

Item: Senate Minutes, September 1992

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 1992. 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 of Monday, September 14, 1992 at 4:00 p.m. in the Board and Senate Room.

Present with Mr. Dunn in the chair were:

Andrews, Angelopoulos, Apostle, B.P. Archibald, Arklie, Atherton, Banerjee, Bankier, Barnstead, Birdsall, A. Brown, D.M. Cameron, Carlson, Chandler, H. Clark, Clarke, Clovis, M. Crowley, Curri, M. Doyle, Dykstra, Easterbrook, Frick, Fullerton, Gass, Gilroy, Girard, Hare, Holloway, Kimmins, Klassen, Laidlaw, Maloney, Manicom, McIntyre, McKee, McMullen, McNulty, D. Moore, Myers, O'Shea, Pross, Ravindra, Richards, Ritchie, Ruggles, Rutherford, Schenk, Schroeder, Sherwin, Silvert, A. Simpson, Sinclair, Sinclair-Faulkner, K. Smith, R. Smith, Stolzman, Sullivan, J. Sutherland, Winham.

Invitees: B. Christie, M. MacDonald.

Regrets: Allen, Belzer, Breckenridge, Burns, Carruthers, A.D. Cohen, Fingard, Fitzgerald, Friedrich, J. Gray, Hansell, D.W. Jones, L.C. MacLean, Purdy, Ruedy, Shepherd, Stairs, Tamlyn, Wassersug, C.N. Williams, Wood.

The meeting was called to order at 3:04 p.m.

92:119

Minutes of the Meeting of August 10, 1992

The minutes of the meeting of August 10, 1992 were approved upon motion (G. Klassen/R. Carlson) with the following changes:

Senate
September 14, 1992

92:107 Mr. McKee noted that the activity of the Ombud's Office had been similar to that of the last two years. He also noted that preliminary data for the next reporting year indicates an increase in activity of approximately 70%.

92:115 Paragraph 3, line 3 should read as follows:

"...for Senate committees to consult thoroughly with Faculties on academic matters. Mr. Carlson...."

Re: list of attendees A. M. Sampson should read A. M. Simpson.

92:120

Nominations from the Senate Committee on Committees

After three calls for further nominations, the Chair declared the following individuals elected by acclamation:

Senate Financial Planning Committee
T. Ghose (Pathology)

Ad Hoc Committee to Review Student Discipline Policy
A. Macklin (Law)

92:121

Schedule of Meetings 1992/93

Ms. Curri drew the attention of the meeting to the schedule of meetings that was distributed with the agenda. This matter was for information as the Senate Committee on Academic Administration had approved the schedule at its last meeting.

92:122

Response from Government re: SSHRC and Canada Council Merger (for information)

Senate
September 14, 1992

Mr. Maloney read letters from the Honourable Mr. Perrin Beatty, Minister of Communications, and Louise Dandurand, Secretary General, Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada in response to the letter from Mr. Dunn regarding the amalgamation of the Canada Council and the SSHRC.

The letters are available for review in the Senate Office.

92:123

Faculty of Graduate Studies Grading Scheme (for information)

Mr. Maloney read a letter from Ms. Fingard that corrected information she had given to Senate at its August 10, 1992 meeting.

The letter is available for review in the Senate Office.

92:124

Policy of Awarding Degrees

Ms. Curri reported on the deliberations of the Senate Committee on Academic Administration on the issue of awarding degrees at times other than October, February and May of each year.

Mr. Klassen suggested the motion should contain a phrase that provided some small degree of flexibility in cases deserving of humanitarian consideration.

It was moved and seconded (G. Curri/K. Sullivan)

that, under normal circumstances, the practice of awarding degrees outside of the normally scheduled convocations, unless it was necessary to correct a mistake made by the University, be discontinued and that the University be prepared to issue a letter confirming completion of degree requirements upon request.

The motion was carried.

92:125

Change in Degrees

Senate
September 14, 1992

Ms. Curri reminded the meeting that Senate had asked the Senate Committee on Academic Administration to review this matter in light of a student's request to have his degree designation changed from a B.A.(Economics) to a B.Sc.(Economics).

It was moved and seconded (G. Curri/L. MacIntyre)

that degree designations not be changed retroactively.

The motion was carried.

92:126

Advanced Major Program in Woman's Studies

Mr. Smith introduced this item by reminding Senate that the Bachelor of Arts degree in Women's Studies already exists and that it is normal to offer an advanced major. The Senate Academic Planning Committee recommended approval of the program.

It was moved and seconded (L. Maloney/R. Smith)

that Senate approve the proposal for and Advanced Major Program in Women's Studies.

The motion was carried.

92:127

Progress Reports - Capital Campaign Task Forces

Student Life Task Force

Mr. McKee reported that the Task Force consisted of eleven persons, including two faculty members and two students. Ms. Barbara Walker of the Board of Governors is the Chair.

The Task Force has met twice and two more meetings are scheduled. Mr. McKee made a presentation at the first meeting and the Task Force is now discussing a wide range of student life issues including: financial support for students (undergraduate and graduate scholarships and bursaries); residences; disabled access; advising services; athletic field; bookstore facilities; lounge and meeting space for students; cultural milieu on campus; the impact of increasing student employment on campus; and

Senate
September 14, 1992

computer facilities for student use.

Facilities Task Force

Mr. Maloney reported that the Task Force had met twice. After general discussions at the first meeting, the Task force developed five preliminary categories for the classification of projects: I) Major New Facilities; II) Major Renovations; III) Deferred Maintenance; IV) Environmental/Access Projects; and V) Support-Type Projects and Facilities.

He noted that a number of specific projects in each category had been identified. However, the Task Force has not determined any preliminary priority listing. This will occur at the next meeting.

Development and External Relations Task Force

Mr. Pross tabled his report, a copy of which is attached to the minutes.

Academic and Research Task Force

Mr. Dunn reported that the Task Force had met on three occasions and had given consideration to documents on critical issues as submitted by Senate, Faculties, students and alumni.

At this point the Task Force had identified five general categories of issues: I) faculty renewal; II) graduate student support; III) undergraduate support; IV) support for teaching and research; and V) program development.

Finance Task Force

Mr. Carlson reported that the Senate Financial Planning Committee discussed critical issues that should be considered in the Dalhousie Campaign. The issues included the decline in government funding, the need for improved accountability to enhance the University's image with the general public as well as students, the need to reduce the high level of fees charged, the need to respond to increase social expectations such as accessibility without extra funding for such actions, and the potential benefit for the operating budget if funds can be provided to reduce the debt, increase endowment for scholarships, add endowed chairs, and replace certain buildings.

The Finance Task Force heard a presentation by Vice-President Mason in which similar issues were highlighted. The discussion emphasized the need to look for ways to support the operating costs of the University in order to avoid budget deficits while maintaining and publicizing Dalhousie's status as a nationally competitive university.

Senate
September 14, 1992

The Task Force has held one meeting prior to this point and has two additional meetings scheduled during September.

Mr. Smith urged that Senate representatives to the Task Forces ensure that documents resulting from the work of the Task Forces remain as general documents so that the campaign will be widely supported by the University community.

A complete list of members of all task forces is attached to these minutes.

92:128

Critical Issues

Mr. Dunn referred to the document distributed at the meeting and at previous meetings of Senate. He reminded the meeting that the priorities noted in the document were the priorities assigned to each issue by the individuals who submitted suggestions. The priorities noted in the document are not a result of Senate debate and resolution in this matter.

In response to a question from Mr. Andrews, Mr. Clark assured the meeting that as the campaign planning proceeds Senate will be given the opportunity to comment on the list of priorities prepared by the Campaign Steering Committee after consultation with its five Task Forces. Mr. Kimmins requested that Faculties be given the same opportunity at the same time.

Mr. Andrews noted that Dalhousie is preparing for a major funding campaign in part due to the decrease in government funding for the University. He cautioned that the selection of priorities must be done with care to ensure we do not send the message that we are willing and able to assume responsibility for funding those aspects of higher education that are normally part of the public's (governments) responsibility. He also suggested we should continue to exercise political pressure to reverse the trend in decreased government funding for higher education.

Ms. Bankier noted her concern about the lack of computer support for faculty members and hoped this might be seen as important by the Campaign Committee. She suggested that if this issue is not addressed by the University, it will become more difficult in the future to attract quality faculty members who are given substantially better support at other institutions.

Ms. Bankier also noted the importance of having research fellowships available for faculty members. In recent years work other than research has begun to make an ever-increasing demand on faculty

Senate
September 14, 1992

member's time - research fellowships would do a great deal to ensure faculty have appropriate time to carry out research.

Mr. Clark cautioned Senate that any capital campaign can only satisfy a small portion of the apparent needs of the University community. He also noted that, despite what we say about our needs, the success of the campaign depends on the nature of projects and whether donors are willing to commit funds to those projects - the University's needs and donors interests are not always compatible.

92:129

SFPC Report, "Deficit Reduction: The Continuing Struggle"

Mr. Carlson indicated that the intent of the Senate Financial Planning Committee in presenting its report on deficit reduction was to emphasize that the University will be facing extremely difficult times over the next few years. It was the Committee's intent to broaden discussion of the issues to the wider University community.

In an attempt to put Dalhousie's problem in perspective, Mr. Carlson noted that the University of Maryland was closing one School and five departments, Yale University will be cutting 11% of its staff, and Columbia University will cut \$35 million from its budget this year. In searching for possible solutions, the SFPC did not agree with solutions that would extend the deficit nor ask faculty to consider less-than-appropriate salary settlements. Mr. Carlson indicated the Committee concluded Dalhousie should seek to have a smaller number of programs. He indicated that it was the Committee's intent to use existing structures to move to a more limited number of offerings or reduce the size of some programs.

It was moved and second (R. Carlson/G. Klassen)

that Senate receive the report **Deficit Reduction: The Continuing Struggle.**

Ms. Banerjee indicated that the Dalhousie Student Union approved a resolution containing the following elements:

1. Program reduction

- a) The Dalhousie Student Union does not support Dalhousie in limiting its academic scope to programs that generate profit;
- b) The Dalhousie Student Union does not support reduction or elimination of programs if quality education is compromised;
- c) All talks of rationalization must include student representation;

Senate
September 14, 1992

d) The Dalhousie Student Union demands that the decision to reduce or eliminate programs meet all of the criteria outlined;

2. Additional Income from Non-Teaching Activities

a) The Dalhousie Student Union demands that the University ensures that private sector funds do not dictate the direction of education at Dalhousie regardless of external funding;

3. Tuition Increases

a) The Dalhousie Student Union believes that increased tuition fees for professional programs decreases accessibility for students. The University has an obligation to educate all students regardless of their financial ability;

b) The Dalhousie Student Union will fight to keep tuition fees down for the entire student body;

c) The Dalhousie Student Union believes that the University should focus on present earning of students rather than potential earning when setting a tuition fee policy;

d) The Dalhousie Student Union does not support increased differential fees for international students who add to the quality of life at Dalhousie. The Dalhousie Student Union believes that by increasing differential fees, the University is denying a very integral facet of academic enrichment;

e) The Dalhousie Student Union does not support differential fees for out-of-province students;

4. Expanded Enrolment

a) The Dalhousie Student Union demands that the University should offer more class sections to maintain or decrease the student/faculty ratio in classrooms if enrolment expands;

5) Faculty Shifting

a) The Dalhousie Student Union does not support shifting faculty around to different departments if quality of education is hurt; and

b) The Dalhousie Student Union does not support faculty complement reduction.

The motion was carried.

It was moved and seconded (R. Carlson/G. Klassen)

that Senate support the following recommendations as presented in the document Deficit

Senate
September 14, 1992

Reduction: The Continuing Struggle:

1.1) The Senate Academic Planning Committee should seek to identify programs where reductions are academically justifiable and make recommendations to Senate on its findings.

1.2) The Budget Advisory Committee needs to integrate such Senate-generate priorities with other information on duplication, demand, and inefficiency to advise the President and Board on which programs could be reduced.

1.3) The Vice-President (Academic and Research) should initiate a process to consider how inter- and intra-Faculty transfers might be facilitated.

In response to Mr. Carlson's suggestion that the actions proposed by the SFPC were consistent with the Collective Agreement, Mr. Sinclair-Falkner argued the contrary. Mr. Sinclair-Falkner suggested the interpretation of Article 25.02 by President Clark as recorded in the minutes of the Senate meeting of August 10, 1992, is an oversimplification of the matter. He indicated that Article 25.02 clearly states that Senate is responsible for determining the teaching, scholarly and research objectives of Dalhousie and changes to these objectives must be done for bona fide academic reasons - financial reasons are not appropriate if acting under Article 25 of the Collective Agreement. He reminded Senate that Articles 26 and 27 of the Collective Agreement provide a mechanism for adjustments to academic programs when the Board says there is not enough money. He concluded by seeking confirmation from the SFPC that we are engaged in academic planning as opposed to academic planning for financial reasons.

In reply, Mr. Carlson indicated that Article 25 required Senate to use academic criteria in deciding whether to reduce programs. Whether expanding reviews was motivated by financial pressures, the key issue in complying with Article 25 is whether the review process followed is an academically-based one. He added it was the position of the SFPC that, in order to preserve the quality of academic offerings, the University cannot afford to continue with across-the-board cuts as this results in limited course offerings, limited support systems, diminished facilities, and increased tuition. It was the opinion of the SFPC that the solution, in order to preserve and enhance quality, was in fewer programs and a reduction in some other programs.

Mr. Carlson also noted that we are currently operating under Article 26 through complement reduction measures taken by the President's Office. However, Mr. Carlson indicated that such measures have not gone far enough. SFPC felt that its recommendations were compatible with the Collective Agreement. Reductions in the number of faculty would result from non-replacements and internal transfers as per recommendation 1.3 (noted above in the motion).

Mr. Barnstead asked if the ordering of recommendations 1.1 and 1.2 implies simultaneous or consecutive action. Mr. Carlson indicated that the Budget Advisory Committee would be proceeding

Senate
September 14, 1992

with its own actions, but its use of Senate approved priorities would need to come after 1.1.

Mr. Barnstead asked whether the Senate Academic Planning Committee would be responsible for the determination of the criteria. Mr. Carlson reminded Senate that a set of criteria had been developed and approved in principle by Senate two years ago.

In reply to a question by Mr. Barnstead, Mr. Carlson indicated that the Academic Review Committee is using existing review documents in terms of action implied by recommendation 1.1.

Ms. Bankier reinforced the sentiments of Mr. Sinclair-Falkner by emphasizing that Article 25 addresses the matter of program review for academic reasons and that Articles 26 and 27 address the issue for financial reasons. She indicated there are clearly two issues: 1) what do we do about the financial problem; and 2) what is the appropriate process if action is taken to deal with the financial issue.

Ms. Ritchie indicated that it was unfortunate that the recommendations have come from the Senate Financial Planning Committee. However, she emphasized that the Senate has a responsibility to look at all academic units/programs and ask whether they are academically justified regardless of the University's financial situation.

Mr. Andrews suggested we can surely make a prima facie assumption that our current programs are academically justified in view of the fact that Senate has approved them, we are engaged continuously in academic reviews, and we continue to confer degrees.

Mr. Andrews expressed the view that we should not pretend we are acting for academic reasons. He suggested we should recognize our actions are for financial reasons and then choose to use the appropriate process.

Mr. Sinclair-Falkner indicated the motion is too broadly worded and will undoubtedly lead to a major grievance especially in view of the SFPC Chairperson's admission that the motion is financially driven. He further indicated that some action has to be taken, but the Senate Academic Planning Committee has to develop a mechanism that maintains academic integrity and credibility.

Mr. Carlson emphasized that the SFPC had to make a decision and it was not prepared to suggest the deficit be increased. Combined with SFPC's perception that the quality of academic offerings was in decline, it chose to recommend as it has.

Ms. Sherwin expressed some sympathy with the fact that use of Article 25 might be preferable since it left Senate with the responsibility for decisions on program reductions. She added that she was concerned that we have not defined clearly enough how we will deal with academic issues in

Senate
September 14, 1992

combination with financial issues.

Mr. Carlson indicated that the SAPC is preparing a document that will suggest guidelines and protections for faculty members involved in transfers as a result of decisions to eliminate or reduce programs.

It was moved and seconded (R. Carlson/G. Klassen)

that the motion be tabled until the Senate Academic Planning Committee report to Senate on recommended guidelines and criteria.

The motion was carried.

92:130

Campus Plan

Mr. Carlson reviewed the development of this issue and noted that the Senate Physical Planning Committee had originally approved a report and submitted same to Senate for approval. Senate delayed consideration of the motion for approval in light of concerns expressed by resident neighbours of Dalhousie and agreed to seek a resolution. It had been agreed that Senate Officers would meet with representatives of the residents group. This was done and changes to the document were negotiated. The amended document was reviewed and approved by the Senate Physical Planning Committee and is now back to Senate for final consideration

It was moved and seconded (R. Carlson/D. Myers)

that Senate approve the document "The Academic Implications of A Collective Vision: A Campus Plan for Dalhousie University" and transmit it to the Board of Governors for consideration.

Mr. Andrews, in referring to the order in which buildings might be erected, asked whether this report had any connection with the Capital Campaign. Mr. Dunn replied that there was no such connection between the two.

Mr. Birdsall indicated that there was little mention in the Campus Plan of particular buildings and who might occupy them - he referred specifically to page 3 of the report. He felt the Campus Plan was quite general in this respect. Mr. Carlson noted that everything in the report, except the last two paragraphs

Senate
September 14, 1992

on page 4, was taken directly from the Campus Plan.

Mr. Smith noted that the fourth line from the bottom of page three should read "Development of one quadrangle-college..." as opposed to "Development of one quadrangle college..." This was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Mr. Sinclair-Falkner expressed thanks to Mr. Carlson for his success in resolving this issue with the resident neighbours.

The motion was carried.

92:131

Report of the President

The President presented a written report (copy attached).

In response to the President's report, Mr. Andrews asked if he was correct in assuming that the plans for the TUNS/NSAC/Dalhousie Consortium would not reorder priorities for research, international development and graduate work within Dalhousie. President Clark indicated Mr. Andrew's assumption was correct and read a portion of the actual consortium proposal as noted below.

"Each institution shall remain independent and autonomous in both management and finances, with the exception of the areas specified below.

"The Consortium will provide combined, integrated information relating to research and graduate programs, and international projects, to provincial and national organizations and agencies."

President Clark also referred to the composition and functions of a Consortium Management Committee.

A copy of the draft of the agreement between TUNS, NSAC and Dalhousie is available in the Senate Office.

In response to President Clark's discussion of rationalization, Mr. B. Clarke asked if Dalhousie should be doing anything to position itself to be something other than reactive to the activity of the Nova Scotia Council on Higher Education. President Clark indicated that we are in a waiting mode and would not know how to proceed until more information from NSCHE was available. It was his intention that

Senate
September 14, 1992

Dalhousie be proactive on this issue rather than reactive.

In response to the President's comments regarding the retention of a public relations firm by Dalhousie, Ms. Bankier encouraged all to be more attentive to the good things we do and be more prone to praise each other on those accomplishments for the purpose of developing a more positive spirit at Dalhousie.

92:132

Question Period

Mr. B. Clarke asked about the loss of several parking spaces behind the Business School. In response, President Clark referred to the fact that the Board had established a company from the US Policy Study Group (Faculty of Management Studies) and Dalhousie is renting a house to that company. Part of the rental includes several parking spaces. Mr. B. Clark noted that this action has displaced several people who normally park in this location.

92:133

Other Business

There was no other business.

92:134

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:04 p.m.

Secretary

Chair