

Item: Senate Minutes, March 1987
Call Number: UA-5, Accession 2007-039, Box 6

Additional Notes:

This document is a compilation of Senate minutes, staff matters and miscellaneous documents for March 1987. 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 special session in the Senate and Board Room on Monday, 2 March 1987 at 4:00 P.M.

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

Andrews, Angelopoulos, Betts, Birdsall, Bishop, Borwein, Bradfield, Braybrooke, Byham, Cameron T.S., Caty, Chaytor, Christie, Cromwell, Cross, Dykstra, Easterbrook, Ettliger, Flint, Forgay, Haley, Holloway, Lewis D., LoLordo, MacMullin, Mangalam, Manning, Mason, Mediolli, Murray, Myers, O'Shea, Ozier, Retallack, Reynolds, Ritchie, Rodger, Ruf, Sherwin, Sinclair, Stewart P.N., Stuttard, Sutherland, Tonks, Wien, Writer, Young, Zakariasen, Christie B. (invitee), Traversy (invitee).

Regrets: Belzer, Cohen A.D., Jones J.V., Konok, MacKay R.C., MacRae, Precious, Tan, Wassersug, Waterson, Welch.

87:031.

Response of Senate to the Report of the President Pertaining to Article 26

Senate met in special session to consider the response of Senate to the report of the President pertaining to Article 26 of the Collective Agreement. A draft of a joint report prepared by the Senate Academic Planning and Senate Financial Planning Committees had been made available to Senate members.

Motion (Wien/Byham):

that Senate accept the draft report entitled "Response of Senate to the Report of the President pertaining to Article 26"

Later amended and carried.

The Chair asked Mr. Wien to introduce the various sections of the report. Mr. Wien informed the meeting that there are five sections to the report, the first of which provides background information. No comments were received on this section.

Mr. Wien highlighted the additional strategies for improving revenue that appear in section 2 of the report. Mr. D. Lewis stimulated considerable discussion by asking if any thought had been given to moving expenses related to the Capital Campaign out of the operating budget. Mr. Wien replied that this had been discussed but to do so would reduce the proportion of revenues available from the campaign for other purposes. Mr. Borwein challenged this on the basis that this should not be a concern since the current practice removes money from the operating fund to pay for things in the future.

Mr. Flint noted the absence of comment on what, in his opinion, was the "root cause" (i.e. government grants). The President responded that this had been raised formerly with the government. He noted that Dalhousie and the Technical University of Nova Scotia get particularly small increases as a result of the way in which the funding formula is applied. He said the point had been made to the policy board when they visited the campus a few weeks previously and that the point will be repeated.

Regarding section 2, paragraph 2, Mr. Bradfield asked if the Committee had gotten the numbers of rejected qualified applicants to the professional schools and the numbers of applicants from modest socio-economic backgrounds. Mr. Wien replied that the main data available were figures on actual fees which showed Dalhousie at or near the top of the country. He also said that representatives of the faculties on the Financial and Academic Planning Committees spoke to the effect that a differential fee increase would be a detriment to those faculties. Mr. Dolan asked for Mr. I. Christie to express an opinion on the raising of fees for the Faculty of Law. Mr. Christie responded that there are approximately 1100 applicants per year for 150 places. He acknowledged that many of them represent duplicate applications to other schools. He said he would not like to see Dalhousie become non-competitive by the raising of fees. He said the class would be filled but they would lose students good enough to gain admission elsewhere. He also expressed concern about peopling the classes by non-needy students. Mr. Andrews noted the phrase "available figures" and asked if these figures included all law schools. Mr. Wien replied that the source of the figures was Statistics Canada for the years 85/86 and 86/87.

Mr. Bradfield asked if the Committee had looked at ancillary services to see if some students benefit from support of some services. Mr. Wien replied that the Committee had not. Mr. Jones then referred Mr. Bradfield to Table 1 of the report. He noted that the Bookstore and the residences make a net contribution to the university budget. Mr. Bradfield then asked if the cost figures for housing include capital cost. Mr. Jones replied that they are amortized. Mr. Mason added that if the property is mortgaged, the cost of the mortgage is charged against the operation. Mr. Andrews brought the discussion back to consideration of the differential fees by expressing concern with the use of the phrase "certain professional schools". After further discussion, an amendment was proposed.

Amendment (Rodger/Bradfield):

that the last sentence in paragraph two of section two be deleted.

Carried.

Mr. Bradfield then asked if the Committee had considered seat sales as opposed to fee increases. Mr. Wien replied that the Committee had not. Mr. Bradfield asked if Table I should be interpreted to be net cost. Mr. Jones replied that it should.

Mr. Wien then introduced discussion of section 3. He noted the large increases in budget for the Development Office, the Alumni Office and the Public Relations Office. He also suggested the need for an improved review process for maintenance, renovations and repairs.

Mr. Ettliger suggested the inclusion of a date in the first sentence of subsection 2 of section 3.

Amendment (Ettliger/Stuttard):

that the following phrase be added to the end of the first sentence of paragraph 2 of section 3 "to take effect for the 1987/88 academic year .

Carried.

Motion (D. Lewis/Bradfield):

Senate recommends that all possible expenses associated with the Capital Campaign be removed from the operating budget and assigned to the budget for the Capital Campaign.

Carried.

Suggestions for amending the amendment were made but ultimately not accepted. Discussion continued on reducing expenses and examining particularly the expenses of Alumni, Public Relations and Development Offices.

Amendment (Andrews/S. Cameron):

that the following phrase be inserted following the words "President's Office" in the penultimate sentence of the first paragraph of subsection 1 of section 3 " with a view to substantially reducing the costs" and

that the words "to examine ways in which the net costs" be deleted and that the words at the end of the sentence "can be minimized" be deleted.

Carried.

Mr. Braybrooke commented that in principle it would not be inappropriate to spend more money on the areas identified. However, he asked "How careful and effective is the monitoring of these operations?" The President replied that expenses in this area had to be put in the context of the next ten years and the pressures on the universities to seek funding from all sources. He provided comparative figures for Dalhousie and several other universities.

Mr. Wien moved to discussion of section 4. He said that the committees had tried to make an assessment of the major parameters. They had concluded that there is little alternative to a partial freeze, noting that even a total freeze would save only \$2M. Messrs. Kennedy, Rodger, and Andrews all spoke with concern about statements in the last paragraph of section 4. Mr. A. Young noted that the budget for Public Relations had increased three times and the Development Office budget had increased five times its former level. He said that he has been told that the normal procedure would be to charge campaign expenses to that office. The President stated that a significant portion of campaign expenses are charged to the campaign. He added that Senate should be aware that that Office handles many other activities such as the preparation of wills and seeking funds for Novanet. Mr. Kennedy again expressed concern about the last sentence of the last paragraph of section 4.

Motion (Kennedy/Rodger):

that the words "academic programs" be replaced by the word "expenditures" and that the word "quality" be deleted from the last sentence of the last paragraph of section 4.

Carried.

Before the above amendment was passed, some senators attempted to assure that the review would include academic programs.

Fund-raising again came up for discussion. The President spoke of the potential for the alumni annual fund to grow to over \$100,000 per year. He suggested the need for taking a long-term view recognizing that Dalhousie has to pay the price for having done little to cultivate alumni giving over the years. Ms. Ozier suggested that there will be a credibility problem if inefficient fund-raising is being promoted. It is important to know how much money is being raised and how much is being spent to raise it. She suggested the need for a report to Senate on this matter. The President stated that he did undertake in the last few weeks to report to Senate and the Board of Governors in the next month or so.

Amendment (Bradfield/Rodger):

that in the first sentence of the last paragraph of section 4 the words "three to four percent" and "each year" and "realistic" be deleted and

that the word "new" be substituted for the word "realistic"

Carried.

Mr. Wien moved the discussion to section 5 of the report. He pointed out the concern for the implications of a partial freeze on academic programs. He suggested that this decision should be consonant with academic plans. Mr. Rodger noted the reference to accreditation and asked if this means that professional schools have preference. Mr. Wien replied that no priority is intended but that this reference was provided as an example. Mr. Rodger noted the reference to core programs and asked if the writers have an idea of what is a core program. Mr. Wien stated that he would hesitate to offer a definition. In the face of further questioning, the Chair suggested that too much emphasis was being placed on the examples.

Amendment (Andrews/Borwein):

that the third sentence in the last paragraph of section 5 be deleted.

Carried.

Before the amendment was passed Mr. Betts and Mr. Ettlinger spoke against it. Ms. Ozier and Mr. Borwein spoke for it. Ms. Caty expressed concern about the impact of the partial freeze on planning resulting from delays in approval of potential appointments. The President admitted that the process is complex but that a document should be available later in the month. Mr. Sinclair stated that all comments should be in on March 11. Therefore if a freeze is implemented, it should be known by April 1st.

At 5:51 P.M. the Chair suggested that some additional time would probably be needed to complete discussion of the document. He gained the agreement of Senate to continue the meeting to 6:15 P.M.

Amendment (MacMullin/Dolan):

that the words "with a particular emphasis on teaching and learning" be added to the second paragraph of section 5.

Defeated.

Before this amendment was defeated several senators had spoken against it.

Mr. Borwein and Ms. Caty raised questions about the delaying effect on appointments. The President stated that Clause 26.07 allows a partial freeze to extend for one year unless there is an improvement in the situation. An extension requires a new declaration. Mr. Kennedy called for more publicity on the affect of budgetary cuts. The Chair agreed to take Mr. Borwein's comment and bring back a report.

Mr. Andrews questioned the origin of the authority for the Committee which will consider requests for appointments. The Chair replied that the President's Report had identified the Vice-Presidents and the Chairs of the Academic Planning Committee and the Financial Planning Committee.

Ms. Ozier reported that in Student Services they are taking a new look at re-deploying resources. She said she has serious concerns about morale and how Student Affairs can present the University to potential students if the situation continues. She urged putting minds to getting out of the situation.

Acceptance of the response of Senate to the report of the President pertaining to Article 26 incorporating the amendments made in the meeting was then voted upon using the main motion by which its consideration had been introduced.

Motion (Wien/Byham):

that the report of the President pertaining to Article 26 be approved.

Carried.

87:032.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:10 P.M.

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY
MINUTES OF SENATE MEETING

Senate met in regular session in the Senate and Board Room on Monday, 9 March 1987 at 4:00 P.M.

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

Andrews, Angelopoulos, Belzer, Betts, Borwein, Boyd, Bradfield, Braybrooke, Byham, Casey, Caty, Christie, Cromwell, Hare, Huber, Leffek, Lewis D., LoLordo, MacMullin, Maloney, Manning, Mason, Myers, Nestman, Ozier, Pooley, Pross, Retallack, Ritchie, Rodger, Schroeder, Sharp, Sinclair, Stewart M., Tonks, Welch, Wien, Wood, Yung, Christie B. (invitee), MacDonald M. (invitee), Traversy (invitee).

Ms. M. Stewart acted as Secretary for this meeting in the absence of Mr. D.V. Chaytor.

Regrets: Cohen A.D., Hersom, Konok, MacDougall, MacKay R.C., MacRae, Precious, Schwenger, Stern, Wassersug, Waterson.

87:033-

Minutes of Previous Meetings

The minutes of the meeting of 26 January 1987 were approved upon motion (Mangalam/Cromwell) with the following amendment suggested by Mr. Betts to page 7, line 5: undergraduate students.

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 February 1987 were accepted upon motion (Tonks/Ritchie).

87:034-

Question Period

Mr. Mangalam reiterated his question of approximately one year ago concerning the proposed focusing of some convocations on social issues of the day. He was concerned that a response was not yet forthcoming. The Chairperson clarified that the Steering Committee had referred this query to the CAA, who in turn directed it to the Killam Lecture Committee. The Killam Committee did not want to change their formal. The Committee on Academic Administration further considered that this issue was not within their mandate. Consequently,

the question was referred back to the Steering Committee. It was hoped that a response would be developed in the near future.

Mr. Borwein queried how library budget cuts could be consonant with academic planning. President Clark pointed out that the APC had recommended the allocation of \$300,000 of the Redistribution Fund to the library. Proposals to determine whether maintenance of library holdings would be a priority next year would be analyzed. Mr. Borwein was particularly concerned with the impact of cuts on journal acquisitions and gave notice of motion that Senate go on record to support maintenance of library holdings in this year's budget. Mr. W. Jones reminded members that Senate on two or three occasions in the past had declared that the library has a funding priority. Ms. Manning expressed her gratitude for the allocation from the Redistribution Fund. Nevertheless, it might not be feasible to maintain the current level of collections.

Mr. Huber requested a response from administration regarding the proposal to not install a sprinkler system in the new residence, in spite of recommendations to the contrary from the city fire department. The President remarked that no final decision had been made and that there was a concern that similar recommendations had not been made with respect to other construction projects in the city.

Mr. Bradfield noted that there had been no mention of the Bank of Nova Scotia in the list of companies divested by the Board. Mr. Huber recalled that nominees of Senate and the Board had looked into the question and reported their decision. President Clark took this as a notice of question to be answered at a future date.

87:035-

Report of the President

The President's report to Senate, which was circulated at the meeting, addressed the campaign for Dalhousie, the search for a Registrar, the search for a part-time appointment to the position of Special Advisor on Women's and Minority Group Issues, the current status of funding and the 1987/88 budget, and a submission regarding a Nova Scotia Community College System. President Clark referred members to a detailed report from Bryan Mason, dated 3 March 1987, concerning the Campaign for Dalhousie which could be reviewed and discussed at a subsequent meeting of Senate (Reports attached).

Mr. Sinclair suggested that Senate consider the campaign report - in the context of responses from other university committees. Mr. Leffek expressed his unhappiness concerning the donation of \$3,000,000 designated for Canelco Scholarships to the campaign, as this was money the university already owned. Mr. Christie objected to the reference that the Weldon Law Building fire resulted in changed priorities and an increase in non-government funds pledged for restoration purposes in that area. He reminded senators that much of the monies raised for restoration purposes had resulted from the Law School's solicited support from

alumni and external law societies. Mr. Sinclair clarified that a proposed allocation of \$2,000,000 to the Law Building expansion, prior to the fire, had not been accepted. Mr. Sinclair further clarified that the original, pre fire, plans for expansion of the Law Building were not confined to the library, but included other required academic facilities. The President recognized that it was highly unlikely that the campaign funds received would precisely match each of the individual target goals. However, the mere fact that the campaign was nearing successful completion was noteworthy. Mr. Rodger reinforced Mr. Leffek's concern regarding the use of Canelco funds. Finally, Mr. Bradfield requested that Senate be kept fully informed as per point #5 of the President's Report of decisions made by the Board with regard to Clause 26.07(a) of the Collective Agreement.

87:036.

Report on Balloting of Honorary Degree Candidates

President Clark reported that nine candidates had been approved as potential honorary degree recipients for the Spring Convocations.

87:037.

Report of Committee on Committees

Mr. Boyd reported for the information of senators that the following individuals had agreed to serve as temporary replacements for Ms. Ozier until June 30, 1987, on the Committees indicated.

Steering Committee - J.A. Ritchie
Discipline Committee - M.G. Forgay
Academic Appeals Committee - G. Fitzgerald

Mr. Rodger raised a question which he believed should receive consideration by the Steering Committee. Specifically, he wondered whether directors of schools and chairs of departments serving on the Discipline Committee were excluded from discussion and decision-making of discipline cases arising in their own unit.

A memo from Mr. Boyd had been precirculated in response to a 12 January 1987 motion of Senate concerning the membership composition of the Senate Library Committee.

It was agreed upon motion (Boyd/Pross)

that the number of members elected by Senate to the Senate Library Committee be increased from six to eight, one of whom would be a representative of the Academic Planning Committee and another would be a representative of the Financial Planning Committee.

Mr. Boyd assured Mr. Rodger that the Committee on Committees would ensure representation

from all Faculties.

87:038.

Recommendation of Steering Committee Regarding Recognition of Officers of Senate and Chairs of Senate Committees

Further to a Senate motion of 24 November 1986 "that the question of how we might recognize service on standing and statutory committees of Senate be referred to the Steering Committee", three forms of recognition were recommended by the Steering Committee. Therefore, it was moved and seconded (Cromwell/Welch)

that Senate approve in principle the following forms of recognition:

- 1. A group photograph, made annually, of the Officers and senior committee chairs should be displayed near the Senate and Board Room.**
- 2. A small token should be presented to the chairs of all committees on the completion of their term of office.**
- 3. A plaque, similar to that for the Chair of the Board of Governors, should list the names of the Chairs of Senate.**

Messrs. Huber and Andrews considered that the current practice of sending letters of appreciation from the Secretary of Senate to members and chairpersons of standing and statutory committees was sufficient. Mr. Rodger suggested that the names of officers and chairs of committees might appear in the calendar. Mr. Andrews did not object to a photograph appearing in the Dalhousie News. Ms. Ozier espoused the merits of recognizing effort expended in leadership roles. Mr. Rodger recommended that the motion be split into three parts for voting purposes. Mr. Braybrooke believed that recommendation 1 might serve the purpose of recommendations 2 and 3.

Upon vote the first motion carried and the last two were defeated.

87:039.

Implementation of Change in Graduate Degree Designations in the School of Recreation, Physical and Health Education

Correspondence dated 19 August 1986 from Mr. Durling, Acting Chairperson of MPHEC, and the relevant CAA minute excerpt had been precirculated. Mr. Sinclair explained that the lengthy discussions with MPHEC had been useful and that the change in name had no effect

on funding.

It was agreed upon motion (Maloney/Sinclair)

that Senate approve implementation of the change in graduate degree designations of the School of Recreation, Physical and Health Education to M.Sc. (Kinesiology), M.A. (Leisure Studies) and M.A. (Health Education).

87:040.

Jurisdiction of the Senate Academic Appeals Committee

The Revised Report of the Subcommittee on the Jurisdiction of the Senate Academic Appeals had been approved by CAA on 19 November 1986 and forwarded to senators prior to the 8 December 1986 meeting. Proposed amendments by Mr. Braybrooke, dated 10 February 1987, and by the Dalhousie Student Union, had been circulated with the agenda. Further, proposed resolutions from Ms. Hansell and Mr. Thompson on behalf of the Senate Committee on Academic Appeals, focused on three points in issue: specifically, finality, scope of appeals and fitness. This SAAC report was distributed at the meeting.

It was moved and seconded (Tonks/Christie)

that Senate accept the revised report of the subcommittee on the Jurisdiction of the Senate Academic Appeals Committee.

Mr. Thompson reviewed the points raised by the SAAC in their 5 March 1987 response. Mr. Rodger commended the subcommittee on their report. He recommended that the report be referred back to the subcommittee to deal with proposed amendments. Considerable discussion ensued, contributed to by Messrs. W. Jones, Thompson, Christie and Tonks, concerning the implications of the first recommendation with respect to opportunities for students to appeal decisions of the SAAC directly to Senate.

Mr. Huber believed that the proposed rules were reasonable and that the SAAC should be required to report to Senate only if one of the parties to the appeal so requested. Mr. Rodger agreed that students should have access to Senate if they desired. Mr. Lewis, a member of the Senate AAC, believed that reporting was helpful and informative to the university community, and hence was in favour of retaining current procedures. Ms. Ozier was concerned that students might be misled in terms of belief in a final appeal. Mr. W. Jones reminded her of the three alternatives available in considering SAAC appeal reports. Mr. MacMullin agreed with the intent of the suggestion to continue with the present process. Mr. Andrews recommended that a mechanism be established to ensure that reports of SAAC become Senate agenda items if the original appellant wished. This should preferably occur 15 days prior to the Senate meeting in question. Mr. Braybrooke suggested that the grounds

for reconsideration by Senate, specifically, if new evidence had been received or if improper procedures had been used, be entered into the rules to alleviate apprehension regarding review of the substance of cases in Senate meetings. Mr. Thompson assured Ms. Ozier that it was not the intent of the SAAC amendment re: finality to favour one party more than the other.

There was considerable debate participated in by Messrs. Rodger, Braybrooke, Lewis, Christie and Tonks regarding the disposition of the CAA subcommittee recommended rules in light of the proposed amendments from DSU, SAAC and Mr. Braybrooke. It was pointed out that the CAA report was compiled based on four years experience and considerable consultation, and that it might facilitate development of adequate academic appeal procedures in Faculties lacking these.

It was moved and seconded (Braybrooke/Borwein)

that Senate refer to the CAA the question of the disposition of the recommended rules, taking into consideration points raised in the discussion.

Messrs. Huber and Christie and Ms. Stewart reminded members of the lengthy history of the debate of this issue and of the need to reach a decision regarding the proposed rules.

The motion to refer was defeated.

It was agreed upon motion (Rodger/Myers)

that further discussion be deferred to the next meeting of Senate.

87:041.

Matter of Information -- CAA Date of Record on Parchments

Further to a recommendation of the CAA, it was moved and seconded (Sinclair/Betts)

that the date of the award of the degree shall be that date on which Senate would normally have awarded the degree had the student's account been clear

A friendly amendment proposed by Mr. Rodger, that the words "**with the university**" be added after "account", was accepted by the mover and seconder. The motion as amended then carried.

87:042.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:10 P.M.

