

Item: Senate Minutes, September 1995

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 September 1995. 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 on Monday, 11 September 1995 at 4:00 p.m. in the University Hall, Macdonald Building.

Present with Mr. Colin Stuttard in the chair were:

Andrews, Archibald, Binkley (Secretary), Birdsall, Bleasdale, Brett, Conrod, Cox, Cummings, Dickson, Egan, Farmer, Fraser, Hartzman, Haley, Hobson, Hooper, Kay-Raining Bird, Kiang, Kimmins, Klein, Lee, Lovely, Lydon, MacDonald, MacInnis, Maloney, Moore, Pacey, Pereira, Ricketts, Rosson, Russell, Sherwin, Siddiq, Sutherland, Taylor, Thomas, Traves, Wrixon.

Observers: Curri, G., Boran, T.

Regrets: Bérard, Camfield, Cross, Marble, McIntyre, Shafai, Starnes, Tatton.

Mr. Stuttard welcomed the Senators to the first meeting after the summer transition period of the new Senate. He announced that Mr. Traves has asked Ms. Binkley to chair the Senate Committee on Academic Administration.

95:104.

Adoption of Agenda

Mr. Stuttard noted revisions to the agenda. Upon motion (Lee/Lydon) the revised agenda was approved.

95:105.

Minutes of Previous Meeting

Ms. Cummings asked that her name be added to those who had sent regrets. Upon motion (Rosson/Ricketts)

the minutes of the meeting of August 14, 1995 were approved as

modified.

There were no matters arising from the minutes.

95:106.

Motion re Colleagues recently departed from School of Education

Mr. Kimmins, Acting Director of the School of Education, moved the following motion:

Whereas most members of the School of Education at Dalhousie have now accepted early retirement, redeployment to other Faculties at Dalhousie, or employment at another university in Nova Scotia as a result of a government-initiated process to re-organize the teaching of Education in Nova Scotia;

Be it resolved that Senate regrets that Dalhousie is losing many productive scholars and teachers and expresses its deep appreciation to all former and present members of the School of Education for their valued contributions to teacher-training, graduate education, and research in the field of education, and for their many efforts on behalf of the Dalhousie community. We wish them all well and hope that Dalhousie colleagues will be able to maintain important collaborative links with them in their new roles. (Kimmins/Sherwin)

Ms. Sherwin asked and Mr. Stuttard agreed to send personal copies of this motion to all former and present members of the School of Education affected by this rationalization.

95:107.

Nominations from Senate Committee

Mr. Boran, Chair of the Committee on Committees, presented the following nominees for election to Senate Steering Committee:

Susan Sherwin (Arts and Social Sciences) 1996
Bruce Archibald (Law) 1997
Lloyd Fraser (Henson) 1997

Following the requisite calls for further nominations, Mr. Stuttard declared elected the persons names above.

Mr. Boran then presented the following nominees for election to the University Hearing Committee:

Marilyn Kinnear (Denistry) 1997

Peggy Hansell (Medicine) 1998

Following the requisite calls for further nomination, Mr. Stuttard declared elected the persons names above.

Mr. Boran then presented the following nominees for election to the Senate Discipline Committee:

Mary Anne White (Science) 1996

Ian Mobbs (Medicine) 1997

and to the University Environment Committee:

Susan Holmes (Henson) 1998

Following the requisite calls for further nominations, Mr. Stuttard declared elected the persons names above.

95:108.

University Tenure Panel

Ms. Binkley, Secretary of Senate, presented the following nominees for the University Tenure Panel:

Gordon Beanlands (Management) 1996

Roland Bonnel (Arts and Social Sciences) Jan. 1996-July 1996

Innis Christie (Law) 1998

Harold Cook (Medicine) 1998

Ford Doolittle (Medicine) 1998

Barbara Downe-Wambolt (Health Professions) 1998

Iraj Fooladi (Management) 1998

Rainer Friedrich (Arts and Social Sciences) 1998

Derek Jones (Dentistry) 1998

Gunter Muecke (Science) 1998

Timothy Shaw (Arts and Social Sciences) 1998

David Yung (Health Professions) 1998

Upon motion (Binkley/Sherwin) and following the requisite calls for further nominations, the motion carried.

95:109.

Quorum for Senate Meetings

Mr. Stuttard explained that Senate did not have a rule defining quorum for the body. He explained that Robert's Rules state that a quorum is what is acceptable to the body, but if

there is no specific rule then the quorum is 50 per cent of the membership plus one. The attendance at Senate's August meeting almost satisfied this fall-back rule, indicating perhaps, that it would be feasible to follow this rule in future, even for summer meetings. Mr. Stuttard stressed that the new Senate was a representative body and that we should all accept the responsibility to come to meetings. He added that there was no intention to vote on a quorum rule at this meeting, but he expected to receive a Notice of Motion for the next Senate meeting. He then opened the discussion.

Mr. Klein wanted to know why we should not use Robert's Rules of Order. Mr. Stuttard said that Senate in the past had often used Robert's Rules but had never officially adopted them into its own rules of procedure. Mr. Stuttard reiterated what he had said earlier.

Ms. Sherwin said she was afraid that important special meetings such as the approval of graduands for Convocation might not get a quorum if the fifty percent plus one rule was used. Mr. Archibald reported that Law has separate summer and winter quorums, and suggested that Senate could do this. Mr. Haley reported that the Senate meetings to approve degrees for students of the Nova Scotia Agricultural College would be lucky to have five or six Senators attending. Mr. Stuttard emphasized the duty of Senators to attend meetings, but agreed that a small quorum might be approved for special meetings.

Ms. Bleasdale suggested that if numbers dropped below fifty percent then Senate should be abolished. She also suggested that at least one controversial item be placed on all agendas to ensure attendance. Mr. Traves argued that we should not call Senate only for "hot" items or rely on the agenda to generate a crowd. Rather we should recognize that there are legitimate reasons to be away, but it is important that a rump does not take over. There needs to be a balance struck between the needs of a working Senate and of representation.

Mr. Cox asked if there is a recall provision for Senators. Mr. Stuttard responded that in the case of Senate committees, if a member misses three meetings, he/she is asked if they wish to resign; constituencies represented by elected senators might decide to do likewise.

Mr. Andrews said Senate needs a quorum rule and we need to know the rules. Some procedure must be available.

Mr. Lydon gave notice to propose the motion: **that the quorum for the Dalhousie Senate be fifty percent of the membership plus one.** Ms. Sutherland indicated he would second the motion. A notice of this motion will be circulated with the agenda for the next meeting.

Ms. Sutherland asked if the summer meetings would have had a quorum if the fifty percent plus one rule was in effect. Mr. Stuttard replied that the August meeting had 26 members present from an active membership of 55 (two student members had not yet been elected and Mr. Kimmins took up two membership seats -- the Director of Education and the Dean of Science). He also pointed out that some members of Senate were on campus that day but did not come to the meeting. In addition, advance voting for Secretary of Senate meant

that more than 50% of members had participated.

95:110.

Date of University of King's College Encaenia

On behalf of SCCA, it was moved (Binkley)

**that Senate approves the date of Thursday, 16 May 1996 at 2:30 p.m.
for the Encaenia of the University of King's College.**

The motion carried.

95:111.

B.Sc. Advanced Major & Honours Degrees with a Minor in Business

On behalf of SCAA, it was moved (Binkley)

**that Senate approve the B.Sc Advanced Major and Honours Degrees
with minor in Business.**

The motion carried.

95:112.

B.A. Advanced Major & Honours Degrees with a Minor in Business

On behalf of SCAA, it was moved (Binkley)

**that the B.A. Advanced Major and Honours Degrees with a
minor in Business be standardized with the B.Sc Advanced
Major and Honours Degrees with a minor in Business.**

Ms. Sutherland asked if any current students would be affected by this change. Ms. Curri assured Senate that no current student would be affected.

The motion carried.

95:113.

Wording on Parchments

On behalf of SCAA, it was moved (Binkley)

**that the wording on the parchment reflect the appropriate
degree, as on the transcript.**

The motion carried.

95:114.

Statement of Principles & Procedures for University Grading Practices

It was moved (Binkley)

that the Senate adopt the Statement of Principles and Procedures for University Grading Practices.

Mr. Taylor moved, seconded by Mr. Lydon

that in E) 1) the words "within ten working days" be changed to "within seven calendar days".

Mr. Thomas stated that the Law School could not meet this deadline. He explained the marking system in Law. He stated that there had never been any problems in the past with getting the grades to the Registrar in time for the Law Convocation.

Mr. Andrews stated that this document had not been discussed at the Faculty level. He asked, has the committee been responsive to faculty concerns? What procedures were used?

Mr. Lee felt that faculty who do not have final examinations would be penalized. In his classes he has major essays due the last day of classes, but would like to allow students a few extra days to complete their papers. He could not do this and get his marking done in time if given only 7 days from the end of classes.

Ms. Curri explained that this was the second time this document had come before Senate and it had been circulated to Faculties and Faculty Councils. She also explained that the modification to seven calendar days would maintain the status quo (i.e., 5 "working" days).

Mr. Taylor reiterated that the document as a whole had gone to his Faculty at least twice. He felt that the Law School should be exempt. He agreed that the change to seven calendar days retained the existing practice. He said he understood the pressure of marking papers in such a short time but also understood the student concerns about receiving their grades in time to make crucial decisions based on those grades. He hoped that in the future, computer procedures could be developed to speed up the process.

Mr. Pereira asked when will these procedures come into effect? Mr. Stuttard replied at the next examination period and the beginning of next term. Ms. Hobson urged the Senate to see these procedures as guidelines. She asked what would happen if everyone brought in their grades within the last seven days after examinations. Mr. Pereira stated he was not against principles but wanted clarification only. Mr. Stuttard agreed that the procedures regarding course outlines etc. would apply in January 1996.

Ms. Sherwin presented the following friendly amendment to the proposed amendment:

that in E) 1) the words “within ten working days ... final examination ” be changed to “within seven calendar days after a final examination and within fourteen calendar days after the completion of a class where there are no final examinations”.

Ms. Curri stated that this was more manageable than ten working days. Mr. Hartzman wanted assurance that there was flexibility in these deadlines. Mr. Brett reiterated that these were guidelines and not rules.

Mr. Cox asked the body to think about the students. He said that students wanted to know their grades as soon as possible. He thought the seven and fourteen days were reasonable.

Mr. Klein said he was convinced by Ms. Curri’s e-mail that ten working days was not feasible, but liked the compromise position.

Mr. Thomas wanted the Law School exempt from E)1). Mr. Thomas moved and Ms. Russell seconded

that “Except for the Faculty of Law” be inserted at the beginning of E)1).

Mr. Andrews said that this would mean that the Faculty of Law would be under no time constraint. Why not change the word "will" to "should" in the second line of E)1).

Ms. Curri said that Dentistry, Medicine and Law do not currently make these deadlines. She did not want exceptions and could support the compromise of seven and fourteen days.

Mr. Thomas argued that Law was exempted in F(iii), why not in E)1) as well. He pointed out that the Law School’s marking system conforms to the system used across the country by other Law Schools. Ms. Bankier emphasized that the exception was needed for the Law School marking system to work.

Mr. Andrews reiterated his earlier argument that the change from "will" to "should" would allow Law to continue their current practices without making them an exception.

Ms. Russell explained the Law marking system again stressing that this was a nation-wide practice in Law schools. Mr. Lovely explained the Dentistry grading system and asked for them to be exempt too.

Ms. Conrod said this was the second time this document had come to Senate. If it did not meet the needs of the professional schools, then it should be sent back to CAA.

Ms. Curri stated that she wanted the professional Faculties to continue their procedures

and to process the grades as they currently do.

Ms. Hobson urged the meeting not to send the document back to CAA. She reiterated that these were guidelines, not hard and fast rules. Mr. Thomas responded that the "Principles" section states "shall endeavour" and that in Law there is no stronger word than "shall". Therefore, these are rules and not guidelines.

Mr. Taylor said he would accept the change from "will" to "should" in line 2 as a friendly amendment to his proposed amendment to E)1. Mr. Thomas was allowed to withdraw his proposed amendment to exempt Law from E)1).

The amendment was then passed.

On resuming discussion on the main motion, Ms. Bleasdale stated that if this document was an attempt to standardize, then what about the relationship between letter and numerical grades. Mr. Brett asked for clarification of the meaning of "performance requirements" and "individual pass".

Mr. Pereira was concerned about the language in Part B. Although it was laudable to state the aims and objectives of a class, he believed it also could be cumbersome and not meaningful. He was not sure what the Committee on Academic Administration wanted. Mr. Archibald stated he had attempted to write class outlines using the guidelines in B. He thought they would be very helpful for part-timers.

Mr. Andrews stated that we were codifying existing practices. Mr. Taylor said that one of the problems for the committee was how to have language loose enough to accommodate all the current practices. It is really a Statement of Guidelines so why not change the title? Ms. Bleasdale asked if this was a "bill of rights" for students or was it meant to facilitate fair treatment of students?

Ms. Curri said that students must be treated fairly. She stated that the document was an attempt to codify the status quo.

Mr. Lee felt that class outlines are important to students. Ms. Cummings stated that there was a need for some principles to protect students and they need class outlines, but getting an outline on the first day may not be to their best interest. She likes to bring in a tentative outline and negotiate with the class before finalizing it.

Mr. Andrews moved **to delete "and procedures" from the first line of the document.**

The amendment carried.

Mr. Lee pointed out that except for those items specified in section B, all other parts of the class outline could be changed. Mr. Hartzman concurred.
The motion carried.

95:115.

Change in the Date of the First Day of Classes in the Second Term

It was moved (Lydon/Traves)

**that the first day of classes for the spring term be changed
from 2 January to 3 January 1996.**

Mr. Lydon explained that students from outside the Metro area, especially from Upper Canada, would have to travel on New Year's Day in order to get to their first class of the new term. Ms. Curri stated that all other dates in the Dalhousie Calendar would be unchanged.

The motion carried.

95:116.

Report of the President

Mr. Traves said that he had nothing to report on the rationalization process; however, he looked forward to the future debates on integration of procedures and regulations of all the Metro universities. Mr. Traves congratulated the Physical Planning staff on their fine job of getting the campus ready for the first day of classes. He stated that the enrolment targets had been met more or less. He wished the students a productive year and congratulated the Student Union for their successful Orientation Program.

Mr. Andrews asked if nothing had been happening in the rationalization process over the last few weeks. Mr. Traves responded that groups have been working at specific tasks and a series of deadlines for reports from these groups was very soon; however, he could not report on their findings.

Mr. Brett wanted to know if the enrolments were up or down. Mr. Traves said he thought they were down by about 60 students excluding the Education students. Ms. Curri said that as of Friday enrolments were down by only 20.

Mr. Traves said that the budget had taken into account a 100 student shortfall, so financially we were on target.

Ms. Conrod asked if Dalhousie had been compensated by the Provincial Government for the buy out/early retirement packages given to the Education faculty. Mr. Traves stated that the only financial item outstanding is the government's contribution of about \$300,000. He will consult Mr. Mason, and will report back at the next meeting.

Mr. Maloney asked how many of the continuing education students came back to Dalhousie to finish their degrees. Ms. Curri said that a number have come back and are working their way through the system.

Mr. Andrews said that, given the maintenance of enrolment, how much complement reduction has taken place? Ms. Hobson said she did not know, but would get the figure for the next meeting.

95:117.

Report of the Senate Ad Hoc Student Discipline Committee (In Camera)

It was moved (Binkley/Dickson)

**that Senate adopt the July 25, 1995 Report of the Senate
Ad Hoc Student Discipline Appeal Committee.**

The motion carried.

95:118.

Adjournment

Upon motion (Dickson/Lovely) the meeting was adjourned at 18:10.

Secretary

Chair

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY
MINUTES
OF
SENATE MEETING

SENATE met in regular session on Monday, 25 September 1995 at 16:00 in the University Hall, Macdonald Building.

Present with Mr. Colin Stuttard in the chair were the following:

Andrews, Archibald, Binkley (Secretary), Birdsall, Brett, Camfield, Cummings, Egan, Farmer, Fraser, Hartzman, Haley, Hobson, Hooper, Kay-Raining Bird, Kenny, Klein, Lee, Lovely, Lydon, MacInnis, Maloney, McIntyre, Moore, Morrissey, Pacey, Pereira, Ricketts, Rosson, Ruedy, Shafai, Siddiq, Starnes, Stuttard, Sutherland, Taylor, Thomas, Wrixon.

Observer: T. Boran; Invitee: B. Mason

Regrets: Conrod, Cox, Cross, Dickson, Kiang, MacDonald, Russell, Sherwin, Tatton, Traves.

95:119.

Adoption of Agenda

Mr. Stuttard noted that a member had requested that "Question Period" be the third item of business. Ms. Hobson added that Mr. Traves was absent, but had sent a written report and she was willing to answer questions. However, she had to leave at 16:45 to attend a meeting of Vice-Presidents (Academic) regarding the Metro Universities' Business Plan. She asked, therefore, that the "President's Report" precede "Question Period". The revised agenda was adopted.

95:120.

Minutes of Previous Meeting

Ms. Sutherland observed that the amendment to the amendment on page 5 should read "fourteen calendar days" and not "fourteen working days". The revised minutes were approved.

95:121.

Matters Arising

Mr. Andrews asked Ms. Hobson if she now knew how much the faculty complement had been reduced. Ms. Hobson replied that she still did not have the numbers. She assumed that the question was really about workload so she was also trying to find out how many instructors were teaching this year compared with last year, but these numbers were not yet available. She presented senators with a Dalhousie University Fact Book for 1993-94 and said that the 1994-95 version would be available soon. She hoped that this type of information would answer some of the commonly asked questions about Dalhousie University.

95:122.

Report of the President

Ms. Hobson reported that the President had sent an e-mail message (18 September 1995) to members of the Dalhousie community concerning the talks about the possibility of a Metro Universities Consortium. She explained that this collaborative effort between all seven universities in metro would result in a business plan. She stressed that the exercise was a feasibility study to see if the metro universities could cut more costs by acting collectively than independently.

Mr. Hartzman wanted to know what role Senate would play in the formulation of the business plan--would the Senate have input prior to the plan going to the Minister of Education and the government? Ms. Hobson said she did not know; Mr. Mason speculated that it would go directly to the Minister. Ms. Hobson assured the Senate that they would be involved in the implementation of the plan if it was accepted, but for now the plan was only a feasibility study.

Mr. Andrews asked if the government had set a financial objective that the Universities had to meet. Ms. Hobson said that they were chasing a phantom and that the government was not revealing the size of the reduction they wanted. Mr. Starnes, President of the University of King's College, concurred. Mr. Andrews wanted to know what the relationship would be between cuts to the Metro Universities and other universities in the province. Mr. Starnes stated that the Presidents of the Metro Universities had sought a commitment from the Minister that the funding ratio of 70% for metro and 30% for the rest would be maintained.

Ms. Sutherland asked why libraries were included in the non-academic rather than the academic component of the plan. Ms. Hobson replied that the academic segment of the plan only referred to teaching programs.

Mr. Mason stated that the report from the consultants on the non-academic aspects

of the plan was due last Friday, but would not be presented to the Vice-Presidents (Administration) until the end of next week. Preliminary work indicated that the savings identified by the group are short of the savings indicated in the "Framework of the Metro Halifax Universities' Business Plan" presented to the Minister last July.

Ms. Binkley asked if the Presidents were also lobbying the government for money to be given to education and health. Ms. Hobson replied yes.

95:123.

Question Period

Mr. Hartzman asked if Senate had reviewed the closure of the Education program. Mr. Stuttard replied that the School of Education had not been closed and would not be closed until Senate so decided. Ms. Hobson stated that there were still more than 150 graduate students taking classes in Education.

95:124

Nominations for Senate's Consideration

Mr. Boran, Chair of the Committee on Committees, presented the following nominees for election to the committees indicated below:

Board of Governors Student Relations Residence Committee

Elizabeth Kay-Raining Bird (Health Professions) 1996

Advisory Council on Athletics

William Tatton (Science) 1997

Nominees to Budget Advisory Committee

Don Cunningham (Dentistry)

Paul Brown (Management)

(only one to be chosen by the President)

Following the requisite calls for further nominations, Mr. Stuttard declared elected the persons named above.

95:125.

Nomination to the University Tenure Panel

Ms. Binkley, Secretary of Senate, presented the nomination of John Benoit (Henson, 1996) for the University Tenure Panel. Upon motion (Sutherland/Rosson), and following the requisite calls for three further nominations, the nomination was approved.

95:126.

Proposal for a Residency Program in Emergency Medicine

On behalf of the Senate Steering Committee, it was moved (Binkley)

that the Senate approve the proposal for a Residency Program in Emergency Medicine.

Mr. Andrews felt that Senate was falling into the habit of approving new programs without thorough review. He pointed out that the Residency Program in Emergency Medicine had not been reviewed by the Senate Financial Planning Committee, nor by the Academic Priorities and Budget Committee. He did not want Senate to abdicate its responsibilities and wanted to be assured that the Academic Priorities and Budget Committee would look at program proposals with the same level of scrutiny that Senate had done in the past, and report fully to Senate in the future with the same level of scrutiny that Senate had done in the past. Mr. Stuttard explained that the delay in establishing its new SAPBC was the reason that the Steering Committee had dealt with this proposal. Mr. Stuttard assured Mr. Andrews that SAPBC would scrutinize such proposals in future.

The motion carried.

95:127.

Quorum for Senate Meetings

It was moved (Shafai/Lydon)

that the quorum for the Dalhousie Senate be fifty percent of the membership plus one.

The following amendment was moved (Ricketts/Sutherland):

that the quorum for the Dalhousie Senate be forty percent of the membership.

Mr. Ricketts stated that a smaller quorum would be fair and yet allow for a workable

Senate especially in the summer. Ms. Sutherland proposed a friendly sub-amendment: that the words "of which the majority must be elected members" be added to the amendment. Mr. Ricketts did not accept this as a friendly amendment, so Mr. Hartzman seconded the sub-amendment to the amendment.

Mr. Periera was opposed to the amendment, even with the sub-amendment. He had not been convinced that the fifty percent plus one quorum would not work. Mr. Lydon agreed and he saw no need to differentiate between types of senators. Mr. Klein felt that Senate should be controlled by elected senators; he agreed that the Senate should try the fifty percent plus one quorum before changing.

Mr. Brett asked if this was a constitutional change and if it needed two-thirds support of the meeting to pass. Mr. Stuttard replied that this was a rule of procedure and required two-thirds support to pass.

Mr. Birdsall opposed the sub-amendment saying that *ex officio* members were already excluded from being Senate officers and members of some Senate committees. Mr. Andrews supported the sub-amendment because *ex officio* members were not representative, but was not sure he would support the amendment.

Mr. Haley stated that he was worried about the possibility of not being able to get a quorum for the meetings needed to approve degrees. He wanted some contingency plans in case a quorum was not present at those meetings. Mr. Stuttard said we would beat the bushes to get the quorum, and foresaw a delay of only minutes or perhaps an hour at such meetings.

Both Mr. Maloney and Mr. Farmer opposed the amendment to the amendment because it created an unnecessary division among senators.

The motion to amend the amendment was lost.

Discussion now returned to the amendment of the original motion. Mr. Lydon, seconded by Mr. Lovely, proposed the following amendment to the amendment:

that "only during summer session" be appended to the motion.

Mr. Lydon argued that a summer quorum would solve the problems of having too few Senators during the summer months, but would retain the fifty percent plus one rule, a common practice elsewhere, for the rest of the year. Mr. Ricketts claimed that the fifty percent plus one was not a common procedure but a default position for a body that had failed to set up their own rules. He argued that very few bodies have such a high quorum and a quorum should be simple and workable.

Mr. Shafai stated that important decisions were going to be made in the near future

and that senators should come out to those meetings; therefore, the quorum should be fifty percent plus one. Mr. Pereira agreed and reiterated his earlier arguments.

Ms. Cummings spoke of the practical problems of getting a quorum during the summer. She argued that if all senators took their holidays in the months of July or August, then at least one meeting would not have a quorum. The amendment would allow for a balancing of senators' rights and the practical needs of getting Senate's work done. Ms. McIntyre said she also supported the amendment for practical reasons. She stated that meetings could not begin until a quorum was reached. She argued that a quorum of forty percent would allow for the meeting to start on time, saving senators five or ten minutes waiting for a quorum to arrive.

Mr. Hartzman, after stating he was not a gentleman, said that the smaller the quorum, the easier it is to manipulate the body. He does not want any special interest groups to manipulate the Senate during the summer. Mr. Andrews agreed with him. Mr. Lydon agreed that generally the larger the quorum, the better, but wanted a smaller quorum in the summer for practical reasons.

The amendment to the amendment was defeated.

The discussion returned again to the original amendment. Mr. Andrews sought, and got, confirmation from the Chair that the vote required two-thirds support of those present, and that the default position was a quorum of fifty percent plus one.

The vote on quorum issues was twenty-two in favour of the motion to thirteen opposed (thirty-six senators were present at that time). The motion failed to get the necessary two-thirds majority support and so was lost.

The meeting then returned to the original motion.

The motion was defeated.

Mr. Stuttard stated that he intended, in future, to rely on Senate's past references to Robert's Rules of Order which called for a quorum of fifty percent plus one if no other quorum was adopted by this body. This would mean a quorum of twenty-eight for future Senate meetings. Mr. Maloney encouraged senators to come to all Senate meetings, but he still had reservations about the meetings required for approval of degrees. Mr. Egan asked if Senate could delegate the responsibility to approve degrees to a sub-committee such as SCAA. Mr. Starnes stated that the most important business of Senate is to approve the degrees and that senators must come out to these meetings. Messrs. Andrews and Taylor echoed Mr. Starnes' statement.

Ms. Binkley took the opportunity to remind senators to send in regrets when they were going to miss a Senate meeting. She also asked what the Senate thought

about senators who missed three or more meetings in a row. Mr. Ricketts felt that Senate should have a rule to deal with this situation; Mr. Andrews felt that the Steering Committee should deal with procedures and bring their recommendations to Senate.

Ms. Sutherland stated that when members of the Administration are away, there is a person who acts in their stead. Could that person come to Senate in the administrator's place and vote? Mr. Stuttard said he would bring that up with the Steering Committee.

95:128.

Other Business

Mr. Hartzman gave notice of the following motion:

that Senate insists on an active role in the formulation of plans under the Metro Universities Consortium.

95:129.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 17:40.