

Item: Senate Minutes, June 1986  
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 June 1986. 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 Senate and Board Room on Monday, 9 June 1986 at 3:00 P.M.

Present with Mr. J.P. Welch in the chair were the following:

Andrews, Angelopoulos, Birdsall, Bradfield, Cameron D.M., Cromwell, Dunn, Egan, Gratwick, Horrocks, Klassen, MacDonald M.D., Maloney, Manning, MacMullin, McNulty, O'Shea, Ozier, Pooley, Pross, Ruf, Sinclair, Stewart, Uhl, Wien, Wolf, Wood, Zinck, Christie (invitee), MacDonald M. (invitee), Traversy (invitee).

Regrets: Bennett, Cohen A.D., Easterbrook, Fulton, Hennen, Jones W.E., Konok, MacKay W.A., Munroe, Murray, Storey, Stuttard.

86:068.

Minutes of Previous Meetings

The minutes of 16 May 1986 were accepted upon motion (Horrocks/Sinclair) with one typographical error noted, page 3, Senate Minute No. 86:062.B.1, line 6 - "Innes" should read "Jones". Mr. Horrocks presence had not been noted in the list of those attending the meeting.

The minutes of the meeting of 26 May 1986 were approved upon motion (Horrocks/Sinclair).

86:069.

Question Period

Mr. Bradfield requested a response to two questions he had posed at an earlier meeting regarding the difficulty in receiving mail and the budget source for Ritchie and Associates. Mr. Graham replied that the temporary ten day mail problems had been in part due to Ritchie and Associates, in part to new machinery and in part to health problems. There had been some reassignment of staff but no layoffs. Mr. Sinclair offered to circulate a memorandum which had been drafted concerning the budgeting of Ritchie and Associates with the minutes.

Mr. **Egan wondered** if there had been any move to establish a search committee for the position of Dean of the Faculty of Health Professions. Mr. Sinclair replied that the matter was under consideration by the President and should be resolved shortly. The question of the impact of possible restructuring

of the Faculty of Arts and Science on other Faculties had presented some initial concerns. Mr. Sinclair advised Mr. Bradfield that the projected 1 1/2 million dollar deficit for 1986-87 did include bank interest payments but excluded costs of Ritchie and Associates.

86:070.

## Reports and Recommendations -- Committees of Senate

### A. Academic Planning Committee

#### 1. Three Year Projections for MPHEC

The relevant documentation which had been precirculated was received by Senate, with Mr. Sinclair noting two amendments.

(1) that Clinical Psychology had been omitted in error on page 2. A funding request had been resubmitted to MPHEC.

(2) the phrase "no significant costs anticipated" next to development Studies on page 3 was removed.

### B. Financial Planning Committee

#### 1. Report to Senate on 1986-87 Budget

Mr. Welch relinquished the chair to Mr. Horrocks. The report entitled "FPC Report to Senate on 1986-87 Budget", submitted by the Chairperson of FPC, had been distributed with the agenda. Mr. Welch reviewed the background information and the underlined recommendations encompassed in the report of the committee. Mr. Bradfield inquired whether the reference to future projections on page 2, specifically to the 2% rule of MPHEC, included interest or capital.

Mr. Huber, a member of FPC, maintained that the university paid almost no interest at the present as \$20,000,000 had been paid off on loans from the banks over the past few years. Mr. Sinclair referred to the figures on page 2 which had been correct at the time the report was written but had been amended since that time. Specifically, the overrun projections for Faculties are: Management Studies \$250,000, Medicine \$800,000, Arts and Science \$100,000 and Health Professions \$0. Mr. Bradfield was concerned that the whole system was one of disincentives to come in under budget. Mr. Pross shared this concern with particular respect to unit rather than Faculty levels. Mr. Bradfield wondered whether there were additional monies from other provinces or whether the reference on page 4 referred solely to the provincial government of Nova Scotia. Mr. Welch believed that monies from the province of New Brunswick were channelled via the Nova Scotian government rather than coming directly to the Medical school. Messrs. Sinclair and Welch referred to page 3, paragraph 4, last sentence, in response to Mr. Pross' question about the validity of the base budget. Mr. Welch

confirmed for Mr. Andrews that the FPC intended that Faculties would be given the opportunity to comment on the appropriateness of base budget adjustments. Mr. Huber indicated that the FPC had had some trouble reaching a consensus on how the budget base could be shifted with shifting enrollments. Ms. Angelopoulos observed that the shortfall was greatest in the Faculty of Medicine, yet that Faculty was hiring heads from outside when inside people were available for such positions. Mr. Welch advised that to this point the envelope system necessitated that disposal of monies was the prerogative of the faculties involved, but justification for deviations was required. Mr. Wien commented that the APC had chosen not to recognize hiring of outside departmental heads in recommending allocation of the Redistribution Fund. Mr. Andrews was concerned about the language of Recommendation 4 regarding the Faculty of Medicine. Mr. Welch clarified that the recommendation should apply only to the year under discussion, that "its" in line 3 referred to the University and that the 20% would go to the Redistribution Fund for the year 1986-1987. Mr. Sinclair indicated that the President's Office was not certain whether this should go to the Redistribution Fund or to the general expenditures of the University. Mr. Andrews wondered whether the recommendation at the bottom of page 2 would apply to the Faculty of Medicine and whether other Faculties might not have a legitimate interest in this attempt to deal with the overrun. Mr. Welch clarified that the recommendation on page 2 did apply to Medicine, that there was no expectation that the University would take care of overruns and that these additional monies would be governmental funds earmarked for the Faculty of Medicine. Mr. Bradfield queried whether the 80/20 split would apply only to this year. Mr. Welch confirmed that the FPC would want to review this in one year's time. Mr. Huber suggested that the phrase "which are earmarked for the Faculty of Medicine" follow the words "additional monies" in Recommendation 4. Ms. Ozier reported that the DFA had received a response from Mr. McInnes to their open letter to the provincial government which spoke out against funding cuts. She would see that Mr. Welch received a copy of this and would inquire if wider distribution was possible.

Mr. Horrocks, as Chair, summarized that the following amendments, based on Senate discussion would be incorporated in the report: recommendation # 1 (page 2) was not required, recommendation # 2 (page 4) would be interpreted as "those funds earmarked for the Faculty of Medicine and recommendation # 3 would have the words "for 1986-87" added.

It was agreed upon motion (Welch/Wien)

**that the amended report of the FPC be accepted.**

## 2. Membership of FPC

Mr. Welch resumed the chair at this point in the meeting. Correspondence from Mr. Welch to Mr. Jones, which included a recommendation that the Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson of Senate be ex officio members of FPC, had been precirculated for information.

There was agreement upon motion (Huber/Horrocks)

**that the Steering Committee be requested to review the composition of the FPC**

**as delineated in the "Constitutional Provisions Governing the Operations of Senate" in light of the suggested change and report back to Senate.**

C. Senate Advisory Committee on Computing

1. Guide to Responsible Computing

Mr. D. Cameron as Chair of the Committee reported that the guidelines had been approved by both the Senate Advisory Committee on Computing and the APC. Further, a number of others such as the Legal Advisor to the President and the Association of Graduate Students had endorsed the document which was intended as a guide or statement to be provided for the guidance of users rather than as regulations subject to enforcement.

It was moved and seconded (D. Cameron/Maloney)

**that Senate approve the proposed Guide to Responsible Computing.**

Ms. Ozier was concerned that the document (page 2, last few paragraphs) was silent on who had the authority to carry out these remedies and what process should be followed. Mr. Cameron reiterated that the intent had been to inform the user what he/she might anticipate experiencing if there was irresponsible use of the university computer(s).

Mr. Andrews wondered whether prosecution would take place through existing mechanism(s) at the university and recommended that the last page specify the framework within which such "laws" would operate and that the section be rewritten in less threatening language. Mr. D. Cameron stated that this section had been carefully reworded several times to make it as inoffensive as possible and yet reflect the view that removal of privileges granted by the university would occur if inappropriate use of public university property occurred. Mr. Zinck was offended by the wording of the last sentence at the bottom of page 1 and by section 2 on page 2. Mr. Huber shared his concerns and disliked the tone of the document. He thought that students and faculty should be encouraged to use computer power available in innovative and creative ways. Mr. D. Cameron maintained that it was the committee's view that it was unethical to observe the private files of colleagues.

Mr. Bradfield raised the question of whether computer work that faculty did in the context of "community activities" would be authorized. Mr. Cameron confirmed that this was the case and added that the concern was with faculty making substantial amounts of money externally while using university property. Mr. Huber did not know how usage of individual microcomputers could be authorized and concurred with Mr. Andrews that the report should go back to the committee for reworking. Ms. Ozier offered several specific changes in wording. Mr. Birdsall stated that support services like Computing need general guidelines and did not believe that many revisions were required. Mr. Wien suggested that (a) under basic principles be omitted and that "accessing" replace "looking at" (files) on page 2. Mr. D. Cameron clarified for Mr. Gratwick that it was intended that the

document be provided when an account number was issued, that it be inside the cover of software packages and that it be available to all interested parties.

It was agreed upon motion (Huber/Maloney)

**that the report be referred back to the committee for reconsideration in light of Senate discussion.**

Mr. Andrews thought that a document designed to guide student use might be different from one addressed to faculty. It was agreed that Senators could forward comments and that the relevant minute excerpt would be provided to Mr. D. Cameron.

Ms. Ozier's suggestion that the committee might wish to meet with the Steering Committee could also be taken into consideration.

#### D Steering Committee

##### (1) Policy for In Camera Sessions

It was moved and seconded (Horrocks/Cromwell)

**that the precirculated proposed policy for holding 'In Camera' sessions be approved.**

Mr. Bradfield, referring to the first sentence on page 2, wondered whether motions passed should be minuted. Mr. Zinck queried what would happen if a non-member of Senate refused to leave or if a member was not prepared to abide by the rules of confidentiality. Mr. Sinclair thought that Roberts Rules of Order covered the recording of discussion during 'In Camera' sessions. Mr. Huber believed that a 2/3 majority was required to eject a member and a simple majority to remove a non-member from a session. Mr. Welch clarified for Mr. Andrews that the proposed policy was intended to apply to both 'In Camera' sessions for which advance notification had appeared on the agenda as well as those called by the chair during a meeting. Mr. Welch suggested that motions would be held over for voting until the end of the 'In Camera' session and would be appropriately worded to avoid confidentiality problems.

86:071.

#### Report of the President

There was no report of the President as he was out of town.

86:072.

#### Other Business

(1) The Chairperson read a letter from the Secretary of the Board of Governors to the Secretary of Senate which reported the Board's approval of the implementation of the B.Sc. (Kinesiology).

(2) Ms. Ozier directed the attention of Senators to the appointment of the Assistant to the President (Computing) last fall and raised three questions regarding the process of the search, the number of women candidates considered, and the document prepared by the incumbent which chartered the course of salaries and could be considered to have an impact on the faculty cohort and academic planning. Mr. Sinclair reported that the appointment had been made following consultation with the APC and Board and the process of search had not been carried out as the incumbent had special experience and responsibilities in this case. The appointment had been made following consultation with others. He believed that Senate should not see a document which had specific relevance to the collective bargaining process. Ms. Ozier had no difficulty with the President seeking advice from individuals of his choosing and proposed that Senate examine how these appointments are made in the future. Mr. Welch referred to the guidelines approved by Senate in 1983 to cover such appointments [incorporated in the Joint Board - Senate Report on Restraint and Renewal] and reiterated that consultation with the APC had occurred as required. If Senate wished to reconsider this process, a more formal motion would be required. He added, in answer to Mr. Huber's query, that APC had been consulted on April 1, 1985. Ms. Ozier agreed with Mr. Welch's suggestion and added that she was not questioning whether the proper procedure had been followed.

86:073.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 P.M.

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY

MINUTES

OF

SENATE MEETING

Senate met in special session in the Senate and Board Room on Monday, 16 June 1986 at 3:00 P.M.

Present with Mr. J.P. Welch in the chair were the following:

Andrews, Cameron D.M., Cohen A.D., Cromwell, Jones W.E., Hennen, Maloney, MacMullin, Oore, Ozier, Pross, Sinclair, Stewart M., Stuttard, Welch, Wien, Wiens, Yung, Christie (invitee), Hartling (invitee). [It should be noted that not all members present at this meeting signed the attendance sheet.]

Regrets: Bennett, Chaytor, Christie, Konok.

86:074.

"1986 and Beyond: A Report on the First Cycle of Academic Planning at Dalhousie University" - Chapter 7

After some discussion by Pross/Cohen, Stuttard, D. Jones, Maloney, D. Cameron, Wien and W. Jones, it was agreed upon motion (Cohen/Hennen)

**that the Meeting be adjourned**

It was believed that this would enable more Senators to participate in the discussion of Chapter 7, to be held at the next meeting formerly scheduled for June 23, 1986.

86:075.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:20 P.M.

~rl

Secre

Chairperson



**DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY**

**MINUTES**

**OF**

**SENATE MEETING**

Senate met in regular session in the Great Hall of the Faculty Club on Monday, 23 June 1986 at 3:00 P.M.

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

Andrews, Cameron D.M., Cameron T.S., Cohen A.D., Cromwell, Cross M.S., Duff, Easterbrook, Egan, Fournier, Friedrich, Graham, Gratwick, Hennen, Huber, Jericho, Kiang, Leffek, Maloney, Manning, MacMullin, Myers, Oore, Parker, Pross, Ruf, Seth, Sherwin, Stephens, Stuttard, Tonks, Wien, Hartling (invitee).

Regrets: Belzer, Bennett, Chaytor, Christie, Horrocks, Konok, Precious, Schwenger, Welch.

**86:076.**

Discussion of Document "1986 and Beyond: A Report on The First Cycle of Academic Planning at Dalhousie University" - Chapter 7

Members concurred with the chairperson's suggestion that following discussion of individual recommendations, motions to accept the recommendations in Chapter 7 in principle and to receive the report would be presented for voting.

The recommendations in Chapters 5 and 6 were there for the guidance of faculties and other units and as information for the next planning cycle. Discussion would be delayed until the fall. In addition, specific recommendations in Chapter 7, which posed concern to members, would receive further consideration in the fall and in the next cycle of academic planning.

At this point in the meeting, individual recommendations in Chapter 7 were considered and the Chairperson reported on feedback on each recommendation that had been received from individuals and groups in the university community.

Recommendation 7.1.1

Mr. D. Cameron would have liked a more explicit recommendation. Mr. Pross thought it would be useful to add quality of classroom space to the list of issues and Mr. Huber believed that effectiveness in terms of outputs (eg learning outcomes) rather than inputs only should be

included.

#### Recommendations 7.2.1, 7.2.2, 7.2.3

Mr. Andrews wondered why social sciences had been identified in recommendation 7.2.1 and Mr. Tonks referring to recommendation 7.2.2 sought advice on how to improve research. Ms. Sherwin thought that the natural sciences and humanities might also be experiencing difficulties and was troubled by the global perspective taken. Mr. Andrews would have been happier if the scope had included the entire university. Messrs. D. Cameron and Hennen were satisfied that the first two recommendations were intended to facilitate improvement of the level of research in those units/faculties which had identified a need.

#### Recommendations 7.3.1 and 7.3.2

Mr. Cross echoed Mr. D. Cameron's earlier request for more substance. Mr. J. Graham, supporting Mr. Cross, believed that recommendation 7.3.2 did not follow logically from objective 7.3.1, but would if there was a direction to determine desirable objectives and criteria for undergraduate education and specific mechanisms for applying these criteria.

Mr. Pross would have liked to have seen Senate more involved in the process. Mr. Andrews reported on the extensive reviews in place and planned for the next five year period in the Faculty of Arts and Science. Mr. D. Cameron queried whether programs considered to be "low quality" would receive more or less monies? Mr. Andrews, reacting to the Chairperson's response that this would depend on whether the program was core or peripheral to the university, contended that the term "core programs" was not appropriate for Dalhousie as the diversity of programs made it difficult to determine relative quality. He wondered whether the word "relative" also applied to "quality" and "needs" in recommendation 7.3.1.

#### Recommendation 7.4.1

Mr. W. Jones clarified for Mr. Andrews that 'departments involved in line 4 referred to existing not potential programs. Mr. Leffek who had corresponded with the Chairperson about this recommendation was opposed to it as emphasizing a plan rather than action. Strategic statements were required in his view. He submitted that attempting to plan in the detail required by this recommendation was counterproductive, although he was prepared to accept all the recommendations in principle.

#### Recommendations 7.5.1 7.5.2 and 7.5.3

Mr. W. Jones informed Ms. Ozier that the information provided as a result of recommendation 7.5.1 would be submitted to the APC and incorporated in the planning document for the next cycle.

#### Recommendation 7.6.1

Mr. Huber, Chair of the APC/FPC Subcommittee which was examining the question of the aging of faculty, thought that this recommendation was premature and that the problem was actually too many middle aged faculty at present. He requested that Senate wait for the report of his committee before deciding whether to ask the President's Office to undertake the steps referred to in the recommendation. Ms. Ozier observed that the agreement of DFA would also be required and requested that the words "voluntary" precede "early".

#### Recommendations 7.7.1 and 7.7.2

Lengthy debate ensued concerning the merits and difficulties inherent in these two recommendations. Mr. Andrews queried what the possible source(s) of funding would be and suggested that if the resolution was taken seriously there would be inroads into Faculty budgets. Mr. D. Cameron commented that he would support recommendation 7.7.1 but that 7.7.2 presented problems in that computing at Dalhousie was disastrously underfunded compared to other universities (being below the Canadian average). He thought Recommendation 7.7.2 should come into force only after the objective in 7.7.1 was obtained and then should apply only to the academic portion of the operating budget. Mr. W. Jones referred to the amounts allotted to computing by UBAC over the past two years which came from the operating budget. Ms. Ozier purported that the recommendation should take into account the underfunding of the university as a whole vis a vis other universities and that sights should be set on what is affordable rather than comparisons to neighbours' consumption. Ms. Manning pointed out similar disparities in the library budget with other comparable libraries. Mr. Cross contended that it was unacceptable to skim off the top to fund computing and noted that the redistribution fund was a tax on everyone. Mr. Andrews objected to recommendation 7.7.2 particularly if decisions were made about computing prior to receiving other applications for Redistribution funding. Mr. Huber thought recommendation 7.7.2 forced the university to either take money off the top or to go through the Redistribution Fund. Ms. Sherwin maintained that Senate needed to examine the schizophrenic tendency to identify priorities for the university and yet to look at each in comparison to one another in light of the current financial situation. A more precise policy was needed.

Ms. Ozier wondered about the connection between libraries and computing. Following the point raised by Mr. Andrews that monies would be taken for the operating budgets of the faculties, it was agreed that the words "the share of" should be deleted from line 1 of recommendation 7.7.1. Mr. Stuttard questioned whether a continuing large share of the operating budget would be going to computing.

There was final agreement that it should be noted in the minutes that recommendations 7.7.1 and 7.7.2 were unresolved and would require reconsideration in the fall.

### Recommendations 7.8.1 and 7.8.2

Ms. Sherwin asked whether the source of funding should be the Redistribution Fund or some other mechanism. Mr. S. Cameron thought that the size and scope of the task set out in recommendation 7.8.1 was monumental. Ms. Ozier believed that needs should be focused on rather than an inventory of current teaching equipment and supplies. Messrs. Tonks and Stuttard observed that an inventory and list of needs were currently generated in the academic process. Mr. S. Cameron hoped that action would be taken to meet needs. Mr. Andrews was not certain whether APC wished to elicit '-greedy' or "realistic expectations". Ms. Ozier suggested that the President could be asked for periodic reports regarding the budgetary attention paid to teaching and equipment needs.

### Recommendation 7.9.1

It was agreed that representation from the Dalhousie Student Union and Henson College should be included on this special joint committee.

### Recommendation 7.10.1

Mr. Pross was concerned that a simple counting process regarding distribution of minority groups was insufficient and added that a course of action should be specified. Mr. Wien responded that it was hoped that the data would enable a special ad hoc subcommittee to present concrete recommendations in a detailed report similar to the process used in developing an earlier document on part-time degrees. Mr. Wien clarified for Mr. Huber that a specific questionnaire would need to be developed and that Mr. Christie was prepared to carry out the task.

### Recommendations 7.11.1 and 7.11.2 and 7.11.3, 7.11.4, 7.11.5, 7.11.6, 7.11.7 and 7.11.8

Letters of support from Deans Horrocks and Christie had been received with respect to 7.11.1. A study along the lines of that referred to in 7.11.2 was already in progress. It was agreed that the words "and the Senate Library Committee" be added after the word 'Computing' in line 3 and that the word "and" in line 2 be deleted. Messrs. Tonks and Nestman were pleased to cooperate in implementing recommendation 7.11.4. With respect to 7.11.5. Ms. Ozier advised Senate of the provision in the collective agreement regarding retraining. Mr. Sinclair commented that few had taken advantage of this opportunity to date. Mr. S. Cameron reported that the Faculty of Arts and Science had no objection to recommendation 7.11.6 but he noted that the word "balanced" was ambiguous. The Chairperson thought this referred to Faculties charging other Faculties. Mr. Huber identified the last sentence of paragraph 1, page 3 of the 3 June 1986 letter from Mr.

Andrews as pertinent to this recommendation, namely that

**It might also wish to consider the point, made to me by Dean Betts, that the envelope system of budgeting for the university inhibits efforts at co-operation.**

The Chairperson agreed that APC and FPC would be considering this problem in the next round of planning.

Mr. Andrews commented that unnecessary duplication in the wording of Recommendation 7.11.7 could be rethought. Mr. S. Cameron maintained that substantial work would be involved in implementing this recommendation. The Chairperson agreed that there could be reconsideration of the time frame.

Recommendation 7.11.8

No comments were made. Mr. Huber requested that streamlining of the registration process, which negatively affected many students, should be included as a recommendation. Ms. Ozier gave credit to the Registrar and Vice-President (Academic) for beginning to look at this issue and suggested that a report on progress should be requested by APC.

It was agreed upon motion (Cohen/Wien)

**that the recommendations in Chapter 7 be accepted in principle.**

It was noted that strong reservations had been raised about recommendations 7.7.1 and 7.7.2.

There was agreement upon motion (Myers/Cromwell)

**that the Report 1986 and Beyond: A Report on the First Cycle of Academic Planning at Dalhousie University be received.**

86:077-  
Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:06 P.M.