

Item: Senate Minutes, April 1996  
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 1996. 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, 08 April 1996 at 4:00 p.m. in the University Hall, Macdonald Building.

Present, with Mr. C. Stuttard in the chair, were the following:

Andrews, Archibald Binkley, Birdsall, Bleasdale, Brett, Conrod, Cross, Cummings, Dickson, Doolittle, Farmer, Fraser, Hartzman, Hobson, Hooper, Kiang, Kimmins, Klein, Lee, MacInnis, Maloney, Marble, McIntyre, Moore, Pereira, Ricketts, Rosson, Ruedy, Russell, Siddiq, Starnes, Sutherland, Tatton, Taylor, Thomas, Traves.

Regrets: Cameron, Camfield, Egan, Lovely, MacDonald, Pacey, Shafai, Sherwin.

**96:043**

Adoption of the Agenda

Upon motion (Maloney/Archibald) the agenda was adopted as circulated.

**96:044**

In Camera: Report of the Senate Academic Appeal Hearing Panel

The meeting moved in camera to consider the report of a Hearing Panel of the Senate Academic Appeals Committee. A resolution to adopt the report (P. Thomas) was PASSED.

**96:045**

Approval of Minutes

Upon motion (McIntyre/Brett) the minutes of 11 March 1996 were approved as circulated.

**96:046**

Dal/TUNS Merger Discussions

President Traves distributed copies of his memo to Senate containing twenty items summarizing the major elements of the Dalhousie/TUNS amalgamation agreement. The agreement ultimately would be signed by representatives of both universities and the Government of Nova Scotia. After a pause of several minutes while Senators read the memo, Mr. Traves, seconded by Mr. Kimmins, moved:

**that Senate approve the amalgamation of Dalhousie University and  
the Technical University of Nova Scotia consistent with the general**

**terms described by the President on April 3 and further outlined in the memo to Senate distributed on April 8, 1996.**

Mr. Traves began the discussion by asking if there were any questions. Mr. Andrews asked for clarification concerning the April 3 reference in the motion. After Mr. Stuttard had explained that Mr. Traves had called a meeting of Senators last Wednesday to discuss the Dal-TUNS merger, Mr. Andrews asked that the reference to April 3 be removed from the motion. Mr. Traves saw this as a friendly amendment and the words **“described by the President on April 3 and further”** were deleted.

Ms. Bleasdale stated that although she was pleased with the merger, she was nervous about the process which she believed was subservient to the provincial government's agenda. Mr. Traves thanked Ms. Bleasdale for her concerns and assured her that throughout the process he had been able to bring material to the Senate and the Dalhousie community without undue pressure from the government. Ms. Bleasdale asked who had leaked the document quoted in the Chronicle Herald. Mr. Traves replied that the Press got the material from a TUNS source and not from the government.

Mr. Kimmins pointed out that undergraduate engineering students currently take two years at associated universities and then go to TUNS for three additional years of study. Each Engineering Department in the associated universities has a representative on the TUNS Senate. Would the associated universities have representation on the proposed Academic Council of the new College? Mr. Traves thanked Mr. Kimmins for raising this issue and for suggesting an appropriate solution. Mr. Kimmins also asked for clarification of item 18 in Mr. Traves' memo. Why was there reference to "TUNS Faculties" rather than "Dalhousie Faculties". Mr. Traves replied that this refers to previously agreed funding to be provided by the Government of Nova Scotia and is to reassure TUNS that the new Faculties will retain it.

Mr. Farmer referred to item 10 and asked why was there a need for an Academic Council, wouldn't the Faculty Councils serve the same function? Mr. Traves explained that many of the structures in the document reflect a balance between the immediate effects of merger and TUNS' desire to maintain some measure of identity.

However, the merged institution would be Dalhousie University, with one Board and one Senate. In the fullness of time, more normal arrangements, he hoped, would be resumed.

Mr. Farmer further referred to item 20 and asked if we will get the Halifax Infirmary building and adjacent land or only the land. Mr. Traves replied that Dalhousie-TUNS will get the unencumbered land ready for redevelopment; that is, after the building has been demolished.

Mr. Andrews wanted to know how the document circulated at the TUNS Senate differed from the document circulated at Senate. Mr. Traves responded that the documents reflected the state of negotiations at the time but are virtually the same. Mr. Andrews stated that the TUNS statement had reference to collective agreements; does the Dalhousie statement refer to these collective agreements? Mr. Stuttard replied that item 14 refers to collective agreements. Mr. Andrews argued that the TUNS document was much stronger than the Dalhousie document.

Mr. Andrews questioned the timing of the process and wanted more time to read the document circulated at Senate. He believed that the Faculties should be consulted about the merger. Mr. Stuttard explained that the President called a meeting of Senators last Wednesday to discuss the merger. A special meeting of Senate was not called because the necessary 48 hours notice could not be given for a meeting before the government was to announce the merger. At the meeting of Senators there was no motion or formal debate, but the issues were discussed. The motion now under debate was circulated by e-mail only 24 hours in advance of this Senate meeting because of the long weekend, although the topic was included on the agenda circulated earlier.

Mr. Andrews stated that the motion is for amalgamation of Dalhousie and TUNS and it would be more creditable if the motion was not rammed through the Senate in a hurry. It is important that the Senate look at everything.

Mr. Taylor stated that regardless of what happened to the motion, we have to continue to discuss the impact of the merger on all aspects of the Dalhousie community. He asked for clarification of two points. First, with reference to items 12 and 13, what will happen to the current Dalhousie programs? Will Science and Arts and Social Science students still be able to take computing science as major/minor or elective classes in the future? Second, will the priorities for Dalhousie capital buildings remain the same as before the merger?

Mr. Traves assured Mr. Taylor that Senate approval will be required for the new Faculties and programs, and students in other disciplines will have the same access to computing science as now exists. Also, the "Arts Building" will remain Dalhousie's top priority buildings. Development of the Halifax Infirmary land will provide more academic or revenue-generating space, possibly including a University partnership with the private-sector.

Mr. Hartzman and Mr. Traves clarified the following issues: The proposed TUNS Subcommittee of the Board will have eleven members comprising five Dalhousie Board members, and six TUNS members and the President ex officio, and will have no independent powers. The future senators elected by TUNS Faculties will also serve on the Academic Council of the TUNS college which will be an advisory body only. Government funding for the new Faculties begins immediately, but will not be spent before amalgamation without the joint agreement of both institutions. There is no independent capacity for action. The proposed administrative arrangements are intended to give TUNS a measure of security for their institutional identity. Dalhousie is extremely decentralized and the procedures and structures to be set up for TUNS Faculties are no more decentralized than for other units at Dalhousie.

Mr. Hartzman, seconded by Mr. Andrews, proposed the following amendment to the motion:

**Senate shall have a prospective role in implementing the amalgamation.**

Mr. Hartzman noted that he had officially learned of the merger proposal only last week, and argued that Senate had to be involved in deciding what academic and structural changes would take place over the next year. Just as the Senate had passed a similar motion concerning the Metro Consortium, so we should include this sentence in the current motion. Mr. Andrews pointed out that the terms of merger are only outlined in Mr. Traves' memo. Senate must now identify the impact on other Dalhousie programs. He acknowledged the time spent by senior administrators in getting to this stage, but now was the time for Senate to take an active role in the process, not simply be informed of the changes. Mr. Traves affirmed that the principles of merger do involve a prospective role for Senate with respect to programs, although the merger agreement does specify that Dalhousie will have three new Faculties. He agreed to the amendment.

Mr. Pereira said that he believed this was a good agreement, but Senate was always playing catch-up. The tendency was for an agreement in principle to rapidly become an agreement to specific procedures and structures because of the time constraints involved in the negotiation process. He wanted to know whether the President could give further assurance of timeliness when seeking Senate assent for future changes. Also, what was the President's best guess regarding implications of merging two costly institutions? Mr. Traves responded that all was speculative, but the funding for the next three years was now set by the government and this meant a \$2.4 million dollar increase at the end of three years. In the long term, our financial situation will depend on the new funding formula for universities that was being developed by NSCHE. It is hoped that the new formula will recognize the true cost of various specialty programs. The government says that funding should reflect the public agenda for education. This rhetoric supports Dalhousie. The government has also said that the research component will be funded. All these signs seem to indicate that we will be as well off or somewhat better off than we are now.

Mr. Brett wanted assurance that the TUNS merger would not siphon off money from other areas in the University. Mr. Traves responded that engineering and computing science will be funded from moneys outside of the current Dalhousie budgets for the next three years. After that time they will take part in the same budgeting process as all Faculties at Dalhousie.

Ms Sutherland asked how the merger will affect the library system. Mr. Traves responded that Mr. Birdsall was looking into this question, but the integration will be in accordance with Dalhousie's current arrangements. The administration mindset is to push the amalgamation as tightly as possible in order to reduce costs and generate the greatest savings which can then be applied to the academic programs.

Ms. Sutherland commented that if Senate wanted to be more involved with confidential negotiations it might need to reconsider its policy of openness and have more sessions in camera. These changes may allow the Senate to be more pro-active.

Mr. Rosson expressed support for the motion, but merger should not be at the expense of existing units. He noted the intense pressure on his Faculty and deplored the publication of misinformation in connection with the Metro consortium.

Mr. Ricketts, Mr. Ruedy and Mr. Kimmins all strongly supported the motion. Mr. Ricketts reminded Senators to keep the big picture in mind; this is an historical step involving risk and a leap of faith that was larger for TUNS than for Dalhousie. The result would be a stronger and better university.

Mr. Wainwright stated that the TUNS wording regarding collective agreements — “Current collective agreements at both institutions will be honoured until such a time as new ones are negotiated” — is not reflected in item 14 of Mr. Traves' memo. Would the President agree to the TUNS wording as reflecting the agreement's understanding? Mr. Traves agreed and said he would incorporate these words into his document for presentation to the Board of Governors.

Mr. Ruedy charged Senate members to rise to their responsibility as Senators and to engage in the process. He noted that in other recent mergers, identical documents were presented to both governing bodies for approval, and expressed some concern that this was not happening here. Mr. Kimmins pointed out that his Faculty had been dealing with rationalization over the last five years. During that time the departments of Earth Science, Engineering and Computing Science had been involved in a number of scenarios much worse than the current proposal. He believed that Dalhousie had taken the initiative last year and the current proposals were consistent with our service to the community. Although the merger proposal may not be the best arrangement, it was better than the current status quo and represented the fourth threshold event in Dalhousie's history.

**The motion carried without dissent.**

**96:047**

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 18:10 h.

Minutes approved.

---

Secretary

---

Chair

**DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY**  
**MINUTES**  
**OF**  
**SENATE MEETING**

SENATE met in regular session on Monday, 29 April 1996 at 2:00 p.m. in the University Hall, Macdonald Building.

Present, with Mr. C. Stuttard in the chair, were the following:

Archibald, Birdsall, Bleasdale, Brett, Cameron, Conrod (Secretary pro tem), Cox, Cross, Doolittle, Farmer, Fraser, Hobson, Hooper, Kay-Raining Bird, Kiang, Lovely, Lydon, MacDonald, Maloney, McIntyre, Moore, Pacey, Pereira, Rosson, Ruddick, Russell, Sherwin, Siddiq, Taylor, Traves, Wrixon.

Regrets: Andrews, Binkley, Camfield, Cummings, Dickson, Kenny, Starnes, Sutherland.

Invitee: Haley

**96:048**

Adoption of the Agenda

An item, "Dalhousie Review", was added under Item 10, Other Business. The agenda was adopted as amended (Farmer/Fraser).

**96:049**

Minutes of Previous Meeting

The draft minutes of April 8, 1996 were considered. On page 5, second last paragraph, "is much stronger than the words in item 14 of Mr. Traves' memo; would ..." was changed to "is not reflected in Item 14 of Mr. Traves' memo. Would ...".

Also, on page 5, paragraph 5, the word "cautious" was deleted.

The minutes were approved as amended (Rosson/McIntyre).

**96:050**

Awarding of Degrees

On behalf of the Nova Scotia Agricultural College, Mr. Haley presented the list of 89 candidates who had completed all of the requirements for the degree of Bachelor of Science (Agriculture). Mr. Rutherford presented the list of three candidates who have completed all of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science (Agriculture).

Senate approved the motion (Doolittle/Cox):

**that Senate approves the awarding of degrees to the candidates identified in correspondence to the Secretary.**

Senate approved the motion (Doolittle/Rosson):

**that the Principal and the Registrar of the Nova Scotia Agricultural College, and the Dean of Dalhousie's Faculty of Graduate Studies, where appropriate, in consultation with the Chair of Senate, be authorized to add to and remove from the Graduation List the names of any students omitted from or included in the list through demonstrable errors on the part of the College, the University or one of its officers, and that any such additions or deletions be reported to Senate.**

**96:051**

Nominations to Senate Committee on Committees.

On behalf of the Steering Committee, Ms. Conrod moved that:

**Mr. Hugh Kindred of the Faculty of Law and Mr. Richard Apostle of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences be elected to the Committee on Committees.**

The motion CARRIED.

**96:052**

Constitutional Provisions Governing the Operations of Senate

Mr. Stuttard asked Ms. Conrod to take the chair for this item.

On behalf of the Steering Committee, Mr. Stuttard moved:



**that the amended text of the Constitutional Provisions  
Governing the Operations of Senate, dated April 12, 1996, and  
further amended today, be adopted.**

Mr. Stuttard then introduced the revised text of the Constitutional Provisions Governing the Operations of Senate as an amalgamation of current approved policy, current practice and some further changes recommended by the Steering Committee.

He identified several typographical errors that had escaped earlier detection: Roman numerals were missing from Section headings in the Table of Contents, “will” to be “well” on the fourth line of page 15, and the words “to adopt” to be inserted after “favour” on page 15 line 11.

Discussion of the document proceeded section by section; the Chair noted that votes on amendments would require a simple majority to pass, but the main motion would require a two-thirds majority.

I. General Principles

Mr. Stuttard identified a substantive change on page 2 where now Senate is to be given the opportunity to debate and vote on a draft budget prior to its submission to the Board of Governors. Mr. Traves asked what impact a vote would have, given that budget approval is a Board, not a Senate, responsibility, and voiced the concern that the vote might mislead some into thinking that Senate had more authority that was the case.

Significant sentiment was expressed that Senate’s role be more than generically consultative, which made the voting provision desirable, especially in light of previous Dalhousie history that involved differing opinions by the Senate and Board over budget directions.

After considerable discussion, it was moved (Traves/Cameron) that the second highlighted section on page 2 be changed to:

**Senate shall consider and express by vote its opinion  
concerning the draft budget before the President  
submits it to the Board.**

The motion CARRIED.

Maintaining the existing practice of consultation through the committee structure was emphasized in the discussion as an effective way to establish Senate input into the budget process.

Ms. McIntyre asked how the constitution would be affected by the Dal/TUNS merger agreement which contained certain provisions that required changes by Senate. Mr. Stuttard replied that these would be handled in due course through the amendment provisions of the Constitution, but could not be done prospectively. Mr. Traves said such issues will be dealt with on a consultative basis.

## II. Membership of Senate

Mr. Stuttard introduced the major changes in this section, and referred to the question of what role, if any, Senators had as representatives of their Faculties.

He moved (Stuttard/Farmer):

**that a sentence be added to the end of the first paragraph: "Senators are expected to familiarize themselves with the views of the members of their respective Faculties in regard to issues that are brought forward to Senate."**

There was extensive discussion of this motion, with several Senators uneasy with an implied obligation to poll all members of their Faculties, although Mr. Stuttard argued that the words were being over-interpreted. Various theories of representation were advanced. Several wording changes were suggested, but it was agreed this element should be addressed in Section IV.

A motion (Taylor/Sherwin) to table this amendment was CARRIED.

## III. Officers of Senate

Mr. Stuttard said that authoritative sources recommend that the duties of officers be stated in the Constitution, and that was the purpose of this section which was based on current practice with changes reflecting a need to balance workloads.

## IV. Relations with Faculties

Following the earlier discussion of Section II, it was moved (Taylor/Bleasdale):

**that the following final sentence be added: "Senators are encouraged to familiarize themselves with the expressed**

**views of their Faculties with respect to issues which are or may be brought before Senate.”**

The motion CARRIED.

V, VI, & VII

Relations with the Board of Governors, Administration, Dalhousie Faculty Association

Mr. Stuttard pointed out that these sections were unchanged from the existing Constitutional provisions.

VIII Matters relating to the Internal Operations and Procedures and the Dissemination of Information

Mr. Stuttard, noting again that operating procedures usually form part of a Constitution, explained that the new parts of this section were mostly provisions already approved by Senate, as indicated by dates given in parentheses, but previously had not been explicitly included in the Constitution.

Mr. Brett raised the issue of how many members should have to sign a petition to hold an extraordinary meeting. He felt that twenty-five was too high a number, and had been established when Senate had hundreds of members. Mr. Stuttard said that this number should be close to the number needed for a quorum, or the meeting would probably fail in any event.

It was moved (Sherwin/Lovely):

**that “twenty-five” be changed to “fifteen” in the second last paragraph of page 13.**

The motion was DEFEATED.

IX Amendments to the Constitution

Mr. Stuttard said that the existing Constitution had an amending formula only for membership, and that the revisions to this section provided a mechanism for any change in Senate Constitution.

To regularize the section, that is, make the mechanism the same for membership as for all other changes, it was moved (Cameron/Farmer):

**that the first sentence of Section IX be deleted, along with the first two words of the second sentence.**

The motion CARRIED.

X. Standing Committees of Senate

Discussion of this section commenced, but members were concerned that time be allowed for consideration of other agenda items without losing the progress already made on the document.

A discussion of procedural issues ensued.

The following motion (Lydon/Cross):

**that the main motion be amended by dividing it so that Sections I to IX be dealt with separately from Section X.**

was CARRIED.

The main motion, as amended, was then put:

**that the amended text of Sections I to IX of the Constitutional Provisions Governing Operations of Senate, dated April 12, 1996, and further amended today, be adopted.**

The motion CARRIED without dissent.

A further motion (Stuttard for Steering):

**that the amended text of Section X of the Constitutional Provisions Governing Operations of Senate, dated April 12, 1996, and further amended today, be adopted.**

was followed by a motion(Traves/Maloney): that the previous motion be tabled.

The motion to table was CARRIED.

Mr. Stuttard resumed the Chair.

**96:053**

Advanced Major and Honours Certificate Proposal

On behalf of CAA, Ms. Hobson moved that:

1. **The current practices regarding the Advanced Major and Honours certificates be maintained.**
2. **On the parchments, the word "Certificate" be replaced with "Degree".**
3. **The current annotation be maintained: "Upon completion of the additional academic studies necessary to convert a Bachelor of [A] degree, previously awarded, to a Bachelor of [A] degree with Honours in [B]".**
4. **Students whose degrees are being converted to Advanced Major or Honours be awarded the degree in the same cohort as those who have completed the four-year degree without upgrading.**
5. **These provisions are to take effect on July 1, 1996.**

Ms. Hobson reminded Senate that substantive issues revolved around the use of the term "certificate", now inappropriate, and the use of "special status" for students.

Mr. Cameron questioned the utility of point 1 in the motion, and proposed that it be deleted, to be replaced with "The Advanced Majors and Honours certificates be amended as follows:" Points 2-5 would then be 1-4. This was accepted as a friendly amendment..

The motion, as amended, PASSED.

**96:054**

Matters for Information

The report, "Pension Trust Fund and Retirees' Trust Fund" (April 8, 1996) was brought to the attention of Senators.

**96:055**

Other Business

Dalhousie Review: Mr. Wainwright, as associate editor of the Dalhousie Review, reported that he had received a letter from Ms. Hobson indicating that operating support for the journal was being terminated; this resulted from implementation of BAC III budget cutbacks.

Mr. Wainwright reviewed the progress of the journal in improving its operating position over the past two years. The Dalhousie Review received a provincial grant, which they hoped would continue, and their SSHRC grant had been renewed in a very competitive category. The SSHRC grant was dependent on matching operating support from the University. He also described the strengths of the journal, citing its interdisciplinary nature and international reputation. He complained about the lack of communication over the past eighteen months, particularly the lack of regular six-month reviews promised eighteen months ago.

Ms. Hobson indicated that BAC III targets set for the Dalhousie Review required operating self-sufficiency by 1996/97. She suggested that the Faculty of Arts and Social Science might consider the Dalhousie Review for inclusion in its budget.

Mr. Taylor reacted angrily to this suggestion; he noted the large differential cuts visited on the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences by BAC III and the Faculty's difficulties in making academic appointments in key areas.

Ms. Hobson pointed out that, to the extent the Dalhousie Review was centrally funded, its reduced allocation was like those of all other budgetary units. Mr. Taylor reported he would be discussing a proposal to make the Dalhousie Review a Capital Fund project. Ms. Hobson thought it would be instructive to find out how Dalhousie's other learned journals, such as the Law Review, were funded.

The editors of the Dalhousie Review and Ms. Hobson were scheduled to meet on May 8.

**96:056**

Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was passed at 4:25 p.m. (Doolittle/Russell).

Minutes approved.