

## SENATE MINUTES

MARCH 9, 1999

The regular meeting of Senate was held on Tuesday, March 9, 1999, at 4:00 p.m. in Room E5004.

### 73. PRESENT

The President, Dr. E. Simpson, Professor A. Fowler, Dr. H. MacKenzie for Dean W. Blake, Mr. G. Collins, Acting Dean W. Davidson, Mr. R. Ellis, Mr. W. Green, Dr. C. Higgs, Dean G. Kealey, Dr. C. Loomis, Dean W. Ludlow, Dean T. Murphy, Dr. C. Orchard, Dean T. Piper, Dean R. Seshadri, Dr. M. Volk, Ms. D. Whalen for Professor H. Weir, Dr. A. Aboulazm, Dr. R. Adamec, Dr. G. Bassler, Dr. J. Bear, Dr. S. Chandra, Dr. G. Clark, Professor M. Coyne, Dr. D. Craig, Mrs. C. Dutton, Dr. J. Evans, Dr. S. Ghazala, Professor K. Hestekin, Mr. D. Howse, Dr. H. Hulan, Professor V. Kuester, Dr. W. Locke, Dr. R. Lucas, Dr. I. Mazurkewich, Dr. M. Mulligan, Dr. V. Maxwell, Dr. D. McKay, Dr. M. Paul, Dr. H. Pike, Dr. N. Rich, Dr. S. Saha, Dr. D. Thompson, Dr. D. Treslan, Dr. D. Tulett, Dr. R. Venkatesan, Dr. K. Vidyasankar, Professor D. Walsh, Dr. B. Watson, Dr. P. Wilson, Dr. S. Wolinetz, Dr. C. Wood, Ms. N. Peckford, Mr. S. Kar, Mr. D. Newton, Mr. C. Corbett, Ms. K. Durant, Ms. D. Hardy, Ms. K. McDonald, Ms. L. Patey, Ms. N. Pike, Mr. S. Shave.

Mr. W. W. Thistle, Q.C., was in attendance by invitation. A number of other observers were also in attendance, including Engineering students, Jamie Hulan, Adam Stanley and Andrew Smith.

### 74. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Dr. E. Dow, Mr. L. O'Reilly, Dr. R. Klein, Ms. T. O'Reilly.

### 75. MINUTES

The Minutes of the regular meeting held on February 9, 1999, were taken as read and confirmed.

### 76. STUDENT APPEAL TO SENATE

Student No. 9121302

Following the normal appeals process, this student's appeal for promotion from Academic Term III of the Engineering Programme was denied by the Executive Committee of Senate at a meeting held on February 25, 1999. The student subsequently requested that his appeal be heard by Senate.

While Senators were sympathetic to the extenuating circumstances outlined by the student and while it was acknowledged that these circumstances had adversely affected his performance, it was the opinion of the majority of speakers that his chance of future success in the Engineering programme would be improved if he repeated Academic Term III.

It was moved by Dr. Tulett, seconded by Dr. Craig and carried that the student's appeal be DENIED. However, it was also agreed to encourage Student #9121302 to apply for re-admission to Term III for the 1999 Fall Semester at which time he will be readmitted to that term, provided he meets the requirements for re-admission to the University.

#### 77. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF SENATE

It was agreed by separate motion where necessary, that the report of the Executive Committee be approved as follows:

\*Report of the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies

#### 78.1 Summer Bridging Programme – Sir Wilfred Grenfell College

A memorandum dated February 8, 1999 was received from the College Academic Council together with a proposal for a Summer Bridging Programme at Sir Wilfred Grenfell College in 1999. Also included was a report on the Summer Bridging Pilot Project which was held from August 10 – August 28, 1998.

The following is a synopsis of the programme as provided by the College:

"It is proposed to offer the programme for students in Newfoundland and Labrador in August of 1999. The pilot programme which was conducted in August, 1998 was attended by 13 students from the Corner Brook area. Following the success of this programme it is proposed that an expanded Summer Bridging Programme be available to all qualified students in Newfoundland and Labrador and offered at Sir Wilfred Grenfell College.

The programme will provide an avenue of entry to Memorial for students with averages close to 70%. These students, when admitted, should have an increased chance of success relative to the entire cohort with averages below 70% because:

- \* the willingness to apply for admission to, attend, and pay for a Summer Bridging Programme is clear evidence of commitment to university studies

- \* entry to the programme will be restricted to those with averages between 65% and 70% and will be competitive within that range

- \* the programme will provide intensive instruction in skills useful in university studies and entry to the university will be contingent on demonstrated competence in those skills (i.e. the student must pass the Summer Bridging course to be admitted).

Students: Students whose high school average is between 65% and 70% in the courses necessary for University admission will be eligible for admission. Entry to the programme will be competitive but within such a narrow range of high school averages, the average itself is a poor predictor of later performance. An application form will be employed and applicants will be required to supply a brief statement of their educational goals as well as two letters of reference. If further information is needed to reach a decision on applications, interviews with applicants may be conducted. The Special Admissions Committee at the College will evaluate all applications.

The number of students admitted to the Programme will be determined by available resources. The maximum class size will be 25 students so the total number of students admitted will depend on the number of instructors available. In 1996 there were 190 applicants to Memorial with averages between 65% and 70%. If

(estimating liberally) 100 of those students were admitted to the programme, they would compose four classes.

Programme curriculum: The Summer Bridging Programme will attempt to provide students with academic skills that will enhance the probability of their success in university-level courses. While the final details of the programme's curriculum are not settled, the programme will resemble other student success courses and include:

- \* instruction and practice in the basic skills necessary to begin university level mathematics
- \* instruction and practice in the critical reading skills needed for reading university-level textbooks
- \* instruction and practice in the writing skills needed to produce well-formulated essays and research papers
- \* instruction and practice in basic academic skills such as note-taking, time management and preparation for examinations
  
- \* an introduction to the nature of the university, what the university expects of students, and the programmes and resources available at the university

In addition to classroom instruction, there will be numerous exercises and assignments, and tutors will be available outside of class hours and in the evenings. As well, a number of extracurricular cultural and recreational activities will be organized.

Instructors: Instructors will be recruited from the faculty and staff at Sir Wilfred Grenfell College and Memorial University in St. John's. The programme will be team-taught so instructors will be sought with interest and experience in teaching remedial mathematics, remedial English, or basic academic skill. A number of the faculty and staff at Grenfell and at Memorial in St. John's are qualified to train instructors in basic academic skills. Training sessions will be organized to prepare the instructors for the programme.

Schedule: The programme will consist of 24 hours per week of instruction and exercises over a three week period in early August, 1999. In contact hours this is equivalent to a university course with a laboratory component.

**Course Credit:** Unlike the 1998 pilot programme, the proposed programme will not carry university credit. Based on last summer's experience it was decided that a Summer Bridging Programme was most appropriately a non-credit course designed to prepare students for university study.

**Fees:** The fee for the programme will be \$330.00. Those students wishing to stay in residence at Sir Wilfred Grenfell College will pay a fee based on the residence fee during the regular semester prorated over the three week period.

**Funding:** The 1998 pilot programme was self-financing when the tuition fees paid by the students in the Fall, 1998 semester are considered. Similarly, if even a small fraction of the students in the proposed expanded programme pass, it will pay for itself in the tuition fees paid in the Fall, 1999 semester. However, external funding will be sought for the purpose of providing a more enriched programme. In particular support will be sought to provide additional training for instructors and tutors in the programme, and to provide technological support (computers, computer software, and audiovisual equipment) for programme instruction.

**Programme evaluation and student follow-up:** Course evaluation will be conducted at the end of the programme by surveying the students and soliciting comments and suggestions from the instructors and tutors. Further, students admitted to Memorial following completion of the Summer Bridging Programme will be tracked throughout their academic career. An expanded Summer Bridging Programme would provide information from a substantial sample and allow a more precise and confident evaluation of the impact of the programme on later academic performance.

It is believed that a Summer Bridging Programme as described will provide a valuable opportunity for the group of students who, while they do not meet Memorial's entrance requirements, nevertheless have a realistic chance of succeeding at university studies. It is further believed, considering the degree of commitment required by the Summer Bridging students, the application procedures to be followed, and the quality of the educational experience provided, that those who successfully complete the programme may be

granted entry to Memorial without compromising the integrity of the admission requirements."

It was moved by Dr. Treslan, seconded by Dr. Wilson and carried, that this Summer Bridging Programme be approved for offering in August, 1999.

\*Report of the Academic Council of the School of Graduate Studies

## 78.2 Canadian Test of English for Scholars and Trainees

Page 398, 1998–99 University Calendar, following the Heading General Regulations, subheading A) Qualifications for Admission, add new clause A.4.h) as follows:

"4.h) Submission of official results of the Canadian Test of English for Scholars and Trainees (CanTEST) with a Band Level 4.5 in the listening comprehension and reading comprehension sub-tests and a score of 4 in writing."

Re-letter current clause 4.h) as 4.i)

## 78.3 Regulation Governing the Executive Stream of the MBA Programme

Page 420, 1998–99 University Calendar, following the section Courses and before the heading Regulations Governing the Degree of Master of Education, insert the following new calendar entry:

"Regulations Governing the Degree of Master of Business Administration (Executive Option)

The degree of Master of Business Administration (Executive Option), or EMBA, is cohort-driven. These regulations must be read in conjunction with the general regulations of the School of Graduate Studies of Memorial University (see page \*\*\*).

### A) Qualifications for Admission

1. Admission is limited and competitive. To be considered for admission to the EMBA programme, an applicant shall normally

hold at least a bachelor's degree, with a minimum B standing, from an institution recognized by Memorial University's Senate.

2. Applicants must achieve a satisfactory total score on the Graduate Management Admission Test (GMAT), as well as an appropriate balance of verbal and quantitative GMAT score components. Specific information regarding the test can be obtained by writing to: Educational Testing Service/GMAT, P.O. Box 6103, Princeton, New Jersey, U.S.A., 08541-6103, by phoning a local test center ((709)-579-5126 in St. John's), or by contacting the Web site at [www.gmat.org](http://www.gmat.org).

3. Applicants with substantial management experience will receive preference during evaluation of applications. Normally, applicants will have a minimum of eight years of relevant management experience.

4. Applicants who did not complete a four-year bachelor's degree at a recognized university where English is the primary language of instruction must submit an acceptable score on the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL), or achieve a satisfactory score on the CanTEST. Information regarding the TOEFL is available from the Educational Testing Service (see address in A.2). Information on CanTEST is available from CanTEST Project Office, Second Language Institute, University of Ottawa, Canada K1N 6N5.

5. All applicants will be interviewed prior to acceptance to the EMBA programme by at least two members of the Faculty's Committee on Graduate Studies to assess the applicant's personal qualities, such as leadership potential and motivation, which are important to successful managers.

6. While all of the criteria above are important, the Faculty's Committee on Graduate Studies will assess the applicant's entire profile. Significant strengths in one area may help compensate for weaknesses in another area.

7. In selecting candidates for any particular cohort, the Faculty's Committee on Graduate Studies will attempt to ensure that there is a breadth of managerial experience and practical backgrounds within the cohort as this is important to the students' learning

environment. Student experience is expected to contribute to and enhance the learning experience for the entire cohort.

#### B) Deadlines for Application Submissions

1. Applications and all supporting documents must be received by June 15 from Canadian applicants. Deadlines for applicants in foreign cohorts should be complete at least four months before the proposed commencement date. Individuals submitting applications later than the above dates are not assured of consideration for admission to the cohort desired; their applications will be processed only if time and resources permit.

2. The Faculty of Business Administration reserves the right not to offer an EMBA programme during any period where there is deemed to be insufficient demand. Further, the faculty reserves the right to restrict the size of any cohort of students admitted to the EMBA programme.

#### C) Procedure for Admission

1. Applications for admission to the EMBA programme must be made on the appropriate form, in duplicate, to the School of Graduate Studies.

2. The following documents must be submitted in support of the official application form:

a) Letter of appraisal from two work-related referees.

b) Two copies of the faculty's Employment Experience Information form.

c) Two official transcripts from each university or other post-secondary institution previously attended, to be sent directly by its registrar (or equivalent officer) to the School of Graduate Studies. If not recorded on the transcript, official evidence of completion of Undergraduate degree must also be submitted.

d) The official GMAT score report, to be sent directly by the Educational Testing Service. The code number for Memorial University is 0885.



e) Where applicable, an official TOEFL or CanTEST score report, to be forwarded directly by the examining organization.

Note: Application files are evaluated only when all required items have been received.

3. Admission shall be by the dean of the School of Graduate Studies on the recommendation of the Faculty of Business Administration. Upon notification of acceptance into the EMBA programme, applicants must give written notice to the School of Graduate Studies of their intention to register. Such notice must be received by the Office of the Dean within 30 days of notification of acceptance, or three weeks prior to semester registration.

#### D) Programmes of Study

1. The EMBA programme is cohort-driven and structured so that students within any cohort complete a program of 20 courses. Normally, the programme will be delivered over four academic terms, and the contact time per course will be 26 hours, recognizing the experience of the candidates, and the extended time between classes which will allow the assignment of more course-related work to be completed outside of the classroom environment. In some instances, the programme may be offered over a shorter duration. When this happens, the contact time per course will increase as the expectation for students to complete course-related work between classes will be lower. The 20-course programme structure is outlined in Table 1.

Table 1

#### EMBA Program of Study

Term 1      Term 2

EMB8103 Statistical Applications in Management

EMB8104 Organizations: Behavior and Structure

EMB8106 Marketing

EMB8107 Managing in the Canadian Environment

EMB 8109 Accounting for Management  
EMB8108 Economics for Management

EMB8204 Human Resource Management

EMB8206 Managerial Finance

EMB8210 Labor Relations  
EMB9103 – Research in Management  
Term 3      Term 4  
EMB8205 Information Systems

EMB8207 Operations Management

EMB8209 Management Skills

Two additional courses chosen by the Faculty of

Business Administration  
EMB8208 Strategic Management

Three additional courses chosen by the Faculty of

Business Administration  
EMB9301 – Research Project

2. Five courses will be chosen by the Faculty of Business Administration to meet the needs of each cohort, subject to the prior approval of the Dean of Graduate Studies.

3. Students in the EMBA programme may apply to complete up to two courses in the regular MBA program. Approval will be given if:

- a) the student can demonstrate a need for a course which is not offered to their cohort, but which is available in the regular MBA programme;
- b) the student can demonstrate that there is a course being offered to their cohort that does not meet their specific needs;

c) the student is able to attend classes at the time and place that the course is offered in the regular MBA programme;

d) sufficient resources are available to allow the student to take the course in the regular MBA programme.

4. Any programme changes, including those described in D.1. through D.3. above, must have the prior approval of the Dean of Graduate Studies on the recommendation of the Faculty of Business Administration."

It was noted that the Executive Committee of Senate had referred Regulation E. Evaluation, of this proposal back to the Academic Council for further consideration. A report from the Academic Council is expected in the near future.

#### 79. Report on the Committee on Honorary Degrees and Ceremonial

At a meeting held on January 12, 1999, Senate approved two nominations for the award of an honorary degree which were submitted by the Committee on Honorary Degrees and Ceremonial. During discussion of this item of business, a question was raised regarding the process necessary for creating another honorary degree title in addition to those currently awarded.

A memorandum dated 29 January, 1999 has now been received from the Committee on Honorary Degrees and Ceremonial advising that, after checking the Senate minutes, it was determined that the last time a new degree title was created it was accomplished by a motion of Senate following a recommendation from the Committee on Honorary degrees and Ceremonial.

An e-mail poll of that Committee was then conducted to determine if the Committee would support a recommendation to Senate that the title "Doctor of Music" be added to those currently awarded under clause V.A.9 of the Regulations for Honorary Degrees and Ceremonial. However, the Committee was virtually unanimous in its opposition to such a change at this time based on arguments such as the possibility of creating an endless proliferation of honorary degrees, the observation that the list of existing honorary degrees provides for reasonable choices to honour an individual's contributions and achievements without the need to link that

degree to the individual's academic discipline and in fact the desire to avoid such a link with earned degrees, as well as the fact that the name of the degree does not necessarily pertain to the subject studied even for earned degrees, e.g. how many Ph.D's have studied philosophy?

The Committee will include this topic on its agenda for further discussion at a future meeting and report its findings to Senate if a recommendation for change to the regulations is necessary.

This memorandum was received for information.

#### 80. Report of the Senate Elections Committee

A memorandum dated February 2, 1999 was received from the Committee on Senate Elections reporting the entitlement of each constituency to seats on Senate for the 1999-2000 academic year in accordance with the Procedures for Selection of Senate Members.

Senate elections are now being conducted and the results will be submitted to Senate when they are finalized.

#### 81. Software Engineering

The President introduced this topic by advising that before the special meeting of Senate held on February 26, 1999, he was approached by a group of Engineering students and given a motion which they wished to have considered by Senate. The President advised the students at that time that he would consider the document as a notice of motion for today's meeting. This notice of motion by the students was prompted by the fact that in a letter dated February 25, 1999 (received by the President's Office on February 24, 1999) the Canadian Council of Professional Engineers advised that the Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of Newfoundland (the Association) by letter dated February 23, 1999, had withdrawn its consent for the evaluation of the four engineering programmes at Memorial University. As a result of this action on the part of the Association the evaluation of the four engineering programmes has ceased pending reinstatement of consent. The present accreditation expires on June 30, 1999. Legal advice was sought and the matter is now before the Supreme Court of Newfoundland.

Mr. W. W. Thistle, Q.C. , Vice-President (Administration and Finance) and Legal Counsel then advised Senate that he has been working with Mr. John O'Dea of Chalker, Green and Rowe with regard to this matter. In anticipation of the motion from the Engineering students which was to have been placed before Senate, he asked Mr. O'Dea about the legal implications which may be involved if Senate were to address an issue which is before the court. Mr. Thistle then quoted from a letter dated 8 March 1999 from Mr. John O'Dea which reads as follows:

"Insofar as the Senate should be concerned with that action, and the action filed in the Supreme Court of Newfoundland, relating to APEGN's withdrawal of its consent to continue the accreditation process at MUN, I feel that the Senate should be advised that these matters are before the courts and that the Senate should not deal with either issue until they have been properly dealt with in the jurisdiction selected by both parties to deal with such matters. In the trade-mark action, the parties are before the Federal Court and it would be imprudent for Senate to engage in a debate on the issue as it may prejudice the case for MUN. In addition, legal counsel for APEGN in that matter would have to be apprised of events. Similarly, the matter of the action of APEGN in withdrawing consent for the accreditation process is before the Supreme Court of Newfoundland and it would be improper and prejudicial for this matter to be discussed by Senate in such a public form. Until APEGN files its reply to the matter in the Supreme Court of Newfoundland and that matter is heard, the Senate should remove itself from any debate on the matter."

The President advised Senate that he had received information from the student representatives that the notice of motion which was received prior to the special meeting of Senate held on February 26, 1999, is to be withdrawn and that another motion will be drafted by the Engineering students. Mr. Corbett, Vice-President (Academic) of the Council of Students' Union, concurred, noting that during a recent meeting with Engineering students, they had expressed the wish that the notice of motion be withdrawn and that they wished to prepare a new motion which is currently in draft form.

It was moved by Dr. Maxwell, seconded by Dr. Tulett and carried, that the information provided by Mr. Corbett be accepted as notice

of motion, and that if the text of the motion, together with the names of the mover and seconder of the motion, is received in the office of the Secretary of Senate in sufficient time, it will be circulated with the agenda for the next meeting of Senate scheduled to be held on April 13, 1999.

The President suggested to the Dean of Engineering and Applied Science and the Dean of Science that they consider organizing a town hall type of forum to give students, faculty and outside bodies who feel the need to speak to these issues the opportunity to do so in a forum outside of a formal governing body, such as the Senate.

## 82. OTHER BUSINESS

### 82.1 Presidential Search Committee

Dr. Adamac proposed that a vote of thanks be extended to the members of the Board of Regents and the representatives from the community at large who served on the Presidential Search Committee.

The following motion was then moved by Dr. Adamec, seconded by Dr. Maxwell and carried:

The Senate recognizes with gratitude the generous contribution of time and effort given on behalf of Memorial University to the Search for a new President by:

Edward Roberts, Q.C., Chair, Board of Regents

Gail Aylward, Member, Board of Regents

Georgina Hedges, Member, Board of Regents

Linda Inkpen, Community Representative

Melvin Woodward, Member, Board of Regents

Victor Young, Community Representative

### 82.2 Draft Statement of University Principles and Goals

On behalf of the Senate Committee on Academic Planning, Dr. Simpson presented a Draft Statement of University Principles and Goals which has been prepared by the Planning and Priorities Group and invited an initial discussion of the document.

In the ensuing discussion, Senators offered comments and suggestions for amendments to the document. Dr. Simpson advised that a revised document would be presented to Senate for consideration at a future meeting.

### 83. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

## MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY OF NEWFOUNDLAND

### SENATE

A special meeting of Senate was held on Tuesday, March 9, 1999, at 5:00 p.m. in Room E5004.

### 84. PRESENT

The President, Dr. E. Simpson, Professor A. Fowler, Dr. H. MacKenzie for Dean W. Blake, Mr. G. Collins, Acting Dean W. Davidson, Mr. R. Ellis, Dr. W. Green, Dr. C. Higgs, Dean G. Kealey, Dr. C. Loomis, Dean W. Ludlow, Dean T. Murphy, Dr. C. Orchard, Dean T. Piper, Dean R. Seshardi, Dr. M. Volk, Ms. D. Whalen for Professor H. Weir, Dr. A. Aboulazm, Dr. R. Adamec, Dr. G. Bassler, Dr. J. Bear, Dr. S. Chandra, Dr. G. Clark, Professor M. Coyne, Dr. D. Craig, Mrs. C. Dutton, Dr. J. Evans, Dr. S. Ghazala, Professor K. Hestekin, Mr. D. Howse, Dr. H. Hulan, Professor V. Kuester, Dr. W. Locke, Dr. R. Lucas, Dr. I. Mazurkewich, Dr. M. Mulligan, Dr. V. Maxwell, Dr. D. McKay, Dr. M. Paul, Dr. H. Pike, Dr. N. Rich, Dr. S. Saha, Dr. D. Thompson, Dr. D. Treslan, Dr. D. Tulett, Dr. R. Venkatesan, Dr. K. Vidyasankar, Professor D. Walsh, Dr. B. Watson, Dr. P. Wilson, Dr. S. Wolinetz, Dr. C. Wood, Ms. N. Peckford, Mr. S. Kar, Mr. D. Newton, Mr. C. Corbett, Ms. K. Durant, Ms. D. Hardy, Ms. K. McDonald, Ms. L. Patey, Ms. N. Pike, Mr. S. Shave, Mr. Thistle.

Mr. W. W. Thistle, Q.C., was in attendance by invitation. A number of other observers were also in attendance.

## 86. Apologies

Apologies were received from Dr. E. Dow, Mr. L. O'Reilly, Dr. R. Klein, Ms. T. O'Reilly.

## 86. The Relationship Between Academic Planning and Budgeting

Dr. Evan Simpson, Chair, Senate Committee on Academic Planning, introduced the topic of the relationship between Academic Planning and Budgeting. A set of notes entitled "Relating Planning and Budgeting" was circulated to Senators in advance of the meeting.

Dr. Simpson reviewed the notes which concluded with a proposition to combine the Senate Committee on Academic Planning and the Senate Advisory Committee on the University Budget into a University Planning Committee whose responsibilities include budgetary policy.

The following is the text of the notes circulated to Senators:

### "THE CONTEXT

Memorial University has special responsibilities as the only university in Newfoundland and Labrador. In order to meet the educational needs of the province, it must cover a wide field of subjects. At the same time, a mid-sized university cannot do everything. Choices have to be made between futures of limited comprehensiveness.

The context of these choices is complex but encompasses some clear and familiar constraints. These include past reductions in and future uncertainty about government grants, a projected decline in student enrolment and fees, a low student retention rate, and a consequent large and growing financial deficit.

Since realistic academic planning is constrained by the resources available to academic programs, it is desirable that a good match between high-quality programs and finite resources be maintained.



## SOME STRATEGIC ISSUES

Apart from historical circumstances and the general appeal of comprehensiveness, there is no very clear institutional rationale for the mix of courses and programs we offer to our students. In the context of increasing competition from other universities, such a rationale needs to be formulated. Since the rational distribution of resources is tied to the demands of the University's academic goals, the need for developing such a rationale is evident.

Internal competition for resources is increased when each unit is encouraged to capture as many course registrations as possible. The effects can be perverse. For example, units may be tempted to lower their standards in order to maximize the number of students in their courses and programs. More and more ships may be put to sea in order to catch the declining number of cod. Criteria for the allocation of scarce resources need to be paired better with our academic goals.

Because resources are always limited, not all desirable objectives can be achieved. It cannot be left to the administration to simply find the money. Neither can chosen objectives be satisfactorily furthered by budgeting a year at a time. The structure of the academic enterprise depends upon adherence to plans that can be pursued over a number of years. The current P&P process is the start of a reasonable approach, since it is aimed at establishing some strategic directions rather than simply cost-cutting.

However, when this process is complete there will remain an ongoing need for processes that permit a realistic assessment of possible academic directions.

## THE ROLE OF SENATE

The University Act states that "The management, administration and control of the property, revenue, business and affairs of the university are vested in the board" (sec. 33) and that "Nothing in this Act shall be construed to give to the senate power to take an action that imposes financial obligation or liability on the university ... (58). One expression of this arrangement is that Senate has a Committee on Academic Planning and an Advisory Committee on the University Budget which do not communicate. However, the Act

also says that senate has the power "to make recommendations to the board that may be considered appropriate for promoting the interests of the university and for carrying out the objects and provisions of this Act" (56(o)). Although the final authority in financial matters resides with the Board, nothing precludes Senate from giving attention to financial matters and providing informed advice.

Senate already gives attention to questions of financial resources through its Committee on Undergraduate Studies, which asks proponents of new programs to explain their costs and the capacity of the unit in question to support them. At present the process appears uneven and rudimentary, but its appropriateness is generally acknowledged.

The current Priorities and Planning process also takes the relationship between academic plans and available resources seriously. Its aims include linking institutional goals with the capacity to support them, and it is assumed that its proposals will be reported to the board through the senate, which therefore needs to accept its responsibility to set priorities and make choices.

#### FUTURE PRACTICE

Integrating planning and budgeting could be achieved by combining the Senate Committee on Academic Planning and the Senate Advisory Committee on the University Budget into a University Planning Committee whose responsibilities include budgetary policy. Discussions have occurred between these two committees, opening the possibility of relating their functions without confusing them.

One way of achieving this relationship is to establish the Advisory Committee on the Budget as a sub-committee of Academic Planning. SCAP would continue to be chaired by the Vice-President (Academic), but the Budget sub-committee might better be chaired by another senior member of faculty. The budget committee would thus act as a constraint upon academic planning while recognizing the primacy of the latter. At the same time, the arrangement would express the legitimate interest of senate in questions of resources.

Should Senate express interest in the proposition that the committees should be combined, the two committees will endeavour to return to Senate with a concrete proposal for a committee whose responsibilities include encouraging the chief academic body of the University to maintain an ongoing strategic plan."

Following Dr. Simpson's presentation the President thanked him for a thoughtful and succinct proposal. He then invited Senators to comment on the document.

A number of Senators expressed their support for the proposal that the Senate Committee on Academic Planning and the Advisory Committee on the Budget should be amalgamated in some way. It was also suggested that the relationship of the amalgamated committee with other Senate committees, and in particular, Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, should be examined. In this regard, it was noted that the relationship between the Senate committees and faculty and departmental committees would also have to be considered, and a full statement of process regarding the routing procedure for new and revised programmes would be necessary.

Another suggestion from Senate was that a review system of academic units should be in place whereby departments can receive advice where necessary and departments which show that they are operating efficiently may be rewarded.

Dr. Simpson concluded the meeting by saying the he found the suggestions made by Senators useful and encouraging and he noted that they will be taken into consideration in the preparation of a further proposal to be brought to Senate for consideration. He agreed that there are also wider issues to be considered than the amalgamation of Senate Committee on Academic Planning and the Advisory Committee on the Budget.

## ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:50 p.m.