

Item: Senate Minutes, November 1983
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 November 1983. The documents have been ordered chronologically and made OCR for ease of searching. The original documents and additional documents for this year which have not yet been digitized can be found in the Dalhousie University Senate fonds (UA-5) at the Dalhousie University Archives and Special Collections.

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

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

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY

MINUTES OF

SENATE MEETING

Senate met in Special Session in the Board and Senate Room on Monday, 7 November 1983 at 4:00 P.M.

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

Anderson, Andrews, Betts, Birdsall, Bradfield, Burt, Cameron D.M., Cameron T.S., Caty, Chaytor, Cohen A.D., Cross, Duff, Fraser P., Gordon W.T., Graham, Haley, Hatcher, Heard, Hennen, Hill, Horrocks, Josenhans, Kamperman, Kennedy, Klein, Leffek, Lewis, MacMillan, Manning, Martin M.J.C., McInnes, Monk, O'Shea, Ozier, Pooley, Pronych, Richards, Rodger, Sinclair, Stairs, Stovel, Stuttard, Thiessen, Tingley, Tomlinson, Van Feggelen, Varma, Warner, Waterson, Welch, Wood, Young, Yung

Regrets: Belzer, Bennett, Blecher, Cromwell, Ettliger, Gesner, Gold, Gwyn, Jones J.V., Munroe, Stewart M., Stern, Trèves-Gold,

83:102. Consideration of the Dalhousie University Brief to the Royal Commission on Post-Secondary Education

The Chairman, in opening the meeting, announced that it was a special meeting to consider the University Brief which was to be presented to the Royal Commission on Post-Secondary Education. He asked that thanks and appreciation be extended to Mr. K. Heard, who had prepared the Brief on behalf of Senate. This was enthusiastically agreed.

Mr. Heard in reply noted that the other two committee members, Messrs. M. Cross and A. Sinclair had helped him greatly as had Messrs. D. Cameron, F. Langstroth, G. Klassen, Ms. J. Eastman and Ms. J. Allen and all who provided him with copies and draft copies of the individual faculty briefs.

A copy of the proposed Brief, which had at the end a list of the 28 recommendations in the text, was circulated before the meeting with a collation of the minutes of the APC from meetings on 25, 26, 27, 28 31 October, which had considered these recommendations. The Chairman explained that the final version of the Brief ought to be ready by the evening of Tuesday, 8 November and since this left little time, he suggested that Senate only consider the recommendations and that any alterations to the text be

suggested individually to Mr. Heard. He also suggested that the recommendations first be examined quickly to see which of them Senate could accept as written, and which needed further discussion. Both suggestions were accepted.

The Chairman then proceeded to announce the number of each item and ask on a vote whether it could be accepted as written. Recommendation 1 had to be amended to conform to the wording agreed by the APC (Minute No. APC 83:98, Item 8):

That the Royal Commission impress upon the Government the damaging effects of cutting back on previously announced levels of funding.

The version, as amended, was accepted without further discussion.

On separate votes, recommendations 9, 12, 16, 20 and 23-27 were selected for further discussion, and recommendation 18 was added to this list during the course of the meeting. The remaining recommendations were accepted as written, with the exception of item 3 where the grammar was to be checked.

With 9 Items for discussion (10 when item 18 was added), the Chairman suggested that Senate accept rules of procedure which allowed each member to speak on each item only once and then for no longer than two minutes. This was agreed.

On a question, the Chairman informed Mr. Andrews that the Faculty Briefs were all to be submitted with the University Brief though there might be some discussion between the person presenting the Brief and faculties on the best way to reconcile some of the conflicting recommendations in different Briefs.

Recommendation 9

That since it is inappropriate and economically wasteful for universities to be compelled to undertake the upgrading of literacy and computational standards needed for the successful completion of students' programmes, a thorough review be undertaken of the general levels of competency attained in provincial schools.

Mr. Rodger observed that the recommendation placed university problems onto the schools, which were not established to serve the universities and that it suggested that the universities were admitting students who did not have the qualifications for university study. Both sentiments he felt were dangerous. Ms. Ozier noted that the recommended review would be very costly and would have little effect on the problem.

On a motion (Rodger/Tingley) it was proposed

That the recommendation be deleted together with the associated text: the two sentences in the centre of page 33 in the Brief "The general, if somewhat...as a requirement for admission" and the final sentence before the recommendation on page 34, "Although this Royal Commission..."

On a vote, this was agreed unanimously. (*Amended by Senate Minute 83:111*)

Recommendation 12

Mr. Graham queried the meaning of the last phrase: "other extraneous conditions", and it was agreed, as a friendly amendment, to replace the phrase with "other non-academic considerations":

That the Government affirm the objective of ensuring that all appropriately qualified students have access to a suitable post-secondary programme, regardless of their financial status or other non-academic considerations.

Recommendation 16

That the Government recognize the needs of a wide range of Nova Scotians for continuing education and extension classes that are not part of a degree programme, by contributing to universities' costs in meeting those needs.

Mr. Graham was concerned that continuing education and extension classes be restricted to work of a University level, that is, to work of a high intellectual standard. Mr. Heard responded that part of the function of the University was to add to the general pool of knowledge which did not necessarily coincide with Mr. Graham's definition.

Dean Betts believed that the recommendation might lead to a proliferation of fringe activities and moved that the recommendation be dropped.

Mr. Chaytor, speaking against the motion, proclaimed that the Earl of Dalhousie had founded the University specifically for the general improvement of the people and that the Faculty should follow this principle. Messrs. D. Cameron, Kennedy, Hatcher and Tomlinson also spoke against the motion. Mr. Richards spoke for the motion, noting, that while he was not against the sentiment of the recommendation, its implications would overstretch the university resources. On a question, Ms. Ozier was informed that "...not part of a degree program" did not mean that the classes were not part of a particular student's program, but rather that the classes were not necessarily part of any program.

On a vote the **motion was defeated**.

On a motion (Rodger/Graham)

it was proposed that "but one appropriate at a university level" be inserted after the word "programme".

A short inconclusive discussion followed on whether such a restriction should be imposed, and if so, how the level would be determined. On a vote, the **amendment was defeated and it was agreed that the recommendation would be included in the Brief.**

Recommendation 18

That the government reaffirm and continue its commitment to the principle of university autonomy, which, for purposes of illustration, includes the right to take decision on: standards of admission, tuition fees, degree and other programme regulations and requirements (bearing in mind the accreditation requirements for certain programmes), the determination of academic priorities and the internal allocation of funds, the criteria for appointment, promotion and tenure, and the preservation of academic freedom.

On a motion (Betts/Stuttard) it was proposed and, on a vote, **agreed that "tuition fees" be inserted after "standards of admission".**

Recommendation 20

That the Government, in consultation with the MPHEC recognize the differential costs of university programmes in order to ensure that a weighting system be developed to reflect more accurately the differences of these costs; and in particular that the costs of providing an adequate education in the sciences be fully taken into account in grant allocations.

Dean Tonks moved (Tonks/Young) that "and health professions" be inserted after "sciences". Mr. Heard responded that he had deliberately avoided mentioning particular branches of the sciences and the general term "sciences" was intended to include all the sciences. On a suggestion from Dean Hatcher and with the full agreement of Senate, the motion was withdrawn and replaced by a motion (Tonks/Young) to insert "and professional programs" after "sciences".

There was a brief discussion on the constitution of a professional program and on a vote the **amendment was defeated.**

Mr. Rodger noted that it was MPHEC that set the differentials with which it allocated the

annual grant for post-secondary education, and that the recommendation was an invitation for the government to intervene in these matters. After some discussion on the role of the MPHEC and the weighting schemes it had used or suggested, a motion (Rodger/Monk) to delete the recommendation was withdrawn and it was moved (Graham/ Van Feggelen) that the opening phases of the recommendation be amended to read: "That recognition be given to the differential cost..."

On a vote, this was **carried**.

On a motion (Pooley/D. Cameron); it was **proposed** that the clause after "...costs;" be deleted. On a vote this was **agreed**, the **final form** of the recommendation is given below:

That recognition be given to the differential costs of university programmes in order to ensure that a weighting system be developed to reflect more accurately the differences of these costs.

There was some discussion between Mr. Rodger and Mr. Heard about the Table on page 51 of the Brief which is associated with recommendation 20. It was agreed between them and with Senate that they would both pursue the question later and adjust the table and its attendant footnotes to their mutual satisfaction.

Recommendation 23

That the Government recognize both the benefits to the province's universities, to Nova Scotian students, and to the province itself, that derive from the presence on its campuses from other lands, by providing the same level of support to universities for foreign students enrolled in their programmes as it does for Nova Scotian students.

Mr. Graham noted that the proposal asked that the Nova Scotia tax-payers support non-Nova Scotian, non-Canadian students. He wondered if the government could afford such a suggestion and would prefer that the Nova Scotia Government urge the Federal Government that foreign aid programmes be used to support students from Third World countries. Dean Leffek supported these comments adding that the problem would be much alleviated if the provincial government would negotiate bilateral agreements with the Commonwealth countries and if CIDA would permit some of its annual billion dollar grant to be used for educating overseas students in Canada.

In the discussion MS. Allen, Messrs. Tomlinson, Leffek, Welch and Cameron alluded to some aspects of the proportion of foreign students

at Dalhousie, their cost and their contribution to the local economy. Messrs. Cross, Rodger, Kennedy and Ms. Waterson were concerned about the best way to present the recommendation.

On a motion (Rodger/D. Cameron) the recommendation was accepted unaltered.

It was agreed on a request from Ms. Ozier that references in the text of the Brief to "third world countries" would be changed to "foreign nations" or some suitable alternative.

Recommendation 24

That the Government recognize and promote the benefits that flow from the diversity in nature and function of the various universities and other institutions that comprise Nova Scotia;s post-secondary education system.

On a motion (Graham/Betts) it was proposed and, on a vote, it was agreed that the recommendation be amended to read:

That the Government fully recognize in its policies the benefits that flow from the diversity in nature and function of the various universities and other institutions that comprise Nova Scotia's post-secondary educational system.

Recommendation 25

That the Government recognize their lack of realism in removing both the grant for non-space capital needs and the grant for alterations and renovations. These acts imply either that such items as the renewal of laboratory equipment, and the repair of buildings are unnecessary, or that the expenses to cover these items can be met from the general operating grant, neither of which is realistic. The provision of monies for these purposes should therefore be reinstated.

It was proposed (Rodger/D. Cameron) that the first two sentences be deleted and the third appropriately modified. Members of Senate expressed some surprise that so biting a wit should forswear these two morsels, and, on a vote, agreed that the recommendation should be included as given below:

The provision for non-space and renovation purposes should be reinstated.

Recommendation 26

That special provision be made in the financial allocations to universities for the costs of services that are rendered to external users, for example those provided by library and computer services.

On a question Mr. D. Cameron was informed that the text of the Brief made it clear that the external users referred to in the recommendation were external to the universities and that, therefore, recommendations 26 and 28 were not in conflict. It was agreed that the recommendation would go forward as written.

Recommendation 27

That the Government accept the need to help reduce the financial burden faced by Dalhousie in eliminating its accumulated debt.

Mr. Graham questioned whether the recommendation was concerned with the operating debt, the capital debt or both. A number of suggested modifications to the recommendation came from the floor of Senate and were combined in a motion (Ozier/Welch) which proposed that the recommendation be amended to read:

That the Government reduce the financial burden faced by Dalhousie by eliminating its accumulated capital debt, which arose in relation to government approved capital projects.

On a motion (Cross/Kennedy) it was proposed to delete the last phrase "which arose...." and, on a vote, this motion to amend the amendment was defeated. On a vote, the main motion was carried.

83:103. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:57 P.M.

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY
MINUTES
OF
SENATE MEETING

Senate met in regular session in the Board and Senate Room on Monday, 14 November 1983 at 4:00 P.M.

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

Anderson, Andrews, Axworthy, 8etts, Birdsall, Bradfield, Brett, Burt, Byham, Cameron D.M., Caty, Charles, Chaytor, Cohen A.O., Cromwell, Duff, Ellison, Farley, Fraser P., Friedenber, Fulton, Gesner, Haley, Heard, Hennen, Josenhans, Kamperman, Klassen, Klein, Leffek, Lewis, MacKay, Maloney, Manning, Martin M.J.C., Misick, O'Shea, Ozier, Pooley, Pross, Renner, Rodger, Shaw L.R., Sinclair, Stern, Stovel, Stuttard, Tan, Thiessen, Tindall, Tingley, Tomlinson, Van Feggelen, Varma, Warner, Waterson, Welch, Wien, Young, Yung.

Regrets: Gold, Gwyn, Pronych, Stewart M.

83:104. Minutes of the Meetings of 14 and 24 October 1983

The minutes of the meeting of 14 October were approved upon a motion (Warren/Pooley) without amendment, those of 24 October had a correction from the Secretary:

Alteration to Item 83:99 Senate Minutes of 2 October 1983

The President was absent and there was no report. The Chairman briefly introduced the President's "Memorandum on Restraint and Renewal" (Senate Minute 83:84). On a motion (Braybrooke/Klassen) it was proposed and, on a vote, agreed that the document would be referred to the APC and FPC for consideration and that these committees would report back to Senate at the meeting on 4 November 1983.

These minutes were approved upon a motion (Sinclair/Pooley) once "university lawyer" (83:95, last paragraph) had been replaced by "legal advisor to the Office of the

President".

83:105. New Member of Senate

The Chairman welcomed Mr. F.S. Medeoli who joins Senate in his capacity as Acting Chairman, Department of Geology.

83:106. Motion to Take Item 4.A. out of its Proper Order

The Chairman reported that the President wished to speak to item 4.A. on the agenda but could not be present at the meeting until later. On a motion (Josenhans/Chaytor) it was agreed that item 4.A. would be considered between items 5 and 6.

83:107. Question Period

Ms. Ozier asked what function Mr. Crocker was to serve on the panels of the AAC (83:95, last paragraph). The Chairman replied that he was there only to ensure that the appeal panels kept strictly to their terms of reference. Ms. Ozier noted that the appellant might well feel daunted by the presence of the legal advisor to the Office of the President and gave notice of motion:

That the legal advisor to the Office of the President not be present when a panel of the Senate Academic Appeals Committee is hearing an appeal.

Mr. Warner asked that the present composition of the AAC be examined. According to Senate minute 83:39.A.I, the M C should have 12 members of which one must be a student. He noted that there was no student on the committee. The Chairman replied that at the meeting of Senate on 6 May 1983 the Committee on Committees had proposed 12 names for this committee and one of these 12 had been a student. In the course of that meeting there had been an additional nomination from the floor of Senate and a ballot was necessary. In error the student's name was included in the ballot and he subsequently failed to get elected. It was understood that Mr. Braybrooke, Chairman of the AAC, had discussed the question with the students and that he would be bringing a proposal on this matter to the next meeting of Senate.

Mr. Friedenbergr rose on a point of order. He observed, with some heat, that the enabling legislation of Senate had been disregarded and that this should be corrected forthwith. He proposed (Friedenbergr/Warren) that:

The student nominee replace the member of the AAC who, in the poll,

recorded the lowest vote.

After a brief discussion, it became clear that there should have been a student nominee on the AAC and the motion was carried on a vote.

On a question, the Chairman noted that it might no longer be possible to reconstruct the poll for the election of members to the AAC. He assured Senate that if this proved to be so, some suitable alternative method would be found that quickly placed the student nominee, Mr. Hill, on the AAC as a full member.

Mr. Bradfield requested information about the progress of the negotiations with Kings College. Mr. Sinclair replied that while no conclusion had been reached, negotiations between the Office of the President and the Office of the University of Kings College were being vigorously pursued.

Mr. Axworthy asked for a report, if necessary a written report, on two questions relating to the President's Memorandum of October 14th. on Restraint and Renewal:

- (i) How and when does the Board of Governors intend to discharge the obligation under the Collective Agreement that they indicate the efforts they are making to raise money for the university?
- (ii) In view of the fact that a partial freeze is to be imposed for a second year with concomitant damage to the academic fabric of the university, what hope or assurance can the President give of any future improvement?

The Chairman responded that in the absence of the President there could be no immediate reply but that a report on the Memorandum was an item on the agenda and that answers to some parts of his questions should emerge in later discussions.

83:108. Reports and Recommendations -- Committees of Senate

A. Committee on Committees

1. Nominations to Senate Committees/Bodies

Mr. Duff, on behalf of the Committee on Committees, brought to Senate the following nominations:

Senate Discipline Committee

J.A. Yogis (Law)
M. Ozier (Psychology)
J. Pooley (Recreation, Physical and Health Education)

Senate Library Committee

B. Archibald (Law) W.T. Josenhans (Physiology and Biophysics) S.W. Semple (Education) M. Binkley (Sociology and Social Anthropology)-To replace J. Fingard S. Fullerton (Science Library) (In addition, the three librarians (University, Health Science, Law) are members of the Committee. The Financial Planning Committees and the Academic Planning Committee each appoint a member to the Committee.

Senate Representative on Nominating Committee for M.P.H.E.C.

W.E. Jones (Chairman of Senate/Chemistry)

Senate Representative on Dalplex Advisory Committee

R.H. March (Physics)

Representatives on TUNS Senate

K. Leffek (Graduate Studies)
D. Betts (Arts and Science)
D. Lewis (Engineering)
K. Dunn (Mathematics)

Representatives on MSVU Senate

A. Tingley (Mathematics)
I. Christie (Law)
K. Heard (Political Science)

Ombudsman's Advisory Committee

E.T. Marriott (Student Services)
C. Boyle (Law)
W.F. Hare (Education/Philosophy)

Senate Representative on Committee to Investigate Possible Involvement in MPHEC Distance Project

J. Kirk (Spanish)

Board - DFA Consultative Committee

P. Darby (Law)
K. MacDonald (Dental Hygiene)
L. Nestman (Administrative Studies)
R.P. Pucetti (Philosophy)
R.L. Comeau (Economics)
K. Waterson (French)

Senate Representative on University Parking Committee

S.R. Blecher (Anatomy)

Senate Representative on Pensions/Employee Benefits Committee

P. Schotch (Philosophy)

Senate Representative on Board of Governors Investment Committee

G.S. Roberts (Business Administration)

Senate Observer to the Association - Board Committee

P. Darby (Law)

Financial Planning Committee

R.G. Storey (Administrative Studies) to replace H.W. King, term ending in

Nominations for Advisory Committee on Public Relations

M. Bradfield (Arts and Science)
R. Goldbloom (Medicine)
P. Pronych (Dentistry)
W. McLauchlan (Law)
S. Caty (Health Professions)
L. Ramaley (Graduate Studies)
R.S. Sandhu (Administrative Studies)

No further nominations were forthcoming. On a motion (Duff/Chaytor) and on a vote, all nominations were approved.

B. Report from the Academic Appeals Committee

Mr. Braybrooke reported that the panel examining the appeal of Ms. Colette Power had reached a decision. The Chairman asked that the AAC give the "timely prior notification to appellant and Faculty" which was now required under the third resolution in Senate minute 83:95 and that the report of the decision be presented to the December meeting of Senate. On a question it was established that the appeal was not urgent and a final decision could be delayed for a month.

83:109. Discussion of the Memorandum from the President on Restraint and Renewal

In introduction the Chairman explained that the Memorandum with four appendices (A-D) had been submitted to Senate by the President at the meeting of 14 October 1983 (83:84, second paragraph), and that according to the Collective Agreement, Senate had 30 working days (until 28 November) in which to comment on the document. He reminded Senate that the Memorandum had been referred to the APC and the FPC for consideration and comment (83:104 and 83:99). The FPC and the APC had separate preliminary discussions on 28 and 31 October respectively. After the meeting on 31 October, a subcommittee of the APC produced a draft response to the Memorandum and the two committees met in joint session on 4 November 1983 and produced the suggested response which was circulated with the agenda. Minutes of the meeting of the APC had been circulated and those of the FPC and the joint meeting were available on the table in Senate.

The Chairman asked Senate to note that in the 7th paragraph on page 2 of the Report it is stated that items (b), (d), and (e) have all been approved by the APC, FPC and Senate. It now appears that while all three items have been approved in principle by the APC and FPC, only item (b) has been so approved by Senate. Assurance was given that the 7th paragraph would be amended and the Report was then available for discussion.

Mr. Axworthy enquired why a balanced budget position had been endorsed and the Chairman responded that further deficits increased interest costs, were not favoured by MPHEC and were not politic at the start of a fund raising campaign. Ms. Ozier lamented that there were to be cut-backs in order to balance the budget and Mr. Bradfield, taking up this point, noted that priorities were needed to set budgets and asked whether the APC was going to produce a plan that would establish these priorities. The Chairman replied that the APC was preparing such a plan, it had been interrupted by the need to examine the recommendations in the Brief to the Royal Commission on Post-Secondary Education and to prepare the report on the Memorandum but he believed that a proposal for a plan would be ready within a few months. Mr. D. Cameron assured the meeting that before implementation was developed, consultative advice would be sought from the APC,

FPC and from Senate.

Mr. Renner observed that he did not believe that a partial freeze on appointments was necessary, that he did not wish to endorse the Memorandum since it did not specify the procedures which were to be adopted to achieve its aims, and that he feared that the restraint for this second year would be administered as it had been last year. Mr. Andrews and Mr. Axworthy also regretted the lack of precise details in the Memorandum and the lack of a reasoning in the Report. Why, they wondered, did the Report agree that a partial freeze was necessary? Mr. Welch, in reply, noted that a review of University finances impressed upon the FPC that reductions must be made and that the documents to support this had not been made available because of a lack of time; Mr. Axworthy and Mr. Andrews were clearly uneasy with the reply and wanted at least a qualitative description of the documents with some indication of how these apparently regular annual partial freezes might cease. Ms. Ozier added on a sad note that she believed a balanced budget to be unattainable and that partial freezes looked as if they might become a permanent feature.

Vice-President Sinclair rose to reply for the administration to points raised by several speakers. He emphasized that there was a difference between a balanced budget and the balanced budget position that was being endorsed. A balanced budget, he explained, required that the money spent in one year should not exceed that received in the same year. The balanced budget position, on the other hand, was achieved by making the most reasonable estimate of the resources available for the year and then allocating funds on that basis. He implied that the allocations would be unaltered even if the resources received were less than anticipated [similar implications can be drawn from statements to the APC and the joint meeting, but no definitive statement has been made of the consequences of an over-optimistic estimate of resources]. Thus, in reply to Ms. Ozier, a balanced budget position was attainable.

In reply to several speakers who suggested that the university adopt deficit budgeting, he noted that while it was economically respectable **for governments to** indulge in deficit financing since they had the power to levy taxes, the only circumstances in which deficit financing could be sanctioned for private individuals, institutions or companies **was either when there** was an expectation that the accumulated deficit would be written off or when the deficit was absolutely unavoidable. Increasing deficits, he observed, simply put up the interest bill. On the question of financial policy in the future, he responded that Senate must wait for an academic plan from the APC. This plan was intended to control financial policy and to remove the need for annual partial freezes on all sections of the university. A brief discussion followed on the procedure to be adopted with the Report which was resolved when, on a motion (Welch/Klassen) it was proposed that:

Senate accept the Joint Report on the Memorandum from President MacKay on Restraint and Renewal.

Mr. Welch, in moving the motion, cautioned that the academic plan from the APC would, because of the financial circumstances, inevitably involve a reduction in some programs. While such planned reductions were preferable to the present indiscriminate erosion they would probably be no less unpleasant.

Mr. Stuttard noted that the suggested restraint was simply a routing budgetary measure which was required under the Collective Agreement and that the Report endorsed many features of the memorandum. Mr. Stuttard expressed concern that criteria for decisions on what appointments would be frozen were not given and therefore would not support acceptance of the report. Vice-President Cameron confirmed the routine nature of the budgetary measure and re-emphasized the need for time to produce an academic plan.

Ms. Ozier declared that she was particularly disturbed by the lack of a clear procedure for administering the redistribution of funds between faculties [item (e)] and proposed an amendment to the motion (Ozier/Friedenberg)

that item (e) be deleted from the report.

Dean Betts spoke strongly against the amendment, arguing that funds for redistribution between the faculties were essential for a rational adjustment to the faculty envelopes. He illustrated his argument with statistical data from the Faculty of Arts and Science and from this and later discussion Senate correctly inferred that while he believed that his Faculty would benefit from a redistribution, he would also be satisfied if it were deprived as a result of other faculties demonstrating a greater need. Mr. Birdsall supported the Dean while Mr. Renner, in support of the motion, believed that item (e) suggested a change without there being any structure to control that change. Vice-Presidents Cameron and Sinclair both noted that the structure that Mr. Renner sought should be provided by the promised academic plan. An inconclusive discussion followed concerning the Memorandum and the plan which emphasized yet again the difficulty of making an argued response to the Memorandum in the absence of the academic plan.

Finally it was established that the Report suggested Senate should only endorse in principle the aims in items (a)-(e) and should reserve judgement on the methods by which these aims were to be achieved. With the assurance that Senate was only endorsing in principle items (a)-(e), Ms. Ozier, with the consent of Senate, withdrew her amendment.

An amendment (Renner/Axworthy), which proposed the deletion of most of the Report and which reversed the sense of what little was left was ruled out of order by the Chairman.

On a vote, the motion to accept the Joint Report was carried.

83:110. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:58 P.M.