

Item: Board of Governors Minutes, December 1991  
Call Number: Board of Governors Fonds UA-1, 57.14

Additional Notes:

This document is a compilation of Board of Governors 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 materials for this year which have not yet been digitized can be found in the Dalhousie University Board of Governors fonds (UA-1) at the Dalhousie University Archives and Special Collections.

This document is a digital facsimile of the materials described above. It was digitized on 26 June 2012.

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.

**BOARD OF GOVERNORS  
DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY  
AGENDA**

Tuesday, December 10, 1991 - 4:00 p.m.  
Board and Senate Room

1. Minutes of Board Meeting of November 19, 1991 (enclosed)
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Board Matters
4. Reports of Standing Committees
  - (a) Buildings & Grounds Committee (N. Newman)
  - (b) Development Committee (enclosure) (D. Curry)
  - (c) Finance & Budget Committee (L. Doane)
  - (d) Student Relations & Residence Committee (B. Walker)
5. Report on Statutory Joint Board/Senate Meeting
6. Revision to D.F.A. Collective Agreement (enclosure)
7. Role and Capacity and Restructuring of Nova Scotia University System
8. Presentation on Ocean Studies (Dr. Robert Fournier)
9. President's Report
10. Other Business
11. Adjournment

Minutes of a Meeting of the  
Board of Governors held on Tuesday,  
December 10, 1991 at 4:00 p.m.  
in the Board and Senate Room

Dalhousie University  
Halifax, Nova Scotia

PRESENT: Mr. George C. Piercey	Mr. Brian Hill
Chairperson	Mr. Donald A Kerr
Ms. Beth Beattie	Dr. Koesnadi
Dr. D. Wayne Bell	Associate Member
Mr. Daniel Campbell	Dr. Patricia Lane
Dr. Howard C. Clark	Mrs. Evelyn Lukan
President	Mr. Thomas Lynch
Mr. George Cooper	Mrs. Annemarie Macdonald
Mr. James Cowan	Ms. Bernadette Macdonald
Mr. J. Dickson Crawford	Mr. George MacDonald
Dr. Donna Curry	Dr. Albro D. MacKeen
Honorary Secretary	Hon. Jacqueline Matheson
Mr. Tom Digby	Dr. T. J. Murray
Mr. H. Lawrence Doane	Mr. Norman Newman
Honorary Treasurer	Ms. Maxine Tynes
Dr. John C. Fentress	Miss Barbara Walker
Mr. Fred S. Fountain	Mrs. Peggy Weld
Mrs. Linda Fraser	Vice-Chairperson
Dr. Jane Gordon	Mr. Robert Zed
Mrs. Cynthia Gorman	Mr. Sherman Zwicker
Dr. Margaret Hansell	

Also present were Dr. Denis Stairs (Vice-President, Academic & Research); Mr. Eric A. McKee (Vice-President, Student Services); Mr. Henry E. Eberhardt (Vice-President, External); Mr. Brian C. Crocker (University Secretary and Legal Counsel); Professor Jennifer Bankier (President, Dalhousie Faculty Association); Dr. Robert O. Fournier (Associate Vice-President, Research); Mr. Ian Nason (Director, Financial Services); and Ms. Elizabeth A. Merrick (Secretary).

Regrets were received from: Dr. Marie Battiste, Mr. Aubrey Browne, Dr. Fay Cohen, Mr. Fred Dickson, Mr. Peter Doig, Hon. Alex Hickman, Mrs. Ann Petley-Jones, Ms. Patricia Roscoe, Mr. Allan Shaw and Dr. Donald Sobey.

The Chair delayed opening the meeting until about 40 students from the group holding a "study in" outside the Board Room had been settled in available seats at the rear of the Board Room.

#### Welcome

Mr. Piercey welcomed those attending the meeting and expressed regret that all who wanted to attend could not be accommodated because of the limited space.

Dr. Clark introduced Dr. Koesnadi, Associate Member of the Board. Dr. Koesnadi, of Indonesia, was in the city attending the Sustainable Development Conference.

#### Minutes

Mrs. Gorman noted that the word "above" in the second mandate to the Financial Strategy Committee recorded on page five in the November minutes should be changed to "of", so that the phrase would read "105%-110% of the Nova Scotia average." On motion (Zed/Kerr) the November minutes were approved as corrected.

Agenda

Items added to the agenda included "Report from the Nominating Committee" and "Loan Guarantee for the Halifax Student Housing Society". Ms. Beattie asked the Board's permission for one of the students in the audience to present a petition to the Board. She said the petition would be very brief and asked that the Board deal with it early in the agenda. The Board approved the additional agenda items and agreed to hear the students' petition before proceeding with its regular business.

Student  
Petition

Mr. Alex Boston was recognized by the Chair. He explained that the students' petition for responsible administration (enclosed for Members) had evolved from student concerns at the beginning of the year about the deteriorating quality of education and level of services students were experiencing. He cited inadequate seating space in classrooms as one of those concerns. Mr. Boston distributed the first page of the petition, noting that it had been signed by about 3,000 students. The student body, Mr. Boston told the Board, was also very concerned about the proposed increase in tuition fees, and would like their petition taken into account when tuition fees were being considered.

Board  
Matters

Dr. Clark referred to a document (Appendix A) distributed at the meeting which outlined arrangements for meetings of Board Committees and the Board in January 1992. He pointed out that the wording of the motion recorded in the November 19 minutes, which the Board had just approved, differed from the written version provided by Ms. Beattie following the November meeting, as the motion recorded in the minutes had made no reference to the Finance and Budget Committee. Officers of the Board had discussed this and had agreed that the intent of Ms. Beattie's motion (contained in Appendix A) should be respected and that the Finance and Budget, the Financial Strategy, and the Student Relations Committees should consider and report to the Board on the specific issues referred to each committee.

Dr. Clark then reviewed each of By-Laws 6.7.1, 6.1.3, 6.5.1 and 6.13.3 governing the conduct of Board meetings (noting that the word "diverted" in 6.5.1 in the document distributed today should read "directed"). Dr. Clark next reviewed arrangements which had been worked out for the Finance and Budget, the Financial Strategy, and the Student Relations and Residence Committees to hold an open meeting in January to discuss the specific issues referred to each committee by Ms. Beattie's motion. Those meetings would be announced and publicized at least two weeks in advance so that anyone wishing to attend could do so. Each Committee would subsequently hold a regular meeting to arrive at its report to the Board in January.

Dr. Clark outlined arrangements for the Board to meet in the McInnes Room on January 21 for an open discussion on matters relevant to the tuition fee proposal. No motions would be considered and no votes would be taken at that meeting. The Board's regular meeting, he said, would be held on January 23, at a location yet to be determined. Reports from the Finance and Budget, the Financial Strategy, and the Student Relations Committees would be heard at that meeting.

Following Dr. Clark's last remarks about Board meeting arrangements, Mr. Digby asked why the President felt students shouldn't be present at the January 21 meeting, and whether Board Members felt they would not be able to make a decision without feeling pressured if students were present. Mr. Kerr responded by commenting on the tremendous atmosphere of confrontation which had occurred as a result of the November 19 meeting when a great number of students were present. He indicated that he, himself, would not consider voting on a motion under those circumstances. Mr. Kerr added that an open meeting on January 21 would give students an opportunity for meaningful dialogue with Board Members, and he therefore saw no need for great numbers of students to be present when the vote was taken.

Ms. Beattie expressed her concerns about separating the Board meetings, with students presenting their concerns on January 21 and a decision being made on January 23 without students present. She felt strongly that students should be present when the Board made its decision. She suggested that closing off the January 23 meeting to students would create an uproar which would probably result in a large number of students demonstrating noisily in the corridor outside the Board Room, if the meeting was held there. She thought Board Members would probably find this more intimidating than having students who wanted to attend present at the meeting when a decision was made. Ms. Beattie was in favour of scrapping the January 23 meeting and holding one meeting on the 21st in the McInnes Room, with students present.

Dr. Gordon spoke in support of holding two meetings, suggesting that such an arrangement would provide an opportunity for everyone to hear and to think over what students will be saying on January 21, and so be better informed to make a decision on the 23rd. She thought the second meeting should be held in a location where all interested students could be present. Mr. Hill raised a point about Board meetings being open, and suggested the Board should follow normal practice by having the January 23 meeting open to students who wanted to attend. Dr. Curry reminded Mr. Hill of the process whereby Board Members, including student Members, could raise problems through the Board's committees, and ultimately issues would be brought to the Board through that venue. She saw no need for two Board meetings in January. Responding to Mr. Hill's remark about Board meetings being open, Dr. Clark noted that meetings were normally open, subject to the limitation of space, and that, due to the limited space in the Board Room, the January 21 meeting had been relocated to the McInnes Room to accommodate more students. He pointed out that Board Members were trustees of the University, and as such they had the responsibility, after having had an opportunity to hear all views and some time to think things over, to make decisions in the University's best interests in as neutral an atmosphere as possible.

Mr. Hill commented that, if the January 23 meeting were held in the Board Room, a large number of students would probably gather in the corridor outside. He suggested that the last paragraph in the document under discussion be modified, and proposed as a motion

that the Board make arrangements for the January 23 meeting to be held along the same guidelines as the meeting on January 21, so that all interested students could attend.

Mr. Hill suggested the McInnes Room as a possible meeting location. Mr. Digby seconded the motion. At this point Mr. Crawford raised the matter of procedural rules for Board meetings, and asked that this be dealt with later on in the meeting.

During discussion of the motion, Mr. Hill explained that students wanting to attend the January 23 meeting would in large part be the same students who would be making presentations and listening to the Board's responses on January 21. These students would want to hear the Board's decision. He assured those present that the meeting would not become a "political hoopla", and that student Board members would ensure the meeting on January 23 could be conducted in a reasonable manner so that Board business could go forward. In supporting Mr. Hill's motion, Mr. Crawford commented favorably on the effective way students had conducted themselves at the November meeting and said he had no worries about holding two open Board meetings. It was his view that the Board had started the process and should now play the whole game out. Messrs. MacDonald and Newman also indicated they had not felt "intimidated" by the great number of students at the November meeting.

The vote was called and by a show of hands, the motion CARRIED.

Reports of  
Standing  
Committees

Buildings and Grounds Committee

Mr. Newman presented a one-page progress report (circulated at the meeting and enclosed for absent Members) on several projects which were presently under way in the University. He then reported that the Committee, at its meeting earlier today, had considered an offer by the owner of 1461 Seymour to sell that property to the University under very favorable conditions. The Committee had agreed to purchase the property and the Board was being asked today to approve the following resolution:

**That the Vice-President (Finance and Administration) be authorized to proceed with the possible purchase and/or mortgaging of 1461 Seymour Street in Halifax on terms that are acceptable to the Buildings and Grounds Committee.**

In response to Members' questions, Mr. Newman said the University had no plans as yet for use of this property, but that the property, in the long term, fitted in very well with the Campus Plan's guidelines. The motion CARRIED.

Development Committee

This report (pre circulated) had been deferred from the November meeting. Dr. Curry reported that the Annual Fund total was now \$911,000, with dollar totals up by 24% and an 11% increase in the number of donors over the same date last year. The Planned Giving seminars were going well, and membership in the 1818 Society had now

increased to 183, which was a 23% increase over last year. Dr. Curry noted that the **final report from RBR Associates** on the proposed athletic field campaign had been received. The report had indicated that, while the people interviewed were enthusiastic about the project, a \$5 million campaign for this project would not be feasible. at this time. She told the Board that Mr. Lord and the Committee were actively trying to scale down the field project to around \$2 million to make it more workable. Dr. Curry concluded her report by noting that progress was being made in planning for the start of the next major campaign.

Student Members Digby and Hill inquired whether the consultant's report on the playing field would be made public. Dr. Clark commented on the confidential nature of the report as it contained the names of participants interviewed. Mr. Eberhardt added that an executive summary providing for the confidentiality of persons named in the consultant's report would be provided to Committee members after the Development Committee had reviewed the report.

#### **Finance and Budget Committee**

Mr. Doane reported that, at its meeting on December 6, the Committee had reviewed the 1992-93 budget assumptions together with a budget framework for planning purposes. Assumptions the committee had looked at included: preliminary indications from government that there might well be a 0% increase in operating grants; projected increase in salary increments and benefit costs permitted under wage restraint legislation; projected cost increases for non-salary items; continued progress (at a much reduced rate) of the FSC's recommended budget base additions; and continuation of the three-year faculty complement reduction plan. The Committee, Mr. Doane noted, had been unable to make concrete assumptions on tuition fees or the student assistance program, but might be able to do so in late January. He noted that if the tuition fee increase was set at 10%, there would be a 1% (or \$1 million) deficit which would have to be covered by departmental reductions; however, if there was a 0% increase in tuition fees, then a shortfall of \$2.5 million would have to be covered.

The Committee, Mr. Doane continued, had also reviewed a five-year revenue and expenditure model prepared along the lines of the financial scenarios in the Financial Strategy Committee's report, and had projected those ahead. He told the Board that projections based on a 0%, 0%, 3% increase in operating revenue would result in substantially greater shortfalls than the reduction for 1992-93.

Mr. Doane presented a document (circulated at meeting) relating to a **Loan Guarantee for the Halifax Student Housing Society**. (This item had been added to the agenda at the beginning of the meeting.) He explained that some years ago the University had guaranteed a \$1.2 million mortgage loan for the Society, which operates Peter Green Hall. The Society was now renegotiating its outstanding mortgage loan of \$805,000 with a different bank, at a more favorable rate of interest, and the Board was being asked today to guarantee this loan.

Mr. Doane presented the following motion (seconded by Mr. Hill):

Be it resolved that approval is hereby granted on behalf of the Board for the provision of a Guarantee by the Board to the National Bank of Canada (the "Bank") in consideration of the Bank agreeing to deal with the Halifax Student Housing Society. The Guarantee is to be limited to not more than \$805,000 and is to be issued on such terms and conditions as are acceptable to the Vice-President (Finance and Administration). The Guarantee documents shall be signed by any two of the following persons on behalf of Dalhousie University: The Chairman, the President, the Secretary, the Vice-President (Finance and Administration), the Vice-President (Academic and Research).

In answer to a question by Mr. Newman, Mr. Nason (Director of Financial Services) explained that the form of the loan was a term loan for a period of five years. When put to a vote, the motion **CARRIED.**

Student Relations and Residence Committee

Miss Walker said the Committee would be scheduling a meeting to consider the mandate given it relating to the tuition fee proposal.

Nominating Committee

On behalf of the Nominating Committee, Mrs. Weld presented a report (Appendix B) on some additional appointments to Board Committees and on a few resignations which had occurred in committee membership since the Nominating Committee's last report in September. On motion (Weld/Zed) **the appointments set out in the Nominating Committee's report were APPROVED.** (An updated summary graph including the approved changes in Committee membership forms part of Appendix B.)

Report on  
Joint  
Statutory  
Meeting

Dr. Clark reported that the Joint Statutory Board/Senate meeting, normally held in October each year, had been held on December 4. There was considerable discussion at the meeting about the role and capacity discussions and about the continuing discussions between Dalhousie and TUNS. Senate and Board representatives had also briefly discussed draft revisions to the University Governance document.

Revision to  
D.F.A.  
Collective  
Agreement

At the request of the President, Mr. Brian Crocker, Legal Counsel, explained that the proposed revision to the D.F.A. Collective Agreement (pre circulated) related to the advertising of faculty positions. The revision had been developed as a result of a grievance, and it had been mutually agreed to by both parties in the Association/Board Committee. The revision to the Collective Agreement now required formal approval by the D.F.A. and the Board. **On motion, the revision (as set out in Appendix C) was APPROVED.**



Role and  
Capacity/  
Restructuring  
Nova Scotia  
University  
System

Dr. Clark briefly reviewed the two most recent meetings held by university presidents to discuss specific recommendations on at least seven issues which CONSUP was expected to provide to the Minister by the end of December. At its meeting on November 19, which the Minister and Premier had attended, the Premier had made the seriousness of the need for rationalization of universities quite clear. CONSUP had discussed how it would proceed in arriving at its recommendations, and it had been left to Dr. Perkin to draft a response to the Minister. CONSUP had reviewed Dr. Perkin's draft document at its meeting on December 3 and had agreed that further discussion was needed. On December 4, Dr. Perkin had written to the Minister indicating that CONSUP would complete its deliberations on January 7 and would submit its report to the Minister as soon as possible thereafter. Dr. Perkin's letter (attached to President's Report in Appendix E) also mentioned that CONSUP's report would indicate university presidents had made more progress in some areas than in others, that there were some areas which would require more time to resolve, and finally that there were some areas in which CONSUP had reached an impasse and it would recommend to the Minister that those areas be referred to NSCHE.

Ocean  
Studies

Dr. Robert Fournier, Associate Vice-President (Research) made a presentation to the Board on the subject of ocean studies. A summary of Dr. Fournier's remarks is attached to these minutes as Appendix D.

President's  
Report

Dr. Clark summarized his report, which forms part of these minutes as Appendix E. In speaking about the 1992 budget perspectives, he noted that as yet government had made no actual funding announcement, but universities were looking at the 0%, 0% and 3% scenario.

Procedural  
Rules  
for Board  
Meetings

This issue had been raised by Mr. Crawford earlier in the meeting. He pointed out that under the Board's By-Laws the procedure for meetings was determined by the Chair, but so far no detailed set of rules had been devised to deal with controversial issues, motions, or the substance of motions. He asked that the Board give this some thought. Mrs. Weld suggested that this was a matter which Officers could consider at their next meeting and report back to the Board. Mr. Crocker was asked to join Officers for that discussion.

Mr. Cooper commented briefly on the work of the Board. He said that while he thought the Board had become more effective and efficient than it was five to six years ago, he thought it still had a long way to go. He suggested that some consideration should be given to restructuring the Board to make it more productive. Possible ways to do this, he suggested, might be: to reduce the size of the Board from 54 to about 16-18 members; to have the real work of the Board done by more committees; and to reduce the number of Board meetings to four a year. Mr. Cooper indicated some other Board members shared his view about the need to restructure the Board to make it more efficient. He suggested that perhaps the scope of the committee looking into procedural rules might be expanded to take this into account.

Dr. Lane inquired whether the Board had ever had a set of procedures. Mr. Crocker responded that, to the best of his knowledge, the By-Laws approved by the Board in 1989 were the only ones ever adopted. Dr. Clark commented that the legislation governing Dalhousie was not the tidiest legislation he had seen, and if the composition of the Board were to be changed it would mean rewriting the legislation and drawing up a completely new Act for Dalhousie. Mr. Cooper suggested there might be procedural ways of restructuring the Board without amending the statutes, and asked if Mr. Crocker would give this some thought. Mr. Crocker explained that the legislation under which Dalhousie operates consists of about 23-24 separate Acts, none of which were incorporating statutes by themselves. He indicated it would be helpful for the University to have one consolidated statute. If this was undertaken when procedural rules were being looked at, he suggested that might be the time to open up other issues, such as a review of Senate. Simply consolidating the statutes would be of no great help to the University, Mr. Crocker told the Board.


Mr. Cooper said he was content to have the Officers look at the issues that he and Mr. Crawford had raised, as well as the larger issue, and prepare a draft document for the Board's consideration. He suggested Officers might want to seek advice from others in its deliberations.


Student  
Petition

The Chair asked how the Board wanted to deal with the students' petition which Mr. Boston had presented earlier in the meeting. At the suggestion of Mr. Campbell, the Board agreed that the first page of the petition should be circulated with the minutes of today's meeting, for discussion at the Board's next meeting.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

  
Donna M. Curry, M.D.  
Honorary Secretary

  
George C. Piercey, Q.C.  
Chairperson