

Item: Senate Minutes, March 1989

Call Number: Senate fonds, UA-5 Accession 2007-039 Box 6

Additional Notes:

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

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

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

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

Senate met in special session in the Senate and Board Room on Monday, 6 March 1989 at 4:00 P.M.

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

Betts, Bissett-Johnson, Black, T.S. Cameron, deBurger, Easterbrook, Fillmore, J. Fraser, Golding, Haley, Leffek, McKee, Mehn-Andersen, Pross, Shannon, Smith, Stairs, M. Stewart, Tamlyn, Vance.

Regrets: Archibald, Forgay, Gold, Gregor, J.V. Jones, Konok, Maloney, Precious, Storey, M.H. Tan, C. Williams.

**89:022.**

Conferral of Degrees -- All Faculties

Based on prior correspondence to the Secretary of Senate, the following degrees and diplomas were awarded upon motion of the deans or their designates of the Faculties concerned.

College of Arts and Science (R. Smith/Betts)

Bachelor of Arts ~ 30  
(Honours 1)  
Bachelor of Science ~26  
(Distinction 1, Honours 3, First Class Honours 1)  
Bachelor of Music ~  
Bachelor of Education ~ 4  
Bachelor of Engineering ~ 4  
TOTAL 65

Faculty of Graduate Studies (Leffek/S. Cameron)

Doctor of Philosophy ~  
Master of Arts ~ 3  
Master of Business Administration ~ 4  
Master of Development Economics ~  
Master of Education ~2  
Master of Health Services Administration  
Master of Library and Information Studies ~  
Master of Nursing ~ 5  
Master of Science ~ 10

TOTAL 38

Faculty of Health Professions (de Burger/Stairs)

Bachelor of Science (Kinesiology) ~  
Bachelor of Science (Health Education) ~ 2  
Bachelor of Nursing (Post RN) ~ 3  
Diploma in Outpost and Community Health Nursing ~ 4  
Bachelor of Social Work  
(with Distinction)

TOTAL 11

Faculty of Management (Pross/Stairs)

Bachelor of Commerce ~ 17

Faculty of Dentistry

In the absence of a representative from the Faculty of Dentistry, it was agreed upon motion (Stairs/de Burger) **that the Diploma in Dental hygiene be awarded to the student named in correspondence (24/1/89) to the Secretary of Senate.**

The Chair explained that the Faculty of Dentistry could present names of graduands at times other than the regular approval times, in response to Mr. Smith's expressed concern that no representative had been present.

It was agreed upon motion (Betts/R. Smith)

**that Senate ask the Chair to write to the Dean of the Faculty of Dentistry expressing disappointment that no representative had been present to bring forward the proposed graduands from that Faculty.**

There was consensus upon motion (Pross/S. Cameron)

**that the Dean of the appropriate Faculty and the Registrar be authorized to add to and remove from the graduation list the names of any students who have been omitted or included on the graduation list due to errors on the part of the university or one of its servants.**

89:023.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 P.M.

## DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY

### MINUTES OF SENATE MEETING

SENATE met in regular session in the Senate and Board Room on Monday, 13 March 1989 at 4:00 P.M.

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

Andrews, Antoft, Barkow, Berard, Betts, Bissett-Johnson, Black, Boardman, Braybrooke, Breckenridge, Brett, D.M. Cameron, Carruthers, Christie, Courtney, Cromwell, Duff, Dykstra, Easterbrook, J. Fraser, E. Frick, Gamberg, Goldbloom, Graham, Gratwick, Gregor, Haley, Hart, P. Jones, Lane, MacIntosh, MacRae, M.J.C. Martin, B. Mason, McDermott, McNiven, Medioli, Myers, O'Shea, Ozier, Pross, Retallack, Ritchie, Stairs, Stewart, Storey, Stuttard, Thiessen, Vance, Wood, Zentilli, B. Christie (invitee), M.D. MacDonald (invitee).

Regrets: Forgay, Gold, Mehn-Andersen.

89:024.

#### Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of the Senate Meeting held on 9 January 1989 were approved upon motion (Stuttard/Betts) with one addition to page 5 at the beginning of paragraph 2, requested by Mr. Stuttard: "In response to Mr. Fraser's last point, Mr. Stuttard pointed out that a subsequent meeting of Senate would decide which, if either, of two such simultaneous meetings would be accepted as a proper meeting. He added that the tennis court meeting..." Remove "Mr. Stuttard pointed out".

The minutes of 23 January 1989 were approved upon motion (Betts/Stuttard) with one correction noted by Ms. Ozier on page 2, paragraph 5, lines 2 and 3: "Two students, two faculty and a chair hear each case."

With reference to the minutes of the meeting held on 13 February 1989, Ms. Ozier wished to have the record of her remarks on page 2 clarified to read: "Ms. Ozier had received the newsletter to parents, being herself the parent of a Dalhousie student, and she questioned President Clark's assumption that parents of Dalhousie students would find it reassuring to know how many members of a union at the University had continued to work while their union was legally on strike. She was of the opinion that Dalhousie parents knew better than that." These minutes were accepted upon motion as amended (D. Cameron/Gratwick).

Mr. Betts observed that individuals listed as present in the minutes sometimes included people who were no longer elected representatives of Faculties. These people had signed the attendance sheet. The Chair suggested that the question of whether members only should be listed as present could be referred to the Steering Committee.

89:025.

#### Report on Balloting -- Honorary Degrees

The Secretary reported that as a result of voting conducted at the 13 February 1989 meeting of Senate, twelve Honorary Degree nominees had been approved and four nominees had not been approved.

89:026.

#### Question Period

There were no questions at this time.

89:027.

#### Nominations from the Committee on Committees

Mr. Pross informed senators that the Committee on Committees was presently seeking nominations for a number of Senate committees and would be delighted to have volunteers. Mr. Pross, on behalf of the Committee on Committees, nominated Mr. T. Cromwell as Vice-Chair of Senate, with a term of office effective immediately until 1991. Following the requisite three calls for further nominations, Mr. Cromwell was declared elected to the position and congratulated.

Mr. M. Zentilli was declared elected to the University Public Relations Committee, following nomination by Mr. Pross and the necessary calls for further nominations from the floor.

89:028

#### Distribution of Non-Replacements of Academic Vacancies

Mr. W.E. Jones noted, that in response to a request for information on non-replacements, he had prepared a compendium of documents which dealt with this issue. These were distributed at the meeting and included:

- (1) The President's views in correspondence of December 15 entitled "1989-1990 Budget" which included a statement "To

meet the presently projected budget shortfall in 1989-90, it will be necessary to reduce the faculty complement by 16 25 by non-replacement." (2) A letter dated 20 December 1988 from President Clark to the Chair of Senate indicating the proposed distribution of 20 non-replacements of academic vacancies. (3) A Senate Academic Planning Committee questionnaire sent to each Dean and Director requesting certain types of information to assist with discussions of distribution of non-replacements.

(4) Correspondence dated February 10 from the Chair of Senate to the President which reflected SAPC's concerns regarding increased flexibility (This had been shared with Senate at the previous meeting).

(5) A letter of response dated 15 February 1989 from President Clark indicating that SAPC's responsibility was simply to comment on the distribution rather than the proposed number of non-replacements.

Mr. Stuttard sought clarification on the role of SAPC in light of the President's 15 February 1989 letter. The Chair replied that the Committee did comment only on distribution, not on numbers of non-replacements.

Mr. Fraser inquired what would happen if, as a result of the ruling on mandatory retirement, there were fewer retirements than anticipated. Mr. Mason responded that non-replacements could be "banked" for the future. Mr. Braybrooke suggested that it would be necessary to know how many vacancies led to replacements, in order to interpret this information. Vice-President Stairs observed that in at least one Faculty, individuals who had been expected to retire, would not be retiring. Hence, there were fewer vacancies than expected. Mr. Betts added that in the Faculty of Science, at this time last year 12 persons had resigned, while only one person this year had expressed intent to resign. The Chair clarified for Ms. Vance the process defined in the Collective Agreement with respect to the role of the SAPC and the President. She had expressed concern that the process might be a waste of time, if Senate could not offer advice to the President.

Mr. Andrews presumed that the officers of the University should know who planned to resign by February. He supported Mr. Braybrooke's contention that there was a need to know more regarding numbers who resigned.

Mr. W.E. Jones agreed to provide Senate with information solicited from Deans. Mr. McNiven contended that it was irrelevant to know who resigned or not since non-salary budgets had been cut down as far as they could go. Mr. Andrews disagreed. Ms. Ozier requested information on where replacements had been made, how many had left in each Faculty, and where new positions had been created. Mr. W. E. Jones reiterated that he could provide Senate with information obtained in response to the questionnaire.

Mr. Braybrooke, responding to Mr. McNiven's comments that cuts were distributed across Faculties on the basis of size, maintained that there was a need for a year-by-year account of the university's shrinking size to determine whether this was in proportion to Faculty size and to know the rate at which the complement was reduced. He suggested that all this information could be monitored annually, at the end of the year.

Ms. Ozier reminded Mr. McNiven that the President at an earlier meeting had said that decisions had been driven by rational criteria such as class size and student enrolment. Mr. Stairs indicated that he could provide Senate with a report of factors which had been taken into account including size of Faculty, adaptability to reductions, past reductions in proportion to size, etc.

Mr. W.E. Jones clarified that SAPC had made recommendations based on concerns expressed by some Deans. Mr. Young wondered if the Administration had been reduced as much as faculty had been in recent years. Mr. Mason replied that over the past 5 years, there had been considerable reduction of non-faculty positions (75 had been eliminated and 6 more would be in the Arts Centre). He added, in response to Mr. Stuttard's query, that the numbers given were those considered to be reasonable and realistic to carry out the program. This would not solve all problems.

Mr. Andrews contended that it was extremely important that Senate be monitoring the process of complement reduction. There was a need to know actual numbers by which the complement of all Faculties had been reduced, since the time the process was put in place. Mr. W.E. Jones concurred that this was desirable. Mr. R. Smith commented on the SAPC's apparent difficulties in getting information on figures and criteria. He added that the information received by SAPC from his Faculty would be of little use since it had presupposed five retirements, which were now unlikely. He suggested that clear cut answers were not available and that Senate might not be capable of acting as a rational body on this issue. Ms. Ozier, referring to an earlier comment by Mr. Mason, stated that senior administration had not been reduced by the Ritchie process. Mr. Mason agreed that the majority of those affected had been junior level support staff, although the position of Assistant Director of Personnel Services had been terminated.

Mr. Brett maintained that it was important to report numbers reduced in all categories of positions, including administration. Mr. McNiven was puzzled concerning the recent creation of 2 1/2 Faculties out of 1, if senior administration was a problem. Mr. Betts explained that this had not been a very expensive process, involving the creation only of one new deanship and a 1/2 secretarial position. Further, it had been agreed to be desirable academically.

Mr. W.E. Jones agreed to bring the information requested in the course of discussion to a future meeting of Senate.

89:029.

#### Ranking of Redistribution and Development Fund Recommendations

A report entitled "A Report to Senate on Recommendations for Disbursement of Redistribution and Development Funds" (dated March 13, 1989), prepared by W.E. Jones and M. Stewart on behalf of SAPC was circulated. The SAPC recommendations for disbursement of Redistribution Funds (1989 - 1990); information for completing an application to the 1989-90 Redistribution Fund and Development Fund (the introductions to the application forms); and the "Methods of Ranking and Assessment of Redistribution and Development Applications from Faculties" were appended. Mr. Jones reviewed the content of the report, noting that the comprehensive review of requests included the four steps discussed in paragraph 2. He explained that the committee had attempted to identify a method by which rigorous weighting factors might apply to committee rankings of the various requests. An attempt by the committee in which academic units were ranked was not viewed as useful to the committee nor to the university community. Furthermore, this information had not been used by SAPC in arriving at their

recommendations. Mr. Young\_ contended that this should not become a precedent, as committees should not develop "hit lists" without serious discussion and criteria for "cuts". Mr. Jones accepted these comments and reminded members that the academic planning process was intended to be a bottom-up process. Mr. Haley expressed concern with the process, noting that the recommendations concerning redistribution and development fund applications were supposed to take into account academic plans. However, he understood that the School of Education's academic plan had not yet been read by the Committee. Mr. W. Jones observed that all academic plans were read by individual members. However, this plan had not been formally discussed because of the difficulties with multiple deadlines, following the strike.

Ms. Walker explained that academic plans were reviewed in depth by designated members and reiterated that individual members read all plans. Mr. W. Jones clarified for Mr. Haley that the "list" had been informally devised in an attempt to be more objective. He noted that each year the individual academic stages of the planning process were increasingly "in sync", so that redistribution and development applications would be reviewed following review of the academic plan. Ms. Vance commented that as a committee member she had hoped that debate would be sparked concerning criteria for quality and resources of Faculties. She would rather have programs cut, if necessary, at Senate than at the Board level. Mr. W.E. Jones reiterated that this was simply an attempt to facilitate ranking by using weighting factors, similar to those used by national granting councils, but that it had not been used by the committee in arriving at their final recommendations. Ms. O'Shea requested information on the role



that Faculty priorities played in ranking of requests. In the case of the Faculty of Health Professions, the only one approved had been ranked fourth by the Faculty. Mr. W.E. Jones explained that the committee also took into account academic plans, information received from Deans and Directors, and quality of applications in final decisions. Faculty ranking played a large role for the most part.

Ms. Walker confirmed that the "list" had not been used in arriving at a ranking of requests for funding. Mr. Braybrooke took it from the discussion that there was agreement that ranking of Faculties and units should be avoided. He asked if it was generally understood by those responsible for raising funds that they should be striving to improve the excellence of the university, even though it was shrinking in size through complement reduction. The provincial government, Financial Strategy Committee and Board of Governors needed to agree on this point. Mr. Myers supported the decision not to circulate the "list" publicly. If there were discussions of overall ranking, there should be a healthy debate in Senate, participated in by the units involved and not left up to spontaneous actions by committees. He acknowledged that in the past years, Henson College had had a fair hearing in discussions regarding allocation of funds although it had not fared well this year. This was likely part of the complicated judgments which need to be made.

Ms. Vance queried the recommendation for development funding for a "new program" in the Faculty of Management, in light of the Board's declared moratorium. The Chair considered that it was inappropriate to discuss details of funding decisions on an individual case basis and the rationale for these decisions in the Senate meeting. However, he invited Deans to meet on an individual basis with himself or the SAPC, if they wished. Mr. McNiven supported Mr. Myers comments, despite the fact that the correlation in his Faculty's case between the list and the SAPC's recommendations was close to 100%. Mr. Pross clarified for Ms. Vance that the project referred to was not a new program. However, new initiatives were consistent with the original purpose of the Development Fund which had been set up several years ago. Mr. W.E. Jones agreed that planning should not stop, as the moratorium would be lifted at some point in time.

Mr. Gratwick commented that redistribution and development funds were very small compared to the total budget. Mr. D. Cameron urged the SAPC to consider a process that was more rational and imaginative than indefinite across-the-board cuts. Mr. W.E. Jones reminded members of the new criteria proposed by SAPC which would be vigorously applied to proposals of new programs in future. Ms. O'Shea sought assurance that Faculty academic planning committees would be given feedback on their applications and priorities. Mr. Berard was troubled by a ranking of Faculties done in isolation. He urged that rational criteria be created prior to any future ranking. Mr. W.E. Jones gave his assurance that such lists would not be casually developed in future.

Ms. Vance referred again to the School of Business proposal and asked if the criteria for new programs shouldn't have been applied in this case. Mr. W. Jones stated that this would be a feasibility study to determine answers to questions such as those raised in the criteria. He added, in response to a question posed by Ms. Ozier, that the Faculty of Management would be getting this money. Ms. Ozier believed that it was incomprehensible that these dollars would be allocated to a feasibility study when the International Development program had been turned back on financial grounds at the Board level. She contended that the danger of any type of ranking of Faculties was the momentum toward discussion of cutting programs and Faculties. In her view, this was a money management problem, as Dalhousie was one of the best endowed universities, where students paid the highest tuition fees, and where a successful capital campaign had been conducted. Mr. McNiven explained that this was a feasibility study of what was predicted would be a profitable program. The initial monies would be recovered.

Mr. Storey sought an explanation of the phrase in Appendix 3 "general philosophy of university priorities". Mr. W.E. Jones agreed that more discussion was needed, as the Mission Statement developed by the committee was not as definitive as desirable. The new Mission Statement would be discussed in Senate. Mr. Andrews suggested that if money was to be recouped, the monies could be given as a loan to the Faculty of Management rather than a grant. Mr. McNiven concurred. The Chair reminded members that the purpose of Development Funds was to provide incentive to programs which

would become self-sufficient. Mr. Berard requested that a mechanism be put in place to inform units of the nature of the assessment and the deficiencies in proposals and applications.

Mr. Jones agreed to provide as much information as possible from minutes and reviewers' notes, to the Deans and units prior to the next application process. He added that all committee members took part in discussion of applications, not just the two or three assigned reviewers.

89:030.

Requested Change in Name of Degree of M.Sc. (Oral Surgery) to M.Sc. (Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery)

Correspondence from Mr. Leffek dated 24/1/89 had been circulated with the agenda. On behalf of the SAPC, Ms. Walker moved

**that Senate approve the change in the name of the degree of M.Sc. (Oral Surgery) to M.Sc. (Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery).**

The motion carried.

**89:031**

Annual Report of Senate Computer and Information Technology Planning Committee (1987-1988)

The document entitled "Senate Computing and Information Technology Planning Committee: Annual Report September 1987 September 1988", forwarded by Mr. D. Sheridan, was received by Senate for information.

89:032.

Senate Steering Committee Reports

The Secretary of Senate reported on the following actions of the Steering Committee:

(1) Sexual Harassment Case:

On 12 December 1988, Senate gave the Steering Committee the authority to deal with the recommendation of a sexual harassment hearing panel. After receiving the confidential comments of the President on the case, the Steering Committee agreed that the change in grade recommended by the hearing panel was appropriate.

(2) Senate Committee on University Government: Report on Appointment of Presidents, Vice-Presidents, Deans, Associate and/or Assistant Deans:

A subcommittee comprised of J. Flint and M. Dykstra had proposed changes in the wording of the document which removed the sexist language but did not affect the substance. These changes had been incorporated in a re-typed version. The Board of Governors had been informed that these changes had been incorporated. Copies of the amended document could be made available to Senators upon request.

(3) Updating of "Student Information Guide on Academic Appeal Procedures at Dalhousie University":

The Vice-President (Academic) of the DSU had pointed to the need for updating this student information guide at the February meeting of Senate. Although this document had been created with the assistance of Senate, it was not an official document of Senate. A consensus was reached that the task of soliciting more current information from Faculties, units and committees could be referred to Vice-President McKee. The President of the DSU would be informed of this decision.

(4) Teaching Release Time for Officers of Senate:

The question of release time for Officers of Senate had been posed at the 13 February 1989 meeting of Senate. The committee agreed that there did not appear to be any strong reason at this time to automatically provide release time, although if the responsibilities increase, the allotment of release time might be shared between the Vice-Chair and Chair.

89:033.

Other Business

Mr. R. Smith suggested that it was timely to review the entire process of redistribution and development funding, in light of problems expressed and encountered in the past. The Chair agreed to have SAPC discuss the process and invited specific comments regarding necessary revisions. Mr. Thiessen contended that there was ongoing concern surrounding this process. The procedures and concept

needed review. Mr. W. Jones stated that there would always be difficulties with any process which had to make difficult decisions. Ms. Ritchie, commenting as a former member of SAPC, agreed that there would be disgruntlement with any difficult process which leads to win-lose situations. She reinforced the conscientious, comprehensive review carried out in the SAPC and added that Senate should view with grave caution any recommendation to do away with Redistribution and Development Funding. Ms. Ritchie was concerned that Senate would not be able to intelligently create criteria for vertical cuts, if it could not even decide on the distribution of \$500,000.

89:034.

#### Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:07 P.M.

## DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY

### MINUTES OF SENATE MEETING

SENATE met in regular session in the Senate and Board Room on Monday, 27 March 1989 at 4:00 P.M.

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

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

Invitees: B. Christie, Conover, Crocker.

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

89:035.

#### Discussion of Draft Mission Statement

The document entitled "Presidential Statement on the Mission of Dalhousie University" (as published in the Dalhousie News, January 18, 1989) had been precirculated. The President commented that the Advisory Committee, which had developed five drafts over the past year, was broadly representative of different groups in the University. He noted that the need for institutional direction which acknowledged resources and the need to set priorities were common themes in meetings with units. He stressed that this was a draft statement which would be further revised based on input received from individuals and comments at the Senate meeting. It was important for the university to come to some consensus about its future directions and mission.

Mr. Borwein was uncertain how to interpret the document's direction on shape and size of the university in light of the lack of detail about faculty complement, resources and student enrolment. President Clark clarified that the Mission Statement was intended to be a document of general purpose and intent. Some general statements about student enrolment appeared on pp 45. The next step would be to translate the Mission Statement into operational detail.

Mr. Smith asked if feedback received from Faculties and others had been discussed by the Committee.

President Clark indicated that the committee had discussed the comments received from Faculties and individuals, but would wait until after the Senate meeting to incorporate revisions.

Mr. Braybrooke sought clarification and explication of several phrases on page three, in particular; "unnecessary duplication" (1. 4), "geographical nature" (1. 6), "essential components" and "efficient operation" (1. 7-8) in light of the second paragraph of the section on "commitments", in particular, the phrase "essential to the academic integrity" (1. 21). In response to the last point, the President speculated that English and math, for example, were central to all universities. The operationalization of this statement would need to be debated. All universities were under great pressure to demonstrate efficient operation and reduction of duplication. Furthermore, every mission statement of any university stressed commitment to excellence. Mr. Braybrooke noted that academic integrity was a complicated concept and wondered what it would mean in terms of such subjects as geography and art history. The President reiterated that the first step would be to come to a consensus regarding the overall purpose of the university and then to operationalize it collectively.

Mr. Kerans believed that it was difficult to grasp the meaning of the Mission Statement without operationalization. In light of the ambiguities present, there was a need for clarity on the process for decision making. In his view, a sense of how financial realities impinged on academic plans and goals was needed. The President reiterated that a discussion document had been drafted which could be collectively discussed to achieve some agreement. He reminded Senators that the Financial Strategy Committee of the Board was consulting widely regarding means to maximize university resources. The Mission Statement would need to be operationalized in light of their findings and the government's decision regarding funding formula.

Mr. Bonen observed that the document was highly interpretable and inquired whether it would be important to reassure faculty that they were encouraged to participate in the process. The President commented that the document had been widely circulated, for example, through the Dalhousie News. Mr. Andrews was disappointed that the document did not inspire enthusiasm as it seemed to focus on preserving the past rather than on creativity for the future. He cited page 4, paragraph 2, sentences 3 and 4 as examples. He believed that the vision, similar to that expressed in the "Conclusion" (page 7), should be reflected through the entire document. A process of debating policy statements surrounding, for example, accessibility was also needed. The President clarified that the committee had attempted to draft a general guidance statement (which, by the fifth draft, might have become less visionary). Specific policy statements could be developed later, according to the usual

process.

Mr. Berard, referring back to Mr. Braybrooke's comments, asked what would happen in cases where the university was duplicating programmes in other institutions which were demonstrably inadequate. He also sought clarification of paragraph 21 sentence 3 under "graduate education". The President pointed to the words "Dalhousie will take the initiative in collaborating with other Nova Scotia educational institutions ..." (page 6).

Mr. Taylor explained that the intent of the Mission Statement was to establish a general framework and guidelines within which the planning process could take place. Operational statements would not be expected at that stage. Ms. Dykstra noted that the Senate discussion mirrored the committee's discussion as it struggled to find a level of specificity which was meaningful and realistic to Dalhousie but did not specify policies or operationalization. Ms. Ritchie believed that the committee had made significant strides in the direction needed. She had already conveyed her concern in writing about the degree of ambiguity in certain parts. The President stated that many responses expressed general agreement with the document while others requested greater specificity.

Mr. Kerans commented that many of the document's phrases discussed at this Senate meeting were essentially debatable and contestable and would only acquire meaning when they were operationalized. An open debate was needed throughout the process to come closer to reasonable decisions. Mr. Taylor explained that in any process some individual or group needs to put a statement into draft form in order to focus public discussion. Mr. Kerans wondered if subsequent discussions would take place in Senate. The Chair confirmed that this was the case, as Senate was the academic governing body of the university. President Clark commented on the enormous difficulties many university senates encountered in collectively operationalizing mission statements. Mr. O'Brien queried how implementable or decision informative this Mission Statement would be. He suggested looking retrospectively at approved programmes to determine if the Mission Statement would have helped to reach decisions.

Ms. Dykstra clarified that the committee had discussed the strengths of the university and come to a working consensus. Mr. Taylor added that Dalhousie is publicly known for its unique areas such as Medicine and Law. Mr. Andrews wondered if there was a close connection between "strong" and "unique". Mr. W.E. Jones clarified that the strength and weaknesses of individual areas had not been examined by the Committee.

Ms. Vance thought the Mission Statement was lengthier than statements at other universities and warned against leaving anything open to interpretation and definition. Mr. Stairs was concerned that the debate had so far focused on process rather than on addressing substantive revisions needed. The President

thought that this Mission Statement was unique in its brevity.

Ms. Ozier was concerned about the documented discussion of future sources of undergraduate enrolment. She believed that this was a "pricey" proposal and asked: (1) how decisions would be made regarding choices for future enrolment; and, (2) where the monies would come from to support the directions proposed. The President concurred that the model for undergraduate education was intended to attract more students from across Canada and outside Canada. Growth of enrolment in graduate studies would be in response to particular demands. Funding mechanisms would likely de-emphasize enrolment sensitivity in future.

Mr. Brett was unable to discern the unique mission of Dalhousie from the statement. He wondered if a recipe for cutting was contained therein. He stressed the need to coordinate financial planning and generation of priorities. The President did not view the statement as a document for cutting. Senate had approved the idea of Areas of Special Emphasis and Dalhousie did have recognized strength in Ocean Studies. Mr. Betts advanced arguments for naming Ocean Studies as an ASE. He believed the Mission Statement represented progress and hoped that feedback would become synthesized in a sixth draft. Mr. Borwein was concerned that non-revenue generating departments, who do not receive external grants, might not be included as ASE's although their graduate programmes were universally important.

Ms. Vance thought that Nova Scotia taxpayers might view recruitment of students from outside the province as threatening. The President reported that a meeting with the Minister of Education last week indicated that the recommendations of the Adlington Report would likely be implemented, adding that Dalhousie was a regional university. Limits or ceilings on enrolments would need to be approved by Senate. Mr. Zentilli suggested that attracting young faculty might be identified as a priority and that the impact on finances might be ascertained. President Clark clarified for Ms. Tamlyn that the committee would bring back a revised draft to Senate and seek general approval in principle. Feedback might also be solicited from Faculties on the next draft, although Faculties had already been invited to submit comments. Ms. Ozier was concerned that a future scenario in undergraduate enrolment at Dalhousie might provide room for only a narrow cut of students from Nova Scotia. There might be fewer spots for the best Nova Scotian students in undergraduate positions. She wanted to know where the monies would come from to support the proposed mission. Lastly, she observed that many programmes had been maintained despite "fads" of what was considered important. Mr. Berard questioned how the drafting committee had determined the national status of Law and Medicine. The President explained that the committee generally agreed upon areas that the outside community identified when asked what Dalhousie was noted for externally, Ms. Silvert would have liked to have seen the distinction between training and education emphasized to a greater extent. Mr. R. Smith contended that the writing was **problematic and recommended that professional**



editor(s) rewrite the document to remove vagueness.

Mr. Stuttard stated that he would like to see goals and knowledge seeking emphasized and environmental predictions (e.g. Section II) minimized in the Mission Statement. Ms. Silvert wondered if it would be desirable to add a paragraph on programmes aimed at retention of undergraduate students. Mr. Stuttard suggested that Sections IV and VIII be merged in the current position of Section VIII. Mr. Christie explained that some of the information in Section II had been derived from the Report of the Committee on Undergraduate Education.

89:036.

### Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:55 P.M.