

Item: Senate Minutes, December 1991

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

Additional Notes:

This document is a compilation of Senate minutes, staff matters and miscellaneous documents for December 1991. 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 on Monday, 9 December 1991 at 4:00 p.m. in the Senate and Board Room.

Present with Ms. P. Lane in the chair were:

Aiken, J. Archibald, Ashley, Atherton, Banerjee, Bankier, Bérard, Betts, Birdsall, Blackford, Bradfield, R. E. Brown, Carlson, R.F. Chandler, Clark, Clarke, J.E. Crowley, Dykstra, Eberhardt, Fentress, Forgeron, Frick, Fullerton, Girard, J. Gordon, J. Gray, J.S. Grossert, L. Haley, Jericho, D.W. Jones, Kwak, McGuire, McKee, Melanson, Moger, T.J. Murray, J.D. Myers, Nottle, F. Novakowski, Pacey, Ravindra, Ruggles, Schellinck, A.M. Simpson, Sinclair, Sketris, K. Smith, R.J. Smith, Stairs, K. Sullivan, J.E. Sutherland, Tamlyn, Tindall.

Invitees: B. Christie.

Regrets: Arklie, Carruthers, A.D. Cohen, Corvin, Hare, J.V. Jones, Laidlaw, Manicom, Mason, M.F. Murphy, O'Shea, Purdy, Ritchie, Roald, M.J. Stewart, M.H. Tan, Walker, Wassersug, Young, Zakariasen.

Ms. Lane called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

91:148.

Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of the regular meeting of 8 November 1991 were approved upon motion (T. Cromwell/E. McKee).

91:149.

Campus Plan

A motion relating to this item had been tabled at the 8 November meeting, with the understanding that it would be considered in December after representatives of residents in the immediate neighbourhood had met with representatives of the Senate, Board, and Administration. Mr. Bérard reported that such a meeting had taken place on 18 November 1991 and that the Chair of the Campus Plan Advisory Committee, Mr. J. Cowan, had written a letter (appended) to the representative of the neighbourhood group to summarize the results of that meeting and to provide a number of additional assurances related to the stated concerns of the residents. It was moved (R. Bérard/T. Cromwell)

that the motion to approve the Campus Plan
[see Sen. Mins. 91:140] be taken from the table.

The motion carried.

As a result of this action, consideration was given to the motion (R. Bérard/R. Carlson) put on behalf of the Senate Physical Planning Committee:

that Senate endorse the joint recommendation of
The Buildings and Grounds Committee of the Board
and the Senate Physical Planning Committee that
the University adopt the Campus Plan Report entitled
"A Collective Vision" as the guideline for future
capital development, with the understanding that
the Plan shall be reviewed at least every five years;
further, that actual capital development take into
account the sensitivities of the wider community.

Ms. Bankier said that she had received a call earlier in the day from a colleague and neighbourhood resident, who said that he and some of the other residents were not satisfied with the assurances that had been given in Mr. Cowan's letter. This caller had requested that Senate take no action on this matter until at least February to allow a meeting of residents called for January to discuss Mr. Cowan's letter to take place. The caller had stated that, if Senate did not defer consideration of the motion to approve the Campus Plan, he and other residents would publicly attack the Plan and undermine any future capital campaign of the University.

Mr. Bradfield said that he had some difficulty in figuring out the Plan as finally presented. Mr. Bérard said that the Plan had been presented at a major public meeting in the fall and that a summary article had appeared in Dalhousie News. Mr. Pacey objected that he had not received a personal copy of the Campus Plan. Mr. Bérard said that copies of the Plan have been available for consultation in the President's Office, the Senate Office, and the Department of Physical Plant and Planning, and Mr. Betts pointed out that copies were available for purchase from the Dalhousie Art Gallery. Mr. Pacey said that he had been told by the Department of Physical Plant and Planning that he would be sent a personal copy but that he had not yet received it. He suggested that no member of Senate should be expected to vote on the motion to approve the Plan unless he or she had been given a personal copy of it to read.

It was moved (J. Bankier/P. Pacey)

that the motion be tabled again until the first meeting of Senate in February 1992.

The motion to table carried by a vote of 22-17.

91:150.

Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Appeals in the Faculty of Medicine

Mr. Cromwell outlined the origins of this ad hoc committee in a specific appeal case which came before Senate in 1989. He explained some of the major problems and complexities specific to academic appeals in a medical faculty and how the report (previously circulated) sought to address them. The committee took the view that any amendment to the appeal procedures in the Faculty of Medicine had to be undertaken by the Faculty itself, but the report provided analysis of problems, suggested solutions or approaches to solutions, and recommended that the Faculty report regularly to Senate on the progress it was making in amending its procedures. On behalf of the committee, it was moved (T. Cromwell/R. Carlson)

that Senate accept the report and endorse the recommendations in the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Appeals in the Faculty of Medicine.

Mr. Grossert objected to the use of the term "chemical dependence" in the report. He said that all living things were dependent upon chemicals of various sorts and that the term should not be used to refer to dependence on drugs or alcohol. Mr. Cromwell said that the committee had

used that term because it was the term employed by the Medical Society of Nova Scotia.

The motion carried without dissent.

91:151.

Committee to Review the Terms of Reference of the Senate Discipline Committee

Mr. Bérard reported that the Steering Committee (S.C. 91:060 previously circulated) had considered requests from the Senate Discipline Committee and representatives of the Dalhousie Student Union to establish a committee to review the terms of reference for the Senate Discipline Committee. On the basis of representations made by the Chair of the Senate Discipline Committee and the Academic Vice-President of the DSU, the Steering Committee agreed to recommend the establishment of such a committee.

On behalf of the Steering Committee, it was moved (R. Bérard/T. Cromwell)

- a) that Senate establish an ad hoc committee to review the terms of reference of the Senate Discipline Committee; and
- b) that this review include a review of the Committee's procedures, the adequacy of penalties imposed by and available to the Committee, and appeal mechanisms; and
- c) that the ad hoc committee be composed of two student representatives, one appointed by the Dalhousie Student Union and one by the Dalhousie Association of Graduate Students, the Registrar or her designate, the Dean of Graduate Studies or her designate, two representatives of Senate, one of whom should be a current or former member of the Senate Discipline Committee, and, ex-officio, the Vice-President (Academic and Research) and the Vice-President Academic of the Dalhousie Student Union.

Mr. McKee said that he wished to raise the question of non-academic discipline. He pointed out that the Steering Committee had agreed that he should draft terms of reference for a task force on the issue of non-academic discipline. He said that there are at least six different discipline mechanisms in existence at the University, and he questioned the distinction between academic

and non-academic discipline. He said that, as statutes give the Senate power over discipline in the University, the Senate Discipline Committee should be involved and that a comprehensive review of internal discipline procedures should be undertaken.

Ms. Ashley said that, while she accepted the general point made by Mr. McKee, the Senate Discipline Committee's wish for a review of its terms of reference related to a number of specific concerns about its role in matters of purely academic discipline. A broader review at this time, she believed, might cloud consideration of those concerns. Mr. Forgeron said that the DSU was comfortable with the recommendation to have two committees looking at matters of academic and non-academic discipline, respectively. Mr. Sinclair said that the Steering Committee was aware of the points raised by Mr. McKee but that it was persuaded by the view, expressed both by the DSU and the Senate Discipline Committee, that the questions be approached by two distinct groups. The Committee did take the view, however, that any task force on broader disciplinary questions should have on it members of the committee being recommended to review the terms of reference of the Senate Discipline Committee.

Mr. Forgeron asked that the motion be amended

**to add, after the word "include" in section
(b) the words ", but not be limited to,"**

The mover and seconder agreed that this was a friendly amendment.

**The question having been called, the motion carried.
91:152.**

Library Hours During Christmas Holidays

On the basis of a notice of motion (previously circulated), it was moved (D. Betts/R.E. Brown)

that Senate urge the President and the University Librarian to make vigorous efforts to find the means to keep the University Libraries open, albeit for a reduced number of hours, on the following weekdays: December 23, 24, 27, 30, and 31, none of which are statutory holidays.

Mr. Betts said that the motion was not to set policy but to give guidance to the Administration. He said that passage of the motion was in line with the University Mission Statement and added that closing the libraries for such a long period was a break with past practice at Dalhousie and

with practice at major universities in other parts of Canada, and that it could be taken as a sign that the University does not care about research. He said that many faculty and graduate students, particularly international students, would like to use the libraries during the holidays.

Mr. Birdsall replied that the libraries were not deemed an "essential service". They remained open when the University was open, but with the University being closed over the holidays, the libraries will close as well. He suggested that several staff members would be needed to provide service at each of the libraries, that these staff members, even if they wished to work, could be given only compensatory time at other times during the year, when need for their services was greater, and that, in the past, very few persons used the libraries during the holiday period. Ms. Sutherland said that none of the staff at the Kellogg Library wished to work during the holidays at such short notice. She said that closing the libraries boosted staff morale and that a retreat from this decision would have a detrimental effect on morale.

Mr. Birdsall said that he would be willing to make arrangements with security to allow access to the libraries for individual members of faculty and graduate students upon specific request, as had been done on several occasions in the past. On that basis, the following amendment was moved (W. Birdsall/J.P. Atherton):

that the words from "find the means..." to "reduced number of hours" be replaced with the words "provide access to the University Libraries"

Mr. Bradfield asked if access would be given only to those who requested it. Mr. Birdsall said that access would be limited to those who made specific requests. Ms. Tamlyn asked if providing staff for these periods would mean reduced service at other times of the year. Mr. Birdsall said that any staff members who would have to be present must be given compensatory time off during the year. Mr. Forgeron asked if requests from both graduate and undergraduate students would also be honoured. Mr. Birdsall said that he would attempt to respond to requests from all students and members of faculty.

The question having been called, the amendment carried.

Mr. Bradfield asked if staff would be forced to work. Mr. Birdsall said that he could not force staff to work in these circumstances. Ms. Sutherland said that she doubted that a single member of the Kellogg staff would volunteer to work with such short notice. Ms. Tamlyn asked if the University would re-imburse staff for travel and child-care expenses. Mr. Birdsall said that there was no budget for such reimbursement.

Mr. A.M. Simpson said that he objected to such restricted access and said that he doubted the need to have several members of staff on hand. Mr. Birdsall said that it was no simple matter to open a five-storey building (in the case of the Killam Library) with a collection valued at over \$50,000 with one staff member on duty. Mr. Stairs said that it was impractical to make the change so late in the year. Mr. Atherton pointed out that the motion asked only that the President and the University Librarian "make vigorous efforts to provide access" and should be understood as such.

The question having been called, the amended motion was defeated.

91:153.

Notice of Motion re President's Report and Question Period

Ms. Lane said that Senate would consider a motion (M. Bradfield/P. Pronych) for which notice had been given,

that the President's Report and Question Period alternate in being placed at the top of Senate's agenda, immediately following the Minutes item.

Mr. Bradfield said that these items had, in the past, been placed regularly at the top of the agenda, following the approval of minutes. He said that these were important items and should not be placed at the bottom of the agenda as many members of Senate often leave before they are reached.

Mr. Bérard reported that the Steering Committee (S.C. 91:064) had recommended that these items be placed normally at the end of the agenda. Ms. Bankier said that, in the House of Commons, Question Period opened the business of the House. Mr. Carlson pointed out that the Steering Committee took the position that, as Senate committees had spent a great deal of time preparing items for consideration, business from those committees should be given precedence over the concerns raised by, and often only of interest to, individual members of Senate.

Mr. D.W. Jones said that he thought that placing these items at the end of the agenda made for more reasoned and democratic discussion. He said that exchanges arising from the President's Report and Question Period often have created an atmosphere in Senate that was not conducive to the reasoned and dispassionate consideration of business. Mr. Bradfield responded that the Question Period was one of the few occasions during which important questions could be put directly to the President and other officers of Senate and the University. Mr. Atherton suggested that, in view of the importance of such questions, it would be advisable to require that

questions be submitted in advance, with some indication, in writing, of the purpose of the question. In this way, the time of Senate would not be taken up with irrelevant questions or those of very narrow interest.

The question having been called, the motion was defeated.

91:154.

For Information - Question Raised at 11 October Meeting

Mr. Bérard reported receipt of a response (previously circulated) to a question raised by Mr. Bradfield at the meeting of 11 October concerning the costs of certain ancillary operations.

91:155.

For Information - Report to the Board of Governors Finance and Budget Committee re 1992-93 Tuition Fees

Mr. Carlson reported that the Senate Financial Planning Committee had reviewed the "Report to the Finance and Budget Committee of the Board of Governors: 1992-93 Tuition Fees" (previously circulated). He pointed out that Senate had passed a tuition fee policy which provided that a tuition fee structure could be set within the terms of that policy without requiring action by Senate. The 1992-93 fee plan was developed within the approved policy and was being communicated to Senate for information only. The report explained how the tuition fee structure was developed. Mr. Carlson explained that the policy called for Dalhousie's tuition to be adjusted to a level of 105%-110% of the average of tuition at other Nova Scotia universities. Last year's 25% increase brought Dalhousie's tuition fees only to the fourth highest in Nova Scotia, and the proposed 10% increase was in line with the approved policy. Mr. Carlson added that, in view of the amount of the proposed increase that would be returned to students through increases in scholarship and bursary funding and improvements to student services, increased tuition fees would play only a minor role in attempts to balance the University budget. A far greater burden would be borne by Faculties through complement reductions and a decrease in budget envelopes. Mr. Carlson noted that SFPC will have additional discussions about possible changes in the policy and welcomed comments or suggestions about such changes.

91:156.

For Information - 1992-93 Preliminary Incremental Budget Requirements

Mr. Carlson reported that the Senate Financial Planning Committee had reviewed a report of the 1992-93 preliminary budget assumptions and requirements (previously circulated). The Committee noted that all of the expenditures reflected either estimates of costs for continuing programs and activities or costs for new initiatives previously approved by Senate. This budget reflects a deficit due to the Provincial Government's plan to provide, at most, 0% increases in university funding. The University's costs will increase despite the current wage freeze, as indicated in the budget assumptions. The proposed budget suggests that the deficit for that year will be eliminated by presidential decisions to reduce spending on proposals advanced in the Financial Strategy Committee report, by previously announced reductions in the faculty complement, by revenues generated from the proposed tuition fee schedule, and by a 1% across-the-board cut to unit envelopes. The SFPC did not identify any alternative recommendations for 1992-93 but will focus on recommendations for the 1993-94 budget year. Mr. Carlson noted that SFPC was quite concerned about the possibility of a substantial deficit in 1993-94, particularly in view of the fact that universities have been told that they will receive no increase or even a reduction in funding from the Provincial Government even with the expected end to the current wage freeze.

Mr. Bradfield said that there was a substantial increase in the 1991-92 budget for expenditures on fund-raising, and he asked what additional revenues had been realized from these expenditures. Mr. Carlson pointed out that one of the major increases in fund-raising revenue was realized in the Annual Fund, the bulk of which went directly to individual units and was not included in the overall operating budget. Mr. Clark said that the Financial Strategy Committee recognized that fund-raising must be a sustained activity. Not only had the Annual Fund grown from about \$450,000 per year to about \$1.5 million per year, but fund-raising was under way to support the announced Chair in Black Canadian Studies and planning had begun for the next major capital campaign. Mr. Eberhardt pointed out that the Annual Fund campaign was ahead of last year's by 25%, by that measure the most successful university annual fund campaign in Canada. He added that substantial effort had gone into development of a planned giving program, which, by its nature, took some years for its full benefits to be realized.

91:157.

Report of the President

Mr. Clark gave an oral summary of his report (appended), noting especially progress in discussions between Dalhousie and the Technical University of Nova Scotia on possible academic and administrative cooperation.

Ms. Bankier asked if representatives of the various bargaining agents would be involved in the next round of meetings of the subcommittees carrying forward the Dalhousie-TUNS discussions.

Mr. Clark said that, on the basis of reports made by the subcommittees after their next meetings in January, a decision will be taken as to how best to involve representatives of the bargaining agents. Ms. Bankier said that this course of action assumes that it is possible to separate academic and employment issues. She doubted that such a separation was possible. Mr. Clark replied that the subcommittees had been instructed to avoid discussion of employment-related issues.

In reply to a question about the risks of failure by the Council of Nova Scotia University Presidents (CONSUP) to realize significant progress toward greater interuniversity cooperation, Mr. Clark replied that he had grave concerns about this question. He said that several presidents seemed quite content to allow the Nova Scotia Council on Higher Education to direct the process of rationalization, a course which he believed would have very serious and negative implications for university autonomy and academic quality.

Mr. Tindall asked for a further explanation of the Board's new investment policy for endowment funds. Mr. Clark replied that the Board accepted a recommendation from its Investment Committee that the Endowment Fund should always have a minimum of 30% of debt securities and 30% of equity securities in the portfolio, and that the remaining 40% should be actively managed using Canadian securities, both debt and equity. Mr. Tindall also asked for further explanation of the Board's approval of the creation of a limited liability company, the "Business Research Information Corporation". Mr. Clark replied that this company, which would be owned 60% by Dalhousie and 40% by a company based in Glasgow, Scotland, would develop and market a data-base on government incentives for business in North America. He explained that this company would assist the University's teaching and research activities, particularly in the School of Business, and could, after a few years, realize a profit for the University.

91:158.

Question Period

Mr. Bradfield asked for information about the cost to the University of issuing American Express Corporate Credit Cards to members of the University. Mr. Clark said that he would ask Mr. Mason to prepare a reply to this question.

Mr. Bradfield also asked about the policy of the University with respect to the maintenance of

small houses. He noted, for example, that the Financial Strategy Committee recommended phasing out the use of small houses because of the costs of maintenance, heating, and so on. In view of this policy, how could the sale of property on Oxford Street be used to justify the acquisition of a house at 1390 LeMarchant Street. He also asked for the full, not the interim, cost of financing that purchase. Mr. Clark said that he would ask Mr. Mason to reply to these questions at a future meeting.

91:159.

Other Business - Role of the Dean of Graduate Studies in Tenure and Promotion Cases

Mr. Stairs reported that an ad hoc committee to review the role of the Dean of Graduate Studies in tenure and promotion cases had met and had prepared a report. This report and its recommendations would be considered by the Senate Committee on Academic Administration at its meeting on 19 December and would forward the report to Senate in January. Mr. Stairs pointed out that it was unlikely that the Dean of Graduate Studies would play a further role in tenure and promotion cases being considered at this time.

91:160.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:05 p.m. upon motion (T. Cromwell/R. Carlson).

Secretary

Chair