

Item: Senate Minutes, October 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 October 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**  
**APPROVED MINUTES**  
**OF**  
**SENATE MEETING**

Senate met in regular session on Friday, 11 October 1996 at 10:00 a.m. in the University Hall, Macdonald Building.

Present with Mr. Colin Stuttard in the chair were:

Adams, Andrews, Apostle, Archibald, Birdsall, Bleasdale (Secretary), Bradfield, Cameron, Clark, Conrod, Egan, Fraser, Hartzman, Hobson, Hooper, Kay-Raining Bird, Kiang, Kimmins, Lydon, MacInnis, MacKay, Maloney, McIntyre, Moore, Morrissey, Oore, Patriquin, Pereira, Ricketts, Rosson, Russell, Scassa, Siddiq, Starnes, Sutherland, Taylor, Traves, White.

Regrets: Brett, Camfield, Dickson, Farmer, Klein, Lovely, Shafai, Wrixon.

**96:110.**

Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as circulated.

**96:111.**

a) Minutes of Previous Meeting

At page 9, line 3 of paragraph 2 under Question Period, "meetings" was changed to "merger"; at page 1, line 1 under Matters Arising, "Andrew's" was changed to "Andrews"; at page 8, in paragraph 1, in lines 5 and 6, "Times" was changed to "Time"; and at page 5, paragraph 4, line 5, quotation marks were inserted after "Faculty". Ms. Morrissey and Mr. Taylor were added to the list of those who had attended the September 23rd meeting. The minutes of the Senate meeting of September 23, 1996 were then adopted as amended.

b) Matters Arising

There were no matters arising.

**96:112.**

Awarding of Degrees

Faculty of Graduate Studies

Mr. Ricketts proposed that the degrees be awarded as follows:

Doctor in the Science of Law .....	1
Master of Laws .....	6
Master of Arts .....	57
Master of Arts in Teaching .....	1
Master of Business Administration .....	2
Master of Development Economics .....	6
Master of Education .....	7
Master of Environmental Studies .....	5
Master of Health Services Administration .....	2
Master of Library and Information Studies.....	3
Master of Marine Management .....	19
Master of Nursing.....	7
Master of Public Administration.....	2
Master of Science .....	46
Master of Science in the Biology E-stream (NS Agricultural College) .....	1
Master of Social Work .....	18
Doctor of Philosophy .....	33
	<b>TOTAL 216</b>

College of Arts and Science

Mr. Taylor proposed that degrees, diplomas and certificates be awarded as follows:

Bachelor of Arts.....	125
(Distinction 5, Honours 11, First Class Honours 4, Adv.Major 17)	
Bachelor of Arts Advanced Major Certificate.....	6
Bachelor of Arts Honours Certificate .....	2
(Honours 1, First Class Honours 1)	
Bachelor of Music.....	1
Bachelor of Science .....	86
(Distinction 7, Honours 11, First Class Honours 6, Adv.Major 15)	
Bachelor of Science Advanced Major Certificate .....	2
Bachelor of Science Honours Certificate.....	4
(First Class Honours 4)	
Diploma in Engineering .....	26
	<b>TOTAL 252</b>

Faculty of Health Professions

Ms. McIntyre proposed that degrees and diplomas be awarded as follows:

Bachelor of Recreation.....	3
Bachelor of Science in Health Education .....	7
Bachelor of Science (Kinesiology).....	1
Bachelor of Science (Nursing).....	14
(Distinction 1)	
Bachelor of Science in Occupational Therapy.....	1
Bachelor of Science (Physiotherapy) .....	1
Bachelor of Social Work.....	15
(Distinction 1)	
Diploma in Health Services Administration.....	2
Diploma in Outpost and Community Health Nursing .....	4
	TOTAL 48

Faculty of Law

Ms. Russell proposed that degrees be awarded as follows:

Bachelor of Laws.....	3
	TOTAL 3

Faculty of Management

Mr. Rosson proposed that degrees be awarded as follows:

Bachelor of Commerce .....	23
	TOTAL 23

It was moved

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

The motion carried.

It was moved

**that the appropriate Dean or the Provost of the College of Arts and Science and the Registrar, 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 University or one of its officers, or for other reasons, and**

that any such additions or deletions be reported to Senate.

The motion carried.

**96:113.**

Report of Senate Academic Appeals Committee Hearing Panel

(i) Decision (ii) Recommendations

Senate considered this item *in camera*, after which the Chair reported that the decision of the Hearing Panel had been adopted.

**96:114.**

Nominations from the Senate Nominating Committee

Ms. Bleasdale moved

**that Senate approve the nominations of Ray Klapstein (Management) and Tom Cromwell (Law) to the Senate Academic Appeals Committee;**

**David Schroeder (Arts and Social Sciences) to the Senate Discipline Committee;**

**David Kaufman (Medicine) to the Senate Committee on Instructional Development;**

**Elizabeth Kay-Raining Bird (Health Professions) to the Senate Steering Committee;**

**John O'Brien (Arts and Social Sciences) to the Board of Governors;**

**Teresa Scassa (Law) to the Board of Governors' Student Relations and Residence Committee;**

**Michael Bradfield (Science) to the Employee Benefits Committee;**

**Lynn Sorge (Arts and Social Sciences) to the University Public Relations Committee.**

The Chair made the requisite calls for further nominations and hearing none, he declared those nominated individuals elected.

**96:115.**

President's 1994/95 Annual Report on the Policy for Increasing the Proportion of Designated Group Members Holding Academic Appointments

Ms. Hobson wished to acknowledge the work of Lynn Purves in Personnel Services, one of our hard-working individuals behind the scenes, who had put considerable effort into preparing the material for this Report. Ms. Hobson also expressed her appreciation for the efforts of the Deans and those on appointments committees in the Faculties who had given their time and energies to putting our affirmative action policies into effect. The Report indicated significant gains over the past few years. Though the Report did not cover the 1996/97 academic year, she was delighted to be able to inform Senate that of the fifteen tenure-stream appointments this year, three of the appointees were Black, and one of these was a full professor in the Faculty of Law. This represented a major step towards a more diverse community at Dalhousie.

**96:116.**

Adjournment

The Chair, recognizing the loss of quorum, asked for a motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 11:25 a.m.

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

SENATE met in regular session on Monday, 28 October 1996 at 4:00 p.m. in the University Hall, Macdonald Building.

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

Adams, Andrews, Apostle, Archibald, Birdsall, Bleasdale (Secretary), Bradfield, Brett, Clark, Conrod, Dickson, Doolittle, Farmer, Fraser, Hartzman, Hobson, Hooper, Kay-Raining Bird, Klein, Lovely, Lydon, MacInnis, MacKay, Maloney, McIntyre, Moore, Oore, Patriquin, Pereira, Ricketts, Rosson, Russell, Scassa, Starnes, Sutherland, Taylor, Traves, White.

Invitee: J. Eastman

Regrets: Cameron, Egan, Kimmins, Siddiq, Tomblin Murphy, Wrixon.

**96:117.**

Adoption of the Agenda

Mr. Stuttard asked that in light of the e-mail circulated to members the order of items 5 (a) and 5 (b) be reversed. The agenda was adopted with this amendment.

**96:118.**

Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting

At item 96:111, line 2, quotation marks were inserted after "merger" and at line 5 the spelling of Ms. Morrissey's name was corrected; Mr. Brett and Mr. Lovely were added to those who had sent their regrets; and the minutes were adopted as amended.

**96:119.**

Changes in Fall Graduation List

Ms. Bleasdale reported that with the authority granted at the 11 October 1996 meeting of Senate, and after consultation with the appropriate Deans and the Chair of Senate, the following names were added to the graduation list for the Fall of 1996:

Bachelor of Arts (with Distinction)

Tracey Hughes  
Bachelor of Commerce

Robert James Angel

Bachelor of Social Work

Gail McIntyre

**96:120.**

Report from the Senate Nominating Committee

On behalf of the Senate Nominating Committee, Mr. Boran nominated Elizabeth Kay-Raining Bird (Health Professions/Human Communications Disorders) to fill a six-month vacancy as Vice-Chair of Senate that will occur when Ms. Conrod takes sabbatical leave (1 January to 30 June 1997). Following the requisite calls for further nominations, Mr. Stuttard declared Ms. Kay-Raining Bird elected.

On behalf of the Senate Nominating Committee, Mr. Boran nominated for membership on the Senate Physical Planning Committee: Nathan Brett (elected Faculty Senator), Anne Higgins (Arts and Social Sciences/English), Amid Ismail (Dentistry), Jim McNiven (Management), and Marcia Ozier (Science/Psychology). Following the requisite calls for further nominations, Mr. Stuttard declared the proposed individuals elected.

In accordance with the Notice of Motion included on the agenda, Mr. Boran also moved:

**That the Senate Nominating Committee recommends to Senate the following changes to the Constitution of Senate: Under "III B. "Election of Officers" of the Constitution, insert the words "When possible" at the beginning of the sentence "No more than one Senate Officer may be elected from any single Faculty at any time"; and (2) insert the words "Except for those elected Faculty Senators who have served as Senators in the past" at the beginning of the sentence "A candidate must be completing at least one year of a term in Senate to be elected an Officer of Senate." To give practical effect to the foregoing, election of Senate Officers should occur after, rather than before, the Faculty elections to Senate. Therefore, the fourth sentence of III B. ("These elections shall be . . .") should be deleted.**

Mr. Boran explained that at its October 18th meeting, the Senate Nominating Committee had discussed the restrictions the Committee faced in selecting suitable nominations for the Officers of Senate, and had concluded that the criteria for appointment of Officers should be revised to allow for the expansion of the pool from which potential candidates could be drawn.

Ms. Sutherland was concerned that opening up eligibility for service to anyone who had served on the old Senate, as well as on the new, might not be in keeping with the underlying reasons for revising Senate, since the old Senate had comprised primarily (full) Professors, and only a relatively small number of members elected by their Faculties, together with the *ex officio*



members. She favoured restricting eligibility to those who had served on the new Senate. Ms. Conrod pointed out that with the present restrictions on the pool from which Officers could be drawn the Nominating Committee had difficulty finding individuals ready, willing and able to take on the demanding responsibilities which went with these positions. Though to date Senate had been successful in attracting high-quality candidates, she hoped members would support the motion out of respect for the Nominating Committee's onerous task, and in order to give the Committee greater flexibility. Mr. Clark suggested we might accommodate the needs of the Nominating Committee and the concerns of Ms. Sutherland by stipulating that in five years, after the build-up of a larger pool, we again limit eligibility to those who had served on the revised Senate. Since Senate had the ultimate authority to accept or reject any individual put forward by the Nominating Committee, Mr. Andrews felt comfortable giving the Committee greater scope to carry out their job.

The motion CARRIED without dissent.

**96:121.**

Dal/TUNS Transition

Mr. Stuttard asked the meeting to consider the notice of motion from the Steering Committee, circulated with the agenda:

**That Senate authorizes its Steering Committee to meet jointly with the Steering Committee of TUNS, to draft terms of reference for the proposed Academic Council in accordance with the Dal/TUNS Agreement to Amalgamate (Signed July 10 and 11, 1996).**

The motion CARRIED.

Mr. Stuttard then asked members to consider the subject of the e-mail of October 23rd, in which he had indicated that he would ask Senate to consider the Academic Coordinating Committee (a sub-committee of the Amalgamation Planning Committee) and a Senate representative for that Committee.

Mr. Traves stressed the importance of appointing a Senate representative so this committee could begin the numerous important tasks before it. Senate could ask the Nominating Committee or the Steering Committee to find the Senate representative, or it could choose that representative at this meeting. If Senate wished to adopt the latter approach, Mr. Traves would nominate the Chair of Senate, Mr. Stuttard. Mr. Traves emphasised that the Amalgamation Planning sub-committees did not possess legislative power, but were in the nature of talk shops, which would work out general agreements and bring any matters requiring action to the established legislative bodies of the University. As such, the committees were valuable forums in which contentious issues could be worked through.

Mr. Andrews requested clarification as to what Senate was being asked to do. Had some other body already determined the terms of reference for this Committee, and was Senate simply being asked to appoint or elect a representative to the Committee? The original motion

circulated by e-mail, and subsequently withdrawn, had suggested that Senate would have some input into framing the terms of reference of the Committee. Mr. Stuttard explained that in May the Amalgamation Planning Committee had proposed the striking of three subcommittees. At that time the Committee referred to was to be called an Academic Integration Committee. The Committee's name had changed as it had become clearer that it would be responsible for coordinating academic administration, and referring issues to the appropriate bodies. Senate was being asked to name a representative to the Committee.

Mr. Bradfield asked that the meeting vote on the suggestion that the Chair of Senate be Senate's representative on the Academic Coordinating Committee, and then return to discuss some of the substantive issues surrounding procedures and the original notice of motion which had been withdrawn.

The question was called and the motion CARRIED.

Mr. Bradfield was concerned that something called the Academic Coordinating Committee should be a committee of Senate, reporting regularly to Senate, and consequently he was surprised and troubled that the original motion had been withdrawn. If it would precipitate discussion he would be happy to move (seconded by Mr. Pereira) the original motion:

**That Senate approves the establishment of an Academic Coordinating Committee as proposed by the Dal/TUNS Amalgamation Planning Committee.**

**TERMS OF REFERENCE:**

- 1. To identify academic and related administrative issues which must be addressed in order to operationalize the Dal/TUNS amalgamation.**
- 2. To oversee and coordinate planning for integration of academic programs and support services.**
- 3. To establish working groups as needed to develop action plans regarding these issues.**
- 4. To coordinate the activities of these working groups and receive their reports in a timely fashion.**
- 5. To channel all recommendations to the appropriate Senate or other university bodies for consideration/action.**
- 6. To identify all necessary changes to academic regulations or policies and ensure that they are implemented by the start of the 1997/98 academic year.**
- 7. To coordinate a process for identifying new academic program opportunities arising out of the amalgamation.**

## **PROPOSED MEMBERSHIP:**

**Adam Bell, Dean of Engineering, TUNS, Co-Chair**  
**Deborah Hobson, Vice-President (Academic & Research),  
Dalhousie, Co-Chair**  
**Gudrun Curri, Registrar, Dalhousie**  
**Warwick Kimmins, Dean of Science, Dalhousie**  
**Grant Wanzel, Acting Dean of Architecture, TUNS**  
**A representative of the Computer Science Faculty**  
**A representative of each of the Senates**  
**The Student Union Presidents or their delegates**

Ms. Hobson thought an important distinction had to be made between the administrative details involved in amalgamation and the academic issues Senate needed to consider. The presence of the Chair of Senate on this Committee would ensure that it maintained a close relationship with Senate. However, there were details with which Senate need not be involved. Her perception was that this item was coming forward now in order to inform Senators that the administrative arrangements were being dealt with effectively. Subgroups of different constituencies, such as the computer scientists, would also be working on tasks appropriate to them, which did not fall within the direct jurisdiction of Senate, but about which Senate would be informed. Mr. Andrews asked that the minutes reflect this crucial point -- that Senate needed to be kept informed, and informed in a timely fashion, so that members could contribute as the process developed, and not after the fact. In his view Senate had not been kept fully informed and involved in the process of amalgamation to date.

The motion on the floor struck Ms. McIntyre as totally inappropriate. She would not expect or want Senate to establish mechanisms or a committee which would tell the Faculty of Health Professions how to work out the types of issues which the Academic Coordinating Committee would be considering. Although Senate should be fully informed, it seemed inappropriate to use an unprecedented technique such as this motion was suggesting to handle administrative issues. There seemed to be general agreement that we needed this Committee, that Senate should have a representative on the Committee, and that academic changes, such as new programs, would require approval by the necessary bodies. But establishment of working administrative committees was beyond Senate's jurisdiction.

Mr. Traves attempted to put the process under discussion in context. If Senators felt we were not far enough along in the process, he shared that sense of frustration, though we had to keep in mind that this was a complex process attempting to bring together two institutions with slightly different cultures and distinctive perceptions of their own identity. This required discussion, accommodation, and a willingness to move towards mutually acceptable positions, on what were sometimes emotionally charged issues. However, he had spoken on the issue of amalgamation at every Senate meeting since the proposal had come forward, and he would continue to bring the relevant issues to Senate. To use one example, the creation of the new Faculty of Computer Science itself, and the creation of new programmes within that Faculty, will work their way through the usual University approval processes, and end up before

Senate. But other matters such as the recruitment of students to the new Faculty, the marketing of the new programmes, and Faculty budgetary systems, will, fundamentally, be the business of the new Faculty, the Registrar's Office, and the University's financial system. On such matters Senators will be informed that action is being taken; but the Academic Coordinating Committee will be overseeing the administrative housekeeping. It will not be usurping the authority of Senate; it will be ensuring that the business of Senate gets referred to Senate.

Mr. Pereira was not clear as to the basis of the conflict between the concerns expressed by Ms. Hobson and Mr. Traves and those expressed by the supporters of the motion. The motion was not necessarily saying that this Committee became a committee of Senate. In response to the question of what would happen if Senate did not approve the terms of reference of the Academic Coordinating Committee, Mr. Traves said the Committee would still go ahead as planned, doing its work. He would be happy to have Senate's approval for the Committee, but the process would be launched anyway, and go forward.

Mr. Bradfield argued that Senate did have responsibility for the academic policies of the University, and therefore should have some ownership over any committees that were examining academic matters, even if they were only coordinating academic matters. Also, in response to the President's assurance that he would keep Senate informed, Mr. Bradfield drew attention to an excerpt from the October 3 Steering Committee draft minutes, which he had received at the last meeting of the Senate Academic Priorities and Budget Committee. He read into the minutes from item 96:050, concerning Steering's discussion of the Academic Coordinating Committee: "Mr. Stuttard had written the President to the effect that the Senate Officers found the memorandum disturbing and disappointing. It was the second indication that the Presidents did not seem to recognize the need to consult with, not simply inform, their respective Senates about progress towards amalgamation. The terms of reference of the proposed ACC appeared to be a hybrid of those of an Academic Integration Committee and a Senate Legislation Committee. Yet during more than two hours of discussion at the joint meeting of the Steering Committees the Presidents had not reviewed the proposal for the new committee despite the overlap with issues being explored during the meeting. This second breakdown in communication needed to be remedied immediately." In light of this, Mr. Bradfield wondered whether assurances were good enough, and was convinced that this motion needed to pass so that Senate would have clear ownership of this Committee, and could guarantee regular and timely reports from its representative, the Chair of Senate. Finally, Mr. Bradfield found it interesting, and perhaps a sign of the extent to which the sands were continually shifting, that the motion had originally come from the Vice-President Academic, Ms. Hobson, and Ms. Hobson was now opposing it.

Ms. Hobson wished to clarify that she had not realised until receiving her agenda that she was cited as the mover of the motion. Her position had not changed. Further, she had not been at the Steering Committee meeting to which Mr. Bradfield referred. She also noted that Mr. Bradfield and Mr. Pereira seemed to be saying different things; Mr. Pereira did not appear to be asking for Senate ownership of this Committee. Senate did not have ownership of the administrative processes. The fact that "academic" appeared in the title did not mean this was a Senate committee. "Academic" appeared in her title, but she did not necessarily report to

Senate. Like Ms. McIntyre, Ms. Hobson was disturbed that Senate would vote on a motion which gave it rights over administrative functions. If members looked at the words carefully they would see that this Committee was going to identify, oversee, and coordinate.

Mr. Brett noted that members' concerns arose directly from the fact that they were reading the words of the motion carefully. The terms of reference talked about identifying the academic issues and identifying all necessary changes to academic regulations, tasks which rightly belonged to Senate or the various committees of Senate. Mr. Andrews found novel the idea that in a University we can somehow separate what is academic from what is administrative. Academic administrators are required to carry out the academic policies of the University, and Senate is the body that ultimately determines academic policy, though it delegates some aspects of administration to Faculties. The opposition to the motion was puzzling, since the more Senate knows about what is going on the more effectively the University can operate, now and in the future.

Mr. Traves agreed with everything Mr. Andrews had said. Ultimately Senate would deal with all these matters. But we were still in the pre-ultimate phase of this process. He sensed a significant emotional overlay about the respective rights of Senate and the rights of the administration. Personally, he was content to bring all the necessary matters before Senate in a timely fashion. Mr. Bradfield suggested that the developments surrounding the creation of the Search Committee for the Dean of Computer Science had revealed that when Senate was not consulted in a timely fashion an important process could be held up and valuable time lost. Mr. Bradfield apologised to Ms. Hobson, if this had not in fact been her motion. Here Mr. Stuttard intervened to clarify that he had put Ms. Hobson's name on the original agenda item as a result of a discussion at SAPBC. That may have been a misunderstanding of what the intention had been at the time, and if so, he too apologised to Ms. Hobson.

Mr. Klein supported the arguments advanced by Mr. Bradfield. He accepted the President's point that we have been informed regularly; but the President had mentioned informing Senate "when possible". Maybe part of the problem was that there were two ways of interpreting "when possible". In the process for striking the Search Committee for the Dean of the Faculty of Computer Science, Senators had been able to discuss the proposal, and could have chosen to reject it. However, it was late in the game when we got the proposal, and we had been told that it would probably be a bad move, politically, not to accept the proposed terms of reference. Maybe sometimes it was not possible for Senate to get things for consideration early enough; and maybe there was not enough motivation for Senate to get things early enough.

In the interests of ensuring that Senators remained informed, Mr. Clark moved an amendment (Seconded McKay):

**That the Senate representative on the Academic Coordinating Committee be directed to report back to Senate following each meeting of the Committee.**

The amendment CARRIED.

In response to Mr. Dickson, Mr. Stuttard suggested that, considering the frequency with which this committee would likely meet, he could report to Senators by e-mail, assuming the main motion passed.

The motion CARRIED.

## **96:122.**

### Report of the President

Mr. Traves briefly summarized key points in his circulated report. He began by publicly thanking the representatives of the Student Union, and through them all students of the University, for the donation of \$1 million from their capital fund to the new Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences Building; he welcomed the new Vice-President (Development and Alumni-Affairs), Ms. Dale Godsoe, who would begin work at the end of the week; he noted the important meetings earlier in the day between the Killam trustees and a number of different groups on campus; he congratulated Dr. Mary Anne White of the Chemistry Department on her appointment to the first Killam Chair in Materials Science; and he commended those who had succeeded in the latest NSERC Strategic Grants Competition.

As part of the move towards amalgamation, the President hoped to be able to announce in the very near future important administrative arrangements concerning the organization and staffing of the service departments, the delivery of computing services, physical plant services, and registrarial services. Work was progressing on the terms of reference for the College Board and the Academic Council. Mr. Traves also emphasised the need to go to the Legislature to seek legislation essential to the creation of the amalgamated University. The intention was to keep the legislation as simple as possible, and to address the immediate issues involved. He would bring the proposed legislation to the Senate, the Board, and to any groups on campus who had a constitutional or contractual right to comment in advance of its submission to the fall session of the Legislature.

Mr. Pereira asked whether the recent grants to faculty members translated into more money for faculty salaries or more money for new appointments in Chemistry or perhaps another area of the University. Mr. Traves explained that the impact of grants and appointments varied. All three of the current Killam chairs were funded from earnings derived from part of the Killam endowment. We had to keep in mind, however, that a Killam Chair was funded for only five years, after which time the appropriate Faculty had to assume budgetary responsibility for the Chair. At present we appeared to have enough money in hand to make a fourth appointment, and over the next year we needed to consider the best area in which to make that appointment.

Mr. Bradfield requested that at some point the President provide Senate with data on the participation of the Board in the capital fund drive. He also asked whether the President was aware that some staff unions have been asked to confirm the seniority rankings of their members, and that members are concerned this may be preparatory to firings association with amalgamation. Mr. Traves stated conclusively that no one had yet sat down or been

authorized to sit down and plan future staffing complements for the amalgamated University. He was aware of the anxiety felt by many employees, but did not see an immediate and specific threat to anyone's job.

Mr. Andrews registered his dismay that he had realised only very recently that November 19 was the twenty-fifth anniversary of the opening of the Dalhousie Arts Centre, and that Dalhousie did not appear to be planning to celebrate this occasion. Of all the campus buildings, perhaps the Arts Centre performed a unique public service to the larger community, even beyond Nova Scotia. In the midst of our Capital Campaign, it seemed all the more important to recognize publicly the Arts Centre's contribution. If the University could organize a public celebration, Mr. Andrews hoped it would include some recognition of the work of Professor Malcolm Ross who had chaired the Senate Committee which planned the Centre, and who was now Professor Emeritus. Mr. Traves was grateful that Mr. Andrews had raised this matter, and he would make enquiries concerning the organization of a public anniversary celebration. The Arts Centre is chief among those Dalhousie institutions which make a tremendous difference to the larger community.

**96:123.**

Question Period

Mr. Bradfield asked whether the President had answered, or intended to answer, two questions posed at previous meetings: one concerning the Environmental Services memorandum which threatened the firing of staff for removing recyclables from campus garbage; the other concerning the routine announcement of senior appointments in newspapers across Canada. Mr. Traves agreed to arrange to circulate the information Mr. Bradfield had requested.

**96:124.**

Other Business

Mr. Stuttard drew to members attention the week of lectures and displays on the practice of architecture, sponsored by the TUNS Faculty of Architecture and running through October 28 to November 1. Faculty at TUNS extended a special invitation to their future colleagues at Dalhousie.

Mr. Stuttard reminded members that many had already indicated their inability to attend the next scheduled meeting of Senate on Friday, November 8 at 10:00 a.m.; and he asked whether we should proceed on the assumption that we would have a quorum. Mr. Traves indicated his preference that we proceed with the November 8th meeting since this would give Senate the opportunity to discuss the draft legislation related to amalgamation, which he hoped would be ready for the opening of the fall session of the Legislature. He would inform Senators as soon as possible as to whether the proposed draft legislation would be on the agenda for November 8, and trusted they would be able to attend to discuss this important matter. Mr. Stuttard reminded members who had not already done so to please send their regrets to the Senate Office.

**96:125.**

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 17:32h.