

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

Additional Notes:

This document is a compilation of Senate minutes, staff matters and miscellaneous documents for January 1984. The documents have been ordered chronologically and made OCR for ease of searching. The original documents and additional documents for this year which have not yet been digitized can be found in the Dalhousie University Senate fonds (UA-5) at the Dalhousie University Archives and Special Collections.

The original materials and additional materials which have not been digitized can be found in the Dalhousie University Archives and Special Collections using the call number referenced above.

In most cases, copyright is held by Dalhousie University. Some materials may be in the public domain or have copyright held by another party. It is your responsibility to ensure that you use all library materials in accordance with the Copyright Act of Canada. Please contact the Copyright Office if you have questions about copyright, fair dealing, and the public domain.

# DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY

## MINUTES OF

### SENATE MEETING

Senate met in regular session in the Board and Senate Room on Monday, 9 January 1984 at 4:00 P.M.

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

Anderson, Angelopoulos, Awad, Axworthy, Betts, Birdsall, Bissett-Johnson, Blair, Bradfield, Braybrooke, Brett, Burt, Byham, Calkin, Cameron D.M., Cameron M.L., Cameron T.S., Chambers, Caty, Chaytor, Clarke, Cohen, Comeau, Cromwell, Cross, Duff, Easterbrook, Ellison, Fentress, Fraser D.B., Friedenber, Friedrich, Gaede, Garside, Geldart, Gesner, Ghose, Gordon, Graham, Haley, Hall B.K., Hatcher, Heard, Hennen, Hoyt, Huber, James K.M., Janigan, Josenhans, Kamperman, Keast, Kennedy, Kimmins, Klassen, Klein, Laidlaw, Lawrence, Lee, Leffek, Lewis, MacAulay, Maloney, Manning, McInnes, McLaren, McNulty, Milne, Misick, Monk, Novotny, O'Brien D.W.P., O'dor, O'Shea, Ogden, Ozier, Patrick, Pereira, Pooley, Pronych, Pross, Puccetti, Renner, Richards, Rodger, Rowden, Rozee, Ruf, Scheibelhut, Segelberg, Sherwin, Sinclair, Stairs, Stephens, Stern, Stovel, Stuttard, Tan, Thiessen, Theibaux, Tindall, Tingley, Tomlinson, Tonks, Treves-Gold, Van Feggelen, Varma, Vining, Waterson, Welch, Wien, Wolf, Young, Yung.

Regrets: Blecher, Fulton, Gold, Gwyn, Jones J.V., MacKay W.A.

#### 84:01. Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting of 12 December 1983 were approved upon motion (Klassen/Cameron) with the following amendments:

83:113 - paragraph 2, line 11 - replace "taking part in" for "conducting"

83:114.A.I, line 5 - should read "deposition", not "disposition"

83:112, paragraph 4 - include word 'MPHEC' between "and" and "filed"

83:114.A.I - motion should read "AAC" not "CAA"

83:114.A.I, line 3 of paragraph 1 - add "Mr. Braybrooke argued that the terminology of 'request' was not sufficiently strong"

83:112 - insert: prior to paragraph 3: 'Mr. Bradfield questioned whether the university sought clarification of the MPHEC definition of operating budgets to determine if the servicing of the capital debt is considered part of operating budgets. Mr. Shaw reported that clarification had not been sought.'

The minutes of the meeting of 16 December 1983 were approved upon motion (Klassen/Cameron).

The Chairman noted several additions and changes in the agenda and received Senate's approval to proceed with the modified agenda.

84:02. Question Period

There were no questions raised at this time.

84:03. Reports and Recommendations -- Committees of Senate

A. Committee on Academic Administration

1. Spring Convocation for the Faculty of Arts and Science

The Secretary reported that at the CAA meeting on 4 January 1984, it was recommended that the Faculty of Arts and Science hold two separate convocations in Dalplex at 10:00 A.M. and 2:00 P.M. on May 11, 1984. One convocation would incorporate Science and Engineering graduands and the remaining ceremony would be for all other graduands. This would, as Dean Betts reiterated, accommodate the desired number of guests for recipients of both graduate and undergraduate degrees in the Faculty.

2. Date of King's College Encaenia (CAA 83:72)

The Secretary advised Senate of the CAA's recommended approval of the date selected for conducting the King's Encaenia, namely, Wednesday, 9 May 1984 at 2:30 P.M., (as requested in correspondence from the Vice-President of the University of King's College.)

It was moved and seconded (Chaytor/Sinclair)

**that the date of 8 May 1984 for the King's Encaenia be approved.**

The motion was carried.

3. 1982-83 Ombudsman's Report

The Chairman noted that the report had been distributed at the 12 December 1983 meeting of Senate and called upon the Secretary who reported that the Deans of all Faculties, Dean of Men, Dean of Women, International Student Coordinator, Registrar, Calendar Editor and Chairman of the Senate Discipline Committee had been contacted to seek feedback on the Ombudsman's Report. As the responses received are in the process of being collated and remaining replies are awaited, the CAA tabled this item until its 30 January 1984 meeting. Accordingly, it was agreed that the report would be discussed at the 13 February 1984 meeting of Senate.

B. Academic Planning Committee

1. Guidelines for Interuniversity Cooperation

Mr. Haley introduced the document and reviewed the recommended amendments by APC on page 1, item 2(i), line 4 to delete "or two" and on page 2 to identify Music and French within the last sentence of ii(b).

It was then moved and seconded (Haley/Wien)

**that the guidelines be accepted.**

Considerable discussion ensued. Mr. Kennedy queried the specific role of Senate and its committees with respect to the proposed procedures to which Mr. Haley responded that Senate would be involved in approval of each specific plan for interuniversity cooperation. Mr. Friedenberg expressed concern about the institution of hierarchical procedures and supported Mr. Kennedy's reference to possible ambiguity regarding Senate's function. Mr. Wien reminded members that the current Jabbara Committee was constituted as recommended in the guidelines and further, that the discussion at the university level had been broadened to include all interested parties.

Ms. Laidlaw, however, envisioned a situation in which departmental members might oppose the recommended cooperative endeavor and be overruled. Mr. Cross contended that such large enterprises, which bureaucratize interdepartmental cooperative efforts could, in fact, result in decreased cooperation and proposed that the word "venture" ii(b) required specification. Mr. Kennedy returned the attention of members to the issue of Senate's role and the timing of inclusion of input from the departmental level. In response to the latter, Mr. Haley determined that the initial impetus would originate from the department(s) concerned.

The mover and seconder of the motion accepted, as a friendly amendment, Ms. Ozier's suggestion that an addition be made to the second sentence of 2(i) on page 2 to follow "appropriate", namely that, "and ensure that the agreement has been secured of all appropriate parties including all departments involved in the cooperative venture".

Upon vote, the motion was adopted.

## 2. Joint Faculties of Education

The Chairman reviewed the historical development of this issue and called upon Mr. Wien, who moved that

**recommendations (a) and (b) of the 18 October 1983 letter from the Senate APC Sub-Committee on Inter-university Cooperation be approved, namely**

**(a) that the APC endorse the efforts of the Department of Education to achieve greater inter-institutional cooperation in academic and related programs**

**(b) that the portion of the proposal dealing with the establishment of an inter-university Faculty of Education by July 1, 1985, not be endorsed.**

**and that items (c) and (d) be deleted in favour of the approved guidelines for inter-university cooperation.**

Mr. Haley seconded the motion. Mr. Friedenbergl sought confirmation regarding the potential impact of accepting the second recommendation, in terms of non-endorsement of the proposal.

Upon vote, the motion was carried.

## 3. Senate Library Committee

The Chairman brought to the attention of members, Senate Minute No. 83:64.C.I, at which time it had been agreed that the Report of the Senate Library Committee be referred to both the APC and the FPC for deliberation about its inherent implications.

The motion of the FPC (FPC Minute No. 83/84:61)

**that when the Redistribution Fund is established the Library should make its case there for additional funds. In the meantime, the Library should apply for additional financial support to the Development Fund. The \$375,000 which was allocated to the Library in the past**

**from A & R funds should be put in the Development Fund if the government restores these funds and the Library would be able to apply for a share of that amount**

was moved and seconded (Welch/Cohen). Mr. Welch commented that the sentiment of both bodies (APC and FPC) was one of sympathy to the needs of the Library and concurrently, that it was inappropriate to allocate funds to the Library without assessing requests and needs of other Cost Centres. Mr. Birdsall clarified that although the \$375,000 mentioned had come from the non-space capital account, it had been treated as part of the library budget. However, after the loss of non-space capital the money had not been removed from the library budget. After Ms. Sherwin and Mr. Rodger identified amendments to the FPC minutes (which the Chairman noted were not yet approved). The specific amendments noted were that A & R in the motion should read "non-space capital" and the introductory paragraph, line 17 should delete the word "school".

The motion was put to a vote and carried.

The resultant motions of the APC (Minute No. APC 83:122) were then presented. It was therefore moved and seconded (Welch/ Josenhans)

**that in recognition of underfunding of the university library system, the APC endorses the motion passed at the FPC meeting of 6 December 1983 and any endeavours to identify an appropriate level of expenditure to be earmarked to enhance and sustain this university resource.**

The motion was approved.

It was further moved and seconded (Welch/Josenhans)

**that \$15,000 over and above the Library Budget be added to last year's budget to achieve the former emergency request of \$100,000.**

The motion was approved.

#### C. Committee on Committees

In each of the following items, it was proposed (Easterbrook/Duff) that the persons named be appointed to the appropriate body. On each of the items, there being no further nominations, the Chairman declared those named elected.

### University Tenure Panel

K.K. Tan (Mathematics)  
R.L. Comeau (Economics)  
J. Barkow (Sociology/Social Anthropology)  
S.R. Blecher (Anatomy)  
A.H. Blair (Biochemistry)  
R. Ravindra (Religious Studies)  
T.S. Cameron (Chemistry)  
J. Carver (Nursing)  
N. Brett (Philosophy)  
M.M. Vohra (Pharmacology)  
    A. Richards (Recreation, Physical & Health Education)  
E. Angelopoulous (Biology)  
F. Woodman (Law)  
P. Monk (English)  
M. Turner (History)  
R. Gamberg (Education)

Mr. Easterbrook noted that the candidates had met the approval of President MacKay, and the President of the DFA. Messrs. Rodgers and Betts pointed to requisite editorial changes in the list, following which Mr. Scheibelhut requested that special consideration be given in the future to representation from the Faculty of Administrative Studies.

### Senate Representatives on Board Committees

Alumni & Community Relations - P. Pronych (Dentistry)

Audit - W. Kimmins (Biology, FPC)

Development - W. Jones (Chemistry, APC)

Investment - B. O'Brien (Ophthalmology)

Relations with other Institutions - L. Haley (Education, APC)

Staff Relations - F. Wien (Social Work)

Student Relations & Residences - J. Carver (Nursing, PPC)

### Senate Committee on Academic Administration

P. Monk (English) - to serve until June 1985

84:04. Vice-President (Planning & Resources)

The Chairman made reference to the substance of correspondence from the President related to the appointment of a Vice-President (Planning & Resources) and the constitution of an Advisory Committee. The letter was distributed at the meeting due to its arrival in the Senate Office following the date for mailout of the agenda. Mr. Kennedy requested clarification regarding previous Senate and Senate committees' recommendations regarding the number of vice-presidential positions. Messrs. Betts and Bradfield and Ms. Ozier and Ms. Laidlaw participated in resultant deliberations, following which it was moved and seconded (Laidlaw/Watson)

**that the Advisory Committee on the Appointment of a Vice-President (Academic and Research) and the CAA be consulted regarding the number of vice-presidential appointments.**

The issue of whether or not the present Advisory Committee would be willing to act as the search committee for this position was raised, but not resolved.

Following explanatory comments by Ms. Ozier regarding the current primary task of the Advisory Committee, and support expressed by Messrs. Welch and Braybrooke, the mover and seconder accepted a friendly amendment

**that reference to the Advisory Committee in the motion be deleted.**

The motion as amended was carried. The Secretary agreed to collate relevant excerpts from previous reports and minutes of Senate and its committees.

84:05. Motion from the Faculty of Arts and Science

Members concurred with Dean Betts' request that the revised draft of the preamble (appended) with the redrafted motion related to Resolution #1, which was distributed at the meeting, replace the excerpt related to the initial Resolution in the pre-circulated 15 December 1983 letter from Mr. Andrews. Dean Betts elaborated on the specific rationale for the proposed motion, as delineated in the preamble.

It was therefore moved and seconded (Betts/Cross) that

**The Senate of Dalhousie University urges the President to establish a Redistribution Fund as part of the University's 1984-85 operating budget. Such a Redistribution Fund should constitute a line item under Unallocated Costs and not under Cost Center Envelopes. The**



**Redistribution Fund should be used to provide additions to the already announced 1984-85 Cost Center Envelopes related to additional needs of selected Cost Centers. The advice of the Senate Academic Planning Committee should be sought in adjudicating competing claims of Cost Centers.**

Dean Hatcher contended that there was a substantial change in this motion from the motion previously circulated with the agenda and added that he considered the original motion to be lacking in documentation and also inaccurate. Dean Betts responded to questions directed to him by Dean Tonks and Mr. Welch related to the source of funds, if anticipated MPHEC funding was not forthcoming, by reiterating that such monies would not be derived from 1984-85 Cost Centre envelopes and speculating on some potential sources of extra funding (e.g. capital fund drive).

Subsequent debate, contributed to by Messrs. Welch, Betts, Kennedy, Chambers, Sinclair and Rodger focused on the distinguishing features of the Redistribution Fund (for 1984-85), the Development Fund (which currently contains \$100,000) and the proposed Contingency Fund. Flexibility was considered to be the commonality in the three types of funds. Members were advised that the original report of the FPC entitled "Contingency and Development Budgets" was being revised by the FPC and reviewed again by the APC, and that the APC had, at their 2 January 1984 meeting determined that the institution of a Redistribution Fund was not feasible for 1984-85 (Minute No. APC 84:01).

At this point, it was moved and seconded (Rodger/Hatcher)

**that the motion of the Faculty of Arts and Science be referred in the first instance to the FPC and then, if necessary, to APC, prior to consideration by Senate.**

Mr. Braybrooke pointed to the concomitant need for a mechanism to review, objectively measure and remedy disparities. Messrs. Renner, Welch and D. Cameron spoke in support of the motion to refer. Dean Betts and Messrs. Kennedy, Pereira, Lawrence, and Ms. Ozier urged defeat of this motion in favour of a decision about the main issue on diverse grounds, including the fact that the question was one of principle, not implementation or capital, and that a mechanism to protect the quality of existing programmes was urgently required. Dean Hatcher and the Chairman reiterated concern raised earlier regarding designation of specific source(s) of such funding.

The question to refer was put to a vote and defeated.

Discussion returned to the main motion. Mr. Huber, criticizing the motions 'insufficiently strong' terminology, proposed consideration of a motion

**to amend by replacing the word "urges" in line 1 with "requires".**

The amendment, seconded by Mr. Keast, was intended to reflect a sense of urgency.

Mr. Dresel raised an objection to the lack of sufficient notice given to Senate members regarding the revised motion (distributed at the meeting) and moved to table discussion of this item.

The motion to table was defeated.

Messrs. Birdsall and Sinclair subsequently spoke against the proposed amendment, purporting that substantial changes were being introduced into the original purpose of the main motion. Ms. Sherwin suggested that the mover consider replacing "requires" with "strongly urges".

The amendment was put to a vote and defeated.

Mr. Welch then urged defeat of the main motion on the grounds that the source of funding had not been determined and that the potential impact of the motion was to alter the original premise of the establishment of Redistribution Funds. A vote on the motion was requested from the floor and the motion carried.

84:06. Report of the President

As the President was unable to attend the meeting, there was no report.

84:07. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:20 P.M.