

Item: Senate Minutes, April 1992
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 April 1992. The documents have been ordered chronologically and made OCR for ease of searching. The original documents and additional documents for this year which have not yet been digitized can be found in the Dalhousie University Senate fonds (UA-5) at the Dalhousie University Archives and Special Collections.

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

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

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY
MINUTES
OF
SENATE MEETING

Senate met in regular session on Monday, 13 April 1992 at 4:00 p.m. in the Senate and Board Room.

Present with Mr. K. Dunn in the chair were:

Andrews, Banerjee, Bankier, Barkow, Bérard, Birdsall, Brett, D.M. Cameron, Carlson, Carruthers, R.F. Chandler, Clark, Clarke, Clovis, Corvin, Cross, Cummings, Curri, Dykstra, Eberhardt, Fingard, Frick, Fullerton, Gilroy, Girard, J.D. Gray, Grossert, D.W. Jones, Kimmins, Kwak, Laidlaw, Manson, McIntyre, McKee, Melanson, Mills, Nowakowski, Parker, Pross, Ruggles, Sherwin, Silvert, A.M. Simpson, K. Smith, Stairs, Stuttard, J.E. Sutherland, Thomas, Tindall, Walker, Welch, Wien, Young.

Invitees: P. Chylek, M. Francis, C. Robinson, J. Spurr.

Regrets: Angelopoulos, Arklie, Bradfield, A.D. Cohen, B. Christie, Fitzgerald, Haley, Hare, J.V. Jones, L.C. MacLean, Maloney, Murray, Purdy, Ritchie, M.J. Stewart, Sullivan, M.H. Tan, Wassersug, Zakariasen.

The meeting was called to order at 4:05 p.m.

92:040.

Alterations to the Agenda

Mr. Dunn pointed out that item #7 on the Agenda -- "Relations between Faculty Members and the

University during a Strike or Lockout" -- referred to enclosures on that topic which had been requested at the previous Senate meeting and should have been listed as a "For Information" item.

Mr. Dunn also noted that the enclosure related to item #6 -- "Proposed Policy on Racism and Sexism" -- had been miscopied and that most members of Senate received only part of the documentation. He suggested, therefore, and it was agreed that this item should be deferred until the meeting of 29 April. He called on members of Senate who wished to submit written comments on this proposal to forward them to the Senate Office.

92:041.

Minutes of the Meeting of 9 March 1992

The minutes of the meeting of 9 March 1992 were approved upon motion (R. Carlson/J. Fingard).

92:042.

Nomination to the Senate Committee on Committees

On behalf of the Senate Steering Committee, Mr. Bérard nominated the following individual to the Senate Committee on Committees:

Mr. F. Ian MacLean (Medicine)

Following the requisite calls for further nominations, the individual named was declared elected.

92:043.

President's 1990-91 Annual Report to the Senate on the Policy for Increasing the Proportion of Female Faculty

Mr. Clark presented his annual report (previously circulated) outlining progress achieved in implementing the University's policy for increasing the proportion of female faculty. Mr. Stuttard pointed out that there appeared to be a typographical error in the first two lines of page 8 of the report. Mr. Stairs said that the first line should begin "A total of seven (7) candidates ..., etc."

It was moved (H. Clark/J. Walker)

that Senate receive the report.

The motion carried.

92:044.

Report of the Coordinating Committee for Measures to Promote Indigenous Black and Native Participation

Mr. McKee presented a report (previously circulated) from the Coordinating Committee for Measures to Promote Indigenous Black and Native Participation. He explained that this Committee was called into being to oversee the implementation of recommendations made in the report of MacKay Task Force, "Breaking the Barriers". The report also sets forth the initiatives planned by the Committee for the coming year. Mr. McKee acknowledged the work done by the Committee, particularly his co-chair, Ms. W. Thomas-Bernard and the previous co-chair, Mr. F. Wien.

It was moved (F. Wien/J. Bankier)

that Senate receive the report.

The motion carried.

92:045.

Atmospheric Science Program

Mr. Carlson, on behalf of the Senate Academic Planning Committee, outlined the history of the proposed graduate program in atmospheric science (previously circulated) and summarized the discussion of the proposal at SAPC and SFPC. He added that the two committees had recommended that Senate approve the program and noted that immediate approval would allow students currently in programs related to the field of atmospheric science to graduate with an atmospheric science designation on their degrees.

It was moved (R. Carlson/E. Mills)

that Senate approve the proposed graduate program in Atmospheric Science.

Mr. Birdsall said that he did not wish to speak against approval of the program but wanted to comment on remarks made at the meeting of the Senate Financial Planning Committee in discussions of this program. He noted that it was probably the first time that a new graduate program was being recommended while the Library's journal holdings in the subject area were being reduced. Mr. Birdsall also objected to remarks which suggested that the Library's concerns about the adequacy of library holdings reflected a vested interest in maintaining and expanding its overall holdings. He said

also that he was concerned that Mr. Mason's remarks about the approval of the program as formality, despite the inadequacy of available library funding. Mr. Carlson replied that SFPC understood Mr. Mason's comments referred only to the fact that the matter of library funding was incorporated in a 1987 agreement between the President and the academic units involved. It was the view of SFPC that the University should abide by that agreement, despite the fact that library costs have risen to a degree unforeseen in 1987. On the other hand, SFPC is committed to ensuring coverage of full library costs for all new programs.

Mr. Grossert said that he was disturbed that the Senate Library Committee had not been involved in determining the question of the adequacy of library resources for the program. Mr. Stuttard asked if the program had been referred to the Senate Library Committee. Mr. Carlson replied that such a referral had not been made but pointed out that, in recent practice, the issue of library costs has been examined by the Library itself and by the Office of Institutional Affairs, which has sought to mediate disagreements between the Library and the department involved. It was moved (S. Grossert/J. Kwak):

**that the motion be tabled and that the issue
of library costs for the graduate program in
Atmospheric Science be referred to the Senate
Library Committee.**

Mr. Clark, on a point of order, asked if a referral to the Senate Library Committee could occur after approval of the program by Senate. Mr. Carlson replied that the Senate Library Committee has recently clarified its role in the consideration of new programs and would be involved in discussions about library holdings for all new program proposals.

With the unanimous consent of the meeting, the motion to table was withdrawn.

Mr. Andrews expressed concerns about the cost of the program after 1994 and about the reliability of the Federal Government, in view of its recent abandonment of the International Centre for Ocean Development (ICOD) to maintain program funding which had been promised. He said that it was not clear to what extent Dalhousie was taking program decisions on the basis of uncertain government support. Mr. Carlson replied that the Senate Academic Planning Committee had recommended approval of the program without expectations of additional government support. Mr. Clark pointed out that the University and the Faculty of Science, which had given high priority to initiating a program in atmospheric science, understood in 1987 that the Federal Government was committed to providing support for faculty members for five years only.

The question having been called, the motion carried.

92:046.

For Information -- Campus Plan: Information Package from Neighbourhood Residents Committee

Mr. Bérard reported that members of Senate had received in the mailout an information package from a group representing residents in the immediate neighbourhood of the University. This package has also gone to the Senate Physical Planning Committee. At the last meeting of that Committee, Mr. P. Pacey had made a presentation outlining his concerns to particular statements and drawings in the Campus Plan. The Committee was now considering a draft document outlining several principles and propositions drawn from the copyright document -- *A Collective Vision* -- which could be circulated to all members of Senate and be discussed at a future meeting.

Mr. Tindall asked if Dalhousie did not hold the copyright of *A Collective Vision*. Mr. Carlson said that copyright for the document was held by the planner, Mr. B. MacKay-Lyons.

92:047.

Report of the President

Mr. Clark presented his report (appended). He said that all indications from representatives of the Provincial Government suggested that the Government was increasingly serious about pushing forward with rationalization of post-secondary education in Nova Scotia, including a search for economies in the administration of universities. He noted limited progress in inter-university discussions related to geology, primarily an agreement to engage external consultants. At this point, however, agreement had been reached neither on the names of consultants nor on their terms of reference.

Mr. Clark said that the Provincial Government was expected to announce levels of university funding in the next few weeks. He also pointed out that the University would soon begin planning for its next major fund-raising campaign and that his office would set in motion a process to determine the priorities for such a campaign.

Mr. Kwak said that university representatives had discussed and made a report to the Council of Nova Scotia University Presidents (CONSUP) on possible cooperation in the field of chemistry. To date, however, the chemists have no idea what has happened with the report. Mr. Clark replied that the report on chemistry had arisen from an initiative related to cooperation in graduate studies. That report has been forwarded to the Nova Scotia Council on Higher Education (NSCHE), which is currently advertising for a new Chair. CONSUP has been occupying itself with the seven specific subject areas which NSCHE identified as priorities for consideration.

Mr. Andrews asked if CONSUP is resigned to "politics as usual" in the matter of rationalization or if it

intends to undertake a campaign to provide the public with an alternative perspective. He recommended that CONSUP members examine the most recent *Nova Scotia Confederation of University Faculty Associations (NSCUFA) Bulletin* for a comparison of the number of universities per capita in Nova Scotia, other Canadian provinces, and the several states of the United States of America. Mr. Clark thanked Mr. Andrews for the suggestion. He added that he did not wish to give the impression that the Government will be satisfied with minor adjustments to the university system, but at the same time he saw no body willing to tackle seriously the number of post-secondary institutions in Nova Scotia. Many of the smaller institutions were sufficiently specialized as to believe that rationalization was not a significant issue for them, while most of the remaining institutions have been rivals traditionally and found it difficult to cooperate. Some of the institutions were quite prepared to abandon the search for agreement in favour of allowing Government to impose solutions.

Mr. Andrews asked how Dalhousie's external review process served the University in its discussions on rationalization. Mr. Clark replied that, in many fields, Dalhousie was the only university in the Province to conduct full external reviews. He said that the University remains committed to the principle that rationalization should proceed only on the basis of external peer-reviews.

Mr. Bérard noted that the President indicated in his report that the University's Health Studies Task Force had "expressed its interest in the establishment of a Health Promotion Centre for Productive Living programme of the Federal Government". He asked that universities not forget their historic role as centres for liberal studies and unproductive living.

92:048.

Forum on Rationalization

Mr. Dunn announced that Senate was co-sponsoring, with the Dalhousie Faculty Association, the President's Office, the Dalhousie Student Union, and the Dalhousie Staff Association, a Forum on Rationalization, to be held on Tuesday, 28 April 1992, at 1:30 p.m. in the Hudson Auditorium at Henson College. The featured speaker at this Forum will be Ms. Sheila Tolliver, Assistant Vice-Chancellor of the University of Maryland System. An announcement of this Forum is appended with these Minutes.

In response to a question about whether this Forum would be a public forum or one to which other universities would be invited, Mr. Dunn said that the Forum was conceived as an internal event. Ms. Tolliver, he said, would be visiting other institutions during her time in Halifax.

92:049.

Vote of Thanks to the Past Chair of Senate

Mr. Clarke rose to express the appreciation of Senate to its Past Chair, Ms. Patricia Lane. He said that it was an appropriate time to recognize Ms. Lane's many contributions to the work of Senate and the University as a whole. It was moved (B. Clarke/D. Stairs)

**that Senate express to Ms. P. Lane its appreciation
for her service as Chair of Senate from 1989 to 1992.**

The motion carried unanimously.

92:050.

Question Period

Mr. Pross asked if the practice of holding examinations during the last two weeks of classes was no longer discouraged and if the practice was becoming more common. Ms. Curri said that a number of students have been reporting that they have been asked to write examinations outside the official examination schedule. It has been the view of the Registrar's Office that minor examinations, i.e., those which do not cover the work of a whole term, have been permissible during the last two weeks of class. She added that a study done by her office suggests that there is a growing number of examinations held outside the official examination schedule. Mr. Stairs said that he too understood that the numbers of "unofficial" final examinations was increasing, and he noted that this would have the effect of shortening the academic year for both students and faculty members.

Mr. Pross asked if some thought had been given to ensuring compliance with Calendar statements on this matter. Mr. Stairs replied that the wording in the Calendar was somewhat ill-defined and allowed relatively broad interpretation. He added that the wording might require some review. Mr. Andrews said that in the old Faculty of Arts and Science the Dean regularly called to the attention of faculty members the Calendar provisions on scheduling examinations. He said that it was possible that a changing pedagogical emphasis on continuing assessment could account for the declining number of formal final examinations. Mr. Kimmins said that he understood that only examinations covering the work of a full term could not be held during the last weeks of class. Mr. Manson said that he understood that the percentage of the final mark represented by the examination determined whether it could be held outside the regular examination schedule.

Mr. Grossert said that he, too, had concerns about the length of the academic year, specifically about the practice of starting terms on Monday and starting the winter term later than in the past. It was suggested that the University should consider making Munro Day a moveable feast. Mr. Manson said that he appreciated the sentiments expressed but had found that any proposed schedule represented a serious inconvenience to someone.

92:051.

IN CAMERA -- Report of the SAAC Hearing Panel

Mr. P. Thomas, Chair of the Senate Academic Appeals Committee, presented a report (previously circulated) of a hearing panel on the matter of an academic appeal from the Faculty of Medicine. It was moved (P. Thomas/P. Girard):

**that Senate accept the report and the
recommendations of the SAAC Hearing Panel.**

Mr. Manson asked what mechanisms, if any, were in place to ensure that visa students could retain their status in Canada during an academic appeal process. Mr. Thomas said that this question was one in which Senate had no role other than to ensure rapid response to an appeal involving a visa student.

The question having been called, the motion carried.

92:052.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m. upon motion (C. Stuttard/D. Stairs).

Secretary

Chair

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY
MINUTES
OF
SENATE MEETING

Senate met in regular session on Wednesday, 29 April 1992 at 4:00 p.m. in the Senate and Board Room.

Present with Mr. K. Dunn in the chair were:

Andrews, Angelopoulos, Bankier, Barkow, Bérard, Birdsall, Bradfield, Brett, Burns, Carlson, Chapman, Clark, Clarke, Corvin, Curri, Dykstra, Fingard, J.F. Fraser, Gamberg, Haley, J.V. Jones, Klassen, Laidlaw, Maloney, Mason, McGuire, McKee, McMullen, McNiven, Melanson, Ruggles, Shepherd, Sherwin, A.M. Simpson, Sinclair-Faulkner, K. Smith, Stairs, Stuttard, Zakariasen.

Invitees: J. Forbes, M. Francis, B. Harris, M. MacDonald, J. Spurr.

Regrets: Banerjee, Arklie, Carruthers, Clovis, A.D. Cohen, Frick, Gilroy, Girard, J.D. Gray, Hare, D.W. Jones, Kimmins, Lane, Murray, Purdy, Rees, Ritchie, Roald, Sketris, M.J. Stewart, M.H. Tan, Wassersug.

The meeting was called to order at 4:05 p.m.

92:053.

Alterations to the Agenda

Mr. Bérard pointed out that he had received a call earlier in the day from the Vice-President

(Academic) of the Dalhousie Student Union asking that item #8 on the Agenda -- "Relations between Faculty Members and the University during a Strike or Lockout" -- be deferred to the next Senate meeting, scheduled for 14 May. Mr. Bérard also noted that President Clark wished to make a few remarks about the next major financial campaign for the University. It was agreed that this item become #8 on the Agenda.

92:054.

Minutes of the Meeting of 13 April 1992

The minutes of the meeting of 13 April 1992 were approved upon motion (G. Klassen/J. Fingard).

92:055.

Approval of Degrees -- Nova Scotia Agricultural College

Mr. L. Haley, Principal of the Nova Scotia Agricultural College, presented the names of forty-eight candidates for the Bachelor of Science degree in Agriculture, offered by Dalhousie University in cooperation with the Nova Scotia Agricultural College. It was moved (L. Haley/G. Curri)

that Senate approve the awarding of degrees to those candidates identified on the list submitted to the Secretary of Senate.

It was then moved (C. Stuttard/T. Laidlaw)

that the Principal and the Registrar of the Nova Scotia Agricultural College, in consultation with the Chair of Senate, be authorized to add to and remove from the graduation list the names of any students which have been omitted from or included in the graduation list due to demonstrable errors on the part of the Nova Scotia Agricultural College or one of its servants, or Dalhousie University or one of its servants, and that any such additions or deletions be reported to Senate.

The motion carried.

92:056.

Change of Name: Departments of Anatomy and Microbiology

Ms. Curri reported that the Senate Committee on Academic Administration had considered requests from the Departments of Anatomy and Microbiology for changes in their departmental names. She noted that the Faculty of Medicine had endorsed the name changes and that the Senate Committee on Academic Administration has also recommended approval of the changes to Senate.

It was moved (G. Curri/C. Stuttard)

that Senate approve the change of name of the Department of Anatomy to the "Department of Anatomy and Neurobiology", and of the Department of Microbiology to the "Department of Microbiology and Immunology".

Ms. Fingard asked if there was any intention to change the names of the degrees granted to students in those departments. Ms. Curri said that no change in the names of the degrees had been proposed.

The motion carried.

92:057.

Budget Advisory Committee

Mr. Dunn called the attention of members to two items of correspondence and draft minutes from a special meeting of the Senate Steering Committee (appended) which related to the President's proposal (previously circulated) for a Budget Advisory Committee. Mr. Carlson also called attention to an excerpt from the minutes of the Senate Financial Planning Committee (previously circulated) covering that Committee's discussion of this item.

Mr. Carlson explained that the Administration has decided to modify the current practice of maintaining the existing relationship among various budget envelopes in the University and to again exercise the option to recommend reallocations to budget envelopes. The President has decided to appoint a committee to advise him on the preparation of budget recommendations. Mr. Carlson said that the Steering Committee had discussed the proposal and had agreed to recommend that Senate agree to provide to the President four names, from which he would choose two persons to serve on the Budget Advisory Committee. The Steering Committee had also proposed that one of the persons selected should serve on the Senate Academic Planning Committee and the other on the Senate Financial Planning Committee.

It was moved (R. Carlson/J. Barkow)

that Senate agree to make four nominations to the President's Budget Advisory Committee; and that one of the two persons selected by the President from this list should serve on the Senate Academic Planning Committee and the other should serve on the Senate Financial Planning Committee.

Mr. Stuttard asked if it would be necessary, should the motion pass, to expand the membership of SAPC and SFPC. Mr. Carlson replied that it would not be necessary, in view of the fact that both committees have annual openings. It was the view of the Steering Committee that it was important to establish very close links between the Budget Advisory Committee and both SAPC and SFPC.

Mr. Andrews said that the President can appoint any number of committees to advise him on anything on which he wants advice, but he feared that the right of Senate to name its own representatives was compromised by the proposal, which would allow the President to select two people from four nominees. He said also that he feared that the Budget Advisory Committee would operate in secret and would not be able to consult fully with Senate. In view of these concerns, Mr. Andrews said that he thought that Senate should only receive the President's proposal. Senate should neither endorse the proposal, nor put forward nominees to serve on the Committee.

Mr. Carlson replied that the decision to provide four names for two positions was to enable the President to ensure that the Committee would reflect some balance among Faculties, perspectives, gender, etc. The Steering Committee believed that Senate could propose four people who enjoyed the confidence of the membership. Mr. Carlson also noted that, according to item #5 of the proposal, the details of the interaction between SAPC and SFPC and the new Committee would be established through joint discussions. He added that the Budget Advisory Committee is restricted in the scope of its recommendations by existing Senate policies and by the Collective Agreement.

Mr. Andrews asked how Senate will approve mechanisms for communication with the Budget Advisory Committee; who will judge if the mechanisms are appropriate and if they are working? Mr. Mason said that he was not sure who would judge. It was the intention of the proposal, he said, that the Budget Advisory Committee would work with Senate to establish a relationship that was acceptable. Mr. Stuttard asked what would happen if Senate only forwarded two nominees. Mr. Clark repeated that the aim of the proposal was to ensure that the Budget Advisory Committee was broadly representative. Mr. Clark added that it was not the intent of the proposal to change the current role of Senate in the budget process. The Budget Advisory Committee would provide advice related to the budget assumptions and the preparation of the budget book. That material and the proposed budget itself would still be given to SFPC, Senate, and the Board's Finance and Budget Committee for comment prior to being considered by the full Board of Governors.

Mr. Bradfield noted that item #2 in the proposal called for the budget to "be informed by" a number of considerations, such as the University Mission Statement, enrolment trends, etc. He asked if those considerations should not also include the various collective agreements in force in the University. Mr. Mason declined the opportunity to respond.

The question having been called, the motion carried on a voice vote.

92:058.

Nominations from the Senate Committee on Committees

Mr. Dunn explained that the Committee on Committees had experienced some initial difficulty in finding a nominee for the position of Secretary of Senate and had persuaded Mr. Bérard to allow his name to be put forward for a second three-year term beginning in July 1993. This would allow him an opportunity to take a half-sabbatical and complete certain teaching commitments in the School of Education. The Committee on Committees was also bringing forward a nomination to fill the position of Secretary for 1992-93. Mr. Dunn said that an advantage of this arrangement would be to allow the terms of the Chair and Secretary of Senate to expire at different times.

On behalf of the Senate Committee on Committees, Ms. Angelopoulos nominated the following individuals for terms as Secretary of Senate:

T.L. Maloney (Health Professions) 1992-93

R.N. Bérard (Education) 1993-96.

Following the requisite calls for further nominations, the individuals named were declared elected.

On behalf of the Senate Committee on Committees, Ms. Angelopoulos nominated the following individuals to the committees named:

Senate Steering Committee

F. Cohen (Management)

Senate Discipline Committee

J. Yogis (Law)

Board of Governors

P. Lane (Science)
N. Pereira (FASS)

Following the requisite calls for further nominations, the individuals named were declared elected.

92:059.

Proposed Statement on Discriminatory Harassment

Mr. McKee outlined the background to the appointment by President Clark of an ad hoc committee to develop an institutional policy on racism and sexism. He explained that the committee collected information on these problems from a variety of sources, including other North American universities. The committee then developed a draft statement on what it called "discriminatory harassment", which called for the creation of a new Committee on Discriminatory Harassment. This draft statement was published in the *Dalhousie News*, and comments were invited from the University community. Mr. McKee reported that some positive and negative comments were received and that the committee made revisions to the statement in the light of the comments received.

Mr. McKee explained briefly how the Committee on Discriminatory Harassment would work, noting that it was intended to operate quickly and discreetly to mediate in cases of discriminatory harassment or to refer them to other bodies in the University empowered to take action. He added that the problems which the committee sought to address were not unique to Dalhousie nor was the approach being suggested to deal with them.

It was moved (E. McKee/S. Sherwin)

**that Senate approve the proposed Statement on
Discriminatory Harassment and the recommendations
contained therein.**

Mr. Bradfield said that the first line of the statement could be interpreted to exclude administrators from the terms of the policy. He suggested, and it was agreed by the mover and seconder

**to change p. 1, l.1 to read "Members of a university
community have a".**

Mr. Stuttard questioned the difference between the statement that persons have a right to "the freedom to express their views in a responsible manner that respects the rights of others" and the statement that persons have a corresponding obligation to "respect the right of others to hold views which differ from their own". He suggested, and it was agreed by the mover and seconder

to change, on p. 1, l. 12, the word "hold" to "express".

Mr. Sinclair-Faulkner said that the Dalhousie Faculty Association had consulted with the chairs of two major committees of the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT) about this matter and that the DFA had received two different responses (appended). These responses reflected, he said, differing views expressed by members of faculty at Dalhousie. He said that he wished to allow debate on the motion to continue but wished, at the end of the debate, to move referral of the document back to the committee which prepared it to allow that committee to consult with various employee groups in the University.

Mr. Birdsall said that he believed further consultation was necessary and expressed several reservations about the document as it stood. He said that the statement on p. 1 that conflicting ideas are a "desirable feature of university life" was too weak. He said that it was not clear what was meant by the phrase on p. 1 "creating a negative psychological or emotional environment for work, study, or participation in campus life". Similarly vague, he said, was the provision on p. 2 that included in the definition of discriminatory harassment expressions "which might reasonably be interpreted as denigrating an individual or group, etc." Such a provision could lead to constant challenges to books and materials held by the Library. Faculty members would also be discouraged from making recommendations of books to the Library. Mr. Birdsall concluded by saying that the document either required major revisions to take account of the issues he had raised or that it should include an exemption for the Library.

Ms. Bankier said that she thought that, on balance, the statement tended to support academic freedom, including the freedom of people to express different views. In her experience, she said, discriminatory practices had impeded the academic freedom of women and minorities. She asked if academic freedom included the freedom to write racist graffiti on washroom stalls or to call a young female First Nations professor a "stupid Indian" in a dispute over grades. Ms. Bankier said that she had some difficulty with the vagueness of the disciplinary mechanisms available and suggested that appointments to the proposed Committee on Discriminatory Harassment not be left solely to the President.

Mr. Clark said that he appreciated the concerns raised, but he noted that most of them had been discussed by the advisory committee. He said that members of the University community provided very little comment to the committee after it published its draft report, and he argued that critics had a responsibility at this point to provide the committee specific comments and suggestions, in writing and within a reasonable time period, for their consideration.

Mr. Andrews said that he supported a process of further consultation, noting that academic freedom is not in a healthy state at this time. He said that some faculty members felt intimidated by the current political climate and were often afraid to express their ideas. He said that he supported the idea not

only of an inclusive academic community but one that was intellectually mature as well. Ms. Bankier said that women and minorities have long been afraid to express their views and that the proposed policy represented an attempt to diminish fear. Mr. Andrews added that he was uncomfortable with the idea that the proposed Presidential committee could recommend disciplinary actions.

Ms. Sherwin said that there was no intention that the proposed committee would discipline anyone. Rather it could only mediate and, if necessary, recommend that existing procedures be set in motion. Without adequate procedures and protections, she said, everyone is vulnerable, as people who are offended might take matters into their own hands. She said that the advisory committee sought comment from the community and remained open to specific suggestions. Ms. Francis said that people often used the concept of academic freedom to cloak racist and sexist views and that even the Library should not be exempt from scrutiny.

Mr. McNiven said that the discussion so far had predicted the impact of the policy to range from marginal to cataclysmic. He suggested that the best course might be to adopt the policy, perhaps with a specific "sunset clause". If the proposals did not work, they could be abandoned or amended.

Mr. Barkow suggested that the document might incorporate examples of the problems the policy was intended to deal with. Ms. Harris said that there was a fear that inclusion of examples could not be sufficiently inclusive for the type of statement being produced. Mr. Barkow added that perhaps there could be some exemption from the policy for the Library and for electronic communications. Ms. Bankier responded that this was not a good idea, for often material contained in electronic communications was in violation of the law. Mr. Shepherd also spoke against exemptions for electronic communications. Ms. Harris said that many, if not most, Canadian universities had or were developing policies in this area.

Mr. Fraser said that, as an undergraduate at Oxford, his experience was one of an harmonious, multicultural community, and that he believed that undergraduates at Dalhousie are quite civil to and respectful of one another. He said that he was not clear about what the University was committing itself to in this policy. Mr. Clark said that, in addition to academic freedom, Senate must concern itself about the growing demand from students, faculty, and parents for a safe environment, free from inappropriate behaviour. He added that Senate, as the body responsible for the internal regulation of the University, was responsible for addressing that issue.

Mr. Stuttard said that he believed the policy warranted further review and consultation. Mr. Gamberg said that he was troubled to some extent by the proposals to refer the policy back to the committee. He said that he was "beginning to smell a blockage" and asked if it was possible to approve the policy in principle. Ms. Curri said that, in the event that the policy was passed, a version of it should be prepared for publication in the University Calendar.

It was moved (T. Sinclair-Faulkner/C. Stuttard)

that the proposed Statement on Discriminatory Harassment be referred back to the advisory committee for reconsideration in the light of the discussion at this meeting; and further, that the advisory committee consult with representatives of employee groups and other appropriate groups, such as the Dalhousie Women's Faculty Organization, the Dalhousie Student Union, and the Dalhousie Association of Graduate Students; and further, that the advisory committee bring a revised draft of its statement to Senate in July 1992.

The motion carried.

92:060.

Ad Hoc Committee to Inquire into the Student Discipline Policy

Mr. Bérard reported that the Steering Committee had considered a memorandum (previously circulated) from President Clark asking that an ad hoc committee be established to review current policy relating to student discipline, particularly non-academic discipline matters. The Steering Committee agreed that such a committee should be formed. It was moved (R. Bérard/R. Carlson)

that Senate establish an ad hoc committee to review the adequacy of existing student discipline policy, particularly as it pertains to matters of non-academic discipline, with the mandate outlined in President Clark's memorandum of 26 March 1992 to the Secretary of Senate, and the composition as outlined in that memorandum, with the provision that at least one of the student members of the committee should be a residence student and at least one should be a graduate student.

Mr. Andrews said that he hoped the opposition to the proposal within the Dalhousie Student Union does not lead to non-participation by that body. He said that he believed that students had a major role to play in matters of non-academic discipline and it was important to ensure that they were involved.

The motion carried.

92:061.

Forthcoming Financial Campaign

Mr. Clark said that planning for the next major fund-raising campaign had begun and that he wished to consult with and engage the cooperation of Senate. He said that he would outline the planning process and discuss it with members of Senate at the next meeting on 14 May.

92:062.

Senate Forum on Rationalization

Mr. Dunn thanked the Dalhousie Faculty Association and the President's Office for their cooperation in supporting the well attended Senate Forum on University Rationalization held the previous day at Henson College. He said that he hoped that additional fora on this topic might be held in the near future.

92:063.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:50 p.m. upon motion (G. Klassen/C. Stuttard).

Secretary

Chair
