

Item: Senate Minutes, March 1985  
Call Number: UA-5, Accession 2007-039, Box 6

Additional Notes:

This document is a compilation of Senate minutes, staff matters and miscellaneous documents for March 1985. 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 Board and Senate Room on Monday, 11 March 1985 at 4:00 P.M.

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

Andrews, Barkow, Betts, Birdsall, Bradfield, Braybrooke, Caty, Chaytor, Cromwell, Cross, Cunningham, Dresel, Dunn, Elgeneidy, Field, Fingard, Gibbling, Gigeroff, Gratwick, Horrocks, Huber, James, Josenhans, Keast, Kennedy, Kerans, Klassen, Larder, Leffek, MacKay, Misick, Morrison, Norvell, Ogden, Ozier, Paquet, Rodger, Rosenberg, Ruf, Semple, Shaw L.R., Sherwin, Sinclair, Stern, Stewart, Stone, Stuttard, Tindall, Tingley, Tonks, vanFeggelen, Wooton, Yung, Christie (invitee).

Regrets: Egan, Fulton, Goldbloom, Hennen, MacIntosh, Munroe, O'Brien D.W.P., Tan, Thiessen, Waterson, Zinck.

85:026.

Minutes of Previous Meeting

The Secretary noted that page 5, line 29 should read **office** not reference in the 11/2/85 minutes.

The minutes of the meetings of 21 January and 11 February 1985 were approved upon motion (Rodger/van Feggelen).

85:027.

New Members

The Chairperson welcomed the following new members to Senate:

Ahmed K. Elgeneidy  
Peggy Larder  
Sandra McFarlane  
Richard S. Rosenberg

85:028.

Question Period

The Chairperson advised Senate members that Vice-President Sinclair had written to the Secretary with a response to the question raised by Mr. Rodger at the 10 December meeting of Senate. This had been forwarded to Mr. Rodger and is on file in the Senate Office for interested members. Mr. Welch's written statement replying to questions directed to the FPC at the 11 February 1985 meeting were available for distribution.

Mr. Kennedy asked whether, in cases of possible conflict of interest in seeking funds from the public sector, policies for **compromise** would be discussed in Senate. Mr. Sinclair replied that the Assistant Vice-President (Research) was preparing a draft document which would address this issue.

Mr. Wooton wondered how intensive the lobbying of the university against the provincial government was at this time regarding the decision to impose higher differential fees on foreign students. Mr. Kennedy urged the President to "vehemently" protest the proposed action and indicated his intention to have this submitted as a notice of motion for the next regular meeting of Senate.

Mr. Huber wondered what the policy of the institution was regarding freedom of inquiry and what concrete steps were being taken to convey this intent (He cited newspaper reports regarding sexual harassment as an example). Mr. Sinclair believed that the policy of Dalhousie would support a challenge of conventional wisdom and added that no directive to facilitate research had been issued but that cases had been handled on an individual basis.

Mr. Gigeroff wished to know whether there was a university policy regarding release of names of potential graduands. Mr. Tingley maintained that lists of potential graduands names and addresses were only provided by the Registrar's Office to the President of the Dalhousie Student Union. He added that photographers would have access to such information, in response to Mr. Gigeroff's further inquiry.

Mr. Bradfield, referring back to the question he raised at the last Senate meeting, asked whether the \$25,000 per month penalty for the "un-vacated" Hart House came from the operating or the capital budget. He also requested information about the function and cost of the cupola at the Forrest Building. Mr. Graham indicated that the penalty associated with Hart House was deducted from the purchase price not directly from the operating budget. He reported the utilitarian value of the cupola which would establish a watertight seal and prevent future repairs. Costs were included in the costs of the overall renovation of the Forrest Building.

Messrs. Tingley and Betts noted that the Class Approval Session for the undergraduate faculties would be held during the last week of classes in response to Ms. Caty's query.

85:029

Notice of Motion

Mr. Barkow briefly introduced his notice of motion, maintaining that Senate was responsible for academic programmes which would suffer as a result of strife at the university and proposing that a "consulting committee" which drew on expertise within the university would prevent past history from repeating itself. He requested that there be general discussion following which the total motion rather than individual items could be moved and voted upon or amended.

This motion is intended to prevent a recurrence of recent Dalhousie history by creating a special Senate committee to review that history and learn from it. The Committee is asked to study the history and processes of the relations between Dalhousie's faculty on the one hand and its Board of Governors and Administration on the other, with the goal of learning how good relations may be restored and maintained in the future. It is asked to report in sufficient time for its recommendations to aid the Committee to Advise on the Presidency.

The Committee is specifically charged with (but not limited to):

- (1) Reviewing the history of Board of Governors/ Dalhousie faculty relations since the inception of the Dalhousie Faculty Association. The purposes of this review are to understand the background to current difficulties and to reveal any recurring patterns and problems.
- (2) Interviewing individuals involved in past and present Dalhousie faculty Association/Board of Governors disputes, including those responsible for conducting negotiations and for resolving formal grievances with the same aim as above.
- (3) Reviewing faculty/Board of Governors relations at Canadian universities comparable to our own but with a better record of relations, with a view to learning how we might achieve comparable success.
- (4) Making full use of labour relations and social science expertise both within (and to the extent feasible) without Dalhousie.
- (5) Inviting written submissions from any individuals and groups either within or without the Dalhousie community who care to make their information and views available to the Committee.
- (6) Reviewing Dalhousie salary levels and comparing the- to those of Canadian and American institutions, and assessing the extent to which salaries and fringe benefits have

been an underlying source of Board of Governors/faculty tension.

(7) Reviewing, in consultation with the Senate Financial Planning Committee and the Pension Advisory Committee, the Dalhousie Pension Plan. It should be compared with that at other North American universities and its role in faculty morale analyzed. The Committee is asked to develop recommendations which will prevent the pension plan from again being a major issue in Dalhousie Faculty Association/Board of Governors negotiations. The Committee is specifically asked to consider whether the nature of the pension plan itself must be altered to achieve this end.

(8) Reviewing the role of Senate as a conduit of communication between senior administration officials and the Board of Governors on the one hand and the faculty on the other with a view to considering how Senate's effectiveness in this capacity might be improved.

(9) Presenting to Senate a report to be made public and which will include specific recommendations to Senate and to any other bodies the Committee deems appropriate (e.g., the Dalhousie Faculty Association, the Board of Governors, the provincial legislature, MPHEC, etc.). These recommendations are to be as concrete as possible.

#### Membership of the Committee

The Committee is to include members with expertise in labour relations, the organization and administration of Canadian universities, and pension plans. It should include members with appropriate social science expertise in the understanding of small group processes and conflicts, in survey research, and in the study of social institutions.

Mr. Ogden advised members of a similar "excellent" investigation, funded by SSHRC, which was conducted at SMU. Mr. Braybrooke would have been happier if the terms of reference were revised to focus more specifically on the conduct of negotiations in recent collective bargaining. Mr. Rodger predicted that this would likely be a futile exercise and was not likely to resolve tension. He elaborated by stating that labour relations experts usually opposed "expert" reviews as interference. Mr. Barkow contended that objectivity, distance and external consulting expertise were required, to clarify processes and perceptions of the situation. Ms. Sherwin was confused regarding the membership of the committee, noting that no members of the university would be far removed from the bargaining process. She added that considerable time and money would necessarily be expended. Mr. Barkow suggested that political biases would cancel each other out and that a repeat of history would be "devastating" financially. Ms. Ozier cautioned Senate against taking on the role of mediator between the Board of Governors and the Dalhousie Faculty Association, and asked the chairperson whether, taking into consideration the constitution of Senate, the motion was in order.

At this point, the motion was moved and seconded by Messrs. Barkow and Josenhans.

Mr. Jones reported that the Officers of Senate had considered the motion at length since it had appeared on the agenda and had concluded that:

(a) Items #1-5, which involved a review of the history of negotiations, were outside of the Senate terms of reference.

(b) Item #6, namely the review of salary levels, was the duty of the Board and the DFA, but the effect on academic programmes might become a question for the APC.

(c) Item #7, which dealt with pension plans, was not considered part of Senate's role, unless it affected the overall budget, in which case the FPC would consider it. An agreeable method for handling pension plans had resulted from recent negotiations.

(d) Item #8 - Communication is a function for Senate. The Steering Committee had discussed this recently and items regarding Senate and its committees were appearing consistently in the **Dalhousie News**.

(e) Item #9 - It was hoped through discussions of the Board of Governors and the DFA that this had occurred or would occur.

He concluded by saying that the motion was too all encompassing and that as a result of the Officers' discussion, he must rule the motion out of order.

Mr. Braybrooke agreed that there was too much content in one motion and wondered if it would be useful to call upon or invite the Board and the DFA to seek outside advice.

Mr. Gigeroff questioned whether another committee might be formed external to Senate.

It was moved and seconded (Barkow/Gigeroff)

**that Senate invite the Board of Governors, the DFA and the President to join it in seeking advice in accordance with the 'intent' of the Notice of Motion.**

Mr. Kennedy purported that the proposal could be justified academically and that the dilemma was that all parties seemed "paralyzed" from action. Mr. Wooton believed that a request by Senate to help the DFA and the Board could be considered out of order. Mr. Gigeroff favoured any means of identifying problem areas. Mr. Barkow lamented the fact that no institutional framework in the university could take advantage of the expertise available to facilitate resolution of such problems. Ms. Ozier contended that problems could be exacerbated as differences between two parties in the bargaining process would not be resolved by forcing help on them. It would be preferable if the DfA and/or the Board internally

decided to review procedures and processes. Ms. Sherwin and Messrs. Stuttard and Andrews and the President spoke against the motion and supported Ms. Ozier's contention. Mr. Andrews added that a report made public, before individuals involved had an opportunity to comment, was undesirable. The President noted that President's Council had debated the question and more recently, the DFA, the Board and others had taken the opportunity to discuss issues of mutual concern.

The mover and seconder withdrew the motion.

85:030.

Reports and Recommendations -- Committees of Senate

A. Committee on Committees

1. Nominations to Committees

On behalf of the Committee on Committees, it was moved and seconded (Cunningham/Horrocks)

**that F. Wien be nominated to serve on the Board of  
Governors of the Lester Pearson Institute.**

Mr. Andrews queried whether the rationale for all nominations could be given, when indication of relevant expertise was not included on the circulated curricula vitarum. The President wondered whether it was proper to ask the Committee on Committees for specific rationale. It was agreed that the Steering Committee would discuss this matter. After three calls for further nominations, Mr. Wien was declared elected.

Ms. N. Jabbra had been nominated to the University Tenure Panel by the Committee on Committees and approval had been granted by both the President and the President of the DFA, in accordance with the terms of reference. She was declared elected, after three calls for further nominations.

The following individuals were declared elected following three calls for further nominations, to the positions indicated:

E. Gold (Cunningham/Horrocks)  
Advisory Board, Centre for Marine Geology

J. Fingard (Cunningham/James)  
Senate. Mt. St. Vincent University

M.M. Vohra was nominated by the Committee on Committees to serve as a replacement for P. Schotch on the University Employee Benefits Committee. After some discussion by Messrs. Huber, Dresel and Ms. Ozier regarding the expertise required on this committee, it was moved and seconded (Cross/Kerans)

**that voting be deferred to give Senate Members more time to satisfy themselves of the expertise involved.**

The motion was defeated.

The Chairperson called for further nominations from the floor and Mr. Kerans was nominated by Ozier/Wooton. It was agreed upon motion (Horrocks/Field)

**that nominations cease.**

A mail ballot would be required. Mr. Braybrooke called for an accounting of particular features which qualified the nominees for this position.

The names of J. Gordon Ogden III and Mary Anne White had been advanced by the Committee on Committees as nominees for the review Committee, Institute of Oceanography. Mr. Jones referred to a letter received from Mr. Fournier which suggested that the Institute of Oceanography be dissolved. Mr. Sinclair thought the correspondence should be taken as information. There was a consensus upon motion (Rodger/MacKay)

**that consideration of item #6 of the report of the Senate Committee on Committees be deferred until further information had been received.**

Mr. Cunningham requested that the Steering Committee examine the method used by the Committee on Committees to arrive at names and to attempt to ascertain qualifications.

It was agreed that Senate would ask the Committee on Committees to appoint an interim replacement on the Senate Computer Advisory Committee for Mr. Beaumont who is on sabbatical.

#### B. Physical Planning Committee

The letter dated, 8 February 1985 from Ms. Ritchie, Chairperson of the PPC, had been precirculated as an interim report for the information of Senators.



### C. Financial Planning Committee

Mr. Welch's report of 11 March 1985 was distributed at the meeting. It consisted of answers to the questions raised at Senate, among other matters. Mr. Jones suggested that members come prepared to discuss this statement at the next regular meeting when Mr. Welch would be present.

### D. Joint APC - FPC

#### 1. Report on the 1985/86 Budget

The Chairperson noted that as the discussions regarding the 1985-86 budget were slightly behind schedule, it was difficult to make a useful report. The report would preferably be presented to the April meeting. Some discussion ensued about the document dated 5 March 1985, entitled Budget Process 1985-86 from Vice-Presidents Sinclair and Shaw. Ms. Ozier asked who the voting members of the "super" committee UBAC would be. Mr. Sinclair said that those listed as observers, namely the Chairperson of the Finance and Budget Committee of the Board of Governors and the representative of the Dalhousie Faculty Association, would be the only nonvoting members.

Mr. Sinclair agreed with Ms. Ozier that the document should be more precise, and replace the words "Personnel and Payroll" with "Vice-President (Academic and Research)" on page 4, lines 15-16. This had been reflected more clearly in the original lengthier document. Ms. Ozier remained concerned, particularly with respect to Senate's role in the Collective Agreement, as identified in Article 26 on financial Constraint. She wondered if there was any mechanism to instruct Senate members, including the Chairpersons of APC and FPC, when it would be appropriate to vote. Mr. Jones advised Senate that the committee discussed the question of recommending or voting on financial constraint and there was a consensus that the committee would not take such action, but would recommend several options for the consideration of the President. The President and Board might then decide that this necessitated declaration of financial constraint and would so indicate to Senate. After such an indication to Senate, the Chairpersons of APC and FPC and the two committees of Senate would have an opportunity to respond. Mr. Huber raised a question regarding timing, noting page 3 "the Budget Plan" and the 'Timetable for 1985-86' on page 4. Mr. Sinclair stated that the budget process was initiated late this year and would hopefully return to its routine timing in September. The budget process would be reviewed by Senate and the UBAC report would become a public document. Mr. Rodger noted that UBAC would examine primary sources of revenue, allocation of funds in general, and alternatives and would not directly recommend financial constraint in response to Mr. Wooton's and Ms. Ozier's query.

### Adjournment

Members agreed that a special meeting of Senate would be called for 25 March 1985 to continue discussion of the remaining agenda items.

The meeting adjourned at 6:02 P.M.

**DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY**

**MINUTES OF**

**SENATE MEETING**

**MARCH 25, 1985**

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

Andrews, Barkow, Belzer, Betts, Birkett, Bonen, Bradfield, Braybrooke, Cameron D.M., Caty, Cohen A.D., Dresel, Field, Fingard, Gigeroff, Hennen, Horrocks, Huber, Josenhans, Kennedy, Klein, Larder, Leffek, Lewis, MacKay W.A., Maloney, Manning, Martin, Morrison, O'Brien D.W.P., O'Shea, Ozier, Radjavi, Rodger, Rosenberg, Ruf, Russell, Scheibelhut, Shaw L.R., Shires, Stern, Stovel, Sutherland, Swaminathan, Tindall, Tingley, Tonks, Waterson, Welch, Wooton, Yung, Zinck, Christie (invitee).

Regrets: Badley, Cromwell, Fulton, MacIntosh, Munroe, Perey, Stone.

85:032.

Joint APC - FPC - PPC Report on the University Campaign Committee

Mr. Dresel introduced the "Joint Subcommittee on Senate Campaign Relations Report to Parent Committees", and stressed that the function of the proposed University Campaign Committee was twofold - to establish policy and to advise the President regarding the Campaign Fund.

**He moved acceptance of the report on behalf of these committees.**

Mr. Dresel maintained that there would be considerable Senate input into expenditure policy in response to Mr. Bradfield's inquiry. Messrs. W. Jones and Dresel clarified the emphasis on the Development Fund for Ms. Waterson and Mr. Betts and noted the distinguishing features of the Development, Redistribution and Contingency Funds. They interpreted the recommendation as the committee having responsibility for decisions as to the amount and source of the Development Fund which might come from the Capital Campaign. The chairman answered affirmatively to Mr. Braybrooke's question about whether funds from the Capital Campaign could be used to endow/relieve existing programmes (e.g. re-equip scientific laboratories). It was moved and seconded (Bradfield/Waterson)

**that the report be amended as follows. Appendix 1, #1, line 1 should read "recommend", not "establish" policy.**

Mr. Bradfield was concerned that policy decisions might be made without Senators being informed. Mr. Dresel suggested that the UCC could instead report more frequently to Senate and the President indicated that Senate would be actively involved in decisions regarding distribution of the Campaign Fund through its committees, APC, PPC and FPC.

The amendment was defeated.

A second amendment was proposed by Scheibelhut/Barkow, namely

**to delete the words "Chairman or" preceding the words "permanent delegate" throughout the description of the composition of the UCC.**

This was accepted as a friendly amendment by the mover and seconder. Mr. Dresel stated that the word "permanent" referred to the term of that member on the parent committee, in response to Mr. Stuttard's question.

The main motion was accepted.

85:033-

Reports and Recommendations -- Committees of Senate

**A. Academic Planning Committee**

1. Part-Time Programme in German

On behalf of the APC, Mr. Cross moved

**that Senate approve the part-time graduate programme in German, this programme to have the same academic requirements as the full-time programme.**

Dean Leffek confirmed for Mr. Gigeroff that there were no extra costs involved for the university.

The motion carried.

Ms. Waterson queried whether it was necessary to have Senate approval of such degrees if there were no change in academic requirements. The President believed it was conceivable that different financial requirements could be involved.

It was agreed upon motion (D. Cameron/Kennedy)

**that in the future, part-time programs would be placed on the CAA agenda as "For Action" items. unless substantial changes from the full-time programme were proposed.**

2. Proposed B.Sc. (Kinesiology)

Mr. Cross moved on behalf of the APC

**that the proposed B.Sc. (Kinesiology) programme be approved.**

Dean Tonks reviewed the historical evolution of the proposal which recognized the desire for a more research-based programme. Mr. Gigeroff questioned the financial implications of

- (1) the "normal" yearly library acquisitions
- (2) equipment upgrading and replacement and
- (3) possible additional workload for faculty.

Mr. Maloney maintained that current acquisition monies would suffice, that the school would devote its own financial resources to equipment needs and faculty workload would not be increased as a result of one new course.

The motion carried.

3. Proposed Bachelor of Science (Nursing)

On behalf of the APC, Mr. Cross moved

**that the proposed Bachelor of Science (Nursing) be approved.**

Dean Tonks outlined the changes in the curriculum and the rationale, including enhanced access for part-time mature students and better preparation for the graduate programme. The Bachelor of Science (Nursing) would replace the BN basic degree track. It is expected that post-RN students could be accommodated in the new programme by 1987.

The motion carried.

4. Proposed M.A./M.Sc. in Computing Science On behalf of APC, Mr. Cohen moved

**that approval be given for an M.A./M.Sc. in Computing Science under the following conditions:**

1. That following approval from MPHEC, the proposal be referred back to Senate for final approval and Senate should then decide whether to implement the programme depending on the money available.
2. That there is clear evidence that money is available for:

- a) required equipment
- b) required faculty appointments
- c) graduate

### **student scholarship**

Mr. Gigeroff expressed the serious reservation of the DSU Council about the cost of the programme in a time of financial restraint at the university. The Chairman advised that the proposal would have to come back to Senate for approval for implementation after MPHEC approval was received. Mr. Rosenberg was surprised by the attitude of the Student Council in light of the demands students had made to have this degree programme. He responded to Mr. Gigeroff's second query concerning potential duplication with the TUNS programme by clarifying that the perspective on the discipline, the courses offered and the emphasis of courses differed. He referred to a recent letter from TUNS which incorporated a positive reaction to Mr. Rosenberg's Dalhousie's invitation to "cooperate". Mr. Field stated that TUNS had been approached several years ago with a request to collaborate. He added that the university could not attract qualified researchers if there was no graduate programme in computing science. Mr. Andrews believed the academic benefits of the programme were perceptible, but appealed to the APC to clarify the academic costs to the institution. The Chairperson of the subcommittee, Ms. Ritchie, noted that the issue of duplication and cooperation with TUNS, and the external reviewer and the Graduate Studies Committee's comments had been examined in addition to the costs of implementation which could be significant if external funding continued to be constrained. Mr. Welch reported that the FPC had looked at the cost issue with care and were particularly concerned with the problem of the computer facilities. On behalf of the FPC, he proposed an amendment to the motion or alternatively, a Notice of Motion for the next meeting of Senate:

**The Financial Planning Committee recommends that a decision to purchase the VAX 780 be made only if external funds are unequivocally identified for this purpose and that in the absence of such funds. the machine be returned to Digital Equipment. at the termination of the free loan period. unless Digital Equipment are prepared to extend the free lease until the final decision can be made on the Master's programme in Computing Science**

Messrs. Dunn and Betts could not envision how the entire Computer Science undergraduate as well as graduate programme could exist without the VAX 780. Mr. Betts expected that NSERC funds would become available later in the year, as the Dalhousie proposal had been ranked second. Mr. Stuttard wondered whether the Waterloo system, reported in the Globe and Mail, was indeed cheaper and more accurate than the VAX 780. Mr. Sutherland contended that academic excellence was evident in the Dalhousie programme although it does not have the technical support of Waterloo, and added that the impact of the federal budget was awaited. Mr. Cameron opposed the amendment on the grounds that the proposed UCC and the University Budget Advisory Committee would be a more appropriate forum for discussion of specific expenditures of funds. He said the real question was whether the university intended to take computing science seriously enough to support it. Mr. Field reiterated that the removal of the VAX 780 would

have a severe impact on researchers and faculty in the Mathematics Department. Messrs. Welch and Bonen maintained that external funds, not the operating budget, should cover the costs of the VAX 780. This did not preclude the purchase of equipment from the Dalhousie Campaign Fund.

Mr. Wooton was concerned about the serious state of the "clogged budget machinery". He said that it might be cheaper to "enter the race" later rather than replace obsolescent equipment. Ms. Ritchie reported that her subcommittee had been informed that the VAX 780 was for research use only and would not impact on the undergraduate programme. Messrs. Dunn, P. Jones and Rosenberg replied that there was no alternative for the VAX 780 quality on campus, and that since it was available for the research of Computing Science and Mathematics faculty, it was significant for the department as a whole. It would be difficult to recruit and retain qualified faculty without this computer. Mr. Cross wondered where the \$300,000 would come from and was concerned about the impact on other programmes. Mr. Dunn denied Mr. Huber's observation that the views expressed by the Computing Science division regarding the use of the VAX 780 appeared to have altered since one month ago.

Mr. Andrews believed the issue was one of academic choices and supported Mr. Welch's attempt to resolve the question. Mr. Welch commented that the FPC was simply restating the proposers stated intent to not use operating funds. Mr. Betts wondered why the machinery could not be leased for a few months while funds were sought from NSREC or the Capital Campaign.

It was agreed upon motion (Betts/Cross)

**that the word "free" be deleted from the second last line.**

Mr. Welch identified for Ms. Waterson the lease provision of approximately \$7,000 per month. Mr. Betts stated this could not come out of the Arts and Science envelope. Mr. Sutherland thought that NSREC might award funds for the operating costs of this machine. The President purported that such details regarding anticipated funds for equipment could not be discussed without prior notice and moved,

**that the amendment be tabled as a "Notice of Motion" for the April 8, 1985 meeting.**

The motion carried.

Mr. Dresel maintained that this piece of equipment was an integral part of the programme and constituted one of the major costs associated with the programme.

It was agreed, upon motion (Dresel/Bonen)

**that the Main motion be tabled until the April 8 meeting.**

## **B. Committee on Academic Administration**

1. Proposed Changes In Faculty Regulation Regarding Grades Obtained by Repeating Classes (CAA 85:009)

It was moved and seconded (Tonks/Maloney)

that the following regulation be added to the statement of Faculty of Health Professions general regulations in the Undergraduate Calendar and that the existing regulation 4.5 (pg xvi of the 1984-85 Undergraduate Calendar) no longer apply.

### Repeating Classes

**With the approval of the School/College Committee on Studies a student may repeat a class. Repeating any class for which a fail or pass grade has been received will result in only the most recently obtained grade being used for the purpose of calculating grade point averages. The original grade will remain on the transcript along with the new grade. For scholarship considerations, the Dean's List and University Medal and for the granting of a degree with distinction, all grades will be used.**

Mr. Rodger was mystified by the proposed change. Mr. Tonks clarified the rationale as outlined in his 4 January 1985 letter. In response to Messrs. Rodger and Andrews questions, Messrs. Sinclair and Tingley agreed that the original grade would remain on the transcript, as is currently the practice within the Faculty of Arts and Science. Mr. Tonks assured Ms. Caty that this was not retroactive but would be initiated as soon as Senate approval was received.

The motion carried.

2. Academic Costume for Degree Juris Scientiae Doctor

There was a consensus upon motion (Leffek/MacKay)

**that Senate adopt the following academic costume for the degree Juris Scientiae Doctor (JSD)s**

**a gown of black stuff faced with olympic blue silk bordered with yellow silk. The hood is of black corded silk with a lining of olympic blue silk bordered with yellow silk, and of the Cambridge design. The birretum is the doctor's bonnet of black velvet with a blue and yellow cord.**



There was further agreement, upon motion (Sinclair, on behalf of the CAA)

**that Senate adopt the following academic costume for the Master's degree in Health Services Administration (M.H.S.A.):**

**the hood is to be lined with sky-blue silk, bordered with white silk.**

3. Date for Kings College Encaenia

It was agreed, upon motion (Tingley/Betts)

**that Wednesday, May 8 at 2:30 P.M. would be a satisfactory date for Dalhousie degrees to be awarded at the Kings College Encaenia.**

4. Curriculum of the Nova Scotia Agricultural College

Mr. Huber inquired about the mechanism which could be used once the programme had been approved to attempt to upgrade the programme. Mr. Sinclair indicated that informal links similar to those adopted in Biology could be used as an impetus for cooperation.

Mr. Andrews sought to clarify whether specific classes had been examined for content and wondered if approval of this motion might not constitute a precedent in offering joint degrees with other institutions. Messrs. Sinclair, Tingley and Betts referred to possible impact on transfer credits from NSAC which would not be given "blanket" approval, although Dalhousie has given credit for some work done at NSAC in the past. The classes to which Mr. Andrews referred, however, had not been examined in detail. The Secretary relayed a summary of the CAA discussion to Ms. Waterson.

Mr. Rodger suggested that the CAA be asked to look into mechanisms which exist which could positively influence our colleagues and to report back to Senate. Mr. Sinclair reminded Senators that they had agreed to consider approval of the curriculum of NSAC, when this matter was discussed at an earlier meeting.

The motion **carried** and Mr. Rodger's request was referred to the CAA.

After some discussion, participated in by Messrs. Kennedy, Rodger, Zinck, Wooton and Betts, it was agreed that the Notice of Motion put forward by Kennedy/Wooton would be considered as the first item of business at the 8 April 1985 meeting of Senate.

85:034-  
Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:10 P.M.