

Item: Senate Minutes, February 1984  
Call Number: UA-5, Accession 2007-039, Box 6

Additional Notes:

This document is a compilation of Senate minutes, staff matters and miscellaneous documents for February 1984. The documents have been ordered chronologically and made OCR for ease of searching. The original documents and additional documents for this year which have not yet been digitized can be found in the Dalhousie University Senate fonds (UA-5) at the Dalhousie University Archives and Special Collections.

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

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

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

Senate met in regular session in the Board and Senate Room on Monday, 13 February 1984 at 4:00 P.M.

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

Anderson, Angelopoulos, Axworthy, Betts, Birdsall, Blecher, Braybrooke, Brett, Burt, Calkin, Cameron D.M., Cameron T.S., Caty, Charles, Chaytor, Christie, Cohen A.D., Cromwell, Cross, Duff, Easterbrook, Fraser P., Friedrich, Geldart, Gesner, Gold, Gordon, Gratwick, Haley, Hatcher, Hill K.C.W., Hill T., Hoyt, James, Josenhans, Kamperman, Kennedy, Kerans, Klassen, Klein, Laidlaw, Leffek, Lewis, MacMillan, Manning, McAllister, Milne, Myers, O'Brien, O'Shea, Ozier, Pooley, Pronych, Pross, Richards, Rodger, Rugman, Scheibelhut, Shires, Sinclair, Stairs, Stephens, Stewart, Stovel, Thiessen, Tindall, Tingley, Tonks, Treves-Gold, Tuck, Van Feggelen, Varma, Warner, Waterson, Welch, Young, Yung, Zinck.

Regrets: Belzer, Bennett, Jones J.V., MacKay, Maloney, Monk, Stern, Stuttard.

84:08. Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting of 9 January 1984 were approved upon motion (Rodger/S. Cameron) with one amendment to add the words "including all departments" following "parties" to 84:03, page 3, second last line.

The Chairman advised members that correspondence from Ms. Ozier dated 9 **February 1984 identifying the "short list"** of candidates for the position of Vice-President (Academic and Research) and from Ms. G. Allen, endorsing a motion of the Dalhousie Student Council supporting academic planning, were distributed at the meeting.

84:09. Question Period

No questions were raised at this time.

84:10. Awarding of Degrees and Prizes

Upon the recommendations of the Deans of the Faculties, the following degrees were awarded upon motion:

Faculty of Arts and Science

Bachelor of Arts ----- 11  
(Honours 1)  
Bachelor of Arts Honours Certificates ---- 1  
(Honours 1)  
Bachelor of Science ----- 20  
(Honours 1, First Class Honours 3)  
Bachelor of Science Honours Certificates ----- 2  
(Honours 2)  
Diploma in Engineering ----- 1

One additional student name was omitted from the list forwarded to the Senate Office. It was agreed upon motion (Betts/S. Cameron) that the awarding of this individual degree would be approved.

Faculty of Dentistry

Certificate in Periodontics ----- 1

Faculty of Health Professions

Bachelor of Science in Physiotherapy ----- 1  
Diploma in Outpost and Community Health Nursing ----- 8  
Bachelor of Physical Education ----- 5

Faculty of Graduate Studies

Doctor of Philosophy ----- 9  
Master of Arts ----- 8  
Master of Business Administration ----- 4  
Master of Education ----- 2  
Master of Science ----- 2  
Master of Social Work ----- 1  
Diploma in Public Administration ----- 1

84:11. **Motion from the Faculty of Arts and Science**

Following a summary of the underlying rationale by Dean Betts, it was moved and seconded (Betts/Cross)

**(1) The science departments of the Faculty of Arts and Science have**

**been underfunded in allocations of non-space capital compared with the Faculties of Medicine, Dentistry, and Health Professions at Dalhousie University, and have had a non space capital funding level lower than those of science departments in most other universities in the province of Nova Scotia and the Atlantic provinces in general;**

**(2) the cancellation by the province of Nova Scotia of non-space capital funding to institutions of post-secondary education severely affected science departments of the Faculty of Arts and Science at Dalhousie University that had already experienced chronic underfunding;**

**(3) the conditions of equipment and facilities of the science departments of the Faculty of Arts and Science have deteriorated to the point where they can no longer maintain effective teaching programmes in their disciplines;**

**(4) a committee of scientists from outside the Faculty of Arts and Science at Dalhousie University concluded in a study conducted in the spring of 1983 that these departments would require an outlay of non-space capital funds of at least \$539,500 simply to restore their equipment and facilities to levels achieved ten years ago;**

**Senate urges the President to make every effort to ensure that the restoration of non-space funds by the province of Nova Scotia on the level required is made available for the 1984/85 budget;**

**and that if funds for restoration of equipment and facilities of the science departments of the Faculty of Arts and Science are not forthcoming from the province of Nova Scotia, that the renewal of these facilities and equipment be made the highest priority item in the proposed capital fund-raising drive of Dalhousie University to begin in 1984.**

Dean Tonks queried the impression left by the initial consideration, that the Faculty of Arts and Science was underfunded in allocations of non-space capital in comparison with the Faculty of Health Professions among others and identified the percentage of the total budget allocated to this item with his Faculty over the past two years (namely 2.6% and 5.6%). Dean Betts responded by stating that the Faculty of Health Professions had indeed been undersupported but that the cost centre figures from 1978-1983 inclusive showed that the average non-space capital grants per student in the Faculty of Arts and Science were lower than the Faculties identified in the preamble to the motion, specifically, Medicine, Dentistry and Health Professions.

Dean Hatcher then expressed his consternation that such a motion could have a

potentially divisive impact on Senate in a time of restraint, in light of Senate's composition and representation from numerous constituencies. Mr. S. Young requested a breakdown in the figures for Arts students and Science students. Dean Betts supplied the information that \$61 represented "Science" students and \$26 "Others" but that the average had initially been quoted. Mr. Scheibelhut recommended that this motion be forwarded to the FPC or another appropriate committee of Senate, to review prior to the presentation to Senate, with the intent that Senate members be sufficiently informed to participate in an objective decisionmaking process. It was thereafter agreed upon motion (Scheibelhut/Klassen) that "the motion from the Faculty of Arts and Science be referred to the FPC, with a request that the FPC report the results of their review to Senate at their earliest convenience."

Mr. Braybrooke spoke in support of Senate hearing and serving to facilitate impartial resolution of such concerns.

84:12. Reports and Recommendations -- Committees of Senate

A. Academic Planning Committee

1. Institute for International Development

It was moved and seconded (Chaytor/Klassen)

**that Senate approve in principle the Institute for International Development with the understanding that it will contribute no additional cost to the university.**

The Chairman called upon Dr. Ian McAllister who clarified the intent of the proposal that such an Institute would (1) overcome fragmentation of current endeavors and 'harness' existing activities (2) maintain Dalhousie's position as a leading Canadian university in its range of international activities & o establish Dalhousie's commitment to internal and external projects related to international development.

Ms. Laidlaw requested information as to the basis upon which sites and countries were selected and asked if political considerations played a part in such decisions. Mr. McAllister responded by stating that selection at present occurred on an ad hoc basis but that it was his view that in

the future the Institute would provide substantial opportunity to negotiate in a coherent fashion. He then commented in response to a question raised by Ms. Allen that external funding would be elicited from two sources, a project by project basis as in the past, and a new component, namely a block grant contribution within the next six months. He anticipated that a concrete budget could be presented to Senate by the December 1984 meeting. Mr. Kennedy queried whether the creation of an Institute would result in initiation of new projects or enhance current activities. Mr. McAllister indicated that both components were anticipated and denied that specific countries, e.g. Africa, would be emphasized as a focus for development.

Further to concerns expressed by Ms. Waterson, Ms. Laidlaw and Mr. Braybrooke, he reassured members that checks and balances would be applied to the future selection and screening of specific commercial contributors, and that a code of ethics and series of guidelines to ensure their consistent application could be made available for the information of Senators. Ms. Ozier questioned whether Dalhousie would facilitate universal accessibility to its programmes for all students or continue to provide education primarily for these from relatively wellto-do countries. Mr. McAllister predicted that this unfortunate situation may continue for some time but tha- it was anticipated that the projects undertaken would assist some of the more economically deprived countries to imprave their educational system. Mr. Rugman spoke in support of the proposed Institute on the grounds that it would provide the opportunity to build the university's external reputation. Mr. McAllister then clarified for Mr. Hill the rationale for the proposed name, namely the Lester B. Pearson Institute for International Development, reiterating that internationa1 reputation, not political consideration provided the impetus behind this recommendation. The question was called and the **motion was put to a vote and carried.**

## 2. Progress Toward a Framework for Academic Planning

The Chairman reported that the APC was in the process of developing a report which proposed a framework for the

process of academic planning. Members concurred with the request originating from the APC, that a special meeting of Senate be scheduled for 27 February 1984 at 4:00 P.M., to engender discussion about the document. It was also agreed that a nominee to serve as an elected representative to the APC (to replace Ms. O'Shea who had resigned), would be named by the Committee on Committees at that meeting.

B. Committee on Academic Administration

1. Date of Fall Convocation (Minute No. CAA 84:10)

The Secretary advised members that the Rebecca Cohn was available for the tentative date of Saturday, 20 October 1984 at 2:00 P.M. It was agreed upon motion (Betts/Tonks)

**that 20 October 1984 be approved as the date for the Fall Convocation.**

2. Dean's List -- Faculty of Health Professions

Dean Tonks addressed the documentation which had been precirculated, including the proposed criteria and statistics regarding the proportion of graduands likely to achieve recognition, had this award been in existence from 1981-1983.

It was moved and seconded (Tonks/James)

**that Senate approve the adoption of a Dean's List and relevant criteria for the Faculty of Health Professions.**

The motion carried.

3. Appointment of Vice-Presidents

The Chairman referred members to the precirculated correspondence from the President dated 30 January 1984, entitled "Vice-Presidents 1984" and to the relevant excerpt from the CAA minutes. On behalf of the CAA it was moved and seconded (Tonks/Betts)

**that Senate support the three Vice-Presidential**

**positions recommended by the President in the document Vice-Presidents 1984, namely the Vice-Presidents (Academic and Research) (Finance and Development) and (Planning and Resources).**

Mr. Axworthy requested the rationale behind the recommendation of the CAA, particularly with regard to the proposed lead responsibilities, incorporated in each position, the workload commitment devoted to the positions, and the intended inter-relationship between the different vice-presidents. Dean Tonks indicated that the CAA agreed that the responsibilities of the Vice-President (Academic and Research) might require the appointment of an Assistant or Associate Vice-President. The Secretary noted that the issue of interrelationships had not been addressed and the Chairman commented that the VicePresidential positions considered by the CAA in 1983 had been temporary, while current discussions focused on permanent appointments. Ms. Allen and Ms. Ozier asked for clarification of discrepancies noted between Annex B and C, specifically related to delineation of responsibility for "personnel relations other than academic staff", salary and wage policy for academic staff, and relevant relations with DFA and non-union staff. Ms. Allen expressed considerable concern about the severe time limitations imposed on the search for a Vice-President (Planning and Resources) if such an appointment is to be made by 1 July 1984. In response to a question from Ms. Waterson the Chairman referred members to the document entitled, Appointment of President, Vice-Presidents, Deans and Associate or Assistant Deans which determined that the term of office for vicepresidents is normally of a five-year duration.

Mr. Kennedy contended that the rationale behind the appointment of three rather than two vice-presidents, in a time of restraint, required clear delineation in a time of restraint [with particular reference to the appointment of a Vice-President (Planning and Resources)], a contention supported by Messrs. Axworthy and Bradfield, Ms. Laidlaw and Ms. Waterson. Mr. Betts referred to the fact that the President at the 30 January meeting of the CAA, had advocated the value of appointment of three vice-presidents, as outlined in his 30 January letter and Mr. Warner relayed



the opinion of the President, expressed at that time, that a degree of continuity was viewed to be valuable in his office.

Messrs. Scheibelhut and Stovel, troubled by the time restrictions, then urged Senate to proceed immediately to the task of striking a Search Committee. Mr. Varma spoke in favour of sufficient vicepresidential positions to address areas of specialization. However, Mr. Hill indicated that the Student Union could not support the motion until further clarification and documentation was provided.

At that point, the question was called from the floor, and the **motion carried**.

The Chairman turned the attention of members to the necessity to constitute a search committee for a Vice-President (Planning and Resources). Ms. Ozier indicated, in response to his query, that select members of the Search Committee for a Vice-President (Academic and Research) not the committee in its entirety might be willing to serve on the new committee if approached on an individual basis.

It was therefore agreed upon motion (Betts/Chaytor) that the Committee on Committees would be asked to propose a slate of nominees for the Search Committee - Vice-President (Planning and Resources). This slate will hopefully be presented at the special meeting of Senate on 27 February 1984. Mr. Easterbrook urged members to propose nominees.

It was further agreed that representation from different sectors of the university would be similar to the composition agreed upon by Senate for the Vice-President (Academic and Research).

### C. Academic Appeals Committee

Mr. Braybrooke summarized the content foci of the recent workshop on procedural matters related to conduct of appeals and indicated that he would be prepared to report on the outcome at the March 1984 meeting of Senate.

## 2. Appeal of Mr. Kirk Meldrum

Mr. Braybrooke read correspondence dated 2 January 1984 from Professor R. Fournier (Chairperson of the Hearing Panel) which relayed the deliberations and decision regarding the appeal of Mr. Kirk Meldrum.

It was moved and seconded (Hill/Warner)

**that discussion of this report be postponed until the next regular session of Senate in March.**

A question by Mr. Rodger resulted in general agreement that this item would be placed early in the agenda. Subsequently, Mr. Hill consented to have his written comments precirculated, upon advice from Mr. Kennedy.

### 84:13. Search Committee for a Dean -- Faculty of Arts and Science

The Chairman reported that the Faculty of Arts and Science was currently in the process of nominating a committee to advise on the appointment to the office of the Dean for a term commencing 1 July 1985.

### 84:14. Report from the President

A nine-page document entitled Report to Senate and the Board of Governors dated 31 January 1984 prepared by the President had been precirculated with the agenda. As the President was not present, questions related to this report were postponed.

### 84:15. Honorary Degree Candidates -- Tabling of Names

On behalf of the Honorary Degrees Committee, the Secretary tabled the names of 10 candidates for the Spring 1984 Convocations and presented a brief resumé for each nominee. Detailed information on all of these candidates is available for perusal by Senators in the Senate Office.

### 84:16. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:59 P.M.

# DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY

## MINUTES OF

### SENATE MEETING

Senate met in *Special Session* in the Board and Senate Room on Monday, 27 February 1984 at 4:00 P.M.

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

Axworthy, Barkow, Belzer, Betts, Birdsall, Bissett-Johnson, Bradfield, Burt, Cameron D.M., Cameron T.S., Campbell, Caty, Chaytor, Cohen A.D., Comeau, Courtney, Cross, Dickson, Duff, Fillmore, Gesner, Graham, Gratwick, Haley, Hall B.K., Hill, Horrocks, James, Josenhans, Kamperman, Kamra, Kennedy, Kerans, Kimmins, Klassen, Leffek, Lewis, LoLordo, MacKay, Maloney, Manning, McLaren, Myers, Nestman, O'Brien D.W.P., O'Shea, Ozier, Pooley, Pross, Renner, Richards, Rodger, Ruf, Scheibelhut, Shaw L.R., Stewart, Sherwin, Sinclair, Stairs, Stern, Storey, Szerb, Thiessen, Tingley, Tomlinson, Tonks, Treves-Gold, Van Feggelen, Warner, Welch, Wien, Williams, Yung, Christie B. (Invitee).

Regrets: Jones J.V., Pronych, Tindall.

#### 84:17. Awarding of Degrees and Diplomas

It was moved and seconded (Horrocks/Wien)

**that the awarding of 3 Bachelor of Social Work and 17 Bachelor of Commerce degrees be approved retroactive to 13 February 1984.**

The motion was carried.

#### 84:18. Reports and Recommendations -- Committees of Senate

##### A. Committee on Committees

It was moved and seconded (Duff/Courtney)

**that Judith A. Ritchie serve out the term of Barbara O'Shea on the Academic Planning Committee.**

There being no further nominations, the nominee was declared elected.

Members concurred with Mr. Rodger's suggestion that consideration of the list of nominees to serve on the Committee to Advise on the Appointment of a Vice-President (Planning and Resources) be postponed until the 12 March 1984 meeting of Senate to permit precirculation of the curricula vitae of these individuals.

#### 84:19. Proposal for a Framework for Academic Planning

The Chairman introduced the document by stressing that although it did not necessarily represent a final position of the APC, that discussion should be initiated because of the significance and implications of academic planning and that the assistance of Senate was

required at this stage. It was agreed that each section would be discussed in turn beginning with the second section.

## II. Current Issues and the Impetus for Academic Planning

Accountability - Mr. Thiessen indicated that he had difficulty with the extent of accountability assumed, specifically with the preservation of social and cultural values rather than technological competence. Some disciplines run counter to this to the extent that unpopular research and teaching can be protected. He maintained that accountability should be coupled with protection. Mr. Kennedy stated that the document should not necessarily reflect the assumption that an information-oriented society will guide planning decisions as future options should remain open.

Faculty - Mr. Belzer requested that sentence 3 be amended to read "concern over stagnation which traditionally has been addressed mainly by new appointments should now be increasingly treated through schemes for faculty stimulation and development.

Accessibility - Mr. Kerans felt that the wording of this section should incorporate the sense that the university must institute structural changes to increase accessibility to new sectors of the population and explore new sectors of the market which are opening up, rather than postpone action until government funding is received.

## III. Objectives of Academic Planning

Objective # 5, (page 4) - Mr. Kennedy maintained that the university must increase institutional flexibility so that the impetus to add programmes which do not currently exist, in a creative manner, is provided. Thus, restriction on only a passive react/respond approach would be removed.

Paragraph 2 - Mr. Rodger expressed his concern that the language reflects accounting procedures. He agreed that roles and objectives should be known and understood, but not with the budgetary detail proposed in the document and added that this plan for a mechanism is incompatible with the organism in the university.

Objective # 3 - Mr. Josenhans identified a potential conflict between the objective and page 5, which indicates that priority lists would not be requested.

Paragraph 2 - Ms. Sherwin requested clarification of the meaning of the phrase "The ideas and goals of the institution". She stated that a single set of objectives would, in all likelihood, need to be vague in light of the differing and conflicting goals and objectives of the individual units. Messrs. Chaytor and Wien responded by indicating that it was hoped that these universal goals would be derived from the debate of the

process and that essential university-wide policy decisions (e.g. openness to part-time students) should provide the context in terms of which the plans of departments would be elaborated.

Ms. Ozier was concerned that expansion did not appear to be reflected in the objectives, and that the emphasis appeared to be on contraction and efficiency. Mr. Wien spoke on behalf of the APC, stating that both types of issues should be included in the document, as priorities for instances of expansion were also appropriate.

**Objective # 6** - Mr. Graham believed that internal accountability in discharging responsibilities should serve as a prerequisite for public accountability, adding that the university should assume a strong position in clarifying what it is doing and the reasons for these decisions.

#### IV. Principles of the Academic Planning Process

Accountability - Mr. Josenhans requested that the word "peer" be removed from line 12 so that other types of review could be assumed such as consumers of university services. Mr. Rodger reported that peer review was a traditional practice and that opening the door to review by government should be avoided. Ms. Allen added that the recommended structural changes proposed in the document provided the possibility of student input.

Mr. Thiessen urged that Senate consider carefully what the university must do to support certain activities/programmes, even if they are not considered legitimate or high priority by the public.

Mr. Kerans pointed out that non-academic expenditures should also be more publicly accountable, as academic accountability is only part of the problem.

Security - Mr. Kennedy advised that a sense of insecurity might arise from the conflict between the premise that all planning start from decentralized (departmental) points, yet mesh with an overall university plan. He wondered if priority lists (line 11), although not requested, might be imposed in light of statements on page 23.

Mr. Pooley added that he also remained unconvinced of the first statement under programme security as programmes would be required to fit within a university plan.

Internal Dynamism - Mr. Betts requested an explanation of the phrase "move freely from areas of over-subscription --- to areas of undersubscription", indicating that the extensive retraining required for individuals to change to very different disciplines

would indeed be difficult.

Ms. N. Treves-Gold added her concerns with the impact on departments and requested clarification of the last sentence in the first paragraph.

Security - Ms. Sherwin reiterated her recommendation that criteria to justify the existence of programmes within an overall university plan and rule\_s for the process must be carefully delineated. In this context, she advocated amendment of the first sentence under "Management" and the last sentence under "Scope".

Accountability - Mr. Friedenberg spoke in support of Mr. Thiessen's earlier conviction that the university recognize the right to defend its constituencies by identifying clearly what is significant and useful in university education and relaying this information to the public. He acknowledged that in a pluralistic society, the university sustains itself by appealing to a variety of publics, many of whom have conflicting interests.

Size - According to Mr. Kennedy, the question of the optimum size of the university remained, and no principle of planning was expressed here. This "laissez-faire" approach seemed to contradict Objective #1 (page 4).

Security - Individuals - Mr. Rodger stated that the phrase "no persons will lose their job" (line 3) should not be included as only the Board of Governors can determine whether this can be guaranteed. Mr. Renner maintained that security is a prerequisite to commitment to a plan.

Overall Section - Mr. Barkow identified basic conflicts which should be explicitly stated as they cannot be reconciled including (1) decisions made centrally versus maximum decentralized input (2) security for all versus flexibility in planning and (3) serving all publics versus serving personal interests.

Scope - Mr. Thiessen stated that "some functions are essential to the whole" (lines 6-7) would also imply that some are disposable, which would inevitably lead to conflict.

Accountability - Ms. Ozier contended that the second sentence required clarification as accountability, primarily should be to the consumer public, in addition to including academic and financial accountability.

President MacKay concurred that the key constituency for university accountability should be the students. He believed the document reflect s the current state of university finances ar.d that in the future, more of the burden will shift to the individual users.

V. The Structure of the Academic Planning Process

Mr. Josenhans indicated that he had difficulties with the ordering in this section under levels of planning with the university level named first.

Mr. Kennedy argued that the product of this planning process should be determined in advance and that accounting should not be confused with planning. He contended that the committee structure was burdensome and complex. Consequently a more efficient method of identifying precise general objectives should be found and accounting should be separated out from the planning process.

Mr. Graham reiterated his concern that the university clearly identify its objectives and goals and actively determine how the public and the consumers should be served. Ms. Allen maintained that students should also have input in this process.

Mr. Thiessen spoke to paragraph 3, sentence 1, page 12, predicting that the end result of this process would be the same as the departmental restraint and renewal documents, in that no departments would identify themselves as oversubscribed. He maintained that it was necessary to create criteria such that an amount within which it was necessary to live, would be specified. Mr. Rodger queried the "concept of envelope budgeting --- be replaced by academic budgets" (page 11, last sentence).

Ms. Sherwin was concerned about the degree of authority awarded to a sub-committee of the APC which was not elected by Senate, to which Mr. Jones responded that sub-committees, reportable to APC, were frequently struck by that committee and APC would retain control of the planning process. Ms. Sherwin then requested that the mechanism should be clarified by which departmental goals might be overruled at the faculty level, maintaining that it was preferable for departmental morale to identify limits within which they must work rather than to request their ideal preference.

Mr. Pross stated that unfortunately specific "cores" of individuals who speak to promote specific branches or subunits of departments would not be reflected in the mass spread sheet. Ms. Ozier offered her support for the first sentence under "departmental level" (page 9). However, she believed that there was a contradiction in the last two lines on page 8 between "only approve, recommend --- or reject" and "should not impose specific plans" .

Mr. Betts supported Ms . Sherwin' s comparison to the exercise undertaken in restraint and renewal, which in the end was perceived to be a waste of time and effort.

Mr. Barkow supported this contention indicating that planning was essential and

stated that any document would be criticized similarly, but that the procedures should be greatly simplified and include minimal principles.

Mr. Kennedy asked whether recommendation of tenure for weak candidates to protect positions was really a present or potential problem (1 - c last sentence - page 8) to which Mr. Betts replied that tenure decisions should continue to be based on the merits of the case rather than financial considerations .

Mr. Friedenbergr expressed commendation to the authors of the document, but sensed that some of the difficulties in interpreting the document lay in the attempt to state abstract general principles concurrently with consideration of specific cases and concrete details.

Mr. Hall defined the document as predictive rather than planning and felt that departments might become "cogs in large, fossilized wheels".

#### VI. Implementation of the Academic Planning Process and

#### VII. Appendix I

Mr. Rodger supported Ms. Sherwin's recommendation that criteria be developed and that these should be derived from a general statement of roles and goals, adding that specific application could not be delineated at this time. He also advised that criteria are required to identify "endangered or protected species" (page 15 -l(d).

Mr. Kennedy suggested that more attention be directed toward internal dynamism reflected in issues such as those identified in l(a)(b) and (c) - page 15. Discussion should focus on goals and priorities for the university.

Mr. Belzer expressed his respect for the individuals who had prepared a working draft and recommended that the re-drafted document include a comprehensive definition of planning.

Mr. Betts shared his difficulty in comprehending fully position description accounting. He reported that statistics over the past few years in the Faculty of Arts and Science pointed to the fact that only 14% of the budget was not legally constrained of which only 3% was faculty salaries (rather than 75% flexibility as implied in the document). In this context, he believed that the envelope system was less rigid than position description accounting and that PDA would be much more difficult to administer.

Mr. Rodger likewise questioned the financial issues incorporated in 15(d)(e) and (f) on page 15, stressing that the Board of Governors would decide financial allocation



of resources. He stated that consultation with the Board should occur or alternatively, that such references should be removed from the document. He further advised that the word "vision" on page 22 - line 4 should be amended.

Mr. Pross reminded members that it is usually expedient to identify the simplest framework currently in existence or one which seems congruent with the organization. He suggested, therefore that the current system of academic reviews of programmes could be broadened to consider such issues as financial development and graduates, and built into a basic five-year cycle. The ongoing process might be more appropriate than developing an elaborate new system.

Mr. Chambers extended these comments by returning the attention of members to the phrase "uncertainty exists over whether fundamental restructuring of the university is necessary (last sentence under "funding" - page 2).

He added that the tremendous amount of administrative work generated by the proposed exercise of P.D.A. was prohibitive and that the university might cease to exist as an academic institution as critical masses of specialization and excellence are required. Therefore, he advocated looking for new innovative methods to further academic excellence and freedom.

Mr. Scheibelhut expressed consternation at the enormous complexity of the proposed mechanism and the potential for minimal payoff in contrast to the efforts involved. He maintained that a simplified, workable method should be identified.

Mr. Friedenberq questioned the impact of the discussion on the tentative timetable (page 18).

#### 84- 20. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:05 P.M.