

Item: Senate Minutes, December 1997

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 December 1997. 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 Monday, 8 December 1997 at 4:00 p.m. in the University Hall, Macdonald Building.

Present with Mr. C. Stuttard in the chair were the following: Adams, Apostle, Archibald, Binkley, Bleasdale, Bradfield, Cameron, Crocker, Cunningham, Emodi, Farmer, Faulkner, Fooladi, Furrow, Gantar, Guppy, Hooper, Hyndman, Kay-Raining Bird, Kimmins, Kipouros, Lacey, Lee, MacDonald, MacInnis, Maloney, McIntyre, Moore, Morehouse, Patriquin, Phillips, C. Powell, H. Powell, Rathwell, Ricketts, Rosson, Shafai, Slonim, Thompson, Tindall, Tomblin Murphy, Traves, Wallace, White, Wrixon.

Regrets: Bell, Camfield, Connolly, Morrissey, Myers, Robertson, Ross, Scassa.

Invitees: Curri, Mason

97:181.

Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as circulated.

Mr. Stuttard welcomed the new Senator from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Mr. Tom Faulkner. Mr. Faulkner asked the Chair of Senate to direct him as to where he should sit, and Mr. Stuttard indicated a vacant chair at his end of the Senate table.

97:182.

Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting of 24 November 1997, were adopted as circulated.

97:183.

Interim Report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Banner and "R" Classes

Ms. Bleasdale reported that the Ad Hoc Committee on "R" classes expected to submit a report to SAPBC before Christmas, then bring that Report to the January 12, 1998, meeting of Senate. She thanked all Committee members for the time they continued to invest in finding a solution and, in particular, members of the Registrar's Office who had been working weekends and late into the night.

97:184.

Nomination to Senate Committee

On behalf of the Senate Nominating Committee, Ms. Guppy moved:

That Senate approve the nomination of Elaine Toms (Faculty of Management/School of Library and Information Studies) to serve on the Senate Committee on Academic Administration for the term January 1998 to June 30, 2000.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

97:185.

Recommendations from the Report of the Dal/Tech Amalgamation Subcommittee on Undergraduate Regulations and Processes

Mr. Stuttard explained that the recommendations from the Dal\Tech Amalgamation Subcommittee on Undergraduate Regulations and Processes consisted of seventeen motions contained in the 29 October 1997, minutes of the meeting of SCAA. Copies of those minutes had been distributed at the previous Senate meeting, and mailed to Senators not in attendance at that meeting. Copies were also available at the door of the Hall. The relevant motions were included in items SCAA97:033 to 97:039.

Mr. Archibald moved (seconded by Mr. Wallace):

That the motions contained in the SCAA minutes of 29 October 1997, items 97:033 to 97:039 be adopted.

SCAA92:033.

The Academic Year

That the academic year be September 1 to August 31.

SCAA92:034.

Application Dates

That the recommendations on application dates be accepted, namely:

For students applying to direct-entry programs and wishing to be considered for scholarships, and for foreign applicants, the final date for submission of applications shall be April 1. For all other students, the final date for submission of applications for direct-entry programs shall be June 1. Applications received after these dates may be considered depending on the availability of places in these programs.

SCAA97:035.

English Language Competency

That Dalhousie and DalTech require one of the following test scores for automatic admission to undergraduate programs: TOEFL 580, MELAB 90, or IELTS 7. Students with TOEFL scores between 550-580, MELAB between 85-90 and IELTS between 6.5-7 shall be considered on an individual basis depending on the student's background and the subject the student wishes to study. Substitutions for the test shall be the equivalent of three years in high school (grades 10-12) where the language of instruction, in all subjects, is English.

SCAA97:036.

Admission Requirements

That the minimum requirements for admission to all direct-entry undergraduate programs at Dalhousie/DalTech be successful completion of Nova Scotia grade XII (or equivalent), with the distribution of subjects as currently required by Dalhousie. The minimum average will be determined by each Faculty in consultation with the Registrar's Office annually; and

That for admission to undergraduate programs requiring previous academic work, the Faculty offering the program shall determine the classes and grades required for admission, provided that the minimum requirements of the University are met; and

That for direct entry programs, "mature" shall be defined as students who are at least 23 years of age, have been out of high school for four years and have not attended university. For programs where previous academic work is required, the criteria for the "mature" category should be determined by the appropriate Faculty or School.

SCAA97:037.

Transfer of Credit for Undergraduate Programs

That to obtain an undergraduate qualification from Dalhousie, for most degree programs, at least half of the work required for the degree must be completed at Dalhousie. For programs in the professional Faculties of Architecture, Computer Science, and Engineering at least one third of the work must be completed at Dalhousie; the particular level/classes to be determined by the Faculty.

SCAA97:038.

a. Requirements for a Second Dalhousie Undergraduate Degree

That the number of credits that may be carried forward from one Dalhousie undergraduate degree to another be the same as the number of transfer credits that may be counted towards a Dalhousie degree.

b. Withdrawal from Classes

That for the purpose of withdrawing from classes, a term be divided into thirds: a class will be removed from the academic record during the first third of a term; a grade of "W" will be awarded in the second third of a term; a student may not withdraw from the class in the last third of a term; and the grade of "WF" will no longer be awarded.

c. Grading System

That the following be adopted: the current Dalhousie alphabetic grading system and associated 4.3 grade point system; a common scale for the purpose of converting numeric grades to alphabetic grades. The scale proposed is the one used by Dalhousie for the purposes of converting other institutions' numerical grades to alphabetical grades.

d. Grade Changes

That there be deadlines for changing grades:

Fall term classes	February 1
Winter term classes	June 1
Spring term classes	August 1
Co-op and Summer term classes	October 1

Students must appeal to the appropriate Faculty to have the grade change processed.

SCAA97:039

a. Reassessment of a Final Grade

That all applications for reassessment be submitted to the Registrar's Office; a \$50 fee must accompany the application (fee will be refunded if the grade is changed); the Registrar shall forward the application for reassessment to the Faculty/School; each Faculty/School shall establish its own procedures for conducting reassessments; the deadlines for requesting a reassessment shall be:

Fall term Classes	March 1
Winter term Classes	July 1
Spring term Classes	September 1
Co-op and Summer term Classes	November 1

b. Supplemental Examinations

That in Faculties where supplemental examinations are available: a student must have achieved a grade of "FM" (marginal failure, GPA value 0.0) in the class in which the supplemental is to be written; supplemental examinations will be administered by the participating Faculty/school/department; only the supplemental grade will be included in the sessional and cumulative average, but both grades will appear on the transcript, for example:

	Original Grade	Supplemental Grade FM	C
Engineering CE1472			

c. Academic Standing Undergraduate Programs

That students' records are assessed once a minimum of four full classes have been taken; academic standing will be based on cumulative and/or sessional GPA. For example, in the Faculties of Architecture, Computer Science, and Engineering,

- good standing: minimum cumulative GPA, e.g., 2.0
- probation: GPA range cumulative or sessional, e.g., 1.7-2.0
- dismissal: minimum cumulative or sessional GPA, e.g., <1.7

d. Graduation Standing

That in addition to other program requirements as determined by a Faculty, one of the requirements for graduation shall be the achievement of a minimum cumulative GPA within the Faculty, which should not fall below the minimum GPA required by the University, and the minimum cumulative GPA required to graduate with distinction shall be 3.7.

e. Examinations

1) That no examinations shall be permitted in the time period between the end of classes and the beginning of the official examination period; students shall not be required to write more than two examinations per day; the Dean's Office shall assist students to make alternative arrangements when their exam schedules call for more than two exams in a day.

2) That no written tests or examinations, with the exception of project presentations and major papers, worth more than 25% of the final grade shall be scheduled in the last two weeks of term, without the explicit approval of the appropriate Faculty or school.

f. Information

That the current Dalhousie system of identifying classes be adopted.

That the only information that may be released about a student without the student's written consent be the following: name, period of registration, qualifications awarded, and field of study (only as relates to degree awarded).

Mr. Stuttard noted at SCAA97:034 the original motion had been subsequently clarified by the Associate Registrar, Ms. MacGillivray, and the amended motion (given above) began "For

students applying for direct entry programs." Ms. Bleasdale suggested it might be advisable to defer consideration of SCAA97:038b, given the on-going discussions concerning the definition of "term" by Banner, and the consequent potential for confusion over its use. Ms. Curri explained that this provision for splitting a term into thirds could apply to both A and B classes and R classes. To avoid any possible confusion over this item, Ms. Binkley, Mr. Lee, Mr. Tindall, and Ms. Furrow suggested rewording of the motion:

For the purpose of withdrawing from classes, the duration of the class be divided into thirds: a class will be removed from the academic record during the first third; a grade of "W" will be awarded in the second third; and the grade of "WF" will no longer be awarded.

This was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Mr. Kipouros asked for clarification concerning the proposed changes suggested by the DalTech Academic Council and contained on the white sheet distributed at the meeting. The Academic Council appeared to have been working with a different version of the proposal. Ms. Curri explained that the Academic Council had been dealing with the version of the document originally submitted to SCAA. She had now received all the changes that had been proposed by the Academic Council, and most of those had already been incorporated by SCAA.

The amended motion was **CARRIED**.

97:186.

Strategic Directions

Mr. Traves thanked those who had responded to his request for feedback on this document. The version now before members incorporated as many as possible of the changes suggested by groups and individuals during the process of consultation over the past several weeks. Those changes were indicated in bold lettering, with the exception of the goals, all of which were bolded for clarity, but none of which had been modified. This was not a blueprint for a series of specific changes and actions, but an attempt to capture the spirit of innovation and flexibility necessary to face the challenges and opportunities of the new Dalhousie and other Universities in the larger context. The document embodied an openness to change, and reflected some of the activities already underway in Faculties across the campus. However, any and all specific proposals arising out of the spirit of this document would still need to work their way through the normal legislative processes and bodies before implementation, providing ample opportunity for appropriate consultation and debate by Senate, Faculty Councils, Departments, and other relevant bodies and individuals.

On behalf of SAPBC, Mr. Stuttard moved:

That Senate accept the "Strategic Directions for Dalhousie University" document, dated December 2, 1997, as a useful general statement to guide Dalhousie's future development.

The Chair recognized Ms. Penny Howard, a student at King's College, who had tried unsuccessfully on several occasions to secure from the President's Office a copy of this

revised version of the document. She asked why nothing had been forwarded to the King's Student Union, given the impact these proposals would have on King's students, most of whom took a large number of classes at Dalhousie. Mr. Traves apologized for the difficulties Ms. Howard had experienced, but explained that this final draft had only been mailed to Senators a week ago. Ms. Howard expressed her alarm at some of the proposals in the earlier draft, and in particular her concern with the goal which stated that "Dalhousie must strengthen its market position and develop new sources of revenue from education, research and professional services." She strongly disagreed with an approach to revenue generation which would undermine the public, democratic, and accessible nature of post-secondary education.

Mr. Cameron asked for clarification as to the meaning of "guide", as it appeared in the motion before Senators. Did that mean we would appeal to the document when it was convenient, and ignore it when it was not? Mr. Traves asked members to keep in mind that the document had no legislative force. It had originated from a series of discussions with Deans and other members of the University community who expressed the need for a clearer vision and sense of direction for the institution as a whole. More formal discussions had reached a broad consensus about where Dalhousie was going and how it should get there. Obviously, the devil was in the details, and implementation of specific proposals at specific times would require careful thought and analysis. But he did not believe the details would impair the general vision. With that clarification, Mr. Faulkner suggested that under Robert's Rules of Order the appropriate motion might be to receive the document, since any other action would be to adopt it as the policy of Senate. Mr. Stuttard noted that a motion to receive would be redundant because Senators had already received it. He underlined the point that the document did not commit Senate to any particular course of action, as Mr. Cameron had indicated.

Mr. Crocker was surprised by the student's response, since the goals struck him as general and "Motherhoodish". Were students concerned that the University would begin marketing courses for money, and that those courses which did not generate revenue would be jettisoned? Ms. Howard referred to a recent meeting of the Canadian Federation of Students, at which attention had focused on the accelerated rate at which corporations were gaining access to and gaining influence within Universities. This trend was often justified by the position taken in this document -- that governments were withdrawing their funding, and Universities would have to look to the private sector for support. She believed we should work to reverse this trend, or we would end up with an educational system similar to that south of the border, where tuition made up most of the revenue, and courses and professors were increasingly funded by corporations.

Mr. Lee considered the process by which this document had been created useful in that it helped to clarify and ensure that the Administration and the Senate were on the same track. He had had problems with segments of the original draft of the document, but most of his concerns had been addressed, and he was happy to be on the same track as the President. He trusted all Senators would take this opportunity to express to the Administration their support for or opposition to the general direction proposed here. Mr. Powell also supported the document, but was intrigued by the idea that Dalhousie offered a "personal student experience," and asked the President to clarify how he envisioned that personalized

experience.

Mr. Adams thanked the President on behalf of the Student body for listening to their concerns and adopting most of the changes they had recommended. He believed the document was a step in the right direction. Similarly, Mr. Ricketts found the document insightful, and the process of consultation collegial and open. He hoped that the student from King's would be encouraged by the final paragraph on page 2 of the revised document, which spoke to Dalhousie's discomfort with the withdrawal of government funding and to our commitment to working towards reversing this trend. He believed we should continue to push the government to make Dalhousie accessible to those eligible to enter. At the same time, he noted that the prospect of diversification of our funding base could help to increase accessibility, and to subsidize those programs which were essential, but which did not generate revenue. Mr. Bradfield was troubled by the first paragraph on page 3, which followed the paragraph cited by Mr. Ricketts. The wording suggested we were in competition with "Miss Murphy's Business School." Also, the final sentence, referring to "our fee-based Universities," suggested we had given up on government support for higher education.

Ms. Thompson was disappointed by the document and could not accept it, in part for the reasons outlined by the student from King's. The document was saturated with corporate market metaphors which were particularly distressing. Rather than accepting the corporate model as the only model for a social institution, she believed we should be countering the world-wide trend toward corporatization, and searching for a more humane model within which relationships would be treated less as commodities. Mr. Wainwright asked Senators to remember, in voting on the document, that there was a significant difference between a general and benign document, and a document which contained elements which could be interpreted in numerous ways. The University would need to be cautious in its interpretation of some of the generalities presented.

Mr. Traves understood the potential confusion over the concept of a personal education experience. Here the term was used to help define what distinguished Dalhousie within the broad spectrum of Universities across the country. At one end of that spectrum were the small, often residence-based Universities which offered a more intimate learning environment. At the other end were the giant institutions which provided less opportunity for personal contact with students. Dalhousie fell somewhere in the middle, with significantly fewer students than the giants, but with the same research-intensive focus and comprehensive curriculum of Universities such as McGill and UBC. The challenge would be to carve out an educational experience which combined the virtues of being medium-sized while offering a comprehensive mix of programs characteristic of large universities.

Mr. Traves appreciated concerns expressed over the language of the document, but this needed to be considered in context. Use of the term fee-based, for example, was a recognition that the University's dependence on tuition fees had been rising steadily and dramatically in the last decade. The document recognized the need for increased government funding; however, we needed to be sensitive to the fact that tuition accounted for a large proportion of our funding, roughly 25% of our present operating revenues. In general, the language of the market seemed appropriate to this document since it asked and attempted to answer, questions about securing adequate resources. These questions were

continually raised in various forums across campus, by faculty, students, and staff. We did not need to feel uncomfortable about tackling them directly.

Mr. Lacey called for the question. There being no dissent, the motion was put and was **CARRIED.**

97:187.

BAC Report XII

Mr. Cunningham, the Acting Chair of the BAC, explained that this Report arose from a request that BAC look at graduate fees, post amalgamation, for DalTech graduate students, and address discrepancies and differences between the level of fees charged to pre-amalgamation Dalhousie students and DalTech students. The overriding principle guiding BAC's deliberations had been one of equity, as the Committee sought to "level the playing field" for all Dalhousie graduate students. The process employed was that used at Dalhousie prior to amalgamation, which was to take the undergraduate fees and to add a specified amount, either \$200 or \$400, to produce the Masters and the PhD fees, respectively. Four of the Report's recommendations dealt with the DalTech graduate fees, and the fifth recommendation concerned international student differential fees.

Ms. McIntyre asked whether Table 2 applied to only DalTech programs, or, as the title implied, to all Dalhousie programs which consisted of eight courses with a minor thesis or project. Also, would BAC be attempting to standardize all Dalhousie graduate tuition fees, as the title implied? This was critical to the survival of some programs in which students currently paid huge differential fees. Mr. Cunningham responded that the Report addressed only fees for DalTech programs. The reference to standardization of Dalhousie fees meant standardization of the current DalTech and Dalhousie fees.

Ms. Binkley asked whether the recommendation concerning international student differential fees applied to all full cost recovery programs as well as to the normal programs. Mr. Cunningham responded that the Committee had not considered full cost recovery programs. Mr. Traves indicated that what might better be referred to as "much higher than normal cost programs" assumed that all students would be treated equally, unless otherwise noted. The University could indicate that such a program had two fee levels, but that would need to be spelled out and could not be assumed.

Ms. Guppy expressed serious reservations about the Report, and in particular about the proposed fees for the Master of Urban and Rural Planning, which were extraordinarily high in comparison to fees for similar programs elsewhere. She would send information to the Committee based on both the relative expenses of other Masters Planning Programs and the relative costs of the MAS program with which this was being compared. Ms. Guppy also reminded members that students for this program had no funding assistance, nor were there external funding bodies to which they could apply.

Mr. Lee was concerned about the transition provision within the document. He believed it was a good idea that fees not be raised for those already in a program, but wondered whether this went far enough. In his own field, for example, deadlines for scholarship applications

meant that many students would have already confirmed their intention to begin a doctoral program in September 1998. Would this be the case for DalTech programs? If so, a student who had turned down other offers in favour of studying at DalTech, might be unpleasantly surprised when faced with a considerable, unanticipated hike in fees. Could BAC consider delaying the transition to the new fee structure for one year?

Mr. Ricketts explained that the Committee had attempted to strike a balance between achieving two goals: harmonization of fees to eliminate major differentials between the fees in the old Dalhousie graduate programs and the fees in the DalTech programs; and the need to guard against a major disruption in tuition fees. That was why only DalTech fees had been addressed. The Health Professional Masters Program, for example, had not been reviewed. At DalTech, the only program registering a dramatic fee increase would be the doctoral program, which was the least expensive program of its kind in the country. In general, members needed to consider that recent discussions involving the President, the Acting Vice-President (Academic & Research), and the Vice-President (Administration & Finance) had clarified that the increased revenue from the proposed changes would all go into student assistance; and a major portion of that would go to the Faculty of Graduate Studies scholarship budget. Beginning next year, all Graduate programs at DalTech would be incorporated into the Graduate Scholarship allocation. That would provide Urban and Rural Planning, for example, with a modest sum with which to attract excellent students. Extension of Dalhousie's scholarship program to DalTech should be one of the benefits flowing from these recommendations.

Mr. Slonim found the timing of these proposed fee increases very difficult. Those attempting to build a new Faculty needed to have something to sell to potential students. This type of increase in fees, particularly at the doctoral level, was a heavy blow, given the importance of excellent doctoral students to the academic integrity of any program. The proposed fee increases would be a significant barrier to attracting talented students.

Ms. Howard reminded members that in the Maritimes between 1994 and 1997 the number of undergraduate students with debt exceeding \$34,000 had risen from 8 to 1000. This program of indebting students systemically discriminated against women, people of colour, aboriginal students, and students with disabilities. In this context, the prospect of increasing fees became alarming. She was also uncomfortable when public, needs-based funding was being replaced with private, merit-based allocations, because what happened was more needy students were subsidizing students who had the luxury of not having to work thirty hours a week to pay for their tuition, and thereby had more time to devote to their studies which, in turn, made them more likely to qualify for scholarships.

Mr. Emodi asked what the role of Senate was at this stage in the process, and whether it made any difference what Senators thought and said. Mr. Stuttard explained that Senate was hearing a Report from the Chair of the President's Budget Advisory Committee, which was directly responsible to the President and the Board of Governors. Senate could pass any motion it wished, if it chose to register its opinion on the Report, and that motion would be conveyed to the Board of Governors. The three members of BAC who were in attendance would take Senators' opinions into consideration, as would the President. But Senate did not have the power to accept or reject the Report. Mr. Emodi asked that the minutes reflect the problems members of the Faculty of Architecture had with the Report, specifically with the proposed fees for Urban and Rural Planning. Fears that the Program would be priced out of

the market were well-founded. His colleagues in Computer Science appeared to have similar concerns about the impact of the proposed increases on their doctoral program. Mr. Emodi asked that Faculties communicate their concerns, together with supporting documentation, directly to the Board of Governors. Secondly, he requested that the minutes recognize that serious problems remain outstanding, and that these minutes also be passed on to the Board.

Ms. Kay-Raining Bird was concerned that the Committee had not been able to consider the differential fees which had been recognized for some time as jeopardizing graduate programs within the old Dalhousie, and burdening students with mountainous debt loads. Where within the University would this issue be addressed? On a general level, it was unfortunate that whenever the University came together to draft recommendations concerning differential fees, we opted to increase the lower fees to match the higher. Mr. Cunningham assured Mr. Emodi and Ms. Kay-Raining Bird that Committee members would take their concerns seriously; and that if BAC were tasked to investigate differential fees throughout the University, it would consult widely and listen carefully. On the issue of consultation, it was Mr. Ricketts' understanding that BACXII had been sent out with a request for written responses by a specified date. Those still anxious to make submissions should forward them directly to BAC. He agreed a number of programs at Dalhousie demanded very high fees; and the Faculty Council for Graduate Studies had recently passed a motion asking BAC to look into the whole issue of differential fees. However, BAC's recommendations were always constrained by the question of how to meet the deficit. He looked forward to a time when BAC had the luxury of debating how to divide up an increasing pot of money, but that time had not yet arrived.

Mr. Slonim, Mr. Maloney, Mr. Emodi, and Ms. Guppy asked that the deadline for submissions be formally extended, since this document had only come to their attention in the past week. Mr. Mason noted that prior to this Report being forwarded to the President in mid-November, it had been circulated to all senior officials at DalTech, with the request that they respond within a week to ten days. The outline of the document had already been discussed with them. Mr. Mason also reminded the Dean of Graduate Studies, in particular, that he had been urging a quick decision on these issues so that money generated by fees could be funneled into scholarships and bursaries. Delaying a decision would impede the process of offering support to students. Mr. Traves suggested that though he had intended to take this item to the Board in December, on the assumption that members had reached a consensus, he could wait until the January Board meeting. That would give BAC time to reflect on issues raised today. Mr. Adams was surprised to find no students on the list of individuals to whom this material had been circulated, and was taken aback by the idea that this would go to the Board without adequate consultation with students. He requested that in future all documents coming from this committee, as well as all documents coming from significant committees of Board and Senate, be routed through the Student Union. Mr. Cunningham responded that the Committee had sent the document to the graduate students at DalTech, but perhaps had erred in not communicating with the Student Union. It was a mystery why the document had not been more widely circulated, but the Committee would investigate.

97:188.

Notice of Motion

Mr. Cameron (seconded by Ms. Furrow) moved:

That Senate confirms that the Constitution of Senate does not provide for

the direction of Senators as to how they shall vote or otherwise behave as members of Senate and, further, that Senate affirms that it is undesirable that members of Senate should be directed as to how they should vote or otherwise behave.

Mr. Cameron explained that this matter was the cause of some confusion, and perhaps some miscommunication, but it went to the heart of the Constitution of this body and warranted elucidation. The matter had arisen after the first and major portion of the University Governance document (Senior Administrative Appointments) had been approved by Senate. The Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences forwarded to Senate a motion requesting that approval be rescinded. In Senate, the motion was put and defeated. At a subsequent meeting of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences members approved a motion calling on Senators from the Faculty to "do everything in their power to defeat the motion", including, he assumed, lobbying the Board of Governors. That motion had not come to the floor of Senate, and consequently had not come to the attention of Senate. As an elected member of Senate, he felt squeezed by pressure from two directions. Personally, Mr. Cameron agreed with the Governance document, and thought some of the changes sensible and long overdue. Yet he had been directed to vote against it, and even to take the extraordinary step of lobbying the Board of Governors to persuade them to overturn an action taken by Senate. To him, the solution seemed clear. On the one hand, faculty should be free to communicate their views to Senate, collectively or individually, but they should not be free to instruct members of Senate as to how they should vote or otherwise behave. The Constitution was clear that the Senate was the senior academic body at Dalhousie, and even specified that the rules to be employed in electing Senators from Faculties were to be approved by Senate. Those rules made no allowance for Faculties to instruct Senators, nor did they provide any recourse should Faculties seek to do so. Finally, Mr. Cameron wished to note that at no time during the deliberation and formulation of this motion within his Faculty had anyone contacted him directly and personally to discuss the proposed changes in the Governance Document. Nor had anyone even asked how he intended to vote. That seemed to him a more appropriate way of communicating than through motions passed by Faculties seeking to direct the behavior of their Senators.

Mr. Lee supported the motion, but thought it would be reasonable to ask the Dean of this Faculty to address Senate, and in particular address what he saw as undue attempts to interfere in the operations of Senate. He would like to hear the Dean's explanation of the initial Faculty meeting that had passed the motion requesting Senate to rescind the Governance document. He had heard, for example, that the motion to rescind had not been on the agenda of that meeting, and faculty members had not been informed that such a motion would be coming forward. The apparent problem in the running of the meeting was now impinging on Senate, which was being asked to spend time on this issue. Secondly, his understanding was that Senators were representatives of the University community, and not of their individual Faculties. For a Faculty to pass a motion instructing Senators how to act struck him as abominable, and he did not understand how a Dean could allow that to happen.

Mr. Faulkner reminded members that when he had arrived he had asked, on a point of personal privilege, that the Chair direct him as to where he should sit. He did not believe his academic freedom or independent judgment had been impaired by the Chair obliging. Senators needed to look carefully at some of the language used here. He thought it would be useful to refer this matter back to the Faculty, so that Senate could have a report from the

Dean as to what had happened, and so that some very important matters of fact which had been misrepresented by previous speakers could be cleared up and brought back to Senate. Academics were fractious at best, and it was very difficult to make a community of scholars work. The motion passed by his Faculty had been an effort to make that part of the community work better, and to assist Senate in its deliberations. Mr. Faulkner moved (seconded by Mr. Tindall):

That the motion be referred back to the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, and brought back to the next Senate meeting when the Dean could be in attendance.

As the seconder of the main motion, Ms. Furrow had hoped that Senate would deal with this matter. She saw no advantage to referring it back to the Faculty. If Senators were unclear as to the wording of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences motion, she would be happy to read it. Mr. Faulkner cautioned that if we wanted to resolve this issue it would be better not to dismiss it with a quick motion here. The Dean and Faculty needed the opportunity to comment, bring the issue back to Senate, and then let Senate have its way. At Mr. Apostle's request, Ms. Furrow read the first part of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences motion: "That the principles of collegiality and accountability require that a candidate for Dean who is seeking reappointment must proceed through a search process that involves the participation of any other candidates who seek to be appointed to the deanship." She then read the second part of the motion, the part which had prompted the motion presently before Senate: "The Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences directs its elected Senators to do everything in their power to persuade Senate to amend the University Governance Document accordingly." She clarified that this motion had come to the Faculty after Senate had passed the particular section of the document that dealt with appointment and reappointment of Deans.

As a new Senator, Ms. Thompson requested clarification. As the representative from King's, she had assumed that she would somehow represent that institution's interests at Senate. If individual Senators did not represent particular constituencies, how did those issues of concern to junior academic bodies, such as Faculties and Departments, get before Senate? Was this not simply a case of Senators being asked by a particular Faculty to bring certain issues forward? Was the issue here the use of the word "direct"? As a matter of clarification, Mr. Stuttard responded that any member of Senate could bring forward any question or point that they wished Senate to consider. The first part of the resolution currently before Senate was simply a statement of fact, and Senate could hardly vote against confirming what was in its own Constitution. The second part moved onto slightly new ground, when it suggested it would be "undesirable that members of Senate should be directed as to how they should vote or otherwise behave." He believed the common interpretation of the word directed, in this context, would be that Senators were being told how to vote. If that was not the interpretation that was intended by the motion in FASS, then perhaps some other word should have been chosen. But if that was the intention, then it was at odds with the current Senate Constitution which stated simply "that Senators are encouraged to familiarize themselves with the expressed views of their Faculties with respect to issues which are, or may be brought before Senate." It was certainly appropriate for Faculties to pass motions of one sort or another, and it was appropriate for Faculties to direct that their Senators take notice of those motions. But if in directing their attention to this motion they were at the same time attempting to limit the freedom of the Senators to vote for or against a motion that might come out of that expressed view of the Faculty, then they were moving into an area that is not provided for under the Senate Constitution.

In response to Mr. Faulkner's point of order that members should speak only to the motion to refer, Mr. Stuttard explained that a motion to refer allowed members to speak to the merits of the main motion as well as the motion to refer. Mr. Faulkner then asked to have his name added to the speakers list.

Mr. Maloney was not in favour of referring the motion anywhere. Regardless of what had happened within the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, the motion spoke to a fundamental principle on which he understood Senate to operate. He believed he had a responsibility to consult with his Faculty if he saw an issue which would potentially affect that Faculty; he also hoped members of his Faculty would come to him with their expressed concern. But he would be offended by a motion from the Faculty Council, or anywhere else within his Faculty, which told him how to vote. When he came to Senate meetings he benefitted from listening to the opinions of his colleagues, who often brought a different perspective to issues. It was his responsibility to listen and participate, as appropriate, then act on behalf of the University as a whole. If Senators had no function other than to do what their Faculties told them to do, we could all save ourselves two hours every other week and just send in notes and letters indicating how we wished to vote.

Mr. Apostle indicated that when the motion read by Ms. Furrow had been introduced at the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Mr. Friedrich had attempted to make a friendly amendment to change "direct" to "urge", but that had been rejected by the Faculty as changing the intent of the motion. Ms. Bleasdale, also from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, was uncomfortable proceeding with the motion, given that Dean Taylor was absent and unable to respond to some of the points raised. She preferred that Senate speak directly to the issue, and advise her of the extent to which she should be directed by her Faculty.

Mr. Faulkner pointed out that the motion read by Ms. Furrow had been given as a notice of motion before a regular Faculty meeting, but the agenda had been so crowded that the motion had been deferred to the next week. At that time, when he had been asked to explain what he meant by "direct" he had quoted the exchange between Owen Glendower and Hotspur in Henry V in order to underline that his use of "direct" did not mean the intention or ability to control. That was how the Faculty had understood the verb "direct". Mr. Friedrich had decided that "urge" did not capture the motion's intent. Mr. Faulkner asked Senators to note that he had not used the word "bind", since that would have been wrong. Mr. Faulkner then reminded the meeting of the true meaning of responsible government, as expressed by Edmund Burke in his speech to the electors of Bristol. He believed we were having difficulty with this concept in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, that the difficulty could be documented, and that Senate would wish to make an informed decision, not one based on rumor. It had been suggested that the Faculty had undemocratically passed a motion requesting that Senate rescind a decision already taken, but that was not so. When members of the Faculty had asked Senate Office whether the Governance document had been adopted, they had been told that though part had been approved, the whole had not been. Like other Faculties, the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences desired Senators who would exercise their free, independent judgement. They also wanted Senators to understand that when large issues were at stake, and people were in disagreement, the lines of communication needed to be kept open; that they should not fall back on a legalistic argument that an issue was finished and nothing remained to be said.

Mr. Faulkner was happy that when he had indicated during the debate that he would be willing to stand as a Senator, and as a Senator maintain that type of open relationship with his

Faculty, Ms. Furrow had been generous and wise enough to offer to nominate him. But he feared that if Senate adopted this motion, that spirit of openness would be stifled. At present there was a notice on the agenda of the next Faculty meeting asking the Senators to report on what they had done in response to the direction from their Faculty. He hoped that would prompt a useful discussion, and he hoped Mr. Cameron would make that meeting. He suggested that that discussion would be enhanced if this motion were referred back to the Faculty, or was now simply voted down.

Ms. Bleasdale asked for clarification as to what Mr. Faulkner meant by a Senator being directed by his/her Faculty, as she was becoming increasingly confused. Mr. Faulkner responded that the meaning of words was part of the problem. He reminded members of Mr. Cameron's question concerning the meaning of "guide", during the discussion of the "Strategic Directions" document. Personally, Mr. Faulkner did not see much difference between guide and direct, and was disappointed that this type of distinction was being drawn. His Faculty had hoped to help the University function in a more collegial way, not to deprive anyone of their independence. He trusted Senate would look at what had happened at the Faculty meeting, at the intention of supporters of the motion, and conclude it should have been conveyed to Senate for its information.

Ms. Furrow hoped Senators understood that when Mr. Lee spoke of a motion brought to the Faculty without notice of motion, he referred to a separate motion which had preceded the one she had read into the record. That earlier motion (to rescind) was the one about which the reference to procedural mischief had been made. She also underlined that both the later motion adopted by the Faculty and that now moved by Mr. Cameron used the word "direct", and Senators should assume the same meaning in the two motions. She was happy to see Mr. Faulkner occupying a seat on Senate; that was the appropriate way to ensure a variety of opinions were effectively communicated. No one group in a Faculty should feel that their voice is cut off from Senate deliberations. Mr. Lee reiterated Ms. Furrow's point about the two distinct motions passed by the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. As for the motion before Senate, he saw no need to refer it back to the Faculty, since this was solely a matter for this body. Finally, he found today's discussion somewhat amusing, when he thought back to a recent, hot debate in which a number of members from the Faculty of Medicine had been accused of voting at the direction of that Faculty on the issue of provisions for Tenure and Promotion.

The question was called on the motion to refer to the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. Mr. Stuttard explained that since Faculties were Committees of Senate, the motion was to refer this to a Committee of Senate. Hearing no dissent on the call for the previous question, the question was put and the motion was **LOST**.

The question was then called on the main motion, and the motion was **CARRIED**.

97:189.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 18:07 h.