

Item: Senate Minutes, February 1988

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 February 1988. 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 February 1988 at 4:00 P.M.

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

Andrews, Angelopoulos, Aspinall, Betts, Birdsall, Bissett-Johnson, R.J. Boyd, Bradfield, Brady, Braybrooke, Burns, T.S. Cameron, Dykstra, Fingard, J. Fraser, Geldart, Greenfield, Jericho, J.V. Jones, Kemp, ADD:Kennedy, Kimmins, Kreuzer, Leffek, D. Lewis, LoLordo, MacDougall, MacRae, Maloney, Mangalam, March, Mason, McNulty, Oore, Ozier, Pooley, Ravindra, Retallack, Richards, Ritchie, Sayre, Shaw, Sinclair, Smith, by Stern, M.J. Stewart, Tamlyn, M.H. Tan, Taylor, Thiessen, Welch, Wien, Wood, Zayid, Zentilli, B.D. Christie (invitee).

Regrets: Belzer, A.D. Cohen, Forgay, Gratwick, Konok, Walker, Wassersug.

88:021.

Voting on Honorary Degree Candidates [IN CAMERA]

Voting on the names tabled by the Honorary Degrees Committee at the January meeting took place in camera.

88:022.

Minutes of Meeting of 11 January 1988

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 January 1988 were approved upon motion (Betts/S. Cameron) with two amendments noted by Mr. Betts. Senate Minute 88:011, paragraph 2, line 1, add: "Greenfield" after Kennedy; and paragraph 1, line 15, delete: "budget".

88:023.

Awarding of Degrees, Diplomas, Prizes and Medals

The following degrees and diplomas were awarded to individuals whose names had been forwarded to the Secretary, upon motion from the Deans of the Faculties involved.

Faculty of Arts and Science (Betts/S. Cameron)

Bachelor of Arts ~ 23
Bachelor of Science ~ 33
(First Class Honours, Honours 4)
Bachelor of Music ~

Total 57

Faculty of Graduate Studies (Leffek/Wien)

Doctor of Philosophy ~ 19
Master of Arts ~ 6
Master of Business Administration ~ 5
Master of Development Economics ~4
Master of Education ~
Master of Environmental Studies ~ 2
Master of Library and Information Studies ~ 2
Master of Public Administration ~ 3
Master of Science ~ 9
Diploma in Public Administration ~
Total 52

Faculty of Health Professions (Tonks/Maloney)

Bachelor of Nursing ~ 3
Diploma in Outpost and Community Health Nursing --- 4
Bachelor of Physical Education ~ 4
Bachelor of Recreation
Bachelor of Science (Health Education) ~
Total 13

Faculty of Management Studies (George/Dykstra)

Bachelor of Commerce ~20

It was agreed upon motion (George/Betts)

that the Dean of the appropriate Faculty and the Registrar be authorized to add to the graduation list the names of any additional students which have been omitted from the graduation list due to errors on the part of the university or one of its servants.

88:024.

Question Period

Mr. Braybrooke inquired whether due consideration had been given to the academic implications of the present policy regarding minimum enrolment of ten in summer school classes. He observed that distinguished scholars contributed to summer school classes in some departments although enrolment could not be guaranteed. Vice-President Sinclair confirmed that the summer school had been asked to live within its budget but that meetings with individuals at Henson College indicated that some measure of flexibility was required.

Mr. Mangalam requested that the Steering Committee report back to Senate on a matter that had been referred to the committee a couple of years ago.

Mr. S. Cameron, referring to Senate APC minute 88:004, asked for an explanation of the ranking scheme used by the committee in discussion of allocation of Redistribution and Development Funds. The Chair agreed to provide Senators with a copy of the ranking system.

Mr. Kennedy asked whether any decisions had been made regarding the two Vice-Presidential appointments. Mr. Sinclair replied that he had been instructed by the President to make no comment at that time.

Mr. Bradfield wished to know if more cleaning staff had been transferred to evening and night shifts and if the morale implications had been considered. Mr. Mason indicated that more staff were changed to evening shift to prevent interruptions caused during classroom hours. He added that consideration had been given to cost and morale factors.

88:025.

Nomination to Committee on Instructional Development

Ms. J.M. Dawkins (Law) was declared elected to the Senate Committee on Instructional Development upon motion (Boyd/Wien), following three calls for further nominations.

88:026.

Report of the Presidential Committee on the Structure of the Faculty of Arts and Science

A motion approved at the January 28, 1988 APC meeting, a memorandum from President Clark to Mr. W.E. Jones and the "Report of the Presidential Committee on the Structure of the Faculty of Arts and Science" had been precirculated.

On behalf of APC, Mr. Wien moved

that Senate approve the principle recommendations of the Presidential Committee on the Structure of the Faculty of Arts and Science, namely:

A Dean of Arts and a Dean of Science be appointed. These Deans would have budgetary control and authority over the Departments under their jurisdiction. Those Departments would, respectively, form the Faculty of Arts and the Faculty of Science.

The Department of Education become a School of Education with its own budget administered by a Director.

The Faculty of Arts, the Faculty of Science and the School of Education form a College of Arts and Science. The College would meet to discuss common legislative issues such as those concerning academic programs and regulations. The Dean of Arts and the Dean of Science would alternate as Provost of the College. A primary function of the Provost would be the chairing of College meetings and the preparation of agenda. Administrative responsibility for what is decided in College meetings would remain

in the Faculty of Arts, the Faculty of Science or the School of Education as appropriate.

Mr. Kennedy saw the three parts as separate issues and maintained that they should be dealt with separately. Mr. Braybrooke contended that the Smith Committee had considered these to be interrelated issues.

An amendment was moved and seconded (Kennedy/Andrews)

that the third part of the motion concerning the formation of a College of Arts and Science should be dropped from the motion on the floor.

Mr. Betts contended that the three parts had been put together as a compromise package which had been included in the referendum. Mr. Wien believed that deletion of the third part could affect part two which was contingent upon the College structure. Mr. Betts spoke against the amendment noting that the Faculty last September had decided that the package should be presented as a single question on the plebiscite. Mr. Kennedy maintained that the Faculty of Arts and Science had never sat as a body to consider the detailed issues associated with the proposal. There had been some considerable concern about the unnecessary bureaucracy associated with the proposed college.

The amendment was **defeated**.

Following an explanation by Mr. Betts that 57% of those voting in the Faculty of Arts and Science had voted in favour of the principle recommendations of the Smith committee, Ms. Ozier suggested that it was more correct to explicitly state the majority "of those voting", not the "majority of the Faculty". Mr. Kennedy was concerned about the creation of another level of bureaucracy. In his view the Smith Report did not go far enough in its proposed compromise. A real split would have been preferable. Ms. Stern sought clarification regarding the administration of the budget of the Transition Year Program referred to on page 8. Mr. R. Smith indicated that the director would administer the budget which would be controlled by the Provost. At this point, the Chair reminded members that APC was putting forward the principle recommendations, rather than the details in the report, for discussion. Ms. Fingard asked whether the proposal had been considered by FPC. She was informed by Mr. Wien that this was not the case. She then inquired whether comparative costs of improving the current administration rather than creation of a new structure had been investigated. Mr. R. Smith read out figures from the Dean of Arts and Science comparing the costs of the present administrative structure and a split Faculty.

Mr. Andrews observed that it would be difficult for the directors of TYP and of Education to report to a different Dean every year, who would have different attitudes regarding programs and structure. He accepted the administrative cost figures produced by Mr. Betts, but was not persuaded that the proposed costs of separate Faculties were realistic. He believed that APC and FPC should be asked where the funds would come from to support two separate Faculties and the operation of a College. He agreed with Ms. Fingard that financing of the operation might be at the expense of academic programs in the long term. Mr. Betts confirmed for Ms. Ozier that the corrected figures had been presented to Senate. Mr. Braybrooke explained that the purpose of the College was to provide opportunity to continue to work together on issues where collaboration had been effective in the past, such as tenure and promotion and curriculum development. He did not anticipate more than one or two meetings a year of the College itself. Mr. Betts commented that TYP was currently under unit review and three budget

possibilities were being considered. He explained that an additional Dean and a Dean's secretary would be required. This would represent approximately \$100,000 in addition to the budget base. However, he predicted that the streamlining associated with the reduction of Faculty time devoted currently to administration could permit this expenditure. Ms. Dykstra believed that the proposed College structure would increase costs without obvious benefits. She questioned whether Colleges should be set up across the university simply because of interdisciplinary activities.

Mr. Kennedy did not expect that a College structure would ensure enhanced communication. Further, separate Faculties of Arts and Science could communicate without an overarching College.

Mr. R. Smith clarified that the proposal had been based on a careful survey of faculty member attitudes at the time. Communication was perceived as a desirable feature of the present system. The proposal emerged as a response to comments received and also from a review of structures at other universities. He added that the report suggested that the Faculty of Arts and the Faculty of Science would also meet as a College to consider curricula and other issues. TYP and Education involved both arts and science disciplines, and hence, were separated out from the two Faculties. Ms. Fingard asked how the motion would be implemented if carried. Would it go to FPC for a detailed study of costs? Mr. W.E. Jones replied that if Senate approved the basic restructuring, the detailed mechanisms would be up to the Faculties and College. Mr. Betts thought that the approved motion would need to be referred back to the Faculty of Arts and Science to make decisions regarding mechanisms, elections, acting deans, departments distributed in the two Faculties, governing committees, etc.

Mr. Kennedy wondered what would happen next. Senate had not approved the body of the report which led to the major recommendations. Hence, the Faculty of Arts and Science could not have recourse to the document. He agreed that the two new Faculties should suggest their own structure and decide the details of implementation. The Chair concurred. Ms. Zayid inquired whether Board approval was required. She asked about the budgetary implications for the coming year. Mr. Sinclair confirmed that the proposed restructuring would be presented to the Board. Acting deans would have to be appointed and the exact budget determined once the structure was in place. Mr. Andrews maintained that conditions should not be imposed upon the new Faculties in terms of procedures to be adopted regarding tenure and promotion, etc. Mr. Andrews clarified for Mr. Hall that students were admitted to degree programs not to a College. Mr. Geldart recognized the benefits and timeliness of the proposal.

The question was called. The **motion carried**.

The Chair confirmed for Mr. R. Smith that Senate would receive further reports and recommendations regarding details of implementation for information only. The President's Office would appoint two acting deans. Ms. Ritchie sought assurance that the immediate costs of implementation would be assumed by the current Faculty of Arts and Science. The Chair understood that this was the case, as the budget was essentially fixed for 1988-89, and as no costs should be associated with the College. Ms. Ritchie wondered how the additional FTE academic administration position would be funded. Mr. Betts believed that the costs could depend on whether the position was open to internal or external candidates. However, this was not a matter for Senate to decide. Ms. Ozier contended that the constitution of the new Faculty of Arts and the new Faculty of Science would not be that outlined in the Report of the Smith Committee as this report no longer had status. Separate consideration of tenure and promotion and curricula in Faculties was therefore a possibility.

88:027.

Report of the Senate Advisory Committee on Computing

The "Annual Report to the President and Senate for the Year 1986-87" had been precirculated.

It was agreed upon motion (Betts/S. Cameron)

that the 1986-87 annual Report of the Senate Advisory Committee on Computing be received.

88:028.

President's 1985/86 and 1986/87 Annual Reports on the Policy for Increasing the Proportion of Female Faculty

The two annual reports had been predistributed to Senators with the agenda. Ms. Ritchie asked for the exact wording of the Affirmative Action Policy. Vice-President Sinclair read the terminology from the Collective Agreement. Ms. Ritchie then requested a definition of "significantly superior". The Vice-President indicated that this was not defined precisely on a university-wide basis. Mr. Betts observed that these decisions were best handled at the departmental level. Ms. Oore wanted to know what was being done to monitor the procedures at every step, including discrepancies in job descriptions and requirements for appointments. Were the offers rejected by women monitored for salaries? She predicted that the comparability study would indeed reveal discrepancies in pay for equal work. Mr. Sinclair thought that these facts could be reviewed and made available to Senate. He sensed that the affirmative action policy was being taken seriously by the majority of departments and that the policy had made a difference. The required form forced departments to think about the issue. Mr. Betts added that the statement on affirmative action was included in all advertisements. Offers of salary were limited at the upper end by the budget situation and at the lower end by the Y value. Ms. Oore requested that a position description be appended to the form and that the salaries offered to the short list of people be identified in future. Mr. Andrews added that the higher rate of attrition for women at Dalhousie should also be investigated.

Ms. Ozier wished to see salaries for women who declined offers and salaries accepted versus those declined and accepted by men. Mr. Sinclair agreed to attempt to elicit this information from the Deans for 1985-86. He reiterated that the President had set up a committee to inquire into the question of comparability.

88:029.

Matters of Information

The following items were precirculated for information:

- Information on Estimated Energy Costs
- Dalhousie's response to the Community College Discussion Paper
- Memo on Development Consultants

88:030.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:01 P.M.