

Item: Senate Minutes, June 1987
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 June 1987. The documents have been ordered chronologically and made OCR for ease of searching. The original documents and additional documents for this year which have not yet been digitized can be found in the Dalhousie University Senate fonds (UA-5) at the Dalhousie University Archives and Special Collections.

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

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

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY
MINUTES OF SENATE MEETING

Senate met in regular session in the Senate and Board Room on Monday, 8 June 1987 at 3:00 P.M.

Present with the Vice-Chair of Senate, Mr. F. Wien, in the chair were the following:
Andrews, Betts, Birdsall, Borwein, Caty, Chaytor, Christie, Cross M.L., Duff, Dykstra, Egan, Forgay, Huber, James, Lewis D., MacKay R.C., Manning, Myers, Oore, Renner, Retallack, Ritchie, Sinclair, Stuttard, Taylor, Tonks, Wood, Zakariasen, Zayid, Christie B.D. (invitee), MacDonald M.D. (invitee).

Regrets: Belzer, A.D. Cohen, Gratwick, J.V. Jones, W.E. Jones, Konok, Pooley, Precious, Schwenger, Shires, Stern, M.H. Tan, Wassersug, Waterson, Williams.

87:076.

Minutes of 4 May 1987

The minutes of the meeting of Senate held on 4 May 1987 had been circulated previously.

Motion (Wood/Andrews):

that the minutes of the meeting of 4 May 1987 be approved.

Motion carried.

87:077-

Introduction of New Members

Mr. Wien read a list of new student members of Senate and asked those present to stand. Ms. Zayid, the new president of the Dalhousie Student Union, stood and was recognized.

87:078.

Question Period

Embellishment of New Buildings

Mr. Andrews reminded Senate about a long-established policy dating back some 20 years, concerning the embellishment of new buildings. A series of motions passed at that time, among other requirements, called on architects to set aside 1% of the cost of new buildings for art works. He also mentioned the establishment of special funds for art works. He then addressed a question to the Officers of Senate asking what attention has been paid to these policies during the construction of the Chemistry and Law extensions and the new residence on South Street. Mr. Wien said that the question would be taken under advisement.

NSERC Funding

Mr. Borwein asked for an interpretation of NSERC policy on funding of foreign students from NSERC funds, which is limited to no more than 1/3 of total enrolment. He said that at Dalhousie this is applied on a department basis, rather than on a university-wide basis as at other universities. Mr. Sinclair suggested that this question be referred to the Dean of Graduate Studies.

Immigration

Mr. Borwein stated that his department feels more circumscribed than others by the restrictions on the employment of non-Canadians. He wondered if the practice is unrealistic. Mr. Sinclair reported that he has met with Immigration officials who have told him the rules but he admitted that there may be regional differences in interpretation. He said that as long as procedures are followed carefully, there is no trouble getting approval, but it does take time. Mr. Andrews wondered if part of the difficulty is due to Dalhousie's policy of trying to appoint faculty at the lowest possible rank. The President, commenting from experience, said there is an impression that Ontario is much more rigidly dealt with. One person at the University of Guelph was essentially employed full-time to deal with these matters. This is more time than is used at Dalhousie.

87: 079 .

Report of the President

The President reported verbally on two matters.

1) He said that the Convocations all went well and Senate should thank people involved in the preparations, citing particularly the Dean of Men, Mr. Donahoe, the Registrar, and the staff of the Physical Plant.

2) He drew Senate's attention to the Dalhousie Staff Association settlement. He said that 85% of those voting approved the contract. He said the agreement will soon be signed and copies will be made-available.

87:080.

Appeal of Discipline Committee Decision

Mr. Wien informed Senate of the right of students to appeal decisions of the Senate Discipline Committee within thirty days. He said that such an appeal had been received recently from a student. He drew Senate's attention to the motion which had been circulated with the agenda. This motion was designed to authorize the Steering Committee to appoint an ad hoc Hearing Panel and to report back to

Senate. Mr. Andrews established through questioning that this was a change in the normal procedure of Senate appointing the Hearing Panel, but that this would not become the standard procedure for the future.

Motion (Caty/Zayid):

that the Steering Committee be hereby authorized to appoint an ad hoc Hearing Panel to consider the appeal of a student regarding the penalty recently imposed on her by the Senate Discipline Committee, this panel to consist of three persons selected by the Steering Committee and one student chosen by the Dalhousie Student Union.

Motion carried.

87:081.

Appointment of Ombud and Assistant Ombud

A recommendation for the appointment of Mr. Rory Rogers as Ombud and Ms. Joy Noonan as Assistant Ombud for the 1987/88 term had been submitted by the Ombud Advisory Committee and recommended to Senate by the Committee on Academic Administration. Approval of these appointments was moved by the president and seconded by the Vice-President (Academic & Research). Mr. Borwein questioned the use of the word "Ombud". Mr. Sinclair replied that it had been extensively debated. Mr. Stuttard asked if it was usual for both these appointments to be made from the Faculty of Law. Mr. Sinclair replied that this is normally done but this requirement does not form part of the job description. Ms. Caty asked if there is any reason why this practice is continued to which Mr. Sinclair replied "not necessarily". Ms. Zayid stated that most applications come from Law students. Mr. Andrews asked if it is a paid position. Ms. Zayid said that there is an honorarium paid by the Student Union. She also said that these appointments have already been approved by the Dalhousie Student Union. Mr. I. Christie added that he would be surprised if payment is only by the Student Union. He said that theoretically the Office covers all constituencies of the University and the appointees do not have to be students.

Motion (Clark/Sinclair):

that Mr. Rory Rogers be appointed Ombud and Ms. Joy Noonan be appointed Assistant Ombud for the 1987/88 term.

Motion carried.

87:082.

Graduate Diploma in Marine Affairs

A letter to the President informing him of MPHEC approval for the introduction of a one-year graduate diploma in Marine Affairs had been circulated.

Motion (Sinclair/I. Christie):

that Senate approve the implementation of the one-year graduate diploma in Marine Affairs.

Motion carried.

Prior to the passing of this motion, Mr. I. Christie informed Senate that the program has three coordinators, one of whom, Mr. Cote, was present. The Chair invited questions, but none were received. Mr. Cote informed Senate that twenty-three applications had been received, and ten students had been accepted and were now in the orientation phase of the program.

87:083.

School of Library and Information Studies

A letter to the president informing him of MPHEC approval for the change in the name of the School of Library Service to the School of Library and Information Studies and its degree, Master of Library Service to Master of Library and Information Studies had been approved.

Motion (Sinclair/Dykstra):

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

Motion carried.

87: 084 .

1987/88 Budget

With the agreement of Senate, Mr. Wien vacated the Chair to Ms. J. Ritchie, a member of the Steering Committee, for discussion of the 1987/88 Budget.

Ms. Ritchie pointed out that Senate would be considering two reports; one identified as Proposed 1987/88 Operating Budget, dated 22 May 1987, prepared by Mr. Bryan Mason, Vice-President (Finance and Administration), and the second identified as the Report of the Senate Financial Planning Committee on the 1987/88 Budget, dated 28 May 1987. She informed Senate that the Board of Governors will be reviewing the Budget on June 23, at which time the Chair of Senate will be present for the discussion and will offer comments based on Senate's discussion.

With Mr. Mason unable to be present, the president initiated the discussion on his report. He said it contained two major items; a preliminary report on the operating budget results for 1986/87 and the proposed 1987/88 Budget. He indicated that the Board of Governors had approved the 1986/87 budget in December of 1986. At that time they had been advised that a deficit was anticipated. Addressing the last page of Mr. Mason's report, he pointed out the column entitled "Approved budget" and explained that the column headed "Restated budget" is a slightly modified form of the approved budget. He said that the column headed "preliminary actual" is now virtually correct with a deficit of about \$1 50,000. Turning to page 2 of the report, he said that the section dealing with the 1987/88 budget had been presented in a larger version to the Board of Governors. He noted that it contained a planned deficit of \$.5 million. He said that government funding overall had increased about 6.5%, but that Dalhousie will receive substantially less. It will however, receive an amount marginally better than that contained in the

January version of the budget. He said that while the budget has retained a deficit target of \$.5 million, the administration is hoping that the deficit will be lower. He added that they are also hoping to achieve a balanced budget in 1988/89. The proposed 1987/88 budget appears as column 4 on the last page of Mr. Mason's report. The President stated that the size of Dalhousie's accumulated deficit is over the 2% limit allowed by MPHEC. The President also reported on internal carryovers. He said that approximately \$350,000 will be carried forward by units from 1986/87 to 1987/88. He also noted that there are some negative carryovers which are expected to be reduced in accordance with university policy. He noted that the positive carryover is less than last year.

Ms. Ritchie then called upon Mr. Wien to introduce the Senate Financial Planning Committee report.

Mr. Wien reported that the Financial Planning Committee has held two meetings to look at the 1986/87 results and the 1987/88 budget. He highlighted the section on year-end variances, expressing particular concern about the over-expenditures in Physical Plant and noting that net revenues for the Bookstore and the Arts Centre were less than anticipated. He also noted that academic cost centres had not over-expended as much as had been anticipated. He drew attention to additional funding for the Animal Care Centre, new program initiatives, student services and recruitment, distance education and instructional development. He noted also that the projected income for the Bookstore had been reduced. He drew attention to the changes which had been made in the allocation to the Library to avoid an anticipated cut in the Collections Budget. He said the Academic Plan will contain recommendations on the level of the Library Collection budget that should be maintained and the process whereby annual increments can be made. He then moved acceptance of the report.

Mr. Welch opened the discussion with a question regarding base adjustments. Mr. Wien reported that the Financial Planning Committee had considered proposals and made recommendations to the President. The President, for the most part, had accepted these with the exception of the recommendation concerning the Library. The President had replied to the FPC by letter explaining at some length the reasons for his decisions. Mr. Welch asked for further explanation. Mr. Wien said the Faculties had made submissions and the Financial Planning Committee had assessed them. Some inequities were apparent with respect to academic support services. The Committee also had the benefit of figures for library allocations across the country, which indicated that the expenditures at Dalhousie did not seem to be as high as at other universities. In response to a question by Mr. I. Christie, the president stated that the amount allocated for base adjustments had been \$300,000. Mr. Lewis asked what steps had been taken as a consequence of the Lewis/Bradfield motion passed at the March 2 meeting, which had recommended that all possible expenses associated with the Campaign be assigned to the budget of the Campaign. The President replied by pointing out the differences between the cost of the Campaign and the other ongoing costs of the Development Office. He stated that the latter is a legitimate charge on the operating budget since it is an ongoing expenditure. He added that until the last two months, no decision on the assignment of the cost of the Campaign had been made. He noted that if all of the costs of the Development Office are borne by the Campaign, then there will no be as much money available for other purposes. Mr. Lewis added the question "Was there a change in the budget line for the Development Office?" Mr. Wright replied that the Development Office had a reduction the same as other departments of at least 4.5%, and possibly slightly more. Mr. Renner asked if past expenditures had been borne by the Capital Campaign Fund. The president stated that up until now the ongoing cost of the Development Office was a line item in the operating budget, but the majority of the cost of the Capital Campaign had not been allocated, i.e. there was a deferred expenditure. Mr. Renner pursued his questioning. The President stated that the University has been committing funds faster than they are being received through the Capital Campaign. Mr. Renner asked if the Capital Campaign is in debt, to which the President replied that it is. Mr. Wright stated that the cost of the Development Office are either ongoing or related to the Capital Campaign. Costs related to the Capital Campaign have been

deferred. He said it was first thought that interest on the Capital Campaign income would cover these costs but it has now been found that the University is spending the Capital Campaign funds faster than the money has been received, therefore, there is no potential for the interest to cover the costs. Mr. Huber observed that it is important for Senate to realize that if money is spent to collect money, there is an impact on the Operating Budget. He added that some Capital Campaign funds are being used to cover operating expenses. Mr. Borwein stated that he would like to see tabled a costing of the Development Office. The President agreed that he would take the request under advisement. Mr. Lewis then noted that the increase in academic budgets is less than the increase in funding to the University giving the example of a 3.9 increase in government funding and a 2.6% increase in academic budget. He asked if this is true and what is the reason. Mr. Sinclair identified certain items not included. Mr. Wien referred Mr. Lewis to Appendix A of the Financial Planning Committee report where the percentage changes are listed. Mr. Borwein asked why the increase in the academic budget is less than the amount of the grant coming from MPHEC. Mr. Brian Christie volunteered that other components in the Budget are not increasing as fast as the government grant. Mr. Andrews asked what assumptions have been made relative to academic fees for 1987/88. Mr. Wien reported that it has been assumed that enrolment will be stable and that fees will be increased 4%.

To conclude the discussion, Ms. Ritchie asked if there were any amendments to the FPC report. Since none were forthcoming, the motion proposed by Mr. Wien, on behalf of the FPC, was put to a vote:

that the Report of the Senate Financial Planning Committee on the 1987/88 Budget be approved.

Motion carried.

Mr. Wien resumed the chair.

87:085.

Senate Advisory Committee on Public Relations

The 1986/87 Annual Report of the Senate Advisory Committee on Public Relations had been circulated with the agenda. Ms. Caty, Chair of the Committee was present and agreed to answer any questions. Mr. Wien directed attention to the first recommendation contained in the report. The recommendation called for full support for the position of Assistant Vice-President (Student Affairs) and for immediate action on the implementation of the Ingersoll report. In response to a question by the president, Ms. Caty agreed that it was the intent of the Committee that the position of Assistant Vice-President could be interpreted as a senior appointment. Mr. Wien recognized that the Ingersoll report had not been widely circulated and that it would be difficult for Senate to approve its implementation without having seen it. Senate therefore agreed to a suggestion that this recommendation be referred to the Committee on Academic Administration.

Attention turned to the second recommendation. Discussion involved concerns about censorship and encouraging students to come to Dalhousie under false pretenses. The president stated his belief that the recommendation implies the need to use discretion. Ultimately it was agreed to modify the recommendation.

Motion (Caty/Stuttard):

that the University develop a Yell-understood public relations strategy.

Motion carried.

The next recommendation concerned the implementation of awards for faculty excellence. Mr. Huber asked if the Committee had in mind excellence in general or research or teaching. Ms. Caty replied that the Committee had all of these in mind.

Motion (Caty/Huber):

that the Committee on Academic Administration pursue the development and implementation of awards for faculty excellence.

Ms. Caty then introduced the last recommendation. Mr. Betts suggested changing the word "fully" to "wholeheartedly".

Motion (Caty on behalf of the Committee):

that in the future more attention must be paid to positive news about the University and in this regard, the students' proposal for an Open House in the fall of 1987 must be wholeheartedly supported in terms of budget, University personnel and alumni.

Motion carried.

87:086.

Ombuds Office Annual Report 1985/86

The 1985/86 Annual Report of the Ombuds Office together with excerpts from the minutes of the Committee on Academic Administration relating to the report had been circulated. The CAA Minute excerpts contained a motion recommending appropriate referral of the recommendations contained in the report. Mr. Stuttard suggested that the word "course" in the motion should be changed to "class".

Motion (Clark on behalf of the Committee):

that the recommendation regarding the definition of full-time students and consideration of per class fees be referred to the President for consideration and further,

that the recommendations related to registration and emergency funding be referred to the Assistant Vice-President (Student Affairs) and further,

that the recommendations regarding fees and regulations be referred to the Vice-President (Academic and Research) and the Vice-President (Finance and Administration).

Motion carried.

87:087.

Report of Ad Hoc Committee on Aging of Faculty

A draft report dated April 1987 from the Ad Hoc Committee on Aging of the Faculty had been circulated with the agenda. Mr. Wien informed the meeting that this report was placed before Senate for information and comment. It will be considered by the Academic Planning Committee which may prepare recommendations for approval by Senate. Mr. Huber, the Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee, introduced the report by emphasizing that it is in draft form and that he had expected to revise it based on discussion in the Academic Planning Committee. He said other members of the Ad Hoc Committee had not seen it in this form but had discussed it and provided direction on its content. He indicated that the first four pages constitute the summary and recommendations, pages 4 to 13 contain factual material and pages 13 to 23 present a disaggregated view. The last part of the document suggests possible policy responses. He said there is a bulge in the numbers of faculty in their 40's, with too few in their late 50's and 60's. There are, therefore, few eligible for early retirement. He said that the level of attrition by age is modest, therefore the cost of salaries over the next several years will rise by about 8%. This represents a financial problem for the future of the order of \$7 million. He suggested that **there are** three possible solutions:

1) Raise more money; **2) Reduce the average costs of staff, and; 3) Reduce the numbers of staff.**

The proposals are aimed at **reducing the average cost** and reducing the number of staff. He expressed appreciation to Mr. Brian **Christie saying that most of the tables were prepared** by him. Mr. **Christie also did a lot of other work for the Committee.**

Mr. Wien directed discussion to the first four pages. He reported that an earlier draft had been discussed by the Financial Planning Committee. Mr. Welch asked for comments made by the FPC. Mr. Wien said a good deal of debate focused on mandatory retirement, noting that the experience of Manitoba had changed. Mr. Huber reported that he had been informed in February that in the current year the number of people retiring is low in comparison with past years. He said the Committee's comments are based on previous experience with Manitoba dating back to 1980 (i.e. six years, but did not include this seventh year).

Mr. Wien then directed discussion to the possible policy responses contained in the report. Mr. Myers reported observing colleagues who had taken career change workshops finding the University more attractive. Mr. Renner reported a major study funded by the Carnegie Foundation in the United States of 6000 faculty members had shown 40% expressed a willingness to change careers given suitable alternatives. Preliminary figures from a Canadian study by Professor Leonard at York University indicated 23% willing to change careers. He said a British study shows that some faculty are unhappy but tended not to be the top scholars. Mr. Huber said there is a need to bear in mind that when making changes in pension arrangements that people in their 40's and 50's have a life expectancy of 30 to 43 years. Mr. Welch observed that when the University has a normal age structure, there is no need for incentives for early retirement. Mr. Huber said that Mr. Christie's models show a normal age structure at Dalhousie not arriving until the year 2030. Mr. Huber said it would be possible to suggest special incentives for one year. This would slice the top off the bulge but the remainder would take 8 years to pass through the critical point. People cannot retire earlier than age 55 according to the Income Tax Act. Such incentives therefore could make the problem worse. The President said that all policy responses were well worth looking at. He said there is a major question and that is, how to present these policies in an attractive, non-punitive way. The President raised a technical point concerning the removal of the actuarial penalty for early retirement. He said that it is debatable whether or not this is relatively inexpensive. Mr. Huber responded by saying that it depends on the assumptions and the numbers of faculty retiring early. Mr. Christie observed that Mr. Renner has a useful research project underway. Mr. Betts reported that there will be seven members of the Faculty of Arts and Science on reduced workload next year. He added that he had been informed by Mr. Roughneen that the current Agreement, expires

on February 17, 1987 and that it may not be renewed. He suggested encouraging people to apply before that date for the maximum period of five years with the option for cancellation. Mr. Renner asked "Is the difficulty with Revenue Canada?" Mr. Betts responded that that is stupid in the face of the manpower situation. Mr. Betts suggested that AUCC should take this matter up with the federal government. Mr. Huber pointed out that the program does not just apply to universities. Mr. Wien closed the discussion by stating that the sense of the meeting would be conveyed to the Academic Planning Committee and that the report will be coming back to Senate.

87:088.

Future Meetings

Mr. Wien reminded senators of the special meeting on June 15th for discussion of the Academic Plan. He also reminded them of the continuation of this meeting on June 22nd. at which time the remainder of the agenda will be considered.

87:089.

Next Meeting

The meeting adjourned at 5:06 P.M.

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY

MINUTES OF SENATE MEETING

Senate met in special session on Monday, 15 June 1987 at 3:00 P.M. in the Senate and Board Room.

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

Andrews, Betts, Borwein, T.S. Cameron, Caty, A.D. Cohen, Duff, Easterbrook, Gratwick, Leffek, D. Lewis, Maloney, Manning, Mason, Nestman, Pross, Retallack, Sinclair-Faulkner, M. Stewart, Stone, Stuttard, Tonks, Wien, Young, Yung, Zayid, Traversy (invitee).

Regrets: Chaytor, Egan, Forgay, Gold, Gwyn, D.W. Jones, R.C. MacKay, MacRae, Perey, Precious, Schwenger, Walker, Waterson.

87:090.

1987 and Beyond Document

The Chairperson, Mr. W. Jones, introduced the document entitled "1987 and Beyond: A Report on the Second Cycle of Academic Planning at Dalhousie University" and reviewed the historical evolution of the academic planning process. Mr. Jones indicated that Chapters 2, 3 and 4 covered much of the same topics discussed at length last year. He requested that Senate members send comments on these three Chapters to APC, by way of the Secretary of Senate. He then noted that Chapter 5 contained recommendations which could be viewed as advice by APC to the individual faculties. The faculties were asked to consider these and to relay comments or questions to APC. Following some discussion regarding the proper procedure to follow with regard to discussion of the sixth Chapter, contributed to by Messrs. Andrews and Borwein, it was agreed that each of the recommendations could be discussed in order.

Mr. Betts contended that several of the CUDEC statistics with respect to student/faculty ratios on pages 19-20 had been misunderstood or misinterpreted. Mr. Tonks supported this contention. Both agreed to send comments to APC with specific written suggestions for revision.

Chapter 6 - University Library

Recommendation 6.1.1

Mr. Wien moved recommendation 6.1.1 on behalf of APC, namely

that the budget of the Library should be divided into two categories, (1) a collections budget and (2) a service budget, these two budgets to be maintained as separate items and to receive individual treatment in annual budget determination.

Ms. Manning indicated that there should be no difficulty separating the collections from the service budget. The problem centered in setting an adequate collections budget. Mr. Wien commented that recommendation 6.1.2 recognized the need for an adequate baseline budget.

The motion carried.

Recommendation 6.1.2

Ms. Ritchie moved on behalf of APC

that the Library, in cooperation with the Senate Library Committee is requested to undertake a realistic assessment of the collections budget, and to review the collections policy of Dalhousie University. The assessment and a report on the collections policy should be ready for presentation to Senate by September 1, 1987.

Mr. Pross queried whether September 1 was a realistic deadline. Mr. W. Jones responded that the intent had been to have this report ready for the next budget, but believed that the date could be postponed until **October 1, 1987**. After considerable debate participated in by Messrs. Easterbrook, Jones, Borwein and Storey regarding the use of the term "realistic" (line 2), Mr. Andrews questioned whether the APC had expected that a thorough review would be conducted. Mr. Stuttard suggested that the review would be of the collections practices rather than policy. Ms. Ritchie commented that 6.1.3 addressed Mr. Stuttard's point.

The motion carried.

Recommendation 6.1.3

Recommendation 6.1.3 was moved on behalf of APC by Mr. Wien.

that the Library, in cooperation with other libraries in the region, is requested to prepare a coordinated acquisitions policy for the region.

Mr. Borwein wondered whether there were any inducements for smaller institutions to reciprocate, while Mr. Andrews inquired whether there had been any indication that other institutions would in fact cooperate. Mr. Lewis sought clarification regarding the meaning of "region" to which Mr. Cohen responded that this would depend on the particular area of collections. Ms. Ozier expressed the view that the steps to enlist cooperation would properly occur at the presidential level.

An amendment was moved and seconded (Sinclair-Faulkner/Borwein)

that the Library is requested to invite -- through the Office of the President -the other libraries in the region to join it in preparing a proposal for a coordinated acquisitions policy in the region, and to report its progress to the Senate by 1 January 1988.

The amendment carried and the motion as amended was accepted.

Recommendation 6.1.4

Mr. Wien moved on behalf of APC

that following agreement on the appropriate size of the collections budget, Senate requests that the budget of the university provide for an annual increase to the collections budget which would allow it to keep pace with inflation and thus maintain its purchasing power.

Mr. Borwein suggested that the words "or improve" precede the phrase "its purchasing power". Mr. Lewis requested that it be specified that inflation referred to library materials. The mover accepted as a friendly amendment Mr. Pross' recommendation that

the words "keep pace with inflation and be deleted.

Following discussion by Messrs. Duff, Pross, Stuttard and Betts and Ms. Manning it was moved and seconded (Borwein/Pross)

that the words "or improve" precede "its purchasing power".

The amendment was defeated.

Mr. Wien agreed with Mr. Stuttard that the problem arose in combining the two parts of the motion.

It was moved and seconded (Wien/Stuttard)

that the initial phrase "following agreement on the appropriate size of the collections budget" be dropped.

Mr. Pross commented that a separate motion to prepare an assessment and a plan was required. Mr. Wien believed that Recommendation 6.1.2 addressed this point. Mr. Sinclair-Faulkner indicated that an advocate for library holdings was desirable while Mr. Storey supported the deletion of the initial phrase of the motion.

It was moved and seconded (Stone/Leffek)

that the following qualifying phrase be added to the end of the motion: "when other pressing academic demands on the budget permit such increases."

Mr. Sinclair-Faulkner wondered what criteria would be used to determine more pressing demands, while Ms. Ozier believed that the amendment contradicted the spirit of the original recommendation.

Upon vote the second amendment was defeated and the first one carried. The recommendation as amended passed.

Mr. Pross considered that the Senate Library Committee should be invited to comment on academic planning issues and recommendations relevant to the University Library.

Recommendation 6.1.5.

Mr. Cohen moved on behalf of APC

that in future budget determinations, the service portion of the library budget be treated in a manner similar to that of other academic units of the University; and that it contribute to and be eligible to receive funds from the Redistribution Fund.

Ms. Manning commented that the service budget was very small. Mr. Wien clarified that "service" referred to non-acquisitions and Mr. S. Cameron referred back to the distinction drawn in Recommendation 6.1.1.

The motion carried.

Recommendation 6.1.6

Mr. Cohen moved on behalf of APC

that the Library should implement an intense space planning process within the Libraries and inform the University community of the Libraries' needs. In this space study, the Library should consider the possibility of storing older issues and seldom used items in less expensive storage off campus.

Mr. Andrews queried whether "Libraries" (line 3) referred to the "Library Systems". This was confirmed by the Chairperson. The motion carried.

Recommendation 6.1.7

Mr. Wien moved on behalf of APC

that the University Librarian is asked to develop a proposed acquisition policy for non-print materials and to prepare recommendations on the handling, storage and provision for access to such materials. A report outlining the proposed policy and recommendations should be available for consideration by Senate by November 1987.

Mr. Andrews questioned whether the collections policy merely referred to print materials or to everything the Library collected. He wondered whether there were budgetary implications to which 6.1.4 applied. Mr. Wien responded that there was no current policy for non-print materials. Mr. S. Cameron inquired about the funding sought externally for Novanet and about the terms of the loan. Mr. Mason reported that the capital cost for Phase I was \$500,000 and that the portion to be paid by Dalhousie was approximately 2/3 of the total cost. The total cost for Dalhousie for both phases was estimated to be \$525,000-\$530,000 with annual "running" costs of \$130,000-\$150,000. In response to Mr. Pross's request for the rationale behind the two-thirds contribution, Mr. Wien revealed that the system also handled the internal system of borrowing as well as inter-university borrowing. Mr. Storey asked if the losses could be cut and gains retained by not proceeding to Phase two if no external funds were available at the end of the initial phase. Mr. Mason thought that both phases were necessary. Mr. Stuttard queried whether other less costly systems had been considered. Mr. Wien confirmed that this was the case. Mr. Mason added that the alternative would have cost Dalhousie \$100,000

more.

The motion carried.

87:091.

Date of Next Meeting

It was agreed that Senate meet on July 6 and 13 at 3:00 P.M. to further discuss the document.

87:092.

Adjournment

The meeting ad adjourned at 5:00 P.M.

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY
MINUTES OF SENATE MEETING

Senate met in regular session in the Senate and Board Room on Monday, 22 June 1987 at 3:00 P.M.

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

Andrews, Betts, Binkley, Birdsall, Bradfield, Braybrook, Cameron D.M., Cameron T.S., Caty, Chaytor, Christie, Cohen A.D., Comeau, Duff, Dunn, Dykstra, Egan, George, Gratwick, Leffek, Lewis D., Maloney, Manning, Mason, Nance, O'Shea, Pross, Rodger, Sinclair, Tonks, Wien, Yung, Zayid, MacGillivray (invitee), Traversy (invitee).

Regrets: Gass, Hersom, Konok, Ozier, Pooley, Precious, Ritchie, Wassersug, Waterson, Wood, Zakariasen.

87:093-

Minutes of May 8

Mr. D. Egan noted the omission of Occupational Therapy from the list of graduands in the Faculty of Health professions. Mr. Sinclair noted an error in the title of minute 87:062; reference to the clause in the Collective Agreement should have been 26.07(a).

Motion (Sinclair/Wien):

that the minutes of May 8 as corrected be approved.

Carried.

Minutes of May 15

Mr. Bradfield noted the omission of Dr. Jones' name as Chair of the meeting.

Motion (Sinclair/A. Cohen):

that the minutes of May 15 as corrected be approved.

Carried.

87:094.

Awarding of Degrees

The Registrar read the names of four individuals from the Faculty of Arts and Science who had now cleared their accounts and should have their degrees awarded retroactively to May 1987.

Motion (Betts/Sinclair):

that the granting of degrees to the named individuals be approved.

Carried.

The Registrar then read the names of two individuals from the Faculty of Law who had cleared their accounts and should be awarded degrees retroactively to May 1987.

Motion (Sinclair/Nance):

that granting of degrees to the named individuals be approved.

Carried.

87:095-

Jurisdiction of Senate Academic Appeals Committee

The president informed members that the document before them was a revision of earlier material prepared by Messrs. Tonks and Christie. He asked Mr. Tonks to comment on this revision and to point out the changes. He suggested dealing with the report point by point. Mr. Tonks identified the current revision by the date of June 1. He pointed out that a major feature is that the Senate Academic Appeals Committee (SAAC) will be asked to formulate grounds for appeals and an internal method for reconsideration.

Motion (Clark/Tonks):

that Senate approve rule #1.

Mr. S. Cameron asked the purpose of circulation of information on individual cases if Senate can do nothing about it. Mr. Tonks replied that it was felt appropriate for Senate to be informed. The President added that it will be possible for Senate to make recommendations for future cases. Ms. Zayid stated that she understood that the document had not been reviewed by the Senate Academic Appeals Committee. She said the document has not taken into account some SAAC concerns and some DSU concerns. She questioned proceeding without this consultation. Ms. Hansell stated that the report is not exactly what SAAC would have wished. She cited as an example that reviewing the rules of Faculties would require more people on the Committee or the hiring of legal advice. She said the Committee is worried about setting up rules on what is appealable. Mr. Rodger wondered if discussion should be postponed until the fall because of the absence of students.

Motion (Bradfield/Zayid):

that the report on the Jurisdiction of the Senate Academic Appeals Committee be tabled until the fall.

Motion defeated.

Mr. Braybrooke reminded Senate that he had objected to the elimination of the appeal to Senate. He expressed the view that the revised report reflected only some of the discussion of Senate. Mr. Wien recalled that there were speakers on each side and suggested that the drafters had come down on one side to test the view of Senate. Mr. Jones rejected the following amendment on the basis that it would cause a return to the current situation.

"Notwithstanding the rest of this rule, the Senate may refer to this Committee a case already heard, to be heard again, either by this panel or by a new panel."

The Chair indicated a willingness to hear a debate on a motion to postpone definitely to the first Senate meeting in October.

Motion (Rodger/S. Cameron):

that discussion of the report of the Jurisdiction of the SAAC be postponed definitely to the first meeting of Senate in October.

The President stated that it was hard to argue urgency but noted that the sub-committee had worked for several months and had consulted interested persons. He expressed an interest in knowing what concerns Ms. Zayid had. Mr. Rodger spoke in favor of the motion on the basis that more students and senators would be present in October. Mr. S. Cameron commented that the document arrived in the middle of the summer and that it was considerably changed. He also expressed concern about the views of the Chair of SAAC. Mr. Jeffery stated that it is his impression that the grounds for appeal would be limited. He said he is not satisfied that the most recent version has cured the defects present earlier. Mr. Sinclair asked for people to come with amendments. Ms. Zayid spoke for total agreement and for deferral of consideration. The Chair expressed his understanding that the SAAC and the DSU had been consulted. Mr. Rodger spoke in favor of general rules and jurisprudence as opposed to detailed rules. Discussion then turned to why the document was before Senate. Responses included a statement that Mr. Braybrooke had raised a question in 1984. The president added that revision was needed for legal reasons. Mr. Braybrooke expressed doubt that the proposed changes would cure the legal defects. He spoke of the need for balance between student rights and faculty concerns. Discussion continued in this vein until the motion was put and carried.

that discussion of the report of the Jurisdiction of the SAAC be postponed definitely to the first meeting of Senate in October.

Carried

Mr. Jones asked those with concerns to discuss them with Messrs. Tonks and Christie so that discussion can lead to a decision in October. Mr. Braybrooke suggested that Mr. Tonks take legal advice on natural justice. Mr. Andrews suggested that it would be better to ask Senators to submit amendments to the circulated document rather than to distribute a revised document. Mr. Maloney agreed.

87:096.

Annual Report of the Physical Planning Committee

Mr. Cohen reviewed the highlights of the Annual Report of the PPC. He noted the government donations for capital projects: the new quarters for Mathematics, Chemistry and progress on the Law School Library and renovation of the Weldon Building and Henson College. He noted no major progress on Management Studies and Geology. He stated that teaching space for Nursing had been addressed and noted the Maxwell bequest for Economics. The Maxwell bequest and Law Building were discussed briefly. Mr. Maloney spoke for improvement to the football field in the interest of enhancing student life. Mr. Pross spoke for improved maintenance of the building used by Public Administration and for the McMechan Auditorium.

He questioned the word "partially" in the section on "Ongoing Problems". Here it was stated that the needs of the Faculty of Management Studies would be partially addressed with the needs of the Law School. Ms. Caty stated that she was pleased to see that the needs of the Nursing class were addressed. She endorsed centralized booking. She asked for comments on parking. Mr. Cohen replied that the PPC had avoided the issue. He noted that the Parking and Security Committee had developed a report.

The Chair directed consideration to the recommendations noting that the first recommendation is essentially the same as 6.4.1 of the Academic Plan. Mr. Lewis suggested and had accepted a friendly amendment for the inclusion of the word "safety" in paragraph E.

Motion (A. Cohen/Duff):

that the President's Office, in consultation with the Building and Grounds Committee of the Board of Governors and the Physical Planning Committee of Senate, should develop a strategic plan for the future of Dalhousie's physical plant. This should be more than prioritized schedules of future capital projects it being important that such a strategic plan address:

- a) The overall supply of physical space required to meet Dalhousie's future academic needs.
- b) Allocation of space and cooperative arrangements for the utilization of teaching space .
- c) Requirements for non laboratory teaching space in terms of the appropriate mix of size, configuration and equipment.
- d) Requirements and responsibilities for research space .
- e) A plan for establishing and meeting the needs for preventive maintenance and environmental and safety standards .

Carried

Motion (A.Cohen/S. Cameron):

that Senate recognize the need to emphasize future allocation of resources for the renewal, renovation and preventive maintenance of existing facilities .

Carried

Motion (A. Cohen/Duff):

After considerable discussion of recommendation 3 of the report it was agreed that Recommendation 6.4.2 of "1987 and Beyond" was more appropriate and would satisfy the intent of the Physical Planning Committee.

that the President's Office should ensure that the University central booking system include all present University classroom/seminar space and that all new space be included as it becomes available .

Carried.

Motion (A. Cohen/Duff):

that Senate recognize the importance of matching requests pertaining to physical facilities to academic planning priorities.

Carried

Motion (A. Cohen/Duff):

that all Faculties should establish internal mechanisms through which Faculty wide priorities can be established for alterations and renovations requests prior to their submission to the Administration. Such requests should be submitted by December 15th of each academic year.

Carried.

Mr. Andrews asked for an explanation of this recommendation. Mr. Cohen clarified that the Committee did not wish a report on the internal mechanisms for developing Alterations and Renovations requests, but expressed concern that two faculties did not seem to have an internal understanding of the process. He stated that the purpose of this recommendation is to ensure that the process be democratized within the faculties so that people will be aware of what is going forward. He said that this should precede submission to the Administration and the Physical Planning Committee.

Motion (A. Cohen/S. Cameron):

that the Parking and Security Committee be asked to report in the near future regarding medium to long term plans regarding parking on campus. Issues of eligibility for parking permits and the degree of subsidization of parking costs should also be reported upon without delay.

Mr. Rodger noted that the DFA is also a party to parking arrangements and suggested an amendment.

Amendment (Rodger/Lewis):

that the phrase "and the degree of subsidization of parking costs" be deleted.

Defeated.

Mr. Lewis then spoke for a report on Security from the Parking and Security Committee. Discussion led to direction for the Secretary to request a report from the Senate representative on the Parking and Security Committee. Mr. Cohen then accepted as a friendly amendment the suggestion from Ms. Binkley

that "Security be included in recommendation 6.

Motion (A. Cohen/S. Cameron):

that the Parking and Security Committee be asked to report in the near future regarding medium and long-term plans regarding parking and security on campus. Issues of eligibility for parking permits and the degree of subsidization of parking costs should also be reported upon without delay.

Carried.

Motion (A. Cohen/Duff):

that every effort be made to allocate sufficient funds to maintain the general appearance of the university grounds, and in particular, the sad state of disrepair regarding the football field/track on Studley campus should be addressed.

Carried.

Ms. Dykstra spoke for the maintenance of other buildings on campus as well. Mr. Cohen reiterated the thanks expressed in the last paragraph of his report. Mr. Jones thanked Mr. Cohen for the report and for his efforts during the year.

87:097.

Senate Committee Reports on Capital Campaign

The Chair first directed attention to the report of the Physical Planning Committee because it contained summary tables prepared by Mr. Mason. Mr. Cohen acknowledged the work of Mr. Richard Evans and Mr. Mason in drafting the table. He stated that the report summarizes progress. No comments were received.

The Chair then directed attention to the report from the Senate Advisory Committee on Computing. Mr. D. Cameron stated that he was pleased with the early commitment of the Campaign to computing. He noted that \$4.2M of initial \$4.5M has been expended or committed with a plan for \$108,000 in each of the next three years. He stated that more funds are needed. Discussion then turned to the table of allocations and expenditures prepared by Mr. Mason.

Ms. Binkley opened discussion on the Senate Library Committee report. She stated that the Library had started with a projection of 9% but this had dropped to 6.4%. She said this represents a change in priorities and that unless changes are made, the Library will not share in the advantage of the Campaign. Mr. Rodger stated that the funds are going to buildings and that this is what that Senate had feared. Ms. Binkley noted that donations in kind are being counted but these actually cost \$15 to \$20 per volume for cataloguing et cetera.

The Chair indicated that discussion of the Capital Campaign would continue in the meeting of Senate scheduled for July 13th.

87:098.

Computer Information Centre

The Chair had earlier agreed to entertain a question from Mr. Rodger. Mr. Rodger stated that he had learned that the Computer Information Centre was being closed on June 30, 1987. He asked what academics had been consulted and what is the rationale for closing the Centre. Mr. Mason

responded that the Microcomputer Information Centre (MIC) was sponsored by the Interuniversity Group. He said its needs have now been surpassed by developments in individual universities. He said the Chair of the SACC had been consulted and the cost of the MIC was not justified. Mr. D. Cameron reported that the SACC had had its first opportunity to discuss the closing that morning. He said that it was accepted without debate because it was not Dalhousie's decision alone. He suggested that there are two points of view. 1) It is important that we be able to conclude experiments as well as begin them. He said the MIC has met its original objectives and is now doing different things. 2) The support to MIC for teaching should not be lost. He said he would be communicating this concern to Senate and the President. He is satisfied that something better can emerge for the support of teaching. Mr. Andrews expressed concern because the report on Teaching and Learning is far from implementation. Mr. Cameron said that the terms of reference of the MIC did not extend to consultative advice now being provided. He said this advice will continue to be offered through the Computer Centre. Mr. Andrews asked for the name of an individual contact person. Mr. Cameron identified Mr. Peter Jones.

87:099.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned shortly after 5:00 P.M.