

Item: Senate Minutes, April 1989
Call Number: Senate fonds, UA-5 Accession 2007-039 Box 6

Additional Notes:

This document is a compilation of Senate minutes, staff matters and miscellaneous documents for April 1989. The documents have been ordered chronologically and made OCR for ease of searching. The original documents and additional documents for this year which have not yet been digitized can be found in the Dalhousie University Senate fonds (UA-5) at the Dalhousie University Archives and Special Collections.

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

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

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY
MINUTES OF SENATE MEETING

Senate met in regular session in the Senate and Board Room on Monday, 10 April 1989 at 4:00 P.M.
Present with Mr. W.E. Jones in the chair were the following:

Andrews, Antoft, Barkow, Beanlands, Betts, Birdsall, Borwein, Braybrooke, Brett, Burns, T.S. Cameron, Carlson, Chandler, I. Christie, Clark, Comeau, Conover, Courtney, Cromwell, Curri, de Burger, R. Doyle, Duff, J. Fraser, Frick, Friedrich, Golding, Haley, Hart, Kimmins, Laidlaw, Lane, Leffek, Luke, Lutley, Mason, McKee, McNeil, McNulty, Medioli, Mehn-Andersen, Montalvo, M. Myers, O'Shea, Ozier, Retallack, Richards, Russell, Schroeder, Smith, Stairs, M. Stewart, Storey, Stuttard, Tamlyn, Tillet, Vance, Varma, Walker.

Invitees: B. Christie, M. MacDonald.

Regrets: Casey, J.V. Jones, Konok, MacIntosh, Ritchie, M.H. Tan, Wassersug.

89:037.

Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting of 6 March 1989 were approved upon motion (de Burger/Walker).

The Secretary reported that there was a typographical error in the minutes of the 13 March 1989 meeting: Ms. should read Mr. Zentilli in line 9 of 89:027. Mr. Braybrooke, referring to Senate minute 89:029, stated that the Chair, of all people, had devoted himself to Senate. Although he didn't question the good will intended, there had been a serious lapse in procedure in not bringing forward the motion recorded in the SAPC minutes of 27 February 1989. Specifically, it read:

WHEREAS: In its meeting of February 1, 1989 the Senate Academic Planning Committee, by secret ballot, voted a ranking of units of the University.

WHEREAS: This ranking reflects the committee's view of the University priorities in academic planning and funding.

The ranking has been used by the Committee in deciding disbursement of the Redistribution and Development Funds and is likely to guide its deliberations in the future.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT: The Chair of the SAPC make this ranking known to the Senate, the President, Deans of all Faculties and the chairpersons of each department within the University.

He referred also to the letter of that date to Dr. Clark from the Chair which appended this motion. Mr. Braybrooke then read a portion of the SAPC report to Senate on 13 March 1989 which included a statement directly contradictory to the SAPC motion. There was no one at the Senate meeting to call attention to this discrepancy. He requested assurance that there would be no future lapses in procedure. Mr. W. Jones responded that the motion in question did not get extensive discussion as it was put at the end of a long and arduous discussion. Furthermore, it did not reflect what the SAPC did and this had been made clear at the last meeting of Senate. The "list" had been released by some members of the Committee prior to the Senate meeting. It had subsequently become obvious to him, in light of feedback received, that there were serious internal and external ramifications if such a list of prioritized Faculties were made public. However, there was no time to consult with SAPC on the weekend preceding the Senate meeting. At the 13 March Senate meeting there had been no request by senators to see the list nor to have it made available. Furthermore, SAPC at a later meeting had not asked him to bring this list forward. Mr. Braybrooke said that some members of the Committee took the opposite view to the Chair's assertion that the list had neither been used by SAPC, nor been a policy of SAPC. Some Committee members may have used the list. Mr. Andrews suggested that discussion be focused on how similar incidents could be prevented in the future. Mr. Braybrooke explained that it was normal to have matters arising from the minutes of meetings discussed. In his view, there was some question about whether the meeting had been misled. Mr. Tomkow, who had moved the motion in SAPC, stated that there appeared to be questions in fact concerning whether the list was used or would be used. Disagreement had ensued in the SAPC meeting of 20 March 1989. However, the Committee had voted on 27 February 1989. He indicated his intention to resign from SAPC if the motion was not acted upon.

Mr. Carlson, another SAPC member, supported Mr. Jones' comments. He and several others who had initially voted for the SAPC motion, did not remember the Committee having used the list in establishing priorities. Subsequently, the opportunity to again ask that the list be released was not supported by the SAPC. The Chair had brought back the new information to SAPC and the motion had not been reinstated. Mr. Tomkow rejoined that it was ludicrous to pass a motion for a second time. Mr. Fraser thought the whole discussion was out of order unless amendments to the minutes were proposed. The Chair concurred that these points should be raised under matters arising from the minutes. Mr. Betts pointed to Senate Minute 89:028 (page 3, paragraph 3) and clarified the point he had tried to make regarding the difficulty in striking a budget by the April 7 deadline when an unknown number of further resignations might be expected by the end of the academic year. Mr. Braybrooke wished it made clear in the minutes of this meeting that there were grave doubts about the accuracy of the Chair's statements recorded in sentences 5 and 6 of Senate minute 89:029 (page 3). He wished it noted that in voting to approve the minutes as a record of what happened, that this did not endorse the truth of the statements. Mr. R. Smith clarified that members could reserve the right to judge the accuracy of some comments made at the 13 March meeting, although the minutes were an accurate record of what happened.

The minutes of the meeting of 13 March 1989 were then approved upon motion (Vance/Cromwell) with this proviso.

Discussion on matters arising from these minutes resumed. Mr. Braybrooke said there seemed to be a dereliction of procedures. He thought there should be some sign of general agreement that care would be taken to avoid such lapses in future. The Chair responded that he was not insensitive to these procedural issues. He could have acted differently by ignoring the motion and going back to SAPC. Instead he chose to tell Senate that a list had been developed.

Ms. Ozier believed that there were two issues at stake (1) disagreement about what the Committee did or did not do, and (2) the appropriate way for a chair of any committee to act concerning instructions of a committee

if these were opposition to the chair's personal principles. The two views of Committee members could be seen in the split vote reported in the SAPC minutes. She suggested that the Steering Committee report to Senate on the second matter concerning correct procedure in similar situations in future.

Mr. Andrews contended that the procedural issue was important. Even if the thinking on the matter continued to evolve, the motion should have been honored. Although he was somewhat sympathetic with the Chair's dilemma, it was a matter of concern to him that the majority vote of the SAPC had not been followed and that the report to Senate had been somewhat selective. The Chair indicated that he had advised Senate of the most current situation and had then gone back to the SAPC. Mr. Andrews inquired if this meant that relations between Senate and its committees did not need to be safeguarded in future.

Mr. Borwein, as an individual senator, requested a copy of the ranking of Faculties. Mr. D. Cameron offered commendation to the Chair for exercising discretion. Senate would not be served by procedures so meticulous that they did not permit discretion nor would it be served by officers of Senate who were automatons.

Mr. R. Storey voiced the same concerns. He interpreted the action taken by the Chair as showing considerable caution and constraint. Most SAPC members had subsequently been in favour of this action. The next opportunity (*i.e.* the next Senate meeting) would not have been the most reasonable time to air this problem. He maintained that the Committee's subsequent consideration of the new circumstances which had come to light gave evidence of this. Mr. Fraser claimed that he was becoming uneasy about the interrogation of the Chair. If people wished to make general points, a discussable motion was needed.

It was moved and seconded (Stuttard/Brett)

that when committees of Senate pass motions to bring information to Senate, that at least the motion itself be reported to Senate.

Mr. D. Cameron asked if this was intended to be different than the existing rules of Senate and asked what the implications of defeat of the motion would be. Mr. Stuttard explained that this is what Senate would expect to happen. Mr. Braybrooke added that it would be a disaster if a motion of this sort were defeated. He reiterated that care should be taken in future that such lapses in procedure not occur.

Mr. R. Smith suggested a friendly amendment which was accepted by the mover and seconder, "**that Senate reaffirm that when a Senate committee votes that a motion be brought forward to Senate, that at least the motion itself be reported to Senate.**"

The amended motion carried.

89:038.

Question Period

Ms. Vance asked to have item 11(3) moved up on the agenda. Members agreed with this request. Mr. Flint was concerned about the President's remarks reported in a recent issue of the Dalhousie News regarding professional schools' needs. He had written to the President about these comments. He asked the President if he would like to comment on how he believed that the Faculties with undergraduate programmes could better serve the professional schools.

The President replied that he and Vice-President Stairs had been communicating with Faculties across campus and receiving comments and suggestions. Mr. Flint had informed him that this comment had caused great concern in FASS, yet no individual faculty member had asked him for a copy of the complete text of his paper. President Clark continued that he agreed that there was a problem with communication. When he had been invited to speak on the role of professional schools he had spoken in generalities. It was the President's responsibility and right to address such general academic issues. In his view, it was a sad comment on the morale in the University that a President would be asked during Question Period of Senate to give any explanation of a speech. It seemed to him that it would be more appropriate to expect one-on-one discussion, a letter in Dalhousie News, or general discussion.

Mr. Leffek asked if Senate was willing to accept grades from Mount Saint Vincent University at Dalhousie if such grades were given by someone other than MSVU faculty. The Chair suggested that this question be put in writing and referred to the SCAA for report back to Senate.

Mr. Braybrooke observed that the President could not tell from the absence of communication that people were not disquietened about the matter raised by Mr. Flint. In fact, two members of FASS had been left to write to the President regarding this concern.

Mr. Andrews observed that Mr. Leffek and the SCAA members should be aware that the action of the Board of Governors of Mount Saint Vincent University was currently subject to legal challenge.

Mr. Flint indicated that he looked forward to the occasion when his concern could be discussed.

Ms. Vance reported that a number of students who were anticipating conferral of degrees in May were concerned that grades for one course in the Faculty of Science were not yet recorded. Mr. Betts commented that the matter was under discussion and was quite contentious, having given rise to more than one grievance. The instructor for this class of 33 registered students had submitted grades as follows: (31)A's, had (1)A+ (1)B+. This was a highly unusual grade distribution, as the median grade of other courses was typically in the B range. The Dean hoped that the matter would be resolved in a few days as he too was very concerned about students who were supposed to graduate.

Mr. Stuttard asked if the grades for one course in the Faculty of Science had been recorded on student transcripts. The Vice-President (Academic & Research) confirmed that these grades were now recorded.

Ms. Vance rejoined that the fact still remained that this had taken more than three months. Mr. Stairs explained that the grades had not been recorded because the distribution had been so unusual that it had led to inquiry. If adjustments were made to grades already recorded the future of these students would be affected. Therefore, the administration was attempting to deal with the problem in advance of the grades being recorded. Ms. Vance asked if there was some rule for this procedure and if these rules were being broken. Mr. Stairs replied that in some Faculties grades were submitted routinely through the Faculties. Although there was no rule for a similar situation, there were general precedents for reviewing grades before, not after, the fact. Mr. Medioli asked who had the right to record marks. Did the authority rest with Senate? Mr. Andrews pointed out Regulation 19.4 of the College of Arts and Science which reads:

19.4 Submission of Grades

On completion of a class, the instructor is required to submit grades to the Registrar, such grades to be based on the instructor's evaluation of the academic performance of the students in the class in question. Christmas grades must be submitted to the Registrar in all 1000-level classes in which enrolment on October 1 exceeded 25: Christmas grades are normally submitted in other full-year classes.

Mr. Andrews inquired about the criteria for considering unusual distribution of grades and the potential damage to academic freedom. President Clark clarified that the Registrar did not, of her own accord, choose not to record the marks. Furthermore, some Faculty regulations were not university-wide regulations. Dalhousie needed to have better defined rules and regulations. He added that the transcript received is the official document of the University and part of the contract between the University and the student. Therefore, it was the university's responsibility to ensure that the marks on the transcript were accurate and appropriate. Mr. Andrews wanted assurance that the regulations of the College were university-approved regulations which had the same authority as regulations from other Faculties. The President clarified that this was the case. Ms. Ozier asked if students were not getting their marks because someone wanted to discipline a faculty member. The Chair indicated that if this matter was not resolved it would come back to Senate.

89:039.

Report of the President

The President reviewed the following items which had been reported in the appended document entitled, "Report of the President, April 1989", circulated at the meeting: (1) Funding, the Adlington Report, and the Status of MPHEC, (2) Government and Related Matters, (3) Donner Foundation Grant, (4) Committee Reports, (5) Expression of appreciation to DSU and welcoming new DSU Executive. Ms. Vance thanked the President for his appreciation of the DSU executive's assistance over the past year but stated that the students who had not received their marks had a right to be angry. The President observed that many rules and regulations were obscure and not well documented. He hoped this situation would improve through changes planned by the SCAA. Mr. Leffek asked if the review of the Faculty of Graduate Studies would be made available to that Faculty for debate before or after SAPC initiated its own discussion. The Chair replied that the report had been requested by SAPC but could be debated by the Faculty of Graduate Studies as soon as it was released by the President. The President added that it was intended that the report be made widely available. Mr. Betts suggested that the President of the University of Kings College be invited to respond to questions regarding the proposed new programme in Contemporary Studies at the next regular meeting of Senate.

89:040.

Conflict in Date for Withdrawal Without Academic Penalty and Date for Withdrawal Without Financial Penalty in 1988-89

Ms. Vance apologized for bringing up this concern so late in the year. She referred to the 19/4/89 SCAA minute excerpt circulated with the agenda and explained that students had not only withdrawn but had changed status from full-time to part-time. Mr. McKee then reviewed the historical evolution of this matter. The SCAA, in an attempt to be fair to all students, had extended the deadline for withdrawal without academic penalty, originally extended to December 20, 1988, to January 13 to enable all students to be informed of their grades. He pointed out that the DSU had not felt it was appropriate to make a full refund of its fees. Inadvertently, the original decision to extend the deadline to December 20 had created a situation whereby some students might obtain their grades and if these were poor would withdraw. Mr. Borwein explained that the reason the SCAA had extended the deadline was to ensure that all students were treated equally. Ms. Vance was concerned about the rationale for this decision as posting of grades was not considered acceptable. Students were caught between two deadlines, in her view. Mr. R. Smith believed that it was incorrect to say that there was no record on the transcript to indicate that students who

had withdrawn following the strike had attended classes. He was interested in the DSU's view that it was not required to refund fees yet wished tuition fees refunded by the University. Ms. Golding stated that she personally disagreed with this DSU policy, however tuition fees were much higher and this was a different matter. Mr. McKee conveyed the perception of SCAA that it should concern itself with academic implications rather than financial implications and that the transcripts were a permanent record.

It was moved and seconded (Vance/Golding)

that the date set for withdrawal without academic penalty be consistent with the date identified for withdrawal without financial penalty retroactive for this year only.

Ms. Ozier thought that the strike was confusing for everyone and especially for students. She spoke in favour of the motion, as students should not be taxed for this unavoidable situation. Mr. Braybrooke pointed out that the motion as it read now could be satisfied by moving the date for withdrawal without academic penalty back. Mr. R. Smith explained that SCAA had received some detailed information from Vice-President McKee and the Registrar. He wanted it clarified that the refund process had been described as flexible and shifting at the SCAA meeting.

Furthermore, a student representative had been present at this meeting. Ms. Curri agreed that in principle the dates for withdrawal without academic and financial penalty should coincide. However, special arrangements had been made after the strike to offer students the opportunity to "opt out" without academic penalty. Ms Vance reiterated her concern about the two inconsistent deadlines and believed that students should be compensated. Mr. D. Cameron felt uncomfortable with a motion which altered a recommendation of a committee and believed it would be more appropriate to have the SCAA reconsider this question and report back at a later date. Ms. Curri explained that notation of individual course withdrawals by students would be dropped from the transcript. However, the transcript would show that the student had attended the course.

It was moved and seconded (D. Cameron/O'Shea)

that the matter be referred back to the SCAA with a request for further information.

Mr. Stuttard sought clarification about whether Senate was also considering students whose status had changed after dropping a single class. Ms. Vance assumed that the question to be considered by Senate concerned whether students who would have received partial or full refunds if they had withdrawn or changed status before December 20 would receive the same refund if this had occurred before January 13. Mr. Andrews interpreted the motion as indicating the need for adequate information in order to further discuss this matter. Mr. D. Cameron agreed.

The motion carried.

The Chair suggested that the more detailed report from SCAA could be brought to the next meeting scheduled for April 24 at which time the remainder of the agenda could hopefully be completed.

89:041.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:02 P.M.

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY
MINUTES OF SENATE MEETING

Senate met in regular session in the Senate and Board Room on Monday, 24 April 1989 at 4:00 P.M.

Present with Mr. T. Cromwell in the chair were the following:

Barkow, Bastarache, Beanlands, Betts, Birdsall, Black, Borwein, Braybrooke, Brett, Burns, T.S. Cameron, Carlson, Caty, Clark, Conover, Curri, Dykstra, J. Fraser, Frick, Friedrich, Greer, Hart, Kimmins, Laidlaw, Lane, Leffek, Luke, Lutley, McKee, McNeil, Murphy, Myers, Ozier, Pross, Retallack, Ritchie, Sinclair-Faulkner, Smith, Stairs, M. Stewart, Stuttard, Tillett, Vance, Walker.

Invitees: B. Christie, M. MacDonald.

Regrets: Belzer, Forgay, Cold, Gratwick, Konok, Maloney, Tamlyn, Wood, Writer, Zakariasen.

Mr. Cromwell explained that this meeting had been called to continue discussion of unfinished agenda items from the April 10 meeting of Senate.

Ms. Vance introduced the following new student members of Senate:

President (DSU)	Dave Shannon
Academic Vice-President	Kim Vance
Medicine	Sanjay Sharma
Law	Randy Pelletier
Dentistry	Phillip Cabrera
Science	Ralph Bastarache
Arts & Social Sciences	Jeffery Fox
Graduate Studies	Ken Greer
Management	Andrew Murphy
(Health Professions	vacant)

89:042.

Conflict in Dates for Withdrawing without Academic Penalty versus Financial Penalty

The pertinent minute excerpt from the April 19, 1989 meeting of the Senate Committee on Academic Administration was circulated along with a memorandum from Mr. McKee entitled, "Post-Strike Withdrawal/Fee Refund Arrangements". This had been drafted at the request of the Secretary of Senate and the Chair of the SCAA.

Ms. Vance noted that a motion had been tabled at the previous meeting which read: "that the date set for withdrawal without academic penalty be consistent with the date identified for withdrawal without financial penalty, retroactive for this year only."

It was agreed upon motion (Vance/Caty) **to lift this motion from the table.**

Ms. Vance explained that students had been confused and had been "caught in the middle" following the strike. Part of the decision making process to extend the date of withdrawal to January 13 had been based on the assumption that students might have an opportunity to see their marks. However, transcripts, which were the only official document for marks, were not received by January 13. Ms. Vance agreed that the motion recorded in the minute excerpt of the 19 April meeting of the SCAA could be accepted as a friendly amendment. This read, **"that dates of withdrawal without academic or financial penalty be made to coincide so that students who withdrew between December 2, 1988 - January 13, 1989 would be treated the same as those who withdrew prior to December 20, 1988, and that fees be refunded in appropriate cases."**

It was moved and seconded (R. Smith/Leffek)

that the motion be amended by adding the words "provided that the DSU act in kind" at the end.

The amendment carried.

After some discussion by Messrs. Borwein, Friedrich, Cromwell and Ms. Ozier regarding the implications of the proposed motion, a further amendment was moved and seconded (Stuttard/Laidlaw)

that the words ~Senate recommend to the Board of Governors" be inserted after 'that" in line 1 of the motion.

The amendment passed.

Mr. Braybrooke was concerned about the controversy concerning the date on which information regarding the proposed extension to January 13 was posted. Mr. McKee clarified that the decision to extend the date was made at the 9 December 1988 meeting of SCAA. The announcement was ready for distribution on January 3, 1989. Ms. Curri added that departments were notified prior to January 3, 1989. Ms. Vance reiterated her contention from the SCAA meeting that the announcement had been posted in the Registrar's Office prior to December 20, 1988. Mr. Braybrooke asked whether students were informed in the January 3, 1989 notice that the dates for withdrawal without academic penalty had been extended from December 20 to January 13 but the date for withdrawal without financial penalty had not. Mr. McKee verified that this was the case. Mr. Braybrooke then inquired whether any students might have learned of the proposed change and then withdrawn between December 20 to January 3. Ms. Curri responded that the Registrar's Office and the university had been closed during that period. Mr. McKee thought that December 22 was the last working day and that most students had withdrawn between January 3 - 13, 1989.

Mr. Smith agreed that Mr. Braybrooke raised an interesting point concerning the "gray area" between December 20 - January 3 and proposed an amendment, seconded by Mr. Friedrich **that the "date January 13 be changed to January 3 in line 4 of the motion."**

Mr. Greer expressed his opposition to the amendment, explaining that many students might wait until the last day to withdraw. Mr. Stuttard asked whether the memorandum to students made it clear that the financial date had not been moved. Mr. McKee read out the relevant portion of the memorandum. Mr. Borwein explained that the SCAA had made its decisions about academic deadlines on the basis of equity, but recognized the substantial financial costs which might result from the original motion. He believed that the proposed amendment to January 3, 1989 addressed both aspects. Ms. Vance disagreed with the amendment.

The amendment was defeated.

The vote on the main motion, as amended, was put. A tie resulted (17 for, 17 against). The Chair cast the deciding vote against the amended motion and the amended motion was defeated.

89:043.

Form of Address in Senate Meetings -- Notice of Motion

Correspondence dated 14 March 1989 from Ms. Walker included notice of a motion concerning sexist forms of address. It was moved and seconded (Walker/Black)

that Senate approve removal of sexist forms of address, where possible, in the Senate.

Ms. Vance pointed out that all Senators were not professors. Another student member, Mr. Greer, suggested that the whole problem might be solved by using the term "Senator". Ms. Laidlaw observed that the term "chairman" was not gender neutral, although it was used in Ms. Walker's memorandum. She then expressed her concern that the front cover of university examination books continued to use sexist terminology. She asked that Senate recommend to the Registrar that these materials be returned and that sexist language be deleted. Mr. Cromwell indicated that the Secretary would draw this to the attention of the proper authorities. Ms. Laidlaw wondered if the Steering Committee could address the use of the term "chairman". Mr. Smith spoke in favour of the motion to use "Mr." and "Ms." as was the custom rather than Professor, and furthermore contended that sexist terminology was not the only problem with the examination books.

Mr. Fraser sympathized with the intent of the motion and agreed with Mr. Smith that use of "Mr." and "Ms." was more desirable than "Professor". Ms. Laidlaw reported that DWFO had sought the President's agreement that all Chairs, etc. would have access to the booklet "Hers and His: Equal Value". The President confirmed that this would occur. Mr. B. Christie suggested that the problem could be avoided by addressing people by both their names. The Secretary pointed out that it was customary to use the terms Mr., Ms., Chair or Chairperson in Senate minutes, and that the Steering Committee had in the past made efforts to remove sexist terminology from Senate documents.

Following brief discussion, the motion was approved.

89:044.

Nominations from the Committee on Committees

Mr. Pross moved the following nominations on behalf of the Committee on Committees. These were approved after three calls for further nominations and the individuals listed were declared elected to the Committees named:

Senate Library Committee

C. White (Physics) - 1992

Ad Hoc Committee on Calling and Cancelling Senate Meetings

L. Trakman (Law)

L. Vining (Biology)

N. Brett (Philosophy)

University Tenure Panel

D. Moore (Social Work)
A. Manicom (Education)
M. Sandhu (French)
M. Hansell (Anatomy)

The requisite approval had been received from the President and the President of the DFA for the nominations to the University Tenure Panel.

Mr. Pross, on behalf of the Committee on Committees, then nominated Messrs. D. Braybrooke and C. Stuttard and Ms. D. Pothier to serve on the "Committee on Relations between Members of Faculty and the University during a Strike". He indicated that this was not a full slate. The Committee had one other nomination in mind. Mr. Friedrich would be nominated at the May 5 meeting. Considerable discussion ensued, participated in by Messrs. Fraser, Pross, Friedrich, and Betts, which focused clarification on the size of the committee and on the question of neutrality and balance of the proposed membership.

It was moved and seconded (Laidlaw/Friedrich)

that Senate refer this matter back to the Committee on Committees for further consideration and ask the Committee to come forward with a full slate.

Ms. Laidlaw asked for clarification of the title and mandate of the committee. Mr. Cromwell read out the relevant motion from Senate minute 89 :007 (p. 6) which clarified both questions .

Mr. Braybrooke agreed with Mr. Betts' remarks that it would be useful to have a member from another part of the University (i.e Administration). Mr. Cromwell pointed out that senators could communicate suggested nominees to the Committee on Committees. Mr. Friedrich recommended that all student bodies be represented on the Committee.

The motion carried.

Mr. Pross noted that it was somewhat difficult to persuade faculty members of moderate views to sit on such committees and that the DSU was responsible for naming student representation on Senate committees.

89:045.

Recording of Names at Senate Meetings

Mr. Betts had raised a question at the 13 March 1989 Senate meeting concerning the recording of non-member names in the list of those present.

On behalf of the Steering Committee, Ms. Dykstra moved

that the minutes no longer include a list of those present or relaying regrets but that a list of those who had indicated their presence could be kept in the Senate Office for perusal by interested senators. Non-members in attendance could be listed separately.

Discussion followed, contributed to by Messrs. Stuttard, Borwein, Betts, Smith and Ms. Vance, which concluded that it was useful to continue with present practice, to continue to have the list updated, and to keep the list circulating throughout Senate meetings.

The motion was defeated.

89:046.

Proposed Community Relations Council and Public Relations Committee

Relevant correspondence from President Clark, dated 23 February 1989, appending the proposed terms of reference; correspondence from Mr. Rosson, Chair, Senate Advisory Committee on Public Relations (6/3/89) to the President; the President's response (14/3/89); and the pertinent Steering Committee minute excerpt had been precirculated.

The President reviewed the rationale and mandate for the two bodies and pointed out that one additional student would be added to the composition of the Public Relations Committee.

It was moved and seconded (Clark/Ritchie)

that Senate approve the establishment of a Community Relations Council and a Public Relations Committee. These would supersede the Senate Advisory Committee on Public Relations and the Board Committee on Alumni and Community Relations.

The President clarified that the Public Relations Committee would report at least annually to Senate. Mr. Betts was concerned that the terms of reference of the Community Relations Council might promote a bias toward professional schools, as very few external advisory committees existed for other disciplines. The President assured him that this was not the case. Mr. Barkow commented that there were concerted efforts by lobbying groups of varied disciplines.

Ms. Curri asked if the Council would include representation from prospective students as a major constituency. President Clark responded that the committee's mandate, and hence its composition, referred to a broad definition of the community. Mr. S. Cameron was puzzled by the suggestion that the Community Relations Council, which had a subcommittee with student representation, would not have prospective students' views represented. Ms. Vance suggested it was naive to think that prospective students were not members of the community. President Clark replied that he had not intended to imply that prospective students were excluded from membership but wished to emphasize that this was not the primary role of the Council.

Mr. Greer sensed that key groups might be missed and that such a Council might appeal to corporate elitist groups primarily. The President commented that the large membership was proposed to represent as many groups as possible. Mr. Betts wondered if NSERC, for example, would be considered part of the "community". The President defined the community of interest in broad, regional terms. Ms. Vance spoke against setting up another bureaucratic group **whose terms of reference were vaguely defined.**

Mr. Greer recommended referring the motion back to a Senate committee. Mr. Cromwell explained that the Steering Committee had already considered the recommendation to establish these two groups and concurred that it go directly to Senate (S.C. 89:013).

The motion carried.

89:047.

Proposed M.P.A. / LL.B. Programme

The pertinent correspondence (dated February 20, 1989) from Mr. Leffek and SAPC minute excerpt (APC 89:049) had been precirculated.

It was moved and seconded (Carlson/Leffek)

that Senate approve the Combined M.P.A. / LL.B. programme.

Mr. Leffek observed that this was the first item on the agenda pertaining to academic programmes, yet it had generated no debate.

89:048.

President's 1987-88 Annual Report to Senate on the Policy for Increasing the Proportion of Female Faculty

The President briefly outlined the contents of the report. Some departments were taking special measures to promote hiring of women. However, overall progress was small. He hoped to see more progress in the coming years. Mr. Leffek noted that significant progress had been made in recruiting women to Ph.D. programmes. This year the numbers had increased to 40%. It was hoped that males and females would be equally represented in the near future. Mr. Betts asked if the reporting period included the effective date of appointment. Mr. Stairs replied that the date referred to was that on which the Board of Governors approved appointments.

Mr. Betts commented that the report did not clearly indicate that four women had been appointed in the 1987-88 year. Furthermore, there was no such thing as Canadian Research Fellows referred to on page 3. President Clark indicated that the figures in the report had been carefully checked. Ms. Vance asked if the position on recruitment and appointment of women applied equally to staff, administration and faculty. President Clark clarified that the only affirmative action policy presently in effect dealt with faculty. Although a broader policy statement was expected, the statement referred not just to affirmative action with respect to women, but also to other target groups.

Mr. S. Cameron was reminded of the advertisement from another university which said that "men need not apply" and requested further information on special measures taken by certain units. Mr. Cromwell observed that the Law School Appointments Committee took initiative in the recruitment process through visits and contacting colleagues, and furthermore, adopted the "demonstrably better" principle as part of its recruitment and appointment process.

Ms. Vance asked if administrative appointments were included in current statements. President Clark indicated that there was no binding policy statement of the type pertaining to faculty members which was included in the Collective Agreement. All policies would need to be approved by the Nova Scotia Human Rights Commission.

Mr. Fraser mentioned the discrepancy in numbers of publications by males and females in certain Faculties and remarked that it was sometimes difficult to get good candidates.

89 :049.

SFPC Report to Senate on 1989/90 Budget Process and SAPC Response

The Chair explained that the SFPC document on the budget process along with the SAPC response, came at this time as a matter of information. The SFPC planned to bring a report on the 1989-90 budget to the May 5 meeting of Senate. All three reports would be discussed at that time.

89: 050 .

Matters of Information

Tuition Fees

A memorandum dated 14 March 1989 from the Vice-President (Finance and Administration) was precirculated. The memo drew to Senate's attention the fact that Dalhousie University's tuition fees are not the highest in Canada, the Maritimes, or in Nova Scotia and attached a table copied from MPHEC's 1988 Statistical Compendious entitled, "Tuition Fees at Maritime Institutions Selected Years 1975-76 to 1987-88" (Memorial, \$1108; McGill,

\$570; Simon Fraser, \$1410; Western, \$1350; Queen's, \$1350; Alberta, \$944; UBC, \$1380+; Manitoba, \$1109). Ms. Ozier agreed that it would be actually more correct to say that Dalhousie's tuition fees were among the highest. She had received from AUCC some additional data which put Mr. Mason's memo and her comments in context. She commended the DSU for looking after students in this regard.

Notification of Development Project - Environmental Management Development - Indonesia (Phase III)

A document entitled, "Development Project - Environmental Management Development - Indonesia (Phase III)" was precirculated. Mr. Cromwell indicated that this report came forward from the Chair of Senate as a member of the Ad Hoc Committee. An ongoing mechanism for review was proposed (p. 4). Mr. Beanlands and others involved in the project were available to respond to questions. None were posed.

The Chair suggested that the remaining items be dealt with at the 28 April 1989 meeting of Senate.

89:051.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:09 P.M.

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY
MINUTES OF SENATE MEETING

Senate met in special session in the Senate and Board Room on Friday, 28 April 1989 at 4:00 P.M.

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

Bastarache, T.S. Cameron, Caty, Cromwell, Gratwick, Haley, Lane, MacRae, McKee, Murphy, Myers, Stairs, M. Stewart, Vance.

Regrets: Walker.

89:052.

Approval of Degrees -- Nova Scotia Agricultural College

Dr. McRae, Principal of the Nova Scotia Agricultural College, observed that there were 62 candidates for the degree of Bachelor of Science in Agriculture, of whom 7 were graduating with high honours and 7 were graduating with honours. This was the largest group of graduands to date.

It was agreed upon motion (McRae/Haley)

that the list of candidates had fulfilled all the requirements for the degree and should be granted the Bachelor of Science in Agriculture at the Convocation to be held on May 3rd at 2:00 P.M.

It was further agreed upon motion (Haley/S. Cameron)

that the Principal of the NSAC and the Registrar be authorized to add to and remove from the graduation list the names of any students which were omitted from or included on the graduation list due to errors on the part of the University or one of its servants.

89:053.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:08 P.M.