

Item: Senate Minutes, July 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 July 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, 22 July 1991 at 3:00 p.m. in the Senate and Board Room.

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

Andrews, Angelopoulos, J. Archibald, Arklie, Banerjee, Bankier, Barkow, Bérard, Boston, Boychuk, Bradfield, D.M. Cameron, Carlson, Carruthers, Chaytor, Clark, Clarke, Cross, J.E. Crowley, Doble, Dunn, Dykstra, Fingard, Fournier, Girard, Gupta, Horrocks, D.W. Jones, Klassen, Longard, Lutley, Manicom, Mason, McKee, McNiven, Murray, J.D. Myers, M. O'Brien, Parker, Poel, Porter, Pottier, Pringle, Ruggles, Ryall, A.M. Simpson, Sinclair, Sketris, K. Smith, R.J. Smith, Stokes, Stuttard, M.H. Tan, Zakariasen.

**Regrets:** Ashley, Clovis, A.D. Cohen, M.M. Cohen, Corvin, B.L. Crowley, Fry, J. Gray, Grossert, Haley, Hare, L.C. MacLean, Purdy, Ritchie, Roald, Stairs, Sullivan, Tamlyn, Wassersug, K.S. Wood, Young.

**Invitees:** B.D. Christie, J. Spurr.

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m. Ms. Lane welcomed new members of Senate and those members of the Board of Governors who were in attendance.

**91:089.**

Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting of 24 June 1991 were approved, with the following changes in Minute 91:082 (p. 2):

**¶3, I. 3 - replace the words "and \$200,000" with "\$100,000 would be allocated to Non-Space Equipment expenditures, and \$100,000";**

**¶5, I. 4 - delete the words "Bookstore, with smaller losses realized at";**

**¶5, I. 5 - insert after the word "included" the words "interest on"**

upon motion (J. Barkow/B. Mason).

**91:090.**

Nomination to the Senate Committee on Committees

Mr. Bérard reported that the Steering Committee has nominated the following persons to terms on the Senate Committee on Committees:

L. Stokes (Arts & Social Sciences) '93

This nomination was confirmed upon motion (R. Bérard/G. Klassen).

**91:091.**

Nominations from the Senate Committee on Committees

On behalf of the Senate Committee on Committees, Ms. Angelopoulos nominated the following individuals to the bodies named.

SENATE ACADEMIC PLANNING COMMITTEE

J. Gerrow (Dentistry) '92

T. MacRae (Science) '92

K. Zakariasen (Dentistry) '92

SENATE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION

K. Leffek (Science) '92

SENATE PHYSICAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

H. Gassman (Management) July-December '91

V. Black (Law) '93

SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

D. MacLean (Medicine) '93  
A. Sinclair (Science) '94

SENATE ACADEMIC APPEALS COMMITTEE

I. Sketris (Health Professions) '92  
P. Darby (Law) '92

SENATE STEERING COMMITTEE

T. Cromwell (Law) '92

SENATE FINANCIAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

Melvin Cross (Economics) '92  
A. Wainwright (Arts & Social Sciences) '94

SENATE DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE

S. Ashley (Law)

SENATE COMMITTEE ON INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

H.J. Murphy (Education) '94  
C. Neville (Arts & Social Sciences) '94  
R. Evans (Law) '94

OMBUD'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE

D. Betts (Science) '94

UNIVERSITY HEARING COMMITTEE

I. McLaren (Science) '92

BOARD OF GOVERNORS - SENATE REPRESENTATIVES

P. Hansell (Medicine) '94

T.J. Murray (Medicine) '92

AUDIT COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD

P. Hansell (Medicine) '93

BOARD OF GOVERNORS COMMITTEE ON DIVESTMENT IN SOUTH AFRICA

L. Trakman (Law) '93

REPRESENTATIVE ON MOUNT ST. VINCENT UNIVERSITY SENATE

D. Lewis (Science) '93

Following the requisite calls for further nominations, Ms. Lane declared the above-named persons elected.

**91:092.**

University Restructuring

Ms. Lane noted that members of Senate had received with the Agenda a document from the President's Advisory Committee on the Nova Scotia University System. This draft document was a proposed submission from the committee to a team of consultants, engaged by the Provincial Government on the advice of the Council of Nova Scotia University Presidents (CONSUP) to advise on possible new structures for the administration of higher education in the Province. The author of the draft document, Mr. R.J. Smith, Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, was present and would lead discussion on it. Ms. Lane added that two supplementary documents (appended) were also available: 1) a draft proposal, prepared by Mr. B. Christie of the Office of Institutional Affairs, for a Board-of-Regents model for a federated University of Halifax, and 2) a brief summary, prepared in the Senate Office, comparing the major features of governance proposals advanced in the Board-of-Regents model, those proposed by the recent Royal Commission on Post-Secondary Education in Nova Scotia, and the current structure of the Nova Scotia Council of Higher Education.

Ms. Lane announced that the advisory committee's draft document should be a matter for discussion at this meeting and that there would be a special meeting of Senate held on Wednesday, 31 July 1991 at 3:00 p.m. to discuss further a revised document and to consider motions made relating to it.

Mr. Clark outlined briefly the history of the CONSUP-Government discussions to date, the

work of the advisory committee, and the expected role to be played by the consultants. He said that the advisory committee welcomed further suggestions from members of Senate.

Ms. Lane called upon Mr. Smith to introduce the advisory committee's draft submission. Mr. Smith noted that the document had been prepared for both the consultants and the general public and, as such, might be seen by some as either too specific or too general in its statements. It represented an attempt to present a range of possible options which the consultants might consider, some of the likely benefits and dangers associated with each, and an indication of what Dalhousie might find acceptable and unacceptable. Mr. Smith said that advisory committee has underscored the need to maintain in the region a major university with a wide range of programs which meet regional, national, or international standards. The advisory committee also hoped to stress the importance of Dalhousie's role as the centre for graduate and professional studies in Nova Scotia.

Mr. Smith pointed out that the "governing body" referred to in the document and in the mandate of the consultants referred to a "consolidating" or "ordering" body, with statutory authority over existing post-secondary institutions -- such as the Nova Scotia Council of Higher Education -- rather than a body engaged directly in the daily internal governance of those institutions. He added that the advisory committee understood that changes in internal governing structures required the approval of the Senates and Boards of individual institutions.

Mr. Clarke presented a draft response from the Dalhousie Faculty Association to the advisory committee's document. This response contained major recommendations on the timing and costing of any structural changes, the consultative process to be followed, and the need to address several "neglected issues", such as dealing with the University's debt, meeting concerns about job security, maintaining existing collective agreements, and providing equitable pension and benefits arrangements. Mr. Clarke said that the DFA does not oppose change but believes that the advisory committee's proposal fails to express a satisfactory vision of future needs in post-secondary education in Nova Scotia. He added that the DFA welcomed the opportunity to meet with members of the advisory committee preparing a submission from Dalhousie and would welcome an opportunity to meet with the consultants themselves.

Mr. D.M. Cameron said that the DFA response appeared to call for the kind of study usually undertaken by a royal commission. Mr. Clarke said that if the job of restructuring was to be done, it should be done properly. While one might argue that the recent Royal Commission on Post-Secondary Education in Nova Scotia had not done its job properly, Mr. Cameron responded, it would be difficult politically to make the case that its work needed to be re-done ab initio. He said that his understanding of the mandate given to the consultants was that they were to recommend structures for a body which could undertake cost analyses,

quality analyses, and the other sorts of studies being proposed by the DFA.

Ms. Bankier noted that this critical issue was being raised, as was the Financial Strategy Report last year, during the summer, when a substantial number of faculty members and students were absent from the campus. She objected to the structure outlined in the Board-of-Regents model, noting the lack of representation from students and faculty members in such a structure, and added that some specific reference to the need for a bi-cameral structure which would allow for such representation should be included in any submission. Ms. Bankier expressed the concern that the Provincial Government was prepared to act without an expectation of significant cost savings or improvements in academic quality but only in order to be seen to be doing something about post-secondary education.

Mr. McNiven said that any analysis of proposed structures should focus on the budget authority of those structures. Without the power to control the allocation of money among institutions, any structure, he said, would likely prove ineffectual.

Mr. Klassen said that the views of alumni, as well the interest of the public should be taken into account in any response. Mr. Clark said that, with respect to alumni interests, the consultants' mandate included the preservation of institutional identities, and the public interest will be expressed in response to the consultants' recommendations.

Mr. Barkow said that he thought the submission should make clear the goals of any structural changes. Mr. Smith replied that the advisory committee wished to address the reasons that have been advanced for a new structure, not all of which Dalhousie shares, and to avoid limiting options for the University.

Mr. Bradfield said that the response should clarify the meaning of graduate and professional education, should address the place of King's College in any new institutional arrangement, and should make clear that major economies resulting from greater integration, if any, would result from the employment of few administrative rather than academic staff. Mr. McNiven added that it was important to include the business programs at Mount St. Vincent University in any discussion of the integration or rationalization of business education in Halifax.

Mr. Stuttard asked if there was any information to support the reference in the document to "unproductive duplication". Mr. Smith replied that there was concern about some small programs, especially at the graduate level. Mr. Stuttard asked how the committee would respond to those who thought that inter-institutional competition was healthy. Mr. Smith replied that the committee believed that regular peer review was a better guarantor of quality in post-secondary education than consumer choice.

Mr. Alex Boston said that the Students Union of Nova Scotia had met recently to discuss this matter and had expressed its opposition to any rationalization prior to an independent

assessment of programs for quality and accessibility. He asked what role students and faculty would have in the process. Mr. Clark replied that there was a student representative on the advisory committee, Mr. Brian Hill, and several faculty members. He repeated that the consultants were only recommending possible structures for a body which would, at some future point, consider the consolidation or elimination of programs. Mr. Christie added that the advisory committee was being asked to consider which type of body would be most effective in realizing the type of university system to best serve the Province.

Mr. Smith said that he believed that it was possible to incorporate into the advisory committee's document many of the points referred to on p. 13 of the DFA response. Mr. Clarke said that he would be willing to meet with Mr. Smith and any other committee members to discuss this possibility further. Mr. Pottier said that there should be a student representative involved in any redrafting. Mr. Andrews asked if he and other individual senators would be able to make written comments and if a new document would be available by Monday, 29 July. Mr. Smith said that he was hopeful that a new draft would be available at that time. Mr. Bérard said that if a new draft was received in the Senate Office on Friday, 26 July, it could be sent to members of Senate on Monday, 29 July. Mr. Barkow asked if any document could be made available on electronic mail. Mr. Bérard said that an effort would be made to send the document on electronic mail to those who wished to receive it in that form.

Mr. Andrews asked if the University's presentation to the consultants would be a public one. Mr. Clark said that the consultants were now discussing among themselves the format for any presentations and that their decision would be given to the universities. Mr. Andrews said that he was concerned that the significant aspects of the presentations of the various universities would be made in private. Mr. Clark said that he would be surprised if a number of the other institutions did not want their presentations to be made in private. Mr. Hill said that he hoped that a student representative would be involved in any presentation to the consultants.

**91:093.**

#### Annual Report of the Senate Library Committee

Mr. Andrews reported that he had been asked, as a member of the Senate Library Committee and in the absence of its Chair, Mr. B. Archibald, to move the adoption of its annual report. He added that, because he had been on leave, he was not able to speak to the report and would refer any questions to the Acting University Librarian, Ms. Boychuk. It was moved (A. Andrews/E. Angelopoulos)

**that Senate accept the 1990-91 report of the**



### **Senate Library Committee.**

Mr. Barkow said that he did not find the report acceptable. He said that the report did not contain any explanation of the Committee's decisions, nor did it address some of the major issues relating to the Libraries, including the introduction of a fines policy at the Killam Library. Ms. Boychuk pointed out that the Killam Library Committee did discuss and agree to the fines policy, and that it was not deemed necessary to submit the policy to the Senate Library Committee. Mr. Barkow said that he was concerned that Senate did not have a sufficient opportunity to make its views known on this issue.

The question having been called, the motion was defeated by a majority vote. It was agreed that the Secretary would communicate this decision to the Chair of the Senate Library Committee.

**91:094.**

#### For Information - Quarterly Press Report

Mr. Bérard reported receipt from the Public Relations Office of their most recent Quarterly Press Report, which included the number of articles in the local and national press which referred to Dalhousie each month and an assessment of whether those references were positive, neutral, or negative. He noted that the report did not include in its survey of distinguished local publications any references to the University in Frank. Mr. Bérard informed members of Senate that copies of the report could be obtained from the University Public Relations Office or from the Senate Office.

**91:095.**

#### Report of the President

Mr. Clark presented his report (appended), which included the names of the consultants named to propose alternative structures for post-secondary education, a report of continuing departmental visits by himself and Vice-President Stairs, a note that no information on targeted funding had yet been received from the Provincial Government, and an announcement that he would be responding soon to the recommendations contained in the Ocean Studies Task Force Report.

**91:096.**

Question Period

Mr. Bradfield asked if the sale of the former Hicks residence on Coburg Road was consistent with the recommendations of the campus planners. Mr. Mason said that there was no conflict between the decision to sell the property and the recommendations of the planners. Mr. Bradfield asked what the implications of the sale were for the parcel of land behind the President's House. Mr. Mason said that there were no plans at this time to sell or develop that parcel of land.

**91:098.**

Other Business - Award of Certificates in Periodontics

Mr. Bérard pointed out that the Faculty of Dentistry wished to recommend to Senate the awarding of the Certificate in Periodontics to three persons. Because of a memorial service for a former member of that Faculty, however, it was not possible for a representative of the Faculty to move the motion. It was moved (G. Klassen/R. Carlson)

**that Senate award the Certificate in Periodontics to:**

**Theresa Bankey  
Mark A. Belanger  
Terrie Logue.**

The motion carried.

**91:099.**

For Information - Integrated M.L.I.S./L.L.B. Program

Mr. Bérard reported that the Board of Governors had given its approval to the integrated M.L.I.S./L.L.B. program on the same terms as had been recommended by Senate.

**99:100.**

For Information - Report of the Task Force on Health Studies

Mr. Christie reported that a discussion paper had recently been completed by the Task Force

on Health Studies and would be made available through Dalhousie News in the near future. Copies of the report could also be obtained from Ms. Patricia Portman in the Office of the Dean of Medicine.

**99:101.**

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m. upon motion (J.Barkow/R. Carlson).

---

Secretary

---

Chair

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY

MINUTES

O F

SENATE MEETING

Senate met in Special Session on Wednesday, 31 July 1991 at 3:00 p.m. in the Senate and Board Room.

Present with Ms. P. Lane in the chair were Angelopoulos, J. Archibald, Arklie, Banerjee, Bankier, Betts, Boychuk, R.J. Boyd, S. Boyd, Bradfield, Breckenridge, Brett, D.M. Cameron, Carlson, R.F. Chandler, B. Christie (invitee), Clarke, Crowley, Dickson, Dykstra, Easterbrook, J. Eastman (invitee), Fingard, Friedrich, Gratwick, Grundy, Gupta, Horrocks, Jamieson, D.W. Jones, Nassen, Kwak, Lutley, Mason, McKee, Melanson, Mazany (representing W. Kimmins), M. O'Brien, Parker, Pottier, S. Porter (representing G. Curri), Pringle, Retallack, H. Roper (representing M. Fry), Ryall, A.M. Simpson, Smillie, K. Smith, M.J. Stewart, Stuttard, Tindall, Trakman, P. Weld (BOG and Alumni representative), Wien, K.S.Wood, Young.

Regrets: A. Andrews, R. Berard, H. Clark, A.D. Cohen, M.G. Fry, L.C. MacLean, T.J. Murray, D. Precious, R.A. Purdy, J.A. Ritchie, G. Roberts, D. Tamlyn, J. Walker, K. Zakariasen.

The meeting was called to order at 3:07 p.m.

91 : 102.

Dalhousie Brief to the Consultants Considering the Structure of a Nova Scotia University System

Ms. Lane began the meeting by explaining that this special meeting of Senate was called to consider the draft document prepared for presentation to the consultants considering the structure of the Nova Scotia University System.

It was moved (R. Smith/P. Pottier)

**that Senate approve the Dalhousie Brief to the consultants considering the structure of a Nova Scotia university system. By its acts of discussion and approval the Dalhousie Senate reaffirms its central, constitutional role in the formulation of academic planning and policy for the University. That role must be maintained in any future discussions of the consultants' recommendations.**

Mr. R. Smith began the discussion by describing the process and consultations which have led up to the current draft of the brief, and the nature of the changes that have been made since the

previous draft considered by Senate. He noted that the consultants would be in Nova Scotia August 26-30, and that six participants were permitted from each university. Dalhousie's representatives will be the President, two Vice-

Presidents (Mr. Mason and Mr. Stairs), the Chair of the Senate and of the Board, with the Presidents of the Dalhousie Student Union and the Dalhousie Faculty Association attending as observers.

Mr. Clarke expressed his appreciation to Mr. R. Smith for his work on the draft and his openness to considering revisions. He mentioned several concerns that remain, notably the short time frame for the consultants' visit and for considering their recommendations, and the failure of the problem of the University debt to be mentioned.

Mr. Stuttard pointed out other items he felt should be dealt with in the brief, including the economic reasons that lie behind Dalhousie seeking change in the University system, the lack of emphasis on the opportunity for administrative cost savings, and the need for the consultants to have solid cost/benefit research available to them before they are in a position to make good recommendations. He also agreed with Mr. Clarke's remarks, and urged Senate not to approve the draft document.

Speaking on behalf of students, Mr. Pringle expressed disappointment in the conclusions and summary which he felt failed to mention undergraduate studies, the situation of the Business School, and the issue of accessibility.

Mr. Tindall also raised process concerns, referring, by way of example, to the suggestion on p. 6 that Senate should be involved in the debate over implementation of recommendations, but this wording implies no role in the formulation of recommendations.

Mr. Klassen felt the draft was much improved. He asked, however, that the time be taken to fully explain and seek understanding for Dalhousie's position from its alumni and the interested public. He noted that we have to preserve the integrity of the University and necessarily ask the hard questions that deserve to be put, if we want to maintain alumni and public support.

With reference to the sections pertaining to the Business School, Ms. Dykstra stressed that at Dalhousie it is not only the Business School but also the larger Faculty of Management that would be affected by any decision pertaining to business education. Ms. Fingard suggested that references to the Business School be reduced since decisions about particular programs were not immediately germane to the exercise for which the brief is being prepared. Mr. Parker agreed, saying that the references do not strengthen the document. He also noted that the brief should not imply that Dalhousie should concentrate on graduate business education, an idea that is being strongly resisted by the School of Business.

Ms. Banerjee asked for clarification of references related to duplication and efficiency, and also inquired about references to the expansion of graduate studies. Mr. Smith replied that the intent is to expand the range of faculty to teach and supervise in graduate studies, but not to extend the institutions offering graduate studies.

Mr. Smith went on to ask whether the concerns regarding the process and time frame pertaining to the consultants could be dealt with in a separate motion, or whether we should say that the time frame is too short and we are therefore unable to make a presentation. With respect to the Business School, he noted that others from the School had pressed for the inclusion of references to the School. He found it difficult to make revisions in the face of contradictory submissions.

Ms. Bankier also expressed the DFA's concern with the process -- the short time frame, the timing in the summer, the possibility that a political agenda is being served. She felt that the document still seems to concede the legitimacy of the process, and the process concerns should be communicated to the consultants in the early paragraphs of the brief.

Mr. Cameron spoke in favour of the document and asked that its reviewers treat it with a sense of balance and perspective. He argued that, if the principles are right, then we should recognize that all interests, especially conflicting ones, cannot be represented. He expressed confidence in the abilities of the consultants, saying that they were not likely to generate ill-conceived recommendations nor to misjudge what they can do in 5 days.

Mr. Betts also agreed with the thrust of the report but thought there was too much emphasis on preserving what is unique at Dalhousie or elsewhere, and not enough attention to the application of a criterion of excellence. He felt that graduate education is given less stress than research or professional education, and there is almost no mention of honours programs at Dalhousie, one of its greatest strengths. He also indicated that the maintenance of standards would be a third difficulty with the idea of a University of Halifax.

Mr. Gratwick added that the document does not say much about the relevance of a program as a standard for evaluating options. Also, the program at Mt. St. Vincent should be called human ecology, not home economics.

Mr. Stuttard then suggested that a further redraft be undertaken. On the initiative of C. Stuttard/D. Clarke, it was moved

**that the draft Dalhousie brief be referred to an Ad Hoc Committee of Senate for revision.**

Several persons spoke in favour of, and against the motion, but when put to a vote it was defeated.

Mr. Smith then read two paragraphs that he had drafted to meet the concerns expressed during the debate. These were as follows:

"The Dalhousie Senate has grave concerns that the timing of the consultants' visit is inappropriate. Senate is particularly concerned about the speed of the visit and the short time available to the consultants to produce their report. The timing of the visit precludes the possibility of extensive discussion among faculty, students and alumni. No cost-benefit study can be undertaken before the consultants' report, and the need for structural change is presupposed in their mandate. No study has been made of the need for structural change. All these features cast very serious doubt on the legitimacy of the consultants' visit and mandate.

Given the Senate's concern about the legitimacy of the process involved, we nevertheless are prepared to present a brief to the consultants without in any way sanctioning that process."

On motion by D. Tindall/M. Dykstra, the following amendment to the main motion was suggested:

**that the paragraphs read by Mr. Smith be inserted in the Brief after its first paragraph.**

After further discussion, the question was put to a vote and the amendment passed.

Members of Senate then agreed that Mr. Smith should be authorized to make minor revisions reflecting the afternoon's debate and that Mr. Clarke should review and approve these changes. Also, Mr. Mason will submit some minor changes with respect to references in the document to other universities.

The question having been called, the main motion as amended was then passed.

In concluding the meeting, members of Senate expressed their appreciation to Mr. Smith for his work on the document. Ms. Lane indicated that the revised document would be circulated to all members of Senate.

A final motion, by D. Tindall/E. Angelopoulos asked

**that the Chair of Senate make a full report to Senate on the meeting with consultants.**

This motion was passed.

91 : 1 03 .

#### Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:27 p.m. upon motion.