

Item: Senate Minutes, January 1997

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 January 1997. 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
APPROVED MINUTES
OF
SENATE MEETING

SENATE met in regular session on Monday, 13 January 1997 at 4:00 p.m. in the University Hall, Macdonald Building.

Present with Mr. Colin Stuttard in the chair, were the following:

Adams, Andrews, Apostle, Archibald, Birdsall, Bleasdale (Secretary), Bradfield, Brett, Camfield, Carroll, Cherry, Clark, Dickson, Doolittle, Farmer, Hobson, Hooper, Kay-Raining Bird, Kiang, Kimmins, Klein, Lee, Lydon, MacDonald, MacInnis, MacKay, Maloney, McIntyre, Moore, Morehouse, Patriquin, Pereira, Rosson, Russell, Scassa, Sutherland, Taylor, Traves, White, Wrixon.

Regrets: Cameron, Fraser, Lovely, Morrissey, Oore, Ricketts, Siddiq, Starnes, Tomblin Murphy.

97:001.

Call to Order

Mr. Stuttard called the meeting to order and welcomed Ms. Elizabeth Kay-Raining Bird, the new Vice-Chair of Senate replacing Ms. Joan Conrod until June 30, 1997.

97:002.

Adoption of the Agenda

The agenda was adopted as circulated.

97:003.

Welcome of New Members

Mr. Stuttard welcomed two new Senators, Mr. Ray Carroll and Mr. Don Cherry, recently elected in a by-election as sabbatical-leave replacements in the Faculty of Management.

97:004.

Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting of December 9, 1996 were approved as circulated.

97:005.

Nominations from the Senate Nominating Committee

On behalf of the Senate Nominating Committee, Ms. Bleasdale moved:

That Senate approve the nominations of Ms. Carol Camfield (Medicine), Jan. '97-June '98, to the Senate Steering Committee, and of Mr. Lloyd Fraser (Henson), Jan. '97 - June '98, to the Senate Library Committee.

After the requisite calls for further nominations, Ms. Carol Camfield and Mr. Lloyd Fraser were declared elected.

97:006.

Dal/TUNS Amalgamation

Mr. Traves reported that the appropriate individuals and Committees were putting plans in place for the amalgamation. He thought we had reached the point at which we might remove the Dal/TUNS merger as a standing agenda item. Mr. Stuttard reported that the joint Steering

Committees of Dalhousie and TUNS were meeting again this Wednesday, January 15th. The Dalhousie Steering Committee was awaiting a response from the Chair of the TUNS Steering Committee to a letter sent before Christmas which had suggested modifications to the draft

terms of reference for the Academic Council of the new College of the amalgamated University. In the near future the Steering Committee would bring forward to Senate a motion for amending the membership of Senate, based on the recalculation of the number of seats in the different Faculties at Dalhousie and TUNS. This recalculation would be based on the figures for number of students and faculty in each Faculty as of December 1, 1996.

Senators agreed to move to item #7 of the Agenda, the Report of the President, while we awaited the arrival of Mr. Gil Winham, the Chair of the Budget Advisory Committee, who would speak to item #6.

97:007.

Report of the President

Mr. Traves asked members to consider the planning of a series of events and festivities in the up-coming year to celebrate the amalgamation with TUNS on April 1, 1997.

These events would fulfil two important functions. They would be an integral part of our public relations campaign and an important means of representing ourselves to the larger community. They would also work towards building a sense of common identity within the new University, as we brought together two different Universities and two different cultures. He looked forward to numerous public protestations of delight in welcoming our new colleagues and an enlarged student body. A document outlining a general public relations strategy was being drafted and would be

brought forward. In the meantime the President asked members to begin to consider how their Faculties could contribute to this on-going celebration and community building process.

Mr. Traves also reported substantial participation in the early retirement programme, as indicated in his circulated report. This represented an opening in terms of faculty renewal and budgetary strategies. Though he understood the pressures these retirements would place on the affected units, he encouraged members to give attention to the needs of the future as well as the present in responding to these pressures, and cautioned against the inclination to focus on filling in the holes created, without thinking about priorities over the next ten years. The tendency to replicate the past could be deadening.

Mr. Andrews referred to his suggestion at an earlier meeting that Dalhousie celebrate the twenty-fifth anniversary of the building of the Dalhousie Arts Centre, and wondered if the President could report any progress on this matter. He thought that in part we might join this commemoration to the amalgamation celebrations, given that the Arts Centre was and remains one of the more imaginative architectural endeavours coming out of the building boom of the 1960s and 1970s. Mr. Traves had welcomed Mr. Andrews' suggestion and forwarded it to Public Relations who were discussing possible events.

97:008.

BAC-X Report and SAPBC Response

Mr. Stuttard welcomed Mr. Gil Winham, the Chair of the Budget Advisory Committee. Mr. Winham introduced the BAC-X report by summarizing the University's budgeting problems and process over the past three years. During this time there had been a shortfall of approximately \$10 million in University grants, and the cost of running the University had risen by roughly \$8 million. This shortfall had been addressed in three ways: through increases in tuition, which had generated an additional \$10 million; through cutbacks, which had totalled approximately \$8 million; and finally, in the area of salaries, where faculty and staff had experienced a 3% roll-back and then a freeze since 1994. Mr. Winham reminded members that these big ticket items in the budget all had constituency groups, and that all of these groups had reasons to feel aggrieved about the operation of the budget in the last three years.

Because of government funding cutbacks, Dalhousie presently faced a deficit of approximately \$2 million, without factoring in tuition adjustments and normal salary increases such as CDIs and steps. The present budget had to be generated in an environment in which students had already suffered from tuition increases; Deans were confronting the fact that future cuts would have to come out of people; and staff and faculty were preparing to enter into collective bargaining in hopes of making up for past shortfalls. The trade-offs would be difficult to craft. The

Committee was now considering BAC-XI and the recommendations for next year's budget.

Mr. Pereira noted the response from the SAPBC circulated to senators. In its discussions, SAPBC had addressed three issues in a triangular form. Members had been unanimous about the desirability of increasing government funding, and the need to pursue political lobbying vigorously. But the Committee had had to attempt to prioritize the issues of salaries, tuition and the maintenance of the integrity of academic programmes. Most members had agreed that preservation of the integrity of programmes was the priority. SAPBC also wished to thank BAC for giving senators the opportunity to engage in discussion of the budget in a timely way. As Chair of SAPBC, Mr. Stuttard, on behalf of SAPBC, also applauded BAC for issuing its Report well in advance of the decisions. SAPBC had emphasized the need for students and their parents, in cooperation with all areas of the University community, to lobby the government for increased funding. The Committee agreed with BAC that there was a lack of necessary information to consider differential cuts in a fair and meaningful way. Some on SAPBC saw tuition increases as inevitable; but all were worried about the implications on enrolment. Because of up-coming collective bargaining, salaries struck members as an unknown variable which could not be factored into the budgetary equations.

Mr. Lee agreed that the priority had to be maintenance of the integrity of academic programmes; but he believed we could not remove salaries from the equation of academic excellence, given that our junior faculty were being offered better salaries at other universities. He also thought we would cripple the excellence of our programmes if we went with only horizontal cuts, and did not seriously consider differential cuts. Mr. Andrews was concerned that individuals not be pessimistic about the possible impact of lobbying the government. He thought that over the years Nova Scotia had funded its students at the lowest level in Canada. This policy had its biggest impact on the largest university in the province. He encouraged the bringing together of all groups in the University community to lobby the government and speak to the electorate on this and related issues. Mr. Kimmins also encouraged members and Senate Committees to more forcefully support the lobbying of government, particularly in light of the relatively low level of funding in this province. Universities needed to become part of the political debate. Mr. Stuttard pointed out that the SAPBC response saw government lobbying as an extremely important issue. Mr. Clark argued for aggressive lobbying in what was a major election year on both the provincial and federal level. Ms. Bleasdale was delighted at the level of support for a combined lobbying strategy. She wanted to add, however, that from her point of view the immediate crucial goal for BAC was to minimize tuition increases. Students were the reason we were here, and without them we would cease to exist.

Ms. McIntyre was disappointed that there were no anticipated savings, and no targets for financial savings, from the Metro Consortium and the Dal/TUNS amalgamation. In light of plans for increasing inter-university cooperation and amalgamation, at least at the administrative level, it was surprising to see no proposals for differential cuts. Could

this opportunity for savings be addressed in BAC-XI? Mr. Archibald also wished further information concerning potential future savings from the Dal/TUNS amalgamation. Mr. Traves indicated that the consolidating administrative units would be presenting drafts of operational plans by the end of this month, but some of the initial savings would be gobbled up by implementation of the consolidations. Ms. Sutherland asked whether BAC-XI would be able to take into account the TUNS amalgamation to any extent? Mr. Winham responded that the situation was not clear enough to make that type of calculation.

Mr. Traves attempted to put government funding in context, pointing out the need to keep in mind the different issues involved in provincial funding. The fact that we attracted the highest level of out-of-province students had to be factored into political lobbying; we could not expect the Nova Scotian tax-payer to be enthusiastic about funding students from other provinces. The proportion of the provincial budget allocated to higher education, relative to other provinces, also needed to be kept in mind. Mr. Traves also advocated that Dalhousie support the increasingly focussed nature of government lobbying. At present discussion was focussed on the need for increased student assistance. Considerable lobbying was also directed at research infrastructure. This type of targeted lobbying appeared to be more effective than general calls for increased provincial grants.

Mr. Archibald perceived a sea change among members of the government, and an understanding that universities contributed to the province and were not just a drain on the economy. Mr. Andrews agreed, and suggested we point out to the government how much revenue the influx of students generated for the government each year. Mr. MacKay encouraged an alliance to lobby externally for increased government support for post-secondary education, but also argued for an internal alliance in which different groups could understand the perspectives of others through discussion.

In responding to the suggestions from SAPBC, Mr. Winham encouraged the activism the Committee advocated, but did not think that its organization was the task of BAC. He also cautioned against trying to tie tuition increases to government funding decreases, since at some point the University might need to increase tuition, even though government funding was increasing. BAC had heard the SAPBC concerns about maintenance of the integrity of academic programmes, and the divisive nature of vertical cuts; and he had listened to some senators' interest in differential cuts. Personally, he believed that vertical or differential cuts could only be based on a wealth of data which was not available to BAC. Concerning tuition cuts, the market was uncertain. Many had argued that we were approaching a precipice, a point beyond which tuition would become so high that universities would experience a dramatic falling off of students. Concerning salaries, he did not think that BAC could accept the argument that salaries were not budgetable until collective bargaining. BAC had to estimate and project what the University could afford. Mr. Taylor spoke to the need to change the funding formula so we were funded on the basis of the actual costs of programmes. In particular Dalhousie needed

to make the case that it had special needs and special programmes to offer the province, and that these had to be factored into the funding formula. We would have to present this argument carefully so we did not put ourselves at odds with other universities in the province. On a related matter, he noted that neither BAC nor SAPBC had looked at the possibility of generating revenue through increasing student enrolments. If the government funding formula remained unchanged we would need a University-wide strategy to identify which programmes could be increased, and to look at different ways of teaching. Mr. Traves would like to see us getting a larger share of the envelope, but thought we would gain much more by refraining from fighting with other universities over dividing up the contents, and by lobbying along with them for a larger envelope. To tackle the question of growth, the information and work involved would be enormous. But we could not avoid this issue. Indeed, it might prove a way to minimize the pain of differential cuts.

Mr. Farmer agreed with focussed lobbying of the government, and asked whether the cost centres could assist the Administration in pulling together the information for such a campaign. He agreed that if cuts were going to be enormous we would need to consider vertical cuts; but he had not heard any suggestions of substance concerning these. He also pointed to the need to protect the University Library. Mr. Birdsall acknowledged that BAC had excluded the library collections budget from budget cuts, and was proposing a 2% increase. He wanted Senate to know that the Senate Library Committee and the Library were working on a long-term strategy document which it hoped to present in the near future. He asked members to read it in the context of the report of the Task Force established by AUCC and CARL, recently published in University Affairs.

Mr. Clark was frightened by the term "inevitable tuition increases". His personal circumstances represented the plight of students facing increased tuition. The protection of academic standards was a noble goal, but by increasing tuition the University was tapping a well that had gone dry.

Mr. Pereira noted that the issue of vertical cuts had been avoided for some time by this body. As he recalled, one of the reasons BAC-III had not been a great success was that many members of the then larger Senate had viewed differential cuts as harsh and unfair. Simply calling for them was not enough. How could the issue best be addressed? It was not the responsibility of SAPBC to set the hit list. Senate was the best place to begin any serious discussion of vertical cuts; and if senators thought they had valid and workable suggestions for vertical cuts, and if they felt they could set the priorities, he encouraged them to bring their ideas forward to this body. SAPBC had asked for guidance in this area in the past, but to date Senate had not given it. Could it please do so? Recently, SAPBC had discussed how to define areas of special emphasis and what it meant to be an area of emphasis. We had started to ask individuals in charge of these areas to make presentations to SAPBC, which we could then report back to Senate. Mr. Stuttard added that SAPBC had attempted to get the Deans from one area to come to speak to us, but without success.

Mr. Bradfield noted the need to lobby the Federal government if the provincial funding formula was a problem. He also thought the Administration could set the example for budget cuts, referring to an incident, from before President Traves' day, in which the President's office had agreed to take a cut by not spending additional money, specifically not to make a new appointment. But ultimately that position had been filled. Mr. Bradfield also noted that the number of arbitrations had increased. This struck him as an expensive way to handle personnel relations. Why not seal that envelope. On early retirement, he reminded members we had set up the Academic Integrity Account which was intended to help cover the buy-outs. Ms. Hobson pointed out that most of those retiring were not retiring until 1998, so they were not in this year's budget.

Mr. Stuttard thanked Mr. Winham for his participation in the discussion.

97:009.

Question Period

Mr. Andrews asked what was the time represented on the University clock in the tower?

Mr. Andrews added that the answer to one of his previous questions had been distributed by electronic mail. Though it was copied to all Senators, the consequences seemed to be that there would be no permanent record in the Senate. He would like to be assured that the public record showed the answer as well as the question. And could we avoid personal comments in the answers delivered in that way. Mr. Kimmins suggested that since the clock was mounted on the President's [tower] he assumed it was the President's time.

Ms. Fee indicated that the numbers of early retirements given in the President's Report did not match the DFA's numbers. Ms. Hobson would check this. Mr. Brett asked if we might have a breakdown on early retirement as far as Faculties go, or if that could be made available on the internet? Mr. Traves indicated this would be made available. Ms. Fee noted the breakdown would be coming out in the Dialogue later this week.

Mr. Clark laid out his problems in getting into classes in his major, Psychology, because they were overfull. Was there a way to get more people into these classes? Mr. Stuttard asked whether the Dean of Science and a Senator from the Psychology Department wished to address this issue. Mr. Kimmins indicated this was a reflection of the lack of large lecture theatres which could hold more than 150 students -- a major problem for students in Psychology and Biology. The new Arts and Social Sciences building might address this problem, which also affected classes offered by other Departments. Mr. Andrews wondered whether the Dean had a more concrete and immediate response, since the new facility would not be built until after Mr. Clark had left. Mr. Farmer thought that if a Department opened a class to a large number of students, it was obliged to provide the facilities for the students. Perhaps putting on another section of the class would be the way to go, though it would be expensive.

97:010.
Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 17:45 h.

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY
APPROVED MINUTES
OF
SENATE MEETING

SENATE met in regular session on Monday, 27 January 1997 at 4:00 p.m. in the University Hall, Macdonald Building.

Present with Mr. Colin Stuttard in the chair, were the following:

Adams, Andrews, Apostle, Archibald, Bleasdale (Secretary), Bradfield, Brett, Burnside, Cameron, Camfield, Carroll, Cherry, Clark, Dickson, Doolittle, Farmer, Fraser, Hartzman, Hobson, Hooper, Kay-Raining Bird, Kiang, Klein, Lee, Lovely, MacDonald, MacInnis, Maloney, Moore, Morehouse, Oore, Patriquin, Pereira, Ricketts, Rosson, Ruedy, Russell, Scassa, Siddiq, Starnes, Sutherland, Taylor, Traves, White, Wrixon.

Regrets: Birdsall, Egan, Kimmins, Lydon, MacKay, Morrissey.

97:011.

Tribute to Ken Dunn

Mr. Stuttard asked the Vice-Chair of Senate, Ms. Kay-Raining Bird, to read a tribute to the previous Chair of Senate, Mr. Ken Dunn, after which members stood for a minute's silence to respect the memory of Mr. Dunn (A copy of the tribute, written by Mr. Bradfield, is appended to these minutes).

97:012.

Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as circulated.

97:013.

Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting

With a correction at item 97:003, line 1 (Mr. Carroll), the minutes of the meeting of January 13, 1997 were approved.

97:014.

Nominations to the University Tenure Panel

Ms. Bleasdale moved:

THAT Senate approve the nominations of John Benoit (Henson College), James MacKinnon (Engineering), Marcia Ozier (Psychology), and Douglas Schellink (Business) to serve on the University Tenure Panel for the period January 1997 to June 1999.

The motion CARRIED.

97:015.

Appointment of Ombudsperson and Assistant Ombudsperson

On behalf of the Ombudsperson's Advisory Committee, Ms. Bleasdale moved:

THAT Senate approve the appointment of Mary Hamblin as Ombudsperson and Tay Landry as Assistant Ombudsperson for the period January 1997 to April 30, 1997.

The motion CARRIED.

97:016.

International English Language Testing System

At the request of the Registrar's Office, and having conducted informal consultation with members of SCAA, Ms. Bleasdale moved:

THAT Senate approve the addition of the International English Language Testing System to the list of tests accepted for assessing English language proficiency at Dalhousie.

The motion CARRIED.

97:017.

BAC-XI Report

Mr. Stuttard noted that the discussion of the BAC-XI would be informal. He asked Mr. Gil Winham, the Chair of the Budget Advisory Committee, to comment on the BAC-XI report. Mr. Winham reminded members that in its deliberations over the University's operating budget the BAC had focussed on three major variables -- budget cuts, tuition increases, and salaries. In an attempt to make up the shortfall of \$2 million in government revenues, the Committee recommended for 1997/98 tuition increases of 7.6%, a 0.9% across the board reduction in the operating budget, and provision for 2% salary increases. The latter, however, ultimately would be determined by negotiations with employee groups. Mr. Winham reported that in the public informal discussion of BAC-XI on Friday, January 24, concerns had been raised as to whether the Committee had been unfair in setting out trade-offs between tuition and salaries. He wished to point out that trade-offs had been implicit for a number of years in the budgeting

process, in particular trade-offs between tuition increases and safeguarding of programs. Despite the painful increases in tuition over the past few years, BAC had to keep in mind that cuts to programs were implicitly unfair to students and also represented cuts to staff and faculty. However, BAC remained acutely aware of the approaching precipice at which tuition increases might create a catastrophic plunge in student enrolment.

At public meetings and discussions BAC had heard much about the need for increased lobbying of the government. Mr. Winham pointed out that a lobbying machine was not cheap, and the current resources of the President's Office at Dalhousie, for example, could not mount the type of lobbying campaign engaged in by the Steel Producers Association, without taking money from areas central to the activities of an academic institution. Secondly, some government cutbacks appeared to be the result of a deliberate government policy to reduce the cost of higher education. Though we should try to fight these cutbacks, we needed to keep in mind the agenda of the provincial governments and the federal government, who faced their own budget trade-offs.

Mr. Clark noted rumours that the federal government would allocate another \$1 billion to health and education, and wondered about the possible effect this could have on the BAC Report. Mr. Winham responded that next year's budget would be finalized before any of these rumours became reality.

BAC-X had indicated that the provincial government's stated intent was to increase funding in 1998/99, and again in 2000; but BAC-XI could not budget for that. In response to a question from Mr. Lee, Mr. Mason indicated that at page 2 in the Question and Answer Section another investment fund was not being proposed. The reference was to the fact that there was frequently more cash in the operating budget than was needed at a particular time, and that money was invested on a short-term basis. Once the "problem debt" was paid off, the cash flow would be even greater and could be invested to generate more money.

Ms. McIntyre supported the Report in general, but asked for clarification on the meaning of the suggested 2% wage increase. Mr. Mason explained that this indicated a 2% increase in annual salary rates, the cost of which would only be incurred for five months in the 97-98 budget year, i.e., from November 1, 1997, when provincial wage restraints cease. The extra cost would appear in the next year's budget. Mr. Patriquin appreciated the Committee's work, but was concerned that we were rapidly approaching the threshold at which declining quality of programs, inadequate classroom resources, and the increasing cost of tuition would seriously jeopardize our ability to attract students and give them quality education. Particularly, given Dalhousie's dependence on students from outside the province, a 7.6% tuition increase could be disastrous. Could we soften the blow for next year? Did we have any flexibility in the rate at which we paid off the debt, for instance? Mr. Winham pointed out that other universities would be unlikely to be able to avoid tuition increases also. He reminded members that cutting

of any kind was dangerous to quality. BAC understood that Deans, librarians, professors, and students were wrestling with the problem of quality daily; and this had been critical to its deliberations. But he agreed with the policy of the Board of Governors, which was not to resort to deficit financing. Since we did not control interest rates, we could find ourselves in a vulnerable position in future if we abandoned balanced budgets.

Mr. Andrews pointed out that the academic lobbying equivalents of the Canadian Steel Producers were CAUT and AUCC. He wondered whether BAC or SAPBC had considered variables other than the three set out in the Report. Might cash be a variable? But specifically, was endowment income a potential variable? He also questioned the assumption in note C that the transfer to the operating budget from the endowment fund would increase at the rate of inflation, 2%. How would that relate to actual earnings? Mr. Winham explained that BAC had focussed on those major variables in which even a small change would represent a major change for the overall budget. Mr. Mason added that the ability to spend from the endowment funds was strictly limited by the terms of the gifts. We currently transferred into the endowment fund approximately \$3.6 million, roughly half of which was designated for student support and for salaries and libraries. The Board's policy was to protect the capital value of endowment funds, so we had to reinvest back into the fund to ensure that inflation increases would be covered. That was what the 2% represented. In the past we had adopted a different stance, and consequently the amount of our endowment, though healthy, was lower than it might have been. Mr. Andrews had been told that the endowment funds had increased from \$167 to \$185 million in the period April 1 to December 31, 1996. He had also been told that ten years ago a study of what endowment funds could be transferred into the operating budget had concluded that approximately 85% to 90% of the income from endowment funds was considered transferable. Mr. Mason was unaware of such study, but endowment investments had performed well, and income was spent appropriately.

Mr. Cherry asked whether we could look at budgeting over a three-year period, in light of the province's commitment to funding increases in 1998/99 and 99/2000. Otherwise, we might be practicing false economy and find ourselves in the position of having to play catch up. He was also concerned about the point at which we would reach the enrolment precipice, and the public's perception of how quickly we were approaching it. Mr. Adams supported some increase in tuition because he supported enhanced quality, but he could not accept an increase of this magnitude.

Nothing in the report addressed the problems students faced in funding their education. Could the President and the Administration try to help out by increasing summer employment at the University and by working with all parts of the University to increase effective lobbying? Mr. Clark was torn between being a realist and being a student. To students from out-of- province Dalhousie ran the risk of looking like a very expensive,

ninth-ranked University.

Ms. Russell thought the Faculty of Law had already reached the threshold with tuition \$1000 more than its closest competitor. Last year, applications had dropped by 16.3%. Quality remained high, but the Faculty was losing students in second and third year. It had

also lost at least \$95,000 from the Law Foundation of Nova Scotia this year.

Unionization of part-time faculty could also be devastating. Because the Faculty's enrolment was controlled, there were limited opportunities for revenue generation, and Law needed a different solution. Mr. Winham responded that another meeting of BAC would consider issues such as those raised by the Faculty of Law.

Mr. Bradfield indicated that SAPBC had discussed the possibility of factoring in variables such as the anticipated savings from early retirements. On the endowment fund, he had learned from Mr. Paul Huber that since 1990 the fund had grown from \$110 to \$185 million.

This was some \$40m above the purchasing power maintenance level. If we continued this way we would soon have a university with a huge endowment, but no students or faculty. Perhaps a partial budget solution would be to use some of the endowment funds to off-set tuition increases for some students. We might also use freed money to attract and keep young talented faculty members. The endowment fund and the early retirement savings, and the pension fund surplus, according to statistics from Mr. Huber, suggested that we might have a way out of the squeeze. Given all the variables, Mr. Bradfield, thought short-term deficit financing was the responsible way to protect the integrity of the University. In 2001 there could be a pension surplus again, but no University. Today is the rainy day when savings should be used. Mr. Mason asked whether we could spend what was not guaranteed. Would markets never go down? It was important to remember that the pension fund may not always be in surplus, but a fourth year of the current agreement might give more to the operating fund. On the endowment fund: as the fund grew we would spend more income; we were not squirrelling money away.

Mr. Winham commented that he didn't follow the Endowment funds, but noted that faculty salaries here were not low relative to the rest of the [people in the] Province; only 5-6% of Nova Scotians earn more than \$50K per year, and he thought that the average salary for members of the DFA bargaining unit was \$62K. However, he acknowledged that faculty salaries were higher elsewhere.

Mr. Ruedy did not feel we were justified in increasing tuition beyond the cost of living increase. More importantly, he could not accept the non-differential approach to tuition increases. The Faculty of Medicine was required to take 90% of its undergraduate students from the Province, and he foresaw no decrease in enrolment because of tuition increases for this group. But the tuition increase would undermine the ability to attract students from a cross-section of the population, something which he considered crucial to the building of a responsible medical profession. At the post-graduate level, the Faculty would no longer be competitive in terms of tuition. Mr. Adams recognized that

some Faculties and Schools would feel the tuition increase more acutely; but this should not detract from the difficulties experienced by all students.

Mr. Bradfield asked members to consider whether we were in a crisis, with increasing tuition, class sizes, and number of part-time faculty. For students this represents decreasing quality; and for faculty, increasing workloads. He referred to Helen Caldicott's analogy of the frog in hot water. His own department (Economics) had a complement of 25 a few years ago; now it is 15, and enrolment had increased 20%. Mr. Clark observed that twenty-five years ago graduation meant jobs. Now graduates needed more degrees after their names to compete in a dramatically shrunken job market. Mr. Traves was confident BAC would reconsider these issues. The difficulty was that people were coming at the issue from different perspectives, and no one was volunteering to take the cuts for others. Mr. Pereira understood the balance which the BAC had felt it necessary to strike. However, he trusted that the Committee members, the President, and the Board would also take into consideration the variable raised by Mr. Andrews and Mr. Bradfield.

97:018.

Faculty of Medicine Appointments Proposal

Mr. Ruedy (seconded by Mr. Dickson) moved:

That Senate approves the Faculty of Medicine's proposal to implement a new appointment process involving periodic reviews instead of tenure for new clinical medical faculty.

Mr. Ruedy asked senators to attempt to understand the differences between clinicians in Medicine and other faculty at Dalhousie. Three and a half years ago the Faculty of Medicine had had to address some of the issues which were affecting the clinical faculty, and one of these was the nature of appointments of clinical faculty. Faculty agreed that tenure was inequitable and divisive for clinical faculty, because it included only approximately 60% of the core clinical academic faculty. The system was also confusing because there was no linkage between tenure and salary; and it was increasingly incongruent with the employment realities of clinical faculty, and their life-cycles. Briefly, of about 837 clinical faculty members in 16 different departments, 279 were core clinical academic faculty. The remainder took students on a part-time or short-term basis, acting as preceptors. The proposed appointments change was aimed at this 279 core academic faculty, largely based in the teaching hospitals and family practice teaching units in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Their major function was patient care, which was the base of the teaching and research programs. Income came through the billings to the medical insurance plan. Salaries of core clinical faculty are supported from two sources: partly through the University's operating budget, which totalled roughly \$8.7 million annually and partly through the contributions from the clinical earnings of individual clinical faculty members. The security of salary, if

guaranteed at all, was guaranteed by the departmental practice plan arrangements. Therefore, tenure carried no implication as regards security of salary for clinical faculty members. What had made the present system increasingly problematic was the great growth in clinical research programs, with no corresponding increase in available funding for University academic salaries. This meant the funding had to be picked up in other ways. Specialization had also increased and with it the need for a greater variety of academic clinicians. Thus, the size of the clinical faculty had far outstripped the ability of the University to fund them.

The life-cycle of clinical-care faculty also shifted, both annually and progressively; and there had been a progressive shift to increased clinical care and sometime teaching responsibilities. Consequently, the functions of a member might change dramatically over ten years. A periodic review would provide the opportunity to bring reality closer to the definitions of roles and changing functions. The document has been written to fit with the Senate document on Appointments, Tenure, and Promotion, and has to be read with clear understanding that the clauses in this document are relevant. Clause 5.1.1 referring to "academic freedom" would still be operative under this proposal. Article #7 relating to grievances would also apply.

Mr. Clark pointed out that in Question 6, under "Frequently asked questions", the reference should be to 1997. Mr. Andrews asked whether changes would be required in the Senate Regulations for Appointments, Tenure, and Promotion. Mr. Stuttard pointed out that if Senate approved this motion, modifications of its Regulations would be required. Mr. Andrews noted that if amendment of the Regulations were required, the DFA would need to be consulted. Mr. Andrews also noted that section 7 of the Senate constitution indicated the importance of consultation with the DFA on questions of job security and redundancy. That indicated the need for referral to the DFA. Mr. Stuttard suggested that it would seem appropriate to discuss these issues with the DFA, but declined to make a definitive ruling at this time. Mr. Andrews also referred to Clause 14.1.2 of Senate Regulations that required consultation with the DFA. Mr. Stuttard noted that this was directed to the President of the University.

Mr. Apostle asked how many people were not involved in appointment or reappointment with periodic review, and whether they would become part of the periodic review process. Mr. Ruedy indicated that 168 clinical faculty members were in probationary tenure track, tenure track, or were tenured; and 111 of the core clinical faculty were on limited term appointments and would be subject to these new provisions.

As a member of the clinical faculty, Mr. Welch was not clear about which group he would fit into. He was now among the part-time faculty members, and the concept of 279 core clinical faculty did not appear in the Faculty's document. He was also concerned that the types of changes over the clinical faculties' careers did not necessarily occur in five-year blocks, and concerned about faculty with Ph.D.s rather than MDs. New recruits to these positions might not have the chance to aspire to tenure. But his more important general concern was whether clinical faculty denied access to tenure would be treated equitably. He underscored that this was a major

change in the employment of future clinical faculty, and a change that would not apply to those clinical faculty who already had tenure.

Mr. Archibald did not find that this document helped him to understand any better the way in which the Faculty of Medicine operated. Under the circumstances he would feel compelled to abstain. If he knew that those who would be affected directly supported this change he might be able to register his opinion. As a Ph.D. with joint appointments in a basic science and a clinical department, Mr. Lee reported that members in the Faculty of Medicine had discussed the document widely, and it was passed by a meeting of the full Faculty. He understood that a Faculty such as the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences might become anxious about the question of tenure, but that did not appear to be reaction in the Faculty of Medicine. He also noted that Ph.D.s came into clinical departments with their eyes open, knowing that jobs were scarce. Because tenure was not tied to salary, they would know that they were not necessarily getting tenure, as was his experience at the University of Calgary. The big concern was the equity of those working in their clinical roles.

Mr. Cameron moved

That the motion be tabled to the next meeting.

The motion CARRIED.

97:019.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 18:05 h.