a year's time. This was largely a question of resources, and members recognized the impact of rising costs on the University Libraries.

In contrast to Mr. Traves, Mr. Tindall supported the position taken by the Chair of Senate in his email dated June 20, 2000. Senate was charged under provincial statute with the internal regulation of the University. Mr. Tindall saw little point in referring this matter back to the University Librarian who had demonstrated little respect for the views of the Faculty of Science. He also did not hear many counter points to Science's position. Ms. Binkley appeared to be suggesting that the Science Faculty should suffer in the way the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences had suffered. Yet the students in her Faculty were on record as opposed to this reorganization. Within Science, opposition reached well beyond Chemistry, as the swift response to a petition posted in the Department of Physics indicated. Mr. Tindall reiterated Mr. Pacey's points concerning the unusual hardship the proposed changes would impose on scientists. Concerning the reference services, he suggested that a calculation of the percentage of general questions was not a measure of the amount of time devoted to questions. He suspected easy questions could be answered easily.

Mr. El-Hawary asked what role the Senate Library Committee played in this debate. Mr. Stuttard read the terms of reference of the Senate Library Committee, available to all Senators in their red books. Mr. Connolly was concerned by the suggestion that the reorganization proceed and be evaluated at a future point. It was clear the main users of this service, the Faculty of Science, were opposed to the proposal, almost to a person. Proceeding might be analogous to the Computer Centre simply announcing it was moving to a new system which could not handle PCs or MACs. What some might construe as an internal computer service decision would generate considerable upset across campus and likely relegate the University to a footnote about an institution that had once existed somewhere in Nova Scotia. Might the Senate Library Committee or an *ad hoc* committee deal with this? Mr. Connolly was also concerned about the apparent lack of what he liked to think was the usual collegial spirit with which Dalhousie dealt with such problems. Why had the changes proceeded in the face of such opposition? While he sympathized with Ms. Binkley, he wondered if it would be better to leave Science the way it was and look into addressing the problems she had raised.

Ms. McIntyre considered this an administrative organizational issue, internal to a building operated by the library. From her experience in initially attempting to maintain the Social Work Library she understood the importance of a library to the convenience of faculty and students and to maintaining a sense of identity and community. However, even after the Social Work Library had been totally integrated into the Killam Library, in the interests of better service and preservation of the collection, it had remained the Social Work Library, with its own Librarian. Students and faculty could expect to receive singular service in the Killam Building, whatever portion of the holdings they were using. Ms. McIntyre understood the Science Faculty's concerns about losing the quality service they had enjoyed. But this was a question of the University Library attempting to use its resources most effectively in the interests of the whole library system, including the Kellogg and DalTech Libraries, the locations of which posed even more challenges

to those attempting to use a range of holdings.

Mr. Sastri did not believe this was simply an internal matter to be resolved by the Library. He wondered whether the University Librarian had acted in a rather peremptory manner, and whether Senate could become involved in smoothing out the process. Mr. Faulkner thought the University Librarian had received more criticism than was warranted, and was concerned that members were not approaching the issue as one on which reasonable people might disagree. He believed that the Senate needed to exercise its role as the body charged with the academic governance of this University, and found it unhelpful to be told that issues of serious concern to faculty and students were merely administrative matters and not questions of policy. A review a year after changes had been instituted would not give Senate effective control. Senate had gone through massive reorganization in the late 1970s and the committee system had been set up in order to address the perception that Senate could stop things but not really do anything. Mr. Faulkner was concerned that the Senate Library Committee had been chaired by a representative of the Faculty of Science, and yet the Committee's recently received Annual Report had not mentioned this issue. He was also concerned that the tone of this debate would discourage the University Librarian from trying to work with Senate to do what he might conceive of as positive. Mr. Faulkner did not wish to influence the outcome of the debate, but he called Senators' attention to the need to preserve collegial and effective academic governance.

Ms. MacDonald was also troubled by the way in which the discussion had been framed. With the relatively little information provided she did not feel comfortable voting and would abstain. She hoped the Faculty involved and the Library could resolve this matter collegially. Mr. Workman was also uncomfortable about proceeding with a vote in the face of fairly entrenched positions. Perhaps the matter could be mediated and maybe the Library Committee could assist in securing agreement between the two groups. A vote today would not resolve the conflict, though it might end the debate.

Mr. Stuttard sensed the beginning of a motion to refer the matter to the Senate Library Committee. Mr. Scully wished to make that motion, following some prefatory remarks. He had become involved in this issue approximately two months ago in a public way when he brought together representatives from the Faculty of Science and the University Librarian for a preliminary meeting. Subsequently he had attended a meeting of representatives of the Faculty of Science, and then visited the Library with three representatives who had attended both meetings. Positions were polarized, and had been for some months, and the present debate demonstrated some slippage not just in collegiality but also in the standard of civility. As someone who was positioned outside the issue, he could see good arguments on both sides. He understood why the Faculty of Science held the position it did and why students supported it. He also saw the challenges facing the University Librarian and all of the Librarians, the vast majority of whom supported what the University Librarian had proposed and implemented. In light of that, he was nervous about Senate voting on the issue. Like Canadian University Senates in general, we should act only on advice from the appropriate Committee. Mr. Scully moved:

That the main motion be referred to the Senate Library Committee and that Committee be asked to report to the first meeting of Senate in September with the understanding that no actions being taken in the Library were irreversible.

Mr. Kimmins believed his Faculty could support a motion which appeared to be a compromise. Members of the Faculty of Science had shown extreme civility during seven frustrating months when the University Librarian had not once suggested that the reorganization could be held back while a compromise was sought. Mr. Kimmins welcomed Vice President Scully's motion to refer this to the Senate Committee, if it could produce the collegial compromise his colleagues had been seeking.

Ms. Bleasdale asked that the Committee also explore, on behalf of Senate, why the process of collegial decision making had broken down. Mr. Devlin asked that the University Librarian work with the Committee to think beyond what had already transpired and attempt to achieve a better understanding of both the process and a possible solution. Mr. Connolly requested that the Senate Library Committee contact the University of Regina to ascertain the direction they had taken and any problems they had encountered.

Mr. Sastri asked Senators to consider how frustrating the past months had been. In that light, they might not categorize their colleagues in Science as uncivil. Mr. Tindall noted that the Annual Report of the Senate Library Committee, debated and adopted at the last meeting, had referred to the proposed reorganization. Senators who had attempted to raise questions at that time had been hampered by the fact that the motion from the Faculty of Science had not been received at Senate Office. He believed the Committee had already considered the matter, and he would be voting against the motion to refer.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

2000:82.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:03 p.m.