

Item: Senate Minutes, January 1987  
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 January 1987. 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, 12 January 1987 at 4:00 P.M.

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

Angelopoulos, Belzer, Betts, Bissett-Johnson, Boyd, Bradfield, Braybrooke, Byham, Cameron D.M., Cameron T.S., Caty, Christie, Clark, Cohen A.D., Comeau, Cross, Dolan, Duff, Egan, Flint, Fournier, Gesner, Haley, Hare, Huber, James, Jones D.W., Kerans, Leffek, Lewis, MacDougall, MacMullin, Manning, McDonald, McNulty, Moger, Murray, Myers, O'Brien D.W.P., O'Shea, Osberg, Ozier, Pooley, Pross, Retallack, Reynolds, Rodger, Schroeder, Schwenger, Seth, Sharp, Sherwin, Sinclair, Stern, Stewart M., Storey, Tonks, Varma, Walker, Waterson, Wien, Wiens, Young, Yung.

Andrews, Cromwell, Gratwick, Jones J.V., Konok, MacRae, Maloney, Precious, Ritchie, Wassersug, Welch, Williams, Wood.

87:001.

Minutes of Meeting of 24 November 1986

Corrections noted: 1) the spelling of **principal** from line 4 of paragraph 2 of minute 86:154; 2) the word "carried" should be shown following the first motion on page 8; 3) the word "carried" should be shown after the amended motion in minute 86:157.

Mr. Rodger reminded Senate that he had questioned the figure reported in minute 86:157 as the amount of support that would be forthcoming from the International Centre for Ocean Development. Vice-President Sinclair then agreed to check the figures before a submission will be made to MPHEC.

Motion (Mangalam/Varma):

**that with the above noted corrections, the minutes of the meeting of Senate held on 24 November 1986 be approved.**

Carried.

87:002.

Minutes of Meeting of 8 December 1986

The Chair reported that Mr. Andrews has supplied in writing a comment for insertion in minute 86:19, specifically, **"In response to a comment by Mr. Andrews, suggesting that the change indicated a diminishing interest in books on the part of librarians, ,,,n.** Mr. Rodger pointed out that in minute 86:170, the spelling of the word "whits" needed to be corrected.

Motion (Rodger/S. Cameron):

**that with the above noted changes, the minutes of 8 December 1986 be approved.**

Carried.

87:003-

Question Period

Classroom Utilization

Vice-President Sinclair, in keeping with minute 86:152, supplied a preliminary report on classroom utilization on the Carleton Campus. He stated that a number of meetings had been held and it was planned to do the scheduling of space in the Faculties of Medicine, Dentistry and Health Professions on the central computer. It is believed that it will be possible to accommodate the Faculty of Health Professions partly by identifying some space in the Tupper Building that is used by classes that can be moved to the Studley Campus. He said that there has been some delay in getting the computer simulation developed however, he expects the committee will meet again within one week.

Deaths

Mr. Rodger noted the recent deaths of Professors Peter Fraser and Arthur Foote and asked if condolences had been sent. The President replied that they had been sent on behalf of the University and Board of Governors. Mr. Jones indicated that they will be sent on behalf of Senate.

Mr. T. S. Cameron referred to Senate minute 86:163 and asked if any additional academic members had been appointed to the Microcomputer Subcommittee. Mr. Christie identified Mr. David Shires from the Faculty of Medicine and Mr. A.C. Peacock from the School of Business Administration as having been added.

### University Role in Society

Mr. Mangalam asked if anyone had seen a recent article regarding lack of parking space for an expensive Toronto condominium. He suggested it might provide some basis for consideration of our role in society. He then inquired about his proposal about addressing significant issues by the University. He acknowledged that he had been informed verbally that it had been considered by the Committee on Academic Administration. It was agreed that since the question had been referred to the Committee on Academic Administration by Senate, a report should be supplied.

### Honorary Degrees

Mr. Varma asked if it was possible for a member to view the nominating letters and the curricula vitae of nominees. Mr. Jones replied that they are available to senators in the Senate Office after the announcement of the names as made in Senate.

### Student Information System

Mr. Bradfield recalled that approximately a year ago, the department chairs had indicated that they saw little value in having access to the Registrar's records through the computer system. He noted that this information is now available and asked for an estimate of what that programming had cost. The Chair suggested that this information be reported in February.

### Differential Grants

Mr. J. McMullin noted that Senate, in considering the report on foreign students, had gone on record as being opposed to differential grants. He asked what strategy is planned for lobbying for the elimination of differential grants. The President replied that the point has been made in various documents and that it will continue to be made.

87:004-

### Report of the President

The President recognized the death of two faculty members, Professors Arthur Foote and Peter Fraser.

A printed report by the President had been distributed at the meeting. The President read section 1 which dealt with the preparation of the 1987/88 Budget. He stated that it will be a difficult budget year and a full report will be given to Senate on 26 January 1987.

He read the second section on the Campaign for Dalhousie and the Annual Fund and stated that the Annual Fund had exceeded its goal. He noted the "magnificent gift of \$2 million from the Sir James Dunn Foundation for the restoration of the Sir James Dunn Law Library", and stated that a more detailed report on the Fund will be forthcoming.

He paraphrased the third section of his report on Scholarships and Recruitment noting the interest in the subject and reporting that Mr. Ron Ingersolls has been engaged as a consultant who will visit the campus for two days in late January.

The fourth section of his report covered the relocation of the Canadian Book Information Centre in response to a motion contained in minute 86:171. He stressed that the report is essentially a reconstruction from the files. He said that he believes it to be complete, at least it is as complete as he can make it. He offered to answer any questions, but none were raised.

He read the fifth section of his report, which advised Senate of the decision to buy a new mainframe computer, namely, a VAX 8800. He recalled that at the meeting of 8 December 1986, Mr. Rodger had raised several questions to be answered following the making of the decision on the purchase of a new mainframe computer. He reported that he has a written response for Mr. Rodger.

Ms. Ozier stated that she does not know Mr. Ingersolls and asked who he is, for what purpose has he been engaged, by what mechanisms will proposals be accepted or rejected, and to whom will he make recommendations. The President reported that Mr. Ingersolls will be here for two days and will audit procedures. Mr. Sinclair stated that the dates will be January 29 and 30, during which time he will meet with a wide range of people. The manner in which recommendations are implemented will depend on the nature of the change proposed. If a policy change is involved, then it will be considered by faculty and Senate. He expects that the changes will be more administrative than academic. Mr. Ingersolls will be expected to gain a quick impression of the situation. He said that it was thought that such a quick look by someone from outside the University will be helpful. He stated that the revision of admission standards will not be the objective of the review. Mr. Huber then spoke in favour of recognizing the intellectual achievement of students. Several senators commented on the manner in which their faculties provide this recognition. Mr. Flint spoke for attracting students on a national basis.

Mr. Bradfield asked if interest on the capital debt is charged against the operation fund. Mr. Mason stated that interest on the operating accounts is charged to the operating account, but that interest on the capital fund is only charged to that fund during the construction phase. He stated that he did not believe it was possible to charge the interest on unfunded capital to the capital account. Mr. Jones suggested that there would be an opportunity for full discussion of budget matters at the meeting of Senate later this month.

Mr. Huber noted that a decision had been made on the purchase of a new mainframe computer. He expressed the concern which had been identified by the Financial Planning Committee of Senate with respect to operating costs and the possible loss of future revenues. He asked what provision has been made to continue to receive revenue from outside use of the computer. Mr. Peter Jones replied that there is approximately \$300,000 of outside income annually and that in addition to this there is income from research applications. He

acknowledged that it will be delicate to maintain the customers, but that there will be a significant overlap period following which they hope to be in a better position to offer services. He noted particularly that the new computer will be compatible with that of other universities.

Mr. Mangalam asked if there will be a picture of Mr. MacKay hung to continue the tradition of hanging pictures of the Presidents in the Board and Senate Room. The President replied that it is the responsibility of the Board of Governors and it is now under discussion.

87:005-

Honorary Degrees -- Tabling of Names [IN CAMERA]

Mr. Jones reviewed the policies of Senate regarding In Camera sessions and asked non-members of Senate to leave for this item.

The President, as Chair of the Honorary Degrees Committee, reported to Senate that during deliberation members of the Honorary Degrees Committee had been very conscious of the recent discussions in Senate. The President then read the names of the candidates and brief biographical sketches of the nominees.

Motion (Young/Bradfield):

**that an Honorary Degree be again offered to one individual who had been previously approved by Senate, but who was unable to accept the degree.**

Carried.

87:006.

Nominations from Committee on Committees

Mr. R. Boyd informed Senate that the Committee on Committees had appointed Mr. I.A. Meinertzhagen to serve the period January 1 to June 30, 1987 on the Senate Library Committee. Mr. Boyd, on behalf of the Committee on Committees, nominated Mr. G. Rowden to serve on the Senate Library Committee until 1989. The Chair of Senate, receiving no further nominations, declared Mr. Rowden elected.

Mr. Boyd, on behalf of the Committee on Committees, nominated Mr. D.B. Clarke and Mr. L.S. Kind to serve as Senate representatives on the Selection Committee for the Alumni Award for Excellence in Teaching. The Chair of Senate receiving no further nominations, declared Messrs. Clarke and Kind elected.

Mr. Boyd, on behalf of the Committee on Committees, recommended that Mr. D.V. Chaytor be appointed by Senate to continue as Secretary of Senate until June 30, 1987 at which time Ms. M. Stewart will be able to resume her duties as Secretary and to complete her term of office

until June 30, 1989.

Motion (Boyd/James):

**that Mr. D.V. Chaytor be appointed Secretary of Senate until June 30, 1987.**

Carried.

Mr. Jones read a letter from Mr. Grossert, former Chair of the Senate Library Committee, explaining how Ms. M. Binkley had replaced him in that position.

Mr. Pross commented on the composition of the Senate Library Committee and noted that at least one faculty will not be represented. Discussion of the general responsibility of Committee members as opposed to a representational basis for action then ensued.

Motion (Pross/Bradfield):

**that the Committee on Committees examine the composition of membership of Senate committees and report back to Senate.**

Carried.

Mr. A.J. Young then commented that he has surveyed the Committees in the past and noted that the Faculty of Arts and Science is highly represented, whereas the Faculty of Health Professions has a relatively low representation. He suggested that the representation should be fairly distributed. Mr. Jones noted that it is difficult for the Committee on Committees to obtain suggestions for nominations. Mr. Boyd agreed.

87:007

Jurisdiction of Senate Academic Appeals Committee

Mr. Tonks, Chair of the Subcommittee of the Committee on Academic Administration, which had prepared the report on the Jurisdiction of the Senate Academic Appeals Committee (SAAC), in his opening remarks recognized the contributions of Messrs. Christie and Jeffery. He then read a statement which outlined the essence of the report. He said that the report recommends that Senate delegate its jurisdiction over academic appeals to the SAAC whose decision will be final and binding. It requires that the SAAC have the authority to approve faculty and school academic appeal procedures and procedures to determine fitness of students to continue in a program. Where such approved procedures have been followed in all significant respects by a faculty, the procedures will not be considered to be unfair. Student appeals on academic and other non-disciplinary matters shall be dealt with at the department, school, faculty levels and such decisions shall be final and binding, subject to the student having the right to appeal on the limited grounds listed. He said the report also defines the

meaning of academic and other non-disciplinary matters. It requires that the SAAC not reinstate a student appealing a decision that he or she is not fit to continue in a program, but shall direct reconsideration by the faculty in a way that cures the defect that the SAAC has detected in procedures used for the way in which the decision was reached. It was agreed that the recommendation contained in the report would be moved as a whole, but debated and amended by paragraphs.

It was moved (Clarke/Stern)

**Be it resolved that the following rules be adopted:**

**1. The Senate Academic Appeals Committee is the highest level at which academic appeals can be heard within the University. Its decision are final and not appealable to Senate.**

**2. The Senate Academic Appeals Committee shall report to Senate from time to time.**

**3. The Senate Academic Appeals Committee may make rules respecting its own procedures, including the time within which appeals must be brought to it.**

**4. where the procedure followed in all significant respects by a Faculty in reaching a decision on an academic or other non-disciplinary matter, as defined in paragraph 7, has been explicitly approved by the Senate Academic Appeals Committee that procedure shall not be considered "unfair to the student" for the purposes of an appeal in accordance with paragraph 6.**

**5. Student appeals on academic and other nondisciplinary matters shall be dealt with at the Department/School/Faculty level in accordance with the process in the regulations of the Faculty of which the student is a member and such decisions at the Faculty level shall be final and binding, subject only to the limited right of any student to appeal in accordance with paragraph 6.**

**6.(a) Any student whose interests are adversely affected by a decision on an academic or other nondisciplinary matter has the right to appeal to the Senate Academic Appeals Committee in accordance with its rules on one or more of the following grounds:**

**(i) that University or Faculty regulations have been given a meaning that they could not reasonably bear,**

**(ii) that the decision was made on a perverse finding of fact,**

**(iii) that a discretionary decision (or decision unfettered by University or**

**Faculty regulations) was discriminatory or made on the basis of considerations unrelated to the issue,**

**(iv) that the procedure followed was unfair to the student.**

**(b) Any student whose interests are adversely affected by a failure to reach a decision described in paragraph 5 in fair time has the right to appeal on that basis to the Senate Academic Appeals Committee in accordance with its rules.**

**7. For the purposes of this resolution academic and other non-disciplinary matters" include matters relating to academic standards, course requirements, examinations and other evaluative procedures, grades, pass requirements, advancement requirements, fitness to continue in a program involving patients or the public, graduation requirements and other University or Faculty requirements or standards.**

**8. Where a Faculty has decided that a student is not fit to continue in a program because he or she is a danger to patients or the public, any decision by the SAAC allowing the student's appeal shall not reinstate the student but shall direct reconsideration by the Faculty in a way that cures the defect identified by the Senate Academic Appeals Committee in the decision under appeal.**

Mr. Braybrooke observed that the policy envisioned would charge the Senate Academic Appeals Committee with approving regulations in the faculties. He expressed concern that the SAAC is inevitably fallible. The discussion that followed indicated the desire of some people for students to ultimately have access to Senate.

Motion (Rodger):

that paragraph 1 be amended by deleting sentence 2.

Failed for want of a seconder.

Mr. Rodger stated the opinion that paragraph four shuts the door twice. Mr. Christie responded that it is important it be understood that paragraph four deals with procedural unfairness. It does not preclude a student from appealing on other grounds. Mr. Betts stated his preference for SAAC hearing appeals when it is found that the Faculty has followed procedures but if an injustice arises, Senate could be asked for leave to hear an appeal. Mr. Huber spoke for the development of case law, referring to his experience as Chair of the Academic Appeals Committee of the Faculty of Graduate Studies. Mr. Evans, the former Chair of the Senate Academic Appeals Committee, spoke for students having wide access to go beyond their faculties until abuse is shown. He observed that in four years, the SAAC has been asked to consider only 15 cases. Four of these had been resolved without a hearing and

four others were ongoing when he relinquished the chair. He stated that because the hearings are held by panels of three, members do not deal with very many cases and are therefore not comfortable with being the final arbiters. He expressed the view that there is educational value to publication of this information for Senate. He noted that the approving of faculty rules would be a new task. He stated that there has already been a long process of clarifying the rules which has led to a tremendous improvement. It became apparent that the discussion could not be completed at this meeting.

Motion (Rodger/Huber):

**that consideration of the report on the Jurisdiction of the Senate Academic Appeals Committee be deferred for later consideration.**

Carried.

It was agreed that copies of the report should be circulated again.

87:008.

Extraordinary Case of Alleged Violation of Academic Regulations - Report from Steering Committee

The Chair of Senate drew attention to a letter which had been circulated at the meeting. It had been written to Mr. J.P. Welch confirming the action of the Steering Committee to appoint a hearing panel to review a situation identified by Dean Zakariasen in a letter dated December 16th. The Dean had ascertained that a former student who graduated in the spring of 1986 appeared to have committed academic offenses which, if they had been known prior to the completion of the 1985/86 year would have meant that the student would not have completed the academic requirements for the D.D.S. degree. The Steering Committee referred to a previous case wherein Senate elected an ad hoc panel. The Steering Committee therefore selected a panel consisting of Mr. J.P. Welch, Chair, Mr. R.L. Evans, Ms. E.S. McFarlane and Mr. J. McMullin.

Motion (Rodger/Sinclair):

**that the panel selected by Steering Committee be approved.**

Carried.

Mr. Evans reported that the panel had held a preliminary meeting but has not met formally to consider the matter.

87:009.

Next Meeting

The Chair announced that Senate will meet again at 4:00 P.M. on Monday, 26 January 1987.

87:010.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:05 P.M.

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY

MINUTES

SENATE MEETING

Senate met in regular session on Monday, 26 January 1987 at 4:00 P.M. in Room 115 of the Weldon Law Building.

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

Angelopoulos, Atherton, Barkow, Beazley, Betts, Birdsall, Bonen, Bradfield, Braybrooke, Brett, Cameron D.M., Cameron T.S., Caty, Cohen A.D., Comeau, Cross, Dolan, Duff, Dunn, Dykstra, Easterbrook, George, Gesner, Gratwick, Gwyn, Haley, Holloway, Huber, James, Jones D.W., Klein, Kwak, Leffek, Lewis D., LoLordo, MacDougall, Maloney, Manning, Murray, Myers, O'Shea, Ozier, Pooley, Power, Pross, Retallack, Reynolds, Ritchie, Rodger, Ruf, Schroder, Sharp, Shaw, Sinclair, Stewart P.N., Storey, Stuttard, Sutherland, Tonks, vanFeggelen, Walker, Welch, Wien, Wood, Yung, Zakariasen, Christie (invitee), MacDonald M. (invitee), Traversy (invitee).

Regrets: Andrews, Forgay, Hersom, Jones J.V., Konok, MacKay R.C., McDonald D., Precious, Schwenger, Stern, Stewart M.,

**87:011.**

Presentation of the 1987/88 University Budget

The entire meeting was devoted to the presentation and consideration of the 1987/88 Budget Book Summary and related matters. It included a report from the President advising Senate that in the opinion of the Board, use of the procedures in Clause 26.07(a) of the Collective Agreement is required.

The following documents were distributed at the meeting:

- (1) Budget Book Summary 1987/88
- (2) Report of the Senate Financial Planning Committee on Preparations for the 1987/88 Budget dated 19 January 1987

(3) Report of the President dated January 26, 1987

(4) Management Report - Administrative Productivity Project dated January 20, 1987

#### Budget Book Summary 1987/88

Mr. Bryan Mason, Vice-President (Finance and Administration), spoke to the presentation of the Budget Book Summary. He said that while the summary consists of only five pages, the complete Budget Book is approximately 19 or 20 pages long. It has been circulated to all cost centre managers. In preparing it there was significant reliance on the advice of the Senior Advisory Council and the Financial Planning Committee of Senate. He reported that the 1986/87 budget was essentially balanced, although there may be a small deficit. He noted that some units are having severe problems.

Mr. Mason pointed out some significant provisions in the 1987/88 budget. He said that \$200,000 has been added to the budget for computing. Half of this will cover additional operating expenses for the new mainframe and the other half will be used for the development of administrative systems. He drew attention to paragraph 5 under the heading of Budget Requirements. This paragraph outlined the provision for reassignment of funds. He pointed out that \$160,000 of the \$260,000 assigned to the Development Fund had already been allocated last year or the year before, leaving only \$100,000 for this year. He informed Senate that the advisability of continuing this Fund had been debated extensively. The application of these funds to reduce expenditures or increase revenue is urged this year. He noted the availability of \$460,000 for selected increases in non-salary budgets. He commented on the effect of inflation and stated that 2% increase will be available to academic units automatically, but non-academic units will be subject to discretionary review. Allocations from the \$300,000, available for base adjustments to academic envelopes, will be made where a case can be made for historical inequities. He said that recognition of the severity of cuts required has led to a budgeted \$500,000 deficit. He said there will be a general cutback of 4.25% and a further 1% levy on academic units for redistribution. There will be no change in the carry over policies except for a structural change in the approach to clearing deficits. Exhibit 1 of the Summary showed the actual changes in dollar amounts and the percentage that these represent in the overall budget. Exhibit 2 outlined the schedule planned for the preparation of the budget and its presentation to the Financial and Budget Committee of the Board of Governors and the Financial Planning Committee of Senate. In concluding, he emphasized two significant unknowns; 1) the level of government funding; and, 2) the time of the announcement of the level of government funding.

#### Report of the Senate Financial Planning Committee on Preparations for the 1987/88 Budget

Mr. Wien, Chair of the Financial Planning Committee, spoke to the report of that Committee, which had been circulated. He identified some questions of concern to the Committee. 1) How can the University maintain an atmosphere of change and innovation during tight budgets? In response, he identified the Development Fund. 2) How can across-the-board

cuts be avoided? In response he identified the Redistribution Fund. 3) How can piecemeal changes in academic envelopes be avoided? He cited the example of funds for computing being assigned off the top. In response he said that a change from this practice is not possible this year because in the example of computing services, there has been a major purchase. 4) What can be done about cost overruns on budgets? In response he said that a decision has been made not to write off overruns.

Mr. Wien outlined some concerns to be addressed: 1) the gap between revenues from government and the cost of operating; 2) the disparity between the amount Dalhousie receives and the amount that is assigned across the province as a whole; 3) lower than anticipated enrolment, which has resulted in a failure to realize \$300,000 of tuition income. He noted that stable enrolment requires more active recruiting; 4) the university is in danger of violating the operation deficit rule of the Maritime Provinces Higher Education Commission; 5) some faculties and units have serious budget overruns. It is not clear how they will be able to reduce their base budgets.

#### Report of the President

The President began his remarks by recognizing that Senate has now received information on the budget situation for 1987/88 and stating "it is clear that the size of the budget reductions that are required are substantial and that they cannot be achieved, nor should they be by the same methods that have been used in recent years". He went on to say "It is for this reason that I am advising Senate and the DFA that, in the opinion of the Board, the financial and academic well being of the University require utilization of the procedures in Clause 26.07(a) of the Collective Agreement. He stressed "that Clauses 26.02 to 26.07(a) deal with the steps that are to be taken under the Collective Agreement before any consideration is given to suggesting that a situation of financial constraint exists or is apprehended". He said that the report being presented is the one called for in Clause 26.06. He said that the report "provides routine budgetary information as it relates to the 1987/88 budget. It describes the effect of routine budgetary measures to be taken in accord with Clauses 26.02 and that had been taken in relation to 26.02(a) and 26.02(b) provides information about steps being taken under Clause 26.04 and advises Senate and the DFA of the apparent need to utilize Clause 26.07(a), that is, a freeze on appointments to new positions and/or the non-replacement of some members who leave the employment of the university".

The President likened Dalhousie's situation to that of other Canadian universities faced with underfunding and rising costs.

He then reviewed his report in some detail, emphasizing certain portions. Under the heading 1987/88 Budget, he said that item ii., an ability to adjust envelope bases where inequities are demonstrated is essential and item iii., a reasonable provision for salary increases to salary competitiveness is a must and that iv., an ability to achieve non-uniform budget changes certainly must be available. He referred to the basic cause outlined in his next paragraph,

noting particularly that while Nova Scotia distributed an average increase of 2.1% in unrestricted operating assistance to universities for 1986/87, Dalhousie's increase was 0.77%. He then referred to the section outlining steps to balance the 1986/87 budget which appeared under the heading of Improvements to Dalhousie's Financial Position. He said that number (ii), the cessation of overmatching of pension contributions would be temporary for two years only. He noted that (iii), the efforts to secure additional funds for Medicine, were continuing.

Under the heading "The 1986/87 Budget", he noted that faculties had balanced their budgets by squeezing the non-salary component. He noted a 3% increase in faculty positions since 1982, but a substantial loss in real income. He contrasted this with a 5.5 reduction in non-academic staff positions. He said that some units will enter the 1987/88 year in deficit. Under the heading "Managing the 1987/88 Budget", he referred to substantial efforts to increase revenue and reduce expenditures. Reading from his report, he said "Despite all these initiatives, it is not possible to identify one faculty which can balance its 1987/88 budget, with a net 4.24% base reduction, without a 'freeze on appointments to new positions and/or non-replacement of some members who leave the employment of the University'." He reminded Senate that he was presenting this report because it seemed necessary to utilize the procedures of Clause 26.97(a). He then read the final paragraph of his report in which he announced the composition of an advisory committee to the President, namely, the Vice-President (Academic and Research), the Vice-President (Finance and Administration), the Chair and the Vice-Chair of Senate. This committee will also advise him of specific replacements if the freeze is implemented.

The President then went on to make some general comments. He acknowledged a widespread belief in a reservoir of funds, but vehemently denied the existence of any unused funds. He recognized that the type of budget actions proposed would raise concerns about the quality of academic programs being reduced. He rejected this view and presented arguments that other factors can be more important than numbers of faculty in determining the quality of programs. He emphasized the importance of curriculum design. He said that the continuing rapid expansion of knowledge and scholarship requires a search for new methods of offering high quality programs.

The President, stating an awareness of the sensitivities within the university community about expenditures related to the President's house, reviewed the cost of maintenance, repairs and furnishings. He also reported an intention to cut back in the President's Office, eliminating at least one position and reorganizing the staff.

In closing, he expressed a willingness to engage in discussions with the Dalhousie Faculty Association and to provide more information, but expressed the hope that any requests will not be of an unreasonable nature because he does not want the work of the University to halt during the period required for Senate and the DFA to prepare a response to his report.

#### Discussion

The Chair of Senate asked that members direct their discussion firstly to the process to be employed in responding to the President's report.

Motion (Wien/Huber):

**that the Financial and Academic Planning Committees of Senate collaborate to prepare a commentary on the report of the Board prepared pursuant to Clause 26.06 of the collective agreement. The commentary should be available for discussion at a special meeting of Senate to be held on Monday, March 2, 1987.**

Carried.

Before the above motion was carried, arguments were made for earlier consideration and explanations were presented of why a longer period of time would be required. The Chair recognized that there were some non-senators and reminded the meeting that senators only were eligible to vote. The following amendment was put before the vote on the main motion.

Amendment (Bradfield/Cromwell):

**that the motion be amended to provide for the special meeting to be held on February 23, with a continuation on March 2, if necessary.**

Defeated.

The Chair opened the meeting to general discussion giving preference for participation to members of Senate.

Ms. Ozier asked for the President to provide a list of any new positions that have been added during his term and any that are added during the 30 day response period. The President clarified that the request related to positions that have been staffed or are in the process of being staffed. He agreed to supply the list if he can get the information. The Vice-President (Academic and Research) added the proviso that it will be done if Ms. Ozier can supply a definition of a new faculty position. Mr. Huber referred to Exhibit I of the budget book summary noting the provision for base adjustments. He asked if any of these will be made retroactively so as to avoid the carrying forward of deficits. The President referred to discussions of the Financial Planning Committee. He said that a decision had been made not to define in his office "Criteria for Past Inequities". Therefore, the possibility remains open for any faculty to make a case. Mr. Barkow asked for information on faculty/student ratios and how Dalhousie relates to other universities. He sought this information broken down by faculties. The President said that some information can be provided. He said the information made available by CUDEC (Canadian Universities Data Exchange Consortium) and given to

the Academic Planning Committee was reasonably comparable. This can be provided within the required limits for the preservation of confidentiality. Mr. Pross suggested that the elimination of central funding for early retirement will discourage persons from doing so. He also stated that whereas the envelope management system applies to faculties, there are no incentives for units within the faculties to save. He also commented on the over-extension of the library circulation system. In responding, Mr. Mason suggested the envelope system works best in larger units and therefore allows flexibility at the Deans level. Mr. Birdsall commented that the present library circulation system is seven years old and in terms of automated devices, this represents extended use.

Mr. Bradfield made several points. He said that the arrangement to limit student fees in exchange for contributions to the Capital Fund worsens the situation in the operating budget. He also said that the Capital Fund drive cost \$400,000 in its early years and this was charged to the operating fund. He expressed the view that there was a reluctance to push government. He called for the introduction of differential fees and suggested raising the fees in professional schools by \$1,000 annually. He said this would yield \$1.5 million. Mr. Mason responded that an increase in fees would be shortsighted in view of concerns about attracting students. He said that the \$750,000 contribution from students to the Capital Campaign is distributed over six years and does not represent a great deal in terms of the operating budget in any one year. He referred to a letter he had supplied to the Secretary of Senate confirming that MPHEC requires interest expense related to capital debt to be charged to the operating budget. He said the cost of the Development Fund Office is also charged to the operating fund, but charges specifically related to the campaign are charged against the campaign. Mr. Welch suggested that in the present financial situation, there should not be a concern with history, but rather with present problems. He expressed concern about the lack of criteria for deciding base adjustments. The President responded that in a sense, by having no criteria, he is asking the Deans if they wish to submit a proposal. He is sure that when the distribution is taking place there will be some criteria. Mr. Wien reported that the Financial Planning Committee has set up a sub-committee to focus on present inequities.

Mr. Betts referred to the data on budgeted academic positions in the report of the President. He said that the Faculty of Arts and Science has had a net 1099 of 7.5 faculty positions that were paid by university funds. He stated that while faculty had been added to Engineering and Computer Science, the other parts of the Faculty have had a net loss of 16 positions. During the same period he reported a 15% increase in the number of students registered with a 34% increase in undergraduate students. Mr. A.J. Young asked for how long our units are going to be able to carry deficits. The President responded that annual budgets have to be set in a longer term perspective. He said that it is not just a question of balancing the budget for the current year, but the budget should be used as a management tool. Mr. Rodger called on the President to support the other AAU Presidents in arguing for the AAU submission to MPHEC. He also challenged some expenditures on computing.

At 6:00 P.M. the Chair received the agreement of Senate to continue meeting for an

additional 15 minutes.

Mr. Storey asked if it is possible to draw on both the redistribution fund and the fund for basic adjustments. Mr. Jones responded that in the past, redistribution funds were added in the base of budgets on the basis of arguments calling for correction of past anomalies. He did not expect this to continue. Earlier he had said that the redistribution fund was designed to support the planning process.

Mr. Dolan spoke against the suggestion of Mr. Bradfield to increase the fees of professional students by \$1000. Mr. Bradfield responded that he specifically had in mind MBA, Dentistry, Law and Medicine and that there are two to three times as many applicants for these programs than can be accommodated. He said that a study some years ago pointed to a significant difference in the cost of educating a student in the Faculty of Arts and Science as compared to a student in Medicine. He questioned the acceptability of further horizontal budget cuts and raised the question of whether or not the time had come for vertical cuts. Ms. Ozier expressed a willingness to accept most of the President's statements but challenged the existence of reserve funds. She said there had been errors in capital spending and cited the Ritchie study to have been a million dollar error. She said that while not calling for an inquiry or legal opinion regarding the Ritchie project, she would ask that before any academic staff are laid off, there be an inquiry in the interest of avoiding making this kind of mistake again. The President responded that no thought is being given to laying off tenured faculty. The President said that the Ritchie project cost approximately \$1 million and the savings will exceed \$1 million per year. He said that he would not agree to an inquiry because of the transition in the administration and because he does not think it would be productive. He said he does not want to comment on the Ritchie project. It was in progress when he arrived and, given the commitment to pay for it, there probably would have been no savings had it not been completed.

In response to a comment by Mr. Welch, it was said that the \$800,000 expected from the government for the Medical School should be available upon the presentation of a plan acceptable to MPHEC.

87:012.

### Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:17 P.M.