

Item: Senate Minutes, December 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 December 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, 11 December 1993 at 4:00 p.m. in University Hall, Macdonald Building.

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

Amey, Apostle, Arklie, Atherton, Aucoin, Bankier, Barkow, Bérard, Betts, Birdsall, Bishop, J. Black, Bleasdale, C.M. Boyd, R.J. Boyd, Bradfield, Burnett, D.M. Cameron, Campbell, Carlson, Chaytor, Clark, Clarke, Clovis, Coté, Cross, M. Crowley, Cummings, DeMéo, Dykstra, Easterbrook, Eberhardt, Farrell, Fitzgerald, Frick, Friedrich, Ghiz, Gilroy, Glazov, Hansell, Hare, Harsanyi, Hobson, Holloway, Hoskin, Huebert, Ismail, D.W. Jones, Kemp, Kerans, Kimmins, Kirk, Klassen, Kozey, Kusmaul, Kwak, Laidlaw, Lewis, Lovely, K. MacDonald, R.M. MacDonald, MacInnis, Mahony, Mann, R.M. Martin, Mason, McCabe, McKee, Mitchell, Moore, Myers, Owen, Parker, Parpart, Paton, Pereira, Poel, Precious, Rappell, Ravindra, Reynolds, Richards, Ritchie, Ruddick, Ruiz-Salvador, Rusak, Rutherford, Ryall, Schellinck, Schroeder, Schwenger, Sedgwick, Sherwin, Silvert, A.M. Simpson, Sinclair, Sinclair-Faulkner, Sketris, K. Smith, Sorge, Starnes, Stoltzman, M. Stone, Stuttard, Sullivan, J.E. Sutherland, Sutow, Tetreault, Van Feggelen, Verabioff, Wainwright, Walker, Welch, Winham, K.S. Wood.

**Invitees:** J. Eastman, M. MacDonald, A. Shaw.

**Regrets:** B.P. Archibald, Binkley, Clairmont, J.E. Crowley, Fingard, J. Gray, Haley, Kaspar, Maxner, McLeod, Murray, Roald, Schlech, Wassersug, Waterson.

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

**93:163**

Minutes of Previous Meetings

The minutes of the meetings of 25 October 1993 and 22 November 1993 were approved upon motion (N. Pereira/E. McKee).

**93:164**

Nominations from the Senate Committee on Committees

On behalf of the Committee on Committees, Mr McCabe tabled the following names for election to committees.

**Budget Advisory Committee**

**G. Winham (FASS)**

**Senate Academic Appeals Committee**

**A. Mills (Science)**

After the requisite calls for further nominations, Mr Dunn declared the nominees elected by acclamation.

**93:165**

For Information -- Proposed Policy on Discriminatory Harassment

Mr Bérard reported that the President's Advisory Committee to Develop a Policy on Racism and Sexism had completed and submitted to Senate its revised policy statement on discriminatory harassment at the University. A number of changes to this policy document had been made since a draft had been discussed at Senate in April 1992 (**SM 92:059**). On the recommendation of the Senate Steering Committee, the policy document will be published in the first issue of Dalhousie News in 1994, and discussion of the document will be placed on the Senate agenda in late January or February.

**93:166**

Presidential Search Committee

Mr Bérard reported that the Senate Steering Committee had recommended doubling the size of the Presidential Search Committee from its mandated composition. On behalf of the Steering Committee, it was moved (R. Bérard/J. Ritchie)

**that Senate approve the expansion of the Presidential Search Committee to include six representatives of the Senate, six representatives of the Board of Governors, and two representatives of the Dalhousie Student Union.**

Mr Dunn invited Mr Shaw, Chair of the Board of Governors, to speak on this matter. Mr Shaw said that he saw the expansion of the Search Committee as an opportunity for a number of different elements in the University community to work together. He suggested that the Presidential Search could prove to be a building and a healing process and expressed his hope that both the Board and Senate would approve the idea of a broad and diverse Committee.

The question having been called, the motion carried.

**93:167**

**Ad Hoc Committee on Senate Reform**

On behalf of the Senate Steering Committee, Mr Bérard nominated the following persons for membership on the Ad Hoc Committee on Senate Reform:

P. Farmer	(Health Professions)
S. Sherwin	(FASS)
P. Hansell	(Medicine)
P. Aucoin	(FASS)
T. Simpson	(Science)

Ms Hobson noted that the Committee had no representation from the Faculty of Law and suggested that the Dean of the Faculty of Law, Mr Ghiz, would be a valuable addition to the Committee. Ms Hobson said that Mr Ghiz had expressed his willingness to serve on such a committee. It was moved (G. Taylor/E. McKee)

**that the Ad Hoc Committee on Senate Reform be expanded from five to six members and that the Dean of the Faculty of Law, Mr Ghiz, be nominated for the additional position on the Committee.**

The question having been called, the motion carried.

After the requisite calls for further nominations, Mr Dunn declared those named above elected.

**93:168**

**Reports from SAPC and SFPC to Senate re the Third Report of the Budget Advisory Committee**

Mr Dunn reported that Senate, at a previous meeting (**SM 93:150**) had referred the Third Report of the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) and the President's response to it to the Senate Academic Planning Committee and the Senate Financial Planning Committee for review. A motion had been passed at a meeting of SAPC on 17 November (**APC 93:106**), for which notice had been given at the Senate meeting of 22 November (**SM 93:159**). This motion would be considered after discussion of reports on the issue from the Senate Financial Planning Committee.

Mr Carlson, Chair of the Senate Financial Planning Committee, reported that SFPC had produced a report (previously circulated) in response to the BAC report. Mr Carlson said that SFPC emphasized the severity of the financial difficulties facing the University, noting that the problem was much more serious than that reflected in the Third Report of the BAC. He said that there is no right or popular way to meet the budget crisis but noted that SFPC wished to avoid making a merely reactive response. The Committee's report, therefore, made recommendations to encourage inter-Faculty cooperation, to encourage experimentation aimed at enhancing quality and efficiency in units and programmes, and to develop a better process to deal with future budget reductions and to assist long term planning.

Mr Welch, a member of SFPC and author of a minority report (previously circulated), said that his dissenting report was in agreement with most of the points in the Committee's majority report but recommended different financial targets for various units based on additional revenues derived from differential tuition or other fees.

Mr Dunn then called on the President to comment. Mr Clark said that the Deans, the Director of the School of Education, and the various heads of non-academic and academic support units had been asked on 22 September to submit plans for meeting the budget targets set for them. Several plans have already been received from the Faculties and from the Dalhousie Art Gallery. Mr Clark noted that he was mildly optimistic about the proposal submitted by the Art Gallery. He observed that some Faculties are attempting to meet their targets without closing programmes, some have proposed major internal organizational changes, while yet others are reviewing their programmes and activities.

Mr Dunn asked the Secretary to bring forward the motion passed by SAPC. It was moved (R. Bérard/E. Sutow), on behalf of the Senate Academic Planning Committee,

**A Motion of the Senate Academic Planning Committee**

**(SAPC 93:106 - 17 November 1993)**

**The Third Report of the Budget Advisory Committee and President Clark's response to it, while sharply focusing attention on (and perhaps even underestimating) the seriousness of Dalhousie's financial difficulties over the next three years, have had profound negative implications for the academic integrity of the institution. Of particular concern are:**

- 1) the manner in which the President, basing his actions on the Report, has suggested arbitrary closures of programmes without adequate consultation regarding the academic and financial consequences of such closures;**
- 2) the erosion of the role of Senate in academic planning, with the consequence that academic programmes whose soundness has not been questioned have been placed in jeopardy because of threatened closure; and**
- 3) the potentially greater confusion and even harm that might accrue were Senate to intervene during this academic year in BAC-initiated processes now already well under way at the Faculty level.**

**To restore the integrity of academic planning within the budgetary realities at Dalhousie, as well as to introduce a University-wide consultative process for decision-making,**

**BE IT RESOLVED**

- 1) that Senate recognizes the BAC distributions among Faculties as a framework for budgetary planning, but that subsequent financial targets for Faculties be reviewed by Senate before the**

**next budget year; and**

**2) that Senate Academic and Financial Planning Committees request that Deans provide the proposals of their Faculties for meeting their current and projected budget targets for review by those Committees; and**

**3) that Senate, Faculties, Deans, the President, and the Dalhousie Student Union begin an immediate consultative process for establishing the priorities of all programme activities of the University; and**

**4) that, as part of the determination of such priorities, the University Mission Statement will have to be revisited by the parties named above; and**

**5) that, once such a consultative process has taken place, a planned programme of institutional restructuring, based on the identified priorities and the financial and human resources of the University, will be undertaken by the Senate and the Administration.**

Mr Sutow, who had been asked by the membership of the SAPC to speak to the Committee's motion, explained that SAPC had been meeting in both regular and special sessions to formulate a response to the Third Report of the BAC. He noted that the Committee had discussed a number of measures to deal with the budget crisis, from maintaining horizontal cuts to recommending salary reductions. The SAPC was convinced that the University's financial problems are real and will continue for the foreseeable future, that Senate must play a leading role in responding to the current crisis, and that Senate must act in a timely fashion. Mr Sutow reported, however, that SAPC was divided in its response, approving the motion recommended to the meeting by a vote of 8 to 5 (with one abstention). The majority opinion was that Senate was not in a position to re-do the work of the Budget Advisory Committee nor was it able at this time to recommend alternative targets for 1994-95, although SAPC could review any further reduction targets.

Ms Stone, also a member of SAPC, said that although the motion was fully debated within SAPC and there was substantial agreement among Committee members, she had been one of the members who had been unable to support the motion in its final form. The current motion, she said, seemed to embody a contradiction between a preamble which was highly critical of the BAC process and a set of recommendations which, by accepting the recommendations of the BAC, effectively endorsed that process. She suggested further that the wording of the motion was vague and that she would prefer a clearer statement of Senate's responsibility to set the criteria on which priorities could be evaluated. Mr Wainwright, too, added that he saw a broad gap between the preamble of the motion and its recommendations.

Ms Hobson said that Senate should appreciate the long hours and hard work expended by members of SAPC, SFPC, and the BAC over the past year in grappling with the University's financial difficulties and should be aware of the substantial level of agreement among members of those committees on basic principles for planning. Ms Hobson said that she hoped that members of the University community would look beyond narrow constituencies or factions to embrace, as the members of these committees had done, a broader vision of the University.

Mr Brett said that the academic assumptions which underlay the BAC report had never been accepted by Senate. Accepting the "framework" of the BAC recommendations implied, he said, acceptance of the process by which that "framework" was developed. Mr Brett also said that the SAPC motion contained a number of words or terms -- e.g., "framework", "consultative process", "revisiting the Mission statement", and "restructuring" -- whose meanings he found disturbingly vague.

Mr Sinclair asked that the debate on the motion focus on its recommendations, rather than its preamble. He noted that the BAC was established through normal University processes and that it sought and continues to seek input from all academic units. He added that the BAC did not recommend programme cuts and that its members were just as concerned as other members of the faculty with the need to develop an open and consensual process for setting priorities.

Mr Welch said that accepting the budget targets recommended by the BAC would be tantamount to accepting an administration coup d'etat and suggested that the motion be amended. It was moved (P. Welch/B. Harsanyi):

**that §3 in the preamble be deleted and that Recommendation (1) be replaced with the following: 1) that Senate recommend to the Board that the Third Report of the BAC be reviewed in light of the SFPC minority report, and that the framework for budgetary reductions among Faculties over 1994-97 be amended to accord with the SFPC minority report.**

Mr Kerans said that he opposed the amendment because he thought the resultant motion would still lack sufficient clarity. He expressed concern that both the recommendations of the BAC and those embodied in the amendment serve to divide the University community. Furthermore, it would be counter-productive, he said, not to recognize the BAC targets for the coming budget year, as Faculties have been developing their budget plans around those targets; rather, Senate should give its attention to dealing with further budget reductions which were expected in light of current Provincial Government policies. Mr Kerans also urged members of Senate to weigh carefully any proposed priority-setting process, noting that some models aim at the identification of programmes that could be judged as "weak", while others focus on identifying programmes as "expendable".

Mr Carlson said that the amendment to the motion would impose substantially higher fees for interns and residents associated with the Faculty of Medicine and would accept differential fees for students in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. Most members of the Committee did not support the minority report because it established a distribution among Faculties that seemed even more arbitrary than that contained in the Third Report of the BAC.

Mr Pereira said that he did not wish to go back over or question the work of the BAC or SAPC. He argued, however, that the SAPC motion was unclear and could lead to confusion over the nature of the restructuring that had to be undertaken and that the amendment did not correct this basic problem. Ms Bleasdale said that the Board of Governors had accepted the Third Report of the BAC without a clear understanding of the meaning of the term "financial framework" and that the current motion just continued the confusion.

The question having been called, the amendment was defeated by a substantial majority, with three

abstentions noted.

Mr Poel said that he thought the SAPC motion was about as good as could be expected. He noted that Recommendation (2) recognized the interest of the Senate in the plans being developed by the Faculties; Recommendation (4), to revisit the Mission Statement, while somewhat vague, was necessary; and Recommendation (5), while not making explicit what body would be in charge of institutional restructuring, certainly implied a leading role for Senate and its Academic Planning Committee. Mr Cross replied that he agreed with Mr Poel's arguments but only because he shared Mr Poel's interpretations of what the SAPC motion meant.

Mr Clark said that he wished to have his objections to the preamble to the motion recorded, specifically his objection to the reference to the "erosion of the role of Senate". He noted that in his public remarks of 22 September 1993 he had acknowledged explicitly the academic primacy of Senate and its role in programme decisions. Mr Clark also suggested that Senate's recent efforts at academic planning have not been inspiring. He observed that the Budget Advisory Committee had sought advice from SAPC and received very little assistance. He noted that SFPC had brought a report to Senate pointing out the need to deal with the coming financial crisis and that Senate had simply tabled the report. He concluded by asserting that the integrity of the University was being called into question by the inability of Senate to set priorities.

Mr Sinclair-Faulkner urged Senate to vote against the motion. He said that Senate was being asked to accept differential financial targets without ever having received a clear explanation as to how they were established. He objected further that the BAC report was ready in June 1993 but was not released by the President until late September. Mr Sutow responded that he did not think that there was time to implement an alternative strategy for the coming budget year and that defeat of the SAPC motion could lead the University toward the abyss.

Ms Bankier said that only Senate can provide the necessary leadership to bring the University through its current financial troubles. She thought that Senate needed to step away from the BAC report and create a Senate body, composed of people with a commitment to the whole University, to bring the community together [Applause]. Mr Barkow added that such a body should be composed of individuals whose independence and integrity was widely recognized.

The question having been called, the motion was defeated by a vote of 59 in favour, 40 opposed, and 7 abstentions.

It was moved (N. Pereira/M. Cross)

**WHEREAS the third report of the Budget Advisory Committee and President Clark's response to it have profound implications for the academic integrity of the institution; and**

**WHEREAS, at present, there is no accepted academic basis for differential budget allocations to Faculties and the School of Education,**

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT**



**Senate rejects the distribution of reductions recommended for the Faculties and the School of Education in the Third Report of the Budget Advisory Committee, but recognizes the the 1994-95 budgetary targets contained in that report, and calls for further review of the academic priorities of the University by Senate before implementing any financial plan for the subsequent two years.**

Mr Parker asked what the motion meant in its claim to reject the distribution of reductions recommended for Faculties in the BAC report while recognizing the 1994-95 budgetary targets. Mr Pereira responded that the drafters recognized the current targets because of the difficulty for Faculties to reopen their planning processes this late in the day. Mr Sinclair asked if the motion was asking the BAC to reopen their process. Mr Pereira said that the intention was to put the planning process in the hands of a Senate committee. Mr Sinclair responded that the BAC was now working on a fourth report and that Senate should be clear about the status of that report.

Mr Brett said that accepting the budget targets for one year only was a means of preserving programmes, especially as current FASS plans have rejected the recommendation of programme cuts. Ms Stone said that she found the current motion much more acceptable than that proposed by SAPC. She said that, although President Clark had accused the Senate of an inability to set priorities, the BAC had never made clear its priorities but had instead made recommendations on the basis of a number of unstated and undefended assumptions.

Ms Sherwin said that accepting the BAC targets even for one year was unacceptable and suggested an amendment. It was moved (S. Sherwin/M. Bradfield)

**that the end of the resolution should be amended to read "Senate rejects the distribution of reductions recommended for the Faculties and the School of Education in the Third Report of the Budget Advisory Committee, and Senate recommends to the Board that the Third Report of the BAC be reviewed in light of the SFPC minority report, and that the framework for budgetary reductions among Faculties over 1994-97 be amended to accord with the SFPC minority report.**

Mr Carlson explained the reasons that SFPC did not accept the recommendations for an increase in the tuition fees for the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. He noted that such a proposal should come from FASS and be debated in relation to alternate means for FASS to meet its budget reduction target. Mr Cross added that, while Mr Welch's figures were somewhat more attractive than those of the BAC, they appeared to be no less arbitrary. Mr Rappell requested that Senate not interpose itself in the discussions on tuition increases taking place between the Dalhousie Student Union and the Board of Governors.

The question having been called, the amendment was defeated.

The question having been called on the main motion, the motion was carried by a vote of 62 in favour, 35 opposed, and 4 abstentions.

It was moved (N. Pereira/M. Stone)

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT**

**To preserve the integrity of academic planning within the budgetary and contractual realities at Dalhousie,**

**Senate directs its Academic Planning Committee to draft a set of procedures and criteria for establishing priorities among University units, and to propose these (in the form of a motion) to Senate by the end of January 1994.**

Mr Kerans expressed concern that SAPC might not be able both to be consultative and to establish criteria for priorities-setting by the end of January 1994. Mr Klassen said that Senate had already approved a document on criteria for priorities-setting and that it has been used by the Academic Review Committee of SAPC. It is not clear, however, how Senate could ensure that this document or a version of it would be used by Faculties. Mr Cross said that the motion simply asks SAPC to review its priorities document and develop a consultative process for its use. Ms Bankier said that the motion was not asking SAPC to solve the University's current problems, only to set up procedures for addressing them. Mr Sutow said that he was concerned that the deadline suggested in the motion was unrealistic. Mr Brett replied that the January date was set in order to allow Senate to deal with proposals emerging from the Faculties.

The question having been called, the motion carried, with five abstentions.

**93:169**

Adjournment

The hour being late, the meeting adjourned at 6:05 p.m. upon motion (E. Sutow/R. Carlson).

---

Secretary

---

Chair