

Item: Senate Minutes, September 1993

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 September 1993. 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, 13 September 1993 at 4:00 p.m. in University Hall, Macdonald Building.

**Present** with Mr. Dunn in the chair were:

Bankier, Bérard, Betts, Birdsall, J. Black, Brett, Carlson, Clarke, Clovis, M. Crowley, Dickson, Dykstra, Eberhardt, Fillmore, Gass, Hare, Hobson, Kaspar, Kozey, Lewis, MacInnis, Mahony, Mason, McCabe, McIntyre, McKee, McPhee, Myers, F. Nowakowski, O'Shea, Owen, Poel, Rappell, Richards, Schroeder, A.M. Simpson, Sinclair-Faulkner, Starnes, Stuttard, Sullivan, J.E. Sutherland, W.R. Sutherland, Taylor, Tindall, Trèves, Walker, Wood, Woodman.

**Invitee:** R. Edgett, L. Maloney.

**Regrets:** Arklie, Bednarski, Carruthers, Elliot, Fingard, Gilroy, J. Gray, Haley, J.V. Jones, Lane, Marrie, Murray, Purdy, Ritchie, Roald, Schlech, Sketris, Waterson, C.N. Williams.

The meeting was called to order at 4:07 p.m.

**93:125**

Minutes of the Meeting of 23 August 1993

The minutes of the meeting of 23 August 1993 (previously circulated) were approved upon motion (E. Sutherland/J. Rappell).

**93:126**

Annual Report to Senate of the Senate Physical Planning Committee

Mr Dunn welcomed the past chair of the Senate Physical Planning Committee, Mr. L. Maloney, who presented the Committee's Annual Report (previously circulated). It was moved (R. Bérard/K.

Sullivan)

**that Senate accept the Annual Report of SPPC.**

Ms Sutherland asked what priorities had been identified by SPPC for the financial campaign and what criteria the Committee had established for evaluating the need for new buildings. Mr Maloney said that he did not have this information at hand but would ask that it be provided.

The question having been called, the motion carried.

**93:127**

Campaign Update

Mr Eberhardt reported on the results of development activities at the University during the previous fiscal year. He noted that some five million dollars had been received from private donors, with the number of donors in all categories having gone up. He informed Senate that Ms R. Goldbloom had been named the Chair of this year's Annual Fund campaign and noted that the campaign for funds to support a Chair in Black Canadian Studies had passed the half-way point to its target.

Mr Eberhardt introduced Mr R. Edgett, who reported on planning for the forthcoming capital campaign. He explained the process by which potential interest in supporting the campaign has been canvassed and described work now under way in developing a "case statement" for the campaign.

**93:128**

Ad Hoc Committee on Senate Reform

Mr Dunn reported that the Steering Committee had discussed the composition of the Ad Hoc Committee on Senate Reform, previously approved by Senate (**SM 93:100**) and wished to recommend increasing the size of the committee from three to five members to allow greater representation. On behalf of the Steering Committee, it was moved (R. Bérard/G. Taylor)

**that the composition of Ad Hoc Committee on Senate Reform  
be changed from three members to five members.**

The motion carried.

**93:129**

Proposed 1993-94 Budget

Mr Dunn said that he had placed this item on the Agenda to allow members to raise any questions they might have about the proposed 1993-94 Budget with the Vice-President (Finance and Administration).

Ms Sutherland asked if the Provincial Government had given any indication of how its proposed five-day unpaid "holiday" might apply to universities. Mr Mason replied that the Council of Nova Scotia University Presidents (CONSUP) had been advised by the Government that universities would be included in legislation mandating such a holiday. He said that CONSUP had asked for some role in determining the implementation of such a scheme at the universities. Mr Mason also noted that the reduction would only apply to that portion of university funding coming from the Provincial Government. As a result, any "holiday" is expected to be less than five days.

**93:130**

Revised Terms of Reference of the University Environment Committee

Mr Dunn reported that the University Environment Committee had submitted revised terms of reference (previously circulated) and that these terms of reference had received the approval of the Senate Steering Committee (SC 93:094). On behalf of the Steering Committee, it was moved (R. Bérard/K.S. Wood)

**that Senate accept the revised terms of reference  
of the University Environment Committee.**

The motion carried.

**93:131**

For Information - Master of Science in Community Health and Epidemiology

Atlantic Provinces Health Promotion Centre

Mr Bérard reported that the Board of Governors had given its approval to the proposed Master of Science in Community Health and Epidemiology and to the Atlantic Provinces Health Promotion Centre.

**93:132**

### Report of the President

Mr Dunn noted that Senate had received a Report of the President (appended).

**93:133**

### Question Period

There were no questions raised during Question Period.

**93:134**

### IN CAMERA - Ad Hoc Appeal Panel

Mr Dunn reported that four students had asked Senate to hear appeals of decisions or aspects of decisions made by the Senate Discipline Committee. The Steering Committee had agreed (**SC: 93:079**) that one ad hoc appeal panel should be established to hear the four appeals. It was moved on behalf of the Steering Committee (R. Bérard/J. Walker)

**that Senate approve the establishment of an ad hoc appeal panel to hear four appeals of decisions or aspects of decisions of the Senate Discipline Committee.**

Mr Dickson asked if the panel would include faculty members from the Faculties in which the students who were lodging appeals were enrolled. Mr Dunn replied that the panel should not include members from those Faculties. Mr McPhee asked if there was to be a student on the panel. Mr Poel said that any senator, including students, could be named to such a panel. Ms Owen asked if these cases were matters of academic or non-academic discipline. Mr Dunn replied that all were academic discipline cases.

The question having been called, the motion carried.

**93:135**

### Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m. upon motion (C. Starnes/R. Carlson).

---

Secretary

---

Chair

**DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY**

**MINUTES**

**OF**

**SENATE MEETING**

Senate met in regular session on Monday, 27 September 1993 at 4:00 p.m. in University Hall, Macdonald Building.

**Present** with Mr. Dunn in the chair were:

Amey, Andrews, Angelopoulos, Arklie, Atherton, Aucoin, Bankier, Barkow, Bednarski, Bérard, Betts, Binkley, Blackford, C.M. Boyd, Bradfield, Breckenridge, Brett, J.W. Brown, M.P. Brown, Calkin, Campbell, Carlson, Carr, Clark, Clarke, Cote, Cross, J.E. Crowley, M. Crowley, DeMéo, Dickson, Dykstra, Easterbrook, Farrell, Fingard, Fitzgerald, Frick, Friedrich, Fullerton, Gaede, Gamberg, Gilroy, Haley, Hansell, Hare, Hobson, Holloway, Honig, Huebert, D.W. Jones, Kaspar, Kemp, Kerans, Kimmins, Kirk, Klassen, R.M. Klein, Kozey, Kussmaul, Lane, Lewis, Longard, K. MacDonald, MacInnis, D.R. MacLean, L.C. MacLean, MacLennon, MacLeod, Mahony, R.M. Martin, Mason, McAllister, McCabe, McGrath, McIntyre, McKee, McNiven, McPhee, Melanson, Myrick, M. O'Brien, O'Shea, Owen, Parpart, Pereira, Poel, Rappell, Ravindra, Richards, Ritchie, Roald, Ruiz-Salvador, Rutherford, M. Sandhu, Schenck, Schroeder, Schwarz, Sherwin, A.M. Simpson, Sinclair-Faulkner, K. Smith, Sorge, Starnes, Stoltzman, M. Stone, Stuttard, Sullivan, J.E. Sutherland, Taylor, Tetreault, Trèves, Van Feggelen, Verabioff, Wainwright, Walker, Waterson, M.A. White, Wien, D. Williams, Winham, Wolf, Yogis, Yoon.

**Invitee:** B. Christie, S. Drake, J. Eastman, M. MacDonald, J. Spurr.

**Regrets:** J. Black, Carruthers, Clovis, Elliot, Gerrow, Ghiz, J. Gray, Grossert, J.V. Jones, Marrie, Murray, Purdy, Schlech, Sketris, C.N. Williams.

The meeting was called to order at 4:05 p.m.

### Nominations to Senate and Board of Governors Committees

Mr Bérard reported that the Senate Committee on Committees had brought forward nominations for places on two committees. On behalf of the Senate Committee on Committees, it was moved (R. Bérard/T. Sinclair-Faulkner)

**that Senate forward the nomination of Mr D. Cherry (Management) for membership on the Investment Committee of the Board of Governors for a term of one year; and**

**that Senate forward the nomination of Mr D. Cherry (Management) for membership on the Retirees' Trust Fund for a term of one year.**

The motion carried.

**93:137**

### Budget Advisory Committee Report

Mr Dunn stated that the major item of business for the meeting would be a discussion of the report of the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC). He explained that Senate, in his view, had to respond to three major questions: a) Are there major financial problems facing the University; b) Does Senate accept the Budget Advisory Committee Report; and c) What are the academic implications of the report? Any programme closures or reductions, he said, are the prerogative of Senate. Mr Dunn reported that the Senate Financial Planning Committee had begun to review the report and its recommendations and that the Senate Academic Planning Committee would begin to address the report at its first meeting in October, along with the academic reviews of the Faculty of Management and Henson College.

Mr Clark thanked the members of the Budget Advisory Committee for their work. He said the Committee had been composed of some of the most respected members of the University community and that their report deserves serious consideration. Although his response to the report had been given in a public meeting in the previous week, he wished to emphasize several points:

- a) The University was not dealing with a financial crisis, as such, but rather a serious anticipated financial problem. It was projected that the University's revenues would rise by several million dollars over the next several years, but that these increases would be outrun by rising costs, particularly the the rising cost of the percentage of the University budget committed to salaries.



b) No firm decisions on programme reductions or closures have been made. A process by which Faculties and non-academic units are to respond to their budget targets has begun and will continue over the next three months. At the same time, the normal budget preparation process will take place, as will the normal procedures related to complement planning. All academic decisions, Mr Clark repeated, must be agreed to by the Senate, the Board, and, in some cases, the Maritime Provinces Higher Education Commission.

c) Some observers have asked why the specific programmes suggested for closure were named rather than others. There was no evidence that closure of other programmes would help in any way to solve the financial problems of the University. Some programmes make money, while others could not be closed without the loss of special provincial funding.

Ms Angelopoulos said that the University had cut back considerably on faculty and support staff over recent years but had added two new vice-presidential positions. She asked if the University was considering cuts in the number of vice-presidents and senior administrators. Mr Clark explained the reasons behind the decisions to create the positions of Vice-President (Student Services) and Vice-President (External) and added that Dalhousie's administrative costs were generally lower than those of comparable universities.

Mr Poel said that it was important that Senate consider the implications of making vertical cuts. It was not clear, he said, that cuts involving tenured senior faculty members and tuition losses would save money for the University. He added that he was offended by the naming of units suggested for closure. Mr Poel said that he had prepared a document (appended) summarizing his views and asked that it be circulated to members of Senate. Mr Clark said that, having visited nearly all departments in the University, he was convinced that the institutions could not sustain continued horizontal cuts. Previous attempts to deal with the University's financial problems and the academic problems that followed from them had not worked. It was time, Mr Clark said, for the Faculties, Senate, and the Board to make hard decisions.

Mr Wainwright asked who made the decision that any given programme was not central to the University's mission. Mr Clark replied that the Budget Advisory Committee looked at the programme array in each Faculty and tried to consider the impact of the continuation or elimination of all programmes on other programmes in the University or the University's stated mission and areas of special emphasis. The BAC recommendations, however, focused on Faculties as a whole, not on individual programmes. Mr Clark added that, in explaining his recommendations to the public meeting held on 22 September, he had made the following point (which does not appear in the printed texts of his remarks, and which should be inserted on p. 8, ¶2, l.18, following the words, "I urge them to do so."):

For example, FASS contains a number of departments which offer programmes from the undergraduate level to the Ph.D. in disciplines which everyone recognizes as absolutely central to the liberal arts and the heart of any national level university. Their preservation is fundamental to Dalhousie's future, and it would be inappropriate for us to consider any options which weakened those departments.

Mr Andrews asked what was the role of Senate in deciding on the process to be followed. He said that BAC was advisory to the President, met in secret, and did not engage in widespread consultation. Mr Andrews asked the President, if he wished to claim that no firm decisions on programme closures had been made, to withdraw the public statement he had made on the matter. Mr Clark replied that he would not withdraw the statement. He said that he had not been encouraged by the collective ability of the Senate and Board to make hard decisions. The Faculties have been asked repeatedly to set priorities, he added, and now had three months in which to do so. Mr Andrews asked further what role Senate had in deciding on the release of the BAC report and the President's response to it. Mr Dunn said that Senate did not have a role in those decisions.

Ms Binkley asked, if a Faculty could meet the financial targets set forth in the BAC report without making the cuts suggested in the President's response to the report, would the Faculty be permitted to do so. Ms Ritchie said that this was consistent with the recommendations of the Committee. Mr Clark re-emphasized that the proposed cuts were only his suggestions and the Faculties can develop and submit their own plans to meet budget targets. If such proposals did not undermine the quality of other University programmes, such proposals would be welcome.

Ms Stone asked why the report, which had been completed in the late Spring, had not been released until the Fall term. Mr Clark said that the summer months had been spent discussing the recommendations with representatives of government. He said that he decided it would be fairer and perceived to be fairer to release the report and his response when students and faculty were back on campus. He also said that he thought it appropriate for the University community to have a response to the report from the President immediately. Ms Stone asked further if BAC had considered the costs, especially administrative costs, of programmes in a Faculty such as Dentistry as compared to the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. Ms Ritchie said that BAC has set targets for budget reductions that will require significant efficiencies in administration costs both in the senior administration and in all Faculties.

Mr Kerans asked how many times the BAC consulted with the President. Ms Ritchie said that the Committee met once with the President just after the release of the President's "Vision Statement" and once more after the release of the BAC report. Mr Kerans asked further if the decisions of the BAC

were driven primarily by academic or financial planning considerations, adding that the report seemed to have implicit academic assumptions. Ms Ritchie replied that the Committee was created to advise on the budget and had only financial documents to guide them.

Mr Cross asked the officers of Senate to explain how Senate was to act on the report and the President's recommendations. Mr Dunn replied that he expected both the Academic Planning Committee and the Financial Planning Committee of Senate would discuss the report. Mr Cross asked if Senate was prepared to order Faculties to engage in the proposed budget planning process, particularly in light of the Collective Agreement. Mr Dunn replied that Senate was not a party to the Collective Agreement; he expected that Senate would give careful consideration to the recommendations brought to it by the Faculties.

Mr Crowley said that the BAC report treated unfairly the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, assigning it a disproportionately high target for reductions, a target which reflected the assumption that the performing arts programmes could be cut. He said further that it seemed that the BAC had penalized FASS for having been fiscally responsible.

Ms Gilroy asked what had become of all the information gathered in the various reviews and self-studies done over the past several years. Mr Dunn said that the Academic Review Committee of SAPC had been studying the results of these reviews in an effort to establish academic priorities.

A number of students in the programmes affected by the President's recommendations rose to speak about the impact of those recommendations on their academic and professional careers and on the cultural life of the community. They emphasized the importance of the performing arts programmes to the University and the uniqueness of those programmes in the region.

Ms O'Brien said that she believed that the Art Gallery could come up with a financial plan that would make unnecessary the recommendation that the unit be closed as a gallery space and hoped that the Senate would discuss the value of the Art Gallery as an academic support unit. Mr Clark said that the closure of the Art Gallery had been recommended in the early 1980s but that Senate had determined that the unit was a vital support to the academic programme. Mr Clark said that he did not believe, however, that the Gallery had been used adequately by the academic departments. Mr Andrews said that the Art Gallery has made repeated and increasingly successful efforts to extend its programmes to academic departments. Mr Dunn assured Ms O'Brien that the Art Gallery would have an opportunity to put its case to Senate and its committees.

Mr Schroeder disputed the implication that Music was a "stand-alone" programme, citing a number of service classes given by that Department. Ms Ritchie replied that the BAC did consider the effects of a variety of possible cuts and chose not to recommend the elimination of specific programmes or departments.

Mr Andrews said that he believed the actions of the President suggested a determination to eliminate programmes and departments and that his suggestions of programme cuts before Faculties could consider their budget targets had been irresponsible. Mr Clark said that he regarded this characterization as a "gross distortion" of his position.

Ms Dykstra said that the President's recommendations concerning the School of Library and Information Service left the School in an uncertain position. She explained that the School had just gone through a review in which it had been characterized as a "gem" and a "shining, bright star" and that she could not, therefore, understand the reasons for the President's recommendations.

Mr Ravindra asked if the Senate Financial Planning Committee would bring to Senate an independent financial assessment of the BAC report. Mr Carlson replied that SFPC was considering the financial assumptions in the report, noting, however, that SFPC does not have access to independent financial information. He added that SFPC has for some time been warning that the financial situation faced by the University is a grim one, and that the BAC report might be overly optimistic in its estimates of the potential deficit.

Ms Fingard said that the BAC report was not based upon a worst-case projection of revenues and may indeed prove to have been too optimistic. She suggested that an alternative to the elimination of programmes would be a salary freeze or cut at the University.

Mr Stuttard asked what academic reasons have been advanced to justify the elimination of programmes. Ms Ritchie said that BAC did not have information to make judgements on programme quality and did not do so. Mr Klassen said that the Academic Review Committee of the SAPC had found no consistent evidence to conclude that any programme was so weak as to justify its elimination on academic grounds.

Ms Lane asked what criteria the President used in determining his suggested cuts. Mr Clark replied that he considered the cost-per-student of each programme, the student demand, the importance of the programme to the University's stated mission, and the ability of the programme to generate sufficient revenue to support itself. Ms Lane made reference to a priorities planning document recommended by SAPC in 1989 and suggested that a timely use of this document might have led to alternative proposals. She said that while Senate had often been criticized for an inability to make decisions, it had made decisions and given direction to academic planning in the University, direction which has not always been followed. She said that Senate committees had been recommending, among other things, programme restructuring and substitution as an alternative to cuts, the promotion of cost-effective interdisciplinary initiatives, and the development of creative and attractive financial packages for faculty who wished either to take early retirement or maintain a more limited association with the University. These solutions were better, she said, than cutting out the cultural heart of the University.

Mr Dunn noted that the meeting had run past its normal time and asked for a motion to adjourn.

**93:137**

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m. upon motion (G. Klassen/R. Carlson).

\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair