CARLETON UNIVERSITY

The Minutes of the 248th Meeting
of the
BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Time: Monday, June 25, 1973, at 4:30 p.m.
Place: Senate Room - Administration Building

PRESENT:
Mr. R. J. Neill (Vice-Chairman), Mr. F. E. Gibson, Mr. K. Kaplansky,
Mr. C. Kelley, Mr. T. R. Montgomery, Dean H. H. J. Nesbitt,
Dr. M. K. Oliver, Professor K. Paltiel, Dr. L. Raminsky,
Mr. H. Soloway, Mr. C. Watt, Dean R. A. Wendt. Also present:
Mr. D. N. Brombal, Dr. G. R. Love, Mr. A. B. Larose, and
Mr. D. C. McEown (Secretary).

SENATOR NORMAN M. PATTERSON:
It was moved, seconded, and unanimously carried, that Carleton University convey to Senator Paterson its special greetings on the occasion of his 90th Birthday, in the form and manner as described by the Board. It was further agreed that if the Senate chose, it could join with the Board in this commemoration.

MR. TERON:
The Vice-Chairman, on behalf of the Board, extended to Mr. Teron its congratulations on his appointment as President of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. It was further agreed that Mr. Teron, as requested, be relieved of his duties as Chairman of the Building Committee and membership on the Investment Committee.

MINUTES:
The minutes of the previous (247th) meeting were circulated to the members prior to the meeting. It was agreed that the minutes as circulated be approved.

RELATIONS WITH THE GOVERNMENT:
The President reported on the current status of talks with the Minister of Colleges and Universities and explained that Mr. Allan Gordon, Assistant Deputy Minister, would be visiting the University for the purposes of these discussions in the next few days.

FACULTY SALARIES:
In response to a request for information at the last meeting of the Board, Dean Wendt outlined the reasons for the setting of the appointment salaries for a faculty member who is a member of a profession.

APPOINTMENTS, LEAVES, ETC.:
It was agreed, upon recommendation of the President, that the academic appointments, leaves, etc., contained in Confidential Appendix A be approved.
DEAN OF GRADUATE STUDIES:
The President reported that the Selection Committee established for the position of the Dean of Graduate Studies had reported their conclusions to him at 9:30 this morning. He indicated to the Board that as a result of these conclusions and the requirement for certain consultations and negotiations to take place, that he was unable at this time to bring forward a specific recommendation. He indicated, however, that it was highly desirable to have the appointment confirmed prior to June 30, which was the time that Dean Ruptash would be stepping down from office.

At the President's request it was agreed that the Executive Committee be authorized to make the appointment on behalf of the Board. It was understood that it was expected that such appointment would be made prior to the end of June.

COMMUNICATION WITH THE GOVERNMENT:
It was agreed that the report made by the President about this item be received. This report is contained in Confidential Appendix B.

STAFF CHANGES:
The staff changes were circulated to members of the Board prior to the meeting and are attached as Confidential Appendix C. It was agreed that the staff changes as presented be approved.

MEETING OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL RELATIONS:
Mr. Larose reported that the preparatory work necessary for this meeting had not been completed but that it was planned to have this meeting, which concerned the role and function of the Personnel Office at the University, during the first week of July.

APPOINTMENT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE:
It was agreed, on recommendation of the Chairman, that the following persons be appointed to the Nominating Committee for this year:

Dr. J. L. Gray, Chairman
Dr. G. Herzberg, Chancellor
Dr. M. K. Oliver, President
Mr. C. Kelley
Dean H. H. J. Nesbitt
Mr. D. Ross
Mr. H. Soloway

ACAP ASSESSMENTS:
The President reported on the continuing activities of the Council of Ontario Universities concerning the process of review of graduate programmes by discipline by the ACAP. He explained that in about 1968, the government became quite concerned with the explosive growth in graduate programmes in the university system of Ontario. This cause for concern had stimulated the Council of Ontario Universities to establish a procedure by which all graduate programmes in the Province would be assessed.
by a committee of experts appointed by the Council. This committee of experts would draw their members, for the most part, from institutions outside the Province and would be involved in the assessment by discipline of the number of places required throughout the system as a whole and for each university and relate this to the capacity of the institutions to provide the required number of places for the defined demand.

The President explained that while in 1968 it looked from the projection of growth in graduate work that there would be a heavy demand on the provincial treasury to fund the graduate work then expected, that it now appears that the pressure of this growth will not come to pass and thus the problem is less critical than it once was. He noted that six of these assessments have been completed to the stage that the committee of experts have presented their findings to the institutions involved for comments on the findings and that ACAP has forwarded their recommendations to the Council. He further explained that the impetus for continuing with the procedures are two-fold. One is that the universities themselves feel that it is necessary for them to develop mechanisms which can be used so that the universities, by a co-operative effort, maintain the initiative in planning and, secondly, that the government still, as a means to control growth, retain an embargo on new graduate programmes which will not be lifted until an assessment and planning mechanism has been developed.

The President explained that this first experience with system-wide assessments is still in the developmental stage and that recent discussions with COU have indicated some concern with the method now chosen. He reported that at its last meeting on Friday, June 22, the principle item had been to receive the first six reports and to establish what should be done about their conclusions. He reported that the Council members had expressed concern that while the committee of experts represented highly qualified people in terms of assessment of the academic worth of programmes, that they did not enjoy a similar reputation in expertise as manpower assessors. This, he reported, caused difficulty for the Council in that it felt it not appropriate to communicate the recommendations concerning the number of places required to the Province in the terms as set in the recommendation, that is, as a quota for the system as a whole and then specific quotas for individual institutions. They did, however, agree to transmit the information in terms of planning target figures for the system as a whole, but not to break this figure down in any form by institution.

He pointed out that one of the functions of the Assessment Committee had been to advise as to whether or not graduate programmes at individual institutions should be: (i) commenced; (ii) expanded; (iii) contracted, or (iv) discontinued. He pointed out that in the cases where recommendations had been received for the discontinuance of programmes that the Council had felt that before this information be communicated to the government that the programmes concerned should be reassessed. He explained that part of the reasoning for this was due to the disagreement by the universities concerned
that some of the methodologies used by the Assessment Committee could be argued with, particularly some of them in which one of the basic criteria had been that it was necessary to have a certain size of department and student body before good graduate work could be supported.

He concluded his remarks by indicating that what was happening now was that COU was reviewing the methods of assessment and that the disadvantage appeared to be that it was a very expensive and cumbersome system. Also, in light of the reduction of pressure, and for financial reasons, there may be a more simple process. An additional disadvantage of the present method is that information which has not been formally ratified, but may become public, about the quality of departments may be adversely affecting some universities before a final judgment is reached. It was pointed out that a modification by which the system was limited to assessment might have the same influence on numbers, and this could be achieved with less difficulty.

The report of the Advisory Committee on Academic Planning to the Senate about the advisability of commencing a Master's of Journalism programme at Carleton was distributed to members at the Board meeting and is attached as Appendix A.

Dr. Love led the discussion and answered questions related thereto, and in reply to some of the questions raised he explained:

(a) that there was an increased demand for Journalism education in the country, so that there would be sufficient students in terms of available applicants;

(b) that the Senate of the Federal Parliament Committee on Mass Media had indicated a substantial requirement for improved Journalism education;

(c) that the teaching resources at the University were available to staff such a programme;

(d) that the change in Director of the School would not adversely affect the implementation of the programme;

(e) that the marginal cost of the programme should be adequately recovered by the income received from the students, provided the Provincial Government approved the programme for grant purposes.

It was agreed, upon the recommendation of the Senate, that the University undertake a Master's of Journalism programme as recommended.
The President expressed to the Board his sincere gratitude for their assistance and cooperation during his first year in office.

A letter from Dr. MacDonald, Executive Director of the Council of Ontario Universities, with a memorandum from the Clerk of Senate, was circulated to members of the Board prior to the meeting and are attached as Appendix B. In addition, a letter from the Minister of Colleges and Universities to Dr. MacDonald about this subject was circulated at the meeting and is contained in the same appendix.

The President explained that COU have been concerned about the alleged use of scholarship money for recruiting purposes and had asked the Board of Governors of provincially supported universities to agree to a procedure by which the provincial operating support grant for students who had changed their first choice of university after May 18, 1973, be transferred to the institution to which the student had indicated as his first choice prior to that date, be accepted by all institutions. The President reported that the Senate, after considering the proposition, had indicated that it felt that it was not an appropriate response to the problem, firstly, because students may change their choice of institution for reasons other than that they have been offered a scholarship from one institution or another and, secondly, the awarding of scholarships should not be made on the basis of a priority of choice indicated by the student on his application form and, thirdly, because the Senate did not feel it desirable for the universities to ask the government to police their system decisions.

The President further reported that the government had expressed similar concerns as outlined in the Minister's letter and that, according to information he had received, it seemed unlikely that other Boards in the Province would accede to the request as set out by COU. The Board, after confirming its previous position that scholarship money should not be used in competitive recruiting, and after stating that it encouraged the University collectively to devise more appropriate methods of controlling such activities, agreed not to ratify the proposal as contained in Dr. MacDonald's letter.

Mr. Larose distributed at the meeting a letter from the President addressed to all members of the Pension Plan and a back-up letter about the proposed changes and ballot. This material is attached as Appendix C. Mr. Larose explained that since the last meeting the staff and the consultants had prepared the material that had been distributed to the Board and had presented it to the Staff Welfare Advisory Committee. The material was also distributed to each member of the plan. He further explained that between now and July 6 members of the staff would be available to answer
PENSION PLAN (CONTINUED):
questions that any member of the plan might have, and that on June 29, it was proposed to have an open meeting to which all members of the plan would be invited and at which time the pension consultants would be available to answer any questions about the proposed plan. Each member of the plan, it was explained, would be given a ballot and asked to indicate his preference for the old plan or whether a new plan should be adopted. These ballots are to be returned by July 6, with results known by July 13.

Members of the Board questioned the desirability of implementing the plan without a longer period for explanation and response to questions, and giving members of the plan a longer time to discuss and assess the merits. Concern was also expressed that it would not be possible, because of holidays, to reach a sufficient number of the faculty and staff. In response to this it was explained that every effort would be made to reach each member of the plan and that it was highly desirable that if the new plan were to be adopted, that it should be adopted before the end of July so that those people that were retiring this year could be included in the benefits.

The Board received the information and agreed that a joint meeting of the Staff Welfare Committee and Executive Committee would review the results of the ballot and at that time would be authorized to decide whether or not the new plan should be implemented.

BURSAR'S REPORT:
This report was distributed at the meeting and is attached as Appendix D. It was agreed that the report as presented be approved.

PROPOSED DATES FOR NEXT YEAR'S MEETINGS:
The proposed dates for next year's meetings were circulated to members of the Board prior to the meeting. It was agreed that the dates as circulated be approved. (Attached as Appendix E)

TERMINATION:
The meeting terminated at 6:45 p.m.