

Item: Senate Minutes, March 1994

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 March 1994. 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, 14 March 1994 at 4:00 p.m. in University Hall, Macdonald Building.

Present with Mr. Dunn in the chair were:

B.P. Archibald, Atherton, Bankier, Bérard, Betts, Binkley, Birdsall, Burns, D.M. Cameron, Campbell, Carlson, Clark, Clarke, Cross, J.E. Crowley, Dickson, Doolittle, Eberhardt, Farrell, Friedrich, Fullerton, Ghiz, Hansell, Hare, Hobson, Kaspar, Kimmins, Klassen, Kozey, Kussmaul, Labrie, Laidlaw, Mann, Mason, McCabe, McIntyre, McKee, McPhee, Nugent, Owen, Parkins, Pereira, Poel, Pross, Ravindra, Richards, Schroeder, Schwenger, Sherwin, A.M. Simpson, Sinclair-Faulkner, Sketris, K. Smith, Starnes, Stolzman, J.E. Sutherland, Verabioff, Walker, K.S. Wood, Wortman.

Invitees: M. MacDonald.

Regrets: J. Black, M.P. Brown, Carruthers, M. Crowley, Cummings, Curri, Fingard, Gilroy, J. Gray, Haley, J.V. Jones, Lane, D. MacLean, MacLeod, Maxner, Murray, O'Shea, Rappell, Ritchie, Roald, Sorge, Sutow, M.H. Tan, C.N. Williams, Waterson.

94:036

Minutes of Previous Meetings

The minutes of the meeting of 14 February 1994 were approved upon motion (G. Klassen/D. Poel).

The minutes of the meeting of 28 February were approved, with the following corrections:

p. 4, SM 94:032, ¶3, l. 3: replace the word "implementation" with the words "establishment of an independent financial advisory committee under"; and

p. 6, SM 94:035, ¶3, l. 5: Add the following words: "Mr Stuttard said that statements to Senate and the Board would not adequately publicize the

fact that programmes in Music, Theatre, Costume Studies, Public Administration, and Library and Information Studies were continuing at Dalhousie, and had not been closed; and that much louder publicity was needed in this region and across the country to attract students back to these programmes. Mr Clark thanked Mr Stuttard for his comments and noted that considerable time and effort had been required to organize the meeting in the Cohn Auditorium on 22 September 1993."

upon motion (G. Klassen/D. Poel).

94:037

Nominations to Senate Committees

On behalf of the Committee on Committees, Mr McCabe tabled the following nomination for election to a Senate committee.

Senate Academic Planning Committee

W.F. Doolittle (Medicine)

After the requisite calls for further nominations, Mr Dunn declared the nominee elected.

94:038

Senate Financial Planning Committee Response to the Discussion Paper of the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC)

Mr Dunn noted that it had been agreed at the previous meeting of Senate (**SM 94:032**)

that Senate receive the SFPC Report and debate, seriatim, the preamble and the nine principles contained in the Report.

Mr Carlson said that SFPC was hoping to establish which principles Senate wished to adopt in budget planning and to ascertain Senate's view of the academic implications of the current budget difficulties faced by the University. The Committee had discussed the possible withdrawal of its report in the light of the arbitration decision on programme closures but had decided to proceed with the report in recognition of the fact that Senate is expected to express its views on any matter relating to the internal regulation of the University. The Committee also considered making an explicit reference to the primacy of the Collective Agreement between the University's Board of Governors and the Dalhousie Faculty Association; it did not agree to insert such a reference, Mr Carlson said, because the University was already obligated to meet the requirements of that

Collective Agreement. Any such statement would imply that the University did not have to abide by such agreements unless so noted.

It was moved (R. Carlson/D.M. Cameron)

that Senate adopt the Preamble of the SFPC Report.

The motion carried.

It was moved (R. Carlson/D.M. Cameron)

that Senate adopt Principle 1 of the SFPC Report.

Mr Carlson explained, and asked that minutes record, the Committee's understanding that any programme reductions or closures that became necessary be carried out in accordance with the Collective Agreement with the Dalhousie Faculty Association.

The question having been called, the motion carried on a voice vote.

It was moved (R. Carlson/H. Dickson)

that Senate adopt Principle 2 of the SFPC Report.

Mr Carlson said that the Committee here wished to express its understanding that the University ran some risks in encouraging entrepreneurial activity and to support the acceptance of reasonable risks in pursuit of such activity. Mr Dickson said that there was a great deal of research activity taking place in the University from which the University could realize greater financial benefits and more fruitful private and public sector linkages.

Mr Pereira said that the language of this principle was vague, and he asked that the criteria for judging risks and the sort of controls that might be put in place should be made more specific. Mr Stuttard asked where the line between academic and entrepreneurial activities would be drawn. Ms Walker urged that before risks were taken the University should assure itself that any activity holds more than a vague promise of increased resources being realized. Mr K.S. Wood, on the other hand, said that there were many people in the community who were wary of the University entering into direct competition with the private sector, especially in such areas as consulting.

The question having been called, the motion carried by a vote of 29 in favour, 12 opposed.

It was moved (R. Carlson/D.M. Cameron)

that Senate adopt Principle 3 of the SFPC Report.

Mr Carlson explained that this principle was developed to offer some protection to the most economically vulnerable members of the faculty. Ms Sherwin asked how this principle related to the DFA Collective Agreement, specifically §26. Mr Carlson reiterated that SFPC recognized the obligations of the DFA Collective Agreement and was concerned primarily with the position of untenured faculty members if there was no academic reorganization.

Mr Stuttard asked if the aim of the principle was to increase the use of part-time and/or limited-term appointments. Mr Carlson replied that the aim was not to increase the number of part-time or limited-term appointments but to offer some reassurances to those already in such positions. Mr Stuttard asked what was meant by the term "larger academic reorganizations". Mr Carlson replied that the term had not been closely defined; rather SFPC sought to support the idea that structural reorganization, rather than the dismissal of untenured faculty members, was a better way to effect budget savings.

Mr Sinclair-Faulkner said that he would find the principles in the SFPC document easier to consider if they were accompanied by some concrete examples or illustrations. Ms Laidlaw and Mr Bérard objected to the specific reference to "young", untenured faculty members and asked that this term be deleted from the principle. The mover and seconder agreed to this change.

Mr Betts said that he thought that the principle ought to distinguish between those tenure-track positions and those who were not and between those who had appointments of less than 50% and more than 50% full-time. It was moved (H. Dickson/M. Binkley)

that the Principle be amended to replace the words "young, untenured faculty members" with the words "untenured faculty members in full-time or 50%-or-greater tenure-track positions".

The amendment carried without dissent.

The question having been called, the amended motion carried.

It was moved (R. Carlson/H. Dickson)

that Senate adopt Principle 4 of the SFPC Report.

Mr Carlson indicated that SFPC did not object to sales of property in general but thought it imprudent, at a time when the University had disposed of nearly all its property outside the immediate area, to consider property sales simply to generate revenue for the operating budget.

Ms Sherwin said that she saw no need to favour property over the maintenance of academic programmes. Mr Atherton said that many of the endowments given to Dalhousie have terms and conditions that are fixed and difficult to change. Ms Bankier said that any choice between people and property should always be made in favour of people, adding that the Principle may conflict with the DFA Collective Agreement.

Mr J.E. Crowley and Ms Binkley said that the Principle seemed not to recognize that interest on the University's sizeable capital debt was a major operating expense. Mr D.M. Cameron replied that SFPC was not opposed to the sale of properties to reduce the capital debt, only to the sale of property in a one-off windfall that would be consumed in faculty salaries or other operating budget items. Ms Walker offered an anecdote in support of the idea of retaining those assets which would be most difficult to replace. Mr Betts said that adoption of Principle 4 might lead to consideration of a further Principle to keep the operating and capital budgets separate.

The question having been called, the motion carried by a vote of 24 in favour, 19 opposed.

It was moved (R. Carlson/D. Betts)

that Senate adopt Principle 5 of the SFPC Report.

Mr Carlson said that this Principle was developed in recognition of the facts that Dalhousie's costs for senior management are comparable to those at comparable Canadian universities but that a good deal of the administrative activity at Dalhousie takes place at the Faculty, school, or departmental level.

Mr Stuttard said that the principle seemed vaguely written and unclear. Mr B.P. Archibald replied that SFPC wished to urge a closer, more comprehensive look at administrative costs throughout the University. Ms Binkley explained her role as an Associate Dean in FASS, and Mr Pereira warned that pursuit of this Principle could lead to false economies. Mr D.M. Cameron replied that it was often possible to carry out administrative responsibilities more efficiently in streamlined administrative structures.

Ms Sherwin said that, despite the general arguments made by SFPC, it was important for the University to look at all levels of administration for savings and efficiencies. It was moved (S. Sherwin/T. Laidlaw)

that the words "and particularly at middle-management or comparable levels" be deleted.

The amendment carried.

The question having been called, the amended motion carried.

94:039

Motion from the College of Arts and Science on the NSCHE External Team Report on Teacher Education

Mr Kimmins, Provost of the College of Arts and Science, reported that the College had met to consider the report to the Nova Scotia Council on Higher Education (NSCHE) of the External Team on Teacher Education ("Shapiro Report"). He expressed his concern and that of the College about the poor quality of the report and the confused and confusing management of the review process by the NSCHE. He indicated his surprise that Senate had not yet taken up the Shapiro Report, in view of its recommendations, on the basis of little or no evidence or argument, to close a senior academic unit at Dalhousie. The University, Mr Kimmins noted, had submitted a set of "Preliminary Comments" on the Shapiro Report to the NSCHE and that this document represented a measured and reasoned response to the Report. On behalf of the College of Arts and Science, it was moved (W. Kimmins/M. Binkley)

that the Senate of Dalhousie University endorse the document entitled "Preliminary Comments on the Report of the External Review Team on Education to the Nova Scotia Council on Higher Education, Dalhousie University,

February 7, 1994"; and

that a similar endorsement be recommended to the Board of Governors of Dalhousie University.

Mr Kimmins added that the "Preliminary Comments" document outlined three criteria that Dalhousie has consistently argued must be met by any exercise in rationalization and that the Shapiro Report and recommendations met none of them.

Mr Stuttard asked that Senate also endorse the response of the President to the Minister of Education and the Chair of the NSCHE (appended), declining to make an institutional response to the Council on the Shapiro Report. It was moved (C. Stuttard/J. Bankier)

**that the motion be amended to add, as a second paragraph:
"and that the Senate of Dalhousie University endorse the letter of 11 March 1994 from President Howard C. Clark to the Honourable John MacEachern and Dr Janet Halliwell declining to submit an institutional response to the Report of the Review Team for Education;"**

The amendment carried. The question having been called, the amended motion carried without dissent.

94:040

Faculty Complement Reduction

Mr Bérard reported that the Senate Academic Planning Committee had passed the following motion related to faculty complement reduction at its meeting of 21 February 1994 (**SAPC 94:019**):

that SAPC accept the President's proposal for faculty complement reduction for the 1994-95 budget year and ask, in view of the fact that Senate has not accepted the recommendations of the Budget Advisory Committee for 1995-97, that the President consult again with SAPC on complement reduction proposals for 1995-97.

94:041

Faculty Budgets

Mr Clark presented a report on the response of the senior administration to budget proposals by the Faculties and other academic and administrative units in response to recommendations made by the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC). He expressed his appreciation to all those who had worked on the proposals. He noted that all administrative units would be able to meet their budget targets, with the exception of the Dalhousie Art Gallery, whose proposal for eventual fiscal self-sufficiency had been accepted.

Mr Clark reported that the budget proposals of six of the nine senior academic units had been accepted. He noted that the proposals of two units, the Faculty of Management and the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, called for additional students fees and indicated that he wished to consult with the Board of Governors about such increased fees before deciding on the approval of those proposals. Consideration of the budget proposal of the School of Education was being delayed until such time as the future of teacher education and other Education programmes in the Province is clarified.

Mr Poel asked if the President was planning to recommend the acceptance of the proposals of FASS and Management to the Board. Mr Clark replied that he was only seeking the advice of the Board on the proposals. Ms Binkley asked why the President thought it necessary to consult the Board on this matter. Mr Clark replied that the Board has been very sensitive to the question of increased tuitions and fees and that it would be prudent to consult with the Board before approving additional fees for students. Ms Sutherland asked if students in the programmes affected by the proposed fee increases had been consulted. Mr Clark said that such consultation had taken place.

Ms Binkley added that some of the ideas for the proposed fee increases had originated in discussions with student groups. Ms McIntyre said that the University had imposed higher tuitions and fees on students in the Faculty of Health Professions but that the Faculty would not receive any part of the income from those increased fees.

94:042

Report of the President

Mr Clark presented his report (appended). He reported that the Nova Scotia Council on Higher Education has informed him that its consultants' reports on Engineering and Computing Science are to be released by 9 April.

Mr Clark reported that fund-raising from parents of Dalhousie students had set a new record and that pledges to the Annual Fund had exceeded the Fund's \$1.5 million target. He encouraged all members of Senate to participate in the Annual Fund. Mr Clark also recognized the accomplishments of several faculty members, including Messrs P. Neumann and D. Guernsey of the Faculty of Medicine, who recently received a Faculty Development Grant from the Medical Research Council of Canada, and Ms J. Guernsey, also of the Faculty of Medicine, who has received government funding for a study of cancer rates in Sydney, Nova Scotia.

Ms Sutherland asked if the University had set aside money in its budget to pay any costs arising from an expected agreement on copyright. Mr Mason said that the new budget was not yet completed but that there has been no plan to ear-mark money in the budget for copyright.

Ms Sutherland asked what impact, if any, on Annual Fund donations to the schools and departments recommended by the President for closure in September 1993, could be discerned. Mr Clark said that it would not be possible to assess changes in Annual Fund giving to specific units until the end of March. Mr Pross asked that the President also try to identify the amount of Annual Fund pledges to threatened programmes that had been made dependent upon the survival of those programmes.

94:043

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m. upon motion (G. Klassen/R. Carlson).

Secretary

Chair

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY

MINUTES

OF

SENATE MEETING

Senate met in regular session on Monday, 28 March 1994 at 4:00 p.m. in University Hall, Macdonald Building.

Present with Mr. Dunn in the chair were:

Archer, Arklie, Atherton, Bankier, Bérard, Binkley, Birdsall, J. Black, Brett, D.M. Cameron, Campbell, Carlson, Clarke, Cross, J.E. Crowley, Cummings, Doolittle, Dykstra, Eberhardt, Fingard, L. Fraser, E.A. Frick, S. Frick, Gilroy, Hare, Hobson, Holloway, Kaspar, Kozey, Kussmaul, Labrie, Lewis, R.M. Martin, Mason, McCabe, McIntyre, Melanson, Moriarty, O'Shea, Pereira, Poel, Pross, Ravindra, Richards, Sandhu, Schwenger, Sherwin, A.M. Simpson, Sinclair-Faulkner, K. Smith, Stolzman, M. Stone, Sutow, Wainwright, Wortman.

Invitees: B. Crocker, J. Eastman, M. MacDonald, W. Straitton.

Regrets: Clovis, Conrod, M. Crowley, Curri, Fitzgerald, J. Gray, Haley, D.W. Jones, J.V. Jones, Kimmins, Lane, D. MacLean, MacLeod, Maxner, Murray, Rappell, Ritchie, Roald, Sketris, Sorge, M.H. Tan, C.N. Williams, Waterson.

94:044

Nominations to Senate Committees

On behalf of the Committee on Committees, Mr McCabe tabled the following nomination for election to a Senate committee.

Senate Academic Planning Committee

C. Kozey (Health Professions)

After the requisite calls for further nominations, Mr Dunn declared the nominee elected.

94:045

Capital Campaign Update

Ms Hobson introduced Mr W. Straitton, director of the upcoming capital campaign. She emphasized the importance of the campaign to the University's future financial well-being.

Mr Straitton reviewed the history of the planning process to date and outlined the major campaign objectives: 1) raising the level of private giving, 2) enhancing the University's financial health, 3) impressing on the public the importance of Dalhousie to the community, 4) mobilizing the Dalhousie community in support of the campaign, and 5) enabling Dalhousie to continue as a major national university. He explained the campaign goals of academic excellence, student excellence, campus renewal, and financial health, including debt reduction. He said that the campaign was aiming for a public launch in Spring 1995 and asked for the support of the faculty, both as donors and as contact points for prospective donors.

94:046

Senate Financial Planning Committee Response to the Discussion Paper of the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) - Continuation from SM 94:038

Mr Carlson noted that the BAC Discussion Paper put forward many options for saving money and that the SFPC was trying to develop principles to guide Senate's response to them. He called on members of Senate to submit their own suggestions about how Senate might respond to the Discussion Paper.

It was moved (R. Carlson/P. Pross)

that Senate adopt Principle 6 of the SFPC Report.

Mr Carlson explained that the aim of this principle was to ensure that the proportion of available resources devoted to teaching be increased and that greater emphasis be placed on teaching.

The question having been called, the motion carried.

It was moved (R. Carlson/D.M. Cameron)

that Senate adopt Principle 7 of the SFPC Report.

Ms Bankier said that many of the groups that would be most adversely affected by reductions in compensation were not represented at Senate. She noted that comparative salary data for faculty at various universities and some analysis of that data would be available in the next number of DEA Dialogue. She suggested that SFPC may have failed to take into account all aspects of the impact of compensation reductions, such as salary comparability, provincial clawbacks, increased workloads, pension reductions, etc. Mr D.M. Cameron said that the principle only sought to affirm that compensation reduction might be a part of a solution to the current financial difficulties faced by the University.

Mr Campbell and Mr Brett asked if "voluntary arrangements" refer to settlements negotiated by individuals, rather than through the Collective Agreement. Mr Carlson said that SFPC was

considering the possibility of faculty members or others making a contribution to the University, on an individual basis. Ms Sherwin said that the wording of the principle was ambiguous and could be divisive.

Ms Sherwin noted that the word "may" made the first sentence a tautology. Mr Carlson acknowledged this interpretation and asked if anyone wished to propose an amendment. Mr Pross said he supported the current wording as a way to urge all parties to consider special factors in any discussion of compensation reductions, e.g., by looking at how they might assist faculty members who wish to make contributions to the University. Ms Stone asked that some consideration be given to issues of equity in the principle. Mr Carlson said that the principle as written did take account of the "vulnerability of specific groups". Ms Stone moved the following amendment, which was accepted as a friendly amendment by the mover and seconder:

that the words "for reductions in salary" be added
to the end of the last sentence in Principle 7.

The question having been called, the vote was recorded as 23 in favour, 23 opposed, with 5 abstentions. The Chair declined to vote to break the tie. Mr Atherton asked if the Chair was not required to vote to break a tie. Mr Bérard said that the Chair was not required to break a tie, but that a motion did not pass on a tied vote. Mr Dunn said that the motion would be reported as a tied vote.

It was moved (R. Carlson/L. Fraser)

that Senate adopt Principle 8 of the SFPC Report.

Mr Pross explained that this principle was aimed at making the Nova Scotia Government more aware of the current and potential contributions of the University to cultural and economic life of the Province and urging the senior administration to be more pro-active in responding to misunderstandings of the role of Dalhousie and criticisms of the University by members of the public. Mr Fraser added that the principle was also part of a longer-term strategy to improve the relationship between the University and the wider community.

The question having been called, the motion carried.

It was moved (R. Carlson/D.M. Cameron)

that Senate adopt Principle 9 of the SFPC Report.

Mr Carlson noted that some programmes cost the University up to nine times as much as other programmes, but current differential fees for these programmes are only about one and a half times as high. This principle, he said, would allow consideration of differential fees for various programmes in light of programme costs, market analysis, and future employment benefits for graduates. Mr Kaspar asked if differential fees would restrict accessibility to programmes. Mr Carlson said that maintaining a strong financial aid programme should help to ensure reasonable accessibility.

Ms McIntyre said that the principle could impact negatively on the Schools in her Faculty and could create barriers to education. She said that it would be unfair for Dalhousie to charge market rates for its programmes, especially in view of the cutbacks that its programmes have had to bear. It was moved (L. McIntyre/J. McCabe)

that the words "and urge that the principle be extended where market analysis, programme costs, and future employment benefits warrant" be deleted.

Ms Wortman said that applications to the Faculty of Law were down this year and wondered if higher differential fees for Law had a negative impact on accessibility and quality of applicants. Ms Hobson said that her understanding was that applications to law schools were down across the country. Ms O'Shea said that incidental costs for students in professional programmes were often higher than those in other programmes. Mr Carlson noted that the amendment would discourage consideration of such factors. Ms Binkley said that she feared that the amendment would undermine the efforts of FASS to secure a "College fee". Mr D.M. Cameron said that the amendment would make the principle effectively meaningless. Mr Kaspar said that he opposed the amendment, because he believed that market analysis was a vital factor in considering differential fees.

The question having been called, the amendment was defeated.

The question having been called, the motion carried on a voice vote.

94:047

Proposed Non-Thesis Option in the Master of Nursing Programme

On behalf of the Senate Academic Planning Committee, it was moved (R. Bérard/J. Cummings)

that Senate approve the non-thesis option in the Master of Nursing programme, based on the understanding that this programme change will not lead to additional costs for the University.

The question having been called, the motion carried.

94:048

For Information - Policy on Discriminatory Harassment

Mr Dunn reported that the Board of Governors had not approved the proposed Policy Statement on Discriminatory Harassment, passed on 14 February by Senate, and that Mr McKee, chair of the committee that produced the statement, had expressed his view that the mandate of that committee had been completed. Mr Dunn said that the matter would be on the agenda of the next meeting of Senate.

Ms Stone asked if the decision set a precedent in terms of the Board's rejection of a Senate resolution concerning the internal regulation of the University. She said that she was concerned that no official representatives of Senate articulated the arguments made at Senate in support of the policy. She said also that, at the Board meeting, President Clark did not make known his earlier support for the policy at Senate and did not vote in favour of the policy.

Mr Pereira said that both of the elected representatives of Senate who attended the Board meeting had checked earlier with the Chair of Senate on their roles and were reassured of their right to speak and vote their consciences.

Ms Stone asked if objections were raised at the Board meeting by the University Legal Counsel. Ms Hobson said that the University Legal Counsel did not raise objections to the policy at the Board meeting. She asked if members of the Board were told that the policy had the approval of several faculty members in the Faculty of Law. Ms Hobson said that no one made that specific point.

Ms Hobson said that the President spoke at the Board meeting of the need for some policy on discriminatory harassment, but that there was little support voiced by others on the Board for the document it was considering. Ms Bankier said that those who would be helped by the policy were not represented on the Board. Ms Hobson clarified the membership of the Board and said that the Board was well within its rights to reject the policy.

94:049

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m. upon motion (D. Poel/R. Carlson).

Secretary

Chair