

Item: Senate Minutes, January 1989

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 January 1989. 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, 9 January 1989 at 4:00 p.m.
Present with Mr. W.E. Jones in the chair were the following:

Andrews, Archibald, Atherton, Barkow, Betts, Birdsall, Bissett-Johnson, Borwein, Braybrooke, Brett, Burns, Byham, D. Cameron, S. Cameron, Campbell, Carruthers, Christie, Clark, Courtney, Cross, Cummings, Curri, Duff, Dykstra, Flint, Forgay, J. Fraser, Frick, Friedrich, Gamberg, Geldart, Graham, Greenfield, Haley, J. Hall, Hart, Hawkins, Imrie, Keddy, Kerans, Kimmins, Kwak, Leffek, LoLordo, Lutley, MacRae, Maloney, Mason, McAllister, McDermott, McKee, McNulty, Medioli, Myers, O'Shea, Ozier, Pross, Ravindra, Retallack, Richards, Ritchie, Ruiz-Salvador, Ryall, M. Sandhu, Schenk, Schotch, Silvert, Smith, Stairs, P. Stewart, Stuttard, H. Taylor, Tindall, Vance, Walker, Williams, Writer.

Regrets: Belzer, Egan, Gold, Gratwick, J. Jones, Konok, Miller, M. Stewart, Tamlyn, M. Tan, Wassersug, C. Williams.

Before the main business of the meeting, the Chair noted that the Secretary was ill and unable to attend. It was agreed that Ms. H. Taylor would act as recording secretary for the meeting.

89:001.

Minutes of Previous Meetings

The minutes of the meeting of 12 December 1988 were approved upon motion (Byham/Dykstra) with the following corrections: Pg. 1, 88:136 change "wholly determined" to "wholly binding". Pg. 2, paragraph 1 was stricken from the record. Pg. 7, the word "harassment" was misspelled four times. Pg. 4, paragraph 1, last line, add "and Vice-Chair" after "Chair".

Mr. Braybrooke believed that at this meeting a name change for the Faculty of Management Studies took place, yet had not been recorded. The Chair indicated the notes from the meeting would be reviewed.

[Note: On subsequent review of the Secretary's notes for the meeting, it was discovered that the following item appeared on the agenda as #7 but was omitted from the recorded proceedings.

Change in the Name of the Faculty of Management Studies

President Clark moved, seconded by S. Imrie

that Senate approve the change in name of the Faculty of Management Studies to the Faculty of Management.

Mr. Braybrooke asked what might be accomplished by this change. Brief discussion following during which Dean McNiven explained that this title was more appropriate to the activities of the Faculty and more in line with similar units at other universities.

The motion **carried**.

The minutes of the meeting of 19 December 1988 were approved upon motion (Ritchie/Betts) with the following corrections: Betts, Ravindra, Carter and Brett were present. Hart and O'Shea were members, not observers. Pg. 2, paragraph 3, line 7, "2" should read "2.5".

89:002.

IN CAMERA - Tabling of Names of Honorary Degree Candidates

The Chair of the Honorary Degrees Committee, President Clark, tabled the names of sixteen individuals who will be voted upon by Senate members at the February 13, 1989 meeting. Those approved might receive the degrees at the Spring Convocation or at a later date. More detailed biographical information was available in the Senate Office for perusal by interested members. The importance of strict confidentiality was stressed.

89:003.

Meeting of Some Senators on November 14 1988

The Chair explained that at the December 12, 1988 meeting some senators asked to have the minutes of a meeting which took place on November 14, 1988 (Tennis Court Meeting) circulated for approval as official Senate minutes. These minutes were circulated along with a memo stating the views of the Chair of Senate in this regard.

Mr. Braybrooke began discussion by circulating a document (appended) outlining his arguments for acceptance of the meeting of November 14 as a regular Senate meeting. He proceeded to present his argument and concluded by expressing the opinion that since the regular Senate meeting of November 14, 1988 had not been properly canceled, the "Tennis Court Meeting" was valid and therefore the minutes of that meeting should be adopted.

Mr. Graham expressed the view that the issue was not whether the Steering Committee was correct in its decision to cancel the meeting, but whether a group of Senators can have a meeting on their own without following usual procedures of Senate. He pointed out that the Tennis Court Meeting was not called by officers of Senate in accordance with procedures nor was it widely publicized. He believed acceptance of the minutes in question would undermine Senate and lead to the eventual destruction of the governing body. He urged the proposers of the minutes to retreat in order to maintain the integrity of Senate.

Mr. Cross wondered what the constitution had to say on matters such as the capacity of the Steering Committee to cancel meetings and the necessity of the presence of the Officers of Senate for a legally constituted meeting. Mr. Jones, in response to the questions of Mr. Cross, indicated the constitution is essentially silent on the cancellation of meetings and the required presence of officers, however there are rules of procedure regarding election of new officers. He explained that 4 out of 7 members of the Steering Committee were available the day of the meeting and had to make a decision. Of the 3 other members, 1 had resigned, 1 was on strike and 1 was out of town. The Steering Committee considered its options about whether they had the right to cancel the meeting and although they were not certain, they believed they had the power based on the following facts: (1) the Steering Committee has been given the power by Senate to cancel meetings in the summer and (2) Senate has agreed in the past that there should not be meetings of Senate held during a strike unless urgent issues arise. Mr. Jones believed it would have been more effective for Senate to set up a committee to look at the rules in this area rather than circulating the minutes of the November 14, 1988 Meeting.

Mr. Borwein agreed the Tennis Court Meeting was not properly called and was an irregular meeting in an irregular situation, but he believed it was the closest they could come to a regular meeting under the circumstances.

Mr. Betts related his experience on the afternoon of the Tennis Court Meeting, explaining that he went to the Senate and Board Room at 3:50 p.m. He encountered a group of approximately 50 people who had just read the cancellation notice and he was informed by this group that there was going to be a meeting on the Tennis Courts. He questioned the absence of the Chair, Secretary and Vice-Chair and was told a new Chair and Secretary would be elected at the meeting. Mr. Betts declined going to the meeting. However, he observed that no notice of the Tennis Court Meeting had been posted nor was anyone left behind to inform other Senators about the meeting. This left a very unrepresentative group of Senators present at the Tennis Court Meeting. Mr. Betts expressed concern about recognizing this as an official meeting of Senate. He believed such action would undermine the credibility of Senate.

Mr. Tindall questioned why certain people were notified by phone about the cancellation of the Senate meeting. Mr. Jones responded that the DFA office was phoned at approximately 2:00 because of the unusual circumstances and notices were posted on the two doors of the Senate and Board Room and 2-3 entrances of the A & A Building. No other individuals or groups had been specifically informed of the cancellation.

Mr. Smith pointed out that the decisions taken at the Tennis Court Meeting have been superseded by a regular meeting of Senate. He suggested that the Tennis Court Meeting could be recognized as an irregular meeting of Senate because of the questionable nature of the Steering Committee's decision.

Mr. Braybrooke suggested that the meeting of 14 November 1988 be recognized as having been the regular meeting of Senate called for that day, because it was not duly canceled. He explained that he was not suggesting that any group of Senators could, by themselves, call a meeting. In this case, there was a regular meeting scheduled, which these people came to attend. He stressed the need to make more adequate provisions for canceling meetings as well as other provisions which do not fit into the employee/employer model. He recommended that the minutes be adopted, but the main point in doing so was to check unrestrained use of power. He hoped a committee could be struck to look into matters of constitutional change.

It was moved (Braybrooke/Medioli):

that the record of the meeting of 14 November 1988 be adopted as a regular meeting of Senate.

Mr. Christie clarified that there were two major concerns being discussed. These were the power of the Steering Committee to cancel meetings and the concern about any group of Senators being able to hold a Senate Meeting. He suggested that both of these concerns could be dealt with by charging the Steering Committee or a sub-committee to make recommendations about the role of Senate in the context of a strike. This would avoid the necessity of passing the above motion.

Mr. Jones read from the "Constitutional Provisions Governing the Operations of Senate", information about the function of the Steering Committee. Mr. Andrews expressed the opinion that the Steering Committee does not have the right to cancel meetings. He pointed out that the key words in the constitution were "on the basis of a schedule". He indicated that discussion of the issue of summer meetings of Senate was whether the regular meeting would be held; not that the Steering Committee would be able to cancel meetings. Mr. Jones agreed that the regulations were not clear and explained that the Steering Committee did what they thought was right.

Mr. D. Cameron believed that the appropriate procedures for canceling meetings should be focussed on and that Senate should be cautious in formulating such procedures. He pointed out that passing the proposed motion would only deal with one particular meeting and not future meetings.

Mr. Fraser believed that Mr. Braybrooke's analysis was irrelevant to the legal situation of a strike. He could not see anything which would exempt functioning at a Senate meeting or other Senate activities during a strike. His interpretation of the cancellation notice was that in light of the fact that striking members could not attend the meeting, it would be canceled. It seemed to him to be a clear case of attempting to protect the rights of both sides. He wondered what would have happened if another group of Senators went off and held the same type of meeting at the same time.

In response to Mr. Fraser's last point, Mr. Stuttard pointed out that a subsequent meeting of Senate would decide, which, if either, of two such simultaneous meetings would be accepted as a proper meeting. He added that the Tennis Court Meeting was held for a reason, that being the debate of an important motion, one that was subsequently passed at a regular Senate meeting. The current debate was whether to accept the minutes of a meeting which took place at a duly scheduled time.

Mr. Jones commented that it is the normal practice of Senate not to accept motions unless they have been circulated to members in advance. For the Tennis Court Meeting there was no notice of motion circulated in advance, nor was there a request from five Senators to hold a meeting.

Ms. Vance indicated that she was not convinced about the legitimacy of the Tennis Court Meeting but was concerned about the process for canceling the original meeting. She was also concerned about four people deciding the fate of a legislative body. She believed it was a gesture of goodwill to not hold Senate meetings during a strike. However, the strike began on November 4 and the Senate meeting of November 14 could have been canceled then, instead of the day of the meeting. It was noted that the student union was given no notice of the cancellation. Ms. Vance suggested that the fact that the motions were passed at a subsequent meeting indicates how important they were. She also noted that the motions passed were not new but simply a definition of old motions.

Mr. Friedrich believed that the goal of the strike was to shut down the university. He could not see how academic self government could continue in this event.

Mr. Barkow proposed that the real issue to be considered was the formulation of a set of procedures, during a strike, for cancellation of meetings. He proposed the following amendment to the motion: **that Senate request its Chair to strike a committee to propose to Senate a set of procedures for calling and canceling Senate meetings during times of a legal strike.** This amendment was ruled out of order.

Mr. Braybrooke indicated that after the current motion was voted upon he would propose a second motion that Senate strike a committee to review the mechanisms for canceling and rescheduling meetings. Mr. Borwein spoke in favor of voting on the current motion before considering other motions.

Mr. Graham pointed out that regular members of Senate are members by virtue of their position as full professors. It was his opinion that being on strike as professors, would also mean being on strike in terms of administration. He urged that the motion be withdrawn.

Mr. Brett commented that he would not like to see a precedent set here regarding cancellation. He believed that if the scheduled meeting was not properly canceled, then there was a meeting and the minutes should be accepted.

Mr. Braybrooke concluded discussion by stating that going on strike does not necessarily renounce all relations between the faculty and university. Research is still carried out in essential cases. He summarized that the issue was to accept the minutes of a meeting considered to be regular because it was held at the same time as the regular meeting, which was not properly canceled. Accepting these minutes would not mean that any meeting of Senators would be legitimate, because of the fact that this was the regular meeting.

The Motion **failed**.

It was moved (Braybrooke/Cummings)

that Senate expresses its misgivings about the adequacy of the constitutional provisions for canceling meetings of Senate and calls upon the Steering Committee to set up a special committee of three Senators to look into this matter as a subject for early report; further,

that Senate asks this committee or a second committee set up for this purpose to consider what provision could be made even during a strike for continuing respect for aspects of the relation between members of faculty and the University that may not fit the employer/employee model and need not be regarded as suspended during a strike.

Mr. Pross suggested that the Committee on Committees would be the appropriate Committee to nominate the proposed Committee, not the Steering Committee.

Mr. Jones suggested that Mr. Braybrooke draft a formal motion which could be circulated and brought forward at the January 23 meeting. Mr. Braybrooke agreed to this suggestion.

89:004.

Policy for Scheduling Final Examinations and Spring Convocations

The Chair pointed out that the Committee on Academic Administration has established a policy for scheduling final examinations and this documentation was circulated for information.

Criteria for Professional Suitability/Required Withdrawal from the BSW Programs

Mr. Jones indicated that the Committee on Academic Administration has been considering these criteria for some time and a policy has been established. He believed it would be appropriate for Senate to give sanction to this document which has been considered very carefully by MSSW and University Legal Counsel.

It was moved (Clark/Curri)

that Senate approve the Criteria for Professional Suitability and Required Withdrawal from the BSW Programs.

Mr. Myers expressed concern about criteria #3 and requested assurance that it was not in contradiction with the Charter of Rights. Mr. Clark reported that the University Legal Counsel had looked at all the criteria and believed they were not contrary to the Charter of Rights.

There was some question about whether "medical behavior" or "medical condition or behavior" was being discussed.

The motion **carried**.

89:005.

Adjournment

The Chair noted that the agenda items not considered at this meeting would be carried forward to the January 23 agenda. The meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY

MINUTES OF SENATE MEETING

SENATE met in regular session in the Senate and Board Room on Monday, 23 January 1989 at 4:00 p.m.

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

Andrews, Antoft, Arnold, Atherton, Barkow, Beaumont, Belzer, Betts, Birdsall, Bissett-Johnson, Borwein, R. Boyd, Braybrooke, Brett, Burns, Byham, T.S. Cameron, B. Christie, I. Christie, Clark, Courtney, Cromwell, de Burger, Dykstra, Friedrich, Geldart, Graham, Gratwick, Gray, Haley, J. Hall, Hart, Hawkins, James, D. Jones, Kerans, Kimmins, Klassen, Kwak, Leffek, Lutley, M. MacDonald, Maloney, Mason, McDermott, McKee, Medioli, Mehn-Anderson, Montalvo, S. Murray, O'Shea, Ozier, Pross, Retallack, Richards, Ritchie, Roberts, Rulz-Salvador, Ryall, Schenk, Silvert, Stairs, P. Stewart, Storey, Stuttard, H. Taylor, Tindall, Vance, Walker, D. Williams, Young, Zentilli.

Regrets: Archibald, Carruthers, Casey, Gold, Konok, Miller, M. Tan, Zakariasen.

89:006.

Consideration of Notice of Motion

Mr. Belzer introduced the motion by describing an incident which occurred a number of years ago in which a student had submitted a plagiarized document in his faculty. It appeared that the student had done this in several classes but no formal action had been taken. The student ended up getting a degree. As a result of this case, it has been policy in the Department of Recreation, Physical and Health Education to bring such cases to the attention of the Senate Discipline Committee, not necessarily for penalty, but to make sure it never happens again. Mr. Belzer felt that passing the proposed motion would ensure these things did not occur in the future. A student would not be able to use the excuse of ignorance after a second charge has been made.

It was moved and seconded (Belzer/Maloney)

That Senate instruct its Discipline Committee not to include a test of intent in determining whether an alleged act of plagiarism in fact occurred. However, if the Committee finds that plagiarism, as defined in the University's Undergraduate Calendar (1988/89, p. 17, "the presentation by one author of the work of another author, in such a way as to give one's reader reason to think that the other author's work is one's own"), has occurred, the question of intent is appropriate in deciding what, if any, penalty ought to be imposed.

A letter received from the Chair of the Senate Discipline Committee, J. Yogis, circulated at the meeting, expressed opposition to the motion. In his letter, Prof. Yogis stressed the fact that there are consequences which follow the offense of plagiarism once a case has been filed, e.g. loss of credit, annotation on transcript. He points out that the question of intent has always been relevant in determining cases of plagiarism. In the Yogis letter it is reported that since January 1985, 15 cases of alleged plagiarism have been considered. In 11 of these it was found that the offense had occurred.

Ms. S. Murray, representing the Student Advocacy Service, expressed concern about the motion in relation to their ability to represent students in plagiarism cases. She made the point that intent is an essential element in the proof of plagiarism and has to be a consideration. She indicated that ramifications of such an offense have to be taken into consideration.

Mr. Gray, a member of the Senate Discipline Committee, expressed his opposition to the motion stating that intent is fundamental to a determination of guilt or innocence in a plagiarism case. He believed the Senate Discipline Committee would find it difficult to operate without this consideration.

In response to a question about how the Senate Discipline Committee determines intent, Ms. Ozier explained that two students, two faculty and a chair on the Senate Discipline Committee hold a hearing at which time the student in question is able to make a presentation. The Committee questions the student and then makes a determination as to whether intent was present or not. Ms. Ozier opposed the motion, however she recognized there may be a problem with plagiarism on campus. She had the opinion that the proposed motion would not make it any easier for the individual professor to bring charges against a student.

It was believed by some Senators that there may be a problem on campus communicating to students how plagiarism will be defined. Mr. Medioli indicated he has marked many papers and put comments on them about plagiarism, realizing that the students don't know they're doing something wrong.

Ms. Vance added that one paragraph in the university calendar was not enough to teach students about plagiarism. She believed that many students don't read the calendar word for word, and that foreign students may not understand what it means. Ms. Vance suggested the motion did not read properly in terms of the definition of plagiarism.

Mr. Barkow indicated that his department sends out a document on plagiarism at the beginning of each session, and they have not seen many cases of plagiarism in the last seven years.

Mr. Brett clarified that there were two issues being discussed. The first was the question of whether knowledge of the rules is expected of students, and the second was whether a person has to act intentionally in terms of plagiarism. In his opinion the motion should address whether individuals are required to know what the rules are.

Mr. Christie believed that there was a third element to the discussion, that being the case of a student knowing they are doing something wrong but being ignorant of the rules. It was his opinion that the Committee should be looking at whether the student has the knowledge that what they are doing is wrong. Mr. Andrews questioned what intent was being discussed. He explained -that plagiarism by definition is an intentional offense. He suggested Mr. Christie's statements did not constitute plagiarism.

Mr. Belzer concluded the discussion by indicating that the intent of the motion was to have cases of plagiarism reported to the Senate Discipline Committee, not for the purpose of penalty but for the purpose of having a record so that ignorance could not be used as an excuse if plagiarism occurred more than once. He found no quarrel with the university definition of plagiarism. Ms. Ozier pointed out that any cases brought before the Senate Discipline Committee would result in an annotation on the student's academic record which would remain for 5 years. Mr. W. Jones believed this was a Senate regulation.

Mr. Belzer moved to vote on the motion and suggested that if it was defeated the regulations in this area should be reviewed. He believed professors should be expected to report cases of plagiarism and that the regulations of the Senate Discipline Committee should be changed in such a way that if intent was found not to be present the issue could be kept in the records but not on the student's transcripts.

The motion was defeated.

89:007.

Consideration of Notice of Motion

Mr. Braybrooke introduced the motion by indicating he wanted to revise the second part slightly by adding the following "according to its judgement by the Committee on Committees and set up" to the second line after the words "set up", and adding the words "lockout or n before the word strike in two places in the motion.

It was moved and seconded (Braybrooke/Borwein)

That Senate expresses its misgivings about the adequacy of the constitutional provisions for canceling meetings of Senate and calls upon the Committee on Committees to set up a special committee of three Senators to look into this matter as a subject for early report; further,

That Senate asks this committee or a second committee set up according to its judgement by the Committee on Committees and set up for this purpose to consider what provision could be made even during a lockout or strike for continuing respect for aspects of the relation between members of faculty and the University that may not fit the employer/employee model and need not be regarded as suspended during a lockout or strike.

Mr. Andrews suggested, as a friendly amendment, changing the word "University" to "Board"; Mr. Braybrooke disagreed with the friendly amendment.

Mr. Braybrooke pointed out that there were anomalies on both sides during the strike and there was agreement that it was questionable whether cancellation of the Senate meeting was legal or not. He agreed with avoiding meetings during a strike unless absolutely necessary and on neutral grounds. He suggested that many matters could be considered by the proposed committee in the second part of the motion. These included the following whether Senate Committees should continue functioning during a strike or lockout; decisions about holding oral examinations for graduate students who had made arrangements long in advance; should striking faculty members be able to receive mail; arrangements could be made whereby Senate would meet automatically two days after discontinuation of a strike or lockout; and, research grant procedures. Mr. Braybrooke emphasized that he was not asking for specific legislation of the recommendations of the proposed committee but that these matters be considered. Dr. W. Jones indicated that both of the proposed committees would report to Senate for discussion of their findings.

Mr. Christie expressed the opinion that the two parts of the motion should be voted upon separately. He also offered a friendly amendment to the first part of the motion by suggesting that the words "calling and" be added before the word "canceling" in the second line. Mr. Braybrooke agreed with the friendly amendment.

Mr. Kimmins proposed another friendly amendment and suggested that a sentence be added about requirements for adequate notice of motion. Mr. Braybrooke agreed with this but suggested it be moved as another motion and that the proposed committee in the second part of the motion could look at the issue.

Mr. Graham commented that he did not feel misgivings about the constitutional provisions for canceling meetings and he **moved**, seconded by E. Belzer,

that the following phrase be removed from the motion: "expresses its misgivings about the adequacy of the constitutional provisions for calling and canceling meetings of Senate and".

Mr. Borwein expressed the opinion that it should be on record that there were misgivings about the constitutional provisions. Ms. Ozier questioned the reasoning behind removing the phrase and to this Mr. Graham responded that it would make the motion more acceptable. Mr. Andrews questioned what the constitutional provisions stated in this regard.

The amendment failed.

Mr. Pross proposed a friendly amendment .o change the words "set up" to "nominate" and this was agreed to.

It was moved and seconded (Betts/Christie)

that the motion be split into two motions.

The amendment to separate the motion passed.

The first motion as amended **passed**. It reads:

That Senate expresses its misgivings about the adequacy of the constitutional provisions for calling and canceling meetings of Senate and calls upon the Committee on Committees to nominate a special committee of three Senators to look into the matter as a subject for early report.

Discussion turned to the second motion of the split motion. Mr. Graham indicated that he found the motion distressing. He found it difficult to see how a professor could be on strike and still participate in University business. He believed if there were exceptions to be made during a strike with regard to the duties of a professor they were best handled in the Collective Agreement. He expressed the opinion that the motion allows the opportunity for Senate to be used as a tool during a strike.

Mr. Kerans indicated that these are the kinds of issues which would be addressed by the proposed committee. He believed that to set out agreed upon rules would preclude the possibility and render lengthy strikes less likely.

Mr. Roberts, the Senate representative on the Investment Committee, indicated that the Investment Committee met on neutral grounds during the strike because irreparable harm could have come to the investments if the meeting had not taken place. He said it would have been helpful to him if the type of guidelines being discussed had been in place at that time.

There was question as to whether the proposed committee could be a joint Senate/Board Committee. Mr. Braybrooke didn't rule out the idea of the Committee on Committees nominating some Board members to this committee.

Dr. Clark indicated that the wording of the motion gave him some difficulty. He felt it was not clear who defines the aspects of the relationship between the university and faculty which don't fit the Employee/Employer relationship. He believed that a committee could address the issues and avoid difficulties in the future, but that would require a different motion than that presented.

Mr. Christie believed the membership of such a committee would have to recognize they have a great deal of work in front of them. He predicted the task would not be completed easily, if ever. Mr. Braybrooke agreed there would be a lot of complex issues to consider which may never be resolved. The proposed committee would try to attend to the urgent questions and report appropriately.

Ms. Ozier pointed out that most of the suffering resulting from the strike rested with the students because of the lack of proper communication. She believed this added to student uncertainty and could have been avoided.

Mr. Cromwell urged Senate to get off the topic of past difficulties and get on with the future. He believed the motion, if successful, would dwell on problems of the past. Mr. Braybrooke replied that he was not concerned with planning for a future strike but, that lessons be learned from the recent strike and provisions made for future strikes.

In response to a question about the anticipated size of the proposed committee, it was indicated that it would be up to the Committee on Committees, but it was hoped that the committee would be reasonably small.

The main motion as amended **carried**. It reads:

That Senate asks this committee or a second committee nominated according to its judgement by the Committee on Committees and set up for this purpose to consider what provision could be made even during a lockout or strike for continuing respect for aspects of the relation between members of faculty and the University that may not fit the employer/employee model and need not be regarded as suspended during a lockout or strike.

89:008.

Report of the President

Mr. Jones noted that the original report of the President had been circulated at the January 9 meeting. An addendum to that report was circulated at the beginning of this meeting. (Both Appended)

The President briefly outlined the details in the report. The January 9 report made reference to four items: The Adlington Report on the funding formula and the MPHEC Schedule associated with it, Communications, Mission Statement and Recent Faculty Accomplishments.

The Addendum to the President's Report updated progress on the Mission Statement and President Clark indicated that comments on the Mission Statement would be received until the end of February. Recent activities of the Board of Governors were also reported in the Addendum, including a motion regarding approval of program proposals, and the terms of reference and composition of the Committee on Financial Strategy.

Mr. Williams urged that an important document such as the Mission Statement should go through the process of organized discussion at the departmental level. President Clark agreed with the importance of having wide circulation and indicated that it is currently a draft document and comments would be welcomed before February 28, at which time changes can be made. It was expected the document would be circulated again after revisions were made. It was pointed out that as a result of the Adlington Report, MPHEC may request a copy of the Mission Statement earlier than expected.

Ms. Ozier requested clarification on the deferral of Implementation of the M.A. in International Development Studies. It struck her as a dangerous precedent and she questioned how long the deferral would be. President Clark indicated that the Committee on Financial Strategy will have its first meeting next week and it was hoped a report would be ready by June. Deferral would be no longer than necessary.

Attention was drawn to the fact that over 20 new programs have been approved in the last few years and in almost every case the statement had been made that there would be no additional costs, yet well over \$100,000 has been added to the budget. There have been instances of programs being proposed under the premise of no additional costs yet costs have become substantial for various reasons. It has become apparent that these things need to be looked at.

Mr. Stairs pointed out that if the M.A. in International Development Studies had been approved, the library would have brought forth a Redistribution Fund Application in the amount of \$5000 for the program's library acquisitions. This would have been \$5000 unavailable to the current programs. He explained that costs of new programs are always present and will sooner or later drain the current resources. He recognized that it is not an easy decision, but given the financial situation decisions have to be made.

Ms. Ozier indicated she did not disagree with the arguments but was concerned that this policy would not be applied to all programs. She did not want to see a political system develop of packing meetings when certain programs are to be passed. Mr. Borwein believed that administrative programs should suffer the same roadblocks as academic programs. President Clark explained that this would be difficult because the university has no control over some costs because of regulations which have to be applied.

89:009.

Nomination to University Public Relations Committee

Mr. Pross moved the nomination of S. Frick (Henson College) to the University Public Relations Committee. Following three calls for further nominations, S. Frick was declared elected.

89:010.

Adjournment

It was noted that the next meeting would begin with Question Period and the remainder of today's agenda would follow. The meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.