

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

Additional Notes:

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

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

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

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY

MINUTES OF

SENATE MEETING

Senate met in regular session in the Board and Senate Room on Monday, 9 November 1984 at 4:00 P.M. in the Board and Senate Room.

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

Andrews, Angelopoulos, Bakvis, Barkow, Bradfield, Charles, Cohen A.D., Duff, Fraser P., Friedenber, Gold, Graham, Holloway, Horrocks, Huber, Josenhans, Laidlaw, Lee, Leffek, Lewis, MacKay, MacLeod, Maloney, McCann, Misick, O'Brien D.W.P., O'Shea, Parker, Paquet, Rodger, Semple, Shaw L.R., Sinclair, Stairs, Stephens, Stewart, Stone, Stovel, Stuttard, Thiessen, Tingley, Tonks, Varma, Waterson, Wien, Wooton.

Regrets: Bennett, Birdsall, Birkett, Caty, Chaytor, Cunningham, Fulton, Gibbling, Jones J.V., Konok, Mencher, Stern, Tindall, Treves-Gold, Waterson.

84:93 Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting of 12 October 1984 were approved upon motion (Rodger/Lee) with the following typographical and substantive changes noted by Messrs. Rodger and Bradfield to Item 84:87 **reiterate** (not reiterated); **been** (not een); and add to paragraph one, page 2, line 3 after revenue "to offset operating expenditures of new buildings and equipment" and substitute "interest" for "equity" (line 10).

84:94. Question Period

Mr. Rodger raised a question with respect to Minute No. 84:91. Mr. Jones responded by briefly reviewing the progress to date in the attempt to arrive at an out of court settlement with Ms. Power.

Mr. Bradfield inquired whether the funds raised by the alumni are allocated to operating revenue and requested clarification regarding whether or not M.P.H.E.C. considered interest as an allowable expense. Mr. Shaw replied that interest had not been claimed as an expense in the past and added that the percentage of revenue from the annual fund which is not designated will be allocated to an unrestricted operating budget. Mr. Bradfield asked Mr. Shaw to provide the total values and percentage breakdown by the next meeting of Senate.

Mr. Andrews, referring to items 3, 4 and 5 of the functions of the Academic Planning Committee outlined in the "Constitutional Provisions Governing the Operations of Senate", asked the Chairman when the APC and/or FPC had last reported to Senate on these items, and if in fact they had "reported at regular intervals" during the past year. The Chairman promised to provide this information at the next meeting.

Mr. Huber noted that the procedures for appointment of chairpersons of departments, delineated in the George, Aldous, Beck report on University Government included as one item, that if the Dean rejected a nominee from the committee, the committee would keep searching for a nominee until one was found who was acceptable to all parties concerned.

The President indicated that he did indeed feel bound by these regulations.

Ms. Laidlaw was concerned that even though the university had adopted an affirmative action policy, there were no women in top administrative positions at the university. The President responded that this was currently the case, although the principle of affirmative action was followed in both academic vacancies and increasingly with academic administrator vacancies. He added that women had been considered in recent months for such posts and had held assistant deanships in the past. Mr. O'Brien reported that currently there was a female assistant dean in the Faculty of Health Professions.

84:95 Award of Degree

Dean Leffek referred to his letter of 5 November 1984 and moved that the name of Peter Raymond Hanoski be awarded the degree of Master of Business Administration, dated 12 October 1984. The motion was seconded by Mr. Sinclair. Responding to queries from Messrs. Lee, McCann, Rodger and Huber, Mr. Leffek indicated that in his view Mr. Hanoski could have the degree conferred upon him at the Spring Convocation, if he so chooses.

The motion carried.

84:96. Report of the Advisory Committee on the Campaign Fund

Vice-President Sinclair relayed the summarized contents of two documents "Activities of the Advisory Committee on the Campaign Fund" directed to the chairman of the FPC (April 23, 1984) and the minutes of the 19 July 1984 meeting of the Campaign Fund Advisory Committee.

The January 26, 1984 Distribution percentages in seven categories were reported as follows:

Faculty 21.5
Computers 19
Buildings and Renovations 21.5
Equipment 11
Learning and Library Resources 9
Scholarships and Student Support 9
Other 9

He maintained that the Advisory Committee, although still in existence, did not perceive its mandate as including allocation of funds to specific projects. He then responded to Mr. McCann's question by stating that the Scholarships and Student Support component would be forwarded to the Awards Office for distribution. Mr. Andrews reminded senators that they

had been asked by the Faculty of Arts and Science to reconsider the library as a high priority. Mr. Welch advised Mr. Andrews that the FPC had seen no good reason at the outset to change the percentage distribution. A sub-committee had recently been formed, composed of representatives from APC, FPC and PPC to look at the whole question of dispersment of funds. This subcommittee may or may not agree with the advisory committee's recommendations. Mr. Andrews was reassured by the chairman that this sub-committee would report to Senate with respect to the priorities within categories. Mr. Sinclair added that consultation with Faculties had occurred and that many Faculties had rank ordered their internal requests within these seven major categories. (This is reported in a document entitled "Campaign for Dalhousie Requests for Funding", October 22, 1984.)

Mr. Misick wondered whether the provincial government's promise of 10 million dollars would have an effect on these priorities. The President was not yet clear about the implications of the Minister's communique. However, he anticipated that this would not affect the priorities assigned to the 25 million being sought from the private sector. The provincial commitment would, in all probability, be applied to physical facilities needs. Mr. Rodger wished the FPC to consider the impact on priorities of two possible scenarios: (1) if the campaign was not as successful as hoped for and (2) if the campaign was unusually successful, would the FPC advise on reallocation. Mr. Welch noted that the FPC had been unaware of the ten million from the province at the time they had considered the percentage distribution. The President spoke strongly in favour of soliciting funds from as many sources as possible to support a range of activities even though some major donors may wish to contribute to specific activities. Mr. Shaw clarified that the priorities had been established on the assumption of major cost sharing from the provincial government, and reported that the PPC had met that week to consider the implications of the government's commitment.

Reacting to concerns raised by Messrs. Bradfield and Andrews, the President assured members of Senate that every effort would be made to keep the academic priorities in mind throughout the campaign, although some funds were earmarked by donors for specific activities or programmes. The Chairman stated that the FPC would report directly to Senate on behalf of the APC, FPC and PPC sub-committee on the Campaign Fund. Messrs. Bradfield and Martin relayed their apprehensions about the omission of reference to residence accommodation in the priority list and wondered if the provincial monies might be considered as a possible source of funds for this purpose.

Mr. Rodger asked the FPC to consider (in addition to the possible scenarios he identified earlier) the implications of the provincial monies vis-a-vis originally anticipated cost sharing arrangements. Further he wanted the FPC to seek to determine what % of the 10 million dollars would be earning income and what percentage would be set against capital expenditure.

A. Committee on Committees

1. Nominations to Senate Committees

The Chairman of Senate assured Mr. Andrews that in future item #7 in the functions of the Committee on Committees (delineated in the Constitution of Provisions Governing the Operations of Senate) would be adhered to. Specifically, the Committee's list of nominees, with their biographical resumes, shall be circulated to Senate at least two weeks before the election. In addition, he concurred with Mr. Andrew's suggestion that the present membership lists for the committees being considered should accompany the nominations. A motion to table the nominations put before Senate by Andrews was defeated.

The following names were nominated on behalf of the Committee on Committees and elected to the Committees indicated, following three calls for further nominations from the floor by the Chairman.

President's Advisory Committee on the Employment of Women, Handicapped Persons and Members of Minority Groups (Stewart/Gold)

Susan Shaw

Academic Planning Committee (Stewart/Horrocks)

John Parker (Faculty of Management Studies)

D. P. Cunningham (Faculty of Dentistry)

Committee on Academic Administration (Stewart/Misick)

Frank Chandler

Committee on the Alumni Award of Teaching Excellence (Stewart/Huber)

Barrie Clarke

Senate Committee on Academic Appeals (Stewart)

Peter J. Wangersky

University Tenure Panel

The recommendation of W.H. Moger had received the requisite approval from the President

and the President of the DFA and was approved by Senate.

B. Academic Planning Committee

1. Academic Planning Committee Document

Mr. Welch assumed the chair. Mr. Jones, as Chairman of APC, relayed introductory comments to the document and summarized the motions contained therein.

Motion #1

It was moved and seconded (Jones/Cohen)

that Senate hereby requests the Senate Academic Planning Committee to develop a statement of Dalhousie's goals and objectives and a mechanism for its periodic renewal, through wide spread consultation within the University, and that it seek Senate approval for such a statement no later than April 1985.

Mr. Cohen noted the need for a coherent planning process which in turn required definition of medium and long-term goals and would provide for continuity and change.

Mr. Thiessen revealed his dilemma in his belief that the revised document represented a significant improvement, and his simultaneous reservation about lists of goals which, while generally laudable, did not materialize (at other universities). They were often used as a manner of accounting to others rather than selecting what the university should do. He added that goals were essentially private and that corporate agreement on goals was unlikely.

An amendment was moved and seconded (Thiessen/Wooton)

that the words "goals and" be replaced by "specific" and that the phrase "no later than April 1985" be substituted with "prior to its implementation."

Mr. Huber spoke in support of the amendment and referred to item C(page 3) of the preamble, stating that an outline of working assumptions would be highly desirable and to page 4, second line, "provides the context in which academic plans are subsequently developed".

Mr. Andrews likewise supported the amendment, as he was concerned about the fundamental assumptions inherent in the main motion regarding the nature of planning. He doubted that any plan would be all-encompassing. Mr. Martin queried whether the amendment lost sight of the original purpose of the motion. Mr. Rodger drew the attention of

members to the second sentence on page one, in speaking in favour of the amendment. Mr. McCann opposed removal of the specified deadline proposed in the amendment. Mr. Jones supported Mr. McCann's statement and confirmed his preference for the original motion.

Upon vote, the amendment was **defeated. The main motion passed.**

It was agreed that a special meeting of Senate should be called on 19 November 1984 at 4:00 P.M. to continue discussion of the Academic Planning document.

84:98. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:10 P.M.

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY

MINUTES OF

SENATE MEETING

Senate met in **Special Session** on Monday, 19 November 1984 at 4:00 P.M. in the Board and Senate Room.

Present with Mr. M. Cross in the chair until Mr. Welch arrived to take over the chair after discussion of Motion 2, were the following:

Andrews, Birdsall, Birkett, Cameron D.M., Chaytor, Cohen A.D., Cross, Gigeroff, Gold, Graham, Gratwick, Hatcher, Huber, Josenhans, Klein, Leffek, Lewis, MacKay W.A., Maloney, McCann, Morrison, O'Brien D.W.P., O'Shea, Paquet, Rodger, Semple, Shaw L.R., Sinclair, Sprott, Stairs, Stewart, Stovel, Stuttard, Thiessen, Tingley, Tonks, Varma, Waterson, Wien, Wooton.

Regrets: Bennett, Caty, Fulton, Jones J.V., Laidlaw, Munroe, Ozier, Tindall.

84:99.

Academic Planning Document

Motion #2

Mr. Jones reminded members that the deadlines identified in the document were directed to the APC as periods within which to report to Senate, not departments or faculties and that APC would be expected to report back to Senate on these items. He noted that the second motion dealt with the question of coming to grips with certain issues (e.g. continuing education, French as a second language) which were currently handled on a somewhat ad hoc basis by APC and the sub-committees established by APC for that purpose.

It was moved and seconded (Jones/Cohen)

that Senate hereby requests the APC to develop a set of procedures for bringing to the attention of Senate unresolved University-wide academic issues and proposed strategies for their resolution, and that it seek Senate approval for such a procedure by February 1985.

Mr. Huber wanted to know the perceived defects in present procedures. Mr. Wien replied that different approaches were used for different questions and it would be useful to determine if

issues which came before the APC were of widespread concern (to Senate). Mr. Rodger believed that the "Constitutional Provisions Governing the Operations of Senate", delineated quite clearly (on pp. 4-9) the procedures which should be followed by APC. Ms. Waterson was troubled by the vagueness of the terminology used in the motion. Mr. Cohen cited examples of specific issues including the aging of the professorate, problematic literary skills of students, incentives for promotion of excellence, etc. Mr. Wooton maintained that different sets of procedures would be required to identify different issues and to resolve or grapple with these issues. In his view, routine procedures could not be developed for dealing with heterogenous problems which were not routine. Mr. Andrews supported this contention and assumed that nothing in the new procedures really altered the terms set up in the Constitution. The APC, as a body, was to be responsive to issues raised by the university and should not impose or delegate. He believed there was no case to justify motion #2.

Mr. Graham concurred with Mr. Rodger, to the extent that there was nothing in this motion which was not already contained in the constitution. However, he added that nothing in the proposed motion overrode or altered provisions in the Constitution, and that if these motions assisted the APC to spell out a course of action for proceeding quickly to deal with academic planning in a systematic way, they should be supported. Clearly the coordination of academic planning with financial planning was extremely important, so that the budget truly reflects what departments, faculties and Senate believe is in the best interest of the University. Messrs. McCann, Cross and Stuttard agreed with Mr. Graham's views, adding that the document was an attempt to replace the current highly centralized planning process with a decentralized one which involved departments and faculties and which, on a rational basis, coordinated the compelling claims of individual units.

An amendment was moved and seconded (Rodger/Graham)

to add the words "as are consistent with Senate's Constitution" after "procedures".

After further discussion by Messrs. Cameron, Young and Jones, the amendment carried and the main motion as amended also carried.

Motion #3

It was moved and seconded (Jones/Stuttard)

that Senate accept in principle the establishment of a University-wide system Or periodic unit reviews.

Mr. Stuttard reminded members of the rationale set out in the preamble. He indicated that currently many units in the university do conduct reviews and that there are integrated reviews which serve the same function (e.g. with accreditation requirements). The initial step for establishment of a rational basis for academic plans would be the establishment of a university-wide system of periodic unit reviews.

Mr. Hatcher contended that there was a need to recognize the federated state of the university which negated the possibility of having one set of guidelines. He suggested an amendment to delete "a university wide" and pluralize the word "system". Mr. Rodger queried components of the preamble, maintaining that faculties had never been reviewed in the past and that usually programmes, not departments or units, were reviewed. He warned against the possibility of duplication. Mr. Andrews agreed, advising that the Faculty of Arts and Science conducted low level reviews of departments when chairpersonships were reviewed. He was concerned about the enormous amount of manpower which would be devoted to this process. Mr. Stuttard clarified the intention of the APC to use a single process of reviews of chairpersons and departments and added that the word unit encompassed programmes. Mr. Huber argued that the reason units were established were budgetary and the progress in reaching goals should not focus on units, which are an administrative convenience but rather programmes which are fundamental to the planning process.

An amendment was moved and seconded (Wooton/Rodger)

that "systems of periodic programme reviews" replace "a university-wide system of periodic unit reviews".

Mr. Hatcher was troubled with the words "programme" and "unit", believing that the disparate nature of components in faculties need to be addressed.

Mr. Cameron's suggestion that the words "**or programme**" be added after the word "**unit**" in the amendment was accepted as a friendly amendment by the mover and seconder.

Ms. Allen believed that the general term "unit" was more appropriate. Messrs. Stuttard, McCann and Jones were perturbed by the removal of the words "university-wide". The mover and seconder of the amendment accepted Mr. Jones' suggestions that the words "**throughout the university**" follow "**reviews**" and the words "**system of**" be deleted as a friendly amendment.

Both the amendment and the main motion as amended carried.

Motion #4

It was moved and seconded (Jones/Stuttard)

that Senate requests the Academic Planning Committee of Senate, in consultation with Faculties, to prepare guidelines based on the parameters outlined above for the periodic review of academic units and academic support services, and that such guidelines be submitted for approval by Senate by February, 1985.

Mr. Hatcher moved an amendment, which was seconded by Mr. Huber, to the effect

that the phrase "in consultation with Faculties" would be replaced by "instruct Faculties to".

Mr. Rodger believed that the word "instruct" should be changed to "request" and the words "or programmes" should be added after units.

Mr. Graham purported that the amendment altered the sense of the main motion. Ultimately, Senate was looking for an academic plan which was "pulled together" in a coherent and cohesive fashion, taking into account the differing units and faculties in the University. He reminded members that in 1963, Senate had been afraid of an atomized process and had dealt with similar questions of a 'top down and bottom up' procedure. Ms. Allen supported Mr. Graham's sentiments and Mr. Hatcher reinforced the need to involve Faculties throughout the process.

Mr. Jones was convinced that the amendment changed the whole intent of the motion. He elaborated by stating that the APC wished to consult carefully, and had no intention of instituting 'top down' instruction. This did not prohibit APC from asking faculties to draw up guidelines. Messrs. McCann, Gigeroff and Stuttard also spoke against the amendment noting that goals of programmes and units should be consistent with university goals, that some faculties already have comprehensive procedures, and that both faculties and APC should collaborate in these matters.

Mr. Wooton believed that Senate should be informed of cases where there was basic disagreement between the APC and faculties. He further recommended that the words "based on the parameters above" should be omitted. This was accepted as a friendly amendment. Mr. Rodger argued in favour of the amendment on the basis that faculties would automatically have problems when their proposals came before Senate, if they had no set guidelines and/or had not adhered to them.

Upon vote, the amendment failed.

Mr. Jones wished to see the words **"or programmes" follow "units"** (page 7). Mr. Huber was concerned about the unrealistic deadline of February 1985, maintaining that the consultative process takes time. He suggested that April 1985 would be a more reasonable deadline.

These points were accepted as friendly amendments. Subsequently Mr. Rodger spoke against the main motion. The Chairman noted that faculties would have the opportunity to speak against the guidelines in April 1985 when they came before Senate for approval. Ms. Waterson was convinced that an exhaustive list of parameters was impossible due to the plurality of interest at the university.

It was agreed upon motion

that the words "based on the parameters outlined above" be deleted.

Mr. Stovel was concerned that the necessary investment of time and money might result in exorbitant costs. Mr. Wien suggested that the reviews would be phased in gradually and that the benefits were substantial.

The main motion carried.

Mr. Huber wanted an estimate of anticipated costs. Mr. Wien replied that the main costs were attributed to bringing in an external reviewer but that there were no precise figures. Dean Hatcher reported that reviews cost approximately \$20,000 each as conducted in the Faculty of Medicine and hence only 4 - 5 reviews could be absorbed annually.

It was moved and seconded (Sherwin/Huber)

that Senate request that the APC present cost estimates of the periodic review process to Senate in April 1985.

Mr. Wooton felt that the costs in time and money terms would have to be tightly controlled. Mr. McCann noted that the government and public sector would soon insist on the type of accountability reflected in the proposed review process. Mr. Andrews believed that the elaborate committee structure was an enormous cost factor over and above those associated with an external reviewer. Mr. Jones clarified that the majority of faculties, with the exception of the Faculty of Arts and Science, currently had a form of review system, and some of those in the Arts and Science Faculty combined with the Faculty of Graduate Studies reviews. Hence, the costs were not entirely new.

The motion carried.

Motion #5

It was moved and seconded (Jones/Wien)

that Senate approve in principle the elaboration of academic plans along the lines proposed in the paper entitled "Major Motions on Academic Planning"

Mr. Jones noted that the intention of the APC was that a full plan be prepared every five to eight years, with the opportunity to update the plan each year. Dean Hatcher contended that departments must keep up to date and that the exercise was of limited value if it did not allow for the necessity to keep a "rolling adjustment". Mr. Wien reminded members of the concern raised by Senate about the earlier proposal that annual plans be prepared by departments. He believed this was an intermediate route and added that departments should be encouraged to update their plans. Mr. McCann thought that the minimum mandatory university-wide standard was at issue. Mr. Andrews purported that the current realities of planning, which goes on at departmental levels was not taken into account by the proposer of the motion and that the lead time was misread.

It was moved and seconded (Andrews/Waterson)

that the phrase "along the lines proposed in the paper entitled "Major Motions on Academic Planning" be deleted

Mr. Wien reiterated the fact that the current motion was prepared in response to the negative reaction to the amount of time and energy required to prepare academic plans each year. However, if departments wanted to update annually, this was not incompatible with the intention of the motion. Mr. Graham spoke against the proposed amendment and was sympathetic with Mr. Hatcher's original point about the need to review, not necessarily revise departmental plans annually.

The amendment failed.

Mr. Rodger expressed consternation about the possible duplication and/or limitation of efforts with the academic planning occurring on an ongoing basis in departments. He referred to the inordinate time devoted to preparation of the Restraint and Renewal documents. He urged Senate to vote against the motion. Mr. Stuttard assured Mr. Rodgers that an updated Restraint and Renewal document would suffice.

The main motion carried.

Motion #6

It was moved and seconded (Jones/Wien)

that Senate request the Academic Planning Committee of Senate, in consultation with faculties, to prepare guidelines for the preparation of academic plans by academic units and by academic support services, and submit these guidelines to Senate for approval by April, 1985.

The suggestion by Ms. Waterson that the words "**or programmes**" be added after "**units**" and Mr. Andrew's recommendation that the words "**Senate instruct**" replace "**Senate request**" were accepted as friendly amendments by the mover and seconder.

The motion carried.

It was agreed that the remaining four motions would be considered at the next regular meeting of Senate scheduled for 10 December 1984.

84:100.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:05 P.M.